Clio's Psyche

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

Psychohistory at the Crossroads Symposium

The Past, Present, and Future of Psychohistory

The Baltimore Riots

Freud's Analysis of His Daughter

The Ordeal of Alfred Dreyfus

Memorials: Peter Gay and Eli Sagan

Psychohistory Meeting Reports

Volume 22 Numbers 1-2
June-September 2015

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 22 No. 1-2 June-Sept 2015

ISSN 1080-2622

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

Editor: Paul H. Elovitz
Book Review Editor: Ken Fuchsman

Editorial Board
Herb Barry, PhD University of Pittsburgh • **C. Fred Alford, PhD** University of Maryland • **James W. Anderson, PhD** Northwestern University • **David Beisel, PhD** RCC-SUNY • **Donald L. Carveth, PhD,** York University • **Ken Fuchsman, EdD** University of Connecticut • **Bob Lentz** • **Peter Loewenberg, PhD** UCLA • **Peter Petschauer, PhD** Appalachian State University

Subscription Rate:
Free to members of the Psychohistory Forum
$72 two-year subscription to non-members
$65 yearly to institutions
(Add $60 per year outside U.S.A. & Canada)
Single issue price: $21

We welcome articles of psychohistorical interest of 500 - 1,500 words and a few longer ones.

Copyright © 2015 The Psychohistory Forum

Psychohistory at the Crossroads Symposium

The Past, Present, and Future of Psychohistory

The Baltimore Riots

Freud's Analysis of His Daughter

The Ordeal of Alfred Dreyfus

Memorials: Peter Gay and Eli Sagan

Psychohistory Meeting Reports

Volume 22 Numbers 1-2
June-September 2015

Clio's Psyche

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

Volume 22 Number 1-2 June-Sept 2015

Psychohistory at the Crossroads Symposium

Psychohistory Is an Approach Rather than a Discipline. 1
David Lotto

Psychohistory's Current State and Future Agenda 4
Ken Fuchsman

The Value of Applied Psychohistory 10
Paul H. Elovitz

Psychohistory and the Historians: 1970-2015 15
David R. Beisel

A Comparison of Early Freudianism with the Psychohistorical Movement 20
Paul H. Elovitz

Commentaries on the Five Papers

Psychohistory is a Valuable Approach 25
Jay Y. Gonen

The Resurgence of Psychohistory in Psychology 29
Joseph G. Ponterotto

Psychohistory: Movement or Discipline? 32
Hans Bakker

Mindsets of Psychohistory 35
Juhani Ihanus

Free Associations on My First Psychohistory Conference 38
Trevor Pederson

A Perspective on Reflective Consciousness and Psychohistory 40
Marc-André Cotton

Psychohistory at the Crossroads of History, Science, and Art 43
Norman Simms

The Symposium Authors Reply

Selected Responses and Additional Thoughts 46
David Lotto

Comments on Crossroads and the IPA. 49
David Beisel

Crossroads within Psychohistory. 53
Ken Fuchsman

Professionalizing Psychohistory and Other Issues 58
Paul H. Elovitz

Symposium Related Articles

My Experience with Psychohistory 62
Peter Petschauer
To Educate or Not to Educate in Psychoanalysis—and in Psychohistory. 65
Juhani Ihanus
A Research Program for Psychohistory 70
Brian D'Agostino
Three Psychohistorical Journals 74
Paul H. Elovitz with David Cifelli
Insights from Psychohistorical Journal Editors 81
David Cifelli and Paul H. Elovitz

Additional Articles

Baltimore: Reflections on Inner City Violence in America 90
Neil Wilson and Paul H. Elovitz
Sigmund Freud's "Psychological Treatment" of Anna Freud. 95
Michael D. Clifford

Book Review

An Excellent Account of Alfred Dreyfus' Ordeal 99
Jacques Szaluta

Meeting Reports

A European Psychohistory Conference 105
Peter Petschauer
Clifford on Freud as the Leader of Psychoanalysis 107
Paul H. Elovitz

Memorials

My Mentor Eli Sagan (1927-2015): In Memoriam 110
Donald Carveth
Peter Gay (1923-2015): In Memoriam 115
Ken Fuchsman

Bulletin Board 119
Call for Papers . . . . . .104 & 121

Psychohistory at the Crossroads Symposium

Psychohistory Is an Approach Rather than a Discipline

David Lotto—Journal of Psychohistory

When Erik Erikson, Robert Jay Lifton, Kenneth Keniston, Bruce Mazlish, and Philip Rieff started the Wellfleet Psychohistory Group in 1966, there was some intention to promote psychohistory as an independent academic discipline or subfield. That project was abandoned.

In *Witness to an Extreme Century: A Memoir* (2011), Lifton says, "The relatively academic ambiance of our first few Wellfleet meetings reflected our initial illusion, which it did not take us long to give up, that of creating an academic discipline of 'psychohistory'" (344). So, I recently wrote to Lifton asking him, "I was wondering if you have anything to add about why creating an academic discipline was an illusion and what caused you to give it up?"

He replied, also in e-mail, "What I meant by that comment was that I consider psychohistory more an approach than an actual academic discipline." He also added: "My main statement about that is in an essay, 'On Psychohistory,' which is in various places, including an early collection of mine, *History and Human Survival*, entitled 'Psychoanalysis and History'" (1971, 288-289).

Before proceeding with Lifton's view, let me spell out what I consider to be psychohistory. I see the range and scope of psychohistory as quite broad and its boundaries to be expansive. For me, the essence of what makes a study psychohistorical is that it seeks to understand or explain its subject matter in terms of psychological motivation. Although most of what has been considered to be psychohistory, even most of Lloyd deMause's work, has come from a psychoanalytic or at least psychodynamic perspective, I would also consider work using non-psychoanalytic psychological approaches, such as terror management theory, attachment theory, and family systems theories (to name just a few that have been used already in psychohistorical studies) to be psychohistorical as well.

I also consider the range of subject matter that can be investigated to be extensive. It would include any biography, study of past or current events, intellectual history, history of ideas, cultural, anthropological, sociological, and even philosophical inquiries, as long as they focus on psychological motivation. Also, studying group phenomena including the investigation of ideologies, political and social movements of all sorts, cultural studies, women's studies, and critical analysis could all be included. In addition, explorations of the entire world of artistic, literary, and musical creations, again to the extent that they seek to understand things in terms of human motivations, would be included. In my view, what makes it psychohistorical is not the subject matter but trying to use psychological motivations and processes, whether individual or group, as at least one crucial factor in coming to understand the phenomena under study. I would consider just about all of what is usually referred to as "applied psychoanalysis" to be psychohistorical.

In my view psychohistory should be more of an adjective and less a noun. It should be more of a way of thinking, a perspective that can be applied across many scholarly pursuits as well as to many areas of real life. Or, as Lifton puts it, more of an approach than an academic discipline. For a study to be psychohistorical, it should address psychological motivation but not necessarily exclude other explanatory factors when attempting to understand the why of not just history. Also, the why—understood as a psychological question—of just about any aspect of human behavior or human creations, including ideas as well as artifacts.

I believe that there are significant advantages to taking this kind of broad, inclusive, and tolerant stance toward what we consider to be psychohistorical. First, it eliminates the problem of finding the proper place in the universe of academic disciplines and sub-disciplines for psychohistory to fit into. Second, defining psychohistory broadly makes it easier to maintain a stance of acceptance, or at least tolerance, toward the wide variety of ways to answer the why questions; to use any and all theories of human behavior or motivation that seem helpful in explaining the phenomena under investigation. Third, such a view can help to minimize divisive schisms and turf wars.

There are many possible answers to questions of which and what sorts of motivations are most useful in understanding any particular subject we are examining. So we don't, for example, have

to say that factors related to child rearing must be central to our account in order to label it as psychohistorical. Nor do we have to maintain that non-psychological factors, the many external forces that impinge on us from the outside, humanly created social, cultural, political, or economic realities, or from forces or events that arise from nature, are not important in understanding why things are the way they are, perhaps in addition to or alongside of the psychological factors.

I am arguing for an inclusive approach; psychohistorical studies should be under a big tent, to use Vamik Volkan's metaphor. Much of what I would consider to be psychohistorical work is done by individuals who do not identify themselves as psychohistorians. They might identify as psychoanalysts, psychologists, psychotherapists, political scientists, historians (of some other sort than psychohistorians), anthropologists, sociologists, philosophers, art historians, social critics, literary critics, public intellectuals, social activists, public policy advisors, feminists, futurists, or with any other of a number of labels.

I do not see any reason to be disturbed by the fact that most of these people have no interest in identifying as psychohistorians or acknowledging that they are doing psychohistorical work even though, in my view, when they are addressing the motivations for the actions and creations of humans, they are doing psychohistory.

I think that one of the reasons Lifton and his colleagues gave up on the project to create a discipline with a unique identity called psychohistory is that they realized that there were severe difficulties in trying to specify the boundaries of the discipline or field. So much of what so many different scholars were doing could properly be called psychohistory, but the people who were doing it were often strongly self-identified in other ways. For the most part, they had no interest in identifying with a new discipline or labeling their work as psychohistorical.

David Lotto, PhD, *is a veteran psychologist, psychoanalyst, and psychohistorian who is a longtime member of the Psychohistory Forum. He practices psychotherapy in Western Massachusetts, edits the Journal of Psychohistory, and may be reached at dlotto@nycap.rr.com.* ❑

Psychohistory Forum Work-In-Progress Presentation Paper Proposals
Are Welcome As Are Articles for Clio's Psyche
Contact Paul H. Elovitz at pelovitz@aol.com.

Psychohistory's Current State and Future Agenda

Ken Fuchsman—University of Connecticut

I once wrote that psychohistory is a black sheep in the family of historical specialties, a disreputable child who is sometimes allowed to sit at the dinner table, but is more often made to stand in the corner. Why would I say that? Here's some background.

At the end of the 19th century, American intellectual and academic life began to change. Disciplines such as history, literature, physics, sociology, and psychology formed professional organizations and set standards for their fields. After a while, if one wanted to have a career as, for example, a political scientist, graduate training was essential. As disciplines began to have sub-fields, they too favored advanced education. The nearest field to psychohistory is political psychology, which has eight American graduate programs from accredited universities. Psychohistory in the U.S. currently has none. A number of psychohistorians have formal training in both history and a branch of psychology—often psychoanalysis—but few practitioners have specific advanced degrees in psychohistory. To be a professional does not always require graduate school training in the specialty. There are psychoanalytic institutes, for instance, which are not affiliated with a university. Still, to be an analyst, education is required.

In psychohistory, no specific training is mandatory. Unlike most other fields, there are no educational standards set, nor examinations to insure competency. Psychohistory is as much an amateur as it is a professional field. Until it establishes criteria for what qualifies one to be a psychohistorian, at best it will remain on the fringes of intellectual respectability. On the Clio's Psyche Listserv in an unrelated matter, psychoanalyst Ralph Fishkin wrote, "It's unethical to put one's self forward as a professional without having had the training that is required by that profession" (Fishkin, May 27, 2015). But how professional can a field be when there is no certified training?

Interdisciplines

Psychohistory itself is an interdiscipline. In her classic *Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory, and Practice*, Julie Thompson Klein of Wayne State University says these are hybrids which com-

bine two fields into a new specialty (1990, 24). Renowned interdisciplinarian Allan Repko writes that they "are bodies of knowledge defined by the theories and methods of the established disciplines" (*Interdisciplinary Research*, 2008, 52). Some interdisciplines, such as biochemistry, find ways of interconnecting the two home fields without great strain. Others do not. Social psychology is found in both sociology and psychology departments, but rarely do the two meet; psychologists take the field in certain directions, sociologists in others.

It is not uncommon for interdisciplines to be caught between divergent principles and methods in their home disciplines. This being between a rock and a hard place is particularly acute in interdisciplines in psychology. Psychologist William Todd Schultz writes, "Psychology's disorder is multiple personality (or, as it's now called, dissociative identity). We speak in a cacophony of voices." For psychology "is less a discipline than a farrago of subdisciplines," each of which has "a lexicon sure to discourage intrepid party crashers" (Schultz, *Handbook of Psychobiography*, 2005, 5). One historian of academic psychology, C. James Goodwin, writes, "psychology...seems to be characterized more by disunity than unity...psychology is not a single discipline but a collection of them" (*A History of Modern Psychology*, 1999, 438-439).

These descriptions are mostly about academic psychology, which generally discounts psychoanalysis. Freud's creation too is no longer a united enterprise. Psychoanalyst George Makari observes that the fragmenting of "psychoanalysis into many schools" has produced a "raucous chorus" that cannot be unified (*Revolution in Mind*, 2008, 263). Historian Paul Stepansky notes that psychoanalysis has become subject to "internal fractionation" with "rivalrous...even sect-like groupings" (*Psychoanalysis at the Margins*, 2009, xvii).

Amidst the fragmentation and factions, any psychology-related interdiscipline will have epistemological dilemmas. Some of these fields avoid the diverse knowledge claims by favoring certain approaches and underplaying or ignoring competing claims. Political psychologists generally favor social psychology over other psychological approaches. Daniel Bar-Tal categorized articles that appeared in the first 19 volumes of *Political Psychology* from 1979 to 1998. He found that 62.6% of the articles were within social psychology and 6.2% were from clinical psychology (K.R. Monroe, Ed., *Political Psychology*, 2002, 176). Psychohistory does not

heavily rely on social psychology. Many psychohistorians lean towards psychoanalysis. But this in itself does not mean that there is one psychoanalysis. The question is, which version of psychoanalysis do they employ?

Given this fragmentation within academic psychology and psychoanalysis, psychohistory will be on more solid epistemological ground if it deals with psychological research from the whole spectrum of the field. Still, there will be many instances where research may lead in more than one direction, and then there will be challenges to see which psychological approach and evidence most fits the problem at hand. In any case, psychohistory has some strong epistemological challenges which, as with other related fields, have not been fully confronted. Given the disarray of psychologies, there is even more reason for psychohistory to develop standards and require training in the field. Not that there is a single result or one way of being a psychohistorian, but without confronting the issues involved, the rigor and methodology will be easily questioned by those already skeptical that psychology can be applied to history.

History

Though history has some dilemmas, it is not as intellectually and epistemologically divided as is psychology. Merriam-Webster says history is "a branch of knowledge that records and explains past events." The study of history has been dependent on surviving documents and records, evaluations to show that documents are authentic, and interpretations of the evidence. The late British historian, Arthur Marwick, writes, "Training in history is training in analyzing, evaluating, and interpreting both secondary and primary sources. It develops an understanding that everything written pertaining to history, secondary or primary, must be approached with scepticism [sic] and caution. It develops the ability to distinguish between pieces of writing which are well-substantiated and logical, and those which simply express theory, hypothesis, or opinion." He goes on to say, "History is a scholarly, not a political, activity, and while, as citizens, we certainly should act upon our political views, in writing history we have an absolute obligation to try to exclude them" (*The Fundamentals of History*, http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/Whatishistory/marwick1.html).

The scope of history is broadening. For a long time, history was about what transpired in the periods since humanity became literate. This covers about 5,000 of our 200,000 years as a species.

To encompass the full existence of Homo sapiens, historians will have to go beyond the surviving written record and incorporate the discoveries of archeologists and anthropologists. There is now a field called "big history." This takes history beyond humanity and begins with the start of the universe. With this wider vision, historians can keep the whole past within their sight.

The Future of Psychohistory

How does psychohistory compare with other psychological interdisciplines? There are a number of such specialties: psychological economics, social psychology, political psychology, psychological anthropology, cross-cultural psychology, and cultural psychology. Each of these interdisciplines have been welcomed and integrated into social science fields. Except for psychological anthropology, none of them emphasize psychoanalysis.

The Society for Psychological Anthropology (SPA) is a section of the American Anthropological Association (AAA); psychohistory is no longer recognized as a sub-field by the American Historical Association (AHA). An award is given each year for the best work in psychoanalytic anthropology. Why is psychoanalytic work in anthropology not only recognized but published in important anthropological journals, while work that calls itself psychohistorical is rarely accepted in mainstream historical publications? The answer is that much of psychoanalytic anthropology is perceived as adhering to the methods and standards of anthropology, while to some historians psychohistory is not academically sound.

In 1988, in trying to explain why psychohistory is not sufficiently recognized as a scholarly field, University of California psychologist William McKinley Runyan wrote that psychohistory does not have "well-defined and well-organized academic training programs" (*Psychology and Historical Interpretation*, 1988, 32). This remains the case over a quarter of a century later. What is to be done?

First, psychohistory needs to have professional standards and training. It needs to use the history of the field to find out what is valuable and what is questionable. The methods and standards in history need to be studied, as do the variety of research methods and schools of thought within psychology. Some of this examination should occur in a psychohistory institute. Denis O'Keefe is beginning this effort with his survey distributed to members of the

International Psychohistorical Association. He is also willing to spearhead an effort for psychohistorical training. When there is such formal education, epistemological dilemmas can be confronted.

Second, currently there are two peer-reviewed psychohistorical journals, neither of which is available on the Internet. Over 200 libraries carry psychohistorical journals, but they are not available online through these libraries. Unless they have physical access to these libraries, it is a challenge for those who are not subscribers to see the work of these journals. This helps keep psychohistory at the fringes. We need to have articles from the journals readily accessible on the Internet.

Third, there are various topics that psychohistory should examine. These include transforming human existence, creativity, sociality, us vs. them, attachment, hierarchy, gender, and killing. For about 95% of our existence, Homo sapiens were foragers and hunters. We began to transform our condition with the development of agriculture and domestication of animals. Later we formed states, advanced science and technology, and became literate. What within our psychology finally enabled us to use our cognitive capacities to dramatically alter the way we live? These are paramount questions for historians and psychohistorians. It is the human ability to innovate, to come up with ideas and implement them, which characterizes our history. Creativity should be a sub-field within psychohistory.

Psychologists point out that humans are the most social of species. Unlike most creatures, we extend our identity and loyalty beyond our kin connections to a wider social group. For most of our history, humans lived in groups of about 150. Eventually, larger entities emerged. For instance, in New York City there were 33,000 residents in the 1790 census, and now the city is approaching a population of 8,500,000. China and India contain more than a billion people within their borders. How can humanity pull off all these diverse people living within one political and geographic entity? There are a multitude of psychohistorical questions here.

We often divide our fellow humans into in and out groups. What are the psychological reasons for this? Who are often included in the in group? How does the in group function to remain an "us"? Humans are one species divided into many sub-groups. For instance, there are currently about 200 nations and 6,900 languages

spoken on Earth. Often times, this political and linguistic multiplicity results in collaboration and alliances, and sometimes conflict. What promotes affiliation and/or hostility between groups in diverse locales and epochs? What enables competing cultures to coexist, and what leads to war?

Another human universal need is to be attached to others. Some psychologists have been tracing different patterns of parenting across cultures. Historians need to show the diverse ways the bonding between parents and children appears throughout history. Psychohistorians have done much of their work in the history of childhood, but more needs to be done focusing on attachment within history. Anthropologist Christopher Boehm says all human societies have been hierarchical, even the relatively egalitarian hunter-gatherers. The role of hierarchy and authority has altered over time and with it the psychology of reaction to those above or below. Given the move from, say, monarchy to democracy, the relation to authority figures changes. This is an area for psychohistorians to explore further.

There is extensive literature on the psychology and history of gender and sexual divisions. The power relations of men and women have been a central part of the way humans organize themselves and is an important subject for psychohistorians. Homo sapiens kill for food, for sport, to ward off predators, and in war, homicide, and suicide. Yet this killing varies from culture to culture and from historical epoch to epoch. The impact of violence and destruction on humans also varies. The full-scope of killing needs greater exploration and explication within psychohistory.

These are just the topics that seem pressing to me. Psychohistory in the U.S. has been in limbo for a while. It has many accomplishments, has often been questioned, and still has many subjects to explore. It is a field full of promise. To be able to realize its potential, it needs to become professionalized, to confront the dilemmas of interdisciplines, to develop rigorous standards, and to continue to expand its horizons.

Ken Fuchsman, EdD, *is a University of Connecticut professor, who is the Book Review Editor of* Clio's Psyche *and on the Editorial Boards of both* Clio's Psyche *and the* Journal of Psychohistory*. He has published a number of articles on President Obama, trauma, the Oedipus complex, and interdisciplinary studies. Professor Fuchsman may be reached at ken.fuchsman@*

uconn.edu. ❑

The Value of Applied Psychohistory

Paul H. Elovitz—Psychohistory Forum

As a psychohistorian since the late 1960s, I can write with confidence that the world is *not* knocking at the door of psychohistorians, interviewing us for our methodologies and wisdom. Rather, we are in a situation akin to that of psychotherapists who are available when called upon to help with the specific life problems that bring people to their doors. Patients aren't especially interested in their theoretical framework. Rather, they want help with their immediate problems regarding their addictions, children's acting out, compulsions, depressions, identity and gender confusions, marital discord, personality disorders, phobias, referrals from the court, relationships, suicidal ideations, and other difficulties of life.

Psychohistorians, like psychotherapists, can have the greatest impact by helping groups and individuals deal with their difficulties. Of course, we don't hang out shingles, help to write the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (*DSM*), or prompt insurance companies to sponsor at least short-term treatment. Rather, we are in a much more hit or miss position. Some examples of applied psychohistory and the colleagues who made or make it happen are discussed below.

During WWII General William "Wild Bill" Donovan of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS)—the predecessor to the CIA—recognized the value of knowing his enemy when he enlisted the psychoanalyst Walter Langer and others to interview captured German soldiers and others who had contact with Hitler to write a secret history of the Third Reich's leader. Despite the difficulties with sources and the countertransference issues evoked by writing dispassionately about one's enemy during wartime, there was much of value in the report that was eventually declassified and published as *The Mind of Adolf Hitler* (1972). Langer was so enthused by this methodology that he offered to write a similar study on Stalin, but the idea was dismissed out of hand since the Russian "man of steel" was our ally and the methodology was only seen as appropriate for enemies. At some point, the CIA realized the value of knowing the psychology of other leaders and potential leaders around the world and has since hired a large array of colleagues to

research and write reports of all sorts on obscure and possible leaders.

The personalities and values of leaders and their capacity to improve or degrade their society is of great importance and interest. Deceased presidents and leaders have been fair game for amateur historians, especially in retirement, coming from medicine and a variety of other fields, resulting in psychobiographies of most uneven value. Their tendency has been to pathologize presidents and other leaders. From the beginning of psychohistory to the present, the field has had an abundance of simplistic studies, such as L. Pierce Clark's *Napoleon: Self Destroyed* (1929).

Psychohistorically probing the lives of living presidents was acceptable in the case of the self-destructive Richard Milhous Nixon, since he was sufficiently disliked by large enough numbers of intellectuals. Because many members of the American Psychiatric Association (APA) had done such an irresponsible job of psychopathologizing Barry Goldwater during his 1964 presidential bid, their organization prohibited its members from writing on living subjects without written permission.

In 1976, at the first national psychohistorical conference in North America, the distinguished psychological scholar Robert Jay Lifton walked up to me and proclaimed that I could *not* give my presentation on the Democratic candidate for president, Jimmy Carter, because it would be unethical to write on a candidate without written permission. Clearly his presumption was that I would be psychopathologizing the future President. Since I was not psychopathologizing and have never been a member of the APA, and I am quite a determined individual, I gave my well-received presentation and spent the next three years working on our 39th president. Before putting this project aside during his presidency, I found myself writing a chapter of an intended but never published book, "Jimmy Carter as a Self-Defeatist." Incidentally, later in my career as a presidential psychobiographer when I had become more confident I would have been able to write that chapter and finish the book. The hallmark of my scholarship in this area and other areas has been to avoid psychopathologizing and to work on writing a psychohistory that is primarily focused on childhood, coping mechanisms, creativity, dreams, group fantasies and delusions, innovation, personality, and overcoming trauma.

Clearly, this is not the approach commonly associated with

psychohistory. As long as psychohistory is associated with psychopathologizing, it is my conviction that our field will continue to be marginalized. This has much to do with why I am a critic of colleagues such as the psychoanalyst and psychiatrist Justin Frank who has authored books such as *Bush on the Couch* (2004) and *Obama on the Couch* (2011). The political psychology of presidential candidates has great value to the pundits and the electorate in providing insights into our potential leaders. Despite the numerous misuses of this genre, the baby should not be thrown out with the bathwater. In *The Psychological Assessment of Presidential Candidates* (1996), Stanley Renshon wrote a valuable study outlining the methodology for presidential psychobiography. Subsequently, at the International Society for Political Psychology (ISPP), this City University of New York (CUNY) graduate school professor faced considerable heat for his mostly positive assessment of George W. Bush at a time when intellectuals were lining up as strongly against the Iraq War.

Robert Jay Lifton has been a strong advocate of applied psychohistory. He has had an extraordinarily productive career, providing psychological insights in *Death in Life: Survivors of Hiroshima* (1968), *Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism: A Study of 'Brainwashing' in China* (1961), *The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide* (1986), *Home from the War: Vietnam Veterans: Neither Victims nor Executioners* (1973), and other books far too numerous to list. In the mid-1960s, he was the key person in establishing the Wellfleet Psychohistory Group's annual seminars at his Cape Cod summer home. Although he considers himself a psychohistorian, he has shied away from using that term. But he brings together some very fine psychologically attuned colleagues at these seminars. One might argue that like a psychoanalyst, who does not focus on his credentials in part because this is *not* what the patient has come to treatment for, Lifton is focusing on how to develop a subject with greater insight.

Lifton's most explicit use of applied psychohistory came about when he left his Sterling Professorship of Psychiatry at Yale University to establish the Center on Violence and Human Survival at John Jay College of CUNY with a major grant offered by New York State. For these monthly seminars, Lifton brought together a large variety of colleagues and policy makers. The lectures, followed by discussion amidst wine and cheese, were open to colleagues throughout the psychological community. At one of his

seminars I attended, an arms inspector from the United Nations presented a fascinating account of the mostly effective efforts to get Saddam Hussein to give up his weapons of mass destruction.

Regrettably, when his budget was cut, Lifton retired from CUNY, taking an honorific lectureship at Harvard University while continuing to host his yearly Wellfleet meetings of the oldest continuous psychohistory group. Charles Strozier, who for three decades has been Lifton's protégé, inherited the CUNY seminars. Aside from his teaching history, Strozier decided to devote his time primarily to the Center on Terrorism, training police officers and firefighters who had just suffered grievous losses on 9/11. This excellent example of applied psychohistory also enabled him to avoid additional teaching during one of CUNY's budget crunches. Strozier continues to have psychologically attuned speakers and to invite colleagues from the psychological community to attend meetings, but his approach raises some issues about the continuation of psychohistorical institutions.

My preference is for separate psychohistorical institutions that meet the needs of society. Professor Strozier is more concerned with approaching issues psychohistorically than with having separate psychohistorical institutions. Because Strozier was the key person in deciding to end the very successful *Psychohistory Review* and is seen as the person most likely to inherit Wellfleet should the participants want to continue that, my fear is that Lifton's incapacity or death would spell the end of the meetings. I hope my concern is not justified.

Vamik Volkan is an outstanding advocate of applied psychoanalysis/psychohistory. Whereas Lifton's military service took him to the Far East, prompting his study of Chinese communist thought control and the survivors of Hiroshima, Volkan's birth on the island of Cyprus, divided between Greeks and Turks, led him to probe how people living next door to each other could maintain separate identities which would prompt them to hate. When his home island became engrossed in civil war, he worried for the well-being of his family from the safety of his psychiatric position at the University of Virginia. Suffering from survivor's guilt, Volkan turned increasingly to applied psychoanalysis. He applied his knowledge superbly in *The Need to Have Enemies and Allies: From Clinical Practice to International Relationships* (1988). This energetic psychoanalytic psychiatrist and administrator established the Center for the Understanding for Mind and Human Interaction

and presided over it from 1988-2002, created and for a while edited the *Journal of Mind and Human Interaction* (1988-2005), and served a term as president of the International Society for Political Psychology. He has authored, co-authored, or edited over 60 books in English, Finnish, German, and Turkish, and has written over 350 articles and book chapters. Quite importantly, he has traveled to political "hot spots" where he has worked to defuse hatreds between groups in conflict. These include Estonians and Russians, Georgians and South Ossetians, and Palestinians and Israelis. Fuller accounts of his activities may be found in his autobiography, *Enemies on the Couch: A Psychopolitical Journey through War and Peace* (2013) and in the Festschrift for Vamik Volkan published in Clio's Psyche (Sept. 2013, 20, 2: 127-219).

Although I strive to avoid psychoanalytic and psychohistorical terminology in my work, I must confess to being, despite my low-key approach, a psychohistorical imperialist. I am imperialist in the sense that I want to extend the insights and the methodologies of our field to as many people in various situations as possible. This is one of the reasons why I have encouraged friends and colleagues to apply their psychological knowledge to art, music, and poetry. These have this incredible ability to reach our emotions and stir up powerful feelings and thoughts. People who do not think of themselves as being especially psychologically attuned can be drawn in by the power of these ancient modalities and can provide a larger audience for our psychological work.

Our goal should be to expand the psychohistorical paradigm into as many areas as possible. I would recommend my methodology that I developed as a psychohistorian over four decades ago which involves listening carefully to the interests and passions of others and to work in the spirit of a midwife in the birth of their knowledge. This means to encourage and take their ideas very seriously and to develop them into articles, books, presentations, and sometimes into their life work. Just as Freud's methodology of listening and observing the transference is vital to psychoanalysis, listening for the ambivalences, conflicts, and unresolved traumas of modern society can make us more useful to our world. When individuals and groups come to us with their problems, we should be ready to help, as have Volkan, Lifton, and other colleagues.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, *is in his fifth decade as a psychohistorian and may be contacted at pelovitz@aol.com.* ❑

Psychohistory and the Historians: 1970-2015

David R. Beisel—SUNY-RCC

Psychological history refers to the scholarly work appearing in print and scholarly conferences from about 1970 on. The first reaction of historians to this new direction was enthusiastic acceptance. For those who took part in those heady days, the early '70s looked like psychohistory's Golden Era.

Since then, the relationship between history and psychohistory has gone through several phases. It was not long before critical attacks began, soon massive waves of them. At first those early criticisms were respectful, collegial, and sometimes intellectually acute. Some were fun. A caption-less cartoon appeared in *The New Yorker* showing a door labelled, "Psychohistory Ward."

More impassioned arguments soon arrived as well, some heated, some angry, some cruel and demeaning. They came from everywhere: scholarly journals, comments at conferences, and even one's own university. "Hey, psycho," yelled one of my colleagues every time we passed in the hall (until I put a stop to it). Psychohistory triggered anger, as witnessed by the barbed commentaries of Jacques Barzun in *Clio and the Doctors: History, Psycho-History and Quanto-History* (1974) and David Stannard in *Shrinking History: On Freud and the Failure of Psychohistory* (1980).

Wanting to be polite, most psychohistorians met these first critical assaults with respectful replies. We were looking to be legitimized by the "Big Daddies." William Langer's name was often invoked. A well-known Harvard University historian, Langer had said in his 1957 presidential address to the American Historical Association (AHA) that an "iron curtain" separated psychology from history. He asked historians to integrate psychology and psychoanalysis in their work. References to Langer did little to legitimize psychohistory though, since most historians had long ago written off Langer's address as coming from someone who had already lost his mind.

Sometimes psychohistorians brought the wrath of historians down upon themselves, defensively blaming historians for being "too defensive." One self-defeating example was Lloyd deMause's essay, "The Independence of Psychohistory," published in his *Jour-*

nal of Psychohistory in 1975, wherein he asserted psychohistory was a science and called historians astrologers.

Things weren't all bad. An uneasy truce—a kind of grudging acceptance—emerged between historians and psychological historians in the '80s and '90s. Meetings were held, journals published, books appeared. Even the AHA allowed a panel or two at its conventions. Still, most members agreed with Columbia University historian Michael Marrus: "Leave motivation to the psychologists." They did so, never citing the relevant findings of psychiatrists Bessel van der Kolk, Jerrold Post, or Vamik Volkan.

On the other hand, psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton has had a long and distinguished career. He proudly proclaims himself a "psychohistorian." Judging by the number of times his book *The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide* (1986) has appeared in the bibliographies of studies on Nazism, it seems historians regard him as the most respectable of all psychohistorically-oriented scholars. Yet, despite his reputation, a *New York Times* book reviewer can call his work "psychobabble." The sad truth is that while *The Nazi Doctors* sometimes appears in historians' bibliographies, Lifton's findings almost never show up in their narratives.

At the very moment when the most vocal critics were denouncing psychohistory, they were working a subtle sleight of hand behind the scenes to sneak psychology in through the back door. Sir Ian Kershaw is a good example. His two-volume Hitler biography has been widely praised. It is superb history but also openly anti-psychological and filled with denial. Early on Kershaw denounces psychohistory as too speculative. He introduces the word "psycho-historians" by breaking the offending thing at the hyphen, keeping it from contaminating his text by quarantining it in quotation marks. Then, while accepting that Hitler's father, Alois, was a distant and abusive father who beat his son, Kershaw discounts the extensive scientific literature on the consequences of child abuse: "What the legacy for all this was for the way Adolf's character developed," he says, "must remain a matter of speculation" (*Hitler, 1889-1936: Hubris*, 1998, 11, 13). No sooner does he inform his readers that he wouldn't be doing any psychology than he says of Hitler:

> It takes little to imagine that his later patronizing contempt for the submissiveness of women, the

> thirst for dominance (and imagery of the Leader as stern authoritarian father figure), the inability to form deep personal relationships, his corresponding cold brutality towards humankind, and—not least—the capacity for hatred so profound that it must have reflected an immeasurable undercurrent of self-hatred concealed in the extreme narcissism that was its counterpoint must surely have had its roots in the subliminal influences of the young Adolf's family circumstances (*Hubris*, 13).

This sounds like psychological history to me.

While historians were expropriating psychology without owning up to it, a new campaign was brewing in another quarter: the pretense that psychohistory didn't exist at all. Preeminent here was the *New York Review of Books* (*NYRB*). The late Barbara Epstein, co-founder and co-editor of the *Review*, was a longtime friend of neurologist and psychohistorian Mary Coleman. At one of their periodic luncheon meetings, Epstein told Dr. Coleman, "Under no circumstances will any psychohistory ever be reviewed in the *NYRB*" (personal communication from Mary Coleman).

A particularly egregious example was how the *NYRB* treated the late historian Peter Gay's multi-volume *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud*, in which the *Review* referred to Gay as a "cultural historian," ignoring his having written a biography of Freud using Freud's own theories, training as a psychoanalyst, writing a book called *Freud for Historians* (1985), and calling himself a "psychoanalytically-informed historian" for much of his career.

Of course, today psychological history goes beyond classic psychoanalysis and draws on all of psychology. Still, the *Review* not only barred psychohistory from its pages, but also launched an active anti-psychological, anti-psychoanalytic campaign by periodically publishing the anti-psychological rants of Frederick Crews. (Crews once denounced Judith Herman's *Trauma and Recovery* as feminist propaganda.) Whatever the individual causes behind Crews' rants (a failed analyst perhaps?), by publishing them and pretending psychohistory doesn't exist, the *NYRB* has done a disservice to both scholarship and the general public. None of this shows up in Martin Scorsese and David Tedeschi's documentary on the *Review* called *The 50 Year Argument* (2014).

During these years the *American Historical Review* (*AHR*)

refused to review prominent historian Rudolph Binion's books on the grounds that they weren't history (personal communication from Rudolph Binion). Binion was one of the many, including myself, who dropped their AHA membership. That left no one to advocate for psychological history in the AHA.

Just nine months ago, the editor of the *American Historical Review* reminded the profession that: "Historians have long been allergic to psychological explanations" (AHA *Perspectives*, December 2014, 19). While correct on the face of it, this is a misleading metaphor. Historians are not "allergic" at all. One can avoid peanuts and take medications to mitigate the effects of allergies.

The current phase of history's relationship with psychohistory does not reflect reasoned intellectual discourse, though most historians would claim it does. It is irrational to denounce thousands of articles and books without having examined them. Among historians today we have one part elitist snobbism, one part revulsion to insight, and one part murderous rage. The self-appointed guardians of history's sacred precincts are after nothing less than psychohistory's complete annihilation.

This has been so for quite some time. A few years ago, historian and psychoanalyst Jacques Szaluta buttonholed the editor of the *American Historical Review* at an AHA convention and asked him if the *Review* would be publishing any psychohistory. The editor, backing away, mumbled something about "we don't publish that stuff in the *AHR*" (personal communication from Jacques Szaluta). The history profession seems to attract individuals terrified of their feelings and frightened of insight. As Louis Armstrong once said, "There are some people that if they don't know, you just can't tell them."

Nevertheless, we might want to take comfort from the newly published Cambridge University Press volume, *Psychology and History* (2014). In their conclusion the editors take a cue from the chapter written by Paul Elovitz to argue that psychohistory has "ended up marginalized by both mainstream psychology and mainstream history" but has "survived in spite of this, and thrived on the periphery of both disciplines" (293). This is not the fantasy historians have concocted for themselves. To the American Historical Association, as for the *AHR*, psychological history is not marginalized; it no longer exists. The heresy, cast aside, is a dead end that didn't pan out. It is to be erased from memory, buried without cer-

emony, history's forgotten bastard child.

Sounds extreme? Here are some facts.

The AHA presents itself as a big tent scholarly organization proudly announcing it welcomes all kinds of historical scholarship. The AHA publishes a taxonomy of historical areas of interest, including more than 665 officially sanctioned specializations. Despite their claims of inclusion, it did not recognize one sub-field: psychohistory. After spending many years on the official list, it was dropped from the AHA's taxonomy several years ago.

I lobbied the AHA president for its restoration, citing thousands of books, flourishing journals, robust scholarly organizations, and large college-class enrollments. She assured me psychohistory would be reinstated. Four years later, it has not happened. Nor is it likely to happen.

Five months ago, historian Lynn Hunt reiterated the AHA's party line. Hunt is the author of a psychologically-oriented history, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (1992), the chief author of a widely used college textbook, a past president of the AHA, and Distinguished Research Professor and Eugen Weber Professor of Modern European History Emerita at UCLA. Her words carry weight. In the December 2014 *AHR*, Hunt declared "the demise of psychohistory." The "iron curtain" mentioned by Langer in his 1957 presidential address "remains standing." The "few attempts to build up a subfield of psychohistory," she announces, have "collapsed under the weight of its [own] presuppositions" (*AHR*, Vol. 119, No. 5, December 2014, 1587).

The culprit behind these suppositions was of course the "false" ideas of psychoanalysis. The hidden message is clear: with Freud now safely dead and buried, historians can sleep soundly in the comfortable knowledge that psychohistory lies buried in the coffin with him.

The thing is, we're still here. Who knows how long it will last? There is always the possibility of revival. Pendulums do swing back. Judith Herman reminds us that trauma needs rediscovering every generation.

My guess is that someone out there with a strong will for self-discovery and a desire to understand what moves beneath the surface will find ways to keep psychological history alive. I hope so. For now, we have today. That should be enough.

David R. Beisel, PhD, *teaches history and psychohistory at SUNY Rockland. He has written widely on European and American History and is a Contributing Editor to* Clio's Psyche. *He can be reached at dbeisel@sunyrockland.edu.* ❑

A Comparison of Early Freudianism with the Psychohistorical Movement

Paul H. Elovitz—Psychohistory Forum

For some time I have been writing the book, *Pioneers of Insight: The Makers and Making of Psychohistory*. Michael Clifford's interesting presentation on January 31st to the Psychohistory Forum on Freud's style of leadership set me thinking of a comparison of aspects of the early Freudian and the contemporary psychohistorical movements. It is fruitful to compare and contrast these related, yet very different, undertakings in terms of acceptance, creativity, followership, leadership, openness to divergent ideas, splitting, and other issues. I will start with a brief description of each of these.

Sigmund Freud was such an original thinker who wrote beautiful, understandable German that people were drawn to him. He was a healer and creator of a new way of viewing individuals and society. His success resulted in the development of an international movement which put pressure on him to react differently than as a healer/intellectual, and brought out the more rigid side of his personality. Early biographers, such as Ernest Jones, depicted Freud as a heroic figure struggling against intense criticism and opposition. Most Freudian clinicians have followed in their appreciative footsteps, based mostly on their idealized transference to the originator of their field. In contrast, Paul Roazen, Michael Clifford, and so many others within and outside of the movement have written at length about Freud's limitations as a leader. Perhaps part of the unconscious and sometimes conscious motivations for this focus on Freud's leadership shortcomings is a process of de-idealization of the "good father," thus demonstrating one's independence from or even hostility to him.

How the early history of Freudianism relates to organized psychohistory is my primary concern. Clearly, there are many differences, along with similarities. Leadership in the psychohistori-

cal movement was never as focused on one individual as it was in Freudianism. Psychohistory is a movement that gradually came together over a period of time before becoming an organized entity in the 1970s. While a rudimentary psychohistorical literature appeared early in the 20th century, a cohesive and significant movement developed only in the 1950s and '60s in the face of the valuable work of a variety of colleagues, including Dodds, Erikson, Brown, the Georges, and Lifton.

Psychohistory became a strong current in the 1970s, showing signs of acceptance by mainstream publications, although there were always very active naysayers. The prestigious *American Historical Review* (*AHR*), under the editorship of Robert K. Webb (1968-1975) and to a lesser extent under Otto Pflanze (1977-1985), published some explicitly psychohistorical articles, including two by Peter Loewenberg in 1971 on Heinrich Himmler and Nazi youth. The '70s were alive with interest in and struggles over how to institutionalize this new knowledge in the face of a growing resistance. In this period, Lloyd deMause was working very hard to get psychoanalysts to focus on the history of childhood and beginning the process of building institutions through the *History of Childhood Quarterly:* the *Journal of Psychohistory* (1973), the Institute for Psychohistory (1975), the Psychohistory Press, the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA; 1977), and the *Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology* (1980-1987). A week after I attended the first International Psychohistorical Association meetings in the spring of 1978, the International Society for Political Psychology (ISPP) also had its inaugural meeting in Manhattan, which I briefly attended. It created its own journal, *Political Psychology*, unlike the IPA, which has a newsletter but never had a formal relationship with the *Journal of Psychohistory*.

The psychiatric institutions of Vienna and Europe were *not* eager to welcome Freud and his followers into their fold, so the Freudians developed their own institutions, such as the International Psycho-Analytic Association, various journals, and a large variety of training institutes. In my lifetime, a central issue has been the relationship of psychohistory to the existing disciplines. Academic psychology, but not clinicians, overwhelmingly slammed their doors on those who were open to this new methodology. History departments were more ambivalent in their response. In 1957, they were cool to the American Historical Association (AHA) Inaugural Presidential Address of Harvard's William L. Langer calling the

application of psychoanalysis to history as "the next assignment" for young historians. However, some younger historians began to consider this approach. Still, in the 1970s most PhD historians interested in the field were anxious and nervous to openly declare themselves to be practitioners of psychohistory.

Most members of the American Historical Association's Group for the Use of Psychology in History (GUPH) were excited by their new methodology but quite concerned about the reactions of the elders of history and uncertain about their relationship to the psychoanalytic clinicians they were reading and meeting. Their ambivalence was heightened by Erik Erikson being uncomfortable with the term psychohistorian and Lifton changing the name of the Wellfleet Group for the Study of Psychohistorical Process, which he created with others in 1966, to simply Wellfleet. This oldest psychohistorical group still meets annually in the fall as an invitation-only seminar.

Charles B. Strozier, who was one of the key members of GUPH, editor of the *Psychohistory Review*, and the only person I know of who was hired with an appointment specifically in psychohistory, insisted that one could not function properly as a historian if you trained as a psychoanalyst. This opinion was formed by the Chicago Training Institute he attended, allowing historians to attend classes but never see patients and never become a psychoanalyst. However, after Strozier moved to New York to a position established for him by Lifton, he rapidly concluded his training, opened a practice, and became very active in the psychoanalytic community.

Lloyd deMause had the mentality of a businessman when it came to developing the field of psychohistory in that he did not usually take rejection personally, but continued to invite people to write articles, serve on the editorial board of the *Journal*, and publish their work through his press. The subsequent *Journal* editor reported that in the 1980s it had 8,000 subscribers, making it the only profitable psychohistorical publication. *Political Psychology*, the journal of the ISPP, came into existence in 1979 and continues to thrive. The *Psychohistory Review*, which had an impressive group of academics on its editorial board, had built its subscription base to about 500 through word of mouth and colleagues requesting that their libraries subscribe to it. Regrettably, Strozier decided to terminate its publication in 1999 because he and the then editor were, to quote him, "tired of it," and more fundamentally, they

thought, again to quote, "that psychohistory was never going to be recognized within the discipline of history as more than ephemeral…[with] 'very few people' having appointments in the field" (Strozier e-mail to David Cifelli, May 2015). GUPH, which had met sporadically for years, also ceased to meet at approximately the same time.

Even when there was an enthusiastic, although small, group of supporters for psychohistory among academics, no one in psychohistory had anything like the authority of Sigmund Freud in the psychoanalytic movement. This helps to explain why the rivalries within it did not result in institutions splitting apart or dissidents starting their own groups. The founder of psychoanalysis could split with and ostracize Adler, Jung, Rank, Silberner, Stekel, and others. In contrast, Lifton and Strozier might "bad mouth" deMause, Volkan, and those associated with the Institute for Psychohistory, the *Journal of Psychohistory*, and the IPA, but the most they could do was influence some colleagues to stay away; they had no direct control.

Lloyd deMause, the most controversial leader of psychohistory, did not exclude colleagues. However, he sometimes offended colleagues by his editorial judgment, leading with theory, organizational decisions, sensational advertising, and the extremity of his theories, such as fantasy analysis, the fetal origins of history, independence of psychohistory, poisonous placentas and mothers, and psychogenic theory. In fairness to him, he did not react negatively when colleagues set up new organizations and publications, such as the Psychohistory Forum, the Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film, and Clio's Psyche. On the other hand, he also encouraged a sense of "us" who have the truth of a scientific psychohistory and the courage to pursue it, versus those lacking in these attributes.

While both psychoanalysis and psychohistory are intellectual disciplines, they differ in important respects. Psychohistory lacks the healing power of psychoanalysis. Quite importantly, the discipline created by Freud provided a way of making a living since so many of its adherents became therapists, but psychohistory never provided an economic base. This diminished the cohesion of the field and caused some to become disillusioned with it. Furthermore, despite Freud's exaggeration of the enemies he faced, psychoanalysis was much more favorably received than psychohistory, which has always had mixed reviews. Norman Kiell in 1988 published *Freud without Hindsight: Reviews of his Work (1893-1939)*,

revealing a far more positive reaction than one would gather from Freud's letters and the early biographies of Jones and others.

Neither Freud nor the other early analysts and advocates of analysis were psychoanalyzed, while many drawn to psychohistory were analyzed and even well-trained psychoanalysts. Lloyd deMause's expectation that establishing group process sessions at the end of Institute for Psychohistory and IPA meetings would prevent the acting out of destructive unconscious emotions did not work as planned and was at times quite damaging to the unity of the group. Difficulties with group process analysis centered on the unevenness of the quality of group process analysts and the fact that some participants came to these sessions with no or little therapeutic experience and minimal emotional awareness. They wanted to talk about content, not feelings. This whole group process experiment seemed crazy to most historians. While there was certainly acting out among his colleagues and acolytes, Freud's enormous emotional and intellectual authority as the founder of psychoanalysis kept much of it in check.

To continue with comparisons, psychoanalysis was started by a Jew and Freud's early followers were overwhelmingly Jewish, while psychohistory has always had a greater mixture of Jews (Gay, Lifton, Loewenberg) and gentiles (deMause, Langer, Strozier, Volkan) among its advocates, leaders, and prominent practitioners. If we compare Freud with deMause, we find that both had a sense of specialness as young children, since Amelia Freud called her son "my golden Sigi" and deMause spoke of having been the youngest child to read, according to *Ripley's Believe it or Not!* Clearly, both had major issues with their fathers. Both saw themselves as scientific, yet each had strong speculative inclinations, although throughout most of his career Freud did a better job than deMause in controlling these impulses. Freud's pessimism, strengthened by WWI and the rise of totalitarian communism and fascism, led him to develop the idea of the death instinct, while deMause's optimism led him to develop the concept of "helping mode parenting" resulting in children who are "gentle, sincere, never depressed…and strong willed." Both leaders were inclined to have favorites, such as Adler and Jung for the Austrian and Henry Ebel and Casper Schmidt for the American. With great insight, the founder of psychoanalysis recognized that "My emotional life has always insisted that I have an intimate friend and a hated enemy" (*Standard Edition*, 1900, 483). Such splitting was not unknown to the American who spoke

about splits being normal among groups. Freud, born in the Victorian era, could be tyrannical at times in dealing with his followers, while deMause could make abrupt changes as a leader, which alienated some of his colleagues. Lloyd deMause sometimes saw himself as the Freud of psychohistory.

In choosing deMause for this comparison with Freud, I do not mean to argue that he was *the* leader of psychohistory, just the one who was organizationally and theoretically most prominent and who I know the most about. Other psychohistorical leaders to consider are Lifton, Volkan, Loewenberg, and Strozier. Robert Jay Lifton was much better known and accepted in the intellectual community generally, but he did not involve himself in psychohistorical organizations beyond his Wellfleet group. Vamik Volkan created a center and a journal, and did such yeoman service for peace that he has been nominated repeatedly for a Nobel Peace Prize. Peter Loewenberg was the key person in creating the University of California Interdisciplinary Psychoanalytic Consortium and much more. Charles Strozier became the leader of GUPH and the *Psychohistory Review*.

An additional point of importance is that psychohistory has a fair number of supporters coming from anthropology, clinical work, literature, political science, sociology, and elsewhere.

Neither movement was able to ensconce itself within the academic departments in the USA, although in Vienna as of 2005 there is a Sigmund Freud University teaching psychotherapy. Despite this academic resistance, both have had a profound impact on our thinking and offer great insights into individuals and society.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, *is a professor at Ramapo College of New Jersey, the founder and editor of* Clio's Psyche, *and may be contacted at pelovitz@aol.com.* ❑

Commentaries on the Five Papers

Psychohistory is a Valuable Approach

Jay Y. Gonen—Independent Scholar

Reading the five excellent papers that were written by old hands in psychohistory gave me a chuckle as I asked myself in

amusement, "So what else is new?" I remember the heady days of the early 1970s when young knights of psychohistory, armed with shiny psychodynamic armors while riding swift psychoanalytic horses, charged the bastion of history with the possible aim, perhaps, of replacing it with psychohistory. The defenders of the historical status quo were becoming very defensive and I had a sense of foreboding that in reaction they might become aggressive and even vengeful. It was not a matter of overt denigration of historians by psychohistorians. It was more like a tacit implication that what was hitherto a deficient history will now be replaced by proper psychohistory.

I was writing *A Psychohistory of Zionism* then, which was published in 1975. Trying to avert the danger that I sensed, I stated the following in the introductory note to the book: "Throughout the book I have tried to accentuate the psychological aspects of historical developments, which is the task of psychohistory. Nevertheless, I wish to state my conviction that psychohistory is a complement to history, not a substitute for it." I was trying to allay any fears by traditional historians that we, the new breed of psychohistorians, are out to supplant them. It did not work. Consequently, we occasionally felt like a persecuted minority, somewhat akin to the way Jews historically feel.

I mention the Jews on purpose because of a specific issue in Jewish culture. Not every Jew is a really "kosher" Jew who qualifies for the designation. As a result, controversies raged in Israel and abroad as to "who is a Jew?" Is he a Jew by virtue of the Halakhah (meaning by the Jewish religious law; he is a Jew because he feels himself to be a Jew) or is he a Jew because others characterize him as such, whether he likes it or not? Lo and behold, similar questions were raised concerning who is "a true psychohistorian." I never thought that this issue could be resolved by extensive teaching programs where budding psychohistorians would receive psychoanalytic training on the one hand and a rigorous practice in handling primary and secondary historical sources on the other hand. Being a psychohistorian is like being a Jew. It does not come with a diploma but springs from a person's identity. Thus, in the current controversy between Ken Fuchsman and David Lotto on this matter I am on Lotto's side: Psychohistory is an approach rather than a discipline. When people ask me which methodology I use as a psychohistorian, I tell them that I read the *New York Times* like I read poetry. But although this stance is quite fine with me, there are al-

ways others who request more specific terms that would imply much greater rigor than the lukewarm statement that I use a psychodynamic method.

The truth is that I was never able to teach what I do. For many years I witnessed my colleagues David Beisel, Paul Elovitz, and Jacques Szaluta struggle with issues involved in teaching psychohistory in the classroom. But I could not teach how I scoop up data that jumps at me from the public domain and, even more difficult to explain, how I connect the dots in unusual ways. Perhaps the whole endeavor represents art more than science. This could cast doubt on my credentials as a psychohistorian. Moreover, it is also possible to determine whether someone is a psychohistorian by checking if he does psychohistory; pure and simple. After *The History of Childhood Quarterly* became *The Journal of Psychohistory*, history of childhood was still deemed by some as an essential part of the field. Consequently, if a study did not include history of childhood, it was not regarded as true psychohistory. And if you do not do true psychohistory, you are not really a psychohistorian. This needling and tormenting of the members of a besieged minority came mostly from within its own ranks as intra-group schisms continued to emerge. This brings me to the issue of self-inflicted wounds.

David Beisel cited an assertion by Lloyd deMause in 1975 that while psychohistory was science, historians were astrologers. This stinging remark represented utter folly, since hurling ridiculous insults at your antagonists only invites attack. The historical, or should I say psychohistorical, irony in all this is that eventually deMause himself invited an astrologist to present an astrological paper to the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) convention. I questioned this act that was nevertheless defended by many participants, including Henry Lawton, who defended it in the name of "eclecticism." I had no patience for this kind of mistaken tolerance and quit the association. I thought that it was foolish for people who were bothered by having been called "loonies" by other historians, and also bothered by their work being called "psychobabble," to provide their tormentors with more ammunition. I attributed this group folly to the group's subservience to deMause, its cult-like guru leader. Cultism was not a phenomenon of other psychohistory groups. The problem of cultism was confined to the IPA. Unfortunately, it created negative attitudes toward psychohistorical writing in general among historians and in-

tellectuals.

Indeed, the IPA had a guru and he received exalted adulation. Here is an example: Many people are familiar with the famous sequence of ideas leading from Copernicus through Darwin to Freud. In like fashion, during a group session Casper Schmidt drew a progression of ideas leading from Sigmund Freud (free associations) to Anna Freud (children's play) to Lloyd deMause (fantasy analysis). DeMause seemed to me overjoyed on that occasion. It was really sad to watch. At the very time that psychohistorians were feeling like a persecuted minority and were struggling with the issue of how to define themselves and their field, they projected an image of a cult. This was a self-inflicted deep wound. These few recollections of mine support the legitimacy of comparing early Freudianism with the psychohistorical movement, as was done by Elovitz. Both movements promoted revolutionary new ideas and had their jobs cut out for them in seeking acceptance by mainstream scientific fields. In this connection Elovitz was right to conclude that psychoanalysis was better received then than psychohistory is being received now.

So what is the future of psychohistory? Are we condemned to keep watching again and again the same movie that we have already seen before? I feel a bit optimistic, albeit with a few words of caution. I would recommend staying away from grand designs concerning what is psychohistory or producing textbooks that cover the whole field. Pursuing specific topics of interest with the proper sensitivity to undercurrents, nuances, and reverberations (what a sloppy methodology) is likely to be more successful in capturing the attention and interest of the audience. It is recommended to stay away from technical jargon whenever possible. Do not seek out revealing answers in the statistical manual of the American Psychiatric Association. It is a dictionary of symptoms rather than an elucidation of causes and is therefore of limited value. Try not to be psychoanalytic ideologues. They are unsympathetic types, the kinds of authorities who impart "insights" with a smile that may, nevertheless, turn into a frown and an accusation of "resistance" once the insights are not accepted. Finally, in selecting topics, follow your heart and do not worry about under what field designation the topic falls. Two of my own recent choices have been the issue of self and world in literature and the topic of Faustian bargains. The late Rudolph Binion might have called them "psychohistorical and psycholiterary." Either way is fine, as long as it is not psycho-

babble.

Jay Y. Gonen, PhD, *is a retired psychologist who served as president of the International Psychohistorical Association in 1991. His books include A Psychohistory of Zionism (1975) and The Roots of Nazi Psychology: Hitler's Utopian Barbarism (2003). He may be reached at jygonen@gmail.com.* ❑

The Resurgence of Psychohistory in Psychology

Joseph G. Ponterotto—Fordham University

Psychological historians are concerned with the diminishing interest in the history of psychology among academic psychology departments. In fact, the American Psychological Association journal, *History of Psychology*, recently issued a call for a special issue to be titled "Does the History of Psychology Have a Future?" Citing the impactful article by Kurt Danziger on the same topic published two decades earlier (*Theory & Psychology*, 1994, Vol. 4, No. 4, 467-484), the *History of Psychology* editors are concerned that the history component of psychology may become the province of historians rather than psychological historians.

The four renowned psychological historians who contributed to the Clio's Psyche issue on "Psychohistory at the Crossroads" are also concerned with the fate of psychohistory as an academic discipline or methodological approach. A vital question to consider is: What will be the future of psychohistory's role in psychological training? From my vantage point as an academic counseling psychologist and active psychobiographer, I feel strong optimism regarding the greater integration of psychohistory into psychology because of the trends discussed below.

Student Interest in Psychobiography

Increasing student interest in psychobiography is reflected in trends related to curriculum integration, the value of psychohistory to clinical skills development, and the promise of new technologies for research. Recently, I led a Fordham University research team (Ponterotto, Reynolds, Morel, and Cheung, *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, in press) that mapped psychobiography training in North America. Though very few full-semester courses on psychobiography were located, a much larger number of traditional psy-

chology courses are incorporating psychobiographical research methods. Psychobiography is particularly popular in courses in personality psychology and narrative psychology. This study also content analyzed 65 psychobiographical doctoral dissertations in North America from 1978-2014. There appears to be strong interest in psychobiographical methods among students and when such courses or training are offered, students embrace them enthusiastically.

Many psychology students are interested in applied mental health careers. Psychohistorical study makes for better clinicians. Roughly a decade ago Buchanan (*History of Psychology*, 2002, 240 -248) highlighted the relevance of study in the history of psychology to heightened clinical skills. First, history training extends the student outside the narrow boundaries of psychology that is essential in understanding clients and patients in the social and historical context. In working with our clients we are also working across generations of ancestry in terms of understanding a transgenerational psyche. Second, history of psychology exposes students to multicultural perspectives, including cultural worldviews, value systems, and indigenous healing models and the potentially oppressive outcome of imposing a western psychology on collectivist culture constituents. Finally, training in history breaks the divide often found between theory and practice in psychology. For example, reading first-hand how Erikson's psychosocial identity model is applied to Mahatma Gandhi in *Gandhi's Truth* (1969) teaches the reader not only theory but also how comprehensive theory can illuminate a lived life in cultural-historical context, which enhances our empathy for the subject.

Traditional data sources for psychobiographers have been letters, diaries, poems, speeches, biographies and autobiographies, newspaper reports, and so on of historic figures. The psychobiographers of the future (our current students) will rely as much on social media as on traditional data sources in crafting psychological profiles. For example, a psychobiography of Barack Obama written in 10 or 20 years may rely as much on his e-mail, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts as on his published speeches, autobiography, and hand-written letters, notes, and diaries. Recent computer and technological advances will facilitate psychohistorians' access to and analysis of "big data," such as thousands of Facebook entries and Instagram photo posts of historic subjects. Working with big data in the age of the Internet and social media

will draw newer generations to psychohistory.

Interdisciplinary Study and Methodological Pluralism

In addition to strong student interest in the intensive study of the individual life, psychohistory in psychology will advance because of academic trends toward interdisciplinary study, methodological pluralism, and multi-theoretical models. At Fordham University and many others, the new curriculum initiatives being supported are those with an interdisciplinary and international focus. Given psychohistory is interdisciplinary, now is an opportune time to bring together scholars and students across disciplines to work together in research and teaching in psychohistory. Further, given that many universities are expanding their international research and exchange programs, now is the opportunity for collaborative research and teaching. It is worth noting that the reception of psychohistory as critical to training in psychology may be greater in countries outside the U.S.A. In the fall of 2015, a special issue of the *Journal of Psychology in Africa* (guest edited by Paul Fouche) will be published and includes psychobiography contributions from authors worldwide. International journals such as *Europe's Journal of Psychology* and the *Journal of Psychology in Africa* have been quite embracing of psychobiographical studies.

In North America, Europe, and elsewhere, there has been a growing embrace of qualitative research that is central to the psychohistorian and psychobiographer. In recent years, *The Qualitative Report* and the new American Psychological Association journal, *Qualitative Psychology*, have published psychobiographies. Furthermore, traditionally quantitative-oriented journals such as the *Review of General Psychology* and the *Journal of Empirical Research in Human Research Ethics* have published psychobiographical case studies. With qualitative and quantitative journals open to psychobiography, there will be more practical and tangible rewards for researchers in psychohistory.

One reason psychobiographies fell out of favor among psychologists after the heyday of applied psychoanalysis in the early 1900s was that there was an overreliance on psychoanalytic and other psychodynamic theories anchoring the research, and the zeitgeist was calling for newer theories of psychology. In the mid-20th century with the work of Erikson, Murray, and Allport at Harvard University, a renewed interest in personology and psychobiography emerged. This was stimulated, in part, by the reception in the scholarly and lay communities of Erikson's profiles of Martin Lu-

ther (*Young Man Luther*, 1958) and Mahatma Gandhi (*Gandhi's Truth*, 1969). Interest in psychobiography has continued and appears to be on an upswing. For example, Zoltán Kőváry predicted a "renaissance in psychobiography" in *Europe's Journal of Psychology* (2011, Vol. 7, No. 4, 739).

Modern, multi-theoretical psychobiographies written by psychologists in different specialties (personality psychology, counseling psychology, international psychology, etc.) are appealing to broad scholarly and lay audiences. Recent psychobiographies of George W. Bush (McAdams, 2011), Barack Obama (Sharma, 2011), Truman Capote (Schultz, 2011), John Lennon (Kasser, 2013), and Bobby Fischer (Ponterotto, 2012) have been well reviewed. Further, active psychobiographers are consulting with Hollywood docudramas of historical figures, such as Elm's work on the Stanley Milgram film, *Experimenter*, and my historical consultant role on the new Cold War Bobby Fischer film, *Pawn Sacrifice*, both to be released in fall 2015.

Though I side more with Dr. Lotto than Dr. Fuchsman in terms of seeing psychohistory more as an integrative model for all of psychology rather than a standard/competency-defined subdiscipline, I believe psychohistory, and particularly psychobiography, will witness a revived momentum in the next two decades.

Joseph G. Ponterotto, PhD, *is a professor of Counseling Psychology and Coordinator of the Mental Health Counseling Program at Fordham University-Lincoln Center, New York City with a small private practice in New York City. His most recent book is A Psychobiography of Bobby Fischer: Understanding the Genius, Mystery, and Psychological Decline of a World Chess Champion (2012) and he may reached at Ponterotto@Fordham.edu.* ❑

Psychohistory: Movement or Discipline?

Hans Bakker—University of Guelph

An intellectual movement or field is not one distinct discipline with one scientific paradigm. A discipline may have one distinct paradigm or it may have five or six paradigms and still maintain a level of scientific unity. Also, applied work akin to standard forms of psychotherapy does not lend itself to one general metaparadigm. Today the study of psychohistory does not so much rep-

resent one discipline as one movement. Regardless of whether psychohistory moves in the direction of a discipline or not it will still require a big tent because it does not have one paradigm. That would mean that psychohistorical work might be done by people who are not necessarily trained in psychohistory. I accept the fact that a big tent is more likely to serve my own needs. The key dividing line seems to be: Either maintain a very big tent or define the boundaries more clearly and create a professional identity that encompasses both scholarship and applied work but that has very explicit boundaries.

Establishing clear intellectual boundaries does not necessarily mean having one and only one framework or meta-paradigm. Once the decision has been made to not introduce supernatural phenomena into a science, the next major level of theorizing is that of the meta-paradigms. It was once thought a science will by definition have only one paradigm. But there are social sciences where that is not the case, as in my field of sociology. In sociological theory today there are five meta-paradigms: structuralist, interactionist, critical, feminist, and postmodernist. The five do not communicate well with one another and it is well understood that sociology is not one discipline but a "multi-disciplinary" approach. Contemporary neo-classical economics is the only social science that is unified around one meta-paradigm: marginal utility theory and the Austrian school approach. Economics has one meta-paradigm, for the most part, but sociology, which does not, is nevertheless still often considered a discipline as well.

In psychohistory there is not just one meta-paradigm. There are around six different meta-paradigms. Therefore, psychohistory is not all that different from sociology or psychology. But why are the American Sociological Association (ASA) or the American Psychological Association (APA) able to mount conferences with more than 8,000 people presenting papers while the International Psychohistorical Association rarely attracts more than a few hundred people? I think the key is academic employment. Members of the ASA are almost all employed as sociologists. Members of the APA are almost all employed as psychologists. However, there are very few job opportunities for freshly minted PhD's in psychohistory. All of that points to a "movement" rather than a discipline, or even interdiscipline in the strict sense. That would have to be improved.

It has been my experience following the Google Listserv

of Clio's Psyche for about three years that the same fundamental issues are discussed and debated (sometimes heatedly) over and over again, with seemingly very little general delineation of clear disciplinary boundaries. It is not so much a case of five or six different meta-paradigms competing against one another. It is more a matter of people continually starting from scratch and bringing all kinds of extraneous matters into the discussion. Sometimes there may be an argument by authority where the views of Freud, Lloyd deMause, Charles B. Strozier, Vamik Volkan, or another famous thinker are seen as the key to solving a dispute. No one thinker has the same kind of authority in psychohistory that Karl Marx has for critical theorists in sociology or that Dorothy Smith has for feminist sociologists.

A clear decision is required. If a decision is made to no longer accept the notion of a big tent approach and have a cluster of meta-paradigms, then that has to be articulated. Specific jobs should then be made available. Since professionalization is not likely, a strategy for the next decade might be to better articulate the six meta-paradigms. What would it mean to be a Freudian rather than, say, a Liftonian psychohistorian?

For those of us who are not professional psychohistorians, scholarly or applied, it would mean being excluded to some extent, but for psychohistorians who view the psychohistorical approach as their main identity as a scholar and/or therapist, it is not possible to maintain both paths at the same time without a considerable degree of frustration. My own meta-paradigmatic position in sociological theory and methodology is interpretive sociology and I feel the main authority should be Max Weber, but there are others in the same discipline who have other candidates in mind for the key thinker associated with interpretive sociology, as opposed to structuralist, critical, feminist, and postmodernist sociology. My own interpretive sociology has been based on Max Weber and Randall Collins. If a decision is made that psychohistory is clearly not a discipline, then articulation of six meta-paradigms would allow for greater clarity. But as a "field" or "movement," psychohistory would still not be all that different from contemporary sociology or psychology.

The key is employment possibilities. Today PhD students who are involved in interdisciplinary programs often find that solid employment possibilities tend to be available primarily to those who have degrees in one discipline. Despite all of the virtues of a

movement or interdisciplinary approach, it is nevertheless still the case that employment opportunities are often limited to people with degrees clearly designated as part of one discipline, from anthropology to zoology. My own work on theory and methodology has attempted to refine the ways in which we discuss sociology as one discipline. Psychohistorians will definitely have to make some clear choices if the movement or discipline is going to prosper in the future.

JI (Hans) Bakker, PhD, *taught at the University of Guelph and was a distinguished visiting professor at Brandon University. He may be contacted at hbakker@uoguelph.ca.* ❑

Mindsets of Psychohistory

Juhani Ihanus—University of Helsinki

With great pleasure, I read the five symposium papers that included wide-ranging reflections on the fundamentals of psychohistory. The papers reveal that there cannot be any stable identity in store for psychohistory. However, several changing identities are needed in order to navigate through the disciplinary landscapes that sometimes tend to hide minefields. Whether we call psychohistory an interdiscipline (Ken Fuchsman) or an approach (Robert Jay Lifton/David Lotto), the passionate and critical questioning of the agendas, theories, and methods of psychohistory is the best guarantee for the future-oriented mindsets of innovative psychohistorical researchers.

When figuring out the future mindscapes of psychohistory, we have to recognize not only the historical and current mentalities of nations, large groups, and individuals as research subjects, but also the choices concerning the topics and views made by psychohistorians themselves based on their subjective inclinations, motivations, and personal developments. There are competing narratives of psychohistory, some of them sticking to stereotypic storylines dictated by "chronically accessible constructs" (John A. Bargh's term) and belief systems, some of them more prone to accepting the role of discontinuities, resistance, and ambivalence in the social construction of research enterprises, communities, and organizations.

Opening up for new psychohistorical cooperation and multi-

ple realization demands from us sensitive, vigilant, and empathic relations to other conceptions of reality. Psychohistorical research cannot be led by any self-indulgent schemes or delusions about our uncontested success in interpreting the historical facts according to our liking. A relational and reflective mindset can be a beginning for a meaningful and creative flowering. The achievements and insights of psychohistory are available and accessible, not chronically but in several creative ways. Of course, there will be risks and conflicts involved when we have to give up some of our cherished pieces of knowledge and let others come to the scene when we have done our due share.

Outlines of the history of psychohistory often tend to repeat stories of the same kind about contradiction, exclusion, trauma, and repression. There are less stories about mutual and collaborative efforts at understanding different researchers and approaches. Psychohistory has been variably located between the social sciences, the behavioral sciences, the humanities, and the method sciences (statistics, philosophy, and so forth). The weakest connection has so far been to the natural sciences, besides the evolution theory (or evolutionary psychology) bind. If psychohistory is to be taken, as David Lotto suggests, with a "broad, inclusive, and tolerant stance," several theoretical views of human behavior and motivation can be applied, not just the oft-repeated psychoanalytic, psychodynamic, and social psychological ones.

There are new inter- and even cross-disciplinary fields of knowledge to be approached. Here are some more additions to those mentioned in the symposium papers. Should we not, critically, try some of them in enhancing the human-science profile of psychohistory?

One area that has been neglected as a companion of psychohistory is positive psychology, an heir to older humanistic psychology. That area, although still scientifically somewhat unsound and idealistic, can give a certain balance to frequent psychopathologizing (criticized by Paul Elovitz) and depicting the traumatic history of humankind by paying more attention to the histories of joy, enjoyment, excitement, awe, bliss, and happiness, or at least to the incessant striving of humankind toward them. Like psychology, psychohistory may need help and may need to reformulate its questions from pathogenic to "salutogenic," as according to Aaron Antonovsky in *Health, Stress, and Coping* (1979), and its disease model toward the health/wellbeing model, taking into account and culti-

vating human positive capacities, virtues, and values. As Antonovsky reminds us, "All those familiar with the history of science are aware that important advances come with the formulation of new questions. The question is the breakthrough; the answer comes with difficulty, but it is the new question that is important" (14). Martin Seligman (with Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi), in his *American Psychologist* article "Positive Psychology: An Introduction," has mentioned that positive psychology "is about work, education, insight, love, growth, and play…positive psychology does not rely on wishful thinking, self-deception, fads, or hand-waving; it tries to adapt what is best in the scientific method to the unique problems that human behavior presents…in all its complexity" (2000, 55, 7). Some doses of that kind of mindset may give impetus to psychohistorical *metanoia* (the change of mind and the renewed sense of coherence).

On the side of the natural sciences, some candidates for collaboration can be named. Some examples include evolutionary biology, epigenetics, pre- and perinatal psychology, and neuroscience. It is not purely cognitive neuroscience but increasingly affective (e.g., Jaak Panksepp, Antonio Damasio, Allan N. Schore), social, and cultural neuroscience that deserves the intense attention of psychohistorians. I earlier proposed that we could build, in the wake of neuropsychoanalysis, a new approach, called neuropsychohistory, combining the efforts of mind-brain-body research and psychohistory. Lloyd deMause has already made some initial steps in his scattered references to neuroscientific research. Mirror neuron studies (e.g., Vittorio Gallese) are also a new promising field where intersubjectivity is seen as a neurodevelopmental cognitive-affective-biosocial process of many-layered attachments, attunements, and embodied simulations. In the field of consciousness research, there are promising attempts at mapping the developments of mentalization and the theory of mind.

What I call psychohistorical mindfulness means taking care of the well being of the psychohistorical project and its many increasingly global resources and workers. Instead of frustration, aggressive transference, the enemy chase, blaming the opponent, and self-defeatism, there can be hope, empathy, self-confidence, optimism, and faith in a future that will cultivate the best seeds of psychohistory. Such qualities can prepare us for flexible survival, flowing on, and not bound for apathy or sectarianism.

Juhani Ihanus, PhD, *is Adjunct Professor of Cultural*

Psychology at the University of Helsinki, Adjunct Professor of the History of Science and Ideas at the University of Oulu, and Senior Lecturer and Member of the Board of Directors at the Open University of the University of Helsinki. He is also an international member of the Psychohistory Forum who has published books and articles on psychohistory, cultural and clinical psychology, and the history of psychology. Dr. Ihanus may be reached at juhani.ihanus @helsinki.fi. ❑

Free Associations on Attending My First Psychohistory Conference

Trevor Pederson—Mental Health Counselor

At the "Psychohistory at the Crossroads" International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) June 3, 2015 discussion of how we should conceive of psychohistory, or where it should go, I strangely found very little reference to the sociological trends of our time. In a climate in which established disciplines within the humanities are having their funding cut, or having their departments merged with others, the idea of lobbying for academic recognition of a new program seems unrealistic. Additionally, even if it were possible, it seems unethical to me to try to attract students to a discipline in which no future is offered to them. In the questioning period, this developed into a suggestion to create an essential reading list available for those who'd like to enter the field and have a competent grasp of the basics. It also further developed into the idea that training could be held before or after the conference, but many were skeptical about the interest of others to do this given the paucity of youth at the conference.

Attention was given to the fragmentary status of psychological and psychoanalytic knowledge. However, given this recognition, it would have been more accurate to not talk about psychohistory, but instead psychohistor*ies*. Respect for psychohistory will always be derivative of the respect afforded to psychology and psychoanalysis, and as long as they remain fragmented with no way to distinguish whose claims are true, then psychohistory will not be considered worthwhile. Professional recognition for psychohistory would be hard enough, but for psychohistories, it seems like asking for a bunch of insightful, but unconnected, aphorisms to be acceptable for a master's thesis. There was little discussion of this plural-

ism as a problem. With the references to Erikson and Freud at the conference, it seemed as if the move to tolerating pluralism was perhaps a recent advance there. Thus, the problem of pluralism may not be salient while it still has the luster of novelty in the community.

Does this mean that psychohistories should be encouraged, like art for art's sake? Some of the panel seemed to advocate for this. The sentiment was that good psychohistory is just more interesting than other studies, and there are journals that will attract, and only select, the best writers, so any would-be psychohistorian could test his mettle or find the quality research she is looking for there. However, this sentiment co-exists with the fact that the IPA has insufficient new blood, and that young academics won't write psychohistory if they never know of its existence. So, the conversation in the question and answer period developed into why psychohistorians haven't linked themselves to other groups—psychosocial studies, cultural studies, psychoanalytic studies of culture and politics, etc.—when a merger might be mutually beneficial. The reigning sense, for an outsider, was that the "narcissism of minor differences" is as rampant here as anywhere else. Fear of references with which one isn't fully familiar, of being swallowed and becoming the other organization, and simple pride that others should make the first move, probably lurks behind the scenes here. It may seem ironic, given that these kinds of group fears are a major part of the subject matter of psychohistory, that their organizations might be just as inhibited by them as any other group. However, it's common to see people who give great advice to others in therapy groups, but who are never able to take it themselves.

There was no further discussion of practical steps to gaining new members, and I'd like to make a suggestion here. There's another discipline that answers the "why" of history and is also out of favor in academia. This is Marxism. It doesn't examine the unconscious or group fantasies, but instead examines very conscious motives of power at the level of class conflict. Marxism also looks to how technology and the inventions of humankind change how we interact, along with noting the very slow and bloody changes to class dynamics in history. In a time when there are many competing schools of psychoanalysis—let alone the wider disagreements within psychology as a whole—it seems to me that examinations of the conscious aspects of motivations to possess and retain power in history might allow for ways to make sense of the competing

claims of the different factions. Take the institution of marriage, for example. It has existed from the era of the most primitive political economies, and we currently see it manifest as the ideal of commitment to someone with whom one has romantic love. However, for most of history, one wasn't free to marry based upon romantic love. This leads to questions of whether romantic love is a recent cultural creation, or whether romantic love existed and was inhibited or suppressed by the institution of marriage for the bulk of history. Clearly, conscious intergroup aggression, along with consolidation of property within classes, will be part of the examination of history. However, studies of fantasies related to marriage, being against marriage, and representations of sexual relationships across cultures could help settle some debates.

If psychohistorians could become curious about their Marxian competitors and seek to make bridges with Marxian scholars, this should lead to some reciprocal interest. Since there are major differences between the approaches, hopefully the narcissism of minor differences wouldn't apply. While the prevailing hope at the panel was that psychohistory would gain more respect, I think it has a better chance of growing by banding with other outsiders and creating more exotic and interesting works.

Trevor Pederson, MA, *a mental health counselor in Casper, Wyoming, is author of The Economics of Libido: Psychic Bisexuality, the Superego, and the Centrality of the Oedipus Complex (2015), and a doctoral candidate at the Boston Graduate School of Psychoanalysis. He may be contacted at trevor.pederson@gmail.com.* ❑

A Perspective on Reflective Consciousness and Psychohistory

Marc-André Cotton—Int. Psychohistorical Association

Although well over 50, I consider myself a "young" European psychohistorian: I was trained by James Duffy through a 12-month online psychohistory course in 2000-2001 and only recently became aware of what David Lotto calls internal "turf wars" among American colleagues—not to mention the ongoing "trench warfare" waged by mainstream historians against psychological history. In my defense, I'm neither a psychoanalyst nor a historian and find it

worthwhile to keep a respectful distance from heated debates.

"Debates" most often reflect the emotional dynamics of the group involved and do not always coincide with the search for truth. Incidentally, the psychoanalysis model is itself a case in point. In 1897, Freud disavowed his "seduction theory" in an attempt to calm down his colleagues of the Vienna Society for Psychiatry and Neurology, who were infuriated by the possible revelation of widespread sexual abuse among families of the Viennese bourgeoisie. At the time, chairman Richard von Krafft-Ebing—author of the quite popular *Psychopathia Sexualis* (1886)—labeled Freud's *Etiology of Hysteria* "a scientific fairy tale," and poor Sigmund confided that "word was given out to abandon [him]" (*The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887-1904*, translated by Jeffery M. Masson, 1986, 184-185). Freud then began to lose his clientele.

No such thing happened with his "theory of drives," for which he gained worldwide recognition. Combined with Freud's newly established belief that the etiology of neurosis was best explained by fantasy rather than trauma, the central position of the Oedipal complex in his psychoanalytical model ensured that such accusations never surfaced again—but banned for decades any real progress in the comprehension of how traumatic memories affect the human mind. Longtime disciples like Sándor Ferenczi and Otto Rank—who both challenged the emotional blindness of psychoanalysis—were excluded from psychoanalytic circles. The contribution of these precursors to the humanistic movement in psychology was eventually acknowledged, but Freud's theory of drives remained hard science and still has a damaging impact on many therapists and child abuse victims (see Valerie Rose Brinton's review of Faye Snyder, *Politics and Memory: When One is Requested to Shut The Eyes*, in *Psychohistory News*, Vol. 34, No. 1, Winter 2015).

Does this brief synopsis shed a light on the possible future of psychohistory? I believe so. First, if we are to set up "educational standards" in a psychohistorical institute, as advocated by Ken Fuchsman, we must guard against parochialism and keep an open mind. In particular, sorting "what is valuable and what is questionable" within our field, as Fuchsman further suggests, might prove disputable and raise counterproductive antagonism. In addition, such an effort would guarantee neither professionalism nor intellectual respectability in the eyes of an ever-skeptical academic

community. Establishing overly rigorous research methods could even have the opposite effect of nipping new flowers in the bud. In this respect, I was dismayed by what looked like deMause bashing on the Clio's Psyche Listserv recently. As I saw it, participants in this quarrel concentrated on settling old scores with the master—whereas mature adults and psychohistorians in particular should be able to simply probe their classics for themselves.

This suggests a second thread of thought on psychohistory implied, as I understand it, in the "why" question. Defined as "the science of historical motivations," combining the insights of psychotherapy with the research methodology of the social sciences, as stated on the Association for Psychohistory website, our field may well need "a broad, inclusive and tolerant stance," as David Lotto recommends but must nevertheless affirm its unique nature. In our quest to unveil unconscious dynamics we *do* assume such processes exist and are active within the human mind and society. This is not the case with historical associations—whose "revulsion to insight" has been outlined by David Beisel—and might explain why other social sciences have hit major stumbling blocks with psychohistory. An exception to the rule, Harvard historian William Langer's strong interest in psychological history stemmed in part from his younger brother Walter, a psychoanalyst who authored *The Mind of Adolf Hitler: The Secret Wartime Report* (1972) for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). As a matter of fact, both brothers worked for the U.S. intelligence community. Even academic psychology has been discredited as a forerunner in clarifying human motivations with its shameful support of the Bush administration's torture program (Marc-André Cotton, "Poisonous Pedagogy: The Contentious Drift of Psychology," *Journal of Psychohistory*, Vol. 40, No. 4, Spring 2013).

Humanity has been spanned by an all-time search for meaning and today's troubled world is no different from that vantage point. Specific to human nature, our reflective consciousness—not to be confused with guilt—drives us to reconsider destructive schemes of behavior so as to find ways to heal individually and collectively. Such metacognition is central in the process of re-experiencing what has been experienced (trauma for instance) and ultimately knowing that to full realization. This should leave an open field for psychohistorians to define what makes us what we are. As argued by Paul Elovitz, our uniqueness originates in a common willingness to expand our emotional awareness by the thera-

peutic experience. It is indeed how I came to psychohistory and what fuels my ongoing interest in this subject. In my experience, psychohistorians are by essence subject-centered and work outwards through this prism—whereas other social scientists remain mostly object-centered. It is therefore arguable that psychohistory should take fuller responsibility for its scope as a meta-discipline; that is, a field likely to make sense of all others.

Does this seem a bit narcissistic? Consider the concept of psychological mindedness that has been going around psychodynamic circles for some years. The expression refers to a subject's capacity for self-reflection, including appreciation of emotional nuance, links between past and present, and insight into one's own and others' motives. It has been recognized that the success of individuals and groups largely depends on the psychological mindedness of their environment—notably in the mental health field. Now doesn't this sound familiar to psychohistorians? Not only have we developed a unique ability to relate to our own traumas through analysis, but we also work actively to unveil the incidence of traumatic experience on society as a whole. This should help us feel and find legitimacy in assessing the singular approach of psychohistory.

Marc-André Cotton, MA, *the International Vice President of the International Psychohistorical Association and an International Member of the Psychohistory Forum, is a teacher, independent scholar, and co-director with therapist Sylvie Vermeulen of the French website Regard conscient (www.regardconscient.net), dedicated to exploring the unconscious motivations of human behavior. He may be contacted at marc-andre.cotton@wanadoo.fr.* ❑

Psychohistory at the Crossroads of History, Science, and Art

Norman Simms—University of Waikato

Though I started to call myself a psychohistorian more than 25 years ago, I could never bring myself to see it as the major influence in my life. I always tried to use it within the parameters of the *history of mentalities*, to understand the individual and group mind as including the development of art, rhetoric, and other cultural studies. Thus the debates on whether or not psychohistory is a sci-

ence or a humanistic guide seem fruitless and pointless: From my perspective, it is not meant to treat and heal either individuals or society. It uses those tools, just as it draws from cultural anthropology, cultural history, and discourse analysis. What sets psychohistory apart lies in its stress on the evolutionary growth of consciousness, language, and creativity; and therefore, of the formative development of the brain. I reject strict, rigid paradigms of Darwinian progress and the determinist concepts of genetic programming.

Even more, when reading through the five essays on psychohistory up for discussion, several points stand out which bother me, and have always bothered me. At almost the same time, I have thought of myself as a historian of *mentalities*, a cultural historian, and a Jewish expounder of text to the goyish (gentile) world. These essays make me see why I value psychohistory as a significant approach to human experience and why I see major drawbacks to it as an academic discipline.

The first thing that got my hackles up is the writers' assumption that America is the intellectual heart of psychohistory. This seemed utterly irrelevant to colleagues at universities outside North America in the countries I am most familiar with—France, Romania, Israel, New Zealand, and Australia. Generalizations and paradigms created to make psychohistory into some kind of predictive social science or grid for understanding group phenomena does not fit with experiences and evidence from other parts of the world. There are special considerations and circumstances about American civilization, but the U.S. is not the rest of the world and its history has a different trajectory than that of other nations and cultures.

The essays offer many insights from many years' experience. Yet Fuchsman fears that psychohistory will remain a black sheep because its credentials are suspect; it seems to fall between the stools of psychoanalysis of historical events and political persons, and a healing art able to predict scientific results. These are mostly American institutional standards. Lotto widens the scope to literary and cultural studies, yet claims it is not the subject that matters but the approach (i.e., methodology and theory). Still, the subject shapes the approach, and psychohistory could learn from philology, iconology, and cultural-anthropological research. Elovitz' first essay is a defense of his work and approach, but still concerned with how to integrate psychohistory into academe and earn professional bona fides. In my view, it would be the value of the insights gained and the results obtained in practical applications that justify

his efforts. Then Beisel and Elovitz' second essays survey 45 years of tension between professional historians and psychohistorians, without describing radical shifts during that period in post-modernist and politically-correct theories in universities and professional bodies, as though the arguments were strictly intellectual.

After receiving my doctoral degree, everything I had prepared myself to undertake was stopped by the emergence of new kinds of epistemological theories: structuralism, post-structuralism, deconstructionism, and similar politically correct versions of anti-intellectual and anti-western trends in scholarship. As they started blowing through the hallowed halls of academe, I fell back in horror. It became painful to attend conferences or literary meetings. Not just the jargon, the ready-made paradigms, and the arrogance of the devotees, but the very texts to be studied and the themes considered appropriate—gay and queer studies, feminist and gender approaches, post-colonialism and Orientalist ideology, and theory for its own sake; and all this to the exclusion of solid philology, intensely sensitive close-reading, wide-ranging comparative literature, and historically-based cultural anthropology.

Thus, in self-defense, I found myself going to psychohistory meetings, psychiatric conferences, religious studies congresses, and seminars in Jewish studies around the world. Still, if asked to categorize myself, I would usually say some sort of psychohistorian. No one was ever satisfied, certainly not me.

Then, to continue the assessment of Elovitz' collection of essays on psychohistory as a science, there is the problem of other models for research, such as Aby Warburg's *Kulturgeschichte* (cultural history), and how they square with various types of Romanian and French *Histoire de mentalités*, *Anthropologie culturale*, or *Sciences de l'homme* as approaches to the study of how human language, consciousness, and perception develop in various cultural zones. The boundaries between *history of mentalities*, psychohistory, cultural anthropology, folklore, and iconography faded away.

While there is a truth out there, it is not easily accessible by the usual American academic disciplines and can be reached through constant dialectic of analysis and interpretation, reading many signs, hints, or metonymies—words, images, and gestures in various texts, discourses, works of art, dreams, and archaeological ruins—through teasing apart; saturation in contextual events and documents; drawing on seemingly far flung analogies; complex

metaphors; archaic songs, dances, and festival masquerades; and very close analysis of confessions and diaries from many different times and places.

Norman Simms, PhD, *is an American living in New Zealand since 1970, who retired from teaching literature at Waikato University to mostly write books on Alfred Dreyfus. For nearly 30 years he edited Mentalities/Mentalités and may be contacted at nsimms@waikato.ac.nz.* ❑

The Symposium Authors Reply

Selected Responses and Additional Thoughts

David Lotto—Journal of Psychohistory

I'd like to start with Jay Gonen's piece. I have missed his presence at the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) conventions and am glad that he brought up the incident about the astrologer which was the precipitant for him and others ceasing their active involvement with the IPA.

I thoroughly agree with his position. As Paul Elovitz tells us, Lloyd deMause, in his leadership role at the International Psychohistorical Association, was an open, accepting, and tolerant leader. He had clear and passionately held theories, beliefs, and ways of seeing the world, but he was also most often welcoming to those who held a wide variety of views, including some that were in opposition to his. This openness and tolerance was one of the reasons I and many others were attracted to the IPA. But he could go too far, as in allowing the presentation by an astrologer who believes that material celestial bodies can influence human emotions and behavior.

Gonen says psychohistorians "occasionally felt like a persecuted minority, somewhat akin to the way Jews historically felt." This was certainly the way Lloyd felt much of the time and spoke about often at IPA conferences. As David Beisel and Paul Elovitz make clear, there were some very good reasons to feel this way, but this kind of paranoid stance can and did lead to a certain degree of defensive isolation.

Which brings me to the issue of the criticism of psychohis-

tory and psychohistorians from academic historians as well as others. One way of understanding this is to keep in mind that there is such a thing as bad psychohistory, or as Marc-André Cotton labels it, "questionable" psychohistory. As Elovitz and Beisel tell us, bad psychobiography has been a frequent target of the critics, often centering on the accusation that the biographer is pathologizing the subject without having good evidence to support the diagnosis.

The other kind of bad psychohistory that is the target of critics is what we might call wild psychohistory, analogous to wild psychoanalysis. This type of analysis involves arguments that are highly speculative with no good evidence or argument to support them, or positions that are based on bad science (astrology or undisciplined fantasy analysis for example), or work that is riddled with unacknowledged political, racial, gender, or social biases.

The criteria for judging the quality of psychohistorical work are the same as for any scholarly enterprise; a solid theoretical base, evidence in support of the thesis, and sensible reasoning. Next, the professional identity issue. Who or what is a psychohistorian and how important is this identity? Let me start with myself. I am a psychologist (PhD in clinical psychology and a state license), a psychoanalyst (a certificate in psychoanalysis from a four year training program), a psychotherapist (how I've been making my living for the last 40 years), and a psychohistorian (published frequently in the *Journal of Psychohistory* and Clio's Psyche, regular attendee of IPA conferences, editor of *JOP*).

Many of the members of the IPA have primary and sometimes secondary professional identities in addition to considering themselves to be psychohistorians. Also, as I argued in my initial contribution, a great deal of psychohistorical work is being done by those who do not identify themselves as psychohistorians at all and may know the word only from reading Isaac Asimov's novels. Of course, if your primary professional identity is as a historian, the situation is different. But, as Hans Bakker reminds us, there aren't nor are there likely to be very many academic jobs for psychohistorians. So it is probably fortunate that most have other professional identities.

The last topic I would like to address is what I would like to call the widening scope of psychohistory. In reading the 11 contributions to this symposium I see that they are full of references to a multitude of subjects which have generated a wide variety of psy-

chohistorical work as well as many suggestions of areas that are ripe for further psychohistorical investigation. There is also a recognition of how many different disciplines, paradigms, and theories have been and can be used in psychohistory.

Ken Fuchsman provides a list of topics that he would like to see explored psychohistorically. Paul Elovitz discusses psychobiography and the applied psychohistory of Robert Jay Lifton and Vamik Volkan. Joseph Ponterotto tells us about the significant amount of psychobiographical work that has been done and is in progress, the importance of the study and teaching of the history of psychology with multicultural and international emphasis, and developments in research methods of interest to those doing psychohistory.

Hans Bakker speaks of the variety of paradigms that have been and can be used in psychohistory and Juhani Ihanus points to the existence of competing psychohistorical narratives, suggesting further topics to investigate. Ihanus also recommends collaboration with related scientific disciplines such as evolutionary biology, genetics, pre- and perinatal psychology, and neuroscience. Trevor Pederson suggests that psychohistory should integrate Marxist analysis and Marc-André Cotton calls attention to the importance of acknowledging and using our understanding of ourselves as a tool for understanding the motivations of others. Norman Simms reminds us that there is a good deal of psychohistory going on outside of North America.

Psychoanalysis, which is in many ways over the last 20 or 30 years the foundational discipline for psychohistory has (accelerating rapidly even more recently) started opening itself up to a variety of influences. Within mainstream clinical psychoanalysis, attachment theory—once shunned—is now virtually part of the established canon. Chaos theory, field theory, trauma studies, and the effects of the transgenerational transmission of trauma in both individuals and large groups, are now topics generating considerable interest within psychoanalysis.

Post-modern sensibilities and perspectives are also becoming widely accepted. This would include the Relational and Constructivist schools of clinical psychoanalysis which emphasize the importance of the many contextual factors that influence what happens during the course of psychoanalytic treatment. The work of Lacan and Foucault, and their disciples, and the mostly French fem-

inist scholars who are adding their perspectives to psychoanalysis, are also part of the post-modern "turn." The journal *Psychoanalysis, Culture, and Society* (2004-) publishes a good deal of this work.

There is even the burgeoning field of neuropsychoanalysis. But, from the point of view of psychohistory, the most significant widening and opening has been in the direction of recognizing the importance of external forces and events on human motives and actions. The huge increase in the importance of trauma work is part of this but the influences on the psyche of culture, societal norms, political and economic realities, and the effects of oppression, exploitation, racism, sexism, social and economic class, and injustice, are also being increasingly recognized as factors which impact our inner lives along with our emotions and behaviors. In short, psychoanalysis is becoming more psychohistorical. After all, both psychoanalysis and psychohistory are pursuing the same goal—trying to understand why people do what they do. ❑

Comments on Crossroads and the IPA

David Beisel—RCC-SUNY

I have reread in one sitting all the papers of my co-presenters and the observations of commentators. So many points move in so many directions as to leave my head reeling. I am confused and wonder: Does my confusion mirror the confusion of psychohistory at the crossroads? I think so.

Nearly half a century on, psychohistory is still—astonishingly—trying to find its identity. Is it a "field" or an "approach"? The answer, of course, is both. Rejected as a subfield by historians, psychohistory is accepted as a subfield by political psychologists. No matter what the bulk of historians think, it stands as a subfield of history, too, and is also an approach that can be used across disciplines as a methodology offering different fields ways to think more deeply about meanings and motives.

Judging from the history of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA), psychohistory at the crossroads is not having a midlife crisis; the themes of identity and acceptance have been ongoing issues from day one. Group-process analysts Alice Eicholz and John Hartman proposed at the very first IPA convention in 1978 that the central group fantasy embraced by its 120 participants

was "bar-mitzvah boy in a suit."

It has been 38 years and it appears the IPA is still trying to find acceptance, still stuck—at least in part—in the uncertainties and confusions of adolescence. After all these years, the first theme of this year's group-fantasy analysis at the end of the first day of the 2015 IPA convention was: Would the group survive another year? We have been asking that question for 38 years. Somehow we live on to meet again next year. The overall Crossroads Symposium seems to me to be part of this ongoing fear. Not only will psychohistory survive, how will it survive? And in what form?

Training programs are admirable and desirable. One thing that motivates Ken Fuchsman's proposal is not only psychohistory's continued existence, but an effort to find a solution for the continuing problem of maintaining standards of scholarship, a problem which has beset our enterprise from the beginning. Ken is quite right in quoting Arthur Marwick because some psychohistorians work backwards from theory towards cherry-picked evidence that fits. By contrast, those trained in traditional historiography always start with a critical analysis of large numbers of authenticated documents, moving from documents to interpretations, not the other way around. Too many psychohistorical works are also prone to make too much of too little, seizing a single behavior as proof of a grand design. These points have been made many times and presumably a professional training program would mitigate these trends.

In fact, past IPA conventions have actively worked to offset these negatives. Colleagues Lee Shneidman, Mel Kalfus, Bernard Flicker, Peter Petschauer, Robert Rousselle, Rudolph Binion, Jacques Szaluta, Paul Elovitz, along with myself, all trained historians, worked many panels over many years in informal efforts to raise consciousness about the rigors of historical scholarship, a main goal of Ken's proposal.

I am uncertain, however, if the implementation of his proposal would attract more people to psychohistory since the main obstacle to enlarging membership, as some commentators have said, is the lack of available jobs. There are no professional openings; no one is hiring psychohistorians. People attracted to the approach are driven almost entirely by personal motives, intent on greater self-understanding and deeper insight.

There is clearly more to psychohistory than the International Psychohistorical Association, ironically named since it has never

met abroad and only once in 38 tries has it met outside of New York City. While psychohistory may be practiced in other parts of the world (why was the robust Gesellshaft für Psychohistoristorie und Politische Psychologie not included in Simms' list?), the fact is that the United States—ethnocentric bias acknowledged—remains the world's center for psychohistorical research.

As a founding member, first convention chair, and twice president of the IPA, I know something about the organization's history and its place in psychohistory's past and present. Since the Crossroads papers under discussion were presented at the International Psychoanalytic Association conference in 2015, and because a number of commentators have used the IPA as a way of approaching several issues, I think it appropriate to offer a few more thoughts on it.

I have always considered my friend and colleague Jay Gonen one of psychohistory's leading practitioners, not only for his pioneering work on Zionism but for his many other writings, especially "The Israeli Illusion of Omnipotence following the Six-Day War" (*Journal of Psychohistory*, Fall 1978), and his excellent 2003 book, *The Roots of Nazi Psychology: Hitler's Utopian Barbarism*. A faithful longtime supporter of the IPA, Jay was also present at its beginnings. He has attended more than a score of consecutive conventions. His comments need to be taken seriously, not dismissed as an example of "recent deMause bashing."

As has been said many times, let us acknowledge that deMause has indeed done much for psychohistory and for the International Psychohistorical Association. But Gonen's anecdote touches on an aspect of the IPA that has been swept under the rug for decades, just one example among hundreds of examples of behaviors privately discussed that have driven people away over the years and needlessly diminished our numbers. A true history of the IPA would have to recount the many slights, false starts, and humiliations that have sabotaged the group's full potential. Assessing "psychohistory at the crossroads" needs to acknowledge these past events and finally guard against repeating them in the future.

In some respects, the IPA looks suspiciously like a cult. To the extent to which that is true, I can personally attest to the vigorous efforts of many who have worked continuously over the years to change that aspect of the culture. Change has proven difficult, a true practical lesson in the persistent resistance of group-fantasy,

though there have been a number of successes.

Part of the reason for this cult-like dimension is implicit in Paul Elovitz' comparison of the history of psychohistory with the early history of psychoanalysis, an appropriate comparison considering the conscious efforts to imitate, one might even say re-create—in reality as well as fantasy—the history of early psychoanalysis as revealed in the words and actions of deMause, Caspar Schmidt, and Henry Ebel, a psychohistory of psychohistory yet to be written.

That the IPA, like early psychoanalysis, looks at times cult-like does not take away from its role as a place where people have convened to see and make friends, socialize with like-minded scholars, and give and hear stimulating papers not likely heard elsewhere. This is obvious. For many years it was what kept me involved and coming back until, like Jay, I finally grew disillusioned and withdrew from the organization. An appeal by Denis O'Keefe happily brought me back a few years ago. The past three conventions have been enjoyable, creative, and stimulating. For the first time in many years they have left me with a cautious optimism about psychohistory's future.

Calls for new directions are always welcome. Denis O'Keefe has quietly developed what I think may prove to be a significant area of future research with his yet unpublished in-depth studies of the unconscious, self-defeating, and potentially destructive fantasies molding social policy in the United States, including the ways in which the structures and internal contradictions of those policies sabotage outcomes. He is almost single-handedly inventing a new field of psychological study.

Much of the past and present research in psychohistory has focused on the pathological and the political. I too wish to see the addition of more work on adjustment, healing, creativity, and the arts. Still, some who call for studies of creativity and the arts have not done their homework, ignoring the work already done by Andrew Brink, Carol Ravenal, Danielle Knafo, Tom Artin, Susan Gregory, Henry Lawton, Jacques Szaluta, and Dan Dervin, especially his important and nearly forgotten study, *Through a Freudian Lens Deeply: A Psychoanalysis of Cinema* (1985).

Psychoanalysis itself may be poised for a comeback. A major part of the anti-Freudian crusade of the last 30 years was centered on the assertion that psychoanalysis wasn't "scientific." All

such discussions scrupulously ignored Fisher and Greenberg's *The Scientific Credibility of Freud's Theories and Therapy* (1977) and their companion volume *The Scientific Evaluation of Freud's Theories and Therapy: A Book of Readings* (1978), which would have contradicted the critics. Today, some of Freud's theories and observations are beginning to find physiological corroboration from the breakthrough findings of modern neuroscience. Some historians are even calling for the development of something called "neurohistory."

I also know from discussions with a number of historians—Thomas Kohut for one—that some historians have come to believe enough psychological and psychoanalytic insight has found its way into the writings of historians as to make a special field of psychohistory irrelevant. Perhaps, though there are stirrings from history that a new field is emerging, or re-emerging, the history of emotions, albeit without mention of Freud, psychoanalysis, or psychohistory.

Some of this suggests psychohistory as a self-conscious field may be eroding, perhaps even disappearing. One commentator notes that psychohistory is being absorbed by psychobiography, becoming part of psychology. This is a plausible scenario, though I would hate to see the significant work done on group psychohistory, including the consequences of group trauma, abandoned in the process, unless sociology was ready to step in and absorb it.

When the IPA began, historians comprised 75% of its membership. Today, half a dozen to a dozen historians remain. Most convention presenters now come from psychology, psychotherapy, social work, or one or another of the social sciences. These numbers suggest that psychohistory at the crossroads may begin walking down several paths at once. Or, it just might happen that our approach may be absorbed into psychology entirely. That might not be such a bad thing. ❑

Crossroads within Psychohistory

Ken Fuchsman—University of Connecticut

Psychohistory has much to recommend it but, like Rodney Dangerfield, it does not get respect. Bruce Mazlish, an early champion and practitioner, writes of "the lack of cumulative power of

work in the field, a kind of dead end built into the very practice of psychohistory itself" ("The Past and Future of Psychohistory," *The Annual of Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 31, 2003, 254). Prominent historian Lynn Hunt says, "The few attempts to build up a subfield of psychohistory collapsed under the weight of its presuppositions" (*American Historical Review*, Vol. 119, No. 15, 2014, 1578). Comments such as these were incentive for "Psychohistory at the Crossroads" panels during the 2015 psychohistory convention. Below I discuss articles by fellow panelists and others.

Paul Elovitz has the ingenious idea of comparing early psychoanalysis with psychohistory's history. He writes that Freud was a divisive leader, often excommunicating dissenters and enduring defections. Dr. Elovitz says that psychoanalysis revolved around Freud. There was no such center, Elovitz writes, within psychohistory. The Wellfleet Psychohistory Group has been privately hosted by Robert Jay Lifton from 1966 to the present; the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) and the *Journal of Psychohistory* led until recently by Lloyd DeMause appeared in the 1970s; the Group for the Use of Psychology in History and the associated *Psychohistory Review* lasted from the mid-1970s until 1999; and the Psychohistory Forum and Clio's Psyche founded by Paul Elovitz, which are over 33 and 21 years old respectively. The International Society for Political Psychology (ISPP), a related movement, was founded in 1978.

Extending the analogy beyond the founder can be helpful. Analysts in England after Freud died were divided between the Anna Freud and Melanie Klein factions. During World War II, the controversial discussions between these partisans ended up with a compromise. The British Psychoanalytic Association recognized the Freudians, the Kleinians, and an Independent Group, all under one roof. This agreement has lasted and shows how diverging outlooks can co-exist. In the United States, psychoanalytic fragmentation with a proliferation of splinter groups has prevailed. The ISPP follows the big tent philosophy of British psychoanalysis, including welcoming psychohistorians.

As Elovitz mentions, the most popular of the psychohistorical varieties has been Lloyd DeMause's. At one time, his *Journal of Psychohistory* had 8,000 subscribers, while the *Psychohistory Review* had 500. DeMause compared himself to Freud, and as with Freud, there have been defections. Certain prominent psychohistorians who had contributed to the *Journal* ceased to do so. Some

eminent psychohistorians attend the political psychology conference but not the annual psychohistorical meeting. Psychohistorians then have not been able to co-exist relatively peacefully as have the ISPP and British psychoanalysis.

An irony of contemporary psychohistory is that some prominent contemporary historians, such as Joan Scott, Lynn Hunt, Lyndal Roper, Joanna Bourke, and the late Peter Gay, all write about history using psychological ideas, but neither call themselves psychohistorians, nor regularly contribute to psychohistorical publications, nor attend the IPA Convention. Similarly, the related field of psychobiography, as Joseph Ponterotto has shown, is alive and flourishing in psychology, but without frequent participation in psychohistorical organizations or journals. In most specialties, scholars in the field gather around a professional organization, but not in psychohistory. Jay Gonen says the IPA was marked by a "cultism" that was not present in "other psychohistory groups," and resulted in "negative attitudes toward psychohistorical writing in general among historians and intellectuals." It is unlikely that the IPA will soon be able to overcome its past.

David Beisel takes a different tack on the travails of psychohistory. He shows that on one hand, many prominent historians and other cultural arbiters shun psychological approaches to history, but on the other hand, many historians cannot avoid being psychological. Beisel documents well how the leaders of the American Historical Association and the *New York Review of Books* have kept psychohistory out of their publications. Somehow psychohistory awakens hostility in some, as if they were dealing with astrology rather than another psychological interdiscipline. Some of this anathema is due to the association of psychohistory with psychoanalysis. Freud's brainchild arouses similar responses. Literary critic Frederick Crews calls himself a Freud basher, and others see psychoanalysis as a form of superstition or a religious cult.

The above concerns the external state of psychohistory. Now I will look at psychohistory from within. Historians generally try to place events in context. For psychohistory, the context is that it is part of the disciplinary system of knowledge. With the professionalization of academia, distinct subject matters replaced older liberal arts ideals. Disciplines developed multiple sub-fields. Some of these sub-fields cross academic subjects and are accurately described as interdisciplines. There are now a plethora of such fields, and psychohistory is one of them. As sociology by definition in-

cludes it being an academic discipline, psychohistory is an interdiscipline by definition.

David Lotto approvingly cites Robert Lifton's stance that psychohistory is an approach more than a discipline. Following what Hans Bakker and Trevor Pederson say about its multiple paradigms, is psychohistory not a plurality of approaches? Is it not also true that physics is both a number of approaches and a discipline? If so, then the distinction between an approach and a discipline is not clear. However, psychohistory is not a discipline, but an interdiscipline. This distinction is important, as interdisciplines have to confront the inevitable problems in connecting two different subject areas.

These challenges are present in how David Lotto describes what is central in psychohistory. The "essence of what makes a study psychohistorical," he declares, "is that it seeks to understand...psychological motivation." He adds that most psychohistory has been psychodynamic. Lotto wisely favors a big tent approach. He thinks that attachment theory, the family systems approach, and terror management theory, among others, should be part of psychohistory. These different psychologies sometimes complement each other, yet often conflict. John Bowlby originated attachment theory as an alternative to the Kleinian approach in which he was trained. Most family systems theories reject psychoanalysis. How would historians, with no particular allegiance, evaluate a psychoanalytic, an attachment, and a family systems account of the same phenomenon?

Having different interpretations of the same subject is common within history. In comparing diverging perspectives, historians want to insure the evidence is factual, that the conclusions derive from the evidence, that pertinent conflicting interpretations are accounted for, and that the narrative in question has a better account of the evidence than competing views. Psychology has a plethora of different outlooks. Trevor Pederson points out that "this pluralism is a problem." It is not infrequent that a psychological account will omit the arguments and research from competing perspectives. Fragmentation and exclusion within psychology raise issues for psychohistory. For a narrative to be psychohistorical, it needs to incorporate the methods and criteria of both psychology and history, and account for the dilemmas within each field. The nitty-gritty work of psychohistory entails evaluation of the conflicting ideas, diverging standards, and criteria both within and between

history and psychology.

The aim is to be inclusive and comprehensive. Multiple perspectives are inevitable, yet need to be rigorously compared. Marc-André Cotton is concerned too much rigor could "nip new flowers in the bud." It is orthodoxy rather than rigor that discourages innovation. He also says that what I propose will not guarantee academic acceptance of psychohistory. I agree. My concern is that psychohistory faces the dilemmas intrinsic in combining two separate disciplines. Norman Simms says what I propose is American rather than international. Whatever the national differences, the disciplinary system began in Europe and remains international.

Fordham's Joseph Ponterotto traces the resurgence of psychobiography within psychology. Ponterotto adds that academic psychologists are not enamored of the psychodynamic versions of psychobiography. Recently such efforts among psychologists have been "multitheoretical" and have been written by those within personality, counseling, and international psychology. He also mentions that one psychology journal's editors are concerned that the history of psychology "may become the province of historians" rather than psychologists.

Ponterotto focuses his comments on psychobiography within psychology. Biography has been integral to history. In 2010, Barbara Caine wrote that for awhile biography in history was relegated to the "margins," but more recently biography is reviving and seen as illustrating the importance of "particular locations and circumstances and the multiple layers of historical… experience" (*Biography and History*, 2010, 2). Extensive dialogue between psychobiographers in psychology and biographers within history is needed so that disciplinary boundaries can be crossed.

Both Ponterotto and Lotto focus more on the psychological sides of psychohistory. The more psychology and history are integrated, the more comprehensive a psychohistorical account is. Lotto's and Ponterotto's work is high quality, yet it shows the challenges in balancing both fields within an interdiscipline. Juhani Ihanus mentions scholars whose work can aid psychohistory. All but one have doctorates in psychology, and none are historians. Of the seven commentaries on the symposium, only Norman Simms stresses history. Given these imbalances, will the interdiscipline of psychohistory find ways of more fully integrating psychological and historical approaches? ❑

Professionalizing Psychohistory and Other Issues

Paul H. Elovitz—The Psychohistory Forum

The diffusion and strength of psychohistory are evident as the commentaries on our five papers come from Finland, France, New Zealand, Canada, Wyoming, Florida, and New York. The content of these responses is an interesting mixture of optimistic and pessimistic views of our field. Joseph Ponterotto's good news is that despite academic psychology departments' traditional hostility to psychohistory, psychobiography is making a comeback. He wisely points out that "psychohistorical study makes for better clinicians" after the psychology students go into the field because "training in history breaks the divide often between theory and practice in psychology."

Trevor Pederson, the youngest of the commentators, presents an ambivalent view of psychohistory, which he is deepening his knowledge of and which he would like to connect to Marxism as have others since the 1920s. Through the years I have known a number of colleagues who are drawn to Marxism and psychoanalysis/psychohistory, but they have overwhelmingly relinquished their Marxism after making a major commitment to probing the unconscious. When Pederson declares that "professional recognition for psychohistory would be hard enough, but for psychohistories, it seems like asking for a bunch of insightful, but unconnected, aphorisms to be acceptable for a master's thesis," I find it demeaning to a field that welcomes many approaches and has created a very large and valuable literature that he appears unaware of. Many of his ideas about our field seem garnered not from this literature or from the double blind refereed studies of Clio's Psyche and the now juried *Journal of Psychohistory*, but from the hit or miss posts on Clio's Psyche's Google listserv.

The lack of employment for psychohistorians, as psychohistorians is a major issue, is highlighted by Hans Bakker and taken to an extreme by Pederson when he writes that "it seems unethical to me to try to attract students to a discipline in which no future is offered to them." *Au contraire*! Psychohistory has provided a wonderful past and continues to provide a fine future for me and many other colleagues. When I won the quite competitive Alumni Teaching and Leadership award at my college, it was precisely because of

what I learned as a psychohistorian. When some of David Beisel's fellow historians were being de-tenured during a major budget crisis, it was his overflowing psychohistory classes that protected his position, along with his willingness to fight for his field and position. Beisel is an extraordinary scholar, editor, colleague, and professor who has taught psychohistory to over 8,000 students. Regrettably, he is too concerned about the failure of the leaders of the historical profession to embrace psychological history. We need to simply do good work and not devote our energy to the naysayers, who are far more prevalent in academia than the clinical world.

When Juhani Ihanus regrets that "neglected as a companion of psychohistory is positive psychology," I like the impulse to not be focusing on psychopathology. However, I would like to bring his attention to my over three decades long push to build a psychohistory focused on adaptability, childhood, coping mechanisms, creativity, empathy, innovation, personality, psychobiography, and overcoming trauma, rather than on psychopathology. We in psychohistory need well-researched psychobiographies and other in depth studies, far more than new theorists and theories, as we have already seen a dearth of both.

It is a remarkable turnabout that the *Journal of Psychohistory*, long associated with Lloyd deMause's advocacy of psychohistory as a separate discipline and scientific field, is now edited by David Lotto, who agrees with Robert Jay Lifton's advocacy of psychohistory as an approach rather than a separate field of inquiry. I am totally in agreement with his tolerant big tent approach to the field in terms of theories and methodologies. My main concern is that the institutions of psychohistory be maintained and grown because they serve as a hothouse of inquiry, spread the word of the approach, and help to establish standards of investigation. Also, interested colleagues are more likely to be drawn to a field or discipline rather than simply an approach.

The demise of Lifton's Center on Violence and Human Survival, Volkan's Center on Mind and Human Interaction (and the journal of the same name), the Group for the Use of Psychology in History (GUPH), and the *Psychohistory Review* are unfortunate. All but the last were a result of retirements. Fortunately, the valuable Association for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society came into existence in the 1995 and has created a fine journal, *Psychoanalysis, Culture, and Society*. In England, *Psychoanalysis and History* was created in 1999. Contrary to Norman Simms' assertion,

the U.S. is certainly the center of psychohistory, but psychohistory is thriving in Germany, where there may have been as many people attending last April's conference in Heidelberg as this year's IPA in New York City. In France, Marc-André Cotton has 100s of people attend his talks on childrearing.

Ken Fuchsman deserves credit for originating the idea for the "Psychohistory at the Crossroads" symposium and soliciting colleagues for it first as panel discussions and then in its present form. Furthermore, Ken is an advocate of creating a psychohistorical training program, which was an intense subject of discussion after one of the panels.

This led me to consider how people become trained as psychohistorians, since there is no degree given in the field. Peter Loewenberg and Peter Gay had solid training in history and political science and careers as historians prior to their postgraduate training in psychoanalysis. Loewenberg had the added training in probing the unconscious that comes from control analysis (intensive, one-on-one long term supervision) when seeing patients. David Beisel was intensively trained as a historian, had a lengthy personal and group analysis, and then the added expertise from his decade-long stint as the editor of the *Journal of Psychohistory*. Lloyd deMause did graduate work in political science and had some training in psychoanalysis prior to devoting himself full time to his business and a scientific approach to psychohistory.

My own training started with three degrees in history followed by sitting through several semesters of history courses taught by a psychological historian. After I taught Western Civilization at Temple University, a new world was opened up to me as I audited my colleague's Western Civilization class focused on personality and the unconscious. I read—actually, devoured—every psychoanalytic and psychological study of historical individuals and events I could find in English. Next, I attended psychoanalytic seminars on biography, cinema, and dreams offered at training institutes. This was a good start but far from enough. To become what I considered to be a well-trained psychohistorian, I needed and got a lengthy personal analysis, group analysis, seven years of psychoanalytic courses, ten years of control analysis, and over a quarter century of analytic practice.

My personal and control analyses taught me about my own projective field, making me a better psychobiographer. Personal

analysis was the single most important part of my training. Organizing and running psychohistorical seminars as a midwife of psychohistory for 39 years and 21 years as a psychohistorical editor have deepened my education, which was then furthered by researching and teaching psychohistory courses since 1972. The stimulation of being a part of a psychohistorical community has been an enormously powerful part of my education as the psychodynamic paradigm was developed as a collaborative effort in discussion and debate with colleagues I met at our different organizations. In looking back on my career that began in the 1960s, I greatly value formal classroom education, personal analysis, collegial interchange, and learning by doing and teaching.

There are many routes to becoming a psychohistorian. The late Henry Lawton was a prodigious worker who became a fine scholar of our field with only self-analysis, although after I finally talked him into going into personal and group analysis, he realized how much he had missed with only an intellectual understanding of the unconscious and his bachelor's and master's degrees in history.

Those who come to the field from a clinical background have much to offer but often have little sense of the rules of evidence that historians are steeped in. Psychohistorical journal editors and referees serve as important educators of would-be authors when they take the time to explain why work is rejected or can be accepted only after extensive changes are made. Whether psychohistorians begin with a background in psychology or history, there is a steep learning curve to complete their education.

There have been various attempts to formalize psychohistorical education, most of which have not gotten off the ground. Historian George Kren and psychologist Leon Rappoport worked hard to establish a graduate program in psychohistory at Kansas State University, but it failed because of inadequate student enrollment. At UCLA, Peter Loewenberg arranged for history graduate students to also attend classes at his psychoanalytic institute, but most failed to establish careers in history departments because of a slack market for historians and anti-psychoanalytic prejudices.

The issue of psychohistorical training and certification that figures so large in Fuchsman's approach is a good idea that I welcome as someone who has worked to bring people to the field for four decades. The problem is that these are unrealistic at the present time. Without there being a way of making a living in the field it-

self, few would sign up for these potentially valuable activities. The interesting work for psychological inquiry that Fuchsman lays out would require hoped-for legions of new psychohistorians that just aren't there. The sheer variety of responses to the "Psychohistory at the Crossroads" symposium support the fact that psychohistory is alive and well, with practitioners from various backgrounds coexisting reasonably well, while developing our field. Whether one believes it is a field or simply an approach, it is this kind of lively debate that has built and continues to build the psychohistorical paradigm. Although a formalized certification program figures into several colleagues' hopes for psychohistory's future, I doubt that at this time, especially looking back at previous failed attempts, it is a viable course of action.

As editor I would like to thank my colleagues for their many valuable contributions to this symposium issue. ❑

Symposium Related Articles

My Experience with Psychohistory

Peter W. Petschauer—Appalachian State University

My first exposure to psychohistory goes back to one of David Beisel's articles about "The Group-Fantasy of Early German Nationalism, 1800-1815" in the *Journal of Psychohistory* (Vol. 8, No. 1, 1980, 1-20). I wrote him a letter (no e-mail or texting then) arguing against his point and was then invited to write a response in the *Journal*. This exchange lured me from history to psychohistory. Dr. Beisel's response opened the door to seeing the past differently. Although I had corresponded with historians before, it was his openness to my argument that inspired me to explore this then new approach further.

After I attended some of the psychohistorical conferences early on, I continued with my other love, 18th century Europe and its conferences along the east coast. My colleagues in East-Central Eighteenth-Century European Studies (EC) were not as contentious as those I experienced in the early years of psychohistory; the EC scholars, oddly, were open to men and women from all fields. By contrast to these colleagues, psychohistorians were in a constant tussle, from debates about leaving New York City with the annual conferences to the leadership of certain individuals and, of course,

the radicalism of some presentations and articles. So, for a time, I escaped from psychohistory to a group that was interested in little else than making sure that its small cohort continued, and presented papers and wrote articles and books.

But once hooked on psychohistory, I kept coming back to it, especially because of Lloyd de Mause's pathbreaking article, "The Evolution of Childhood" (1974), and then books covering the stages of childrearing. The design and content of the stages appealed to me, even if I disagreed with some of the details and said so in several presentations and articles.

At that point, my exploration of psychohistory did not bother me personally or professionally as a historian, nor did it seem to bother anyone else with whom I worked or otherwise interacted. Most colleagues who have written the subsequent articles in this issue have had the same experience. Even the American Historical Association (AHA) initially embraced the new approach to doing history. As a matter of fact, William Langer said so very specifically in his 1957 "The Next Assignment" presidential address (http://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/presidential-addresses/william-l-langer). The field's explorative initiatives were protected as if under a large tent; confidence in ourselves and in our field pervaded our discourses. This confidence resided in part in our youth, the excellent training of a whole generation of historians by the very best practitioners from the U.S. and Europe at the finest American universities, the liberalism of American society and, most importantly, the eagerness of almost every field to open itself to interdisciplinary approaches. The word "innovation" was in the air; my university even had a Dean for Innovation and Change.

This openness gradually disappeared as almost all fields hardened into rigid positions and defenses. This retrenchment was lived by older practitioners like me. After the exuberance of the '70s came the gradual entrenchment of authoritarian voices in America. It showed itself in every aspect of American life really: offices, churches, academic fields, politics, etc. The words "process" and "interdisciplinarity" lost favor. Naturally as well, the members of almost every field grew older, less eager to change, and more defensive. Historians earning their doctorates at less prestigious universities were more cautious than an earlier generation to commit to a field not well established in academia.

Importantly, budgets were cut, sometimes dramatically in the '80s, causing uncertainty in departments about retention of faculty. To make things worse, some odd innovations reduced the quality of programs. For example, graduate students were required for long periods to take two foreign languages, that is, if s/he studied Russian history, they at least would be required to take Russian and/or German and/or French. For some this requirement was too onerous, so it was dropped in favor of one foreign language and computing or something similar. Courses in psychology, or even anthropology, became off limits as well; they were "out-of-field," seen as speculative and not hard sciences like economics. Many historians wanted to be "real scientists" and neutral. At the same time, the number of course requirements were increased so that a student could not readily take courses in other fields.

Another trend made itself felt. Fewer and fewer historians were eager to admit or even knew of their approach to history. The honesty of giving one's reason for a certain approach, like Marxism, Socialism, or Neo-Capitalism, became lost in the eagerness to publish and be known. We began to assume that we are speaking only from a set of truths, not from a set of past experiences that shaped our opinions and approaches to a certain topic. As every psychohistorian knows, we all come to history with our own set of values based on childhood, parenting, interpersonal relationships, etc. that determine our take of a topic. That is, as Paul Elovitz reminded me in an e-mail recently, "in psychohistorical work at its best, you must confront your own emotions" and be aware of "countertransference, splitting and resistance."

So, the question that my colleagues raise in the symposium articles now centers itself: Why did most historians become so negative about psychohistory? The answer lies both in the past and the current situation. As indicated, the field of history hardened from a relatively open adventure to one of internal rigidity and massive bordering. Perhaps as a consequence, psychohistorians became distressed about acceptance. Rejection is no fun, but with sufficient self-assurance about what one is doing, rejection is not an issue; said differently, we have allowed ourselves to be influenced by the loss of the big tent and interdisciplinarity. If we as members of our field are sufficiently persuasive, strong, or valuable, then we will survive the recent losses of leaders and the aging of most of the rest of us. If we are not, then there is no loss when it disappears. The passing will be like the loss of several other programs and subfields

that I have experienced, among them my favorite for years: Russian and Soviet Studies. But Jewish, Holocaust, and Peace Studies took its place.

To me it seems we have nourished a group fantasy that tells us that we are not accepted and we can highlight the culprits of our woe. The reality is that most historians also do not feel accepted by their colleagues and that they too can highlight their tormentors. So, on the one hand, they are projecting their experience on "us." On the other, we are accepting this moniker and in turn accuse "them" of not appreciating us.

For psychohistorians (and historians) what matters most is Howard Stein's advice in a recent e-mail to me, which I am paraphrasing, that to write good history, biography, etc. one needs to be sensitive to one's own opinions about the topic at hand, be attuned to the topic itself and how it changes as we work on it, and finally write or present our discoveries and insights in as clear and humane a fashion as is possible.

I hope that I have become a better scholar because of the insights and examples of my psychohistorical colleagues.

Peter Petschauer, PhD, *is Professor Emeritus of History at Appalachian State University, a Research Associate of the Psychohistory Forum, and a member of its Editorial Board. Among his various books is one on his father's disillusioning experience as an officer in the SS and another on the four women who mothered him. He is the subject of a lengthy Journal of Psychohistory article, "The Impact of a Psychohistorian's Life Experience and Personality on His Career and Scholarship" (Summer 2015). He may be contacted at petschauerpw@appstate.edu.* ❑

To Educate or Not to Educate through Psychoanalysis—and in Psychohistory

Juhani Ihanus—University of Helsinki

A long and strong tradition depicts and prescribes psychoanalysis as a therapeutic enterprise that does not use suggestion, manipulation, or indoctrination to foster insight and does not resort to supportive and educative methods to enable personal development. The prohibition against mixing worldviews (*Weltanschauungen*) and education has been largely established in psychoanalytic think-

ing and practice, but it is not all embracing. In Sigmund Freud's ways of working with patients and in his writings there are clear educational undercurrents even if Freud himself was no pedagogue. Already *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (1905) contained the basic Enlightenment idea that adults should learn to understand how much their perceptions of the psychic reality and sexuality of children are impregnated by their affective resistance against and repression of their own infantile sexual impulses.

Although Freud focused on infantile sexuality and insisted on the "education for reality," he actually refrained from giving sexual education and instruction to his own children, owing to the bourgeois conservative attitudes of his time toward sexual issues and emotional interaction between parents and children. When followers started to gather around Freud and formed the first psychoanalytic organization, the missionary and optimistic atmosphere was discernible. Fritz Wittels ("Brill – the Pioneer," *Psychoanalytic Review*, 35, 1948, 397–98) in his recollection of the early pioneers of psychoanalysis has stated, "…they [had] hoped a psychoanalytic revolution would transmute the Victorian Era into a Golden Age. Freud… remained the most sober and cautious of them all." In spite of Freud's reservations about the potential of psychoanalysis and its applications, many of his followers were eager to use it as an educational method in emancipating children, and in creating a "world without penitentiary" (Wittels, *Die Welt ohne Zuchthaus*, Stuttgart: Hippokrates, 1928).

Several pioneers of psychoanalysis became engaged with combining psychoanalytic theories and educational practice. Already in 1908, during the First Private Psychoanalytic Meeting in Salzburg, Sándor Ferenczi referred to the negative effects of education at the root of psychic disorders and proposed the reform of sexual education for children. In addition, Ernest Jones published an early article, "Psycho-analysis and education," in 1910. Named as "psychoanalytic pedagogy," this new area of applied psychoanalysis emerged and was actively advanced, especially from the 1920s, by numerous people including August Aichhorn, Siegfried Bernfeld, Berta Bornstein, Edith Buxbaum, Otto Fenichel, Anna Freud, Hermine Hug-Hellmuth, Annie and Wilhelm Reich, Editha Sterba, Bruno Bettelheim, Rudolf Ekstein, and Ernst Federn.

Freud had given impetus to this field in "The Claims of Psychoanalysis to Scientific Interest" (1913a, *S.E.*, XIII, 119) by proclaiming that only such a person can be an educator who knows

how "to empathize with the soul-life of the child." However, adults do not easily understand children because they do not understand their own childhood. To succeed better in this, psychoanalytic (and psychohistorical) knowledge cannot be restricted to the intellectual level but should include personally lived, experienced, and felt knowledge about unconscious motivations. In his introduction to Oskar Pfister's *Die psychoanalytische Methode* (1913b, *S.E. XII*, 327), Freud expressed high hopes: "Let us hope that the application of psychoanalysis to the service of education will quickly fulfill the hopes which educators and doctors may rightly attach to it."

Educational institutions and seminars were founded according to psychoanalytic guidelines, not only in Vienna and Berlin but also as far as Moscow (where even Stalin's son stayed for a while in a psychoanalytically oriented short-lived kindergarten from 1921 to 23). Paul Federn and Heinrich Meng started publishing *Psychoanalytische Volksbuch* in 1926 that announced the new journal *Zeitschrift für psychoanalytische Pädagogik* (1926–1937, edited by Heinrich Meng from Stuttgart and Ernst Schneider from Riga), claiming that psychoanalysis "finds its basic meaning and its clearest success as an Education Science."

Educational utopia in psychoanalysis can be defined as a special version of psychological utopia that through psychoanalytically oriented educational reforms tries to convey the transformation of the inner self of children, adolescents, and parents/ educators, and thus the change of unhealthy societal structures and processes. Utopian zeal is discernible in the works of educational psychoanalysts when they tried, each in their own way, to change the authoritarian impact on character structuring (character crystallizing the social order) and on family formation (the family as both an instrument of education of a bourgeois society and a utopian microcosm for progress).

For example, Bernfeld contributed to *Zeitschrift für psychoanalytische Pädagogik* ("Ist Psychoanalyse eine Weltanschauung?" Vol. 2, 1928) and concluded in his article that psychoanalysis pushed everyone not only to *see* but also to *evaluate* a considerable part of the world in a new way and consequently to *act* in a new way too. He presented it as a scientific discovery that, nevertheless, had several worldview (and ethical) effects.

Although Freud himself was not willing to reform social laws, his notions of sexual drives–their repression as a basis for

neurosis and their sublimation as a basis for the highest cultural achievements–could be seized upon and modified to provide arguments against bourgeois sexual morality or for the rehabilitation of sexuality as a strong natural force against Christian-ascetic values (cf. Bernfeld, ibid., 203). There were two kinds of broad currents that used psychoanalysis as a fermentation process for utopian renewal. The first of these concentrated on criticizing and reforming the institutions of marriage (the "bankruptcy of marriage") and the family (the "patriarchal family"), sexual morality, and cultural restraints. The second fostered "free love," individualist moral values and the openly narcissistic enjoyment of nature, nakedness, life, and the arts.

Bernfeld proposed that "consequent psychoanalytic sexual morality, sexual reform, is not possible" because one could draw so many different kinds of conclusions from the psychoanalytic "facts" (ibid., 203–4). On the vicissitudes of education, Bernfeld considered it obvious that psychoanalysis could not serve as an essential element of education in all layers of society. It was also a destroyer that explicated how the whole culture, including religion, the arts, philosophy, and morality, had become what it was, and what it was destined to become. That which had become, and which was determined to become, could also be changed. This made psychoanalysis truly utopian and dangerous: it was a crucial "element of education," not of the present but of the "future order" (ibid., 207–08).

Victorian and post-Victorian morality formed the basis for emancipatory psychoanalytic pedagogy, whereas free education and the antiauthoritarian movements of the 1960s against "totalistic institutions" served as an important background for psychohistory, especially the history of childhood and its applications concerning new and more democratic, helping modes of parenting and child rearing and ensuing societal and cultural change have educational and reformative aspects. In deMause's work, the world-on-the-couch psychoeducative aspect has utopian ingredients, while his fantasy analysis and psychogenic theory of history often propose political, societal, and cultural prognoses. Perhaps psychohistory has less "healing power" than psychoanalysis, as Elovitz mentions (see his article in this issue), but it does not lack it altogether when it manages to convince us that we can learn from the evolution of child rearing and from our own history how we often stubbornly repeat our errors and resist change. Psycho-

historical consciousness based on research can initiate growth for meaningful and peaceful living.

Both applied psychoanalysis and applied psychohistory in the educational field have their dark sides of trauma and its reliving, even in child-care work and organizations. There is an ambivalent tension between emancipation/reform and rigidi- maltreatment in relation to our understanding of infantile psychic reality and the effects of adult intrusion into this reality. Psychoanalytic education toward the reality principle and psychohistorical awakening to the nightmare of history are both resisted because of our dearth of the positive moments of personally lived and embodied emotion and insight. It is still the case that we have to reflect on Freud's late admission that psychoanalyzing, educating, and ruling were those "impossible professions" where one could be sure beforehand about the inadequate results of one's work (Freud, "Analysis Terminable and Interminable," 1937, *S.E*., XXIII, 248).

As much as Freud maintained psychoanalysis as a psychological science, he seems to have argued that psychoanalysis is "not an impartial scientific investigation, but a therapeutic measure. Its essence is not to prove anything, but merely to alter something" (Freud, "Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy," 1909, *S.E., X*, 103). Psychohistory was also meant by deMause to be a special discipline, although it may nowadays be seen as an intermediary (sometimes also marginalized) approach including various agents from different fields of knowledge (see David Lotto's article in this issue).

The increasing capacity of the parents to empathize with their children belongs to the psychohistorical script of the evolution of childrearing and the concomitant evolution of the psyche and society. They are slow processes but can be enhanced via more advanced and individuated psychoclasses teaching "helping-mode parenting" to the less evolved. That vision by deMause sees the end of child abuse and neglect accompanied by the end of wars and other grandiose and self-destructive social conditions and dominative group-fantasies. This psychohistorical cure posits a "world that loves and trusts its children and encourages them to develop their unique selves" (deMause, *The Emotional Life of Nations*, 2002, 430). Such new advances as community parenting centers (see Robert McFarland and John Fanton, "Moving Towards Utopia: Prevention of Child Abuse," *The Journal of Psychohistory*, 24, 1997, 320–31) moved deMause to declare that by starting a world-

wide program to end child abuse through empathic parenting we can avoid the "global holocaust." He even claimed, "This is the single most important finding of the new science of psychohistory" (ibid., 432).

While observing his own son, Peter's, infancy, Wilhelm Reich wrote in a letter (May 2, 1944) to A. S. Neill "how little this high-boasting psychiatry knows" about newborn babies (Beverley R. Placzek, Ed., *Record of a Friendship: The Correspondence between Wilhelm Reich and A. S. Neill 1936–1957*, 1981, 112). This undoubtedly hints at many theoretical formulations concerning the riddle of the infant in psychoanalysis and in psychohistory, too. The child is still in the midst. However, it belongs to the vital nature of education and to the human history that both education and desire continuously move, not keeping to the proclaimed and rigid Truth or Discipline. For Reich, "healthy children" were the "greatest natural researchers… playfully conquering new fields of knowledge" (*People in Trouble*, 1953 [1976], 258). They will always be the "children of the future." Perhaps this belief connects Reich even closer than Freud to "the single most important finding" of psychohistory.

Juhani Ihanus' biography can be found on page 38 . ❑

A Research Program for Psychohistory

Brian D'Agostino—Int. Psychohistorical Association

It is essential that the field of psychohistory remain a big tent that scholars having many different professional backgrounds, theoretical approaches, and methods can call home. In this spirit, I define academic psychohistory in the broadest possible terms as the study of how history shapes and is shaped by the psychology of individuals and groups. In addition, the field encompasses applied psychohistory, which puts the insights of research to work in ameliorating social problems and creating a more humane and sustainable future.

While holding this expansive view of what psychohistory is, I also have more specific ideas about a research program that could advance the field. The program I envision would not exclude others. It would concern itself with deep processes of historical evolution that span past millennia and can provide insight into public af-

fairs today. It would be guided by an overarching theoretical framework (what Thomas Kuhn called a paradigm) that is not directly testable, but which generates a series of testable hypotheses. I view Lloyd deMause's "Psychogenic Theory of History" as providing raw material for such a paradigm, though I disagree with deMause's reductionism and do not think that his specific typology of childrearing stages is necessarily the best starting point for this program of research.

The theoretical framework I propose is centered on the simple proposition that childrearing practices have important macro-historical consequences. While this proposition may seem axiomatic to psychohistorians, it is far from self-evident to many others. In fact, it was even controversial when I proposed it last fall on the Clio's Psyche Listserv discussion group. This led to a very interesting dialogue, which was published in the Winter 2015 issue of *Psychohistory News* under the title, "How Much Does Childrea ring Really Impact History?" (http://www.psychohistory.us/archive.php).

The proposition that childrearing practices have important macro-historical consequences is too general to be tested directly but can be a source of testable hypotheses. In this essay, I will focus on one of these hypotheses, or family of hypotheses, namely that political preferences and belief systems held by individuals are related to the quality of the care they experienced as children. The advantage of formulating the hypothesis in this way is that it builds on existing research in political psychology, especially the literature on authoritarianism. I also assume that beliefs and subjective preferences determine behavior, in conjunction with situational factors, which is supported by theory and experiment (see Richard Marken's *Doing Research on Purpose: A Control Theory Approach to Experimental Psychology*, 2014).

An important early study in this context was Theodor W. Adorno et al., *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950), which used survey research and interviews to uncover a personality type associated with political conservatism, ethnocentrism, and anti-Semitism. While breaking new ground in political psychology, this study contained significant psychometric and methodological flaws. Subsequent research by Bob Altemeyer in *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right-Wing Authoritarianism* (1988) and Brian D'Agostino's "Self Images of Hawks and Doves," in *Political Psychology* (1995) corrected for these flaws and replicated some of Adorno et

al.'s core findings.

The idea that political beliefs and preferences might be related to childrearing practices is implied by the terms "strict father" and "nurturing parent" that cognitive linguist George Lakoff postulated as the underlying types associated with conservative and liberal beliefs and political preferences. Many psychohistorians would recognize Lakoff's strict father and nurturing parent types as different "psychoclasses," Lloyd deMause's term for groups having a common personality profile arising from a specific pattern of childrearing.

I would argue that a major testable hypothesis that can be derived from the new paradigm I am proposing is that the authoritarian or strict father type is in fact associated with punitive parenting, though the nature of this association is likely to be complex. Adorno et al. provided some evidence for this hypothesis, but their research did not adequately explore the childrearing/political preference nexus and subsequent research on authoritarianism did not address it at all.

This hypothesis can be explored using both historical and social science methods. As for the former, consider as an example the causes of the French Revolution. If the childrearing/political preferences hypothesis is correct, there should be plausible evidence of a causal nexus between advances in 18th century French childrearing and subsequent revolutionary upheavals in France. Two studies that explore such a nexus are Lynn Hunt's *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (1993) and Barry M. Shapiro's *Traumatic Politics: The Deputies and the King in the Early French Revolution* (2009), reviewed by David Beisel in this journal (Vol. 17, #1-2, 2010, 149-153). Such research is a model of empirical work that can be done across a range of cultures and historical periods. Lloyd deMause's far-reaching speculations on the historical stages of childrearing entail many similar historical hypotheses that can be tested empirically through in-depth studies of this kind.

As for social science approaches to the childrearing/political beliefs hypothesis, research can be done using a combination of interview and survey methods, as in *The Authoritarian Personality*. In "Scapegoats and Sacred Cows: The Ideology of American State Capitalism" (*Journal of Psychohistory*, 2012), I sketched a psychodynamic model that could account for one version of the childrearing/political beliefs nexus. I argued that right wing authoritarians

in the United States at the present time are typically people who were subjected to punitive parenting, generally by fathers (c.f. Lakoff's "strict father" type). They apparently idealize the punitive parent and repress/project onto symbolic objects the rage they originally directed at him. It would appear that they typically also internalize the father's contempt for weakness and dependency, which is associated with infancy and the nurturing mother.

I hypothesize that the idealized punitive introjects are typically projected onto the violent arm of the state—the military and police—while the internalized contempt is projected onto the "nanny state," that is, the social welfare and regulatory aspects of government. It is the latter to which American conservatives generally refer when they castigate "government"—even as they treat the military and police as sacred cows. By contrast, someone who becomes conscious of the punitive father introjects as the source of their rage is likely to become politically progressive, rebelling against the violent side of the state and embracing the nurturing side.

It follows from this that punitive parenting does not result in conservative attitudes when the unconscious complexes associated with it remain unconscious. Thus, psychotherapy and spontaneous personal growth can transform the effects of punitive parenting on political belief systems. People raised in a nurturing manner may end up in the same place politically by a different developmental route. Research in this area needs to take account of such complexities, which may explain why some studies have failed to find a straightforward statistical correlation between childrearing and political attitudes.

In addition, we need to consider childrearing variables other than punitive parenting by fathers. Snyder and Clifton identify some of these variables, including quality and continuity of attachment in infancy and early childhood in *The Predictor Scale* (2013). Their "predictor scale," which incorporates a number of relevant variables, may be useful in social science research on the sources of political preferences.

In summary, the nexus between childrearing, political preferences, and belief systems is a promising area for psychohistorical research. Testable hypotheses on this and related topics arise from a theoretical framework in which childrearing practices are assumed to produce important macro-historical effects. These hy-

potheses can be explored using historical methods, such as research on the childrearing antecedents of the French Revolution, as well as social science methods such as survey and interview studies of authoritarianism and conservative/liberal political belief systems.

Brian D'Agostino, PhD, *is President of the International Psychohistorical Association and Editor of the Psychohistory News. He is the author of publications that have appeared in Political Psychology, Political Science Quarterly, and Review of Political Economy, and of the book The Middle Class Fights Back: How Progressive Movements Can Restore Democracy in America (2012). He may be contacted at bdagostino@verizon.net.* ❑

Three Psychohistorical Journals

Paul H. Elovitz with David Cifelli—Ramapo College

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, there was a growing interest in applying psychology to history and the social sciences. Freudianism was riding high among intellectual leaders of America, leading some to create a more coherent psychohistorical literature through the establishment of journals. In New York in 1973, Lloyd deMause created *The History of Childhood Quarterly: The Journal of Psychohistory* (referred to as the *Journal*) as the first explicitly psychohistorical journal. After three years, it dropped the childhood reference since librarians resisted ordering a scholarly journal referring to childhood. In 1972, historian Richard Schoenwald of Carnegie Mellon and several others organized and directed the Group for the Use of Psychology in History (GUPH), affiliated with and usually meeting at the annual conference of the American Historical Association (AHA). *Newsletter: Group for the Use of Psychology in History* started as five pages in 1972 with historian Patrick P. Dunn of the University of Wisconsin as general editor and Charles B. Strozier and others as editors. In four years it became the *Psychohistory Review* (the *Review*) and would continue until 1999. Strozier, a young historian hired with an appointment in psychohistory at Sangamon State University (SSU), edited the *Review* and became the principal organizer of GUPH (William J. Gilmore, *Psychohistorical Inquiry: A Comprehensive Research Bibliography*, 1984, ix). Clio's Psyche, sponsored by the Psychohistory Forum (1983-), was inaugurated in 1994 as a 10-page quarterly newsletter. Although within five or six years it had the length of a

journal and soon introduced refereeing, it retained its newsletter format until 2008, when it assumed a more traditional journal layout. Together, these three journals have created a substantial psychohistorical literature.

This article is enriched by interviews of various editors, including David Beisel (1979-87) and David Lotto (2010-) for the *Journal*; Charles Strozier (1979-86), Larry Shiner (1986-99) for the *Review*; and Paul Elovitz (1994-) for Clio's Psyche. Regrettably, Lloyd deMause, the founding editor, owner, and longest serving editor of the *Journal*, was unavailable to be interviewed because of ill health.

Lloyd deMause worked to build a psychohistorical community with various publications through the establishment of the Association for Applied Psychoanalysis (ca. 1969-72), the Institute for Psychohistory, the *Journal of Psychohistory*, the Psychohistory Press, *Behavior Today*, and the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA; 1977-) of which he was the first president. As a publisher of newsletters for the automotive industry, he was in an excellent position to launch a new journal. He had a clear vision, knew the business of publishing, and had a large staff at his office on Broadway in Manhattan. To increase subscriptions, deMause maintained a massive campaign of mailings urging people to subscribe. Many subscription advertisements were sensational, which worked to gain subscribers, but offended some academics. His concept of psychohistory, including improving childrearing and ending warfare, was deMause's life's work. Making money and conducting a business were only a means to this end, so deMause took a partner to run the company and devoted full time to his passion.

The scholarly community created by deMause's activities generated ideas for special issues, articles, symposia, and books. He was devoted to the idea of psychohistory as an independent science. His troubled relationship with academia was related to Columbia University's refusal to let him write an explicitly psychohistorical doctoral dissertation in political science—leading to his dropping out of its program. On the one hand he relentlessly pursued academics for psychohistory and on the other, as in "The Independence of Psychohistory" (1975), he offended historians by likening them to astrologers and psychohistorians to astronomers—this was offensive to even his closest historical collaborators.

In contrast, the GUPH group behind the *Psychohistory Review* mostly saw psychohistory as a subfield of history and much more slowly grew their journal by word of mouth. The *Review* sought an academic audience, not a mass audience like the *Journal*, which included clinicians and laymen, as well as academics. Strozier and the GUPH planned to overcome academia's resistance to a new field, just as economic, intellectual, and social history have overcome resistance and become accepted historical fields. In 2000 Strozier declared "that deMause had the distinct ability to enrage me" and how "I began the *Review* very specifically to offer an alternative to him and what I felt was his sloppy and biased editing" ("Charles Strozier Replies to Stein," Clio's Psyche Vol. 6, No. 4, March 2000, 159).

In terms of institutions and theory, Lloyd deMause has been the most innovative of the advocates for psychohistory. Colleagues inspired by his analysis of the history of childhood, dedication to improving childrearing and studying and averting war, or wanting to have their articles and books published, were clearly drawn to deMause even though they often disagreed with his vision of psychohistory as a science and were less than enthusiastic, or even quietly critical, about some of his theories. These controversial theories included the evolution of childhood (leading to a type of perfect childhood with "helping mode parenting"), the fetal origins of history, group fantasy analysis, and toxic mothering. Members of the Institute for Psychohistory and the IPA, especially if they were laypeople or new to the field, were inclined to be sufficiently impressed with deMause's leadership in the field to accept his ideas without much questioning until he entered into what David Beisel, editor of the *Journal* for a decade, called the "lock-step dogma of the psychogenic theory" or later, "the birth stuff" (Beisel e-mail to Cifelli, May 2015). Within the *Journal*, few articles explicitly opposing deMause's theories ever made it to publication, except in symposiums on it.

Lloyd deMause was totally dedicated to developing a scientific psychohistorical paradigm. There was considerable disagreement with deMause's conception of psychohistory as a discipline separate from history and a subject amenable to scientific proof. At the first national psychohistorical conference, sponsored by GUPH and held at Stockton State College of New Jersey in 1976, there were sharp differences of opinion on many subjects, and the academic organizers—who were inclined to dismiss him, the Institute

for Psychohistory, and the *Journal* out of hand—allowed no real platform for deMause's ideas. DeMause left the meeting more determined than ever to build a scientific psychohistory that stood above the other disciplines.

Different conceptions of the field were reflected in the two psychohistorical journals. David Beisel said that the two periodicals "enriched each other," but also that Strozier "threw many barbs at us and hit below the belt" (Beisel e-mail to Cifelli, May 2015). Although Beisel and Strozier were concerned about the attitudes of traditional historians, the latter strove much harder than the former for recognition of the field. Strozier included a higher percentage of historical articles and far less theory, and avoided articles based on clinical research. Beisel worried that too much concern about the opinions of established historians lessened the creative development of the psychohistorical paradigm, which he saw developing in those associated with the IPA and the *Journal*. The articles in the *Journal* emphasizing the application of the scientific method to psychohistory troubled or outraged many historians.

The subscription base of each journal varied due to the different nature of their contents. The *Review*, with 400-500 subscribers, had a higher percentage of libraries subscribing, and the *Journal,* with 8,000 subscribers at its peak in the early 1980s, had many foreign subscribers along with a significant number of libraries. While the *Review* relied heavily on Sangamon State University, the *Journal* remains a source of income for the deMause family even with only 500 subscriptions at present. Clio's Psyche has about 400 subscriptions, including electronic subscriptions.

The life and death of the *Psychohistory Review* were influenced by its connection to Sangamon State University. When in 1986 Charles Strozier moved to John Jay College of the City University of New York (CUNY) and Robert Jay Lifton's Center on Violence, he reported that his friend Larry Shiner was chosen as the next editor because of Shiner's employment at SSU, thus keeping the connection between the University and the publishing of the *Review* alive. Then, in 1999 when the university was cutting much of its substantial support, Larry Shiner grew tired of editing and Charles Strozier decided that psychohistory was only an "ephemeral" field within academia, so the publication was terminated. (Had they been given the option, there were a few colleagues not directly involved with the *Review* who declared that they would have accepted the editorship with or without university

support.) In contrast to the fate of the *Review*, the *Journal*, edited by deMause, Beisel, and now David Lotto, has stayed committed to its psychohistorical mission. Articles on teaching psychohistory, mostly by Beisel and Elovitz, are a reflection of hopefulness about the future prospects of the field.

The Group for the Use of Psychology in History members who initiated and supported the *Psychohistory Review*, were much more cautious and hesitant about accepting theoretical approaches to the field than those who were closely associated with deMause. Historians, the dominant group within the *Psychohistory Review*, were suspicious when it came to calling the field a science. Clearly there were a few colleagues, such as Rudolph Binion of Brandeis University, who remained on the editorial board of both journals for a very long time, but the majority of contributing editors and writers were affiliated with one journal or the other rather than both. Among the historians affiliated with the *Journal,* despite discontent with deMause's theories and claims that psychohistory is a science, a number stayed—the first five IPA presidents after deMause were all historians.

Certain authors and articles were lightning rods for criticism of the *Journal*, prompting prominent historians to remove their names from its editorial board and to boycott IPA conventions. The publication of Howard Stein's "Judaism and the Group-Fantasy of Martyrdom" in the *Journal* (Fall 1978) was a point at which some who had supported both journals had their names removed from the *Journal's* Contributing Editors Board. Stein is a brilliant and prolific psychoanalytic anthropologist who for seven years did a fine job editing the *Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology* that deMause published. However, when he wrote the Judaism article, he clearly was in rebellion against his Orthodox Jewish education, with the result that he did not treat the subject with the sensitivity that it required. Subsequently, he lamented that "the tone was urgent, angry, even desperate" ("Howard Stein: An Intellectual Odyssey" Clio's Psyche 6, 4, March 2000, 169). Henry Ebel, a scholar associated with the *Journal* in its early days, also received much criticism for the tone of his articles and psychohistorical aphorisms—his erratic behavior even kept him from holding onto a professorship. Casper Schmidt was a brilliant young psychiatrist whose extreme ideas, such as AIDS having a purely psychogenic etiology, outraged many. The space in the journal given to Ebel and Schmidt and the failure to work with Stein to present his

ideas in a more tactful manner, hurt the publication's reputation.

Clio's Psyche was founded in 1994 as a newsletter, and much like the *Review* became a full-fledged journal with a double-blind refereeing system. Like the *Journal*, it usually contains about 30,000 words per issue. Quite self-consciously, Clio's Psyche avoids psychoanalytic and psychohistorical terminology, allowing it only when it is an essential part of authors' arguments. It also avoids the strong political positions that have appeared in the *Journal*. From the onset it has been open to a wide array of approaches to psychohistory and has maintained good relations with the other journal editors. Beisel and Lotto have been strong supporters. When Strozier was interviewed about his Heinz Kohut book he wrote, "I like to think the *Review* has been reincarnated in Clio's Psyche!" (Vol. 8 No. 2, 90). In a hand written note informing me (Paul Elovitz) that the *Review* was ceasing publication, Shiner wrote on May 1, 1999, "It's up to you now. Good luck with Clio," and subsequently gave permission to repeat it to others.

Other attributes of this newest psychohistorical journal are numerous short, to-the-point, and lively articles that have allowed many authors, including newcomers to the field, to be published; in-depth conversation-style interviews with distinguished scholars have given recognition to the pioneers and contributors in the field; lengthy, informational memorials; and the online discussion group of Clio and the Psychohistory Forum has carried psychohistory into the digital conversation era. Although all three journals are only partly indexed, Clio's Psyche may be found online at cliospsyche.org—usually with the exception of the four most recent issues.

In its early years, the *Review* had a great emphasis on book reviews as people were struggling to learn more about the field. Clio's Psyche and the *Journal* opted for longer book review essays than was usually the case in the *Review*. Authors tended to come from a wide scope of fields and change over time as the journals evolved. The *Review* always had a large number of historians and other academics writing for it and fewer clinicians. The *Journal* had more articles on history in its earliest years, though never a preponderance of historians writing for it. Clio's Psyche published a substantial variety of authors who come from psychoanalysis, history, clinical work, and a variety of other disciplines. Both Clio and the *Journal* have had more articles about contemporary events and teaching psychohistory than the *Review*.

The three journals under discussion here should not be thought of as the only ones publishing psychohistorical articles. *American Imago* (1939-), the *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* (1932-), and the *Psychoanalytic Review* (1913-) all publish them, and the *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* did from 1970-80. Others with considerable psychohistorical content include *Mind and Human Interaction: Windows Between History, Culture, Politics and Psychoanalysis* (1987-2003); *Mentalities/Mentalitiés* (1981-2011); *Psychoanalysis and History* (1999-); *Psychoanalysis, Culture, and Society* (2004-)*; Psicologica Politica* (1990-); and the publications of the Gesellschaft für Psychohistorie und Politische Psychologie (1993-).

The editors of the three journals discussed at length here dealt with the failure of academia to openly embrace their work in different ways. Strozier declared psychohistory to be "dead" but "absorbed into the writing of history" and continued his own psychohistorical research and writing (Strozier e-mail to Cifelli, May 2015). While deMause kept on working hard for the field, he felt unappreciated in that his vision of it was accepted more by laypeople than by academics. Beisel is appreciative of the opportunity to be part of the development of such a vital field, but angry at the missed opportunities. Lotto is pleased to be editing the *Journal*, to which he has restored a refereeing system. I (Paul Elovitz) laud deMause for bringing so many colleagues together in person and in print, as well as generating innovative methodologies and provocative ideas to be debated. I value the opportunity to be part of an innovative psychohistorical community which I have also nurtured and expanded in the Psychohistory Forum. However, I am somewhat less optimistic than when he wrote "The Partial Success and Bright Prospects of Psychohistory," as one of the 16 articles of the *Future of Psychohistory Special Issue* of Clio's Psyche in March 2000. Whatever their current thoughts, all of the editors have made significant contributions to psychohistorical literature and thought.

***Paul H. Elovitz**, editor of this journal, is writing Pioneers of Insight: The Makers and Making of Psychohistory and drew on his knowledge as a veteran psychohistorian as well as his extensive library on the subject. **David Cifelli** is a student at Ramapo College, who did much research on the three journals and was responsible for fact checking and the questionnaires to editors. They may be contacted at pelovitz@ramapo.edu and dcifelli@ramapo.edu.* ❑

Insights from Psychohistorical Journal Editors

David Cifelli and Paul H. Elovitz—Ramapo College

Below are the questions and answers forming a part of the research materials on which the article, "Three Psychohistorical Journals," was based. David Cifelli and Paul Elovitz formulated the questions and Cifelli contacted the editors, who were nice enough to reply and subsequently authorized their publication. Because of a delay caused by Larry Shiner being at a conference in Paris, Elovitz, rather than Cifelli, made the successful contact with him. Bob Lentz, who for its first nine years was Associate Editor of Clio's Psyche, suggested that the Q & A should be published, but chose not to be interviewed. Cifelli asked Elovitz questions about psychohistory that went beyond his editorship. These materials are shown below in their entirety.

Charles B. Strozier (May 3, 2015)

1. How did you view the mission of the *Psychohistory Review*?
I am not sure I ever thought of my purpose in founding the *Psychohistory Review* as having a mission per se. It was clear to me that psychohistory had emerged as an exciting new intellectual venture and needed a broad-based journal of high standards without a focused or somewhat ideological purpose.

2. What was the relationship, if any, of the *Psychohistory Review* with the Group for the Use of Psychology in History (GUPH)?
The Group for the Use of Psychology in History had already been founded within the American Historical Association by me and several colleagues and the *Psychohistory Review* logically became its journal. Such a relationship between such groups and their journals is a common practice. I always felt it was important to maintain this connection to insure our legitimacy.

3. How did you build the readership, including many library subscriptions?
It was difficult to build a readership. It happened one reader and one library at a time. By the mid-1970s we had about 400-500 subscriptions.

4. Did the readership and mission change over time?
Not really, though as a publication we became more formal and the journal was bound better.

5. Did you encourage the publication of clinical research?
I never included clinical research. That seemed to me outside the realm of psychohistory. Perhaps I was wrong.

6. What kind of a refereeing system did you use? How many referees?
I always tried to have a couple of readers review an article. Sometimes, if I personally solicited an article from someone of stature I might compromise on one outside reader. Usually, readers were from those on the Editorial Board.

7. How was Larry Shiner chosen to be your editorial successor?
Larry was a good friend at Sangamon State University (now the University of Illinois/UIS) and had gotten interested in the journal. The only reason we survived was because the university provided financial support. When I left for CUNY in 1986, someone at Sangamon had to take it over or it would have died. I was very pleased with his commitment to the journal for the next decade.

8. What contributions did you make as an Associate Editor after Shiner took over?
I helped Larry with reading papers and generally consulted on things, but the journal was entirely his project after I left.

9. Why did the *Psychohistory Review* cease publication in 1999 and how was the decision arrived at?
The *Psychohistory Review* ceased publication because Larry got tired of it, as I did, but probably the more fundamental issue is that it was clear by then that psychohistory was never going to be recognized within the discipline of history as more than ephemeral. Very few people (other than me) had had appointments as such in it. Almost no one published under its name. This was in marked contrast with what seemed to be unfolding in 1972. Psychohistory in this sense had died. But we might say psychohistory is dead, long live psychohistory. It has firmly taken root by being absorbed into the writing of history. There do remain the thorny issues of training and method, but by the late 1990s it seemed time for me and Larry to move onto other things.

Lawrence Shiner (June 20, 2015)

1. How did you get involved with the *Psychohistory Review* and how did you view its mission?
I first became involved by writing some book reviews, one of which turned into a review article. I may have also vetted a couple of submissions that touched on areas of European history with which I was familiar. I became editor when Chuck (Strozier) accepted a position at CUNY's John Jay College to work with Robert J. Lifton at the Center for Violence and Human Survival. The History Department at CUNY already had a couple of journals and Chuck's new duties were going to be demanding. Since there was no one else in our history department with the interest or background to take on editing the *Review*, I accepted. Actually, I was only affiliated with the UIS History department for part of my appoint-

ment, since my primary appointment was in philosophy, although I also taught courses in European intellectual history for the history department and published on the philosophy of history, including a book, *The Secret Mirror: Literary Form and History in Tocqueville's "Recollections"* (Cornell, 1988)—although it was a literary analysis not focused on psychology.

2. Did the readership and mission change over time?
Because my interests were in an interdisciplinary approach to intellectual and cultural history, I tried to expand our contributors and readership to involve scholars whose primary focus was not necessarily on relating history and psychoanalysis. In addition, because of my interest in French history and culture, I made some efforts, with the help of Elizabeth Marvick, to involve French scholars such as Micheline Guiton. I also published some overviews of psychohistory in Europe.

3. What kind of a refereeing system did you use? How many referees?
Our rule was to use two referees who were knowledgeable in the content field with at least one of them also aware of the methods and problems of relating psychology and history.

4. Were there controversies that arose from some of the articles published?
I don't remember any major controversies sparked by particular articles, but Chuck's memory would be better than mine.

5. Were there many articles based on theory that were published or rejected for publication?
Without going back to do a count, I can't say what percentage, but I know there were a number and that I was always alert to and supportive of good endeavours in that direction.

6. Were there many references to Freud in the articles? To Erikson? What other theorists?
Generally, there were lots of references to Freud and many to Erikson but I was also interested in submissions that were non-psychoanalytic since I felt that the field was the relationship between history and academic psychology of all theoretical orientations, not simply psychoanalysis. My general memory, however, is that there were only a few such pieces.

7. [Omitted since it is included in the next answer.]

8. How much editorial and financial assistance was provided by SSU?
At the time I became Editor, the university teaching load was three four-credit-hour courses, and I was given one course released time as Editor, the services of a graduate assistant who did the bulk of the initial text editing, and, crucially, secretarial help from the Public Affairs division, specifically from the staff of the publication *Illinois Issues* (a publication de-

voted to state government). In addition, there was a small direct subsidy to cover those printing costs not taken care of by subscription earnings.

9. What editorial contributions were made by other scholars, such as Associate Editor Lawrence Friedman?
In terms of support from others involved such as Associate Editors and Contributing Editors, Board members, etc., I could break it down roughly this way. The Contributing Editor, for most of the time, was on the staff of *Illinois Issues* and supervised the members of the secretarial staff who helped us with final proofing and generally made sure high stylistic and publication standards were maintained. Of the Associate Editors, Chuck was, of course, deeply and continuously involved; the *Review* was his creation and he cared a great deal about it. Larry Friedman was less involved and his commitment declined as time went on since he was consumed with his own scholarly work. Our Book Review Editor for part of the time was Mark Johnson, who held a MA in history from UIS and worked closely with Chuck on selecting books for review and the reviewers. We relied heavily on our Board members to seek submissions, evaluate submitted papers, and review books.

10. Why did the *Psychohistory Review* cease publication in 1999 and how was the decision arrived at?
There were at least three factors in the decision to shut down. First, and most important, the stream of really good submissions became smaller during the last two years. Second, both Chuck and I had major writing projects underway in addition to heavier teaching loads, the latter exacerbated in my case by a third factor. The third factor was that a change in the University's budgetary situation led the administration to make clear it could no longer support the *Review* to the extent it had done previously and that we would definitely lose the direct subsidy we had received, probably the graduate assistant, and possibly even the released time for me as Editor.

11. What role did the Board of Editors play in the decision?
Chuck and I talked at length about the first problem, the decline in the volume of high quality submissions. Since we had taken pride in the high academic standards of the *Review* as worthy of comparison with other journals in the field of academic historical research, we felt it crucial to have a sufficient pool of academically rigorous articles from which to choose. We felt it better to cease publication when we were at the top of our form rather than to have the *Review* gradually decline. Consequently, we consulted with a few Board members who had been actively involved with the *Review*, and although most were reluctant to see the *Review* shut down, they fully understood and supported our decision.

David R. Beisel (May 13, 2015)

1. Why and when did Lloyd deMause choose you as editor of the

***Journal of Psychohistory*?**
I was having dinner with Lloyd deMause and his wife at the conclusion of our first International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) Convention in June 1978, which I had run as the first convention chair. I had also been voted by the membership into the position of IPA president at the Business Meeting. The outcome of that vote was a surprise to me. An even bigger surprise came when Lloyd asked me to succeed him as the *Journal*'s editor. I first asked if he would promise not to interfere with any editorial decisions and he promised he would not. He kept that promise for the 10 years I was editor. He thanked me when I said yes because he said, "It would allow [him] to do all the writing he wanted to do without having to spend [his] time editing."

2. You are listed as Associate Editor of the *Journal of Psychohistory* in the fall of 1978. Were you the editor at that time?
I think I assumed the editorship with the next issue because Lloyd had already prepared the Fall 1978 issue.

3. Did you share Lloyd deMause's view of psychohistory as a science and emphasize hypotheses and theories much like the hard sciences? In reading deMause's theories on fantasy analysis, the fetal origins of history, and toxic mothering, did you agree or disagree with them and how did it influence your editorship?
I never shared Lloyd's view of psychohistory as a science or as a field trying to become one, or favored the lock-step dogma of the "psychogenic" theory or the total emphasis on childhood to the determinant of everything—it left history out of psychohistory. I felt then as I do now that his essay "The Independence of Psychohistory," in which he called historians "astrologers" and psychohistorians "astronomers," was not only off the mark but was a needless insult to my fellow historians and counter-productive to our being accepted by them, which in the long run proved to be the case.

4. Did you inherit a mature *Journal of Psychohistory* or wasn't it well established when you became editor?
Not sure what you mean by "mature" and "well established." The *JOP* was well established because it had been publishing for several years and had a solid subscriber base. Some of the scholarship that had been published there, though extremely provocative, was based on solid evidence (Binion's work on Hitler, Lloyd's early work on childhood, things on the 19th century family, Kren on the Holocaust, on trauma, on sibling sequence, etc.), so it was "mature" in that sense. I thought under my editorship it would become *more solidly academic and less theoretical.*

5. How did the *Journal of Psychohistory* grow under your editorship in a variety of terms (including readership)? Were there changes in who subscribed?
At one point in the early 1980's Lloyd told me the readership was up to

8,000, making us the second largest history journal in the country (according to him). I never checked his numbers, just took him at his word. I do know by personal anecdote that a goodly number of psychoanalysts and historians told me they let their subscriptions lapse when he started promoting his "birth stuff," as many called it.

6. How did you feel about non-professionals submitting articles to the journal?

Not sure what you mean by "non-professionals." There were a number of contributors who were independent scholars without academic affiliations whose work I encouraged and published (Bob Rousselle, a PhD in ancient history from SUNY Binghamton; Mel Kalfus, Vice President of an advertising firm who got his PhD in American history at New York University after publishing with us). I was interested in any good work from any source, though it was clear from what we published that we mostly published the work of academics and therapists. But that was who was submitting. Anyone without a history, social science, or psychological background or a background in the humanities was unlikely to submit manuscripts anyway.

7. What was the nature of the refereeing system you used and how helpful and time consuming was it?

I used two to three referees per article, sending out those articles that made the first cut, myself. It was a very time consuming process, particularly in those pre-computer days as everything had to be sent out via regular mail and we had to wait weeks for things to get to and fro.

8. How would you describe the tone of the *Journal of Psychohistory* under your editorship?

I think the tone was serious—at least I hope it was—perhaps a little too academic, but I was very much aware of the charges being leveled at the journal as not being scholarly enough and was trying to offer some sufficiently documented essays to convince our critics to take us seriously. Perhaps I cared too much about the critics.

9. What were your thoughts about the *Psychohistory Review* and the GUPH during your editorship? To what extent were they seen as rivals of the *Journal* and the IPA? How do you view Clio's Psyche, which came into existence after your editorship?

I was never resentful of GUPH or the *Psychohistory Review*, though Strozier did throw lots of barbs at us and hit below the belt many times—I thought he was more outrageous than Lloyd sometimes and chalked it up to the desperate need we all felt to gain the respect of historians as a legitimate field. I felt the *Review* was a little boring but saw us as dividing the field into two groups, one a bit more conservative and the other a bit more innovative, two streams that enriched each other. I was never as militant as Lloyd in maintaining an image of two rival groups. When Clio came along I welcomed it as a fresh place to create dialogue and

learn from. It has become a superb publication under Paul's stewardship.

Beisel: Concerning more general questions and answers

10. How do you think the next generation of psychohistorians should be trained? Should they have an extensive clinical and/or historical background?
Not sure how to answer this. I think people with an interest will gravitate to us. (I suspect it will always be a small group.) It is clear that there will be no Psychohistory Departments at any universities. My main concern is that people without training in the rigors of academic historiography will diminish the already diminished reputation of the field by a too casual approach to the historical side of research. I think that has to come first, before psychology or in addition to psychology; it is something that's very difficult to learn on one's own.

11. Do you see a new wave of students entering the field as psychohistorians? Or is psychohistory largely dominated by the older generation? Are most newcomers mature scholars or clinicians who take up psychohistory later in life?
If popularity of subject is any guide, there are large numbers of untapped young people who would be happy to study psychohistory (8,000 have passed through my classes since 1978 and today my section and that of Denis O'Keefe fill up every semester). One semester's encounter seems to be enough for most of our students, however. The question remains: where can they continue to study? I recommend continuing to read psychohistory while pursuing traditional fields such as sociology, history, and the humanities. Professionally, there is no advancement in the historical profession as the dogma of the AHA that psychohistory is dead (and the general ridicule of the field) alert young scholars that doing psychohistory isn't going to get them anywhere. One can hope that once people get established and begin to feel there's more to motivation than their elders have permitted them to see, they will find their way to the psychological and psychohistorical literature. Therapists are more inclined to come to us than social scientists—at least at the present moment. That is all to the good. But one can never predict what the next scholarly fashion might be. That's why psychohistory isn't a "science."

David Lotto (May 11, 2015)

1. When did you officially start editing the *Journal of Psychohistory*?
I became assistant editor in the spring of 2010 and became co-editor in the spring of 2014.

2. Are you inclined to view psychohistory as a science or humanity?
That's a complicated question and would take quite a while to answer fully. Quick summary: Within the boundaries of the quasi academic realm suggested by the science-humanity dichotomy, it's a social science like history, psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, or

pedagogy. Psychohistory has affinities for and can share subject matter with areas usually considered to be within the domain of the humanities (for example, literature, art, music, etc.).

3. How did Lloyd deMause or Susan Hein choose you as editor?
I have been involved with the IPA since the mid-1980's and have known Lloyd and Susan for a long time.

4. What are the challenges you face now as editor of the *Journal*?
Completing the transition to a peer-reviewed journal, which means continuing to attract manuscripts that meet the journal's scholarly criteria.

5. Is there a new wave of young scholar clinicians writing for the *Journal*, or does it tend to be dominated by the older generation?
It's really a bit early for me to answer this question. I've only been co-editor for a year and at that time we had a substantial backlog of articles that had been accepted for publication. Previously, Lloyd always encouraged young and new writers, chiefly by giving presenters at the IPA convention—including students—a place to publish their work. We continue to welcome new contributors and will publish anything that meets the criteria of the journal. See the inside of the front cover of the journal for more specific information about criteria.

6. Has the focus of the *Journal* changed since the editorships of Beisel and deMause?
If you look at the inside of the front cover there's a list of the members of the Editorial Board. All of these people have agreed to act as peer reviewers. I select the three, four, or five reviewers based on the fit between the subject matter of the manuscript and the area of expertise of the Editorial Board member. In the past, there were some papers published in the *Journal* that would probably not have been acceptable to the current readers.

Paul H. Elovitz (During weekly meetings in April and early May, 2015)

1. What makes psychohistory special and how does this connect to your vision of the mission of Clio's Psyche?
Human beings are motivated far more by their emotions than by abstract ideas. The beauty and specialness of psychohistory is that it connects the emotions to the intellect and owns this reality rather than denying it. As Clio's editor, this is one of my guiding principles. This is related to my not usually focusing on theory.

2. Any regrets about starting Clio's Psyche **or any article you published?**
No! It has all been a learning experience and quite an exciting adventure. In retrospect, it would've been good to go beyond our newsletter format to a traditional 6x9 inch journal format a few years earlier because col-

leagues take the more expensive journal format more seriously. But we had to be sure that our finances were in place and that we didn't go bankrupt. Regarding articles, I very occasionally scratch my head at the judgment of our referees. As to my own articles, I am mostly pleased when I look at them, although I certainly would write some differently at the present time.

3. What's the relationship between the *Journal of Psychohistory*, the International Psychohistory Association, and the Psychohistory Forum's Clio's Psyche**?**
There is no relationship beyond them all advocating psychohistory. The *Journal* is privately owned by the deMause family and has no legal relationship with the IPA. I serve on the Board of Editors of the *Journal* and am a founding member of IPA, past president, and the only colleague who has attended all 38 of the annual conferences. There is a lot of overlapping of membership and what we do. There are some colleagues who avoid the *Journal* and the IPA but find Clio and the Psychohistory Forum more to their liking.

4. Is anyone in line for the future editorship of Clio's Psyche**?**
One of the three journals went out of existence because the editors chose not to search for a replacement, even though there were several colleagues who, upon hearing of its demise, would gladly have assumed the position. The privately owned *Journal of Psychohistory* has transitioned to a new editor who has restored a refereeing system. Whether Clio's Psyche will do the same upon my incapacity or retirement is yet to be determined. We welcome colleagues of all ages joining us in our editorial work.

5. Can I view the three psychohistorical journals I have been reading about as on a spectrum?
Yes, in terms of broad generalizations from the perspective of their entire history, the *Journal* has been more theoretical and political in its approach, the *Psychohistory Review* more historical and devoted to the history of ideas, and Clio concerned with contemporary events and avoiding psychoanalytical/psychohistorical jargon. Each is unique in its own way.

Elovitz: Concerning more general questions and answers

6. Why hasn't psychohistory become the next big thing?
The basic principle is to take the message and ignore the messenger. Historians, journalists, and others use the psychohistorical messages when dealing with specific problems, but usually ignore or condemn the organized field. I identify as both a historian and a psychohistorian. The average layperson when they hear the word "psychohistory" thinks it makes perfect sense to combine history and psychology.

7. Is psychohistory helpful in solving society's problems? Do you see a role in public affairs for psychohistorians?

Certainly psychohistory can be helpful. However, it is doubtful that politicians take our work into consideration, although there may be exceptions. For example, Jimmy Carter's sister Gloria told me that while he was president, Carter read the 1977 book some of us contributed to on him, which emphasized the danger of his taking America to war. (However, there is no direct evidence that this influenced his decision not to go to war.) During the Reagan administration Lloyd deMause and a colleague went to the White House and gave a psychohistory seminar to a group of staff members. When Lloyd asked what the staff took away from the seminar, they were told that the staff listened to everyone and that the next week an astrologer would be giving a seminar. Subsequently, those close to Reagan reported that the astrologer definitely had some influence, at least in the timing of certain actions.

Concerning the second part of your question, Robert Jay Lifton and Vamik Volkan have certainly had a positive public role, but they have been viewed overwhelmingly as psychiatrists dedicated to peacemaking, rather than as psychohistorians. ❑

Additional Articles

Baltimore: Reflections on Inner City Violence in America

Neil Wilson—Private Psychoanalytic Practice
Paul H. Elovitz—The Psychohistory Forum

The inner city riots in Baltimore evoke considerable sadness and frustration. Why were there large-scale riots in the inner city, destroying the infrastructure of the rioters' own neighborhoods? All this in a city where the mayor, police commissioner, and three of the six police officers who were suspended and charged with crimes were African-Americans, as was the district attorney who charged them. This in a country with an African-American president.

Could the struggle in some places between inner city youth and the police not be mostly about race? If the struggle is not primarily about race, does that mean that those pressuring the leadership of Baltimore, Ferguson, Philadelphia, and other cities to greatly increase the representation of minorities in police departments are missing some vital points about the causes of rioting? Is the issue much more about class, economic opportunity, family structure, minority attitudes to authority, and unconscious needs rather

than race? If so, shouldn't society's focus be on how to improve the economics, change the psychology of the American urban underclass, and break the cycle of hostility between urban youth and public safety officers far more than race?

I (Paul Elovitz, hereafter PHE) come to these issues from my own life experience. In my early years, I lived in the inner city of an industrial city where children normally and automatically listened to what a policeman said to do, and treated him (then always a him) with respect and fear. When I was in my early 20's walking suburban streets with reddened eyes in the middle of the night following the burial of my mother, the police stopped me, asked for my identification and reasons for being out at that unusual time. Hearing about my loss, they said I should go home, which I did. We treated each other respectfully.

I (Neil Wilson, hereafter NW) am concerned about today's attitudes to the police. I grew up in Brooklyn and later became a member of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). When arrested during the Mississippi summer of registering blacks in 1964, I did exactly what the police told me to do. In New York, it was out of respect for what the police represented more than for their night sticks. In the South, it was out of my inclinations and CORE's advice that I would suffer serious bodily harm or death if I failed to abide by the orders of the law officers who took me to jail on false pretenses. How have we reached this point where many police, regardless of their race, feel that they are in a war with the younger inhabitants of the ghetto?

To what extent is the defiance of police by young African-Americans and the subsequent riots when there is a well-publicized case of police shooting in their community self-destructive? An unconscious motivation for a rash of suicides in schools is to be remembered and talked about the way previous suicidal people have been. An outpouring of love and attention is offered to the suicidal dead. For decades we have been talking about "death by cop" in cases of suicidal men who want to end their lives in what they imagine to be a "blaze of glory" by provoking the police into killing them or their killing themselves because they have done something so heinous that they see no other way out. There is an impulse to die (with the eyes of the world on them, to be remembered by others).

Fighting and defying the police is clearly "asking for it"—it

can be suicidal. Burning the stores, pharmacies, etc. in inner city neighborhoods as in Baltimore helps perpetuate a culture of poverty. People are already suffering in a "food desert" where liquor stores proliferate and mom and pop groceries provide almost no fresh fruits and vegetables. The riots lessen the facilities available to the poor inhabitants, denigrate their livelihood, and decrease the likelihood that food stores, pharmacy chains, and so forth will take the risk of investing in these neighborhoods for decades to come.

Riots also mean that upwardly mobile immigrants and others who would take advantage of the inexpensive store and home rentals available and provide examples of success in neighborhoods that are woefully starved for role models of success for the young are much less likely to move into these areas. The paucity of male role models other than drug dealers and gang leaders in these neighborhoods decreases the likelihood that young men will see a way out of their poverty. When we look at the burned-out remnants of buildings in Baltimore, we think of how many people made a good life and thrived in these same types of buildings. Their children went on to become artists, business owners, doctors, engineers, lawyers, psychologists, social workers, and whatever they wanted to become. To the extent poor people are ghettoized, their opportunities are limited.

Racism is alive and well in America, often thinly disguised as critiques of Obama, Obamacare, welfare, big government, and affirmative action. Nevertheless, our achievements in lessening racial inequality and legal prejudice have been enormous. In our lifetimes, we have gone from Saturday night lynchings and laws against miscegenation to racial acceptance of an almost unbelievable level when compared to the laws and social mores of our parents and grandparents. The young people I (PHE) teach despise the idea of racism, although it is very difficult to know how this belief in equality is implemented within their daily lives. During virtually all of my adult life, I've had Hispanic or African-American neighbors living next door; I no longer see this as unusual in the suburbs.

However, this middle class racial integration is certainly not the experience of minorities in Baltimore, Ferguson, and other places where citizens rioted, denigrating their own neighborhoods. It is important to explore this tendency and ask where the adults are when the young carry out such destruction and self-destruction. To what extent are they working to stop the violence rather than just making pronouncements to the media complaining of governmental

actions or inactions? Some adults are working on it. During the Baltimore riots the media focused on a mother who, upon seeing her son on TV involved in rioting, left her home to find him and dragged him home, cursing and beating him along the way.

It should be noted that overwhelmingly, after the death of an African-American at the hands of the police, the minority community peacefully demonstrates in protest. This is not usually the focus of the media in our celebrity society. Rather, it is the anger and destructive/self-destructive rage of the small minority of mostly youths that makes the evening news. This brings back memories of participating in anti-Vietnam war rallies with thousands and even hundreds of thousands of peaceful demonstrators, only to see the riotous actions of a handful of destructive inner city looters as the focus of the TV news in the evening.

The roots of hostility to the police start early. Even for the most law-abiding citizen, "peace officers" represent conscience that leaves many people uneasy. In an elevator, a Hispanic policeman who is my (NW) patient, warmly smiled and exchanged pleasantries with a little African-American girl whose mother furiously told her to "never again talk to the police!" There is a growing defiance of authority among teenagers, especially minority ones. When I drive past a school as students are dismissed, many kids will slowly, defiantly, walk in front of cars as if the drivers don't exist.

As a psychoanalyst, I (NW) consider what the possible unconscious psychodynamics of men who confront, provoke, and defy policemen can be. What comes to mind is some combination of unconscious, suicidal wishes, defiance of a father figure, omnipotence in the face of force, identification with a rebellious father, and the denial of passive needs. A study of the upbringing of those victims recently in the news pertaining to their childhood would be productive.

Growing up is difficult for teenage boys generally, more so for inner city minorities who have fewer fathers and other role models around as well as minimal economic opportunities. Suburban boys are much more likely to be protected by their parents and communities from the criminal justice system when they cross some legal lines as teenagers sometimes do. Even in cases of single parent suburban families, there is more space, both within and outside the home as well as online, for kids to express themselves than in the crowded inner city where the police have a much greater

presence.

Those policemen are authority figures and teenagers' rebellion all too often gets played out with them these days. We need a study of the upbringings of Michael Brown, Freddie Gray, and other victims recently in the news pertaining to their childhood and fantasies about confronting the police. There are surely better, less self-destructive approaches to the demand for equality and recognition.

Another aspect to this tragic loss of life is that many police, if not treated with respect, overreact out of fear of situations getting out of hand when dealing with defiant teenagers and men. Several policemen have recently been killed or maimed, an occurrence frightening to all officers. This alone can lead to police overreacting with life-threatening violence.

When people look at black or Hispanic teenagers as dangerous, we wonder if there is a possibility that some of these young people may incorporate a sense of badness into their self-image. Barack Obama has told the story of being a teenager entering his own Honolulu apartment building only to have an older woman report him as following her. She refused to apologize after being told he was a resident, leaving him feeling upset. But he could talk the issue out with his grandparents. This is not just an intellectual issue for me (PHE). We have a tall 10-year-old grandson who the world sees as black, even though he was born with Native American, Caucasian, and African-American DNA and adopted by our son and his partner within weeks of his birth. Will this very sweet boy soon be looked upon as a dangerous teenager by police and others who see only his blackness?

Neil Wilson, PhD, *is a psychoanalyst and psychologist in private practice in Teaneck, New Jersey and* ***Paul H. Elovitz, PhD,*** *is editor of this journal. They may be contacted at neilwilson6776@gmail.com and pelovitz@aol.com.* ❑

Congratulations to **Marc-André Cotton** and therapist **Sylvie Vermeulen** for their 15 years of research on the consequence of child abuse, available on the French website *Regard conscient* (www.regardconscient.net). Cotton is also lecturing extensively on the subject.

Sigmund Freud's "Psychological Treatment" of Anna Freud: The Re-Creation of Trauma

Michael D. Clifford—Psychoanalytic Private Practice

Beginning in the fall of 1918, and continuing for almost four years, Sigmund Freud conducted a psychological treatment of his daughter Anna. This treatment was conducted six days a week in his office, a part of their shared home. This was the first phase of the treatment, and even this phase was a very long treatment for its time. Then, after Easter 1924, a second phase of treatment began, and lasted for about 18 months, until the fall of 1925. Anna Freud would periodically consult with her father about her own psychology until his death in September 1939.

In this article, I consider some of the complex facets of the psychological treatment of Anna Freud by her father Sigmund Freud. I will not use the word "psychoanalysis" to describe this treatment, because it does not seem to have the most basic qualification for a psychoanalysis—that is, the establishment and the analysis of a transference. How, after all, is it possible for even the most skilled psychoanalyst and the most talented patient to sort out what is transference (with its implicit meaning of a distortion of the therapeutic relationship, shaped by the parental relationship) and what is based in reality in the treatment relationship, if the analyst and patient are father and daughter and live in the same household?

Anna Freud's relationships to her caretakers and her parents were complex. Perhaps least conflicted among these was her relationship with her nursemaid, a young Catholic woman named Josefine. She was hired when Anna Freud was born, and Anna became very attached to Josefine. As a toddler, once when she lost sight of her nanny, Anna went in search of her, leaving her mother, and in the process getting lost herself. When she was 29 years old, she wrote to a friend of going to Josefine's funeral the previous day, reporting that Josefine was "my old nursemaid, the oldest relation and the most genuine of my childhood" (Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *Anna Freud: A Biography*, 1988, 35). Josefine's funeral probably occurred in the second phase of her treatment with her father, so the significance of her assessment of the meaning of her relationship with Josefine cannot be overestimated. There seems little question Anna Freud held Josefine closer than her mother, but what is sur-

prising in this letter is that she seems to be stating that she held Josefine closer than her father, as well.

It has often been reported in the literature that there was tension between Anna and her mother Martha. Martha often badgered Anna to try to be more attractive, so she would marry. But over time, especially since her father's cancer was diagnosed in 1923, Anna consciously decided that she would continue to live at home until her parents died, as was often the role of the youngest daughter. Increasingly, this was Freud's wish, as well. After Freud's cancer diagnosis, Anna became her father's nurse through the more than 30 procedures he endured until his death, operations that cut away more and more of his oral cavity. There was an explicit agreement between Sigmund and Anna Freud that she would execute her role with a clinical detachment, devoid of sympathy when she wrestled the prosthesis into her father' s mouth (so he could eat and speak). Over time, Anna Freud moved into other roles that would usually be performed by a spouse. When Freud decided to end his life in September 1939, he discussed it with Anna and Max Schur, his physician. His wife Martha was not consulted.

Anna Freud was the sixth and last child born to Sigmund Freud and Martha Freud. She was their third daughter. She was born in 1895, the same year Freud published his first book—*Studies in Hysteria*, co-written with Joseph Breuer—a book that established psychoanalysis as a discipline. Since Anna was the only one of Freud's children to pursue psychoanalysis professionally, some authors assume that she was his favorite child. It was not so: Although Freud did have a warm relationship with Anna, from his side it appears initially the relationship was primarily characterized by his delight in her "naughtiness"—he wrote to Wilhelm Fliess that she was "beatified by naughtiness." Her "naughtiness" also contrasted to the family gender conceptualization of femininity correlated with "goodness." Young-Breuhl notes that Anna left this naughtiness behind when she was an adolescent, and became overtly "good," but her biographer does not tie this shift to Anna Freud's sexual maturation, and her conflicts over sexuality. It was not until she was almost 30, when she was travelling with him, that Freud seems to have been able to recognize Anna's individuality. He comments to a correspondent that he is surprised to find her to be agreeable company.

Although she had five siblings, in her experience, Anna Freud was too frequently a solitary child. (She was also aware that

she was neither of her parent's favorite child.) As the youngest, she was often left out of activities that involved her siblings. The primary way she coped with her loneliness was to begin to tell herself stories, which evolved to the point that they were complex tales involving many characters. "Anna was the one who made up stories [who] lived in stories" (Young-Breuhl, 43). These stories began to take over Anna Freud's psychological life to the point that she and her father began a treatment to address their tyranny in her mental life.

At the end of 1918, within a few months of beginning his treatment of Anna, Freud wrote "A Child is Being Beaten." Using six case examples, he stated that patients often report masturbatory fantasies that began with a helpless child being threatened by an authority figure. Finally, in the fantasy, the tension rises until the authority beats the child. Freud argued these fantasies should be understood psychoanalytically as efforts to resolve Oedipal conflicts, utilizing displacement both of the adult's identification with the child, and of sexual (Oedipal) wishes with the aggression (beating). In Young-Bruehl's assessment, Anna Freud is the fifth of Freud's six patients, because this patient is described as indecisive about her career and Anna Freud was trying to decide whether to become an elementary school teacher or a psychoanalyst. Further, Freud characterized this patient differently from the others: He wrote that she could not be described by "crude psychological terminology." This was apparently an attempt to both differentiate this patient from the others in the paper and to state that this patient does not have "deep" psychological issues. In this same vein, Freud also states that unlike the others described, this patient did not proceed to masturbate, to release the tension of these fantasies. But in her first paper, entitled "Beating Fantasies and Daydreams" (written as a follow-up to her father's "A Child is Being Beaten"), Anna states the patient she describes did indeed masturbate as a way to end the torment of the intrusive, uncontrollable beating fantasies. Young-Bruehl cites numerous letters in which Freud refers to his treatment of Anna as proceeding well, and in which Anna admits her struggles with beating fantasies, which apparently end with her masturbation.

The timing and the topic of both Freuds' papers mean that within a few months of beginning Anna Freud's treatment, her masturbatory fantasies were being discussed in detail. Imagine that scene: Anna Freud, lying on the analytic couch, being required to

state what is on her mind—clearly her masturbatory fantasies—with her father sitting behind her. For those readers who have been patients, consider discussing your masturbatory fantasies in detail with your opposite-sex parent; for those readers who are analysts or therapists, consider exploring your opposite-sex child's masturbatory fantasies in detail.

With this scene in mind, I suggest that this treatment essentially destroyed Anna's sexuality, or more precisely the interpersonal dimension of her sexuality (as her correspondence states, she continued to masturbate, but in a way which only seems driven and not pleasurable). Her full sexuality was sacrificed for the treatment and also to maintain her relationship with her father. Anna Freud did have a close relationship of more than 50 years with Dorothy Tiffany Burlingham (Louis Comfort Tiffany's daughter). But there is no evidence that this relationship ever became sexual, however difficult that restraint might be to imagine from our contemporary sensibility. Their relationship began when Dorothy brought her children to Vienna to be analyzed, taking them away from their manic-depressive father. Anna may have repeated the trauma she suffered in the treatment with her father, with these child patients: Burlingham's grandson characterizes his aunt and uncle's treatments by Anna Freud as a "sacrifice at the altar of psychoanalysis" (Michael John Burlingham, *The Last Tiffany: A Biography of Dorothy Tiffany*, 1989, 256). Neither of these Burlingham children had satisfying lives; indeed, the daughter killed herself in Freud's former home, while Anna and Dorothy were living there.

Michael D. Clifford, PhD, *teaches the history of psychoanalysis at National Institute for the Psychotherapies, New York City, and other institutes across the country. He is the founding director of the Archives of Self Psychology, a project of the International Association of Psychoanalytic Self Psychology. He has a private practice in psychoanalysis and comprehensive psychotherapy, specializing in trauma, with adults, adolescents, and children and may be contacted at mdclifford@gmail.com.* ❑

At cliospscyhe.org older versions of Clio's Psyche are available to view. In addition, there is considerable information on the Psychohistory Forum, its Work-In-Progress Meetings, and our activities in general. For information on *Young Scholar Membership* and *Subscription Awards*, please contact Paul Elovitz directly at pelovitz@aol.com.

Book Review

An Excellent Account of Alfred Dreyfus' Ordeal

Jaques Szaluta—U.S. Merchant Marine Academy

With the publication of his latest work, *Alfred and Lucie Dreyfus in the Phantasmagoria* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), Norman Simms is now a leading world scholar on Alfred Dreyfus and the "Dreyfus Affair." The author is imaginative in the wide array of sources he employs to develop the issues in this case. The "Dreyfus Affair," as this event came to be called, had ramifications on French and, ultimately, world history. The book under consideration is Simms' third volume on the subject he has worked on for over ten years. The first two were *Alfred Dreyfus: Man, Milieu, and Midrash* (Academic Studies Press, Boston, 2012), and *In the Context of His Times: Alfred Dreyfus as Lover, Intellectual, Poet, and Jew* (Academic Press, Boston, 2013). Simms is now working on a fourth volume. The present study deals with Dreyfus' reentry into the army during World War I to his last days. It also describes how he and his wife Lucie lived, as well as the "*midrashing* processes of their Jewish traditions." Simms promises these ideas "will explode on to the pages of subsequent studies" (325).

This volume is a masterpiece of scholarship, with its focus on Dreyfus and his supportive family. It is an exhaustive 500 pages with exceptionally small print, a mammoth work giving the reader much to ponder.

The book's very title is striking, as it refers to Dreyfus' arrest and conviction for treason, followed by imprisonment on the tropical Devil's Island off the coast of South America in French Guiana. For five years he was isolated there from his wife, family, and friends. Dreyfus was treated sadistically, with no one speaking to him in his jailors' attempt to break him emotionally. Simms' detailed description of Dreyfus' time reveals an extremely harrowing ordeal. The term "*phantasmagoria*" is fitting indeed because to Dreyfus the entire series of events was an insane, traumatizing nightmare.

The Dreyfus Affair was a gross travesty of justice, which

ballooned into a national and international scandal of global concern and proportion. In 1894, Dreyfus, a captain in the French army, was arrested and court-martialed on the charge of treasonously having passed secret military information to Germany. Yet, Dreyfus was devoted to the French Republic. Following the stunning defeat of France by Prussia in 1870, the Prussians annexed Alsace and the Dreyfus family moved to Paris. The defeat left the French, including Dreyfus, with a burning desire for revenge, leading him to attend elite military schools and become an army officer. After the court martial, Dreyfus could not imagine his fellow officers could be so duplicitous.

France was the most democratic country in Europe as a result of the French Revolution of 1789, which was followed by the rule of Napoleon. Jews could now serve in the French army; whereas, during the *ancien régime*, they had been barred from service. The inspiring slogan of this revolutionary era was "careers open to talent."

Simms has particularly special, if not exceptional, qualifications and credentials for writing these books. He knows the French language well, and he employs an abundance of French sources. He is very familiar with Judaism: the religion, its literature, its customs, and its language (he uses a wide sprinkling of Yiddish and Hebrew throughout the text). As he notes about himself, "my *midrashic* way of writing often develops as a conversation or debate between different voices—sometimes those of the authorities cited sometimes my own commentary—in the main body of the text and those in the footnotes" (1). Simms sees Dreyfus as someone who "*midrashes* his own life" (108). Clearly, the author identifies with Dreyfus. He is also a psychohistorian with extensive accomplishments in this field.

In the entire Affair, Dreyfus was a hapless victim, and this is of utmost significance. While psychohistorians study many leaders to examine their self-defeating psychodynamic motivations, Dreyfus should not be included in this category. He was simply in the wrong place at the wrong time. As Simms shows, Dreyfus was a model of rectitude and had a family background and marital relationship that led him to be an exceptionally "well adjusted" man.

Dreyfus had a loving mother and father, a doting elder sister, and a close relationship with an older brother. He later married Lucie, who was loving, devoted, and supportive of her husband

throughout his arrest and imprisonment. Simms writes a great deal about the quality of their relationship, which clearly indicates the beneficial aspects of their love for each other, and how they endured this very trying separation. He describes how they "maintain their faith in one another, in their love, and in the ideals they shared as Jews" (456-457). Lucie's active, creative role in keeping Alfred sane and in making him think beyond his present sufferings is inspiring (449).

The support of his wife and family greatly contributed to saving Dreyfus throughout the long ordeal of physical and emotional torture he experienced. Dreyfus also had astounding ego strength. To be sure, the lengthy incarceration he endured—under atrocious conditions—adversely affected him. Nevertheless, when he was finally, completely, publicly, and ceremoniously exonerated in a military ceremony that returned him to service in 1906, the crowds who attended this event shouted "*Vive Dreyfus*!" He dignifiedly shouted back to them "*Vive la France*!" (465). During World War I, Dreyfus served in the French Army, retiring after that conflict with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Although the Affair ended well for Dreyfus, with the coming of the Second World War, the defeat and occupation of France in 1940, and the Holocaust, the fate of his family, as well as that of French Jews in general, was marked by arrests and deportations. Lucie had to "go into hiding from the Vichy collaborationists" and a granddaughter and other relatives were "murdered by the Gestapo" (464). The Vichy regime, headed by Marshal Philippe Petain, included officers who were opponents of Dreyfus.

Simms pays close attention to the kind of person Dreyfus was. He depicts him as highly cultured and intellectually curious, with wide interests in literature, history, sociology, art, and philosophy. As an artillery officer and graduate of technical military schools, he was trained in math, science, and engineering. Although some critics have contended Dreyfus had ordinary intellectual tastes and was a mediocre person, that claim is the result of slander in the anti-Semitic press. The evidence, revealed in the "workbooks" he kept in prison, demonstrates quite the contrary. Someone as well informed as Dreyfus can be referred to as a Renaissance man. After graduating from the *École de Guerre* in 1892, he was assigned to the Army General Staff, with an exemplary career.

Despite the popular furor fueled by the certainty that Dreyfus—and by extension, the Jews—was guilty, the persons primarily responsible for the plot against him unconsciously admitted their guilt as it unraveled. A day after the arrest of Colonel Hubert Henry, who had forged documents to incriminate Dreyfus, Henry committed suicide in his cell. From a psychoanalytic perspective, suicide is murder of the self that is aimed at those who caused the person's torment. In effect, Henry admitted his wrongdoing by not defending himself, as had the man he framed. Commandant Ferdinand Esterhazy, the actual guilty officer passing secret information to the German Embassy, fled to England.

One officer with a conscience who played a pivotal role in re-opening the case was Colonel Georges Picquart, a new Chief of Army Intelligence; he discovered Dreyfus was innocent.

Simms also explores the group behavior in France in this period that demonstrated deep stereotypical prejudices that could be widely marshaled to incite riots. Émile Zola, the author and journalist who worked to exonerate Dreyfus, incurred the wrath of large crowds who shouted "Death to Zola" during anti-Semitic riots throughout France. It became so serious that Zola fled to England. What is also noteworthy about Zola is that he initially held the common view that Jews were insidious. After he became involved with Dreyfus' family, he became poignantly aware of how slanderous his stereotypical views were. Simms finds that "Zola began to sense his own prejudices and took steps to rectify them" and that he began "to realize the individuality of each person, the ridiculousness of the caricature imagery" (415).

As was indicated above, Dreyfus had wide-ranging alacritous tastes and interests in artistic and academic fields, intellectual matters, and productions. One artist who receives extensive attention from Simms is Jean-Louis Meissonier, a leading painter in the second half of the 19th century. As Simms discusses Meissonier's appeal for Dreyfus, he states that "his conception of art on the side of rationalism and intellectual inquiry, related to both the disciplines of natural science and of formal history, both approaches requiring careful attention to detail and the ability to imagine specific persons, events, places and ideas within dynamic contexts" (332). As shown here, and in so much of his book, Simms writes like a literary, artistic, and historical critic, which reinforces that this book is not written for the general reader, but for the specialist of the period under consideration.

Alfred and Lucie Dreyfus in the Phantasmagoria is certainly very informative, but Simms should have placed the Dreyfus Affair in a greater historical context. The year 1870 was quite consequential for France, as it was defeated by Bismarckian Prussia then. Prussia took extensive territories from France, among them Alsace, the Dreyfus' ancestral home. Bismarck was instrumental in replacing the French monarchy with a republican form of government unfavorable to the Catholic Church; a republic recalled the anticlerical French Revolution of 1789. Although Bismarck was Protestant from an essentially Protestant state, he engineered this form of government because he thought that it would hinder France's attempts to make anti-Prussian alliances with Catholic, monarchist governments.

Simms points out that many levels of French society at the end of the 19th century still "craved the old certainties" of "King, Church, and Army" with anti-Semitism contributing to the fears (423). The defaming of an innocent person, and then a group, was not unknown in France or other parts of Europe.

There were other, remote contributors to the atmosphere that fostered the Dreyfus Affair. The French Revolution, with its "Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen," took a sharp and anticlerical turn, resulting in the Pope's denunciation of the Revolution. The expulsion of Protestants (Huguenots) two centuries earlier also reflected French intolerance (Robert F. Byrnes, *Antisemitism in Modern France*, *Vol. I: The Prologue to the Dreyfus Affair*, 1950, 137-138).

These outbursts of widespread violence and barbarity show the ease with which intolerant group dynamics took over, whether the object of the group's hatred was Protestants or Dreyfus and the Jews. One person prominent in anti-Semitism in France was Édouard Drumont, who in 1886 published a best-selling two-volume work titled *La France juive* (*Jewish France*), which held the Jews responsible for all the misfortunes in French history, including Protestantism. He even regarded the defeat of France in 1870 by Germany as a Jewish manipulation to pillage France of its gold (Byrnes, 138-139). All his anti-Semitic manifestations fed the political group-fantasies, and connected with the Dreyfus Affair. Ultimately, when these anti-Semitic fabrications were exposed as based on hateful fantasies, the French Republic was able to survive.

Simms is certainly a psychohistorian, but there is a paucity

of psychodynamic interpretations in this book. Remarkably, he criticizes psychohistorians who do not go further. For example, in his earlier volume *In the Context of His Times* (2013), Simms argues that "Avner Falk gives a quick two-page resume of the Dreyfus Affair and, despite the topic of his book, *A Psychoanalytic History of the Jews*, makes no attempt to see it in any psychological or psychiatric terms or subject it to psychoanalysis" (206). He does add that Falk recognizes that the Dreyfus Affair "was very emotional" (207). Such observations are very pertinent to the Dreyfus Affair, and Simms could have included the findings of ego psychology to go further in explaining the mentality of the large mobs engaged in widespread violence. He should have dealt with collective phenomena, marked by paroxysms of rage. Surprisingly, in his bibliography, he cites hardly any psychohistorical literature. To be sure, Simms does pay a great deal of attention to the nature of anti-Semitism, this collective phenomenon, which he recognizes as having unconscious motivations and being paranoid.

In conclusion, Simms' work marks a significant contribution to understanding the personality of Alfred Dreyfus, his wife Lucie, his family, and the Dreyfus Affair. Simms excels as a scholar. He also contributes to understanding the person and the pivotal role of Émile Zola in taking on the culpable leaders of the French Army, as well as Zola's elucidating the historic role of the Catholic Church. Zola, and many others, was the conscience of France. The Dreyfus Affair may be summed up as being the "shame and glory of France."

Jacques Szaluta, PhD, *is Professor Emeritus of History at the United States Merchant Marine Academy. He has published widely in the field of modern European history and psychohistory, including his book, Psychohistory: Theory and Practice (2002). Dr. Szaluta is a graduate of the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training and is in private practice. He may be reached at SzalutaJ@usmma.edu.* ❑

Clio's Psyche *Call for Papers*

The Psychology of Steven Spielberg and His Films

December 2015 Issue

Submissions due October 1, 2015

Contact Ken Fuchsman at kfuchsman@gmail.com with a proposal for which Spielberg film you'd like to psychoanalytically review by August 20, 2015.

Meeting Reports

A European Psychohistory Conference

Peter Petschauer—Appalachian State University

On April 17-19, 2015, about 85-95 colleagues of the Gesellschaft für Psychohistorie und Politische Psychologie e.V. (GPPP) came together for its annual meeting in an older hotel in one of the suburbs of Heidelberg, Germany to probe the emotional dimensions of the Enlightenment. The comfortable meeting room had ready access to a lovely patio where conference attendees drank coffee, ate pastries, smoked, and talked during breaks. Ludwig Janus moderated the sessions, which were held for 45 minutes followed by discussion. Some presenters gave PowerPoint presentations, others spoke or read their papers. At least half of the attendees were women and a few were students.

The theme of the conference was "The Emotional Dimension of the Enlightenment: Responsibility for our Feelings," which was spelled out by Ludwig Janus, who also functioned as moderator, a position in which he excelled. In his introduction he referenced the quote, "We would like to understand the wave on which we ride, but we are the wave," from the art historian Jacob Burckhardt. Janus highlighted the importance of how our lives are shaped by the events of our time. He spoke of an Enlightenment that freed our thoughts and allowed for more creativity. This began with reflections on the literature of the 18th and 19th centuries. This literature explored our innermost feelings and in-depth psychology. However, emotion was still proven to influence societal events. Janus used "expressions in the war-making of the 20th century and in its collective ideologies" as an example of such. It is his belief that by furthering infant research and prenatal psychology, there is a greater chance psychologists will be able to understand "pre-linguistic feelings on a personal level, to reflect on them and to be responsible for them." The conference explored this emotional dimension of research. Janus sees it as "a basic approach of psychohistory; a reflection on the ways in which emotionality works in the psychohistorical process."

The papers presented included:

On the first day, "The Emotional Dimension of the Enlightenment" by Ludwig Janus; "Biographic Comments to the

Theme of the Conference" by Tilmann Moser; and "Creators and Creativity: The Influence of Trauma in Early Childhood on the Artist's Work (Rilke, Dali, Kahlo)" by Ofra Lubetzky.

On the second day, "Authenticity of Emotions in Artistic Work" by Klaus Evertz; "The Intrauterine Relationship Matrix: The Indian Paradigm of Unconscious Organisational Designs of Societal Structures" by Horia Crisan; "Reflection on the Feelings of Infants in the Rig Veda" by Harald Strohm; "When Frau Räsong Fell into the Lake–Taking Responsibility for Emotions–Experiences from Childhood Therapy" by Antonia Stulz-Koller; "Characteristics of Feelings in Regression Therapy" by Marita Klippel-Heidekrüger; "Psychosomatic Medicine and Phenomenology" by Wolfram Schüffel; "Emotions in Philosophy–Attempts at a Compromise with the Body" by Bernhard Wegener; and "Dynamic of Public Feelings" by Winfried Kurth.

On the last day, "Peculiarities of Emotionality in Russia" by Juhani Ihanus; "America Then and Now. Alone in a Complex Society" by Peter Petschauer; and "How Does an Artistic Mindset Deal with the Problems of His (Her) Time" by Manfred Kalin.

In a subsequent e-mail, Ofra Lubetzky of Israel wrote about her interests and the paper she presented. Her focus was on "the history of the human being and how the relation between mother/father and child from the very early beginning influence the long life." Previously, she did not view her work as psychohistory, and she now hopes to gain a better understanding of what psychohistory means.

I found the conference to be a most pleasant experience and somewhat different than the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) conferences that I often attend in New York and attended this year. The atmosphere was rather relaxed, and it was very respectful and rewarding that almost everyone stayed for the entire conference. Regrettably, in New York City at the IPA, clinicians sometimes just come in to present their papers and leave. Visitors to Manhattan will often not stay the full time as they take advantage of the different cultural aspects of the city or carry on with their busy lives (as I did after two exhilarating days). It is always good to see that psychohistory is alive and well in Europe as well as in North America.

***Peter Petschauer**'s biography may be found on page 65.*

Author's Note: *All translations of the topics are mine and may on occasion do violence to both German and English. The German version is readily accessible on the GPPP's website: http:// www.psychohistorie.de/. Look under Tagungen. There you will also find all other pertinent information about the GPPP.* ❑

Clifford on Freud as the Leader of Psychoanalysis

Paul H. Elovitz—Ramapo College

Michael Clifford's erudite presentation, "Adler, Freud, and Winnicott," was the topic of our January 31, 2015 Psychohistory Forum Work-In-Progress seminar. Although the day was freezing, the library of the Training Institute for Mental Health in Manhattan was warm with excited intellectual exchange. The 19 colleagues attending the seminar, allowing for multiple identifications, comprised 13 therapists, 12 psychologists, 11 psychoanalysts, four historians, three social workers, one psychiatrist, 12 women, and seven men. Two participants were so enthusiastic about this session that they wondered if we could have a follow-up meeting on the part of Clifford's materials that were not covered. Several then e-mailed me, referring to the meeting as "superb," "excellent," and "the best I've ever attended."

The session was devoted almost entirely to the nature of Freud's leadership of and interpersonal relations within the psychoanalytic movement. While participants expressed great appreciation for the brilliance and contributions of the founder of psychoanalysis, they labeled Freud's leadership as "tyrannical." When he started the Wednesday Psychoanalytic Society in his home in 1902, he enthusiastically welcomed his "colleagues and acolytes." He wanted to know their ideas, lives, and fantasies rather than simply dictate his ideas about the unconscious he had formulated through his pathbreaking and courageous self-analysis. But it was always clear that *his* ideas came first.

It should be remembered that none of Freud's early followers had the advantage of a real psychoanalysis. In fact, Wilhelm Stekel, with eight sessions, was the first of his followers actually analyzed. While probing themselves and developing the parameters of psychoanalysis, this group struggled to build a psychoanalytic movement in Vienna, Europe, and then around the world. Ulti-

mately they succeeded, but as time went on, Freud became more rigid and somewhat authoritarian. He was most creative and self-revealing when exchanging with colleagues such as Fliess, whom he would write to and sometimes meet with in Berlin. Within the group, Freud's struggle with how self-revealing he could be without undermining his leadership led him to become increasingly rigid.

The relationship between a theorist's life and theories is extremely important. In *Beyond Good and Evil* (1886), Nietzsche wrote "that every great philosophy... [is] the personal confession of its author and a kind of involuntary and unconscious memoir" (1886). For this reason, much of the biographical material other investigators might simply dismiss as "mere gossip," psychoanalysts, who were the majority of colleagues at our seminar, see as invaluable sources of understanding about Freud and other theorists.

Clifford paid particular attention to the role of the loss of a nanny on a theorist's emotional development. Bowlby's nanny was dismissed when he was four years old, leading him to spend a couple of months looking for her, and years later, to his development of attachment theory. Clifford's loss of his and his siblings' nanny when he was quite young helped awaken him to the importance of attachment. He quoted Freud, writing about himself, as saying "the nanny was his instruction in all things sexual." In a letter to Fliess, Freud additionally wrote, "Did I tell you how I was bathed in the warmth of my nanny's menstrual cycle?" Psychoanalyst Hanna Turken saw this as a symbolic rebirth. As is apparent from this paragraph, much of Clifford's presentation and our discussion focused on Freud the man.

There was no question that Sigmund was the favorite of his mother, but he wrote as if his father was the major influence on him and his formulation of the Oedipal complex. He was surprised at the impact his father's death had on him. There was enormous sibling rivalry among Freud's colleagues and adherents. Partly because of this intragroup rivalry and the turmoil it caused among the membership, Freud formed a small secret committee, as written about by Phyllis Grosskurth and Paul Roazen.

But the Viennese membership, fearful of losing their role in psychoanalysis, came together in a secret meeting of their own as Freud worked to broaden what had been a Viennese group into an

international one. Many of his outraged adherents met in a hotel room, only to have Freud burst in uninvited to make his case for why psychoanalysis had to broaden its organizational reach beyond Vienna and its overwhelmingly Jewish followers. Freud feared that psychoanalysis as simply a Jewish science would be dismissed out of hand because of the extreme anti-Semitism of the period.

Another aspect of Freud's leadership was his strong tendency to prefer some of his followers at some points and later break with them. As he observed about himself, "My emotional life has always insisted that I have an intimate friend and a hated enemy" (*Standard Edition*, V, 1900, 483). He was aware that his intimate friend could sometimes become his enemy. A colleague who went off in a direction Freud considered to be "not psychoanalysis" would be ostracized—although not necessarily immediately, as in the case with Adler. Freud might slowly adopt some of the ideas that he previously condemned as un-psychoanalytic, as he also did with Adler. In our discussion, some likened this ostracizing behavior to the orthodox Jewish practice of shunning. Several of Freud's followers whom he rejected for doctrinal reasons committed suicide, including Silberer, Tausk, and perhaps Steckel.

Freud's inclination to need enemies led him to exaggerate the degree of people's opposition to psychoanalysis. Indeed, Norman Kiell pointed out in *Freud Without Hindsight: Reviews of His Work: 1893-1939* (1988) that Freud was reviewed by contemporaries much more favorably than one would gather from his letters and the work of his friendly biographers. Exclusion has been such an important and divisive issue in the history of psychoanalysis, ever since its founder Freud got to define what constituted psychoanalysis. However, as Clifford points out, Freud subsequently incorporated the ideas of people who he had declared to not be doing psychoanalysis—a clear indication that there was no single definition of psychoanalysis. This is all to the best since psychoanalysis is really about, in my view, a method of inquiry getting at the unconscious by using the transference in probing the life story of the analysand.

It appears to me that sibling rivalry and rivalry for the attention of the founder/father Freud has played an important role in the numerous divisions within our field. It should be remembered that Freud, genius that he was, was never analyzed according to his own theory, which required transference to an analyst, because his was a self-analysis. In fact, among the early analysts, few were analyzed.

There weren't many analysts at the time, and so much of what happened in the Wednesday evening Vienna Psychoanalytic Society is what we today call wild analysis.

Theory has great value but it becomes a major justification for splitting, which we humans are so prone to do to gain preference over others and act out our own unconscious and conscious desires. Freud was a good "hater," according to Hanns Sachs. He and the Wednesday evening group needed the "other" as a way of defining themselves. Certainly, they lived in extraordinarily dangerous times—an era in which fascist fanatics like Hitler would come to dominate.

The group concluded by wondering why so little time was devoted to examining that interesting and lovely man Donald Winnicott, since participants had read Clifford's second paper, "The Making of Donald Winnicott: Key Relationships that Formed His Personal and Professional Life." The follow-up meeting several colleagues suggested was to discuss Winnicott. Most of the attendees continued their lively discussion over lunch at the Hilton New Fashion District Hotel on the next block.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, *is the founding director and convener of the Psychohistory Forum.* ❑

Memorials

My Mentor Eli Sagan (1927-2015): In Memoriam

Donald Carveth—York University (Toronto)

For over a decade, Eli Sagan's classic, *Freud, Women, and Morality: The Psychology of Good and Evil* (1988), sat on my shelf unread. When I finally picked it up, I was stunned. Here were answers to many of the central problems in psychoanalytic theory that had troubled me for years, expounded with both scholarly erudition and rare lucidity. I began teaching it. One day a student asked, "So who is this guy Sagan anyway?" I confessed I really didn't know, but returned to my office determined to find out. I could find next to nothing about him on the Internet but finally came up with an address in New Jersey. I wrote him a fan letter.

A few weeks later I was sitting in my college office when

the phone rang and a raspy voice said, "Hello, Carveth, this is Eli Sagan!"—and so, already in my 60's, I found a mentor. No wonder I couldn't find him on the Internet: Eli didn't have e-mail, own a computer, or use a typewriter. Each of his many large books had been composed by pen and paper. He was an "old-school" scholar in every sense.

Every other Sunday morning and then at least once a month for the next few years, Eli and I enjoyed our telephone dialogue as I read through each of his books and discussed them with him one by one. Somewhat later we began to discuss my own work, often going over it critically line by line. Psychoanalysts know something of the role of transference in creativity; my recent book is the product of my idealizing transference to Eli Sagan which has been, in many ways, healing for me. Somehow in order to go beyond my life-long pattern of writing journal articles and to acquire the audacity to publish a full-length book, I needed to put myself under the authority of a father-figure and obtain his permission to do so. Naturally, my book is dedicated to Eli.

We met face-to-face for the first time in New York, just prior to the time when Eli and Frimi—his charming, talented, and devoted wife for 65 years—moved from their long-time residence in Englewood, New Jersey, to a retirement community outside Boston to be near some of their children and grandchildren. Eli and Frimi did me the honor of attending a lecture I gave at a conference at Boston University on evolutionary sociology that addressed his work in that field along with that of Talcott Parsons and Eli's friend Robert Bellah. The following evening they attended a presentation I made to the Boston Graduate School of Psychoanalysis where I introduced Eli and he addressed the group. The following September, I arranged for Eli and Frimi to come to Toronto where we together delivered a well-received talk entitled "Modernity Psychosis: The Evolutionary Psychoanalytic Sociology of Eli Sagan" to the Toronto Psychoanalytic Society.

Tragically, a few weeks after his return to Boston, Eli suffered a stroke from which he struggled hard over the following months and years to recover. At first he appeared to be making progress in reacquiring his capacity for speech, but he ultimately hit a plateau and conversation remained very difficult for him. This impediment was all the more painful for a brilliant man who in addition to loving life itself, was especially devoted to language and the life of the mind.

I will not review here the series of major contributions Eli made to psychoanalytic sociology, psychohistory, and psychoanalytic theory. Paul Elovitz' interview, "Eli Sagan: Scholar of Aggression and Sociologist," in the June 2001 issue of Clio's Psyche (Vol. 8, No. 1: 31-38) provides an excellent overview. I have already written in this journal about "The Psychoanalytic Sociology of Eli Sagan," in the December 2011 issue of Clio's Psyche (Vol. 18, No. 3: 357-361). At the time of his interview with Paul, Eli was working on his last book, *Citizens and Cannibals: The French Revolution, the Struggle for Modernity, and the Origins of Ideological Terror* (2001) which, at the time, he felt might turn out to be his best book.

Although I have personally been most influenced by *Freud, Women and Morality*, from a psychohistorical standpoint I think Eli was right. This book is by no means only about the French revolution; it is also about modern culture and what Eli called the "modernity psychosis" that bedevils it. In a sense, Eli's last book is continuous with his first, *Cannibalism: Human Aggression and Cultural Form* (1974), one of the very few psychohistorical studies of the currently neglected concept of sublimation. In it he describes the progressive cultural development from cannibalism (oral devouring), to head-hunting (anal collecting), human sacrifice, and on to slavery and other forms of (phallic) domination (classism, racism, sexism).

I was thinking of Eli the other night as I watched the recent historical drama *Selma* (2014) about the 1965 Selma to Montgomery voting rights marches. Despite profound and brutal resistance, the movement was eventually successful in pressing President Lyndon B. Johnson to sign the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Eli and I often discussed the subsequent stalling of the forward evolutionary move toward democracy, equality, and justice with the failure of Johnson's "war on poverty" and his program for a "Great Society." Eli was struck by the "failure of nerve" of liberal-minded people (President Obama included) and their retreat from carrying the goal of liberation to its logical conclusion in economics in addition to racial, gender, and all other forms of equality.

Eli had a profound sense of the "backlash" that arises when existing forms of domination are threatened. He believed we cannot understand or confront the madness in society unless we have confronted and worked through the madness in ourselves. In his interview with Paul he said: "If you don't have a connection with

the Nazi within yourself you'll never understand Nazism. If you don't understand the cannibal within yourself you will never understand cannibals. People who do not have a sense of their own aggression will never understand the aggression of others" (32). Eli spent 22 years on the psychoanalytic couch himself, motivated no doubt by his own neurotic retreat from the academic career he desired and for which he was brilliantly suited, under pressure from his father to enter and eventually run the family business. On his retirement at age 47 he liberated his repressed oedipal aggression and threw himself into reparative mode, authoring a series of first-rate scholarly studies in psychohistory and psychoanalytic sociology that, despite his lack of advanced degrees, won him teaching posts at the University of California at Berkeley, Brandeis, the New School for Social Research, and elsewhere.

Eli had his finger on the pulse of the "failure of nerve" that leads human beings to fear their own aggression, to refrain from self-assertion, and to have to cap their success at a certain level by retreating from challenging the *status quo* and the "powers that be." There is a moving scene in *Selma* when days after having been attacked and beaten by the National Guard, and now joined by supporters from the north, the marchers are surprised by the sudden apparent retreat on the part of their oppressors, who move aside and open a path in front of them. Martin Luther King, Jr. brings the march to a stop, everyone kneels to pray, and then he does an about-face and leads them back rather than forward. In the film, it is only after an impassioned private plea by John Lewis that King appears to find the courage to carry on.

Shakespeare wrote, "Conscience doth make cowards of us all." If we substitute superego for conscience, I think that pretty much captures it. The mixture of love, hate, fear of, and loyalty to the inner authority figure, the aggressor whom we have internalized, with whom we identify, and to whom we are inclined to submit prevents us from carrying out the sublimated or symbolic murder that is necessary for us to grow up and carry the emancipatory project to its conclusion. Freud's concept of the normal oedipal resolution as renunciation of incestuous and parricidal desires out of fear of castration, leading to the turning of aggression toward the oedipal rivals against the self, resulting in the superego as identification with the aggressor, is a description not of health but of widespread (normotic) pathology. Sagan points out that although Freud does not allow the data to cause him to revise his view that "The

Oedipus complex…in boys…is not simply repressed, it is literally smashed to pieces by the shock of threatened castration" ("Some psychical consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes," *S.E.*, 19 1925: 257), his own case study of "Little Hans" ("Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy," *S.E.*, 10 1909) indicates that the true oedipal resolution is not *renunciation* out of fear of castration, but *sublimation* or symbolic *fulfilment* of oedipal desire. Sagan writes:

> Near the end of the treatment Hans had two significant dreams. The first was a thinly disguised situation where he had managed to marry his mother and have many children with her. The second brought Hans a penis as large as his father's. … So successful was this imaginative fulfillment of oedipal strivings that it immediately produced remarkable changes. "In the course of the next few days," Freud writes, "Hans' mother wrote to me more than once to express her joy at the little boy's recovery" (*Freud, Women and Morality,* 1988, 82-83).

Hans Loewald ("The Waning of the Oedipus Complex," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 27 1979) writes that "it is no exaggeration to say that the assumption of responsibility for one's own life and its conduct is in psychic reality tantamount to the murder of the parents, to the crime of parricide" (756-757). Will we ever be able to finally grow up and accomplish this, or will we merely continue to compromise with the superego and the forces of repression and oppression?

Eli's departure from the academic life after taking his B.A. at Harvard and his late and only partial return to academia took a toll. Yet his marginal status with respect to both the university and organized psychoanalysis, at the same time, liberated him to think and write with degrees of independence and creativity that are difficult to achieve while living under the superego pressures and constraints of these institutions. Eli Sagan was one of a kind. He was a deep and clear thinker, a lucid writer, and a great teacher. His books are well worth revisiting.

When I think of Eli, I think of Irving Stone's popular biography of Freud, the title of which, *The Passions of the Mind* (1971), seems somewhat more fitting for Eli than for Freud himself, given the latter's more dispassionate, skeptical, and ironic stance. Freud

was a rationalist who thought whatever little salvation might be possible for human beings had much to do with reason and the capacity to think: He called for a "dictatorship of the intellect" over the other functions of the personality. Eli, though also a highly rational man, knew that humane values come not from reason but from feelings, not from the head but the heart—from what Jean-Jacques Rousseau called "pity" or fellow-feeling. Eli was a passionate, deeply morally and politically engaged intellectual. He served as Finance Chair for the George McGovern for President Committee in 1972 and Treasurer of the Council for a Livable World. One of the achievements he was most proud of was having been listed twice on Nixon's Enemies List. He is sorely missed.

Don Carveth, PhD, *is Emeritus Professor of Sociology and Social & Political Thought at York University, current Director of the Toronto Institute of Psychoanalysis, and author of The Still Small Voice: Psychoanalytic Reflections on Guilt and Conscience (2013). He may be found on the web at: www.yorku.ca/dcarveth.* ❑

Peter Gay (1923-2015): In Memoriam

Ken Fuchsman—University of Connecticut

In 1955, at age 32, Peter Gay was a successful political scientist. He had become a graduate student at Columbia in 1946, started teaching in the Department of Public Law and Government in 1947, and earned his political science doctorate in 1951. In 1952, his dissertation on German democratic socialist Eduard Bernstein was published to excellent reviews. Surprisingly, in 1955 he was passed over for promotion. Gay was at a crossroads. He told his dilemma to his close friend, Richard Hofstadter, the distinguished Columbia historian. Fortuitously, the university's history department had an opening in modern European history. Through Hofstadter's influence, a political scientist became a historian.

This academic experience was not the first crossroads in Gay's life. Born Peter Joachim Frohlich in Berlin on June 20, 1923, for 16 years he and his family endured being Jewish in Nazi Germany. A life changing occurrence was his family's ability to escape Germany in 1939. The Frohlichs went to Cuba, then to Denver in 1941. En route, they changed their last name to its English language equivalent, Gay. Peter graduated from the University

of Denver in 1946, then he was off to Columbia University.

Once he was in the history department, Gay educated himself in the methods and standards of history, querying historian friends as to what he needed to learn. In 1959, he published a book combining political science and history, *Voltaire's Politics*, and married. His wife, Ruth Slotkin Glazer, was recently divorced from sociologist Nathan Glazer and had three daughters under the age of ten from her first marriage. Peter and Ruth remained married until her death in 2006. It was a long and productive marriage, and later in life Ruth became a historian herself, publishing books on Jews in Europe.

The publication of his two volumes on the Enlightenment lifted Gay to recognition as a leading historian. The first of them, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation: The Rise of Modern Paganism* won the National Book Award in 1967. Over the course of his long career he was the recipient of many awards, including the Heineken Prize for History in 1990, the Gold Medal from the American Academy of Arts and Letters in 1992, and the American Historical Association Award for Scholarly Distinction in 2003.

Earlier, while he was writing his Enlightenment books, something was brewing inside Dr. Gay. He was developing a strong interest in psychoanalysis. This percolation had been going on for a long period. He first became interested in Freud's ideas in 1950 through two other refugees from Nazi Germany: Franz Neumann and Herbert Marcuse. Neumann had arrived as part of the political science faculty at Columbia while Gay was a graduate student. They became friendly, and through Neumann he met philosopher Herbert Marcuse. Their high regard for Freud convinced Gay he should learn about this controversial innovator. Marcuse in 1955 published his view of the promise of Freud's work, *Eros and Civilization*. The first evidence of Freud's influence on Gay's work was his 1968 volume, *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider.* One chapter was called "The Revolt of the Sons" and another "The Revenge of the Fathers." As Gay himself said, "…the Oedipus complex had come to the Weimar Republic" (*A Life of Learning*, 2004, 7).

The year Gay published his Weimar book, the revolt of the sons was striking close to home. In April of that year, the Columbia University chapter of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Student Afro-American Society (SAS) took over

buildings on campus, and occupied them for a week until the police intervened, cleared the buildings, and arrested 700 people. After that, a strike shut down the University for the remainder of the semester. The student revolt divided academic departments. According to historian Robert McCaughey, "So strong were intradepartmental disagreements about the events of spring '68 that collegial relations were soured for years. This disagreement influenced the decisions of several faculty to leave Columbia, among them Peter Gay in history" (*Stand Columbia*, 2003, 464). Gay went to the history department at Yale in 1969, where he later was appointed Sterling Professor of History, and retired from Yale in 1993. Among the activities of his productive retirement was serving as the founding director of the New York Public Library's Center for Scholars and Writers (1997-2003).

In Connecticut, Gay's interest in Freud and psychoanalysis intensified. He studied at the Western New England Institute for Psychoanalysis from 1976 to 1983, and had a traditional psychoanalysis, seeing his analyst five times a week. Gay's historical work became centered on Freud and psychoanalysis for a number of years. He made substantial efforts to convince historians that they needed psychoanalysis to understand history. Historians, Gay maintained, do not always acknowledge how psychological assumptions permeate their writings. Gay said historians "attribute motives," study "passions," and "analyze irrationality." The historian is "an amateur psychologist" (*Freud for Historians*, 1985, 6). He wrote that historians assume that individuals are motivated by self-interest; a rough psychology adopted from a rough economic theory is imported into history as if it meets empirical standards. He showed the empirical and theoretical inadequacy of such purported motivations, even within the economic sphere. The supposedly material motivations of historical actors do not stand up to critical psychological examination. While Gay's analysis was convincing, he acknowledged that "I cannot see any evidence that it has left the slightest mark on my profession" (Gay, *A Life of Learning*, 2004, 9).

Still, Gay soldiered on. Between 1976 and 1993, he wrote or edited seven books with Freud in the title. The most well-known is his massive single volume biography of Freud called *Freud: A Life for Our Time* (1988). His five-volume *The Bourgeois Experience* was psychoanalytically influenced and appeared between 1984 and 1998. Given how much Gay championed Freud, it is not

surprising that some identified him as a psychohistorian. He resisted this label, and was critical of the field. He said its "defects...compromise much of its work"; "these weaknesses" include "reductionism" and a "cavalier way with evidence" (*Freud for Historians,* 17). To Gay, "the historical reductionism of psychohistorians, however interesting and even important it can be, cannot by its nature unmask the past in all its dimensions" (*A Life of Learning*, 11). When asked if he was a psychohistorian, Gay said: "No, I am a historian...I am a historian who uses psychoanalysis" (Elovitz, et al., Clio's Psyche, Vol. 4, No. 2, Sept. 1997, 63).

While Gay avoided being grouped with psychohistory, he was writing on Freud in a period of Freud bashing. Frederick Crews' 1990's essays in the *New York Review of Books* attacking Sigmund Freud unleashed a storm of controversy and were succeeded by a number of books debunking Freud. Gay stayed out of these disputes. Though this did not stop Crews from taking potshots at Gay, describing "the perfect vacuum achieved by the historian and Freud apologist Peter Gay" ("Confessions of a Freud Basher").

While Gay was an ardent defender of Freud, his biography is more balanced and scholarly than those that preceded and succeeded it. Still, it is easy to see Gay's loyalty to and admiration of Freud, and his underestimation of some of Freud's liabilities. In March 2009, I witnessed an 85-year-old Peter Gay evaluate a reading of Terry Johnson's comedy *Hysteria*, a play about Freud in 1939. The play is not particularly favorable to Freud, and Gay in his comments defended Freud's efforts. Though by that time Dr. Gay needed a walker to get around, his mind was sharp and his insights evident.

Peter Gay lived for six years after this event at the University of Connecticut, dying on May 12, 2015 at the age of 91. His first book was published in 1952 and his last in 2015. He was a prodigious worker with an extremely wide range of interests. Gay said of himself, "I have at times been accused of being a workaholic. I must plead guilty to the charge that it is undisturbed working time that makes me happy. The traditional division between work and play does not really fully apply to me" (*A Life of Learning*, 18). His playful work led him to write about Mozart, Voltaire, Freud, modernism, Manet, Gropius, Deism, the romantics, and much more. In describing his own motivation, he wrote, "the single quality that gives my writing a certain coherence, I think, is a passion

for getting things straight. In short, it is revisionist...to correct what I deem significant misreadings of the past has always been interesting, tempting, and highly enjoyable to me" (*A Life of Learning*, 13). He wanted accuracy and to correct what others have written; to leave his own mark by revising what his predecessors had done.

Gay was legendary for hosting people at his Hamden, Connecticut home, with his impressive library, art collection, love of tuna sandwiches, and also dining at the Yorkside Pizza Restaurant, near the Yale campus. For psychohistorians, he will be remembered for going against the grain by advocating for a psychoanalytically informed history, and also bucking the trend by showing the stature of the founder of psychoanalysis when Freud bashing was the rage.

***Ken Fuchsman**'s biography may be found on page 9.* ❑

BULLETIN BOARD

CONFERENCES: The **Psychohistory Forum's 2015 Work-In-Progress Seminars** will be announced as details are finalized. On **September 26, 2015 Denis O'Keefe** (New York University) will speak on the application of psychohistory to public policy including terror management. On **November 7, 2015 Larry J. Friedman** (Harvard University) will present on the nature of hatred. Additional proposals are welcome and will be vetted by a committee once a presentation paper is submitted. We wish to thank **Michael Clifford** (psychoanalytic practice), **Ken Fuchsman** (UConn), and **Susan Gregory (**private practice**)** for their recent Forum presentations and **Jacques Szaluta** (Merchant Marine Academy) for serving as moderator. Announcements and papers are sent out electronically to Psychohistory Forum members. Upcoming conferences of interest include the Association for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society at Rutgers University on October 22-24, 2015 with Sudhir Kakar as the featured speaker; the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis on the Assaults on the Psyche: Within/Without is on November 15, 2015 at the New York Law School in Manhattan; the International Psychohistorical Association's (IPA) conference will be on June 1-3, 2016 at New York University; and the International Society for Political Psychology's (ISPP) conference will be on July 14-17, 2016 in Warsaw, Poland. **CONGRATULATIONS:** To **Thomas Kohut** of Williams College who this fall will be the Fulbright-Freud Visiting Scholar of Psychoanalysis at the Freud Museum in Vienna, as well as teaching a course at the university and researching empathy. To **William R. Meyers** on the publication in June by Palgrave Macmillan of his *Social Science Methods for Clinical Inquiry: The Unconscious on the World Scene*. **OUR**

THANKS: To our members and subscribers for the support that makes Clio's Psyche possible. To Benefactors Herbert Barry, David Beisel, Tom Ferraro, Peter Loewenberg, David Lotto, Marvasti Jamshid, and Mary Peace Sullivan; Patrons Bill Argus, Ken Fuchsman, Alice Maher, Peter Petschauer, and Jacques Szaluta; Sustaining Members Peter Barglow, Dick Booth, George and Carolyn Brown, Alan Mohl, Joyce Rosenberg, Burton Seitler, and Arlene Steinberg; Supporting Members Paul H. Elovitz, Judy Gardiner, Sue Gouaux, Bob Lentz, Marcie Newton, Sandra Parness, Mena and Dominic Potts, Daniel Rancour-Laferriere, and Christina Stern; and Members Matthew Bowker, Valerie Rose Brinton, Michael Britton, Molly Castelloe, Hanna Cohen, Brian D'Agostino, Irene Javors, Margaret Kind, Denis O'Keefe, Bonnie Oglensky, Geraldine Pauling, Vivan Rosenberg, Roberta Rubin, Joan Seymour, and Howard Stein. Our special thanks for thought-provoking materials to Hans Bakker, David R. Beisel, Donald Carveth, David Cifelli, Michael J. Clifford, Marc-André Cotton, Brian D'Agostino, Paul H. Elovitz, Ken Fuchsman, Jay Y. Gonen, Juhani Ihanus, David Lotto, Trevor Pederson, Peter Petschauer, Joseph G. Ponterotto, Lawrence Shiner, Norman Simms, Charles B. Strozier, and Jacques Szaluta. To Nicole D'Andria for editing, proofing, and Publisher 2013 software application, Caitlin Adams Gaynor and Joyce Rosenberg for editing and proofing, and David Cifelli and Professor Paul Salstrom for proofing. Our special thanks to our editors and to our numerous overworked referees who must remain anonymous. ❑

We Wish to Thank Our Diligent, Hard-working and Prompt Editors, and Anonymous Referees

Clio's Psyche *Call for Papers*

The Psychology of Terror and Terrorists

For the December 2015 Issue the Deadline is
October 1, 2015

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

- The group and individual feelings terror induces in us
- Case studies of coping mechanisms used in the face of terror
- Domestic terror: Shooting strangers in public places
- Murder-suicide next door in the cities and suburbs
- Police as executioners in cases of "cowardly suicides"
- Case studies of the motivations of terrorists at home and abroad
- Suicidal terrorism: Case studies Andreas Lubitz, Abdulazeez, et al.
- The war on terrorism on TV and at the cinema
- What we learn from failed suicides and suicide bombers/shooters
- The emergence, psychology, and fear of "lone wolf" terrorists
- Why girls and women become suicide bombers for ISIS, et al.
- The historical and current relationship of suicide to religions
- Murder-suicide among the Tamil Tigers, in ancient Judah at Masada, or elsewhere
- The legal processes, news making, and the "theater" of terrorists' trials
- Freud views on suicide, murder, and human destructiveness
- Psychoanalytic explanations of suicidal terrorism: Nancy Kobrin, et al.
- Suicide in the context of WWII and war in general
- Reviews on books dealing with murder-suicides and terrorism, such as Jessica Stern and J.M. Berger's *ISIS: The State of Terror*

<><><><CP><><><>

We seek articles from 1,000 to 2,000 words—including your brief biography. Some 3,500 word essays are also welcome provided they are outstanding scholarship and well written. We do not publish bibliographies and usually have citations only for direct quotes. Articles, abstracts, and queries should be sent to Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, at pelovitz@aol.com.

Clio's Psyche
627 Dakota Trail
Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417