
Clio's Psyche

Examining the "Why" of History

Volume 2, Number 1

June, 1995

The Rupture of Innocence: Oklahoma City, April 19, 1995

Howard F. Stein
University of Oklahoma

At 9:02 A.M. on Wednesday, April 19, 1995, I was sitting at my noisy 25 year-old electric typewriter in my home in Bethany, Oklahoma. I heard a loud kettle drum-like "boom," thought it might be the work of my 16 month-old son pounding the hollow sheet rock walls of our condominium. Or some jet's sonic boom. I could feel vibration from the floor and walls. My wife said she thought the sound came definitely from outside rather than inside, and that it might have been a natural gas explo-

(Continued on page 12)

The Family Origins of John Maynard Keynes

David Felix
CUNY - Graduate School and BCC

The effects of fathers on their sons are inescapably pervasive. John Neville Keynes (1852-1949) had a remarkably specific influence on the great economist John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946). Each was a Cambridge University don who wrote significant works in logic and economics. The father's achievement was **bounded by** his two scholarly fields and educational administration, while the essence of the son's career was its boundlessness. Emphasizing the father is not to minimize the mother's **quietly** powerful influence. Yet, it is true that, to use an economist's idiom of importance to Maynard later, Neville's intimacy with him might seem to have "crowded out" a comparable intimacy with Florence Ada Keynes. Yet, while she loved her three children deeply and more than supportively, she was rather distant in all her relationships and never properly exercised the feminine prerogative, at least in that late Victorian period, of letting her feelings overflow. Neville's feelings, however, were subject to constant leakage. This exchange of the conventional paternal and maternal variances in closeness and emotive roles, constituting a reversal of the Oedipal situation, had to leave its imprint on all the children.

Depression, as Nietzsche and Freud tell us, is a result of unvented anger. Maynard, frequently depressed, had something to be angry about and someone to be angry with ° humiliating chastisement and Neville. This is not to deny another possible factor, depression as the effect of insufficient maternal loving. Of course Florence loved her son deeply but did her distant persona communicate it?

Besides striking and slapping him, Neville whipped the boy. I have found instances reported in the diaries over a period of

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|--|----|
| The Private Sector of John Maynard Keynes | 3 |
| <i>Brian D'Agostino</i> | |
| Fathers | 4 |
| <i>Paul H. Elovitz</i> | |
| Sidney Halpern (1927-94): Memoir of a Psychohistorian | 6 |
| <i>Baruch Halpern</i> | |
| The Judicious Psychohistory of John Demos.. | 8 |
| Free Associations: Violence in Our Midst.... | 15 |
| <i>Paul H. Elovitz</i> | |
| <i>Schindler's List</i> : Lawton Responds to Kren.. | 18 |
| <i>Henry Lawton</i> | |
| Karen Horney's Search for Self-Understanding | 19 |
| <i>Harry Keyishian</i> | |
| Funding Psychohistory: An Interview with John Caulfield | 20 |
| Bulletin Board | 24 |

three years, when Maynard was two-and-a-half to five-and-a-half. (Whipped is Neville's — and Florence's — term; they did not specify the instrument.) There may well have been more occasions — the biographer Robert **Skidelsky** fixes the **whippings** (along with "frequent slappings") from "Maynard's second to seventh year — but these four exercises in the inflicting of pain *and* humiliation are enough to form a hard core of obscene Victorian horror in the father-son intimacy and in the life of the family. While I came upon no mentions of a **whipped** Geoffrey — Maynard's brother, always the

good" child — the spirited Margaret, their sister, suffered at least one **unqualified** whipping at the age of a little over two-and-a-half-years.

Florence opposed the whippings in specific instances and, implicitly, in principle. When one of them took place in her absence, she wrote, "I do not **think** I should have let you whip him, **husb[and]**, if I had been at home." She pointed out that the active boy, Neville being hypersensitive to noise and other disturbances of his train of thought, had been kept in the nursery all day: "I don't wonder that he gets restive." Another time she expressed herself more pathetically. Occurring on September 7, 1887, the episode, as Neville recounted it, is powerfully illustrative:

The little shrimp was **naughty** this morning & had to be whipped. He preserved his equanimity during the preliminaries. But he soon began to cry bitterly & then my heart smote me. Florence was nearly crying. He told her afterward that it stung him so & made him feel warm down there. I **think** it did him good. He was good for the rest of the day. He is a dear affectionate little man & kissed his hard-hearted father very affectionately soon after the punishment was over.

Perhaps Neville regarded Maynard's attitude this time as salutarily improved from that of the first whipping; "I whipped the little man because he would not go upstairs properly. He wept and looked very reproachful, but would not say he would be a good boy." In the year and-a-half since then **Maynard** had learned the limits of defiance.

One might try to imagine oneself as this two-and-one-half and four-year-old boy, whom his loving father had long convinced of his great

value but suddenly hurt and, worse, humiliated. The **punishment** comes suddenly. The agent of punishment is this huge benign presence become magically, monstrously strange. Consider again the boy feeling "warm down there" and later kissing the destroyer of his dignity. Surely Maynard got a sense of orgasmic action that was more than punishment, surely Neville felt something more pleasurable than the satisfaction of doing his disagreeable duty. Spanking is a favorite form of sexual experience in the giving and receiving. Three days after this episode Neville was "feeling capitably well, & my play at tennis satisfactory."

The anger — the rage — Maynard felt was expressed variously, covertly and unrecognized by either when it approached Neville himself. It was expressed openly and sometimes outrageously when directed against others. Consider Maynard Keynes's description of the birthday celebration of his 90-year-old father: "[E]legant, mid-Victorian, highbrow, reading Swinburne, Meredith, Ibsen, buying William Morris wallpaper, whiskers, modest and industrious, but rather rich, rather pleasure

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 2, No. 1

June, 1995

ISSN 1080-2622

Published Quarterly by The Psychohistory Forum

627 Dakota Tram Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

Telephone: (201) 891-6866

Fax: (201) 848-0454

Editor: Paul H. Elovitz, PhD

Associate Editor: Bob Lentz

Editorial Board

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-Retired • **Joseph Dowling, PhD** Lehigh University • **Glen Jeansonue, PhD** University of Wisconsin • **George Kren, PhD** Kansas State University • **Peter Loewenberg, PhD** UCLA • **Peter Petschauer, PhD** Appalachian State University • **Leon Rappoport, PhD** Kansas State University □

Subscription: free to members of The Psychohistory Forum, \$25 yearly to non-members, \$29 outside USA & Canada

We welcome articles of **psychohistorical** interest that are 300-600 words.

Copyright © 1995 The Psychohistory Forum

loving, rather extravagant within carefully set limits, most generous, very sociable, loved entertaining, wine, games, novels, theatre, travel." The patronizing, faintly contemptuous note is clear enough. In another, no less hostile sense, the social scientist had clamped John Neville Keynes to the microscope's plate and lectured learnedly on the creature's magnified characteristics. Maynard never attacked Neville, but in 1911 told this "rather rich" person that he was "in favor of the confiscation of wealth," and in 1917, speculating on the dire effects of the war, wrote his mother (who had superseded Neville as chief correspondent of the two): "The abolition of the rich will be rather a comfort and serves them right anyhow." More broadly, although he was an orthodox exponent of neoclassical economics and set out himself to become rich, he nurtured unintegrated populistic-socialistic sympathies that would slowly merge with his economist's professional thinking. He found other seniors easier to attack than Neville.

Easily expressing contempt in the third person for father figures, from adolescence Maynard was as insulting — "rude," in English idiom — in second-person encounters with others. He did not directly attack the great Alfred Marshall, but enjoyed despising him in a measured way, a **sentiment uninhibited** by Marshall's patronage of his career after giving up on Neville. Maynard assured one friend that Marshall might be a "very great man," but was rather a silly one in his private character," and, on another instance, corrected Roy Harrod's respectful attitude: "He was an utterly absurd person, you know." Roy Harrod, Keynes's protege long before becoming biographer, granted, "There was something freezing and terrible about Maynard's [rudeness]." Inaccurately, he excused it as "employed selectively against victims deserving punishment." Not so: while Keynes sometimes used it to blast through foolish opposition to a good action, it was frequently gratuitous. Isaiah Berlin first met Keynes when he found himself sitting next to him in the King's College dining hall and became the victim of his *a priori* crossness. After finding the menu unsatisfactory, as if Berlin were responsible, Keynes inquired his presence there. When, as Berlin recalled, he said he was giving a paper afterward on pleasure, Keynes returned, "Pleasure? What a ridiculous subject." He then lapsed into silence. More accurately, Harrod

concluded on Keynes's rudeness, "It was not **usually** meant to be unforgivable, but was often not forgiven." Sir Kenneth Clark, the art historian, worked with Keynes on the Arts Council, which Keynes, in his last years, directed to the nations great cultural benefit. Clark explained the limits of their relations: "Although [he was] a kind man, I have seen him humiliate people in a cruel way." Keynes had a great store of anger to draw upon.

Maynard's situation at home was extreme, Neville having introduced him to the painfully physical and psychic aspects of a male parent's love. Beginning to express its consequences at Eton, he would be an incessantly active homosexual for two decades. The wonder is that he would turn away from such a life and become a happily married man. But, on second thought, one must credit in his case, as in Margaret's and Geoffrey's, the more normal" aspects of their "family's ambiance — and the impulsion to live them out as well. That homosexual character, however, would widen the terrain on which Maynard functioned and make him receptive to heterodox forms of thought and action in general and in economics. John Maynard would rebel against John Neville with the materials his progenitor had endowed him. Thus the (Maynard) Keynesian Revolution.

*David Felix is an active Research Associate of the Forum and of its Communism: The Dream That Failed Research Group. He recently retired from his history professorship at CUNY to be able to devote full time to his research and writing. Last year he published, John Maynard Keynes: The Biography of an Idea and this year **he** is working on John Maynard Keynes: A Critical Life which will be published in 1996 by Transaction Books. This paper is extracted by the author from his March 4 presentation to the Forum. □*

The Private Sector of John Maynard Keynes

Brian D'Agostino
Center for the Study of
Violence and Human Survival

What relation does the thought of John Maynard Keynes have to his psychobiography?

It is instructive to compare his 1936 classic *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money* to the **thought** of two other great economists, Marx and Kondratieff. According to Marx, great depressions occurred because an increasingly impoverished working class could not afford to buy the output of an increasingly productive capitalist economy. Kondratieff, on the other hand, said long periods of capital investment create an approximately 50-year cycle of prosperity followed by stagnation, each long wave inevitably culminating in a great depression. Ignoring such long term phenomena, Keynes narrowed his focus to the short-term business cycles of five years average duration. Unlike Marx and Kondratieff, he made no inquiry into deep causes, proposing instead that the government should compensate for recessions with deficit spending and for bouts of inflation with budget surpluses.

These economic ideas came from the mind of a man who suffered from a lifelong, recurring psychological depression. A superb psychobiography of Keynes by David Felix [*John Maynard Keynes: The Biography of an Idea* (Transaction Books, 1994)] attributes this depression to the humiliation and abuse his otherwise loving father inflicted upon John Maynard in early childhood. Keynes never succeeded in discarding the father introjects [internalized bad feelings from his father] at the root of these depressions, but instead seethed with hostility throughout his life, as expressed unconsciously in personal attacks on innumerable eminent people he interacted with.

Neither would Keynes endure the experience of these depressions; indeed, such introspection would have been the first step to bringing the introjects to consciousness and thereby dealing with the root of his suffering. Instead, Keynes compulsively increased the work level in his government career whenever he felt the onset of a recurring loss of psychic energy. Through a series of such short-term fixes, Keynes *managed* his underlying depression, rather than tried to understand its deep causes and possibly eradicate it.

It can surely be no accident that the specific solution Keynes the economist prescribed for the economic Great Depression exactly fit the specific solution by which he regulated his own psychic depression. Keynes rejected Marx's call for a massive redistribution of wealth, which would have been psychically

equivalent to overthrowing the father introjects. Nor could he embrace Kondratieff's theory of long waves beyond government control, which would have been equivalent to passively but consciously enduring recurring psychic depressions. Instead, Keynes prescribed management of short-term economic fluctuations by means of compensatory government fiscal policy. This corresponds exactly to his method of psychic regulation: tolerating no idle capacity and keeping himself fully employed with government work whenever he felt the onset of depression.

Keynes's projection of psychic material onto the economic system may help explain his neglect of long-term processes and other limitations and distortions in his economic thought. But what about the central and enduring idea of the Keynesian revolution — that those holding political power are ultimately responsible for the private sector? That world-transforming idea, I would think, drew its power from a valid insight in the unconscious depths of John Maynard Keynes. Could the insight have been that his father, and not he, was ultimately responsible for what happened in his childhood — his private sector? I would think so.

Brian D'Agostino, a political scientist, is a Research Associate of the Psychohistory Forum and of the City University of New York's Center on Violence and Human Survival. □

Fathers

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College

Fathers! Fathers are crucial to our lives, yet in some ways their role is a puzzle, especially when we think of mothers and their enormous importance, particularly in our early lives. From our fathers, we are given but a microscopic seed. This sperm appears insignificant along side of the much larger egg. The womb that is our environment as we grow towards birth and childhood is part of our mother, not our father. Our mother's pain at our birth engenders a mutual symbiosis as well. We need our mother's milk, we need our mother's touch, we need our mother's direction. In many families, especially those of an earlier generation, the father's role in the family

seemed less significant than that of the mother. And yet we know, and have **known** since childhood, that our fathers are **involved** in the **shaping** of our lives.

Therapists know that the loss of a father has tremendous impact **upon** the life of his son. Patient loads are well-stocked with men whose fathers are absent, dead or ineffectual. The trauma experienced by an adolescent when he loses his father is enormous. One of my teachers, a man apparently so immersed in his work that he had little time for his children, died leaving a twenty-year-old son. As the son delivered the eulogy at his father's funeral a colleague whispered to me, "That boy has his father on such a pedestal — he'll have a hard time." The son committed suicide within a year of his father's death. Colleagues and the professional literature tell many similar stories. On the other hand, the death of the father may begin a process within the child that is therapeutic and ultimately positive. One colleague, who has written extensively on the subject, calls this "creativity as repair." In keeping with this process, a disproportionate number of highly creative men suffered the loss of a father in childhood or adolescence.

Recently, I had a long talk with a dear friend, a woman who is experiencing serious problems with her adult son. This young man could not have been more fortunate in this choice of mothers, yet he lacked an adequate father. As tears welled in his mother's eyes, I had to tell her, "But mothers are not enough. We men need fathers, and fathers have to do with separation." Helping with separation is one of the things that our fathers do for us and that we do for our sons, for separation is one of the most difficult tasks that faces a **human** being. My friend's son had been thrown out of the house by his father at the age of fifteen, repeating the destructive pattern of his father, who had done the same to him. Such a violent separation usually leaves the son feeling worthless and abandoned.

Yet how can we separate from our own fathers? And how do we then accept the separation of our fathers from us? Separation from my own parents was not easily accomplished; the difficulty of separation was compounded by my mother's terminal illness and my father's terrible grief while my older brother and sister and I were in our early twenties. Both of our parents worried that we

would become slaves to my mother's cancer. Partly as the result of our loss, as well as our collective **and individual** inability to more fully express our fear and grief verbally, each of us set about creating a whole family. We all married and had children soon afterwards. We each had two boys and a girl, just as in the families we had known best: our own, and our father's as well.

The loss of a father through death is, as Freud **pointed** out, a crucial moment in the life of a man. Amidst the hurt, pain and loss, there is also an eventual liberation for many men as they are at last freed from the grasp of their fathers. In my generation omnipresent mothers ran the home (and the children, for that matter) while fathers were typically remote, unapproachable yet powerful authority figures. "Wait till your father gets home!" was the threat of my generation. Yet my parents came home together, as my mother worked all day in *my father's store*. From the moment that they stepped into the house after work, it was Mom who ran the house, who made dinner, who listened to our problems at school and gave us advice. Interaction with my father after work tended to be limited to the following exchange: "Hi, Dad." "Hi, son. How ya doin'?" Yet if something important was happening in my life I tended to turn to him.

As I faced the dangers of being beaten up by gangs in the tough neighborhood in which I grew up, I could not turn to my mother for advice on what to do. Telling her son to fight was not something that came readily to her gentle nature. My father felt no such ambivalence. "Get out there and bloody the bullies! You don't have to win — you just have to let them know that it hurts, that you're not a patsy." He would become excited, punching the air like a boxer. But I felt very small. He could take care of himself, but I was not yet sure if I could. I hated to hear his words, but I listened to him. On several occasions I got out there and bloodied the bullies.

Why is it that some part of most men feels freer when their father is gone, freer to accomplish more? Is it that they are inhibited, that their fear that their father will criticize any action causes them to restrict their activities? Is it that they are fearful of somehow surpassing their father, fearful that he will retaliate, even though consciously they may only relate to their fathers' statements of pride in their

accomplishments? What is it that makes most men thrive after the loss of their father? That they do in most cases I have little doubt. Perhaps it is that **they** are freer simply to be like their fathers, to be in charge, to be above reproach; to be, or try to be, the father whom they remember from their childhoods.

At my father's funeral in November of 1987 there was a hole within me, within some aspect of my unfinished relationship with my parents, that I was seeking to fill as I shoveled earth on his coffin. I would have to fill that by working within myself and my family. I recognized, too, that we bury and honor the dead not for the dead, but for the living. We are performing a function for ourselves and in some small way for our future generations, for the unborn within the family as well. The sense of the unborn within the family was felt so vividly when we went back to my niece's home to continue the process of mourning our beloved father, grandfather, cousin, friend and colleague. The kindly, red-bearded rabbi said his words and rushed off amidst the freezing rain and snow. There was such a dichotomy between the warmth of the family, as we talked and ate, and the cold outside, such a dichotomy between the warmth of the young and the living and the cold of the grave.

As the eight grandchildren and several spouses talked, their thoughts were turned towards future plans and most especially towards who would have a baby, who would first give birth to a child to bring not only joy and hope into their lives, but also in some way a replacement for their beloved grandfather. They looked around, they felt each other out; the emotional power of what they were doing was obviously enormous. As we drove back to Dad's empty house with one of my sons, who had no immediate plans of marriage and fatherhood, it was so apparent that he too felt a great pressure to bring a child into the world as he said, "Aren't Nancy and Richard going to have a baby soon? Rose and Ralph will be **thinking** of having kids. And Larry and his girlfriend are very serious — I think they'll be getting engaged soon." The power of the desire to replenish our family's **thinning ranks** was a force far more powerful than I can describe. In the face of death, the power of life and fatherhood reasserted itself and the newer generation of seven great grandchildren includes a child named Michael, after Dad.

Paul Elovitz writes more extensively about his family history in a chapter of the Forum's book-in-progress on immigrant psychology, Immigrant Experiences: Personal Narrative and Psychological Analysis. U

Sidney Halpern (1927-94): Memoir of a Psychohistorian

Baruch Halpern
Penn State University

Psychohistorians are remembered for the depth and originality of their thought, their publications, the people they teach and their contributions to society. The death of Professor Sidney Halpern of Temple University last July 11 leaves our field bereft of a man who excelled in all but one of these areas.

Let us start with a few of Halpern's non-academic accomplishments. In 1953 he founded and was President of the Plymouth Mutual Life Insurance Company which had 100 employees and 1,000 agents when he left it to become a college professor. He served as Publisher of Mercury Books (publishers of JFK, *Profiles in Courage* and *PT 109* as well as Weignall, *Life and Times of Cleopatra*). Also, he was on the editorial board of *American Imago* and was Business Manager of the same publication. Amidst many activities he earned a doctoral degree in classical studies at the University of Pennsylvania. His thesis, *Caesar and the Aurelii Cottae*, was done under the auspices of William MacDermott who, like so many other people he touched, became his friend. Halpern also had some training in psychoanalysis, but dropped out of it because he became too involved in the personal lives of his patients. Psychoanalytic detachment was *not* his forte. Some of the variety of his accomplishments are spelled out in his numerous listings in *Who's Who in the East* as well as *Who's Who in the World*.

In 1967 Halpern came to sit in the groves of academia at Temple University under the auspices of the History Department. In survey courses on Western Civilization and American History he delved into Freud, Marx, Einstein, Ancient Israel, liberty and the rise and fall of America as a great civilization. He was fascinated by Marxism and then Freudianism,

but perhaps he may most accurately be called a Groddeckian. George Groddeck (1866-1934), like Nietzsche, believed in the primacy of the "id," an unstoppable unconscious force. Within four years he turned to academic administration, first as Director (1971) and then as Dean (1971-82) of the previously sleepy Ambler campus where he did almost all of his teaching. In a short period he transformed it from a quiescent two-year operation with fewer than 600 students to a full-fledged extension campus with close to 7,000 full and part-time students. But his administrative experience was not all of growth, since he held significant responsibilities when Temple went into a crises of detenuring. Halpern's own health deteriorated severely, along with the fiscal well-being and morale in the university he was trying to save from being severely weakened by the ethnic, "white flight" from Philadelphia to the suburbs. In 1982, though his health was broken, he returned to teaching which he continued until almost the end of his life. Though he protested that he was "ill, iller, illest" and "brain dead," intellectual activity continued to give him some relief from his pain.

Halpern occasionally published brief articles, such as "Free Association in 423 B.C." and "The Mother-Killer" in *American Imago*, "Thanatosis: Life's Last Stand" in *Imago*, "A Classical Error in Freud's 'Interpretation of Dreams,' in the *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, as well as impassioned letters to the editor of various publications. Yet, his major writings remain obstinately unpublished at his death. These unpublished manuscripts include *The Passions of Caesar and Christ*, *Caesar as Flamen Dialis*, and "Salvation is from the Jews," as well as materials on genocidal anti-Semitism and the psychology of the Industrial Revolution. In the end he preferred helping other people to getting his own work into print. Psychohistory is poorer for this failure to publish.

Men are most remembered for their personal qualities. Halpern would mentor colleagues, giving freely of himself for extended periods. In a crisis he was readily available and felt most alive. A colleague from Temple remembered Sid "as the kindest man I ever knew as well as the most brilliant and interesting," but was then **quick** to quote a former student's assessment of him as "the most wrongheaded man in the world" on the basis of

his defense of Richard Nixon during Watergate as a Christ-like martyr. Halpern was a natural contrarian, willing to argue any side of any issue, provided it produced thought. More than **anything** else, he enjoyed arguing, intellectual dueling, fencing, probing, and thinking with other people to help spur them and him on. He loved both to put a smile on people's faces and to outrage them, just a bit. Clearly, Halpern was no simple man, but who better than psychohistorians to appreciate this brilliant, erudite, and generous individual in all his complexity.

The life of this son of immigrant Jews from the Russian Empire was shaped by anti-Semitism, the Holocaust, and the creation of Israel on the one **hand** and the idea of liberty on the other. And yet, his concern was always for the individual — how the individual would fare in the world.

Sidney Halpern was buried on Mount Olives in Jerusalem on Bastille Day. Since he noted all anniversaries and was an intellectual revolutionary, some friends enjoyed the coincidence of his internment last July 14. If he were writing this obituary he would be thinking of **puns** and asking what were the deceased person's last words? Though he often quoted Winston Churchill's "I'm bored," his last reported words were the uncharacteristic "What happened?" Since he understood that most last words were fabrications, a loved one **thinks** he would prefer "Invent some famous last words for me!" This psychohistorian is survived by his son Baruch, daughter Nikki of Paris, three granddaughters, his sisters Claire Gold and Miriam Sacks of Philadelphia, and friends he laughed with and mentored. He will be missed.

Baruch Halpern, a classicist like his late father, is professor of Judaic Studies at Pennsylvania State University in College Park where he heads the Judaic Studies Major.

Editor's Note: I met Sidney Halpern in 1968 when we were colleagues at the Ambler Campus of Temple University. As we became friends, he helped me overcome some difficulties I was facing in writing my doctoral dissertation on the workers in the English Industrial Revolution. I then audited his courses in Western Civilization and American History where I learned much about psychoanalysis, Freud, Darwin, Marx, capitalism, and Sidney

Halpern. Under his tutelage, I learned to begin to think psychohistorically.

*One of my last acts at Temple University was to serve on the committee that recommended this talented administrator to be the next director of the Ambler Campus. Helping to write this obituary was a sad duty which brought fond memories of a good friend to mind. **Those wishing to contribute to the Sidney Halpern Award for the "Best Idea in a Published Article or Book in Psychohistory"** should contact the Editor. □*

The Judicious Psychohistory of John Demos

Bob Lentz

Early American historian John P. Demos, this issue's featured Distinguished Psychohistorian, was born in 1937 and received his PhD in 1968 from Harvard University. He has taught at Harvard, Brandeis University (Chairman, Department of History, 1982-84), and Yale University (since 1986), where he is currently Samuel Knight Professor of American History. He was a Fellow at the Chicago Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1973-74, under Heinz Kohut, and served on the Carnegie Council on Children, 1972-77.

*Dr. Demos' books informed-by psychohistory include A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony (Oxford University Press, 1970), Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England (Oxford University Press, 1982), and The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1994). He has twice been a National Book Award Finalist (in History for Entertaining Satan and in Non-Fiction for The Unredeemed Captive). He and his wife, Virginia, a psychologist and therapist, have two children. Dr. Demos ("JD") spoke with us ("CP") from Stockbridge, Massachusetts, where he is on fellowship. His cautious use of psychohistory came **through** in his well-considered responses.*

CP: How do you define psychohistory?

JD: I've always seen it very broadly

and loosely: any careful attempt to apply psychological concepts and methods to problems relating to the life of the past.

CP: Do you regard yourself as a psychohistorian?

JD: At an early stage of my own life as an historian — basically the beginning and mid-sixties through the seventies — I thought of myself as a psychohistorian in a fairly specific way. I spent a good deal of time and effort trying to learn all I could about relevant branches of psychological theory. I spent several years in the sixties studying especially the work of Erikson. And before that, Sigmund Freud himself. I did course work with Erik Erikson — I thought of myself as being something of a disciple of Erikson's. Then in the early to mid-seventies I spent two years as a special student at the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis and came under the influence of Heinz Kohut who was then leading the movement that became known as self-psychology. All the time I was learning these different theoretical systems or points of view I was trying to apply those points of view in my own work in a fairly direct way. After the seventies, certainly since the early to mid-eighties, I have ceased to try to learn more in the general direction of psychoanalytic psychology and to make direct applications of the theories in my work. However, I don't mean in any sense to recant or abjure my previous efforts as a psychohistorian. It's just that to some extent the center of my interests as a historian has shifted and I feel content to let the psychology and psychohistory I've learned and done in the past just percolate into my newer work.

CP: Were there specific reasons that you moved away from directly applying psychology to history?

JD: No, it was more like a drift, rather than a specific turning away. For reasons that have nothing directly to do with psychohistory I have become very centered in the last eight to ten years in my work on problems of historical writing — on the literary aspect of historical work. It just doesn't seem that the language of psychology, psychoanalysis, and psychohistory is conducive to that.

CP: You've written that "public history" should be aimed at and "accessible" to the "educated general reader." And you've referred

to "history as art versus history as science." Will you elaborate on the literary aspect of writing history?

JD: Well, I think there is something of a movement underway now — in which I hope to participate — to sort of reconnect historical scholarship with literature which after all was very much part of the past for historians. During a couple of decades of very fruitful advance in scholarship during the sixties and seventies historians resorted more and more to techniques and methods which required a sort of formalized — and from the standpoint of public and popular perception of their work a more arcane — kind of language. Psychohistory was part of that, as was demographic history, economic history, and even the new political history or political theory. Bridges were being built between historical scholarship as practiced day-by-day by working scholars and other social science disciplines. History was becoming more scientific. But that was all achieved at some loss of access in the more popular kind of readership. It raised questions about the way the words go down on the page. One aspect of the recent movement to reconnect history with literature is surely the hope that we can once again reach a broader audience.

CP: Of which of your works that are psychologically-informed are you most proud?

JD: The most sustained effort I made in psychohistory was my book on witchcraft [*Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England*]. Some chapters were really very heavily infused by psychological — more specifically psychoanalytic — concepts and methods and language. A year ago I had occasion to do a little teaching from the book and I cringed a bit at some of the language in the more fully-developed psychological chapters. But perhaps I achieved a depth there that I could not have achieved without a quite straightforward, explicit use of psychological concepts and terminology.

CP: And your newest book, *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America*?

JD: *The Unredeemed Captive* fully expresses the wishes I said a few minutes ago to go in the direction of a more literary-minded kind of history.

CP: Is it psychologically-informed?

JD: It definitely is. It's the story of a New England Puritan woman who was captured by Indians as a child and never came back, which is why from the standpoint of her New England family she was "unredeemed." There's a key episode in this story where she has a very specific and direct chance to come back to New England and she refuses. An emissary arrives in the Indian village where she's living to make the case for her return. She entirely rebuffs him, mainly by way of remaining almost entirely silent in the face of two hours of entreaties from him. By this time I **think** she's been fully assimilated to Indian life and ways, and that certainly is part of the explanation for her unwillingness to return. But I think there are other parts as well, having to do with complicated and deep feelings she had, especially about her own birth family and her father back in New England.

I thought long and hard about how to present that event in my book and I actually went through a process of trying to understand her position by way of psychoanalytic theory. I wrote a three or four-page analysis of her decision in the concepts and language of psychoanalytic theory. But I never intended to put that directly into the book. It was useful to me as a way of working out a framework, a way of thinking about her situation. I subsequently sat down and completely rewrote it in ordinary, everyday language with no overt trace of the kind of psychoanalytic thinking that I had brought to bear on the problem in the weeks before. So, the book is informed by my long years as a psychohistorian but does not express that experience in a direct way.

CP: How did you come to psychologically-informed history?

JD: I had some inkling from very early on in my graduate training that there was a whole range of historical problems which were psychological in nature and to which historians often **brought** a **kind** of common sense psychology. But that seemed to be often unsatisfactory. Social scientists — anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists — had made a lot out of the family as a target of study, whereas historians to that point had barely noticed it. I felt that a more systematic engagement with an understanding of psychological ideas and theories might be helpful. Specifically, there was the almost serendipitous factor of my being assigned to

write a paper about the history of witchcraft in early America. As I got into that project it seemed to cry out for a kind of psychological approach: why were these people feeling and doing as they were? The really deep and interesting questions were actually psychological ones. It also seemed to me that the numerous previous attempts to treat witchcraft had barely scratched the surface of the psychological dimension. So that made a powerful impression on me, as an opportunity for psychohistory. And, there are other factors, such as my having married in my mid-twenties a psychologist — my wife's influence was very important over a great many years. So, there's no one thing. It's **kind** of a convergence of personal and intellectual experiences.

CP: What impact did Erik Erikson have on you? What is his legacy?

JD: Well, I'm surprised and dismayed by how much Erikson and his work seem to have receded from the consciousness of scholars as a whole. I find that when I mention his name to current groups of graduate students they barely know who he is. And in the work of scholars who are well-past graduate school but not past middle-age, Erikson just doesn't very much appear, at least not in any formal sense. Perhaps it's because Erikson's ideas, for example, the identity crisis, have permeated the culture at large so widely and deeply that we don't identify Erikson's own particular influence anymore. But I don't think there is much attempt anymore to use his ideas in a specific and directed way which was certainly what I did in a section in my first book on the history of early New England family life [*A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony*]. I still feel that that was a useful exercise.

CP: What do you see as the importance of childhood to psychology-applied-to-history?

JD: In so far as formative patterns for **human** experience — adult experience — are laid down in childhood, there can't be any doubt about its importance. The history of childhood is an important sub-field for psychohistorians, just as childhood experiences are important for clinicians. Actually, we've learned quite a lot about the history of childhood — if one could only remember how little we knew about it in 1960, one would feel fairly good about achievements we've made in that direction.

CP: You mentioned studying under Heinz Kohut in Chicago.

JD: Well, I was very struck by Kohut's ideas. I felt a peculiarly close correspondence between his theory that has since been called self-psychology and my particular target of study which was early American Puritans. Puritans were people with really powerful issues around narcissism, the centerpiece of Kohut's work. Perhaps the correspondence between Kohut's theories and other historical issues, other historical periods, may not be nearly so great. But for me, working on the Puritans in the early seventies, Kohut was a revelation and really very important. In many ways my witchcraft book — at least the psychological part of it — is founded on Kohut's work.

CP: What were the roles of Harvard, Brandeis, Yale and other institutions in early applying psychology to history?

JD: Well, I don't **think** there was much academic institutional support in the early days. Any reaction from those institutions to my own growing interest in psychohistory was skeptical. But mid-way through my graduate years at Harvard I stepped off track from the history doctoral program- and took a year in what was then called the Social Relations Department where I mainly studied psychology. That was **thanks** to a fellowship grant from the Social Science Research Council. The SSRC was one institution that was sympathetic to this sort of interdisciplinary enterprise.

The two years, 1973-75, I spent in Chicago were very important and I feel extremely **lucky** to have had the support of the Institute for Psychoanalysis and an organization called the Center for Psychosocial Studies. The Center was truly a brave new effort to marry the interests of psychoanalysts on the one hand and academic social scientists, including historians, on the other. It was a free-standing research institution with support from the Institute, individuals at Chicago-area universities — especially the University of Chicago, and also one or two very generous philanthropists in the Chicago area. I started out as a Research Fellow at the Center and then in my second year I became the Acting Director. It was a very lively place to work and provided institutional as well as intellectual support for what I was doing.

CP: What about individuals at the

universities?

JD: My teachers at Harvard were not particularly favorable to my doing this and, in that, they mirrored the attitude of most established historians at the time.

Most of my colleagues at Brandeis were not primarily interested in psychohistory. The exception is my old friend and colleague, Rudolph Binion, whose interests from a subject standpoint were quite distant from my own. He is an enormously original and valuable Modern European historian whereas I've always been an American historian. But we did intersect a lot around broader questions of psychohistory. We didn't always agree. My own instinct as a psychohistorian was essentially to try and follow the footsteps of one or another of the major theorists, for example, Erikson and Kohut. Rudy Binion's instincts seemed to be to proceed in a much more eclectic and *ad hoc* fashion, borrowing bits and pieces of theory from here and there as he found them useful — even to some extent creating his own theory and positions.

After I moved to Yale in the mid-eighties I felt very fortunate to have Peter Gay as my colleague. Peter is now by any standard one of the leading practitioners and defenders of psychohistory through a whole variety of writings. To have been at all close to Peter these last nine to ten years has been a reminder of how much is still to be gained from the psychohistorical viewpoint.

CP: You earlier acknowledged your wife, Virginia, who is a therapist and a psychologist. How has being married to her affected your work?

JD: Well, there're so many ways. First, and most specifically, as an adviser and critic on specific projects of mine. That was probably most important of all in the early years when I was working in a very directly psychological and psychoanalytic vein. More broadly, I think just the close, everyday contact with her own life and effective work as both a clinician and a developmental psychologist has meant a lot. Virginia has for quite a number of years now made the work of Silvan Tomkins central to her own research and clinical work. Tomkins is the leading theorist about emotion in recent years. His theory of the primary affects — primary emotions — has been important to me through Virginia's work. It had a direct place in my

witchcraft book and other things I've written as well. Although most of my interest and activity as a psychohistorian has been by way of psychoanalysis, Tomkins has been different — **basically a non-psychoanalytic** theory which I also found important. And I always assumed, by the way, that a psychohistorian could, and probably should, seek out other methods and approaches than the strictly psychoanalytic ones. For example, I am surprised at how little effort historians have made — even family historians like myself — to engage seriously with family systems theory which is one of the major new trends in psychological theorizing over the last 20 or 25 years. That's a theory which should be applicable to a variety of material from history, especially family history.

CP: What has been your experience with teaching history-informed-by-psychology?

JD: That's something I tried to do off and on for close to 25 years, mostly at the level of advanced undergraduate courses or graduate courses. Any cross-disciplinary course like that is hard to do within the framework of an academic term. It necessitates engagement with two separate disciplines plus finally an effort to bring them together somehow into a fruitful interaction. One issue that I feel up against every time is how to give the students in the course a sufficient kind of baptism, so to speak, in psychological theory, or psychological theories, so that they can start to be effective as psychohistorians. I take the first several weeks of a course and give the students a quick immersion in psychological theory, mainly psychoanalytic theory. It's difficult, it's challenging. But I always enjoy it and feel it's worth doing, I just always come out feeling sort of exhausted.

CP: What psychological training should a person entering the field today pursue?

JD: In my own experience, it was a combination of three things: I certainly did a lot of reading on my own before I ever took any course work. But then I did feel it would be valuable to take course work and I did that in my year in the Social Relations Department at Harvard and at the Institute for Psychoanalysis in Chicago. The most important kind of training that I got as an aspiring psychohistorian was actually by way of participation in clinical conferences at the Institute. There really is no substitute for listening to experienced clinicians

talk about clinical material. I do **think** that the fundamental analogy that we have to make as psychohistorians is from clinical psychology.

CP: What about personal analysis?

JD: Well, that was certainly an important part of my own life, too. I cannot say that I went into analysis mainly for intellectual reasons — I think I went into it mainly for personal reasons. But I really can't imagine having attempted this sort of work without **having** some personal experience with it. I **think** it's a combination of personal analysis and participation in clinical case conferences that's made me feel confident about working this way.

CP: In *Entertaining Satan* you describe your multi-dimensional approach — "the four corners of one scholar's compass, four viewpoints" — biography, psychology, sociology, and history. How do you regard your multi-dimensional approach today? Is it the approach of choice for the historian researching and writing over, say, the next decade?

JD: Well, I **think** one could mix and match, work other disciplines into the mix. But, really, the main point that I was trying to make there is that I've always seen psychohistory as not a separate discipline or sub-discipline set apart, but rather as a piece of a much larger package I call "social history." I've always thought that if I had to pin one label to myself I would say "social historian." In my work as a psychohistorian I always saw myself as operating in *a* part of my way of operating as a social historian — but not the only part. I was always distressed with what I saw as a kind of counter-tendency in some other psychohistorians to sort of segregate the effort of psychohistory from other parts of history and to give it a special status. It seems to me it fits in quite well in fact with other parts of our activity as historians. □

The Rupture of Innocence: Oklahoma City, April 19, 1995

(Continued from page 1)

sion. I gave our difference of inference no thought, dismissed it, and resumed typing. (Was I "in denial," I later asked myself; that is, was I trying to assimilate the new, the alarming, to something familiar and comforting?) Within only minutes the piercing shriek of sirens filled

the air — a sound that soon would rally, characterize, and later **haunt** all of Oklahoma City.

Later that morning I drove to my office at the Family Medicine Center, a building on the Health Sciences Center about 1¹/₂ miles northeast of downtown. The traffic was more characteristic of Manhattan, New York City, than any rush hour or traffic jam I had seen in my eighteen years in Oklahoma. As I passed the blood bank there were already hundreds of donors patiently standing in line to give blood. I did not drive in to "do" anything in particular; I was not a certified clinician of any kind. Still, I wanted to be with other faculty, residents and interns. Maybe "being with" them, sitting and listening, was a kind of doing, a bearing witness and emotional catharsis, and a sense-making of it together. We sat in numerous small, dense groups, watched the TV, spoke little. Being there together was itself a kind of assurance and comfort.

For the next several days at least, countless cultural rules that had reigned supreme in ordinary times and dominated clinical conversation were abruptly changed, in fact, dropped. The endless drone of faculty meetings devoted to cost containment, to attracting young and **healthy** patients, to institutional economic survival, and to fierce economic combat between hospitals or alliances of hospitals, for a few weeks gave way to an almost welcome generosity of giving that has long been the signature of Oklahomans in the face of disaster. We spoke for a while as mere, vulnerable people, not as roles and functions. In the cavernous but austere new Family Medicine Center where scotch tape had been strictly forbidden on any walls or doors, and where to hang up anything on a "common" hallway wall required the assent of the CEO, ribbons (yellow, blue, purple) began to appear everywhere. Televisions sprang up everywhere in the Center, broadcasting the events far beyond the office or module of the TV's owner. It was as if everyone knew how and when and where to suspend our conventional cultural values.

At the same time, during the first hours after the disaster, when the explosion was finally traced to a car or truck bomb made of ammonium nitrate and fuel oil (staples of prairie life), certain phrases came to be made recurrently by news reporters and by people downtown: "Terror Hits Home"; "Terror Hits

the Heartland"; Oklahoma's "Loss of Innocence." In the midst of the event itself the effort to make sense of it, and of the violent emotions unleashed by it, already began to take place and shape. Before the explosion had even a chance to cast a shadow in the morning, it already began to slip into the work of myth and legend. Radio and television reporters at the scene often waxed maudlin and voyeuristic. The prospect of finding live or dead children in the building's day care center became the obsession of many who were covering the event. Innocence and its violation, from children to Oklahoma and the prairie, and to the American sanctuary of blessed anachronism, became the central theme as the event began to become history.

Several days later, I drove to a police and National Guard barricade a few blocks north of the bombed-out building and the shattered glass. I stared in dry-mouthed horror of the sight. No television picture (black and white, or color) or photograph of any size could approximate the sight of blackened, hollow sockets where offices and windows and living people had been. The scale was appalling. My own disbelief joined that of my fellow Oklahomans. What I saw was supposed to be confined to the bedtime work of nightmares, of bad, never-remembered dreams, and to foreign countries.

Soon, though, my own thoughts and feelings took a different direction from that of newscasters and most of the people whom they interviewed. I was less interested in focusing on the detective-work aimed at identifying who did the bombing. I wondered instead about how Oklahomans would try to make sense of what happened and what was happening.

Before our very eyes and ears, the event of the explosion was almost immediately swallowed up in legend to make sense of it, and to diminish Oklahomans' anxieties: (1) a focus on potentially dead and endangered children in the Federal Building's day care center, and on the innocence of children; (2) the hope of finding a miraculous pocket, a cavern in the rubble, made by falling debris, and into which many people could find sanctuary; (3) the "violation of innocence," of a building, of a city, a state, a region, a nation; and (4) the search for outsiders who did the unforgivable terrorizing act.

Two group imaginations were and remain constantly entwined: Oklahomans **thinking** about themselves, ourselves, and about America, also ourselves; and Americans outside Oklahoma **thinking** about themselves, ourselves, and about Oklahoma. Clearly, Oklahoma plays a vital, if often unspoken, role in the American imagination. And in every phrase, every metaphor, there is always more than meets the eye.

That "more" is often unpleasant, unwelcome cultural truth.

Consider the notion of "innocence" and of innocence violated. One need not be a rocket scientist or a classical Freudian to discern the sexual allusion in innocence lost: an innocence that is vigilantly kept up as the religious, political, familial, and moral facade that masks deed that are forbidden to be put into words. Oklahomans humbly pride themselves as being a kind of buckle in the Bible Belt, yet Oklahoma is also high in teenage pregnancy, wife-beating, child-beating, and family-related child-death, all conducted "behind closed doors" of family inviolability and privacy. There is a disingenuous protest **quality** ("'**They,**' not 'we,' do this heinous kind of thing.") to the outrage against outsiders who would dare harm our children. The terrorism that cannot be publicly discussed, the terrorism that begins at home but cannot be labeled as such, is now safely displaced onto and focused in outside terrorists. If Oklahomans cannot, even dare not, squarely face the disparity between professed family values and actual deeds, Americans everywhere, too, can ill afford to acknowledge let alone rectify these contradictions and ambivalences in Oklahoma or elsewhere. Not far behind innocence's assertion and protest lies a rage that in turn covers shame and guilt, the dread of exposure. Response and responsibility in the shadow of the bombing are no simple or merely local matter.

Whatever else "heartland" connotes and condenses into a single image, it is the heart, the last frontier and remnant of honest sentiment and close, cooperative community, an island of caring and giving in a national sea of callousness and indifference. Oklahoma's reputed "loss of innocence" is equally America's loss of innocence as it (that is, we as a nation) is embodied by and deposited in the idealization of the prairie, the Great Plains, its families, its espoused values, its official wholesomeness, its burden of history.

Consider, as an example of Oklahoma's role in national fantasy, the following letter by Jan Edry in Acton, Massachusetts, published in the May 3 edition of *The Daily Oklahoman*, page 6:

Dear friends in Oklahoma, You are our hearts before they became hardened by the city and by life. You are our trust before it was violated. You are our smiles before they became a rarity. You are our warmth and **humanity** before we became cold and unmerciful.

To us, you are our bread. You are the drawl that we, with our Boston accents, would love to have. You are cowboy hats and boots, barbecues, square dancing and beautiful open country beneath a vast, starry sky. You are a musical.

You are hay bales and barn raisings. You are our neighbors and friends and represent all that we would like to be if given the chance. We love you.

You are us, OKC. We grieve deeply for your loss. We are there with you and will continue to be until your loss — our loss — is atoned.

A more poignant expression of how cultural geography plays a personified, even bodily, role in local, regional, and national fantasy could hardly be imagined.

"Heartland" and "innocence," too, cannot be understood apart from the intense love-hate attitude toward authority Oklahomans have had since pre-statehood territorial days. Beneath, or alongside, political and religious conservatism, is a proud "rebel" streak, a defiance of authority — even by authorities! A punitive enough conscience is also one eager for a moral holiday — and for a pretext to take it. Several years ago, many Oklahoma county commissioners went to jail for violating the law in behalf of their fierce localism. For many Oklahomans, Oliver North is a culture-hero. Early in the state's history, the Ozark mountains and the western grasslands hid many of the nation's most notorious, and secretly admired, outlaws.

Certainly this anger at authority, especially authority defined as "external" (from bankers to the federal government), did not alone "cause" the April 19 bombing of the

Federal Building, but neither is it mere historical background. It is a nutrient, as in a petrie dish, where rage toward "outside government" can grow and thrive in the sacred name of American self-reliance. And it is part of the deeper meaning of "innocence" in the heartland.

The April 19 bombing now joins the Nazi Holocaust, the American atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the mass suicides in Jonestown, Guyana (1978) and Waco, Texas (1993), and the mass casualties of catastrophic fires, floods, tornadoes, political purges, hurricanes, expulsions, earthquakes, and exterminations in their impossible taxing of the imagination to absorb the mere fact of the scale. As a horrific natural experiment, it helps us to comprehend better the nature and experience of personal and collective trauma, to discern what is local and what is universal. It is as if the best we can comprehend is that *numbers* died, not people. Yet "even" nearly 170 is too vast to be grasped as personal. The flight from our own unconscious destructiveness and helplessness **thus** characterizes **both** those who do the actual destroying and the rest of us who strain to understand and emotionally hold onto what took place and how many died and were injured. Depersonalization and dehumanization are as much the emotional property of those who survive and mourn as those who bomb, kill, and maim.

The issue of "innocence" takes still another dimension. Media reporters, health care workers, rescue and recovery firefighters, policemen and policewomen, clergy, and the wider public focused throughout the ordeal on injured, dead, or trapped infants and children in the Federal Building's second floor day care center. This almost exclusive focus of attention and horror on the plight of infants and children is a variation on the theme of innocence and violation. It is as if we Oklahomans were identifying mostly, if not exclusively, with (and as) the victimized infants and children. The victimizers became a symbolic conflation of big government, bad government, outsiders, and fanatic military cults: all authority becomes suspect, unable to protect or rescue the abandoned children, those in the building, and the rest of us by virtue of our identifications. Repulsed by the thought of being at the mercy of a hostile, alien, capricious outer world, we Oklahomans, imagining ourselves to be a

community of young siblings in a murderous family, "circle the wagons" and take care of our own in a manner second to none in the nation. But, in the near future, the impaired, symptomatic, injured, and suffering, and those who later will suffer from emotional, psychosomatic, family, work-accident, and other problems traceable to the trauma of the bombing (and its rekindling of earlier, repressed, dissociated, and split-off personal trauma), will be seen and shunned as outsiders. Those who yesterday were "us" will be ritually manufactured into a disowned "them," as part of a paranoid style of mourning this incalculable loss of group boundary and the sense of safety it provided. A vast cultural change of heart is required for the outreach, the support, the listening, and the sheer offering of time to be mustered far down the prairie road.

Psychohistory is, among other things, the study of the interplay between what fateful events do to us; what they unleash in us as memory, as feeling, and as deed; what we do with them once they have occurred; and what we do to give fate its theater. The events on and following April 19, 1995, become even more unbearably tragic as we begin to discern unconscious links between abstract political platforms and incendiary slogans that call for "less government," political doctrines that brand the federal government as especially vile, and public deeds that draw from suggestion and suggestibility to make metaphor concrete, literally to realize the symbolic.

In Sophocles' account, King Oedipus blinded himself once he had seen his deed. It remains to be seen whether we — as Oklahoma Cityans, as Oklahomans, as prairie folk, as Americans — can bear the scope and scale of what doesn't happen here, but did.

Howard Stein is a psychoanalytic anthropologist at the University of Oklahoma. He is author of The Culture of Oklahoma (1993) and co-editor of Maps from the Mind: Readings in Psychogeography (1989).

Editor's Note: On April 21 I spoke with Howard and he agreed to write this article for Clio's Psyche. Subsequently the IPA arranged with Howard for an article in its newsletter which appeared first. Thus, Howard has written two related but different articles on the tragedy in Oklahoma City. □

Free Associations: Violence in Our Midst

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College

The O.J. Simpson Trial: As I write these words, I am vacationing at Paradise Lake Estates, a beautiful, perfectly-contained community in Florida. One hundred and sixty-two, separate, air-conditioned homes, with manicured lawns and grapefruit, lemon and lime trees, surrounding a picture-book, man-made lake. The garage floors and most of the driveways are painted pastel colors. I am sitting by the lovely swimming pool looking out at the lake. The palm and flowering trees sway over my head and the birds sing their songs and fly past. When I turn my head I see the security gate.

The guards, smiling to the residents and their guests, are protectors of this tropical Garden of Eden. Security's job is to keep out the annoyances and the evils of the world: to exclude the casual strangers, salespeople, burglars, muggers, rapists, and murderers who might want to enter. The guards are assisted by an eight-foot high, tree-and-shrub-covered wall surrounding this oasis, as well as a moat which doubles as a drainage canal.

Whenever I turn on the television news or the car radio I am reminded that the rest of the world is less idyllic than our friends' home and community in which we are staying for a week. The radio focuses on crime and punishment: Colin Ferguson's sentencing for randomly shooting non-African American commuters on the Long Island Railroad, the trial of the stepmother in a nearby town charged with killing her ten-year-old stepson, but mostly the O.J. Simpson Trial. I have my choice of stations on which I can listen to "THE TRIAL."

The station we listen to claims to provide continuous coverage of the Trial — a radio smorgasbord of gossip and comedy, interspersed with so called "experts" on the law. A female commentator takes the "O.J. must be innocent" position and interprets all evidence in this light, while the male host assures the audience of the famous man's guilt. The callers are asked to "rate the actors" (witnesses) on the basis of their performance and credibility. The

radio personality then defends his referring to witnesses as "actors" on the grounds that radio is an entertainment medium. Ad-libbed comments and voice-overs are used to keep the audience entertained and tuned in to "WJNO — 1230 on the dial."

Why has the O.J. Simpson trial become the most-watched event since the Gulf War? Why is it on television when we return from any afternoon's pastime, whether shopping or drinking margaritas at the Banana Boat Restaurant on the intercostal waterway? Our friends work long hard days, yet they make time for this "mega media" event (What a strange term!). What does it offer viewers? What do we as psychohistorians say about it?

My own experience in studying the emotions of the Gulf War led me to realize the incredible importance of our feeling connected to each other by following some major media event. The Simpson case is doing this for America in 1994-95. Discussing the trial brings Americans together as nothing else — until the Oklahoma City bombing or some other catastrophe displaces it.

But why? Is the national focus because a sports and media celebrity has fallen and faces life in prison? Because a black man is accused of killing a white woman? Is it to see the best legal talent money and the spotlight can buy look inadequate to the task one day and brilliant the next? To see a white, female prosecutor in action in the mostly male world of lawyers? To see if the Los Angeles Police Department will be acquitted or convicted (in the Court of Public Opinion) of racism and sloppy evidence handling? To see if a jury (at my last count) of eight blacks, one Hispanic and three whites — of nine women and three men — can find an African American celebrity and wife-beater guilty of killing his white ex-spouse and her white friend?

There is a vast cast of "actors" in the Trial for the prosecution and the defense, as well as the hangers-on waiting for their fifteen minutes of fame. On the verge of a mistrial, Judge Lance Ito, mocked even by a United States Senator, struggles to play the role of a "tough judge" for which he is poorly cast.

Meanwhile, back at Florida's Paradise Lake Estates, the self-appointed head of the Pool Committee comes around to straighten the lounge chairs. His glance reveals a resentment

of anyone who would spoil the symmetry of the row of unused chairs by using them for **sunbathing**. A man vacuums — yes, vacuums rather than sweeps — his driveway, while another complains about the ducks, who pay no property taxes or rent, leaving their droppings around without shame. The only danger within paradise appears to be the alligator who allegedly lives in the lake and will devour any swimmer or small creature available. Pet owners are careful to walk their animals on a leash. I ask people I meet if they have seen, with their own eyes, the alligator and they all say no, but they are positive it lurks in the lake. Fear of the unseen alligator certainly keeps most people in line.

But the primary danger cannot lurk within this perfect man-made paradise! With their high walls, stand of trees, security guards and moat to protect them, Americans can't be vulnerable. The danger must be outside! But maybe it is inside, like the unseen alligator. After all, Simpson's dead, ex-wife Nicole Brown also had a beautiful, gated compound, but within she was an abused and isolated wife, and ultimately a murder victim. There is a relationship between our spending so much time wanting to feel safe within our homes and communities while focusing on violence outside.

We are the same people who paid to see the former gang member and inmate of the San Francisco Youth Guidance Center (reform school) tear through a line of **hulking** football players as we watched his number "32" **run** down the sidelines to score touchdown after touchdown. We also paid millions to see O.J. in *The Killer Force*, *Firepower*, *The Towering Inferno*, *The Klansman*, *Naked Gun 2 ½*, *Naked Gun 33 ½*, and other movies.

Why are we now more intrigued by his present role? Maybe the difference is that O.J. is paying instead of being paid. No longer satisfied with Hollywood scripts or even docudrama, we want the real thing. But O.J.'s lawyers do not trust him to play himself on the witness stand. Nicole Brown has given her final performance and will never testify, except for reruns of her desperate calls to 911.

We watch the trial for many reasons. There is our need for some danger to make our lives more interesting since we live in dull safety (though we do like to worry) in places

like Paradise Lake Estates, suburbia, and high-rise buildings with doormen and complex security systems. We may identify with O.J., the celebrity on trial fighting for his life, freedom, and reputation, or with the victims, Nicole Brown and Ronald Goldman.

The beautiful enclosed community in juxtaposition to the Trial is a metaphor for the situation of America and our problems of violence. There is much attention to the Simpson estates, to the compounds which were designed to keep good things in and bad things out but failed because the primary threat to the well-being of the occupants was within. We would like the enemy — the problem of violence and murderous rage — to be without but the enemy is in fact within our homes and within ourselves. It was most upsetting to many people that they would not be able to blame some foreign terrorists for the terrible destruction in Oklahoma since, once again, the danger came from within.

Law as therapy: Whenever something terrible happens someone says "there ought to be a law against that." Politicians react to the outcry and start the legislative process. There are many laws applicable to the terrible bombings in Oklahoma City. After the Bombing we will end up with more laws. But these after-the-fact laws will only be applicable to future tragedies.

Laws need to be enforced, not just passed. The dust had not settled at the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building, when the Attorney General called for the death sentence. The President's call for "swift and certain" justice was the right tone to avert vigilantism.

Are there any good books or articles on the psychology and therapeutic impact of law and the underlying legislative process? The legislative process is about helping people feel less frightened. However, is feeling better, better law? I doubt it. I always try to keep in mind a basic rule of psychohistory I learned a generation ago: *Problems are forgotten more often than they are solved as our emotional needs and focus change.* And laws, too, are forgotten.

I suspect passing laws is a less intrusive step than building more jails, which, in most cases, I oppose. Jails take troubled young people and train them to be criminals for the next 20-30 years. And the recent slaughter of

100,000s of Rwandans after the terrorist assassination of the Rwandan president reminds me that there may be some advantage to our legislative processes to help us deal with the difficult feelings following a catastrophe. Our **fury** is much more constrained as we talk of new laws. Talking gives us time — time to heal.

Hate Radio: In the wake of the Oklahoma Bombing, our President provokes a debate, for the first time, on talk radio. "Anger on the Airwaves" was the name of an unpublished article I started writing in the second half of the 1980s. The occasion was my own frustration and anger at the replacement of calm, reasonable talk radio hosts with angry, opinionated individuals such as Bob Grant, Jay Diamond, Gordon Liddy, and Rush Limbaugh. Whereas the older hosts sought to inform and educate, the newer ones sought to denounce and ridicule. The day after the Oklahoma City explosion I tuned in the radio to the station dominated by these hatemongers and found they were true to form as they sought to blame it all on foreigners and advocated tougher U.S. immigration laws and their enforcement. As the domestic roots of the Oklahoma blast became apparent, these angry talk show radio hosts saw the right-wing militia movement as an ally to be protected against liberals like Clinton rather than as a breeding ground for fanatics like Timothy J. McVeigh.

Infanticide in America: When ideals of motherhood clashed with a suspicious situation 25 ago, denial reigned supreme as five times in a row police accepted a mother's story of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, as baby after baby died mysteriously in the crib in a small town in New York State. When finally confronted by a prosecutor, Mrs. Waneta Hoyt told of smothering the infants with a pillow because she could not stand the crying and was sentenced to a long prison term. Today there are child abuse hot lines that distraught mothers can call, yet the support mothers get in raising children is certainly less than it was 25 years ago when there were more two parent families and grandparents able to help.

Infanticide did not stop a quarter century ago in America. Ten years ago a baby was rescued from death by exposure in a trash dumpster behind the gas station I stopped at every week in the lovely suburb of Teaneck, New Jersey. Her college-student mother had

sought to get rid of her in sub-zero weather. Last year the country was mesmerized by the plea of Susan Smith for the return of her two young sons, who were allegedly carjacked by a black man. It was revealed that she had killed them both, apparently to please her boyfriend who did not want to be bothered with young children. And, while infanticide is alive **and well in America, millions of our countrymen have** come to identify so intensely with recently conceived fetuses that they engender a climate conducive to the harassment and even killing of doctors who would perform abortions.

The Denigration of the Presidency: Last November the Republican victory was part of the white male backlash against the strong federal government, affirmative action, the current administration, and politicians in Washington. After election day the nation then acted as if Newton Leroy Gingrich was President rather than William Jefferson Clinton. But what is most amazing, precisely as Gingrich and the Republicans completed their first 100 days, in which they overwhelmingly succeeded in achieving their legislative goals, is that Americans remembered (talk about the return of repressed memories!) that their actual President is from Arkansas rather than Georgia. If by some chance the Speaker of the House should at some future date replace our current President, we would still have a Southern, draft-dodging, pot-sniffing, cigar-smoking, career politician in the White House. But would our society focus so on these negatives then?

The blast in Oklahoma helped to bring the country back to its reality as it "galvanized national attention on the man in the Oval Office in a way that was routine during the Cold War (*New York Times*, May 7, 1995, p. 30)." We have once again rallied around the flag. Though we might prefer a foreign enemy, a domestic one does prompt Americans to focus more on our actual President and allow him to actually lead — for awhile. But as soon as Clinton has a "winning streak," the Whitewater accusations come back into public focus. The denigration of our presidents, especially this one, seems endless.

Violence in Our Midst: This article has been about a variety of subjects revolving around America's violence and need for enemies. If our country can't have foreign enemies than domestic enemies will have to do. It is about the enormous violence in our midst,

a violence we would rather externalize. Domestically, the violence we would rather localize in African American and Hispanic ghettos keeps spilling into our lives because it is within us, regardless of our skin color. The O.J. Simpson trial is a reflection of our voyeuristic need to dwell on mayhem and our fascination with the law. Our legal system, which many feel has little relationship to justice, is all the rage in the current era. We psychohistorians would do well to probe deeply what unconscious needs "law and disorder" and the judiciary serve. □

Schindler's List: Lawton Responds to Kren

**Henry Lawton
Group for the Psychohistorical
Study of Film**

George Kren is a fine scholar so it is with regret that I take issue with his comments [in *Clio's Psyche*, March, 1995] on my abbreviated analysis of *Schindler's List* published in the June, 1994, issue of this publication. Though I am well aware that the film was based on a true story, my ideas about it are derived from what I saw on the screen. I see this film more as an unconscious communication, rather **than an historical** document. The conditions in Poland are not the point. Of course, they were horrible beyond imagination. The film touches on this, but, as Kren points out, it is "sanitized."

I agree with the Kansas State University professor that Schindler acted out of narcissistic motivation, but I remain unconvinced that he was "overcome with revulsion over the Nazi cultivation of death." This is not evident from the film itself, though I have not consulted the historical record. In this film I saw no altruist at work. Schindler's interest in his workers was narcissistically paternal, he cared for them because they were his pawns that he gleefully used to outwit the stupid Nazis at every turn, ven to the point of insisting on the necessity of children for certain tasks. Kren says that my view that Schindler's workers accepted exploitation to stay alive is "utterly untenable." Why? If he is right, then why do the workers thank Schindler at the end of the film, and why does he not understand the reasons for their gratitude? There are incidents where workers

come to him in the hopes of joining his work force or getting a relative in it. This is not because they love the man, but because it is a chance to make it through and survive the Kingdom of Death! Does this film actually focus upon "the real Schindler?" I do not know, indeed this uncertainty was one of the film's more profound aspects. The viewer is forced to confront many very deep and profound moral questions in trying to figure out who Schindler is and the motives for his actions.

Unless one accepts the idea that creative productions, such as film, can have only one meaning, why can't this film be, among many other things, a fantasy apology for modern capitalism? Films have many fantasy meanings simultaneously that are often obscured in the service of unconsciously communicating shared fantasy content (see the "Film Issue" of the *Journal of Psychohistory*, vol 20#1 (Summer 1991) for further elaboration). Whatever else he was, Schindler was a capitalist in the worst sense of the word. He did not come to Poland to save Jews, he wanted to make money and he was not overly concerned about how he did it! He is a symbol of capitalism run amok. Clearly, George Kren and I see this film very differently. But the fact that this film can be seen as a fantasy of our modern capitalist world, in no way diminishes its power as a story of the Holocaust that raises many profound moral and ethical questions that have nothing to do with capitalism.

Henry Lawton is Director of the Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film and author of The Psyehohistorian's Handbook. 0

Karen Horney's Search for Self-Understanding

Harry Keyishian
Fairleigh Dickinson University-Madison

Bernard Paris' biography *Karen Horney: A Psychoanalyst's Search for Self Understanding* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), deals with a powerful **thinker** and practitioner whose influence is far greater than her reputation. Born Karen Danielson, Horney (1885-1952) entered analysis with Karl Abraham in 1910, became a founding member of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Association in

1920, and in the 1920s published a number of essays that developed away from orthodox Freudian theory, especially as regards feminine **psychology** and the concept of "penis envy." She emigrated to the United States in 1932, became associate director of the Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute in 1933 (at the invitation of Franz Alexander), and relocated in 1934 to become a member of the New York Psychoanalytic-Institute. As her disagreements with Freudian theory widened, antagonism towards her grew within the movement, and in 1941 she broke away completely to found the American Institute for Psychoanalysis. She developed her ideas in a series of studies published in the 1930s and 40s that culminated in *Neurosis and Human Growth* (1950).

A Professor of English at the University of Florida, Paris has in a series of books championed Horney's theories as a powerful tool for the analysis of literature, culture and biography. Robert C. Tucker's *Stalin in Power, 1928-1941* exemplifies the method he uses. Here, Paris draws upon previous biographies, fresh documents, and conceptual breakthroughs to present the fullest picture we are likely to get for a long while of Horney's life and thought. In addition to providing a clear exposition of her ideas, he also subjects Horney to a Horneyian analysis, finding a wealth of autobiographical detail in her writings about her fictitious patient Clare. The results are fascinating, if not always pretty.

For Horney, neurotic individuals adopt interpersonal strategies of defense early on to deal with psychologically unfavorable conditions: they become expansive, dependent, or aloof (depending *compulsively* on aggression, love or independence as solutions to their problems). Internally, they waste psychic energies in the development of idealized selves" to shield against feelings of inadequacy. Horney stresses being responsive to experience rather than sticking to one defensive solution or another, urges the nourishment of the "real" self that represents authentic growth, and proposes an optimistic view of human nature as governed by a yearning for self-fulfillment.

Paris' research shows that Horney's insights were born of a process of intense personal struggle. While on the one hand displaying admirable courage in developing her theories in an often hostile environment, she

herself could become autocratic and capricious in authority. She had disastrous relations with men in part because of self-contradictory urges: she wanted them simultaneously to be supportive (dependent) and commanding (crudely forceful). Seeking to satisfy unstable demands, she entered many destructive relationships, sometimes with younger colleagues like Erich Fromm (with whom she eventually quarreled) and sometimes, to her discredit, with candidates at her Institute, whose emotional lives she frequently devastated. While presenting this dubious personal legacy in **unblinking** detail, however, Paris makes the case for Horney as an individual of powerful ideas and insights who used her struggle to gain deeper insights into herself and her patients. The power of her ideas entitles her to a greater cultural presence than she has, and Paris' book may help her gain it.

*Harry Keyishian, Professor of **English** at Fairleigh Dickinson University and Editor of Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, has a long standing interest in Horney. He is a prolific author who has published on Karen Horney's view of vindictiveness and many other subject& U*

Funding Psychohistory: An Interview with John Caulfield

Paul H. Elovitz

*Editor's Note: I recently discussed funding psychohistory at considerable length over several sessions with John Blakley Vincent Caulfield, Director of Fund Development and Executive Director of the Foundation for the Center for Family Services in West Palm Beach, Florida. After devoting his career to other aspects of public service, he became a public sector funding specialist in 1987. Although my interests are mainly the Psychohistory Forum and Clio's Psyche, many of his ideas and methods should be helpful to other psychohistory and humanitarian projects. Caulfield, Professor Melvin Kalfus of Boca Raton, Florida, Dr. Mena Potts of Wintersville, Ohio, and Jerome Wolf of Larchmont, New York, have agreed to serve on the Advisory Council of the Forum and this **publication** to*

help set the direction of organizational development.

Psychohistory has been enormously successful in the last 30 years in developing a new way of looking at the world. We have done a fair job of institutionalizing our gains in periodical publications and a variety of non-profit organizations. Yet the field has not been especially successful in building a financial base to further its growth. When I asked John Caulfield, to advise us on what we should do to raise money for the Psychohistory Forum, Clio's Psyche, and all the important work we do, he started out by clarifying the terminology. "I am not a fund raiser, but rather, a director of development. I develop ways of raising funds." He went on to say that although he raises funds himself, most of his work entails teaching others how to raise funds since "They have the connections, I don't. What *you* have to do is to get together certain people in your group, as an Advisory Council, and say to them that 'this is the way to take the lead in raising funds.' Perhaps," he continued, "with this interview I can help you begin the process."

I felt uneasy. As an intellectual, I prefer not having to deal with the business aspects of psychohistory. I do not like asking people for money. Nor do I like asking them to raise money. Furthermore, most members of the Forum are even less adept at fund raising than I am and they have far less incentive than I have to get involved. I thought of a colleague and friend who left a marvellous psychohistory program at a major university precisely because an important part of his leadership job was fund raising. I heard myself saying, "I am concerned at your suggestion that it is my job to get the members to raise funds since our typical members are quite busy. They are busy therapists, professors, social workers, and business people who often barely have time to attend meetings. And," I continued, "we have the special problem of half of our membership being at a distance outside of the greater New York area."

John Caulfield jolted me out of my pessimistic frame of mind when he asked, "For what does the Forum need money?" I heard my voice hesitate and then respond, "To support Clio's Psyche, for a modern computer, to support our research groups, and to increase our membership and impact." This Director of

Development would not let me off the hook when I denied knowing exactly how much we needed and in what priority. By the time of our third meeting I was able to give him the following specifics. Our immediate goal is \$4,000 to cover the printing of longer issues of *Clio's Psyche* and its distribution to a larger group of people to build its readership. We need \$3,100 to pay for a modern computer and fax/modem system which would put us on the Internet and include a laser printer. In addition, \$1,100 would pay the legal and accounting costs to make the Forum a tax-deductible organization. A yet-to-be-determined amount would pay for a direct mail promotion to significantly increase the number of our members and subscribers. Subsequently, we also need to hire a part-time executive director to take on more of the ever-increasing administrative work of the group. There are some weeks in which I feel the work of the Forum is almost a full-time job.

"Now I have some data so I can be more helpful to the Forum," Caulfield commented. "Since you have accomplished the first step of spelling out the organization's financial needs the next step is to let all the members know these needs. Down the road," he continued,

"

someone will say, 'Well, I can **think** of something,' or they may find a grant for you or even make a donation themselves." He went on to say that in his experience, when a group is doing important work "someone will get the money from somewhere." They will let the needs be known when they are talking with their friends and their associates. Most of the time, these needs may fall on deaf ears, but every once in a while you will find that one donor, who will say, "Maybe I can help you out." or "Maybe I can assist you in finding money." He stressed that if our members have on their minds the idea that help is needed in order for this group to progress, ultimately it will through their efforts. If members realize that the work of the group is, besides presenting seminars and writing articles, papers and books, "to find the where withal in order to continue these things, they will do it. Your members and their friends will be your best fund raisers."

Caulfield went on to say that we need to find assistance in identifying grants and then applying for them. His advice was to go to the Foundation Center in New York City, read some of the literature on fund raising, and for me and

other members to speak to the development director at colleges or hospitals to get some advice and counselling. We should ask them because they know the means of getting money from corporations and foundations. He added, "All this takes considerable time and effort so you will need to find someone who has the time to do the research." I asked if there was any likelihood of getting a volunteer grantsman. "I doubt it," was his response, "because the grant writers themselves are looking to earn a living so they do little charitable work writing grants." Caulfield asked if I could tap into any group of students in the College who could gain credits from working with me doing research and writing grants. This brought to mind a terrific student doing an independent study research project with me. I determined to ask both the student and my Associate Dean to work out the details.

The question I then presented was how to approach corporations and foundations for funding. Would they be interested in psychohistory and would a psychohistorical grant make it past the outside readers? Both Caulfield and I agreed that the best prospect of success in approaching these outside sources was with applied psychohistory that addressed a concrete problem. Examples of applied psychohistory that come to mind are research projects studying millennial thoughts and actions in the militia movements in USA, the impact of Caesarian births on personality, the role of cults in modern American life, and the probable impact of millennial thought associated with the year 2000 on the last Presidential Election of this century. For large research grants, John indicated that some overhead costs of the Forum could be built in as should **funding** for a part-time grants writer.

Caulfield stressed that to get funding, from inside or outside sources, it is essential to work out an explicit budget. I explained that since we had always kept precise financial records, it was not a big problem to develop a budget. He thinks the time necessary for developing the budget would be well spent. "It should not be a skimpy one," he warned. "You can kill yourself getting a grant and then find out that the grant is just not enough money to get the job done. You might just as well ask for the amount that you really need." I agreed that, given the habits of frugality we have developed in running the Forum, it would be very easy to

underestimate expenses. He went on to say that besides being quite specific regarding the costs, we need to explain exactly what we are about and the special expertise that we can bring to the subject. We must **be equally** concrete **on** the materials we want to produce **and** what the benefits will be in terms of increased knowledge, publications, and problems solved.

"You mentioned Clio's Psyche as one of the Forum's highest priorities for **funding**. Though I enjoy reading it, I want you to tell me why anyone should give money to support it?" I swallowed hard and said, "We are proud of our achievement in creating this publication and taking it from its modest beginnings of eight pages and increasing it to the size of twenty-four pages in five issues. We **publish** on time and have high-level articles written by **quality** people." I caught my breath and continued, "We also have Lloyd deMause, Peter Gay, Robert Jay Lifton, and Vamik **Volkan** — outstanding contributors to our field of knowledge — lined up as featured psychohistorians." I went on to say, "We need a longer publication for more intensive and extensive materials. Our ideal length would be 40 pages in that it would allow for longer articles by our members, fuller interviews, and much more variety."

I explained that our ideal niche is different from the three leading psychohistorical publications: *The Journal of Psychohistory* which focuses on group fantasies, *Political Psychology* which includes many academic references, and *The Psychohistory Review*, which concentrates on psycho-biography. Our model is Vamik Volkan's *Mind and Human Interaction*, only more varied **and** livelier. Right now Clio's is an enlarged newsletter, though a number of our members, such as Rudy Binion of Brandeis University, have been kind enough to call it a small journal. As a true small journal of 40 pages we could draw more people to psychohistory. It will be a small publication with a limited but vital market. I remember that I concluded my thought with, "We will stimulate thought and leave a record of insights which are important in our increasingly unreflective age."

"Clio's Psyche is an impressive achievement," was Caulfield's comment. "How have you funded it? As far as money is concerned, are you flying by the seat of your

pants?" My response was, "Yes! We are funded by dues and subscriptions and we are stretched to the limit of our resources. Our printing and mailing costs have gone up." We **have** "gotten ahead of our financing," as Mary Coleman so nicely puts it. The Forum's administrative costs have been carried by a few people: our fine Associate Editor, our gracious part-time secretary/administrator, and me. "After twelve years," I said, "there is a limit to what extent I can carry the Forum, especially given the added **burden** of Clio's Psyche. And the time demands are also becoming excessive."

John Caulfield brought me back to the issue of difficulties in asking for money. He recollected from our consulting in 1990 or 1991 that we were then talking about changing the system of financing the Forum. I said, yes, that was about the time we gave people a choice of category of membership at different contribution levels. I had discovered that some of our members had both the inclination and resources to pay more than we were asking. Because within the last year a number of people answered my call to support the Forum by becoming Contributing and even Supporting and Sustaining Members, we were able to produce Clio's and triple its size. Two people even signed on as Patrons, which was a big help.

"I'm glad to hear that", said Caulfield, "but I **think** members of the Forum also have to be more active in asking for money. Remember, no one likes to ask for money. People need money but they do not like to ask for it and you are not unique in that respect. Paul," he said, "what you have to keep in mind is that the work your group is doing is going to help more than the academic area. It is going to help an awful lot of people, not only now, but in the future. Bear in mind," he said, "that when you ask for money you are not asking for money for yourself. If I asked for money for an agency that takes care of babies, what I keep uppermost in my mind is the babies. I am asking for money for these babies, not for John Caulfield."

He explained, that normally when he teaches a group to fund raise the hardest part of it is getting them to accept repeated failure as a prelude to success. After the fifth failure people tend to give up, instead of feeling that they are warming **up**, **which** is more the case. "But, remember: the money is needed, someone has to ask for it, and you are asking not for yourself

but for others."

As I sighed at this prospect, Caulfield continued, "I would not be shy about it. I would even tell your members that the editors of Clio's and the officers all pay their **annual** dues and spend their own money. If a person is going to give you money, he wants to know why he is giving you the money and how it is going to be used. Besides," he continued with a twinkle in his Irish eyes, "I **think** you will find that the money will come in. Use the tools you have. You might find an angel out there who has a little bit more money than you think who will give you a pretty good grant."

His next suggestion totally astounded me. "You know who I would write to right now? Newton Gingrich! He was a history professor like you. Perhaps you do not agree with his political philosophy, but he is looking to gain favor and I would write him a note and tell him what you are doing. Tell him you are in need of funds and **ask** if he has any suggestions. Get him interested." I struggled to stop laughing long enough to say that I doubted the Speaker of the House would be interested in psychohistorical insights.

But the Director of Development would not be deterred as he said, "Gingrich is trying to build himself up now as a leader, scholar and statesman. You don't have to like him or his motives. Remember," he said, "funds are given to avoid taxes, to get a name on a building, to get recognition, to salve a conscience." Though my laughter had turned to a skeptical look, he continued, "So there are 100s of reasons for giving money. Who knows? Maybe Newt in some way wants to be connected. Give it a shot, even if it is a shot in the dark."

My response was to protest, "I would be more inclined to take a shot with someone who is not so terribly busy and currently bombarded by a significant part of the country." Undeterred, Caulfield said, "I will tell you, Paul, that because everyone is hitting up the same people in West Palm Beach, we do not just hold back and not send them letters. It just takes a 32-cent stamp and a bit of letter writing to a particular person." He leaned forward as he spoke. "There is a woman in Palm Beach we wrote and asked for \$10,000. She sent a letter back saying no, but here is \$1,000. Yes, it was a turn down, but it helped."

I quibbled, "Yes, but aren't you seeking

funds for a substantial agency with a large physical facility rather than a comparatively small group of scholars and therapists?" Caulfield retorted, "Mine is a family agency. You are going to have to write to people who are interested in the kind of work that *you* do, because if you write to others they are not going to know what you do, they do not understand what psychohistory is, and it is going to take a long time. Remember," he said, "money comes in first from those who know a group's work and are interested in it." He and I finally seemed to be back on the same wavelength.

He asked me what my experiences were with psychohistorical giving. I reflected on my having pioneered, in a small way, in this area in the 1980s when I was the Vice President of the International Psychohistorical Association. I arranged the establishment of certain psychohistorical awards for graduate and undergraduate students. A temporary award became permanent when the benefactors were so pleased with the way it worked out. Then, a former student of mine established an award for genealogy related to psychohistory. Next, a person unknown to me and the other Executive Board members came forth with a gift of stock worth \$2,800 for an award. Something similar happened at my college when a gift of about \$150,000 was arranged for by one of our staff who is a middle class woman of modest means. When I asked her about it, she explained it was the bequest of a relative who left it to her judgement to determine what worthwhile cause should be its recipient. So while she continues to live a middle class, hard-working life, the college received the gift through her decision.

I then asked Caulfield how people of modest means can give. His response was, "First and foremost by assuming some of the responsibility for **fund** raising and by otherwise volunteering their time. Having a dinner or a cocktail party fund raiser would be quite beneficial. A cocktail party could raise some money and give some of your members a chance to get together to socialize and talk about the needs of your group and publication."

Then he went on to describe attending a planned-giving seminar recently and being surprised to get the figures on "the large amount of money now being donated through bequests from wills and insurance policies. More and more people are beginning to do this." He described a friend who has taken out a number

of insurance policies on his life and donated them to the different agencies in which he has worked. I said, "Even **though** I have had psychohistory in my will for over a decade, it never occurred to me that other people might do the same."

I thanked him for his many valuable ideas and for **having** volunteered his time to the Forum. I hope we can put his ideas to good use.

□

Bulletin Board

NOTES ON MEMBERS AND THEIR RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS:

Congratulations to **Scott Thompson** on the publication of *The Price of Achievement in the Reagan Years* (Castle, 1994). **H. John Rogers** of West Virginia is probing the confessions of murderers. **James Huffman** of Fredonia University of SUNY is writing a book on American culture with considerable emphasis on Walt Disney and others. **Robert Chaikin** has been analyzing the African American student "Freaknik" migration to Atlanta for a week in April. **CONGRATULATIONS:** To **Peter Petschauer**, Greer Professor of History at Appalachian State University, who has been elected to chair the North Carolina State Universities Faculty Council. After living in the beautiful Mountains, last year Peter and Joni bought a hide-a-way-house in the Tidewater. At Ramapo College **Margaret (Peggy) McLaughlin** has been strongly recommended for promotion to associate professor and Paul Elovitz received a second Dean's Award for Extraordinary Contributions to the Extra-curriculum. **Leyla Rzakulieva** won the first Psychohistory Forum Student Award for her article "My Experience with Nationalism" in our December issue. Leyla is a scholarship student from war-torn Azerbaijan and an economics honor student. She plans to go to graduate school at Columbia University, majoring in international relations. **MOVES:** **Alex Jasnow** gave up his lovely home and psychology practice in New Jersey to enjoy Provincetown and paint. **Norman Simms** will be leaving the University of Waikato in New Zealand to assume a new position at Ben Gurion University in Israel. **MEETINGS:** The fall program of the Forum will start on September 16 when Rutgers professors **Virginia Yans McLaughlin**

and Ted Goertzel will, respectively, present on the psychobiography of Margaret Mead and Linus Pauling. On November 4 James Huffman will present "In Sickness and in Health: A Psychological Approach to American Culture." At the June conference of the IPA the Forum will sponsor workshops on Teaching Psychohistory ("Overcoming Students' Resistance to Psychohistory" led by **David Beisel on June 7**) and of the War Peace and Conflict Resolution Research group (June 8) as well as a luncheon. Presentations of our Presidential Personality and Childhood Research Group will also be on June 8. The ISPP meetings are scheduled in Washington, July 5-9. The International Society for the Psychoanalytic Study of Organizations will be meeting in London, July 7-9. The International Federation for Psychoanalytic Education invites Forum members to attend its sixth annual conference at the Toronto Hilton Hotel in Toronto, October 13-15. For details call Leon Cahan, IFPE Administrator in San Antonio, TX 78256-2304, Tel. (210) 698-2311.

CONDOLENCES: To **Mary Lambert** on the death late in 1994 of her **husband** George *who* had struggled for many years with ill health.

BIRTHS: Congratulations to **Peter Loewenberg** on the birth on February 2, 1995, of Jonathan Alexander *who* weighed in at seven pounds, eight ounces and twenty inches in length and is doing fine. Jonathan's father recently travelled from UCLA to Austria to lecture on "Dehumanization and the Final Solution." Mel **Kalfus** is adding Elderhostel instruction to his regular teaching at Lynn University in Boca Raton. **WELCOME** to new members Jeff Gustin, Diane Perlman, and Charles Seitz. **OUR THANKS** to our members and friends for their support which makes Clio's Psyche possible. To Patrons — Herbert Barry and an anonym; a Sustaining Member — Ralph Colp; to new or renewed Contributing Members Rudolph Binion, Andrew Brink, David Felix, Paul Elovitz and Alberto Fergusson. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to Brian D'Agostino, John Caulfield, John Demos, David Felix, Baruch Halpern, Harry Keyishian, Henry Lawton and Howard Stein. Also to Anna Lentz and Pauline Staines for their assistance in producing this newsletter and to Darryl Garvin, Darla Silverman and Professor Sue Adrion for proof-reading. This issue is dedicated to the memory of Professor Sidney Halpern. U