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On September 16, 1935, the Reich minister for public enlightenment and propaganda in Nazi Germany, Joseph Goebbels, had a special occasion to praise his Führer for giving a masterly example of rhetoric at that year’s Party Congress in Nuremberg. Hitler had just introduced the race laws “for the Protection of German Blood and Honor” that would provide the formal basis for stripping Jewish Germans of their civil rights and nationality. Goebbels hailed Hitler’s speech as exemplary because it announced the hitherto most stringent and menacing anti-Jewish measures by way of a drip-feed tactic:

If my propaganda leaves no doubt that the Jews have absolutely nothing to lose—well, then it can come as no surprise if they fight! … You have to always leave the ending open … just as the Führer did in his masterly speech yesterday: ‘We hope that the laws concerning the Jews have opened the chance for a tolerable relationship between the German and the Jewish people …’ (laughter). That’s what I call skill! That works! … If you leave a little chance open to them, then the Jews will say, ‘Hey, if we start atrocity propaganda from outside, it’ll be worse, so let’s keep quiet, and maybe we can go on after all’ (laughter, applause). And, above all, they won’t run away.

As Goebbels’s audience—the National Socialist propaganda officers from all Reich districts—showed by their knowing laugh-
ter, they were fully aware of the ultimate objective of the government’s policy, namely to rid Germany of all Jews. Nor did they have any illusions about the fundamental mendacity of their Führer’s hypocritical reassurances about a “tolerable relationship between the German and the Jewish people.” What mattered to them and to Goebbels was the efficiency of lying and pretending that there was still a glimmer of hope for Jews in Germany while they still had a chance to fight back or leave; once they were entrapped and helpless, this pretence would no longer be necessary.

As we know, the lie, in conjunction with other factors, succeeded in preventing about 50% of pre-1933 German Jews from leaving Nazi Germany until the outbreak of World War II. How was it possible to maintain such a pretence, given that even by the time of Goebbels’s 1935 praise of Hitler’s rhetoric, an official nationwide anti-Jewish boycott had already taken place, and Nazi state propaganda had been shouting from the rooftops “perish, Judah” for more than two years? Furthermore, this lie was to be maintained in the following years leading up and even subsequent to the “Crystal Night” pogrom of November 9 and 10, 1938, when the chief national daily newspaper, Völkischer Beobachter (People’s Observer), still claimed that “not a single hair had been touched on a Jewish head.”

Such brazen denial could hardly be an efficient attempt at covering up the murderous violence against Jews vis-à-vis either the German or the world public. Rather, it made the victims and their treatment, in the words of the historian Marion A. Kaplan, “into the object of a general, hateful taboo” and the genocide campaign into a strange “open secret” that was known but unspeakable. A taboo is not a simple secret to be covered up by a simple lie, but instead, a “reflective” secret that turns on itself: even its status as a secret is, officially, secret. A taboo is, at the same time, a prohibition of certain actions or perceptions concerning socially exceptional persons or things and a meta-prohibition, a prohibition of its own mentioning.

In the case of the “Holocaust taboo,” its public non-communicability seems to have lasted not only through the war but continued, albeit in an altered form, for several decades afterwards in the German public. Up to the days of the 1960s protest move-
ment and the impact of popular TV accounts, the Holocaust remained a shameful taboo covered up by the conceit that the details of the genocide were not known or unimaginable to the vast majority of Germans. Hitler and the other Nazi leaders’ repeated announcements of the impending “annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe” that had, it was claimed, not been taken seriously or literally but only as wild rhetoric and figurative bravado.

The publication of detailed secret reports on popular opinion and discontent by Nazi Germany’s interior security services (GESTAPO, SD) and by the clandestine Social Democratic resistance movement (SOPADE), as well as secretly recorded German POW conversations in allied camps and many private diaries since the 1980s, have exposed this pretence of ignorance among a greater part of the population about the genocide as a deception. Many people who later claimed to not have “known” about the genocide and to have understood Hitler’s imagery as being “just rhetoric” did in fact know and were worried about retribution; thus, the Allied bombing campaign and Soviet war atrocities were often interpreted as revenge for “what we have done to the Jews,” which was known partly from personal experience or eyewitness accounts and partly based on conjecture. What impact, then, did the Nazis’ Holocaust rhetoric have on the Germans’ collective psyche?

One might speculate that the presentation of the genocide as a “therapy-by-way-of-parasite annihilation” was understood as verbal camouflage, similar to the special vocabulary of SS reports that counted mass murder scores under the headings “deportation,” “special treatment,” or “final solution.” However, such camouflage terms were employed by people who knowingly committed crimes and atrocities and wanted to cover them up in their documents in case “unauthorized” readers saw them. Such deliberate obfuscation tells us little about how the Shoah was perceived by the German public and entered its collective psyche. In contrast to these deliberately vague and misleading cover terms, the genocide imagery of Nazi propaganda was excruciatingly crass and concrete. Its paradigm, as outlined in Hitler’s Mein Kampf (1925-26) and reiterated with few alterations until 1945, was a metaphorical scenario in which Jews were depicted as “disease-carrying parasites” that had infected and were continuously poisoning the nation’s “body.”
Hitler saw himself as the only competent healer who, according to his own accounts, had already largely achieved the isolation of the parasite at a national level by 1939. However, other European nations were still being infected and, as a result, turning into Germany’s enemies. Therefore, as Hitler announced in his “prophecy” speech of January 30, 1939, the Jewish parasite race had to be prevented from ever poisoning any nation. It had to be annihilated. This scenario included an event schema of infection-crisis-therapy with the antagonists, the parasitic Jewish enemy-race and the healing agent, i.e. Nazi-led Germany, as its main participants. Its outcome was to be an apocalyptic confrontation in which Nazism would rid Europe and, generally, the world, of the parasite once and for all.

In the first phase of World War II, this scenario was repeated time and again without changes in speeches, print media, film, educational literature, and even children’s picture books. Hitler proudly reminded the nation of his annihilation “prophecy” in further “anniversary” speeches in 1941 and 1942, indicating that by then its “double promise,” or the elimination of the Jewish parasite and victory in the war, was being implemented: victory was made possible by parasite-annihilation, and the latter would be achieved in a victorious war.

However, after the defeat at Stalingrad in early 1943, which made a German war victory seem less likely, this ritual boasting stopped and was replaced by a defensive justification of the parasite elimination promise as a supposed guarantee against an Allied victory. The enemy nations would surely lose on account of their weakening by Jewish parasites that they were still harbouring and protecting. Not only was this scenario wholly counterfactual in the military-political context of 1943 to 1945, but it was also contradictory as its bifurcated outcome no longer matched the event schema of successful therapy-solution and the feared resurgence of the parasite.

By this time the vast majority of the German population no longer believed in a final victory through “racial therapy” solution and was generally aware of the Jewish genocide being committed, as the evidence from secret opinion reports show. In terms of its metaphorical sense, the parasite scenario had become transparent
and was understood as the Nazi-official way of referring to the genocide. Its purpose was no longer (if it ever had been) to veil the Shoah, nor was it any longer a boastful account of Nazi-Germany’s achievements in parasite-elimination, as in the years 1939 to 1942; rather, it served as a reminder to the German public of what had been committed in their name and with their sufferance, if not active support. In its last uses up to the fall of the Third Reich, the parasite-annihilation metaphor provided a blackmail argument to turn the people into accomplices of the genocide as a public taboo.

Andreas Musolff, PhD, Professor of Intercultural Communication at the University of East Anglia in Norwich (UK) has published on the history of political discourse, metaphor theory, and the history of pragmatics. His monographs include Metaphor, Nation and the Holocaust (2010), Metaphor and Political Discourse (2004), Mirror Images of Europe (2000) and War against the Public: The Language of Terrorism (1996, in German); he has co-edited further volumes on political discourse in Europe as well as articles and book chapters on metaphor theory. He may be reached at A.Musolff@uea.ac.uk.

Angel of Death: Josef Mengele and the Mechanism of Doubling

Victor Meladze—Independent Scholar

In the quest to build a utopian society and advance the cult of science, humans throughout history have often forfeited their consciences for the illusory power of absolute knowledge and world dominance. The ends-justify-the-means calculus has been the central ideological principle of a number of genocidal sociopolitical movements of the last century, Nazi Germany being one key example.

The architects of the Third Reich employed physicians as instruments to conflate racist fantasies with scientific ideas and rationalize genocide as a medical imperative to save Germany, and this decision stands alongside the murderous legacies of Stalin’s Soviet Union and Mao’s Communist China. Dr. Josef Mengele is a prototypical case study of all health professionals engaged in medi-
calized torture and killing in the name of science, national security, and the maintenance of grandiose group purification projects.

The Faustian bargain—or the mechanism of doubling, to use Robert Jay Lifton’s term for a dialectically charged alternate identify formation—was at the core of Mengele’s psychopathological ability to commit atrocities against the prisoners of Auschwitz (Lifton, *Nazi Doctors*, 1986). An assessment of Mengele’s psychobiography can shed light on our own doubling self-processes and those of today’s medical professionals who compromise the Hippocratic Oath by serving as “enhanced interrogation” facilitators (accessories to torture/homicide) for the U.S. military industry.

**A Product of German Childrearing**

Like other Nazi doctors who actively participated in Hitler’s “Final Solution,” Mengele was a product of brutal German childrearing of the late 19th to early 20th centuries. In fact, psychohistorians have gathered sufficient evidence to implicate German childrearing modes of the 18th and 19th centuries as playing central—even causal—roles in the outbreaks of two worldwide wars and the Holocaust. To quote Lloyd deMause, “If German childrearing around 1900 is recognized as a nightmare of murder, neglect, battering and torture of innocent, helpless human beings, then the restaging of this nightmare four decades later in the Holocaust and World War II can at last be understood” (*The Emotional Life of Nations*, 2002).

Although details of Mengele’s childhood are sketchy, the information that is available supports the assertion that most violent and fanatical Nazi party members and supporters came from authoritarian, middle-class homes, not from poverty or low-income families. Mengele was born in 1911, the second of three male siblings, into a financially well-off Catholic family in Günsburg, Germany. His father was an owner of a machine factory and a veteran of World War I, while his mother, like his father, was domineering and controlling in the treatment of her children. Mengele described his mother as “very strict; she treated us severely. She was a woman of strong character” (Gerald Astor, *The Last Nazi: The Life and Times of Joseph Mengele*, 1965). With the information that is available on German childrearing modes of this period (that includes high rates of physical, psychological, and sexual abuse), it
can be assumed, within the limits of statistical certainty, that Mengele underwent some form of neuropsychically damaging treatment by both his mother and father.

Further compounding Mengele’s childhood traumatization was his frail physical health. During his formative years, Mengele was afflicted by a host of illnesses that kept him in bed and house-bound. Hence, his physical ailments placed him in greater dependence on his controlling mother and consequently facilitated maternal engulfment anxieties (the thwarting of individuation and development of a cohesive self).

The absence of his father during World War I also has to be considered in Mengele’s developmental conflicts, which he later sought to repair and restage through heinous crimes against prisoners in Auschwitz. Drawing from his childhood confinement and isolation from other children during bouts of illness and subjugation by authoritarian parents, the unconscious motives of the Nazi doctor, who delighted in choosing the fate—life or death—of concentration camp prisoners, become readily apparent.

**Crimes against Humanity**

Mengele escaped from Auschwitz as the Soviet army was closing in (January 27, 1945) and eventually fled to Brazil where his grave was discovered in Embu (June 6, 1985). Information about his crimes, like those of all notorious figures in history, has been the subject of much speculation and distortion in the popular culture. His story has been examined through scholarly research and spawned a number of film and novel adaptations as well.

Robert Jay Lifton’s analysis of Mengele’s case history is among the finest in the field of social science. According to Lifton’s research and interviews of former Nazi doctors and Auschwitz survivors, Mengele had an obsession with validating Nazi theories of racial hierarchies, where the Aryan race was theorized to be above all other races in bioevolutionary development. For Mengele, Auschwitz provided an ideal environment and population (helpless, imprisoned test subjects upon which to commit crimes without moral or legal constraints) for conducting medical experiments. Mengele was most obsessed with genetic configurations of identical twins and committed a litany of crimes against them under
the guise of medical procedures aimed at advancing scientific and racial theory.

In *The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide* (1988), Lifton examines the confluence of historical, cultural, ideological, individual, and group dynamics that transformed Mengele and other Nazi doctors into methodical “researcher-killers.” Among the psychological dynamics that Lifton traces in his monumental work is the doubling mechanism involved in the structuring of the alternate self, turning “healers into killers.”

**Mechanisms of Doubling**

Lifton identifies five characteristics of doubling that enabled Nazi doctors to commit atrocities while maintaining the intrapsychic and social facade of being healers of humanity.

First, in a manner similar to psychic splitting/dissociation or multiple personality organizations, doubling involves a process between the physician’s “prior self” (like a medical professional who adheres to the Hippocratic Oath and is a loving father and family man) and the “Auschwitz self,” the Nazi doctor who murdered innocent people as part of a larger genocidal project.

Second, doubling is a mechanism of assimilation into a death-dominated milieu. In Auschwitz, for example, all activities/stimuli that Nazi doctors internalized through the psychic-sensory systems were rationalized as being integral components of a greater Nazi vision of purging the world of Jews and other delegated subhuman peoples.

Third, according to Lifton, doubling is most readily embraced by the human organism in extreme situations where immersion in death imagery is unavoidable. It is a psychic survival response of human beings that shapes the mindset that killing others is necessary for the preservation of the self.

Fourth, doubling is a defense against feelings of guilt experienced by people who are involved in acts that grossly violate internalized social norms and mores that comprise the structures of the “good prior self” (morally and ethically sound self-process of people before they committed premeditated murder). The Auschwitz self that was involved in genocide, as an example, was a con-
tainer of the Nazi doctor’s guilt. It was the “evil self” that did the killing and not the “good doctor.”

Finally, there is an unconscious dimension to doubling. Much of doubling takes place outside of conscious awareness of the participants of all group enterprises.

Mengele, according to Lifton, with all of his sadistic, self-absorbed, and destructive psychological traits acquired through childhood trauma, cannot be understood in isolation from the Nazi ideology or “biomedical vision.” Mengele, more singularly than any other SS doctor, internalized the fantasy of being a “biological revolutionary” who was on a mission to remake the German people and the very genetic makeup of mankind (Lifton, *Nazi Doctors*, 1986). In Auschwitz’s torture and death-immersed environment, Mengele found an ideal ensemble of opportunities to give unrestrained expression to his murderous impulses, specifically his need to project his death and annihilation anxieties onto delegated scapegoats.

Lifton’s study of Nazi doctors and the psychology of genocide illuminates the dark and mercurial machinations of the group unconscious. One of the core elements Lifton’s work demonstrates is the disturbing perspective that all humans are susceptible to doubling in the service of evil mass murder. Mengele and other Nazi doctors who actively engaged in the Holocaust were not uniquely diabolical in this regard.

*Victor Meladze is an independent scholar who may be reached at victormeladze@sbcglobal.net.*

**Women, Power, and Hitler’s Killing Fields**

**Rochelle G. Saidel**—Remember the Women Institute

In *Hitler’s Furies: German Women in the Nazi Killing Fields* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt 1963), Wendy Lower quotes a Nazi secretary: “What am I doing here, who am I? What am I doing in this man’s war? Men make war. Men kill. And they need women as handmaidens in their war” (91). The point is well taken, because the men were in power and the women were their power-
less subordinates. However, Lower differs and writes: “Accustomed as we are to thinking of killing, war, and the perpetration of genocide as male activities, in the absence of accessible evidence to the contrary we remain blind to the extent of women’s participation” (140).

Lower’s book is about such female participation, but her sometimes chilling examples of first-degree killing are few and can be seen as exceptions to women’s low-level participation in Nazi mass murder in the East. However, she claims these cases are proof of a sizable number of women in the front lines of mass killing.

While there is new and valuable information about how some women were involved with Nazi ideology, the title is a misnomer. The introduction mentions Erna Petri, convicted with her SS husband of shooting Jews on their estate in Grzenda, then Nazi-occupied eastern Poland. We learn later in the book that she enjoyed shooting Jewish children. From this case and a small number of others, historian Lower writes she “deduced” that “there were plenty of women who killed Jews and other ‘enemies’ of the Reich, more than had been documented during the war or prosecuted afterward” (4). While this may or may not be true, her book does not prove that it is, and she admits that “documented cases of direct killing are not numerous” (4).

Professor Lower states the known fact that “the most powerful agencies, starting with the SS and the police, were the main executors; these agencies were controlled by men but also staffed by women” (5). In other words, women were always subordinate to male superiors, who made the decisions about killing. She interpolates from her estimates of Nazi men and women in the East that in peacetime conditions, there would have been 3,000 female murderers, but adds that in wartime this is an unrealistically small number. There is, however, no way to prove such a number, and given the patriarchal hierarchy of Nazi Germany, the percentage of women as actual killers may be quite small. Lower says of numbers that her so-called “Hitler’s Furies,” who were “zealous administrators, robbers, tormentors, and murderers in the blood lands” (6) were part of at least half a million women who went east during the war. What percentage of this half million were genocidal murderers is an un-
answered question.

As Lower explains, female teachers, nurses, secretaries, and welfare workers, along with spouses, were in the occupied East (Poland, Czechoslovakia, White Russia, Ukraine, etc.), where most of the worst crimes occurred. However, this does not mean they carried out or even were involved with the crimes, except perhaps on the lowest bureaucratic levels. Their presence in hospitals, schools, and offices in the East does not exactly put them in the killing fields. Presenting examples in her categories of women, Lower mentions Ingelene Ivens, a teacher sent to Poland. Ivens later wrote of her experience and does not seem to have been a killer. As described in the book, she and other teachers may have been less than perfect, and some may have even witnessed atrocities, but this did not make them killers.

Regarding nurses, most that she mentions worked in military hospitals or homes for wounded soldiers, and have no place in this book. Only one, Pauline Kneissler, was a bonafide nurse-killer who took part in the Nazi euthanasia program, assisting at killing centers in Germany like Hadamar for those deemed unfit. The farthest east she was posted was an euthanasia center on the German-Polish border, not exactly the killing fields. When she was later sent to Minsk, it was to tend (and possibly euthanize) German soldiers.

As for the secretaries and wives, there is sometimes an overlap. We meet Liselotte Meier, a secretary and lover of Stormtrooper Hermann Hanweg, who seemed to wield some power in his office; Johanna Altvater, a ruthless secretary to Wilhelm Westerheide whose specialty was killing Jewish children; Josefine Krepp Block, a secretary who married a Gestapo officer and killed children; secretary Gertrude Segel, who married Commander Felix Landau and shot Jews from their balcony; and Sabine Dick, secretary to Einsatzgruppe A killer George Heuser. Dick completed the paperwork for Heuser, who was later convicted in West Germany for the murder of 11,105 people.

Vera Stähli Wohlauf was the wife of Julius Wohlauf, assigned to liquidate the Miedzyrzecz-Podlaski ghetto in August 1942. Vera joined him during the Aktion, allegedly brandishing a whip.
Erna Kürbs Petri, in addition to the killing mentioned earlier, also shot six Jewish boys into a pit. Liesel Riedel Willhaus, wife of Unterstürmführer Gustav Willhaus, like Gertrude Segel, seemed to enjoy shooting Jews from her balcony for sport.

According to Lower, “Thousands of Gestapo secretaries were direct witnesses and administrative accomplices to massive crimes. However, while employed as secretaries, they were not likely to become violent and perpetrate crimes themselves” (61-2). As this was also true of most nurses and wives, the title of the book is rather sensationalistic and misleading. Furthermore, as Lower correctly states, for all of the women she named as killers, “the Holocaust was part of the dynamic of their relationship” (164) with men who were in charge of them, either as their husbands or their bosses. For all these women, they were not acting alone but as part of a couple, either with a husband or male superior, trying to earn his admiration.

Although Professor Lower makes no comment about it, she includes a case that clearly demonstrates that Nazi women were relatively powerless and that some of the unnamed German women in her book were even victims of their own colleagues-in-arms. In a chapter entitled “Accomplices,” she glosses over an incident of the rape of some of these so-called female accomplices by Nazi men. Lower writes: “Under the pretense that there were more reports to be typed, they [German soldiers] dragged women from their rooms and, as another secretary put it delicately, ‘sought our company’” (111). In other words, male members of Nazi execution squads in the East raped German female secretaries, and some German women were victims of their German male superiors.

Yes, there were surely female accomplices to desk murder and worse. Still, the men were in charge, and as Lower admits, the number cannot be known. Her providing the details about eight Nazi women who killed is an important contribution to Holocaust history, but it seems statistically insignificant and cannot prove other German women’s complicity in genocide. Certainly there must have been more than these eight, but the book does not tell us their names or how many of them there were. A lot of extraneous historical material in the book is not unimportant to the study of the Holocaust, but it is not about German women in the killing fields in
Lower’s statement that “genocide is also women’s business” (166) cannot be denied, although I would add that women are not the ones in power during wars and genocides. In fact, during genocides, women have often been especially victimized by men who use rape as a sexualized tool of power. Women have been left out of history in general, and their stories must be told.

I have no interest in defending complicit German women. Nevertheless, I am concerned that Lower possibly exaggerates her case and places in the killing fields a large number of German women who were as innocent as a German citizen could be at the time, or were employed at low-level powerless jobs in the Nazi bureaucracy, or were bystanders, or were helpless witnesses, or were indeed occupied with children, kitchen, and church. She rightly points out that “generalizations about female innocence prevailed” (197) after World War II. However, she seems to be making generalizations about the guilt of German women during the Nazi era.

Rochelle G. Saidel, PhD, a political scientist, is founder and executive director of the Remember the Women Institute in New York City, which focuses on the experiences of women during the Holocaust. She is co-editor of Sexual Violence against Jewish Women during the Holocaust (2010) and author of The Jewish Women of Ravensbrück Concentration Camp (2004). She is also author of Mielec, Poland: The Shtetl That Became a Nazi Concentration Camp (2012), Never Too Late to Remember: The Politics Behind New York City’s Holocaust Museum (1996), and The Outraged Conscience: Seekers of Justice for Nazi War Criminals in America (1985). For contact, see www.rememberwomen.org.

Jews Caught between Hitler and Stalin

Paul H. Elovitz—Ramapo College of New Jersey

To live in East Central Europe in the era of Hitler, Stalin, and the Second World War was unlucky for all people—most especially for Jews. The Nazis were determined to exterminate all
Jews, and the Soviets distrusted Jews because of their association with capitalism (however small in scale), relatives living abroad, and Stalin’s hidden anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism was rampant among the general population, resulting in their killing many Jews upon the arrival of the German armies. My focus is on the two survivors of a family of seven. After describing their early lives and losses in these troubled times, I will discuss some of the psychological legacy of their experiences.

On January 22, 1931, in Soviet Russia (now Ukraine), twin boys Zvi (Gregory) and Zeev (later Vladimir, and finally André) Bukstein were born to their engineer father Isaac and mother Rachel. When the boys were two, their parents, older sister Jaffa, and they slipped over the border, escaping from communist Russia to a town in Poland, where Isaac’s parents lived. Isaac helped to operate two mills owned by his parents, and the family lived comfortably. The children spoke Russian as their first language, Yiddish with their grandparents, and Polish or Ukrainian on the street with their neighbors. In public school, they learned in Polish and went to Hebrew school every day as well.

On August 23, 1939, the foreign ministers of Stalin and Hitler, the two great European mass murderers of the 20th century, signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. Its secret provisions provided for the invasion and destruction of Poland by Germany and Russia. The Buksteins fell into the Soviet-controlled half of Poland, which meant that they did not have to live in the ghettos or wear a Jewish star with the word Jew (Jude) sewn on it. However, they did become casualties of a class war that the communists waged against capitalists, both big and small. The two mills were expropriated, and Isaac and his father were made ordinary workers. After eight months, Isaac Bukstein was arrested as an enemy of the working class and the state and taken away, never to be heard from again by his family. Three nights later, Rachel and her three children were taken from their home to a crowded freight car, to be joined by her in-laws and other class enemies, on a terrible ride to an uncertain life.

The unheated train headed east toward a desolate, unknown region. Its passengers did not know why they were there any more than where they were going. There is little doubt that 40-year-old
Rachel felt her family’s situation could not be worse. Yet, had she lived in the German occupied western sector of Poland, the situation would most likely have been even worse.

Had the Bukstein family not been deported eastward, over a year later the invading Germans would have simply killed them indiscriminately, as they did all Jews upon their entry into Russian-held Poland. In fact, a tourist guide to Holocaust sites in Poland reports 800 Jews in their town were burned to death in a barn by the Germans in August 1941. This is what would have happened. What did happen was terrible, but it may ultimately have saved the lives of the brothers.

Six weeks of misery on the train began a process of reconciliation between Rachel and the elder Buksteins. They had prized their own three daughters and looked down upon the daughter-in-law as not good enough to be married to their only son. On the train and in exile, they would appreciate her treating them as well as she treated her own children. For this elderly couple who spoke broken Russian, Rachel’s perfect Russian and comparative youth were a great advantage in understanding and surviving in a strange and frightening world.

The “Siberia” the nine-year-olds and their family faced turned out to be freezing cold and brutally hot in the summer, semiarid northern Kazakhstan. After a month and a half of living like cattle on the train, the family disembarked in a small village, only to be taken by ox cart to a still smaller hamlet. All the villagers, informed of the new arrival of Jews, came to the station because it was a “novelty to see a Jew.” Life in the hamlet was primitive, since it had small earth huts, no electricity, and no running water. The boys fetched water from the community well, gathered cow dung for heating and cooking, and hated the horrible stench of the latrine in the backyard.

The Buksteins survived in this strange land where winter brought bitter cold and terrible blizzards only because they arrived in May, when the weather was tolerable, and Rachel had been able to bring some valuables that could be traded for food. Of the six family members, she was at first the only able-bodied person, working on the collective farm, picking potatoes in the field, teach-
ing kindergarten, and doing whatever else she was told in order to keep body and soul together. Hunger was the family’s constant companion. The boys continued their study of Russian in a one-room schoolhouse until the age of 12, when they left school to work on the collective farm—making the family’s food allotment less unbearable.

Neither fences nor prison guards held deportees in Siberia or Kazakhstan. It was the harsh climate, great distances between villages, government control of communications, primitive road systems, and village informers that created a sufficient system to control and to hold in all but the most desperate and the most determined. The boys’ grandparents and sister, longing for their life in Poland, thought that anything had to be better than their life in Kazakhstan and escaped, dressed as peasants. Soviet Security Police, then called The People’s Commissariat for Internal Affairs (the NKVD), made frequent visits to Rachel. Attempting to avert suspicion and punishment, she protested indignantly that her husband’s parents had stolen her daughter Jaffa. The catastrophic events of World War II would destroy the escapee’s “best-laid plans” as Germany invaded Russia, bringing the Holocaust to the areas it occupied.

The whereabouts of the escapees remained unknown. The only evidence consisted of several letters from them; the last arrived postmarked from the Russian city of Kazan. It said, “The world is on fire.” In retrospect, it is easy to understand this as a reference to the June 1941 German invasion of Russia, which Soviet censorship prevented them from writing about directly. Censorship also kept Jaffa and her grandparents from knowing the horrors that awaited them if they continued on their quest to return home to German occupied Poland. Subsequently, there is little doubt that they were caught and killed in the Holocaust, although Gregory Bukstein held onto the hope until the end of his life that his sister could somehow have survived.

The greatest tragedy in the boys’ lives was the death of their beloved mother. When the war came to an end in May 1945, Rachel thought of gathering food and religious objects to put together some sort of a belated bar mitzvah ceremony. In search of these, she walked to the next village, about 19 miles away. On the way
home, on December 24th (Christmas Eve), she was overtaken by a blizzard. Her frozen body was found 13 days later. Gregory got some men to help him dig a shallow grave in the rock solid earth, and Rachel’s body was laid to rest. Zeev (later André) was torn with guilt, never forgiving himself for not being present to help bury his beloved mother, because there were not enough rags to cover his feet on that freezing January day. The distraught boys were taken in by a neighbor and felt “completely lost.”

About six weeks after the funeral, the brothers were put on a train back to Poland, since Stalin was returning deported people because he wanted to maintain wartime solidarity with the allies and was courting the favor of the Eastern Europeans. The boys ended up in a temporary displaced persons (DP) camp in Poland after a harrowing experience in which the brothers were almost separated. Representatives of a kibbutz won them over partly with delousing, good food, clean clothes, and clean, separate beds. They had some relatives in Israel and were drawn to the idea of a Jewish homeland. Unfortunately for the brothers’ hopes, the British, who still held a mandate on Palestine, were working to keep survivors from reaching the “promised land” because they feared Arab riots against them and civil war. In 1947, the boys joined over 4,500 children, women, and elderly on the ship Exodus. The British turned the ship away, and the boys went to the uncertain life in a German DP camp rather than accept the offer of French citizenship.

In the following year when the British left Palestine, the Bukstein brothers achieved their goal of being part of the establishment of Israel. Claiming to be a year older than they actually were—and despite their lack of medical training—both were accepted in the Israeli military in the war of independence and served as medics.

Life has a way of taking people in many different directions. Young Gregory (Zvi) “loved medicine very much” and would have been delighted to have made dentistry or medicine his career, partly because many mentors the boys found in the DP camps were medical professionals. Regrettably, since he had no way of financing a medical education, Gregory would make his career first as a government employee in Israel and mostly as a businessman in America. While in Israel, both Buksteins became enthralled with the
arts, leading Zeev to go to Paris for ballet and voice training, where he took the name of André Pascal.

Eventually, both brothers ended up in New York City, sharing a common apartment and collecting art that was subsequently donated to Ramapo College of New Jersey. Gregory made a good living exporting cattle hides to be made into leather in Eastern Europe and Kazakhstan. When André’s show business career began to falter, he came to live with his brother in Manhattan. He found success as a tour guide to Latin America and to China in the early days when the Chinese communists opened up their country to the West.

The trauma of their losses had an enormous impact on their subsequent lives. Neither brother married and André appears to have been homosexual, but I found no evidence that he lived with a partner. Shortly after moving to New York without his brother, while struggling to make himself understood in English, Gregory suffered a panic attack. Establishing a friendship and feeling trusted got him through this ordeal. Friendship was a core value of the two brothers. They clung to each other, tolerating relatively short separations during their business trips to the two great communist countries and surrounding themselves with friends in their lovely apartment in New York.

The psychology of identical twinship was important to their development and survival. They had played “the secret game of twins,” as Gregory called it, by sitting in for each other. However, when André died of cancer in 1992, Gregory’s enormous grief diminished his will to live. Every day he drove to his brother’s grave in Westchester County, and before too many years were up, he joined his beloved brother in death.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, a historian of modern Europe, professor, and psychoanalytic psychotherapist has taught a course on the Holocaust for over 35 years. He taught at Temple, Rutgers, and Fairleigh Dickinson universities prior to becoming a founding faculty member at Ramapo College. In 1999 his college president asked him to write a lengthy pamphlet on the Bukstein brothers to honor Gregory for giving generously to the Ramapo Foundation. He worked closely and cooperatively with his primary source,
Gregory Bukstein, but in the end the donor requested that the pamphlet not be published at that time. Ramapo College Vice President Cathy Davey gave permission to use it in teaching the Holocaust and, this year, to extract parts of it for this article. Professor Elovitz may be contacted at pelovitz@aol.com.

Our Dead Are with Us Forever

Peter Petschauer—Appalachian State University

They inhabit my dreams
with murderous instructions and terrified screams.
They frighten me all too many nights
and hollow out my days—
the people killed in the ’30s and ’40s.

They lie buried in Poland, Germany, and Austria—
and from there to the deepest forests of Siberia.
At work,
when the sun shines on my life,
they are still.
At night,
when the world is still,
they shake off their ashes for a visit.

Germans killed communists, socialists, Gypsies, and Jews—
Russians killed communists, farmers, soldiers, and Jews.
Germany’s number one enemy was Jews and Germans—
Russia’s number one enemy was Russians.

The murdered Jews and Germans understood –
they were the perpetrators’ target.
Knowing themselves different—
they would surely be marked for death.
The Russians killed understood—
the murderers had marked them by mistake.
If only Stalin knew, they told themselves, they would live.
Stalin knew.

Millions went to their deaths—
most without a trial—
without proper food and clothing, alone and in groups. They died in deep forests, in filthy trains, in open fields, in hot labs, at impossible work, marching in the snow.

Families forever scarred—murdered by shots they never heard—suffocating in chambers they never entered. Not understanding why their societies betrayed their own—not knowing the resting place of their beloved.

Germans avoided their crimes until the 1960s—shocked by the projections of their inner evil onto the Other—the gay, the Gypsy, the Jew, the German, the Pole. Russians avoided their crimes until the 2000s—suppressing the evil deeds on their own. With most perpetrators and victims now dead—their misery remains without resolution.

Peter Petschauer, PhD, is a historian of Russia and Germany, prolific scholar, and member of the Editorial Board of Clio's Psyche. As the son of a member of the SS he joins with a Holocaust survivor friend in speaking to young people about the Holocaust and the evil of the Nazis regime. He may be contacted at petschauerpw@appstate.edu.

Observers

Witnessing the Holocaust

David Beisel—RCC-SUNY

Thinking about writing again on the Holocaust, I turn to my heavily thumbed copy of the superb two-volume Library of America collection, Reporting World War II: American Journalism, 1939-1946. Why, I wonder, was I spontaneously reaching for this familiar source instead of looking, as one might expect, at any of the comprehensive collections of Holocaust documents available on my bookshelf?

I think my impulse may contain an intentional hidden message, one revealing an assumption borne out by many scholars that
the Holocaust, no matter the enormity of the event, is not a thing in itself but stands as part of an even larger event, the Second World War. The Holocaust surely deserves studying in itself, yet, it also needs to be seen contextually as part of the larger killing frenzy which gripped the world from 1939-1945.

Our knowledge of that especially horrific part of World War II has advanced incrementally. By breaking Germany’s military code, the British knew about the massive killing of Jews as early as 1940. Reports of the killings of millions appeared in The New York Times in mid-1942. Newsweek, the Saturday Evening Post, and Time magazines carried stories that same year. Edward R. Murrow’s CBS radio broadcast in early December told the world: “What is happening is this. Millions of human beings, most of them Jews, are being gathered up with ruthless efficiency and murdered…The phrase ‘concentration camps’ is obsolete,” he said. “It is now possible to speak only of ‘extermination camps’” (Reporting, I, 454).

By the war’s end, revelations by journalists were coming in from all sides—Dachau, Auschwitz, and Buchenwald—accompanied by astonishing newsreel footage. The Nuremberg trials and the first Holocaust memoirs appeared, soon followed by Anne Frank’s diary and the Broadway play and Hollywood film based on it. Despite this mass of evidence, the fate of Europe’s Jews went largely unnoticed by the general public as information about the slaughter was absorbed into the general category of “Hitler’s victims.” The specific targeting of Jews for extermination was disbelieved, overlooked, and pushed from consciousness and remained absent from general public awareness for a very long time.

Only at the beginning of the 1960s—from the Eichmann trial on—did the Holocaust start to become part of humanity’s larger consciousness. Since then, research has concentrated on many things: organization, procedures and methods, who carried out the killings, how they carried them out, and who knew what when. Attempts have been made to explain what motivated the perpetrators; most rely on traditional themes—ideology, Social Darwinism, rabid nationalism, ingrained anti-Semitism, and racial pseudoscience; all important rationalizations and beliefs to be sure, but only part of the
Psychologists and psychohistorians have made their own contributions. These incremental advancements have slowly broadened our understanding to include other targeted groups—the Roma, Seventh-day Adventists, homosexuals, the mentally and physically challenged, women, and children—extending today to awareness of Nazi plans to exterminate all Poles and the inhabitants of Ukraine and Belarus.

In 1992, pioneering Holocaust historian Raul Hilberg published *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders*. Absent from his title was a group just then coming increasingly into focus: rescuers. Explored in documentaries such as *Weapons of the Spirit* (1989), celebrated in Gay Block’s photo exhibit at New York’s Museum of Modern Art (1992), and written about by scholars such as Eva Fogelman (*Conscience and Courage*, 1994), rescuers were increasingly recognized. What, people now wondered, made tens of thousands of Europeans from varied social, regional, cultural, and religious backgrounds risk their lives by helping Jews? A modest sub-genre of rescuer studies and memoirs has grown up ever since.

This progressive widening of study beyond survivors and perpetrators suggests it may be time to look more closely at the psychological consequences of the Holocaust on a comparatively neglected group—namely, eyewitnesses.

Many who witnessed Nazi atrocities first-hand suffer and continue to suffer from unrecognized and underdiagnosed traumas. Civilians in areas of conflict who observed atrocities, along with liberators, print journalists who saw and reported on the death camps, photojournalists, cameramen who shot newsreel footage, and audiences seeing that footage, were all deeply traumatized by their experiences.

Famous survivors such as Elie Wiesel and Primo Levi sought to escape their Holocaust trauma by continuously writing about it. Primo Levi once told an interviewer: “After Auschwitz, I had an absolute need to write. Not only as a moral duty, but as a psychological need” (quoted in Di Scala, *Europe’s Long Century*, 435). The same held true for many witnesses. Levi’s insight was driven by the need to heal and may reveal an intuitive prescription
for health since multiple studies have shown that writing about a traumatic experience improves the functioning of the immune system.

Dachau, the first and most notorious concentration camp, was established in 1933. While not originally intended as a death camp, many died there. Over time, it began to function like the death camps in the east. When I visited in the late 60’s, I imagined I could still smell the stench of death in the ovens.

War journalist Martha Gellhorn was one of the first to report on Dachau, recounting in a piece for Colliers (June 23, 1945) how, upon leaving Germany on a plane with U.S. soldiers, “One of the men said suddenly: ‘We’ve got to talk about it, see? We got to talk about it if anyone believes us or not.’” Gellhorn went on to describe her own indescribable experience:

Behind the barbed wire and the electric fence, the skeletons sat in the sun and searched themselves for lice. They have no age and no faces; they all look alike and like nothing you will ever see if you are lucky. We crossed the wide, crowded, dusty compound between the prison barracks and went to the hospital. In the hall sat more skeletons and from them came the smell of disease and death. They watched us but did not move: No expression shows on a face that is only yellowish stubbly skin stretched across bone. [A survivor]…was found under a pile of dead. Now he stood on bones that were his legs and talked, and then suddenly he wept. ‘Everyone is dead,’ he said, and the face that was not a face twisted with pain and sorrow or horror. ‘No one is left. Everyone is dead. I cannot help myself.’

Perhaps his body will live and take strength, but one cannot believe his eyes will ever be like other people’s eyes (Reporting, II, 724-5).

Those eyes were in fact Gellhorn’s eyes. Dachau, she said, changed “how I looked at the human condition, the world we live
in.” She planned to write a novel about the concentration camps in order to exorcize Dachau’s memory by what she called an act of “willed forgetting.” According to her biographer, it failed: Dachau was Gellhorn’s “own point of no return.” The novel she wrote, The Wine of Astonishment, “did not relieve Martha of Dachau. She remained haunted by what she had seen all her life” (Selected Letters of Martha Gellhorn, 175-6).

The same was true for author J.D. Salinger. Going through five major battles in 11 months, Salinger, like Gellhorn, witnessed many scenes of horrific suffering and death. Like her, he undoubtedly suffered traumatic insult from those pre-Dachau experiences. “You never really get the smell of burning flesh out of your nose entirely,” he said, “no matter how long you live” (quoted by David Shields and Shane Salerno, Salinger, 158).

For Salinger, as for Gellhorn, Dachau was the tipping point, an emotional burden he could no longer endure, the last straw. His handwriting, according to his daughter, “became something totally unrecognizable.” Soon after witnessing Dachau, Salinger “checked himself into a Nuremberg civilian hospital, a psychiatric casualty of the war’s final revelation” (Salinger, xvi).

Numerous observations by historians, friends, and acquaintances sprinkled through the companion book, which accompanies the film Salinger (2013), corroborate Dachau’s lasting impact on him and demonstrate how Dachau merged with other war traumas to be repeated in his famous novel. “The Catcher in the Rye,” Shields and Salerno say, “can best be understood as a disguised war novel.” As for his later Nine Stories, “the ghost in the machine is postwar trauma” (Salinger, xvi).

Dachau devastated Hollywood director George Stevens, too. Stevens had achieved fame in the 1930s by directing a series of romantic comedies. In the Second World War he headed up a film unit for the Army Signal Corps, and found himself at Dachau in April 1945. Stunned and sickened by what he saw, he nevertheless spent several weeks compulsively filming mounds of corpses and skeletal survivors. After that, according to the New York Times: “The traumatized Stevens was artistically paralyzed for a long time” (March 3, 2014, C4). He drank heavily. It was years before
he made another movie, never returning to the kind of frivolous comedies he had directed before.

Foreign journalists must be counted among traumatized witnesses of the Holocaust, such as the Soviet Union’s Vasily Grossman, who tried mastering the trauma of the death camps by reliving it through his writings, such as his novel *Life and Fate* (*New York Review of Books*, 2006). Included among the stunned witnesses are radio journalists such as Edward R. Murrow, whose broadcast description of a visit to Buchenwald contains the well-known line: “For most of it I have no words” (*Reporting*, II, 865).

Accompanying Murrow on that visit was journalist Bill Shadel. He recalled: “Ed was white, shaken, disturbed, angry, seething.” Murrow told a friend: “I knew then I was going to be sick.” While they were at Buchenwald, Sergeant Fred Friendly, who was to become Murrow’s producer and collaborator at CBS, “was making a similar discovery in another quarry of death—Mauthausen concentration camp in Austria” (Ann M. Sperber, *Murrow: His Life and Times*, 249, 251, 253).

At the same time, Allied Commander-in-Chief Dwight Eisenhower was in Ohrdruf concentration camp; he was accompanied by generals Bradley and Patton. He deliberately prolonged his visit for two hours “to be in a position,” he said, “to give first-hand evidence of these things.” Later, Bradley reported Ike had turned pale and silent. Eisenhower himself admitted that what he was seeing “was so overpowering as to leave me a bit sick,” but nevertheless pressed on while the usually tough-minded Patton was throwing up behind a shed (Bradley, *A Soldier’s Story*, 539; Michael Hirsh, *The Liberators*, 99, 101).

Regular GIs were also overwhelmed by what they were finding in the camps. Studies have shown that people who experience an earlier trauma are more likely to be traumatized by a later event, one which may not have the same traumatic effect on others. Others show that people who experience one trauma after another often become increasingly desensitized to the next trauma. Both things held true for witnesses in World War II.

Massive anecdotal evidence from the scholarly literature shows that liberators traumatized by the unimaginable horrors of
the war were nevertheless particularly shocked by the camps. A friend, psychoanalyst Morty Goldstein who lost a thumb in the Battle of the Bulge as an 18-year-old, once told me that of all the things he witnessed in the war, it was the camps he could never forget. Scenes and smells from the camps are vividly remembered by liberators some 50 or 60 years later and sometimes bring on impacted tears. Robert Abzug’s *Inside the Vicious Heart* (1985) and Michael Hirsh’s *The Liberators* (2010) vividly describe these reactions. Both are rich factual repositories awaiting deeper psychological analysis.

Liberators from other armies—the British, the French, the Canadians, the Russians—need to be acknowledged, too. Witnessing should extend to German soldiers as well, but this does not exonerate the German army. Long ago historians such as Omer Bartov dispelled the myth of the “clean Wehrmacht.” It has since been understood that the Nazis found many ordinary men to serve as willing executioners. Wehrmacht units, not just the SS, participated in the mass killings of Jews, considering it part of their normal daily “work.”

Nevertheless, the conversations of German POWs secretly recorded in Britain and the U.S. from 1942 to 1946 reveal that many officers and men who saw the killings but were not involved in them were shocked and outraged by what they saw. Some, like Axel Freiherr von dem Busshe, were compelled to join the anti-Nazi resistance. The long-term emotional scarring on all of these witnesses needs studying.

One must also bring into the mix Holocaust witnesses from Eastern Europe, such as those interviewed by the French priest, Fr. Patrick Desbois, for his study *The Holocaust by Bullets* (2008). The horror of industrialized killing has focused public attention on the death camps—Auschwitz as the central iconic symbol—and away from the killing fields and killing forests of eastern Europe where “only” hundreds of Jews were slaughtered at a time. Fr. Desbois has sought to make up for this by identifying and excavating those neglected sites and interviewing surviving civilians in order to preserve a record of what happened.

The film, *Hitler’s Hidden Holocaust*, based on Desbois’
book, aired on the National Geographic channel. Two excerpts are posted on its website. (Those with strong stomachs can view the entire film on YouTube.) Here, one can witness the reactions of witnesses who are finally able to share their stories. “The children, the children,” sobs one woman, releasing a bit of the traumatic memory stored away for so long. One commentator observes that by helping witnesses unpack their memories, Fr. Desbois is “offering them an opportunity for confession.” Just witnessing such trauma left bystanders feeling sinful.

In addition, Holocaust trauma periodically reaches up to unexpectedly impact people in inadvertent ways. A teaching colleague (also a practicing psychotherapist) recently told me of a client who, after months of treatment, suddenly revealed she was a Holocaust survivor, then used the full session to describe in graphic detail what “really went on” in the cattle cars on the way to the death camps. After the session, my colleague told me, he rushed from his office to vomit on his office steps.

This is not unusual. Historians, such as Hitler biographer Sir Ian Kershaw, have often reported being so moved when dealing with Holocaust documents they had to stop what they were doing and leave the archives for a breath of fresh air. Psychiatrist and psychohistorian Robert Jay Lifton reports needing to find ways to decompress, to cope with the flood of emotions assaulting him every day as he researched The Nazi Doctors.

To what extent these observers are being traumatized is an open question, yet it is well to remember psychologist Inna Gaisler-Salomon’s recent reminder that “stress experienced during a person’s lifetime is often correlated with stress-related problems in that person’s offspring—and even in the offspring’s offspring. Perhaps the best studied example is that of the children and grandchildren of Holocaust survivors. Research shows that survivors’ children have greater-than-average chances of having stress-related psychiatric illnesses like post-traumatic stress disorder even without being exposed to higher levels of stress in their own lives” (New York Times, March 9, 2014, Sunday Review, 12)

The evidence shows that the trauma of witnessing extends across the generations, embracing those who continue to witness
secondhand. This includes scholars, therapists, and the children and grandchildren of survivors, as well as people encountering the Holocaust through visits to museums, in photos, in scenes on television, in movies and novels, and by attending annual memorials. Psychologists and psychohistorians need to continue to address what such traumatized witnesses may mean for social, political, and interpersonal relations, as well as the ongoing potential for traumatic reenactments.

David R. Beisel, PhD, teaches history and psychohistory at SUNY Rockland. As an Editorial Board Member of Clio’s Psyche, he has written on a wide variety of topics in American and European history. His new book, On Nazi Evil, is scheduled for release this fall. He can be reached at dbeisel@sunyrockland.edu.

Pope Pius XII, the Dogma of Mary’s Assumption, and the Holocaust

Daniel Rancour-Laferriere—U. of California, Davis

Eugenio Pacelli (1876-1958) was raised in a devout Roman Catholic family with strong ties to the Vatican. In a recent biography, Robert A. Ventresca notes that the level of Marian devotion in the Pacelli family was high. Eugenio and his three siblings were all given the middle name “Maria.” The family prayed the rosary together every day. Eugenio, however, was the most devoted “mariophile” in the family. He spent hours at a time alone in a certain chapel in central Rome. Responding to a question from his mother about what he was doing there all that time, Eugenio responded, “I pray, mother, I tell the Madonna everything” (Soldier of Christ: The Life of Pope Pius XII, 2013, 20).

Fast forward to November 1, 1950, when Pacelli (now Pope Pius XII) bestowed the highest possible honor on the object of his cult devotion. It was the bull titled Munificentissimus Deus, proclaiming the dogma of the “Assumption” of Mary into heaven: “We pronounce, declare, and define it to be a divinely revealed dogma: that the Immaculate Mother of God, the ever Virgin Mary, having completed the course of her earthly life, was assumed body and
soul into heavenly glory.”

This denial of Mary’s death was meant to be taken very seriously: “If anyone, which God forbid, should dare willfully to deny or to call into doubt that which We have defined, let him know that he has fallen away completely from the divine and Catholic Faith” (Papal Teachings: Our Lady, 1961, 320). Adding to the gravity of this mariophile fantasy is its unique status in the history of the Roman Catholic Church: *Munificentissimus Deus* is the one infallible *ex cathedra* pronouncement made by any Pope on any topic since the doctrine of papal infallibility itself was proclaimed in 1870.

What might have been the Pope’s motive for making such a strong declaration about a Jewish woman named Mary—just five years after the Holocaust? As is generally known, Pius XII, head of Europe’s largest Christian denomination during the Second World War, kept silent as some of his fellow Christians slaughtered six million Jews. Pius was updated by his many contacts throughout Europe about this genocide as it progressed. Pius did manage—quietly—to save some Jews during the war. However, he did not have the courage to say in public what many were waiting to hear; that is, a loud and forthright denunciation of the Holocaust in progress (Ventresca, 169-218).

All those many Jews perished but for Pius, it seems, this one Jew Mary, the mother of his God Jesus Christ, must not perish. Indeed, we search the bull in vain for any admission that Mary actually died. It was enough for Pius to deny Mary’s death by getting her “assumed” directly into heaven so that she could join Christ, who had already arrived there after dying for the sins of all humankind.

The academically-inclined Pius worked diligently on the background research for his bull. He studied many texts from many historical periods, the most important being works by the Greek Fathers about the *Dormition* (Mary’s “falling asleep,” the Eastern Orthodox equivalent of the Assumption).

For example, in his first homily on the *Dormition*, Germanus of Constantinople (d. before 742) insists that Mary is not dead: “Far be death from you, Mother of God…Far be the grave
from you...Far be dust from you...” and so on, in a cascade of de-
nials. In his second homily on this topic, however, Germanus ad-
mits that Mary is at least temporarily dead. This is a problem, and
the problem is exacerbated by what happens as the Twelve Apos-
tles are carrying Mary’s dead body on a bier to the sarcophagus:

A certain foolish member of the unbelieving Jewish
people—for they are a ‘vanity of vanities’ (Eccl
1:2), always giving offense and always ready for a
quarrelsome argument—reached out his lawless
hand (for Scripture says, ‘In these hands there is al-
ways iniquity’ [Ps 25:2]), and shook the pallet that
served as her bier, daring to molest the body of the
immaculate one and not fearing even to throw to the
ground the fleshly throne of the Most High. Imme-
diately his hands were cut off, and he became a
dreadful example to the Jews, who are always so
aggressive against Christ.

Another version of this legend (by John of Damascus, d.
either 749 or 753) is not as rabidly anti-Jewish, and has what from a
Christian viewpoint is a “happy” ending: “the perpetrator of this
dreadful deed...changed his mind and began to believe, and was
converted,” so that he “was brought in an instant from being mutil-
ated to having healthy hands again” (all translations by Jesuit
scholar Brian E. Daley in *On the Dormition of Mary: Early Patris-

As Stephen J. Shoemaker has shown, the great majority of
the early Dormition narratives (in many languages) feature a Jew
who attacks Mary as her body is being carried to the tomb (“‘Let
Us Go and Burn Her Body’: The Image of the Jews in the Early
There are also visual representations of this scene, which go back to
the ninth or tenth centuries, and which may be found to this day in
both Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox contexts (see Figure 1).
Shoemaker observes that the attack by the Jew is often part of an
imagined plot by Jewish leaders to obtain Mary’s body and burn it,
so that no relics would remain for Christians to use for making
miracles. The miracle in this case is the very restoration of the
chopped off hands of the Jewish attacker. It was believed that such
miracles could win converts in the form of defectors away from the Jewish faith (Shoemaker, 799-800).

Figure 1. A Jew Attacks the Bier of Mary, and His Hands Are Cut Off. Orthodox Church of Greece, Mēnaion (1982), cover illustration (detail) for vol. 8.

Pope Pius XII has to have been aware of the anti-Jewish motif in the Dormition traditions, for (among other reasons) he quotes both Germanus of Constantinople and John of Damascus in his bull of 1950. Both of these Church Fathers had related the tale of a Jew attacking Mary’s bier. Of course, Pius does not quote any specifically anti-Jewish passages in the bull, for they would not directly support his positive message about Mary being taken up into heaven, and in any case there was no need to bring up negative Jewish images right on the heels of the Holocaust. (Pius had the tact of the professional church diplomat he was—Papal Secretary of State—before becoming Pope in March of 1939.)

The wicked Jew who tried to upset the funeral bier must have been perceived by Pius as interfering with Mary’s escape from death, an escape which Pius was trying to secure in the form of an infallible church dogma about Mary’s Assumption, body and soul, into heaven. That Jews had evil intentions in this matter would not have been surprising for Pius—to his mind Jews were like that. Pius was an ordinary Christian anti-Semite. On every Good Friday of his life as a Roman Catholic priest, for example, Pius recited the traditional paranoid prayer “for the perfidious Jews” (pro perfidis Judaeis). As I have argued elsewhere, anti-Semitism is actually built into Christian scripture. It is also a prominent feature of the writings of church Fathers (the Adversus Judaeos tradition). Before the Holocaust, there is a long history of Christian persecution of Jews—ghettoizations, expulsions, forced baptism, pogroms, and so

The relevance of traditional Christian anti-Semitism to the promulgation by Pius of a new dogma on Mary’s Assumption is this: Jews were trying to interfere with the bodily Assumption of Mary into heaven by destroying her body. They were saying, “Let us go and burn her body,” to quote from the title of Shoemaker’s article.

But consider what informed Catholics like Pius knew in 1950 about the act of *burning already dead bodies*: the bodies of Jews gassed in Auschwitz were burned in crematoriums or open pits. Christians had actually done to Jews what Jews in some of the Dormition traditions allegedly wished to do to Mary’s body. This ironic parallel could not have escaped the (at least unconscious) attention of the Pope, immersed as he was in the task of formulating a dogma which would get Mary—her unburnt body as well as her soul—into heaven. Pope Pius XII may have been partially responsible for the Holocaust of six million Jews in his day. Still, he saw to it, in the form of an infallible dogmatic pronouncement, that there was no holocaust of that very important Jew Mary (the mother of God himself) in her day.

I believe that Pope Pius XII made his dogmatic pronouncement on Mary’s Assumption because he had failed publicly to denounce the Holocaust while it was in progress. The dogma of the Assumption is an intellectualized elaboration of the Pope’s fantasy of rescuing Mary. Perhaps it compensated for the shame of failing to rescue other Jews by speaking up for them. Shame is not guilt, however. I doubt that the dogma was the Pope’s symbolic expression of guilt for hating Jews in the first place, since Pius continued praying the liturgically-mandated prayer “for the perfidious Jews” even after proclaiming his dogma of the Assumption.

Daniel Rancour-Laferriere, PhD, is Emeritus Professor of Russian at the University of California, Davis and the author of numerous scholarly books. He may be reached at: http://Rancour-Laferriere.com.
In Cinema, Photography, and Poetry

Holocaust Documentary Photography: Framing the Visual Discourse

Rachel Youdelman—Forum Research Associate

Since their first publication in 1945 after the liberation of the concentration camps, when Allied commander Eisenhower ordered British and American photojournalists to document what was found, a body of photographic images has circulated in popular media representing evidence of the Nazi extermination of Europe’s Jews. Of the photographs made of the Holocaust, there are three types: those made as documentation or souvenirs by Nazi perpetrators, those made by photojournalists post-liberation, and those made clandestinely by the Jewish resistance.

Why have only certain images evolved from their original contexts as documents of Third Reich business or as documentary news images into culturally entrenched, emotionally resonant canoncic documents of our visual culture? Why in particular have images of Jewish resistance fighters never entered the visual discourse of the Holocaust at a comparable level?

Per Eisenhower’s order, all U.S. military photographers and reporters stationed within 100 miles of Ohrdruf were summonsed to provide coverage. Life Magazine also sent a group of photographers, notably Margaret Bourke-White and Lee Miller. The flood of photos subsequently published authenticated Nazi crimes, instantly galvanized public opinion, and served as evidence during the Nuremberg trials. Over time, however, the body of images—often published without regard to provenance, omitting both attribution and caption—came to be less specifically referential and more “symbolic.” Among millions of photos in a variety of archives over the world, only a few have been repeatedly published, transforming them “from mere photographic trace into icon” (Bathrick, David, Visualizing the Holocaust: Documents, Aesthetics, Memory, 3). What is it about the few continually reproduced images that leads to the transformation into “icon” and a merging into collective memory?
Repeatedly identified as “iconic” are certain Holocaust photographs from two categories: those taken by photojournalists post-liberation intended for publication in a news context; and those taken by Nazis, either in an official capacity by members of the Propaganda Kompanie (PK), by SS troops equipped with cameras, or by individual soldiers seeking personal souvenirs, which were not necessarily intended for publication.

One such representative iconic image is that of a child with his hands raised in surrender in the aftermath of the Warsaw uprising, under guard by German soldiers (see fig. 1, and all photos cited, here: http://grenouille-publique.tumblr.com/#79154646680). A photo made by Nazi officers, likely by PK 689, it appeared as the 12th of 53 such photographs appended to the official report of the 1943 liquidation of the Warsaw ghetto (known as the “Stroop Report” for its compiler, SS officer Jürgen Stroop). Wide critical consensus cites the image as iconic of the era as does public obsession with the disputed identification of the boy reflected in a variety of news stories, books, and documentary films.

“Crowded Bunks in the Prison Camp at Buchenwald” (see fig. 2), so-captioned in a New York Times article of May 6 1945, is another that has entered the canon. The photo is the work of a member of the U.S. Army Signal Corps on April 16, 1945 days after liberation. Elements in the picture allude to familiar Christological iconography: next to emaciated men lying in bunks, a single standing figure bathed in light evokes patient suffering and traditional ecce homo imagery, suggesting resurrection.

Press photographer Margaret Bourke-White’s photos of the liberation of Buchenwald are among the most well-known and widely circulated Holocaust documentary photos. Particularly often published is her photo of a group of male inmates standing behind barbed wire, in striped uniforms and coats (see fig. 3). The central figure, a young man with turned-up collar and a comparatively healthy appearance, makes the image palatable as an icon, that singly represents the scope of Nazi crimes. Palatability is also a factor in the “Warsaw ghetto boy” photo, in that none of the Jewish prisoners are dressed in torn rags or reveal much evidence of severe starvation. As Marianne Hirsch notes, “Other images of emaciated, dirty, visibly suffering children taken in the Warsaw
ghetto have never achieved the same kind of visual prominence of the little boy with his hands up” (qtd. in Richard Raskin, A Child at Gunpoint: A Case Study in the Life of a Photo, 18).

The traditions of the Christian Passion and Crucifixion, of Jewish and Christian martyrdom, and Biblical narratives such as the Book of Job—which reflect the attempt to psychically reconcile the experience of unjustified suffering with belief in God—are resonant myths which are deeply felt, mirrored, reinforced, and sustained through select documentary images of the Holocaust. In this sense, “history conforms with myth” to paraphrase Howard Stein (“The Holocaust, the Uncanny, and the Jewish Sense of History,” Political Psychology, Vol. 5, No. 1, 5-35). Yet Abba Kovner’s injunction to his fellow fighters in the Vilna ghetto, “Let us not go like lambs to the slaughter,” along with the striking and extensive visual record which the resistance movement generated (see figs. 4-10) turns the dominant iconic narrative of patient suffering and subsequent redemption on its head.

Though there is a place for the “resistance” narrative in the collective psyche, it is clear that in the context of the Holocaust, its emotional resonance is lacking. Furthermore, if resistance images had been launched into wide circulation at the same time as the photographs introduced as evidence at the Nuremburg or Eichmann trials, the Allies’ case could have been weakened. Beyond this practical consideration is the timbre struck by the reverberating Judeo-Christian myth of the innocent lamb who must go to his sacrifice uncomplaining. Resistance imagery thus violates the dominant narrative of the Holocaust.

One often hears the question asked rhetorically about the Holocaust, “Why was there no Jewish resistance?” implicating the cultural expectation of passive Jewish suffering. However, in reality, notes Steven Katz of Boston University in his inaugural lecture as the Slater Professor in Holocaust Studies, there was armed resistance in 61 ghettos, armed resistance in five concentration camps, and armed resistance in three death camps. As Katz puts it, these efforts at resistance were remarkable for having been attempted under extraordinary “existential conditions”—the threat of reprisals, the lack of access to arms, the lack of a national army, deliberately misleading information from German officials, an unsympathetic
Catholic church, trucks marked as from the Red Cross delivering Zyklon B gas to the death camps, a consistent lack of assistance from the allied countries, a severe lack of food—all of these factors point to the right question to ask, which Katz asserts is “Why was there so much Jewish resistance?” Tellingly, “Why no resistance?” is not asked of other such groups, suggesting that a variety of emotional projections are directed by the dominant culture upon Jews. As mirrored in the currency of the artifacts of visual culture, Jews historically are not tolerated in the role of resister or aggressor: conventional cultural narrative seems to require Jews to suffer passively.

Within the context of Jewish history, Jews “do not feel the Holocaust of World War II to be unprecedented” but see it on a continuum of slavery, expulsion, exile, and continuous pogroms, or in other words, as “a recurrent historic role” (Stein 6-7). Jews have had centuries of adaptive management of victimization, from the Crusades to pogroms to a variety of expressions of anti-Jewish sentiment; the very valuing of martyrdom itself is an attempt to wrest meaning from these experiences. Reflecting some ambivalence on this score, contentions of Jewish passivity are a significant part of the historiography of the Holocaust—among historians, Raul Hillberg damningly implicates such “passivity,” while Hannah Arendt focuses her critique upon alleged complicity of the Jewish Councils of the various ghettos established by the Germans. Disturbingly, Bruno Bettelheim focuses debate on what is termed the “pathology of the helpless,” going so far as to blame Anne Frank’s death upon her father, because he did not keep a gun.

Underlying these sentiments, propagated by fellow Jews, is an internalization of intense shame. It seems irrational to implicate the victims of a crime, not to speak of the unreasonable expectation that European Jews as a group, fragmented as they were by nationality, language, political affiliation, and so on, should have been armed, organized, and perpetually ready for potential assault from any front. To the dominant culture, the meaning of the Holocaust is reflected in its visual representation, and the body of imagery of presumably passive crowds of Jews going quietly to their deaths would seem to reinforce that sensibility. Martyrdom experienced on a huge scale but reduced to a manageable number via a few rep-
resentative images symbolically serves this function.

“Memory retains only images,” observed Tadeusz Borowski in his darkly eloquent Auschwitz memoir (This Way for the Gas, Ladies and Gentlemen, 97). To be sure, the imagery that constitutes the visual record of the Holocaust has functioned as a kind of pictorial cultural memory. That memory mirrors a collective consciousness which is both driven by and reflects deeply entrenched cultural narrative: photographic images of the Holocaust that have found a lasting place within the collective memory of the dominant culture have been, in a sense, carefully edited for both palatability and exclusivity and have supported traditional Christological iconography, featuring a specific visual vocabulary for the expression of anguish and consequent deliverance through innocent martyrdom. It is the deep emotional resonance of such representation that permits a meshing of the narrative of the anguish of victims of the Holocaust with that of the Christian Passion, albeit mitigated by the dominant culture’s emotional projections upon Jews.

Indeed, in the backlash of the Eichmann trial, William F. Buckley castigated Israel for a “refusal to forgive,” while Anti-Defamation League leaders figured furiously how to mitigate the perception that Jews themselves were somehow responsible for having had these “horrors inflicted upon them,” and especially that the Eichmann trial would “damage the image of Jews as a fair-minded and merciful people” (Peter Novick, The Holocaust in American Life, 130-135). The visual canon of Holocaust photography is thus framed both by hostility to the notion of Jews seeking “vengeance” as well as by cultural myths which support the traditions of Jewish and Christian martyrdom, on a continuum of the culturally pervasive narrative of spiritual redemption through intense suffering.

Rachel Youdelman is a photo editor specializing in researching and licensing fine-art and historical images for editorial and academic publication. She studied post-war Polish poetry (in English translation) and art history at UC Berkeley and is a graduate of the Feminist Art Program at California Institute of the Arts. In 2012, she completed a master’s program in visual studies at Harvard University, with a thesis on Victorian taxidermy. She may be contacted at ryoudelman@gmail.com.
Beyond Expression: On Holocaust Poetry

Juhani Ihanus—University of Helsinki

If we agree with Dori Laub and Nanette Auerhahn that at the core of Holocaust trauma is “the breakdown of the communicative dyad in the internal, representational world of the victim” (“Failed Empathy – A Central Theme in the Survivor’s Holocaust Experience,” Psychoanalytic Psychology, 6, 1989, 380), it may be surprising to find out that German-language poetry written during World War II in National Socialist prisons, ghettos, and concentration camps offers sources for listening to and linking to various individual voices of victims. For a long time, literary studies neglected these “traumatic verses” (see Andrés Nader, Traumatic Verses: On Poetry in German from the Concentration Camps, 1933–1945, 2007). Holocaust studies have gone through changes that have also affected research on Shoah poetry, since anthologies of such poetry began to be published more widely in the 1990s.

The Holocaust has been approached from various perspectives, and it has been imaginatively “produced” in different art forms and media, despite Theodor Adorno, and in his wake, other critics having contradicted the aestheticizing and trivializing of the horror. The unfathomable circumstances of the Holocaust were held to belong to a speechless sphere, unreachable through language. To write poetry “after Auschwitz” was seen by Adorno as a barbaric act. On the other hand, Ruth Klüger, an Auschwitz survivor and author of concentration-camp poetry, maintained that memorizing, reciting and writing poetry in Auschwitz and other concentration camps was an attempt to find comfort and coping through language, “to stem the tide of this senseless and destructive circus” (Klüger, weiter leben: Eine Jugend, 1992, 127).

A new kind of interpretive focus on Shoah poetry was proposed and developed by Andrés Nader. He has applied psychoanalytic views and readings, trauma and PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder) research and theories of mourning when studying the poetic texts of concentration-camp inmates, who had different religious and political backgrounds. Nader does not treat such texts “as the literary equivalent of screen memories” but looks “for the
layers of meaning and fragmentation, for the strategies that enact the narrative” (Nader, “The Shock of Arrival: Poetry from the Nazi Concentration Camps at the End of the Century,” *Poetics Today*, 21, 2000, 160; see also Nader, 2007). Intertwining experiences of injustice, despair, victimhood, shame, humiliation, responsibility, and guilt are combined in concentration-camp poems with various individual needs, self-protective efforts, and imaginary collective leaps from the ash-filled abyss.

Through poetry, the inmates have tried to make sense of their everyday hell and to transform their horror by creating meaning, insight, mental distance, and hope in hopelessness, by giving voice to the voiceless, and by revealing the suffering faces in the faceless world. The personal voice of the victims resonates through the masks of nameless power; *poiesis* (poetry) makes the invisible visible, allows the silenced to become heard. The change in reading and listening to Shoah poetry has involved the shift of focus from a plain human testimony to a more nuanced polyphony of semantic and emotionally tinged episodic (or autobiographical) memory fragments that include individual and collective views, echoes, fantasies and dreams in the middle of deadly realities. For example, in Georg von Boris’s poem (from a slave-labor camp in Bavaria) the question of humanness and humanity is raised in utter despair, “Death lets us live, / That’s just it. / But hunger makes animals of us all. / Are we still human? We – / It’s so disgusting – / We are feeding on corpses” (quoted by Nader, 2000, 181).

In a victim group, difficulties of mourning and working through other shared negative emotions can encrypt the effects of trauma through the whole life span and to the generations to come. The perpetrator group is mostly nameless in Shoah poetry, which does not lessen but actually heightens the perpetrators’ guilt for violence and atrocities and their total numbness in the face of traumatic losses.

Nader mentions that “rather than memories, recollections of the past, poems written in the camps are direct expressions of individual attempts at coming to terms with incomprehensible, traumatic events” (2000, 155). To this proposition can be added that those poems also incorporate flashbulb memories, vivid, detailed, emotionally charged flashes or “snapshots,” experienced as highly
meaningful and truthful, of extreme situations and violent episodes.

We, as readers haunted by these verses, can try to tune in to them, albeit their shots reach toward us from beyond the ashes. Holocaust verses, often in restricted traditional forms and conventional narratives, are condensed life stories and self-stories told by human beings of all ages who had to live at death factories and orient themselves, in spite of the camp chaos, toward their future life projects. These verses live on, memorialized as the expressions of the captive camp mind that refused its restrictions and its forced fate, becoming its own destiny, carrying on its “humiliated memory” and its “ruins” for the freedom beyond the ashes, both metaphorically and literally (Lawrence Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory*, 1991). Spaces of such memory can be our gifts.

After being released on April 27, 1945 from the concentration camp, while most of those nearest to him were killed, Viktor Frankl, the now famous founder of logotherapy, wrote from Vienna September 14, 1945 to Stepha and Wilhelm Börner about the “terrible” and the “inscribable” of the Shoah experience, “So I have now remained all alone. Who has no analogical destiny cannot understand me. I am tired beyond expression, mournful beyond expression, lonely beyond expression. I have nothing left to hope and nothing left to be afraid. I have no more joy in life, only duties. I live on my conscience…” (“Viktor Erich Frankl und Wilhelm Börner: Briefe 1945 bis 1949,” in Georg Gimpl, ed., *Ego und Alterego. Wilhelm Bolin und Friedrich Jodl im Kampf um die Aufklärung. Festschrift für Juha Manninen*, 1996, 398). Frankl had, however, found purpose in his life already in the concentration camp, and after that, in writing and rewriting about the personal sense of meaning in life. He was thus creating not a closure but a relative consolation and further forging of identities against forgetting.

Frankl’s “beyond expression” experience still reverberates in Shoah poetry. Writing one’s camp-self made it possible to express and project a post-camp liberated self. Shoah verses can be seen as the result of expressive, therapeutic and reflective writing in the traumatic environment. These verses still do the authentic service of exploring further our human predicament, and perhaps they
manage to help us in co-constructing our situation for the future.

Juhani Ihanus, PhD, is Adjunct Professor of Cultural Psychology at the University of Helsinki, Adjunct Professor of the History of Science and Ideas at the University of Oulu, Senior Lecturer and Member of the Board of Directors at the Open University of the University of Helsinki, and Contributing Editor of The Journal of Psychohistory. He has published books and articles on psychohistory, cultural and clinical psychology and the history of psychology. He may be reached at juhani.ihanus@helsinki.fi.

Exploring Personal History: Two Films by Diane Kurys

Ida Dancyger—Hofstra University
Ken Dancyger—New York University

French filmmaker Diane Kurys has written and directed two films 30 years apart, Entre Nous (1983) and Pour Une Femme (2013), that directly relate to her personal history: her postwar birth into a Jewish family who survived the war. In Pour Une Femme, the world is an angrier, more dangerous place than in Entre Nous. In the latter film Diane Kurys has downplayed the romantic interpretation of the earlier film. Guilt, aggression, and personal morality all become more acute factors for the filmmaker. Her original story and its circumstances continue to dominate her work over the course of 30 years.

Both films focus on the incompatible marriage of her parents in an internment camp during World War II in the south of France. Although the marriage of these two strangers, both Jews, saves Kurys’ mother, their life together is destined to fail. Mother and father are simply too different from one another. The War and the Holocaust shaped their decisions for survival in the moment, and places the next generation, Kurys and her own life choices in the context of her family history, at the center of these films.

It is clear from the outset in Entre Nous that Lena (Isabelle Huppert) and Michel (Guy Marchand) are mismatched. Lena is young, pretty, and naïve; Michel is older, plain, decisive, and
coarse. Where else but in war, in an extreme life and death situation, could he win a princess? A momentary look between strangers, a bold act/decision, was the turning point of these two lives. To his credit he does save her. However family life in Lyon, after the war, is unstimulating. So Lena seeks out another young mother who seems confident and experienced in life. Their bond is a threat to Michel and an opportunity for Lena. In fact, it’s a lifeline—Madeleine (Miou Miou) offers Lena friendship and eventually love. Lena has not yet known love. The war preempted her adolescence and now as a mother, she knows little of life. The two women, Madeleine and Lena, help each other deal with the traumas of their war experiences. Michel will aid Lena in setting up a business with Madeleine, only to destroy it before it opens. He wants his wife to serve rather than surpass him.

Lena leaves the marriage with their child (who represents Kurys), and in the postscript of the film we learn that Lena enters a lifelong lesbian relationship with Madeleine. This does not mean Lena is liberated from the effects of the war. The trauma remains and no doubt will shape her relationship with her daughter, Kurys. Why else would Kurys return to the same story 30 years later?

In Entre Nous, although the war and the Holocaust shaped Lena’s life, her instinct to survive trumps all else. However, the postwar period offers her a second chance. She makes the choice for love and an unorthodox life style. This young, naïve woman has grown up and exerts her own sexuality and individuality.

Pour Une Femme follows many of the same details. In Entre Nous, Michel (Benoit Magimel) saves Lena (Melanie Thierry), they marry, and have a child in Lyon. Their marriage has limited satisfaction for Lena. Lena does not love Michel. In Pour Une Femme, the transformative character is male, Michel’s brother Jean (Nicolas Duvauchelle). The brothers are now Russian Jews rather than French. Lena’s love affair with Jean will threaten and eventually fracture the marriage.

In this film, the Holocaust and the war have a profound influence on these characters. Michel and Jean have had personal losses due to the war in Russia. Jean has become a killer for the Russian security forces. His personal goal is to kill Nazis, who
killed his parents. His brother Michel is less invested in the past. He wants to get on with a new life in France. Jean offers Lena the kind of love, romantic, and sexual love not present in her life with Michel. Thirty years on, Kurys’ mother’s loved one is now heterosexual, more conformist than in the earlier story.

Although Kurys has framed her mother’s lover in heroic and romantic terms, there is an underlying sadness to her own character, the daughter, Anne. It’s not only the sadness of her parents’ incompatible marriage; it’s also the Holocaust part of her family’s past. Her mother’s life was endangered by being a Jew. She settled for survival and gratitude rather than love in her marriage. She only finds love with an impossible choice, her brother-in-law, Jean, a man clearly shaped and damaged by the war against the Jews. To manage the loss of his own parents, Jean has become an avenger, first in France and eventually in Palestine. Revenge trumps relationships for him. Lena is left to choose unhappiness in the marriage or something unknown outside the marriage. She chooses again for survival, this time perhaps for the sake of her child and this of course has an impact on Diane Kurys.

Kurys eschews the dark tone of other European filmmakers whose films are rooted in World War II and the Holocaust. Roman Polanski (The Pianist, 2002), Agnieska Holland (In Darkness, 2011), and Elem Klimov (Come and See, 1997) are far readier to jump into the pain and consequences of their personal histories; nor does Kurys opt for the probing mischievous search for personal identity as in Sarah Polley’s Stories We Tell (2013). Kurys instead provides a more romanticized vision in both films. Is she easing herself into her difficult story of family origin or is she avoiding the pain in her history?

Ken Dancyger, MA, MSc, is Professor of Film and Television at the TISCH School of the Arts of New York University. He is the author or co-author of 7 books (14 are translated) on screenwriting, directing, film editing and production including The Technique of Film and Video Editing (5th ed., 2011); The Director’s Idea (2006), Alternative Scriptwriting (with Jeff Rush, 5th ed., 2013), Writing the Short Film (with Pat Cooper, 2005), Global Scriptwriting (2001), The World of Film and Video Production (1999), and Broadcast Writing (1991). He may be contacted at
Denial and Intergenerational Transmission

Holocaust Denial and Challenges in the Psychoanalysis of the Second Generation of Survivors

Eva Fogelman—Forum Research Associate

In 1966, psychiatric resident Vivian Rakoff at Montreal’s Jewish General Hospital noted that 25% of families seeking help in his department were Holocaust survivors, a number disproportionate to their population. The Montreal Star, in a story entitled “Children of Survivors Are Delinquents,” reported Rakoff’s impressions of psychopathology among such children, including behavioral disturbances and inadequate coping skills.

Rakoff received a furious phone call that night that began, “Hello, Dr. Mengele. Isn’t it enough that Hitler did experiments on us? Now it’s your turn.” His enlisting help from Holocaust organizations was unsuccessful and Rakoff, while continuing to treat survivors, withdrew from public visibility on the issue.

His first article described the problems of adolescent children of survivors whom he had seen in treatment. He wrote, “It would be easier to believe that they, rather than their parents, had suffered the corrupting, searing hell… With the accumulation of knowledge and the unfolding of the concentration camp experience through the damaged generations, one may fairly ask if indeed there were any survivors” (Vivian Rakoff, “Long Term Effects of the Concentration

Presenting symptoms included attempted suicide, severe phobias, chronic depression, and anger. These findings evoked intense, varied reactions by children of survivors. Some sought psychological treatment and heard interpretations responsive to their feelings and experiences. Others were enraged at clinicians for generalizing severe psychiatric symptomatology to the entire population, though they often disregarded clinicians’ empathic reactions to patients in distress.

Around this time, Henry Krystal, a psychoanalyst and Auschwitz survivor, organized several conferences for doctors, social service providers, and German government officials on the after-effects of “massive psychic trauma” for survivors of Nazi concentration camps and the Hiroshima nuclear bombings. Krystal learned of the intense, unique family dynamics centered on the children of survivors, observing that “related to the subject of object-loss [of beloved relatives] is the yearning (hope) that the lost people would be restored magically. The most common expectation is that such love objects would return in the form of children... [who would] represent the new versions of parents, close relatives or offspring lost in the Holocaust” (Henry Krystal, and T. A. Petty, “Rehabilitation in Trauma Following Illness, Physical Injury, and Massive Personality Damage,” in Henry Krystal, ed., *Massive Psychic Trauma*, 1968, 325).

While organizing a conference at Wayne State University, Krystal learned of Rakoff and his colleague John Sigal and invited them to present. Sigal explained that children in such families suffer from parental deprivation. While cautioning against generalizations based on dysfunctional Holocaust families, he announced plans for a more scientific study.

An Israeli psychiatrist, Hillel Klein, who had conducted research on Holocaust survivor families on a kibbutz, disputed Sigal’s findings. He maintained that survivors spent more quality time with their children than other parents and that their children had a rich fantasy life that enhanced security and provided relief from anxiety (“Problems in the Psychotherapeutic Treatment of Israeli Survivors of the Holocaust,” in Krystal, *Massive Psychic Trauma*, 1968, 233-248).

Other studies concluded that many Holocaust survivors
adapted remarkably well. Despite mourning the murder of family members and friends, the loss of self-definition, and the destruction of community, survivors began new lives, established and supported families, and built new communities.

At professional meetings of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APA), concerned professionals such as Krystal continued to convene psychoanalysts to explore the transmission of trauma. The first meeting was held in Boston 1967 and second meeting was in New York in 1968. Among the participants of the discussion group on “Children and Social Catastrophe: Sequelae in Survivors and the Children of Survivors” were Henry Krystal, Hillel Klein, Judith Kestenberg, Peter Blos, Yehuda Nir, Vivian Rakoff, John Sigal, Elmer Luchterhand, Paul Chodoff, Janis Schossberger, and Sam Kaplan.

New York psychoanalyst Judith Kestenberg sent a questionnaire to 320 analysts around the world to ask about their treatment of children of survivors. Reporting in 1972, she concluded: “A vast majority of those questioned revealed an amazing indifference to the problem... Some were startled by the questions because it never occurred to them to link their patients’ dynamics to the history of their parents’ persecution” (Martin Bergmann and Milton Jucovy, Generations of the Holocaust, 1982, 27-28).

Interested psychoanalysts met informally at the American and at the International Psychoanalytic Association Meetings. In 1974, Kestenberg was joined by psychoanalysts Martin Bergmann and Milton Jucovy, among others, in developing new psychoanalytic approaches to treating the second generation. The “Group for the Psychoanalytic Study of the Effect of the Holocaust on the Second Generation,” met monthly in New York for approximately 15 years and culminated in Generations of the Holocaust (1982). In 1975, Kestenberg finally persuaded the American Psychoanalytic Association to sponsor the study group, Effects of the Holocaust on the Children of Holocaust Survivors.

I joined these discussion groups at an APA meeting in 1976 and at the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) meeting in 1977. After listening to dozens of survivor children in the privacy of my office, I wanted to interact with colleagues who understood the importance of combining the historical with the personal in under-
standing human behavior.

These meetings of clinicians began with participants introducing themselves and their interest in this study group. Apparently, many had a personal family history that made them realize that psychoanalytic concepts might not best describe the consequences of massive psychic trauma for the “second generation.” Surprisingly, even some psychoanalysts present were reluctant to share their family connection to the Holocaust. Most clinicians were oblivious to the nuanced psychological dynamics in the lives of Holocaust survivor families, or dismissed survivors as chronically depressed.

The survivors themselves largely did not seek out professional help for their problems. In the 1960s and 1970s, children of survivors who did pursue therapy did not identify themselves as heirs of the Holocaust, and most psychotherapists and psychoanalysts were oblivious to the “second generation’s” collective identity.

Ironically, most of those mental-health professionals whose patients informed them that they were children of survivors were unclear about the therapeutic implications. They often either interpreted psychopathology or colluded in a conspiracy of silence to protect themselves from hearing graphic death narratives.

Not knowing their clients’ historical background, clinicians often misdiagnosed insanity—particularly paranoid schizophrenia and psychosis—among survivors or their children who expressed mistrust of the outside world. Likewise, psychoanalysts interpreted survivor-mothers as overprotective, unaware of the reality from which their solicitousness stemmed.

Many children of survivors and their parents felt that mental health professionals were making them specimens on which to experiment, the way some survivors were guinea pigs for medical “researchers” in concentration camps. A number of mental health professionals were shocked at being the targets of survivor and second generation rage at the First International Conference on Children of Holocaust Survivors (1979), when the professionals explained the psychological impact of Nazi persecution and the tragic losses suffered by the second generation. Many of those present, then young adults, manifested emotional, cognitive, and behavioral reactions to their parents’ massive trauma, but not pathological ones.

The torrent of rage, which derived from feeling victimized, was in lieu of the collective mourning process that usually takes place when survivors and children of survivors get together. This intense anger is really about what was done to innocent people by their persecutors. Since the persecutors were not present, it is my hypothesis that a cohesive group developed via the rage that got directed at the “messengers.”

Some reconciliation was realized when theologian Michael Berenbaum led the participants in chanting the Kaddish (prayer for the dead) and tears were shed for those who were no longer with us—who were killed in the Shoah.

The mental health professionals present began to establish self-help kinship groups and second generation therapy groups. However, they encountered resistance when they asked administrators at Jewish organizations to provide specialized mental health services for this population.

Some therapists became overzealous about the Holocaust; they sought to treat survivors and their children as a way of expressing their Jewishness. The Holocaust often is overemphasized in their identity and thus in their clinical work, which means they focus on a victim mentality of what it means to live as a Jew. Part of the therapeutic process with this population is to help them develop a more balanced, positive Jewishness and not just an identification with suffering.

One prominent therapist doing work in this area, Chester Feuerstein, had been part of the American liberating tank units in
1945. He met up with the Russians at the Elbe River; he witnessed firsthand the unbelievable effects of the Nazis’ murderous actions. In the early 1970s, despite considerable opposition, he worked to establish the Holocaust as a legitimate area in clinical psychology that affects mental health, as he would later do with the Vietnam War. Later, he fought with the Executive Board of the New York Clinical Psychologists to establish Holocaust memorial awards for the best work in this area.

By the end of the 20th century, what Feuerstein tried to achieve had become normative, but at a cost; American culture now has a potpourri of victim groups. With so many competing diseases and social stigmas, unwarranted comparisons are being made. Children of survivors sometimes hear, “You’re just like alcoholics,” or “like the children of alcoholics,” making for a groundless equation. Instead, Holocaust survivor families feel the enormity of personal and communal losses, and often struggle to bridge the ruptures they have experienced in personal identity.

In the 21st century, the immediacy of 9/11 on American soil has diminished denial in psychoanalysis. The stark contrast between how 9/11 survivors and their families and how those who survived other massive historical traumas are being attended is jarring. A new consciousness has set into the mental health arena, and there is no turning back.

Eva Fogelman, PhD, is a psychologist in private practice in New York and is a pioneer in starting groups for generations of the Holocaust. Co-director of Child Development Research and founding director of the Jewish Foundation for Christian Rescuers ADL, she is the author of Conscience and Courage: Rescuers of Jews During the Holocaust, which was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize, and writer and co-producer of Breaking the Silence: The Generation After the Holocaust. She may be contacted at evafogelman@aol.com.
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The Intergenerational Transmission of Trauma

Ira Brenner—Jefferson Medical College

Despite the almost 70 years that have passed since the liberation of the death camps in Nazi-dominated Europe, there seems to be no end in sight to fascination with the Holocaust. New stories still come forth about such things as untold heroism, depravity beyond imagination, bizarre twists of fate, concealed identities on both sides in order to escape or survive, unparalleled greed, and, of course, human destruction on an industrial scale, which was “legalized” by a government of murderers.

The man-made origin of this unprecedented genocide implies that, because it was devised by humans, it should therefore be comprehensible by humans, but the qualities of the men and women who bring about such things remain the subject of much debate. Moreover, the descendants of those who were marked for extinction in the Holocaust also elude a complete understanding of how their survivor parents, grandparents, or great-grandparents’ ordeals have impacted them. In fact, the question of whether there actually can be an intergenerational transmission of such trauma remains uncertain for some. This skepticism is remarkable given the wealth of data from many disciplines. However, given the fact there are even those who deny the Holocaust itself, we should not be completely surprised.

In this report, I will restrict my purview to the one perspective with which I am most familiar, that of depth psychology. While I realize that other contributions from, for example, the biological, genetic, endocrinological, and religious/philosophical realms also have something to add to this continuing question, I will focus on the psychological realm. Specifically, I will briefly review the evolution of thinking about how and what might have been passed on, highlighting some of the pioneering figures in the field as well as some of those who have elaborated upon and extended their contributions. It is by no means a complete list of all who have ventured into these treacherous waters.
The earliest reports about problems in children of survivors were typically quite worrisome, as the most disturbed were recognized at a very young age and were the first ones brought to the attention of mental health professionals, such as Henry Krystal, in the 1950s and early 1960s. Children of survivors of “massive psychic trauma” experienced depression, anxiety, uncontrollable behavior, and psychotic symptoms, which led some experts to conclude that this group was doomed to a life of misery and chronic mental illness. The role of these parents’ incurable suffering, which rendered them unable to rear their children in a healthy way, was the obvious conclusion. Such profoundly damaged parents, whose inability to mourn their incalculable losses, adjust to a new life of freedom and opportunity, and let their children simply be children, seemed like a reasonable formulation.

Moreover, if it could be established that their children’s problems could be traced back to the camps, would they too be eligible for restitution payments from the German government? Would the second generation also be entitled to “Wiedergutmachung” (Germany’s reparations)? Already then the exceedingly important clinical issues were becoming politicized as much money was at stake on behalf of the children. To my knowledge, however, such claims were never successful, which refutes the cynical assertions that a prime motivation for establishing the research into such transmission was purely for monetary gain.

In the early 1970s, the New York-based Group for the Psychoanalytic Study of the Effects of the Holocaust on the Second Generation (GPSEHSG) was formed and organized by Judith Kestenberg, Martin Bergman, and Milton Jucovy. Kestenberg sent a questionnaire to analysts treating second generation patients and learned that the topic of the Holocaust was generally avoided. This shocking finding catalyzed her interest in exploring why this was so and how the treatment might have floundered because of this avoidance. The GPSEHSG invited analysts treating such patients to present clinical material to them in order to further their research into the mechanism by which the children were affected.

Kestenberg theorized that a transposition occurred, such that the parents’ unresolvable grief and mourning greatly burdened the children who simultaneously carried on the mourning process, be-
came the lost loved ones themselves, and unconsciously lived through the Holocaust that saturated their early development. It was only through an understanding of the parent’s survival experience that their sometimes bizarre symptoms could be deciphered and metabolized. A process that went beyond identification was postulated in this group who appeared to be living in two time zones, a psychological time tunnel.

Elaborations of this model were later put forth as a “psychic hole” and an “empty circle” in which the children of survivors lived out the parents’ experience unconsciously and often in an unsymbolized manner. Eva Fogelman, who worked with Kestenberg, observed this phenomenon also, but from the perspective of group therapy, a different modality that offered corroboration with the individual work with the second generation. I also studied with Kestenberg and expanded her work into the realm of dissociation. I saw that much of the second generation phenomena might be thought of as a manifestation of the child’s attempt to integrate their parents’ traumatically induced altered states into their own psyches as a natural response to their developmental processes. As more became known about attachment disorders and the nonverbal transmission of fear from mother to infant, this knowledge was applied to the transmission of Holocaust trauma as described by Mark Sosin and others.

In a related vein, but using a different model, Vamik Volkan described the deposition of the traumatized self of the parent into the developing child’s mind. In addition, he considered the transmission of culturally familiar symbols of the Holocaust such as ovens, trains, Nazi uniforms, barbed wire, etc. into the group identity of virtually all members of this persecuted group. This “Third Reich in the unconscious” might therefore be evident in diluted forms, even in those not directly affected by Nazi aggression.

Another very compelling model is the “telescoping of generations.” It describes a disturbance in the development and maintenance of healthy self-esteem, resulting in a problem with narcissism based on the parents’ pathological reliance on the child for their mental equilibrium. As a result, the parents took more than they gave, leaving the child emotionally depleted and robbed of its own experience. Then the children become filled with the parents’
and grandparents’ unspoken secrets. In the case of the Holocaust, the second generation became inextricably linked with the often times concealed family history of unsymbolized loss and trauma. When working psychodynamically, the analyst eventually relives aspects of this parasitic parent-child relationship when, for example, the patient expects that whatever she does is not pleasing enough or, whenever she dare feel good, it will be taken away from her by an insatiable, hypercritical, chronically aggrieved parental authority figure. The incalculable losses due to the Holocaust can never be restored no matter how much or how hard the child sacrifices or is sacrificed. A cycle of disappointment, guilt, despair, and rage may ensue.

Whether as a “memorial candle” as described by Dina Wardi, or as someone who can never completely open that “black box” of horrific memory, as per Helen Epstein, the second generation inherited a unique legacy. In my opinion, it will continue to reverberate psychologically throughout the succeeding generations until it eventually becomes incorporated into the long and tortuous historical and oral tradition of the Jewish people. The villain in this tradition is the archetypal enemy of the Israelites, known in the Bible as Amalek. He is always lurking and waits for his opportunity to attack. He aims to destroy them mercilessly whenever he can. According to this lore, he has been reincarnated throughout history as, for example, Haman in the story of Purim back in ancient Persian times. Most certainly, he reappeared again in 20th century Germany as Adolf Hitler. The forces of life and creation remain in an eternal struggle with the forces of death and destruction, a battle that gets enacted in each of us throughout our existence.

**Ira Brenner, MD,** is Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia and Training Supervising Analyst at the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia, where he is also Director Emeritus of the Adult Psychotherapy Training Program. He has a special interest in the area of psychological trauma and is the author of over 80 publications, including co-editing two special issues of The International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies and writing four books which include The Last Witness—The Child Survivor of the Holocaust (1996), co-authored with Judith Kestenberg and Dissociation of Trauma—
Memories and Their Meaning: 
Legacies of Love and Loss

Hannah Kliger—Pennsylvania State U., Abington College

In a faded photograph, a woman donning a print dress and French braids stands defiantly on a rocky shore, her rounded chin jutting out as she squints into the camera. She is en route from a destroyed past in Poland to a new life in pre-state Israel. The year is 1946, and the woman in the photograph bears a striking resemblance to a nearby picture taken more than half a century later of another young girl with unruly bangs and the same rounded chin that also sits on the living room mantle.

They are survivor grandmother and her granddaughter, who are prompted to understand the chilling but significant part of their family’s past that was shaped by the Holocaust years, together with the researcher/clinician, who is daughter to one and mother of the other.

What follows is an attempt to reconstitute a co-created re-imagining of history to understand the pathways through which traumatic experiences are communicated and to highlight the powerful personal and professional potential of such a project. Moreover, the mutative engagement by the generations to recount and reconstruct the family saga, alongside recent visits to related historical sites and archival holdings in Poland, Germany, Italy, and Israel, offered a chance to report and refine the data collected so far alongside qualitative interviews and comparison data from other testimonies. In particular, as the third generation young woman in this family portrait is now 21 years of age, an entry point for this endeavor encompassed the motifs and the meaning attached to them during the developmental milestones of young and emerging adulthood, from the ages of 18 to 39.
In a series of interviews with my mother, Frieda Kliger, I have been prompted to rethink the life-changing experiences that my parents encountered during this time period (for my mother, that would be between 1939 to 1960), as well as to compare these with my own pivotal decisions during this era in my life, pondering new ways to think about these potent and meaningful years, including the changing relationship with my parents, my family of origin, and my own growing nuclear family.

The year 1939 is seared in my memory as the year that the war began. In my household, we never called it anything but “the war” (di milkhome, in Yiddish) or “di fintstere milkhome” (the dark or miserable war). That same year marked my mother’s graduation from high school and her entry into the period of emerging adulthood at the age of 18. The overlap of those two events, both the normative and the traumatic occurrences, meant that young adulthood was rapidly superseded by emergency and by externally mandated measures that caused my mother to face who she was and make decisions more rapidly and urgently than at the pace she might have otherwise preferred.

The years between 1939, when she turned 18, and the end of World War II in 1945, were marked by horrific disruption, the death of her loved ones, and the destruction of her world. Steps she took to complete some measure of post-high school training in the years after World War II in the hopes of gaining certification as a teacher were never fully implemented. Financial pressures necessitated finding employment in New York’s garment industry after the family relocated to America in 1958. Frieda was 37 years old at the time and her husband, Roman (my father), whom she met and married in the Bergen Belsen Displaced Persons (DP) Camp on December 18, 1945, never offered to make accommodations in his own work schedule to allow Frieda to take night classes or supplementary courses.

Underlying the choices that my parents made during this period of my mother’s young adulthood, including their momentous decision to relocate their young family to America after spending 12 significant years in Israel from 1946 to 1958, there seems to have been a kind of intense and energetic push to prove their worthiness, validate their survival, and engage in what my mother calls
“the struggle for life.” The few pictures that I have of my parents in those early years show a vigorous and hopeful pair, eager to move forward to the task of reconstructing their lives. They remained committed to each other in this way throughout the 62 years of their marriage, enduring years of struggle and sickness as well as many moments of joy and pleasure. However, getting access to the emotional tone of her relationship has been much more complicated. It includes going through the process of my own 21-year-old daughter, gathering information from her beloved grandmother.

My emerging and young adulthood experiences between the ages of 18 and 39 are still vivid in my mind as a series of encounters with life-defining choices that culminated in the birth of my second child in December 1992. Beginning at age 18 when I was a college student, I recall embarking on an intense journey of self-discovery, choosing to have serious relationships with men very selectively, and then ultimately meeting and making a life with the man who is now my husband.

In addition to personal and relational considerations, I began to take myself seriously professionally, searching for a way to configure the complicated inheritance of silence and secrecy through my college major of sociology and in my first round of graduate studies. Thirty years later I would return to graduate school in clinical social work to finish that task with consequences that partly shaped my scholarly interest in identity and families, my engagement with the academic field of communication, and my entry into the clinical work of therapy.

The intergenerational transmission of trauma and resilience is one major pattern that emerges when considering the differences and similarities in the emerging and young adulthood experiences of my own personal developmental history and that of my parents’ generation. My parents were able to mobilize themselves throughout their long romance to embody both pleasure and its opposite, what Freud called the “life and death instincts.” A more recent treatise on the question of enduring love, a book called Can Love Last? The Fate of Romance over Time (2003) by Stephen Mitchell, states that romantic commitments in love entail not a devotion to stasis but a dedication to process in the face of uncertainty.
Mitchell beautifully captures this in a metaphor, the idea of how to sustain love over time, which he terms a “sandcastle for two.” Mitchell’s sandcastle is not “a permanent abode,” and it requires continual rebuilding. Who, if not two survivors like my parents, could appreciate the ways in which reality and fantasy coexist? My mother lost her entire family, created a new one through her marriage of despair (a term used to describe the postwar frenzy to mate) to my father, crossed the Alps to a pioneering new society in Israel, reckoned with her husband’s limitless love and his lingering illness which required constant attention, and succumbed to the pull of the far away land of America where her children were raised.

I am also drawn to the metaphor of sand, and the shifting relational winds of this period of emerging and young adulthood that brought me face to face with darkness and light, illness and vitality, independence and interdependence. Integrating this self-knowledge with my role as scholar and clinician in this reflection about my parents against the background of wartime tragedies, and in the ensuing conversations with my daughter who is now herself immersed in the developmental tasks of young adulthood, I feel I was successful in initiating a move away from mourning to the possibility of love. With that shift, I am better equipped to imagine an integration of this knowledge with my role as teacher and therapist, helping others reach for optimism and hope.

Hannah Kliger, PhD, LCSW, LMFT, is Professor of Communication and Jewish Studies at The Pennsylvania State University, Abington College, where she has also been Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Dr. Kliger’s publications focus on the communicative practices and communal organizations of minority groups. In addition to her book on ethnic voluntary associations of Jewish immigrants, she has authored numerous articles on communication and culture in immigrant communities. Her research with the Transcending Trauma Project at the Council for Relationships, where Kliger also maintains a part-time practice, explores resilience and reconstruction in the aftermath of traumatic events. Licensed as a clinical social worker and marriage and family therapist, she is currently a clinical candidate at the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia. She can be contacted at hkp1@psu.edu.
How My Father’s Silence about the Holocaust Influenced My Becoming an Analyst

Joyce Rosenberg—Psychoanalyst in Private Practice

The Holocaust has been the great unknown in my life. It has undoubtedly contributed to my becoming a psychoanalyst.

My father, born in Germany in 1925, rarely talked about his childhood or his parents who sent him to England in the Kindertransport in 1939 and then were killed in 1942. I don’t remember him mentioning his mother until I was well into my teens, and I have only one recollection of him talking about my grandfather. Nothing he said about them dealt with the Holocaust. What little I knew my mother told me, and in words designed to shield me from the truth. When I was probably no more than six, she said something along the lines of “Daddy lost his parents.” I didn’t understand; I was a child who would wander off in department stores, “getting lost,” assuming that was what had happened to them.

It was in my early adolescence that I figured out on my own that the Nazis had killed my grandparents. It was a process of deduction. I knew my father was a German Jew and that his parents had died some years after my father had left. I’m not sure when or how I made the connection that they had been murdered.

No one told me that my father was in the Kindertransport. I knew my parents had met as children in England, where my mother, who was also Jewish, was born. My mother did tell me when I was in my teens that my grandparents had sent my father out of Germany because it would be easier for them to leave if they didn’t have to also care for him. When I learned in adulthood about the Kindertransport, I deduced that it had been my father’s escape route.

I grew up in a home that observed Jewish traditions like the Passover seder, which encourages the asking of questions. Instead, information was withheld in my family, I believe to protect me from the painful truth. However, as an analyst, I have come to understand that withholding was also an attempt to protect my father
from the guilt, shame, and grief he carried, which he only began to barely reveal in the last decade of his life. At that point, I was already well on my way to becoming an analyst.

One of my childhood memories is of my mother saying that my father was angry with himself because, when Nazi soldiers were going through the family home one day, he was frightened and ran out into the fields where his father was, leaving his mother alone. That narrative remained undisturbed until my father mentioned Kristallnacht in an e-mail in the late 1990s, alluding to what his mother endured when Nazi soldiers stormed through the house. My grandfather was actually in Buchenwald at the time. Whatever happened that night is still a mystery to me, but I know it was something horrific that a 13-year-old boy could not prevent or stop and that the man he became could not talk about it.

How much he tried to lessen his pain by withholding became clear to me when I was about 40 and he about 70. My father had gone to Yad Vashem, the Holocaust memorial in Jerusalem, to look up records about his parents, and he later told me the documents said my grandparents were “lost in the East.” After my father died, I looked up the records online. They are from the “List of murdered Jews from Germany.” The website says his parents were “murdered/perished in Eastern Europe.”

Why didn’t I ask my father about what happened to him and his parents? By my early 20s, I did want to know. My mother told me not to ask him; she said he didn’t want to talk about it, that he hardly ever mentioned it to her. That was enough for me to never broach the topic with him. I felt it was more important to protect him from pain than it was for me to get the answers I sought.

It is widely understood and accepted among analysts that one reason why we enter this profession is a desire, conscious or unconscious, to cure, fix, or help a parent. Psychoanalytic literature contains many theories about what motivates people to become analysts or therapists. Alice Miller (The Drama of the Gifted Child: The Search for the True Self, 1997) sums them up well: “The therapist’s sensibility, empathy, responsiveness and powerful ‘antennae’ indicate that as a child he probably used to fulfill other people’s needs and to repress his own” (19).
I was what is called a parentified child, although it was my mother whom my parents outwardly demanded I care for. In the last years of my father’s life, after he had a stroke and developed dementia, I was his emotional caretaker. Every other weekend, I drove from New York to Delaware to visit him. I was continually trying to anticipate his needs, lift his spirits, and soothe him when he was angry. Of course, I did this out of very great love for him. However, I also came to realize I had unconsciously acted as his caretaker for much of my life, and the reason was the wounded and traumatized child who had been through the Holocaust. Although I didn’t know the details of what happened to him, I knew he had suffered and continued to suffer, and I wanted to help and comfort him.

It was a natural progression then for me to become an analyst, entering a profession in which I listen to and provide care for people who are suffering. At least in the early stages of a treatment, I don’t know why they are suffering, much as I didn’t know in the first part of my life about my father’s pain. I am again repressing my needs in the service of caring for others. One might also argue that I do this in unconscious hopes of winning the approval of my patients, as I continually did with my parents.

It wasn’t until I was well into adulthood, and probably well into my two analyses, that I began to grasp just how much I had grown up in an atmosphere of “don’t ask, don’t tell.” The years of not knowing—and not being allowed to know—about my father and the Holocaust also contributed to my choice of work. As an analyst, I am free, within the bounds of good technique, to ask questions. I am allowed to know about my patients’ pain. They let me know over the course of our work what happened to them. I realize that I am seeking, through each patient, an easing of the prohibition against asking and knowing from my childhood.

I also provide for patients the holding environment that D.W. Winnicott said a mother gives her child in “The Theory of the Parent-Infant Relationship” (*The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 1960). The holding environment is a place where a mother shields a child from what Winnicott calls impingements that would harm the child’s sense of self. It is an integral part of psychoanalysis. Analysts listen without voicing judgment. We toler-
ate anger and aggression, even when it is directed at us. We don’t force patients to explore painful feelings, subjects, or events if it isn’t right for them.

That was the same holding environment that I created for my father. I let him withhold the truth when he needed to be protected from pain. I let him be angry and difficult as an elderly man who was raging not only at the circumstances at the time, but also unconsciously at the horrors the Nazis forced upon him. When I became an analyst, I was already well schooled and perhaps comfortable in providing a holding environment, having done so for my father for decades.

Yet with many patients, I can also use the holding environment to help them work through and move beyond some of their pain. My father lived a remarkable life given the emotional burdens he carried. I cannot say that he was ever able to work through the pain.

Many children of survivors grew up with parents who were silent about the past. The children—and not just those of Holocaust survivors—have a sense that there is a secret, that something is being withheld. One, Helen Fremont, reveals in her book After Long Silence (2000) that she and her sister didn’t know they were Jewish until they reached adulthood. There were many other things Fremont did not know, such as “What I didn’t realize was that all our names had been recently invented. … To this day, I don’t know what my mother’s real name is” (18).

Fremont became a public defender, a profession where she can also seek the truth as does her sister who became a psychiatrist. My experience with a parent who survived the Holocaust wasn’t unique.

Joyce M. Rosenberg, a licensed psychoanalyst, is a member of the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis and a Research Associate of the Psychohistory Forum. She has a private practice in Manhattan, working with adults and couples. She has written papers on the Holocaust, the connection between the psyche and creativity and the role of empathy in culture and psychoanalysis. She is a financial news writer at The Associated Press and may be contacted at psyjourn@att.net.
Intergenerational Transmission of Trauma
In My Family

Ruth Neubauer—Forum Research Associate

I remember mom saying she was never close to her mother. I also know her father was essentially gone for the first four years of her life, fighting for his German homeland in World War I. This brings me to thinking about my mother’s attachment patterns as I continue to sort out my own. Why was it I never felt bonded with my mother?

Upon reflection, she was not bonded with her own mother and with her father it was such an insecure attachment that it explains her overcompensating dependence on my father and my brother—he took over our father’s role after his death. This is perhaps at least part of her very deeply “mixed” feelings about me which unfortunately, along with my brother’s whispering, was played out by removing me from her final will. This hurtful act set me wondering about her all the more.

My mother left Germany when she was 22, in 1936. Against her parents’ will, she got on a boat, vomited the whole two weeks on the ocean, and arrived in New York City on a Saturday. There she was met by her very religiously observant Jewish uncle. He had walked from 96th Street to Pier 5 on the far West Side way downtown. After Mom arrived, they left her luggage until Monday and walked all the way back.

She met my father on New Year’s Eve at the Empire Hotel at a dance for Jewish refugees. They were married two months later. My father was 14 years older than her and also had come to New York in 1936. However, he was more grounded because of his personality, and in addition, he had two brothers and his parents here, as well as a business to save from bankruptcy in the Depression.

The German war against Jews, which grew into the Holocaust in World War II, is the reason for so much in our lives. There was, in my deeply and broadly relational family, a sense of having
landed. With all the disruption and all the losses and all the survival, having landed in America seemed to mean as much.

There was a fierce determination to continue being a village like the one in Bohemia in which this clan had grown up. Further, that determination was imbued with a commitment to humor and laughter. A kind of continuity of the good nature dad and the others all had shared as young boys, there was a prankish side that brought smiles! These were the Jewish boys of the town of 8,000 in the countryside of Sudetenland, just 30 miles from the German border.

I grew up with those who survived. When I went back to Tachau in 2002 with 32 extended Jewish family members, we found no Jews left. None! All that remains is in the seemly invisible Jewish graveyard. It is impossible to see or find unless you know exactly which bushes alongside the road are the entry point. We met with the mayor and were treated like royalty with our pictures on the front page of the local newspaper. We left a tree to be planted and a plaque that read: “In memory of the Jewish citizens of Tachov who perished in the Holocaust (1938–1945). The spirit of their Tachov lives on in us, their surviving generations. Dedicated June, 2002.” How could I not carry this history around?

For us, the German assault on Jews was the reason for displacement, the reason for fear—as in the consistent dreams from which my mother woke up screaming night after night, believing she was being chased; for a sensitivity, like a covered-over-but-ready-to-burst blister—for a sensitivity that being Jewish means vulnerability to the worst kind of scapegoating, and it could just show up any time. Being “out there” has, for Jews, an inborn sense of danger connected to it.

I’ve come a long way in the journey of being part of this particular transitional generation, the bi-cultural girl in my high-school class, the wife of someone who shared the same history, in the professional world at age 41 in the field of psychoanalysis, learning to speak my truth as never before within the precious context of deeper understanding and great compassion of my colleagues, supervisors, and friends.
At my current stage of adulthood, I am feeling less personally vulnerable, but I worry for the world and for the Jews all over our world, hoping the trauma will die with my generation and our children will be free.

After all, as we read in the Passover story, we Jews needed 40 years in the desert upon our flight from Egypt. We needed two generations to be able to feel free enough from the experience of slavery to experience freedom more fully. For me personally the transmission of trauma, whether spoken or unspoken, exists. The underlying grief exists. The will to go on quite remarkably also exists.

Given my earlier thoughts about attachment, I imagine the extraordinary losses all at once. Separation from homeland, mother-tongue, parents, family, school-mates, neighborhoods, houses, the comfort food of childhood, and almost everything of origin. This is a pyramid of losses of almost everything familiar.

Thus I carry the trauma of the Holocaust with me as I go more and more deeply into American culture, as my children and grandchildren carry on.

**Ruth Neubauer, LCSW, is in private practice in Denver, Colorado. She has been teaching “Psychoanalytic Ideas for Everyday Living” to non-professionals for many years through Osher Lifelong Learning Institute, both at American University in DC and Denver University currently. She is co-founder of “Retirement” or WHAT NEXT™ facilitating workshops and support groups for Women Over 50 in Transition. She can be reached at ruthneubr@aol.com.**

Reclaiming Holocaust History: The Past Lives Within Us

**Arlene (Lu) Steinberg—Columbia University**

Sam Gerson, a psychoanalyst and child of Holocaust survivors, describes the irreparable wound and absence that permeates survivors and their offsprings’ lives. Yet, what is absent? Is language partly what is missing? Haydee Faimberg in *The Telescop-
ing of Generations: Listening to the Narcissistic Links between Generations (2005) describes a young man whose existence and struggles hint at a darker Holocaust history, and yet the word Holocaust never appears in the chapter. Despite greater historical acknowledgement of the Holocaust, for many the past continues to remain unnamable.

Is the lack of an acceptable language to express survivor experiences what is missing—the missing third? (Sam Gerson, “When the Third is Dead: Memory, Mourning and Witnessing in the Aftermath of the Holocaust” in the International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 90, 1341-1357, 2009). Survivors’ children inevitably served the first role of the badly needed “third” or witness, filling the void left in the wake of cultural, communal, and state silence. Living with their parents, who were still reeling from their own harrowing experiences, there was an implicit need to process this legacy.

In collecting survivor testimony, Dori Laub, the Yale Fortunoff Video Archives, and later the Shoah Foundation have created a way to fill the void and perhaps introduce the relational/cultural third. Gerson stresses the need for an engaged witness, an “Other” who cares to listen. For survivors’ children like me, besides historical documentation, intergenerational dialogue between parent and child is reintroduced via the doing, hearing, and sharing of the testimony. Ironically, many survivors eloquently and willingly describe their experiences in their testimonies, despite the oft-repeated assumptions that they were unwilling or not able to do so. When questioning my mother about her not speaking much when my sister and I were young, she responded: “I had to wait till you were old enough. Once you asked questions I knew you were better able to handle my responses. I didn’t know the impact on a young child of all that I had witnessed and experienced.”

My mother was clearly concerned about flooding us at too young an age. Struggling to protectively shield her children, she saw us as separate, vulnerable beings in need of protection. Unfortunately, traumatic histories lurk in the background, ultimately communicated in the most innocent of words and phrases, capturing a reality far beyond those words.
When my parents finally gave testimony in 1999 for the *Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation*, my sister and I were grown. They described their painful losses and experiences, including my mother’s 37 months in Auschwitz, having arrived on the second transport from Slovakia in 1942, and my father’s one year in Hungarian slave labor and two Austrian camps, Mauthausen and Gunskirchen. In 1999, the world had come to accept the Holocaust as a reality, both sugar coated and yet showing features not captured previously. My mother was relieved to see *Schindler’s List*’s (1993) portrayal of the sadism of the camp commandant, Amon Goeth, different from previous depictions of machinelike brutality, and consistent with her experience of the engaged, sadistic enjoyment of the Nazis who brutalized them.

The Holocaust was a witness-less crime. The perpetrators hid their crimes behind obedience to authority and bureaucratic detail as they carried them out. Those who lived nearby denied any knowledge. After the war, those fortunate enough to survive years of harrowing experience were asked to quickly resume “normal” life with no resources, family, and an interrupted education. They were instructed or encouraged not to speak of their ordeals. Many described this as the greatest pain of all. In the camps they had each other, sustained by the thought that they must survive to bear witness, as Terrence Des Pres poignantly portrayed in *The Survivor: An Anatomy of Life in the Death Camps* (1976). Yet, after the war, alone, they were confronted with little to no acknowledgement of the horror they had experienced. Within this context many married, began families, and created (or for some, recreated) lives lost. The resilience it took to achieve this was rarely acknowledged.

I chose to share my family’s story several years ago in a classroom. Indeed, with the presence of other witnesses, I felt the courage to watch my parents’ testimonies for the first time. Perhaps for me to fully witness my parents’ stories, I needed the presence of other live, empathic witnesses at my side. Witnessing their testimony opened up channels of communication, as I felt less afraid to ask questions and better able to appreciate their history and its impact on me.

My mother grew up a sheltered youngest child. Despite feeling integrated in the Slovakian community where she grew up,
her brother’s best friend “came with a gun to take her” to the transport. Torn from her family, home, and community, she struggled with the profound betrayal she and her family faced at the hands of those whom they had trusted.

Another phrase she frequently used was “I opened Auschwitz.” I learnt that she arrived before they opened Birkenau, the site of the gas chambers. While initially kept in a building with running water, she remembered Auschwitz commandant Rudolph Hoess saying “it is not bad enough,” leading to the opening of Birkenau. My mother worked many jobs, including the Aussenkommando, where one rarely survived for very long, and the Leichenkommando, where she “carried dead bodies.” When her work enabled her to procure a pair of shoes, she gave it to those who needed them, as shoes impacted survival. Despite the horror, my mother did not let herself plummet into self-involved despair, retaining her care-taking nature and humanity and placing herself at personal peril to rescue others.

While living seemingly average lives in 60s New York, the dark clouds of the Holocaust and the rich history of my parents’ childhoods always existed in the background. I learned not of the Holocaust, but heard of the “war” and the “camps” with so many missing, as my parents were the sole surviving members of their families. I recall feeling dread at the idea of my going to summer “camp.” Although wanting to go, in keeping with my need to be a normal American kid (along with my wanting straight blonde hair), I was also fearful. Indeed, the word “camp” encapsulated loss and horror, and while aware I was going to a fun place upstate, my own homesickness was suffused with Holocaust imagery. I still recall my mother’s face as she said goodbye to me, an image juxtaposed with her saying goodbye to her own mother at the train station when she was deported. Both my children also hated camp.

My mother described in her testimony the “Famous Chicken,” lovingly cooked and given to her by her mother at her deportation, not fathoming the starvation that lie ahead. Is this what sustained her? She held tightly to it, until it was violently confiscated from her. Although remaining haunted during the war by the wish to have consumed it, I believe the “Famous Chicken,” despite being uneaten, symbolically embodied her mother’s love.
Its internalization continued to sustain her and her caring capacities, and perhaps even contributed to her resilience. The Holocaust did not rob her of an internalized loving mother, enabling her to take care of others even in Auschwitz. This capacity was also apparent in her later parenting, which included her concern of overwhelming her young children. Her amazing resilience has been her legacy, from her mother to her children and grandchildren. However, the excruciatingly painful real loss of her mother, my grandmother, was also transmitted to me, particularly in the word “camp.” Camp felt alone, infused with a loss of mother’s closeness and care.

My mother, having been on the second transport to Auschwitz, has the low number of 2988 tattooed on her arm. While some react to it as a reminder of the horror, it represented security to us, even serving as the code on their home alarm system. Recently I shared with my mother the autobiographical reflections of the psychoanalyst Anna Ornstein in *My Mother’s Eyes: Holocaust Memories of a Young Girl* (2004) on her own number. Ornstein described her sense of pride as it signified survival. Those destined for immediate death in Auschwitz did not get tattooed. Ornstein’s testimony, alongside my mother’s, has helped validate my mother’s feelings and my own perceptions.

Watching my parents’ testimonies has helped me fill in gaps and reduce my dread. Despite the sadistic brutality aimed at my parents, their interviews also reflect their ability to cope using humor, as well as their vitality to love life, each other, and to invest in the future through work and family. While I have witnessed and shared my parents’ fear, pain, rage, and loss, I have also experienced their nurturance, love, resourcefulness, and resilience. Hearing their testimony about their past has reduced my own dread. It comes with greater appreciation of our present and future, while continuing the impossible task of finding a way to mourn our many losses.

_Arlene (Lu) Steinberg, PhD, is a psychologist/psychoanalyst in private practice, a clinical supervisor at Teachers College, Columbia University, and Treasurer of the Division of Psychoanalysis (39) of the American Psychological Association. She may be contacted at lu2steinb@hotmail.com._
Memorials

Henry Lawton: Psychohistorian and Social Worker

Paul H. Elovitz—The Psychohistory Forum

Henry Lawton (1941-2014) died on February 26 when his heart gave out after a very long battle with ill health. Although progressive nerve weakness caused the atrophy of his muscles (primary lateral sclerosis, or PLS) and other ailments left him with a walker and then a wheel chair with his head slumped to one side and almost no voice, he kept doing psychohistory and serving its organizations and scholarship until the very end of his life. He published widely, including *The Psychohistorians Handbook* (1988), and was the long time Book Review Editor of the *Journal of Psychohistory* (*JPH*). He served the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) with incredible diligence as a founding member, secretary (for about 30 years), president (twice, from 2000 to 2004), vice president, librarian, group process analyst, newsletter editor, and scholar. When the Psychohistory Forum was established in 1983, he was co-director for several years before he left its leadership to found the Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film in 1989.

While making his professional and scholarly contributions, this independent scholar worked full time as a social worker with teenagers, their parents, various agencies, and the juvenile courts.

Henry William Lawton was born in Trenton, N.J. on July 1, 1941 as the elder of two sons to a Protestant family of English, German, Irish, and Canadian descent whose ancestors were well established in this country. Unfortunately, his immediate family...
was often struggling economically. His parents separated when he was nine and divorced about three years later. In his Featured Scholar Interview in this journal (March 2003, available at cliospsyche.org/archives.html), he was quite open and explicit about his feelings and influences on him during his life. (Unless otherwise stated, all quotations in this memorial are from him, although not all were previously published.) Henry identified strongly with his mother’s love of history and her desire to help others. Prior to marrying, she did a type of social work for the Red Cross and dreamed of returning to the field. He wrote, “all through my childhood she would regale me with vivid stories of her experiences and the often-exotic people she came in contact with. She always regretted leaving that work and wished that she could have found a way to continue.” He went on to declare that “Good son that I was, I lived out her dream for her by doing child welfare work for 30-plus years in the N.J. Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS).” He recognized that “this was an unconscious decision that [he] did not realize until years later.” His identity with his mother extended to a rejection of his father who she denigrated as someone who used other people for his own betterment.

Henry was a lonely boy who developed a fascination with history and an enormous capacity for work. After four years as a weatherman in the U.S. Air Force (1959-63), he earned degrees from the College of New Jersey (then Trenton State, BA, 1968), Fairleigh Dickinson (MA, 1971), and Rutgers (MLS, 1977) universities, prior to taking a graduate course on family therapy. For a long time he was embarrassed by his lack of a doctoral degree in a field where almost everyone else seemed to have one, but his vast erudition was apparent when people spoke at length with him. He was a mostly self-educated man who never stopped learning. Henry credited “Lloyd deMause for providing me a place to find my scholarly voice and encouraging my scholarly work.”

A career as a college professor and research scholar is something of which Henry dreamed. Instead, he shared his passion for knowledge on a one-on-one basis with his colleagues, especially at the Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film, the IPA, and the Work-In-Progress Seminars of the Psychohistory Forum. Students spoke highly of his pedagogy when he stepped in to help me
by teaching the second half of my summer undergraduate course on the Holocaust.

When Bob Lentz asked, Lawton said that what brought him to psychohistory was “a long emotional process and some ‘accidents.’” He had always “been interested in history,” which he had “a true aptitude for” stemming from his mother’s “great sense of history” that enthralled him as a child and adolescent. In his sophomore year of college, his approach to knowledge was transformed when he read Norman Cohn’s *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (1957), which he wrote, “changed my life intellectually. It was the first history book I read that showed the force of emotion and fantasy in history.” Subsequently, “Doing my master’s thesis, [on Richard Nixon]…in the early 1970’s was another factor bringing me to the field.” He applied a rudimentary psychohistory in his master’s thesis on Richard Milhous Nixon in graduate school. In *Millennial Thinking in the Politics of Richard Nixon and the Potential for Fascism in American Life*, Henry revealed his rejection of anti-communist rhetoric, deviousness, hypocrisy, and other values he associated with the 37th President.

When asked in his featured interview in this journal as to what work he was most proud of, he listed a special issue on film he edited and wrote for in the *JPH* in 1992, his *Handbook of Psychohistory*, and two lengthy articles in the *JPH*. They are “The Myth of Altruism: A Psychohistory of Public Agency Social Work” (Winter 1982) and “Milhous Rising” (Spring 1979). Lawton had an abiding fear that Nixon, whose favorite book in college was *Resurrection*, would somehow be able to resurrect his political career after the disgrace of Watergate and threaten the nation. This somehow seemed connected to his fascination with horror films. He could talk endlessly about these films, including to this friend, whose tolerance for horror films was minimal. I would kid him and say, “let’s get to the crucial part involving the return of the repressed”—that is, when the seemingly dead human or non-human monster returns, usually to be slain again by the victim turned hero/heroine. This love of film led Henry to found the Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film (1989-2008), which he ran until his health made it impossible to drive to New York City and lead its meetings. Henry usually seemed embarrassed by my kidding about
his love of horror films, and he would sheepishly declare that they had lost some of their interest for him. Actually, I thought it was wonderful that he found so much emotional and intellectual enjoyment in this endeavor. In the 21st century, much of Lawton’s scholarship was focused on Joseph Smith and the Church of the Latter-day Saints (Mormons), about which he was purchasing and reading books to the very end of his life. One of his articles on Joseph Smith Jr. is published posthumously in this journal (see page 89).

Incredible stick-to-it-ness—determination—was a characteristic Henry Lawton had to an unusual degree. He worked for over three decades at a social work agency at which employees usually burn out in a year or two. Instead of giving up on teenagers whose cases were deemed hopeless, he kept on treating and advocating for them. One of the recollections of him published in this issue is by a woman who credits Henry with saving her life. Whether standing over a photocopy machine making copies of useful articles or reading into the wee hours of the morning, he just kept on working long after others usually gave up. There was a bulldog-like quality to how he kept at a project once he committed.

Henry was a quiet, introspective man who “kept a self-analytic journal off and on since” age 16, starting it because he “noticed that, in comparison to [his] friends in high school, [he] seemed unduly anxious with girls and wanted to know why.” As a dedicated advocate of self-analysis, he resisted going into psychoanalysis for many years, despite the urging of friends, but upon being in treatment for two weeks, he declared that “I found myself coming up with insights that had never occurred to me in years of journal keeping.” Once engaged in the analytic process, he kept working to dig deeper, staying for three decades. He regretted that he had not been able to go into psychoanalytic training because of financial limitations.

Helen and Henry Lawton were well matched from their very first date. Among so many other things, they both loved a wholesome, unpretentious life, their home, and to eat. They were extremely devoted to their two children, a devotion that has since been reciprocated. They lived frugally, with Helen staying home with the children until they were grown. Since his government job did not pay very well, Henry delivered newspapers in the early
morning, worked as a part-time reference librarian, and at one point had a small research business that I started with him. The Lawtons have always been quite proud of their four grandchildren and were often their caretakers.

During Henry’s illness, the couple’s Dutch Reformed Church in Wyckoff, N.J. rallied around them. For four years and nine months, two strong members of the “Henry team” came to the Lawtons’ home to put him to bed, since this was more than Helen could handle on her own. At the very moving memorial prior to his cremation, there were about 25 names on the beautiful wreath sent from the “Henry team.” Two of the members who spoke expressed a feeling of being honored to have helped this scholarly neighbor whose plight, erudition, and thankfulness touched them. The minister gave a moving and uplifting sermon—I doubt it would have made a difference if he knew that as far back as I can remember, Henry always referred to himself as an agnostic.

On behalf of the psychohistorical community, I wish to express our condolences to Helen, Jason, Jennifer, the grandchildren, and Henry’s brother Jeffrey.

_Paul Elovitz’ biography may be found on page 18._

_The Social Worker Who Changed My Life_

_Anonymous_

There is so much to say about Henry Lawton, whose life that was cut short by a neuro-muscular disease that left his body paralyzed for years until he died. I knew Henry from his work with the Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS) as a case worker. I was one of the children he removed from an abusive family to be placed into an orphanage—something he usually worked to avoid.

Many years after Henry and I met, he described the first time he met my family as like being a lion tamer in a cage with lions. There was a real possibility of an argument between my mother and I turning into a physical altercation. Henry wasn’t like the many other social workers I had experienced; he looked deeper
into what was going on—I owe my life to him for his perseverance. I remember his saying that it was the worst case of child abuse he had ever seen in his 25-year career.

Henry rescued me from my abusive family and placed me first in a shelter and then a group home—an orphanage. He was my ally in going before Family Court judges and in getting me into college despite DYFS regulations to the contrary. Henry cared about me and helped me to learn to care about myself. Once in college I was no longer on his caseload, but he still continued to be a part of my life. For more than 10 years after Henry stopped being my social worker, he continued to talk with me and help me to make better life choices.

More than talk, he showed up. Henry was the closest person to family I had at my wedding. I am a better person because of the time that Henry put into helping me to grow up and see that I could have a better life. Thanks to his help I was able to break away from the cycle of unplanned pregnancies, drug and alcohol dependence, and problems with the law. I became a productive member of society. I grew into an adult who has never been arrested, I had my daughter years after getting married, and I was even able to earn a four-year college degree.

I owe my life to the hard work Henry put into helping me to become a better person.

*Anonymous asked to withhold her name and email.*

**In Appreciation**

**Herbert Barry**—University of Pittsburgh

At the beginning of the annual International Psychohistory Association (IPA) conventions, and thereafter during the three days, one of my pleasures was to see and converse with Henry Lawton at the registration table. He was extraordinarily dependable and helpful. When I was president for one year, from 1991 to 1992, I believed that Henry would be my most suitable successor, but he declined to be nominated. My opinion apparently was premature but not otherwise erroneous because he subsequently served
well as president. I believed that the roster of presidents should be enlarged. My article in the IPA Bulletin in 1992 therefore invited members to nominate themselves for president beginning in the same year. The only response was by Lloyd deMause, who thereby became my successor in addition to having organized the initial Convention and having served as the first president.

**Herbert Barry III, PhD**, is a psychologist who became a faculty member at the University of Pittsburgh School of Pharmacy in 1963 and Professor Emeritus in 2001. He has presented reports on his research at many of the annual IPA conventions, usually on presidents of the United States. He may be contacted at barryh@pitt.edu.

---

**Remembering Henry**

**David Beisel**—The Psychohistory Forum

Henry Lawton was a dedicated, hard-working, and loyal psychohistorical pioneer. I worked with him in many ways and was always amazed at his commitment and energy. Serving for many years as the Book Review Editor of *The Journal of Psychohistory* (JPH), Henry was a trained librarian interested in building up a circulating library for the IPA. He also helped author the IPA’s constitution in 1978. In the 1980’s when I edited the journal, Henry submitted the paper of which I think he was most proud, “The Myth of altruism,” a psychohistorical analysis of some of the hidden negative impulses driving the social work profession. Publishing it was an enormously courageous thing to do for a social worker employed by a public agency.

Mostly, I remember Henry’s joy doing group fantasy analysis at the bi-monthly Saturday Institute for Psychohistory meetings and subsequently as a group process analyst at the IPA, when at the end of the day he would describe what hidden feelings and agendas the group had revealed via our individual and collective body language, avoidance, and slips of the tongue. Thank you Henry, I learned so much from those analyses. You will be missed.

*David Beisel’s biography may be found on page 28.*
Psychohistory brought us together. Henry Lawton and I met in about 1976 at the Institute for Psychohistory and talked more at the first IPA meeting. We were both founding IPA members who lived close to each other in New Jersey and drove to various meetings together. Before long, we started meeting regularly on a monthly or weekly basis for lunch to discuss psychohistory, his clients and self-analysis, and psychoanalytic ideas. We met in Hackensack where he worked, just across the river from Teaneck, where I was in psychoanalytic training and practicing at the Low-Cost Clinic.

Soon we started going to local museums and historical sites, walking through 17th and 18th century Dutch and English churches and graveyards in Bergen County and thinking about the lives of the people involved in them. We would drive together to Institute for Psychohistory and Psychohistory Forum Saturday meetings in Manhattan, stopping to pick up bagels, lox, and cream cheese to serve between the morning and afternoon sessions. Sometimes we would invite a colleague to drive with us. On the ride home, we would analyze the session and plan future meetings or publications.

Henry’s enthusiasm for scholarship, especially about cinema, was as contagious as his laughter. When he relaxed, he had a great smile. One summer we started an information research service together. He would spend hours in front of a Xerox machine photocopying articles and even whole books that he could not afford to buy at the time. I joked that his house might fall in from the weight of his research materials—and that was decades before he could not use his walker easily because the overflow of books on the floor blocked the way. I also kidded him that one of the adolescents he had rescued from abuse and bureaucratic ineptitude had become his “second daughter.” He really cared about his clients.

After his retirement, his body began to fail him. At 6 a.m. one morning en route to the IPA from his home, I was horrified when, as I walked in front of Henry ready to catch him if he fell forward, he just fell over backwards onto the flagstones because his
muscles had given out. Yet, he went on that day to work the registration table and gave his usual presentation at the conference. For Henry’s March 2003 Featured Scholar Interview for Clio’s Psyche, Bob Lentz asked him about his work with me, a question and answer I did not include in the published interview. I will conclude with it and my answer.

“Over the years Paul has been helpful to my growth in many ways. Perhaps without realizing it, he helped me know that I had to go my own way and, more importantly, that I could. I will always be grateful to him for that. I hope that I have given him something in return as well.”

Yes, Henry, you certainly have given me a great deal throughout the years.

Paul Elovitz’ biography may be found on page 18.

Henry Lawton

Harriet Fraad—Private Practice in New York City

My Henry Lawton is sitting behind the registration table surrounded by folders for the IPA Conference. He is efficient in the friendliest way, helping us get our materials and know what is happening. He is also there as a living archive of IPA’s history. He is there as a presenter of deep insights born of his long experience in a bureaucracy that cannot rescue all the hurt children who keep on getting hurt. He is there as a gentle inspiration. He is there at the meetings trying to ease the strains of the IPA in a way that creates the least trouble. There he is, dealing with thorny personal and political issues while he tries the best he can to resolve the interpersonal tensions and eruptions that threaten us. His presence is a constant glow of compassion, humor, and purpose.

I also see Henry in the envelopes with his address for participation in all things IPA. I then see Henry in his stalwart life partner, Helen, who stood in for Henry when the desk was impossible for him. Her very presence spoke of the loyalty and deep caring of Henry’s long and loving life as a partner for Helen and his children. In a way, Henry was an IPA partner for all of us.
Henry’s kind, wise energy is there in the life force of the IPA. He is deeply missed as a presence. He is still with us, not only as the presence of an absence, but also as a quiet and constant reminder of the many purposes we share in working together to build the IPA.

Harriet Fraad, PhD, is a licensed mental health counselor and certified hypnotherapist in private practice in New York City who is a regular contributor to the Journal of Psychohistory. She served as president of the IPA from 2007 to 2009 and also has a radio program on WBAI. Dr. Fraad may be contacted at hfraad@aol.com.

When Henry Was Always There

Juhani Ihanus—University of Helsinki

When I first met Henry Lawton in June 1994, it was at the opening of the annual IPA Convention in New York. Henry was standing behind the desk, collecting payments, handing out program sheets, and welcoming participants with gracious gestures and smiling both contentedly and empathically. All were greeted, and I sensed that I got a moment of special attention.

This caring and sharing atmosphere was never absent in our later contacts. I only met him in person during the IPA Conventions, where he had his memorable psychohistorical film sessions, but his presence was felt through correspondence in his quick and balanced messages, for example, as the Secretary of the IPA and the Book Review Editor of the JPH. He was sure to accept even strong critical statements if he felt them to be constructive, developing further psychohistorical work.

I started to trust that Henry was always there, “being in the world,” like existentialist philosophers used to say. Henry’s “being in the world” meant “co-being” with his family, friends, colleagues, as well as strangers.

His passionate interest in books became evident to me when, after a long IPA Convention day, we happened to meet in the Strand Bookstore at Broadway, between the bookshelves. Henry’s
reaction was surprise, accompanied by, “My goodness! You are here!” This coincidence and Henry’s short exclamation has remained a precious memory, giving structure to my experience of being in the realms of personal and interpersonal exploration. We were both searching for old books and new knowledge. This search was made even more exciting because I knew that Henry was also there.

Juhani Ihanus’ biography may be found on page 41. ☐

The Loss of Henry Lawton

Allan Mohl—Forum Research Associate

When I joined the IPA in 1988, I was aware of Henry Lawton as secretary and chairperson of membership. In 2010, when I decided to write an article on polygamous families for Clio’s Psyche, Henry’s expertise on the history of Mormonism was quite helpful to me despite his failing health.

Henry was a major figure in the IPA who had been one of its founders who held all positions of leadership except for treasurer. During my tenure as president, 2009 to 2011, the question was raised as to whether Henry was still capable of functioning effectively as secretary because he was not in good health. After some communication with Henry and his wife, I felt that he could remain in this position and looking back, I feel it was the right decision.

Despite his physical condition and with the aid of his wife Helen and his son Jason, Henry continued to be effective as both secretary and chairperson of membership. He continued to attend IPA conferences and presented films of interest on fundamentalism and other topics. Continuing in the role of secretary gave him a sense of purpose and helped his morale in the face of a debilitating illness.

During the period of my tenure as president of the IPA, I presented Henry with a certificate of accomplishment within the organization. His influence was enormous and despite his condition—he suffered from primary lateral sclerosis—he continued his
valuable involvement in our organization. Henry was an icon-ic figure in the IPA who will be greatly missed.

Allan Mohl, PhD, LCSW, is a licensed clinical social worker who maintains a private practice in Dobbs Ferry, NY. He is a member of various professional organizations including the Psychohistory Forum. Dr. Mohl can be reached at Mo9Al@aol.com.

Remembering Henry Lawton

Richard Morrock—Independent Scholar

I first met Henry Lawton in the mid-1980s, when I attended my first IPA annual conference. He was a genuine asset to psychohistory in his capacities as IPA secretary, as coordinator of our group process sessions, and also, as founder and director of the Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film. Even then, ill as he was, he continued to attend and present at the IPA’s conferences.

Henry was intensely devoted to psychohistory, which he regarded as a cause, not just a field of scholarly inquiry. Henry was horrified by child abuse and saw the IPA as a means of exposing and preventing it.

Occasionally the IPA attracted some strange characters. One of them, a South African who championed apartheid, targeted both of us with racist invective. Henry understood the roots of this man’s rage, which stemmed from his abusive upbringing. It would be safe to say that anyone this fellow chose to attack had to be doing something right.

I remember reading a book, which Henry was also familiar with, that sought to justify the sexual abuse of boys. Henry saw what the authors were getting at before I did. Henry was a pillar of common sense in the IPA, and he always championed the victims of injustice. My heart goes out to his family. He will be sorely missed in the psychohistorical community.

Richard Morrock is a prolific scholar who has written extensively. He may be contacted at rimorrock@yahoo.com.
He Made Me Smile and Think More Deeply

Terence O’Leary—IPA Life Member

Although I have been away from the IPA and the Psychohistory Forum for a number of years, this absence has not affected my love and appreciation for Henry Lawton. For me, the most astounding attribute for which I smile whenever I imagine speaking with Henry again was his fantastic sense of humor. My appreciation is based on his love of film and his incredible interpretations of them. His enlightening exercises in popular psychohistory enabled me to see how so many of these pictures were intended to exacerbate social fears, ignorance, and to reinforce myth-based prejudices and phobias.

Thinking of Henry brings a smile to my face. Thinking of his long-term suffering at the end of his generous life only causes me to admire him even more. He could always make me laugh and smile.

Terence O’Leary, a friend of psychohistory, may be contacted at terence.oleary@verizon.net.

Henry Lawton: A Remembrance

Geraldine Pauling—Independent Scholar

When Henry talked about starting the film group back in the 1980s, I was keen to get involved since I was looking for an avenue through which to finish my dissertation. Film analysis was a perfect fit. For a number of years, I would host these film meetings in my Manhattan apartment. I had been a member of the psychohistory community since 1984 and an early subscriber to Lloyd DeMause’s Journal of Psychohistory: The History of Childhood Quarterly, so I knew that psychohistory would lend itself to studying the family and, in particular, mothers.

Henry’s astute perceptions of group fantasy were the guiding impetus for the film group’s participants. It was sad that we disbanded when he became ill and when my own disability worsened. I was unable to complete the research inspired by his work.
until recently, when I returned to the manuscript and was about to let him know it would soon be done—I never got to make the call.

Henry’s contributions to psychohistory, as we all know, were invaluable. What stands out most in my memory is how he provided a stabilizing force at conferences and willingly proffered so many unique insights; without his influence we would be all the poorer. Thank you, Henry, for the light you shed on a new discipline: the psychohistorical study of film. In the darkened theater, your illumination is writ large on the screen for all to view.

Geraldine Pauling’s doctoral work in cognitive psychology at the City University Graduate Center and her studies in Family Therapy at the Post Graduate Center for Mental Health led to an interest in psychohistory. She joined the IPA in 1984 and was one of the founding members of the film group, hosting monthly meetings for many years until she had to focus her energies on raising a special needs grandchild. As an independent scholar, she is working on a longitudinal film study inspired by Henry Lawton’s views on group fantasy in film. She may be contacted at ggmerrill@gmail.com.

Appreciating Henry Lawton
Howard F. Stein—University of Oklahoma

In this brief comment, I limit myself to my experience of Henry Lawton as group process analyst at the annual conventions of the IPA for many decades. Early on, as I observed and witnessed and appreciated his gifts, I said to myself, “That’s what I want to do.” My path to organizational consulting and organizational psychohistory began with Henry Lawton.

Henry was always a quiet physical and emotional presence in the groups. I felt confident that he was there for us. He was a man of few words, but every word counted. He exuded self-assuredness, but never bravado. He was group-centered, never interpretation-centered. For me, he embodied Bion’s concept of “container/contained” and Winnicott’s concept of “holding environment.” I will remember his occasional leprechaun-
like grins when he would make a subtle confrontation, observation, and interpretation to the group of people, often ending his words with a simple admonition, “Think about it.”

I think of Henry “nautically” as a kind of rudder of a ship, keeping the group on course, pointing out defenses against understanding, creating mental space for greater depth of understanding. He would inquire now and then about possible links between themes in our group process, the IPA, and the unconscious process of the wider society and the world.

I miss Henry Lawton. I will remember him for the rest of my life. His torch is now ours to carry in doing the work of group psychohistory.

Howard F. Stein, PhD, a psychoanalytic and applied anthropologist, psychohistorian, and Psychohistory Forum Research Associate, is Professor Emeritus in the Department of Family and Preventative Medicine at the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center. He is a prolific author and poet who may be contacted at Howard-Stein@ouhsc.edu.

Doing Psychohistory
Henry W. Lawton

Interest in psychohistory remains alive and well despite its somewhat uneven track record. Some scholars shrink from endeavoring to do psychohistory due to uncertainty about its emotional and intellectual requirements. It is my hope that what I offer here will help ease this uncertainty.

People read what we psychohistorians write and listen to what we say. They wonder whether we are select practitioners of some arcane art or if psychohistory is a field that is easily accessible. The truth lies somewhere in between. There are those intrigued by what we do, who view psychohistory as the harbinger of new and better understanding about man’s historical motivations, and others who would be happy to see us gone. Some psychohistorians fantasize that this latter group is all around us, seeking our destruction. As with any fantasy, there is an element of truth, but
most people are just not all that concerned about what we do or have to offer. Some of our work certainly provokes anxiety, but the best of our work is challenging and stimulating.

Psychohistory remains one of the great emotional and intellectual adventures open to modern scholars. It is an exciting field, full of growth and vitality. We have been busy doing psychohistory, trying to make the field viable, learning, and understanding. We have not paid enough attention to what it takes to do psychohistorical work. It is time to do otherwise.

Though we are able to trace our antecedents as far back as Freud and Dilthey, psychohistory is a relatively new field, pioneered by such scholars as Erik Erikson, Bruce Mazlish, Peter Loewenberg, George Kren, Lloyd deMause, David Beisel, Charles Strozier, and many others. Nonetheless, confusion about what psychohistory is still persists today. I define psychohistory as the interdisciplinary study of why human beings have acted as they have in history, prominently utilizing psychoanalytic principles. We do psychohistory because it offers new, deeper ways to understand historical motivation—ways that go beyond what more traditional disciplines can offer. The interdisciplinary approach is needed so that we can utilize insights and evidence from all fields (especially psychoanalysis, history, anthropology, family systems theory, small and large group psychology) in our work. Many practitioners, including me, make strong use of psychoanalysis in our work because, despite all the efforts to question its tenets, it still offers the best way to understand human beings and what they are about.

Psychohistory is more interpretive than narrative, utilizing methods from varied fields to understand reasons why. It is built on the traditional disciplines; their insights are the building blocks with which we work. A psychohistorical approach is necessary because history has long been more concerned with questions of what happened rather than why it happened. Thus, psychohistory was born as a new field, independent of the limits and denials of traditional disciplinary thinking, to make the jump to the fuller understanding that we seek to achieve.

Our field is often accused of reductionism because we emphasize the primacy of emotion and fantasy, while our more tradi-
tional colleagues still tend to focus on other factors such as political, social, intellectual, cultural, or economic events. More accurately, we seek explanatory bedrock. All of these other factors can be said to derive from emotion; denying this reality is essentially a defense to deny the reality of emotion in history, which can often be rather intense and anxiety-provoking. Taking these other factors into consideration is not wrong if we realize that they stem from emotion and do not use them in the service of denying that basic fact. Motives are exhibited by persons, either as individuals or acting together. Behaviors and motives are also essentially caused by emotions individually felt and/or experienced in shared contexts such as the family or a social group. Human beings are their own agents; motives are the expressions of their feelings.

Psychohistorians try to use the materials of traditional scholarship in new ways, plus material ignored or inadequately used. Data that we especially need, such as that about childhood or intimate emotional life, is often not as readily available as we would like it to be. We must be tenacious researchers, but this is not always enough. Like therapists with their patients, we must carefully use our own disciplined subjectivity—our own countertransference—as a major interpretive tool to understand the emotional meaning of our material.

In a sense, history is like our patient, but we seek to understand rather than to cure. Also, of course, we do not have a patient/therapist relationship. We cannot have a dialogue with the patient but, as Peter Loewenberg has noted, we do immerse ourselves in our data so that we can listen with as much sensitivity as we can muster to what the voice of history is trying to tell us. This is not simple and can be an emotionally draining enterprise.

For the psychohistorian, comprehension is an intellectual and emotional act. Traditional disciplines tend to intellectually comprehend and deny or downplay the importance of emotion, feeling, and fantasy as tools of understanding. All this said, what are the emotional/intellectual requirements for psychohistorical work? What does it take to be a psychohistorian?

Even after almost 50 years, there is still little training available for psychohistorians. What does exist is essentially informal,
mainly consisting of scholars who meet together in study groups (e.g. The Psychohistory Forum and the online psychohistory discussion groups) or conferences (e.g. those offered by the International Psychohistorical Association) to present and discuss their work. We remain basically self-trained, often working in isolation; each of us reads the literature in accordance with his/her own needs or the dictates of whatever research we may be doing. This is one reason for the highly variable quality of psychohistorical scholarship. The literature that we need for our work is taken from many disciplines and may be difficult to locate. One reason I wrote The Psychohistorian’s Handbook (1988) was to help the aspiring scholar get some grounding in the literature of many fields and the principles of interdisciplinary research. It helps to have a sound background in one or more traditional disciplines—e.g. history, psychoanalysis, anthropology, political science, etc. In psychohistory, it is crucial that the scholar be willing and able to make the jump beyond traditional disciplinary norms. This might be an act of considerable emotional and intellectual courage for some of us, but the dividend of a better quality of understanding is, in my experience at least, worth any price that might be involved.

People still ask if being psychoanalyzed is necessary for psychohistorical work. Some have argued, as I once did when I relied on self-analysis, that having an analysis is no guarantee of superior insight and not having one a guarantee of inferior work. Since psychohistory involves both intellectual and emotional comprehension, an analytic experience, if it is done well, helps us be more attuned to the importance of emotion, fantasy, dreams, etc. as motivating issues. Thus, if one has been analyzed it is likely that s/he will do higher quality psychohistorical work.

The psychohistorian must have a healthy, well-developed sense of curiosity. It must be intense enough to help us push beyond traditional disciplinary limits. Open-mindedness must stand with our curiosity. We should be aware of and respect the insights of traditional scholarship, but be comfortable with thinking for ourselves. It helps if the psychohistorian is something of a revolutionary, in the sense that the authority for what we seek to achieve comes not only from traditional thinking (our data) but, more importantly, from within ourselves—in essence, from our own subjec-
tivity/countertransference. Indeed, some complain that psychohistory embodies extreme subjectivity, ignoring the supposedly objective standards of traditional disciplines. Yet all scholars’ theories and explanations are significantly influenced by their life experiences. This is as important, if not more so, than supposedly objective frameworks. Psychohistorians know this and use our countertransference to what we study as a tool for enhanced comprehension. It would be an error to think that facts, insofar as they are ascertainable, do not matter to the psychohistorian. Quite the contrary! If we do not have a solid base of information, we have nothing to work from and build upon.

We must have the ability for deep introspection and the strength to tolerate anxiety. The subjects that we seek to study can often prove more complex and/or terrifying than originally expected or anticipated. Our material can evoke fearful emotions in both scholar and reader (this is one reason that Lloyd deMause’s work is so controversial to many). Some may feel provoked to run away from psychohistorical work due to anxiety and/or denial. This is unfortunate, and should be resisted as much as possible. It is important not to be easily intimidated. The more self-aware and disciplined the scholar can be, the better.

One can never expect to know everything necessary when doing interdisciplinary work. When confronted by something unknown in his/her research, the psychohistorian cannot give up. You must learn what you need to know to solve your problem. This is one reason why I have always felt that psychohistorical work should not be deadline driven. You need time to do this work. Still, it can also be easy to fall into the trap of perpetual study, because it seems like there is always something new. It is important to know when to draw the line in order to bring your project to a conclusion. Accept that you will never be able to be definitive.

Anyone wanting to do psychohistorical work must be a skilled researcher. You must be able to get around in a library on your own. Unfortunately, you cannot always count on the help of the librarian because, if for no other reason, most of them know little of our field and what it is about. Also, in today’s world, knowledge of the Internet is crucial. You need to know about search engines and how to use them. It is essential to have the imagination
to vary the search terms. You may need to try a number of different ones before you get useful information. Due to the fact that the quality of Internet information can be highly variable, it is often necessary to check the material against other sources for accuracy. However, the Internet can also be a veritable treasure trove of primary source material. There are a number of vast digital libraries of primary material that can be downloaded for free by the enterprising scholar. Both in the library and on the Internet, the important thing is to have the imagination and tenacity to seek out what you want to know. If you can do this, you will find there is virtually nothing that you cannot find out something about.

In conclusion, I encourage people to study psychohistory because it is one of the great emotional and intellectual adventures open to modern scholars. It is underappreciated despite the important work done by pioneers in our field that is more interpretive than narrative. We use the materials of traditional scholarship differently; mostly with a greater emphasis on emotion, fantasy, and the researchers’ own feelings. Very important for psychohistorical work is a healthy, a well-developed sense of curiosity, deep introspection, the ability to tolerate anxiety, an openness to different ideas, good research skills, an ability to work on your own, and trusting one’s own authority. When done well, our scholarship is as good as any other field while providing unique insights. What we offer is one of the great emotional and intellectual adventures still open to those interested in the pursuit of the life of the mind.

[Editor’s note: Jason Lawton provided this and the following file, last accessed by Henry on June 20, 2012, for publication.]

Forthcoming Psychohistory Forum Saturday Work-In-Progress Seminars

Ken Fuchsman (UConn) and Paul Elovitz (Ramapo College) will present “Is Humankind More or Less Civilized?” on September 20, 2014. Lawrence J. Friedman (Harvard University) will speak on “Give Peace a Chance: Growth of a Dissenting Minority in the Early Cold War” on November 1, 2014.
Working Notes on Countertransference and Other Issues in Researching Joseph Smith Jr. and the Mormons

Henry W. Lawton—The Psychohistory Forum

For the past several years I have been studying a fascinating subject for psychohistorians: the Mormons and their founder Joseph Smith Jr. While there is a huge amount of historical literature on most aspects of Mormon life and leadership, psychohistorical scholarship on the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints (the Mormons, Saints, or LDS) remains in its infancy. For the most part, scholarship in this area remains locked into faith promoting vs. non-faith promoting work. Anything that is felt by church leaders to be non-faith promoting is declared to be dissent from this essentially closed system.

Dissenters do not have sub-groups; they are the sub-group. The main group and splinter groups exist in isolation from each other, yet they depend on each other. Splinter groups tend to be as rigid in their dissent as is the mainstream church in defending its orthodoxy. Dissenting scholarship seeks to show that some aspect of Mormon history and/or culture needs revision, that some doctrines are wrong, or that the leaders are evil or corrupt. There is little middle ground in this scholarship, as most scholars appear to have some sort of ax to grind. Dissenters are quite serious about their differences with prevailing doctrine and they have been excommunicated for their viewpoints. They describe themselves as wanting to find and/or present the truth, whatever it may be. Their truth is seldom, if ever, in line with church doctrine. The Mormon Church has no tolerance for diversity of beliefs—either accept established doctrine or you have no place in the community of the faithful. As an interested outsider, it is my hope that I will be able to shed new light on the Mormons and what they have become. As a psychohistorian I recognize that my efforts can generate anxiety and that I must be careful to avoid letting my feelings sabotage my LDS project.
This inquiry must begin with the life of Joseph Smith Jr., the prophet and founder of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. To comprehend how and why the church developed under this prophet and its place in our modern world, it is necessary to understand the life of Joseph and his family of origin, which influenced what he became. In this article I will outline the necessary steps to psychobiographically understand a person like Joseph Smith Jr. My goal is to show how we can cut through the mysterious aspects in the life of Joseph Smith Jr., who has perhaps been the most underappreciated religious innovator in American history. I will define the methodology we need to know in order to comprehend a person like Smith Jr.

Any person is importantly defined by the nature of his/her work. Likewise, it is important for the scholar to be aware of how much his/her emotional makeup shapes the understanding of emotion and fantasy felt by Smith Jr. This is a system that will influence how we see Joseph. Having a good comprehension of Joseph Smith Jr. might enhance our own self-image. It is important to watch out for bad psychobiography that might be used to mask emotional issues such as depression, anxiety, feelings of inferiority, etc. felt by the scholar. This can be a cause of confusion in assessing the person you are trying to understand. It is essential for scholar and subject that these factors are in balance. The scholar should not act out his/her pathology through the person under study. This can be one reason why psychobiographical work might take more time than you would expect.

The Problem of Joseph Smith Jr.

Consider the following from *The Essential Joseph Smith* (Signature Books, n.d., 245), in my opinion the best version of this sermon:

You don’t know me—you never will. You never know my heart. No man knows my history. I cannot do it. I shall never undertake it. I don’t blame you for not believing my history. If I had not experienced what I have, I could not have believed it myself. I never did harm since I have been born in the world. My voice is always for peace.
What manner of man would make such claims? Why would he describe himself in such terms? These assertions come from a funeral sermon given by Joseph Smith shortly before he was killed by an anti-Mormon mob. The church was founded in 1830 by Smith with six members and has evolved into a worldwide church with 11 million current members. Despite there being a great deal of information about him, Joseph Smith Jr. has long been something of a puzzle for those seeking to understand him and the church he created. His family of origin was no stranger to various sorts of trauma. These traumas seemed to be inflicted from the outside and/or by their own bad judgment. Joseph grew up in an atmosphere of anxiety, depression, and poverty where his family did not always have enough to eat. The family moved 10 times when Joseph was young, always seeking a better life. His education was sporadic because he and his siblings had to help their father in their fields. Alvin, his revered older brother, had worked tirelessly to help the family keep its head above water until he died suddenly due to a medical misdiagnosis. All the Smith children survived typhoid fever, which was often a kiss of death. When Joseph was seven, he developed a severe infection in his leg. His doctors wanted to amputate, but the child and his family would not permit it. Young Joseph refused to take liquor—the only anesthetic at the time—knowing that it meant extreme pain. Why would a child do this? Why would his parents go along with their son’s wishes? Is there some sort of unconscious collusion going on here?

His father also lost his wife’s dowry in an ill-conceived business venture. This plunged the family into even worse poverty than they had already known. They seemed to have set themselves up to fail. Why the family would have done so remains a mystery best answered by psychohistorical examination. Family is important, over and above the normal influences, because it might also shape issues of religious belief. In the family of Joseph Smith, his parents had differences on religion but I do not have a sense that they were preoccupied with their differences. Smith may have felt that he had no consistent parental example to follow. Therefore, he had to go his own way.

Joseph gravitated toward religion after a series of visions that stretched over several years. He was a charismatic leader who
had his troubles, including that his followers were not a group of passive sheep. Along with many of his followers, Joseph looked forward to the second coming of Christ, but unlike others, the Mormons did not set a date in the near future.

Polygamy proved to be his undoing. Smith had introduced this to his inner circle as early as 1834. However, it had been whispered about for years. The editor of the local newspaper was going to publish an exposé about that which was known but not officially acknowledged. Joseph had the printing press destroyed. He was charged for destroying the press and the violation of free speech. While waiting for trial, Joseph elected to go to a county jail located outside Mormon control, where he was killed.

Smith Jr. must have known on some unconscious level that he wanted to die in order to save women and men from themselves. Did he unconsciously cause his own death at the hands of a mob? Did he see himself as a new Christ? Did he want to inspire future generations of Mormons via the example of his martyrdom as Christ had done for Christians?

From this it should be obvious that a psychobiographical approach, despite its difficulties, is the best way to understand Joseph Smith Jr. and his creation.

Transference and Motivation

My conscious motivation for this research was related to an anger that seemed to me out of proportion to the subject. I wanted to tell the presenter that I felt the presentation was unduly excessive. I quickly realized that I did not know enough to intelligently engage in a critique. Once I started reading, I found myself totally hooked on the subject and felt that with enough study I might be able to do it better. As my studies progressed I became aware of some unconscious transference.

This transference occurred in part because of the similarities between my father and Joseph Smith Jr. Like my father, Joseph had a slight limp and was a charming, promiscuous man, not above lying when he felt it to be necessary. Both men, for different reasons, were adulterers. I felt a great deal of ambivalence and some envy toward Joseph and my father. Joseph and his followers developed elaborate religious justifications for their conduct. My father
used a tissue of lies that became increasingly untenable over the years. I felt a certain envy of my father’s appearance of ease connecting with people. However, that ease tended to be on a surface level because once others got to know him they were often disenchanted. Whether or not the relationship was able to evolve to a deeper level was always uncertain. Like Joseph Smith Jr., my father seemed to prefer a surface relationship where people looked up to him. Mormonism produced longer term relationships among converts and followers, while my father based many of his relationships on sex and/or taking advantage of the other person. Both men, for different reasons, felt themselves to be alone. Since I did not like my father, although at this stage of my life I want to know more about him, I have to be aware of my inclination to have a negative transference to Smith.

Such issues need not be explicitly written out as part of a research project. However, they need to be known and understood because they influence how we interpret our findings. Psychologists routinely put themselves on the line. Awareness of our emotional baggage will positively influence any psychobiographical project. Fear of revealing too much about ourselves is one reason why scholarship might provoke anxiety and I fight this tendency.

**Religion**

Understanding any group involves knowing its emotional power, meaning, and appeal for members. We need to know how members feel the group meets their needs and contains their emotions and fantasies. Understanding large and small group psychology is necessary here. Contrary to those who believe there is inadequate literature on large and small group psychology, the reality is that there is ample material on this subject. An important aspect of group life is that it can influence how members define themselves. Religion is an especially obvious example of this. Most of the time Joseph Smith Jr. defined himself in terms of his religion. What would he have been without religion? In all likelihood, he would have been an anonymous farmer that no one beyond his family would ever notice.

How, then, should we deal with the problem of religion? We should try not to project our personal beliefs, values, feelings,
and fantasies upon what we seek to understand. Of course, this is easier said than done. We need to familiarize ourselves with the doctrines and practices of the religion we want to understand. It can also be helpful to understand the issues involved with dissent. There have been over 200 dissenting Mormon groups, most of which have not survived. Personally, I come from a position of religious agnosticism, which means that I do not share the antagonism to the Mormons that is common among many of my fellow Protestants. Approaching the topic with disciplined awareness of my emotional baggage and an open mind is essential. The desired goal of neutrality regarding different issues involved with the Mormons can be difficult since they have evoked powerful reactions ever since their creation by Smith.

**God and Angels**

There is the issue of God and angels that is important because Joseph Smith regularly had visions of God, Jesus, and angels. He routinely spoke with an angel named Moroni. Such experiences had a lot to do with the creation of his church. This, combined with an additional scripture that forms *The Book of Mormon*, offered a very real appeal for converts who believed that Mormonism did not come from Joseph; rather, from God through Joseph. He was the prophet, seer, and revelator bringing the word of God to his followers. One reason that members felt a strong attraction to the church was because they felt able to bring their questions and/or problems to Joseph and found answers or resolutions from God through him.

Moving away from the LDS church and towards academia, scholars, especially Weston La Barre in his book *The Ghost Dance* (1971), have made a persuasive case for God being a delusional search for the strict and loving lost father of childhood. *The Ghost Dance, The Origin of Religion* remains one of the basic texts on the origin of religion. A contemporary text that makes the same point is M. D. Faber’s *The Psychological Roots of Religious Beliefs, Searching for Angels and the Parent-God* (2001). Faber successfully integrates the neurological and emotional developmental processes of human beings. He does not try to assign primacy to either one; rather emotional and neurological work together as a system. Belief in God is something that most of us need to some degree. Such belief is also something that can take us beyond ourselves.
We are as children, looking to restore the loving father-child relationship. If the parent-child relation was abusive, religion might help ease the pain and make it bearable via inflicting pain upon nonbelievers or heretics. If the relationship was fulfilling, we might see the father/God as a being who might help us find ways to assist other people. Still others might find in religion a way to control their inner rage and violence.

Such a formulation can, all too easily, be an excuse for prejudice, which must be avoided. We must respect the faith of others even if we find it to be personally repugnant. Though religion can be a force for good, all too often it can be something less.

[Editor’s Note: This unfinished article was found in the computer of the late Henry Lawton by his son Jason and passed on to Clio’s Psyche to be edited for publication.]

Where Have All the Flowers Gone?  
A Memorial to Peter Seeger

Ken Fuchsman—University of Connecticut

Pete Seeger, the eminent folksinger and political activist, died at the age of 94 on January 27, 2014. He was one of the few members of the 1930s Old Left who was influential with the youth generation of the 1960s. American left movements over the last century have often followed a developmental cycle that begins as youthful rebellion against unjust authority, followed by a period of ascendancy then diminishment and/or disillusionment. In these movements’ early stages, immoral special interests are seen as preventing democracy, while the virtuous victims are seen as populist forces of redemption. As time goes on, many on the left become like those they once opposed, as many Communists became anti-communists, or New Leftists became yuppies. Pete Seeger followed a somewhat different path, yet his early rebellion was succeeded in middle age by a blander social rebellion.

His affiliation with radicalism began as a teenager in 1936 and lasted until he resigned from the Communist Party in 1949. Yet in 2004 he said, “I’m still a communist, in the sense that I don’t
believe the world will survive with the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer” (Hajdu, 2004, http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2004/09/pete-seeger-last-war). Seeger’s musical career combined his allegiance to politically progressive causes with his prominence within folk music circles.

His birth in 1919 meant he arrived on this planet too early to be called a red diaper baby (the child of members of the Communist party) but he picked up his radicalism from his family. His father and mother were both professional musicians. His dad, Charles, from an old line New England family, established the University of California’s music department. Charles’ opposition to American involvement in World War I led to his resignation from “Cal” and a return to the east coast. The Seegers had three sons. Peter was the youngest. His parents divorced when he was seven. During the Depression, Seeger’s family was able to afford to send him to prominent boarding schools in Connecticut. After graduating from Avon Old Farms in 1936, Pete entered Harvard, but dropped out two years later, then went to work for Alan Lomax collecting folk music from throughout the U.S.

At the age of 17, Pete became another upper middle class adolescent who found the ideas of Marx appealing, and joined the Young Communist League, then six years later became a member of the Communist Party. He was drawn to Communism during the party’s Popular Front period. After Hitler took power in Germany in 1933, Stalin became preoccupied with the Nazis. Parties under his control began to find common ground with anti-Nazi political parties. In the U.S. at this time the party slogan was “Communism is 20th Century Americanism.” American Communists identified with the working class whether urban or rural.

For his entire career, Seeger remained somewhat true to the perspectives of the Popular Front period. He was interested in uncovering and recording folk songs from all regions of the United States and from countries throughout the world. Musically, Seeger was an internationalist and a champion of working people, wherever they might be. His own political songs also favored the lower classes over the economic bosses. Seeger believed that the people united can overcome the power of the elite. In this sense many of his political and non-political songs crossed the boundary between
liberalism and radicalism and had a democratic flavor.

In the early 1940s, along with Woody Guthrie, Lee Hays, and Millard Lampell, Seeger founded the Almanac Singers, a politically radical folk group. Their first collection of songs were anti-war and anti-capitalist. President Roosevelt was seen as collaborating with Wall Street to promote war against the people’s interest. Here youthful radicalism saw the powerful as destructive and championed the masses. Later these singers recorded pro-union songs. One of them, co-written by Seeger, is entitled “Talking Union.” In this composition, it is the familiar opposition of workers and bosses, where the employees want to unionize and their employers want to destroy this effort by whatever means necessary. In the conflict between the people and the interests, Seeger and his collaborators proclaim, “But if you all stick together, boys... You’ll win.” The redeeming power of democratic unity can defeat entrenched economic power. This song contains rhetoric that has characterized American political insurgencies from the Stamp Act to the more recent Occupy Movement. Later, after Hitler invaded the USSR, the Almanac Singers reversed their anti-war stance and embraced American involvement in World War II with Seeger himself writing a song of pro-war support called “Dear Mr. President.”

Seeger’s next important folk group was The Weavers, which he co-founded with Lee Hays, Ronnie Gilbert, and Fred Hellerman in 1948. The Weavers downplayed their political convictions and instead popularized folk songs from the U.S. and throughout the world. Their 1950 recording of “Goodnight Irene,” by the African-American blues singer Leadbelly, was a number one record. Seeger was entering a new stage in his leftist career by accommodating with the power structure, recording for a major record company, and keeping his politics and music separate. He resigned from the Communist Party the year after The Weavers were formed.

The Weavers’ popularity corresponded with the second Red Scare. Their record company succumbed to the pressure and dropped The Weavers who disbanded in 1952. In 1955, the one-time Communist Party member, Peter Seeger, was interrogated by the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC). While many individuals called before this group pleaded the Fifth Amend-
ment, Seeger refused to answer questions on the grounds of the First Amendment. He was later convicted of contempt of Congress, though the conviction was subsequently overturned. Television and nightclubs would not allow Seeger to perform for many years, but he found other ways to get music to his audience.

His fortunes began to alter as the U.S. slowly came out of the obsession with domestic subversion. Liberalism began to revive after the ascendancy of Martin Luther King Jr. in the mid-1950s and Kennedy’s election in 1960. In 1957, Seeger introduced to Martin Luther King Jr. an old hymn that he had somewhat altered. The song was “We Shall Overcome,” which, after King promoted it, soon became ubiquitous at civil rights rallies across the country.

In 1958 a folk group, the Kingston Trio, had a number one hit with “Tom Dooley.” All of a sudden a folk music revival spread throughout the country, eventually including television shows such as Hootenanny. One indication of Seeger’s changing circumstances was his signing to Columbia Records in 1961 by another old 30s radical and legendary Columbia Records executive John Hammond. Some of Seeger’s less radical music was about to enter the mainstream.

In 1955, he had composed an anti-war song, “Where Have All the Flowers Gone.” As a member of The Almanac Singers Seeger associated war mongering with capitalists. Here it was just war itself that was the enemy. Seven years later “Flowers” reached number 21 on the top 40 in a recording by the Kingston Trio. Also, in 1962, “If I Had a Hammer,” a song co-written by Seeger and Lee Hays in 1949, reached number 10 in the Peter, Paul, and Mary version. This was a populist song about “love between my brothers and my sisters all over this land,” the “hammer of justice,” and the “bell of freedom.” Here is a Seeger composition about social justice where the people unite but again there is no evil force standing in their way as was portrayed in the earlier “Talking Union.” In 1954, when Seeger put music to and adapted lyrics from the book of Ecclesiastes for “Turn! Turn! Turn!” he added one phrase, after the line “a time for peace,” he wrote “I swear it’s not too late.” The Byrds rock version with this addition made it to the top of the charts for three weeks in 1965.
The one occasion where a recording of Pete’s actually made the top 100 was in 1964. The song was “Little Boxes,” written by Malvina Reynolds, and is a satirical song about conformity and the loss of individuality in contemporary culture. Another anti-war Pete Seeger song, “Waist Deep in the Big Muddy,” was recorded in 1966. This song was about a fool army captain in the 1940s who, despite being repeatedly warned of the danger, died by wading too deep into the Missouri River (also known as Big Muddy). On the record, without quite saying so, Seeger made it clear he was also talking about Vietnam, but without any reference to a military-industrial complex. While this recording never landed on the Billboard charts, it made its mark in other ways. Seeger taped the song for an airing of the Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour in November 1967, but the CBS censors removed it. The Smother Brothers objected, got their way, and early in 1968 Seeger sang this song on their program. Slightly earlier, in October 1967, prominent liberal journalist Richard Rovere wrote a lengthy anti-Vietnam war article for The New Yorker and titled his piece “Waist Deep in the Big Muddy.”

With the revival of activism in the 1950s and 1960s, Pete Seeger’s now watered down political convictions reached a wide public audience through the mediums of popular music and television. However, the politically active folk singers of the mid-1960s added a dimension to some of their compositions that are not often found in Seeger’s work: introspection and self-questioning. For instance, Bob Dylan’s 1964 “My Back Pages” reflects on how he has felt younger when being less self-righteous, and “Changes” by Phil Ochs from 1966 concerns the impact of shifting events and feelings. In Ochs’ 1966 satirical song “Love Me I’m A Liberal,” he has his phony narrator say, “I go to all the Pete Seeger concerts. He sure gets me singing those songs.” There were ways then that Seeger made the transition from the old to the new left and other ways that, in keeping with the fate of his youth, he had somewhat different concerns than the generation of singer-song-writers inheriting his mantle. His renewed popularity was related to making people feel connected without arousing anger at the power elite.

Pete Seeger kept continuity between the radicalism of his youth and the political activism of his middle and later years in his
championing of world music and his anti-war stance. He persevered in these beliefs all his long adult life. Seeger was able to appeal to many by making his beliefs compatible with recurring American democratic concerns with freedom, justice, unity, equity, and peace. As have many other once youthful radicals, in middle age he found himself flirting with the mainstream he once vehemently opposed.

Ken Fuchsman, EdD, is Assistant Extension Professor at the University of Connecticut. Dr. Fuchsman is on the Editorial Board of Clio’s Psyche and the Journal of Psychohistory, as well as Book Review Editor of this journal. He writes on the history of American radicalism, the history of psychoanalysis, and popular music. For five years Dr. Fuchsman hosted a radio program entitled “The Life and Times of Rock & Roll.” He can be reached at ken.fuchsman@uconn.edu.

Celebrating a Cambridge University Press Psychology and History Book

Ken Fuchsman—University of Connecticut

The field of history recently has not paid enough attention to the interconnection of history and psychology. I was glad then to see the publication of Psychology and History by Cambridge University Press this past February, which is edited by psychologists Cristian Tileagă and Jovan Byford. I (KAF) interviewed our editor, Paul Elovitz (PHE), on his contribution to the volume, the book itself, and the field of psychohistory.

KAF: Tell me how you came to be involved in the Cambridge University Press volume on psychology and history?

PHE: An invitation was sent to me by the editors because, in the words of their “Summary and Rationale”: they were looking for “prominent scholars” from history and academic psychology to discuss “the merits of inter-disciplinarity” since they thought there were no “edited volumes or special issues of scholarly journals that brought together prominent scholars from the two disciplines and provided an opportunity for exploring the way in which psychology
and history might benefit from a closer relationship and dialogue with each other.” They envisioned *Psychology and History* as filling this “gap.” In keeping with my longstanding interest in both the history of psychohistory and reaching a larger audience, I accepted the invitation despite other pressing obligations. It turned out that I was one of only a few U.S. professors contributing to the volume. The editors, Cristian Tileagă and Jovan Byford, both academic psychologists in England, were a model of courteous professionalism and efficiency in a project that extended over a number of years.

**KAF:** How is your paper different and overlapping with some of the other papers in the book?

**PHE:** Mostly, the essays are different, focused on academic psychology or specific issues in the relationship of history and psychology. However, Joan Scott in “The Incommensurability of Psychoanalysis and History” covers some of the same historical ground with a great deal of emphasis on some of the ideas coming from France. As a scholar devoted to writing the history of psychohistory, I go into more detail in most cases.

We are all interested in the conversation, but it is my impression that the psychologists are academics who do not find it easy to cross disciplinary boundaries and are bravely venturing in these new waters. Most of the historians are newer to the field of psychohistory then I am after four and a half decades working in the vineyards of our interdisciplinary endeavor. I seek to give the history of this valuable discipline.

**KAF:** To what extent has psychohistory’s problem with both historians and academic psychologists been being identified with psychoanalysis? Although Freud bashing has been around for a long time, it reached a peak in the mid-1980s and appears to be declining. While you yourself have defined psychohistory as “an amalgam of psychology, history and related sciences” that “examines the... difference between stated intention and actual behavior,” some of your colleagues explicitly connect psychohistory and psychoanalysis. For example, Jacques Szaluta sees psychohistory as the interdisciplinary “application of psychology, in its broadest sense, or psychoanalysis in a specific sense, to the study of the past.” Peter Loewenberg describes psychohistory as “a dual disci-
pline” whose “method is an amalgam of psychoanalytic clinical technique with humanistic historical analysis.” Will psychohistory be able to make many inroads into history and psychology in the U.S. as long as it is identified with Freud?

PHE: Yes. Most people accept or will accept psychohistorical explanations without having any great regard for their theoretical basis. They are reading books in which the biographer makes the subject come alive by getting at childhood development, coping mechanisms (mechanisms of defense), personality, traumatic reliving, unconscious motivation, and other elements that psychoanalysts and psychohistorians have shed so much light on. In terms of group psychology, they will turn to useful concepts such as those developed by Vamik Volkan in helping them understand the nature of group and national hatreds and feelings of entitlement that lead to genocidal intentions and activities. Again, it’s not the theory but the usefulness of the concepts that count. Though academic psychologists are inclined to be cool at best or downright hostile at worst to psychoanalysis and psychohistory when they identify them as such, they still utilize our concepts. Fortunately, they and hostile or standoffish academic historians are not the gatekeepers to psychohistory since the Internet allows us to go around them to the interested public. Furthermore, most psychologists are clinicians, not academics, and as such are used to working with actual people and what they need. Consequently, they are much more open to what psychohistorians have to offer.

KAF: You discuss conflicting conceptions of psychohistory. What are they, and how have they impacted the field?

PHE: My desire is to do psychohistory focused on childhood, coping mechanisms, creativity, dreams, group delusions (and fantasies), innovation, originality, overcoming psychic trauma, psychobiography, and psychopolitics. Without a focus on psychopathology this places me in a minority among those who actively advocate psychohistory in America and elsewhere. However, among those who do the hard work in the dusty psychohistorical archives, which have been thrown open to a great degree by the Internet, I am not in such a minority. Most people use psychoanalytic and psychohistorical concepts for a better understanding of their subjects and what they deliver to the reader. The greatest level of suc-
cess comes when the author does not lead with psychohistorical concepts, or only puts them in an appendix as did Alexander and Juliette George in *Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House*. I go back to the excellent quote of the late popular historian Barbara Tuchman that “Every thoughtful historian is a psychohistorian.” At the other extreme are individuals who use group psychohistorical concepts for a type of wild analysis, labeling what they’re doing as fantasy analysis. Of course, this concept can be a useful instrument when used judicially.

The editors of *Psychology and History* are interested in a dialogue, not a merger. This reminds me of many history colleagues who were intrigued by applying psychology to history and current events in the 1970s and early 1980s, but were reluctant to put more than a toe in the water. They spent much time debating the pros and cons of the field. For better or worse, I have always been inclined to dive right in and start swimming—to devote my time to actually doing psychohistory—rather than debating the pros and cons of the field. Lloyd deMause is a staunch advocate of psychohistory who sees the field as a new science under which other disciplines are subsumed. In contrast, I view it as an art in which we use the scientific approach at times, but rely to a great extent on our own intuition and countertransference.

**KAF:** Is the publication of *Psychology and History* an indication that psychohistory has gained more ground in Britain than the U.S.?

**PHE:** It is a nice thought that psychohistory is doing better in Britain than the U.S. However, despite some recent activity and much greater acceptance of psychoanalysis, this is not the case. When the American Brett Kahr arrived in London over 20 years ago, he ran psychohistorical seminars for quite a while before he gave up in despair. The Texan Robert Maxwell Young arrived in England in 1960 and despite the opposition he faced made a great deal of progress in spreading psychoanalysis in England. Both of these extremely capable and energetic American men have paved the way for an openness to psychoanalytic and some psychohistorical inquiry. In recent years many psychoanalytic programs have been established in English universities. Some English intellectuals have also been attracted to the psychoanalytic ideas of Jacques Lacan and Jacques Derrida. The journal *Psychoanalysis and History* is a
nice addition to the literature published in England. Joanna Bourke’s 2006 book, *Fear: A Culture History* is a good example of some of the 21st century activity. However, overall, despite recent interest and progress, both psychoanalysis and psychohistory are much more established in the United States than in the British Isles.

**KAF:** How did your topic of the interdisciplinary marriage of psychology and history come to be developed?

**PHE:** Throughout my entire intellectual history, I have been working first as a historian to understand psychology and then to focus these and all other fields on the creation of psychohistory. Thus, upon being invited to contribute I immediately proposed the marriage topic to the editors. My analogy of the marriage brings to mind a troubled relationship in which the academic disciplines of psychology and history are living in separate bedrooms at the furthest ends of their abode with the incredibly valuable work of applied psychoanalysis, political psychology, psychobiography, and psychohistory being carried out overwhelmingly by those living closer together in the center of the household. While academic psychology and history may currently be either hostile or indifferent to the marriage, the field has blossomed. A few colleagues like Lloyd deMause have loudly proclaimed its value and have seen it as a separate field. Most colleagues have simply delved into it as a way of doing better work and solving certain problems.

**KAF:** The introduction to the volume speaks about the different approaches of academic psychology and academic history. What does psychohistory have to contribute to the field of history, academic psychology, and psychoanalysis?

**PHE:** This is a big question. I recommend that people read my chapter. It concludes with the Tuchman quote that “Every thoughtful historian is a psychohistorian.” Historians need to have an awareness of unconscious motivation, childhood, emotion, personality, family background, dreams, sexuality, group dynamics, delusions, mechanisms of psychic defense, psychic trauma, the repetition compulsion, the difference between conscious and unconscious motivations, and so much more. Academic psychologists need to get beyond laboratory experiments and the very tightly-framed questions that they are inclined to ask and train their grad students
to answer. They need to deal with the issues that clinical psycholo-
gists are so much more inclined to face since they work with real
people over periods of time. Again, long experience as an editor
and organizer of meetings has led me to look to clinicians to be
open to our work. Psychoanalysts have much to learn from our
work, but first they have to get past the inclination to write only
about Freud and some other theoreticians and to work from theo-
retical frameworks. Most of those with an interest need to learn to
delve into the dusty archives while putting aside their theoretical
constructs.

**KAF:** What do you see as the obstacles to psychohistory gaining
more recognition, and how do you see psychohistory realizing its
promise?

**PHE:** Prejudice and lassitude are the two primary obstacles. There
is much prejudice among academics. The prejudice of psychoana-
lysts is likely to be based on the notion that you don’t have a living
patient to illicit associations from, so the field is invalid. They fail
to realize that historians and other scholars usually don’t have liv-
ning subjects. Consequently, the best work on deceased people can
be by those who understand countertransference and how scholars
project their own fears, fantasies, and life situations on their sub-
jects. Psychohistorians who have been analyzed are in a position to
understand and pass their own projections or at least make them
explicit to the reader. The wild analysis of Goldwater during the
1964 election by people who never met or studied him led the
American Psychiatric Association (APA) to bar its members from
publishing research on living subjects without their written permis-
son. If I needed the written permission of the Bushes, Carter, the
Clintons, Gore, Kerry, McCain, Nixon, Obama, Sadat, Tsongas,
and so forth, then I never would have published on the field of
presidential psychobiography, which has been a major part of my
writings. To realize the promise of our field as psychohistorians we
need to bring our approaches and erudition to as many areas of the
human experience as possible.

**KAF:** How has the psychohistory of the American presidency that
you have written so much about enriched our historical understand-
ing of the last 40 years of American history. How should this un-
derstanding be incorporated into general histories of the period?
PHE: The incredible focus on presidential candidates and contemporary presidents has resulted in a treasure trove of personal and political information that is mostly used superficially, but in the hands of serious political psychologists it enlarges our understanding of the human condition. We know so much more about both the lives and psychology of contemporary presidents than we did of their predecessors.

KAF: If people want to know more about your essay and/or acquiring the book, what can they do?

PHE: Go online and buy a copy from Cambridge University Press for $99.00 or $79.00 for an e-book. When I last checked Amazon is offering a Kindle e-book for $63.20 and a print copy for $88.32.

KAF: Paul, thank you for an illuminating discussion, and I hope this book gets the attention it deserves.

The Psychology of the One Percenters

Tom Ferraro—Psychoanalyst in Private Practice

The “one percenters”—a term brought to public attention by the Occupy Wall Street Movement that began in the fall of 2011—is the group that has siphoned the wealth from the American middle class over the last 30 years. It includes the legacy wealth holders, entrepreneurs, millionaire athletes, Hollywood stars, hedge fund managers, and senior firm officials connected to American enterprise. What kind of diagnosis would a psychoanalyst give these individuals?

A Closer Look at a Sociopath

In the words of Gordon Gecko, the anti-hero of the film Wall Street (1987), “Greed, for lack of a better word, is good.” His character was modeled after Michael Milken, the Junk Bond King who was convicted of racketeering and fraud and sentenced to 10 years in prison. There are many like Milken: Bernie Madoff, Ken Lay, and Martha Stewart were also convicted of criminal actions and sentenced to serve time. All appeared to show a lack of concern for others, deceitfulness, unquenchable greed, a lack of guilt, and a failure to conform to the social norms of the law. These are
all symptoms of the sociopath. Why has the emergence of the sociopath become so commonplace in big business? So commonplace that it caused a global meltdown we have yet to recover from?

Some blame must be placed on the field of psychoanalysis itself, which turned away from a focus on conscience and morality beginning in the 1950s and instead focused on issues of the self and how to help patients obtain greater satisfactions in life. Don Carveth’s *A Still Small Voice: Psychoanalytic Reflections on Guilt and Conscience* (2013) clearly describes this trend.

Back in 1979, Christopher Lasch, author of *The Culture of Narcissism*, who President Jimmy Carter consulted about societal malaise, observed that the media’s constant devaluation of all forms of authority would lead to dire consequences. He predicted that when a culture no longer had ego ideals to look up to for guidance, it would begin to lose moral bearing. This has occurred, yet it takes a certain kind of environment to draw out and give license to the traits of a sociopath—traits found in the psychology of the corporation.

**The Corporation**

The modern corporation is a system that has been around for only 150 years, and it has grown to become the most dominant institution of modern times, even exceeding the reach and power of governments. In 2003, Joel Bakan, law professor at the University of British Columbia, wrote *The Corporation* that traced the history of the corporation. He explains that the corporation was originally created to have limited scope and designed to insure the public good; so far, no harm no foul.

However, the 14th Amendment—designed to guarantee equal rights for all—was transformed by the successful assertion of highly-paid lawyers that the corporation was also a legal entity, with all the rights and privileges of a person. This led to greater protection for the corporation under the law and also led to the ability of each corporate owner to be protected against serious legal action. The goal of any corporation and its legal mandate is to make as much profit as possible for the stockholders. So from an entity that was first established to have limited power and to serve
the public good it slowly became an institution that had unlimited power and was designed to serve its owners only. The corporation has become a hungry machine that does not feel, does not have compassion, and exists only to make money.

Bakan does something very creative. He argues that if the corporation is now considered a legal person under the law, then exactly what might this person’s diagnosis be if he were to be psychoanalyzed? He lists the major traits that one sees in most corporations, and he shows ample evidence to support each description:

1. A lack of concern for the feelings of others—the bottom line is profit, not people
2. An incapacity to maintain enduring relationships—downsizing is commonplace
3. Reckless disregard for the safety of others in the pursuit of profits
4. Deceitfulness, repeated lying, and conning others for profit—Chase Bank and the mortgage bundling debacle
5. An incapacity to express guilt—Chase has set aside a vast sum to defend its innocence
6. A failure to conform to lawful behavior—see the Bernie Madoff case

He concludes that according to the Personality Diagnosis Checklist of the World Health Organization, corporations can be diagnosed as “sociopaths.”

As George Tyler explains in *What Went Wrong: How the 1% Hijacked the American Middle Class and What Other Countries Got Right* (2013), these trends became malignant in the Reagan era, which emphasized deregulation and a *laissez-faire* attitude toward big business. The 150 million employed corporate workers in America have experienced stagnation since 1985. The “trickle-down effect” of Reaganomics seems to have been defying gravity for the last 30 years, and the money keeps trickling upward to the one percenters instead.

**The Milgram and Zimbardo Experiments**

The majority of CEOs and heads of global companies are educated and ethical men with good consciences, not psychopaths.
Yet the trend toward exploitation, greed, and lack of fairness continue in unabated fashion, as President Barack Obama acknowledged on television in September 2013. So why are the heads of corporations and banks allowed to continue to make such seemingly unethical, reckless, immoral, and greed-based decisions? Why do ethical leaders and the public permit the corporation to exploit their workers, the customers, and the environment?

One answer can be found in a classic psychological experiment conducted at Yale University in 1963. Stanley Milgram was a psychology professor interested in why adults are so obedient to authority figures. He set up an experiment looking at the willingness of participants to obey authority figures who instructed them to perform acts in conflict with their personal conscience, referencing the willing participants within the Nazi regime. His findings showed a shocking willingness to go to almost any length on the command of the authority. His electric shock experiments found that ordinary people, without any particular hostility, can easily become agents in a terribly destructive process and would shock subjects who would writhe and scream in pain.

Along the same lines, Phillip Zimbardo, a psychology professor at Stanford University, conducted the so-called Stanford prison experiments funded by the State Department in 1971. This experiment discovered that when subjects were placed in an environment that licensed cruelty and sadism, most were more than willing to carry out acts of extreme cruelty against others. The experiment became so violent that it had to be stopped within six days.

Both experiments support the idea that environmental demands override personality traits or personal ethics. This is what happens in most corporations. When placed in an environment that demands profit without regard to human compassion, many bow their heads, turn a blind eye, and do their job.

Conclusions and Solutions: What the Media Can Do

America is now a nation of people that are angry, overworked, depleted, depressed, and disgusted with both large corporations and a government that failed to protect them from this. The Milgram and Zimbardo experiments illustrate that the corporate
worker will comply with the authoritative mandate of the corpora-
tion and thereby disown any personal responsibility, like the Nazi
bureaucrats who were complicit in the extermination of six million
Jews during the Holocaust.

The real issue here is not the psychology of the one per-
centers. They simply have adapted to the psychology of the corpo-
ration. However, as Bakan so brilliantly showed, the personality of
the corporation is sociopathic. The corporation is a hungry, ruth-
less, amoral money-making machine that does not feel your pain.

What will be needed is a leader in government who is able
and willing to address this issue, facing up to the vast array of
Washington lobbyists that the pharmaceutical, insurance industry,
oil and gas, securities, and so many other industries spend billions
on to force governmental cooperation. Currently in 2014, there are
fewer jobs for lower wages. It is hard to argue that we are still the
land of opportunity. President Obama even said in September 2013
that 95% of all income growth since 2009 has gone to the top 1%.
Widening income disparity and the shrinking middle class can be-
come a potential threat to our democracy. The government has
failed in its responsibility to protect the public good.

Three decades of Reaganomics has darkened the American
Dream for most of us. These patently unfair conditions have cre-
ated a growing rupture in the social pact that many Americans feel
has bound them to the nation. Occupy Wall Street was a small
whimper that seems to have vanished, but discontent remains. An
argument can be made that the recent escalation of school shootings
may be a reflection of this; those who are the weakest and most vul-
nerable in the society contain the deepest anger of the nation and
express it for the rest. The one percenters are the new winners in
this game and the remaining 150 million workers are the losers.

The only system large enough and powerful enough to ad-
dress this problem is the media itself, which has a long history of
serving as the conscience of a culture. The growth of investigative
journalism was responsible for the overthrow of the Nixon admini-
stration. The media has a responsibility in all of this, and the fact
that the media is owned by corporate power and is beholden to cor-
porate advertisers makes this extremely problematic.
Alexis de Tocqueville wrote that the American character was overly concerned with commercial interest, work, and survival, and not interested enough in the arts or literature. I think he was correct in this, and it leads to our obsession with money and consumerism. The corporate monster is a powerful greed machine, and we the people are all suffering because of this. The monster is slowly destroying the American dream, and no one seems to be able to do much about it.

Tom Ferraro, PhD, is a psychoanalyst, sports psychologist, and commentator on contemporary society who lives on Long Island and may be reached at DrTFerraro@aol.com.

Revisiting Mazlish’s Essays

Juhani Ihanus—University of Helsinki


Bruce Mazlish’s essays spanning the years 1968 to 1987 were published in The Leader, the Led and the Psyche: Essays in Psychohistory in 1990. Now, this work has been reprinted, giving us the possibility to reflect on Mazlish’s views and conclusions concerning psychohistory and how they have stood the test of time (almost a quarter of a century).

It must be noticed that Mazlish has not primarily seen himself to be a psychohistorian but a historian who applies psychoanalysis and sees the psychohistorical perspective as a necessary tool in the historian’s (and the political scientist’s) work. In his important essay “Leader and Led, Individual and Group,” first published in The Psychohistory Review in 1981, Mazlish maintains that the “next” “next assignment” for psychohistorians is to study both leadership and followership in leader–led relations and to concentrate on political identity rather than on personal identity. The leader and led select their selves from “the available psychic repository, the shared culture.” Mazlish thinks that such selection is codified and frozen by ideology but “is made real and alive to the led through the leader’s image” (260). There is no reference in this work to the history of childhood or Lloyd deMause’s psychogenic theory of history.
In his new preface, Mazlish has commented that research on leader-led relations has been male-oriented and should pay more attention to women leaders (x–xi). The growing social media and the importance of net relations are also changing the leaders’ image into the tailored and manipulated image fit for the media and the globalized (and at the same time more fragmented) audience. Perhaps it is not only large-group psychology, demanded by Mazlish, that is needed, but a new kind of media psychology: the Internet and virtual reality psychology.

Psychohistorical research can help evaluate the roots of psychoanalysis and its theories. For Mazlish, psychoanalysis has its roots in the natural sciences (especially Darwinian evolutionary biology), in the “the novelistic tradition” and in the social sciences (9). Mazlish has been open to the new ego-psychological (Eriksonian) and self-psychological (Kohutian) variations of psychoanalysis, but clearly he did not yet grasp the more intersubjective, relational, and communicative versions of psychoanalysis.

Looking back at the role of Freud’s psychoanalysis, Mazlish evaluates that Freud’s work “keeps losing the battles, but he has won the war” (x). By this statement, he means that though there are disagreements about the constructs and functions of the unconscious, be it the dynamic, cognitive, neural, linguistic, or cultural, its impact on human motivation and action has been recognized even in various branches of hard-data sciences. Mazlish is expecting that the neurosciences will shed further light on the brain-mind-body interactions. However, this link is mentioned in one sentence only, and the connections between psychohistory and the emerging fields of neuropsychoanalysis and social and cultural (cognitive-affective) neuroscience would deserve more attention in the future.

In his essays, written in a clear and enjoyable style, Mazlish gives examples of how to examine both political (e.g. Nixon and Khomeini) and intellectual (e.g. Marx, Freud, and Weber) leaders and how to apply more problem-oriented than life/biography-oriented history. Concerning research on large groups and their behavior, Mazlish has noted that individual psychological and clinical psychoanalysis, as well as Bion-type small-group theory, offers little in the way of effective tools for psychohistorians. Attitudinal polling is one way of collecting responses representative of a large group in a given context, but this is just one hint given by Mazlish. In his later article, “The Past and Future of Psychohistory,” in The Annual of Psychoanalysis in 2003, Mazlish proposes “the construction of a theoretically strong and integrated psychohistorical social psychology and its implementation in detailed, diverse studies” (261).
Since The Leader, the Led, and the Psyche was first published Mazlish has not continued active psychohistorical research. His later interests have included, for example, history of science and technology and global history. Still, even today his critical theoretical and methodological musings and proposals for further developments in the fields of history and political science are worthy of reading and they remind us of the very basic and vital values of psychohistory.

Juhani Ihanus’ biography is on page 41.

The Sign of the Cross Casts Long Shadows

Dan Dervin—University of Mary Washington


Scholars are distinguished by their labors in the field, and we never dare call them miracle-workers, but in The Sign of the Cross Rancour-Laferriere has pulled off something of a minor miracle. He has found a solution to organizing a vast array of histories, both religious and secular, along with his own scholarship and insightful interpretations by balancing all of the material on the single figure of the cross.

For Christians, the cross signifies the intersection of the human and the divine through the defining event of the crucifixion. This Incarnation of God into man turns oppositions into a paradox ultimately of the victim’s victory through defeat. But while its otherworldly power of redemption from sin through suffering with the promise of life everlasting is affirmed, the author applies this unifying image to the disconcerting ways it has been misappropriated for unsavory and all-too worldly ends at odds with its original mission. Thus enormously complex materials—psychological, cultural, and historical—converge on these two crossed lines.

Here, I can only touch on three main areas: the cross as crucifixion on Golgotha; the cross as melted down and re-forged into the sword of Crusades and empire; and the cross as reconfigured in Nazism and vehicle of anti-Semitism.

The cross is ultimately rooted in the life of Jesus and the early Church from whence it draws its personal inspiration, religious authority,
Clio’s Psyche

and political hegemony. We recall that with Adam’s sin the human race fell and thereby suffered alienation from their creator. Whatever credibility this account still claims, it is stretched by the vast populations dispersed over the planet since that original couple. Talk about psychic overdeterminism. The disproportion is mind-boggling, and let’s not even try to factor in the scientists’ multiverse where countless planets may support living beings who may also be in need of redemption. However, in biblical times, the earth was the center of the known universe, and it was due to one person’s fall that God offered up his only son to redeem us.

Among the Savior’s admonitions was to share in his sacrifice, to embrace our cross and follow in his footsteps. Thereby, we validate our faith through suffering (92, 104). In the present reconstruction, Jesus set his actions on a deliberate course of grandiose claims to divinity that inexorably led to his non-resistance to earthly powers in order to achieve atonement on the cross. Judas’s lament in Jesus Christ Superstar, “I only did what you wanted me to,” is apt. Christ is thus defined as a grandiose masochist/narcissist (9, 109, 141, 151), and the cross is the “paradigmatic signifier of moral masochism” (160).

This oddly self-destructive, but highly potent, mix of passivity and grandiosity is adopted by his followers as moral masochism (as opposed to the sexual forms of perversion, 59). In general, self-inflicted pain serves various psychic functions—as compromise against more drastic forms of self-hatred, a cry for help, an attempt to alleviate guilt, an affirmation of group affiliation, and a gesture toward identification with the aggressor, or in this case ostensibly with an exalted ideal of brutal sacrifice.

I’m digressing here to offer an allied psychodynamic view. I view the cruciform image as a new cultural ideal in which aggression is turned inward. Perhaps it played off a collective conviction that violence had gotten so out of control that we may end up destroying ourselves in total. This redirection drives and affects also implies the negative Oedipus complex, in which the son submits totally to paternal authority rather than striving to overthrow it, and accordingly the male replaces the female as a future love-object (once put forth as an etiology of homosexuality).

Regardless of the two scenarios, Freud foregrounds guilt as internalized aggression that continues to exert its influence both as conscience and as punishment for harboring dangerous (erotic, hostile) wishes. Guilt, like Freud, is on the side of civilization. Thus, along with displacements, transformations, and sublimations, we can factor in moral perversions as issuing from affective frustrations, guilt, and feelings of unwor-
We know the strictures of self-denial and mortification of the flesh, but one piece of clerical echoed here resonates powerfully: It's your cross to bear. This is typically given in the context of a wife's complaining about her husband's drinking or abuse or infidelity or of a child in an abusive situation, and it serves to silence the victim while perpetuating the harmful behavior. Still, we also know violence is not resisted and even welcomed in all the turmoil of crusades, pillage, rape, genocide, the Inquisition, heresy trials, of witch hunts all proclaim the triumph of aggression—a return of the repressed with a vengeance. Anti-Semitism was endemic to Christianity from early on as shown in the writings of Church fathers, saints, and theologians. The charge against Jews as Christ killers, guilty of deicide, despite evidence to the contrary, so gripped Europe that when Hitler instated a “hooked cross,” translated as the swastika, the ground was already laid for the Holocaust. Some of this is already familiar, but the author often synthesizes it all to the next level.

Along with his bold consistency, I would offer a caveat, plus a psychodynamic tool for further probing moral masochism, and two psychohistorical paths for further investigation. The caveat is that while the author supports his thesis of Jesus as grandiose masochist, he drives this model pretty hard, given the unstable source material, and oversteps when he dismisses Jesus's driving the money-changers from the temple as a “temper tantrum,” an act of “grandiose personal provocation” (140). Beneath the clinical labels, we may yet glimpse a troubled individual worth our continuing interest.

Psychoanalytic writings on suicide, notably dating from Karl Menninger’s 1938 *Man Against Himself*, implicate two other parties in the suicide: reunion with a former loved one and revenge against an enemy for forcing this extreme recourse. These fantasies or symbolic gestures may influence the troubled religious mind already immersed in emotional dilemmas and add dimensions to moral masochism.

For psychohistory, the author contrasts the observances of ordinary church-goers with a second category of more exemplary moral masochism of saints and martyrs as well as the authorized sadism of crusaders and inquisitors (71-2, 106-9). I would consider this second grouping as delegates for enacting the wishes and desires of the relatively normal rank and file (the author uses the concept of proxy, 87f). Secondly, the prospect of believers relentlessly seeking new ways to gain the divinity’s attention suggests the dynamic of a withholding parent whose favor the child struggles vainly to win by repeatedly raising the stakes of self-inflicted pain. The silence of God has entered theological discourses es-
especially since the Holocaust, and even Mother Theresa lamented the loneliness of loving a God who did not reciprocate. Undoubtedly, the book will excite many different responses among its readers.

Dan Dervin, PhD, a prolific and long-standing psychohistorian, is completing The Evolution of Inwardness, A History of Childhood. Prof. Dervin may be contacted at ddervin@umw.edu.

Meeting Report

Castelloe’s Film Applying Volkan’s Peacemaking Model to American Violence

Paul H. Elovitz with Molly Castelloe—The Psychohistory Forum

The March 8th meeting of the Psychohistory Forum broke new ground for our Work-in-Progress seminars with its focus on film. Molly Castelloe sent members both a video link to a film and an article on the film that she is working to complete. For several years, Dr. Castelloe has been creating a film about the path-breaking peacemaking work of Vamik Volkan. For this presentation, she was applying Volkan’s group psychoanalysis concepts of chosen trauma, chosen glories, group entitlement, and linking objects to develop a deeper understanding of violence in America and, specifically, the profound attachment to the U.S. gun culture.

Our meeting in the library of the Training Institute for Mental Health began in the usual way, with each participant briefly introducing themselves and stating a question that they have about the materials. Of the 15 participants, seven were psychoanalysts, three historians, two psychologists without psychoanalytic training, one political scientist, and one nurse. There were 10 women and five men among the participants with the age range extending from the 30s into the 70s. Jacques Szaluta moderated the meeting as is customary, assuring that the lively discussion was orderly and that all had a chance to express themselves.

The film consisted largely of interviews conducted by the filmmaker with Vamik Volkan and M. Gerard Fromm, former Director of The Erik Erikson Institute for Research at Austen Riggs in Stockbridge, MA. Following the 20-minute screening, there was quite an animated discussion about the material, with many very interesting and often diffuse
It was agreed that play is an antidote for trauma. Peter Loewenberg’s idea that Israel is a synthetic country was also applied to the United States, the idea being that parts of “synthetic countries” don’t readily fit in with others. This is perhaps one of the reasons for the greater gun violence in the United States than in Japan, for example, or most of Europe. The increased number of guns in Newtown, Connecticut was also noted. Still, were the guns being purchased for self-defense or violence? Whatever intention was involved in the purchase of the weapons, ownership of guns is much more likely to result in the death of someone within the owner’s circle of family or friends than that of an intruder, especially under circumstances where there is alcohol or drug consumption.

Other issues that came forth in the meeting were that the identity of the United States is in many ways intimately aligned with our War of Independence. “We love war,” one female Forum member wryly declared, “it’s how we prove our manhood.” Francis Scott Key wrote the poem that comprises the lyrics of our national anthem after witnessing the successful defense of Fort McHenry in Baltimore, MD, from an attack by the British Royal Navy in 1814. Reference was made to the onstage gift of a rifle by Mitch McConnell to Tom Coburn on national television only a few days prior, during the recent Conservative Political Action Committee Conference. One participant remarked that many Americans live in a myth that they are playing Gary Cooper in High Noon. There are more guns in this country than humans, asserted another.

It was noted that the South is a more violent part of the country than the North, both before and after the Civil War. This was related to both its being more rural and the need to avert slave rebellions. The scenes screened by the filmmaker identified some of the elements of American identity, including disassociation from our European ancestry and the notion of being a “self-made” nation.

Video material included footage of Dr. Volkan in the Norman Rockwell Museum discussing some of the imagery in Rockwell’s oil paintings of “The Four Freedoms.” Special emphasis was given to the painting “Freedom from Fear” (1943), where the figures of a mother and father tuck two children into bed while the father’s folded newspaper reveals headline of “The Blitz.” Following 9/11, many Americans came to the museum to visit this painting, illustrating that the impact of the trauma of these attacks destroyed the U.S. bubble of narcissism—of a country that thought it was protected from attack by two great oceans, that doesn’t abide helplessness well, and that was forced to face the reality of its own
One psychoanalyst pointed out that gun violence is acted out in the body in ways similar to a psychotic episode, and that disassociation takes place in the school shootings that began with Columbine. “What’s going on in our society that we are raising kids to be killers?” queried one participant. The observation was made that these random shootings have a history in our country that began with the shootings by postal workers during the Reagan era.

Regarding the film, one version was shown prior to the meeting and a modified version at the meeting. Many ideas were put forth for additional approaches, including the modern problem of refugees, the question of the Native American Indian, the addition of interviews with adolescent boys, or clips of Gabrielle Giffords in Congress advocating for gun control. However, there was a general consensus that the film content itself is too disassociated, that the narrative needs unity, fewer talking heads, minimalization of theory, and more powerful visual images. Several colleagues suggested that it is too ambitious to try to make sense out of American gun violence and that the film would work better if Castelloe focused simply on Vamik Volkan and his peacemaking work.

The participants at the meeting then adjourned to the Fashion Center restaurant for an enjoyable lunch.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, is director/convener of the Psychohistory Forum who may be contacted at pelovitz@aol.com. Molly Castelloe, PhD, is a Forum Research Associate who is a contemporary arts specialist and mother of two young sons. She may be reached at msc214@nyu.edu. □

BULLETIN BOARD
CONFERENCES: The Psychohistory Forum’s 2014 Work-In-Progress Seminars are announced as details are finalized. Ken Fuchsman (University of Connecticut) and Paul Elovitz (Ramapo College) will present on September 20, 2014 on the progress or lack thereof of civilization, asking the question: “Is Humankind More or Less Civilized?” On November 1, 2014 Lawrence J. Friedman (Harvard University) will speak on “Give Peace a Chance: Growth of a Dissenting Minority in the Early Cold War.” Additional proposals are welcome and will be vetted by a committee once a presentation paper is submitted. Announcements and papers are sent out electronically to Psychohistory Forum members. We wish to thank Molly Cas-
telloe and Jacques Szaluta for their recent presentations. At the International Psychohistorical Association’s (IPA) June 4-6, 2014 37th meetings at NYU Psychohistory Forum, members Herbert Barry, David Beisel, Molly Castelloe, Brian D’Agostino, Paul Elovitz, Ken Fuchsman, Juhani Ihanus, Irene Javors, Alice Maher, Joel Markowitz, Jamshid Marvasti, Allan Mohl, Merle Molofsky, Denis O’Keefe, Peter Petschner, Arnold Richards, Howard Stein, Jacques Szaluta, and Eddie Taylor will be making presentations. Forthcoming conferences this year include the International Society for Political Psychology’s (ISPP) 37th Annual Conference on July 4-7, 2014 in Rome; the Association for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society (APCS) Conference will be at Rutgers University on October 17-18, 2014; the International Forum for Psychoanalytic Education (IFPE) will be held in San Francisco on November 6-8, 2014; and the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis (NAAP) conference will be held on November 15, 2014 in Manhattan. We welcome new members April Leininger and Billie Pivnick.

CONGRATULATIONS: To Peter Petschner, who was honored on May 10th with an honorary doctoral degree by Appalachian State University where he serves so well as a faculty member and subsequently as a professor emeritus devoted to enriching the lives of his institution, especially in the area of the arts. Also to Professor Juhani Ihanus on the publication of his book of poetry, On the Road to Narva the Kabbalist, as well as of an edited book in his honor.

NOTES: Arnie Richards and Arlene Kramer Richards have been teaching psychotherapy twice a year in Wuhan, China as part of a three year contract.

ERRATUM: Apologies to Howard Stein for an editorial error: In “Introduction to the Confluence of Poetry and Psychohistory” in the December 2013 issue, the editors and referees asked him for some changes, which he made, but then we inadvertently published the original version.

OUR THANKS: To our members and subscribers for the support that makes Clio’s Psyche possible. To Benefactors Herbert Barry, David Beisel, David Lotto, Jamshid Marvasti, and Mary Peace Sullivan; Patrons Tom Ferraro, Eva, Fogelman, Ken Fuchsman, Peter Loewenberg, Peter Petschner, and Jacques Szaluta; Sustaining Members David James Fisher and Joyce Rosenberg; Supporting Members Don Carveth, Paul Elovitz, Bob Lentz, Judy Gardiner, Billy Pivnick, Daniel Rancour-Laferrier, and Burton Seitzler; and Members Molly Castelloe, Brian D’Agostino, Marvin Leibowitz, April Leininger, Peggy McLaughlin, Joseph V. Montville, Denis O’Keefe, Joan Seymour, and Christine Silverstein. Our special thanks
for thought-provoking materials to Herbert Barry, David Beisel, Ira Brenner, Molly Castelloe, Ida and Ken Dancyger, Paul H. Elovitz, Eva Fogelman, Ken Fuchsman, Harriet Fraad, Juhani Ihanus, Hannah Kliger, Henry Lawton, Victor Meladze, Allan Mohl, Richard Morrock, Andreas Musolff, Ruth Neubauer, Terence O’Leary, Geraldine Pauling, Peter Petschauer, Daniel Rancour-Laferriere, Joyce Rosenberg, Rochelle Saidel, Howard F. Stein, Arlene (Lu) Steinberg, and Rachel Youdelman. To Nicole Alliegro and Nicole D’Andria for editing, proofing, and Publisher 2010 software application, Caitlin Adams for editing and proofing, and Dr. Eva Fogelman and Professor Paul Salstrom for proofing. Our special thanks to our editors and to our numerous, overworked referees, who must remain anonymous.
Clio’s Psyche Call for Papers
How Electronics are Changing Our Lives
For the December 2014 Issue the Deadline is
October 1, 2014

Clio’s Psyche is looking for articles on a variety of subjects including the psychoanalysis/psychology of the following:

- Developmental changes in children based on early exposure
- How electronics empower the young
- How the “digital generation” differs from your generation
- Neurobiographical changes based on electronics
- Intimacy in interpersonal communications
- Degrees of intimacy: texting, Internet, cell phone, Skype, F-2-F
- The impact of electronics on the experience of the “other”
- How technology influences our metaphors and thinking
- The impact of texting on the family: dependence/individualization
- Electronics and the sense of self
- The Impact of electronics on impulse control
- How electronics has improved or deteriorated your life/world
- Electronics and the democraticization of society
- The danger to civil liberties from electronics
- Humor in the electronic world
- Electronic cocoons and echo chambers
- Anthropomorphizing electronics including robots
- Using Skype for therapy, teaching, romance, journalism, or business
- Psychobiographies of futurologists and innovators: Asimov, Edison, Gates, Jobs, Khan, Kurzweil, Wales, Zuckerberg, et al.
- Reviews of recent books and films
- Poems relevant to our special Issues, major subjects, or psychohistory

We seek articles from 500 to 1,500 words—including your brief biography. Some 2,500-3,500 word essays are also welcome provided they are outstanding scholarship and well written. We do not publish bibliographies and have citations only for direct quotes. Articles, abstracts, and queries should be sent to
Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, at pelovitz@aol.com.