
Clio's Psyche

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

Volume 15 Number 1

June 2008

Sports Psychology

Gender Benders in Women's Tennis

Daniel Dervin
University of Mary Washington

In *Sports Heroes, Fallen Idols* (2005), Stanley Teitelbaum's interesting study of male sports heroes, their world, and their often tragic arc of plummeting from fame, the men share several features with women athletes, but there is also a different dynamic at work. Due to their special skills, both genders experience love as conditional, balanced by their potential and ability to live up to others' expectations (p. 18). Among male tennis players, however, there is more camaraderie and post-match horseplay in the locker room, while women players socialize less and remember a fist

(Continued on p. 23)

Athletes on the Couch

Tom Ferraro
Sports Psychologist

By 1979, when *The Culture of Narcissism* was published, the world was well into the electronic revolution. An overabundance of images combined with the destruction of many social controls led Christopher Lasch and other social critics to predict that we were headed into the age of the narcissist. He wrote that we would begin to see more anger and a greater sense of emptiness in patients. He felt that many were on a desperate quest to find a new self. In his book about narcissism, Lasch devoted an entire chapter to the world of sports, realizing that the narcissist

(Continued on the next page)

Fred I. Greenstein: Princeton Political Psychologist

Paul H. Elovitz
Clio's Psyche

Fred Irwin Greenstein, Professor of Politics, Emeritus with the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University, was born in New York City on September 1, 1930 as the older of two children and only son of a middle class Jewish family. His father was a buyer for a department store and his mother did not work after his birth. He was educated primarily in public schools in the suburbs of New York City. At Antioch College, from which he graduated in 1953, he planned to be a journalist and had a number of journalistic jobs in connection with undergraduate work-study so-

(Continued on p. 33)

The Politics of Trauma: Iraq as Vietnam

Rudolph Binion
Brandeis University

Trauma has a dynamic of its own that is little understood. One of its rarer aftereffects—the reliving of a traumatic experience by its victims or their successors—is especially baffling. It is also especially significant for political psychology in that reliving a mass trauma can dominate a nation's politics for an indefinite stretch. Traumatic reliv-

(Continued on p. 30)

Turn to the next page for
IN THIS ISSUE

IN THIS ISSUE

Sports Psychology

<p>Gender Benders in Women's Tennis 1 <i>Daniel Dervin</i></p> <p>Athletes on the Couch..... 1 <i>Tom Ferraro</i></p> <p>Sports Celebrity Justice 6 <i>Stanley H. Teitelbaum</i></p> <p>Gladiators' End..... 8 <i>Daniel Dervin</i></p> <p>NBA Dress Code: Changing Behavior? 9 <i>Peter Anderson</i></p> <p>The Quest for Excitement..... 11 <i>Daniel Klenbort</i></p> <p>Sources of Success in Sports 13 <i>Herbert Barry III</i></p> <p>Psychoanalytic Consultation in Sports 13 <i>Robert Pyles</i></p> <p>Baseball as the National Pastime 16 <i>Andy Abrams</i></p> <p>Child Abuse and Baseball: Torre and Steinbrenner 19 <i>Paul H. Elovitz</i></p> <p>Gymnastics and Female Body Image and Identity 26 <i>Aino Sarje</i></p> <p>My Sporting Life 27 <i>Joe Illick</i></p>	<p>The Quest of the Hunter-Gatherer 28 <i>Ehor Boyanowsky</i></p> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/> <p>The Politics of Trauma: Iraq as Vietnam..... 1 <i>Rudolph Binion</i></p> <p>Featured Scholar: Fred I. Greenstein 1 <i>Paul H. Elovitz</i></p> <p>The Passion of Mel Gibson 39 <i>Review by Glen Jeansonne and David Lehrssen</i></p> <p>Makari's History of Psychoanalysis 41 <i>Review by Kenneth Fuchsman</i></p> <p>The Death of Susan Sontag 43 <i>Review by Irene Javors</i></p> <p>Letters to the Editor in Response to Aging..... 45 <i>Lincoln Grahlfs, Neil Wilson, Marvin Eisenstadt</i></p> <p>Letter to the Editor on Election 2008 47 <i>Nancy C. Unger</i></p> <p>Letter to the Editor on Jews and Baseball 47 <i>Joe Dorinson</i></p> <p>Remembering Norman Cohn..... 51 <i>Henry R. Lawton</i></p> <p>Call for Papers: Psychology of Death and Dying. 52</p> <p>Call for Papers: Love and Hate Retrospective..... 53</p> <p>Bulletin Board 53</p> <p>Call for Papers: Psychology of Election 2008..... 54</p>
---	--

would be drawn to the adoring crowd where he could feed off of the cheering, fill his emptiness, and express his rage—all at the same time.

It is now almost thirty years later. What can we say about Lasch's dire predictions about the coming narcissistic epidemic and what can the world of sport tell us about this outbreak?

It is often said that the art world expresses trends in culture long before the public feels these trends. The artist's sensitivity is able to articulate subtle cultural movements twenty years before the masses experience them. Perhaps the same can be said of the sports world. Is it possible that the athlete expresses unconscious trends in the culture before the adoring fan realizes these trends? *Silence of the Lambs*, with its depiction of oral sa-

dism, was made in 1991. Mike Tyson bit off part of an ear of Evander Holyfield in 1997. The world of sport in this case lagged six years behind the world of cinema. Exactly how rampant is oral sadism and is this a reflection of narcissistic rage and emptiness? Does this reflect a trend and can we see evidence of oral sadism elsewhere in sports?

It often falls to the media to analyze and dissect trends in sports. Despite the fact that they are ill equipped to do so, they seize upon the latest traumatic sporting event and spend time trying to understand the meaning behind it. This is when the psychoanalysts are sometimes brought in to help. The trauma history in the world of sports is an interesting one. These events represent cultural tipping points along the way where the current pa-

thology spills over and reveals the direction the culture is heading.

In his book, Lasch posited that the country would become more aggressive as it regressed into a harsh superego functioning. He felt that we were dismantling respect for all authority and this would result in people falling back on primitive early childhood superego function as they lost available ego ideal identifications.

Here is a review of the major stories and major players in sports over the last twenty-five years. I provide this history to observe whether Lasch's predictions about narcissism and oral rage can be seen in sports.

1984: John McEnroe was the first real Superbrat of tennis. With his vulgarity, cursing, and tantrums, McEnroe quickly earned the label "McNasty" by the press. He single-handedly

pulled the world of tennis into the age of the narcissism.

1994: The dainty world of figure skating made history and headlines when Tonya Harding was accused of bashing-in the kneecap of her competitor Nancy Kerrigan prior to the 1994 Olympics.

1996: Baltimore Oriole Roberto Alomar got into a heated argument over a called third strike with umpire John Hirschbeck and spit in his face.

1997: NBA player Latrell Sprewell was suspended for a season when he lost control of his rage and choked his coach, P.J. Carlesimo.

1997: Mike Tyson bit off the top of an ear of Evander Holyfield during their boxing title fight. Shortly after that Tyson was quoted as saying he would "eat the young" of his next competitor.

1999: The usually genteel game of golf was tainted when American fans took to spitting into the faces of the European players and their wives during the Ryder Cup matches at the Country Club at Brookline.

1999: Tiger Woods threatened to boycott the Ryder Cup if he was not given an increase in money. It seems that American players only receive \$5,000 for the privilege of playing for their country every two years. Woods made this demand for an increase in pay during a year when he made more than \$60 million in endorsement and purses. This display of greed may even have shocked his agents who quickly backed off this demand as they heard the public backlash.

2004: The Mephram High School football team was accused of sodomizing the younger players with broomsticks, golf balls, and pinecones during a hazing ritual.

2004: The NBA experienced the deepest embarrassment in its history when Ron Artest led his teammates into the stands to brawl with the fans. Multiple arrests and hospitalizations resulted.

2005: Our national pastime fell into disrepute as the U.S. Congress began its investigation of steroid abuse in Major League Baseball. Mark McGwire was reduced to tears as he attempted to dance around questions of drug use during his career. Oral ingestion of performance-enhancing drugs was revealed to be commonplace.

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 15 No. 1

June 2008

ISSN 1080-2622

Published Quarterly by The Psychohistory Forum

627 Dakota Trail, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

Telephone: (201) 891-7486

e-mail: pelovitz@aol.com

Sports Psychology Guest Editor: Bob Lentz
Editor: Paul H. Elovitz, PhD

Editorial Board

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

Subscription Rate:

Free to members of the Psychohistory Forum

\$48 two-year subscription to non-members

\$40 yearly to institutions

(Add \$10 per year outside U.S.A. & Canada)

Single Issue Price: \$15

We welcome articles of psychohistorical interest of 500 - 1500 words and a few longer ones.

Copyright © 2008 The Psychohistory Forum

Add all this up and it is easy to see the trend in the need for admiration, over-competitiveness, lack of respect, greed, rage, and sociopathy. Jeff Benedict's book, *Public Heroes, Private Felons: Athletes and Crimes Against Women* (1997), supports this claim as he documents the narcissism, drug use, and the violent behaviors in professional and college athletes. Stanley Teitelbaum's book, *Sports Heroes, Fallen Idols* (2005), describes the modern athlete as arrogant, grandiose, and entitled. We have entered the age of narcissism.

If this is the underlying dynamic of sport, what are the symptoms that lead an athlete to the psychologist's office? Are narcissistic dynamics revealed in the typical athlete under treatment? Do we see anger, a harsh superego, and a sense of emptiness in our athlete patients? Do young elite athletes reveal the same personality traits? Was Lasch's hypothesis correct when he suggests that the culture itself is responsible for the development of narcissistic disorders? This hypothesis flies in the face of self-psychology theory, which has always posited that narcissism is an outgrowth of early childhood failures at the hands of a disinterested or borderline mother. I will first review my caseload to offer a sense of the type of athletes that come to me and then give a detailed account of one treatment session with an established superstar to address the question of how culture may contribute to the development of narcissistic behaviors.

My caseload is usually filled with either professional athletes or younger players who range in age from fifteen to twenty-five. These are the young prodigies who are either headed for the professional ranks or to the Olympics. Their sports are usually golf, tennis, figure skating, gymnastics, baseball, boxing, or luge. The vast majority come in with severe anxiety disorders or depression, and live in a world of stress, competition, overwork, and exhaustion. They are all familiar with international travel, performing in front of TV cameras, and seeing their name in print. They will have been working at their craft six to eight hours a day seven days a week for ten years.

For the younger ones, their parents will usually have heard of me through the media or another athlete. They will have at this point recognized that their young prodigy is teetering on the

edge of a breakdown. The parents will have witnessed the vomiting before competition, the sleepless nights, the endless worry about slight physical or mental problems, and the chronic injuries. If the athlete is a professional or college player there will usually be some drug abuse in the picture as well.

The anxiety the athlete expresses will include worry, apprehension, twitching, some drug or alcohol use, vomiting, headaches, cold clammy hands, sleeplessness, fatigue, and anger. They will experience psychosomatic problems including muscle pain, stomach pain, skin rashes, and headaches. Their personalities will often include a sense of entitlement. They will cancel appointments without hesitation. They will reveal a need for admiration with many sessions being filled with a recitation of recent accomplishments. They will have fantasies of greatness and will be preoccupied with envy. One can practically smell their sense of underlying shame. They will also reveal severe perfectionism, over work, scrupulosity, and indecision. All this adds up to the clinical spectrum known as high-functioning narcissism with obsessive-compulsive tendencies. Secondary to this would be the anxiety and depression symptoms.

The typical treatment in the field of sport psychology and one these athletes have already been exposed to is behavioral. They have all been coached in some form of anxiety control, anger management, and visualization process. Uniformly, the patients have an expectation that the treatment will be of relatively short duration, perhaps three to ten sessions at the most. If done well, these treatments will remediate a small portion of the symptoms expressed, leaving the personality disorder intact and untouched.

The following is a recent session with an athlete who has been in twice-weekly psychoanalytic treatment for the past four years. The bulk of the work is over the phone to accommodate the patient's travel schedule and the fact that he lives in Florida. The session begins with the patient just having returned from a season of play. He ruminates about how he had regressed in his ability to beat opposing players and how he felt he used to be able to do more against them. He then begins to complain about his former coach's ruining his confidence by instilling fear and doubt with constant criticism—the coach's voice is in his head when he

is on the field. He likes his new coach much better and feels he is much kinder.

Here we see the projection of his harsh, even vicious superego as it is placed in his old coach and then introjected back into him. (He will often experience psychosomatic symptoms, which can usually be traced to internalized and unexpressed rage.) He feels very disappointed in himself in that he still struggles with his old coach's negative voice, referring to his experience with the former coach and team as his "damage," and feels he has been infected by this coach, who yelled at him constantly, and his abuse. "I still have work to do. The damage is still there.... I used to be able to take people on and take risks. Now I look to avoid taking risks." This shows us how important and damaging a harsh superego can be to the flow of an elite athlete's performance.

He goes on to report that increasingly he can hear his own voice and his instincts are coming back. He adds that his teammates respect him now and he is much happier with his kind new coach. This may be a reference to his working through of a harsh superego into a gentler and accepting one. "Our coach wants me to be myself and no one else." But "my old coaches would say I was tired and lazy, and scream at me. I had to buy into their power because I had no options.... My old coach was stifling, punishing, perfectionistic, sadistic." I wondered aloud if he was actually referring to himself. Resisting my interpretation, he says, "My teammates say I am so positive and that's the real me." He tries to integrate my interpretation by saying his dad pollutes him as well with demands and criticism.

He curses frequently at this point as he gets in touch with his anger toward his father. I begin to now differentiate between his father and his former coaches versus who he is and that he can be himself and more relaxed. He remarks his father has no respect for him and has not been able to give him the most basic human respect by trying to understand who he is as a person. I suggest that this reminds me of how he had to take care of his father all the time and no one took care of him. (He was left alone to raise himself as a child and was drinking and smoking pot by age six.) He returns to the theme of how needy his dad is, how tied they are to one another, and how angry he is at

all this. He says he is like a pond with the father creating ripples by throwing a rock into the pond. This ends the session.

My sense of this session is how angry this patient is, how self-hating he has been, and how damaging his anger is to his health, performance, and well-being. It also suggests how often he uses projection to get rid of his harsh superego by placing it on former coaches. His therapy has tried to help him find some kindness in himself. Certainly his discussion of his father takes us into the primary cause of his troubles. He had no mother and a largely absent father, and was left alone to raise himself with the help of marijuana and beer. His case illustrates Lasch's concern that harsh superegos have emerged in our culture when there is no one to identify with.

Christopher Lasch predicted that people would become angrier and emptier. They would feel oral hunger and oral rage more deeply and more often. A quick review of the major sports stories of the last twenty-five years supports Lasch's hypothesis quite well. As the problem of narcissism and emptiness grows, the world of sports has grown with it. What better setting could a narcissist find than an arena or stadium filled with fans that applaud, competitors one can beat up on, a trophy one can drink from, and a photo op waiting for you when it's all over? The sadness in this picture is that in many ways the world of applause and fan worship becomes the only world the athletes want.

Most recently I have begun to note a new trend in sports started by the most recognized athlete on earth, Tiger Woods. Woods has developed a new concept of *team* with the star athlete at its core. This is a modification of the idea of the entourage and is so professionalized that it takes on a new meaning. Many professional golfers have embraced this idea, including Phil Mickleson, Ernie Els, and Michael Campbell. The new team typically includes a swing coach, fitness trainer, nutritionist, medical doctor, agent, lawyer, and sport psychologist. It is the narcissist's attempt to re-establish a social setting. The only difference between former ideas of the social such as a family or neighborhood and this notion is that in this case the star is clearly in the center of this milieu and is buying a social setting for himself. This new sense

of the social has one purpose: to further the career and success of the star at its center.

A major difference between today and 1979 when Lasch was writing is that the players now are wealthier. They can afford to buy for themselves a community of advisors to safeguard them from loneliness and failure. The tragedy is when I hear from star athletes who call me from their hotel room somewhere across the nation. Typically they will have just celebrated their win with strangers and employees, and, as their depression begins to sink in, they will ask me plaintively, "Is that all there is?"

Tom Ferraro, PhD, is a psychoanalyst in private practice on Long Island, New York. He specializes in the diagnosis and treatment of athletes and has been recognized as one of the top twenty sport psychologists in the nation by Golf Digest. He writes syndicated columns in Asian and American magazines, researches cultural differences in athletes, and regularly comments on breaking sport stories for Fox News Channel, NBC, and WFAN radio. Dr. Ferraro may be contacted at DrTFerraro@aol.com. □

Sports Celebrity Justice

Stanley H. Teitelbaum
Postgraduate Center for Mental Health

Many people believe that high profile athletes who are charged with legal transgressions are given favorable treatment by the law because of their celebrity status, while others maintain that they receive harsher treatment than others, in order to set an example within society. The reality is that both positions are accurate, and that overall, some athletes are held to a higher standard and prosecuted more vigorously than may be warranted, and others are afforded excessive leniency. What accounts for the tremendous range in the way sports stars are treated by the law?

Among the variables at play here are, a) the psyche of many athletes who indulge in high-risk off-the-field misconduct, b) the psychological makeup of particular judges, c) overly zealous prosecutors, and d) the psychology of jurors.

Currently, there is an epidemic of sports stars that lose their perspective and cross legal boundaries without regard for the consequences. These athletes have been conditioned from an early age to believe that because of their athletic talent, they can write their own ticket and do whatever they want; and if they get into trouble, they will be protected and bailed out. They often develop a pathological degree of arrogance, grandiosity, and entitlement, a personality triad which I refer to as the toxic athlete profile, which fuels poor judgment and risky choices. The astronomical contracts awarded to athletes these days reinforce an inflated sense of self and encourages them to lose track of appropriate boundaries. Following rules, regulations, and limits are anathema to them. There is a major erosion of respect toward authority among many sports heroes, which parallels what is happening in our culture: pathological narcissism.

A highly publicized case in which a famous athlete was treated leniently by a judge involves Barry Bonds' attempt to reduce his child support payments. The judge, a self-described ardent baseball fan, granted Bonds' request, despite his mega-million dollar salary. After delivering this special treatment for the then baseball hero, the judge hastily solicited Bonds' autograph. Fortunately, this travesty of justice was later reversed.

The recent Michael Vick dog-fighting scandal highlights elements of both sides of celebrity justice. In an extensive nation-wide telephone poll conducted after Vick's indictment, thirty-six percent of the respondents believed that the Atlanta Falcons' star quarterback would receive preferential treatment by the court for his alleged heinous acts of animal cruelty, including the hanging, strangling, electrocuting, and drowning of dogs that had performed poorly in testing situations, while only nine percent thought he would be treated worse than the average person.

Surprisingly, there are indications that Michael Vick was treated more harshly than the average person. The federal prosecutor in the case acknowledged that first time offenders like Vick generally are spared a prison term under the sentencing guidelines, but the government viewed the actions of Vick as "heinous, cruel, and inhumane" and, therefore, they would seek time in jail.

Once Vick entered a plea deal, his fate was in the hands of presiding Judge Henry Hudson. Hudson, known for his hard-line, non-empathic approach to criminals, was unimpressed by letters of support for Vick and sentenced him to twenty-three months in prison, which was almost at the upper end of what the prosecutors had recommended. Actually, Vick got off easy, because Hudson had full power to exceed the recommended guidelines and impose a sentence of up to five years.

When he was a prosecutor, Hudson had pursued the death penalty against a borderline retarded man for a brutal rape and murder, and won a thirty-year prison term. It was later determined that a serial killer had committed this crime and that the accused man was innocent; but in his memoir Hudson views his aggressive tactics as a "career-defining case."

There are numerous instances in which overly zealous prosecutors try to make a name for themselves by aggressively pursuing cases against athletes. The Duke lacrosse-rape case stands out as an egregious example. The story is well known, and the sanctions against prosecutor Mike Nifong are fully deserved.

Another case involved Mark Chmura, a Green Bay Packers all-star, who was charged in 2002 with third-degree sexual assault and enticement of a minor. In essence, Chmura was accused of raping a seventeen-year-old former babysitter during a high school after-prom party. The alleged victim claimed that she was attacked in a hot tub encounter with Chmura at the party. There was scant evidence to support these charges, and the football hero, who had declined to visit the White House with his teammates following their 1997 Super Bowl victory because of President Clinton's "immoral behavior," was acquitted. At the very least, Chmura used poor judgment in attending a high school prom party, and in so doing he placed himself in potentially vulnerable circumstances even if he was innocent.

The O.J. Simpson trial stands out, of course, as the quintessential example of a sports star who succeeded in being treated leniently by jurors in a murder case. An effective million dollar defense "dream team," led by Johnnie Cochrane and his "if it doesn't fit, you must acquit" message

enabled Simpson to gain an acquittal that most people continue to find deplorable.

A somewhat less extreme example of an athlete being treated leniently by an impressionable jury involves the case of Marcus Moore, a Colorado Rockies pitcher. In a stormy trial Moore was acquitted of raping his girlfriend, and one of the jurors later acknowledged that even though all of the jurors thought he was guilty; they didn't want to convict him because of his "status as a ball-player." It seems likely that the jurors in the Moore case were entangled in "the celebrity worship syndrome," a term coined by psychologists to describe an excessive fascination with the lives of the rich and famous. Interestingly, two psychologists conducted a research study which found that almost one-third of Americans have an unhealthy interest in the lives of celebrities; and in extreme form this preoccupation becomes an addiction.

Returning to the theme of the psyche of the sports hero who freely crosses legal boundaries, I am reminded of the saga of basketball star, Jack Molinas. Molinas was an outstanding New York City high school and college player who was banned for life in 1954, during his first season in the NBA for betting on games in which he played. Molinas then became one of the most corrupt figures in sports history. He was the mastermind of the infamous college point-shaving scandal of 1961.

Molinas was arrested on charges of bribery, attempting to suborn a witness, and conspiracy to fix twenty games involving twenty-two players at twelve colleges. He was offered a plea deal by the authorities in which he would receive a six month prison sentence in exchange for admitting his role in several point-shaving games. Molinas had a genius IQ, and his inflated ego led him to believe that he could present a strong case in his favor. Despite his high IQ, his judgment was poor, and he arrogantly turned down the deal. He was convicted and sentenced to ten to fifteen years. His readiness to play the odds permeated his decision to not play ball with the judicial system, and he lost his bet. In keeping with his level of corruptness, Molinas exhibited a lack of guilt or remorse about his criminal activity. His warped perception prompted him to feel victimized by the system, rather than to recognize his role in compro-

mising the integrity of college basketball and damaging the careers and lives of the players enticed into point-shaving. After all, he lamented, "My so called crimes hadn't hurt anybody except some bettors and some bookies." In response, the judge excoriated Molinas by stating, "You are a completely immoral person [who] callously used your prestige as a former All-American basketball player to corrupt players and defraud the public." Molinas won an appeal in which it was ruled that his sentence was excessive, and he served only five years at Attica prison. He subsequently became involved in illegal activities tied to organized crime, and, eventually, in 1975 was murdered, gangland style.

The sample of cases of Barry Bonds, Michael Vick, Mark Chmura, O.J. Simpson, Marcus Moore, and Jack Molinas, involve athletes who crossed boundaries, including one who was a corrupt sport hero. They faced overzealous prosecutors, variable judges, and impressionable jurors. My research suggests that while some athletes are held to a higher standard and others are treated leniently by the law, in general, our culture appears to be moving in a direction in which a harsher standard will apply toward athletes who indulge in moral or legal transgressions.

Stanley H. Teitelbaum, PhD, is Training Analyst, Senior Supervisor, and Faculty at the Postgraduate Center for Mental Health. He is the author of Sports Heroes, Fallen Idols (2005) and Illusion and Disillusionment (1999). Professor Teitelbaum may be contacted at cobaltjag@aol.com. □

Gladiators' End

Daniel Dervin
University of Mary Washington

In August 2007 when the National Football League (NFL) was gearing up for its preseason, news reports about Atlanta Falcons' star quarterback Michael Vick were initially greeted with shocked disbelief. How could this be happening? How could he be doing this? At first he denied any involvement, then he minimized his role. But as the new season was peaking in October, Michael Vick's life was down in the pits.

Based on rumors of illegal dog-fighting, his property in southeastern Virginia had been raided that summer. The evidence of a dog-fighting venture called Bad News Kennels operated by him and his buddies from Virginia Beach was irrefutable. But the really bad news came out in the treatment of the pit bulls. Some were afflicted with such wounds as punctured heads and were kept in cages. Others turned up in a mass grave. These had been executed: literally electrocuted, hanged, drowned, shot, or slammed to the ground. In his final court appearance in December, a remorseful Vick admitted to participating in two of these killings, and was sentenced to twenty-three months in Leavenworth Prison. Once the highest paid player in the League, he will be twenty-nine or thirty at his release, with his future career very much in doubt.

Why would he throw it all away for some cheap thrills of mutts going after each other? True, there was a lot of betting going on, but Vick would hardly need this sort of venture capitalism on his pay scale. Then there is the "bad companions" angle. Vick had a strong family, but he grew up on mean streets and kept in touch with his old honchos who never got his breaks. Some may discern similarities in O.J. Simpson's destructive and self-destructive behavior, but these came after his glory days and ruined his reputation, not his career. A closer parallel may be found in the tragic killing of Washington Redskins' star safety, Sean Taylor, in November 2007. Like Vick, his sudden rise to enormous wealth raised problems with his troubled past and his more recent brushes with the law. He allowed his Florida estate to be used by various family members, and one of his half-sister's friends took the opportunity at a party there to case the place. Later, with three others he broke in, not expecting anyone to be home. Confronting them with a machete, Sean Taylor was fatally shot. His grief-stricken friends said his only flaw was in being too nice (*New York Times*, December 9, 2007).

A troubled family history and misguided loyalties may also have played a role in Vick's dubious enterprise, but there were surely better ways to help old buddies. A more probing explanation has been suggested, and to appreciate it, we need to turn away from the inner city and the dog pits to the arenas of professional football. Concurrently

with Vick's plight, a vast and altogether unsavory underside of these athletes' lives has begun surfacing. Light is being cast on the players' ethics code of "play through the pain."

A growing body of medical evidence shows that players' repeated head trauma results in such long-term brain damage as memory-loss and dementia. Players for the New York Jets are forbidden to discuss injuries, and team doctors appear complicit in letting them stay in the game after concussions while minimizing the severity of these injuries (*New York Times*, Dec. 22, 2007, p. 1A). But the effects of many of these injuries do not end after the game or career. The long-suppressed stories of hobbled, dysfunctional, and unemployable former athletes still in their middle years are also seeping out. Some of their medical costs are astronomical, but many feel they are getting a cold shoulder from their former bosses and even from the players' union.

Interviewed for an investigative report on this predicament, Super Bowl veteran Dave Pear admitted, "You can't take the violence out of the game, and that's okay, because it wouldn't be football without the violence, I guess." Likening his performance to the Roman gladiator, he adds, "Football is not a contact sport. It's a collision sport." In his forties, crippled with back and spinal injuries, suffering from memory-lapses, and dependent on pain medication, he says, "I live in a torture chamber" (Michael Leahy, "The Pain Game," *Washington Post Magazine*, Feb. 3, 2008, pp. 8-26). Like the gladiator, the football player eventually discovers that for all his prowess and popularity, he is ultimately no better off than a slave.

With this background in mind, readers may appreciate Kenneth Jacobson's letter to the editor of the *Washington Post* (Aug. 25, 2007): Michael Vick's brutal behavior in effect emulated NFL bosses and displays "identification with the aggressor."

This invaluable, if somewhat overworked concept was introduced into the psychoanalytic field by Anna Freud in her classic *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense* (1946). It has been deeply probed and widely applied in Leonard Shengold's *Soul Murder* (1989) and a follow-up. In its basic form, the pain, humiliation, and trauma inflicted by

someone in authority with whom one has a mixed relationship of affection and dependency is handled by identifying with that harshly-experienced authority. It is so insidious because the "solution" entails a denial of one's own self. Often symbolic, the act may be an offering, a sacrifice, or an execution. But the gesture is doomed to fail because the figure of power one assumes is illusory, and the true self is negated in sacrifice. Briefly, one regains a semblance of autonomy by becoming one's enemy. At his hearing, Vick pleaded, "I hope that one day when this is all over that I can show everybody that Michael Vick is not the person you see or hear about in the media" (*Washington Post*, Dec. 11, 2007). Whether he in effect sacrificed his own self-representation, he faces a dog's life in the pen.

A somewhat similar dynamic was played out in the abuse of prisoners in the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq. The delegating of power was passed down the chain of command to the lowest ranking soldiers who carried out the deed, believing for a spell they were strong as gladiators instead of the slaves to the system they proved to be. When the perpetrators end up in prison or the brig, it is not a role-reversal but a self-realization. However, not the kind anyone would ever wish for.

Dan Dervin, PhD, is a prolific psychohistorian. His publications include Enactments (1996), Matricentric Narratives (1997), Father Bosetti in America (2004), and numerous articles in these pages and elsewhere. He is a Research Associate of the Psychohistory Forum and professor emeritus of literature at the University of Mary Washington. Professor Dervin may be contacted at ddervin@umw.edu. □

NBA Dress Code: Changing Behavior?

**Peter Anderson
George Washington University**

Facing scrutiny and negative press coverage brought on by on-court violence and the hip-hop image of its players, National Basketball Association (NBA) Commissioner David Stern instated a dress code beginning with the 2005-2006 season. The unprecedented rule among major professional

sports leagues states that all players must wear business attire when entering or exiting games, while sitting on the bench injured, or during any other league-related event. The assumption that a dress code would change players' behavior is drawn from the fact that the policy was only discussed after the Pacers-Pistons fight at Auburn Hills, Michigan in November 2004, when fighting started on the court and spread into the stands. Another assumption was that the code would positively affect the way the fans view the players and the league as a whole. These two assumptions draw heavily on the psychology of social and self-perception. Can wearing different clothes change how you act in a given situation? Can it change someone's opinion of you?

Psychological studies have had much to say about the subject of clothing, behavior, and perception in and out of the world of sports. A 1988 study by Cornell professors Frank and Gilovich found that players whose teams wear black in NHL and NFL contests commit significantly more penalties than teams in any other color. The result of the study can be attributed to the players act more aggressively while wearing black and/or the referees perceive the players wearing black to be more aggressive. Wade and Stafford in 2003 found a small but significant correlation between student uniforms and perception of gang behavior. Teachers whose schools had dress codes perceived lower levels of gang behavior. In the Zimbardo (1971) prison experiment, when several normal Stanford undergrads were given the role of prison guard and dressed as such, they acted violently and inhumanely toward their captives, who were fellow Stanford undergrads. Uniforms and the unconscious thoughts they evoke can be very powerful.

Dress affects not only the unconscious of the wearer of the clothes but also the spectator. NBA players wearing a certain color or style of uniform entering the arena could possibly change how they act on the court moments later. In their typical street clothes (which have styles that have been considered both thuggish and hip-hop, depending on whom you ask) players may be rougher than while wearing business attire. Differences in behavior and perceptions of behavior based on clothing can be attributed in part to the uncon-

scious act of priming. The viewers of NBA games have certain concepts and ideas associated with the hip-hop clothing previously worn by many basketball players. Several of these stereotyped concepts could be "rapper," "gangster," "thug," or "dangerous."

Can the effectiveness of the NBA dress code in changing player behaviour be statistically measured? It may be possible to measure the effects of the dress code on the number of personal fouls committed. Players wearing business attire entering the arena may unconsciously act less violently than in their street, hip-hop clothes. Referees may unconsciously perceive the business dress as less violent prone and call fewer fouls. Another statistic to consider would be arrests off the court (which might address police perceptions as well as player behavior).

The NBA did take an interesting stance in creating a dress code to improve the marketability of its stars. But it's an odd one given that much of the league's popularity among younger viewers comes from its hip-hop image. Videogames, TV shows, and basketball clothing are all based on this culture. In fact, ESPN has two shows marketing the idea: "Streetball" and "City Slam." The shows follow "street" players (players who grew up honing their skills on inner city courts) who exude and display the hip-hop styles the NBA is so eager to stifle.

The dress code might be detrimental to attendance, TV ratings, and www.nba.com hits by stifling the creative and unusual personalities of people such as Dennis Rodman. Dallas Mavericks owner Mark Cuban signed aging star Rodman so he could fill the seats. In Rodman's Dallas debut, 18,203 fans showed up to watch him play—the second largest crowd in team history. Dennis Rodman is known for wearing women's clothing, having several tattoos and body piercings, and changing hair color with each game.

All psychological conjecture aside, a more straightforward, commonsense view might be worthwhile. Perhaps the tattooed, cornrowed, hip-hop 76ers point guard Allen Iverson put it best when he said, in response to the NBA's dress code, "You can put a murderer in a suit and he's still a murderer."

Peter Anderson is a third year student at George Washington University Law School who may be contacted at panderson@law.gwu.edu. □

Norbert Elias on Sports: The Quest for Excitement

Daniel Klenbort
Morehouse College

Sports play a large role in modern life. Many men and an increasing number of women spend an enormous amount of time and expend a great deal of emotion on sports. They play, watch, read and talk about sports. For many, sports are the most important topics of conversation. People care about sports. As participants, they give their all and as spectators, they are fans—short for fanatics. With the exception of professionals, people's passion for sports is non-utilitarian. There is no practical gain for winning or for supporting a team that wins. Sports are a major aspect of modern societies, but a rather peculiar one, since unlike education or work, they appear to serve no useful purpose.

Norbert Elias has discussed sports in a number of essays, collected in *The Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process* (Elias and Dunning, 1986). As we shall see, the title tells us a lot about how Elias sees sports. Elias is mainly concerned with two questions. What human need do sports satisfy? How did modern sports develop? Elias believes sports satisfy a need for excitement and modern sports developed as part of a wider civilizing process.

Elias maintains that there is what he calls a "civilizing process." Over long periods of time, human psychology changes. This theory was an extension and a deepening of Freud's view on the movement from primitive to civilized. Elias is careful not to use *civilized* as a noun and to avoid using *civilizing* as a value term.

Elias believes all humans share certain psychological characteristics, but that each human, as he or she grows up from infancy, has their psychology shaped by their culture. All humans undergo a civilizing process, but not the same one. Everyone's basic motivations are shaped by their society,

that is, by other people. The result is a socially shaped second nature, which varies from society to society.

In present day societies the impulse towards violence is severely curtailed, in part externally by an effective state with a monopoly of legitimate violence, and in part through internalization of social norms. For many people the super-ego forbids physical harm to others. When such a person does harm another, he feels guilty. In all societies, it is presumably forbidden to harm another member of one's own society. But in former time societies were small and strangers, and especially nearby enemies, were fair game. Today, except for war, we tend to forbid violence against people of other societies. This is, to say the least, convenient, as it allows us to walk in our streets and malls without fearing the strangers around us. This feeling of security is by no means universal. Among the Amazonian Indians and the pre-colonized peoples of New Guinea, and in the gang territories of Los Angeles, there is no such security. Once a person leaves the safety of their small territory, fear and vigilance are constant companions.

As Freud already noticed, there is a price to be paid for this civilizing of the urge to violence. It creates a kind of inner tension. At the same time, it may make ordinary life a bit boring. The function of sport according to Elias is to "stir the emotions, to evoke tensions in the form of a controlled, well-tempered excitement without the risks and tensions usually connected with excitement in other life situations" (Elias and Dunning, p. 48). Sport arouses people in a way that avoids harm. People can have the pleasure associated with violence without the normal consequences of violence. Sports such as football, both American and soccer, resemble battles between warring groups, but without the consequences. Thus, such sports have "two contradictory functions—the pleasurable de-controlling of human feelings, the full evocation of an enjoyable excitement on the one hand and on the other the maintenance of a set of checks to keep the pleasantly de-controlled emotions under control" (Elias and Dunning, p. 49). Modern humans have achieved these contradictory goals by creating strict rules and appointing referees to enforce them. Sport satisfies a human need that is

not satisfied by an ordinary life of “getting and spending,” but does so without disrupting normal peaceful society.

Elias believes sport, in the modern sense, is a relatively recent development. Many societies have games and sports of some sort, but he believes modern sport is quite different than sport in earlier periods in the civilizing process. Even sports, such as wrestling and football, which in some form have been around for hundreds or thousands of years, were, in earlier times, quite different and different in ways that reflect the long-term civilizing process. To be quite clear, we can claim no credit for being shaped by a more pacific society; we did not make the society we grew up in less violent, nor was the process by which it became less violent the consequence of deliberate actions. The lower threshold of violence in modern societies is the consequence of a long unplanned development. This process can go into rapid reverse, as shown by the Nazis, and, to a lesser extent Abu Ghraib.

Wrestling, boxing, and other forms of individual sports contests are old and widespread, but they have changed. Ancient Greek wrestling and boxing allowed a level of real violence repugnant to modern sensibility. In the ancient *pankration*, the combatants were allowed to strangle their opponents, break their fingers and toes, and gouge out their eyes. We do not consider such a violent contest an acceptable sport today. Rome, with its gladiatorial games, was even more brutal. In contrast to the ancients, we want our violence to cause no real harm, hence not only in relatively safe sports, but in X-rated “violent” movies and television.

Football of various sorts was played in medieval and early modern England (and elsewhere), but unlike modern forms of football, it was far less regulated than the modern game. The result was numerous injuries and occasional deaths. The authorities disapproved and made numerous attempts to outlaw football, but with little success (Elias and Dunning, pp. 176-177). Modern games are tightly regulated to avoid, or at least minimize injuries, which makes them different than earlier games of a similar sort.

Elias points out most modern sports originated in England and spread to various regions of

the world. Some, such as soccer, became almost universal; others, such as cricket, spread “only” to the British Empire, though a variant became American baseball. Rugby’s spread was somewhat limited, but also developed into American football. All these sports developed in England from rougher, more local, and more amorphous games into uniform nationally regulated sports, which limited their violence.

The first to be tamed and regularized were aristocratic pursuits, such as fox hunting, boxing, and horse racing. They were regularized in the eighteenth century in England and, subsequently, the English forms of these sports were adopted on the Continent. Thus, French aristocrats formed highly exclusive jockey clubs and used such English terms as *jockey*, *steeplechase*, and *boxing* (Elias and Dunning, p. 127).

Soccer, and other team sports, took longer to regularize and to spread. It was not until the second half of the nineteenth century that uniform rules were adopted, which limited violence on the field. Soccer spread all over the world, as did such terms as *goal* and *goalkeeper*.

Elias believes that the English origin of these sports is no coincidence. The English upper class was the first group to develop a system under which factions could alternate power peacefully. For the first time, these factions ceased to see opponents as enemies to be persecuted when in power and plotted against when out of power. If the faction in power lost, they were willing to cede power, confident that they would be safe and that they would have a chance to fight another election and possibly gain power again. Elias connects this pacification of the English political class and the relative pacification of sport. For him, this is not a cause and effect relationship; sports and politics are two parts of a complex process of change.

The civilizing process has limited violence for most modern human beings, but humans, especially males, still crave the excitement that comes from violent encounters between individuals and groups. Modern sports are a partial solution to this disconnect between human needs and modern pacified human societies.

Daniel Klenbort, PhD, earned his doctoral degree in Russian history at the University of Chi-

cago prior to serving for over forty-years as a professor of history at Morehouse College. He is active in the World History Association and will give a paper at the June conference in London. His interests are varied, including the relationship between humans and the environment over the long term and the high level of violence in Ancient Greek society. He may be contacted at klenbort@mindspring.com. □

Sources of Success in Sports

Herbert Barry III
University of Pittsburgh

Competitive games occur in almost all human societies. Three sources of success are physical skill, strategy, and chance. Many games have more than one source of success. For example, strategy can enable a cleverer contestant to defeat a stronger or larger opponent in most games of physical skill, such as boxing between individuals and football between teams.

In a world sample of diverse societies, thirty-nine had games of physical skill only and thirty-nine had games of physical skill and also games of chance, where success is determined by external agents, such as dice or cards (Herbert Barry III and John M. Roberts, "Infant Socialization and Games of Chance," *Ethnology*, 1972, Volume 11, pp. 296-308). In the societies with games of physical skill and also games of chance, bodily movements of infants were severely restricted, such as in a North American Indian cradleboard. The infant's physical contact with the caretaker was infrequent. The infant's mother slept in a different bed. We inferred that games of chance are adult expressions of dependency acquired during infancy. The gambler passively submits to the external agent, which determines success. Physical skill and strategy are irrelevant. The gambler also has an infantile fantasy of magical omnipotence. In the musical play and movie *Guys and Dolls*, the successful gambler sings "Luck Be a Lady Tonight." Benevolent Lady Luck is associated with the mostly absent but ultimately rescuing mother.

Competition induces excitement and aggression. Strenuous physical activity expresses and relieves the intensified feelings. Greater ten-

sion is usually felt by golfers and chess players than by boxers and football players. Golf requires no strenuous activity or physical contact with the opponent, and chess is not a game of physical skill.

Chess, a game of strategy, is an effective method for training children to acquire rational and empathic behavior. Young children choose each move quickly and impulsively, ignoring the opponent's threats. Successful chess players learn to choose each move carefully, in accordance with their game plan. They also need empathic understanding of the opponent's best next move and game plan.

Most first born children learn to restrain aggression, especially against the younger brothers and sisters. Most later born children learn to compete against the older brothers and sisters. First-borns, who are inhibited against physical violence, can avoid contact with the opponent by playing tennis, golf, or chess. A questionnaire by Arpad Elo and me revealed that players in weekend chess tournaments were predominantly first-borns. In contrast, professional football players are predominantly later-borns.

Herbert Barry III, PhD, is a psychologist and a Professor Emeritus at the University of Pittsburgh. He has contributed more than 200 publications to the fields of psychology, psychohistory, anthropology, psychiatry, political science, pharmacology, and alcoholism. He was president (1991-1992) of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA). Professor Barry may be contacted at barryh@pitt.edu. □

Psychoanalytic Consultation in Sports

Robert Pyles
Harvard Medical School

I have been working with various professional and serious amateur athletes and performing artists for some twenty-five years. Like many situations that lead us to our psychoanalytic understanding, mine began with a personal trauma. I had been an athlete in high school and college, playing American football, track, and fencing. But like most of my generation, once I graduated from col-

lege and went into medical and analytic training, I considered my athletic career to be over.

In my early thirties I developed several life-threatening illnesses. These were diseases for which no medical treatment was available at the time. The usual course was gradual decline and eventual death. As a way of dealing with the physical and psychological stress of these very serious personal crises, and not knowing what else to do to cope with my sense of personal helplessness, I began to run.

At about that time, in 1972, Frank Shorter had won the Olympic Marathon for the United States, the first time an American had won this event. This set off a running boom, which has continued more or less unabated. When I first began to run, I found I had allowed myself to lapse into terrible physical condition. I could barely go a half-mile without stopping. But I kept at it, eventually running a total of forty-seven marathons, including twenty-seven Boston Marathons and marathons in Ireland, Greece, and other countries.

Running sometimes 1,500-2,000 miles per year, I ultimately lost forty pounds, and became a complete vegetarian. Over a seven-year period, my illnesses disappeared and I began to feel pretty invulnerable. As I increased my mileage and began to train for my first Boston Marathon, I broke my foot two weeks before the race. To my astonishment, I became literally clinically depressed. I discussed this with the sports medicine orthopedic group that I consulted. They explained to me that this reaction to sports injuries was very common. In fact, one of the worst problems they had to deal with in treating injured athletes, was that the athlete would return to activity much too soon, often exacerbating injuries and complicating recovery. They could not understand why these athletes would not follow orders and go through an orderly rehabilitation.

Intrigued, I began talking to marathoners, many of whom were my friends. I began to find that *everyone* had a particular personal story in which endurance running became an adaptive measure for dealing with some crisis or difficulty in their physical or emotional life. As I began to understand it in myself, I also began to understand in others the central role of athletic activity to psychic equilibrium. This seemed to be particularly

true of those who had experienced some success in sports.

I began to develop ways of teaching my orthopedic colleagues basic psychoanalytic evaluation techniques to deal with their patients. I later carried this on to working with coaches and trainers of sports teams. Using case examples, I explained the adaptive value of the sense of mastery in dealing with feelings of helplessness, depression, and anxiety. They began to appreciate the symbolic meaning for each individual of their particular sport. For example, there was a young woman who used what she referred to as "conversations with God" as a means to deal with her depression. She could only have these conversations while she was running, for reasons connected to early experiences with parent figures. Only when this was interpreted was she able to stop her exercise long enough to heal.

Further, I explained the concept of the sense of self and the sense of personal identity that is often embodied in the person's ability to perform in his sport or activity. They were especially interested in the effect of injury on the sense of self, and how injury threatened the sense of omnipotence and resulted in narcissistic regression. They were fascinated by the concept of internalized objects and transference. Talented athletes have often been mentored and more or less adopted early in life by coaches and trainers, as well as have received enormous gratification from proud parents. An injured athlete loses all of these benefits, and many of them therefore cannot forego their sport. As one described how he felt when injured, "I am a wounded animal. Approach me at your peril."

For some ten years now, I have been involved in the Major League Baseball Rookie Development Program, which is jointly sponsored by Major League Baseball owners and the Players Association. Each of the thirty major league teams is entitled to send their three best rookies. The program offers a thorough grounding in issues that the first-year players will face: dealing with the media, drugs and alcohol (particularly steroids and performance-enhancing drugs), financial scams, and temptations of various sorts the players will meet on the road, including encounters with women.

Over the years, psychotherapists, mostly psychoanalysts, have worked with Second City, a

famous comedy acting group, to prepare relevant brief scenarios which enact situations the players will face. The actors use the technique of spontaneous "improvisation," basically free association on stage, and encourage the players to do the same. On one level the program is designed to help with practical advice on how to deal with difficult situations, but on another level the purpose is to stimulate thinking and questions for later consideration in small discussion groups.

Issues that are brought up within the scenarios include sexual harassment, rookies dealing with veteran players, cultural differences between players of different races, prejudice, poor athletic performance, provocative media situations, and difficulties with relationships with family and loved ones, particularly wives and girlfriends.

Four or five scenarios are played out. The players then adjourn to small discussion groups of eight to ten, with one veteran retired player and one psychotherapist. The importance of the veterans cannot be overestimated because these are quite often famous and legendary players, who act as role models and beginning discussants for each of the groups.

The two primary themes that emerge almost every year in every group are concerns about performance and relationships. The pressures on these young men to perform are enormous. The difference between a beginning player and one who has established himself in the league for several years is, quite literally, millions of dollars. As we discuss various psychological performance-enhancing approaches, it is interesting to see how behavioral techniques such as "visualization" have a psychoanalytic underpinning. For example, in visualization one normally imagines oneself playing or running in an idealized way. This is a way of putting the player in touch with various positive internalized objects. As that connection is strengthened through repetition, the connection with a positive internal world, mentors and parents, is strengthened.

The life that professional athletes live is quite abnormal compared to the ordinary life that most of us are familiar with. For example, the pattern of their earning capacity is upside down. Ordinarily, we begin a career and gradually gain skills, and then financial rewards increase in pro-

portion over the years. This allows time to understand how to handle one's finances and the pressures of dealing with financial decisions. In contrast, the young athlete often comes into a great deal of money right at the beginning, before maturity is developed to deal with it. In addition, the sense of omnipotence and narcissistic gratification that many of these young men have experienced throughout their career has a tendency to lead them into mistakes of excess, in terms of poor judgment, and compulsive and sometimes violent behavior. The normal checks and balances on behavior for many of them have not been present. They have been coddled, nurtured, and encouraged, but often not disciplined. The discussions emphasize the importance of internal discipline in ensuring a long career.

The stresses on relationships are also abnormal. These young men spend a great deal of time traveling, in strange cities, often subject to blandishments from various con men and admiring women. It is interesting to hear the anguish with which these young men speak of how one can determine whether the interest that a woman might have for them is genuine or hero worship. The importance of maintaining a primary relationship with a wife or a girlfriend, and the utilization of that stability in enhancing ultimate success in sport, is a frequent topic.

The small groups often become solid bonding experiences for these young men. Similarly, solid relationships often develop between the rookies and the veteran players and psychiatrists. They become accustomed to talking to psychotherapists and begin to understand the value of the use of psychological techniques as well as psychotherapy in their sport and in their lives. They learn that action is not always the answer. At the end, I give them my card and also articles I have written on the psychological effects of sports injuries. It is fascinating to follow the careers of these young men as they develop into veteran players, and to see how issues first discussed in the group often blossom as they mature.

I have been interviewed many times by the media for psychoanalytic aspects of sports issues. For example, two players were competing several years ago for the home run title. In particular, they were seeking to break the legendary Babe Ruth's

record for total home runs in a season, which had stood for many years at sixty. I was asked by a reporter whether I didn't think it was very difficult for these two men to be competing with each other so closely. I explained that on the contrary, it was much easier for them to compete with each other, and to have each other to focus on, because it was much easier to compete in a sibling relationship than it was to compete with a legendary and giant father, as with the figure of Babe Ruth.

Psychoanalytic consultation in sports is not only interesting and enjoyable, but it presents psychoanalysis in a very positive and modern light. So often psychoanalysis has an image of being something antiquated, something that takes place only on the couch and in the consulting room. For people to see psychoanalytic principles in action, operating and valued by famous and talented people, presents psychoanalysis as the vibrant force of life that it really is.

Robert Lindsay Pyles, MD, is past president of the American Psychoanalytic Association and immediate past president of the Massachusetts Psychiatric Association. He graduated from Harvard Medical School in 1962 and remains a clinical instructor on the faculty. Dr. Pyles, who is in the private practice of psychoanalysis in Wellesley Hills, Massachusetts, may be contacted at rpylesmd@comcast.net.

[Editor's Note: This article is based upon a presentation by the author in April 2008 in Barcelona to the European Psychoanalytical Federation.] □

Baseball as the National Pastime

Andy Abrams
Charleston School of Law

Baseball has captured the imagination of Americans for the past two centuries. The game has so mirrored the spirit, values, and psyche of the populace that upon visiting the United States, French historian Jacques Barzun once felt compelled to write: "Whoever wants to know the heart and mind of America had better learn baseball." For purposes of this article, we will assume that Barzun's observation is, or at least was, accurate.

The far more intriguing question is: why is baseball America's national pastime?

By the middle of the nineteenth century the children's game that entailed striking a ball with a bat and running to bases had been converted into an organized activity for adults. Teams organized in large cities in the Northeast, structured around the trade guilds of the time, with the earliest newspaper accounts of baseball dating back to October 1845. By 1869, the public's interest in the game had reached a sufficient level that the business community concluded that there was profit to be made in this previously amateur activity, and America's first professional sports team was born, the Cincinnati Red Stockings. Professional sports had reached American soil and there was no turning back. Americans began to see baseball as a reflection of society and delighted in aligning country and sport. Felled by the baseball "fever," Mark Twain in 1889 felt compelled to write that baseball was "the very symbol, the outward and visible expression of the drive and push and rush and struggle of the raging, tearing, booming, nineteenth century." As the nineteenth century came to a close, a convergence of factors propelled baseball into an exclusive status as the national game, or, as it quickly became known, the "National Pastime."

The industrialization of the late 1800s and early 1900s forced America to confront the predictable pressures of a changing nation. As waves of immigrants came to America seeking a better life and, in the process, provided a ready workforce to man the machinery of the plants and factories, the urban centers in this country experienced a population explosion. The cities were bursting at the seams and the infrastructure struggled to keep up with the dramatic growth. Overcrowded slums were populated by newcomers with weak community ties. The factory jobs held by these immigrants, including women and children, were menial, hazardous, and low-paying. Corrupt urban politics that could take advantage of this new-found immigrant political base became rampant. Despite a booming economy bolstered by the availability of this cheap immigrant labor, the future appeared dangerous and particularly unsettling to the native white *status quo*, who were concerned about both their country and their culture.

Progressivism developed as a movement to help alleviate these systemic domestic problems. The Progressives functioned as optimistic activists who believed that they could solve these domestic issues by identifying, studying, and understanding them. On the international front, with the increased wealth and prestige of an industrialized nation, the United States began to see itself as a world power, and, despite the growing internal social stratification, the country experienced a tremendous upsurge of nationalism.

What America needed was a mechanism for assimilating these “newcomers” and acculturating them, so that they would adopt and reflect the existing values and mores of American society. There, poised and ready, stood baseball. The public was already wildly embracing the game. Attendance at major league games skyrocketed during the first decade of the twentieth century from 1.8 million fans in 1900 to 6.6 million fans in 1909. This explosion in interest and attendance is largely attributable to the urbanization that increased the number of potential fans, the increased economic prosperity that put more money in the hands of these fans, the improved transportation that made the ballparks more accessible, and the improved communication (most particularly the newspapers) that could rapidly spread the message of baseball to the masses.

Clearly, the excitement of the game itself, the presence of notable citizens and dignitaries in the ballpark, the increased newspaper coverage, and the introduction of sports heroes into everyday life all added to the aura of baseball. The press seized upon this expanding public interest for economic purposes. The salaries of the sportswriters were based upon readership; therefore, the more important the game and its participants appeared, the more people would read the writer's columns, and the bigger the author's paycheck. Not surprisingly, the baseball writers began to depict the game as epic struggles with larger than life heroes as combatants. Accordingly, sportswriters and their papers quickly developed a symbiotic relationship with the game—the more coverage, the more fans; and the more fans, the more readers. It is little wonder that the press began to find ways to make the sport appear relevant, if not essential, to the

ideology, values, and ethos of the largest segment of the fan base—Middle America.

Players were described as being courageous, hardworking, and selfless—willing to employ their skills and, where necessary, “sacrifice” for the good to the team. The game was depicted as a rational game, with established rules and accepted behavior, and all decisions regarding who, where, and when the ballplayers participated were made by a manager (management), not by the players (labor). The game largely mirrored the structure of the workplace and transmitted the values that management wished to impart to the workers, most particularly the newly-arrived immigrant workers. The baseball creed became one of egalitarianism and, at least theoretically, epitomized the American dream. Success was available to anyone with talent, who was prepared to follow the rules and work hard for the good of the whole. In light of major league baseball's systematic exclusion of black baseball players until Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in 1947, it is clear that for a significant segment of Americans the creed was myth. But this “democratic myth” served its purpose with a message that was abundantly clear if not fallacious—any young boy who wanted to be integrated into the American culture needed to play baseball. For those who could not actually participate in the sport, there was always the grandstand. The logical extension of what has been called the “integrative myth” was that similar to actually playing the game, those who watched the game likewise were exposed to and would ultimately adopt these American values. Thus, for player and fan alike, being a part of America's game enabled them to fully understand what it was to be an American.

A similar myth also developed during this same period, which sought to address the concerns of the times. Although baseball as an organized sport began in the major cities of the Northeast, played by the various trade guilds and young professionals, the popularly-accepted story of the game's roots was quite different. According to what has been labeled the “agrarian myth,” baseball purportedly was born and raised in the fields and pastures of rural America and was eventually transported to the big city. While historically inaccurate, the myth served an important function. As

previously discussed, there was a growing concern among Middle Americans about the dramatic growth in the cities and the waves of immigrants, who not only did not necessarily share the same customs and traditions as middle-class Americans, but who often did not even speak the same language. Placing the origins of the game in the countryside was a nostalgic paean to an idealized, simpler time. The baseball terminology itself underscored this desire to create a pastoral beginning for the sport. The site of the contests were called "parks" or "fields" or "grounds," and in these bucolic settings the outfield became known as the "pasture," the infield had "paths," and there in the middle was a "mound" where the "horsehide" was thrown. In short, the game was both a literal and a figurative oasis in the midst of Twain's "raging, booming, tearing" America.

In addition to the impact of myth-making, two final factors likely contributed to baseball's ability to establish itself as the national pastime: continuity of persons and continuity of place. While poets and pundits have made much of the inherent beauty of the game (a pastoral setting, time to visit between pitches, and no clock), clearly a large part of the appeal of the game to the masses was the players themselves. Beginning in 1903 with the signing of the National Agreement, the American League and the National League agreed to honor the player contracts of one another and in doing so eliminated the ability of players to "jump" leagues. Additionally, included within these player contracts was a provision that came to be known as the "reserve clause," which effectively allowed the ball club to reserve the services of the player for as long as the team wished to employ that player. This clause withstood periodic legal challenges and remained in tact until baseball free agency arrived in 1975. Effectively, in tandem, the National Agreement and the Reserve Clause ensured that throughout the formative period and, ultimately, for over seventy years, because only the ball clubs could transfer players to other teams and cities, the ballplayers typically remained affiliated with a team for an extended period of time. This enabled fans to develop strong attachments to their favorite players and created a sense among the fans that at least to some degree this attachment was mutual. While the elimination of this clause has enabled these athletes to become more mobile and, in the

process, richer, this increased mobility of player from team to team has also led to reduced continuity of personnel and thus to weaker fan affiliation with the ballplayers themselves.

Further, there was a continuity of place that contributed to the public's allegiance to the team and, by extension, the sport itself. As part of the National Agreement, the owners agreed to "territoriality," which established a protected domain for each team. Under this concept, the each owner agreed not to invade the turf of the other by moving new or existing teams into these areas. As a result of their agreement to jealously guard their geographic space, between 1903 and 1953 no major league baseball franchises changed cities. The result was that the fans of a particular team knew from year to year that their team would be there, as the "home" team truly was and seemingly for all time would remain the home team.

Ultimately, however, the ability of baseball to stake out its claim as the national pastime is, as Barzun had noted, a reflection of the "heart and *mind* [emphasis added]" of Americans. The desire of an individual to be liked or accepted by members of a group, as Solomon Asch has concluded, is one of the most powerful normative social influences that exists. For baseball, the explicit and implicit mantra became, "If you want to be an American (the group), you must learn baseball." Using this as the basic framework for analysis, the story of baseball's transformation from a children's game to a national sport embraced by millions, is really an exercise in social psychology.

As previously noted, at the turn of the twentieth century, the physical, social, and psychic territory of middle-class Americans was being threatened by the "hordes" of newcomers. The response of the majority to this influx was a clear manifestation of the territorial imperative. In order to protect their financial and social gains, and with the desire for security or stability, the *status quo* used baseball to ensure that the waves of immigrants were first acculturated and, subsequently, assimilated into society. Baseball became the vehicle for the transmittal of those values and attitudes, such as adherence to rules and respect for authority, that the *status quo* felt best protected their territory.

Similarly, the willingness, if not outright desire of these immigrant groups to be assimilated, likewise reflected a comparable desire for security and stability. Their response to the prevailing social influences consistently followed the conformity process identified by Harvard psychologist Herbert Kelman: compliance, identification, and internalization. First, these newest Americans conformed publicly to the accepted behavior and values by playing or at least watching baseball, while still maintaining their existing beliefs privately. As respected leaders in their communities began to play and attend these games, and as ballplayers with similar ethnicity achieved celebrity status, the immigrants began to identify more closely with the game and to conform to its articulated value system. This eventually led to the immigrants internalizing these values, as they conformed both publicly and privately to the espoused beliefs and accepted behavior articulated by the *status quo* through its primary mouthpieces—the schools, the church, and the press.

As a result of these motivations, manifestations, and social/psychological influences, baseball was indelibly etched into the psyche of the American public and thus became America's sport—its National Pastime.

Andy Abrams, LL.M., is Professor of Law at Charleston School of Law, where he teaches education law and sports law, and serves as the school's dean. Prior to joining academia, he was a trial lawyer in Greenville. Professor Abrams may be contacted at aabrams4@comcast.net. □

Child Abuse and Baseball: Torre and Steinbrenner

**Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College**

Joe Torre, partly because he grew up in a baseball-obsessed household with an abusive father, was the longest serving and most successful manager under the free-spending yet difficult baseball club owner, George Steinbrenner. Though he won more division titles, pennants, and world championships than any other manager in the history of Steinbrenner's majority ownership of the New York Yankees, his level of success did de-

cline as the frustrations of working under his grandiose employer became increasingly burdensome. This occurred in a most striking fashion during the 2004 and 2007 playoffs, as will be discussed below.

My methodology is to discuss Steinbrenner's relationship with the Yankees and his *modus operandi*, and then Torre's childhood and professional experience as both a player and manager. I will also show the ways in which Steinbrenner assumed the role of Torre's abusive father and how the manager dealt with this.

George Steinbrenner has been principal owner of the New York Yankees since 1973. As a result of ill-health, he retired from active oversight of his team last fall, so the past tense is used in referring to his behavior and ownership, although not his attitudes. "The Boss," as he has always liked to be called, thinks of himself as an unconditional winner. He even said, "Winning is the most important thing in my life, after breathing. Breathing first, winning next." Unlike many owners who approach baseball as only a business, he not only cared passionately about winning, but he was willing to spend a lot of money in pursuit of this goal. This process is made easier by the fact that the Yankees, even with an annual payroll of over \$200 million, are quite profitable.

Yet Steinbrenner meddled in the activities of the team in ways which were often counterproductive to his stated goal of winning. Though he likes to be considered a "nice guy," he has acknowledged that "it is not secret that I can be a very difficult boss." Indeed, he has been quoted as saying, "I will never have a heart attack. I give them" (*New York Times*, October 13, 2005, p. D2). Don Zimmer, a friend of Steinbrenner for several decades and the Yankees' bench coach under Joe Torre until he became too frustrated with working for "the Boss," said the owner "puts all his money into his team and he expects to win. Every day. And when the team slumps, he gets angry and wants answers. It does no good to try and tell him that there are no easy answers for why a team goes into a slump" (Donald Zimmer with Bill Madden, *Zim - A Baseball Life*, 2001, p. 256).

Baseball is a unique sport in that on any given day the best team can be beaten by the worst because of the dominating role of the pitcher and

the uncertainty of team performance. The best team will almost certainly lose sixty games a year, just as the best hitter will likely fail at least two out of every three times he comes to bat. The management of failure is central to success in baseball, as in other sports; a good manager not only encourages players, but helps them to deal with their failures, so that they do not lose confidence in themselves.

George Steinbrenner's drive to win every game and to find someone responsible when he did not, at times became an obstacle to success. He liked to fire managers when things were not going well. Early in his ownership, he got into "open warfare" with his manager, Billy Martin, an alcoholic whom he hired and fired five times (Zimmer, *Zim*, p. 170). Steinbrenner could be quite devious, indirect, and meddlesome in his approach, making him a target of criticism for the fans and sports writers when things went badly. Steinbrenner's penchant for getting caught being devious led to his being convicted of making illegal contributions to President Nixon's re-election campaign in 1972 and then fined and sentenced to community service for this offense. Others had made the same illegal contributions without drawing the attention and public humiliation of the sports-obsessed ship-builder from Cleveland.

Similarly, he was banned from baseball for two and a half years for paying \$40,000 to a gambler he was attempting to use to publicly discredit one of his star athletes, Dave Winfield, who was suing him for breach of contract. For an assessment of Steinbrenner's impact on baseball, one may go to independent-minded commissioners of baseball, such as Bart Giamatti who labeled Steinbrenner the "Typhoid Mary" of baseball, because "Wherever he went, disease followed." Giamatti's successor as commissioner, Fay Vincent, declared that the Yankee owner "embodied sleaze," calling him "baseball's worst recidivist." He described Steinbrenner as "disruptive, corruptive, corrosive, boorish and embarrassing"—"as unattractive and despicable a person as I've ever dealt with" (quotes are from Paul H. Elovitz, "Torre, Steinbrenner, and Sports Psychology," *Clio's Psyche*, September 1996, pp. 56-58).

Although Joe Torre succeeded more and survived longer than any other manager under "the

Boss," his level of success declined in the latter stages of his tenure. Indeed, in the 2004 playoffs and under his guidance, the Yankees completed the most remarkable collapse in postseason history, when they lost four consecutive games to the Red Sox after having won the initial three handily. How do we explain both Torre's ability to survive so long under a brutalizing owner in a cutthroat sport and his relative decline in success?

There are a number of answers to the question of his success. Torre, who had been an outstanding catcher during his years as an active player, may not have had a winning record managing the Atlanta Braves, St. Louis Cardinals, and New York Mets, but he learned an enormous amount about managing. The six years he spent as a broadcaster also gave him a unique perspective on the game, and for a decade he proved himself capable of balancing the needs of the fans, the team owner, and the players in a winning way after joining the Yankees as manager.

The question thus becomes: How did Joe Torre succeed in an atmosphere so demanding and potentially hurtful? The answer begins with his childhood, where he grew up as the youngest of five children of an abusive police-detective father in Brooklyn. He was younger than any of his two brothers and two sisters by eight years. In the Torre household, baseball was the family passion and everyone rooted for National League teams and hated the Yankees during an era of many New York Subway Series. His older brother Frank was a professional ballplayer and his father served as an unofficial scout for a major league team. Young Joe, named for his father, played and talked baseball endlessly. He fell asleep talking baseball with his roommate brother Frank. His oldest brother, Rocco, who had become a policeman, arranged for Joe to be able to use batting cages for free: he hit until his hands bled. Yet Joe lacked the confidence to even try to make the high school baseball team.

Joe Torre describes himself as a "fat," "spoiled," and "nervous child." A boy who was "shy," "beyond bashful," "made to feel ashamed," and "lacking in confidence," and who hid his feelings. Joe says his "father never hit [him]" but that "[he] walked around the house on eggshells" for fear of waking his father who slept upstairs during

the day. (As manager of the Yankees he would have to worry about not awakening the wrath of George Steinbrenner who was best left "sleeping" upstairs in the corporate office.) He was "never comfortable with [his] dad" except when they were at the ballpark together. If he knew his father was home, he would stay out playing ball until his father had gone to work. The one act of assertion that he remembers in reference to his family came when he was nine years old and his sister was holding a knife to protect her mother from her father. Their father, in turn, reached for his revolver, when little Joe grabbed the knife out of her hand, defusing the situation.

Joe describes his mother Margaret as "a loving, stabilizing influence," who was always present for her kids, especially her baby, whom she lovingly called "my Joey." She was a "marvelous cook" who loved to feed her family, fattening Joe up and keeping him close to her. Though he says, "she could also be very tough," he only remembers her hitting him once, though she often raised her hand to hit him, stopping "herself by biting her index finger." Young Joe learned to read the signals of her mood changes as well as those of his father and to be patient (Joe Torre, *Chasing the Dream: My Lifelong Journey to the World Series: An Autobiography*, 1997, pp. 18-19), just as he later learned to read his players, opponents, the fans, and George Steinbrenner. The males of the family were all chauvinistic, especially his father and Frank, and the girls were trained to be subservient and wait on them. Both girls had been given names with a masculine base: Josephine (now Sister Marguerite, an Ursuline nun) and Rae.

Torre describes his father as a highly controlling, manipulative man who gave small presents to many people so that they would be obligated to him. His nickname was "Joe the Boss." Every winter he would go to Florida for two months at a time with his girlfriend, thus giving the family some peace. (This is comparable to the respite that Yankee manager Torre had in New York when "the Boss" Steinbrenner stayed down in his Tampa home during much of the baseball season.) At home, his father was a tyrant to his children and his devoutly Catholic, Italian-born wife whom he once threw down the stairs after learning she was pregnant with their fifth child—Joe Torre. While

Joe was growing up, his mother would frantically call her son Frank, who was then thousands of miles away playing baseball in the minor leagues, in the hope of getting some protection. Finally, Frank assembled the children, and, with his mother's reluctant permission, gave their father an ultimatum that he must leave the family, without any monetary obligations whatsoever beyond signing over the house to his wife. The senior Joe Torre reluctantly left because he feared Frank, who told newsman Stone Phillips for a Safe At Home Foundation interview, that he himself "was bigger, stronger and probably just as crazy" as was his father (see msnbc.com: Joe Torre: Safe at Home).

Torre remembers the most "exciting" and "happiest time of my life" as being during the fourth game of the 1957 World Series when his brother Frank was the hero in the struggle against the hated New York Yankees (Torre, *Chasing*, pp. 1, 5). In the Milwaukee Braves locker room, he got to see behind the scenes. He learned something about the fickleness of the fans and sports commentators when in the following year Frank became the popular scapegoat of the Braves for making two errors in the World Series they lost.

Joe's dream of becoming a professional baseball player seemed hopeless after he graduated high school because "I was too fat and too slow to be a ballplayer...no one wanted me." He took a menial job at the New York Stock Exchange, but baseball remained his passion. At this point his brother Frank, whom Joe idealized, subjected him to catching, the toughest job on any team, but one not requiring speed. He also thought his kid brother "was a candy-assed kid who needed to be toughened up." Joe is eternally grateful to Frank, yet he also describes him as "a world-class needler...always stirring the pot," whom he "hate [d]" for being verbally abusive, calling his little brother "a fat slob" who could "never be a ballplayer." Frank even encouraged other major leaguers to ride him about his weight (Torre, *Chasing*, pp. 59, 61, 32).

As a catcher Joe Torre proved his brother Frank's criticisms wrong by becoming not only a major league player, but also the Most Valuable Player of the National League in 1971. Yet he remained, by his own statement, immature, selfish, and spoiled for a very long time in his life, regard-

less of his success. Joe met his first wife in a Playboy Club and his second wife in a bar. He never invited his family to the weddings because he knew they would disapprove. Yet when his Playboy Bunny wife left him with their baby, he had his mother and sisters raise the child. Maturity came slowly to Torre, but he developed among his baseball band of brothers and assumed the position of union representative.

When his playing days were over, Torre came to appreciate owners who were willing to give him a chance and spend money accordingly. Torre once noted that Steinbrenner was easier to get along with than his Atlanta Braves boss, Ted Turner, who was so intrusive that he jumped on the field during a game. He even learned how to predict and pre-empt Steinbrenner's moves, thus making himself much less vulnerable to them. A major accomplishment in Torre's career and life was his establishment in 2003 of the Safe At Home Foundation, which combats abuse at home. He wants to protect the weak from abuse just as he wishes his family had been protected from the abuse of his father. Margaret's Place, named for Torre's mother, is the school-based initiative attached to the Safe At Home Foundation which offers personal and group counseling.

Torre has commented that baseball teams are "like a family" (*New York Times*, June 4, 2006). The impact of Torre's family and childhood on his managerial style is considerable. He identifies with the lack of confidence of young players, especially when they are down, and thus he has more compassion for his players when his teams lose. He accepts his former bench coach Zimmer's observation that when winning he is more demanding than when the team is struggling, which is reminiscent of his brother Frank's being tough on him even as he succeeded. He feels he is more understanding of rebellious young players because he was a rebel himself.

One of the best statements regarding Torre's approach to the game came from Joe Girardi, a catcher whom Torre mentored and made his bench coach when Zimmer got fed up with the owner's unwarranted criticism, and quit. Upon being made manager of the Florida Marlins, Girardi said the following of his mentor: "Joe Torre taught me how to get the best out of your players

and how the personality affects them on a day-to-day basis. His communication skills with players are unbelievable." Furthermore, "Joe's job was to protect the clubhouse and make the player[s] safe, and he did that." When Torre told Girardi that he was ready to be a manager, he reports that it was "like a father telling a son he's ready for the world" (*New York Times*, October 21, 2005, p. D4). Joe Torre, the abused child, had assumed the role of the good father providing safety and direction for his sons. (Girardi, after checking with his mentor, in the fall of 2007 succeeded Torre as manager of the Yankees.)

Two major themes in his success have been to protect the health and safety of his players, and to be inspired by overcoming illness to achieve victory. The titles of sports columns like "The Walking Wounded Win Again" and "The Yankees Limp to Victory" are indicative of this tendency, which showed most clearly when the drama of the pennant and World Series races in 1996 was framed in the light of the failing health and heart transplant of his brother Frank, who was most responsible for Torre's successful baseball career. In 1999 the health crisis to be overcome and to inspire the team was his own case of prostate cancer. Under his direction, the Yankees won ten American League East Division titles, six American League pennants, and four World Series titles.

Yet as time wore on, the manager and his players needed some special stimulus to again achieve the ultimate success of a World Series. This was especially the case because, in the face of George Steinbrenner's lack of appreciation, inappropriate behavior, and insatiable need to take full credit for the achievements of others, they faced the unconscious and even conscious temptation to passive-aggressively frustrate "the Boss" by not doing their best. But rather than finding another emotional inspiration, the Yankees were distracted by Steinbrenner's criticisms and the need to integrate new players like Alex Rodriguez into the team.

The cost of dealing with a difficult team owner and demanding job eventually caught up with the Yankees' skipper who had achieved remarkable success by going to the postseason annually from 1996-2007. After the 2007 World Series (which the Yankees did not participate in) Joe

Torre ended his career as the Yankee manager, despite being the most successful and highest paid manager in baseball. This occurred in the following manner. In the middle of the last Division series, George Steinbrenner declared that if the Yankees did not win the next two games and clinch the Division, the manager would be fired. They won one, rather than two games. In the Steinbrenner tradition of dealing with popular personnel, Torre was not fired directly by the principal owner who wanted a World Series victory every year, but simply given a contract that was insulting in the face of his previous accomplishments. Consequently, Torre thanked "Mr. Steinbrenner" for the opportunities he had been given and left New York.

In the opinion of this analyst (and fan), Joseph Paul Torre was worn down by the strains of managing the team, the press, the fans, and most of all Steinbrenner. His Safe at Home Foundation had helped (and continues to help) victims deal with domestic abuse and he did not want to tolerate further interference and abuse by a grandiose and meddling owner.

In conclusion, Joe Torre's survival as the New York Yankees' manager under George Steinbrenner was made possible in part by his experiences in growing up with a manipulative and abusive father. He encouraged and cared for his players in ways comparable to how his big brothers Frank and Rocco supported his baseball dream, though his focus is somewhat less on "tough love" than was theirs. Because of the difficulties of working for George Steinbrenner, he now manages the Los Angeles Dodgers.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, a Boston Red Sox fan while growing up in Connecticut, became a devout Yankees fan over three decades ago. He is editor of this journal and may be contacted at pelovitz@aol.com.

[Editor's Note: Also on baseball, see Joe Dorinson's "Jews and Baseball" letter to the editor on page 48.] □

The Election 2008 Seminar
is scheduled for the Fall
Presenters include
Herbert Barry and Paul Elovitz

Gender Benders in Women's Tennis

(Continued from page 1)

pumped in their face or a painful defeat for long after (L. Jon Wertheim, *Venus Envy*, 2001, p. 52). "I don't come to make friends," Venus Williams says. "I come to win matches" (p. 51).

My sampling from women's tennis, itself arguably exceptional among women's sports, suggests early gender divergences. Boy athletes are viewed by Teitelbaum as "coddled since childhood," emotionally stunted, self-centered, and insensitive to others' needs. Such deficits can foster compensatory behaviors, such as gambling, substance and steroid abuse, or, after their heyday, clinical states of depression and despair. While the pitfalls of fame and celebrityhood seem to impact both genders, there is no single pattern for girls who become tennis players. Yet the most commonly repeated one is very young girls being driven and dominated by their fathers' ambitions. Most prominent are Mary Pierce, Steffi Graf, Andrea Jaeger, Jennifer Capriati, Maria Sharapova, Mirjana Lucic, Sonya Jeyaseelan, Jelena Dokic, and the Williams sisters, Serena and Venus.

The tradition reaches back at least to the 1920s and France's Suzanne Lenglen's struggles to escape her "Svengali-like father" (Paul Fein, "Does Father Really Know Best?", *Tennis Confidential*, 2002, p. 184). Not all of these fathers have been abusive, and the girls were often eager to get into the game, but many fathers' doubling as coaches and managers put their girls in a painful bind. Covering the women's tour in the 1990s, Michael Mewshaw heard "horror tales about girls being berated and beaten by fathers, brothers, or coaches" (*Ladies of the Court*, 1993, p. 26). Some "had seen Patti Hogan being whipped on the bare legs by her racquet-wielding father" and others named juniors "being slapped around and destined to become the next generation of battered women." In a few instances, mothers play a similar role. Anna Kournikova suffered from the "mother from hell," and Alexandra Stevenson's mother's micro-managing deflected attention from the real star. Mothers end up getting banned from locker rooms; fathers from the stadium. On the other hand, Monica Hingis's game was carefully nourished by

her tennis mom, Melanie Molitor. Without her supportive presence at courtside, Monica's game foundered. Monica Seles and Lindsey Davenport are other rare exceptions of escaping parental interference.

Another gender difference is that female athletes peak earlier without necessarily maturing faster than males. A girl may start hitting balls right out of the nursery, turn pro at thirteen (Capriati), work out with older male players, and win her first grand slam at seventeen (Sharapova's 2003 Wimbledon title). Lucky to own high-school diplomas, they have already earned millions. Their glowing, muscular bodies are lined up with products; their faces are on magazine covers. Surrounded by trainers and consultants, their lives are the quarry of paparazzi no less than those of movie stars. But although they own mansions and sports cars, what they often do not own is themselves.

Driven by parents' agendas, many promising and a few top players burn out before their twenties. Stefano Capriati famously bragged about teaching Jennifer push-ups in the crib and pushing her to turn pro while still an eighth grader by asserting, "When the fruit is ripe, you eat it" (Fein, p. 140). In a few years, she admitted, "I really was not happy with myself, my tennis, my life, my parents, my coaches, my friends...when I looked in the mirror, I actually saw this distorted image: I was so ugly and fat. I just wanted to kill myself" (Fein, p. 184). Instead, she drifted into teenage delinquencies—soft drugs and shoplifting. But when she launched her comebacks, she brought back her father as coach. Andrea Jaeger's father would say, "Your child plays for himself last. First he plays for you, then for his coach, then for himself." Andrea was driven to play in so many tournaments that her body failed; with her shoulder permanently wrecked, she retired at age twenty-one. Other players, like Mary Pierce and Jelena Dokic, with notoriously abusive fathers, far from being critical, heap gratitude and praise on them. "Sometimes," Pierce wondered in 1994, "if things hadn't been so tough, would I have been the tennis player I am today?" (Fein, p. 138). On another occasion she asserted, "He made me the player I am today" (Wertheim, p. 126). When her game sagged, she also resorted to her father. "I owe everything

to my dad," Dokic echoed in the face of his public outrages (Wertheim, p. 166).

In contrast, when at around age eleven, Lindsey Davenport made a "sloppy error" in a tournament, her "father groaned aloud and shook his head. Lindsey stopped her match, and told him, 'Dad, if you do that one more time, you'll never get to come watch me again'" (Wertheim, p. 13). Martina Hingis's mother told an interviewer, "Tennis is just a short stage of your life, and it can be good preparation for the rest of it. I want to help Martina to become independent and self-analytical until someday she finds a partner" (Fein, p. 18). All the same, naming one's daughter after Martina Navratilova does send a message. At her Wimbledon final when asked if her parents were coming, Davenport replied, "Oh, God, no. They have their own lives. Besides, they're kind of over my career" (Wertheim, p. 41).

But for many players, tennis starts out as fun only to be burdened with parents' agendas, their unresolved conflicts and displaced ambitions. Monica Seles instinctively gravitated to the game at age six while her father was giving lessons to her older brother, and later when she was suffering acute loneliness in a Florida tennis camp whose instructors were trying to change her game, she summoned her father who helped her get back on track (Seles, *Monica: From Fear to Victory*, 1996, p. 24). After her traumatic stabbing by a self-styled Steffi Graf fan, Seles was only able to begin reconnecting with her former self by rediscovering the unalloyed pleasures of smacking a tennis ball.

The tennis court may be a public arena of concentrated competition, but it also has a more private zone where identities are being negotiated: withheld or rewarded, gained or scrubbed, and, in rare instances, rediscovered. What serves to unify the multiplicities of women's tennis experiences are these identity-themes. Putting identity in the center, one circles the clock for its constituents: at 1-3, competitions define players; at 3-6, attitude; at 6-9, the physical self (including injuries, stamina, and training); at 9-12, the separation-individuation process emerges and proves the most significant for grasping the dynamics of women tennis players. But the degree of success in the psychological quarter does not impact on their performance in conspicuous or predictable ways. Lindsey Daven-

port, who is happily married, displays a buoyant self-esteem in contrast with her hunched shoulders and lowered head previously, but she is now suffering the impact of physical wear-and-tear. Still, she emerges as the most balanced of the present group, as Chris Evert had been before her. Both appear to have consolidated early love relations (object-relations in psychoanalytic terms), learned to deal with issues of self-esteem, and maintained realistic perspectives. Martina Navratilova has managed to survive post-tennis malaise, partly through the thrill of briefly returning to doubles competition, but also by enriching her life with political causes, creative work, friends, and travel. But multiple interests have had the reverse effect for Serena Williams, whose dabbling in acting and women's dress styles have turned her court appearances into fashion statements. Too many balls to juggle, erratic training, lack of preparation, overconfidence, and over-reliance on her father-coach Richard Williams have combined to slow her pace and send her shots askew. Here there may be an instance of Erikson's identity diffusion in a daughter who was taught she could be anything by a parent notorious for his tall-tales, farfetched schemes such as buying Rockefeller Center, and re-invented pasts (Wertheim, pp. 70-79). Venus Williams, who won Wimbledon in 2005, has kept her goals simpler and better focused.

Various dysfunctional fathers violate their daughters' boundaries before they have been formed. A contentious merger experience is reestablished, which players must battle through, on and off the court. They have to be the invincible *I* on the court, but accept being the weaker *I* in the paternal bond. They may find that the love and acceptance they are striving for is determined by the father's secret or not so secret agendas. These include narcissistic vindication from old slights or injuries and garden-variety greed, or, in the case of Jim Pearce, traumatic reliving and revenge. Himself an abused child, he would yell during Mary's junior tournaments, "Kill the bitch!" (Fein, p. 138).

One consistent correlation is that tennis daughters of father-coaches tend to wallop their strokes, hit killer overheads, and serve nearly as fast as top men players. The tradeoff of having disruptive, overly-possessive fathers is in giving their daughters permission to hit-out much harder

than other women players (there may be a psychosexual subtext here). The downside of women players with a big game seems to be the toll taken on their physical condition: body-parts tend to wear out faster. In contrast, Martina Hingis, who was coached by her tennis-playing mother, relies on strategy and anticipation—a mental game of outwitting her opponents.

Struggling through their psychological ordeals may make the women more whole and better human beings, but have but marginal impact on their level of play. Asked why she looked much happier than in the past, Jennifer Capriati in her comeback-kid mode replied, "I guess I've stopped thinking what the world thinks of me" (Wertheim, p. 34). Her return was impressive but short-lived. She soared to the top after winning the French Open in 2001, but by late 2004 she left the court after a quarter-final loss in a minor tournament, perhaps for the last time, plagued by shoulder injuries. Interviewed in her Tampa residence, she reflected on the costs of overtraining and overscheduling events, of too much pressure from her father and poor advice from others. But she also recalled her teenage daydream of hearing others remark as she passed by: "There's Jennifer Capriati, the greatest tennis player who ever lived" (*New York Times*, May 25, 2006). Now, without tennis defining her life, she spends countless hours "inside her head." She surmises she needs to find an appropriate hobby because "A lot of the time my hobby is thinking."

A Brief Update (May 2008)

After a successful bout with motherhood, Lindsey Davenport returned to the tennis circuit in September 2007 and made up for lost time by winning two tournaments and coming close in others; in Spring 2008 she was sidelined temporarily for injuries. Enjoying mixed successes in her comeback, Martina Hingis retired after testing positive for a banned substance, cocaine, which, if true, may have stemmed from her earlier foot injury, but she has contested the ruling and denied any drug use. The careers of the Williams sisters continue to soar and plunge. Venus won Wimbledon in 2007, but after a lackluster performance in the Australian Open has taken a leave of absence to deal with issues, apparently concerning her physical well-being. After dropping from the top fifty in

2006, *Serena also had a mediocre run in the Australian Open, but has gotten better focused and managed a seventeen-match winning streak in Spring 2008.* (See page 9 for author credit.)

Gymnastics and Finnish Female Body Image and Identity

Aino Sarje
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, women's free-group gymnastics has been one of the most popular sports in the Nordic countries. Hundreds of gymnastics festivals have attracted thousands of gymnasts in Finland alone. The mass performance of gymnastics has been an institution and a demonstration of social relationships. It has created, changed, and maintained values and norms on the movements and habits—the body image and identity—of the women gymnasts. Participants have learned and internalized the idea of gender difference, the role and status of men and women in society. In my paper, I describe two styles of Finnish women's gymnastics, the earlier of which was in use from the beginning of the 1900s and the latter from the 1920s until today.

At the beginning of the 1900s, in the first mass gymnastics performances, women broke social structures by stepping into a public domain controlled by men. They moved in the manner of male gymnasts. Their performances were emancipated compared with the general norms of the time. They abandoned corsets and high-buttoned shoes, and freed themselves from the bourgeois female ideal of the nineteenth century. The ideal body build of the gymnasts was that of the Amazon, with her fine posture, large rib cage, and strong muscles. The physical activity, health, and joy transmitted by the mass performances questioned the nineteenth century ideal of the fragility of women.

The female gymnasts supported the view of the two men who developed the Swedish gymnastic style, Per Henrik and Hjalmar Ling, who thought that men and women tended to move in the same way though to a different degree. Ling's

view on women's gymnastics was that women needed exercise more than men as they had to give birth to children and nurse them. Lingian gymnastics included difficult balancing movements and the use of apparatus, and it began to use very high beams and horizontal bars which "called for a great deal more will than normal." This was also thought to affect the personality of the gymnasts "by developing strength of will, decisiveness, the desire to perform, faith in oneself and bravery." In the 1900s it was considered very advanced for women to pursue these virtues.

This gymnastic style emphasized the links between team gymnastics and women's efforts to gain equality with men. Women's gymnastics had the opportunity to adopt an identity in many respects similar to men's, through gymnastics based on military gymnastics and a system of giving orders. The identity of women mastering Lingian gymnastics was marked by their readiness to place themselves in certain professions and positions, such as teachers in education and office holders in government.

However, there was strong opposition to the introduction of this style of women's gymnastic style both in Finnish male gymnastics culture and in society in general. It was not thought "correct" for men and women to exercise using the same movements as this would have meant the same image and identity. In 1909, a major figure in the men's gymnastic movement expressed the view that because "a woman's body, structure, form, strength, stamina, and above all a woman's character, are all so utterly different from those of a man, a system which permits precise equivalence in the physical education of both genders must clearly be classified as unnatural." Women were allowed to exercise, but only on men's terms and not as men's equals. My interpretation is that men began to fear the idea of fusion, of being merged with the female/motherly side.

Women could use gymnastics to create beauty: "those wonderful characteristics of proportion that bewitch our eyes when we look at the works of art of Ancient Greece." At the end of the 1920s, the attitude to women's gymnastics was described by an important opinion molder in Finland as follows: "It is quite clear that there is no need for women to compete with men in strength,

stamina and difficulty of movements, but that female gymnastics has to adapt especially to the female character, that is to contain smooth, beautiful and graceful movements.”

Now, women and girls aimed for slenderness and flexibility rather than strength and speed—those physical characteristics that were considered to typically belong to the male body. Graceful movements had to be part of the female identity, part of a woman's everyday behavior and appearance. Apparatus that could be used for strengthening the upper part of the body was removed from girls' schools. The new-style women's gymnastics included influences from dance as these were considered to be feminine and thus acceptable in women's gymnastics and more widely in society as a whole.

This revised perception of their bodies did not encourage women to adopt an identity that would compete with men. Furthermore, in the 1930s, the German influence introduced the “Aryan spirit,” where a woman was supposed to move “like a woman”—she was not supposed to behave “like a man” in any way. In 1934, there was an admiring newspaper article about women's mass gymnastics performances. The editor wrote: “May God protect and embellish the Finnish woman, who worships the beauty of her soul and body, for that is the way toward a steadfast Finland and a firm nation.”

Aino Sarje, PhD, SocD, has in her two doctoral theses discussed questions of aesthetics and social psychology in relation to dance as art. In the last few years Sarje has been independently researching the history of Finnish women's gymnastics at the University of Jyväskylä. She may be contacted at aino.sarje@luukku.com. □

My Sporting Life

Joe Illick

San Francisco State University

I am a 73-year-old male who swims daily in San Francisco Bay, at least a mile and sometimes over two, in water temperatures that range from the high forties in January and February to the rare low sixties. From December 21 to March 21, I compete against all the other members (male

and female, ages 20 to 80+) of my swim club to see who will swim the most miles and become the Polar Bear. During the past decade I have won twice and been second many times. Furthermore, I compete against all these swimmers in races as long as three miles. I consider myself an athlete, though hardly a super athlete.

Nor, in my lifelong, on-again-off-again athletic career, have I ever considered myself unusual. My earliest memories of physical competition center on the rural Pennsylvania elementary school I attended, where I sought to impress the older boys with my swift running in games like “Prisoners' Base” that ranged over our enormous playground, not to mention the annual May Day track contests.

Because I lived on a farm, my playmates were usually limited to my three younger brothers and two male cousins who resided there with me. Girls, such as my cousin Winnie, were excluded from most games. I had little experience with team sports such as football and baseball, though I played lots of one-on-one basketball on our driveway once it was surfaced. My focus was on individual sports, especially swimming and tennis, both of which I was taught after my parents joined a nearby country club when I was eleven. I commuted to a ten-mile-distant urban high school, where my small size and undeveloped skills disqualified me from participating in any of the major sports but allowed me to star in swimming and tennis, though such efforts were scorned by the jocks at the annual letter banquets. Still, I wore my “B” for Bethlehem sweater with pride.

As an undergraduate at Princeton there was no way I could join the tennis team, which was composed of preppies who appeared to have played since birth. But I did win my “P” on the swimming roster, specializing in freestyle sprints. The fellowship of the pool softened the hard-edged qualities of an Ivy League school.

I was so overwhelmed by my studies in graduate school at the University of Pennsylvania that I largely forsook sports—though I did learn to play squash—for the library and did not resume my athletic endeavors until I moved to California almost a decade later. Fortunately, I had married an accomplished tennis player, so I was not completely sedentary. When the running craze struck

the nation in the 1970s, I became a part of it, frequently competing on weekends but never finishing at the head of the pack or even joining a jogging club.

It was my divorce in the mid-1980s and the companionship of a woman who swam regularly that drew me back into the water. Inadvertently, I discovered masters swimming, where the five-year age divisions made it possible for me to compete against and frequently triumph over men who were my contemporaries. Is there some hidden reason why that gave me pleasure? I would say the answer is atavistic, not peculiarly personal. Anyway, for a decade I attended a rigorous swim practice and traveled the circuit of meets.

In the mid-1990s, I discovered the cold but welcoming waters of San Francisco Bay. A fellow pool swimmer told me he had swum from Alcatraz to the city, a short but somewhat perilous undertaking. Nevertheless, I never doubted my ability to match his feat. Then I started occasionally swimming off a local beach—until the day my clothes were stolen. I joined a swim club to have a locker, and to my happy surprise I found that it featured frequent open-water competitions.

It is easy to understand my attraction to the Bay but less easy to understand why it took me so long to discover it. Much as I enjoyed city living, I was at heart a country boy who longed to escape urban restraints, including the pool, and open water offered this getaway. Daily! Some of my club mates accused me of being compulsive, even obsessive, for never missing a day. I knew otherwise.

It was salubrious. Though I had never considered health as a motive for engaging in sports, I would not deny the benefits of exercise to my body. Furthermore, in the early stages of my divorce I quite consciously forced myself to jog at dawn to ward off depression; surely activity is an uplifting force. I have used such terms as “impress,” “pride,” and “triumph,” not to mention “fellowship,” but I do not assign excess weight to them. Rather, I would say that athletic endeavor becomes a quotidian part of existence—enjoyable and healthy, yes, but not remarkable. On reflection, I realize that I spent over a decade in therapy without ever mentioning my sporting life.

Joe Illick, PhD, Professor Emeritus of American History at San Francisco State University, is the author of William Penn the Politician (1965), Colonial Pennsylvania: A History (1975), At Liberty: The Bethlehem, Pa. High School Class of 1952 (1988), and American Childhoods (2002). He may be contacted at illick@sfsu.edu. □

The Quest of the Hunter-Gatherer

Ehor Boyanowsky
Simon Fraser University

Sitting in my study, writing about human aggression, man's inhumanity to man, I am bemused by the spectacle of eagles, ducks, fish, and seals involved in the unceasing cycle of life, violence, and death unfolding outside my window—a delicate symbiotic balance struck between predator and prey. Why this is so might be illustrated by the observations of my twenty-one-year-old son, Alexei, who last winter was thrilled to get a contract to paint the Chinese crimson and gold banners bedecking a festival stage and hand out leaflets in Vancouver's notorious downtown eastside, the violence and drug center of Canada. When I ask what it was like to hang around that unprepossessing part of town, Alexei says it was strangely exhilarating: “People are hunting and gathering, eating and sleeping, and fighting and socializing right in front of you. It's so real! It's not the suburbs. It is like, like...” “The wilderness?” I offer. “That's it!” he exclaims. “It's like the wilderness; it's so real because there is nothing filtered or refined, nothing insulating you from reality. One minute you are safe, nothing is happening, and the next minute you could be in danger.”

I am gratified that he, the child, gets it. Although not a physical risk taker, he has always felt the pains and pleasures of human experience more deeply than most or than he even let on. Struggling on the edge of the abyss, Alexei moved away from home at age sixteen to try a new start on school and life. He ended up being an apprentice whitewater rafting guide on the fiercesome rivers of British Columbia and Yukon. In some ways, it may have saved his life. Now he is happiest as a fly fishing guide and, though filled with

trepidation, this summer he is working in Kamchatka in the Russian Far East. Although he is very well presented and sociable in urban society, I have come to realize that as a child he was extremely vulnerable to slights and rejections by others. By contrast, in life-threatening situations he is most resilient and appears to have the greatest sense of personal efficacy. As I write, I see him and a friend newly out of rehab heading down to the cliffs to cast for and release cod and other groundfish. The eagle and the seal watch at a distance.

I grew up in the bush country of Northern Ontario. Not until I was sixteen, riding in my brother-in-law's float plane, did I realize that there was a lake every mile or so. But I was already fascinated by water and the mystery of what swam within. One day, some union organizers who came to town and stayed in our rooming house took me with them in a boat to the Chukuni River Bridge. The pickerel (walleye) were in a feeding frenzy and, to much hooting, we landed our limit in a couple of hours. I was hooked. I remember the clean, fresh smell of those fillets frying and the joyous laughter of that meal I had helped catch. It was my personal epiphany. Fish, mysterious, somehow perfectly beautiful, archetypically female, became my ultimate creatures of fascination: as parsimoniously elegant as a perfect paradigm. Having had an adoring mother and a much older sister whose friends used to clasp me to their bosoms, I became enamored of women early, but did not have a regular girlfriend until I was eighteen. Being somewhat attention deficient, I needed a passion wherein life becomes a simple rhythm of staying safe, dry, and well fed and of pursuing my unseen quarry: a miracle each time it suddenly materialized as a living thing on the end of my line.

Fishing became an obsession from the age of eight. I could not pass a body of water without wondering aloud what swam within it and my sports team's buses (the closest rival was Dryden High, 130 miles away) rang with mocking choruses from the cheerleaders and my teammates: "I wonder what fish there are in that river?" I began to have a recurring dream of rowing in a boat in deep water, a fiord with luminescent green mountains rising for thousands of feet to the sky, and mighty fish taking my bait. It became a harbinger of a peaceful night's rest and I began to conjure it

up whenever I was agitated and could not sleep. Like fishing itself, it is an analgesic for when I am most troubled.

Why are some people obsessed with the quest? With pursuing salmon and other exotic species to the ends of the earth at unbelievable personal and financial cost? One close friend, David Goodman, president of a bank in Washington, DC, fishes over 150 days a year, spending well over 100 thousand dollars merely to catch...and release...salmon. Several years ago he published an extremely witty and insightful article about why his relationships are doomed to fail. My take on his conclusion? Fishing is the lens through which we see the world and there are two kinds of people in that world: those who have never fished or say they fished as children... and fishermen. Those who are not anglers if they are not catching fish, find fishing boring and fish themselves, slimy and repulsive. Yet to the angler they are surpassingly beautiful.

To be good, fishing must not be totally easy or successful. Many years ago a hallowed fishing writer wrote of an unsuccessful angler who got his wish when he went to heaven and was put on a trout stream where he caught a good-sized trout on every cast. Of course, it very quickly became his personal hell. By contrast, Sacha Tolstoi, an internationally renowned Parisian angler and fishing writer travels twenty-four hours en route to British Columbia from Uruguay where he now lives. He mounts that epic odyssey to fish one river, the Thompson, merely to catch rainbow trout or to hook one of the world's largest and most powerful steelhead, at best, once every three days. That river haunts his dreams though he has fished everywhere and resides much closer to the fabled rivers of Patagonia.

The artist Henry Moore once said that the secret of life is to have a task, something you devote your entire life to, and that the most important thing is that it must be something you cannot possibly do. Seekers of the ideal, ranging from the most sublime, like Moore, to the most nefarious serial killers, share a mental state in which they envision the perfect experience and become obsessed because reality always falls short.

The true angler escapes that fate in one sense. As he, or less often, she, attains one stage of

her quest, a higher order of pursuit awaits. The first stage is to catch a fish that one spots or knows lurks in the water. Watching my son as a seven-year-old track a shoal of tiny surf perch in the little cove below our house, it became clear to me that he had entered the first phase: he had to catch them, disdaining even my offer of a fishing rod in favor of cutting a willow switch himself and, upon noticing they were feeding on barnacles, baiting tiny hooks at the end of string with tiny pieces broken from the rocks, until with a whoop, he and his friend Christian announced their success: they had learned how to catch their quarry. The efficacy of the trickster is its own reward. Then the game transformed into catch-as-many-as-they-could so they got a bucket, filled it with seawater, and fished incessantly and with the focused attention of herons (something Christian could never attain in first or second grade—I often saw him banished to the hallway outside the principal's office, and when I asked why he did not try to be good for a week or two to avoid stereotyping by the teacher, he exclaimed: "I can't help myself!"), until they had filled the bucket with fish. The quest and challenge was so intense, reality was reduced to the school of fish they could see below the surface whereas the world—with all of its jangling noise—was shut out, and Christian, suddenly at peace, had no difficulty focusing. Then they poured the fish unharmed back into the ocean and, now heroes pumped with preadolescent testosterone, bounded up the steep path to the house.

My own experience of that phase progressed from catching suckers, toothless carp-like creatures, literally and figuratively the bottom feeders of the piscatorial prestige chain, to catching ravenous northern pike and their gigantic cousin, the muskellunge and, finally, to fly fishing (the most difficult and artistic method) for the mystical steelhead, sea-run rainbow trout that migrate to Japan before returning to their natal stream. Since then, through the lens of the angler I have seen the earth as the Great Mother, both fragile and eternally resilient, that must be revered and protected, especially her wild fish and wild rivers.

So, despite what animal rights people may argue, it is as a predator that the man or woman who wades a stream, calculating the currents, identifying the feeding stations, becomes once again a

part of the hunter-gatherer cycle, thrilling to the life-affirming shock of a wild thing taking their fly, struggling beyond their ability to control this life form immediately, reassuring them that life goes on in spite of the mixed blandishments of humanity's involvement with things wild. To sustain that experience, we must most often release our quarry so that the race of fish we capture can survive in the wild, and, hopefully, as many of us as possible can be graced by the experience. In the best of worlds, we may take an occasional fish to reconfirm the hunter-gatherer connection, to experience the taste of wild, life-sustaining flesh. In the worst, rather than retaining its intrinsic value, the fish represents merely a prize in a tournament.

As I row my tiny boat out to drop the prawn trap, to exercise and, with luck, to hook a salmon, I gaze at the green, timber-clad mountains rising from the sea and I am suddenly struck by the fact I am living in my recurring boyhood dream. I am puzzled that the realization took so long. The answer is that many of the universal truths governing our lives are not revealed until we have progressed through the requisite number of stages. Only then does the reality surrounding us become clear.

Ehor Boyanowsky, PhD, is a social and criminal psychologist and Associate Professor in the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University in British Columbia (BC), near Vancouver, where he researches crimes of violence and aggression and crimes against the environment. He has been president of the Confederation of University Faculty of BC and the Steelhead Society of BC, and has written widely in the areas of interpersonal violence and aggression, and wilderness conservation and literature. Professor Boyanowsky may be contacted at boyanows@sfu.ca. □

Binion on Iraq as Vietnam

(Continued from page 1)

ing may be touched off by circumstances reminiscent of the original trauma, or else a trauma may just replicate spontaneously—may just clone on its own. In either case the reliving goes by the rules of unconscious equivalence: thus roles may reverse, opposites are interchangeable, and any one friend or enemy, say, may stand in for any other. Those

rules of unconscious equivalence apply because trauma is relived only unconsciously. On this head I have encountered a single, qualified exception in my previous researches: a maverick French deputy who charged the French national assembly that toppled the Fourth French Republic in 1958 with re-enacting the traumatic demise of the Third French Republic in 1940: he met with clamorous denial on all sides. For the rest, all my efforts notwithstanding, I have been unable even to suggest in general terms who tends to re-stage which traumas why. But I think I have come some way toward understanding how such restaging works. This understanding stands to gain inordinately from even a summary look at the national traumatic reliving that I propose to consider today. For one thing, this is a current rather than a historic traumatic reliving: it is running its course even now, with us Americans running along, so that we can so to say catch ourselves in the act. And for another, it appears at first blush to fly in the face of that purportedly basic, or even defining, characteristic of traumatic reliving in general: that it unfolds unconsciously.

The trauma in question, which Americans are currently reliving, is America's defeat in the Vietnam war. As every American schoolboy and schoolgirl knew before Vietnam, America never lost a war. But then America did lose that war, and ignominiously, to a poor colonial people, after committing untold atrocities in a hopeless, ten-year struggle against guerrilla insurgents before finally abandoning local US collaborators to their fate in 1975. Unlike this gradual humiliation in Vietnam, America's second huge trauma of the past half century was pinpointed in time, as the short term for it indicates: 9/11, or al Qaeda's devastating assault of September 11, 2001, on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Washington by commandeered passenger planes used as missiles. Until 9/11, Americans had felt impervious to enemy attack at home (forgetting that the British had sacked and burned Washington in 1814, and not counting some West Coast fear of Japanese buzz bombs in World War II). On 9/11 President George W. Bush, ordinarily way out of sync with his compatriots, personified them for an unforgettable, interminable moment caught by Michael Moore's documentary *Fahrenheit 9/11*: utterly blanked out before the elementary school class where he got the news, struck unfathomably dumb (or dumber),

he was, in a word, traumatized. His administration was to replay 9/11 vicariously in reverse. First it set up Iraq and Iraq's strong man, Saddam Hussein, as proxies for al Qaeda and its evil genius, bin Laden, on the strength of the wild claim that the two men and their followings were in jihadist cahoots. Then on March 20, 2003, Bush's America, backed by a token "coalition of the willing," spearheaded a massive air assault on Iraq's command, trade, and population centers expressly intended to inflict traumatic "shock and awe." Predictably, this aggression and the ensuing invasion and occupation opened Iraq up to al Qaeda while stirring up local jihadism against Americans, as if to validate post facto the original false charge that Iraq was a party to 9/11. (I say "predictably" with full assurance in that even I, of all people, did predict this outcome in print at the time.) Therewith, by Washington's table of equivalences, the replication of 9/11 at Iraq's expense was complete. At the same time, the American-led war in Iraq had only just begun. The "end of major combat operations in Iraq" proclaimed by Bush after six weeks of "shock and awe" marked the start of an ideologized, colonial-style war of pacification, or counterinsurgency, transparently reminiscent of the traumatically lost war in Vietnam.

Let me recall just a few salient points of this congruence of Iraq with Vietnam. Each was a war of aggression launched under special war powers consented to the President by a Congress manipulated by false intelligence. Thus the 1964 Tonkin Gulf Resolution empowering Lyndon B. Johnson followed an alleged unprovoked attack by six North Vietnamese torpedo boats on a couple of American destroyers minding their own business off North Vietnamese shores; as emerged later, however, those destroyers were in reality spy ships routinely dispatching raiding parties into North Vietnam, and the six attacking torpedo boats were no more than blips on a radar screen. Comparably, in 2002 the Bush administration, going one better to the same effect, got its War Powers Resolution through Congress on the strength of preposterous trumped-up charges that Iraq was fabricating weapons of mass destruction for jihadist use in concert with al Qaeda. (As the official line went in September 2002, "you can't distinguish between al Qaeda and Saddam when you talk about the war on terror.") Both American-led wars were ideolo-

gized as crusades against worldwide networks of evil, Communist and Islamist respectively. In Iraq as earlier in Vietnam the self-proclaimed liberators were radically unwelcome for all their handouts of guff and candy. In each case they lost control on the ground to guerrilla warfare, mostly urban. They claimed to be fighting Communist terror in the one case and Islamist terrorism in the other, only to commit atrocities and practice torture identically in both. In each case they protected corrupt puppet governments while they talked of instituting democracy. In America domestic support for the war plummeted by roughly the same timetable each time round, with Washington's only exit strategy remaining a proud refusal to cut and run. In each case America, by way of explaining away its failure, charged neighboring countries—Laos and Cambodia, then Iran—with aiding and abetting the insurgents. And so on and on.

This close parallel between the two wars has hardly passed unnoticed in America. Quite the contrary, it has been a commonplace from the very get-go among American opponents of the war, soon a mounting majority. Vietnam veteran John Kerry centered his 2004 Democratic presidential campaign around the theme of Iraq as a new "quagmire" like Vietnam. Even on the Republican side, Richard Nixon's chief diplomat of Vietnam days, Henry Kissinger, told CNN on August 15, 2005, that he had "a very uneasy feeling" about the Vietnam-Iraq parallel, and other bigwig Republicans have since concurred.

Now if we see the Vietnam-Iraq parallel for what it is, America's reliving of Vietnam in Iraq, we should see as well, with the same 20:20 psychohistorical vision, that what touched off that reliving was the war already underway in Iraq. The ideologized aggression on Iraq in the wake of 9/11, the dubious War Powers Resolution behind it and the fanatical guerrilla warfare that it unleashed, were so many reminders of the fateful Vietnamese engagement. As such, they led irresistibly from the one reliving, that of 9/11, into the other, that of the Vietnam war. However, the recognition of the continuing, losing Iraq war as a reliving of the traumatic Vietnam war raises a tricky conceptual problem. Its solution will prove highly revealing about the politics of trauma—but first the problem. If, as I said at the outset, traumas are relived un-

awares, what are we to make of Americans' increasingly widespread awareness of the recycling of Vietnam in Iraq?

A first correct answer is deceptively simple. It is that America as a whole is not doing the reliving; rather, the government alone has been rerunning the Vietnam scenario, just as in that traumatic scenario the government started and conducted the war independently of the nation as a whole and increasingly against its will. The Bush administration, which took the rerunning upon itself, has been, together with its supporters and apologists, in denial of the transparent parallel between the two wars. Or rather, Bush himself did admit that parallel a couple of times, but only to argue from it to a need to "stay the course," or in effect to deny it after all. For the rest, those who denounce the parallel are telling the war party: "You are reliving Vietnam," to which the Bushmen reply: "No, we are *not*." Thus does the traumatized nation deny by halves that it is reliving: the one half sees only the other half behind a reliving that the other half can't or won't see at all. Or to put a finer point on it, the opponents of the Iraq war are not charging the Administration with refighting the traumatically lost Vietnam war on any level of intentionality. They are only saying about the Iraq war: "America has been there before, with the same disastrous results as now, which will only worsen the longer America stays." In so saying, however, they are distancing themselves from that reliving no less than if they told the war makers: "Some demon in you has you replaying the Vietnam scenario." As traumatic relivings go, this one is singular insofar as a good half of the nation performing it does at least recognize the surface congruence between the traumatic experience and its reliving. Even so, the fact of a reliving—the deadly pathology behind that congruence—remains unconscious.

But this needful distinction between seeing the Iraq-Vietnam parallel and seeing the reliving behind it is, to repeat, deceptively simple compared with the whole truth of the matter, which is that the opposition to the Iraq war is an integral part of that reliving. This may sound like a catch-22: if you protest the Iraq war, you are by that very token a party to it as a replay of the Vietnam war. Yet that is the tricky score. A trauma suffered *en groupe* is

relived *en groupe* not by composite design, but through a concatenation of individually motivated actions and attitudes. No one involved in that resultant reliving feels involved in it. I can speak personally to the sense of necessity and futility intermixed with which I marched against the Vietnam War from Morningside Heights across Central Park to Fifth Avenue in New York and again, four decades later, against the Iraq War from the Boston Common down Beacon Street and around to Copley Square, yet I can find no trace in me of a desire for America as a whole to relive the Vietnam fiasco. Still less can I feel how the reliving mechanism has been paralyzing the will of the political opposition to halt the replay of Vietnam before the bitter end, yet anyone with sufficient detachment can see this paralyzing at work plain as day. Indeed, the most striking thing about the political opposition to the Iraq war is its ineffectuality on the Vietnam model. Right after its victory in the congressional elections of 2006 the antiwar party could have cut off funding for the war without further ado; instead, it preferred to "support the troops." It might also have impeached the President for the trickery, long since exposed, that procured him his War Powers Resolution, but such a ground for impeachment presumably lacked the high seriousness of sexual misconduct in the Oval Office.

At the time of the "shock and awe" aggression I wrote of it as a reliving of 9/11 in which Bush's personal stake turned on Saddam Hussein's alleged attempt to kill Bush Sr. As for Bush Jr.'s stake in the Vietnam reliving that ensued, I see it as again filial. At the successful conclusion of the Persian Gulf War in 1991, the elder Bush, flanked by Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney and Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman Colin Powell, declared: "By God, we've kicked the Vietnam syndrome once and for all." With the Iraq war the younger Bush replied rightly: No, Dad, we haven't.

One final point. Vietnam and 9/11 each traumatized the American nation as a whole. Later the American government led the nation as a whole in replaying 9/11 and then in replaying Vietnam. In the latter case, in launching and leading the Vietnam replay in Iraq, the present government has acted, *mutatis mutandis*, as the then governments acted in launching and waging the Vietnam war

itself--in the original traumatic experience. In the case of 9/11, however, the replay was likewise launched and led by the government even though that traumatic original, the assaults on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon, did not follow from any governmental doings. Theoretically it did not even need to be relived rather than simply memorialized, recalled incessantly, and defended against after the fact, like many another trauma; or alternatively it might have been relived in who knows what other form, governmental or not. Yet the Bush government, for all its blindness to reality and deafness to the voice of the people, did sense and implement the obscure need for the nation to work through its 9/11 trauma again and then its Vietnam trauma again. Nor is this a unique instance of a government's special sensitivity and responsiveness to the traumatic felt needs of the governed; on the contrary, governments in general, even highly democratic ones, appear to be more representative on the level of trauma than of public opinion. And with this troubling addendum to a John Locke's or a John Stuart Mill's vindication of representative government, my reflections on Iraq as Vietnam are closed.

*Rudolph Binion, PhD, taught at Rutgers, MIT, and Columbia universities before being appointed Leff Families Professor of Modern European History at Brandeis University in 1967, where he teaches comparative history and psychohistory. His psychohistorical books in English include Frau Lou: Nietzsche's Wayward Disciple (1968), Hitler Among the Germans (1976), Soundings Psychohistorical and Psycholiterary (1981), After Christianity (1986), Love Beyond Death (1983), and Past Impersonal (2005). A member of the Editorial Board of *Clio's Psyche*, he may be contacted at binion@brandeis.edu. □*

Featured Scholar: Greenstein

(Continued from page 1)

cial sciences. After his military service in the U.S. Army, he used the GI Bill to pursue his interests in graduate work on political psychology under Harold Lasswell and others at Yale in the Political Science Department, earning his masters (1957) and doctoral degrees (1960).

Professor Greenstein has had numerous

academic positions, including Assistant in Instruction and then Instructor at Yale University (1958-62); Director, Yale Political Science Research Library (1960-62); Assistant to Full Professor at Wesleyan University (1962-73) where he twice chaired the Department of Government; and at Princeton University (1973-2001) where he chaired the Department of Politics (1986-90), and ultimately retired as Henry Luce Professor of Politics. His various visiting professorships have been at Capetown, Essex, Melbourne, Virginia, and Yale universities.

Much of Greenstein's scholarship has found its way into print. He has written and/or edited books, monographs, articles, book chapters, and papers. His scholarship includes *Children and Politics* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1965), *Personality and Politics* (NY: Princeton UP, 1969), *The Hidden-Hand Presidency: Eisenhower as Leader* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1982), *How Presidents Test Reality* (NY: Russell Sage, 1989, with John P. Burke), and *The Presidential Difference: Leadership Style from FDR to George W. Bush* (NY: Princeton UP, 2004). He is currently completing a study of the political psychology of the first seven presidents of the United States—those from George Washington to Andrew Jackson—to be published next year.

Our featured scholar has served on a variety of editorial boards, including of the *American Political Science Review* (1968-71), *British Journal of Political Science* (1968-76; 1993-), *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* (1970-82), *American Politics Quarterly* (1972-76), *Political Behavior* (1978-88), *Presidential Studies Quarterly* (1979-), *Congress and the Presidency*, *Leadership Quarterly* (1988-92), and *Political Psychology* (1990-98). He served on the councils of the American Political Science Association (1969-72), the Council, Inter-University Political Research Consortium (1969-71), and the International Society of Political Psychology. Award committees to which he has devoted his energies are the Political Science Advisory Panel, National Science Foundation (1970-72); Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, American Political Science Association (APSA—1970-74); Schattschneider Award Committee, APSA (1975); Woodrow Wilson Award Committee, APSA (1979); Carey McWilliams Award Committee, APSA (1983); Nominating Committee, APSA (1983-85); and Nevitt Sanford Award, International Society of Political Psychology (1987-2007).

Among Fred Greenstein's leadership positions are the Presidency of the Presidency Research Group (1979-80), Directorship of the Woodrow Wilson School Research Program in Leadership Studies (1983-), service to the International Society of Political Psychology as Vice President (1990-92) and President (1996-97), and the American Political Science Association (1976) as Secretary (reelected 1977).

His contributions have been recognized by the Nevitt Sanford Award of the International Society of Political Psychology (1987-2007); Harold D. Lasswell Award of the International Society of Political Psychology (2000); Career Service Award of the Presidency Research Group, American Political Science Association (2004); Louis Brownlow Award of the National Academy of Public Administration (1983); and the Richard E. Neustadt Award of the American Political Science Association (1990).

Fred Greenstein (FIG) was interviewed over the Internet by the editor (PHE) in April. Professor Greenstein is married, has three children, and remains an active member of the Princeton University community. He may be contacted at fig@princeton.edu.

PHE: What brought you to political psychology?

FIG: After graduation in 1953 from Antioch I planned to become a journalist. I was drafted and became eligible for the Korean War GI bill. I decided to use it to embark on an interlude of graduate work on political psychology, because I was deeply puzzled by such phenomena as the clearly pathological Nazi figures who were defendants in the Nuremberg trials, the emotionality of public responses to World War II and the Cold War, and the virulence of the McCarthy era. But I found myself much taken by behavioral science courses. After studying at Yale with Lasswell, I became hooked and stayed at the institution for political science.

PHE: What is your principal affiliation?

FIG: My primary affiliation is political science, which now has a political psychology section. I am a founding member and past president of the International Society for Political Psychology.

PHE: Was there any especially helpful training for

doing your work in political psychology?

FIG: I am self-educated in political psychology.

PHE: Have you published, or do you plan to publish, an autobiography or any autobiographical writings?

FIG: No, I do not plan to write an autobiography. However, in 2000 I published a short, somewhat autobiographical essay, "The Presidency in My Mind's Eye," that I will draw from in responding to some questions about my work on the presidents.

PHE: Is there particular training a person entering political psychology can pursue?

FIG: I have no general advice for people who want to study political psychology, except to suggest that they find interesting topics and use multiple methodologies.

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

FIG: I have no idea where it is all going.

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

FIG: I think that my most original (but not most readable) book is *Personality and Politics*, which is subtitled *Problems of Evidence, Inference and Conceptualization*. There is a good account of the argument of that book in the career summary on my Website.

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

FIG: At the moment I am completing a study that looks at the political psychology of George Washington to Andrew Jackson—the first seven presidents of the United States. It is a follow up to my 2004 *The Presidential Difference: From FDR to George W. Bush*. I expect to see my new book in print next year.

PHE: What have you learned about the early political socialization of children?

FIG: In researching *Children and Politics*, I examined the conceptions of political authority held by children between the ages of nine and thirteen, the development of information and party attachments, and differences in political leaning based on social class and gender. My major finding is that significant aspects of an adult's political behavior have their genesis in the child's early political leanings.

PHE: What is your psychoanalytic/ psychotherapeutic experience and what is its influence on you as a political psychologist?

FIG: I was a research student at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute in the early 1960s, but I did not find the intellectual climate congenial (too much unquestioned dogma as I perceived it) so I dropped out within the year. However, I spent three years in analysis and consider that a thoroughly positive experience. The capacity to free associate is invaluable, as well as the direct experience of the reality and importance of the unconscious.

PHE: Throughout your long career, have you found universities to be receptive to psychoanalysis and political psychology?

FIG: The universities at which I have taught—Yale, Wesleyan, and Princeton—have left me to do my own thing. I have not lacked for recognition in them, but my reference groups have never been in a single institution. They have been wherever I find intellectual stimulation and recognition. Consequently, "receptiveness" has never been an issue.

PHE: What books were important to your development?

FIG: Several works that have influenced my intellectual direction are Fromm's *Escape From Freedom*; Adorno *et al.*, *The Authoritarian Personality*; and a smattering of Lasswell's work.

PHE: When did you first get interested in politics?

FIG: As a child of the Depression, I first became aware of the wider world at a time when FDR was as much a part of the atmosphere as the weather and the changing seasons. His compelling features were omnipresent in the newsreels and photographs and portraits. His endlessly imitated speak-

ing voice was as much an audible presence as those of Amos and Andy and Jack Benny. Three recollections stand out. In the first I am a six-year-old wrestling an Alf Landon campaign button from the shirt of a playmate during the 1936 presidential campaign, and his mother is swooping down on me in retribution. In the second my family is solemnly listening to Roosevelt's address to Congress following Pearl Harbor and accepting as an unquestioned verity his avowal that "the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory." In the third I am sprawled on my bed with my homework spread on the floor and the radio playing in the background. An announcer breaks in with word of Roosevelt's death. I dropped my pen, leaving a permanent ink stain on the floor—a continuing reminder that the man I had thought of as "*the* president" was no longer on the scene, and the nation would now be led by fallible mortals.

PHE: How did you connect to the Watergate Crisis?

FIG: For over three decades 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue has been the center of my research. In the dying months of the presidency of Richard Milhous Nixon, I entered into a near total immersion in the sources of evidence on the occupants of the modern Oval Office. I had just published a rather abstract work on the links between politics and the psyche, and I was casting about for flesh-and-blood subject matter for my next book. I found it in the televised psychodrama of the Nixon impeachment hearings.

PHE: Within political science and political psychology, what has been your primary interest?

FIG: From 1974 to 1999, the eleven presidents from FDR to Bill Clinton have been my obsession. I have pored over the published and unpublished sources on them, interviewed their associates, and had brief, but informative, contacts with Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, George Bush, and Bill Clinton. Many years earlier, I had a picturesque encounter with Harry Truman.

PHE: What was your personal encounter with Truman?

FIG: It occurred in 1958, during a week he spent at

Yale, where I was working on my doctorate. Truman was about to meet with a graduate student group of which I was an officer. As he was escorted into the Hall of Graduate Studies, I met him with a welcoming statement. "Never mind that, young feller," Truman broke in. "I'm an old man with an old man's kidneys. Where can I take a leak?" Sweeping me into the men's room with him, he stood at the urinal, telling me about how FDR's vice-president, John Nance Garner, once refused to deliver a urine specimen to a nurse's station at Walter Reed Hospital, declaring that it was not fitting for "the vice-president of the United States to be seen carrying a jar of piss."

PHE: My bemusing association to this story is that Garner is the man who said the vice-presidency is "not worth a bucket of warm piss." To turn to a later president, how did your study of Dwight Eisenhower change your view of him?

FIG: The likeable Ike did not seem to warrant close attention, because he came across as a politically innocent grandfather figure, who left it up to his subordinates to determine his administration's policies. Indeed, my most vivid memories of the period are of such dismissive jokes as "Ike couldn't read his briefing papers last week—his lips were chapped." After years of telling my students about how out of place the former supreme commander had been in politics, I experienced a shock of non-recognition in the 1970s when I examined his newly declassified presidential records. I discovered him to have been a literate political sophisticate, who was firmly in control of his presidency, but who chose to wield his power largely through intermediaries.

PHE: What did you think of President Kennedy?

FIG: Despite the skepticism of many academics about the Kennedy glitter, I was won over by the youngest elected president in American history. Even the Bay of Pigs was mitigated by Kennedy's prompt assumption of responsibility and his ironic observation that "victory has one hundred fathers, defeat is an orphan." With all of its crises, the Kennedy presidency was redeemed for me by the sheer panache of a man capable of such badinage.

By the time of Kennedy's assassination, I had moved twenty miles north in Connecticut from Yale to Wesleyan University. A colleague and I sought to gain insight into the outpouring of national grief by conducting what now would be called focus groups with our undergraduates. Ours proved to be one of many efforts by social scientists to understand the intensely personal emotional response of Americans and citizens of many other nations to the death of an individual whom they had never met and who had been instantly replaced by his successor.

In one survey, members of the public reported that they experienced such psychosomatic symptoms as insomnia, loss of appetite, and even dizziness in the wake of the events in Dallas. The students my colleague and I spoke with were also acutely distressed. What struck me most, however, was the immediate improvement in their views of Lyndon Johnson. Before November 22, they had thought of him as a somewhat comic throwback to an earlier political era. He had undergone a sudden increase in stature. As one student put it, "Just the fact that he was in the presidency gave him a sort of deification."

PHE: What did you think of Kennedy's first two successors?

FIG: Kennedy's two successors were brothers under the skin. Johnson and Nixon were alike in being highly intelligent and politically gifted, but also emotional basket cases. Johnson was prone to Texas-sized mood swings and alternating feelings of inferiority and grandiosity. Nixon was pathologically suspicious and in imperfect control of his simmering animosities. The two men presided over presidencies that began with impressive achievements and ended in abysmal failure. In the case of Lyndon Johnson, the successes included the War on Poverty, the first civil rights law with enforcement provisions since Reconstruction, legislation guaranteeing voting rights to black Southerners, Medicare, and dozens of other Great Society measures. In the case of Richard Nixon, they were détente with the Soviet Union, the opening to China, and the extrication of U.S. combat forces from Vietnam. But by early 1968, a half million American troops were mired in Vietnam with no end in sight, and Johnson was a virtual captive in a

White House ringed with protesters. On the final day of March, Johnson addressed the nation, announcing that his administration was now prepared "to discuss the means of bringing this ugly war to an end."

PHE: How did the burden of the Presidency impact Johnson and Nixon while in office?

FIG: Of the flood of memories evoked by these troubled administrations, the most compelling is of the visible effects of their presidential experiences on Johnson and Nixon. Johnson was haggard and noticeably aged by the time he left office. He commented to Nixon shortly after the latter was sworn in that "the most pleasant words that ever came into my ears" were his successor's oath of office, "because at that time I no longer had the fear that I was the man that could make the mistake of involving the world in war." Johnson died at age sixty-four, two days after what would have been the conclusion of his second elected term. Nixon lived to be eighty-one, but he was at the end of his physical and psychic tether in the final days of his presidency.

PHE: How was Ford able to deal with the strains of the presidency that took such a toll on his two predecessors?

FIG: By the time Gerald Ford became president, I was on the faculty of Princeton University. Early in 1977, I brought a group of my students to a Washington think tank for an interview with the recently defeated Gerald Ford. Mindful of the toll the presidency had taken on Johnson and Nixon, I asked Ford how he dealt with the pressures of the presidency. There had been no splendid agony to the presidential experience of this stolid son of the Midwest. He replied, "I had to have a physical outlet—swimming or some other activity—that burned up those juices that were not normally consumed during the day. But I found that the pressures I had read about were not nearly as severe as I expected, as long as my staff organized them properly."

PHE: How did Carter deal with the pressures and what was your impression of him when he visited Princeton shortly after the end of his presidency?

FIG: When it comes to withstanding the heat in the

presidential kitchen, the contrast could scarcely have been greater between Ford and his successor. Jimmy Carter gave the appearance of having advanced in age by far more than four years during his single presidential term. At Princeton he was contentious, responding to one student question with anger at the Democratic Party and to another with an angry denial of the facts. Observing him there it was not hard to understand why Carter had failed to bond with the rest of the political community.

PHE: How about Reagan?

FIG: By that time all eyes were on Ronald Reagan. When Reagan was elected governor of California, he had been asked what kind of governor he expected to be. "I don't know," he replied. "I never played a governor before." Reagan played the part of president of the United States to perfection, giving no indication that the presidency was burdensome to him. Despite his first-term chief of staff being a Princeton graduate, the White House never accepted our invitations apparently because of concern over demonstrations against him at an Ivy League campus.

PHE: What was your experience with George Herbert Walker Bush?

FIG: Bush, who made the opening remarks at a 1997 conference on the presidents from FDR to Ronald Reagan, was friendly and good-natured. It was his practice to cement his personal and political relationships by sending hand-written letters. I received two such missives during his presidency, each of them thanking me for the book I edited from the Princeton conference he had addressed. One of his aides had asked me to send it to him just after he took office and another had made the request three years later. In each instance, I received a thank-you note, but the second note made no reference to the fact that he had received an earlier copy of the book and neither of them alluded to the book's contents.

PHE: Did you get to observe Clinton up close?

FIG: Only on one occasion, in 1996 as part of a group visiting the Oval Office. His remarks were not particularly profound. In reflecting on the distractions stemming from his sexual behavior in the

White House, I am reminded that in the absence of what has come to be known as emotional intelligence, the presidency is a defective instrument of democratic governance.

PHE: What are your thoughts regarding political memory?

FIG: Political memories should not be equated with political fact. My memory of the Eisenhower presidency is a near antithesis of the Eisenhower presidency that has emerged from the historical record. Still, it is an axiom of human affairs that things that are perceived to be real are real in their effects. Today's presidential contenders run not just against one another, but also against past presidents as they endure in the pantheon of the mind's eye.

PHE: What importance do you place on the ability of a president to *not act* in a crisis or to find symbolic substitutes for dangerous actions when there is great public pressure to perform?

FIG: I believe that the capacity of a president to hold his or her fire and not act precipitously is of great importance.

PHE: On the basis of your presidential scholarship and life experience, please comment on how Clinton, McCain, and Obama might respond to the pressures of the presidency.

FIG: I do not worry about the capacity of the two Democratic presidents to withstand the pressures of the White House, but I worry about McCain because of his well-known fierce temper.

PHE: Thank you for an interesting interview.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, editor of this publication and professor at Ramapo College, is a presidential psychobiographer currently writing psychobiographies of John McCain and Barack Obama who may be contacted at pelovitz@aol.com. □

Articles

are only accepted for publication in
Clio's Psyche
after being refereed by experts

Film Review

The Passion of Mel Gibson

Glen Jeansonne
University of Wisconsin
and
David Lührssen
Independent Scholar

No film in recent years, at least none since Oliver Stone's *JFK*, provoked as much controversy as Mel Gibson's *The Passion of the Christ*. It was embraced as an affirmation of faith by evangelical Protestants and conservative Roman Catholics, critiqued by other Christians for its interpretation of Jesus' death and resurrection, condemned by many Jews concerned about its potential for anti-Semitism, and reviled by others as religious propaganda.

The Passion of the Christ conveyed Gibson's messages artfully and with striking aesthetic power. However, it was the content and not the form of his film that attracted notice. Not unlike the controversy surrounding Stone's dramatization of the assassination of John F. Kennedy, various sides in the discussion over Gibson's film defended and attacked its historical veracity when, ultimately, the facts of history were beside the point.

Kennedy became part of the mythology of American and world culture following his death. To dramatize the events leading to Kennedy's murder involves crossing through contested perspectives on the American political process and the life of a man adopted by many as a hero figure cut down early in his quest; the wise and benevolent king slain by evildoers. Stone pushes the historical envelope, even implying that Vice President Lyndon Baines Johnson conspired in the assassination, a murky assertion without historical foundation. He also gives credence to some of the more bizarre conspiracy theories of erratic New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison.

However, the mythology surrounding the life, death and return of Jesus, around whose memory religions and civilizations have been built, is

considerably more profound. This mythology is more epochal, at once broader and deeper in its transcendent themes, and dwarfs the legends surrounding any historical ruler or political figure in terms of its far-reaching influence on human lives and events. By raising the specter that Kennedy's death was a conspiracy directed by a political insiders, Stone hoped to cast America's political establishment into disrepute. By filming the execution of Jesus in traditional Catholic terms, Gibson was making a more profound statement about the meaning of history and existence itself.

Both films are a Rorschach test for viewers and speak significantly to the psychology of their makers and the worldviews they represent. Stone's movie reflected the skeptical, even paranoid edge of the 1960s counterculture, whose proponents were determined to find conspiracy behind the headlines and the hidden hands of powerful elites on the direction of political and economic events. *JFK* represented a search for meaning hidden behind surface appearances. When Mikhail Gorbachev was introduced at the Nobel Prize ceremonies, he was termed "the man who has done more to change the history of the twentieth century than anyone except for Oliver Stone."

The worldview behind Gibson's movie also involves a search for the inner meaning of historical or mythical events. In his terms the death of Jesus was not merely the execution of a religious teacher but the gateway to salvation. Affiliated with maverick currents within the Roman Catholic Church that resist the hierarchically sanctioned reforms of Vatican II and seek to uphold a traditional dogmatic theology, Gibson may see himself as a martyr within a faith that has always accorded great honor to martyrdom. Realizing that the treatment of his subject in *The Passion of the Christ* was likely to raise a firestorm of controversy, Gibson positioned himself in a martyr's role by witnessing for his beliefs in the public square. He did not face the physical tortures endured by the martyrs of the past but the prospect of a diminished career and sullied reputation.

Gibson put himself at risk in terms of financing and developing his film, paying for it himself and eschewing the focus groups and committee approach by which many Hollywood movies are

shaped, and braving the derisive response from sectors of the entertainment industry and media.

Gibson stays faithful to the gospel narratives, apparently accepting these as accurate portrayals of what actually happened, and unaware of or unconcerned about inconsistencies or recent alternative scholarly views of the gospels. While he does add material derived from the visions of a nineteenth century Catholic mystic, Gibson chose to paint the last days of Jesus in the lurid colors of traditional Roman Catholic theology, with its emphasis on the agony of Jesus' procession to death. In his painful self-sacrifice Jesus becomes the greatest model of martyrdom, unmoved in the face of torture and accepting that the ultimate penalty for belief is death.

The old Roman Catholic preoccupation with the indignity and abuse heaped upon Jesus by his Roman and Jewish tormentors, visualized in ecclesiastical art and architecture as the Stations of the Cross and by Catholic mystics whose intense identification with Jesus' wounds resulted in stigmata, is at the heart of Gibson's vision. Some Eastern Orthodox and other Christian theologians complained that the good news of the story, the resurrection on Easter Sunday, was shortchanged in a glimpse at the film's end while the dark spectacle of degradation occupied much of *The Passion's* running time.

Gibson's perspective is entirely in keeping with certain traditional strains of Roman Catholicism, which even included reenactments of Jesus' harrowing passage to the hill of execution. The iconography of martyrdom has been pervasive in many Roman Catholic cultures; the imagery and accompanying stories have been part of the psychological condition in the Catholic world since the Middle Ages and had led many of the faithful to valorize martyrdom, emotionally if not literally. *The Passion of the Christ* is a technically able, artistic recreation of the spirit of the old passion plays in a contemporary medium. Confronting commercial and career risks never encountered by the anonymous medieval playwrights who helped concretize the genre's boundaries, Gibson cast himself in the martyr's role as the producer, director and screenwriter. He prepared himself to face the stigma of producing a major motion picture

that expounded traditional Roman Catholic theology and raised the specter of anti-Semitism.

The movie's phenomenal commercial success and profitability is balm on the wounds but has not healed them. Gibson did himself no favors when he declined to refute statements by his father that appeared to deny the reality of the Holocaust, nor by his own notorious drunken remarks about Jews. One may even speculate that Gibson chose to increase the pain of his own position as producer and director of the film by self-sabotage and rubbing salt on his own injuries. Perhaps through the intensity of his identification with the victim of his film, he became unconsciously determined to increase his own victimhood. Certainly in this film Gibson deliberately flirts with an element of self-destructiveness in his own psyche.

It must be said that unlike earlier generations of Hollywood filmmakers, who ironically transposed the Nordic iconography of a blond and ruddy Jesus to film for studios owned by Jewish proprietors, Gibson was careful to cast actors of Mediterranean appearance in all roles, undercutting the visual stereotype of Northern European hero figures versus swarthy villains of Semitic appearance. Gibson was not irresponsible as an artist but his personal irresponsibility may in itself have represented an unconscious embrace of martyrdom in a world he deems hostile to his beliefs.

*Glen Jeansonne, PhD, is professor of twentieth century American history at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and is the author of Women of the Far Right: The Mothers Movement and World War II (1996); Gerald L.K. Smith: Minister of Hate (1988), and much else. **David Luhrssen** is a newspaper editor and historian who has lectured at Marquette University, Beloit College, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. They may be reached at gsj@uwm.edu and dave@shepherd-express.com. □*

Editorial Positions

are available at

Clio's Psyche

Suitable as a postdoctoral experience or for a graduate student as an Internship

Contact Paul H. Elovitz
Pelovitz@aol.com

Book Reviews

Makari's History of Psychoanalysis

Ken Fuchsman
University of Connecticut

Review of George Makari, Revolution in Mind: The Creation of Psychoanalysis. New York, NY: Harper, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-06-134661-3, 613 pages, \$32.50.

Psychiatrist George Makari is certainly familiar with the recent Freud Wars. In his *Revolution in Mind: The Creation of Psychoanalysis*, he says Freud is often portrayed as genius or fraud (p. 2). Some "believe psychoanalysis is a hopeless pseudoscience. Others want to save it by shoring up its scientific claims. Still others believe salvation will come only when psychoanalysts recognize their endeavor is...akin to the work of the humanities." Despite this "turmoil" Makari proclaims that psychoanalysis contains "the richest systematic description of inner experience that the Western world had produced" (pp. 5, 483). There is a division in Makari's text between his strong belief in Freud's creation and his recognition of the problematic nature of psychoanalytic knowledge.

He contends that there has been too much focus on Freud. To illustrate the evolution from Freudianism to a broader psychoanalysis, Makari divides his history of the field up through World War II into "three closely intertwined, sequential phases." First, Freud forged "a scientifically tenable theory of mind" that was "an overarching synthesis" that "took command of revolutions that were already in progress" (pp. 4-5). Second, Freud created a movement. But schisms wracked his followers. Freudian psychoanalysis was accused of being "authoritarian and unscientific;" and internecine conflicts "exposed the highly tenuous nature of" psychoanalytic "knowledge claims" (pp. 4-5).

Third, after World War I, psychoanalysis became a pluralistic community with the development of different outlooks. Still Makari's history raises questions. If the knowledge claims of psy-

choanalysis are tenuous how can it contain Western thought's richest account of inner experience?

Dr. Makari combats the old myth that Freud was an isolated genius creating psychoanalysis alone. Freud's theories emerged out of Freud's deep immersion in nineteenth century science and philosophy. The conceptions Freud developed grew out of "post-Kantian philosophers, biophysicists and psychophysicists." It is "a scientifically plausible model of the mind" (pp. 83, 108). "Freud's synthesis...broadened natural science so that it could take up the great questions of human interiority.... Through this integration, it seemed science could be rescued from an embarrassing poverty and the humanities could be understood according to universal laws" (p. 123).

If one motif in Makari's history is the scientific plausibility of Freud's initial theory, another is that psychoanalysis is unscientific. Freud's insistence on sexuality as the cause for psychological problems, led "many of his colleagues" to question, how "any clinician working with a limited number of patients" could "claim to know that one factor always caused an illness" (p. 90). French doctors thought the Viennese, had "an 'idee fixe' in regard to sexuality and generalized wildly on the subject" and rather than being science, this was "grand philosophical speculation" (p. 215).

The tension in *Revolution in Mind* over the scientific status of Freud's work comes to a head in Makari's account of Freud's confrontations with his followers. In 1910, at the Nuremberg Congress of psychoanalysts, according to Makari, Freud called for "standardization" and "uniformity.... There was a problem with such invariance.... it ran counter to the requirements of scientific research, which called for freedom of inquiry, experimentation, and innovation" (pp. 240-241). Even within the earlier Wednesday Society of Freud's adherents, there were "few tested rules.... no stable method" nor "explanatory principles" that did not require explanation (p. 155). Makari says, "the Viennese Freudians.... could not...question Freud's clinical authority, his veracity as an empirical observer, or his therapeutic claims" (p. 161).

It is not surprising then that when Adler and Freud's views conflicted that it was "not possible to demonstrate that one system of thought had

more truth value than the other.” Loyalty to Freud’s views, lack of standards of evaluating evidentiary and doctrinal claims revealed “Freud’s Achilles heel.” His libido theory “seemed to flout the rules of empiricism and scientific epistemology” (p. 263).

After another doctrinal challenge had led to Jung’s leaving, Freudians made “commitment to the psychosexual unconscious...a litmus test.” This “postulate was not a fact” and “scientific theories...had no power to compel acceptance without proof.” Once, Freud had tried to “build a psychology of inner life that conformed with science,” but now “post-Nuremberg Freudians became more of a polemically driven interest group.... Findings that contradicted the theory... were not acceptable” (p. 296). Renowned Swiss psychiatrist, Eugen Bleuler, called psychoanalysis a “sect” that did not strive to have “many shared views with the rest of science and scientists,” but “closed itself off to the outside world with a prickly skin that is hurting friend and foe” (quoted in Makari, p. 255).

This account paints a bleak picture and a strong indictment of psychoanalysis. Yet George Makari says that after World War I, “Freudian studies” became “a broader, more diverse, more open, and ultimately more popular field. Free-thinking men and women would flock to this reformed community.... Many stopped calling themselves Freudians and began to see themselves as psychoanalysts” (p. 299). With Freud’s new post-1918 ideas, he himself “altered from hoary old patriarch to one of many sons and daughters of what might be a nascent science” (p. 319).

Does this mean that psychoanalysis developed a sense of unity and recognized standards by which to evaluate competing claims? Not really. Dissenters continued to split off, be cast out or talk past each other. In 1941, the New York Psychoanalytic Society demoted Karen Horney to lecturer and revoked her training privileges. During World War II, the British were divided among followers of Anna Freud, Melanie Klein, and Independents. Discussions between them lasted for much of the war. They could come to no epistemological consensus, and eventually allowed each to retain their own separate, though, interacting practices. Makari comments, “it seemed psychoanalysis had

separated into irreconcilable worldviews.... fragmenting psychoanalysis into many schools. It seemed no one could bring unity to this raucous chorus” (p. 439).

On one hand Dr. Makari presents psychoanalysis as having common ideas that give it prominence; on the other hand it is a raucous chorus of irreconcilable worldviews. When Makari says psychoanalysis is the leading theory of the mind and has the richest account of inner life, which of the many psychoanalyses is he discussing?

Makari recognizes that the Achilles heel of psychoanalysis is that it makes claims which often are scientific, yet it has not established scientific methods. Even such a stalwart as Martin Bergmann recognizes the epistemological hole in psychoanalysis. “Disagreements between psychoanalytic schools were not those encountered in the natural sciences, which further experiments eventually resolve, but more closely resembled religious and philosophical disputes, which cannot be resolved by rational means” (Martin Bergmann, *Understanding Dissidence and Controversy in the History of Psychoanalysis*, 2004, p. 2).

These epistemological dilemmas that haunt psychoanalysis can be found, with variations, in other more academically established disciplines. “Modern biology,” R.C. Lewontin writes, “is characterized by a number of ideological prejudices that shape the form of its explanations and the way its researches are carried out” (*Biology as Ideology*, 1991, p. 41).

Biologist Ernst Mayr concurs. He says: a “reason why consensus is hard to achieve is that disagreeing scientists adhere to different underlying ideologies making certain theories acceptable to one group which are impossible for another group” (*This Is Biology*, 1997, p. 103). It is not only ideology splitting biology, it is varying criteria for evaluating evidence. Science historian Evelyn Fox Keller writes an “analysis of the literature on biological development over the course of the century reveals not only great variability in criteria—over time and between different research schools—for what might count as an explanation of biological development, but also how flexible these criteria can be” (*Making Sense of Life*, 2002, p. 6).

The academic discipline of psychology also finds itself divided. Historian of psychology, C. James Goodwin, writes: "psychology at the close of the twentieth century seems to be characterized more by disunity than unity." He also declares that "it is unclear if psychology has ever been a coherent discipline" and that "psychology today is really a plurality of sub-disciplines, each a specialty in its own right," for "psychology is not a single discipline but a collection of them" (*A History of Modern Psychology*. 1999, p. 438, 439).

That other related subject areas face dilemmas does not diminish the issues psychoanalysis must confront. Psychoanalysis straddles a fine line. It investigates subjects that, in some ways, are beyond the realm of science's competency, and psychoanalysis also makes claims that are clearly within the domain of the sciences. Psychoanalysis needs to pursue both directions simultaneously, to be outside and inside the sciences. Makari's admirable history illuminates the need for psychoanalysis to retain its theoretical fluidity, while integrating research findings from other fields, and establishing some rigorous means of adjudicating claims from rival psychoanalytic schools.

Kenneth Fuchsman, EdD, is a historian who teaches interdisciplinary studies courses online at the University of Connecticut, where he has served in a variety of capacities for thirty years. Dr. Fuchsman, who writes on the history of psychoanalysis and is currently exploring the dynamics of oedipality in single parent and blended families, may be contacted at ken.fuchsman@uconn.edu. □

The Death of Susan Sontag

Irene Javors
Yeshiva University

Review of David Rieff, Swimming in a Sea of Death, A Son's Memoir. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2008. ISBN-13: 978-0-7432-9946-6, hardcover, 180 pages, \$21.00.

David Rieff, the son of Susan Sontag, bears witness to his mother's end story. His narrative is excruciating, heartbreaking and demanding of our attention. The author forces us to ask ourselves questions regarding how to deal with terminal ill-

ness, the costs of experimental medical treatments, the denial of the dying loved one to accept not just the possibility of death but its uncompromising certainty.

Susan Sontag, survivor of both breast and uterine cancer, was diagnosed in March 2004 with MDS—myelodysplastic syndrome. This is a cancer that eventually develops into leukemia. There is no successful cure; in short, this is a death sentence. At seventy-one, Sontag confronted her third cancer with the same resolute conviction with which she had fought her previous illnesses. She sought out and collected information about the most extreme treatments in the belief that a cure was always possible. Rieff comments about his mother, "real commitment for her was always radical."

She underwent a bone marrow transplant, knowing full well that this was a terribly painful procedure that had minimal odds for a successful outcome. In his *New York Times Magazine* piece, "Illness as More Than Metaphor" (December 4, 2005), Rieff reported that Medicare had refused to pay for the procedure and that his mother paid, \$45,000 for a compatible donor and \$256,000 in cash to the hospital. In short, if Sontag had not had the financial resources to cover the costs of this procedure, there would have been no treatments. This further underscores the harsh reality that without money one is limited in one's access to therapies available in other countries or even in this country.

Despite weeks and months of treatments that further weakened and debilitated her, Sontag held on, as "the habits of hope survived her loss of it." Rieff writes, "what was my mother looking for? ...what the condemned always hope for a commutation of sentence, a reprieve." Unfortunately, no reprieve came and on December 28, 2004. Susan Sontag died.

While reading this heartfelt memoir, I was reminded of my mother's death at the age of sixty-seven from a rare form of leukemia some 24 years ago. At that time, I was in my early thirties and barely over the loss of my father to lung cancer some five years before. I can remember sitting in the doctor's office with my mother when we were informed that she had prolymphocytic leukemia. To this day, I still don't know how to spell the di-

agnostic term correctly and find myself unable to Google it. This strange sounding collection of words was my mother's death sentence. There were no cures, only palliative treatments. You went from being well to becoming very sick, no stops along the way. My mother died within six months of the diagnosis. She had no "heroic treatments," and spent the last few months of her life seeing friends and family and preparing to die.

On the other hand, I ran around searching for possible leads to cures: guided visualization, positive thinking, tofu, macrobiotics, etc. I would present these ideas to my mother and she would look at me and say, "that's nice," and go back to reading her book. My mother who didn't go to college, or dialogue with the great literary and intellectual personalities of any time, seemed to understand that death was an inevitable conclusion to life and not a personal insult.

In *The Denial of Death* (1973), Ernest Becker writes, "the idea of death, the fear of it, haunts the human animal like nothing else; it is a mainspring of human activity—activity designed largely to avoid the fatality of death, to overcome it by denying in some way that it is the final destiny for man." As Rieff reports, his mother never accepted the idea of her own mortality, "but survival was her goal, and that never changed from the moment of diagnosis to the hour of her death." While still able to get about, Sontag lived in continual fear of her demise and needed to have people with her 24 hours a day. Not even the prescribed anti-anxiety medication could calm her fears. Her struggle was about living and she wanted nothing to do with dying.

While reading the memoir, I found myself asking whether or not there was any point to all this terrible suffering. The painful and debilitating medical procedures, the mental anguish, the grasping at life, and the terror of the unknown—a world of existential and metaphysical riddles and paradoxes.

Rieff, has no guide to lead him through the journey of grief and bereavement. He is the survivor of a loss and like all of us who survive we are filled with doubts about what we could have, should have or might have done differently if there was a differently. Rieff, in one of the most disparate passages of the book states, "there are times

when I wish I could have died in her place. Survivor's guilt?" Or perhaps, Rieff wishes to join her rather than face the terror of such irretrievable loss!

Rieff is still in a state of shock three years after the death of Susan Sontag, continuing to "swim in a sea of death." For me, the saddest part of this memoir is that Sontag died in such a state of rage at the "dying of the light." She bequeathed to her son an emotional legacy of anger and fear in the face of death. It is no wonder he feels such survivor guilt when his mother is virtually railing at the heavens, "why me?" Sadly, Sontag could offer her son no solace or teach him the wisdom of acceptance.

In the "Epilogue" to the memoir, Rieff describes his journey to bury his mother at Montparnasse cemetery in Paris. He talks of his flight from Kennedy airport, "the journey began over the Atlantic, me in my window seat, the tranquilizers having zero effect, she in the hold." When he arrives at the cemetery, he is alone, and he does not know what to do, "I kneel, kiss the granite slab... and then I go- hurriedly, confusedly ... it is not just that I have nothing intelligent to say: I am incapable of thought."

On the day of my mother's funeral, at the cemetery, when the casket was lowered to the ground, I found myself thinking about a day in Prospect Park—I was four years old and I found a worm—I ran with it to my mother who was sitting with other young mothers on a park bench. "Look what I found," I yelled with total delight. She told me to put it back on the ground or it would die. My first encounter with death, with life—all so very confusing—such a mystery!

Rieff, in the final pages of his memoir, discusses "closure," and states, "I do not believe for an instant that there is such a thing...perhaps, we become accustomed to our grief...part of the emotional landscape... it becomes a dullness...no forgetting is on offer...one mourns those one has loved who have died until one joins them."

When receiving chemotherapy treatments for breast cancer, Sontag wrote in her journal, "be cheerful, be stoic, be tranquil." She added, "in the valley of sorrow, spread your wings."

One hopes that all of us will be able to make sense of our mortal lives by learning to live

“in the valley of sorrow,” and still have the spirit to “spread our wings.”

*Irene Javors, MED, LMHC, is a licensed mental health counselor with a private practice in New York City, who is on the faculty of Ferkauf Graduate School of Psychology of the Mental Health Counseling Program of Yeshiva University. She is a Diplomate of American Psychotherapy Association with a specialization in the area of grief and bereavement. Javors writes an ongoing column, “Culture Notes,” for *Annals*, the official journal of the American Psychotherapy Association and is the Chair of the Diversity Committee of the New York Mental Health Counselors Association. Her email is ijavors@gmail.com. □*

Letters to the Editor

Responses to the Aging Special Issue

I'm Not Old; I Was Just Born a Long Time Ago

Dear Editor,

Your March Special Issue on the Art, Creativity, and Psychology of Aging led me to reflect on aging. In a strong sense, age is a state of mind. There are, moreover, some important components of that state of mind. With advancing age most of us exhibit a greater degree of candor. Age also carries with it both a realization that what is history to others has been life experience for us, and an increasing realization that every day counts. Finally, we begin to recognize a certain futility attached to physical possessions, and we think, occasionally, about how we want to be remembered.

When I was young I spent much time with my maternal grandparents and today I am frequently aware of the profound impact they had on me. On my grandmother's eighty-second birthday we had a big dinner for her and there was a cake with the numbers eighty-two on top. She sat and looked at that for a minute, then said, “How did I get so old?” I was twenty-nine at the time and was amused. Now, at eighty-four, I understand how she felt. I remember also being intrigued by the

fact that, when the afternoon newspaper arrived, that same grandmother would turn quite promptly to the obituaries. Today, I find myself drawn to the obits in my professional and alumni journals. The ultimate consequence of increasingly reading that old acquaintances are dying and hearing about the deaths of notables whose age is very close to mine is an ever more acute awareness of my own mortality.

With that awareness comes the impulse to use what time is left productively. The human mind and body, like complex machines, have to be used to maintain their effectiveness; if they are allowed to stay idle too much of the time they become sluggish in their operation. I pride myself on having been active and productive throughout my adult life; I cannot picture myself otherwise. I see others my age whose mental or physical condition has appreciably deteriorated and fervently hope that this will never be my fate. I recall that when my mother was in her late eighties the family decided that her driving was no longer safe and convinced her to give up her car; I dread the prospect that I may someday be in her position.

There is also a need for “down time.” Thus, paradoxically, although I recognize the need for it, relaxation comes tinged with a nagging awareness of the many things still to be accomplished. I have slowed down some in recent years, but, paradoxically, I also have the urge to put things down on paper. There is a sense that all the wisdom and experience I have acquired over the years will be buried with me if I don't pass it on.

Something one inevitably does after a certain age is to look back over a long series of world-altering events and marvel at the feeling of having experienced, personally, much of what is commonly viewed as history. My generation, for example frequently talked about “the war” and everyone knew that the reference was to WW II. Thus, it was somewhat of an awakening when I used that phrase in class and one of my students said, “What war?”

At Antioch College, where I spent my freshmen year, a quotation from Horace Mann, the college's first president, “Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity,” has been adopted as a sort of motto. In the context of that quotation, I am not ashamed to die. However,

to the extent that there are victories for which I can take any credit, that credit has to be shared with many others. Furthermore, the battles are never finally won; the gains must be defended constantly and repeatedly.

In conclusion, I offer one final thought. Stay active in both mind and body and you will hardly notice the days and years passing by.

Sincerely, yours,

F. Lincoln Grahlfs

F. Lincoln Grahlfs, PhD, retired from the University of Wisconsin Centers in 1988 after more than three decades of teaching sociology and anthropology. He grew up and was educated in New York City and served in the US Navy in World War II. Since his retirement his major efforts have been directed toward peace and nuclear disarmament. In 1997 he found himself missing the classroom interaction and spent the next five years as an adjunct professor at St Louis Community College. Dr. Grahlfs may be contacted at flg17@sbcglobal.net. □

Denial and Childhood Fantasies of Aging and Death

Dear Editor,

The maturity of the authors in the March Art, Creativity, and Psychology of Aging Special Issue of *Clio's Psyche* was impressive, especially in regards to their apparently realistic acceptance of the aging process. The various authors demonstrated how advanced age may lead to wisdom and a positive perspective on life itself. In reflecting on these articles, I am in across the board agreement. Yet, as I pondered the topic, I remembered my friend Edith.

When I visited her in the hospital, Edith was in a coma and, according to the doctor in charge, near death. Before leaving, on an impulse, I held her hand and pulled on her thumb, without any awareness as to why I had done this. That night after a dream I did not remember, I realized that pulling her thumb had the unconscious meaning of bringing her back to life. My usually loving older brother also had a cruel streak. In a game he invented he would act as if he were dying, pleading

with me to pull his thumb so that his life would not end. As a six-year-old I remember being confused and anxious about his pleading, as a part of me realized it was silly. Yet I always gave in, just in case.

Recently I returned from my wife's native country of Taiwan where there is great respect shown for the aged. When nine or ten of us would go out for a many-course dinner, it was the oldest at the table honored by always being the first to taste each course. Yes, I was always served first and I would be assured that my meal was hot. However, another custom is that the oldest generally pays the bill. Understandably, I eventually became less than enthusiastic about this expensive custom.

We traveled by train many times a day to get around Taipei City that was almost always crowded. Unlike in America, there is priority seating for the disabled, pregnant women, and the elderly. However, I was shocked and angry at being offered a seat on my first train-ride by a middle-aged woman. By showing how insulted I was that she thought I could not stand up comfortably, I handled it badly. This was in contrast to Sander Breiner, "A Psychoanalyst/Psychohistorian Looks at Aging," who on a hot day graciously accepted an unwanted-ride by a young woman when he was walking near his home. The offer was attributed to his advanced age. At a past time I suspect he would have wished for a different motivation.

To avoid a repetition of being offered an unwanted reminder of my age, I learned to spryly swagger when I entered a train and it often worked; yet I still was offered a seat now and then. However, on our last day, carrying bundles, we were late and ran to catch a train, panting and out of breath. No one got up!

Yes, aging is confusing. Freud wrote of the time he was on a train and saw an old man sitting in the next compartment. He was then shocked to realize that he had seen himself in the reflection of the train window. Thus he acknowledged that aging and denial sometimes go hand in hand.

As Michael Isaacs wrote in "A Relocated Psychoanalyst Reflects on Aging," death is often a taboo topic in psychoanalysis. I was impressed that Paul Elovitz used the word "death" over and

over again in his call for papers on the topic of the psychology of death and dying. Death is a confusing topic since no one knows what it actually is and it is certainly scary to contemplate the end to all we know. Freud stated that we cannot actually picture our own death.

There are many metaphors and euphemisms for the term. I came up with a dozen that put death in a rather positive light. They are: pass on, go to a better place, leave this earth, depart this life, check out, eternal rest, final chapter, to the great beyond, meet you maker, rest in peace, kick the bucket, out of your misery. They all sound better than the unknown reality of death.

Humor is a good outlet when thinking of aging and death. An aging George Burns, when asked if he still looks at pretty ladies in the street said, "Yes, but I don't remember why." Woody Allen mentioned that he doesn't mind dying. He just doesn't want to be there when it happens. Ed Koch recently purchased a burial plot at Trinity Church in Manhattan. On his "departure" he offers an open invitation for anyone to come whenever they please.

Sincerely yours,

Neil Wilson

Neil Wilson, PhD, is a psychoanalyst, psychoanalytic educator, and psychologist in private practice in Teaneck, New Jersey, as well as a long time reader of and sometimes reviewer of psychohistory. As he reflects back on his life he is perhaps most proud of serving as a Freedom Summer Volunteer in 1964 working to overcome barriers to African American voter registration in Indianola, Mississippi. In 1972 he co-founded the New Jersey Institute for Training in Psychoanalysis which he directed (or co-directed) until stepping down from this responsibility this month to devote his full attention to his practice. Dr. Wilson may be contacted at neilwilson88@yahoo.com. □

Reflections on Aging

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the excellence of Clio's Psyche. I would like to make some comments on the aging process discussed in March 2008, focusing on the issues of psychological life.

Let me start with my definition of old and young: a young person of any age looks to the future and plans for it, while an old person of any age looks to the past and has problems seeing any future for him/herself.

Chronological age is only one of three age categories to consider. The other two are: physical age—how you look, how you physically live your life, how others see you, and psychological age—are you thirty-years-old and still uncertain of who you are (identity), with whom (intimacy), and how you should spend your money (career consolidation), are you fifty-years-old and have too small a social circle with no next generation involvement (generativity), no interest in passing on anything to anybody (keeper of meaning), or are you sixty-years-old and cannot find peace or any connection to one's own past life or the world around you (integrity)? (George Vaillant, March 2008, p. 139; Nora O'Brien, March 2008, p. 106)

This, by the way, relates to death and dying as well. Many deaths are linked to these components of the aging process. Who cares (social support)? Who can help (this or next generation individuals)? How much life does your life encompass or promise now or five or ten years from now?

Physical (biological) death and psychological death are obviously related to chronological age and thus death as outcome. Thanks for the opportunity to express my thoughts.

Sincerely yours,

Marvin Eisenstadt

Marvin Eisenstadt, PhD, is a psychologist on Long Island with a longstanding interest in creativity. □

Gender, Race, and Money in the Election

Dear Editor,

In our e-mail discussion of gender unfolding in this primary season, I think you were exactly right when you said that, "The media has almost no interest in the question of gender." I have heard, however, a few "who's more oppressed, people of color or women?" debates. I didn't even realize we were in a contest! The remark I found most

ignorant—and irritating—was “sexism has never killed anyone, but racism has.”

I agree with the pundits who pointed out that when Clinton was heckled with “Iron my shirt!” there was none of the outrage that would have followed someone shouting at Obama, “Shine my shoes!” Similarly, when McCain was asked, “How do we beat the bitch?” he chuckled before answering, something he would not have done if someone had asked, “How do we beat the nigger?”

The media’s far greater attention to gender greatly annoys, but does not surprise me. This nation is far more willing to own up to (or at least discuss) its racism than its sexism.

Speaking of politics, I enjoyed your exchange with David Lotto, especially your very candid final assessment. I fight this “money is political power” argument all the time here in California, where people frequently claim that initiatives and referendums always favor whichever campaign spent the most money. My French colleague Marie Bolton and I did a study of environmental initiatives in which Big Oil dramatically outspent various Green groups. The results are suggested by the title of our essay: “The Case for Cautious Optimism: California Environmental Propositions in the Late Twentieth Century,” *La Californie: Périphérie ou laboratoire?*, Annick Foucier and Antoine Coppelani, eds., 2004, pp. 81-102. I wish David Lotto would read it.

Sincerely yours,

Nancy C. Unger

Nancy C. Unger, PhD, is Associate Professor of History and Women's and Gender Studies at Santa Clara University. The paperback edition of her biography, Fighting Bob La Follette: The Righteous Reformer, will be available in September. Dr. Unger may be contacted at NUnger@scu.edu. □

Jews and Baseball

Dear Editor,

Martin Abramowitz’s publication in 2003 of 142 baseball cards featuring Jewish ballplayers (*Jewish Major Leaguers Baseball Cards*) sparked renewed interest in Jews in baseball. *Boston Globe* reporter Nathan Cobb observes that although

“God’s chosen” represent almost three percent of America’s population, they number only point eight percent of the baseball fraternity. Over the years, Abramovitz notes, Jewish batsmen hit .265 on average as opposed to .262 for the “others.” Pitchers from “our crowd” also enjoyed a slight edge: a winning percentage of .504 to .500. One glaring weakness of Jewish players, he concedes, was a lack of speed: they stole only 995 bases.

Literary critic Eric Solomon posits several salient reasons for Jews’ involvement in baseball. First, he writes, baseball provided “a superb avenue for acculturation.” Proof of this assertion can be found in the writings of Abe Cahan, whose Yiddish daily, *Der Forvertz* (*The Forward*) characterized the rules of the game as a means to a desirable end: assimilation into mainstream America. In his novel, *Yekel* (1896), the renowned journalist equated baseball with Americanization. Cahan illustrated the tensions within society. His protagonist, Yekel, loves baseball and boxing. For him, sports provided acceptance just as it conferred identity. After all, baseball represented a “secular nationalistic church” which actually linked fathers and sons in a way, author Peter Levine argues, that “helped mitigate conflict between generations.”

Secondly, the national pastime appealed to Jewish intellect with a penchant for dialectics and documentation. Baseball, thirdly, sparked outstanding literature, propelling heads over hands. Fourthly, this country-turned-city game lured urban youngsters from the ghettos. After all, what could be more urban than the Jewish experience from the *shtetl* to Gotham? Finally, baseball culture engaged Jewish sensibilities. Listen to Eric Solomon when he writes that “the national game rich in folklore, deep in mythology, full of anecdote in the Sholem Aleichem mode, cabbalistic in numerology, quasi-religious in gods, creative in language...denying time’s rules while emphasizing the conflict between youth and age—mythic, historical, spiritual, simple and complex. Harsh and beautiful, real and fictional...baseball, in simple, is America” (“Jews and Baseball: A Cultural Love Story” in George Eisen and David K. Wiggins, eds., *Ethnicity and Sport in North American History and Culture*, 1994, pp. 77-78).

Baseball unleashed vast stores of creativity. Witness the novels of Bernard Malamud, Philip

Roth, Mark Harris, Jerome Charyn, Jay Neugeboren, and Eric Greenberg; the print journalism of Roger Kahn, Dick Young, Stan Isaacs, Maury Allen, Lester Rodney, and Bob Lipsyte; the broadcast journalism of Mel Allen (nee Israel), Marty Glickman, Al Michaels, Charlie Steiner, Warner Wolf, and Chris Berman, to name just a few of the best. In the music-baseball nexus, Jews also excelled. Albert Von Tilzer composed that all-time favorite, "Take Me Out to the Ballgame" and Paul Simon penned a lament for a vanishing hero in "Where Have You Gone, Joe DiMaggio?"

Author Steven Reiss declares that Jews gravitated to the business side of baseball. These businessmen, primarily German-Jewish in origin, sought social acceptance as well as private gain from their baseball investments. Present at the creation were such Jewish owners as Nathan Andersen, Aaron Stern, Louis Kramer, and Julius Fleischmann. Another, Andrew Freedman used his Tammany Hall connections to gain a controlling interest in the New York Giants from 1895 to 1902. This loutish owner, who lacked both diplomatic skills and the social graces, invites the scorn of author Roger I. Abrams, who describes him as "arrogant, overbearing, and insufferable," and begs comparison with George Steinbrenner because he fired sixteen managers in eight years. A more benign brand of Jewish ownership could be found in Pittsburgh under the aegis of Barney Dreyfuss, in Boston under Emil Fuchs, and more recently in Milwaukee under Bud Selig.

Eastern European Jews flocked to a less expensive sport: basketball. Baseball required more green space than was available in urban ghettos. Parents preferred work, study, and playing the piano to playing sports. "To the pious people of the Ghetto," comedian Eddie Cantor asserted, "a baseball player was the king of the loafers." Nevertheless, many youths found baseball congenial as spectators as well as participants. Settlement houses encouraged sports among the immigrant children. Already assimilated, affluent German-American Jews feared that their "co-religionists" from Eastern Europe posed a threat because they "are often charged with lack of physical courage and repugnance to physical work." Therefore, an anxious Jewish elite promoted the creation of settlement houses to craft a counter image. Beginning

in 1889, one of many agencies on the Lower East Side of Manhattan, the Educational Alliance attempted to reverse common perceptions through athletic training. "Let a young man develop his body, and he will neither shrink from imaginary danger nor shirk manual labor which falls to his lot."

Without doubt, our national pastime produced an exemplary role model in Henry Louis Greenberg, a strong Jew who fought back. In an age of rabid anti-Semitism, this Bronx slugger in a Detroit Tiger uniform served as both a beacon of light and a pillar of strength. Detroit's atmosphere was polluted by the anti-Semitic fulminations of radio priest Father Coughlin and auto tycoon Henry Ford. As MVP in 1935 and again in 1940, at two different positions, Greenberg dispelled the stereotype of the invertebrate Jew. After a distinguished military record in World War II and as a returning hero in 1945, Greenberg became an icon for all Americans.

"Hammerin' Hank" helped the cause of racial integration. In 1947, as a member of the Pirates, he was the first Dodger opponent to openly encourage and support Jackie Robinson. Recalling his own bout with bigotry, the veteran Jewish slugger exhorted the rookie Robinson to "Stick in there. You're doing fine. Keep your chin up." After an accidental collision at first base, in which the lumbering Hank and the nimble Jackie became entangled, reporters, eager for controversy, queried the Dodger rookie for information, that is, "dirt." Robinson disappointed them by replying: "Class tells. It sticks out all over Mr. Greenberg." For Jews especially, Jackie represented our hopes as well as our dreams of a truly pluralist America. Perhaps Henry Foner said it best when, as the youngest of four famous brothers, he asked the "four questions" on the first Passover night in 1947. "Why is this night different from all others?" Usurping the role of patriarch, young Henry answered his own question in a novel way: "Today, the first black American player entered the major leagues."

Dodger pitcher Sandy Koufax clearly merits mention for his extraordinary exploits as our "main man" on the mound. However, as Jane Leavy reveals in her book, *Sandy Koufax: A Lefty's Legacy* (2002), the Dodger great continued to en-

counter prejudice throughout his rise to fame. Despite considerable progress brought about by Jackie Robinson's breakthrough to which prominent Jewish figures contributed, the virus of bigotry remained resistant to disinfectants.

The second Jewish player to enter Cooperstown's Hall of Fame, Sandy Koufax from 1961 to 1966 was the best pitcher in baseball. In that period, Sandy hurled four no-hitters, including a perfect game against the Cubs in 1965. During his illustrious though injury-shortened career, Koufax earned three Cy Young awards and one MVP, and amassed 165 wins and a 2.76 ERA. Twice, the Brooklyn-born lefthander struck out eighteen batters in a single game. He led the light-hitting Dodgers to three World Series championships in four attempts with an astonishing .095 ERA. Koufax won the strikeout title four times, once with a record 382 Ks.

Whether the sensational southpaw encountered his quota of anti-Semitism is still a moot subject. Like Greenberg before him, Koufax was not very religious. Nevertheless, he felt compelled to identify with Jewry, especially on the holiest of days. In 1965, for example, Koufax refused to pitch a World Series game on Yom Kippur. Met owner Fred Wilpon, a friend since high school, insists that Koufax is deeply Jewish primarily because of his New York background.

In her brilliantly crafted book, Leavy, citing Fred Wilpon, observes astutely that the Koufax-Don Drysdale holdout in 1965 constitutes the legendary southpaw's finest hour off the field: "the most underestimated event in Koufax's career." By bargaining collectively for the first time, Koufax and Drysdale (the twin towers of Dodger pitching power) ignited a revolution. They in turn paved the way for the heaviest Jewish hitter in the annals of American baseball: Marvin Julian Miller. Possessed of a social conscience, rooted in trade union culture, grounded in prophetic tradition, and leavened with core values, Marvin Miller was an unbeatable force.

The Sporting News listed Miller as number five among the top hundred most powerful people in twentieth-century American sports. In 1994, *Sports Illustrated* ranked Miller as number seven in the top forty most influential figures in sports, placing him ahead of Wayne Gretsky, Arnold

Palmer, Larry Bird, and Pete Rozelle. "Red" Barber identified Marvin Miller, along with Babe Ruth and Jackie Robinson, as one of the three most important men in baseball. Of this trinity, only Miller is excluded from the Hall of Fame. His leadership of the Major League Baseball Players Association from 1966 to 1982 and in 1984 brought the "diamond workers" to full dignity, contractual freedom, monetary rewards, and occupational safety.

Born in the Bronx, Miller grew up in Brooklyn. Mother Gertrude taught public school while father Abraham peddled his wares in Manhattan. Marvin's work resume included a stint of government service during World War II, and work with the Machinists' Union, the UAW, and the Steelworkers Union from 1950 to 1964 as staff economist, chief economist, advisor, and assistant to union president David McDonald.

In 1966, ace pitchers as well as energetic player-union leaders, Robin Roberts and Jim Bunning urged Marvin Miller to head their fledgling union. Through careful planning coupled with labor savvy, Miller won over dissidents and crafted a united front resulting in a progression of victories including raises in both minimum wage and average salary, improvements in safety standards, better fringe benefits, and increased pension allotments. Through it all, Miller listened, learned, and educated. Slowly, he convinced the players of their importance in the baseball scene.

Inviting a list of grievances, Miller heard about the lack of safety in Crosley Field, the flea-bag hotels on the road, the doubleheaders after night games, and the need for more outlets for hair-dryers. He demanded and received data on salaries. Advising the "angries" to "cool" it, Miller morphed into a Great Educator as well as Great Emancipator. Then he acted in concert with union members who started their movement with a \$344 annual dues payment. Dodger owner Walter O'Malley bellowed: "Tell that Jewish boy to get back to Brooklyn."

All that remains is for him to gain entry into Cooperstown. The "Lords of Baseball" evidently underestimated Marvin Miller, whose calm demeanor "belied a ferociously tenacious personality." Economist Andrew Goodman correctly observed that Miller's other contributions, less famil-

iar to baseball aficionados, led to greater safety. These largely ignored innovations included "improved scheduling and padded outfield walls, better-defined warning tracks, and safer locker rooms." Moreover, Arthur Ashe asserted that Marvin Miller had contributed "more for the welfare of black athletes than anyone else."

Clearly, Jews have come a long way. Often compelled to wander, we have found a home in America. Baseball, our endless love, has brought us home again. In response to the call, "Play Ball!"—we chant, "*Carpe diem!*" Thus, as we seize the day, at long last we are safe at home.

Sincerely yours,

Joe Dorinson

Joseph Dorinson, MED, is a professor of history at Long Island University whose specialties within popular culture include humor, Jewish history, and sports. Though a small portion of the much longer paper from which this letter is drawn was previously published, Professor Dorinson wanted to share this with our readers. He may be contacted at Jdorinson@aol.com. □

Remembering Norman Cohn

Henry R. Lawton
International Psychohistorical
Association

Last year I was saddened to learn of the death of Norman Cohn (1915-2007), long an intellectual hero of mine as one of the greatest scholars of our age. Though his scholarly output was moderate (five books and various articles), what he did turn out was diligently researched and well written. *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (1957) and *Warrant for Genocide* (1967) are quite justifiably considered classics. Both of these books could not have been written without serious fluency in many languages old and new. Thus it should not surprise us that Cohn had trained as a linguist at Christ College of Oxford, and that by the end of his World War II military service he was doing intelligence work interrogating SS members and other Nazis, as well as refugees from Russia. His wartime experiences had a lot to do with why he turned to history and spent a decade researching *The Pursuit of the*

Millennium. After the war he taught in Scotland, Ireland, England, the United States, and Canada prior to being appointed in 1966 as a Professorial Fellow and then Astor-Wolfson Professor at the University of Sussex. In addition he assumed directorship of Sussex's Columbus Centre for Studies of Persecution and Genocide. (Unfortunately I have not been able to determine what this center accomplished or even if it is still in existence.) As a result of nomination by Isaiah Berlin, his work was honored by his election as a Fellow of the British Academy.

Professor Norman Cohn, who was born and raised in London, wrote sophisticated history despite being trained in another field. He chose difficult subject matter in *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, where he shed new light on the medieval precursors of present-day totalitarian movements and is widely credited for almost single-handedly creating the field of millennial studies. In *Warrant for Genocide* he conclusively showed how the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, a Tsarist anti-Semitic forgery describing a vast Jewish conspiracy to take over the world, helped intensify anti-Jewish prejudice contributing to the Holocaust. Unfortunately, despite the fact that it is well known as a fabrication, the *Protocols* is disseminated over the Internet and is still used all over the world to justify anti-Semitism. In *Europe's Inner Demons* (1975) Cohn identified the fantasies that culminated in the widespread scapegoating of out of favor groups such as Jews and women as witches. This process reached truly horrifying proportions in the Inquisition. In *Cosmos, Chaos and the World to Come* (1993), Cohn looked for the roots of apocalyptic/millennial beliefs and found them in the ideas of the ancient Persian prophet Zoroaster. In *Noah's Flood* (1996), Cohn examines the bible story of the flood and how it has changed over the centuries.

I discovered Norman Cohn, quite by accident, while I was an undergraduate at Trenton State College. History was the field of my interest and though American history had always been my area of prime interest, I made it a point to read widely. Whenever I had a few extra dollars, one of my favorite recreations was to browse in a bookstore. Since I was living near Princeton University I found the University Store to be like an intellectual candy store because of its enormous selection of

books. Later I discovered the Strand Bookstore in New York City; however, since the emergence of the online bookstore Amazon.com I seldom go to traditional bookstores.

In the University Store, by happenstance an interesting book caught my eye. It had a bank of black clouds, topped by red taking up half of the cover. The full title suggested some sort of history not generally known, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Messianism in Medieval and Reformation Europe and its Bearing on Modern Totalitarian Movements* (2nd edition, 1961). I remember feeling hesitation, is this book too arcane and obscure? "What the hell," I said to myself, "Why not take a chance?" It was several months before I got around to reading it and boy was I surprised! I could not put it down.

Reading *The Pursuit of the Millennium* literally changed my life. It was the first time that I had clearly seen the role of emotion/fantasy at work in the theater of history. This was a decade before I knew about psychohistory. Despite his focus on Medieval and Reformation Europe, Cohn was able to define the conditions that might foster emergence of millennial movements with enough precision to allow successful application of his model to other times and/or places. Such effort worked very well for me on undergraduate and graduate levels. (Those wishing a more elaborate discussion of Cohn's ideas might wish to consult my article "The Dream of the Millennium" published on the Internet at <http://www.uq.au/mc/9912/dream.html>.) I was earning As on all my history papers and getting introductory exposure to psychohistory without realizing it. However, seeing the third edition (1970) was distressing because Cohn sought to de-emphasize the importance of religious emotion as a factor influencing the nature of modern secular totalitarian movements—a serious error in my opinion. Despite this, Norman Cohn remains one of my intellectual heroes. He had the imagination and courage "to step outside the box." His work has continued to influence my own thinking, research, and writing. For example, my master's thesis, *Millennial Thinking in the Politics of Richard Nixon and the Potential for Fascism in American Life* (1971), and current research on Joseph Smith, Jr. and the Mormons reveal its continuing importance.

Call for Papers

The Psychology and Experience of Facing Death and Dying

Due October 15, 2008

Some possible approaches include:

- What constitutes a "good death?"
- The denial of death
- How people prepare to die
- Stages in the process of dying
- The humor of death and dying
- Responses to the death of a loved one
- The treatment of death by the family, professionals, and society
- Intergenerational psychodynamics in facing death and dying and its aftermath
- Death in the cinema—the films of Ingmar Bergman and others
- Case studies of the death of famous people such as Churchill, Freud, and Jefferson
- The deification in death of Princess Diana, Elvis Presley, *et al.*
- Responses to the death of the hero or tyrant
- Psychological insights on death in literature
- Suicide and assisted suicide
- Suicide in war and terrorism
- Cross cultural approaches to death and dying
- How victims of the Holocaust and other genocides deal with death in their lives
- Case studies from hospice workers, therapists, and thanatologists
- The body after death: autopsy, burial, cremation, and various death rituals
- Reviews of books on death by Nuland, *et al.*

Articles of 500-1500 words (and one long piece) are welcome. Contact Editor Paul H. Elovitz at pelovitz@aol.com.

Psychohistorians should credit Professor Cohn as one of the first to explore what is now called group fantasy. Even today his ideas remain well ahead of their time. While sad about his passing at age ninety-two years, we should take solace that Norman Rufus Colin Cohn will live on through his path-breaking writings.

Henry R. Lawton, MA, MLS, retired after thirty years as a social worker for the New Jersey Division of Youth & Family Services (DYFS) where he worked with troubled teenagers at risk for out-of-home placement. As an independent psychohistorical scholar for over three decades, he has authored a variety of articles and The Psychohistorian's Handbook (1988)—still the only how-to text for the field. He is Book Review Editor of the Journal of Psychohistory, Secretary and Past President of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA), and Founder and (retired) Director of the Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film. He may be contacted at hwlipa@gmail.com. □

Bulletin Board

CONFERENCES: The next **Psychohistory Forum Work-In-Progress Saturday Seminar** will be on fall election year meeting on **“Psychobiographical and Psychological Aspects of Election 2008** with presentations by **Herbert Barry, Paul Elovitz**, and a third psychohistorian. The **31st Annual International Psychohistorical Association (IPA)** will be held at Fordham Law School in Manhattan on **June 2-4, 2008** with the Forum sponsoring panels on the 2008 election candidates and trauma. The next **International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP)** conference will be held on **July 9-12, 2008** at the **Sciences Po in Paris** with a Forum sponsored meeting, “Trauma, War, and Disillusionment.” Following that the 2009 ISPP conference will be in Dublin at **Trinity College** and the 2010 in San Francisco. The **8th Annual Childhood and Society Symposium** on “The Sexualization of Childhood” will be held on **June 13-14, 2008** at Point Park University.

NOTES ON MEMBERS AND PUBLICATIONS: Congratulations to **David James Fisher** on the publication of *My Bettelheim: Living and Dying* (NY: Rodopi Publications, 2008) in Rodopi's Contemporary Psychoanalytic Studies.

Call for Papers

Psychoanalysis of Love and Hate: A Retrospective

Review essays of texts on the psychoanalysis of love and hate

Special Issue, March 2009

Some possible texts to be reviewed include:

- Sigmund Freud - *Psychology of Love*
- Ian Suttie - *Origins of Love and Hate*
- Melanie Klein & Joan Riviere - *Love, Hate & Reparation*
- Erich Fromm - *The Art of Loving*
- Theodor Reik - *Of Love and Lust*
- Michael Balint - *Primary Love and Psychoanalytic Technique*
- Rollo May - *Love and Will*
- Reuben Fine - *The Meaning of Love in Human Experience*
- Jessica Benjamin - *Bonds of Love*
- Ethel S. Person - *Dreams of Love and Fateful Encounters*
- Jonathan Lear - *Love and Its Place in Nature*
- Martin Bergmann - *The Anatomy of Loving*
- Jane Goldberg - *The Dark Side of Love*
- Otto Kernberg - *Love Relations*
- Ilham Dilman - *Love: Its Forms, Dimensions and Paradoxes*
- Stephen A. Mitchell - *Can Love Last?*
- David Mann (editor) - *Love and Hate*
- Andre Green & Gregorio Kohon - *Love and Its Vicissitudes*
- Mario Mikulincer & Gail Goodman (editors) - *Dynamics of Romantic Love*
- Joseph Lichtenberg - *Sensuality and Sexuality across the Divide of Shame*
- Leo Bersani & Adam Phillips. - *Intimacies*

Due January 10, 2009

Articles of 1000-1500 words (and one long piece) are welcome, as are additional suggestions. Contact Guest Editor Professor Ken Fuchsman at ken.fuchsman@uconn.edu.

Hanna Turken presented "The Object Seeking Role of Hate, Anger and Violence: The Case of Mr. V and the Transitional, Transformative Role of the Therapist" on March 29 at the International Psychotherapy Institute (IPI). On May 23 **Robert Quackenbush** presented "The Use of Psychoanalytic Techniques with Children and Adolescents," at the Center for Psychoanalytic Studies. **Nadra Hashim** has been appointed as an adjunct professor at Mid-Continent University in Kentucky. Our thoughts are with **Ralph Colp, Mary Lambert,** and **Lee Shneidman**, who are all struggling with illness. We welcome new members **Willa Bernhard, Daniel Gold, Nadra Hashim, Lorraine O'Brien, Nora O'Brien, Lauren O'Keefe,** and **Terence O'Leary.** **OUR THANKS:** To our members and subscribers for the support that makes *Clio's Psyche* possible. To Benefactors Herbert Barry, Ralph Colp, David Lotto, and Terence O'Leary; Patrons David Beisel, Peter Loewenberg, and Shirley Stewart; Sustaining Members Ken Fuchsman and Lee (and the late Connalee) Shneidman; Supporting Members C. Fred Alford, Willa Bernhard, Andrew Brink, David James Fisher, John Hartman, Mary Lambert, Lauren O'Leary, Daniel Rancour-Laferriere, Hanna Turken, and Nancy Unger; and Members Bob Anderson, Ted Goertzel, Daniel Gold, Bob Lentz, Alexander J. Nemeth, Denis O'Keefe, Doris Pfeffer, Charles Strozier, Howard Stein, and George Victor. Our special thanks for thought-provoking materials to Andy Abrams, Peter Anderson, Herbert Barry III, Rudolph Binion, Ehor Boyanowsky, Daniel Dervin, Joe Dorinson, Marvin Eisenstadt, Paul Elovitz, Tom Ferraro, Kenneth Fuchsman, F. Lincoln Grahls, Joe Illick, Irene Javors, Glen Jeansonne, Daniel Klenbort, Henry Lawton, Dave Lührssen, Robert Pyles, Aino Sarje, Stanley Teitelbaum, Nancy Unger, and Neil Wilson. To Caitlin Adams for editing, proofing, and *Publisher* 2003 software application as well as to Matthew Reed for editing and proofreading. Our special thanks to Bob Lentz, Guest Editor for the Sports Psychology Special Issue, and our numerous, overworked referees, who must remain anonymous. ▢

Our ideal is insight without jargon

Call for Papers

The Psychology of Election 2008

Due July 15, 2008

Some possible psychological approaches include:

- Psychobiography of Obama, McClain, Clinton, and Nader
- Is McCain Really a Maverick?
- Change and Hope in Obama's Thought
- How the World Views the Election
- Race and Gender in the Election
- Cycles in American Politics
- Spouses in the Election
- Psychoeconomic Aspects of the Election
- The Role of the Internet
- Generational Divides in Politics
- Psychology of Independent Voters
- Media and the Election
- Choosing the Vice President
- Reviews of Candidate Books.

Articles of 500-1500 words (and one long piece) are welcome. An Abstract, Outline, or Draft Copy is Preferred ASAP
Contact Editor Paul H. Elovitz at
pelovitz@aol.com

*Applying Psychology to Current
Events, History, and Society:
Essays from Clio's Psyche*

Paul H. Elovitz,
Editor

Table of Contents

- Section 1 The Editor's Introduction
- Section 2 Becoming a Psychohistorian and Personal Reflections
- Section 3 Psychobiography
- Section 4 Political Leaders and Their Followers
- Section 5 Group Process and Methodology
- Section 6 Some Psychohistorical Inter-views
- Section 7 Interviews with Some Women Psychohistorians
- Section 8 Women in Society
- Section 9 Intimacy, Love, and Humor on the Internet
- Section 10 The Cost and Celebrity of Fame
- Section 11 Violence
- Section 12 Violent Movie Fantasies
- Section 13 Capital Punishment
- Section 14 September 11 and Its Aftermath
- Section 15 Germany, the Holocaust and the Trans-generational Transmission of Trauma
- Section 16 Apocalyptic Violence
- Section 17 Terror and War
- Section 18 Geography and Home
- Section 19 Conspiracy Theories and Paranoia

- Section 20 Religion
- Section 21 Disease, Illness, & the Denial of Death
- Section 22 Dreams
- Section 23 Teaching Psychological History
- Section 24 Expanding the Psychohistorical Paradigm
- Section 25 The Future of Psychohistory

Appendices

- Section 26 Memorials to Builders of the Psycho-historical Paradigm
- Section 27 Featured Scholars, Special Issues, Special Features, and Symposia
- Section 28 Sources
- Section 29 Contributors
(These include: C. Fred Alford, Herbert Barry, Rudolph Binion, Sue Erikson Bloland, Andrew Brink, Don Carveth, Nancy Chodorow, Mary Coleman, Robert Collins, Ralph Colp, Henry Davis, Lloyd deMause, Dan Dervin, Alan Dundes, Paul Elovitz, Eva Fogelman, John Forrester, Lawrence Friedman, Peter Gay, Anna Geifman, Carol Gilligan, Betty Glad, James Gollnick, Jay Gonen, Phyllis Grosskurth, Paul Hamburg, Jean Hantman, John Jacob Hartman, Flora Hogman, J. Donald Hughes, Lynn Hunt, Irene Javors, Sudhir Kakar, Mel Kalfus, Daniel Klenbort, Danielle Knafo, Thomas Kohut, Henry Lawton, Robert Jay Lifton, Peter Loewenberg, David Lotto, Elizabeth Marvick, Jennefer Mazza, Ruth Dale Meyer, Maria Miliora, Robert Pois, Philip Pomper, David Redles, H. John Rogers, Robert Rous-selle, Todd Schultz, Linda Simon, Evelyn Sommers, Howard Stein, Charles Strozier, Jacques Szaluta, Ellen Toronto, Lawrence Tritle, Hanna Turken, Montague Ullman, Nancy Unger, George Victor, Vamik Volkan, Victor Wolfenstein, and Elisabeth Young-Bruehl.)

Published September, 2006, x, 236 pages \$38
(\$20 to students sold at college bookstores)
Available from the Psychohistory Forum
For Information visit
Cliospsyche.org

