Clio's Psyche

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

The Psychology of Fear and Hatred
Special Issue

A Psychobiography of Donald Trump

Fantasy Politics and an Imaginary Analysis of Hillary Clinton

Obama's Tears

Medieval People and Anti-Semitism

Spielberg, the Man and His Films

Jewish Humor

Volume 22 Number 4
March 2016

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 22 No. 4 March 2016

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
Guest Co-editor for Fear and Hatred: Joyce Rosenberg

Editorial Board
C. Fred Alford, PhD University of Maryland • **James W. Anderson, PhD** Northwestern University • **David Beisel, PhD** RCC-SUNY • **Donald L. Carveth, PhD** York University • **Lawrence J. Friedman, PhD** Harvard 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
$82 two-year subscription to non-members
$75 yearly to institutions
(Add $60 per year outside U.S.A. & Canada)
Single issue price: $29

We welcome articles of psychohistorical interest of 500-2,000 words and some up to 3,500 words that have deeper scholarship.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTORS: Clio's Psyche welcomes original manuscripts that address individual or group issues from a psychological perspective. We are interested in contemporary and historical events. Childhood, family, group trauma, mechanisms of defense, personality, political psychology, psychic trauma, and psychobiography are of special interest. Our readers come from many fields so we avoid technical terminology. All manuscripts must include an abstract of a maximum of 150 words and 6-10 keywords that stress the psychohistorical aspects of the article. Authors should also include a brief biographical statement of no more than 100 words. Manuscripts should be composed on a word processor and sent electronically as a Microsoft Word document to Paul H. Elovitz by e-mail at pelovitz@aol.com. Our style is based on the University of Chicago *Manual of Style* with some modifications which may be found on our website. Note we do internal citations rather than end or footnotes and we do not publish bibliographies. Back issues, excluding those published in the previous year, may be found at our website. There is a blind refereeing system so authors should try to leave out all identifying information from the manuscript itself. For additional guidelines for writing an article for Clio's Psyche visit our official website at cliospsyche.org.

Copyright © 2016 The Psychohistory Forum

The Psychology of Fear and Hatred
Special Issue

A Psychobiography of Donald Trump

Fantasy Politics and an Imaginary Analysis of Hillary Clinton

Obama's Tears

Medieval People and Anti-Semitism

Spielberg, the Man and His Films

Jewish Humor

Volume 22 Number 4
March 2016

Clio's Psyche

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

Volume 22 Number 4 March 2016

The Psychology of Fear and Hatred
Special Issue

Hate and Its Ramifications 225
Neil Wilson
Hate, Like Love, Binds Us Together 227
C. Fred Alford
A Great Fear and Hatred: Suicide Bombers 230
Marcia Anne Newton
Reflections on Racist Nationalist Hatred in Yeltsin's Russia 235
Sebastian Job
Dehumanizing Others, Torture, and Genocide: The Power of Hate 240
Ruth M. Lijtmaer
Why We Hate: The Easy Answer 243
Merle Molofsky
Portrait of a Terrorist 247
Ira Brenner
Revoking Citizenship: The Malaise Afflicting France 249
Marc-André Cotton
The Evolution of Rage 254
Joel Markowitz
Germanophobia and the Debut of the New Science of Propaganda 256
James Allen
Educating Against Hate 262
Peter W. Petschauer
Franz Herda: American-German 268
Peter W. Petschauer
Psychoanalyzing the Political Rhetoric of Fear 269
Robert Samuels
Donald Trump Gives Permission to Hate, Thus Easing Our Superegos 273
Anonymous

Conscience, Obama, Clinton, and Trump

Reflections on Trump's Celebrity Politics and Psychobiography. 277
Paul H. Elovitz
Conscience, Superego, and Muslims 286
Paul Salstrom
Tears of Rage: President Obama and the Emotional Legacy of Newtown 292
Ken Fuchsman
Fantasy Politics and an Imaginary Analysis of Hillary Clinton 296
Paul H. Elovitz

Medieval People and Anti-Semitism

Two Medieval Lives: Hildegard of Bingen and William Marshal 300
Eva D. Papiasvili and Linda A. Mayers
A Window on Hatred and Persecution 307
Christina Stern

Spielberg, the Man and His Films

Steven Spielberg: The Quest to be a Moral Male 312
Ken Fuchsman
Ode to ET 318
Irene Javors

Masterpieces that Are the Through Lines for the 20th Century 320
Tom Ferraro

Book Reviews

Jewish Humor 324
Burton Norman Seitler
Marks' Important History of the Modern World 326
Jacques Szaluta
Reappraising the First President Bush 329
Paul H. Elovitz

Memorial

Remembering Arno Gruen 332
Joyce Rosenberg and David Cifelli

Letter to the Editor

Terrorists as the Other 334
Tom Gibbs

Bulletin Board 335
Call for Papers 337

The Psychology of Fear and Hatred Special Issue

Hate and Its Ramifications

Neil Wilson—Psychoanalyst in Private Practice

A psychoanalytic perspective on hatred can provide useful insights. Freud wrote about ambivalence toward the mother as the origin of the emotion of hate. Hate and love are experienced by all. Hate is aroused initially by the experience of being fed when breast feeding was once the almost sole method of nurturing the infant. Satisfaction is always temporary and deprivation is a given for all of us from the very beginning of life. This mix of satisfaction and frustration is played out at all phases of life, but is hardest to bear during the earliest. Caregivers control the instinctual desires of the infant.

Obviously the emotion of hate is mostly antisocial. The exception would be hating Hitler, Nazis, ISIS, killers, and such. However, experiencing hatred toward a loved one is filled with conflict and not often openly expressed.

When working with patients in my psychoanalytic practice this issue is a common struggle. A shy grown man was on a crowded train standing opposite an attractive woman. He was thrilled to be close to her and shyly eyed her. A man got on the train and stood in front of my patient, blocking his view of the woman. He became furiously angry at the man and fantasied that the man would have a heart attack, fall down, and he then could see the woman again. His hateful fantasy was readily interpreted as it related to competitive feeling toward an older brother.

The same patient dreamed that he had enormous power. He was given a contraption handed him by Donald Trump. It had a button, and if he pushed it all Muslims in the world would die. He was contemplating what to do when he suddenly woke up. He was embarrassed to tell me the dream. He also stated he was a secret admirer of Trump. He thought Trump stated and stood for all the ugly, hateful thoughts that many people have but never admit. He jokingly said that if he actually had control of the button he would never use it. Again, free association led to his powerful older brother who he idealized and secretly hated. In these examples ha-

tred and jealousy of the brother are initially buried and slowly unfolded during treatment.

Idealization itself is a mixed bag. It is such an extreme emotion that it hides all negative feelings. In psychoanalysis some patients tend to idealize the analyst. When this is slowly and carefully analyzed the underlying opposite emotion will be revealed.

Hatred not expressed and unconscious can lead to a masochistic lifestyle. The extreme of this process is suicidal thoughts or actual suicide. Freud labeled suicide as the symbolic murder of an incorporated family member and/or spouse. Suicide leads to the terrible suffering of all those close to the person acting this out. There is sometimes an actual awareness by the suicidal person of the hateful misery resulting from the awful act of self-destruction.

In the West, ISIS is considered the worst purveyor of hate today. Killing innocent people and feeling justified is an affront to humanity. Their hatred and control of women is striking. Recently in Syria a woman was arrested for wearing clothing which was form-fitting and revealed her bodily curves. She was whipped, receiving 25 lashes. When her veil was removed, makeup was discovered and she received an extra five lashes. This raises the issue of some of the sources of hatred in some Arab societies.

The Qur'an states that newborns should be breastfed for two years. In discussion with Muslim colleagues they reported that most Arab countries have gotten away from that requirement. Two years of breast feeding may well lead to a sense of control over the mother. Often breastfeeding ceases when pain is inflicted by the infant biting on the nipple. I wonder if prolonged breastfeeding could be a factor in control and consequent hatred of women by ISIS. Slowly but surely women are becoming more liberated. For the first time in Saudi Arabia women just voted in a general election.

Hatred is an underlying issue among certain diagnostic categories, with paranoid people being a prime example. They deny and project onto others thoughts and feelings that they repress and attribute to others. For example, blacks in America were seen as dirty, promiscuous, pushy, etc., and in some cases still are. Prejudice was, among other reasons, a convenient albeit unconscious style of relieving the hater of his own unacceptable thoughts and instincts. Hatred can lead to a temporary peace of mind.

In summary, hatred is an emotion all humanity has experi-

enced. It gets played out among countries, cultures, class levels, individuals, families, marriages, etc. We all can hate or have hateful feelings. However, most decent people do not act out this destructive emotion. Awareness of the emotion and its origins should lead to an easing of hateful intensity and finally more acceptance and loving feelings.

Neil Wilson, PhD, *is a psychoanalyst and psychologist in private practice in Teaneck, New Jersey who may be contacted at neilwilson6776@gmail.com.* ❑

Hate, Like Love, Binds Us Together

C. Fred Alford—University of Maryland

On the morning of May 28, 1995, Sinedu Tadesse, a junior at Harvard, stabbed her roommate, Trang-Ho, 45 times as Trang lay sleeping in her bed in their Harvard dormitory. By the time police arrived, Sinedu had hanged herself in the bathroom. Unlike most killers, the Ethiopian student left a detailed diary of her emotional state in the years leading up to the killing.

Sinedu was not a popular student. She had difficulty finding a roommate and was elated when Trang-Ho agreed to share a suite with her. But they did not get along, in part because Trang's boyfriend frequently slept over, and Trang was looking for another roommate. Sinedu found the humiliation intolerable. She wrote in her diary, "You know what I fear? I fear that shitty cringing feeling that accompanies me....Should my rooming thing does [sic] not work out in a way that makes me hold my head high & speak of it proudly." (All quotes in this article are from Melanie Thernstrom, "Diary of a Murder," *The New Yorker*, June 3, 1996, 62-71).

If she could have, Sinedu would have inflicted this terrible cringing feeling on her roommate. Only that, it seems, would have made her feel better, and that, she knew, was impossible. "Our situations would never reverse, for me to be the strong & her to be the weak. She'll live on tucked in the warmth & support of her family while I cry alone in the cold."

It was a situation made worse, or at least more pathetic, by the way so many seemed to confuse them, regarding the roommates as virtually identical non-Western exotics. Even at the memorial service, Harvard's minister could not seem to keep victim and exe-

cutioner straight, referring to both as victims, asking the Lord to forgive them both. "Media accounts made them sound like twins, petite, hardworking foreign-born premed junior biology majors."

Unable to become Trang-Ho, unable to trade places with her, Sinedu decided to kill herself, while taking Trang-Ho with her. Only that would feed her hatred. "The bad way out I see is suicide & the good way out killing, savoring their fear and [then] suicide. But you know what annoys me the most, I do nothing."

In his novel *Immortality*, Milan Kundera has one of his characters say, "hate traps us by binding us too tightly to our adversary." What Kundera (or perhaps just his character) fails to understand is that this is just what is wanted, hatred allowing us to pretend we want to be free, but never giving us the chance. In hatred, we transform interpersonal bonds into bondage, and relationships into prisons. For a little while, hate allowed Sinedu to come in out of the cold, as she cocooned herself in the warmth of her hate.

Sinedu's strategy didn't work for very long; it usually doesn't. Hatred culminates in violence when the one who hates comes suddenly and late to reality, recognizing that the intensely desired fusion is impossible. By then, however, the one who hates has given up so much of herself to the desire to be the Other that there is no going back. The self of the hater has been depleted, and no return is possible, only the perverse satisfaction that the one who is hated will share the annihilation—fusion in the realm of entropy.

Hatred is not the opposite of love, love's eternal enemy. Hatred is the imitation of love, creating and preserving imitations of those love relationships upon which psychic structure depends. Hatred is self-chosen bondage to another, bondage serving to structure the psyche. As though slavery was the only alternative to psychic fragmentation. Hatred is self-structure on the cheap. In this regard, hatred is a more complex relationship than is often appreciated.

Some may object to the term psychic structure, as though the term must reify an entity that does not exist. With the term structure I mean nothing more, or less, than history, the stories we tell ourselves to make sense of our lives, and so give them continuity and purpose. The structure created by hatred is history, the history of our hatreds, narratives of our malevolent attachments that help hold self and world together.

Frequently these narratives are expressed in an almost lov-

ing recitation of harms suffered and revenge inflicted. The history of one's hatreds constitutes the single most important, most comprehensible, and most stable sense of identity for many people, and more than one nation.

Humans are creatures of attachment. Love is not universal, but attachment is: connection with others. It is an insight that begins with Aristotle's *Politics*, which defines humanity as *zoon politikon*, a political animal, realizing him- or herself only in a community of others.

Hatred also creates communities: the community of those who hate the same Other, and the community between those who hate each other. Or, as Aeschylus has the Furies put it in *The Oresteia*, when encouraging the Athenians to unite: "Let them hate with a single heart. Much wrong in the world thereby is healed."

Kevin Phillips, political advisor to Richard Nixon, who knew a thing or two about hatred, constructed a winning political coalition for Nixon in the 1968 election on the basis of who hated whom. Phillips knew that the strongest coalitions are built not on mutual interest or affection, but shared hatreds. In his office, Phillips had a map of who hated whom: Polish Catholics hate the Jews, who are hated by the blacks, who are hated by just about everybody but the Jews, who really hate the Catholics, who hate northern liberals, except in Massachusetts, where they are the liberals, except when it comes to homosexuals, which makes it hard to be liberal, except that the Massachusetts Catholics hate southern rednecks more, and they all hate the hairy young people, especially the suburbanites, many of whose children are young and hairy (remember, this is the 1960's), which just means that they hate them all the more, only they can't show it politically, so they hate someone else. And so it goes.

Hatred is a political phenomenon far better understood and appreciated by politicos, men and women involved in the practical politics of securing and maintaining power, than by psychological and social theorists.

Hatred as a political force has received far less attention than love and fear, its emotional complements. Love, we learn early, may be translated into patriotism and loyalty, fear into obedience, and the corruption of national spirit in diverse ways, from militarism to appeasement. But what of hatred? What is needed is not a new sub-discipline, the theory of hatred. What is needed is a

better understanding of how hatred infiltrates and corrupts all the political virtues, such as patriotism, community, loyalty, tolerance, and citizenship. What is needed is an analysis of the way in which each of these virtues has its dark side, its correlation rooted in hatred, as when loyalty to one's own nation depends on hatred of others.

Hatred is capable of simulating not just love, but almost all the virtues. Sometimes hatred takes the place of these virtues, as when patriotism is defined as hatred of the enemy. More often, hatred infiltrates these virtues, so that hatred of the enemy becomes so confused with love of country that it becomes almost impossible to sort them out. A better understanding of hatred is not enough, but it's a good place to start.

C. Fred Alford, PhD, *is Professor of Government and Distinguished Scholar-Teacher at the University of Maryland, College Park. He is author of over 15 books on moral psychology. His most recent is Trauma and Forgiveness (Cambridge, 2013). Alford is Executive Director of the Association for Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society, and Co-Editor of the Psychoanalysis and Society Book Series with Cornell University Press. He curates the blog, www.traumatheory.com and can be reached at calford@umd.edu.* ❑

A Great Fear and Hatred: Suicide Bombers

Marcia Anne Newton—Albany College of Pharmacy

There is a great fear in both the West and the Middle East of suicide bombers. Below I examine females who sacrifice their lives to kill others.

What was once perceived as a phenomenon has become a growing trend: the use of women as weapons of destruction for Jihad-related political causes. In our attempts to reconcile the universal perception of woman as givers of life and nurturers of the family with the taking of it in such a disturbing manner, there is an abundance of theories attached to overt patriarchal attacks on women: revenge, despair, shame, and patriarchal coercion. Through a Freudian lens, I seek to illustrate how female murder-suicide reveals deeply-rooted symptoms of Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) caused by an unconscious Oedipal sado-masochistic narcis-

sistic identification with the original loved one ("object" in the language of psychoanalysis), the mother. This identification is replaced by a desire to be reunited with the Oedipal father in the guise of Allah.

In 1985 during the Israeli occupation of South Lebanon, Sana'a Mehaidli, a 16-year-old member of the Syrian Social Nationalist Party (SSNP) dressed in an army uniform drove an explosive-laden bomb into an Israeli convoy in Jezzine, Lebanon, killing herself and two Israeli soldiers. Since the 2000s, the list of female suicide bombers has grown and includes women like Reyam al-Riyashi. In 2004, Reyam al-Riyashi, mother of two and a Hamas operative in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, detonated a two kilogram bomb in a building killing herself and four Israelis. Shortly before her death, she is videotaped holding an automatic rifle with her two children standing in front of her. She proclaims, "I am the Shahida Reem Saleh Riyashi. I hoped that the shredded limbs of my body would be shrapnel, tearing the Zionists to pieces…. How often I spoke to my soul, 'O Soul, if you loathe the Zionists, enemies of my religion, my blood shall be my path to march to Heaven"' (Julie Rajan, *Women Suicide Bombers: Narratives of Violence*, 2011, 58).

At face value, Sana'a Mehaidli's and al-Riyashi's deaths, like so many other female suicide bombers' deaths, seem to be for a political cause in the name of Allah. A Jihadist's suicide mission for a political cause is seen by many Muslims as an honorable event and martyrs are considered political heroes. In the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, for example, pictures of female martyrs like Wafa Adris line the exterior of Muslim's houses and are in the bedrooms of young aspiring martyrs who seek a privileged place with Allah. *The Qur'an* states, "Do not think of those who are slain in Allah's way as dead. Nay, they live, finding their sustenance in the presence of their Lord" (3:169). Any Muslim with complete conviction in the ways of Allah has the potential to become a martyr. More recently, Robert M. Cover describes martyrdom as "an extreme form of resistance to domination" that is on a suicide-bomber's terms (in Rajan's *Suicide Bombers*, 2011, 13). Failure to achieve this exalted position, however, results in a loss of self-respect and respect in the family. A case in point is Hasna Maryi. On July 23rd, 2007, Hasna Maryi, a young Jihadist woman from the Iraqi Al Anbar province, was dropped off at the Kilometer 5 checkpoint in Amara, Iraq. With a bomb strapped around her waist she pretended

to fall, attracting the attention of three police officers nearby. When these police officers approached Hasna, she detonated the bomb, killing herself, the police officers, and injuring ten civilians (Bobby Ghosh, "Female Suicide Bombers: The Latest Weapon," *Time*, June 26, 2008, 1). Her brother Thamer's own suicide mission a year before had ended prematurely when a belt exploded in the car on the way to the attack site.

What is particularly striking about Hasna's case is how she reacts to her brother's earlier failed suicide mission. According to Hasna's sister, Sadiya, Hasna was overcome with grief that her brother did not die a martyr and locked herself away. She was found a week later in her room "comatose and surrounded by feces" (Ghosh, 2). Sadiya states that "Hasna was distraught – not because her brother was dead, but because he had not completed his mission. 'She had been ready to hear about his death,' says Sadiya. 'But the idea that he would not be a martyr was too much for her to bear'" (2). Ghosh proceeds to tell the story of a woman whose mission was to redeem her brother and complete the mission he had failed and, at the same time, rejoin him in paradise having felt that a part of her own self had died.

On the one hand, with a firm conviction in the teachings of *The Qur'an*, instead of fearing death, Hasna embraces it with a Jihadist's conviction that with Allah she will truly experience life: "…seeing that you were without life, and He gave you life; then He will cause you to die, and will again bring you to life; and again to Him will you return" (2:28). On the other hand, the violence in Hasna's real act of murder-suicide evidences an identification with and internalization of her mother's ego, but it is an ego that has inflicted a maternal narcissistic injury that propels Hasna's act as one that is sado-masochistic. This injury is neatly illustrated in Freud's "Mourning and Melancholia" (1917).

In "Mourning and Melancholia," Freud presents a complex merging of the two conditions—mourning (loss of interest in others and activities) and melancholy in which the impoverished ego is deemed "worthless, incapable of any achievement and morally despicable" (246). Significantly, "The self-tormenting in melancholia, which is without doubt enjoyable, signifies…a satisfaction of trends of sadism and hate which relate to an object, and which have been turned round upon the subject's own self" (251). In Hasna's case, the combination of mourning and melancholy, coupled with her acts of defecation, betray her maternal fixation and feelings of be-

trayal. Unconsciously, a melancholic subject's feelings of hostility are directed towards the mother and carried out in forms of self-punishment in narcissistic identification. Consequently, Hasna is punishing the Other through the self: "It is this sadism alone that solves the riddle of the tendency to suicide" (252).

Interestingly, Hasna's act also evidences symptoms of Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). In Freud's *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920), a work whose views on the traumatic neuroses have morphed into more modern definitions of PTSD, Freud describes a compulsion to repeat repressed memories that are initiated by the ego. However, as evidenced in the psychoanalytic transference situation on the traumatic neuroses, Freud observes that "The patient cannot remember the whole of what is repressed in him and what he cannot remember may be the essential part of it…. He is obliged to *repeat* the repressed material as a contemporary experience instead of, as the physician would prefer to see, *remembering* it as something belonging to the past" (39; emphases in original).

The traumatized subject's compulsion to repeat is analogous to the example Freud gives of the young child at play whose *fort-da* game—in which the child throws a reel of cotton over the end of the cot and then pulls it back into view—symbolizes not just the child's mother going away and the need for her return, which, unconsciously, causes the child to perpetuate feeling abandoned, but the child's impulse to take revenge on the mother for going away: "All right, then, go away! I don't need you. I'm sending you away myself" (35). This scenario speaks to symptoms of PTSD that haunt survivors of trauma but keep them trapped in a cycle of re-experiencing a traumatic event that isn't ever fully grasped.

Significantly, given Freud's observation that a repressed memory in the unconscious will always be transformed or displaced in some form when it surfaces to the conscious. This is a significant factor in relation to Hasna's unconscious motivation for her murder-suicide. An author and leading authority on suicide terrorism, who has written extensively on motherhood and early childhood abandonment by the mother, is Nancy Kobrin. At the core of Kobrin's work is the idea that Islamic suicide terrorism is "displaced rage against the 'Early Mother' of childhood" (*The Banality of Suicide Terrorism: The Naked Truth About the Psychology of Islamic Suicide Bombing*, 2010, 3). In a modification of Melanie Klein's work on projection and introjection that was to logically lead to new ideas on projective identification (refer to Klein's

"Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms," 1946), Kobrin observes a child's fear of maternal abandonment, oscillating with feelings of bliss in the early mother-child relationship: "Splitting of the bad parts of the infant's perceptions must be projected on to the Early Mother, making her the 'bad' Early Mother, and develops into paranoid rage" (35).

Positing the female body within a patriarchal framework, Kobrin observes that the displaced and "inappropriate murderous rage is unconsciously meant for the terrorists' mothers…. Even female suicide bombers deny their own female identity and do the bidding of their Muslim men. These women also harbor murderous rage against their own mothers. Why? Because they have internalized the men's hatred of women as self-hatred" (102). In relation to Hasna's situation, I suggest that present is an unconscious sado-masochistic desire for Hasna to deliver and receive punishment by an unconsciously perceived (un)worthy loved one, the mother, who sent her brother away and left her distraught. In this way, Hasna's unconscious desire corresponds to Freud's revelatory and yet highly denigrating observations on mourning, melancholy, and maternal fixation that positions the mother at the core of a child's psychological strife that is carried into adulthood.

Hasna's sado-masochistic merging with her mother leads to an unconscious desire to merge with a father who not only puts an end to her punishment and legitimizes the punishment of others for a political cause but cements the earlier narcissistic injury in which Hasna felt betrayed by her mother for sending her brother away and, by extension, herself. Unconsciously, what is projected into female suicide-bombers' acts is the patriarchal reinforcement of mothers as the root cause of their PTSD. The result of this unconscious scenario, which draws an interesting parallel with the subject's passage through the Oedipus complex, is, as it was for Hasna, entry into an ideal society, not here on earth but in paradise with a healing father, Allah.

Marcia Anne Newton, PhD, *is an instructor at The College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences in Albany, NY. She has publications on a variety of topics in psychoanalysis including sexual trauma and psychosis, paradoxical notions of sexuality, and the creative impulse. She also has numerous reviews published on theatre, poetry, and memoir. Dr. Newton can be reached at marcie.newton@acphs.edu.* ❑

Reflections on Racist Nationalist Hatred in Yeltsin's Russia

Sebastian Job—University of Sydney

After an almost 90-year hiatus, racist nationalism re-emerged openly and proudly in Russia in the final years of the Soviet Union, and accumulated a certain degree of popularity on the streets of the capital in the first post-Soviet decade. During my research in Moscow at various points during the Yeltsin years (1991-1999), I observed that people in the racist nationalist movement generally used a political or religious language to speak of "Russia" and the "White Race." However, identification with these national and racial entities obviously performed additional psychological and existential functions for the people concerned. As a rule, these functions took on a distinct cast depending on whether race or nationality was at center stage, but in either case anxiety, fear, and hatred were prominent affective features pointing to the psychological substrate of the ideology.

It is useful to distinguish three levels at which these emotions fueled the ideology. First, anxiety arose at a pre-ideological level due to social disintegration. The Soviet Union as a geopolitical great power; Soviet Society as a brotherhood of nations embraced by a putative workers' state; and official communism as inheritor of the modern revolutionary project; amounted to a more or less stable, predictable, and meaningful container for peoples' life experiences, frustrating and oppressive though they frequently were. The rapid collapse of these institutions and prospects not only occasioned a great deal of grief, bewilderment, exhilaration, and loss of moral coordinates, it also generated pervasive "ontological insecurity" (Ronald David Laing, *The Divided Self*, 1960, 86).

Hatred of foreigners represented a particular way out of this psychosocial morass. The affective burdens of anxiety, worthlessness, and ontological insecurity could be directed towards an external object of fear, the foreigner. The foreigner was now, to varying degrees, responsible. Having located the fearsome object, the basic effort of the ideology was to replace fear, as much as possible, with hatred. Here we enter the second level, for here the person trades the role of victim of circumstances for the role of agent of a political project. In other words, externalization—locating the problems outside the self—was the necessary premise for politicization, and

politicization indexed the formation of a new image of the self, a collective we-image, worth defending.

In my view we are justified in discerning in every specific image of the bad Other a corresponding image of the self that is under threat. And to the degree that the foreigner appears increasingly fearsome, we can presume the activation of a correspondingly enlarged or existentially profound self-affirmation. So, by degrees, we see that fear takes on a third aspect. Rather than primary anxiety in the face of social calamities, and rather than simply fear of the Other to whom our calamities are attributed, we now have fear for the loss of the new psychosocial identity charged with resolving the primary anxiety.

During my fieldwork I came across a dizzying variety of ways of portraying the bad ethnic Other. They were "cockroaches," "viruses," "shit," "perverse," "criminal," "incestuous," "homosexual," "robotic," "sulfurous," and "satanic." Eventually I came to sort these figures, their affective intensity and supposed "size," along a rough continuum from least to most threatening. At each point, different dimensions of the racist nationalist self were at stake. Here I will mention only the ends of the spectrum.

When I asked the people I was studying what they didn't like about their favorite bug bears ("blacks" from the Caucuses region and Jews), by far the most common response was this: blacks and Jews are *naglye* (impudent, insolent, rude, impertinent). This kind of reaction arises, I think, from the everyday inter-ethnic friction generated by different cultural mores and the unequal value of different "ethnic capitals" in a situation of social turmoil. Fed by exposure to the pertinent propaganda, however, inter-ethnic friction can trigger identification with a racist nationalist "we-image." That is, giving up one's prior self-image, one can start to identify an ethnically purified nation with oneself and vice-versa. To the extent that this happens, the mere presence of these *naglye* Others, this not-self, becomes a source of extreme aggravation. Sofia, a teenage girl who wrote an account of what pushed her towards "nationalism," described how, infatuated with rap music, she once dreamed of leaving Russia. Later, "I began to understand that, in reality, little by little, I was being degraded by all that; I understood the complete senselessness of that black culture!!" (Sofia, "Russkie Devushki," at www.demushkin.org, 2005). Eventually, after switching over to Russian rock, and learning about fascism and Na-

zism from an older male friend, she writes that

> My views and principles began to change sharply. I grew up and began to notice that Russia is already becoming far too much of a multi-national country. I began to get irritated by those impudent (*naglye*) black 'people' that came to a foreign country they understood absolutely nothing about! Every trivial thing, every deed from their side, irritated me terribly…. When I walked alone on the street I felt their smiling gazes…my closest girlfriend was almost raped by two Tadjiks…. I don't want to feel myself an alien in my own country, I don't want my white race mixed with the black…. I want the Russian land to belong to Russians and for my children to live in RUSSIA! (Sofia, "Russkie").

We might say that when the racist nationalist describes the Other as "impudent" they are complaining about a rival *ego*. Whatever the justice of the complaints themselves, there is a basic objection to an ethnic Other that doesn't know its proper—subordinate—place. But unlike non-racist nationalists who are prepared to see foreigners as equal competitors, or who make efforts to incorporate them into the national space, the racist nationalist allows the Other no equal place by definition. Their humanity is dismissed. They become, as Sofia puts it, people in quotation marks. This is inevitable given that the racist nationalist self is not only an *ego*. Rather, it contrives to view itself from the position of an ideologically formulated *ego-ideal*; from this perspective the self swells out to become coterminous with the expanse of the ideally pure, ideally self-like country.

The relative success of racist nationalism as an ideological tendency in the first post-Soviet decade depended in the first instance on its capacity to plausibly interpret banal inter-ethnic frictions. At the other extreme, however, it depended on providing a solution to deeper existential needs. In this situation, the ideology responded with a search for authentic roots, for a durable and time-honored definition of the collective self whose autonomy could be fought for; indeed, whose autonomy and self-affirmation was a matter of life and death, of honor, of historic mission. Here the construal of the bad ethnic Other in mythic terms may be taken as a symptom of, or a lever for, a corresponding self-mythologisation in terms of an elevated ego-ideal. Consider the following examples, where the ethnic Other assumes the position of an evil ego-ideal, a figure most often Jewish, animated by a malevolent and nearly om-

nipotent and immortal will.

The Gnostic-inspired *Obshchestvo Navi*, which also went by the name of the Holy Church of the White Race, declared that its enemy was none other than the "Creator" of this world, otherwise known as Yahweh, and that their mission was to bring his kingdom to an end (Ilia Lazarenko, *Kniga Navi*, http://www.navi.inc.ru/introitus.htm). More commonly the near omnipotence of the enemy was merely a result of a struggle to posses and exploit this world: "They are killing us because we, Russians, stood in the way of those straining towards world power, to world domination, we stood in the path of those who are completing in Russia their centuries old aspiration to rule over the world" (Boris Mironov, *Komy v Rossii Meshaiut Russkie*, 35).

The reference to a "centuries old aspiration" points at the same time to the enemy's collective immortality. The pamphleteer V. Shumskii believed that "Judaic depravity and unprecedented perversity has roots extending back thousands of years" (Vladislav Shumskii, *Strashen Gitlerizm, no Sionizm Strashnee*, 1999, 46). This unchanging essence was also why old tracts could do fine service under new conditions. The following is from M. O. Men'shikov, originally cited in A. Selianinov's 1911 book *The Jew and Russia*, and recycled in the 1990s. "You [Russians who support equal rights for Jews – S.J.] are preparing an invasion… of tens of millions of an extremely dangerous, extremely criminal Asian people, forming for the last four thousand years a festering abscess on the body of every country that this parasite has settled on" (in Rusich [Collective pseudonym], *Yevreiskaia Okkupatsia Rossii*, 1998, 6; ellipses in original citation).

If there is any one image answering to these "supernatural" and yet "subhuman" characteristics of the evil Jewish Other, it is one which actually overturns our expectation that they will be depicted as the puppeteers in control of everything. Rather, in a further twist, the Jews themselves are revealed as automatons. That is, they themselves answer to a yet more secretive and nefarious external power. Sometimes this was obliquely indicated, as when Constantine, leader of the ultra-nationalist Russian National Union, or Dima, leader of a skinhead brigade, informed me matter-of-factly that Jews do not have souls; or when Sergei, a skinhead from a rival brigade, referred to ethnic Others as "those things," or as "non-people"; or when Shumskii referred to Jews as a "zombified population." In general these comments were meant to be dismissive,

and yet they hinted at some vaster existential abyss between us and them. Victoria Vaniushkina, a translator of reactionary philosophy whose racism was otherwise fairly muted, gave an explicit rendition of this when she told me: "I don't think Jews are people. I have the impression that they are robots invented by some Egyptian priest."

The neopagan journalist Vladimir Istarkhov told a more developed version of the same story: "Judaism, employing religion and circumcision, turns Jews into biorobots"; these "subhumans," who have paid for their money and power with their souls, are "programmed" by the Levites ("the ancestors of the dark occult wing of the Egyptian priesthood"), who are themselves the servants of Satan (Vladimir Istarkhov, "Evreiskoe Khristianstvo ili Russkoe Iazichestvo," in *Russkiye Vedomosti,* No. 30, 1998, 3).

In such representations, then, the journey from the ethnic Other as a person—irritating and "insolent" as they may be—to a fantasmatic desubjectified "thing," the locus of a stupendous power of which they, in fact, are the first victims, is completed. In my view, attention to these different ways of imagining the ethnic Other can help us to develop a more differentiated understanding of fear and hatred, exactly because they point to different dimensions of the self. It is this ideologically construed self and its subjective plausibility, its satisfactions and rewards, which is ultimately at stake when fear and hatred of an ethnic Other becomes central to the personality.

Sebastian Job, PhD, *has taught anthropology, history, and sociology at the universities of Sydney, Macquarie, UNSW, and UWS, is Honorary Associate at the Department of Anthropology, the University of Sydney, and is currently lecturing at the Australian National Institute of Dramatic Art. He has published principally on Russian politics and social theory and may be contacted at sebastian.job@sydney.edu.au.* ❑

Psychohistory Forum Work-In-Progress
Presentation Paper Proposals Are Welcome
As Are Articles for Clio's Psyche

Contact Paul Elovitz at pelovitz@aol.com

Dehumanizing Others, Torture, and Genocide: The Power of Hate

Ruth M. Lijtmaer—Psychoanalyst in Private Practice

The starting points of mass violence and hatred are economic problems, political disorganization, rapid social changes, a nation's history of shame, military defeat, declining power, power, and intense political conflict in the society. All these are manifested in situations where many people have lost their jobs, their economy has suffered from monetary devaluation, there is a strong respect for authority, and unhealed wounds due to past violence against them. Other components are when there is a belief in the culture's superiority, when religious belief systems are threatened, or when killing or humiliation are a daily occurrence. This state of affairs develops into dehumanizing the victims, leading to exclusion, harm, and murder of them, who are designated evil—not human beings like "us," therefore deserving of elimination. It is thus, in the end, "easy" to kill, because it is not humans that are being killed, but dangerous objects or parasites. This pervasive, synchronized attack on all aspects of life involves the cooperation of masses who are persuaded and united by a similar ideology.

The political-ideological-religious justifications in all these contexts represented a mental instrument that could validate dehumanizing the chosen enemy, justify subjecting this enemy to atrocities, and give "meaning" to the apparent necessity of exterminating dangerous "elements" as part of a battle between good and evil. As Ira Brenner pointed out:

> Dehumanization exemplified by the Nazis and other dictatorships, is a two-step process. Step one is identifying undesirable humans; step two is turning them into nonhumans, as in the Hutus' degradation of the Tutsis, referred to as 'cafards', or insects. A second type of dehumanization occurs in the case of suicide bombers. They bypass their individual victims' identity and then rehumanize themselves as spokespersons for their group, while rehumanizing the victims as representatives of the opposing large group ("Terror and Societal Regression: Does Psychoanalysis Offer Insights for International Relations?" *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association,* 54: 977-988, 2006, 979).

Another example of dehumanization is that both Lenin and Hitler conceived of their nation or people in biological terms, as an organism containing a parasite consuming or sucking the blood of the people. The continuing presence of this deadly organism within the body politic would lead to its destruction and death unless removed. Hitler described the German nation as a living organism consisting of the German people as good cells. Jews were called bacteria or parasites, pathogenic cells that had invaded the otherwise healthy organism. In order to rescue or save Germany (from death), the source of the nation's disease, Jewish bacteria or parasites, had to be removed from within the body politic. Political forms of violence occur as people struggle to destroy those entities that, they imagine, are working to destroy the entities that they worship and with which they identify. Therefore, political ideologies are built upon a rescue fantasy (Richard Koenigsberg, "Hitler, Lenin and the Desire To Destroy 'Parasites,'" March 20, 15, *libraryofsocialscience.com*).

The planners of genocide and torture can provide potential killers with retributions, like acknowledgement of their acts or social promotion, but they can also decide to kill them if they do not comply with their orders, dehumanizing them. They also provided potential killers with a convincing rationale that included a "moral" or a "positive" goal achieved by the genocide (e.g., "purity of the race") combined with monolithic dehumanization of the target population (e.g., "they are the bacteria of our society"). There is usually a paradoxical message in this rationale: The target population is seen as being both strong (the threat) and weak (they can be easily killed since they are not humans), between the good (us) and the evil (them).

Different emotional effects are present in this process. Envy is one of them, activated in the polarization of society. Envy is based on hatred of the good and the desire to destroy it because of its inaccessibility. The perpetrators find a group to envy to project what they wish to have upon. Another affect present in the destruction of others is revenge. The fantasy is that by killing external persecutors, one will be freed, once and for all, of destructive impulses. This constitutes a powerful motivation for the ego to maintain such defensive strategies. In fact, it often appears as the only way to protect oneself from unbearable anxiety. In cases where projective identification is excessive, such an unconscious strategy to avert anxiety induces a wish for destruction, not only of the perpe-

trators involved, but also of whole groups of people who become associated with these alleged persecutors. Actually, such projection of "all things evil" onto an exterior "enemy" is a recognized scheme used knowingly by some politicians or governments who deem it useful to focus the attention of the masses on an outside target rather than on domestic issues.

Relying on people's instincts to distance themselves from horror, fear, and dehumanization, perpetrators seek to destroy memory in both survivors and those advocating for survivors. These are attempts to externalize humiliating personal, cultural, or other national feelings of unacceptable weakness and helplessness. They can do so by repeatedly and ritualistically recreating these feelings in the victim population. If violence is done against those who are unreal, then, from the perspective of violence, it fails to injure or negate those lives, since those lives are already negated. But they have a strange way of remaining animated and so must be negated again (and again). They cannot be mourned because they are always already lost or, rather, never "were," and they must be killed, since they seem to live on, stubbornly, in this state of deadness.

Psychoanalytic thinkers believe that violence and hate can lead to a regression to more archaic modes of behaving, such as splitting and projective identification, thus weakening the capacity of the ego. It can also activate manic defenses as a means of protecting positive human representations ("objects" in the language of psychoanalysis), as well as the development of envy, revenge, paranoid projections, and changes in the super-ego and ego-ideal. Psychoanalysts showed how individuals in such situations projected both the superego and the ego ideal onto the leader, thus relinquishing their own individuality, with a subsequent regression that resulted in following their leader. When the leader replaces the ego-ideal, actions which have earlier been forbidden by the super-ego are now permitted. The individual's prohibiting superego is thus made lax and corrupt. It is a matter of a mutual process of seduction between the leader and the led.

The charismatic leader who is thought to have the solutions to the problems channels the need of the individual as well the needs of the masses, to be liberated from the personal responsibility of solving the internal anxiety. Paranoid thought processes can be maintained and legitimized; internal superego conflicts are replaced by external struggles. The price of being freed from personal re-

sponsibility is docile submission. This passive consenting is based on a corruption of the ego-ideal, which gives rise to the superego relaxing its earlier norms and prohibitions. Aggressive impulses are encouraged and given full expression. The result is a lasting and permanent corruption of the superego.

Ruth M. Lijtmaer, PhD, *is a senior supervisor, training analyst, and faculty member at the Center for Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis of New Jersey and is in private practice in Ridgewood, NJ. She frequently presents lectures and papers at both national and international levels. She is the author of scholarly publications concerning multicultural and religious issues, trauma, transference-countertransference, psychoanalytic psychotherapy, the violation of human rights and forgiveness, and pain. Dr. Lijtmaer may be reached at ruth.lijtmaer@verizon.net.* ❑

Why We Hate: The Easy Answer

Merle Molofsky—Psychoanalyst Private Practice

Freud in *The Instincts and Their Vicissitudes* (1915) closely examines the relationship between love and hate, links love with sexual pleasure and sexual function, and links hate with unpleasure. Further, he claims that "Hate, as a relation to objects, is older than love" (139). He writes "It is noteworthy that in the use of the word 'hate' no such intimate connection with sexual pleasure and the sexual function appears. The relation of 'unpleasure' seems to be the sole decisive one. The ego hates, abhors, and pursues with intent to destroy all objects which are a source of unpleasurable feelings" (138).

If we follow Freud's ideas set forth in this essay, we have a biological frame of reference. Love and hate are related to biological processes, and to our earliest biophysical/emotional experiences, pleasure and unpleasure. Our personal history is the narrative structure of our feelings of hate. Of course, we are embedded in society and embedded in history. Our personal history therefore is embedded in society and history. Thus, when Freud offers us a biological narrative, we are able to understand the narrative extends beyond the physical. Here is an eminently straightforward statement Freud offers in the essay: "[T]he nervous system is an apparatus which has the function of getting rid of the stimuli that reach it, or of reducing them to the lowest possible level" (120). Perhaps

the easiest answer to the question of why we hate can be phrased in psychoanalytic terms as both, or either, narcissism or ego states. We hate what we believe hurts us. Our physical wellbeing may feel threatened, our self-esteem may be wounded, and our sense of efficacy and capability may be compromised. We hate what we believe causes these feelings of unpleasure.

Physical unpleasure, from the earliest distresses of infancy, pain sensations, discomfort, dislike of smells or tastes or sounds or sights or other sensations, can be hated. "I hate broccoli" translates, of course, to "I hate the taste of broccoli." The biological stratum of hatred is the easy part. Yet other psychological mechanisms come into play, and we wind up hating beyond the original cause of distress, the original unpleasure. Narcissistic needs, and narcissistic injury, of course will have a major impact, and will result in feelings of hatred.

Narcissistic needs begin with the need for cherishment, the need to be loved, to see oneself reflected in the loving eyes of primary caretakers. The baby's physical survival depends on the baby being taken care of, and the baby's emotional development depends on the baby being valued for her/himself.

The vicissitudes of narcissism are easily linked to love and hate, which Freud touches on in his essay on instincts and, of course, in *Narcissism*, published one year earlier, in 1914. Freud early on establishes the notion of a primal and healthy narcissism, self-love serving as a survival mechanism. Before the ego has had a chance to form and develop, innate early auto-erotic impulses of infancy combine with the first love ("object" in the language of psychoanalysis) choice, and the vicissitudes of both auto-eroticism as a survival mechanism. Desiring the caretaker as the focus (again, the "object") is also a survival mechanism, resulting in primal narcissism. The non-verbal self-state, if it could be put in words, would be, "I love you because you love me." All's well and good, it would seem, except that the infant is bound to feel frustration in her/his quest for cherishment and love from the first other person in life; thus, the vicissitudes of narcissism are the vicissitudes of love and hate, with frustration as the fulcrum. "I love you as long as you love me and make me feel loved, but, if you at all frustrate me, I will hate you. You frustrate me! I hate you!"

The need for love, the capability of loving, as it turns on the fulcrum of frustration, leads to hatred of the caretaker. That hatred

is the template for further elaborated hatreds, hatreds amplified by developing ego functions, which become psychosocial. Of course, the psychosocial becomes psychohistorical because the social canvas is vast.

Freud discusses the concept of the ego-ideal, and concludes his treatise on narcissism with a passage that opens up a universe of psycho/social/historical possibility: "The ego-ideal opens up an important avenue for the understanding of group psychology. In addition to its individual side, this ideal has a social side; it is also the common ideal of a family, a class or a nation" (101). Thus, perceived threats to one's sense of self and to one's identifications with the "common ideal of a family, a class or a nation" will lead to hatred, which has a prevailing "dark side," the forces of prejudice, racism, rabid nationalism, ethnocentricity, and a desire to control and even eradicate that which is hated.

The vicissitudes of prejudice have been broadly discussed, particularly related to the defense mechanisms of projection. The aspects of self that violate one's own self-esteem that may lead to self-hatred are purged through projection, where the personal faults are attributed outward to the "Other." The "bad" becomes the "not-me," it becomes the hated Other. Jean-Paul Sartre's monograph, *Anti-Semite and Jew*, published in 1944 when Paris was liberated from Nazi German occupation, is a notable early example of applying the psychoanalytic concept of projection as a defense mechanism to the world stage, to historical events.

The combination of repressing self-awareness of fault, which might result in self-hatred, manifesting as projection as defense mechanism, with hatred of what threatens one's physical well-being, one's narcissistic equilibrium (ability to function effectively), results in a perfect storm.

Sartre discusses in-depth the construction by an anti-Semite of "the Jew." The Jew as container for all that is feared, the Jew as that which threatens the narcissistic equilibrium, the sense of self, and serves as a template for all prejudice. In the United States, white Americans, who constituted a majority of Americans for a very long time, constructed the Negro, a container for all that is feared.

Certainly when people in power, like Christians in Europe and white people in the United States, feel overwhelmed by their fears, they need to construct a menacing "Other" and, ironically, it

is they who menace the "Other." The Other becomes persecuted, oppressed, victimized and, hence, dangerous. Those in power who abuse others indeed have much to fear. They fear the uprising of the oppressed. Actually, their sense of guilt, no matter how rudimentary, how repressed, leads them to expect reprisals. Also, without being able to acknowledge the complexity of their feelings, they feel great envy of the persecuted Other. The persecuted, rejected Other survives, often by dint of ability. Thus the Jew is clever, the Negro is physically superior, good at athletics, dance, and music, the Asian is inscrutable, the Other possesses great abilities that threaten power.

Melanie Klein's discussion of envy and gratitude identifies envy as inherent, an envious desire for the good that is bestowed on the infant, with gratitude as the resolution of the paradigm of the paranoid-schizoid position and the depressive position. Envy and guilt are intertwined, and guilt can be assuaged through reparation. In Kleinian terms, this involves the developing infant's ability to recognize that the beloved "good breast," the feeding breast of the cherishing caretaker, and the hated "bad breast," the depriving breast of the withholding caretaker, are one and the same object, what Donald Winnicott called "good-enough."

Yet the psychological achievement of the adequately developing infant is not necessarily the psychological capacity of the hating, prejudiced adult. The hated Other may never be perceived as human enough. The great Hindu precept, "Tat Tvam Asi" ("Thou art That"), is a moral recognition that enables the contemplative adult to integrate good breast and bad breast, to recognize the full humanity of the Other. If the Other really endangers one's physical and emotional well-being, is it a genuine threat? Can one actually hate the person who would harm one, and yet acknowledge that person's humanity? We may know why we hate. However, do we know how to integrate love and hate? Can we? Should we?

Merle Molofsky, PhD, *is a psychoanalyst in private practice, a published novelist and poet, and a produced playwright. She serves on the faculty of the Training Institute of the National Psychoanalytic Association for Psychoanalysis (NPAP) and of Harlem Family Institute (HFI). She is a member of the Advisory Board of HFI, and the Board of Directors of the International Forum for Psychoanalytic Education (IFPE). She serves on the Editorial Boards of The Psychoanalytic Review and of The Journal of Psychohistory. She has published articles in psychoanalytic journals,*

including Clio's Psyche*, and chapters in psychoanalytic books. Her novel,* Streets 1970*, was published by International Psychoanalytic Books in 2015.* ❑

Portrait of a Terrorist

Ira Brenner—Jefferson Medical College

The 17 year old boy was the youngest of six children born to religious parents who had to leave their home country because of rising political tensions and the fear of persecution by the ruling class. He was seven years old at the time and this move had a serious and deleterious effect on his development. He never felt accepted nor part of his new country, always feeling like an outsider. His family was never granted citizenship, which exacerbated his sense of alienation. He strongly identified with his religious group and remained insulated and separate from the larger community, which viewed this group with wariness at best and deep hatred at worst.

He grew up maladjusted and hot tempered, doing poorly in school despite his intelligence and his getting into fights. He was an outcast. As his ethnic group became overtly persecuted in this new country, he wanted to return to his homeland, but was not legally allowed to do so. Being underage and essentially stateless, he felt increasingly unsafe and restless. His family became progressively more destitute and he decided to travel to Belgium, after which he went to Paris without proper papers. There he moved in with relatives who also were in dire straits. Because of his illegal status, he was afraid to look for a job and be caught by the authorities. As his new situation became intolerable to him and his poverty stricken relatives, he got word that his family was forced to leave the country but were denied access to anywhere else. As a result, they, along with thousands of other refugees, were trapped in a no man's land at the border.

This profoundly distraught teenager reacted strongly to his family's plight, and out of a sense of helplessness, wanted to avenge their suffering. With his remaining money, he went to a gun shop and purchased a handgun and bullets. He then found his way to the embassy and demanded to speak to the ambassador, claiming he had secret knowledge of vital, national importance. The ambassador had just left the building, so he was directed to the

man second in command, at which time he shot the official five times at close range. Making no attempt to escape, he was determined to bring international attention to the cruelty which his people were being subjected to, and reportedly yelled out this reason as he pulled the trigger. While he was in custody, his victim died of his wounds, and he was charged with murder.

Who was this brazen terrorist capable of such a high profile assassination? A Muslim extremist inspired by Al-Qaeda or ISIS? A violent jihadi influenced by a charismatic imman preaching revenge for the suffering and deaths of innocents in Afghanistan or Syria? No. This young man was an obscure Polish-Jew, born in Germany, named Herschel Grynszpan, whose memorable act in early November 1938 was actually blamed for starting the Holocaust! The Nazi regime was already planning reprisals against the Jews as their "legalized" noose was being further tightened. Joseph Goebbels, Propaganda Minister, cynically exploited this event to justify the national pogrom, which came to be known as Krystallnacht, or the "night of shattered glass."

Junior Ambassador Ernst vom Rath's death on November 9, 1938, coincided with the 15th anniversary of the Beer Hall Putsch in Munich of 1923, the most hallowed date of the Nazi year. This excerpt from Goebbels' diary revealed sinister thinking: "In the afternoon the death of the German diplomat vom Rath is announced. That's good…. I go to the party reception in the old Rathaus. Terrific activity. I brief Hitler on the affair. He decides: allow the demonstrations to go on. Withdraw the police. The Jews should feel the people's fury." He goes on to write, "that's right. I issue appropriate instructions to the police and party. Then I give a brief speech on the subject to the police and party. Then I give a brief speech on the subject to the Party's leadership. Thunderous applause. Everyone dashed to the telephone. Now the people will act" (Peter Longerich, *Holocaust: The Nazi Persecution and Murder of the Jews*, 2010, 111).

By the time the bloodlust ended, 200 synagogues and thousands of Jewish properties were destroyed; billions of dollars of damage are estimated to have occurred (Gerald Schwab, *The Day the Holocaust Began*, 1990). Almost 100 Jews were murdered and 30,000 more were forced into concentration camps. The true face of Nazi tyranny was thus revealed to the world.

Grynzspan, curiously, was never recognized as a hero who

championed the cause of the suffering of the Jewish people, the way that others who followed him were. Most notably, those who fought in the Warsaw ghetto uprising have come to epitomize pure martyrdom. Historically, we may have fallen prey to the same Nazi propaganda that incited the violence in the first place: that it indeed was all Grynszpan's fault and that whatever he brought on was deserved. Other aspects to this often overlooked aspect of Holocaust history (Rita Thalman and Emmanuel Feinerman, *Crystal Night*, 1974) are worthy of further research and are beyond the scope of this brief essay.

What lessons, if any, can be learned from the past when members of a large group who are oppressed and persecuted feel justified to avenge the deaths of their brethren? When is it effective in bringing about changes and when does it backfire? How easy is it to sway public opinion, induce fear in the populace, and provoke a violent backlash against a vulnerable minority?

Ira Brenner, MD, *is Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia and Training Supervising Analyst at the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia, where he is also Director Emeritus of the Adult Psychotherapy Training Program. He has a special interest in the area of psychological trauma and is the author of over 80 publications, including co-editing two special issues of The International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies and writing four books which include The Last Witness—The Child Survivor of the Holocaust (1996), co-authored with Judith Kestenberg, and Dissociation of Trauma—Theory, Phenomenology, and Technique (2001). Dr. Brenner has lectured nationally and internationally, and has a private practice of adult and child analysis. He may be reached at ibrenn@aol.com.* ❑

Revoking Citizenship: The Malaise Afflicting France

Marc-André Cotton—Int. Psychohistorical Association

In the grip of terror, people are inclined to outwardly project the feeling of being overwhelmed by a flood of emotions. As we know, projection is used in psychoanalysis as a tool to explore the unconscious. But such dynamics of projection and mental transference can sometimes be problematic, as they usually lead to blaming

others for our bad feelings: "*you* did me wrong and I righteously hate you for doing so." In dysfunctional families, projections onto close relatives fuel hatred, if not violence. Everyone feels justified in unloading the emotions he or she feels on the other. They serve as pretext to the abuse of women and children.

A Backdrop of Terror

Social dynamics are reflective of these individual dramas and can, in some circumstances, show similar dysfunction. As in family and couples therapy, collective interactions should be addressed in all truthfulness; dark pages of history should be revisited to disclose their impact on the present. Truthfulness implies a genuine interrogation about what is affected in our inner selves, with a conviction that therein lays the key to resolving our problem. This requires being honest about our own acts, while considering wrongful conduct as an expression of what has not yet been fully revealed and realized.

In the current debate in France about deprivation of nationality, there is a backdrop of terror rekindled by the recent mass shootings; we are at war, but against whom? Dealing with the question in these terms is already misleading. If we're unwilling to be introspective about where our fears actually come from, we will most likely find an extraneous factor causing them and make a point of getting rid of it by any means. In medieval cities, for instance, criminals were routinely banished for petty larceny after being shamed at the town's pillory. In the wake of the Reformation, banishment was among the most prevalent penalties in cities of the Holy Roman Empire such as Frankfurt, Augsburg, and Cologne, and a means to do away with deviants and outsiders found guilty of disturbing peace or moral order (Jason P. Coy, *Strangers and Misfits: Banishment, Social Control, and Authority in Early Modern Germany*, 2008, 1-10).

A Popular Measure

In his speech to parliament three days after the November 2015 attacks in Paris, President Hollande declared that he would strip French nationality from any individual found guilty of a terrorist act, "even if he was born a French person, if he has another nationality" (Speech by President of the Republic before a joint session of Parliament, Versailles, November 16, 2015). The proposal, which was questioned even within his own party, includes a constitutional revision that will be discussed by the National Assembly in early February. According to a recent survey released by *Le Figa-*

ro, this measure would be approved by 85% of the French electorate, and even more among rightwing sympathizers. On the left of the Socialist Party, deprivation of nationality is endorsed by 64% of environmentalists and radical leftists (François-Xavier Bourmaud, "Poll: 85% of French favor deprivation of nationality," *Le Figaro*, December 30, 2015 [Newspaper titles have been translated from the French with the permission of the author of this article]).

There is nothing new here. Taking away an offender's legal rights through the "royal ban," which sentenced a fleeing convict to public hatred, meant nobody was allowed to give him shelter and anyone could strip him of his belongings or kill him with impunity (J. Maillet, "History of public institutions and social facts," Dalloz, 1956, 671). After the fall of Napoleon, banishment took the form of a first "law of exile," banishing the Bonaparte family from the French territory. Since 1915, deprivation of citizenship affected some 16,000 citizens, mostly under the Vichy Regime. It might be recalled that General de Gaulle was stripped of French nationality by a decree signed by Marshal Pétain (*Journal officiel de la République française*, October 12, 1940). Strictly circumscribed by existing laws on account of its highly symbolic character, this exceptional measure is currently limited to binational citizens (Mathilde Golla, "Five terrorists soon stripped of French nationality," *Le Figaro*, October 7, 2015).

Reflecting Rather than Reacting

Without presuming the effectiveness of such sanctions in preventing terrorism, this debate speaks volumes about the climate of fear that prevails in France. A state of panic was prompted by the 2015 terror attacks. The national media have fostered this by their dramatic coverage on the first anniversary of the January mass shooting in Paris. With exclusive television reports, unpublished testimonies, and new camera angles on the raids, we plunged back into the Charlie Hebdo and Hyper Cacher massacres. The constant reactivation of these traumas sustains a public demand for security that compels the French government to fight a roaring fire. Would a constitutional reform extending deprivation of nationality to all French citizens, as Hollande now suggests, suffice to restore social cohesion? It's doubtful.

That is where a collective form of introspection should come into play, encouraging reflection rather than reaction, however justifiable it may seem. Instead of excluding or exiling to avoid the fact that terrorism mirrors social fractures, let us consider these

extremes as dramatic expressions of a collective dynamic. Let us not resurrect ancient scapegoat rituals to hide the deficiencies of our own communities. To act effectively, we must take into account the tragic path of these young jihadists and their families, deeply ingrained in the patriarchal culture their parents and grandparents were born in. On January 4, 2016, a documentary by *France 3* gave a truthful and uncompromising glimpse of "the life course of these renegades of the French society" (Stéphane Bentura, "Attacks: The Faces of Terror," *France 3*).

Undisputed Analysis

However, we cannot ignore the successive failures of public programs for the most vulnerable social classes, often with an immigrant background. These are exiles within the French borders, and they suffer from exclusion–-sharply on the rise in the past few decades—in the forms of urban ghettos, ethnic discrimination, and communitarianism, to name a few (Didier Lepeyronnie, *Urban ghetto segregation, violence, poverty in France today* in Robert Laffont, ed., 2008). This shift towards cultural isolationism is a response to the planned eviction of these youths, born as French people, in miserable neighborhoods where Republican values never took root. In a recent survey of French immigrant suburbs, sociologist Gilles Kepel describes the ins and outs of this "unprecedented polarization" of the nation, where the markers of Islam appropriate public space, predominantly the poorer districts, with the proliferation of halal shops, the general use of the veil by women, and the conspicuous presence of Salafism (*Passion française*, *ed.* 2014, 18-20).

Without reducing the complexity of the jihadist phenomenon to its territorial dimension, the French daily *Libération* emphasizes that nearly all murderers in 2015 come from Sensitive Urban Zones (ZUS) or other poor municipalities of the country (Pierre Beckouche, "French terrorists overwhelming social geography" *Libération*, December 28, 2015). Aiming at selecting the elite students for the French Grandes Écoles, the policy in National Education does not meet the needs of these downtrodden children, often of Muslim extraction, and tends to confine them to failure in school. In terms of juvenile delinquency, incarceration has proven to be an aggravating factor of social exclusion, even a vector of Islamist radicalization, as shown by the recent debate on French prisons (Farhad Khosrokhavar, "Prisons and radicalization in France," *Open Democracy*, March 19, 2015). Although undisputed, these

analyses do not translate into action; we still prefer punitive measures, a defense reaction to fear, often leading to further exclusion.

Prohibiting Violence against Children

So what is the malaise afflicting France? The gut response of projecting one's own unresolved emotions onto others prevails in French society and public deliberations. A parent/child relationship largely based on denial and violence is questioned; socio-economic difficulties should not serve as justification for this relationship. Indeed, such psychological conditioning starts at a very early age, when we get accustomed to blaming instead of paying attention to others, as a result of not having been listened to. Adults suspect children, from early childhood on, of all kinds of malice and reprimand their life impulse, at times quite harshly.

Recently, before speaking at the United Nations (UN) Committee on the Rights of the Child in Geneva, the French Secretary of State for the Family, Laurence Rossignol, admitted that promoting the rights of children should be a social and political priority: "Violence toward children are far too numerous, often taboo. They frequently cause a stunning shock that inhibits our action" (Laurence Rossignol, "Making child rights a political and social priority," *Huffington Post*, January 13, 2016). But unlike 27 state members of the European Council, France still refuses to ban corporal punishment within the family, in violation of the revised European Social Charter, compelling all signatories "to protect children and young persons against negligence, violence or exploitation" (European Social Charter [revised], May 3, 1996, 17). By breaking the stalemate over the consideration of banning violence in education and promoting positive parenting in all social strata, the French authorities would not only comply with their international commitments, they would also make a decisive step towards empathy and dialogue in families and society.

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 contact@regardconscient.net.* ❑

The Evolution of Rage

Joel Markowitz—Psychiatric Practice

Rage is a major survival device. The feeling of rage overrides our need to survive. It thereby augments our ability to attack and destroy dangers. Four million years ago, our early ancestors descended from the trees. They were small animals that lacked long canines and claws. Slow-moving on land, they clustered for mutual support and became social animals. They chased away predators by throwing stones and wielding sticks.

Natural selection augmented human rage. The angriest of pre-humans out-survived and out-bred the others by attacking most-convincingly. Predators can't afford injury. They are more likely to retreat when attacked by convincingly enraged primates than by primates who pretend that they will attack.

How did the gatherer-scavenger-hunter groups cope socially with their particularly angry individuals? Ingenious and elaborate mores effectively repressed or deflected their Oedipal needs and behavior. Intra-group competitive-aggression and competitive-sexuality were largely avoided. Antagonistic individuals were assigned to different hunting groups. A remarkable memory for lineage prevented inbreeding, but non-competitive sexual behavior was otherwise freely indulged.

They feared change. In 180 thousand years, they never feathered their arrows or improved their digging sticks. Their friendly cooperation and essential avoidance of active-oedipal functioning suggests that of pre-oedipal children.

Paganism—Oedipal/Phallic-Pagan Development

With the advent of agriculture, we became pagans. Aggressive and competitive-sexual needs emerged from repression—and they were freely acted out for the first time. Military threat supported hierarchy and controlled intra-group aggression.

Collective pagan libido was expended in almost automatic warfare, cycles of conquest, cultural flowering, decadence, defeat, ruin, and the sweeping away of cultural artifacts by the new, primitive conquerors. There was no fundamental (i.e., psychosexual) progress for the ten thousand years of paganism. Pagan philosophers viewed history as little more than the rise and fall of states. They had no reason to believe otherwise. War became a

major selective process, which exploited inter-group aggression and protected groups by externalizing collective rage. Scapegoating channeled intra-group rage and increased group unity. Demonizing the enemy increased rage, which increased military effectiveness.

The Christian Era—Collective Latent-Oedipal Development

Two thousand years ago, the "Christian Era" replaced pagan thinking. In theory, we could wage wars for unselfish reasons—God, family, tribe, or nation. That need for an unselfish emphasis limited the incidence of war.

Aggression was further controlled by increased repression, obsessive-compulsive thinking and behavior, and other ego-controls. Sublimation channeled and transformed some aggression (and much sexual fantasy and impulse), which found expression in art, science, and ongoing progress.

While fighting for a god and against heretics sometimes led to fanaticism and savagery that exceeded the brutality of many pagan wars, collective moral thinking also evolved. The Christian Era sublimations evolve into increasingly empathic behavior.

Current Attitudes Regarding Rage

This is still the Christian Era, and we see remnants of the acting-out of rage for god in some militant Muslim groups today. They know that they alienate collective sympathy by their murderous and sadistic behavior. But their rage often overrides practical considerations (as with road rage, impulsive assaults, some suicides, etc.).

The almost simultaneous emergence of the sexual revolution and women's liberation movement created a crisis in relationships and instabilities to which we are still trying to adapt. The sudden respectability of sexual pleasure, race, ethnicity, and gender choices have all added to social stresses.

At the same time, our increasing self-acceptance and the erosion of—and evolution beyond—traditional restraints have loosened controls on the expression of rage. The greater freedom in expressing our needs and the availability of guns make both murder and self-destruction easier.

School shootings are one example of that. Emotionally troubled students have always hated others who are successful academically and socially. The availability of guns and our greater freedom of self-expression as we evolve collectively toward ma-

turity now enables students to kill classmates they hate and envy more easily.

Poverty and economic instability stoke fear. Fear generates intra-group rage, wife and child abuse, homicides, and suicide. More Americans kill themselves every year.

The Future Hope

We are a problem-solving species. Societies rarely mobilize to take effective action until disasters happen. Their problem-solving abilities have then tended to be formidably effective. We are moving from our latent-oedipal mindsets toward early-mature mindsets; we have grown increasingly sophisticated over the past two millennia. As Freud wrote, the tendency of libido is to move upward toward mature psychosexual development. A most-mature understanding of human issues is, in fact, evolving.

Communication technology increasingly escalates the extent and quality of global education. Our current population of 7.3 billion will produce an unprecedented number of problem-solvers. We can now focus on rage and violence more effectively than ever before. I've noticed that, especially since the Columbine massacre, people—and our media—are more openly asking for psychodynamic answers to problems. Collective thinking had previously been more likely to obey Christian Era injunctions to avoid psychodynamic determinants. Increasing numbers of people are in therapy with rage issues among other problems. New anti-fear and anti-rage medications are evolving. Perhaps for the first time we will be emotionally able to mobilize in time to prevent disasters instead of having to depend on disasters to mobilize us.

Joel Markowitz, MD, *is a psychiatrist in Manhattan who has treated patients for 60 years and may be reached at markowitzjoel@gmail.com.* ❑

Germanophobia and the Debut of the New Science of Propaganda

James Allen—Ramapo College of New Jersey

Stephen E. Ambrose's 1992 best seller *Band of Brothers* chronicles E Company's horrific slog from Normandy and Holland to Germany. Finally, they settled into their German quarters in the last months of WWII. But rather unexpectedly, as Ambrose tells it,

"The story ends up thus: Wonder of wonders, the average G.I. found that the people he liked best, identified most closely with, enjoyed being with, were the Germans. Clean, hard-working, disciplined, educated, middle-class in their tastes and life-styles…the Germans seemed to many American soldiers as 'just like us'" (Stephen Ambrose, *Band of Brothers*, 1992, 110).

In the search for insight into the emotion of hatred, Germanophobia offers a uniquely fascinating case study. The Germans, it will appear to the 21st century observer, lack the usual credentials of the Other. Ethnically, religiously, and linguistically, they appear, as the fellows of E Company concluded, "just like us." Americans of German descent are comprised of many national icons, including presidents, military leaders, actors, and authors. Entire schools of thought from socialism to neo-Conservatism bear a German immigrant stamp. The catalog of contributions is vast, from a "Bud" and blue jeans to von Steuben and von Braun. It would certainly seem paradoxical, given America's readiness to uptake so much that was German, that coeval with four centuries and the several waves of German immigration there existed an ongoing Germanophobia.

This essay will review some of the components of pre-20th century Germanophobia. It concludes that none were so noxious as to cause a "thorough submergence" of German-American identity (Kathleen Conzen, *Germans in Minnesota*, 2003, 177). I argue that only a government-directed propaganda campaign was sufficient to cause the German-American cultural cleansing to which they were subjected during WWI. Psycho-sociological manipulation principles—propaganda—possible only in mass society, were utilized during Wilson's administration to formulate American public attitude towards the enemy in Europe. But as unpredictable as poison gas wafting above the trenches of the killing fields of Europe, occasionally blowing back upon the army that unleashed it, this toxic propaganda ended up having disastrous effects on America's single largest immigrant group.

Anti-German sentiment followed closely behind the first wave of German immigrants into the colony of Pennsylvania in the 1750's. Benjamin Franklin's apparent xenophobic correspondence was based on the perceived threat of the new arrivals' sheer numbers, their lacking the habit of self-governance, and their apparent impenetrable stupidity. They represented a peril which Franklin describes as nearly existential. Either we turn them away from Pennsylvania, he warned, or "all the advantages that we have will

not in My Opinion be able to preserve our language, and even our government will become precarious" (John B. Frantz, "Franklin and the Pennsylvania Germans," *Pennsylvania History*, 1998, 65, 1, 21-34).

But a closer examination of Franklin's motivation for his anti-German rhetoric may suggest a different explanation. By 1764, after years of political and business squabbles, Franklin's differences with the Pennsylvania Germans were largely resolved. Now he referred to them as an "industrious, sober people." There followed a marked relaxation of German recalcitrance to Americanize. Their language, dress, integration into colonial colleges, and occasional leadership positions in the society all exhibited a gradual if uneven acculturation. It would appear that our venerable Founder's earlier vindictive language was more the product of a personal grudge than any ingrained Anglo-Saxon prejudice, which some scholars see as a basis of an evolving barometer of "whiteness."

Another of the variegated roots of Germanophobia was witnessed during the post-1848 tide of emigrants—the 48-ers. Political exiles of a radical bent presented yet another type of threat. This strain of xenophobia is reminiscent of Cato vis-à-vis the Greeks. The carriers of these foreign ideas were formidable in their education; they were seen as exquisitely trained sophists before whom the simple, austere yeoman of the plains would be no match. The disease of radicalism was to be censored, not trifled with. Thus educated German immigrants were viewed with a jaundiced eye.

However, the 19th century cultural exchange between Germany and America was far more durable than the decrial of the would-be censors of the day. A score of American thinkers including Washington Irving, Henry W. Longfellow, and James F. Cooper had availed themselves of German learning. American cultural landmarks no less significant than the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Boston Public Library owe their establishment to this mid-century cultural cross-fertilization. (See *Traveling Between Worlds*, *German American Encounters*, eds. Thomas Adam and Ruth Gross, 2006—especially Eberhard Brüning's "Saxony is a Prosperous and Happy Country," 20).

During this period nativism provided grist to Germanophobia. In the 1820s and 30s, huge numbers of Catholic Irish and Germans were arriving on the East Coast. The nativist reaction saw

Catholicism as inimical to American ideals. As these papist (ergo anti-republican, reactionary, monarchical), desperate, burdensome misérables were most ubiquitous in the eastern cities, the reaction began in Boston but spread to several states over the course of the mid-1800s. Monasteries, convents, and churches were burned. Fantastic calumnies were conjured against priests and nuns which became overnight bestsellers.

The year 1854 marked the high-water mark of nativism. Its political star was on a meteoric rise, winning nearly total control of the Massachusetts legislature. Their political priorities were a curious mix of xenophobia, populism, abolition support, moralism, progressivism in varying stripes, and what we currently refer to as a mistrust of "insider" politicians. The Know-Nothing movement's most salient feature, however, remained its virulent anti-Catholicism. Approximately half of all Germans were Catholic. But the impact of nativism, as is usually the case with movements experiencing meteoric ascendancy, was short lived. Its impact on German-Americans, as with the other manifestations of anti-German-American sentiment briefly treated above, was largely inconsequential.

Despite centuries of xenophobic slings and arrows, German-Americans were reasonably happy in the United States. Indeed, Americans' pro-German slant during the Franco-Prussian War would suggest that the ambient disposition towards her 10 million German-Americans was positive or at least benign through the fin de siècle. An 1896 article from *The Atlantic* lamented the new type of immigrant from Russia, Southern Italy, Hungary, and Austria comparing them negatively to those German immigrants of a half century earlier, commenting, "They have none of the ideas and aptitudes which fit men to take up readily and easily the problem of self-care and self-government, such as belong to those who are descended from the tribes that met under the oak-trees of old Germany to make laws and choose chieftains" ("Restriction of Immigration," http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1896/06restriction-of-immigration/306011/). America and her hyphenated German population seemed to have resolved the transitory issues of the past. Then, the Great War.

As America remained neutral for the first years of the as yet European war, German-Americans were largely anti-British in their position. Until the Lusitania and eventual declaration, *all* of America was hotly debating the question of involvement. None consid-

ered it unpatriotic or seditious.

Through the 19th century Germanophobia was a multifaceted phenomenon, rather sinusoidal in its intensity. Until the 20th century it would be untenable to argue that at its core there pulsed unalloyed hatred. Whence will this relatively sudden quantum leap into a more pernicious strain of anti-German cultural vigilantism? The crossover appears to have happened en masse. The virulence, the rapid onset, the actions undertaken against them with a mantle of sanction, a sentiment enveloping the broad masses and taking on hysterical attributes, all suggests a catalyst. Something else was in play.

A new social order had been evolving. It was widely accepted that society's organic social structures had dissolved. The sociological implications of this new mass structure were understood by a few prescient trailblazers. With the advent of the consumer economy, cinema, broad literacy, and radio, theorists and practitioners of mass psychological manipulation were poised to test their ideas.

For over 250 years the German immigrants endured a fairly benign xenophobia, largely group attribution perception. Those Germans: useless dreamers and poets (Dichter und Denker), impious, radicals, beer guzzling souses, off in their reclusive communities and recalcitrant to Americanize. It would take a new 20th century science to intensify and stir to action age old anti-German emotions, amplifying them from nativist crankiness into an irrational, violent onslaught against any expression of Germanness. Only with the emergence of state/media directed propaganda informed by the science of mass/crowd psychology was the real, frightening potential of xenophobia realized.

Twentieth century propaganda was differentiated from past models by action. Propaganda "can divert a prejudice; or it can elicit an action contrary to an opinion held by the individual without his being clearly aware of it" (Jaques Ellul, *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*, 1973, 25). Not a later researcher of propaganda like Ellul, but its first practitioner, Edward Bernays (Freud's nephew) already knew the answer to his rhetorical question: "If we understand the motives and mechanism of the group mind, is it not possible to control and regiment the masses according to our will without them knowing it?" (Ellul, 25)

Bernays was assigned to head the Committee on Public In-

formation (CPI). Any and all federal communication resources were put at his disposal. George Creel, Bernays, and the more than 100 staffers of the CPI enlisted Hollywood producers, academics, illustrators, editors, religious leaders, and anyone else with influence within the civil society. By any measure, the goal of galvanizing the just recently lukewarm, even pacifist American public behind the war effort was a complete success. To achieve this goal Bernays understood that he needed to maximize the fear and hatred of the German enemy.

The well-known recruiting poster of a King Kong type gorilla helmeted with the Prussian *Pickelhaube* holding a fainting woman on one hand (presumably Lady Liberty) and a primitive, bloodied club marked "Kultur" in the other, typifies the campaign. The Germans had to be perceived as something less than human. They were to be understood as being devoid of the most basic human traits. CPI poster art depict Germans bayoneting babies, crucifying doughboys, a German Red Cross nurse tormenting a dying soldier, all acts of depravity befitting of the monstrous beings they were (George Creel, *Advertising America*, 1920, 7).

Tragically, an unintended consequence in the process of wholesale vilification of the German foe, which included targeting the presumed wellspring of their maniacal imperialistic onslaught, i.e., *deutsche Kultur* (German culture), implicated German-Americans. Would not these German-speaking Americans to some degree share the same depraved culture as the Kaiser and his minions? This logic loosed the hysteria-fueled suspicion and persecution of nearly 10 million Americans.

State councils of defense set up county councils. German-American communities were targeted for surveillance. Vigilantism sprang up against Germans, particularly in the Midwest. Lynching, whipping, and executions were rare but did occur. By the fall of 1918, 2,300 German alien residents were interned. Their cohorts had all been reclassified as "alien enemies." The hysteria was comprehensive, attacking German culture at its roots. Laws were established to ban the teaching of the German language and symphony orchestras were forced to remove German compositions from their repertoire. German street names and words were bowdlerized. German books and newspapers burned.

The long term effect of this Germanophobic hysteria on German-Americans was devastating. Despite unquestionable patri-

otism, even enthusiastic enlistment, America's single largest ethnic group suffered irreparable damage from the CPI's propaganda program. The public was blinded by fear and hatred.

The effort to eliminate German culture from the social landscape was nothing less than the will to ablate a people's ethnicity, an ethnic cleansing less the extermination or deportation. This last of the five levels on Allport's scale of prejudice—extermination—was surely never even contemplated by Americans. But there was some level of a quietus. The imprint on the German-American population was permanent. Their awareness of American resentment of their Germanness began a subtle cultural self-abnegation. After the war, nearly 900,000 German-Americans chose not to identify themselves on the national census as being of German decent (*The Nation*, no. 107, 1918). It was the cost which they were willing to pay for acceptance.

James Allen, MA, *has traveled extensively throughout Greece and has observed the Greek political scene from his family residence in Rhodes, Greece for 35 summers. He is an independent* Clio's Psyche *scholar who teaches Western Studies and World Civilizations as an adjunct at Ramapo College of New Jersey for a decade and may be contacted at diodorus2000@yahoo.com.* ❑

Educating Against Hate

Peter W. Petschauer—Appalachian State University

Every day it seems, we are confronted by media highlighting violent behavior that emerges in the context of dislike, disdain, and hatred. They lend themselves to extraordinary visual exploitations. We ourselves may not appreciate being confronted by violence and hatred, but many members of all societies find themselves attracted and repelled at the same time. Expressions of these hatreds are not confined to the Middle East, Afghanistan, and Paris, but are a daily presence in the U.S. as well. Here too they draw attention precisely because they are unique and human. Hatred is a human form of expression that creates an action on the part of the person and persons who embrace it. These behaviors are scintillating to writers, viewers, and readers alike, inviting us to become voyeurs if not participants.

The question that arises is why some members of a society,

or in many cases whole societies, find themselves drawn to hatred and the violence that it often implies? While this issue of Clio's Psyche addresses the "why" and "how" of hatred, I will show that hatred and violence can be, and are in some places, avoided through empathetic and inclusive childrearing.

While many researchers working on the history of childhood found only negative behaviors of parents, caretakers, and societies in the past, autobiographies and biographies beginning with the 18th century in the West show men and women who grew up in households that were not abusive. Thus whole groups gradually became more inclusive and empathetic. Many social scientists and psychologists argue that these empathetic parents and caretakers simply suppressed their negative childhood experiences. Maybe so, but even if they did, they learned from them and treated their own children more positively and their insight, in turn, led to less violence and hatred in some key groups.

This brought about democratic institutions, emphasis on education for all, healthcare for most, and less violent behavior. That is, large groups made up of empathetic individuals emphasized the well-being of their fellow human beings rather than their "Otherness." Those who argue that regimes like those in Germany in the 1930s to 1940s and in Russia in the 1920s to 1960s were normal will find me arguing that they were aberrations, and that in some parts of Europe, at least by that time, much more empathetic groups had emerged. These are the same groups today that struggle to find positive responses to the refugee crisis.

In order to highlight my perceptions, even in the face of what seemed like abuse all around, I will first mention empathetic human beings among several groups in Europe and then, second, link them to two major theorists, Lloyd deMause and Christian Pfeiffer. Since deMause's work is better known in America than Pfeiffer's, I will focus primarily on Pfeiffer below. Both theoreticians point to improved childrearing as the key to the emergence of human beings who are less prone to abuse, violence, and hatred.

For years, I have been questioning the implications of the writings that found abuse even in households in which no one reported it. I first noticed a hint of more thoughtful childrearing in German school ordinances, autobiographies, and biographies as early as the 16th century. It had become more noticeable by the 19th century and fully evident by the 20th century. By then as well, nu-

merous authors had become aware of abuse in households and schools and pleaded for improvements. Literally, a chorus had arisen, saying essentially that abuse, violence, and hatred go hand in hand; children who were abused at home and in school tended to abuse as adults, unless they recognized the abuse for what it was.

Most of these individuals grew into upper and middle-class households. Even the farming families in the Austrian-speaking mountains where I grew up are/were well-off. A further point is that even in households that were harsh, the underlying sense was one of care and love. The individuals who emerged have been leaders in stopping abuse, speaking against violence, and working to find humane rather than violent solutions to problems around them.

Theoretical Points

Lloyd deMause, a major pioneer in the history of childhood, taught us that childrearing improved over time, at least in the West. In "The Evolution of Childhood" (1982) and elsewhere, he associates some of these improvements with Christianity and other parts with the awareness that some practices were not bringing about the results that parents or children had hoped. His final childrearing step is that of the "helping mode" in which the parents empathize with the child that they never discipline. The thousands of biographies written in modern history may suppress some of the negative behavior that occurred in many households, but we are also left with many tales of improvements in households and schools based on humane awareness, insight, and practice. This helping mode is currently, and hopefully only momentarily, drowned out by radicalized stances in today's households and in politics in the U.S., just as it was in Germany in the 1920s to the 1930s, and rumble about in many European societies today.

We generally accept that understanding the needs of children, giving them approval, caring for them, and showing them kindness and sympathy, if not empathy—even friendship—are part of this breakthrough into a form of adult interaction that is uncomfortable with violence and cannot readily condone hate of others simply because they are different or have done something with which we disagree. Christian Pfeiffer offers stunning support of a trend exemplified in individual examples and deMause's argument in *The Abolition of the Parental Right to Corporal Punishment in Sweden, Germany and Other European Countries. A Model for the United States and Other Democracies?* (2015, 128).

Pfeiffer starts the history of improved childrearing before the Enlightenment with Michel de Montaigne, jumps to John Locke, and ends the early investigation with Jean-Jacques Rousseau. But in spite of these early starts, he argues that it took 200 more years before Sweden in 1979 abolished "the parental right to corporal punishment…." (Pfeiffer, 8). Finland and Norway quickly followed suit. Germany took longer and looked more toward empirical evidence for its changes; it did the same in 2000.

One of the reasons a law was proposed in the German Bundestag (lower house of parliament) to forbid parental corporal punishment originated with a 1997 study by Peter Wetzels. It found "that scarcely-loved children and children who were beaten often were three to four times more at risk of becoming victims of sexual abuse compared to the group of children who were raised in a loving and non-violent way," (10). Other studies showed "that not only severe beatings, but also the frequent use of light corporal punishment results in substantial development risks for the children concerned" (10). Pfeiffer showed in the subsequent Bundestag hearings as well, "Parents who had raised their children with little love and much beating, and who lived with their children when they grew old, were at high risk of being treated very badly" (11). As a result of this sort of information and much public debate, the German Civil Code now reads: "Children have a right to an upbringing without violence. Physical punishments, psychological injuries and other degrading measures are prohibited."

The question is, of course, are such laws effective? In addition to other positive societal influences, they are. According to Pfeiffer, Kai Bussmann carried out an empirical survey in 2007 in Sweden, Austria, and Germany, countries where corporal punishment was forbidden, and in Spain and France, where it is not. According to Pfeiffer, "His data show great differences regarding the way…parents raise their children. Whereas in Sweden only four percent of the surveyed parents practiced…corporal punishment of 'spanking with the hand,' in Austria and Germany it was 16 and 17 percent respectively. In contrast, in Spain it was 53 percent and in France 51 percent" (12).

Since that time—that is, the 1990s into the first decades of the 2000s—researchers have conducted massive surveys with thousands of students in elementary schools. Here is one finding only: "There was a clear connection between a violent style of parenting with little care on one hand, and violence or other forms of youth

delinquency (damage to property, shoplifting) on the part of the young person concerned on the other. Particularly striking was the finding that children who were frequently beaten and were scarcely -loved later became repeat perpetrators of violence almost six times more often than those who were raised in a non-violent and loving way" (16-17).

Part of this understanding of the benefits of caring childrearing had led to laws in all European countries that children may not be beaten in schools, and laws in many Western European countries that they may not be abused physically or psychologically at home. Aside from the original adaptors, Albania, Austria, Bessarabia, Bulgaria, Crete, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Germany, Iceland, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Malta, Majorca, Moldova, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, and Ukraine are now part of this movement as well. The positive results for these societies are now beginning to show themselves, in spite of some immediate political setbacks.

These sorts of findings apply to the U.S. as well. Pfeiffer analyzes data to conclude that the number of executions carried out per 10 million inhabitants from 1976-2013 and the right to corporal punishment by teachers correlate with ways of raising children for six groups of U.S. states (28). The data supports his point about the connection between caring childrearing and the reduction of violence and underlying disdain for others, the root of hatred:

• One execution was carried out in eight states where the right to corporal punishment was abolished between1876 and 1985.

• Fourteen executions were carried out in 11 states where the right to corporal punishment was abolished between 1985 and 1989.

• Thirty-one executions were carried out in 12 states where the right to corporal punishment was abolished between 1990 and 2011.

• Thirty-four executions were carried out in eight states where the "right to corporal punishment existed in 2006, but was not applied."

• Sixty-seven executions were carried out in six states, where the "right to corporal punishment existed in 2006, but was seldom used (less than 2% of students)."

• There were 122 executions carried out in five states where the "right to corporal punishment existed in 2006 and was used (up to 7.5% of students)."

According to the author, "The more repressive children were raised in a U.S. state during the past decades, the more severe is the level of the state's punishment" (29).

Pfeiffer offers examples to illustrate similar points. His team discovered a deadly combination in, "The number of registered killings with firearms per 10 million inhabitants in the United States in… 2012 and teachers' right to corporal punishment as an indicator of the repressive way of raising children for six groups of U.S. states" (29). They also found a rising rate of killings from 128 for the first of the above group of states to 501 for the sixth group.

Conclusion

The point of this essay is not to argue that hatred springs from poor childrearing methods and improving these methods will reduce hatred. The point is instead that we now know that reducing abuse of children in homes and schools reduces future abuse and abnormal behavior later in life. Further, wherever hatred shows itself for whatever reason, the propensity toward a violent expression of it tends to be supported in men and women who have been abused as children.

Improved childrearing thus not only brings about a lesser eagerness to be aggressive toward children and older adults, but also a greater eagerness to restrain expressions one can link to hatred. Indeed, improved childrearing is increasingly accepted in many parts of the world and some areas in the U.S. and brings about positive changes in spite of the media's attention to the unusual, to violence, and to expressions of hatred.

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.* ❑

Back Issues of Clio's Psyche are available on cliospsyche.org

Franz Herda: American-German

Peter W. Petschauer

Franz Herda,
a man one can admire:
American and German alike
painter and opponent of the NS regime.
Friedrich Percyval Reck-Malleczewen,
odd noble opponent of the regime,
called him friend.
Albertine Gimpel,
the Jewess he hid from the Gestapo,
called him husband.

Born in Brooklyn to German-American parents
Bavaria drew him to study art.
He remained to observe the regime:
before he knew the complexity of mean.
The U.S. passport kept him free
allowed him to become engaged.

In Munich from SA hoodlums,
he saved a woman and a man:
a blond German and a starred Jew.
Did the man land in Dachau,
or worse,
like his friend?
Denounced twice by a publisher
Friedrich found there his death in 1945.

Herda could save his wife in Bavaria –
post-war hopes were foiled in the U.S.
With Albert Einstein's support for naught
portraits of him and others brought no success.
He lies buried with his wife,
in the place of his finest success
there in Bavaria
where he confronted the nasty regime.

Zivil Courage they called it then:
Germany in the 30s and 40s.
Civil Courage they called it later:
the U.S.A. in the 50s.
To stand up to men

who scorned values that make us human.
Who had others trample willingly on their fellows.

Civil courage:
needed again today.
To face up to men spreading fear and hate.
Applying tactics of these other times
cynically exploiting the weak and unprepared.
Two Josephs come to mind:
Goebbels and McCarthy.
Disseminators of half-truths and lies.
Relentless efforts to oppress foes and,
before long,
adulators.

Peter Petschauer's *biography may be found on page 267.*

❑

Psychoanalyzing the Political Rhetoric of Fear

Robert Samuels—University of California

Key insight that psychoanalysis can add to our understanding of the contemporary politics of fear concerns the Freudian notions of fantasy and masochism. When Freud moved from believing that all of his patients had actually suffered sexual abuse to the idea that some of them only fantasized their abuse, he opened up a new perspective on human suffering and identity. Psychoanalysis forces us to ask why people may imagine their own victimhood and what this type of unconscious identity may do to how they relate to others. Moreover, we shall see the fantasies of victimhood help to explain how fear is transformed into hatred in politics.

One can read much of political history as a battle among different victim identities. Not only do most religions center their mythologies on martyrdom, but many political and religious groups present themselves as victims to themselves and to others. From a psychoanalytic perspective, we learn that the victim's self-image is of being innocent and right—therefore you cannot criticize the victim. Moreover, victims feel justified in their aggression toward others as they tend to divide the world into evil perpetrators and innocent victims. For example, after 9/11, the U.S., the strongest

military and economic power in the world, represented itself as a victim, and thus was able to justify invading Iraq and engaging in torture and other activities that are normally hard to justify. Likewise, American politics has been dominated by the ability of the wealthiest people to represent themselves as victims of taxes, Big Government, and Liberal Elites.

Since psychoanalysis shows us the power of magical thinking and imaginary fantasies, it is best positioned to help us understand these dominant political forces which often focus on the rhetoric of fear. For instance, terrorism is centered on the ability to create fear in a group of people by making them uncertain about when the next attack will come. Furthermore, these terrorist groups often recruit people by proclaiming their shared victim status, and then they use this victim identity to justify horrible crimes against humanity. Victimhood thus serves as a powerful form of social bonding, which is key to a wide range of political formations.

Victim politics often involve a zero-sum worldview so that one is seen as either a victim or a perpetrator, and one of the problems here is that it becomes easy to blame victims for their own suffering. For example, many conservatives believe that poor people of color victimize white wealthy people by making the rich pay for welfare programs for the poor. This type of victim reversal has resulted in a culture that believes that white people are now discriminated against in education and employment because blacks get affirmative action and other preferences. This type of politics hides true suffering and inequality and rhetorically turns victims into perpetrators.

Psychoanalysis then helps us to understand aspects of politics and society that other modes of discourse cannot because only psychoanalysis has a theory of masochism, fantasy, magical thinking, and imaginary identity. In the case of the politics, psychoanalysis teaches us that by underlying fear, we find both individual and group unconscious processes concerning victimization. Therefore, fantasies of victimhood often play a role in transforming fear into hatred and justifying destructive actions. For example, in many domestic and religious terrorist attacks, the attackers identify themselves as political and social victims who are justified in their violent actions because they represent the Good against the Evil they are trying to eradicate. Unfortunately, as a society, we tend to label these actors as simply crazy, and thus we do not expose the structure of their ideological fantasies.

In "A Child is Being Beaten," Freud argues that the first stage of a fantasy is determined by the triadic structure where a child is jealous of a rival and sees the Other being beaten as a sign of parental love and attention. Here, the child identifies with the victimization of the Other in a situation of competition, envy, and rivalry. We see these same dynamics in politics where even abused and neglected people are seen as receiving special attention from the government, and thus one may wish to replace these victimized minorities by taking their place in the victim position.

In my own psychoanalytic practice, I have seen the power that a fantasy of victimization plays in shaping a person's identity. Since this fantasy provides a stable sense of identity, it is often hard for it to be called into question or given up, and yet, analysis often involves what Lacan called a traversing of the fundamental fantasy. From this perspective, we often see the world from the perspective of fantasy, and so reality itself is experienced through the lens of victimhood. In fact, what has struck me the most in my many conversations with wealthy American conservatives is that they actually experience their every day existence as one of victimhood. For instance, a rich man I know who owns several houses, often complains that he is going to move away because of the high taxes he is forced to pay and the governmental regulations that control his businesses. It does not matter that he is a multi-millionaire, what matters is that he sees himself as a victim. Likewise, many Christian fundamentalists see themselves as being victimized by secularists who want to teach evolution, promote abortions, and destroy families by endorsing same-sex marriage. In this structure, the fetus of the abortion is seen as the ultimate innocent victim, and this innocence then justifies any type of violent retribution. Ultimately, the symbol of Christ on the cross shows how large groups can be organized around the sign of an innocent victim.

What is so interesting and confounding about the conservative embrace of victim identity is that they often attack liberals for promoting a type of identity politics centered on victimhood. From a conservative perspective, the claims of African Americans and Native Americans of a victim status based on their history of abuse is itself a form of victimizing white Americans who played no direct role in slavery or colonization. Likewise, conservatives argue that they are victimized by political correctness and the need to be sensitive to different minority groups. Here, splitting and identification help to show how political ideologies are formed and main-

tained.

As Republicans see themselves as victims of the liberal media, education, and government, Democrats often position themselves as innocent victims of conservative attacks. From this liberal perspective, all evil is outside, and their progressive acts of good will and charity create a clear split between the good Us and the evil Other. Liberals also often base their politics on the ideology of empathy and the idea that they understand and identify with the suffering of others. Of course, there is nothing wrong with trying to help others, but this type of empathy can entail a patronizing sense that one knows best and one can have the identical feelings and experiences as someone without the same privileges and benefits.

Returning to Freud's theory of fantasy, he argues that masochism occurs because one takes pleasure in the guilt that is generated from an incestuous desire, and that through regression, one enjoys the guilt more than the desire. Once again, only psychoanalysis can explain how we find pleasure in pain and why we might enjoy our guilt as much as we enjoy sex. In the political context of liberalism, we can argue that white liberal guilt acts as a masochistic pleasure and is coupled with an identification with the social victim. This type of identification and identity can result in important political actions for social justice, but it harbors the problematic sense of innocent goodness, which prevents the do-gooder from seeing the possible harm caused by charity or other forms of aid and philanthropy.

In Freud's case of the Rat Man, he goes as far as arguing that underneath every good intention lies an unconscious evil desire. One reason for this idea is the Freudian notion that all of our affects are ambivalent and thus contain a mixture of love and hatred. For Freud, a key problem for the obsessional neurotic concerns the way objects and the self have to be divided into good and bad. This splitting of the ego and its world creates a potentially paranoid world of innocent victims and evil perpetrators. Part of analysis then is to use free association to help people to discover their ambivalence concerning key figures in their lives.

The question becomes how to keep the Other from being seen as all good and all bad? In short, how do we replace otherness with ambivalence? Clearly the rhetoric of current politics is often centered on making polarizing divisions and rallying around loved ones and hated Others. Liberals like to pretend that all would be

good with the world if conservatives just went away, and conservatives argue that they are the victims of liberal elites. In this fantasy structure, both sides actually support the imaginary worlds of the other side.

Robert Samuels, PhD, *has a Doctorate in Psychoanalysis from the University of Paris VIII and is the author of seven books including Between Philosophy and Psychoanalysis, Writing Prejudices, Hitchcock's Bi-Textuality, and Why Public Higher Education Should be Free. He teaches writing and discourse at the University of California, Santa Barbara, where he is president of the faculty union, UC-AFT. Dr. Samuels is currently writing a book on psychoanalysis, politics, and neuroscience and may be contacted at his blog Changing Universities or bobsamuels_us@yahoo.com..* ❑

Donald Trump Gives Permission to Hate, Thus Easing Our Superegos

Anonymous—Psychoanalyst in Private Practice

It's quite possible that millions of people want Donald Trump to be president because they believe, consciously or unconsciously, that he gives them permission to hate. In psychoanalytic terms, Trump eases their collective superego, allowing people to own and validate their aggression and hatred that shame and guilt from childhood forced them to at least try to repress.

Trump's comments about Mexicans, Muslims, and Carly Fiorina's appearance as well as his imitation of the disability of a journalist seemed to boost his standing in polls of likely Republican voters and some others. He has dismissed political correctness, a form of collective superego in our society, and is freely expressing his opinions, something many people wish they could do. Along the way, Trump has touched the negative feelings many Americans have about foreigners, emotions likely based on fear and an inability to control what they perceive as the consequences of immigration: fewer jobs for workers who already live here and an increase in crime or terrorism.

Despite the shocked reactions of people reported in the media, Trump resonates with many Americans. When he mocked a journalist's disability, he publicly did what some people do in private, imitating and denigrating someone who has a handicap; they

would never do it publicly for fear of inviting scorn or rejection. Yet here is a potential president of the United States, a parental figure to many, offering his constituents a very different superego than any politician has in generations. Many people seem to be perceiving Trump as saying it's okay to hate.

It's helpful to look at the dynamics of hate to understand why Trump is so appealing to so many, yet in this short paper I must come quickly to the point. Hate, a byproduct of aggression, has been the subject of thousands of psychoanalytic papers and books dating back to the early decades of this field, as well it should be; hate is a complex emotion, whether it is relatively transient, felt by a child reacting to a frustrating moment with a parent, something that manifests itself in a lifelong grudge, or is ingrained in a society and brought to the surface by a politician's provocative comments.

I see hate as a result of discomfort and helplessness. When a baby is in discomfort, she hates the situation she is in and cannot control, particularly when she is very young and has little mobility. A toddler or child whose wishes, demands, and needs are rejected by an omnipotent parent hates the predicament they find themselves in, and the parent who the child believes created that situation. Or, as Melanie Klein theorized, the breast/parent that had something the child needed and wanted (*Envy and Gratitude and Other Works 1946-1963*, 183-187). We all by varying degrees integrate our infantile hatred and aggression into our psyches, but it's not hard to see, for example, how employees with a difficult boss will have the same frustration and feeling of powerlessness and hatred that an infant or young child has.

Child psychiatrist and Yale Medical School Professor T. Wayne Downey offers a view of hate that can apply to a child, angry adult, or potential voter: "Hate comes to counter helplessness and paradoxically, it both expresses frustration at the same time that it defends against it in fantasy" ("Notes on Hate and Hating," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 59 [3-20], 2004). A person who can't change a painful situation or control the behavior of another does at least have the power to hate. Many emotions and aggressive or neglectful actions are contributors to hate, Downey notes. He states, "Acrimony, mendacity, envy, jealousy, vindictiveness, abuse, rivalry, soul murder, 'gaslighting,' rape, Machiavellianism, racism, hate crimes, demagoguery—all are part of a list that evaporates into a snow of syntax. All these terms mean slightly different

things, but all have hatred as an inherent common denominator" (7).

Of course, there are intervening steps between the hate a child feels and the hatred adults feel toward individuals, groups, or even entire nations or cultures. Some of children's hatred is unconscious, but even when it is out in the open, children soon learn from parents' reactions to their aggression that their hatred is unacceptable. Guilt, shame, and in turn the development of the superego, force them to repress these forbidden feelings. Still, hatred that is repressed must go somewhere, and children (and later adults) turn it against themselves, act it out by throwing or breaking objects or displacing it onto others in the form of frustration, anger, and yes, hatred of groups of people. Even when hatred is the result of discomfort, problems, and powerlessness in an adult's life, it still carries the echoes of a helpless child's reaction to an unpleasant situation. For those many children who had hate hurled at them by parents, siblings, schoolmates, and neighbors, the repression may have been less successful. Their aggression and hatred are there for the world to see.

Hatred has long been a political tool, whether it was used by the American (Know-Nothing) Party in the 1850s, or by Hitler in his rise to power in Germany in the 1930s. Psychoanalytic scholars, including Alice Miller and Vamik Volkan, have written about the national psyches—usually a people struggling with defeat, humiliation, poverty, and denigration, but also a society filled with fear—that have allowed leaders to summon up and solidify the hatred of others. These leaders are often charismatic and have a public air of self-assuredness. They may be wealthy or have good looks, physical prowess, or success on the battlefield. They exude power and more than anything speak to the fears of their audience.

Trump has many of these characteristics. He is very charismatic to many; a billionaire, but one from an upper middle-class childhood, one who has succeeded in real estate and casinos while avoiding the financial disasters both industries have suffered over the past three decades. His casino holdings in Atlantic City went through bankruptcy proceedings four times, although Trump himself never has. He has persuaded savvy investors to buy stock in his companies or to lend to them. He has a life of luxury and has married beautiful, statuesque women. Also, as his public comments to and about others over the decades have shown, he is extremely sure of himself and his right to say and do what he wants.

In at least one of his books, Trump labels himself a narcissist and many psychoanalysts would agree. To the voters who admire him, Trump, who tells protesters to shut up and attacks reporters, is an ego ideal, someone they want to model themselves after. Perhaps more importantly, he offers an easier superego, the part of the psyche that tries to control what people do and say. I am differentiating, as some theorists have, between the superego and the ego ideal, although in Freud's early writings, they appeared to be one and the same (Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, 1973, 144-145).

It's interesting that Trump's standing in the polls grew as it did during last fall and leading into the weeks before the first voting in Iowa and New Hampshire, as he made more provocative statements. While political analysts (not psychoanalysts) continually predicted Trump's latest statement would be his undoing, his popularity among potential Republican voters kept rising. It was clear that more people were enjoying the fact that he said the things they not only wanted to hear but wanted to say. It's also likely that the rising poll numbers made many people feel like it was alright to support Trump not in spite of what he said, but because of what he said. To the growing body of Trump supporters, it was now acceptable to say publicly that they liked someone whose superego was looser than theirs.

Writing about the herd instinct that can feed group hatred, psychoanalyst Joseph H. Berke says it can "appear to reverse hostility into positively toned ties of mutual support and solidarity" ("The Wellsprings of Fascism: Individual Malice, Group Hatreds, and the Emergence of National Narcissism," *Free Associations*, 6, 1996, 334-350).

The reaction of many people to Trump recalls what comedians have done for generations. They will say publicly the outrageous, aggressive, hostile, obscene things that many of us wish we could say. However, while we applaud out of gratitude that these entertainers are misbehaving for us, we're also laughing out of nervousness because our unconscious—especially the superego—is uneasy at this vicarious acting out. Lenny Bruce, George Carlin, and others have been masters at hitting that raw nerve—again, the superego—in their audience.

I don't have the sense that many people are laughing at Trump. I'm hearing mostly applause and cheering as the audience

is being allowed to luxuriate in having their superegos eased, at least when it comes to being allowed to hate.

Anonymous *is a psychoanalyst whose second profession makes it advisable to not state their name.* ❑

Conscience, Obama, Clinton, and Trump

Abstract: Traditional Republican politicians have been blindsided by celebrity culture in the person of Donald Trump, with his extraordinary ability to dominate the news. Whether or not Trump wins the nomination, his campaign is still an exemplar of our era of celebrity politics and entertainment news. This psychobiography describes Donald Trump's rise in the 2015/2016 presidential race by examining aspects of his childhood, life, and personality, including his aggressiveness, narcissism, and relationships with family and wives. In a time of disillusionment with establishment politics, Trump's raw emotion and unwillingness to spell out specific, practical policies resonates with many voters looking for the polar opposite of the sitting president in terms of personality and attitude.

Reflections on Trump's Celebrity Politics and Psychobiography

Paul H. Elovitz—The Psychohistory Forum

In the wake of Donald Trump's early domination of the nomination process, celebrity culture has transformed traditional Republican politics. In the world of "The Donald," it's about personality rather than comparative political platforms and policies. Whatever the outcome of the primaries, Trump's campaign is an exemplar of celebrity politics and entertainment news. After discussing some of the causes of this unusual electoral development, I will focus on a psychobiography of the New York billionaire.

Certainly, there are many factors influencing the primaries. Following the terrorist attacks in Paris and San Bernardino, fear and hatred have increased considerably. When Trump wraps himself in the anger of the electorate in our time of fear, as the spokesman of public rage, he draws large, enthusiastic crowds of devoted followers. Those who cheer for Trump at his rallies are reassured that

they need not fear terrorists or illegal immigrants as Trump declares he will impose "a total shutdown" on Muslims entering the country and build "a beautiful wall on our southern border and the Mexicans will pay for it."

The appeal of politicians like Donald Trump is that they are simplifiers. They have the answers for people who feel lied to by politicians and do not have the inclination or time to go into the complexities of politics, policies, and comparing programs of different aspirants for the presidency. They reassure many Republicans that they are strong enough to save the country from decline. Among followers of Trump and others there is an element of identification with the aggressor. That is identification with those who appear powerful and are willing to express their power quite readily, without regard for the feelings and rights of others, or political realities. Donald Trump is famous for asserting his power, for example, when he fired people on *The Apprentice* reality TV game show which he hosted for 14 years.

Not being politically correct becomes an asset since these politicians express what many voters secretly or openly think, especially at moments of great fear. In *Crippled America: How to Make America Great Again* (2015), Trump, who has his picture on the front of each of his books, writes that the "picture…on the cover of the book is so angry and so mean looking" since that is what America needs, rather than a "beautiful" one of him that he could have chosen (ix). This is not your traditional smiling politician, but rather one who wants to be seen as strong and mean enough to cut through the realities of deadlocked national politics to solve all of our problems. This is one reason why I raise the issue of identification with the aggressor. A blue collar friend, who in the past supported George Wallace and Ross Perot, is enamored of Trump who he sees as strong enough to confront the national debt issue and political gridlock. He resonates with his favorite GOP candidate's denunciation of the politicians running the country as "stupid."

An additional reason for Trump's emergence in 2015 is that he is the polar opposite in personality and style to our sitting president, just as Reagan was so different from Carter and Bush was so different from Clinton. Obama is intellectualized and slow to mirror the emotions of the public, while Trump is all about wrapping himself in the emotions of his followers. In Trump's family, there was a certain contempt for his MIT professor uncle who hardly made money compared to his brother the builder.

There is a plethora of material available for the psychobiographer examining Donald Trump: He is a media magnet, an outspoken and loquacious individual who has been famous for four decades in the country's communication center, as well as being prolific as an author. Although critics describe his books as self-indulgent, repetitive, and bombastic, they are easy and sometimes interesting reads. They are revealing, as when he writes in *The Art of the Deal* (1987) that "I play to people's fantasies" and "I like to test people" (58). Furthermore, his character traits and values appear to have been formed early and to have remained relatively unchanged. There are also secondary sources available to the psychobiographer. These include Gwenda Blair, *The Trumps: Three Generations Who Built an Empire* (2000); Michael D'Antonio, *Never Enough: Donald Trump and the Pursuit of Success* (2015); and Timothy O'Brien, *TrumpNation: The Art of Being the Donald* (2005).

Donald John Trump was born on June 14, 1946 as a rambunctious second of three sons and fourth of five children to a successful builder in Queens and his Scottish-born bride. He was a chubby toddler who seems to have had an irrepressible quality throughout his whole life and who did not easily fit within the confines of school where he passed notes, talked out of turn, and threw spitballs. At birthday parties he threw water balloons and raised a ruckus. In elementary school he describes himself as "a very aggressive kid" and reports being almost expelled for giving his music teacher a black eye (*Art*, 49). His sister Maryanne Trump Barry, now a federal judge, says "He was a brat" (*TrumpNation*, 49). Some of his "friends" nicknamed detention "DT" for "Donny Trump." I put quotes around "friends" because, given his need to be the center of attention and his extremely competitive nature, he does not appear to have close friends in his life, although he has certainly been good at making alliances with others. His first year roommate at military school said, "He wasn't that tight with anyone. People liked him, but he didn't bond with anyone. I think it was because he was too competitive, and with a friend you don't always compete. It was like he had this defensive wall around him, and he wouldn't let anyone get close" (Ted Levine quoted in Blair, *The Trumps*, 237).

Trump describes himself as growing into a "pretty tough kid" who "wanted to be the toughest kid in the neighborhood, and had a habit of mouthing off everybody, while backing off to no

one" As "a bit of a trouble maker…My parents finally took me out of school and brought me upstate to the New York Military Academy" There, while he had run-ins, he reports he "learned respect for other people…self-discipline" (Trump, *Crippled America*, 2015, 129). After graduating from the New York Military Academy, Donald briefly considered attending film school in California before settling into an education that would set him up to become a successful businessman (*Art*, 53).

A key element in Trump's personality and success is based on his identification with his father. He declares "I learned how to think like a billionaire, by watching my father, Fred Trump. He was the greatest man I've ever known, and the biggest influence on my life" (Donald Trump, *Think Like a Billionaire: Everything You Need to Know about Success, Real Estate, and Life*, 2004, xiv). His father's distance from his sons was not simply reflected in his sending Donald off to military school to learn how to behave himself. His son declares that "Fred C Trump, wasn't the kind of dad who took us to the movies or played catch with us in Central Park. He was better than those fathers. Instead, he'd take me to his building sites in Brooklyn and Queens, he'd say 'let's make the rounds,' and we'd be on our way" (*Billionaire*, xv).

Note how Trump idealized his father for being distant despite, as an attention-seeking child, seeing other children bonding with their fathers and having catches in Central Park. Based on my years of doing child therapy, my thought is that behind this idealization is denial of his feelings of envy and the yearning that he felt in having an emotionally detached father. When he writes, "[my father] never yelled at me or had to punish me, but he was always strong, and a little remote, until I joined his business," it is evident that Trump is still presenting an idealized version of a man who expressed his discontent with his "trouble maker" son before sending him off to military school (*Billionaire*, xiv). It is apparent his father wanted to teach his sons some things about the value of money and to develop a work ethic in them. Thus, they reportedly collected bottles for deposit and had paper routes. Later on summer vacations they collected rents from tenants and worked on projects. However, the children were also being driven around in limousines at a time when these cars weren't common in their neighborhood (*TrumpNation,* 48). Donald clearly identified with his self-absorbed father, which fits in with his narcissistic approach to life.

"Donny" Trump's strong identification with his developer

father from an early age is indicated in his using his own as well as his two years younger brother Robert's building blocks to make a tall tower. He liked it so much that he proudly describes gluing it together, which of course denied his brother's use of his own blocks. His seven years older brother, Fred Jr., was expected to follow his father into business and be the family champion, but there was a much better fit between the second son's personality and their father. The funny, generous, sweet "Freddy" cowered at times before his father's drive to teach his sons to be "killers" and suffered from his namesake's lack of praise and public criticism when he entered the family business. Donald could see that being sweet and funny like his older brother would not work with their father. Instead, Donald became determined to stand up to his father and push back in order to become successful in business. According to a businessman in real estate, "He [Donald] thrived on conflict, the bigger the better" (Blair, 224, 245, 260). Older brother Fred eventually made his life as an airplane pilot before dying at age 43 as an alcoholic and heavy smoker.

While school was hardly Trump's first priority, he did okay in high school, where he was given the honor of cadet captain for graduation, and was voted "Lady's man" as a senior (NPR, "This Is Where Donald Trump Played by the Rules and Learned to beat the Game"). After studying at Fordham University in the Bronx for two years, Trump transferred to the far more prestigious University of Pennsylvania, with help from his older brother who worked in the University's admissions office, and took classes in the Wharton School of Finance before graduating in 1968.

In contrast to his older brother, Donald thrived on competition, established a close working relationship with his father in the family business, and was quick to push back if criticized. At some point in his career, he was ready to go his own way. He commented, "My father thought I was nuts to build in Manhattan, but I didn't listen to him because I had my own vision" (*Billionaire*, xvii). Donald is very admiring of leaders like Warren Buffet, Jeff Bezos, Ted Turner, and Steve Jobs who don't "follow the stampede" and who carve their own paths. Indeed, he favorably quotes the psychoanalyst Michael Maccoby's, *The Productive Narcissist*, saying there is a convincing argument that narcissism is a useful quality for starting a business. "A narcissist does not hear the naysayers. At the Trump organization, I listen to people, but my vison is my vision" (*Billionaire*, xvii-xviii).

In a chapter of *Crippled America* called "Stuff," Trump lists the best car, best suit, best cufflinks, shirts, ties, shoes, jewelry, furniture, golf, credit card, shampoo, movie (*Citizen Kane*), album, Broadway show, ice cream, and hamburger (xviii). While none of the people in the large crowds who cheer for him will likely ever become billionaires, they can fantasize about being billionaires as they vote for him and even get some stuff similar to their hero's. They can vicariously think of becoming president, as Trump espouses and shouts their deep-seated, politically incorrect, and hidden beliefs. In running for president he has avoided paying the traditional price of serving in the military, working his way up in electoral politics, becoming a policy "wonk," making political alliances, and being politically correct. He has proclaimed his narcissism rather than insisted that he is just "one of the people." In their fantasies they can do the same.

"Donald" further declares that, "Almost all successful alpha personalities display a single method determination to impose their vision on the world, and a rational belief in unreasonable goals, bordering at times on lunacy." Trump grandiosely heralds his own "alpha personality," determination, "narcissism," and "vision" bordering on "lunacy." It is typical Trump to turn what others see as criticism into assets, thus he also praises his short attention span (*Billionaire*, xviii). In his business activity, he even describes himself as "raising a ruckus in an inappropriate situation" (*Art*, 141).

The fact that Trump is known as "The Donald" is a reminder that names can have considerable importance in the development of a person. This thought brings to mind a former patient who was born in a displaced persons camp to a psychologically unstable mother and a weak, poorly performing father, with no real role models of success. He had to teach himself how to drive by simply watching others do it, among other things that one is usually taught. His mother's intense love for him, combined with his first name of "Victor," helped him achieve a higher level of success than one would expect, as he fought many of the battles of his life victoriously. Freud and other psychoanalysts point out the strong influence of names on some individuals. The word "trump" refers to any playing card that out-ranks others; that perspective card is referred to as a "trump card." To "trump up" is to deceitfully build a case against someone. The large sound of a trumpet also comes to mind when you hear the word trump. Certainly Donald has always been able to trumpet his own achievements and self above and be-

yond others. He trumpets his name with Trump AC Casino, Trump Books, Trump's Carousel, Trump's Castle, Trump Classic Cars, Trump Drinks, Trump Education, Trump Ice, Trump Pageants, Trump Palace, Trump Parc, Trump Payroll, Trump Resorts, Trump Restaurants, Trump Tower, and licenses his name around the world.

In Trump's world, you're up or down. He does not focus on the four times he was down to the point of corporate bankruptcy in 1991, 1992, 2004, and 2009. He was saved on one occasion by family money and in the others he negotiated his way out of these situations. In the case of his third bankruptcy in 2004, Trump wrote "I figured it was the bank's problem, not mine, what the hell did I care? I actually told one bank, 'I told you you [stet] shouldn't have loaned me that money.'" I told you the goddam deal was no good" (Donald Trump and Bill Zander, *Think Big and Kick Ass in Business and Life* (2004, 58). The reality was that people lost their jobs and the banks' shareholders their savings. Should Trump be elected, can this billionaire narcissist be trusted to not bring the same narcissistic attitude to the needs of the country?

To this billionaire, the successful person is allowed to be a narcissist as part of his genius; he's allowed to be bordering on what others see as lunacy, but he knows that he's the one. He asks for advice but doesn't necessarily listen to it. "Should I run for President?" Donald Trump asked one of his then respected associates. "Nobody likes you" was the answer in both 2011 and 2015. Trump appears to be liked far more as a celebrity than as an individual. (It is noteworthy that the individual who spoke his mind about the billionaire's likeability no longer has this valuable association with him.) As early as 1987, Trump flirted with the idea of seeking the Oval Office, but it is only in the present electoral cycle that he has been serious about running. Why shouldn't he be? He's been a media magnet, unlike Bush, Carson, Christie, Cruz, Fiorina, Kasich, Paul, and Rubio. Although he asserts that he is willing to bankroll his own campaign, he doesn't have to pay nearly as much for publicity as others since our culture idolizes celebrities; he gets enormous attention without the cost. He does not feel the need to be accurate or measured in his comments. What counts is that he be the top showman, even if it is at the expense of truth. This can be seen in his continued flirtation with the anti-Obama "Birther Movement." By raising the citizenship issue again, Trump sought to hurt Ted Cruz, the eventual winner of the Iowa caucus, by

claiming Cruz is not eligible for the presidency due to his Canadian birthplace. Truth is often a casualty given this real estate magnet's attitude that all publicity is good publicity.

There are fairly clear cut patterns that Donald Trump follows on the campaign trail. He commonly declares that he likes someone and then criticizes that person almost in the same breath. Either before or after launching a sharp attack against a person or country, he issues a compliment, however meaningful it may or may not be. When raising the issues of Obama's or Cruz' citizenship, he does not definitively make the point but says others will do this. This provides media attention, but also leaves him with some level of deniability. Trump frequently begins criticisms of his competitors with "I like him" or "he's a good a guy," and goes on to call them "liars" (Cruz) and "chokers" (Rubio). He says he "loves China" and then declares that "China is ripping us off." Trump, who is not known for using polite language, demanded on February 25th that the Mexican president apologize for using foul language in a response to Trump's plan to have the Mexican government pay to build a wall along the Southern border. (In *TrumpNation*, there are various examples of Trump's profanity.) I suspect that some of his statements are aimed at "raising a ruckus," part of what he may see as negotiating ploys, which, in politics, draw the media attention he craves. Other things he says fit in with his idea of "play[ing] to people's fantasies."

Donald Trump lives in a world of winners and losers, perfect and imperfect, and therefore it is no surprise that he sees his mother as perfect. "Part of the problem I've had with women has been in having to compare them to my incredible mother, Mary [McLeod] Trump. My mother is smart as hell." As a six or seven year old child, he remembers watching Queen Elizabeth's coronation in 1953 with his mom, and remembers her in exalted terms as queens tend to be remembered. Trump believes that his showmanship comes from her. She "had a flair for the dramatic and the grand… she had a sense of world beyond her…my mother loves splendor and magnificence" (*Art*, 55). Although he claims his father could be "a showman" (*Billionaire*, xv), there is no question that Fred Trump was also shy with groups and it was his Scottish born wife who strongly influenced her son in this regard. Donald asserts he is not afraid of strong women, yet if women displease him he often writes them off as "bimbos" or far worse in cases such as Rosie O'Donnell, who dared to criticize him.

When Donald Trump married Ivana Marie Trump, he felt that he had found a female version of himself. Like his father before him, he was marrying a foreign-born woman. He reports getting talked into a pre-nuptial agreement by his friend Roy Cohn—a successful New York "fixer" who became well-known as an aide to Senator Joseph McCarthy in the Army hearings of 1953. Donald and Ivana would go on to have three children. These kids would suffer through their parent's lengthy, well-publicized divorce, with its considerable focus on the issue of money. Trump blames the failure of his marriage on his mistake in getting Ivana involved in business, as she was put in charge of the Plaza for "one dollar a year and all the dresses she could buy." "The fact is, you do feel invulnerable, and then you have a tendency to take your eye off the ball a little bit and hunt around for women. And hunt around for models" (David Segal, "What Donald Trump's Plaza Deal Reveals about His White House Bid," *New York Times*, January 16, 2016). Having an attractive woman by his side is something he values far more than most men. His wives have been models and an actress. His current third wife is a Slovenian-born naturalized citizen who has mostly kept out of the limelight until recently.

The billionaire celebrity Donald J. Trump has energized the current race for the Republican nomination and, to many political pundits, he seems unstoppable as of the end of February. Yet, this is far from a certainty because he is an extremely polarizing individual who has higher negatives than other leading politicians in public opinion polls. This brief psychobiographical study provides some information about his attitudes and life as well as some psychohistorical explanations for his appeal to many voters. By examining Trump's upbringing, schooling, and relationships—both with family and "friends"—his new found popularity among many voters can be better understood and explained. Time will tell whether or not his approach to politics and raw emotional appeal will bring him the Republican nomination and even the presidency.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, *is a presidential psychobiographer who may be reached at pelovitz@aol.com.* ❑

Conscience, Superego, and Muslims

Paul Salstrom—St. Mary-of-the-Woods College

A few years back, Donald Carveth asserted in his Clio's Psyche article "Social and Historical Influences on Psychoanalytic Thought" (Vol. 20, No. 3, December 2013, 253-262) that the human conscience is being neglected to our peril. Carveth made a case that our conscience is independent of the superego and is just as important. He invoked Eli Sagan's "distinction between the superego as an identification with the aggressor, with parental and social authority, and a conscience grounded not in social internalization, but in our earliest experiences of attachment and love, our identification with the nurturer" (261). So Carveth urged that Freud's psychoanalytic paradigm—the triad of id, ego, and superego—be expanded since "We now need to recognize conscience as a fourth component of the structural theory of the mind in order to more adequately grasp moral conflict between the pseudo-morality internalized from parents and society and the authentic morality, 'the still small voice,' that stems from what Winnicott called the 'true self' and its attachments and libidinally grounded object relations" (261).

Carveth mentions that "Freud chose to incorporate both conscience and ego ideal into the superego" (261)—so maybe the subordination of conscience in psychoanalytic theory began when Freud thereby denied conscience an independent, autonomous existence? Carveth doesn't say; rather, his argument is with later theorists like Marcuse and Kohut who, he says, thought that "with the decline of paternal authority the superego had dissolved and an unstructured personality had emerged" (257). Assuming that Marcuse and Kohut followed Freud and viewed the conscience as part of the superego, they presumably thought the conscience too had dissolved with the decline of parental authority.

Anyway, says Carveth, *guilt* has not disappeared despite these past several generations of permissive childrearing. He thinks guilt has simply been repressed. Even if permissive childrearing has shrunken the superego (or more likely altered it, he says), permissive childrearing hasn't shrunken or altered the conscience, but has simply helped us ignore it. Definitely, "the still small voice of conscience" *was* easily ignored—until we learned of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) among soldiers returning from war,

which is frequently grounded, says Carveth, "in 'moral injury' arising from obedience to a superego shaped by familial and military authority that led [soldiers] to commit unconscionable acts" (261).

Whatever the status of the superego should or shouldn't be, I personally agree with Donald Carveth that moral conscience is an autonomous force. I think our capacity for conscience is inherent in human nature and crucial to society's viability. If the conscience isn't nurtured and validated more than it has been recently in our society, I think we may soon be in deep trouble due to ever greater acts of hatred.

So, you might ask, if the conscience is so important, what exactly is it? The answers come in two types: (1) the formulaic answers, two of which Immanuel Kant came up with, and (2) the non-formulaic answers, one of which Gandhi pursued for 50 years. Kant's two answers are the two versions of his categorical imperative: "Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a moral law without contradiction…" which he also phrased as: "Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end." Both versions appear in Kant's *Groundwork of Metaphysic of Morals* (1785).

Gandhi's answer, unlike Kant's, wasn't a formula but a quest. I also think Gandhi's approach offers more hope, because it prompts us to try using all the resources that might be available, which Gandhi called experimenting, such as in *The Story of My Experiments with Truth* (1927, his autobiography). However, what resources might be available? Here Gandhi took issue with an idea that Western civilization now exemplifies, namely the idea that matter and spirit are separate. Gandhi didn't want India to follow the path that the West has been following since the 17th century, the path of 'de-mystifying' and 'desacralizing' the natural world, the path of objectifying the world and blinding ourselves to the immanence of the sacred. Gandhi presumably never read Kierkegaard but he came to the same conclusion, that truth is subjective. Even though Gandhi often capitalized Truth, what he meant was *his* truth, the truth that his own experiences and experiments led him to. His truth might not be someone else's truth. Erik Erikson deals with this in *Gandhi's Truth* (1969). Gandhi's version of conscience isn't framed as a formula because that might lead to someone else being condemned, someone who might be seeking truth just as sin-

cerely as himself.

So, no formula. What else is there? Example. The resources we need in order to be a useful example are available in the immanence of the sacred. How can we access them? By trying to help people, to serve them. Catholic moral teachings call this intention. Baptists are on the same track when they try to "live close" by giving service so that the Holy Spirit will then guide them. Somehow, disinterested service awakens our conscience and the still small voice grows louder. But even if one *isn't* trying to help others, the resources of sacred immanence are still there in everyone, waiting like a dormant seed—"that of God in every person," as the Quakers call the conscience.

Gandhi said he sometimes seemed to literally hear a voice telling him what to do in a given situation, but that's not most people's experience, although people don't necessarily talk about such experiences if they have them. Most of us have probably had the feeling, "I know what I have to do" at least a few times in our lives—and if our intention wasn't selfish, that feeling was probably right.

Further, the conscience is autonomous. It's not part of the id, superego, or anything else. You can ignore it but it won't ignore you. A lot of what Donald Carveth calls moral injury among ex-soldiers apparently results from coming under conviction (another Baptist phrase) by their conscience. A superego acquired from our parents or from boot camp doesn't exempt us from our conscience. Indeed, repressed guilt is still manifesting in clinical work as much as it ever did, says Carveth, and therefore psychoanalysts have been imprudent to drop Freud and Klein's clinical emphasis on guilt and "intrapsychic conflict" in favor of emphasizing "trauma, deprivation, abuse, and neglect by carers" (256). Carveth links this shift in psychoanalytic emphasis to a decline in our society of guilt *as a conscious experience*. He goes on to also link guilt's decline as a conscious experience to our society's economic transition into a "late capitalist consumer societ[y] promoting oral-narcissistic regression and instinctual release rather than repression" (255). As he further elaborates, "the psychoanalytic retreat from guilt and the superego in favor of a preoccupation with the 'self' was a consequence of the economic shift from productive industrial to consumer capitalism and the culture of narcissism it creates. This is a culture of release rather than restriction; a culture hostile to regulations and regulators." Furthermore, "a culture that tolerates, even en-

courages, the bending or evasion of rules; a de-moralizing culture hostile to moral critique and to whistleblowers; a culture hostile to conscience" (260).

I quote Carveth at length here because his examples sound like themes from the Republican presidential contenders. But before approaching that slippery political slope, I want to agree with Carveth that the American economy has helped cause all this by its growing dependence on consumerism. However, not just "late capitalism" is driving American consumerism, psychology is too. Americans are overconsuming partly because they feel economically vulnerable. Following World War II, with the help of new International Monetary Fund regulations, U.S. based multinational corporations acquired large holdings abroad, including large *proportions* of the resources and productive facilities of many Third World countries. As of 1946, the investment of U.S. corporations in their foreign subsidiaries stood at only $7.2 billion, but by 1975 it stood at $133 billion.

The corporations often turned their new foreign assets toward producing consumer goods to market in the U.S. and other developed countries. American workers then lost jobs, some good jobs, while American consumers, including those workers, acquired the cheap foreign products that began flooding U.S. markets. Meanwhile, in Third World countries whose resources and labor were being turned so heavily toward producing cheap exports, more and more rural revolutions began breaking out. Yet the world economy kept dividing countries and their people evermore between 'haves' and 'have-nots.' Swelling worldwide media consumption kept making that division harder for the 'have-nots' to ignore.

Now some terrorists from "have-not" places are intent on causing mayhem "in the belly of the beast" so to speak, meaning here. More and more of the people who Americans are viewing as "the Other" are viewing Americans as *their* Other. This doesn't bode well, especially since the Donald seeking the American presidency isn't Donald Carveth. Before carefully re-reading Carveth's 2013 article, I would have assumed Donald Trump's pronouncements came straight from his id, but maybe they're straight from his superego? Either way, U.S. democracy may find itself by November 2016 in peril, tottering on the brink of a slippery slope.

Meanwhile, some of us seem to take comfort that Donald

Trump isn't the *only* populist running for the presidency. If Trump is appealing to angry superegos, Bernie Sanders is surely appealing to troubled consciences. If Trump is exonerating 'haves' (or simply changing the subject), Sanders is stumping for America's 'have-nots,' who are proliferating. So maybe there's a chance Bernie Sanders could win the Democratic nomination and then the presidency?

But here I recall what happened when a late friend of mine, a street preacher, accosted George McGovern on a street in Huntington, West Virginia during McGovern's second presidential attempt in 1984. My friend asked McGovern if he thought anyone could gain the nomination of either major party, Democrat or Republican, without selling his soul. McGovern pondered the question thoughtfully and then answered "No."

Am I implying Bernie Sanders could only gain the 2016 Democratic Party nomination by selling his soul, i.e. violating his conscience? No, I'm implying Bernie Sanders *won't* receive the 2016 Democratic nomination. Hopefully Donald Trump won't receive the Republican Party nomination, but he might.

Some commentators reassure us that today's anti-immigrant xenophobia isn't our country's first. One erupted in the mid-1850s when the Know Nothings swept all before them for several years. Then during the 1900s came a Red Scare on the heels of each world war. Those episodes gradually blew over as most Americans came to realize they and their loved ones were *not* actually vulnerable to immigrants or communists. At issue back then were merely "foreign" ideologies (including Catholicism in the 1850s) along with jobs. Today, Americans aren't afraid Muslims might make millions of converts in the U.S. The kind of fear that's spreading now isn't ideological, it's physical—like the fear on the West Coast during World War II of Japanese Americans.

Today's media are magnifying it. Donald Trump's campaign is big news throughout the world, including in the Middle East and North Africa. Brian T. Edwards, who holds a chair in Middle East Studies at Northwestern University, writes: "I was in Fez [Morocco], lecturing to university students when the news broke that Donald Trump had called for an immediate halt to Muslims entering the U.S.… The exceptional reach and uncontrolled speed with which the worst of our cultural products spread means that the ideas by which America was attractive during the last century are

no longer reflective of the present one." He goes on to write, "to young Moroccans—whose country is 99 percent Muslim and long friendly to the U.S.—Trump's anti-Muslim comments were the latest sign that American culture has become increasingly hateful toward them. The global effects of speech such as Mr. Trump's are profound here and will be long-lasting."

Furthermore, Edwards recalls the reactions from his students and a fellow professor: "'I have a question,' one female student asked me. 'Why Islam? Why are Muslims considered the worst by Americans?' …Another student followed with a related point: 'Most people in the U.S. have guns. Here in Morocco we don't have guns. We are peaceful.' The students nodded and seemed distressed that they might be thought otherwise." A Moroccan history professor added, "'What's distressing is not so much the comments Trump is making, but the response he is getting.… It seems not to be so outrageous to Americans that he might say these things. The response is that it is extreme, but not outrageous.'"

While more and more Americans feel defensive and, yes, xenophobic, more and more of the people who those Americans see as 'the Other' are seeing Americans as *their* 'Other.' So it's hard to envision how a revival of moral conscience could occur in the U.S. Common sense says children and youth would have to be involved; however, American children and youth are kept busy preparing for standardized tests. If moral conscience is to revive in the U.S., children and youth may somehow have to revive it themselves, presumably rejecting standardized tests in the process. The challenge we're facing will test the parameters of our, and our children's, moral conscience. Over time, we humans have found ways to follow our consciences and still cooperate with each other as part of large groups. But in today's emerging global village, can those groups find ways to cooperate in doing good with the rest of the world's groups? If they can, surely they'll "hear" their conscience become louder and louder.

Paul Salstrom, PhD, *teaches history at St. Mary-of-the-Woods College near Terre Haute, Indiana. He's the author of Appalachia's Path to Dependency (1994, 1997) and may be contacted at PSalstrom@smwc.edu.* ❑

Tears of Rage: President Obama and the Emotional Legacy of Newtown

Ken Fuchsman—University of Connecticut

The epidemic of mass shootings weighs heavily politically and psychologically on President Obama. On January 5, 2016 in talking about guns, Obama argued that it is not only second amendment rights that are threatened. The right of free worship, he said, was denied to Christians in Charleston, and on other occasions to Jews, Muslims, and Sikhs. Moviegoers in Aurora and Lafayette were prevented from assembling peacefully. Obama adds that "Our unalienable right to life, and liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—those rights were stripped from college students in Blacksburg and Santa Barbara, and from high schoolers at Columbine, and from first-graders in Newtown." As he was talking about Newtown, it was evident that he was becoming emotional, and then he wiped away a tear and said, "Every time I think about those kids it gets me mad" ("Common-Sense Gun Safety Reform"; note that all citations in this article are from whitehouse.gov unless otherwise stated).

They might have been tears of rage, tears of sorrow, or both. It was clear that even after three years, the mass killings of first graders at Newtown is still powerful for our President. The day after Obama's eyes watered, one of the news services carried pictures of eight presidents crying in public. For six of the men, the tears flowed before or after they were president. Except for Obama, only Bill Clinton visibly cried in office, in 1994, in response to a man recounting his wife's death. Barack Obama's tears were self-generated; he was overcome while reading a prepared text.

This recent occurrence was not the first time the massacre at Newtown led to Obama crying. During his press announcement the day of the Newtown shootings on December 14, 2012, he wiped away a tear. Before the meeting with reporters, Obama e-mailed David Axelrod, "It's the first time I cried in the Oval Office" (James Warren, April 30, 2013, *New York Daily News*). A few weeks after the shootings, Obama said the day of the Sandy Hook killings was the "worst day of my presidency" (December 30, 2012, Meet the Press). The President recently said Newtown "continues to haunt me" (January 7, 2016, CNN).

The President is often called "no drama Obama," yet on a number of public occasions he has been emotional. For a man who prides himself on self-control, these emotional releases have an inner meaning. We can never be certain as to what the President's associations are, but we have some hints. We know how important having a stable family is to the President.

As a child, Obama says he had a "sense of abandonment" and felt "like an orphan" (*Dreams from My Father*, 430; Mendell, *Obama*, 19). His parents married when his mother discovered she was pregnant, but they never lived together. After infancy, Barack Jr. only saw his father once, at the age of ten. His mother often led a nomadic life, pursuing noble goals, but rarely finding financial stability, and sometimes living on the other side of the planet from her son.

The President writes that he never knew his father, and still wishes he had a dad who was present and engaged (June 15, 2013, "Celebrating Father's Day Weekend"). His mother, he says, was not "a well-organized person," and monetarily she was "always at the margins" (Janny Scott, *A Singular Woman*, 353-354).

Obama, as an adult, developed a counter identity and chose a path for himself that was the opposite of his parents. He chose to marry someone who is rooted in one locale because he had "a desire for stability that maybe I was missing" (Amanda Ripley, *Time*, 2008). Obama is proud to provide a stable environment for his children that he did not get from his mother. The President declares, "I try every day to be for Michelle and my girls what my father was not for my mother and me." He adds, "When I look back on my life…I'll be thinking about Sasha's dance recitals and Malia's tennis matches…. I'll be thinking about whether I did right by them." To Obama, there is no "more important job" that any man can have than "being a dad" ("Celebrating Father's Day Weekend"). Fulfilling this mission of providing for his children what he did not receive as a child is central for this President. A family disruption could remind him of the unsettledness he felt when his parents were not sufficiently parental. We can understand the deep meaning familial stability has for him.

The day of the Newtown tragedy, Obama told the nation that he responds as a parent and not as chief executive. He knew that every American parent feels "the same overwhelming grief that I do." That night, he said that he and Michelle "will do what I

know every parent in America will do, which is hug our children a little tighter and we'll tell them that we love them" (December 14, 2012, "Shootings in Newtown, Connecticut"). As a father, husband, and President, Barack Obama identifies with the Newtown parents and all of the parents in the country.

Just two days after the murders, the President spoke in Newtown about "the joy and anxiety of parenthood" and how from "their very first cry" our children become the "most precious, vital part of ourselves." Yet we cannot "shield our children" from "mishap or malice." Still, our responsibility is to assist them in being resilient and to rely on themselves. The job of keeping "our children safe and teaching them well is something we can only do together, with the help of friends and neighbors, the help of a community and the help of a nation" (December 16, 2012, "Prayer Vigil for Newtown Shooting Victims"). For Obama, parents and the nation working collaboratively is where the familial merges into the political. From his first appearance on the national stage in 2004 to the present, Obama has maintained a distinct political faith, believing that we are not divided by race or political allegiance, that we are all Americans who share common interests.

Obama entered the presidency hoping to replace partisanship with collaboration. In his first inaugural address, Obama said, "we come to proclaim an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations and worn-out dogmas that for far too long have strangled our politics" (*The Inaugural Address*, 2009, 5). A common cause, a patriotic unity, was what he wanted to restore. He saw himself then as the political leader who could bring us together politically. Yet Obama seemed ill prepared to deal with the increasing polarization in Washington, D.C. He is right when he says as parents raising children and as a nation we cannot achieve what is best without collaboration. But political consensus has not been evident much in recent years. Gridlock between Congressional Republicans and Obama has often prevailed. In 2016, he said, "It's one of the few regrets of my presidency -- that the rancor and suspicion between the parties has gotten worse instead of better. I have no doubt a president with the gifts of Lincoln or Roosevelt might have better bridged the divide" (January 12, 2016, "State of the Union Address"). Newtown brings the threads of his personal and professional lives together. Family love and devotion have been redeeming aspects of Obama's life. He knows how much

this means for those who have it, and what tribulations there are for those who do not.

When the Newtown tragedy struck, Obama remarked that this was the fourth mass killing during his Presidency. Following San Bernardino, the count was up to 17. After the slaughter of first graders, he was worried that some may see "such violence visited on our children year after year after year is somehow the price of our freedom" ("Prayer Vigil"). Obama's rage continues as mass murders occur over and over again while no federal gun legislation is on the horizon.

Obama has moved from feeling abandoned and orphaned as a child to the joy and anxiety of finding that our children can be the most vital part of our lives. When he looks back on his life, Obama says he will not be thinking about legislation or policy, but about Michelle and their girls. He declares that personal success is less shining if "we fail at family" ("Celebrating Father's Day Weekend"). He says, "I am very proud of what I've done as president, but the only job that's more important to me is the job of father" (January, 20, 2016, in "Flint Water Crisis," ABC News). Passing legislation to protect families from deadly violence is central to him as parent and as the nation's father figure. To accomplish this, Obama would have needed a substantial Democratic majority or somehow overcome the extensive partisanship in Washington. There is now a larger Republican majority in Congress than at any time since before the Great Depression. On Obama's watch, the Democrats have gone from controlling both Houses of Congress to being a minority. The President has not convinced Congressional voters to side with his party, nor has he been eager to engage in establishing the political relationships necessary to overcoming partisan divides. Reporter Chuck Todd calls Obama "the stranger" because of his lack of interest in communicating with members of Congress. Jonathan Alter says that Obama "preferred spending his evenings having dinner with his family…to chatting with a bunch of politicians he barely knew" (Alter, *The Center Holds*, 2013, 1).

Obama has had difficulty balancing his devotion to his family with the extensive political duties of his office. For him, the well-being of children and a nation of parents working collaboratively are entwined. Yet polarization and suspicion are greater now than before he became President. Obama regrets that his political skills are not equal to some other presidents and recognizes

that this has contributed to the increase of political rancor. A Commander in Chief with greater gifts, he says, may have bridged these political divides. The implication is that someone else may have brought the nation and parents together better than he has done. If so, this may even have resulted in successful collaboration, including gun legislation protecting youngsters and the rest of us. His regrets about his political skills and the continued vulnerability of children to gun violence gives us a clue as to why this self-questioner, this devoted parent, continues to be angry and haunted by the Newtown tragedy.

Ken Fuchsman, EdD, *is a professor at the University of Connecticut, where he has taught and served as an administrator for many years, and is on the Editorial Boards of* Clio's Psyche *and the Journal of Psychohistory. He has published a number of articles on President Obama's life and career, and also writes on trauma, the Oedipus complex, and the nature of being human. He can be reached at kfuchsman@gmail.com.* ❑

Fantasy Politics and an Imaginary Analysis of Hillary Clinton

Paul H. Elovitz—Psychohistory Forum

While browsing through my suburban public library, my eyes caught the title *Hillary Rodham Clinton: On the Couch*. How nice, I thought, that I could read a psychobiography of a woman I had been following closely since 1992, written a few small articles on, and who just might become our next president. The author, Alma H. Bond, PhD, is described on the cover as a "psychoanalyst and psychobiographer." The publishing house is Bancroft Press, and the book was published in 2015.

My excitement soon turned to frustration as I discovered the book is written in the form of a series of sessions that the doctor has with Hillary, extending from August 19, 2013 to May 9, 2014. Clearly, Hillary was never on the couch of Alma Bond, who was described as having been born in February 1922, and received her PhD in developmental psychology from Columbia University, and then graduated from the post-doctoral program in psychoanalysis at the Freudian Society. The flyleaf of the volume quickly instructed me that this 94-year-old woman is also the author or co-author of

books putting Marilyn Monroe and Jackie Onassis on the couch. The 29 books in her bibliography implied some thorough study, however her particular thanks to Wikipedia was not reassuring. The reports on the fantasy 50 minute sessions with Hillary were usually summarized in a couple of pages.

Clearly, Hillary Rodham Clinton is a subject of popular fantasies. Through the years I have found that this daughter of a suburban Chicago conservative Republican businessman has been projected upon to an amazing degree. She is despised and demeaned or loved and respected by Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. For many she can do no good, for others she is a martyr to political skullduggery.

Alma Bond depicts Hillary and her relationship with Bill as the popular fantasy that Bill is a hopeless womanizer and Hillary a long suffering wife. When the reality is that when Bill wooed Hillary after she failed the Washington, DC bar exam (Carl Bernstein, *A Woman in Charge*, 2008, 92), and followed her boyfriend to Little Rock, Arkansas, the couples' friends weren't sure who would run for office first, but Hillary's feminism and Yankee accent were definite negatives. After they married, Hillary settled into becoming the primary breadwinner as Bill gambled on political success. Until Hillary entered the White House as First Lady, she made more money than Bill. As Chief Executive of Arkansas, the most Bill earned was $75,000 while Hillary brought in $115,000 as partner in a law firm. There are various reports of her shouting loudly at Bill for his unfaithfulness during his governorship. Reading prosecutor Ken Starr's voyeuristic report presenting evidence of President Clinton having 11 instances of what I call "high school sex" involving fellatio, cunnilingus, and telephone sex (whatever that is!) with Monica Lewinsky, but he presented no evidence that the affair was consummated with vaginal sex. It is my impression that Bill believed what others saw as a lie, that he had not had sex with "that woman" (Lewinski) because he did not consider what they did as sex. As his mother said back in 1992, she and her son always had a tendency to simply forget inconvenient facts—in her case that she once divorced her second husband Roger Clinton, who she later remarried. For the sake of their daughter and their common passion to change society through politics, Hillary suffered through the humiliating impeachment proceedings, just as she had suffered at the hands of her father while growing up.

While *Hillary Rodham Clinton: On the Couch* is based far

more on fantasy rather than reality, I can recommend it as a source of amusement if you don't know much about the reality of the Clintons. The book also brings the issue of political process in our era of celebrity and fantasy politics. On a day-to-day basis the actual process of governing is ignored except when the Republicans denounce almost everything Obama does or doesn't do and Clinton wraps herself in his legacy while campaigning among his adherents, especially if they are African Americans. Fantasy abounds in the early part of the 2016 presidential election contest, especially among the Republicans. Donald Trump maintains the fantasies that Obama was not born as an American citizen, that the politicians in Washington are "stupid," that he can build a beautiful wall between the United States and Mexico which the Mexicans will pay for, and that his comments are really not misogynistic, personally abusive, or racist. Articulate, bright, and well-educated 44-and 45-year-old first-term senators like Ted Cruz and Marco Rubio think the country needs them despite the disadvantages of having an inexperienced young senator as president, as we have observed in the last seven years. Yet millions of voters show a preference for those with little experience since those who have considerable experience are subject to constant attacks for what they have and have not done.

We live in an era of celebrity culture in which appearance becomes increasingly more important than reality. Thus among the Republican presidential contenders, would-be nominees who have a real track record of governance such as Bush, Christie, Kasich, and Pataki struggled to gain traction, mostly in vain with some having already dropped out of the contest, while Carson, Cruz, Rubio, and Trump have at various times gathered far more screen time, general media attention, and been proclaimed as the front runner. This is in part because there is decreasing attention to the reality of political accomplishments and attributes of the candidates and increasing focus on who is in the limelight. In the celebrity limelight, reality doesn't seem to make much difference, but rather who's up and who's down. The media also plays a game of choosing a potential nominee to intensely focus on, usually pointing out all sorts of positives about them. I call this the honeymoon "getting-to-know-you" period, which I have observed with Carson, Cruz, Rubio, Sanders, and Trump in this electoral cycle. The media then proclaims that Trump is the front-runner and is being challenged by Carson, Cruz, or Rubio. Sometimes these proclamations become self-fulfilling prophesies if the individuals capture the imagination of others. In

most cases it appears to increasingly become a disadvantage to have a proven record of accomplishments and failures.

The debate subjects focused on by the Republican contenders have had very little to do with the governance of our country which perhaps is not surprising since their emphasis has been running against Washington rather than actually governing America. As the party out of power, they have had the luxury of less responsibility for the actual governing and coming up with well thought out policies. This tendency has been exaggerated by the congressional leader's decision on the night of the President's inauguration to obstruct rather than cooperate for the good of the country. For it has been so much easier for GOP leaders to pass 62 resolutions condemning the Affordable Care Act (their dreaded Obamacare) than to provide a practical and reasonable alternative despite there being promises to do just that by Congressional leaders like Paul Ryan.

Governing is complex and boring, but horse races are fun. The political horse race draws in voters who, like fans of the racetrack, become excited by the process and seek to choose a winner. The important thing is not who can effectively govern, but who looks and sounds like a winner. Donald Trump thinks he has what it takes to make "crippled America" great again (as best I remember, we're still the "greatest" power in the world) and promises to transform the country.

Bernie Sanders and Hillary Clinton actually debate some real policies in their contest to represent the Democrats in the fall election. The democratic socialist senator from Vermont has an advantage over the more experienced former first lady of Arkansas and the USA, New York senator, and Secretary of State: He has a simple message of leveling the economic and political playing field that inspires many young people, while she speaks in the specifics of making things happen in politics. The reality of politics is that you get elected in poetry, but govern in prose.

Dr. Bond ends her fantasy psychoanalysis of Hillary with a warm hug and a dream that Clinton's image would be on Mount Rushmore as she would "be among the greatest presidents our country has ever known" (282). The reality of this 2016 presidential race at moments seems almost as fanciful.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, *is a presidential psychobiographer and the editor of this journal.*❑

Medieval People and Anti-Semitism

Two Medieval Lives: Hildegard of Bingen and William Marshal

Eva D. Papiasvili and Linda A. Mayers—
Psychoanalysts in Private Practice

Introduction

While writing a chapter on the Middle Ages in *Abnormal Psychology Across the Ages* (Thomas G. Plante, ed., 2013), we became interested in the lives of anchorites and knights, unique to this era, with special interest in the "why" of individual successes and failures. The Middle Ages, extending from 476 to 1492 CE, was an era of traumas of epic proportions. Yet, it left numerous lasting legacies, marking the people who lived and thrived through them for their resilience and creativity. Applying psychoanalytic concepts, such as regression in the service of the ego, we argue that in confronting the issues of growing up in what seems to us an irrational era, they creatively relied on the beliefs of their age. Rising from obscurity to prominence, Hildegard of Bingen and William Marshall exemplify such multidimensional "transcendental" processes.

Transcendence was defined in the Middle Ages as self-consciousness outside of the material world. Augustine's adaptation model to the trauma of the Middle Ages prompted regression into helplessness, but also proposed the tools to transcend this helplessness by using identification with the omnipotent transcendental figure, such as St. Augustine. Among the markers of "transcendental adaptation" was "holiness," bestowed on certain individuals and groups. Many anchorites and some knights held recognized holiness status by engaging in the study and defense of God. The lifestyle of anchorite (defined as one who retires from the world for religious reasons) women included seclusion in the proximity of a church, serious study, and prayer. The symbolic expression of a knight fighting the evil forces was that of St. George slaying the Dragon.

The posttraumatic fluidity of the boundary between reality and fantasy was evidenced by abundant reports of visions, described as two dimensional translucent images—such as the stained glass windows in Gothic Cathedrals—always recognized as apart

from physical reality. Visions could be viewed as a specific manifestation of transcendence, whereby under traumatic conditions, the ego privileges primary process in the area of perception. This involves the partial deactivation of the reality focused perceptual system, resulting in a partial withdrawal from a threatening reality and a partial regression to an earlier narcissistic state, analogous to the withdrawal of an artist who withdraws partially in order to create.

Written and spoken speech was rich with metaphors and condensed symbolism. The internal and transcendental worlds were viewed as transformatively connected. A 5th century example is Augustine's *Confessions*, describing "the inner transformation of soul catastrophe into soul salvation" (Thomas F. Graham, *Medieval Minds: Mental Health in the Middle Ages*, 1967, 27). Dante's *Divine Comedy* offers a 14th century example, describing a soul-healing journey through a hierarchical internal world, projected into the transcendental dimension. Translating the Inferno as the seat of the id's sexual and aggressive drives, Purgatory as the seat of the ego's insight and the working through of one's problems, and Paradise as the superego's moral and ideal superstructure, *The Divine Comedy* parallels Freudian psychoanalysis of the 20th century.

Boarding apprenticeships for future anchorites and knights started from age seven. Boy knights boarded in the castles of lords, who ran knight training programs. They started out as "pages," in service of the lady of the castle's household; from age 14, they served the castle's lord as "squires," while training the young pages in arms. The knight's schooling involved religious, military, and chivalrous aspects. The Church, in charge of the religious curriculum, molded the boys' outlets for erotic and aggressive strivings as well as moral aspirations, including sanctioning knights' aggression in defense of God and tolerating the splitting in their attitudes towards women. These beliefs indicated that the "lady fair" was to be worshiped, an idealized image of virginal purity, while other women were devalued as whores.

Although not so common for girls, the boarding religious education for anchorites was institutionalized when the youngest girl of a continental European family was placed in the care of an adult anchorite teacher. At around 12, the girls would undergo the anchorite induction burial ritual through which the anchorite became "dead to the world," re-born as a child of the Church, and "enclosed" in the anchorage. The anchorage was built as an attached enclosure, with a window on one side connecting to the

church, and the other opening connecting to the public world. The architectural structure of the anchorage could be viewed as a symbol of symbiotic attachment to the body of the "mother-church."

The transitional families (the lord and lady of the training castle for the knights and the reverend father and mother for the anchorites) were a developmental provision unique to this era. Positioned in between the transferential and the transcendental, they offered connection to both worlds.

A Medieval Humanist

Hildegard of Bingen (1098–1179) trained as an anchorite and later became a Benedictine abbess, writer, composer, philosopher, poet, rhetorician, and polymath. Hildegard's oeuvre includes three volumes of visionary theology, two volumes on natural medicine, 69 musical compositions, the first recorded musical morality play, volumes of poetry, and sermons she preached in the 1160s (Hugh Feiss, *The Life of the Saintly Hildegard*, 1999).

Hildegard was born in Germany to a family of the minor nobility. Sickly and the youngest of ten, at eight years old, Hildegard was placed in the care of Jutta, a magistra of the Benedictine Order. The two were enclosed in an anchorage together six years later. They prayed, meditated, read and discussed scriptures, worked in the garden, tended to the sick, and did handiwork. The monk Volmar instructed Hildegard in music, advanced Latin, philosophy, and theology.

Upon Jutta's death, Hildegard was elected leading magistra by her fellow nuns. Wanting more independence, she asked the Abbot for permission to establish her own convent. When the permission was declined, Hildegard became ill, an event that she attributed to God's unhappiness. Only then did the Abbott grant Hildegard her own convent, where Volmar served as provost, confessor, scribe, and editor. Fifteen years later, Hildegard founded a second convent. Both of Hildegard's convents were "unconventional" in that the nuns wore attractive dresses and jewelry, engaged in philosophical discussions, music, poetry, and theatre performances. God given beauty of body and soul was to be enjoyed, Hildegard asserted.

Hildegard reported her first visions, calling them "The Shades of the Living Light," at three years old, while in the meadows with her nurse. Throughout her life, she continued to have visions, and at the age of 42, following God's instruction, she record-

ed them, conflicted about this to the point of physical illness. She described vividly how she received the visions, with her eyes and ears, of the "inner person," first refusing to write them down; only when she became ill did she start writing. A pattern of somatization in response to conflict becomes identifiable.

Hildegard wrote three volumes of visionary theology, where she describes each enigmatic vision, and interprets the content in the *Voice of the Living Light* (Barbara Newman, 1998). Analogically to Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1899), Hildegard's *Interpretation of Visions* becomes a transformative journey, in which Hildegard's case is projected into the transcendental, transsubjective dimension.

Know the Ways is structured into three parts, giving a glimpse into Hildegard's personal transformation: Creation, Redemption, and Salvation. In *Book of Life's Merits*, Hildegard highlighted the confrontations between the virtues and the vices—a medieval exposition of inner conflict. The book also contains one of the earliest descriptions of Purgatory as the place where each soul works off its debts—a medieval version of the ego at work. Hildegard's "medieval psychoanalysis" predates Dante's by 150 years.

Her *Book of Divine Works* had its genesis in her vision of the "sprinkling drops of sweet rain—the *words*." The visions here culminate in "the Universal Man," linking the internal and the transcendental. Focusing on the *word* is an important psychological phenomenon. As is the case with medieval prophets, the *words*, energized by affective and sensual dimensions, transform the listener. In the case of Hildegard, the *words* also reflect her internal transformation toward an acceptance of desire and the softening of self-punitive tendencies. This movement to open-mindedness, originality and creativity, marks the transition from the discontinuity of psychosomatic dissociation toward a multi-perspectival triadic Oedipal and post-oedipal inner coherence and repair of symbolizing function.

In *Physica*, Hildegard provides the first recorded description in European history of the female orgasm: "When a woman is making love with a man, a sense of heat in her brain, which brings with it sensual delight, communicates the taste of that delight during the act" (Newman, 1998, 242). The *Ordo Virtutum*, the first recorded musical morality play, and 69 musical compositions called *Sym-*

phonia, make Hildegard one of the most prolific Medieval composers. Scholars have asserted that Hildegard's compositions reflect the anatomy of female desire, giving expression to the concept of *viriditas* (greenness)—an earthly expression of the transcendental overcoming of dualism. The reverence for the Virgin Mary is reflected in all of her music and poetry. Hildegard's Virgin Mary, a Medieval predecessor of the psychoanalytic working alliance, may be a condensed transcendental figure, superimposed on her nurses as the object of her early attachment, whose accepting presence is now permanently internalized (Scott C. Schwartz, "Medieval Antecedents of the Therapeutic Alliance," *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 27, 1999, 282).

An acclaimed public rhetorician, Hildegard transcended bans on women's public rhetoric and interpretation of scripture. In the 1160's, she conducted preaching tours throughout Germany, calling for reform. Hildegard's internalization of the transcendental relationship with God/ego ideal evolved into a position of inner security, transcending the constraints of ecclesiastic authorities, as well as her own.

The Guarantor of the Magna Carta

William Marshal (1146-1219) became one of the most influential statesmen of Medieval England. A fourth son of minor nobility, he rose to positions of preeminence under King Henry II, King Richard I and King John, becoming the Governor and the Regent of England, and a guarantor of the Magna Carta.

In 1152, when William was five years old, King Stephen and his army besieged a castle William's father John Marshal was holding for the opposing party. A truce was agreed whereby William's father would surrender the castle. William was given as a hostage, to assure the surrender. Instead of surrendering, John refortified the castle. When King Stephen threatened to catapult little William over the castle walls, John replied: "I still have the hammer and the anvil with which to forge still more and better sons!" (David Crouch, *History of William Marshal*, 2007, 304). Fortunately for William, King Stephen couldn't bring himself to kill him. According to the chronicles, it was five year old William's extraordinary ability to engage King Stephen on a personal level that assured his survival, when he demanded that the king explain the "flight of catapult," which would be "watched over by our Lord in Heaven, who watches everything I do, so my nurse told me" (Crouch, 2007, 305). William stayed at King Steven's court

for the whole remaining year of the war, as the king's protégé and the darling of the courtiers.

At the age of 11, William was sent to the household of his maternal uncle to train as a knight. When he was 22, William accompanied his uncle on a mission for Eleanor of Aquitaine. Ambushed, William's uncle was killed, and William was gravely injured. Again, "the kind enemy secretly provided him with clean bandages to prevent infection and saved him. Eleanor paid William's ransom and engaged him as the tutor of her son, the Young King. Later, William supported the Young King against his father, the reigning King Henry II. Dying of dysentery 13 years later, the Young King asked William to take his cloak to Jerusalem. It was during this pilgrimage that William became a Knight Templar, and held recognized holiness status. Defying the Knight Templar restriction to marry, he fell in love, got married and had ten children.

When, upon William's return, Henry II's sons, Richard and Geoffrey, rebelled against their father, he accompanied Henry II to fight the revolt. On one occasion, William became the only man ever to knock Richard off his horse, which ended the rebellion. Pursuant to his coronation, Richard I, the Lionheart, appointed William as one of six Regents to govern the kingdom, while he fought in the Crusades. In Richard's absence, William stood on the side of the Barons who defended Richard's interests against John. When King John took the throne, William represented the King at the signing of the Magna Carta, the only one trusted by both sides. Upon his death in 1216, King John named William as the Regent-Protector of his nine year old son, King Henry III. As the Regent of England, William reissued the Magna Carta twice.

At age 71, William led the knights to victory in the Battle of Lincoln, ending the attempt by French Prince Louis to claim the throne of England. He then negotiated peace, affirming the map of Western Europe for centuries to come. In 1219 William died following a period of failing health and was buried in Temple Church, London.

From the records during his life and deathbed statement of "beating death by the grace of God and kind enemy princes since my childhood," it is apparent that the experience of being betrayed by his father at five, but saved by the "enemy prince," marked William for life. The early attachment to his nurse, who regarded him as worthy of being protectively "watched over," possibly overrode

betrayal and rejection by his father, and fueled fantasies of a special link to the omnipotent "Lord and Savior." This identification as the special son of the omnipotent Lord may be behind his enlisting in the Knight Templar order. Trusted by all sides at the historical signing of the Magna Carta, in William's world, the enemy was not a feared or hated villain, but an opponent to be won over.

His father's betrayal is a dynamically complex matter, potentially giving rise to the underlying ambivalence towards "earthly fathers," and attachment to a transcendental "Father-protector." Unhorsing Richard rather than killing him reflects empathy for sons rebelling against their fathers. When accused by Richard: "You wanted to kill me," William replied, "My lord, if I wanted to kill you, you would be dead" (Crouch, 2007, 315).

Compared to Hildegard, William is not a "visionary" in any obvious way, but his "vision of the world" as a place where enemies are opponents to be won over or to be "unhorsed rather than killed," comes through in his actions. In this sense, he predates an enlightened statesman and diplomat-realist of the modern era who sees the world from multiple perspectives. In analytical parlance, this amounts to the shift from the pre-oedipal schizoid-paranoid duality of good and evil, progressing into Oedipal and post-oedipal intra-psychic and interpersonal multi-perspectival negotiations.

The most successful personalities of the Middle Ages transcend their trauma by transforming passive suffering into active, creative adjustments. They do not stop at the level of identification with the aggressor, as those who "failed" may have. It is likely, however, that in both "successful" individuals as well as those who "failed," the underlying attitude is one of ambivalence, due to internalized discontinuities of early parental care. The prototypical "nurse" may have functioned both as a crucial primary archaic savior, as well as a transitional/reparative figure of attachment and separation-individuation. The nurse was projected into the transcendental dimension, thus countering the abandonment, betrayal, and existential threats of the earthly world. She provided narcissistic refueling, containment, hope, and the ability to find and create a "better breast/world," ultimately projected into the timeless transcendental dimension that was employed as a protective, internally stabilizing shield.

Eva D. Papiasvili, PhD, ABPP, *is Supervising Faculty in the Doctoral program of Clinical Psychology, Columbia University*

and Founding Chair of Psychoanalysis, Art and Creativity. She is Co-Chair for North America of the International Psychoanalytic Association's Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychoanalysis. ***Linda A. Mayers, PhD,*** *is Faculty, Senior Supervisor, and Past President of the Professional Board of the Postgraduate Center for Mental Health and Training and Supervising Analyst at the Institute of the Postgraduate Psychoanalytic Society. Dr. Mayers is an adjunct associate professor at CUNY. They may be contacted at eva.papiasvili@gmail.com and lamayers1@msn.com.* ❑

A Window on Hatred and Persecution: Anti-Jewish Images in Medieval Europe

Christina Stern—SUNY Rockland

In 1987, while on a trip to Brussels, I ventured into the city's major cathedral, jointly named for two Catholic figures, St. Michael and St. Gudula. Brussels is a lively city that is known for its modern as well as medieval features. It houses the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Commission, while attracting travelers with its picturesque Town Hall and other historic landmarks. As I meandered through the church's Gothic interiors, I noticed a small table that held a stack of flyers. The text of the flyers directed the visitor's eyes to a particular stained glass window and told the history of the window.

The details of the event are not fully clear, but it appears that some Christians in the late 1300s alleged that local Jews desecrated the Eucharistic Host—the wafer that represents (and, according to Catholic doctrine, is in actuality) the body of Jesus. The window shows an image of several Jewish men surrounding and stabbing the wafers. The Jewish figures are portrayed in demeaning and stereotypical terms with menacing facial expressions and exaggerated noses. Several of the men wield daggers, and the wafers were reported to have shed blood when stabbed. (The image and its history may be found on cathedral's website at: www.cathedralisbruxellensis.be/en/history). At least six and possibly as many as 20 Jews in Brussels and neighboring Leuven were burned alive in 1370 as punishment for this alleged act of host desecration.

My experience that day in the cathedral played a formative

role in my decision to study the history of power, prejudice, and persecution. I was surprised to learn that anyone, even in the pre-modern context of the Middle Ages, could possibly believe such an outlandish charge against Jews. Second, I was shocked that a visual marker, which in effect commemorates the brutal murder of Jews, would actually be located *within* the walls of a church.

It turns out, as I soon learned, that many scholars in recent decades have asked similar questions about the history of anti-Jewish attitudes in the medieval era and the manifestation of those prejudices in visual forms. Indeed, contemporary scholarship on the topic is vast, and interested readers may wish to explore more fully the works of the writers noted in this essay.

Cathedrals, Castles, and Christian Identity: Surveying the Medieval World

In order to examine the scholarship, it may be helpful to highlight a few points about historians' understanding of the Middle Ages. Historians typically date Europe's Middle Ages from approximately 500 CE to 1500 CE. After the fall of the Roman Empire in 476 CE, Europe experienced a number of momentous upheavals. Religious change was dramatic. As Christianity spread across the continent and British Isles, Christian beliefs became woven into politics, culture, and daily life, and the European landscape gradually filled with churches.

Castles were another defining feature. Local leaders (including various lords, counts, dukes, princes, and kings) were eager to consolidate their political power, and they constructed castles for the purpose of defense and as symbols of their power. As the medieval centuries progressed, many of these local leaders not only converted to Christianity, but also came to view themselves as ardent defenders of it.

For many medieval people, Christianity offered a message of hope as well as a sense of belonging. However, there was a downside to this sense of Christian community. The creation of an in-group (a majority in-group based largely on religious identity) correlated with the creation of out-groups and marginalized peoples. Secular and ecclesiastic leaders exploited and accelerated this process.

Power, Prejudice, Persecution: "Polluting" Groups as Threats to Social Order

Over the past half century, historians have explored in-depth

the issue of medieval persecution and have attempted to analyze its various ideological, administrative, and iconographic underpinnings. Some prominent historians on this topic include Edward Peters, David Nirenberg, and Sara Lipton among many others. One influential work is Robert Ian Moore's *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (1986). Moore theorized that the medieval persecution of Jews, lepers, and prostitutes accompanied the process whereby various rulers expanded, consolidated, and centralized their power. In addition, Moore drew on the work of anthropologist Mary Douglas, author of *Purity and Danger* (1966), to posit that European authorities—from church leaders to princes and kings—harnessed and manipulated notions of purity and pollution to portray targeted groups as moral and even physical threats to the social order. To support this argument, Moore surveyed a range of historical documents to note that the language of pollution was applied in the 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries to groups that were singled out for the purposes of ostracism and punishment.

In addition to portraying targeted groups as dangerous and "polluting," some medieval leaders also promoted the notion of Jews as the enemies of both Jesus and of the entire living Christian community. Historians have also examined the development of anti-Jewish attitudes in relation to Christian anxieties about core tenets of the faith, especially those doctrines that centered on the meaning of the body of Jesus.

The Crusades (1096–1291) functioned additionally as a watershed moment. On the way to Jerusalem, some crusading Christian groups brutally attacked Jewish communities in the Rhineland and elsewhere. Many historians have noted that the Pope's rhetoric in his 1095 CE call to crusades was significant. The texts of Pope Urban II's speeches present a stunning case study of how to create the Other (the Muslims in this case) in order to persuade a population to go to war. Upon capturing Jerusalem, it should be noted that Jews, along with Muslims, were slaughtered.

However, there are some scholars today who underscore the positive day-to-day interactions of medieval Jews and Christians. In *Living Together, Living Apart: Rethinking Jewish-Christian Relations in the Middle Ages* (2007), Jonathan Elukin argues that Christians and Jews largely co-existed and interacted peacefully for most of the Middle Ages, despite the proliferation of anti-Jewish legislation, images, and religious doctrines.

Anti-Jewish Themes and Imagery: Lipton's Observations

In recent decades, a number of scholars have examined the history of anti-Jewish iconography. In *Dark Mirror: The Medieval Origins of Anti-Jewish Iconography* (2014), historian Sara Lipton notes that Jewish figures, such as the Hebrew prophets, became recognizable *as Jews* in European Christian art in the 11th century onwards. Some Christian artists, including manuscript illustrators, began to use an image of a "pointed hat" to signify Jewish males. Over the course of subsequent centuries, various Christian artists employed a variety of additional visual markers to identify particular figures as specifically Jewish and to convey negative messages. The repertoire of anti-Jewish iconography was extensive and included, for example, the following: images of devilish figures consorting with Jews (thus identified by pointy hats), drawings of Jews clasping purses, and illustrations of Jewish figures tormenting Jesus on the cross or stabbing the Eucharistic host. Although Lipton argues at one point that she believes that medieval Christian clerics and artists did not consciously aim to "create an anti-Jewish visual repertoire," an argument that some scholars would dispute, she also acknowledges that this iconography had significant implications in the Middle Ages and early modern eras to stereotype Jews and portray them as enemies of Christian society.

Images as Teaching Tools and as Instruments of Insult

In medieval Europe, images served as a main teaching source. Literacy was the province of a tiny, educated group of elites, and books were relatively rare and expensive items in those centuries before the advent of the printing press (mid-1400s). Thus, the paintings, sculptures, and stained glass windows of Europe's churches played an important role to impart myriad religious and cultural messages.

For instance, one prevalent anti-Jewish theme is that of the allegorical *Ecclesia and Synagoga* ("Church and Synagogue"). In this genre of images, Ecclesia is depicted as a regal woman, while a juxtaposed Synagoga is depicted as blindfolded and as, riding on a donkey, a symbol of stupidity, or touching a goat, a symbol of the devil. In one particularly insulting stained glass window that dates from the 1400s and is located in St. John's Church in Werben, Germany, the hand of God seems to descend from the skies to pat the crowned head of Ecclesia while plunging a dagger into Synagoga. The maker of this window clearly aimed to send a triumphalist message about Christianity and, in so doing, equated Judaism with

falsehood, defeat, and shame.

Some medieval European churches also contain, either within or outside on the exterior walls, drawings or sculptures of medieval Judensau imagery, wherein Jewish figures, sometimes depicted with pointy hats, are shown as engaged in obscene acts with pigs or pig-like creatures. Such images not only mocked Jewish kosher laws but also relied on viewers' feelings of disgust to generate antipathy. Although many churches have removed these images in recent decades, Judensau imagery can still be found in some Christian sites. (The theme was used by anti-Semites and Nazi leaders well into the 20th century.)

The same is true of illustrations depicting alleged blood libel and host desecrations. (Blood libel, a fantasy/allegation which held that Jews kidnapped and murdered gentile children, pivoted on a set of themes analogous to the host desecration fantasy.) Artworks featuring this theme were common in manuscripts and in some churches. Even the celebrated Italian Renaissance artist Paolo Uccello devoted several canvases to this topic in his set of paintings titled the *Miracle of the Profaned Host* (1467-68). One of these paintings shows a host teeming with bright red blood from the wounds inflicted on it. Depictions of host desecrations were and are particularly problematic for several reasons. One, they gave visual form to, and thereby seemed to substantiate, stories that were pure delusional fantasy. Two, by accusing Jews of such acts, Christian leaders could scapegoat them in times of crisis or achieve other strategic political objectives at the expense—and often the very lives—of those in the Jewish communities. Many incidents involving allegations of host desecration and blood libel led to the torture and execution of innocent Jews in the medieval and early modern eras, including cases where Christian authorities ordered Jews to be killed by fire.

The images themselves, whether painted before or after the execution of the accused Jewish individuals, were pernicious and exerted long-term cultural influence. Such images typically showed Jewish males (women were not generally included in such imagery) as cruel, fearsome, and enemies of Christian society. In times of political or social crisis, medieval elites could draw on such a repository of hateful associations to scapegoat and persecute the local Jewish communities for any number of social problems.

The window in the cathedral is a reminder of the ugly and

pervasive history of Christian anti-Semitism in the Western world. Since the Second Vatican Council (1962-65), particularly since the 1965 decree titled *Nostra Aetate* ("In Our Time"), the Catholic Church has done a doctrinal "about-face" to emphasize the fundamental connections between Jews and Christians. *Nostra Aetate* formally repudiated the charge of deicide and condemned acts of anti-Semitism and other forms of religious hatred. Under the current pope, Francis, the church's Commission for Religious Relations with Jews reaffirmed the framework of *Nostra Aetate*.

Yet the vestiges of the past still linger in parts of the European landscape. The visual evidence found in some medieval manuscripts and churches attests to a disturbing cultural dynamic that endured for centuries, leading to policies highly detrimental to Jewish communities. The stained glass window serves as a jolting reminder of this history. It is also a starting point for peering into the past and grappling with the tragic legacy of medieval prejudice and persecution.

Christina Stern, PhD, *is a professor in the History Department at SUNY Rockland. Her research interests include medieval European history, women, and Catholicism ,as well as the history of Jewish and Christian relationships in the West. She can be reached at cstern@sunyrockland.edu.* ❑

Spielberg, the Man and His Films

Abstract: How Spielberg's childhood influenced the male role models in his films, including *Schindler's List*, *Jaws*, *Indiana Jones*, *Bridge of Spies*, *Lincoln*. *Saving Private Ryan,* and *Munich*.

Steven Spielberg: The Quest to be a Moral Male

Ken Fuchsman—University of Connecticut

Steven Spielberg is a phenomenon. He is the only director with five movies on the American Film Institute's list of 100 best motion pictures and he has directed two of the most highly attended films of all time. His movies are the highest grossing of any director in the history of cinema. Not surprisingly, Spielberg is the third richest individual in Hollywood, and ranks 164th on the Forbes list

of 400 wealthiest Americans. Of the 29 films he has directed, ten of them have historical subject matters. His astounding creativity, popularity, and concern with the past make him a good candidate for psychohistorical examination. Understanding Spielberg's trajectory entails how he emerged from a certain family milieu, and with specific psychological issues. As he says, "Hardly a single one of my films isn't based on something that happened in my childhood" (Schickel, *Steven Spielberg*, 2012, 1).

Steven was born on December 18, 1946 in Cincinnati, Ohio the eldest child of Arnold Spielberg and Leah Posner Spielberg, an Orthodox Jewish couple. Three of Steven's grandparents were part of the great immigration wave before World War I. Arnold's life mirrored the recent phenomenon in American life. As with so many Depression-era young men, he was in the Army during World War II. Again, like so many of his generation, the GI Bill financed his bachelor's degree. Arnold's was in electrical engineering. Once his career started, instead of being rooted in one place, the workaholic moved his family for work reasons. First he worked in his hometown of Cincinnati, and later in New Jersey, Arizona, and California.

All this time, Arnold was making a number of advances in the computer field. Still, living in different places with an often absent father did not sit well with Steven. He says that after finally getting friends and being acclimated, the family would move; "This happened to me four major times in my life. And the older I got the harder it got. *E.T.* reflects a lot of that" (McBride, *Steven Spielberg*, 2010, 47).

The moves unsettled Steven's mother. Leah had been a talented classical pianist, but gave up her studies, if not piano playing, when she became a full-time mother, eventually having four children. In Phoenix, she felt out of place. Arnold's workaholic tendencies meant she bore most of the child care responsibilities. In their bedroom in Arizona, Arnold and Leah would argue most nights. The children could hear them. Somewhere during this time, Leah began an affair with a family friend, and Leah and Arnold divorced in 1966. Steven resented his father. A number of Spielberg's movies show unhappy or disrupted suburban families. Though his father encouraged Steven, he was also critical of his only son, and the son reciprocated. As Steven told Lesley Stahl, he blamed his father for the divorce, even after he found out that Leah left Arnold for another man. He put his mother "on a pedestal… it

was easier for me to blame him" (Stahl "Spielberg: A director's life reflected in film," *60 Minutes*, 2012). Steven admits to being angry at his father for "many, many, many wasted years." As Stahl notes, an absent father busy with his job is a character type recurring in many of his films.

Out of all this disruption, other strands in his movies include a concern with how a man can be moral amidst challenges, and there is a focus on childhood and youth. According to Nigel Morris, in the 1980s Spielberg had a reputation "as a director of adolescent fantasy," and was "saddled with a Peter Pan image" (*The Cinema of Steven Spielberg: Empire of Light*, 2007, 178, 73). Another recurring motif is an adult male in dangerous or threatening situations. The protagonist may have had moral lapses or committed unethical actions, but somehow comes back to doing the right thing, or pays consequences for questionable conduct. Spielberg values men becoming moral after trials and tribulations.

In *Jaws* (1975), there are four main male characters: mayor, police chief, oceanographer, and shark hunter. The mayor, Larry Vaughn, is an opportunistic official. The police chief, Martin Brody, is a family man with a wife and two children. There is an unattached oceanographer, Matt Hooper. Finally, there is the renegade Quint, a navy veteran haunted by killer sharks in the war. In this Watergate era film, the mayor suppresses that a killer shark is preying on the town. Brody defers to his superior and goes along with the cover up. After another victim is killed, the parents confront the chief. Brody admits his fault.

With his guilty conscience, he collaborates with Hooper and Quint to get rid of the shark. Quint is eaten by the shark and Hooper proves ineffective, while the chief ingeniously is able to blow the killer fish up. In doing so does he successfully makes reparations for going along with corrupt officialdom. Instead of an absent father pursuing his own career goals, in *Jaws* we have a parent dedicated to family and community, admitting his own failures and making amends. Brody the imperfect, honorable official contrasts with the corruption of the mayor, and on a larger canvas, President Nixon and his crew.

In contrast, the swashbuckling Indiana Jones is a traditional male action film hero. He has dangerous enemies, perilous circumstances, and repeatedly takes heroic actions. This fantasy of a superman masquerading as an archeologist has had enduring appeal to

the public in four different movies.

Since 1993, there have been a series of Spielberg historical films connected to morally complex situations, with male characters becoming honorable and heroic. They were all made after Spielberg's second marriage in 1991 to Kate Capshaw. He found himself with a large family of hers, mine, ours, and adopted children. At around the age Spielberg's parents' divorced, he was finally settling into a comfortable domesticity. Soon some Spielberg films focused on historically significant events.

The first of these is *Schindler's List* in 1993. Oskar Schindler seems to be an unlikely hero, a Nazi and a spy. Yet in his own way he fits in with other male figures in Spielberg's films. Despite his morally compromised past, he risks his life to do right. In this case, Schindler is a factory owner who bribes fellow Nazi officials to protect the Jews who work in his factories. There were over 1,200 Jews whose lives were saved because of Schindler's actions. As with Chief Brody, Schindler eventually upholds principles and shows heroism existing in immoral, terrifying, and life-endangering situations. It is in character for Spielberg to make a Holocaust-related movie showing how being ethical can emerge in evil circumstances.

In 1997, Spielberg returns to World War II in *Saving Private Ryan.* Amidst the carnage of D-Day and after, there is again moral action in the most brutal and compromising of circumstances. The U.S. government intervenes to preserve the life of the last son of a family whose other sons have all died for their country. The company commander in charge of this rescue is Captain Miller, portrayed by Tom Hanks. The solder being protected is Private Ryan, played by Matt Damon. During the course of the film, many of Miller's soldiers other than Ryan lose their lives. They have died to save one man; without this mission they might have survived. The last to succumb is Captain Miller. As Miller is dying, he says to Private Ryan, "earn this…earn it." The film then shifts: Ryan is an old man at the cemetery where Captain Miller is buried. Ryan turns to his wife and says, "Tell me I've led a good life, tell me I'm a good man." Ryan knows many have died to save him. How could the course of his life undo these deaths? The barbarity of war leaves a stain on many, some lose faith in a moral order and their own virtue. Amidst the evils of war, Spielberg shows how no one remains unscathed, yet Miller, Ryan, and Spielberg search for the morality, the goodness amidst the moral violations inherent in

modern war. How to be a good man in perilous circumstances is a recurring motif for Spielberg.

Munich from 2005 is the most morally complex of his historical movies. At the 1972 Olympics in Munich, Palestinian terrorists kill 11 Israeli athletes. Israel's government plans to murder all those who took the lives of their young men. The film is the story of how these terrorists were hunted down and killed; it is based on George Jonas's book, *Vengeance* (1984). There is an Old Testament eye for an eye element in this Israeli operation. To many, this retaliation is highly moral; to others it raises questions. The Israeli government authorizes Avner Kaufman to organize an independent team of assassins. They target and kill most of the original terrorists. Some of the Israelis were also slain, and Avner's group also murdered a woman who killed one of their own. It also appears that the CIA is protecting the mastermind of the Munich attack. The line between justified revenge and other motivations gets blurred. Avner begins to doubt that all the Arabs targeted for elimination were actually Munich killers. He feels used, becomes disillusioned, and tires of all the betrayals and brutality.

Avner left his position with the Israeli government in 1974. He settled in Brooklyn with his wife and children, but suffered from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). As Spielberg says of Avner, "there is something about killing people at close range… that is going to test a man's soul…. I don't think he will ever find peace" (Schickel, 2012, 235). Some of what torments Avner is whether all this slaughter made any difference. With a view of the Empire State building, he meets his Israeli boss in Brooklyn and asks him, "Did we accomplish anything at all? Every man we killed has been replaced by worse. Did we kill to replace the terrorist leadership or the Palestinian leadership?" He is not given an adequate answer, and refuses his superior's request to return to Israel. As the two men part and walk their separate ways, the movie ends as in the background the World Trade Center becomes visible. The clear message is that the age of terrorism continues. Spielberg says, "This movie is a prayer for peace" (Schickel, 232). He also says it is about Avner's "struggles to keep his soul intact" (235). The concern with being moral in an immoral world recurs here as in other Spielberg films. If asked Ryan's questions about leading a good life and being a good man, it is hard to imagine Avner unequivocally answering yes.

In *Lincoln* (2012) and *Bridge of Spies* (2015), Spielberg re-

treats from the complexities of character in some previous films. *Lincoln* centers on the period from January to April, 1865, when the President is assassinated. The focus is in Lincoln's political skill in getting the amendment abolishing slavery through Congress. The President is also shown on the battlefield, with his wife and children, and with various political officials. His calm leadership and level headedness are featured. He appears as a model human and President. Lincoln's frequent melancholy, spiritual struggles, and his many racist statements about blacks are left out.

The movie ends with a shot of Lincoln delivering his extraordinary second inaugural address on March 4th, 1865, but omits the rigorous religious self-examination he went through to write this speech. Lincoln says the terrible "scourge of war" was God's response to the persistent offense of slavery. The nation was punished and suffers because of this peculiar institution. Yet though the inaugural was written during the time covered by the film, its composition is not part of the narrative. *Lincoln* is a portrayal of a heroic leader, without the moral torment integral to this melancholy man.

Bridge of Spies from 2015 is the story of the negotiations for the release of Gary Powers, captured after his spy plane was shot down in 1960 over Soviet air space. James Donovan, an attorney in private practice, who had been a prosecutor during the Nuremberg trials, and on request defended a Soviet spy, was chosen to negotiate a prisoner exchange to bring Powers home.

There have been many movies about the shadowy world of espionage, and the subject matter of *Bridge of Spies* falls into this genre and also resembles film noir. In these genres, characters often exist in a morally cloudy universe. As most everyone is not who they appear to be, heroes are hard to find. If someone appears to have noble aims, there is usually reason to distrust them.

As the lead protagonist, James Donovan is seen as a straight forward man of moral integrity, determination, and resourcefulness. He pulls off not only the return of Powers, but of a Yale student imprisoned by the East Germans. He is a Spielberg hero navigating through perilous situations dealing with devious men. Any mixed motives Donovan might have are hidden. In both *Lincoln* and *Bridge of Spies* the admirable morality of the lead characters is stressed, their moral struggles are omitted.

Spielberg is only one of a few prominent contemporary film

directors who will address questions of male morality in perilous situations. As Spielberg acknowledges, many of his films are rooted in his childhood. He has transformed these preoccupations into fully adult concerns. How can men act morally when there is immorality all around? He expresses psychological and ethical questions amidst covering significant events from the past. Spielberg sometimes illuminates and, at other times, evades the complex legacy of history and human character.

Ken Fuchsman, EdD, *is a professor at the University of Connecticut, where he has taught and served as an administrator for many years, and is on the Editorial Boards of* Clio's Psyche *and the* Journal of Psychohistory*. He has published a number of articles on President Obama's life and career, and also writes on trauma, the Oedipus complex, and the nature of being human. He can be reached at kfuchsman@gmail.com.* ❑

Ode To ET

Irene Javors—Yeshiva University

Night- stars are doing their thing- twinkling and looking like an MGM movie set,

Gazing with cliched wonder at the heavens, a falling star or would be comet

cat-tailing across the velveteen sky.

Twinkling light, sonic boom, ear splitting crash- no meteor -

But what?

Crawling out from the wreckage this being- unsure-

the creature sniffs the air sorting out data-

air breathable, land firm, direction unknown.

"Damn-it" the entity thinks- "what do I do now?"

Like anyone lost, he seeks safety.

Finding this weird looking structure that has an opening, our space traveler heroically enters- a

house- a suburban house-

So begins the adventures of E.T.

He meets with beings who call themselves human- children- adults and other beings known as

animals.

The children are great- the adults, especially those who call themselves, men, not so nice.

These men wear boots and carry guns and are always suspicious and in hot pursuit.

They feel like aliens to E.T.

On his planet, no one is afraid of people they don't know, they try to befriend them.

Not fun being a 'stranger in a strange land.'

The children help him as does the creature called a dog.

He wants to go home- his transportation has left him stranded

He learns the language of the humans and masters the phrase-

"Phone home."

These children want to help-

He repeats over and over:

"Phone home, Phone Home."

The children figure out how to do so.

But there are mixed emotions-

They have grown attached to each other-

They have looked at each other and seen the light of a beating heart.

They have become known to each other.

They have stopped seeing difference.

They have embraced the alien in themselves and in the other.

The extra-terrestrial has become more human and the human has become more extra-terrestrial

All have found the way home.

Irene Javors, MED, *is a licensed mental health counselor. She is in private practice in New York City. She is the author of*

Culture Notes: Essays on Sane Living, 2010; and a volume of poetry, Mists of Memory (1986). She is a member of PEN. She is on the faculty of the Mental Health Counseling Program, Ferkauf Graduate School of Psychology, Yeshiva University. She writes on topics involving culture and psyche and may be contacted at ijavors@gmail.com. ❑

Masterpieces that Are the Through Lines for the 20th Century

Tom Ferraro—Psychoanalyst in Private Practice

The German fairy tale of "Hansel and Gretel" describes how Hansel left a trail of bread crumbs so that he and his sister could find their way home after being abandoned in the woods. Our best artists do the same for our culture by creating art objects as clues leading us out of the darkness. These artifacts taken as a whole act as through lines or golden threads that can lead us into the light, if we only follow. I will be discussing eight art objects created over a 130-year span, which are all clues on a single trail. In this paper I will be tracing the emergent crisis created by the rise of secularism, how it destroyed moral values, and how the eight writers and artists I discuss all chronicled this crisis in their own way.

It starts with Nietzsche and his pronouncement in 1882 that "God is Dead." He predicted that the expansion of education and the rise of modern science would shatter our belief in God and would therefore produce a moral and spiritual crisis in *The Gay Science* (1882). Twenty-four years later Henry Adams wrote the essay *A Law of Acceleration* (1906), which mirrored Nietzsche's anxiety as he warned of the unstoppable acceleration of technological power, energy, and change that was coming. He sensed that the world was losing its center and predicted a tidal wave of new forces that were approaching which included coal power, chemical power, electric power, radiating power, and forces not yet determined. Adams felt these forces would be seen as our new religion and that we would be irresistibly enslaved by both money and machines.

Thirteen years later the Irish poet W.B. Yeats wrote "The Second Coming" (1919), which further clarified our descent by using the image of the Great Sphinx of Giza. Yeats, one of the foremost literary figures of the 20th century, gave voice to both Nie-

tzsche's and Adams' anxieties. The opening lines were:

> Turning and turning into the widening gyre
> The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
> Things fall apart; the center cannot hold;
> Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world…

This is said to reference the falling apart of Western civilization. The next few lines are:

> A shape with lion body and the head of a man,
> A gaze blank and pitiless as the sun
> Is moving its slow thighs, while all about it
> Wind shadows of the indignant desert birds.

This gives us a sense of the beast's sociopathic power but the poem's most lasting image is found in the last two lines:

> And what rough beast, its hour come round at last,
> Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?

Samuel Beckett picked up on the theme of Godlessness in the play that many consider the most important of the 20th century, *Waiting for Godot* (1950). This play used two befuddled clowns who wait out their life in misery and suffering in the hope that Godot will soon be arriving. The play describes life as meaningless, outlines the battle between despair versus hope, and reflects the century's growing problem with religious belief. The only prop on stage is a dead tree. Beckett was again throwing the culture clues as to exactly where we were in our descent.

Some 10 years later Truman Capote published *In Cold Blood* (1965) as a non-fiction novel that told the true story of two men who casually murdered a well-to-do Kansas farm family. During its writing, Capote invented a new literary genre, the non-fiction novel, which came to be called the new journalism and made Capote an international star. It also ended his career. *In Cold Blood* is a vividly chilling description of how violence was becoming more sociopathic, banal, arbitrary, unavoidable, and merciless. Capote understood the importance of this murder, flew out to Kansas, met and became friends with one of the killers, Perry Smith, during Perry's four years of incarceration prior to his hanging. Mr. Smith was the personification of Yeats' rough beast and this story devoured Capote, turning him into an alcoholic and drug addict, eventually leading to his death.

During the 1960's, 80 years after Nietzsche first wrote the line, the "God is Dead" movement emerged full blown in the media, culminating with the *Time* magazine cover story "God is Dead" (1966). In 1968, Joan Didion wrote the collection of essays *Slouching Toward Bethlehem*, inspired by the Yeats poem. One of her essays chronicled the depravity of the hippie movement in the Haight-Ashbury section of San Francisco in the late '60's. She immersed herself in the hedonism and drug world of the free love movement. Her breakdown came shortly after her essays were published, in which she described how the youth of the nation were becoming unhinged as they became "the falcons that could no longer hear the falconer" and "how the center could no longer hold." The hippie movement unofficially ended with the Sharon Tate murder by Charlie Manson and his "family" in 1969.

As the world sped toward the end of the 20th century, it took a French writer to put the finishing touches on the story of this second coming. The world's leading post-modern theorist Jean Baudrillard wrote *The Illusion of the End* (1992), where he described not only the death of God but the death of history. He described how the combination of the electronic revolution, the media, and the information explosion all caused the culture to implode upon itself. The law of acceleration described by Henry Adams had become Yeats' slouching sphinx, Beckett's death of God, and Baudrillard's end of history. Baudrillard stated that secularism in the form of information overload and the luster of material goods in the world had caused an implosion of discourse, narrative, meaning, and history.

The Denouement: The Beast at the Gates

One did not have to wait too long for the denouement. It came in the form of Jeff Koons, the American artist whose work is often described as meaningless, crass, and utterly banal. Art critics nearly uniformly reject his work but art dealers and the public seem to adore it. The art work that first put him on the map in the 1980's was *The New* series, which consisted of Koons buying new Hoover vacuum cleaners, displaying them in large Plexiglas, and illuminating them with fluorescent lights. He managed to convert vacuum cleaners into sacred totems. He has made several installments in this series and they each sell for about $11.8 million. His "Balloon Dog (Orange)" (1994) is an 11-foot-high stainless steel replica of a child's balloon dog with an orange mirror-finish surface. In 2013 it sold for $58.4 million, which set a record as the most expensive

work by a living artist sold at auction. His genius is evident and revealed in an interview where he coyly remarked that his "Balloon Dog" series should be considered the Trojan horse of the 20th century alluding to the death, angst, and sadness contained within his hollow stainless steel balloon creatures. These pieces contain all the repressed horrors currently felt by modern man.

Artists are the oracles to history and often the best ones create the most memorable masterpieces that are in response to the most important spiritual crisis of the time. Each artist described above has produced works considered 20th century masterpieces. Each piece attempted to deal with the rise of secularism and the fall of moral order. Nietzsche, Adams, Yeats, Beckett, Capote, Didion, and Baudrillard saw the second coming. Finally we are given Jeff Koons' grand denouement, "Balloon Dog (Orange)." His art is big enough, shiny enough, and solid enough to contain all our evil, all our one percenters, all our greed, all our lack of values, all our emptiness, all our money, all the dust of the World Trade Center, all of the ISIS beheadings, and all the school shootings of the last 40 years.

God has died and the new secular religion has arrived. The rough beast has been loosed upon our world. All of man's libidinal and destructive forces emerging without containment, like the atom bomb or a Jackson Pollock painting. The beast is at the gate. The moral decay is complete. We have been given lots of bread crumbs to follow and to help us get through and we are all like Hansel and Gretel. We are all hell bent on surviving this world we live in. Let's face it, the old witch is in the woods and she is ever hungry for our flesh. It is good to know we have a few clues that may lead us out of this fearful mess.

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

Call for Associate Editors

The Editorial Board of Clio's Psyche welcomes applications for the position of Associate Editor.
Included in the job description is editing a special issue on a yearly basis. Interested colleagues should direct inquiries to the Editor at pelovitz@aol.com.

Books Reviews

Jewish Humor

Burton Norman Seitler—Psychoanalytic Practice

Review of Joseph Dorinson, Kvetching and Shpritzing: Jewish Humor in American Popular Culture (McFarland, 2015). ISBN-13: 978-0786494828, i-x, 238 pages, Paperback, $40 (on Amazon).

Jewish people have been characterized as "the people of the book." To a comedian, this is immediately and catalytically converted into the people of the comic book. I wonder, if it were not for humor, would Jews ever have survived countless hardships involving bondage in Egypt, diasporas, Inquisitions, Ghettos, pogroms, genocide, not to mention the most stressful of them all—the persistent ministrations of overly-doting, chicken-soup bearing mothers?

Joseph Dorinson's *Kvetching and Shpritzing* is a work of considerable scholarship dealing with these subjects. It runs the gamut from providing reasons underlying and necessitating Jewish humor, why and how it evolved, and its importance in securing, safeguarding, and maintaining Jewish identity's very existence in the face of generations of less than cordial treatment, all the way to supplying the reader with multiple examples of Jewish comic relief.

Dorinson systematically traces several genres of Jewish wit: vaudeville, the Yiddish theater, burlesque, musical theater, nightclubs, radio, television, literature, film, and "the Jewish Alps," a.k.a. the Catskills, or what has simply come to be known as the "Borscht Belt." "Why so many Jewish humorists? Why not?" The author asks and answers in a fashion befitting much of Jewish repartee, where an answer to a question often takes the form of another question. It was Sam Levinson who actually attempted to answer this question. He claimed that this apparent paradox might be described as "democracy in action." That is, in a war of wits, Jews needed to be able to outsmart their adversaries. For example, "A dying Rabbi summons the town atheist. The town atheist asks him 'why?' 'Why not?' says the Rabbi, quickly adding, 'all of the others I will see again, but you, to you, I wanted to say goodbye'" (141).

Levinson, says Dorinson, went further, contending that Jewish humor contains specific salient features: consciousness, pride, linkage to and an honest picture of the outer world. He cited incongruity as the motor force behind humor, claiming that it was poverty, rather than wealth, that powers the Jewish joke. Dorinson correctly states that Freud put his imprimatur on humor, its relation to the primary process of the unconscious, and its analysis. He notes that more than promoting healthy skepticism, democratic thought, social principles, and self-criticism, Jewish

wit also constitutes an inexpensive form of therapy and catharsis.

While Dorinson does not endow us with an inexhaustible collection of historical background materials (which, short of compiling an encyclopedia, might be a nearly impossible feat), it is extensive and thorough enough to obtain more than an adequate appreciation of the multiple factors that give rise to Jewish humor as a unique and, it would seem, lasting entity. His work is filled with biographical sketches of distinguished humorists, their careers, and the experiences that influenced their output. Among the more notable ones, Dorinson has mentioned fiddlers of the funny bone like Henny Youngman, Milton Berle, Groucho Marx (and his equally zany brothers), Red Buttons (a.k.a. Aaron Chwatt), as well as Sid Caesar and his ensemble with their particularly pertinent penchant for pastiche and parody: Howard Morris, Neil Simon, Mel Brooks, and Carl Reiner (and later his comic genius son, Rob).

He refers to the mind-boggling memory and mile-a-minute musical musings of the inimitable Danny Kaye (a.k.a. Kaminsky) to George Burns (and his brilliantly funny wife, Gracie Allen, who played the fool perfectly, and yet was nothing less than a comic savant in her own right), the understated WASPish humor of Jack Benny (a.k.a. Benny Kubelsky) and his wife, Mary Livingston (a.k.a. Sadie Marks). On the list are Jerry Lewis and his not so subtle, mad cap slapstick comedic bent; Steve Allen's quirky intellectual characters; Jerry Stiller (and his outrageous son, Ben); the anti-establishment mania of Lenny Bruce; the social criticism of Mort Sahl; the self-effacing humor of Rodney Dangerfield (a.k.a. Jacob Cohen, alias Jack Roy), who "gets no respect;" and the irreverent banter of Jackie Mason "do ya know wad I mean, do ya know wad I'm talkin' about?" All of these comics, as well as the ones listed below, said Gordon Allport, noted personality psychologist, come from the heritage of a people in strife whose response is humor in the form of acceptance, avoidance, or aggression.

Morey Amsterdam (a.k.a. Moritz Amsterdam) deserves to be mentioned for his encyclopedic repertoire of jokes. Much space is devoted to Woody Allen (a.k.a. Allen Stewart Konigsberg) and his neurotic nihilistic antics, Robert Klein's outspoken wit, the strangely infectious humor of Andy Kaufman, Al Franken's diffident characters, Jerry Seinfeld's extraordinary brand of vin ordinaire, the fertile but never settled mind of Billy Crystal, and on and on, not to mention all the great female comics that have graced the stage, screen, radio, and TV, like Fanny Brice, Judy Holliday (nee' Tuvim), Joan Rivers, Madeline Kahn, Gilda Radner, Elayne Boosler, Sarah Silverman, Wendy Lieberman, and Korey Kahaney (an Irish-in-name only, wickedly funny lass). The list is seemingly endless and continues to grow to the present day.

It seems to me that the mainstream of Jewish humor illustrated by this incomplete list emanates from a reaction to and defense against op-

pression, as well as the means of obtaining a sense of self through identification with a common cultural ethos.

As Dorinson points out, if the humor came naturally to some of the people cited above, it certainly did not come easily or without a price. For example, in search of the showy sparkle of success, they aimed to please no matter the cost, which included self-denial, self-effacement, and self-exhaustion. This was particularly true of Sid Caesar and Jerry Lewis, but also was common with many other gifted comics. We saw this all too clearly in the tortured creativity, internal agony, and ultimate demise of the great Lenny Bruce.

Sometimes because of, and at other times despite their own inner turmoil, this book puts a human face on the loony and delightful characters that regularly put a smile on our faces. The book is not only a scholarly work, but a riot as well. For those reasons and more, it is a wonderful read.

Burton Norman Seitler, PhD, *is a clinical psychologist in private practice and Director of Counseling and Psychotherapy Services (CAPS-R) in Ridgewood and Oakland, New Jersey. Dr. Seitler serves on the Board of Directors of the International Society for Ethical Psychiatry and Psychology, is on the Editorial Board of the journal Ethical Human Psychology and Psychiatry, and is founding editor of the journal J.A.S.P.E.R. He is also a Research Associate of the Psychohistory Forum and may be contacted at binsightfl1@gmail.com.* ❑

Marks' Important History of the Modern World

Jacques Szaluta—U.S. Merchant Marine Academy

Review of Robert B. Marks, The Origins of the Modern World: A Global and Environmental Narrative from the Fifteenth to the Twenty-First Century (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), ISBN 978-1-4422-1239, 218 pages, Hardcover, $63.64 (on Amazon.com), also in paperback.

Robert B. Marks, in the *The Origins of the Modern World* offers a broad new sweep of the origins of modern times, as he specifically says in his subtitle, "A Global and Environmental Narrative from the Fifteenth to the Twenty-First Century," which is significantly not Eurocentric. His present work reflects the more recent and advanced scholarship which considers the influence of Asia, notably of China, India and Japan, departing from traditional interpretations of the "Rise of the West" or of the

"European Miracle," which has included the United States, as the foundation of the modern world. This work is extremely informative, as the author delves into ecological issues, which includes contemporary problems such as global warming, and at times population growth and declines, as in the horrific period appropriately called the "Black Death" in the mid-14th century, an epidemic which affected three continents.

Accordingly, the theme is global, as the text is enhanced with numerous maps of the world, and the author writes that regarding the location of the Indian Ocean that for well over a thousand years, "it arguably was the most important crossroad of trade and generator of merchant wealth in the world" (45). What catapulted Britain, and soon thereafter the United States, to global domination, was that the Industrial Revolution began in Britain in the early 19th century. Marks posits that some scholars of this period contend that the world is now in the Anthropocene age. This was the epoch during which humans began impacting Earth's ecosystems with their actions.

This is a timely book, and to cite the main topics in this work, they are the expansion of the Russian, Chinese, and Ottoman Empires, the conquest of the Americas, the spread of Islam, the Industrial Revolution, and the rise of the United States. With regard to China, which plays a pivotal role in Marks' account, it stood out in being dominant in trade and sea power, which was stimulating for the West. As Marks says that significantly, what drove global trade (food crops and manufactured goods) apparently existed as early as 1000 CE. It is China's economy and large population which stimulated Europe. To highlight the enormity of China's standing position is its enormous and outstanding building of ships. From 1404 to 1407, about 4,681 ships were constructed. The largest, a so called "Treasure Ship" under the command of Admiral Zheng He, was about 400 feet long and 160 feet wide, and as the author notes, it was "longer than an American football field" (p. 43). In 1407, a huge armada was assembled near the Yangtze River on China's eastern coast. This fleet consisted of over 300 ships and was manned by 27,000 sailors. This indeed indicates the enormous power of China at this time.

It has been commonly believed, on a popular level, that Europeans were the first to circumnavigate the world because they were ultimately more enterprising. However, as Marks points out, with the rise of Islam, Europeans could no longer go to Asia over the regular land routes, now held by Muslims who blocked access to Asia, and therefore Europeans had to find new sea routes to reach the Indian Ocean and China.

Islam also had positive achievements, for from the 8th to the 15th century, the most extensive libraries in the world were in Islamic countries, and the most renowned library was very likely the library in Alexandria, Egypt. At the present time there are serious and challenging animosities between Western nations and radical Muslim groups such as ISIS

(Islamic State in Iraq and Syria). The attack on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, not to mention numerous other attacks, exemplify the conflict between these two civilizations.

What is also significant is that by the 14th century, Islam had split into three separate empires: the caliphate was gone, resulting in the Ottoman Empire; the Safavids, centered in Persia; and the Mughals established in India. The seeking of independence by various groups is not unique to Islam, as for example, the rise of nation states in Europe. In this regard, Marks could have offered a more profound or textured explication. What is particularly noteworthy is that the author chronicles the extensive aggression, rivalries, and warfare of various societies, but he does not examine the reasons why this existed in the many centuries he presents. One group, which was notoriously aggressive and murderous, were the Mongols, who wreaked carnage in Asia and far into Europe. Indeed, this book is a serious work in its range of scholarship, but it is historically conventional. Historians, in their training, beginning in graduate school become cognizant of the issues of "changing interpretations" in historical scholarship. The author presents a progressive interpretation of developments of the modern world, but he does not go far enough. Although he relevantly discusses the influence of numerous intellectual figures, namely Marx, Engels, Weber, Malthus, and Darwin, to mention but a few which are also part of his themes, he ignores the leading intellectual figure of the 20th and 21st centuries, which is Sigmund Freud.

Freud's innovative field of psychoanalysis has certainly, by the 1950s, led to the field of psychohistory, which provides a more insightful interpretation of history and is by now well established, despite the opposition to it. In this regard, Marks could have gone further had he employed such an approach.

In the contemporary world there is much concern with Radical Islam and its influences, and with some groups such as ISIS, but he focuses attention on the fact that the Muslim world has in it huge deposits, which the Western world needs for its technological maintenance. However the contention between these two societies, or cultures, is not just an economic one, but one should take into consideration the position of women in societies which are notoriously misogynistic and reactionary. This makes them hostile to the more enlightened societies in the West.

The conventional historian strives to understand what happened, but the psychohistorian, seeks to understand *why* it happened. For example, Freud recognized that in all societies, some form of aggression and completion are universal, and they try to channel these hostile feelings and projections that are paranoid and attribute these hostile motives to another group. Freud recognized these issues in his works, and these attempts to attenuate them are insightfully elaborated in one of his masterpieces, titled *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930).

Nevertheless, this is an important work that is thoughtful, relevant to the recent historical research for the present time, and well written. As the author perceptively notes in his conclusion, his study has "synthesized the results of recent historical research into a global narrative" (p. 209).

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.* ❑

Reappraising the First President Bush

Paul H. Elovitz—The Psychohistory Forum

Review of Jon Meacham, Destiny and Power: The American Odyssey of George Herbert Walker Bush (NY: Random House, 2015). ISBN 978-14000-6765-7, xxiv, 836 pages, hardcover, $35.00 ($20.83 on Amazon), paperback ($6.87 on Amazon).

When a colleague from the University of Wisconsin and I researched and wrote "George Bush: From Wimp to President," I became interested in the contradictions in the childhood, personality, and values of our 41st president (see Joan Offerman-Zuckerberg, ed., *Politics and Psychology: Contemporary Psychodynamic Perspectives*, 1991, 99-116). This privileged second son of a very successful conservative WASP family is both highly competitive and caring of others. He eclipsed his elder brother at an early age yet maintained excellent relations with him. Unlike his own first born son, he chose the danger of flying off aircraft carriers over the safety of Yale and then the uncertainty of drilling for oil in and off of Texas over the relative safety of joining his family on Wall Street. Although mocked as a wimp during his vice-presidency and 1988 run for the presidency, Bush proved resourceful and ruthless enough to become the first vice-president since 1837 to be elected directly into the presidency. To avoid confusion, I will distinguish between the two Bush presidents by referring to them as "Bush 41" and "Bush 43."

Meacham has had extraordinary access to Bush 41, his diaries, his wife's diaries, and his friends and associates. The resulting nuanced biography has deepened our knowledge of the elder Bush and has been rewarded with the author's second Pulitzer Prize. It has confirmed the assessment of his personality that I came to in 1989 and 1990 as I researched the chapter I was writing with Glen Jeansonne.

The post-presidential Bush 41 of recent years is incredibly open, especially compared to his younger self whose reluctant autobiography, *Looking Forward* (1987) said remarkably little about himself, given that

his New England upbringing stressed that a person should only properly have his/her name in the paper at life passages such as birth, marriage, and death. Indeed, his mother called him while he was running for President, complaining that he was talking too much about himself. The Bush 41 of his later years is much more effusive, and clearly Meacham is extremely good at eliciting information. It is initially surprising to learn that both he and Barbara cried and felt "sick upon the death of FDR" (69). He volunteers and becomes saddened when he recalls an anti-Semitic comment he made as a 13 year old regarding a Jewish friend (who remained a friend and a longtime supporter). On the other hand, Meacham also points out an instance when Bush protected a boy with a clearly Jewish name who was being bullied in an era of much more open anti-Semitism. As he approaches death he readily sheds tears and struggles with guilt. There is lots of interesting material on the intergenerational tradition of humor within the Bush family which intrigued me because it is quite apparent that Bush 41 has an excellent sense of humor, but not one that was readily revealed in public.

George H.W. Bush's life was shaped by his decision as an 18 year old to join the Navy as a pilot, rather than going off to Yale which his family would have preferred. He was determined to follow his father's example of service to the country in wartime. The father who took him to the train station to face an uncertain future flying airplanes in combat was not the terrifying "Senator Bush" that the grandchildren remembered, but the man who hugged his son and cried at his departure.

For me, one of the most interesting elements in reading this massive biography is the extent to which the Bushes are humanized. When I did my research, George's mother Dorothy seemed mostly to be extremely devoted, unrealistically demanding, and highly competitive. Prescott Bush seemed to be the distant, self-absorbed, successful businessman and politician. In Meacham's study, in contrast, his parents are three-dimensional. Part of the explanation for this that comes to mind has to do with how younger people are inclined to separate themselves from their parents as they seek to prove themselves as adults. In the process, they are not as likely to see the full humanity and dimensions of their parents. As they grow to the ages of their parents or older, they are more experienced in the different stages of life and can recognize the humanity that they could not fully absorb when they were younger. While Meacham catches this sense of competition, success, and the need for service in the family, he reveals so much more about the entire Bush-Walker clan than I had readily available or could gather from my interviews in 1990-1991.

Clearly, George Herbert Walker's close brush with death in the South Pacific when his plane was shot down and his two crewmembers were killed, left him with a strong sense of survivorship and the need to justify his existence as a young man in a hurry. He had always identified with his parents' values, but he had to keep proving himself whether in

the offshore oil business, running for office in solidly Democratic Texas, or in jumping out of airplanes right into his 90th birthday. The 41st president shows great concern for the suffering of others, but it is as individuals, not as needy groups requiring governmental social programs.

The Bush children all idealized their soft spoken father and have tried to emulate his accomplishments with varying degrees of success. It was never easy to grow up with a remote powerful father and a demanding mother in a family facing constant public scrutiny. Bush 41's namesake, who looked like him but had his mother's somewhat caustic personality, had the most difficult time. George W. turned to alcohol as he failed to match his father's accomplishments and was expected by some close to the family (and perhaps within it) to burn out like "a Roman candle." Ultimately, he reformed himself, not simply because his wife, Laura, threatened numerous times to leave him with their twin daughters if he didn't give up the bottle, but because his biggest fear was to disgrace his father.

John Ellis Bush (Jeb) was like their father as a second son expected to become the family hero. But to everyone's surprise, it was his older brother who first won a governorship, and then the presidency. Their mother Barbara, who at age 90 was recently in South Carolina leaning on her walker trying in vain to save her son Jeb's presidential campaign, used to complain that the children listened so much more to her husband than to her. In fact, while he was away she was described by her visiting husband's younger brother as whacking away in trying to separate her fighting sons George and Jeb. Jeb's personality turned out to be more like that of his father, but that has not worked well for him in current presidential politics.

Restoring 43's reputation is a major goal of the elder Bushes. Poppy (his most enduring nickname used by the family) Bush had almost daily telephone contact with his son during 43's presidency, but unfortunately supported and commented, rather than suggested policy when called. The father, so much more of a consensus builder than the son, failed to provide the type of perspective that could have saved the nation from some of his son's disastrous policies, such as the Iraq invasion.

Although Jon Meacham soft pedals some of the failures of the first Bush's political career, his book is an invaluable source which I recommend with few qualifications.

Paul H. Elovitz *is a presidential psychobiographer.* ❑

Memorial

Remembering Arno Gruen

Joyce Rosenberg & David Cifelli—Psychohistory Forum

Arno Gruen (March 26, 1923–October 20, 2015) was a distinguished psychoanalyst, psychologist, psychohistorian, and researcher who has given much to the field. His work was centered on the fundamental belief that evil is not an innate character trait of humans, but rather the result of betrayal and self-hatred from an early age. His research and many books and papers worked to apply this theory to help explain events and people throughout history. This view of the world and work to understand and ultimately fight the suffering, inequality, and violence of the world led to him being awarded the Loviisa Peace Prize in Finland in 2010. He ended his acceptance speech with "It is empathy and cooperation – not profit, selfishness, and the drive for ever more bigness – that will lead us toward a more humane civilization than our present one."

The seeds of Arno Gruen's humanity that led to his receiving the peace prize, were sown early in life; as a Jewish child born in Berlin and growing up in Germany, his view of the world was open-minded and accepting. When his father told him that one should distinguish between Jews, Christians, atheists, and often between the Germans and the French, the young Arno was surprised: "I thought we are all human beings." This was in 1930, before Hitler came to power, unleashed anti-Semitism in Gruen's homeland and likely contributed to Gruen's search for the reasons behind the violence and hatred that swept across Europe in his youth.

The Peace Prize was one of many accomplishments in Gruen's long career. Notably, he also won Germany's Geschwister-Scholl-Preis for his 2001 book, *Der Fremde in uns* (*The Stranger Within Us*). His family had fled Germany and the Nazis in 1936, eventually making their way to the United States. He received his undergraduate degree from the City College of New York before going on to New York University to study psychology. Seeking to become a psychoanalyst, he studied at the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysts under Theodor Reik. He worked in private practice and also had many professorships. His longest tenure was 17 years at Rutgers University, teaching there until he moved to Switzerland in 1979. *The Betrayal of the Self* (1988) was his first book to be published in English and an excellent example of his scholarship. He published countless more articles and books; most recently he published *Against Terrorism* shortly before his death in 2015.

Arno Gruen's work and research countered Freud's belief that human beings are inherently aggressive or violent. Instead, Gruen be-

lieved that hatred and violence are the result of the mistreatment and punishment of children that feeds self-hatred, which is in turn projected and acted out on others. In his acceptance speech for the Loviisa Peace Prize, he crystallized and lamented what he saw as the collective and inevitable loss of self that human beings suffer beginning at a very young age, laying the foundation for the hatred and violence in the world:

> What is reality if we are constrained from birth to see the world not as we experience it ourselves but as others tell us it is? Before and directly after birth our perceptions are shaped by empathy, not by cognitive intellectual processes. Our early empathic perceptions are direct and immediate, uninfluenced by society's expectations, and for that reason are true to reality. But from the very first day of life, the way we ought to see the world is communicated to us by others, along with the message that our own perceptions have no validity. Thus, our cognitive perception, based on the expectations of those who raise us, never develops without distortion. This is especially true if these expectations are not in accord with a child's needs but rather meet with the parents' need for self-esteem.

As news of his passing spread, Arno Gruen's friends and colleagues recalled his great compassion and kindness to those he knew, and his large presence in their lives. Many remembered his longtime close friendship and collaboration with dream worker, psychoanalyst, psychiatrist, and researcher, Montague Ullman (1916-2008). In 2008, Gruen sat by Ullman's bedside the night before he died from a stroke, giving comfort to Ullman's partner and colleague Judith Gardiner. Gruen and Ullman had known and worked together for 50 years, since the time Gruen sent Ullman an article he wrote on the interaction between organic states and functions and they began collaborating on a study of the effects of stroke on patients' behavior. These two men shared more than an ongoing interest in science; they were both humanitarians who were concerned for the future of mankind.

Arno Gruen will be missed, but his scholarship will live on through his library of publications. It is hoped that his calls for peace and empathy in the world will echo on, long after his departure from this world. We wish to express our condolences to his wife Simone Gruen-Müller and his daughters Connie, Margaret, and Zoey.

Joyce Rosenberg, JD, *is a psychoanalyst, journalist, and co-editor of this Psychology of Fear and Hate Special Issue.* ***David Cifelli*** *is a student at Ramapo College. Both are Research Associates of the Psychohistory Forum who may be reached at psyjourn313@gmail.com and dcifelli@ramapo.edu respectively.* ❑

Letter to the Editor

Terrorists as the Other

Dear Editor,

Clearly the recent (December 2015) issue of Clio's Psyche was timely in its discussion of the psychology of terrorism and especially relevant in light of the recent Paris attacks, the murderous rampage at the Colorado Planned Parenthood offices, and of course, the attack in San Bernardino. The political aftermath demonstrates that in the United States, terrorism is considered a manifestation of the "Other." The psychology of terrorism in this country is essentially the psychology of the Other—the other race, religion, or government, the other group, and the other person. This psychology dominates the comments and stances of the majority of Republican presidential candidates who define terrorists by an Otherness that is easily recognizable; thus the Paris and San Bernardino attacks are terrorism, but the attack on the Planned Parenthood offices is not labeled as such. This psychology of the Other tends to be drawn along the lines of race, religion, and possibly culture as much as political ideology. It allows a convenient form of racism and bigotry by perceiving the Other as a threat, a potential "enemy combatant," based simply on race and religion, even when no evidence of terrorism exists.

Terrorists seldom see themselves as terrorists, but rather as idealists driven by political or religious motivations, thus perceiving themselves as soldiers for the greater good, the right. From their perspective, they are serving a greater truth and are justified in their use of terror. The bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City was clearly an act of terror, but general perception and response were nothing like the perception and response toward Islamic people after the destruction of the Twin Towers. There was little or no backlash against white, anti-government fringe groups on the part of mainstream Americans after the Oklahoma City bombing. There were no demands from average citizens for rounding up the individuals and groups who encourage and implement such domestic terrorism. Law enforcement did not begin to profile and investigate these fringe elements with the high visibility and vigor that they later employed against Islamic groups and citizens, even those who were born in this country.

Individuals and groups who employ terroristic threats outside clinics by taunting patients, doctors, nurses, and staff, and those who employ rhetoric that incites such acts, do not perceive themselves as terrorists. Neither do those same individuals and groups perceive terrorists as those that share their ideology and bomb clinics or murder doctors. Their own perspective is from an ostensibly higher moral ground. In our society, those individuals and groups are generally perceived as Americans expressing their views; they are not perceived as terrorists. Those who

have bombed and murdered are simply criminals, people who broke the law, not terrorists. They are not perceived or defined as terrorists because they are not recognizable as the Other. We need look no further than the current political rhetoric to see this in action and to see that it sets a dangerous precedent of continued divisiveness and hate. As Don Carveth stated in his letter in the December issue of Clio's Psyche, "If social science is to have any credibility as science distinct from ideology and propaganda, it must rigorously attend to the issue of conflicting value perspectives, instead of unthinkingly adopting one and proceeding to pathologize or demonize others." It is up to people like the editors, contributors, and readers of journals such as Clio's Psyche to combat this psychology of the Other.

Sincerely yours,

Tom Gibbs

Tom Gibbs, MA, *is a poet and independent scholar with a master's degree from Marshall University. His work has appeared in previous issues of* Clio's Psyche *and he can be reached at borderspringsbellsouth.net.* ❑

BULLETIN BOARD

CONFERENCES: Our forthcoming **Psychohistory Forum Work-In-Progress Seminar** will be on **April 9, 2016** when **Ken Fuchsman** (University of Connecticut), will speak on "The Role of Attachment in the Human Condition." Papers will be e-mailed to members electronically on or before March 15. Additional seminars will be announced as details are finalized after papers are submitted and accepted. The Psychohistory Forum's last seminar was on **January 30** when **David Lotto** (*Journal of Psychohistory* and private psychoanalytic practice) presented on racism in the Republican Party and America. As usual, **Jacques Szaluta** (Merchant Marine Academy) served as moderator. Proposals are welcome and will be vetted by a committee once a presentation paper is submitted. Announcements and papers are sent out electronically to Psychohistory Forum members. 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. The Association for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society (APCS) will be meeting at Rutgers University on October 13-15, 2016; the Interdisciplinary Conference of the Forum for Psychoanalytic Education (IFPE) meets on October 27-29, 2016 in Pasadena; and the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis (NAAP) November 12, 2016 meeting are in Manhattan. **CONGRATULATIONS:** To **Howard Stein** and **Seth Alcorn** on the publication of *The Dysfunctional Workplace: Theory, Stories, and*

Practice (University of Missouri Press). **WELCOME:** To new members **Susan Kassouf** and **Inna Rozentsvit** and Arjun Bastola as our new webmaster. **OUR THANKS:** To our members and subscribers for the support that makes Clio's Psyche possible. To Benefactors Bill Argus, Herbert Barry, David Beisel, Tom Ferraro, Peter Loewenberg, Marvasti Jamshid, and Mary Peace Sullivan; Patrons Peter Barglow, Ken Fuchsman, David Lotto, Alice Maher, Peter Petschauer, and Burton Norman Seitler; Sustaining Members Dick Booth, George and Carolyn Brown, David James Fisher, Ruth Ljitmaer, Alan Mohl, Joyce M. Rosenberg, and Arlene Steinberg; Supporting Members Paul H. Elovitz, Eva Fogelman, Judy Gardiner, John J. Hartman, Daniel Rancour-Laferriere, Inna Rozentsvits, and Christina Stern; and Members Suzanne Adrion, Heiderose Butscher, Molly Castelloe, Susan Charney, Geoffrey Cocks, Brian D'Agostino, Lawrence J. Friedman, Michael S. Isaacs, Judith Logue, Peggy McLaughlin, Merle Molofsky, Joseph V. Montville, Ruth Neubauer, Ken Rasmussen, Margery Quackenbush, and Howard Stein. Our special thanks for thought-provoking materials to Fred Alford, James Allen, Ira Brenner, David Cifelli, Marc-André Cotton, Paul H. Elovitz, Tom Ferraro, Ken Fuchsman, Tom Gibbs, Irene Javors, Sebastian Job, Ruth Lijtmaer, Merle Molofsky, Marcie Newton, Joel Markowitz, Linda A. Mayers, Eva D. Papiasvilli, Peter Petschauer, Joyce Rosenberg, Paul Salstrom, Robert Samuels, David Seitler, Christina Stern, Jacques Szaluta, and Neil Wilson. 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, Professor Paul Salstrom, and Michael Stellitano for proofing. Our special thanks to our editors and to our numerous overworked referees who must remain anonymous. ❑

We Wish to Thank Our Authors. Thanks to our Diligent, Hard-working and Prompt Editors, and Anonymous Referees.

Clio's Psyche *Call for Papers*
for Future Issues

Clio's Psyche *is looking for articles on a variety of subjects. Here are some special issues that we would welcome informed guest editor or co-editors for psychologically articles on:*

- Psychobiography & Globalization—Due 4/1/16 for June issue
- Psychology of Election 2016: Candidate Psychobiography, Emotions, Political Illusions, and Realities—Due 7/1 for Sept.
- The Impact of Celebrity Culture on America
- Dependency and Independency in the Family, Politics, and Society
- TV as Object Relations: Our Emotional Connection to Fantasy
- Entrepreneurship, Innovation, and Business Success
- Images and Psychology of Enemies and Hatred through the Ages
- The Intrapsychic and Societal Processes of the American Acceptance of Homosexuality
- Environmentalism and Anti-Environmentalism
- The Contemporary American Fascination with Animals
- Anti-Government Fantasies and Civilization

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

We seek articles from 1,500 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. Before writing it is good to examine issues from the last decade on cliospsyche.org/archives. Articles, abstracts, and queries should be sent to the editor:
Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, at pelovitz@aol.com.

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