
Clio's Psyche

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

Volume 6, Number 4

March, 2000

The Future of Psychohistory

Psychohistory's False Start

Rudolph Binion
Brandeis University

Two premises together define psychohistory: that human history all reduces to human doings and that the reasons for human doings are largely unconscious. Because it was psychoanalysis that first accessed the unconscious underside of human doings, psychohistory began as applied psychoanalysis. This was a false start. For one thing, it discouraged aspirant psychohistorians from learning the why of historic behavior from the historic record itself and encouraged them instead to

(Continued on page 138)

The Partial Success and Bright Prospects of Psychohistory

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum

As a historian, I find depictions of the future tell me more about the past and their prognosticators, than about the future. What lies before us will be built from the raw materials of the past and assembled in the cauldron of the human imagination. Thus, when I saw *Star Wars* in the 1970s, I thoroughly enjoyed identifying the historical raw materials combined with technology that made up the film which soon became a cultural sensation. In publishing the political predictions of talented

IN THIS ISSUE

The Future of Psychohistory

Psychohistory's False Start	133
<i>Rudolph Binion</i>	
Partial Success and Bright Prospects	133
<i>Paul H. Elovitz</i>	
Freud's Understanding of Repression	139
<i>Thomas J. Scheff</i>	
The Civilizing Process	142
<i>Daniel Klenbort</i>	
A Psychosocial Approach to Racism	143
<i>Simon Clarke</i>	
Fathoming the Weirdness of History	144
<i>Jerry S. Piven</i>	
A Historiometric Perspective	146
<hr/>	
Keeping the Psychohistorical Flame Burning	148
<hr/>	
The Electronic Future of Psychohistory	150
<hr/>	
Reflections on the Future of Psychohistory	151
<i>Henry Lawton</i>	
What Brought Me to Psychohistory	152
<i>Anne Dietrich</i>	

Twenty-First-Century Psychohistory	153
<i>David Lee</i>	
Empathy, Kohut, and Intellectual History	154
<i>Vivian Rosenberg</i>	
Resistance and Reconciliation	156
<i>Howard F. Stein with Responses by Charles Strozier and Paul H. Elovitz</i>	
Psychohistory 2000 and Beyond	160
<i>Daniel Dervin</i>	
Interdisciplinary Futures	161
<i>Juhani Ihanus</i>	
<hr/>	
Howard Stein: An Intellectual Odyssey	162
<i>Peter W. Petschauer</i>	
Holocaust Poems	172
<i>Howard F. Stein</i>	
Holocaust Denial in New Zealand	173
<i>Norman Simms</i>	
Playing God: Roosevelt and Pearl Harbor	175
<i>George Victor</i>	
Dreams of Infanticide I: Dancing for Dionysus	177
<i>Robert J. Rousselle</i>	
The Virtual Reality of the Web Landscape	178
<i>Peter W. Petschauer</i>	
The Family Origins of Creativity	181
<i>Book Review by Daniel Dervin</i>	
Bulletin Board	183

colleagues, I am intrigued at how their own personalities, values, and voting patterns are reflected in their educated and often correct guesses. I assume readers will do the same with my prognostications. You will find that you will learn more about the history of psychohistory than of its future.

In the last millennium, in 1999 to be specific, we invited colleagues to write about the future of psychohistory and psychoanalysis in the 21st century. (The large number of submissions necessitated the postponement of the psychoanalysis articles until the June, 2000, issue.) Potential authors were invited to discuss the status of psychohistory in their particular discipline, institution, and country. The issue of whether it is more appropriate for psychohistory to be a supplement to existing disciplines or a separate discipline was raised. We asked how psychohistory has fulfilled its promise since William Langer's "Next Assignment" presidential address to the American Historical Association in 1957, published in 1958.

You will read the impressive and varied responses, some from people I had not known before, in the 15 articles below. Academic psychologist Dean Keith Simonton of the University of California at Davis is a distinguished student of creativity who explores his subject from a non-psychoanalytic background. Daniel Klenbort and I have discovered a common interest in the civilizing process. Articles by young scholars such as Anne Dietrich in Canada, David Lee in Europe, and Jerry Piven in New York were specifically invited because they represent the future of our field. My introduction will focus mostly on the little-known history and present state of our field.

The early practitioners of fledgling psychohistory were European psychiatrists and psychoanalysts who were steeped in history. They commonly used historical examples, sometimes when they were trying to avoid revealing the identity of a patient known to others in their circle. Their studies were usually written in technical psychoanalytic language and based on theory rather than in-depth historical research. Hitler's domination of continental Europe led to the dispersal of many of these talented individuals to England and the Americas.

After World War II, depth psychology and a profound concern for psychosocial issues became well established in the United States as it built on some previous work of applied psychoanalysis, leading to the important work of Erik Erikson, Erich Fromm, Robert J. Lifton, Norman O. Brown,

Robert Coles, and a variety of other scholars. Many early studies in the field of psychohistory tended to focus on Hitler, the Nazis, and Richard Nixon. Practitioners such as Bruce Mazlish and Robert Waite saw themselves as historians rather than as psychohistorians. The Harvard historian William Langer, whose psychiatrist brother Walter had done a classified, pioneering intelligence study of Adolf Hitler during World War II, in his 1957 presidential address to the American Historical Association referred to applying psychoanalysis to history as the "Next Assignment." The *American Historical Review* published some explicitly psychoanalytic, psychohistorical studies. The pioneering Wellfleet psychohistory group (still in existence and by invitation only) was established on Cape Code.

In 1976 the first national conference of psychohistorians was held at Stockton State College in New Jersey with much debate over the relationship of psychohistory to history, political science, psychology, psychoanalysis, psychiatry, sociology, and other disciplines. The organized field of psychohistory came into existence in the 1970s with the establishment of a variety of psychohistorical organizations in the United States. These included the Group for the Use of Psychology in History (GUPH), the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA), the International Society for Political Psychology (ISPP), and the Institute for Psychohistory. Today the GUPH, the IPA, and the ISPP have been joined by a variety of other organizations including the Bay State Psychohistory Group, the Psychohistory Forum, the Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film, the Center for Psychohistorical Studies, and the University of California Psychoanalytic Consortium. The ISPP, with an annual meeting in North America, Europe, or Asia, is quite large and consistently attracts new leadership. The IPA has yearly, and sometimes twice-yearly, meetings in New York City, and GUPH meets episodically at the American Historical Association's annual meetings in the U.S. (The ISPP, the least psychoanalytically based of these three groups, has increasingly been embraced by academic political scientists who now predominate in it in much the way literary scholars dominate the Association for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society, founded in the 1990s by Lacanians.) The other groups have more frequent, regional, small-group meetings.

Last year's demise of *The Psychohistory Review* was so distressing that it helped prompt this special issue only a year after our Academia,

Psychoanalysis, and Psychohistory issue. The *Review* was a sound academic journal. Personally, I had enjoyed my association with its editor, Larry Shiner, and was planning to submit an article on the origins and early usage of the words *psychohistory*, *psychohistorian*, and *psychohistorical*. More importantly, more than 130 libraries were subscribing to it, which meant that the publication would reach far more readers and ensure that it would be preserved as a record of a part of psychohistorical scholarship.

There is hope that the *Review* may be revived by Michael Flynn of the Center for the Study of Violence and Human Survival at John Jay College of CUNY in Manhattan. His negotiations with a sponsoring university have been slow. Michael recently indicated that if he is successful, *The*

Psychohistory Review will not resume publication until the year 2001.

The underlying reasons for the cessation of publication by *The Psychohistory Review* remain unclear to me. Certainly, Larry Shiner's pending retirement from academia is a vital part of the picture. Several fine scholars are reported to have volunteered to take over the editorship and have solicited the financial support of their colleges. I know my gut reaction was to offer my services as an interim editor and at least one other colleague expressed the same thought. It was reported to me that the *Review's* Editorial Board wanted an editor who could bring the prestige and financial resources of a university to the task. To me, it seems unfortunate that the good was sacrificed in the name of the ideal. After all, the *Review's* value was not diminished because Charles Strozier started it at a small, brand new state college (Sangamon State), which went on to become the University of Illinois at Springfield. Professor Shiner did a fine job as editor despite his not being a psychohistorian. That an outsider could do this is a reflection of the extent to which psychohistorical principles have permeated academic thinking. It is healthy for psychohistory to reach out to others to join in our vital enterprises. As editor of **Clio's Psyche**, I felt a sense of companionship and pride when Larry wrote me that it is up to this publication now to carry the torch of psychohistory.

Publication is flourishing in our field despite the loss of *The Psychohistory Review*. **Clio's Psyche**: *Understanding the "Why" of Culture, Current Events, History, and Society's* 1996 special issue, Publishing in Psychohistory, interviewed the editors and listed the main publications: the *Journal of Psychohistory*, *The Psychohistory Review*, and *Political Psychology*. Other publications cited there are *Mind and Human Interaction*, the *Psychohistory News*, *Mentalities/Mentalités, Or le temps: Revue Francaise de Psychohistoire*, *psicologica politica*, and *Journal for the Psychoanalysis Culture and Society*. Since then, there has been the creation of additional psychohistorical publications including *Psychoanalysis and History* and *Tapestries*. Some psychoanalytic journals regularly publishing psychohistory are *American Imago*, *Free Associations*, *Applied Psychoanalysis*, the *Psychoanalytic Review*, and the *International Review of Psycho-Analysis*. Explicitly psychohistorical publication is alive and well in America and the world.

The growth and success of organized psy-

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 6, No. 4

March, 2000

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, PhD

Associate Editor: Bob Lentz

Internet Co-ordinator: Stan Pope

Editorial Board

David Beisel, PhD RCC-SUNY • Rudolph Binion, PhD Brandeis University • Andrew Brink, PhD Formerly of McMaster University and The University of Toronto • Ralph Colp, MD Columbia University • Joseph Dowling, PhD Lehigh University • Glen Jeansonne, PhD University of Wisconsin • George Kren, PhD Kansas State University • Peter Loewenberg, PhD UCLA • Peter Petschauer, PhD Appalachian State University • Leon Rappoport, PhD Kansas State University

Advisory Council of the Psychohistory Forum

John Caulfield, MDiv, Apopka, FL • Melvin Kalfus, PhD Boca Raton, FL • Mena Potts, PhD Wintersville, OH • Jerome Wolf, Larchmont, NY

Subscription Rate:

Free to members of the Psychohistory Forum

\$25 yearly to non-members

\$40 yearly to institutions

(Both add \$4 outside USA & Canada)

Single Issue Price: \$10

We welcome articles of psychohistorical interest that are 300 - 1500 words.

Copyright © 2000 The Psychohistory Forum

chohistory in the new millennium will depend on its members' cooperation, creativity, devotion, and productivity. The more good work we do, the more our approach and field will receive favorable recognition.

Yet, movements have a tendency to split into separate groups. Psychohistory has not been immune from this inclination, which at some points brought constructive competition to the field, and at other moments destructive splitting and undercutting. Thus, colleagues tended to belong to and write for the Group for the Use of Psychology in History (GUPH, founded in 1971), which produced the *Newsletter of GUPH* from 1972 to 1976 when it was transformed into the substantial *The Psychohistory Review*, or for the various organizations and publications associated with Lloyd deMause. The latter include the Institute for Psychohistory (1972), the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA, founded in 1977 with annual meetings beginning in 1978), the *Journal of Psychohistory* (1973), the *Psychohistory News* (started in 1977 as *Psychohistory*), and the Psychohistory Press (1974).

We will not delve into the causes for this and other divisions beyond indicating that they might be explored under the following headings: varying disciplines of origin, conflicting styles, history of childhood vs. adult personality approaches, psychobiographical vs. group dynamics, New York vs. heartland, individual vs. group psychohistory, psychoanalytic vs. non-psychoanalytic, academic vs. non-academic, personality clashes, and organizational rivalries.

Lloyd deMause, the most organizationally energetic psychohistorian, was a force to be reckoned with in the second millennium. He promises to also be a powerful force in the third millennium in which he has already launched an online course on the psychogenic approach to psychohistory and an online, University of Michigan-sponsored psychohistory discussion group. One of his great strengths is his enormous passion to bring psychohistory to as many people as possible, and a weakness is his feeling, articulated in his article below, that he must go around the professors, more than work with them, to get to the students. Robert Maxwell Young, a Texan living in England, plays an important role in the development of applied psychoanalysis in the United Kingdom and increasingly on the World Wide Web. At UCLA, Peter Loewenberg is a pioneer. He is bringing history graduate students to a psychoanalytic institute

as part of their doctoral program, as well as being a key person in the formation of the University of California Psychoanalytic Consortium. Vamik Volkan of the University of Virginia brings together diplomats, leaders, academics, and psychoanalysts to help understand and defuse the hatreds leading to war. Robert Jay Lifton and Charles Strozier at the Center for the Study of Violence and Human Survival hold seminars of great importance to those interested in overcoming violence in our world. These are but a few of the passionate and talented scholars contributing to our field.

Since the reader may be wondering about the relationship of the Psychohistory Forum, **Clio's Psyche**, and me to these divergent groups, let me state it. **Clio's Psyche** and the Psychohistory Forum expressly work to include scholar/therapists from all backgrounds and of all theoretical persuasions. This is not always easy because some of our colleagues sometimes have a "you are with us or you are against us" mentality. Nevertheless, we have had some success and we urge all psychohistorians to take this approach.

Melvin Kalfus, a fine scholar of Olmsted, Wagner, and Jewish life -- as well as being **Clio's Psyche's** June, 2000, Featured Psychohistorian -- argues in his article that a key part of our task today is to keep the psychohistorical flame burning in an anti-psychological, anti-psychohistorical era. Is this a realistic approach by a man who did an outstanding job as president and long-time treasurer of the IPA and is a first rate institution builder? Perhaps he has lowered his goals because unlike some other paradigms that have developed in the 20th century, psychohistory has not taken firm root in the graduate schools and has not been seen as an essential part of any self-respecting history program. With very few exceptions, historians have come to or openly proclaimed psychohistory after getting a job or tenure, not before. This is in contrast to the situation of economic historians who, in the middle of a hard fight for respectability early in the 20th century, trained their graduate students and sent them out as professors to spread the gospel of the importance of looking at society using a lens of economic causation to better understand history. Economics makes "sense to people" -- it seems concrete and is not wedded to the massive denial often facing our field. Psychohistory has not yet reached that stage, so there is not yet a demand for psychohistorians as psychohistorians per se. Naturally, this was a source of frustration to the five of the eight IPA presidents

who had their doctoral degrees in history. (Two of the other three presidents had doctorates in psychology.) The reality is that most practicing psychohistorians come to it with degrees neither in history nor psychology. Psychohistory is a truly interdisciplinary field.

The primary reason why I see psychohistory as having good prospects is that psychoanalytic, psychological, psychohistorical, and therapeutic concepts permeate all aspects of society, and have transformed the way that we see the world. When I listen to the radio, watch television, or open the popular or scholarly press, I come across psychological language. For example, the February, 2000, issue of the *World Press Review* refers on its cover to "Indonesia's Separation Anxiety" and the February 24 PBS *News Hour with Jim Lehrer's* lead story was the "Republican [Party's] Identity Crisis." Sports psychologists are finding high profile employment as teams use every means available to get their own players back in a winning frame of mind and use every means to "psyche out" their opponents. Psychological concepts permeate the airwaves and the study of literature as students and teacher try to figure out what makes characters tick. What was called "psychobabble" 25 years ago (and still is by George W. Bush) is now part of the mental hardware of most Americans. When a bigoted pitcher from Atlanta defames New York and its peoples, the commissioner of baseball suggests that maybe he should be sentenced to therapy (although John Rocker hardly seems to be a good candidate for psychoanalysis or any therapy).

When my students, or the average layman, repeats the words "psycho" and "history" upon hearing what I do, they first ask what it is, then say, "Oh, that makes perfect sense, what a great idea!" (Most of my colleagues come with more fixed notions of the field and are usually less friendly to it.) In a society increasingly laden with psychological terms, the notion of applying psychology to society and history seems commonsensical. If we look at the growth of psychology in our society, we have to be impressed simply by the quantitative numbers. More and more people have exposure to therapies, trying to raise their kids based on what was said on morning television by a child psychologist. The language of self-help groups (borrowed from the therapies) so permeates our society that everywhere I turn I come across references to people or groups "being in denial."

My working title for this introduction was

"Killing the Messenger While Taking the Message." The message of a psychological approach to history and society has been accepted by many and written off vociferously by others as psychobabble. But most of those denouncing its messengers and message have in fact accepted the premises on which it is based, however haphazardly. I find that in the same breath they denounce a psychological approach, they use some psychological terms. The victory of the psychosocial approach is partial, and much more thorough outside of academia than in it, where it is usually safe to make unfavorable comments on psychoanalysis and psychohistorians. Bashing psychoanalysis may be a popular intellectual sport with some of this bashing coming from those with some exposure to it. An extreme case is Woody Allen who loudly complained about his therapy during much of his 36 years as a patient. (This talented filmmaker appears to have used therapy as an emotional crutch rather than to cure his neuroses, as well as a source of fantasies and ideas.)

It is my sense (and hope) that the tide of psychological awareness can not be stopped. Many history and psychology departments will attempt to stop this tide at their own peril. When society turns more systematically to psychohistory we need to have a large body of work and a variety of well-conceived methodologies to offer. The future of psychohistory will be brightest if those of us who are already committed to developing our psychosocial paradigm:

- Do good work. Set a high standard for ourselves and be good examples for others.
- Write in clear language readily accessible to the layperson.
- Be tolerant in our differences and in our disagreements. Accept that there are many truths rather than just one truth or method of inquiry. Do not abandon the public espousal of the field because you disagree with the work of others.
- Use our special insights, techniques, and knowledge as an instrument of empathy, insight, and help rather than as a way of feeling superior to the uninformed.
- Attract young scholars, therapists, lay people, and journalists to the field. Take time to teach and mentor them.
- Organize conferences, workshops, and ongoing seminars in our clinics, colleges, hospitals, regions, and other group settings.
- Support a variety of psychohistorical organiza-

tions and publications.

- Work to revitalize psychoanalytic institutions that sometimes fall into the pattern of simply repeating Freudian theory in the same old way. Introduce them to modern psychohistory.
- Nurture new generations of leaders and editors so that our institutions and journals do not collapse with the illness, retirement, or death of current officers and editors.
- Fund psychohistory in a variety of ways -- through memberships and subscriptions, awards and scholarships, endowed chairs of psychohistory and foundations. Put psychohistory in our wills.
- Find great popularizers -- individuals who will do for psychohistory what Carl Sagan did for astronomy, Rachel Carson for the environment, and Isaac Asimov for science.
- Apply psychohistory to vital issues of the day (as have Lifton, Strozier, and Volkan to war, peace, and conflict resolution) such as the problems of anomie, a loss of a sense of self, civic alienation, and loneliness in our fragmented society.
- Welcome new technologies while adhering to old values. Use electronic communications to communicate with each other and the world.

We are the carriers of the psychohistorical torch. In the following pages you will read the thoughts of others who have joined in the exciting psychohistorical endeavor.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, is Founder and Director of the Psychohistory Forum, Editor of this publication, a Contributing Editor of the Journal of Psychohistory, a founding member and past president of the IPA, former editor of Psychohistory (now the Psychohistory News), and Director of the Psychohistory Forum research project, The History and Makers of Psychohistory. After teaching at Temple and Fairleigh Dickinson universities, he became a founding faculty member at Ramapo College. Currently, he is researching and writing about the Year 2000 political candidates. He may be reached at <pelovitz@aol.com>. □

Psychohistory's False Start

(Continued from page 133)

read into the historic record what psychoanalysts had learned about patients. For another, even the richest of historic records are short on childhood

experience, the stock-in-trade of psychoanalysis, so that psychoanalysis could not even be well applied to history. For a third, a concern with pathology inevitably brushed off from psychoanalysis onto fledgling psychohistory, which should rather have come to terms with normalcy as its first order of business. But above all, the bulk of history is human interaction on a large scale, whereas the stuff of psychoanalysis is individual experience, including individual experience in groups.

Despite its fealty to psychoanalysis, fledgling psychohistory missed its calling as well in that, even while it fitted psychoanalytic models to history, it failed to adopt and adapt the introspective, associative approach that psychoanalysis requires for patients to see and feel the unconscious underpinnings of their symptoms. The psychohistorical researcher could meet this psychoanalytic requirement through a total intellectual and emotional immersion in his subject, whether individual or group. But this demanding exercise found little favor as against the easier speculative alignment of historic with clinical materials.

Off to a false start among the Freudians, psychohistory ran itself to ground. By the 1970s it had more or less exhausted its psychoanalytic agenda and began casting about for clinical substitutes, which proved ever more cultish and farther afield from history. For outsiders, meanwhile, it lost its novelty and at length its plausibility. Other modes of historical inquiry swiped its most fetching concepts. College courses on the literature and method folded; scholarly output fell off; seasoned practitioners deserted; recruitment slackened. The upshot is a happy one: at the turn of the millennium, the way is wide open for a radical renewal.

Though I see no sign of a viable renewal in the offing, one is bound to come in due course. The reason is simple -- as simple as the wonderment that comes with our earliest sense of reality. We keep trying to understand our world, but there is no understanding our world without understanding its past, which means knowing why people have done what they have done. And to know this is, in a word, psychohistory.

Rudolph Binion received his graduate degrees from Columbia University and the University of Paris. He taught at Rutgers, MIT, and Columbia before taking up his present position as Leff Professor of History at Brandeis University. He has practiced psychohistory since his massive psychobiography of Lou Andreas-Salomé, Frau Lou (1968). His subsequent works

include *Hitler Among the Germans* (1976), *Soundings Psychohistorical and Psycholiterary* (1981), *After Christianity* (1986), *Love Beyond Death* (1993), *Sounding the Classics* (1997), and many psychohistorical articles, most recently in cultural and demographic history. He is currently preparing a collection of psychohistorical studies of group process. He may be reached at <BINION@brandeis.edu>. □

Freud's Understanding of Repression

Thomas J. Scheff

University of California, Santa Barbara

Review of Michael Billig, *Freudian Repression: Conversation Creating the Unconscious*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Paperback, ISBN 0521659566, 275 pp., \$22.95.

It is a rare book that has the potential of transforming an entire field of endeavor. *Freudian Repression* is such a book. Although Billig modestly claims only to clarify Freud's theory of repression, the book lays the groundwork for a complete re-statement of psychoanalytic theory as a whole. By focusing on the details of dialogue, Billig's work portends a psychoanalytic theory and method that is virtually new.

First of all, it should be said that Billig is not one of Freud's detractors; he is profuse in his admiration of Freud's work. He pays it the compliment of having read all of it and an impressive amount of the secondary literature as well. He is fulsome in his praise of Freud's brilliance as an observer and his extraordinary clarity as a writer. In this respect, the book clearly belongs in the camp of the followers of Freud.

But he is not an idolater. He appreciates what he finds to be true in Freud's work, and criticizes the parts that ring false. In this respect, Billig belongs to no camp. He is a "free artist of himself," to use Harold Bloom's phrase. In these days of intellectual fads and schools of thought, such writers are a rarity.

What Billig has done is to apply discourse analysis to dialogue reported in Freud's cases and in his life. In doing so, he has avoided some of the pitfalls of the discourse analysis camp. The other discourse and conversation analysts have stayed on the surface, assiduously avoiding not only unconscious motives, but any kind of motivation at all.

Although they do not use the term, they pride themselves in being behaviorists, dealing, as they say, only with linguistic behavior. However, in taking this course, they fall into the trap of employing a metapsychology that is only tacit. Hidden from view, it cannot easily be discussed, particularly its gross oversimplification of human conduct and experience. As he does with Freud's writing, Billig also takes only what he needs from discourse analysis. In eschewing both metapsychologies Billig comes up with a new one, one that seems to capture more of the reality of human conduct, and is much more defensible.

Billig's story begins with what seems to be an inconsistency in Freud's theory of repression. On the one hand, Freud clearly stated in his history of the psychoanalytic movement that the concept of repression, not that of the unconscious, formed the core of psychoanalytic theory: "the theory of repression is corner-stone on which the whole structure of psychoanalysis rests." On the other hand, Freud was surprisingly diffident about his knowledge of repression. In the *Introductory Lectures*, published when he was over 60, the confident head of the psychoanalytic movement stated: "...so far we have only one piece of information [about repression]," that "...[it] emanates from forces of the ego." Apart from that, Freud added, "we know nothing more at present." As Billig points out, this one piece of information does not tell us much, since we have no way of knowing what forces Freud was referring to, nor, for that matter, how the ego itself is to be construed. The vast significance of the concept of repression compared to the meager amount of knowledge about it, Billig proposes, makes an enormous gap in psychoanalytic theory.

Given this gap, Billig sets about to fill it with a new theory of repression. He proposes that repression arises from social practices regarding topics or feelings that are generally regarded in a particular society as too shameful to discuss. At the time that Freud lived in Vienna, sexuality was such a topic. Billig goes on to document that in Freud's practice there were other such topics, such as anti-Semitism, and that there were also such topics in Freud's own life, such as desire for women other than his wife.

Billig proposes that repression begins in social practices: Little Hans learns from dialogue with his mother and father that certain topics (sexuality, aggression, etc.) are not to be discussed. If one of these topics is raised, the parent routinely

changes the subject to another topic, one that is not forbidden. This transition is usually marked by small, innocuous phrases, such as "Even so" or "Oh, well." In the case of the Ratman, he had established the use of the word *aber*, which means *but*, along with a gesture of repudiation, in order to change the subject when he heard his inner voices. The inner voices themselves, according to Billig, are also a routine to avoid topics or feelings.

The author's analysis of dialogue is so precise and brilliant that I can not do justice to it here. Suffice it to say that his use of dialogue raises strong doubts about most of Freud's interpretations. For example, Freud thought that the case of Little Hans provided strong support for the oedipal theory that he had derived from adult cases. But Billig reinterprets the dialogue that the father reported to Freud. He shows how the dialogues suggest that it is the avoiding of talk about sexuality and aggression that frustrates the child's curiosity and increases his desire to know more about the forbidden topics. Of course the child is interested in these topics, but probably no more than hundreds of others. This interpretation locates the oedipal themes not primarily in the child, but in the parents. But the interests and avoidances of the parents reflect, for the most part, the conversational practices of the society in which they live.

The major focus of Billig's re-evaluations, in addition to Little Hans, is the cases of Elizabeth, the Rat Man, the Wolf Man, and the case of Dora. In addition to these cases, Billig also uses Freud's reports of dialogue with his wife Martha and with his sister-in-law, Minna. Each of these cases allows Billig to uncover new facets of the process of repression. For example, he uses the dialogue concerning Martha and Minna to strongly suggest that Freud repressed his desire for Minna and other women.

Perhaps the most dramatic of many revelations is provided by the analysis of the case of Dora. Billig demonstrates that although both Freud and Dora were Jews living in a virulently anti-Semitic society, all references to Jewishness and to anti-Semitism seem to have been excluded from their sessions, and in much of Freud's life. As an example of the latter, Billig demonstrates how Freud was able to avoid referring to Christmas gifts he received and even, in some cases, exchanged.

The most flagrant instance of mutual avoidance is demonstrated by Billig's use of Freud's response to an episode that Dora reported

of her visit to an art museum in Dresden. She told Freud, in passing, that she stood for two hours admiring Raphael's painting of the Madonna. When Freud asked her what had pleased her so much about the painting, "she could make no answer. At last she said, "The Madonna," which, of course, is no answer. Rather than probing further into her obvious evasiveness, his usual tactic, Freud simply accepted her non-answer, moving on to another topic. In a footnote in his report of the case, he interpreted her fascination for the painting in sexual terms: an identification with virgin mother enables young girls to fantasize motherhood without admitting sexual desire.

Billig, however, suggests a more comprehensive interpretation, one that was validated by a later event in Dora's life. When she got married, soon after the publication of Freud's report on her case, Dora and husband converted to Christianity. Her two hours of gazing at the Madonna was likely to have been fantasizing not only about motherhood, but also about Christian motherhood. This is likely to have been the reason she didn't respond to Freud's question, and the reason he avoided questioning her further about her non-response.

Apparently it was a widespread practice for Jews of Europe of that time, especially middle-class Jews, to avoid the issue of anti-Semitism and their oppression by their society. Perhaps this was the main reason that so many of them failed to escape from that oppression. Freud himself fled Vienna so late that it was only the intervention by a third party on his behalf that allowed him to escape.

Not all the members of Freud's family were so lucky. Billig tells a particularly grim story about Adolphine, the youngest of Freud's five sisters. She had a reputation in the family as being slightly dotty. When walking in Vienna with her brother Martin she would whisper to him that a man had just called her "a dirty stinking Jewess and said it was time they were all killed." Since neither Martin nor the other Freuds noticed such remarks, they treated her reports as a joke. But, of course, they were no joke. As Billig notes, the Nazis took Adolphine and three of her sisters to the death camps. None of them returned.

Both individual and collective repression of the facts of anti-Semitism had tragic consequences for Freud's own family, as well as for the other European Jews. I can remember that as a child, my father wrote countless letters to his parents and sister, pleading that they come to Amer-

ica. They always answered that there was no danger. Like Freud's sisters, they perished in the Holocaust, victims not just of the Nazis, but also perhaps of their own repressions.

Billig's new theory of repression suggests that it begins with social practices of avoidance of certain topics. Both the practice of avoidance and many of the topics to be avoided are taken up by the individual. How are they internalized? Billig's theory is not completely articulated, but it suggests two steps. First, learning the social practice of routinely avoiding a certain topic by changing the subject to another topic. This practice is intentional at first; it results in a collective failure to notice the forbidden topic. Perhaps after many repetitions, the individual takes the second step, learning to routinely avoid noticing his or her practice of avoiding the forbidden topic, by changing the subject to one that is not forbidden. This second step functions to remove the forbidden topic from conscious awareness. If this second step fails to remove the shame, a third and even subsequent steps can be taken (see the discussion of the case of the Ratman, below).

The author's theory suggests that when a topic is forbidden both by social and by individual practice, it effectively disappears from consciousness, as was the case, apparently, with anti-Semitism among middle-class Jews in Freud's time. In this case, an individual who notices what everyone else has repressed becomes embarrassingly deviant, as was the case with Adolfin in Freud's family. Conversely, if the individual represses topics that the collectivity does not, or uses personal routines in the service of repression that are not confirmed in social practice, such idiosyncratic practices are seen as neurotic or psychotic symptoms. Billig illustrates this point with the obsessions, inner voices, fetishes, and rituals employed by the Ratman (his real name was Paul Lorenz).

This patient seemed to have worked out unusual and complex routines to avoid his feelings. One example Billig uses concerns an episode when Paul apparently became annoyed. His girlfriend had gone away to nurse her sick grandmother. He reported to Freud that his inner voice gave him two commands, to kill the grandmother and to slit his own throat. Freud interpreted these voices as a means of masking Paul's feeling of anger, first toward the grandmother, then toward himself for his murderous thought. Apparently in Paul's case, more than two steps of avoidance were needed, as

he was ashamed of not only the original topic, but also the later avoidance steps themselves.

Billig's theory of repression and his examples represent the interaction of two processes usually kept separate: social interaction and internal representations. His interpretations of dialogue show the interpenetration of these two realms. Billig's theory fits neatly into the growing body of thought on the social construction of the self and of reality, as he notes. But his theory and interpretations are much more precise and specific than social constructionism, which is little more than an abstract idea. Billig shows how both normal and neurotic responses arise from social practice, and, less explicitly, how they are internalized.

The author's theory undercuts Freud's idea that the drive toward repression is a universal biological phenomenon. In his version, aggression and sexuality were repressed in Freud's Vienna because of the linguistic processes in the segment of society he was familiar with, middle-class Jews. That is, aggression, hostility, and sexuality were repressed in this group, but because of linguistic practices, not biological necessity. The example of Freud and Dora's repression of Jewishness and anti-Semitism seems to be a telling refutation of the idea of biological necessity.

I have only a few minor reservations about this book. One trivial one is that the sentences seem to me awash in a sea of unnecessary commas. Although they don't change the meaning, they slow down the reader. A second problem occurs only in the first, theoretical part of the book, some 50 pages. I found the argument here tiresomely repetitive. However, as soon as the cases are introduced, the remaining 200 pages, the pace picks up nicely. There are no unnecessary words in Billig's analysis of the cases. Some could even have been expanded.

A tiny detail about the case presentations: they are nicely indexed under the heading, "Freud's patients." But I think an appendix listing the patients' names, their age at the time of treatment, the length of treatment, and the year(s) during which treatment occurred would be of great help to readers (practically everyone) who are not as familiar with the cases as Billig.

One final issue which is not really a reservation, but a suggestion. I would like to see further attempts by Billig to articulate his analysis of these cases with larger theoretical frameworks. He mentions one, Vygotsky and others, on theories of self-

talk. Larger frameworks would be provided by G.H. Mead's theory of the genesis and maintenance of the self in social interaction, and Erik Erikson's ideas about stages in the growth of the self. At the level of collective behavior, Billig's analysis of the case of Dora suggests a new field of endeavor, the formation of denial in oppressed minorities, surely a vital issue in today's world. These and many other ideas were generated by Billig's small book, surely a sign of its intellectual and scholarly vitality.

Thomas J. Scheff is Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He is the author of Microsociology (1990); Emotions and Violence (with Suzanne M. Retzinger) (1991); Bloody Revenge (1994); Emotions, the Social Bond, and Human Reality (1997); Being Mentally Ill (1999); and other books and articles. He is a former chair of the Sociology of Emotions section, American Sociological Association, and former president, Pacific Sociological Association. His fields of research are social psychology, emotions, mental illness, and social theory. His current studies concern conflict resolution, love and alienation in popular songs, and the emotional/relational world. Professor Scheff may be reached at <scheftj@gte.net>. □

The Civilizing Process and Long-Term Historical Change

Daniel Klenbort
Morehouse College

When we think of psychohistory, we usually think of using psychoanalysis to investigate the psychology of individual humans who are of historical importance, such as Hitler or Gandhi. And when we think of Freudian psychology, we usually think of the human psyche as fixed. Humans have drives, their minds are divided into conscious and unconscious as well as into ego, id, and superego.

But there is another side to Freud's thinking about history, namely his belief that psychology changes as people become more civilized. It is extremely unfashionable to juxtapose the terms "civilized" and "primitive" as Freud does. Yet it is worth recalling what Freud means by this juxtaposition. Freud sees human culture as changing over time and human psychology changing as human culture changes. Human culture not only changes, but it advances. Humans learn to master nature so

as to satisfy their needs and desires, and humans develop in their social relations. The two sides of human development, technical and scientific knowledge on the one hand and social relations on the other, are intertwined; they develop together. The advance of culture leads to an advance of civilization, as individual human beings learn to master their instinctual drives. The cultural process mankind has undergone from primitive to civilized is basically the same process a child in a civilized society has to go through as she is civilized by her environment.

Civilization involves the control of a people's primitive instincts but it is not all or nothing. There are two sources of self-control: love and power. Love leads to an internalization of civilized norms, such as honesty, non-violence, and sexual restraint. This is the most real civilization and results when culture genuinely transforms the individual psyche. Power, by way of contrast, creates only the external appearance of civilization in the individual. Power uses the power of the state to reward and punish so as to force citizens to act in a civilized manner creating a sort of pseudo-civilized citizen.

Even for the truly civilized there is a cost to controlling their impulses. The primitive part of a person is never entirely extinguished. For the modern primitives in civilized clothing, the urge to escape civilization is very powerful. It is for this reason that wars, waged by ostensibly civilized countries, can easily lead people to behave in highly uncivilized ways. A person who in ordinary life would be very unlikely to even strike another, goes off to war and kills others, in some cases highly ambivalent about, but in others exhilarated by, being freed from the yoke of civilization.

The scholar who has done most to pursue and extend this sociological side of Freud's thinking is Norbert Elias (1897-1990). In such books as *Involvement and Detachment* (1987), *The Civilizing Process* (1994), and *The Germans* (1996), Elias makes Freud's view of human psychological change in history one of the cornerstones of his historical sociology. Asked what he learned when he lived in Ghana, Elias answered, "I was always of the opinion that the theory Freud left behind needed to be developed further. I thought that superego and ego formation in simpler societies would be different from ours, and this expectation was fully confirmed in Ghana." Elias goes on to ascribe the difference not to any European superiority, but to the greater insecurity of life in simpler

societies, which results in the creation of personal gods and spirits as representatives of the superego (Elias, 1994, pp. 70-71).

In his works, Elias attempts to describe the changes in the European psyche that led to the present level of "civilization" as well as the differences between the developments in different European countries. Elias never used "civilization" as a noun, but rather talked about a civilizing process, a way of looking at "civilization" that fits well with Freud's thinking. Elias was acutely aware that the civilizing process could be reversed and lead to acute periods of decivilizing, such as the World Wars and the Third Reich. On a personal level, Elias also compared himself to Freud as a scientist (in Elias' case, a sociologist), who remained true to his calling and did not compromise with prevailing opinion (Elias, 1994, p.76).

Elias' scholarship shows how psychoanalysis can help us to understand not only the psychology of individuals but the psychology of evolving mankind. It is vital to continue to work to understand ever-changing social psychology of humans, as we continue to struggle with the issues of war, violence, and death in our new millennium.

Daniel Klenbort was born in France and received his PhD in history from the University of Chicago. He has been on the faculty of Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia, since 1965 and may be contacted at <klenbort@mindspring.com>. □

A Psychosocial Approach to Racism and Ethnic Hatred

Simon Clarke

University of the West of England

I am prompted to write this article as many social scientists become disillusioned with their discipline and look toward new ways of knowing at the start of the 21st century. Because of the failure of sociology to explain outbreaks of violence and ethnic hatred around the world, there is a growing interest in psychosocial studies amongst the academic community in Britain. For example, after the Holocaust and the ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia, how was it possible to end the 20th century with the horror that was Kosovo and the brutality in Sierra Leone? This paper discusses how we might start thinking about ethnic hatred and racism -- psychosocially.

Structure and affect, society and psyche are

inseparable in terms of the explanation of social phenomena. The psychosocial method links structure and affect in a way that sociology, psychology, and social psychology have been unable to separately. In psychosocial research there is an emphasis on the psychodynamic -- individual, group, and societal -- with a focus on the psychological mechanisms that we use to "think about," "make sense of," and "exist in the world." The psychosocial approach is therefore about the way in which the historical, political, and social interact with the psychological. Psychosocial studies are, or should be, truly interdisciplinary.

It was a second or third reading of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1983) that stimulated in me an interest in psychoanalytic theory. Initially, Conrad's work seemed an adventure which unfurled into a critique of the cruelty, greed, and senseless barbarity of colonialism in which "white" is the root of all evil in the colonial darkness. A further reading revealed a very different journey, a journey into the unconscious, the unknown, the heart of darkness. A place of imaginary fears and enemies, of fantasy. It is a journey into our psychological pre-history.

In the Introduction to this edition of *Heart of Darkness*, it is argued that "the darkness is a deeply suppressed inner anarchy which is impossible to comprehend, or explain, and better not to imagine." I disagree, and feel that it is because of this rejection of the inner world that sociology has failed to explain racism satisfactorily. Indeed, it fails to address three of the central issues surrounding racism. First, the ubiquity and the affective component of hatred. Second, the way in which people, as in the former Yugoslavia, who used to co-exist in communities can come to hate and destroy each other so rapidly. And, finally, the fact that sociological explanation ignores any psychological structuring of racism. I believe there is a complex interrelationship between socio-structural and psychological factors that provides the impetus for people to hate each other.

In a previous paper ("Racism, Hatred, and Discrimination Through the Lens of Projective Identification," *Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society*, 4, (2), 1999, pp 158-161), I outlined how I thought that the Kleinian concept of "projective identification" can give us a better understanding of the psychodynamics of racism -- how we "think" about others, "feel" about others, and, most importantly, how we "make others feel." Whereas projection per se can be a relatively harm-

less process, projective identification involves a deep split, a ridding of unpalatable parts of the self onto some other, forcing the other to feel the way we feel about them. I often quote from Frantz Fanon's *Black Skin White Masks* (1968) as an example: "The white man has woven me out of a thousand details. I was battered down by tom-toms, cannibalism, intellectual deficiency, fetishism, racial defects, [and] slave ships" (p. 112). The black person lives the projections of the white construction of "otherness," trapped by projected fantasy on one hand and by historical, economic, and political processes on the other.

A starker example of the fusion of structural and psychological factors can be seen in Paul Hoggett's "A Place for Experience: A Psychoanalytic Perspective on Boundary, Identity, and Culture" (1992), a study of white people's resentment of Bangladeshi communities in London. Tower Hamlets is a multiracial area in London that has suffered massive social dislocation and poor housing. A series of stabbings led to tension between the white working class and Bangladeshi communities. The improvement of homes by the introduction of double glazing and central heating led to a cockroach infestation. Despite clear evidence that the infestation was due to the improvements made -- an increase in temperature favorable to cockroach breeding and miles of conduit enabling the roaches to reinfest treated housing -- it was attributed to the target of the projection and the cockroach came to symbolize the Bangladeshi community.

These are but two examples of a growing literature and interest in psychoanalytic or psychosocial explanation. Racism and ethnic hatred can only be understood in terms of both structural and psychological factors. This, of course, is a rather simplistic hypothesis. The dynamic is more complex, an interrelation between outer and inner worlds, between historical, political, and social circumstances and that deep, raw emotion that is the heart of darkness. Racism is a particular form of "otherness," imputed in biologic/racial inferiority and based in fantasy.

Fantasy has been played out and legitimized by pseudo-science in the form of Social Darwinism: because science is a form of containment, if we can classify "otherness," we can contain it, control it, and use it. Crucially, psychoanalysis can help us understand why we feel this need to hold, contain, persecute, filter, and cleanse difference. "Race" is a socially constructed con-

tainer through which we project our "inner" world onto others. Others are a psychological manifestation of our fear of difference and psychic disorder.

It is the communicative aspect of psychoanalysis that interests me as a sociologist. In particular, the work of Melanie Klein and the object relations school can help us explain the way we think and feel about others, and, crucially, the way we make others feel. The concepts of splitting, fantasy, and projective communication can help us understand the motivation behind racist or discriminatory behavior. I place a considerable emphasis on projective identification and argue that it is a significant communicative dynamic which lies at the heart of racism and ethnic hatred. It is in this area that the current sociological literature is sadly lacking in explanatory power. Psychosocial research can provide insights into the affective mechanisms at work in society and fill in many of the gaps left by sociological explanation.

Simon Clarke is a lecturer and researcher at the University of the West of England where he teaches sociological theory and social psychology and is currently researching racism and exclusion in higher education. Clarke will soon submit his doctoral dissertation, The Psychodynamics of Racism, Hatred, and Exclusion, for examination. He may be contacted at <Simon.Clarke@uwe.ac.uk>. □

Fathoming the Weirdness of History

Jerry S. Piven
New School University

History is replete with wondrous and strange behaviors which are rarely understood without the unique discoveries of psychology and its attendant scientific and hermeneutic methodologies. I have recently completed a doctoral degree in depth psychology to better understand these phenomena. Let me now turn to three examples which we might have great trouble fathoming without psychology and psychohistory.

Imagine a tortured soul who in the midst of his daily excretory ritual is accosted by a hostile vision of Lucifer himself. The Devil attacks him in the castle lavatory, hurling scatological slurs (and perhaps other matter) toward the hapless defecating victim, whose only defense is to fling insults (and other available material) back at his evil foe. He finally defeats Satan with "a mighty anal blast."

Imagine how this fecal hallucination became the inspiration for a theological revolution, how this tortured soul became the leader of a religious movement which changed history irrevocably. "*Scatet totus orbis*," he proclaims -- "the entire world defecates."

Imagine another unusual psyche, a failed artist with one testicle, who is obsessed with the elimination of a virulent disease from society. He enjoys having his lovers relieve themselves on his face, cannot experience the erotic unless their fetid excretions pour over his eyes and mouth. He becomes the leader of his country which engages in a furor of genocidal ethnic cleansing. This leader is so charismatic that after his paranoid speeches his subjects riot and go on delirious killing sprees, and random strangers copulate frenetically from the ecstasy his message inspires. He lays waste to innumerable lands, peoples, and cultures.

Finally, picture a child who suffers terribly every day at the hands of his father, an expert in childrearing practices. In the name of discipline and moral development, the father admonishes him, places him in a steel harness to prevent him from any sinful movement. The child grows up to be a respectable juror, but eventually falls ill. He hallucinates that God is victimizing him excruciatingly, invading his body, and turning him into a woman. Paradoxically, he becomes the advocate and avatar of this God, and spreads his message from his padded cell.

If such cases do not arouse a sense of wonder, bafflement, shock, or disgust, then history and the human mind itself will surely hold scant interest. The first case is that of Martin Luther, a rare soul whose impact on history and religion is inestimable. And yet he was not a well man. His obsession with feces is absolutely weird, his excremental visions embarrassing, offensive, or comical to contemporaries who hear them. How was this psyche, in all its genius and dementia, formed? The second case, and I cannot imagine that the reader will not have guessed, is none other than Adolf Hitler. How was it that a genitally deformed child came to enjoy such perverse sexuality, strive psychotically to dominate and destroy the world, and inspire such violence and delirious sexual excitement? How is it that groups of ordinarily sane human beings can be whipped into a frenzy, aroused in their hostility and bloodlust to slaughter blithely and self-righteously? The final example is that of Dr. Schreber, a case made famous by Freud and debated endlessly by psychologists for 80 years.

Wherefore his religious delusions? Why would God want to turn him into a woman?

How are we to understand the bizarre phenomena, the spontaneous madnesses, in these examples? Psychohistory addresses cases and questions such as these. Psychohistorians approach history from a variety of disciplines, integrating anthropology, sociology, political science, literature, and biology into their psychological investigations of human motivation and the irrational. We find the sheer insanity of history beguiling and fascinating. The imagination and lunacy, vision as well as hallucination, is what seduces us. Those who are struck by the irrational will find typical chronicling and explanation of historical events and people drearily dull, insipid, soporific, and, frankly, worthless. We seek models to understand history and the mind and its host of derangements. There really is no amateur way to understand people like Hitler and Martin Luther, or Nazism, revolution, and religious wars. How does one understand coprophilia [use of feces for sexual excitement] or *jihad* on one's own? The future of historical analysis must include a psychological and interdisciplinary paradigm to make any sense of the question of "Why?" History without the psyche is not human at all.

Psychodynamics are neither random nor unpredictable. We have found that children develop with specific needs and proclivities, that the nature of character and pathology result from certain modes of experience. Thus, Luther's phantasms may be traced to the torturous relationship with his father, deriving from the complex matrix of abuse, guilt, and loathing heaped upon him like so much offal. We can similarly perceive that Schreber's religious hallucinations of the God who victimizes him symbolize his pathological relationship to the invasive and violent father who made him feel helpless and feminized. Or we may examine something far different, such as the erection of the Egyptian pyramids, detecting in these massive monuments eternal denials of the gruesome facts of death and decay.

But we do not only use psychology to diagnose history, for example, to diagnose Joan of Arc as a schizophrenic and be done with her. We wish to learn from history, to understand the feelings, the symbols, the depths, and the nature of the hallucinations and madness. How do we understand ourselves if not by struggling with those imaginations? When one looks at the Crusades, for example, does one not ask how in God's name the same

people who fell to their knees before the divine in love and gratitude, could mount their horses and travel vast distances to lay waste to the splendors of the Arab world, to the most cultivated and spiritual people on the planet at that time? What does this say about us, our religions, self-righteous invasions, and holy wars?

Therein is the fascination. We espy a culture turning to madness and cannibalism in a heartbeat. We ask both what inspired this frenzy and when do we succumb to similar ferment? We examine a case of human sacrifice, the holy consumption and consecration of the victim, and wonder if perhaps there is an uncanny similarity when we ritually eat the body and drink the blood of Our Lord. This is our task: to use our unique psychological knowledge to deepen our understanding of these uncanny phenomena, and to explore the nature of humanity through the historical imagination. Always with a sense of exploring and deepening, taking very little for granted when it comes to that enigma we call psyche. For it is an enigma, and becomes all the more fascinating and alluring as we discover the opulence of the imagination. Isn't it exciting!

Jerry S. Piven is an adjunct professor of the psychology of religion at New School University and New York University. His courses focus on death, sexuality, and psychoanalytic investigations of culture and history. Professor Piven also trains at the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis, and has lectured for the International Psychohistorical Association, the American Academy of Religion, and the Ernest Becker Foundation. He is the author of a book entitled Death Denial and Religious Evolution: Psychopathology and Sexual Violence in History, which is under consideration for publication. □

Psychohistory from a Historiometric Perspective

Dean Keith Simonton
University of California, Davis

Historically speaking, the term *psychohistory* has acquired a somewhat narrow meaning. For the most part, psychohistory has been taken to mean the psychological interpretation of historical events and personalities. Initially, these psychological interpretations relied almost exclusively on psychoanalytic theory. Even when the theoretical orientation is not psychoanalytic, the methodologi-

cal approach remains so. That is, the interpretation proceeds in a manner very similar to that of a clinical analysis. The raw facts of history and biography are discussed in qualitative rather than quantitative terms.

Yet I would argue that psychohistory might benefit immensely if it were to do more than confine itself just to the theoretical findings of psychological science. After all, scientific psychology prides itself as much or more on its methodological sophistication, especially its quantitative techniques. Significantly, these techniques include methods for (a) the content analysis of official documents, private correspondence, and creative products (whether scientific, literary, musical, or visual) and (b) the causal analysis of correlational data regarding content analytical, biographical, and historical variables. Collectively, this collection of measurement and statistical techniques has been styled "historiometry." This term not only distinguishes these methods from psychohistory, but also from cliometrics which, while clearly quantitative, does not examine psychological processes, as do both historiometry and psychohistory.

Historiometric inquiries have already shed a tremendous amount of light on the psychological processes that underlie historical manifestations of genius, creativity, leadership, and aesthetics. In my own research program, for example, I have studied eminent scientists and inventors, great philosophers, literary giants, illustrious artists, classical composers, the Presidents of the United States, absolute monarchs of Europe, and other distinguished achievers in almost every domain of accomplishment. In these studies, moreover, I have examined such factors as intelligence, precocity, personality, values, motivation, family environment, education, political circumstances, and the broad sociocultural milieu. Others who have successfully applied quantitative techniques to historical data include Herbert Barry, III, R. B. Cattell, Wayne Dennis, Francis Galton, Aubrey Immelman, Harvey C. Lehman, Colin Martindale, David C. McClelland, Robert R. Sears, Peter Suedfeld, Lewis M. Terman, Philip Tetlock, Edward L. Thorndike, and David Winter. The method has been extensively utilized in the psychological analysis of political leaders, most notably in Winter's studies of Presidential motivation and in studies by Suedfeld and Tetlock regarding the historical repercussions of a political leader's cognitive complexity.

Furthermore, some historiometric investi-

gations have actually addressed issues that have roots in psychoanalytic theory. A particularly remarkable example can be found in Colin Martindale's *The Clockwork Muse: The Predictability of Artistic Styles* (1990). Beginning with the concept of creativity as entailing regression into primary process, Martindale then devised content analytical measures of primary process in literature, music, and the visual arts. Fluctuations in primary process imagery were then shown to predict the origination of new aesthetic styles.

Admittedly, many historiometric investigations are more oriented toward testing nomothetic principles than engaging in idiographic explanations. That is, the historiometrician usually strives to learn about the general processes and functional relations that govern human behavior, thought, and feeling. The psychohistorian, in contrast, is more often interested in a specific historical or biographical question in which the "names, dates, and places" are an integral part of the interpretation. This approach appears more compatible to the quasi-clinical method favored in most psychohistory. Nonetheless, there are many examples of historiometric studies that attempt to grapple with issues that psychohistorians should find inherently valuable. Two examples may suffice.

Many psychohistorians have tried to understand the personality and behavior of Richard M. Nixon, certainly among the most puzzling of all modern Presidents. Some of Nixon's peculiarities were explicated in terms of his distinctive motivational profile by Winter and Carlson ("Using Motive Scores in the Psychobiographical Study of an Individual: The Case of Richard Nixon," *Journal of Personality*, 56 1988, pp. 75-103). After determining Nixon's power, achievement, and affiliation needs using content analytical procedures, the investigators were able to compare his profile against what would be expected from the vast psychological literature on the correlates of these three motives. In a sense, Nixon represents a fairly typical example of how persons tend to behave who have the same motivational constitution.

Another historic figure who has received considerable psychohistorical attention is King George III of Great Britain. His sporadic bouts with mental illness have attracted many interpretations, some psychodynamic and others medical (e.g., the porphyria hypothesis). Although this literature has been explicitly identified as an example where psychobiographers have exhibited scientific progress in the adequacy of their explanations, I

have published a historiometric investigation that shows that these accounts may have overlooked a crucial psychological process ("Mad King George: The Impact of Personal and Political Stress on Mental and Physical Health," *Journal of Personality*, 66, 1998, pp. 443-466). By adapting biographical measures from instruments used in health psychology, and by applying time-series statistical analyses, I was able to show that his mental and physical illness followed shortly after periods of exceptional stress in his personal and political life. Hence, King George was exhibiting a phenomenon far more commonplace than most psychobiographers had suspected.

Psychohistorians interested in obtaining a better understanding of this quantitative methodology may consult my book, *Psychology, Science, and History: An Introduction to Historiometry* (1990). In addition, representative examples of my historiometric articles regarding creative genius have been published in a recent anthology, Simonton, *Genius and Creativity: Selected Papers*, (1997). Finally, I should mention my most recent review article, "Significant Samples: The Psychological Study of Eminent Individuals" (*Psychological Methods*, 4, 1999, pp. 425-451). The article systematically compares historiometry with other methodological approaches, including psychometrics, psychobiography, and comparative studies. My hope is that the more extensive use of historiometric methods can help revitalize psychohistory as a respected and creative discipline. After all, historiometricians and psychohistorians share one critical value: The persons and events of history cannot be fully understood without understanding the psychology of the actors who make history.

Dean Keith Simonton received his PhD in Social Psychology from Harvard University in 1975 and is currently Professor of Psychology at the University of California, Davis. His research program has generated more than 200 publications, including seven books, such as Genius, Creativity, and Leadership: Historiometric Inquiries (1984), Why Presidents Succeed: A Political Psychology of Leadership (1987), Scientific Genius: A Psychology of Science (1988), Psychology, Science, and History: An Introduction to Historiometry (1990), Greatness: Who Makes History and Why (1994), and Origins of Genius: Darwinian Perspectives on Creativity (1999). He is a member of numerous professional organizations and serves as president of the

International Association of Empirical Aesthetics, has been honored with many awards, and is on the editorial boards of various scholarly publications. He may be reached at <dksimonton@ucdavis.edu>; his Web page is <http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/Simonton/>. □

Keeping the Psychohistorical Flame Burning

Melvin Kalfus

Psychohistory Forum Research Associate

The major problem that psychohistory faces as the millennium unrolls is not so much hostility as it is lack of awareness of its very existence. To be sure, there is a deeply entrenched hostility to psychohistory within the strongholds of the current intellectual establishment -- almost certainly fueled by the anti-Freud, anti-psychoanalysis tide that runs so powerfully within these same circles. But beyond these circles, what the mention of psychohistory is likely to provoke is a blank stare or "What's psychohistory?" or a tired joke, "The history of crazy people?" (to which I always respond, "Yeah, the human race"). But it should be noted also that inside and outside the establishment institutions, there are pockets of strong interest and acceptance. At least, so my personal experience suggests to me.

The most instructive experience I've had with hostility to psychohistory (or, in my case, psychobiography) was the reception (or non-reception) given to my book on Frederick Law Olmsted (landscape architect and pioneer environmentalist, best known for his work on Central Park in New York City). Both *The New York Times Book Review* (NYTBR) and *The New York Review of Books* (NYRB) ignored the book, even though both of them review everything else about Olmsted that comes along, including books they have strongly disliked. NYRB has been notoriously hostile to Freud and psychoanalysis, while NYTBR has been somewhat less so. Two newspapers (in Washington and Boston) attacked the book because they said it used Freudian arguments with the purpose of destroying Olmsted's reputation. My book is far more Winnicottian than Freudian and actually displays a "vast admiration for Olmsted and his works" (to quote a quite favorable review in the *Journal of American History* [JAH]). And "Freudian," of course, is the code word for anything that smacks of psychoanalytic theory.

Other than the JAH, the historical publications did not review the book. Interestingly, two Olmstedian publications published very favorable reviews, as did both psychohistorical publications (the *Journal of Psychohistory* and *The Psychohistory Review*). With all of this, I have to admit that my book may well have been too academic (a danger for a work whose origins are a dissertation) to be accessible to a general audience and that this may well have accounted for its neglect in the broader media. Accessibility should, perhaps, always be our goal.

A couple of years ago, the head of the Lifelong Learning Department at Florida Atlantic University (FAU) asked me to offer psychohistory courses to their participating seniors. And during several years of teaching in the Elderhostel program of the Jewish Education Commission of South Palm Beach, I have taught numerous psychohistory-based courses, the most recent of which was *The Truth About FDR*. In both venues, psychohistorical analyses were very well received by the participants. Of course, it should be clear that in these formats, we were really dealing with "psychohistory-lite." My approach to these classes was centered on the classic psychohistorical questions: "Why this? Why now?" And we worked strongly from the premise summed up by Alice Miller's evocative phrase, "prisoners of childhood." These seniors had little trouble dealing with such concepts as repression, splitting, the paranoid and the depressive positions, group fantasy, and delegation. The notion that excited them most of all was that of studying the formative years (including childhoods) of political figures and creative people. Two of my most popular courses were the one about FDR and one on Wagner and the Jews.

All in all, I taught psychohistorically oriented courses to several hundred Elderhostel and Lifelong Learning students mostly in their sixties and seventies, some older, some younger. A large percentage of the FAU students and a small number of Elderhostelers were repeat students in my classes. No more than a handful of them ever heard of psychohistory before encountering one of my courses. (One of these was a woman who had taken a course with Dave Beisel at Rockland Community College and had become a fan of his and of psychohistory!) Several had read something of Erikson's. In one FAU class, an introduction to psychohistory, they purchased copies of **Clio's Psyche's** special student issue. Of course, I always handed out reading lists. Yet I would say that as interested as these seniors became in the

subject, I doubt that very many followed up on their own. And I would be very much surprised if I successfully produced any recruits for the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA).

I'd like to conclude this review of some of my experiences in doing psychohistory with an incident that happened to me nearly 20 years ago -- one that I believe could still happen today. I was having lunch with some business associates at the Top of the Sixes -- a restaurant on top of the office building that ran between 52nd and 53rd streets along Fifth Avenue in New York City. From where we sat, we could see the new building down 53rd Street that was then under construction. Earlier that week, a construction accident high up on this building had sent large chunks of debris showering down into the street. Most of the pedestrians had raced for cover, but at least one man had run into the middle of the street, where he was fatally struck down by a large chunk of falling masonry.

I suggested to my companions that this man may well have had an unconscious death wish, that had sent him running into the street rather than ducking for cover like the others. They hooted and hollered and carried on. It was the stupidest thing they ever heard of! Did I really believe that in the split-second available, this man had calculated the exact point that this debris would fall, etc., etc. I explained, very low-key, that it didn't work that way. Rather, it was likely that whenever this man had encountered dangerous situations -- emergencies that arose so quickly that his choice of response had been guided entirely by unconscious forces -- he had invariably chosen the option that had put him in mortal danger, until finally his luck had run out. But my associates would have none of it; indeed, they actually seemed angry that I could suggest such a preposterous thing.

Fade out, fade in, several minutes later. My table companions were now discussing a TV program that had proposed that aliens from outer space were responsible for the wonders of the ancient world ranging from the pyramids of ancient Egypt to the grotesque monolithic statues of the Easter Islands. My associates had no trouble at all in accepting this as gospel truth. Indeed, it triggered a long and (to them) fascinating discussion of the "paranormal." This included a recent book, *The Search for Bridey Murphy* about a young woman who, under hypnosis, was able to recall a "prior life." Again, my associates had no trouble at all in accepting the possibility, perhaps even prob-

ability, of reincarnation. Indeed, it seemed that there could be no "paranormal" phenomenon -- no matter how far-fetched -- that they would not give some credulity to, except for the power that our own unconscious exerts in our lives. Apparently, that was far too scary an idea to permit even a moment's calm discussion.

I had a special reason to remember that incident a few months ago, when I saw *The Sixth Sense* -- a terrific movie that absolutely devastated me and that still haunts me (for a variety of reasons that would take another article to discuss). But I could not miss the fact that it was almost the perfect embodiment of the mind-set displayed by my long-ago luncheon companions. By the end of *The Sixth Sense*, what had begun as an apparent psychoanalytic problem proved to be the ultimate triumph of the paranormal!

The popular culture yearns for explanations of things. Over the decades, has not the psychological continuously vied with the paranormal in supplying those explanations? In pessimistic moments, it is tempting to believe that *The Three Faces of Eve* and *Sybil* have by now completely given way to *The Sixth Sense* and *The Blair Witch Project*. But I suspect that the current cultural scene is far more evenly balanced -- repressed memories on the one hand, prior lives on the other. Indeed, I suspect that a rather large segment of the public is devoted at one and the same time to both modes of explanation for the uncanny in their lives. Here in Boca Raton, Florida, I am well acquainted with a sizable number of bright, articulate people who have recourse to both psychotherapists and psychics in dealing with their personal problems. (Of course, I am well aware that the cynic may see little difference between the two.)

At the end of the day (as the current cliché has it), I am optimistic for the long run, though I see a hard road ahead. I very much fear that broad academic acceptance of psychohistory as a discipline will only come after a considerable public interest has been ignited -- and perhaps not until the pendulum has swung (as swing it will) on the place that both Freud and psychoanalytic theory hold in American culture and in American intellectual circles. Consider that both women's studies and African-American studies took hold on campus only after they had become powerful cultural forces in America. Psychohistory (like psychoanalysis) will always have its opponents. But I firmly believe that it can attract a public and that it can make its way in academia, even though it may

have to begin at the edges and fringes and work inward.

In the meantime, we have to keep the flame burning. What is there to do but keep on preaching to the converted and jumping at every opportunity for a wider audience -- writing, teaching, lecturing, debating, working the Internet -- whatever. But the trick is to seek out such a public audience while being rigorous in our standards for the practice of good, sound psychohistory -- in the quality of psychohistorical work and the integrity of psychohistorical argument. It is awfully tempting to appeal to the public with sensational material based upon wild speculation and unsupported "findings." In the long run, yielding to such a temptation would be (and has been) colossally self-defeating (though some may well argue that an even worse sin is to be dull). The challenge of the 21st century is to be relevant to the needs of an increasingly complex and increasingly open world, and to be accessible to the broad public audience. And we have to do this while still doing the hard work that any professional discipline requires. If we can do that, and I believe that we can, the cumulative effect can be profound. It's a long, hard road, but we have to stay the course.

After all, do we not believe, as psychohistorians, that we cannot influence people until they are ready to be influenced? When they are ready, we have to be there.

Melvin Kalfus, PhD, taught history and psychohistory at Florida Atlantic and Lynn universities. Among his psychobiographic publications are Frederick Law Olmsted: The Passion of a Public Artist (1990) and "Richard Wagner as Cult Hero" (1984). A current researcher of the Civil War, FDR, and Hollywood and the Jews, he is a member of the Advisory Board of the Psychohistory Forum and a past president and long-time treasurer of the International Psychohistory Association. □

The Electronic Future of Psychohistory

Lloyd deMause
Institute for Psychohistory and
Journal of Psychohistory

Since psychoanalysis is a profession that one can earn a living from and psychohistory is a would-be course in academia, it may seem odd to

lump the two together in a consideration of their futures. Yet since psychohistory stems from psychoanalysis, it to some extent shares psychoanalysis' ups and downs and perhaps even its future.

Psychoanalysis has suffered a severe setback in the past few years. Psychoanalytic institutes report smaller entering classes, psychoanalysts privately admit their patient load is down a third or more, and the American Psychoanalytic Association devotes its yearly convention to the question of "Is There Still a Profession of Psychoanalysis?" This isn't just due to HMOs and insurance companies being anti-psychoanalysis ("Prozac, not therapy"). It is part of our current national mood, with newsweeklies featuring cover stories showing a one-year-old in prison uniform and asking, "Is It All in the Genes?" and answering, "Yes." Manic stock markets and personal insight just don't seem to go together very well.

Psychohistory, meanwhile, seems to be catching hold lately, particularly worldwide, especially through the Internet. The Web site of the Institute for Psychohistory (www.psychohistory.com), featuring 20 articles and 3 books in full, is getting over 5,000 hits a week. I get hundreds of e-mails from people in New Delhi, Mexico City, and Zurich asking questions about psychohistory, including one from an entire college class in Australia saying they are excited by having discovered the Web site, and how their professor now requires reading it for graduation.

The Internet appears to be becoming the best way to get to students past professors who fear learning something new, especially something psychological. The Institute has just started an exciting new free online moderated discussion group called H-Psychohistory, which is hosted by Michigan State University and run by H-Net, which has over 100 electronic lists that reach over 60,000 subscribers in more than 90 countries, promoting scholarly communications as well as research and teaching interests. (Everyone is invited to join by sending an e-mail message to <listserv@h-net.msu.edu> saying "sub h-psychohistory [first name] [last name]".)

In addition, the Institute has begun a free online training course in psychohistory consisting of 20 weekly assignments that mainly use readings that are already posted free on our Web site. (Everyone is also invited to join by sending a blank e-mail to <onlinetrain-subscribe@topica.com>.) When psychoanalysis found a century ago that it

had difficulty getting its training course into academia, it started its own training institutes around the world. Psychohistory may find the Internet will be the equivalent, though perhaps leading to more and more psychohistory courses in academic institutions rather than competing with them.

The Institute for Psychohistory now has 19 branches around the world, many with local yearly conventions. This June the International Psychohistorical Association is holding its 23rd Annual Convention in New York City. The *Journal of Psychohistory* is now in its 27th year with distribution to both individuals and to most of the important libraries around the world. Psychohistory books have been translated into 11 languages. One way or another, tens of thousands of interested individuals are being exposed each year to our research and theories. Not bad, after only three decades of work.

Lloyd deMause is Founder and Director of the Institute for Psychohistory, Founder and Editor of the Journal of Psychohistory, and Founder and current President of the International Psychohistorical Association. He is the editor and an author of The History of Childhood (1995, 1974) and A Bibliography of Psychohistory (1975); co-editor with Henry Ebel of Jimmy Carter and American Fantasy (1977); and author of The New Psychohistory (1975), Foundations of Psychohistory (1982), Reagan's America (1984), and Childhood and History (forthcoming). Of all psychohistorians, deMause has the largest online psychohistory presence and may be reached at <psychhst@tiac.net>. □

Reflections on the Future of Psychohistory

Henry Lawton

Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film

The evolution of psychohistory as a separate field has been slow and has involved much controversy in the last 30-40 years. Though there are still those who are skeptical about the worth and validity of the field, we have not been intimidated and continue to advance the work slowly and patiently. There are a variety of reasons why psychohistory is not more prominent on the scholarly/intellectual stage. Among them are anxiety about facing and realizing the force of emotion in history, philosophical complexities inherent in interdisciplinary study, current socio-cultural animosity to

psychoanalysis, and fear of the unknown. These forces have not been able to destroy our field, because we are developing an important paradigm. We are realizing that human beings in the theater of history are driven far more than we might like to imagine or know by emotion and fantasy on both individual and shared levels, and are increasingly able to show how this is so. Our insights are here to stay.

Psychohistorians are still largely self-taught and an independent group of people. We have the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA), which has been active as the professional association of the field for almost 25 years. We have the *Journal of Psychohistory*, which remains the leading journal in the field. We have the Psychohistory Forum and its journal, **Clio's Psyche**, under the able and dedicated leadership of Paul Elovitz, which continue to do quite well. There is the Center for Psychohistorical Studies, under the leadership of Jerrold Atlas, which has sponsored conferences in Europe and publishes its own journal, *Tapestries*.

In the last couple of years psychohistory has moved onto the Internet. The IPA and Lloyd deMause have their own sites filled with literature and information about the field. Eric Heimstadt, an independent scholar from California, has set up the Digital Archive of Psychohistory that offers access to psychohistorical literature. There is an active e-mail discussion group which has attracted a diverse membership. As I write this article, an online training course in psychohistory is being set up.

Lastly, I want to mention the Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film, which has been in operation since 1989 and is directed by myself. Films are popular because they communicate shared fantasies felt by the society and, thus, can be an important index to what goes on emotionally in a given culture. Though our group remains small in size we have interesting, exciting, and challenging discussions in our efforts to understand the psychohistorical workings of film. We have put together an issue of the *Journal of Psychohistory* outlining the psychohistorical theory of film and the potential of this exciting area of study. For the past five years we have sponsored a day of film study at the IPA Convention that involves presenting papers and viewing films.

In sum, psychohistory most definitely has a future. Increasing numbers of groups and activities are available for interested scholars, both academic

and independent. Readers interested in learning more about any of the groups and services discussed above are welcome to contact me.

Henry Lawton, MA, MLS, has been a child welfare worker for the New Jersey Division of Youth and Family Services for the last 28 years and for most of that period he has also been an independent scholar in psychohistory. He is Book Review Editor for the Journal of Psychohistory, and a charter member of the International Psychohistorical Association as well as its Secretary since 1984. Lawton is the Founder and Director of the Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film. Among his publications is The Psychohistorian's Handbook (1989), still the only how-to text for the field. He irregularly publishes "Psychohistorical Bibliography" for the membership of the IPA. Lawton may be reached at <HWLIPA@aol.com>. □

What Brought Me to Psychohistory

Anne Dietrich

University of British Columbia, Canada

My interest in the field of psychohistory originated during my adolescence, when I came across some writings on psychoanalysis in my father's library. Although much of what I read on psychoanalysis was at that time beyond my understanding, my adolescent quest for "truth" and the interesting ideas of Freud sparked my curiosity regarding human motivation and behavior. It was not until my undergraduate years as a beginning student of psychology that I became better able to understand the complexity of the history of human emotion, thought, and behavior.

As an undergraduate, I was intrigued with my required courses in the history of both ancient and modern psychology. We looked at the origins of the study of human psychological and social functioning, beginning with ancient Greek scholars, continuing through Medieval times, the Enlightenment, and the Victorian era. We then moved from Vienna to the Behavioral and Cognitive movements in the United States in the 20th century. The history of humankind, in particular the history of the study of the human mind, so compelled my interest that I declared a minor in philosophy in addition to a major in psychology, and I studied ancient philosophy, logic, the philosophy of mind, and the philosophy of science. I

worked as a teaching assistant as an undergraduate, and taught the history of psychology.

Theories have always interested me. I enjoy analyzing the theories of others, modifying them and/or developing new theories. Why do we act as we do? What motivates us? Why do other individuals do what they do? Why do groups function in certain ways? The answers to these questions are complex, multifaceted, and overdetermined. I believe that what came before most definitely influences what is yet to come.

During college, I also began looking at my own personal history -- how my own painful past experiences had shaped my adult path and had affected my career choice and my area of specialization (interpersonal trauma). I came to see how the paths of my parents had been shaped by their own histories, and likewise for my grandparents. I came, perhaps most importantly, to realize that I had a choice in not repeating with my children the mistakes of my forebears. Such choice entails understanding why those mistakes occurred. Such understanding is necessary at both the individual level and the societal level for positive global change to occur.

I plan on continuing my study of psychohistory -- to learn more about why events in the past occurred as they did. It is my conviction that this knowledge is very important in preventing future repetitions of past errors, particularly at the societal level. To ignore the past is, in effect, to deny change and progress.

Now I will more systematically describe my education and its relation to my career and intellectual interests. After completing my BA (with honors) and MA degrees in psychology at Simon Fraser University, I became a PhD candidate at the University of British Columbia (UBC). Since 1987 I have been working with survivors of trauma in various contexts. I have approximately 12 years experience doing volunteer work with various populations, including trauma survivors, and approximately six years experience working in hospital settings, which includes conducting psychological assessments and, more recently, group therapy for persons with severe personality disorders. I have taught psychology since 1992 as a teaching assistant and, for the past several years, as a part-time instructor at UBC. I have done research on assessment of risk of violence and, most recently, research on the relationship between Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Complex PTSD, and Revictimization in adult survivors of

childhood trauma. I have also been involved in writing treatment guidelines for PTSD, and am currently the Secretary Treasurer for the Canadian Society for the Study of Trauma and Dissociation. Psychohistory will be an important tool in my quest for further understanding.

Anne Dietrich lives with her two children in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, and may be reached at <amdma@telus.net>. □

Twenty-first-Century Psychohistory

David D. Lee

University of Groningen, The Netherlands

When I first encountered psychohistory in 1983 it was with great excitement. Rudolph Binion, a pioneer psychohistorian at Brandeis University, offered his course on Hitler and the Second World War which was based on his *Hitler Among the Germans* (1976). I had been attracted to history as an undergraduate, in part, to search for an explanation for World War II and the Holocaust, and to understand the centrality of these events for European and North American culture.

Binion's psychological explanation for Hitler's murderous drive had the benefit of answering a great many difficult questions about motivation: the dynamic link between Hitler's service in the First World War (and his gassing at the end of it) and Auschwitz, the irrational anti-Semitism, his mesmerizing oratorical abilities, and his ability to tap into the German psyche so expertly. I now recognize certain flaws in Binion's theory, but the man and his seminar crystallized for me the intersection of historical and psychological analysis in a captivating way.

When, years later, I approached Professor Binion for counsel on graduate schools, he recommended I talk with Peter Loewenberg at UCLA. Encouraged by Loewenberg, I went to UCLA and wrote a dissertation in modern European history on the psychoanalytic pioneer and Protestant pastor Oskar Pfister (1873-1956). The work is intellectual history, but is fundamentally informed by my psychohistorical training with Loewenberg.

In addition to familiarizing myself with the standard historiography and methodology, a project in which all graduate students engage, working in psychohistory included exposure to traditional and contemporary psychoanalytic thought. Natu-

rally, Freud's work was central (Loewenberg often assigns a Freud essay or two), but we also read much from the neo-Freudians, Kohut and his followers, and from the various European schools such as object relations and Lacan. It was sometimes easy to forget that at heart Loewenberg is a historian as we found ourselves discussing the ideas of other social scientists such as Karl Deutsch and Thorstein Veblen as often as those of Freud or current psychohistorical authors.

I learned many things from my studies in psychohistory, but two have remained of crucial importance to me in my work and teaching. First, the interconnectedness of our historical writing (our constructions of truth) with the shifting currents of intellectual development (not to speak of trends). Carl Schorske recently argued in *Thinking With History* (1998) that Western culture's passage into modernism at the turn of the last century is, at its core, fundamentally characterized by dehistoricization in favor of a psychological frame of reference. That is to say, we must recognize not only the psychological nature of our "modern" selves, but also the constructed nature of that understanding. Loewenberg, who studied with Schorske, focuses his research on the "latent or unconscious themes, of style, content, and conflict, that integrate apparently discordant data from a specific historical locus" (*Decoding the Past*, 1984). In seminar, Loewenberg also discusses non-psychoanalytic approaches within psychohistory, but as a training analyst himself he clearly favors the analytic.

The second prime contribution psychohistory has made to my work is the identification of the power and omnipresence of countertransference. Few other subfields recognize and no others stress the importance of the historian's emotional relationship with his or her material. Those familiar with the historiography can point to numerous cases in which insight has been achieved or missed based on an (in)ability to recognize the personal origins of an interpretation. Only when one knows and is comfortable with his own motivation is one ready to search for the same in historical actors.

Psychohistory still has much to offer the historical profession. The two contributions I found of greatest import remain largely unrecognized by most within the profession at large; thus, there is much work still to be done. Yet, structural deficiencies such as the demise of a major journal in the field and the omnipresent initial resistance (occasionally outright hostility) to analytic ideas

within academia (and a consequent lack of positions) make 21st-century psychohistory look like a threatened species. I would like to think that this is not a trend in a single direction, but an ebb in a tide which will surely bring Freud and psychohistory back into the forefront of historical discussion. Psychohistory's future, like that of psychoanalysis itself, is likely to lie in the fruitful combination of its methods and historiography with those from other fields such as social, cultural, intellectual, and political history.

David Lee has just completed a two-year fellowship in the Theory and History section of the Department of Psychology at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands. □

Empathy, Kohut, and Intellectual History

Vivian Rosenberg
Drexel University

When I came to the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) in 1990, I felt very uneasy about dipping my toes into such unfamiliar waters. Although I had a PhD in the History of Ideas, I was affiliated with neither a history department nor a psychiatry or psychology program. As a teacher of history of ideas, philosophy, and literature in the Department of Humanities-Communications at Drexel University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, I saw myself as a generalist and a synthesizer. Thus, I was not at all sure that the IPA was an appropriate place for me.

I gravitated toward the IPA because I had become fascinated with the history of the idea of empathy. I hoped that psychohistory might provide a method to explore the historical and psychological roots of this idea as well as its contemporary cultural implications. Furthermore, I had never been interested in abstract discussions of ideas. Not only did I want to relate ideas to specific historical and cultural contexts, as many historians -- especially those in social history -- now do, but I was also intrigued with why particular thinkers were attracted to particular ideas. Ideas are, after all, created by real people, people who laugh and love and, all too often, cry, people whose ideas are shaped by hopes and fears and needs. I thought that the tools of psychohistory might illuminate changing ideas about self-other relationships. Moreover, I wanted to relate these ideas to the interior lives of the human beings who

thought and wrote about them from within their family and community contexts.

In the first paper I presented at the IPA, I chose Kohut's self-psychology to examine the idea of empathy in the life and thought of the American philosopher, Josiah Royce. A year later, I submitted an article based on this presentation to the *The Psychohistory Review*. The editor, Larry Shiner, wrote a thoughtful critique and suggested that I develop this analysis. I did so by turning the Kohutian spotlight on Royce's friend and famous colleague, William James. The IPA accepted the James paper for the 1991 convention. Then, drawing on material from the two IPA presentations, I wrote "Through a Kohutian Lens: William James and Josiah Royce." Published in *The Psychohistory Review* in 1992, this article eventually won the William L. Langer award, announced at the American Historical Association's 1995 conference, for the best article published in *The Psychohistory Review* from 1992-1995.

I note these personal details because I think it is important to stress how crucial the IPA has been for my professional development. Although I had worried about being an outsider among the many psychiatrists and historians who meet at the IPA, I found a very eclectic and wide-ranging group, many of whom moved easily across disciplinary boundaries.

I also benefited from my association with the Psychohistory Forum. Because I could not make the trip from Philadelphia to New York City on a regular basis, my attendance was sporadic. Nevertheless, I was warmly welcomed and given the opportunity to spin some ideas in this informal setting. At Forum meetings and lunches, I also had a chance to get to know Paul Elovitz and to meet and talk with Peter Stearns, the Carnegie-Mellon historian whose extensive work in the study of the history of emotions has been so significant for those interested in the intersections of history and psychology. I believe that the openness and diversity at the IPA and the Forum make these organizations especially valuable to the increasing numbers of scholars involved in interdisciplinary studies. In my case, not only did I find the exposure to a variety of ideas a stimulus to my own research, but I also benefited from the personal encouragement and professional support of people I met at the IPA and the Forum, especially Paul Elovitz and Peter Stearns.

My experiences at the IPA and the Forum, however, raised some questions in my mind. As a

newcomer, I was very conscious of a need not only to choose a psychological framework for my analysis, but also to justify that choice. I had hoped to hear others explain their choices, but I found little emphasis on theory or on the underlying assumptions that influenced presenters to choose one theoretical perspective over another. In fact, there seemed to be a kind of old-fashioned tone to many papers, with their authors apparently assuming that the theoretical frameworks they adopted were somehow "objective" and transhistorical. I suspect many of them had come to psychohistory trained in the positivist mode that dominated the 1950s; many of them had also undergone analysis and seemed to take for granted the "truth" of whatever theoretical framework they had encountered in training and/or counseling.

Lacking such a background, I was faced with the necessity of choosing, in a very self-conscious way, a psychohistorical lens for my research. Of course, there was no way I could make a thorough study either of Freud or of the many other theories of human nature that have evolved over the 20th century. Thus, I proceeded to review a handful of psychological theories among the many I heard of, knowing full well that my study was necessarily arbitrary and incomplete. Eventually, I settled on Kohut as a suitable framework for my analysis. I also made a conscious effort to articulate my own motives for choosing a Kohutian lens.

When we raise the questions about why we are attracted to certain people, I suspect we have to honor a certain "mystery" at the core of human relationships; we also must acknowledge the role of serendipity when two people happen to meet, quite by accident, and then discover a special feeling that connects them. Perhaps we must also acknowledge similar elements of mystery and serendipity that figure into our attractions to the subjects we study and theories we adopt in our professional work. Still, in this century where pluralism permeates every aspect of life, I would expect researchers to explicitly acknowledge, insofar as is possible, their underlying assumptions and to try to avoid any hint of dogmatic certainty.

In my Kohutian analysis of Royce and James, I noted that neither I nor others attracted to Kohut's ideas believe that his is the last word. Furthermore, I appreciated the fact that Kohut himself did not claim his theory was a fixed and finished one, applicable to all times and places. His openness to the contingencies of time and place and

culture was, for me, part of the attraction. Another reason I was drawn to Kohut was that he placed empathy at the core of his psychoanalytic theory and his counseling strategies. Moreover, studying Kohut's writings, I found his approach consistent with compelling perspectives on the changing nature of the human self now being developed by a growing number of social historians, anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists, especially those in the social constructionist camp.

Curious about what motivated other presenters to adopt their preferred theoretical frameworks and disappointed with the absence of discussion at the IPA about the underlying assumptions motivating different psychohistorical approaches, in 1992 I sent in a proposal for a panel that would address these issues. I was delighted when my proposal was accepted and hoped that such a panel might spark other presenters in the years that followed to consider questions like the following: How do psychohistorians choose among competing paradigms, each of which has data to support it? To what extent should psychohistorians explicate and justify their choices of a particular theoretical framework? How do psychological theories reflect the peculiarities of the times and places in which they were developed, and in what ways does a given theory function to support and reinforce or perhaps challenge certain political power relationships or other specific social arrangements that affect people's daily lives? Have human needs changed significantly over time? And is the self essentially the same or different in different historical and cultural frameworks? These are some of the questions I hope IPA presenters will address in the future.

Obviously, these questions tie into postmodernism, a term that is notoriously difficult to pin down. I know, too, that postmodernism is also a body of thought that excites some people and horrifies others. For many who were trained in the positivist era, it may feel almost counter-intuitive and even nihilistic. And yet I am convinced that postmodernists and social constructionists are raising issues that cannot be avoided.

Psychohistorical theories, of course, help us bring into focus and find meaning in the "blooming, buzzing confusion" of diverse human experiences. However, in one field after another, the possibility of "objective" knowledge is being challenged. It is now accepted among leading figures in most disciplines that the culture we live in, the instruments we invent, the theories we develop,

and the very language we use to describe experience -- all of these factors inevitably influence the way we shape and interpret human nature.

In this new century, I would expect that the IPA and the Forum will continue to encourage diversity and tolerance of multiple perspectives. I also hope that there will be more open acknowledgement that any given theory highlights some factors and obscures or ignores others; that every theory is grounded in a specific cultural and social environment; and that we need to articulate, insofar as is possible, the assumptions motivating different theoretical and methodological approaches. It will be much to our advantage if we can draw in more people interested in meta-discussions, people familiar with the work, for instance, of Philip Cushman, Louis Sass, Robert Stolorow, Stephen A. Mitchell, and others committed to deep, broad-ranging questions and hermeneutic inquiry.

*Vivian Rosenberg, PhD, is Professor of Humanities at Drexel University in Philadelphia and a longtime Research Associate of the Forum. As an intellectual historian she is a devoted scholar of the history of the idea of empathy and has presented a number of papers on this topic. In 1994 she received *The Psychohistory Review's* William L. Langer Award. She may be reached at <VRosenberg@drexel.edu>. □*

Resistance and Reconciliation: Some Personal Thoughts on Psychohistory

Howard F. Stein
University of Oklahoma

On many occasions during the first three decades of my career in some dozen disciplines, I have found myself in the struggle, and occasionally the resolution, of the enigmatic words Beethoven wrote prefacing the final movement of his last string quartet, Opus 135: first, "*Muss es sein?*" (Must it be?), then, "*Es muss sein*" (It must be). What for so long seemed -- and still seems -- to be self-destructive factionalism within psychohistory (as well as in countless other scholarly and clinical disciplines), reveals itself to be "culture" or "group fantasy" in the guise of "science" and "scholarship." As we are invited to contemplate (once again) the future of psychohistory, I direct our attention in this essay -- via retrospection -- not only to public and academic attacks from without

on the wide and profound legacy of Sigmund Freud, but also to the undermining from within the ranks of those who espouse the psychoanalytic study of society and history. What others may do to us and wish upon us is bad enough; the carrying out of the destruction among ourselves is infinitely sadder.

If I accept what has happened ("*Es muss sein*"), I also wish to understand it so that it does not have to continue happening (repetition). Psychohistory itself comes to resemble, at least in some features, the historic eras and cultures we study. We need to ask: How much of this conflict history is about our science, and how much of it is about fundamental human group issues that we live out? Issues played out in the theater of psychohistory's own history: death, annihilation, separation, autonomy, sexuality, aggression, dependency, rebellion, and so on. I draw from four experiences as vignettes.

In the early 1980s, I received a phone call from Charles Strozier, editor of *The Psychohistory Review*, inviting me to join his editorial board. While recognizing my contributions to psychoanalytic anthropology and to psychohistory, he added that I would have to resign from editorship of the *Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology* (JPA) and also renounce any association with Lloyd deMause and the Institute for Psychohistory. I was as incredulous as I was torn: I could not believe the ultimatum. Why, I remember asking, did the choice have to be either/or, absolute loyalty and absolute disloyalty, and not both/and? After all, I refereed manuscripts for many fields and journals already. Strozier stood firm with his offer and with its conditions. I declined, though he subsequently published an essay of mine in his journal.

Even after nearly two decades, the sting of this conversation remains, and with it the biting question, "Did this have to happen?" -- and for the future, "Can we foster human conditions within psychohistory in which an event such as this doesn't have to happen?" I did not continue editorship out of loyalty to deMause or to specific theories of his, but to the work we were doing, separately and together. I felt, and continue to feel, deep gratitude to him for the opportunity to serve as editor. The eight years of editing from 1980-1987 the *Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology* were among the most alive, exhilarating, of my life. In Strozier's proposal I felt as if I were being asked to betray myself, and receive in return greater official respectability due to the differing, though overlap-

ping, intellectual communities that deMause's and Strozier's journals served. I sought neither the status of insider nor outsider -- merely to edit a journal. To draw upon W. R. Bion, I sought to do "work"; yet I felt I was being asked to surround that work in, and subordinate it to, "basic assumptions."

In this episode, I hear a psychohistorical echo of the split between Anna Freud and Melanie Klein (and their respective followers, schools, theories, and periodicals). What was at stake could not be spoken -- maybe even articulated -- in the armed intellectual and clinical camps and the war of words.

By 1987 or so, my former wife, Margaret Sheehan, JPA managing editor, and I had brought the journal from being two issues behind (in 1980) to being two issues ahead at the publisher's office. I had received many compliments on the quality and range of the articles. Then I received a phone call from Lloyd deMause, editor of the *Journal of Psychohistory* and publisher of both journals. He said that subscriptions to the journal I edited had markedly dropped so as to make further publication impossible even with his generous subsidy. (As he spoke, I thought: The Reagan decade had been unkind to both journals; there was less interest in reflection, more in action.)

Besides, deMause continued, there was no history of childhood material, only group psychohistory, in JPA. I had not realized that it had been the journal's -- and my -- mission to employ anthropology to supply socialization data for psychohistory, as though JPA were merely an auxiliary source. I knew from the outset of deMause's admiration for Arthur Hippler (which I share), whom he chose to be founding editor of JPA and who had published seminal studies of Australian parent-child relations. Still, when deMause invited me to take over editorship of the journal, he encouraged my autonomy; he did not ask me to become someone else.

DeMause promised to bring the final two issues (if I remember the number correctly) to publication, at which time JPA would cease to be an independent journal and would be "folded into" and "absorbed" into the *Journal of Psychohistory*. These words stuck with me.

I was stunned by the call. I did not know how to evaluate the "business" argument. If true, it felt nonetheless only a part of the story. It felt disingenuous. Something felt missing, but deMause

insisted that nothing was missing. I felt betrayed, but that I had no right to feel betrayed. I felt as if I were being killed off, if only symbolically. The imagery of enfolding and absorption conjured in me wild images of a womb's re-absorption of its own fetus, of smothering an infant to death. True, these were my vivid "transferences," but they felt induced, as by projective identification. As with Strozier's invitation for me to join his board, here, too, I had no separate reality with which to assess my response. I had to depend on my inner reaction, my "countertransference," to inform me about intersubjective reality. I felt as if JPA were being killed off in the prime of life, that it was somehow a sacrifice to an ideology and whatever that ideology meant to Lloyd deMause. But it could not be further discussed. Power was at stake, and whatever that power signified. Ultimately JPA was not mine to preserve. Its death, albeit symbolic, was a protracted one.

I was not an "insider" to the Institute for Psychohistory in the early years, and I do not know from direct experience what underlay the creation of the Psychohistory Forum in 1983 (and, subsequently, its journal, **Clio's Psyche**, in 1994). At the time I heard repeated reference to words such as *splitting*, *defection*, *orthodoxy*, *rigidity*, *dilution*, and *rebellion*.

By the late 1990s, there were three established and flourishing journals explicitly devoted to psychohistory (alphabetically): **Clio's Psyche**, the *Journal of Psychohistory*, and *The Psychohistory Review*. When in November, 1999, Paul Elovitz, editor of **Clio's Psyche**, invited me to write an essay about the future of psychohistory, one of the unsettling circumstances which had prompted the topic was the demise of *The Psychohistory Review*. This was the first that I had heard anything about the *Review* ceasing publication. What, I wondered, is its psychohistory?

What is the future of psychohistory given these recent and past events -- and their inner legacy? Is it not necessary to distinguish between (a) scholarship that goes by the name of "psychohistory" and is presented and published in explicitly "psychohistory" conferences and journals and (b) equally valid and challenging psychohistorical scholarship that goes by other names and is presented or published elsewhere? For instance, the Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction; its director, Vamik D. Volkan, MD; and its quarterly journal, *Mind and Human Interaction* (now published by International Universities Press)

come immediately to mind. Likewise, the International Society for the Psychoanalytic Study of Organizations, which holds an annual convention, has welcomed psychohistorical perspectives on workplace culture and culture change. As with all social "division of labor," we need to attend to the inner significance of the institutes and publications, and its consequence for research and publication.

For those of us "in" psychohistory, those who call ourselves "psychohistorians," what does this do to notions of "the independence of psychohistory"? What's in a name? Shakespeare asks. What kind of difference makes a difference? Gregory Bateson asks. Have we created our own groupishness, group-fantasy, etc., within the very discipline that has chosen itself (ourselves) to study historical groupishness? If so, what is its consequence for our scholarship? For instance, Who is invited, and who is not invited, to present at "our" conferences? Who is given voice and who is subtly silenced? Who is published, and who is not published, in our journals? Is it possible to be "in" a scholarly group without forming intense in-groups and out-groups based on a splitting of affiliative/aggressive self- and object-representations?

With these questions, we have thereby arrived at the doorstep of Freud's *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, his concept of "repetition compulsion," and his felicitous notion of the "narcissism of minor differences" -- a narcissism that, under conditions of threat to identity, can become exclusionary if not downright vicious. Certainly, the fear of fusion and dissolution can foster counter-phobic differentiation and border-making. Leaders of psychohistory, no less than leaders of national or ethnic groups, can be delegated unconscious tasks by their groups. And certainly group leaders and followers (members) can enact in public settings private, childhood dramas. Why should all this not be the case in psychohistory? There is abundant psychogeography in psychohistory, that is, the group process that goes into the making and maintenance of borders and boundaries.

Ever since I participated in the first convention of the International Psychohistorical Association in 1978, we have been concerned with attacks upon psychoanalysis and upon psychohistory. A crucial historical and psychohistorical question is: What is similar, and what is different, now, over two decades later? An equally important question is: What are individuals' and groups'

adaptations to the experience and perception of attack (insularity, search for legitimacy, etc.)? Further, how are we to understand the social process whereby psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic studies of social process are officially rebuked, but flourish in the "popular" culture and lay press -- reminiscent of W. H. Auden's point that "to us he [Freud] is no more a person now but a whole climate of opinion"? If we are so finished with Freud, why do we continue to engage him in battle? If a society represses and dissociates in one realm, does not the dissociated and repressed return in another? If this is so, then the question becomes not whether psychoanalysis and its extensions are alive or dead or dying, but where they are each of these.

Can group-process analysis (such as occurs at the annual conventions of the International Psychohistorical Association) help to self-correct the very group(s) that studies(-y) historical and international group process? The answer to the question of the future of psychohistory is at least in some measure answered not by others' attacks on Freud (or choose your own figure-hero-villain), but by what we do with those attacks in tandem with our own ambivalence toward psychoanalysis' first century. When I finally surrender to accept what has already happened ("*Es muss sein*") in my field (s) and in my life, I look to the future of our work and ask, "*Muss es wieder sein?*" -- Must it happen again? Do we -- human beings who happen to do psychohistory, or who happen to be psychohistorians -- have the courage -- based on the capacity to love -- to peer into, and perhaps understand, and perhaps diminish, our own self-destructiveness? Among ourselves, can resistance fall and reconciliation flower?

[Editor's Note:

At the recommendation of our referees, and with the full agreement of the editors, the three psychohistorians Howard Stein focused on were given the opportunity to respond. Lloyd deMause wrote on February 6 that he had nothing to add to the article, which is "accurate as far as events I know about are concerned." He also expressed concern that the issue "might be divisive now" and noted collegial relations with Charles Strozier in more recent times.

Charles Strozier's Response to Stein:

I would say, reading Stein's memory of our conversation after 20 years, a conversation I do not remember but believe as entirely possible, that I

was wrong, and only add that Lloyd DeMause had the distinct ability to enrage me. On the creative side, I began the *Review* very specifically to offer an alternative to him and what I felt was his sloppy and biased editing. The *Review* became, I think, a triumph of sensibility. It served us all well.

Paul Elovitz Responds to Stein:

Despite concerns about divisiveness, as a historian of our field I think it helpful to set the record straight by making the following points.

While not meaning to minimize the differences among psychohistorians (see my introduction for a categorization of these differences), it is noteworthy that more often than not we have cooperated. Chuck Strozier writes for **Clio's Psyche** and presents at the Psychohistory Forum. He attends the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA), of which Lloyd is president, sometimes as a featured speaker. Lloyd deMause presents at the Psychohistory Forum and writes for **Clio's Psyche**. I wrote for *The Psychohistory Review*, attend meetings at the Center Strozier co-directs, and regularly write for the *Journal of Psychohistory*. Sometimes we take different roads to psychohistorical knowledge and sometimes our roads converge.

Regarding Professor Stein's speculations around the creation of the Forum in 1983, let me state the facts. In 1976 Alice Eichholz and I originated the Saturday Workshop Seminars with Lloyd's enthusiastic support and under the auspices of his Institute for Psychohistory. After several years Alice moved on to other things in Vermont. In 1983, Lloyd planned to concentrate the Institute's energies on outreach programs to larger audiences. As part of this new focus he decided to discontinue the Saturday program. At the time I would rather have kept the existing arrangement. However, it was a part of Lloyd's Institute, meeting in Lloyd's seminar room on Broadway in Manhattan, so I had little choice. At my request we met for lunch where I asked Lloyd how he felt about my plans to continue the small seminar format as a freestanding psychohistorical organization. He wished me well in the endeavor and became a paying member. The Psychohistory Forum has gone on to become an important contributor to psychohistory. Lloyd deMause and I continued to work together in the IPA, where I went on to become president in 1988. (Perhaps it is worth noting that David Beisel, Lloyd deMause, Henry Lawton (who was co-director of the Forum in its early days) and

I are the only members of the IPA to have attended every annual meeting.)

Howard, who was in Oklahoma when these events occurred, heard the words "splitting, defecation, orthodoxy, rigidity, dilution, rebellion" banded about in relationship to the creation of the Forum. These words said more about the fantasies of the speakers than the realities. My account of the events mentioned above makes it clear that the gossip and speculations were far more wrong than right. The field is richer for the creation of new organizations and publications. Indeed, however much Lloyd and I have disagreed about fantasy analysis (I find it to be a promising but unproven methodology), the role of psychohistory (he sees it as a science and I see it as an art), and other issues, he has never stood in the way of new organizations and publications being founded by his co-workers in the IPA. (It is noteworthy that last week on the new online discussion group, H-Psychohistory, deMause even mentioned that of the 250 or so IPA presenters through the years he doubted that more than a dozen or so really tried to apply his psychogenic theory.)

Regarding Stein's advocacy of a psychohistory of *The Psychohistory Review*, my concern is that it not be done in a manner divisive to our small field. At the moment I am not very optimistic about our being able to accomplish this without recriminations which would be disruptive of our creative work.

Concerning the demise of the *Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology*, I was saddened by this loss to our field, but I have no inside knowledge. I am quite aware of the financial difficulties of producing scholarly publications.

Regarding Howard's report of the conversation with Chuck, I have no direct knowledge and therefore cannot comment directly on it. It is certainly better for the field that we not have an "us vs. them" attitude, something from which I have not been immune. With embarrassment, I remember starting to attend the inaugural 1977 International Society for Political Psychology (ISPP) meeting in New York City very shortly after our first IPA meeting. I felt so out of place that I left within the first hour. A decade later, I attended the ISPP and have enjoyed participating in some of its meetings. Struggling with my own exclusionary tendencies helped me to understand the importance of avoiding doing this in psychohistory and life.]

□

Psychohistory 2000 and Beyond

Daniel Dervin
Mary Washington College

As multi-disciplinary field or distinct discipline, psychohistory has produced an extensive and impressive track record over the last half-century (if one begins counting from the early usage by Erik Erikson). Yet in crucial ways it has become the victim of its own successes. A healthy pluralism which co-existed along with certain founding documents (most notably by Lloyd deMause in the branch with which I'm most familiar) has on the one hand led to a wide-ranging but healthy proliferation of intellectual offshoots, while on the other hand has resulted in marginalization and fragmentation. If in these collective endeavors there is an emerging core, no one so far has come forward to pull it all together. And while such expectations may simply be wishful thinking, they comprise an urgent future task.

Optimism and candor impel me to speak of this task as both necessary and impossible. Such is partly the case because the obstacles derive from our strengths. Grounded neither in the clinic, the lab, or the library, psychohistory is extremely difficult to perform, so difficult, I sense, that we have become highly discreet in respect to our respective positions. Our efforts are like tamper-proof pharmaceutical products: we avoid scrutinizing others' containers lest ours be questioned. Feelings of safety, tolerance, and respect for others' integrity are indisputable values, yet if we do not engage other psychohistorians' ideas and allow them to be tested against other criteria we are severely hampering our own development.

Sometimes our methods fall short, our theories don't match the situation, or our data are contradictory. Can we say outright, "I don't know" and live with uncertainty? Are we captivated by fantasies of originality? If our views are cogent, they can hold their own in a community of informed colleagues. If we suffer from an anxiety of influence, then let's agree that every influence is not a dangerous seduction. In sum, by operating mostly in a vacuum, we have the opportunity to develop our own views to the fullest, but in so doing we also perpetuate fragmented psychohistories. In the best of all possible futures, I envision periodic retreats where groups of psychohistorians can assemble and in a spirit of tolerance share differ-

ences while seeking a common ground conducive to theory-building.

Though it's true that the annual International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) meetings offer opportunities for airing ideas and receiving feedback within a free-wheeling carnivalesque atmosphere, every year the world of discourse seems to be re-invented from primordial chaos. I often hear myself asking, "Are we all in this together, or is it every person for him/herself?" Or else I'm remarking on more than one presentation, "That's interesting, but where is the connection with psychohistory? Oh, I see, you're really here to promote your book or journal or career or clinic or agenda. And will you be staying for other sessions? Oh, I get it, you're not that interested in psychohistory as such, though you can't say you're that familiar with its main tenets." True also, the prospect of winning converts and allies is tempting, but my wish for the future is at least a minimal vetting of paper proposals. Can we have a carnival sans chaos? (I refer to content only, not to the orderly organization of sessions.)

Still there are signs that augur well for the future. Most heartening is the influx of brilliant work from Eastern Europe, notably on childhood and parenting practices. These welcome infusions can be attributed in part to the enthusiasm of Jerry Atlas and the open-door policy of Lloyd deMause (whose theories are being amply vindicated). Other positive signs stem from the recent high level of scholarship in the *Journal of Psychohistory*, the quality and range of work in **Clio's Psyche**, each's experimenting with forum-style formats, and the Euro-focus of the new journal on the block, *Tapestries*.

These developments raise hopes that our indispensable and impossible enterprise will continue to thrive as we strive to become more self-aware of our psychohistorical challenges.

Dan Dervin, PhD, is an emeritus professor of literature at Mary Washington College in Virginia. His track record in psychohistory dates from 1981 when he began attending IPA meetings and contributing to the *Journal of Psychohistory*. More recently he has organized his understanding of the field in *Enactments: American Modes and Psychohistory Models* (1996) and is currently assembling a collection of writings on childhood and parenting. He may be reached at <ddervin@mwc.edu>. □

Interdisciplinary Futures

Juhani Ihanus
University of Helsinki

Psychohistory and psychoanalysis are clearly not in the mainstream of scientific research in Finland. Psychohistorical research is done actively by only a few individuals in departments of history and psychology. Finnish psychoanalysts are no longer in leading posts in psychiatric institutions. They are mainly active in their two associations, one Freudian and the other more independently psychoanalytic. These associations concentrate primarily on training and internal discussions. Some practicing psychoanalysts write articles, but little psychoanalytic research is carried out. However, in some instances, theories are applied in the humanities and the social sciences. This marginal position of psychohistory and psychoanalysis is well-known in other countries as well. The tide has turned against these once promising disciplines. Let us turn back to some more promising beginnings.

The missionary atmosphere and passionate urge for universal validation among pioneering psychoanalysts was expressed by Fritz Wittels in 1908 at a meeting of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society: "Some of us believed that psychoanalysis would change the surface of the earth ... [and introduce] a golden age in which there would be no room for neuroses any more. We felt like great men.... Some people have a mission in their life." This optimism was, to some extent, shared by Freud when he expressed the hope that the time was not far away "when people generally have the insight that no neural disturbances can be understood or treated if psychoanalytic views, and often also techniques, are not used as help." (On the other hand, Freud later mentioned psychoanalyzing as an "impossible profession" on a par with educating and ruling.)

Psychohistory, as the science of historical motivation, was also introduced as an antidote to traditional history. The relationship between history and psychohistory was compared by Lloyd deMause in *The New Psychohistory* (1975) with that between astrology and astronomy or, not so pejoratively, between geology and physics.

In this new century and this new millennium, psychohistory is facing its historical test: To proceed or to give up? The future scenario of "given-up" psychohistory does not well suit the

image of actively analyzing the world on the couch. Freud was already well aware of the difficulties in carrying individual psychological conceptions over to analyzing "mass psychological" phenomena. Still, amidst all the resistance, it seems a worthwhile enterprise and an exciting emotional-intellectual journey. It dares to take us to issues of the self and others individually and in groups of all sizes -- to help us understand the fear of true cooperative interdisciplinarity.

Psychohistorians, psychoanalysts, and other researchers still have opportunities to open themselves to neglected areas, to omitted or censored chapters of human consciousness and human history. This research transference demands constant vigilance in detecting blind alleys and blind spots in one's own and others' previous research. It is also a question of taking risks, of tolerating multiverses of co-existing visions, and participating in the Internet even if the electronic world seems to hold it as a truism that there is no more history, because all the past is present instantaneously at the click of the mouse.

Discussion of the future of psychohistory and psychoanalysis is apt to slide into a sermon. The task of a prophet, however, may not be only to foretell future events. Nowadays, futures (not *the* future) of psychohistory and psychoanalysis may be open arenas for discussion: what kinds of futures do those present want to have, and how will they work towards their constantly evaporating goals, which have to be co-constructed and co-interpreted, re-told in the unfolding narratives. In his speech of 1956 (printed the following year), Theodor Reik recalled Freud's thoughts about the future of psychoanalysis:

He [Freud] recognized the mistake of American physicians in making psychoanalysis "the handmaiden of psychiatry," as he said in a letter to me. He foresaw still unrecognized possibilities for future research and made us, analysts of the generation, aware that there are more things in the conscious and unconscious than are dreamed of in our philosophy. At one of those Wednesday meetings with a small circle of his students, he once mentioned that psychoanalysis would one day play a greater role in the re-education of society than in the treatment of individuals, that it would function as a ferment of civilization. Such passages in his writings as the observation that he had "touched the world in its sleep"

and the insight that he had "all mankind as patient" suggest the collective function in store for psychoanalysis. Is it only a projection of present trends into the future, idle fantasy, when we foresee a slow infiltration of analytic points of view, a peaceful penetration of society by analytic ideas? ("A Declaration of Intellectual Independence" in *Psychoanalysis and the Future: A Centenary Commemoration of the Birth of Sigmund Freud*, pp. 147-151)

As heir to Freud's vision, psychohistory has proceeded to analyze all the world "on the couch." For psychohistorians, it is not "idle fantasy" but various group fantasies that are active in forming what "we choose to call our history." The difficulties for psychohistory are still enormous. Should the lessening of the urge to masterfully and penetratingly control these group fantasies lead to a more successful embracing and understanding of them? Is it possible that psychohistorians are, in their research, also tied to war-as-a-birth and ensuing annihilation fantasies? Could there, after all, be playful space for peace as the principal mode of thinking: "Not the peace one slavishly abides for mere persistence -- but that peace which is both a life for others and a forgetting of oneself" (Emmanuel Levinas, "Foreword: Simulacra: The End of the World" in David Wood (ed.), *Writing the Future*, 1990, pp. 11-14). Peace, like love, is disquieting, full of transformation fantasies.

Archives, containing the sealed past of psychoanalysis and psychohistory, should not be closed. In the memories of these archives is the inscription: "in the future, remember to remember the future" (Jacques Derrida, "Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression" in *Diacritics* 25 (2) 1995, pp. 9-63). Through psychoanalysts, psychohistorians, and other researchers, the past becomes polylogical, opening toward futures. Histories are open for retelling.

Juhani Ihanus, PhD, is Adjunct Professor of Culture at the University of Helsinki, Adjunct Professor of the History of Science and Ideas at the University of Oulu, and Lecturer in the Open University of the University of Helsinki. He has recently published a work on Edward Westermarck, *Multiple Origins* (1999). He is the author of five scientific books in Finnish and many scientific articles on psychohistory (especially connected with Russian Studies), the history of the humanities, and clinical and cultural psychology.

Professor Ihanus can be reached at <juhani.ihanus@kolumbus.fi>. □

Howard Stein: An Intellectual Odyssey

Peter W. Petschauer
Appalachian State University

Howard F. Stein was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1946. He received both his BA with a major in Historical Musicology and a minor in Anthropology (1967) and his PhD in Medical and Psychological Anthropology (1972) from the University of Pittsburgh. He taught in the Department of Psychiatry at Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tennessee, from 1972-1978. Stein is currently Professor, Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, College of Medicine, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, where he has taught behavioral sciences since 1978. He has held numerous visiting professorships including in the Department of Psychiatry, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, in the early 1980s, when he began collaborating with Vamik Volkan and Maurice Apprey, and in the Department of Family Medicine, University of North Carolina, in the mid-1980s. Stein has been a member of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) and of the editorial board of the *Journal of Psychohistory* for over 20 years. He has published many psychohistorical articles in the *Journal*, *The Psychohistory Review*, and **Clio's Psyche**. Among the many awards Stein has received are the 1998 "Recognition Award" from the Society of Teachers of Family Medicine, a career-recognition award for outstanding contribution to the teaching of family medicine to residents and medical students, and the 1999 "Omer C. Stewart Memorial Award" of the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology, of which he is currently President.

Stein is the author of 22 books, including several with co-authors; 41 chapters in books; 189 articles (several co-authored); and 150 published poems as well as numerous other publications. From 1980-1987 he edited the *Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology* and currently sits on many editorial boards in a dozen disciplines. His major books include *The Ethnic Imperative: Exploring the New White Ethnic Movement* (with Robert F. Hill) (1977), *The Psychoanthropology of*

American Culture (1985), *The Psychodynamics of Medical Practice: Unconscious Factors in Patient Care* (1985), *Developmental Time, Cultural Space: Studies in Psychogeography* (1987), *Clinical Stories and Their Translations* (with Maurice Apprey) (1990), and *Euphemism, Spin, and the Crisis in Organizational Life* (1998).

Peter Petschauer interviewed our featured scholar during a conference they attended at Duke University in Durham, North Carolina, in May, 1999. (Paul Elovitz and Bob Lentz asked additional questions in February, 2000.) Stein may be contacted by e-mail at <howard-stein@ouhsc.edu>.

Peter W. Petschauer (PWP): Please tell us about your family background and childhood.

Howard F. Stein (HFS): My family was Jewish. My father was Romanian Jewish ("Schvartzy Yidn," black Jews) and my mother was Polish-Russian Jewish. Her side saw themselves as more learned and upper crust than her husband and his family. Our family fought about lots of issues, in part because its members came from so many different ethnic Jewish backgrounds, and social classes/psychoclasses. My father owned a small store in downtown Coraopolis, a suburb of Pittsburgh, where I grew up. He probably belonged to the lower-lower class (pushcarts on Maxwell Street in Chicago in the early 20th century) and my mother came from an upper-middle class background. In many ways, my parents were *Gastarbeiter*, long-time residents in the community but outsiders. We were also outsiders in the local Jewish community, where my family was liturgically & ritually "Conservative" when most had become "Reformed" and threw the Orthodox out of the local temple. An only child, I attended elementary school in Coraopolis and at the same time attended Hebrew School in Pittsburgh in the afternoons and early evenings. This entire environment taught me early on about homelessness (*zwischen zwei Welten* [between two worlds]) and about ethnic diversity.

Bob Lentz (BL): You work in many disciplines. What is psychoanalytic anthropology?

HFS: Psychoanalytic anthropology is based on an understanding of the experience of growing up in (or as) a biological organism. Issues ranging from self to culture, unconscious to object relations, and symbolism to ritual are heavily informed, if not (over)determined, by growing up as a biological organism in the setting of older inti-

mates (e.g., caretaker[s]-infant dyads, mother-father-child triads, etc.). I find it most useful to see a psychodynamically-informed anthropology more in the metaphor of the root or trunk of the human science of anthropology, rather than as a branch. Some of the most eminent psychoanalytic anthropologists are Weston La Barre, George Devereux, Melford Spiro, and L. Bryce Boyer.

BL: What is medical anthropology?

HFS: Medical anthropology is devoted to the understanding of health-related systems in all cultures. Medical anthropologists study, for example, shaman-clientele relationships, ethnic health beliefs and values, ethnomedical practices (rituals, substances used in treatment), and the articulation of "health" institutions with other institutions (e.g., politics, religion, family, etc.).

BL: What is psychogeography?

HFS: Psychogeography is a way of thinking about the human perception of, creation of meaning out of, and action in natural and social "space." The materials out of which we experience and live in this space are our bodies, our earliest relationships, and our families. Psychogeography is about how these become transformed into psychic structures and later projected and played out in "space," ranging from mountains and rivers to tribes and nations. Much of my work in psychogeography started out focusing on inter-ethnic and international relations (us-them), and is now directed mostly toward understanding and working within workplace organizations.

PWP: What brought you to these fields and psychohistory?

HFS: A process that probably started with my dissertation, "An Ethno-Historic Study of Slovak-American Identity." It focuses on intergenerational continuity and discontinuity among Slovaks and Rusyns in steel mill communities in the Northeastern U.S. Part of the study was on health-related beliefs and practices and how these affected patient behavior in physician-patient relationships. Then at the Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tennessee, I taught ethnicity and culture to medical students. I was teaching about Slavic-Americans, other Euro-American groups, African-American ethnicity, and health care issues. For some time I had also been interested in Slavs, anti-Jewish feelings, and *pogroms* in the Central European area. I began writing about Jewish history, specifically trying to understand victimization and the dance of death between long-standing enemies.

I was starting to develop the notion of "adversary symbioses," like Americans and Soviets, or Greeks and Turks; also, the symbiosis between anti-Semitic and anti-Gentile feelings. These are groups who can't live with or without each other.

Early at Meharry, in 1972 or 1973, I was invited by my chairperson, Jeanne Spurlock, MD, a gifted analyst and child analyst, to participate with psychiatry residents in her weekly seminars in classic papers in psychoanalysis. After I had listened and observed for a while, I was given my chance to participate directly. I'm not sure whether it was by assignment or choice, but I got the Wolf Man paper. I was in heaven!

In 1976 or 1977 Henry Ebel and Lloyd deMause invited me to participate in the first International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) Convention in New York City in June, 1978. (I had not yet read deMause.) With that attendance came many conversations, and intense friendships, with deMause and Ebel, and further attendance at all of the IPA annual meetings until the late 1980s. I became a devoted group member. I felt as if I had found my place, or at least a place. As I attended IPA conventions, many psychohistorians welcomed my ideas. I came away refreshed. Ten to fifteen years later, people were saying, "You are really a psychohistorian." First comes the work, then the group and the label. Over time, I began to feel that the IPA was becoming more doctrinaire, less fresh. I also began to have closer relationships with individual IPA members than with "the organization" per se. I contribute to, and work in, over a dozen different disciplines, and I can't attend and belong exclusively everywhere. But the 1999 IPA conference was as exhilarating as any I've attended.

In 1980 Lloyd offered me editorship of the *Journal of Psychological Anthropology*, and agreed to the name change to "Psychoanalytic" to reflect my editorial policy. I have to say that the best eight years (1980-1987) of my life followed. It was a life-changing process. For a while, at least in one socially recognized capacity, I had ceased to be a wandering Jew. It allowed me to think and to shape a field. It was fatherhood and parenthood long before I had my son in late 1993. It allowed me to be nurturing, generative, and a leader.

PWP: How do you define psychohistory?

HFS: I do not define myself as a partisan of psychohistory. I am also a psychoanalytic anthropologist, medical anthropologist, political psy-

chologist, organizational scholar, and consultant. I don't stop being one when I am another.

I see the work of psychohistory in the sense that Paul Harvey presents news stories: I want to discover historically "the rest of the story," or certainly more of it beyond conventional understandings. I look for unconscious motivations in history, not just traditional national and ethnic histories. I am not interested in trying to present a final analysis -- because I don't believe in it, there is always more -- but rather I seek to discover the spirit of something, for instance, the part that is *not* being said in relationship to what *is* being said.

For example, as I keep trying to understand the source(s) of World War II, I think on the one hand about the relationship between World War I and World War II, and on the other hand about experiences in German family life and childhood. I see history as partly enacting cultural memory in group fantasy. Thus, in German history, I look to Richard Wagner and to the way he and his music were used: expressive culture precedes and sets the stage for political culture. (Yet, Wagner is profound and not merely sinister -- how do we hold onto both?)

In contrast to some of my colleagues, who identify with the objectivist scholarly tradition, I also define psychohistory as being an active engagement by the observer or researcher. While they emphasize the interpretative aspect of our enterprise, I assist individuals in my different work settings to discover their own cultural backgrounds and the influence on their work. I interpret culture and ethnic cultures in and for institutional and work settings rather than traditional ethnic and political settings.

I am also searching for different ways of reaching my audiences. While I applaud and use the traditional written format, with which psychohistorians reach academic audiences by publishing in journals and books, I am trying to reach audiences in addition through poems and a play I have written. In the play, I explore the reactions of people summarily fired from a corporate setting, those who remained behind, and the managers who decided to initiate the separation. One of the issues for psychohistorians to explore is how we can give people in various settings, not just in academic settings, access to the findings of our field. How do we convey to others insights so that they are truly helpful? How do we communicate in such a way that affected people gain genuine access to what we know about the complexity of relationships be-

tween human beings, not just in the large political context but also in the day-to-day institutional context? For most people this context is much more immediate and meaningful than the more commonly addressed political one. I sense that the cultural realities of work settings can only be explored and explained in non-traditional venues such as poems and plays. Perhaps this can be true in other settings, such as national ones. In other words, here I define psychohistory as a field that is both a set of publications and a set of constantly innovative explorations.

BL: Two of your poems, on the Holocaust, follow this interview. Please tell us about the poetry you've published.

HFS: I've published three poetry volumes (*Prairie Voices*, 1996; *Evocations*, 1997; and *Learning Pieces*, 2000). By the late 1980s, I began to feel that strictly scholarly forms were not sufficient to articulate what I was learning, what I was coming to know, and what and how I felt. Poetry and the story became alternative interpretive forms, and became a way of enriching scholarship as well. I write about many subjects, mostly the very ordinariness of living.

PWP: What is your primary professional affiliation?

HFS: My primary affiliation is with medicine and anthropology, specifically with psychoanalytic and applied anthropology. I have been an applied medical anthropologist in a family medicine department, and on the national family medicine scene, since 1978. Thus, I am an anthropologist in and of family medicine who is primarily employed to teach clinical behavioral science to residents in family and occupational medicine and to medical and Physician's Associate students.

Still, it is hard to know how to reply. Who gives me a paycheck? With whom do I organizationally identify? Sometimes I feel like the singer in the song "Sixteen Tons": "I owe my soul to the company store." Who claims me? Whom do I claim? What is my sense of self in all of these tidal waves?

My "primary affiliation" is fraught with much ambivalence. I often feel that I am employed to teach what no one really wants to know, or to teach it in so culturally stylized a form that it will disturb no one. I have found it difficult to be affiliated without being marginalized in anthropology. "Affiliation" is an emotion-laden term for me: it has to do with more than where I obtain my

paycheck; it has much to do with being claimed, with being recognized as belonging, with sense of identity and sense of place. It has to do with a struggle for a "true self" and against the pull of my "false self" -- concepts of Winnicott that resound in my life. It has to do with legitimacy and not being haunted by a sense of bastardy. It changes, expands, and takes new forms. For instance, I am now president of the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology, and I have come to see myself increasingly as an applied anthropologist. The affiliation comes from the doing, the doing together, and the mutual recognition.

BL: You "teach" "clinical behavioral sciences" to medical and health students and practitioners. Please give us an example of what this entails.

HFS: For 20 years I have taught an annual graduate level, field-oriented seminar called Behavioral Sciences in Occupational Medicine. It is about the culture of and in the workplace, the relationship between work and the rest of life, the relationship between variously labeled pathologies and work. For nearly 24 years, I have coordinated the behavioral medicine program at the Enid Family Medicine Clinic, a second- and third-year residency training site in northwest Oklahoma to prepare family physicians for rural primary care. I am there all-day Friday, arriving for 7:30 a.m. grand rounds, then giving talks and arranging speakers for noon lectures; consulting with physician trainees on physician-patient-staff-disease issues, and occasionally counseling with a resident or staff member.

PWP: What are you working on now?

HFS: I am working on my life! I continue with the work of the last 10 years, except that I now give it a more practical direction. I am trying to talk with many kinds of different people so that they understand better the settings in which they live and work. One way I see myself accomplishing this goal is through searching discussions with them on not only the intellectual but also on the emotional level. Engaging people in their worlds, in their lives, as a way of teaching "my" subject. As a matter of fact, you [PWP] were engaged in one of the readings at Duke University at the end of May where I explored with medical staff members the difficulties of individuals in work settings churned by downsizing, reengineering, and other catastrophic change.

PWP: Do you plan to publish any autobio-

graphical writings?

HFS: In some ways, like all of us, I am constantly writing my autobiography. This interview is a form of autobiographical reconstruction - an interpretation of how I arrived at this point in my thinking. I do want to publish a formal autobiography at some point, maybe with the title, *Even in America*. Much of the "politics" of my academic life (nearly 30 years, now) has led me to experience much secretive, subtle, and not-so-subtle anti-Semitism, bullying, and Jew-baiting -- things I had thought were matters of the past and not of the present. Yes, they happen, even in America, even now. I have experiences that those who foisted them onto me (projective identification, injection, etc.) adamantly deny ever happening. But, positively, it will be a kind of *Dankgesang*, a song of gratitude and testimony to experience -- if I may borrow from Beethoven's Opus 132 quartet. In the middle of a very hectic work and family life, I am trying to find the life scenes, the life moments that have become the driving forces in my life.

PWP: What special training and mentors were most helpful to you?

HFS: The training has been more of a process than a definite and concluded period of development early in my thinking. I am still in "training." I never was formally a student of, say, Weston La Barre (*The Ghost Dance: The Origins of Religion*, 1972, and *They Shall Take Up Serpents*, 1962), but he was a mentor of mine from 1976 until his death in 1996. I have learned from reading and talking with him and Vamik Volkan at least as much about the experience of being a Jew as I have from a long early Hebrew education. In my early formal training I should point principally to my initiation into culture-and-personality studies. My specific mentor at the University of Pittsburgh was Otto von Mering, a traditional European scholar who was proudly American, respected Erik Erikson, and studied under Clyde Kluckhohn at Harvard.

I should also mention immediately the access to my own inner life and the decades of therapy that enabled this access. My therapy was, and remains, a crucial part of my continuous "training." Insight is part of out-sight. Recognizing some of my own dualities made an understanding of Jewish and German, Greek and Turk, and Soviet and American identities clearer.

Somewhat later in this process, I had the opportunity to work as an Ittelson consultant to the

Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (GAP) twice a year between 1980 and 1988. What a feast! I worked with the Committee on International Relations, which included such people as Volkan, John Kafka, Otto Kernberg, and John Mack. Although this was formally a consulting role, it was in fact training as well. It was like attending master classes in music with Casals or Heifetz or Szell. From my GAP beginnings, Volkan has become one of my dearest friends. With the GAP committee, I co-authored the book *Us and Them: The Psychology of Ethnonationalism* (1987). Out of my work with GAP arose insights regarding "Two-Track," or unofficial as well as official, diplomacy, the wisdom of which I now apply on the organizational or institutional level to consulting.

PWP: What other individuals and books in psychology were important to your development?

HFS: Erik Erikson, especially *Childhood and Society*, still has a major influence on me and I continue to go back to him, remembering passages from the uncanny "nowhere." What a writer he was! He painted human worlds with words. He had vast command of many literatures. I restudy him the way conductors study and restudy great scores. I read Freud somewhat later in my development, at first especially the broad theoretical studies (especially *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*), and later the clinical papers. Others include Maurice Apprey (many papers on anorexia nervosa and its family of disorders), Michael Balint (psychoanalytic books), Rudolph Bion (who used his own countertransference to explore Hitler's military decision-making in *Hitler Among the Germans*), Wilfred R. Bion (*Experiences in Groups*), L. Bryce Boyer (including the recent *Countertransference and Regression*), Lynn Carmichel (an academic family physician and author of many papers on physician-patient relationships), Lloyd deMause, George Devereux (*From Anxiety to Method in the Behavioral Sciences*), Henry Ebel (scholar, *Mensch*, Jew and German), Erich Fromm, Jules Henry (*Culture Against Man*), Melanie Klein, Henry Lawton (with his sheer staying power and the day-to-day attention to details regarding *organizational* psychohistory as well as his *The Psychohistorian's Handbook*), Thomas H. Ogden (*Reverie and Interpretation*, *Subjects of Analysis*, *The Matrix of the Mind*, *The Primitive Edge of Experience*, and *Projective Identification and Psychotherapeutic Technique*), Gayle Stephens (*Family Practice in the 1980s*, *The Intellectual Basis of Family Practice*), and D. W.

Winnicott.

PWP: What is your psychoanalytic/psychotherapeutic experience?

HFS: I have been in therapy for many years. It is not primarily for "didactic" purposes, but for my life. I sometimes think of my life as a kind of ethnological "specimen" from which I try to learn as much as possible about my subject matter. The therapy helped and helps sort out some of my inner confusion and conflicts, and my workplace turmoil. I now use its insights in the context of the institutional consulting and therapy. It has taught me -- reluctantly -- the importance of affect, emotion, as well as fantasy and other cognitive expressions of thought. Learning from within becomes a way of learning from without. Both are inter-subjective. Learning from the inside equips a psychohistorian to be a better historian of many different areas and eras.

I find that including the arts -- music, theatre, poetry -- in my life and work helps give me greater access to cultural and historical materials. I do not so much claim to be a fine arts historian as the recipient of ongoing arts therapy!

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

HFS: A person must: pursue intensive psychoanalytic training or analytic therapy; understand group processes, both on the most local or micro-level at home and in larger or macro-level environments; and learn about groups as much as about individuals (because from Freud and Binion we know that individual psychology is pre-eminently group psychology).

A person must also: pursue area or era studies and study art and social history; know how to obtain pertinent data, from fieldwork to library research; truly have a command of historical texts, and primary sources where possible; know the different authors in the field, and the many sides of an issue; and grasp how people did things in the past, to not project present onto past and to correct one's projections if necessary, and to understand the difference, for example, between medieval childrearing and modern childrearing.

PWP: How can we, as psychohistorians, strengthen our work?

HFS: Read. Live. Experience. Be first-rate scholars. And write, and continue to be better at it. Treat it like an art form. Let me recount to you one of my father's favorite stories. A person is

lost in midtown Manhattan. He looks around, then walks up to someone whom he thinks looks local. He asks, "How do you get to Carnegie Hall?" The fellow replies, "Practice, practice, practice." We have to practice, hone our work, everywhere. Psychohistory is where the doing of psychohistory happens, not just where we label it. Self-identified psychohistorians do not necessarily do some of the best studies in psychology and history.

In psychohistory, as in psychology in general, there are abundant institutes and centers. One can mention the range from Vamik Volkan's Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction at the University of Virginia to Paul Elovitz's Psychohistory Forum in New York City. I learn from all of them. Possibly the most important thing I have learned is to not be an ideologue. I want to belong where I am allowed to think new thoughts. Strengthening a group or organization ought to be primarily about encouraging thought and work. One group from which I have learned a lot since the early 1990s is the International Society for Psychoanalytic Study of Organizations. While it is not psychohistory in name, much of the work of the members is so in spirit -- scholars such as Michael Diamond, Burkard Sievers, Gordon Lawrence, Yiannis Gabriel, Seth Allcorn, and Harold Bridger are associated with it.

PWP: What is the importance of childhood to psychohistory?

HFS: It is crucial, but its role is not resolved, at least for me. It is part of a two-stranded DNA in psychohistory, the universal and the particular. In this regard, I think a great deal like La Barre. We all are preemies, big-brained preemies who grow up in families. Neoteny sets the stage for our species' virtues and vulnerabilities. Then, too, we need to be alert to the influence of a specific childhood in a specific place and time. Thus, the tension between being a preemie and the presence of a specific culture.

There is, for example, the issue of oedipality: sexual longing and the role of the parent of the opposite gender. The key in a child's development is how that conflict is resolved. How, for example, is the child treated by the parenting figure? What sorts of real people are available for identification when s/he goes through Kleinian positions and Freudian stages?

This sort of tension between the universal and the local is where deMause's six stages fit in. But deMause places more emphasis on explaining

the changes in childrearing modes and I place more on the interdependence of history and culture and childhood. There has to be a kind of social density, population-wise, for major ideological shifts to occur. But, to me there is no question that childhood sets the drama played out on the stage of history and culture.

PWP: Can you comment on the issue of identification with a particular parent and achievement?

HFS: This is Freud 101. How long of an answer do you want? This is the stuff of autobiography!

In our apartment building, my maternal grandfather ruled from his apartment across the hall from ours. With me, my grandfather was a very sweet, playful man. I felt safe with him in ways I did not with my parents. I adored my mother, revered my father, but felt most at home "across the hall," at my grandfather's.

He despised my father -- a stance that played fatefully in my discounting my father, who could at times be brutal. His anger fed and justified my fear and further distanced me from him. My mother was a sickly, unhappy woman, often a subtle seductress. Although my father worked hard in his little store below the apartment, I took sides with my mother and excluded him emotionally from much of my life. I never realized how isolated and lonely he was.

When I was growing up, I obeyed and respected him, yes, but deep down, I discounted him. Over time I grew closer to him, especially in his last decade of life (until he died when I was 50), after my mother had died (when I was 39). For a while, despite his age, he was still quite strong and independent. I admired him immensely. We became close friends. Then I saw him become ill and infirm. I saw him in ways he had never allowed himself to be seen. Only in recent years have I appreciated my father's devotion to my education. He was often the Leopold Mozart to his errant Wolfgang.

There were ethnic or religious and class undercurrents to the strife between my parents' and my grandfather's families. My father's parents came from Bucharest and Jassy, Rumania, and were lower-lower class, while my mother's father came from "Russian Poland," as it was then called, and were upper-middle class. My maternal grandmother's family had already been in the U.S. a generation, I think; she had a German-Jewish sur-

name: Finkelhor. Early in my life I adored Russian and German music; only in the last several years have I become interested in Romanian music. Such is the power of evolving identification.

Identity conflict and creation thus became extremely complicated for me. I trace some of my being *immer wieder heimatlos* [always homeless] to this cultural and emotional tension in the household. I also trace my interest and my emphasis on culture, on the "psycho" dimension of history, on splitting and projective identification, on moving between groups as culture broker, and on my present interest in organizational culture, to these experiences of being in places where I'm unsure whether I belong -- whether I'm really wanted, and as what, and for what.

Paul H. Elovitz (PHE): Will you share some thoughts and feelings about your Judaism?

HFS: Just as it is not simple, neither is it completed. I draw upon -- consciously and unconsciously -- many different "Jewish" currents. There are the Hebrew Bible, the Hebrew Prayer Books, and the New Testament; they were and remain glorious works of inwardness. The lifework of Abraham Joshua Heschel (*The Earth Is the Lord's*, *The Prophets*, and *God in Search of Man*) and Martin Buber (*I and Thou* and *Between Man and Man*) is as central to me as that of Sigmund Freud; I try not to keep them (and many others) compartmentalized in my work or life. I am a very sporadically "practicing" Jew. At the same time, Torah (to choose one central metaphor) for me is less limited to five sacred books, scroll, and narrowly-conceived law, as it is a matter of the love of learning, a willingness to continue to learn with one's heart, one's soul, and one's strength. I find myself (to use clumsy words) centered, grounded, rooted, placed, real... as I participate in Hebrew liturgy, whether reading at home or in *Schul*. There are times that it is the same feeling, the same sense of self-integrity, when I hear a Bach, Beethoven, Schubert, or Bruckner mass. It is as if to say, when I am in such places -- and it could be alone on the prairie as well as in a synagogue Minyan -- I am restored to who and what I really am as a human being. And that "who" and "what" are defined by standing in the presence of G-d. It is that Presence that makes the difference between brilliant or clever scholarship, and scholarship that touches and mends the heart at the same time as it reveals new "information" at another level. I can only hope that my life and work, psychohistorical and otherwise, are moving in this direction.

PHE: Your 1978 article, "Judaism and the Group-Fantasy of Martyrdom: The Psychodynamic Paradox of Survival Through Persecution" (*Journal of Psychohistory*, vol. 6)," upset me and many other colleagues and was unfairly cited by Holocaust deniers to serve their agenda. How do you feel about the content, style, and reception of this article almost a quarter century later?

HFS: My 1978 paper, "Judaism and the Group-Fantasy of Martyrdom," interweaves themes that are a part of my continuing interest and, yes, passion: Jewish history and identity, ethnicity and nationalism, the psychological dimensions of the relationship between oppressor and oppressed (or victimizer and victim), childhood and history, and the specific role(s) of projective identification (as well as other forms of psychic riddance, control, separation, and denial of separation) in history and society. I was on to "something" then, which I have subsequently developed in many directions.

While I agree with the content of what I wrote, I find that the tone was often urgent, angry, even desperate. Content-wise, I think that the piece (together with other things I had and have written on Jewish history and ethnicity) is useful in helping to understand other ethnic groups and inter-ethnic relations. But the tone often got in the way of the content. [Editor's Note: I agree that the tone kept many of us from carefully considering Stein's message. As a psychoanalyst, I have learned that one can say most things, perhaps almost anything, if one chooses the right tone, context, mood, level of maturation, and time -- which may take many, many years of waiting.]

If people (any people, all people) could come to recognize the part they play -- however small it might be -- in their own history, some of the repetition might cease, and some transcendence might be possible. Although I could not control the way my writing (on Judaism or any other subject) might be used, I also recognize in hindsight that readers, identifying with the tone, could use it to distort the content, and turn it all against Jews as further "justification" for anti-Semitism. I continue to struggle with the issue of how to help whole groups (from ethnic to national to professional to clinical) courageously and compassionately face their own ambivalence, their own conflicts, and their own history.

PWP: How do you understand the psychology of fundamentalism, violence, and terrorism?

HFS: Sometimes I wish I were Charles Strozier or Vamik Volkan -- they know so much about these things and are so wise. As I understand it, fundamentalisms and the violence they entail are expressions of what Erikson called "identity crises" or identity panics: the defensive structures, meanings, and symbols that were once available are gone. They are a response to traumatic loss, a paranoid elaboration of mourning, to borrow from Franco Fornari. People try desperately, under regressive pulls, to deal with psychotic, persecutory anxiety. The end of the Cold War and, now, the end of the millennium, correspond with and evoke the inner experience of the end of the world. DeMause has long proposed, and offered evidence for the proposition, that fundamentalisms surge when things are getting better, not worse, and that improvement brings up enormous ambivalence, guilt, and shame. My guess is that violence and fundamentalism have something to do with profound ambivalence toward one's own culture and the projection of the hatred part of that ambivalence onto enemies and a call for a return to the idealized "fundamentals."

The rise of all sorts of *recent* fundamentalisms and violence traces to the emotional consequences of the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet Union and its "empire." Until the end of the 1980s, I see an emotional balance in the world that restrained the ferocity of ethnic and religious expressions. Many groups were contained and focused by the "us versus them" syndrome, the U.S. versus the Soviet Union, East vs. West. The two camps, which included the allies aligned with each major power, kept the more local tensions defused and channeled. But what happens when the "them" and the "us" disappear? Now what do we do? What sort of order, local or world, do we create? What sort of solutions do we provide now to national and ethnic issues? Who are we after the categories of "communist" and "socialist" have evaporated? What do we do if the leadership of a society becomes overly aggressive toward its own people? Do we put aside the traditional considerations of national frontiers for the benefit of the people who are being oppressed? Do we place these "supra-national" moral considerations only in Europe? In the expression of fundamentalism I see a regressive force to find absolutes; it is a psychotic anxiety that seeks resolution. Now that the Soviet Union and the Cold War are gone, we have free-floating aggression and enormous anxiety -- affect and fantasy in search of an object.

We have the re-emergence of national fundamentalism, ethnic fundamentalism, and religious fundamentalism. There even is the emergence of what I would call corporate fundamentalism in the business or workplace world, where the workplace is becoming the omnipotent object of dependency in one's life. It is one where, in the midst of mass firings, restructurings, mergers, and takeovers, workplaces demand total loyalty and take virtual control over people's lives. In many instances, multinational corporations are becoming more powerful than the nation-states of which they are ostensibly members. **[Editor's Note:** For a fuller presentation by Stein of his views on corporate terrorism, see his "The Holocaust as Trope for 'Managed' Social Change" in our December, 1999, issue.]

In all these cases, the past does not determine the future. The present uses the past to shore up the cataclysm-filled present and creates a glorious, rather than a dreaded, future.

I see terrorism and fundamentalism as psychologically linked. I also want to avoid getting bogged down in labels as to who is and is not a terrorist -- which often is an exercise in projection. Both outlaw groups and groups in official power can terrorize others, can engage in atrocities. Ideologically, they appeal to some kind of narrow ideology about inclusion, exclusion, and expulsion from very fragile boundaries. Some local leaders, because of their own anxieties and their will to power, use the seeming lack of international and intra-national resolution to their own ends. There is no one to stop them. They reinterpret the Koran or the Old Testament to suit their purposes and to create acceptable, to them, local solutions. In some instances these solutions foster infiltration of duly established institutions for the purpose of destabilizing a society and to attain political control and through it impose solutions. Even in terrorist situations, though, the terrible is also a solution as a welcome alternative to chaos. The political despot, a modern tribal shaman, sacred or secular, can only succeed to power if he is carrying out the wishes of others as well. As La Barre often said, shaman and society are made for each other; the promised omnipotence of one will salve the despairing impotence of the other.

PWP: What are your thoughts about millennialism?

HFS: Interestingly enough, we have several group fantasies about the millennium, principally of course at the fringe of society. Whole

groups of people think that all systems, particularly computers, will break down and that "everything" will come to an end. This is the "Y2K" complex. This fantasy, fired on by revised predictions of Nostradamus and others, latches on to earlier fantasies about the end of the world. This fantasy is supported, for profit, by a conglomeration of merchants who thrive on selling everything from machine guns to corn flakes for the inevitable end. We have the media hype, and the media are delegates and mouthpieces of collective wish and dread.

The issue of catastrophism and the expectation of rebirth are complex. There are all sorts of images of violent endings and beginnings. Can the workplace and school shootings be construed as partly pre-millennial or anticipatory of the New Heaven, the New Earth? The private militias and survivalists are symptomatic of it. Some people can't wait for the End of Time, and others dread it. Many ordinary people I know are stockpiling food. Will there be sufficient social density, so to speak, of people who were truly loved by their parents and teachers, so that the regressive pull of millennialism will lead to less splitting, less massive projective identification, less fanaticism, and less social destruction at the turn of the century and millennium? I hope so, but I don't know; I wish that we were better at prediction.

Perhaps psychohistorians can have some effect on the direction of this millennial fever by addressing the anxieties, wishes, fantasies, and feelings that surround it. I suggest reading Sylvia Thrupp (ed.), *Millennial Dreams in Action* (1962), and La Barre's *The Ghost Dance*. I do not share the recent and current millennial fantasies, but they do fit a familiar pattern. I do certainly share some anxiety over people who are enthusiastic about radical death and rebirth!

PWP: How can psychohistorians have more impact on psychoanalytic institutes and in the analytic community?

HFS: We should certainly try to have psychohistory courses, by whatever name, in analytic institutes. But if we believe that psychohistory is good as applied psychoanalysis in analytic institutes, it is good anywhere: in English departments, in organizational management training, in grade school history and high school civics classes. Everything we do should be a form of applied psychoanalysis.

I want to be clear on what I do and don't

mean. I don't mean primarily extrapolating from the consulting room to society. What we learn from individual patients and from our own patienthood needs to exist in dialectical tension with doing actual long-term fieldwork or intensive documentary research. Ideally, psychoanalytic theory itself will be enriched as well as enriching psychohistorical research and teaching. Every classroom, every seminar, is itself a potential setting for studying group psychohistory!

We need to make a constant effort to help the field of psychohistory flourish, in as many places and forms as possible. We psychohistorians seem to continue in our hope that our field will find acceptance if only we can somehow find access to institutes and universities and attract new people. How American! That is, to be welcomed into the mainstream, to assimilate. The reality is that the *Ausländer* [outsiders (to psychohistory)] will not suddenly in massive numbers take psychohistory, nor will converts spring forth at every corner, and make it into the field that offers solutions for every societal ill.

PWP: Will universities and research institutes some day hire psychohistorians as psychohistorians instead of for their other qualifications?

HFS: Yes, with the Second Coming, or perhaps the Third! I am certainly not employed as a psychohistorian or as a psychoanalytic anthropologist. Even as a generic "behavioral scientist," a term which medicine sort of recognizes, I have a hard time recognizing myself in what I do. I work as internal organizational consultant and quasi-therapist, timing and adopting psychodynamic insights to where people are emotionally, to what they are feeling. Sometimes I'm called their Shrink; sometimes people don't have a clue what to call me or how to use me. Nor do I! For me, psychohistory is ordinary, even though I would not label it as "psychohistory" per se when I explain to my colleagues what I am doing. It is not only a foreign language, but it is threatening. I'm very selective and cautious where, with whom, I identify myself in psychohistorical or psychoanthropological terms. If I use terms that are threatening, can I entirely blame those whom I teach or supervise for their resistance? They don't want to be "analyzed," they don't want to be seen as patients or analysts.

PWP: I have no trouble calling you a decent man and an excellent scholar. How can psychohistorians have greater impact on society in general?

HFS: We have to do exemplary work and hope that somewhere it "takes." We don't really know when or where or with whom we will have influence. Most of it happens independently of our effort to exert control.

Sometimes we get so narcissistically caught up in striving to make it to Carnegie Hall that we fail to recognize where we are already heard, understood, and appreciated. We get to "play" in some fabulous "halls." In the last several years, David Beisel has tried to convince us to get out of what I'd call the "minority group syndrome." If we keep seeing only the country clubs we're *not* admitted to, we'll probably not recognize those where we're already "in." In addition, maybe we need not be so ambitious to try to persuade everyone of the value of our approach. In addition to persuasion, there are other styles -- admittedly less official, less formally recognized. But they are real.

PWP: How true! What is the impact of psychohistory on your areas of expertise?

HFS: On the level of language, my friend La Barre told me long ago that we should not use the word "impact" when we really mean "affect" or "influence." Save "impact" for teeth, bowels, and bombs. There are more elegant, precise words to evoke how psychohistorians' work affects us. "Impact" conjures destruction and annihilation. Do we want people to help us think, or to blow us away? So much of what we do is beyond our awareness and control!

I can tell you who and what in psychohistory I quote most, but the real test of influence is when I have digested others' work and trust my own voice! Psychohistory has been most effective when it exerts unconscious influence over me, when psychohistory has already been metabolized.

I particularly like the IPA group process. With that approach we study who and what we are; we bring the object of psychohistory literally home. We are at once experiencing subject and historical object. I have used group process analysis and understanding in my role as Balint group leader and facilitator for medical interns, residents, and faculty, and in my role as organizational consultant. I owe to the IPA group process my conviction that we psychohistorians -- and all group or culture members -- learn an enormous amount about the making of history by observing, feeling, and talking about our own experiences in how groups operate. I can think of few things more un-

comfortable but also more refreshing.

We need to do and live psychohistory everywhere, all the time. I hope that I am doing so as I teach family doctors and occupational medicine physicians and physician's assistants about clinical and organizational work. It is a process in which I am engaged. It is an approach, a method, and a way of working and understanding. I am constantly doing and applying psychohistory in the broad area of healthcare teaching where I "make my living," and in fact whenever and wherever I speak or consult. I ask myself how people in all sorts of walks of life are hearing and listening, what lives they are bringing to a clinical case or consultation, what emotional currents are taking place in a faculty meeting or case conference. In this regard I keep thinking of James Masterson's frequent admonition to fellow analysts: "You are the servant of a process."

PWP: How might we recruit new people into our field?

HFS: If I may invoke Max Weber's distinction between exhortative and exemplary prophets, I think we'll do better recruiting in the long run if we try to be more of the exemplary type: doing the work and doing it well, doing it better than anyone else. Maybe the most important thing is not recruiting people into "our field," rather inspiring them to think in ways that are naturally psychohistorical. Not to look for "psychohistorians" per se, but to look for outstanding, self-reflective scholars.

Peter W. Petschauer, PhD, is Professor of History at Appalachian State University in Boone, North Carolina. His most recent book is Human Space (1997). He may be reached at <petschauerpw@appstate.edu>. □

Holocaust Poems

Howard F. Stein

November 9th, 1938

In memoriam, W.H. Auden

(Composed for the meeting of the Don Blanding Poetry Society, Enid, Oklahoma, November 21, 1999)

I was not there,
But my ancestors were,
The November night when roving gangs
Of boys and men
Smashed the windows of Jewish shops,
Looted their stores, burned synagogues

To the ground, and murdered several
hundred German Jews.

I was not there,
But still I cringe to know
How shallow are the most deep-sunk
roots,
When one may stare a Jew in the eye
And say, "You do not belong."
I was not there on Kristallnacht
When hate took so freely to the streets.

I was not there,
But I remember as if
It would have been yesterday
When we all shouted, "Crucify!" at
Calvary,
Then turned away and muttered,
"Let Him die for our sins."

I was not there,
And cannot bear
To think
I could have been
And might still be.

Survivor's Wound

Thoughts on the Death of Paul Celan

If none will see
Atrocity,
Does the survivor
Have a wound?

If I screamed
And no one
Heard me,
Would I still have
Screamed at all?

My torment is double:
Holes in my flesh,
And holes in time.

I speak for the dying
And the dead:
Affirm, at least,
My scream!

Nothing happened,
You whisper back --
Nothing;
Your atrocity is
But a dream.

If none will see
Atrocity,
Does the survivor
Have a wound? □

Holocaust Denial in New Zealand

Norman Simms
Waikato University, New Zealand

In almost every other Western democracy, *ipso facto* Holocaust denial is a crime, but not in New Zealand. There are two particular cases I want to discuss briefly and then speculate on why these matters reveal something very odd about the New Zealand collective psyche. The first case concerns the way in which a student is being protected by the institution and the real issues are misunderstood or repressed. The second case has to do with a professional historian whose master's thesis argued that there were no gas chambers in Nazi-occupied lands and that less than a million Jews were murdered during the Holocaust. In each instance, the important point is not the denial itself but the failure of most New Zealanders, as individuals and as a collectivity, to comprehend the ethical, moral, and emotional implications involved.

The student at a New Zealand university is a notorious and prolific Neo-Nazi Holocaust denier. Since his arrival from East Germany less than 10 years ago, he has averaged at least 2000 to 3000 thousand pages of "discourse" on the Internet each year. This "poor student" is a man in his late 50s who currently is a property speculator. It would seem the intention of his supporters is to push him through to a doctorate so that he can be paraded as an "expert witness," although his thesis topic -- the use of the German language in New Zealand -- is relatively neutral and irrelevant to his political views. While the Human Rights Commission has ruled that his remarks are insulting to Jews, because they are in German he cannot be considered to be inciting racial hatred. Their ruling is that his remarks are merely unpopular political opinions. When the human ethics committee of the university was approached, on the grounds that his thesis would involve him in dealing with the now elderly and frail Jewish immigrants from Nazi-occupied Europe who make up well over 80% of German speakers in this country, they responded that they could only deal with "proposals" and not with "persons."

More disturbing, however, has been the response by non-Jewish colleagues on staff. Many of the younger faculty have simply hidden away and avoided discussions, since they are "naturally"

afraid of losing their jobs by questioning authority ("managerial prerogative," the current buzz word for top-down rather than collegial structures). Others gasped and spoke of "freedom of speech," as though this were an absolute and not a relative term. Even when it was pointed out to them that the denial is a criminal offense in most Western countries, these statements are deeply hurtful to survivors of genocide, and they encode threats which are realized in violence in Germany, Argentina, and other countries, the staff can only say: But you want us to do what the Nazis did in the 1930s. Most painful were the colleagues who could not understand that there was a problem at all and said things that at first blush seem like non sequiturs: "Everyone wants to live with their own kind" or "You people are always so paranoid."

Before I explore further the configuration of the Kiwi [nickname for a New Zealander] response to Holocaust denial, and therefore to the Holocaust itself, let me quickly outline the second case of the master's thesis that denies the gas chambers. This thesis was embargoed for more than five years by the author, although its existence was known, even overseas where it was cited by notorious Neo-Nazi sympathizers in their effort for academic credibility. In the last two years the author, now an academic historian, whose doctoral dissertation is of a first-class quality, has gradually come to the point where he has disowned his conclusions and requested the granting institution to withdraw it from the library. He has agreed to apologize to the Jewish community. He claims that at the time he was young, naive, inexperienced, and misled by his academic supervisors.

The question, therefore, has to be asked, not why or how could a young scholar be wrong in his reading of history, but how was the thesis allowed to proceed and be accepted by external assessors and his own university? Why has it taken nearly a decade for the New Zealand author to gain the perspective and the courage to reject the manifestly unsound opinions and pseudo-facts in his thesis, when now his professional historical research is on such a high plane? What kind of a scholarly milieu exists here in which a terrible slur against the Jewish people could be considered legitimate for so long?

In both cases, the initiative to question and challenge the deniers' arguments has come from a small number of non-New Zealand Jewish lecturers, with little or no support from their colleagues. The one major exception is a German-born aca-

democratic whose family suffered from the Nazis during the war. As a consequence, this young man -- himself still working on his doctorate -- has been subject to harassment and questionings of his professional worth.

Is it simply a matter of innocence in New Zealand that educated men and women are incapable of comprehending the enormity of the Holocaust and the implications -- and agendas -- of those who deny it? On many occasions New Zealanders have taken collective stands on moral issues: the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, the rejection of nuclear weapons, and the protection of the environment. New Zealanders have sacrificed to send their country's largest military force since World War II to protect the people of East Timor, an action forced on the past right-wing government by popular pressure. Is it a question of historical shortsightedness based on a tradition of British colonialism and the snobbishness of English intellectual anti-Semitism? (Anti-Zionism remains popular with the politically correct, and Israel is categorized as an imperialist power.)

It goes so far that several colleagues who anywhere else would be recognized and accept themselves as Jews reject the claim and think of themselves as Anglicans [Episcopalians] or secular Kiwis. There are so few Jews in this country -- perhaps between 4500 and 6000 at most -- that Jewishness is a quaint and comical feature of American sitcoms; any closer than that and it is just an annoyance, a disturbance to the bland facade that we are all good clean Kiwi blokes together. Or that in a myth of biculturalism what binds Maori and Pakeha (non-Maori) is their shared non-religious Christianity. We are told that Jews just don't understand "British fair play." Or that we suffer from "hemispherism," a variant on the cosmopolitan slur that claims Jews have no loyalty to the nation.

Or is it something deeper in the psyche, an unconscious dread of the older, more serious, notoriously suffering Other that threatens to expose the weaknesses of the colonial child, to take away the precarious hold on the land that was barely settled 150 years ago? Or do psychohistorians have to dig even deeper? The nine years of our right-wing national government was marked at its inception by a series of mass killings -- more in a short period than in the entire modern history of New Zealand: a distraught son whose mother had recently died shot a dozen people at random in a small town; a grandfather who had sat brooding in a wooden

pyramid on his farm suddenly emerged to kill some dozen of his extended family; and a young man whose parents pleaded for psychiatric restraints and were turned away went on a raping and shooting spree. The day our new left-of-center coalition government was sworn in this past December, a young father stabbed his two small children, his wife, and a neighbor who tried to intervene.

For the past several years the country has been plagued by "home invasions" -- rapes, murders, and terrorizing of families and neighborhoods. Black Power and Mongrel gangs build fortified enclosures and battle with the police. Young fathers and mothers torture their infants, stab them hundreds of times, and fling them against the wall again and again. Social workers place young boys in the care of convicted serial rapists and then seem surprised that the lads are taken on training exercises by their caregivers. In other words, something dangerously distressing seethes not very far below the surface of the reputedly bland and peaceful New Zealand landscape. Is it any wonder then that Nazi ideas and the image of the Holocaust are denied as trivial, merely differences of opinions?

In recent weeks there have been a few new developments. On the one hand, the senior person in the German Department has decided to take an early retirement, not for any reasons associated with the Holocaust-denial issue, of course. On the other, the university continues to fudge the issue of the Neo-Nazi business, saying either "it falls between the cracks" or "there are no specific regulations to deal with such a matter." And although the change in national government marks an opportunity to change attitudes, so far the new administration is slow to act on these ethical matters, and the people appointed under the old regime, feeling threatened, continue to repress the issue.

Norman Simms, PhD, emigrated from the U.S. to New Zealand in 1970 where he teaches English literature at Waikato University and publishes extensively. He is editor of Mentalities/Mentalitiés and Vice-President of the Institute of the French Society for Psychohistory. Professor Simms may be contacted at <nsimms@Waikato.ac.nz> except when he is traveling abroad as he often does. □

Playing God: Churchill and Coventry, Roosevelt and Pearl Harbor

George Victor
Psychohistory Forum Research Associate

The most troublesome idea about Pearl Harbor is that Roosevelt knew the attack was coming and did not warn the commanders there. The idea is still unthinkable to many people, offensive to them whether they believe it or not.

Carl Friedrich's thesis that governments operate daily by conspiracy (making plans in secrecy, manipulating information, and covering up their acts) -- although presented in many recent movies and vaguely accepted by most people -- is still not taken very seriously, and particularly not when applied to the United States entry into World War II. Friedrich's suggestion in *The Pathology of Politics* (1972) -- that administration acts are often best described in a Machiavellian framework -- runs counter to prevailing thought by which a nation's myths are preserved and histories still feature good guys and bad guys, thereby serving a patriotic function.

Starting on December 7, 1941, Japan won a series of one-sided victories over the United States. To a dazed, frightened public, the defeats were perceived as inflicted upon the greatest nation on earth by an inferior people. They were inexplicable. Unexplained disasters call for a myth, and President Roosevelt gave the nation one in his speeches on December 8. He said the United States had been negotiating in good faith to maintain peace with Japan, while Japan had treacherously planned and carried out a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor. The sneak attack was offered as the explanation of how puny, nearsighted, feudal warriors using shoddy planes and warships had destroyed a great navy. It also served to explain that the United States entered unwillingly into a European war which the President had pledged to keep her out of -- that she was forced into it by Japan's attack. The idea of Japanese sneakiness soon proved insufficient to explain the defeat, and the myth grew to include laxity and drunkenness by Navy and Army forces in Hawaii, their failure to cooperate with each other in defending Pearl Harbor, and their not carrying out orders to go on alert against an attack.

While some details of the myth were true, as a whole it created a grossly misleading history of the United States entry into World War II.

Later, historians found that the administration had not been deceived about Japanese intentions and that its highest priority had been to get into the European war and defeat Hitler, thereby saving much of the world. To implement that priority, the Navy had engaged in an undeclared war in the Atlantic during 1941, attacking German and Italian warships with the purpose of provoking Hitler to make war on the United States or at least of producing an incident by which Roosevelt could get a declaration of war from Congress. Much less has been written about his strategy for getting into war in the Pacific, although this strategy is also documented.

In May, 1999, *Naval History* published as its lead article, "Advance Warning? The Red Cross Connection." By "advance warning," author Daryl Borquist meant that Roosevelt knew the Pearl Harbor attack was coming. In following issues, *Naval History* published letters containing scathing *ad hominem* attacks on Borquist and on all others who advance the heresy that Roosevelt knew. Also attacked was the United States Naval Institute (sponsored by the Naval Academy) for publishing such trash.

Roosevelt was a particularly secretive President, and I found only one scrap of evidence about his thinking of what he might do if he received warning of a coming attack on the United States. A year before Pearl Harbor, British intelligence learned that Germany was about to bomb Coventry. Brought to Churchill, the information posed a dilemma. If he warned Coventry -- if the city were evacuated -- he risked Germany's learning that her military code had been broken. Churchill decided that his nation's interests would be served better by not warning the city. He did, however, warn Coventry's fire department and ambulance corps. That mitigated the sacrifice. (Churchill would become accustomed to such decisions during the Atlantic naval war, when intelligence would reveal coming German attacks on British merchant convoys. Because alerting the convoys to escape harm by changing course might enable Germany to learn her code had been broken, he would allow the convoys to continue on course.)

The bombing of Coventry was highly destructive -- so much so that, like "Pearl Harbor," the name "Coventry" became a word for disaster. In England, where the story is well known, some people have not forgiven Churchill for failing to warn the city. Shortly after the bombing, British intelligence agent William Stephenson (code name,

Intrepid) told Roosevelt about Churchill's dilemma and decision. He reported that Roosevelt said, "War is forcing us more and more to play God. I don't know what I should have done" in Churchill's place.

Evidence that the administration had warning of the coming attack on Pearl Harbor was first made public in 1945 by the Congressional committee investigating it. Since then much additional intelligence pinpointing Pearl Harbor as Japan's target has been released, along with records of administration discussions of how such an attack was necessary to win a Congressional declaration of war and of obsessive concern about how much to tell the commanders at Pearl Harbor. The evidence indicates that Roosevelt faced a dilemma analogous to Churchill's -- that a warning to those commanders might prevent the attack and thereby prevent United States entry into the European war.

According to Borquist's evidence, Roosevelt did secretly warn a director of the American Red Cross to prepare for an attack on Pearl Harbor. As a result, medical personnel and supplies were sent there just before the attack, and a dozen mobile hospital units were established. Thereby Roosevelt did what Churchill did at Coventry, and the sacrifice at Pearl Harbor was mitigated.

Sacrifice is, of course, typical in war -- so much so that ordering sacrifice is recognized as a duty of wartime leaders. Formally the United States was not at war during autumn 1941. But in fact the nation was at war in that Roosevelt and leaders of the armed services considered her at war. In addition, the United States concluded secret agreements with Great Britain, Canada, and Holland (represented by the Dutch government in exile and the Dutch East Indies) for individual and joint military actions, and carried them out. Pursuant to orders, the Navy attacked on sight German and Italian warships in the north Atlantic. Warships were damaged and sunk; sailors were wounded and killed, and United States forces occupied territories under German suzerainty -- Iceland and Greenland.

Roosevelt's war strategy during 1941 had a reasonable foundation. On November 26 he made a crucial decision, to present to Japan what became known as the "ten-point proposal." Without considering the proposal's merits, it is enough to note that he and his advisers fully expected Japan's response would be to break off negotiations and proceed within days to attack the United States. By that November, Hitler's slaughter of innocent peo-

ple had reached about three million, and was on the increase. As he had threatened, he had conquered and enslaved much of Europe. His death camps were under construction. His planned genocide was directed not only against Jews and people with fractions of "Jewish blood," but also against other ethnic groups, most notably Slavs, who numbered in the hundreds of millions. The extermination was stopped at 12 million only by Germany's defeat. In terms of common parlance, by defeating Germany, Roosevelt and Churchill saved much of the world.

Roosevelt had been exceptional among major nations' leaders in seeing clearly and taking seriously the threat Hitler posed. Even Churchill, who by 1940 was committed to ruthless war against Germany, had earlier been taken by Hitler's charisma. In his 1933 book *Great Contemporaries*, Churchill had included a chapter on Hitler! In 1933 Roosevelt had begun to anticipate war with Germany.

This is not a justification of Roosevelt's war strategy; it is an explanation. I agree with Friedrich that a judgmental position tends to interfere with understanding the past. In historical perspective, when the December 7 disaster is compared to the projected cost of not entering the war against Germany, the sacrifice at Pearl Harbor is comparable to other war sacrifices. It is similar to the sacrifice at Coventry and to the sacrifices Roosevelt ordered in the Atlantic during 1941. The sacrifice in the Philippines -- which is known to have been weighed in advance by Roosevelt and his advisers -- was far greater in terms of lives lost and devastation of the land. While receiving little attention, the Philippine sacrifice has been accepted as a cost of war. But the sacrifice at Pearl Harbor has not been accepted as such, probably because the myth Roosevelt fostered still serves a patriotic function.

Planning and carrying out important operations secretly came naturally to Roosevelt. By family accounts, his mother Sara was a tyrant, going to considerable lengths in managing his life, and tolerating little open opposition, even when he was an adult. When she opposed him over something important to him -- for example, marrying Eleanor -- he outwardly agreed to obey Sara, while making secret plans to do what he thought best. Thus, inadvertently, Sara prepared him to be an effective Machiavellian ruler.

George Victor, PhD, left the practice of psychology to devote himself to a life of

scholarship. He is the author of *Hitler: The Pathology of Evil* (1998) and is currently at work on *The Myth of Pearl Harbor*. □

Dreams of Infanticide I: Dancing for Dionysus

Robert J. Rousselle
Independent Scholar

The ancient Greeks considered dreams to be significant, and often sought the aid of interpreters to understand them. They saw dreams as predictions of the future rather than insights into the unconscious. The only complete book of dreams and their interpretations to survive from Greco-Roman antiquity is the *Oneirocritica* of Artemidorus. The following dream and commentary comes from it:

(In a dream) the content of the Mysteries is completed in the same manner as in real life, and in as much time as it takes to complete the Mysteries. A woman dreamt that she danced in a chorus for Dionysus while drunk. She later killed her own little boy who was three years old. For in fact this is the same as the story about Pentheus and Agave, and the festival of the god is celebrated triennially (4.39; my translation).

We have no day residue or other particulars surrounding the dream so we are totally reliant on what Artemidorus tells us. This compiler of dreams, who lived in the mid-second century C.E., obtained his dreams from books and interpreters of the marketplace in Greece, Italy, and Asia (Artemidorus 1. Introduction). The literary nature of the dream, its imitation of a classical tragedy with a chorus, suggests it is perhaps contemporaneous with Artemidorus, who strove for brevity in his dream analyses.

Here dream and commentary are narrated in four sentences. The first states the principles of interpretation and the fourth how those principles are fulfilled. This would imply that the myth of the murder of Pentheus by his mother Agave, the "real life" foundation of the Dionysiac mysteries, is mirrored in the dream of the mother. Though that is not the case in the manifest content of the dream, we will suggest that it is found in the latent content. In addition, the length of time it takes to see the Mysteries, held every third year, equals the age of the child when he was killed. The dream itself

is briefly and succinctly narrated in the second sentence: "she danced in a chorus to Dionysus while drunk." The third sentence shows how the prediction of the dream was realized, which for the Greeks reflects the most important function of the dream, as predictor of future events.

The manifest content of the dream is a literary re-enactment of the myth of Dionysus. The woman dreamt she danced in a chorus, which reflects the use of the chorus in Athenian tragedy. Yet there are disquieting contradictions in Artemidorus' interpretation of the dream and any version of the myth of Agave and Pentheus that we know of. Though Agave is a devotee of Dionysus, and the chorus is made up of Bacchic women, Agave is never a member of the chorus. Nor was Agave drunk, though she was possessed by the god. Finally, the Pentheus of myth was a youth at least in his teens, ruler of Thebes, and not a three-year-old child. Artemidorus also freely interprets the time element. The child might have been three years old when killed, but when Artemidorus says that the Dionysiac festival was celebrated every third year it should be recalled that the Greeks counted inclusively and that the festival was in fact biennial.

Analysis of the dream suggests a different interpretation. *Choreuein*, danced in a chorus, is a secondary revision of something far more sinister. It appears to reflect a contraction of *chorion* and *agreuein*, a condensation of two words into a usually meaningless verbal compound. Though *choreuein* does mean danced in a chorus, it never appears in Greek as a contraction of *chorion* and *agreuein*. *Chorion* is described by Greek physicians as the membrane that contains the embryo (Hippocrates, *On the Nature of the Child* 16; Soranus, *Gynaecology* 1.57) as well as the afterbirth. In the dream the container of the fetus, which can represent the fetus itself, would also symbolically stand for the child. *Agreuein* comes from the root *agr*, used in words denoting wildness, savagery, fierceness, and hunting. *Agreuein* means to catch or seize, and echoes the verse from Euripides' *Bacchae*:

...agreuon aima tragoktonon,
omophagon charin (137-138).

...catches the blood of the slaughtered goats, delights in devouring raw flesh (137-138; my translation).

The tearing apart of a living animal, the *sparagmos*, and the eating of the raw flesh, the *omophagia*, were the culmination of the biennial

midwinter Dionysiac festival (E. R. Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, 1960, pp. xvi-xx, 87).

The latent dream thoughts are that the mother seizes her son and devours him, which is censored, and, upon waking, reported to the dream interpreter as dancing in a chorus. Hence *chorion agreuein* (seized the membrane surrounding the fetus, that is to say, the child) is condensed into *choreuein* (danced in a chorus).

The appearance of Dionysus helps facilitate the condensation in the dream, since his biennial midwinter rite featured the tearing apart of a living animal and the ingestion of its blood and raw flesh. There are also scattered references to cannibalism in the rite, mentioned by classical authors from the fourth century B.C.E. up to Christian polemicists in the Roman Empire. Modern scholars dispute whether human sacrifice ever occurred at these rites, however, the Greeks did and this belief helped bring the woman's fantasy of tearing apart and devouring her child out of the unconscious and into the secondary revision of dancing in a chorus to Dionysus.

In the dream the woman dances *methustheisa*, while drunk. The word appears last in the sentence, as if an explanatory afterthought linking it to the act of killing the child when she awoke. *Methusko* derives from *methu*, wine, and is usually used to refer to the intoxication of wine. However, it could also be used metaphorically to describe any kind of intoxication, whether from passion, pleasure, or some other source. Dionysus is the god of wine, and wine for the Greeks enabled them to become *entheos*, possessed by the god. The same result could be achieved by drinking a similarly life-giving red liquid, the blood of a recently torn-apart animal. Hence the intoxication of wine in the dream, a feature of the springtime Dionysia when the new jars of wine are opened, is but a secondary revision. The latent meaning refers to the Dionysiac possession of the *maenad*, her intoxication with the god, during the biennial midwinter Dionysia, which featured the *sparagmos* and *omophagia*.

Though infanticide was permitted in ancient Greece, its implementation was restricted. The decision was made by the child's father, or in Sparta by the council of elders, when the child was only few days old. Once the child was introduced into the family at the Amphidromia, when it was a week to ten days old, it would be reared (Plato, *Theaetetus* 160 E-161 A; Sarah Pomeroy, *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece*, 1997, pp. 46,

68-72). The circumstances surrounding the death of the child in Artemidorus do not conform to Greek practices.

Rather, the woman's dream reflects an infanticidal urge that exceeded the ritualized, custom-bound decision to rear or destroy a child. Though the manifest meaning of the dream tries to dilute the violence by having it conform to a Dionysian mythico-literary model, the latent meaning reveals the mother's cannibalistic fantasies towards her child. In this case those fantasies, partially revealed through the dream, were soon after acted out.

Thus we see that the dream narrated by Artemidorus as a prediction dream, can be interpreted using modern psychoanalytic techniques to reveal much about the dreamer's unconscious. She clearly has infanticidal urges toward her infant son that go beyond what was allowed in ancient Greece, urges she eventually acted upon. We also see that the same dream processes, including censorship, condensation, and secondary revision, were operative then as now, illustrating the cross-cultural viability of psychoanalytic dream interpretation.

Robert Rousselle received his PhD in Ancient History from SUNY-Binghamton. A member of the International Psychohistorical Association and a Contributing Editor to the Journal of Psychohistory for many years, he is the author of 30 articles and book reviews. □

The Virtual Reality of the Web Landscape

Peter W. Petschauer
Appalachian State University

"The spatiality of the Internet [World Wide Web] is an abstraction and therefore not tied to the physical world." Upon some reflection, Akin Akinly, one of my students, added that the Web is "holographic, a spatial representation of the human neural network, replicated in the topography of cyberspace." For most of us, the Net is a virtual [artificial or simulated, performing the function of something that really isn't there] space, a web or universe, even a womb, that contains millions of addresses and links, and has the possibility of expanding into every conceivable direction. These few descriptors already indicate that we use the language of our human past to describe this unique

spatiality. Thus we "get on" (the train of) the Web and we "surf" (its ocean of sites). However real the Web may be in its virtuality, we can barely begin to imagine this unusual new world and so we assign it characteristics that brings it closer to our understanding. This being/entity, too, will never be more to us than our limited mental scope permits.

The World Wide Web is virtual in that one cannot see it in the traditional sense; it is real in that it opens to our linking devices, like the end of a womb, and that we can access it, communicate through it, and buy on it everything from apples to xylophones. It is virtual in that we cannot actually touch products on it; it is real in that they may be seen, say as a photo of a book cover, and that they can be shipped from a warehouse somewhere around the globe. It is virtual in that we cannot ordinarily see the electric impulses and languages that make text and image transmissions possible. But it is real in that the messages we send through it emerge in the form of letters and pictures on our screens. While we cannot see actual addresses in the form of buildings, we can see them in the form of Web pages.

Web spatiality is so real that its pages, or sites, can be bought and sold. The word *site* itself goes back to the Latin *situs*, place and location, as in to locate a town, house, or oneself. The Web address <Loans.com> was called a "prime piece of Internet real estate" when Bank of America recently bought it. (Quotations throughout are from recent issues of the Charlotte, North Carolina, newspapers, the *Observer* and the *Herald*, and are available from the author.)

Bruce Sterling, a science fiction writer, asks astutely, "What makes the invisible visible? New metaphors, sometimes, but I'd be betting on better instrumentation. A picture of the Earth from space did more for environmental awareness than any number of ecological urban legends." Such "instrumentation" may include the available equipment; the number of individuals who can interact on the Web; the number of trained persons who can create software and hardware to exploit its new areas; and the funding available to explore options and products. Thus, for example, if equipment and software for the Web increases in sophistication, or venture funding rises, then in turn the Web can expand much as a womb expands to meet the needs of the growing child.

Once one has created addresses, or points of reference, it is useful to create a map to reach

them. (By now the Web has so many addresses that a team of six *Money* magazine reporters had to labor for two months to sort out the best sites of every major personal-finance category.) Maps imply a finite universe; a space that can be followed to its borders. But because the Web is virtual, its borders should not be visualized as the ones we traditionally imagine; they may be no more than a limit of potentialities. The image of the Web being a womb fits well with an expanding universe of potentialities onto which one writes addresses.

Several people have begun to "map" the Web (see, for example, <www.cybergeography.com>). Sometimes this sort of map-making is called "common mental geography" because it is difficult to visualize the Web in terms of traditional maps even though it has spread all across the globe. As the Web is mapped, average users of it can visualize it in new ways and thus behave differently when they think about it and access it. According to one researcher, Martin Dodge from the Center for Advanced Spatial Analysis at the University College London, "Simply having a map allows a new perspective, a new way to orient yourself. Relationships otherwise obscure may be revealed."

Dodge further thinks that maps may assist not only to navigate the Web, but also "to define and control new territory." The idea that one can control new territory on the Web allows for visualizing it as an expanding universe. Controlling new territory also implies conquering new territory and thus introduces the concept of traditional conquerors, be they suited up in political or business attire. That stream of thinking matches the idea of the Web as a landscape, as David Rarii visualized it in a recent article. One can carry the symbolism even further; as Charles Ferguson indicated with the subtitle of his book, *High Stakes, No Prisoners: A Winner's Tale of Greed and Glory in the Internet Wars* (1999). Wars have traditionally been associated with territory.

According to Pamela Li Calzi O'Connell, the maps of cyberspace may be arranged in two categories: "those depicting the physical structure and information traffic and patterns of global networks, and those addressing the content and social spaces of the electronic world." While the two categories may overlap occasionally, several structural approaches stand out. One good example is Lucent Technologies' Stephen Eick's "Network Visualization Gallery" of Web traffic flowing around the world (see <www.bell-labs.com/user/

eick/NetworkVis.html>). The images beautifully resemble geography and borders. In the most connected industrialized areas of the world individuals and institutions open sites and communicate with each other at a frantic pace. We gain an image similar to the route patterns of an airline that highlight certain cities around the world; one also notices the areas that are not linked at all and resemble the white spaces on pre-colonial maps. Only the participating areas are the safe havens.

Another example of map-making is Lucent Technologies' William Cheswick's non-geographical conception of cyberspace (see <www.cs.bell-labs.com/who/ches/map/gallery>). He wants "to take the Net in its own terms -- in its own space. Geographical maps I've seen have not worked very well." Instead he has created what he calls "promiscuously propagating sea ferns, with countless feathery vines."

According to Gregory C. Staple, so-called content maps are "the equivalent of land-use maps in the traditional cartographic world." An interesting site in this area is <www.newsmaps.com> which has grid-based topographical maps. In this approach, map peaks reflect intense message and document activity and map lows reflect lesser levels of activity; distances between the peaks indicate relationships of topics. Other content map sites have recorded entertainment Web sites and teenagers' happiness (<www.bcpl.net/~lboot/webmap2>). Julian Lombardi and Bob Pickens have launched one of the latest practical attempts in content mapping through their company, ViOS. According to Ranii, "ViOS intends to create a three-dimensional, virtual environment that resembles the animated landscapes of computer games." The idea is that certain industries, say, computer manufacturers, can be accessed through one viewpoint icon. Thus, all computer manufacturers can be housed in one "neighborhood." Meaningfully here, because most people recall icons more readily than words, they determined that Web "users would be able to use landmarks to locate a site."

Many individual users of the Web do not reflect about the border or limits of it or create new Web businesses, and are only peripherally interested in a map or design of the Web. They want to be able "to get on it" and use it. "Getting on it" describes another dilemma for persons thinking about the spatiality of the Web. What do we "get on"? Usually we get on a horse, a bus, a train, or a plane -- "real" means of transportation. The Web transports us very differently. Yet, to write in the

language of some of my students, "It is a cool ride."

Individuals associated with corporations tend to be interested in different perspectives of the Web than private individuals. Some business people are simply interested in designing an approachable site so that it can attract and retain customers. Because of their design skill, "amazon.com" became a household word as much as "eBay". Some would argue that because of the creation of these addresses virtuality approaches reality. Not only that, amazon.com is backed by a huge distribution center in Reno, Nevada, that truly defies the term virtual.

This approach to creating addresses shows us that the Web fashioned another approach to doing business and thus adds a whole new dimension to business activity, with some individuals saying that it is a virtual way to doing business. To paraphrase Thomas Friedman, on one level the Web has added a whole new service industry to traditional industries, on another level the Web has underpinned globalization. In other words, we have ceased to operate exclusively on the ground [earth] level of steel plants and cars; we are now operating as if above and beyond these industries. We operate in a linked environment that enhances these industries while creating a different approach to interacting and interdepending in everything from refining ideas to transacting business.

Another perspective to this landscape is the service that people like Robert Lee provide as they connect businesses with other businesses. For example, he "buys and sells wholesale electricity, gas, and coal, and financial securities designed around those commodities." Other organizations that work with the Web in similar fashion are e-Steel, Chemdex, SciQuest, ChemConnect, VerticalNet, and BizBuyer. All of these organizations link certain business activities with one another and thus are said to operate within a certain "neighborhood." In this case "the neighborhood" reflects the human need to speak of certain activities as if they were located in a certain part of the Web. They are not; they are linked through no more than the similarity of their business.

One of the remarkable realizations emerging from Cheswick's fernlike Web map is that the Web not only links people and institutions beyond their respective external boundaries, it also links people and divisions within organizations. Thus employees can "talk" to each other without leaving their offices and create a virtual environment en-

veloping their offices. As a matter of fact, my daughter Melanie tells me that the hospital where she works in Stuttgart, Germany, does not allow e-mail to leave the confines of the institution; thus it functions only "intern(ally)."

For individuals, the Web offers another virtual dimension. It is the sheer convenience of corresponding with relatives, friends, and colleagues around the corner and around the globe, and we thus participate not only in the spidery web that some speak of, but we also participate in a new way of perceiving space and distances. Distances that once seemed only surmountable with time and expense by mail, boat, plane, phone, and fax now are scaled with practically instantaneous messages and attachments that may delight the mind and the eye.

For some time, the very newness and approachability and openness of the Web evoked positive visions of it, like the image of a womb. More recently, the less positive images of the spider web and labyrinth have emerged. While one may stick addresses on the spider web which are visible to those who have access to it, one may also get stuck on it. While one may enter the labyrinth of the Web, one can get lost in it and emerge scarred, perhaps never to re-enter.

The openness of the Web adds a final revealing dimension to its virtual reality. In many of its uses and applications, the Web continues to reflect the perceptions and needs of the members of the middle and upper classes that created it. One is supposed to be able to ride on the Web, like along a "real" highway, safely and freely. It is supposed to be as safe as a womb. Our credit cards, our Social Security numbers, are all protected and secure. Although this perception of a harmless labyrinth has been questioned before, with the new cyber terrorist who can attack sites and institutions, we have added fear. As Nadja Schoelzhorn, a family friend, sees it, the secret spaces of the labyrinth have now turned from terra incognita to dark corners. They are both virtual and real dark places. The terrorist is now terrorizing virtually and the Web has succumbed to the same angst that we feel when we go to the subway or to the library. The terrorist, someone who causes havoc on land (terra) is now causing it virtually (supra terra). It is not too farfetched to say that the middle and upper classes have lost one more safe haven. □

The Family Origins of

Creativity

Daniel Dervin

Mary Washington College

Review of Andrew Brink, The Creative Matrix: Anxiety and the Origin of Creativity. New York: Peter Lang, April, 2000. ISBN 0820444804, pp. 232, \$50.95.

What do *Middlemarch*, the Mona Lisa, *The Three-Penny Opera*, and the gnomic squiggles of Emily Dickinson have in common? Granting they are all products of the creative imagination, one might still be forgiven for answering, "Not much." The whole field of creativity is so complex that no simple, candid response can satisfy this question. Still, if one probes these random examples a bit, one may recall a recent X-ray analysis of Leonardo's masterpiece revealing it to be a palimpsest with his own image underneath, and the analyst Simon Grolnick described Emily Dickinson as poetry surrounded by prose. This sense of misfit, which the Hungarian-English Michael Balint referred to as the "basic fault," emanating from a failure in the maternal dyad, may also have something to do with the traces of mirroring in Leonardo's mysterious Mona.

Reversing perspective from the creative product to its process is irresistible, yet to find a single unifying explanation for the perplexing mysteries of creativity is a daunting task, and on art as on sex everyone is a self-proclaimed expert. The field of creativity, even within the restrictions of psychoanalysis, is so enormously complex that reductionism is unavoidable. In Andrew Brink's narrowed focus on origins and anxiety, the trick is to avoid the so-called genetic fallacy, a psychoanalytic term having nothing to do with genes but with the tendency to account for complex phenomena exclusively through origins.

The present aim to trace creative processes to a biopsychological matrix is thus both valid and hazardous. Adopting an evolutionary perspective, Brink suggests that earlier species have been hard-wired for a kind of problem-solving, wound-healing adaptation which *Homo sapiens* has acquired and converted to psychological ends, although the higher that organisms evolve the lower the capacity for regeneration. Drawing on the attachment theory of Bowlby and others, he examines the ways in which nurturant processes can go awry in the maternal dyad, leading to various creative adaptations. "Creativity begins with the in-

stinctual attachment system which unites mother and infant at the start of life. Creativity differentiates adaptively, in response to anxiety, in the exceptional skills with materials, words, and notes found among artists, writers, and composers." Rather than possessing any distinctly imaginative faculty, "every artist or writer produces a personal iconography, primarily as a result of attachment-induced anxieties, only secondarily in response to social ills and injustices." This trauma-based anxiety, which cues creative responses -- cures, solutions, adaptations -- stems from a "sub-optimal attachment style at the opening of life" (p. 1).

Attachment theorists, who to me tilt toward the input-output mode of behaviorism rather than the vicissitudes of identification explored in psychoanalysis, propose three models: secure, anxious-ambivalent, and avoidant (a fourth, disorganized/disorientated, was added later). Among the latter, anxieties over security intrude or prevail; however, reparative strategies also may come into play. Brink's matrix of creativity is situated in the "'interactive repair' between mother and infant" (p. 6). In this universal matrix, the initial creative response is a resource, democratically deployed across the human spectrum; it may culminate in homeostasis and the sense of inner well-being, of feeling all together and connected, as well as in a product of inspired genius to be cherished down through the ages. I suppose it can also result in kitsch, doggerel, or romance fiction, but that is another question, for creativity is construed here as basically a self-regulating adaptation rather than a source of original visions (p. 8).

Brink's strategy is two-pronged. On the one hand he wants to exceed the limitations of object relations. On the other hand, he wants to extend the insights of Bowlby to the inanimate objects that form the building blocks of aesthetic experience; Brink terms aesthetic objects "anxiety organizers and containers" to be reproduced a la Winnicott in a "safe place" (p. 179). He also aspires to further his own earlier studies of *Loss and Symbolic Repair* (1977), *Creativity as Repair* (1982), and *Bertrand Russell: The Psychobiography of a Moralist* (1989). His overall thrust is melioristic; he makes the organism's self-organizing capacities a key concept. In his conclusion, he expands on the biologically-based regenerative capacities of creativity and considers cultural products as providing "repair codes," an invaluable traditional function lost in the modern period, but in need of being re-instated on newer

but more limited grounds.

After introducing his themes in Part I, he reviews several psychoanalytic positions on creativity, including Freud and Rank, the English object relations school, and Alice Miller. These mini-studies are insightful and deftly balanced. Part III examines creativity in a bipolar context. The investigators here are Nancy Andreason and Kay Redfield Jamison, the one over-relying on empirical data, the other on genetic inheritance. Here the theme wrapped inside his others emerges in his seeking to preserve creativity as a centrally human endeavor rather than as an illness or a genetic defect.

The poets Robert Lowell, Anne Sexton, and Sylvia Plath are considered from studies by Cohen and Gibson. They profile a family isolated from the community, hampered by an "abusive, weak, or absent father and an over-controlling mother," complicating attachment for the child and arousing allied anxieties (pp. 158, 168). The mother blames the father for the family's isolation or ostracism, and "singles out a promising boy or girl to "push" toward delivering the family from its obscurity. The delegated child was to establish or restore family prestige by outstanding achievement" (p. 158). If this formula of ineffectual father/overbearing mother sounds familiar, that's because it coincides with contemporaneous psychoanalytic constructs of homosexuality, notably by Irving Bieber in the early 1960s. The model, which also anticipates Helm Stierlin's studies of the child-delegate as family savior, could apply equally well to Adolf Hitler as to Bill Clinton, neither of whom need be viewed as bipolar or, for that matter, creative, though Hitler tried. In other words, the Cohen-Gibson model is extremely broad as a predictor of a specific disorder and somewhat dated. Nonetheless, Brink makes good use of it in interpreting the three poets' blighted careers.

Brink seems to me at his best when he is out on a limb, thinking independently of his models or carefully interrogating them as in his chapter on regeneration. Bound to the maternal dyad, attachment theorists -- at least as deployed here -- feel regressively focused to me; they neglect narratives of internalization/identification that form a self otherwise assumed to be already in place. They have little, if anything, to say of the radical restructuring the psyche undergoes during the oedipal triangulations which profoundly affect gender-identity and the cultural forms with which creativ-

ity interacts. Thus, for example, the male poet's oedipal patterns in Harold Bloom's well-grounded Anxiety of Influence theory would be out of bounds since it occurs beyond the maternal dyad; assuming pre-oedipal precursors, they are not the final determinants.

Overall, there is much to applaud and admire in Brink's always stimulating and richly informed study. I finished it doubly appreciative of the great distance between origins and output, of the necessary if elusive links between them, and grateful for genuine contributions to a still obscure area which his investigations allow us to see more clearly.

Dan Dervin, PhD, is a prolific psychohistorian who has recently written Matricentric Narratives (1997) on questions of gender and agency in women's writing. □

Bulletin Board

The next **SATURDAY WORK-IN-PROGRESS WORKSHOP** is scheduled for **March 4, 2000**, when **Jacques Szaluta** (U.S. Maritime Academy) with Richard Harrison (New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training) will present "Steven Spielberg's Creativity and Connection to the American Unconscious." As soon as possible, we will send the paper for the April meeting. In the fall, we will have our usual Presidential election year psychobiographical presentations on the victorious Democratic, Independent, and Republican party candidates who will face each other in November. **CONFERENCES:** Last December 7, **George Victor** participated in a Washington colloquium on Pearl Harbor sponsored by the Naval Historical Association. **POSITIONS:** **Paul Ziolo** has moved from Warsaw to teach at Liverpool University. **TRAVEL:** **Jay Gonen** and **Mary Coleman** welcomed in the new millennium in Paris. Lee and Conalee Shneidman visited the historic sites of Egypt, and, as usual, **Jerry Kroth** is spending the winter in Mexico. **Norman Simms** is spending the spring semester at the Sorbonne. **CORRECTION:** Judith Hughes has pointed out that Charles Evans Hughes was Chief Justice of the United States rather than of the Supreme Court as was incorrectly stated in the obituary of H. Stuart Hughes in our last issue. **AWARDS:** Congratulations to **Vivian Rosenberg** of Drexel University on the award of a sabbatical to research on empathy. **Anne Dietrich** recently had a two-month competitive research fellowship in Tallahassee,

Florida. The **Robert J. Stoller Foundation** announces its annual \$1000 essay prizes, one pre-doctoral, one post-doctoral, for essays on psychoanalytically informed research in the biobehavioral sciences, social sciences, or humanities. The essays should be of publishable quality, 25 pages in length, and not yet accepted for publication. Send three copies of each essay to Maimon Leavitt, M.D., President, Robert J. Stoller Foundation, 210 Woodruff Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90024. The deadline is June 30 and the award is announced on or before August 1, 2000. See <www.stoller-foundation.org>. **WEB SITES:** Free Association Books' Web site includes a chapter of each new book it publishes. See, for example, Evelyn Heinemann, *Witches: A Psychoanalytic Exploration of the Killing of Women*. Click "New Books" at <www.fa-b.com>. Histsex is an e-mail list for historians of sexuality, found at <<http://homepages.primex.co.uk/~lesleyah/listinf.htm>> or by blank e-mail to <histsex-subscribe@listbot.com>. **NEW MEMBERS (Research Associates):** Welcome to **Laurie Adams**, and to **Anie Kalayjian** of Cliffside Park, New Jersey. **OUR THANKS:** To our members and subscribers for the support that makes **Clio's Psyche** possible. To Benefactors Herbert Barry and Ralph Colp; Patrons Andrew Brink, Peter Petschauer, H. John Rogers, and Jacques Szaluta; Supporting Members Anonymous, Rudolph Binion, and Hanna Turken; and Members: Eva Fogelman, Florian Galler, Michael Hirohama, Richard Morrock, Geraldine Pauling, and Nannette Sachs. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to Rudolph Binion, Simon Clarke, Lloyd deMause, Dan Dervin, Anne Dietrich, Juhani Ihanus, Melvin Kalfus, Daniel Klenbort, Henry Lawton, David Lee, Peter Loewenberg, Peter Petschauer, Jerry Piven, Vivian Rosenberg, Robert Rousselle, Dean Keith Simonton, Thomas Scheff, Norman Simms, Howard Stein, Charles Strozier, and George Victor. Thanks to Jon Battaglia for computer help and to Anna Lentz and Brett Lobbato for proofreading. □

The Best of Clio's Psyche

This 93-page collection of many of the best and most popular articles from 1994 to the September, 1999, issue is available for \$20 a copy.

It will be distributed free to Members renewing at the Supporting level and above as well as Subscribers upon their next two-year renewal.

Contact the Editor (see page three).

Clio's Psyche of the Psychohistory Forum Call for Papers

- Violence in American Life and Mass Murder as Disguised Suicide
- The Future of Psychoanalysis in the Third Millennium (June, 2000)
- Assessing Apocalypticism and Millennialism Around the Year 2000
- PsychoGeography
- Election 2000: Psychobiographies of Bradley, Bush, Gore, McCain, Buchanan, et al
- The Psychology of Incarceration and Crime
- Legalizing Life: Our Litigious Society
- Psychobiography
- Manias and Depressions in Economics and Society
- The Role of the Participant Observer in Psychohistory
- Psychohistorical Perspectives on Loneliness
- The Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a Model for Healing
- The Processes of Peacemaking and Peacekeeping
- The Psychology of America as the World's Policeman
- Entertainment News
- Elian Gonzales Between Two Worlds
- Television, Radio, and Media as Object Relations in a Lonely World
- Kevorkian's Fascination with Assisted Suicide, Death, Dying, and Martyrdom
- The Psychobiography and Myth of Alan Greenspan: The Atlas Who Has Not Yet Shrugged

Many of these subjects will become special issues. Articles should be from 600-1500 words with a biography of the author. Electronic submissions are welcome on these and other topics. **For details, contact Paul H. Elvoitz, PhD, at <pelovitz@aol.com> or (201) 891-7486.**

Call for CORST Grant Applications

The Committee on Research and Special Training (CORST) of the American Psychoanalytic Association announces an American Psychoanalytic Foundation research training grant of \$10,000 for CORST candidates (academic scholars) who have been accepted or are currently in training in an American Psychoanalytic Association institute. The purpose of the grant is to help defray the costs of psychoanalytic training. The grant is to be administered by the local institute to be paid over three years of training at \$3,500, \$3,500, and \$3,000 per year, or as needed.

The application is: a.) A brief statement of 1000 words of the research proposed, b.) A letter from a scholar in the field (e.g., department chair, colleague, or dissertation advisor) attesting to the validity and significance of the research, c.) A letter of endorsement by the Education Director of the institute certifying the candidate is in, or has been accepted for, full clinical psychoanalytic training at an institute of the American Psychoanalytic Association, and d.) An up-to-date Curriculum Vitae.

Applications are to be submitted in three copies by May 1, 2000, to Professor Paul Schwaber, 258 Bradley Street, New Haven, CT 06511.



Howard F. Stein

(Editor's Note: We welcome scanned pictures of past Featured Scholars to be published in future issues.)

Letters to the Editor

The History of Psychohistory

Clio's Psyche's interviews of outstanding psychohistorians (see "An American in Amsterdam: Arthur Mitzman," page 146) have grown into a full-fledged study of the pioneers and history of our field. Psychohistory as an organized field is less than 25 years old, so most of the innovators are available to tell their stories and give their insights. Last March, the Forum formally launched the Makers of the Psychohistorical Paradigm Research Project to systematically gather material to write the history of psychohistory. We welcome memoirs, letters, and manuscripts as well as volunteers to help with the interviewing. People interested in participating should write, call, or e-mail Paul H. Elovitz (see page 119).

Awards and Honors

CORST Essay Prize • Professor Janice M. Coco, Art History, University of California-Davis, winner of the First Annual American Psychoanalytic Association Committee on Research and Special Training (CORST) \$1,000 essay prize, will present her paper, "Exploring the Frontier from the Inside Out in John Sloan's Nude Studies," at a free public lecture at 12 noon, Saturday, December 20, Jade Room, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City.

Sidney Halpern Award for the Best Psychohistorical Idea • The Psychohistory Forum is granting an award of \$200 to Michael Hirohama of San Francisco for starting and maintaining the Psychohistory electronic mailing list (see page 98).

Psychohistory Forum Student Award • David Barry of Fair Lawn, New Jersey, has been awarded a year's Student Membership in the Forum, including a subscription to Clio's Psyche, for his contribution of a fine paper as part of the Makers of the Psychohistorical Paradigm Research Project last June.

Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting

THE MAKERS OF PSYCHOHISTORY RESEARCH PROJECT

To write the history of psychohistory, the Forum is interviewing the founders of our field to create a record of their challenges and accomplishments. It welcomes participants who will help identify, interview, and publish accounts of the founding of psychohistory.

Call for Nominations

THE MAKERS OF PSYCHOHISTORY RESEARCH PROJECT

To write the history of psychohistory, the Forum is interviewing the founders of our field to create a record of their challenges and accomplishments. It welcomes participants who will help identify, interview, and publish accounts of the founding of psychohistory.

Call for Papers Special Theme Issues 1999 and 2000

- The Relationship of Academia, Psychohistory, and Psychoanalysis (March, 1999)
• The Psychology of Legalizing Life

Free Subscription

For every paid library subscription (\$40), the person donating or arranging it will receive a year's subscription to Clio's Psyche free. Help

P
S
Y
C
H
O

The Psychohistory Forum is pleased to announce

The Young Psychohistorian 1998/99 Membership Awards

John Fanton recently received his medical degree and is doing his five year residency in Providence, Rhode Island. Currently, he is at the Children's Hospital, Women and Infants Hospital, and the Butler Psychiatric Hospital. His goal is to become a child maltreatment expert working in the area of Preventive Psychiatry. At the IPA in 1997 he won the Lorenz Award for his paper on improving parenting in Colorado.

Albert Schmidt is a doctoral candidate in modern European history at Brandeis University who plans to defend his dissertation in April when his advisor, Rudolph Binion, will return from Europe for the occasion. Rather than do a biography of SS General Reinhard Heydrich as originally intended, he is writing on the German protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia under Heydrich's dominance. In the last four years this talented young scholar has been awarded nine fellowships, grants, or scholarships.

Dreamwork Resources

The **Historical Dreamwork Method** is available to help the biographer better understand the dreams of the subject and other aspects of psychobiography. **Clio's Psyche** welcomes papers on historical dreamwork for publication and for presentation at Psychohistory Forum meetings. Contact Paul H. Elovitz (see page 43).

☆☆☆

Call for Nominations

Halpern Award for the Best Psychohistorical Idea in a Book, Article, or Computer Site

This Award may be granted at the level of Distinguished Scholar, Graduate, or Undergraduate.

Call for Papers

Special Theme Issues 1999 and 2000

- The Relationship of Academia, Psychohistory, and Psychoanalysis (March, 1999)
- Our Litigious Society
- PsychoGeography
- Meeting the Millennium
- Manias and Depressions in Economics and Society

Contact the Editor at

Letters to the Editor

Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting

Saturday, October 2, 1999

Charles Strozier

"Putting the Psychoanalyst on the Couch: A Biography of Heinz Kohut"

Letters to the Editor on
Clinton-Lewinsky-Starr

Book Review Essay

Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting

Saturday, January 30, 1999

Charles Strozier

"Putting the Psychoanalyst on the Couch: A Biography of Heinz Kohut"

Call for Nominations

for the

Best of Clio's Psyche

By July 1 please list your favorite articles, interviews, and Special Issues (no

Clio's Psyche of the Psychohistory Forum

Call for Papers

- The Future of Psychohistory and Psychoanalysis in the Third Millennium (March, 2000)
- Violence in American Life and Mass Murder as Disguised Suicide
- Assessing Apocalypticism and Millennialism around the Year 2000
- PsychoGeography
- Election 2000
- Psychobiography
- Manias and Depressions in Economics and Society
- The Psychology of Incarceration and Crime
- Legalizing Life: Our Litigious Society
- The Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a Model for Healing
- The Processes of Peacemaking and Peacekeeping
- The Psychology of America as the World's Policeman
- Entertainment News
- Television, Radio, and Media as Object Relations in a Lonely World
- Kevoorkian's Fascination with Assisted Suicide, Death, Dying, and Martyrdom

Most of these subjects will become special issues. Articles should be from 600-1500 words with a biography of the author. Electronic submissions are welcome on these and other topics. For details, contact Paul H. Elvoitz, PhD, at <pelovitz@aol.com> or (201) 891-7486.

Clio's Psyche of the Psychohistory Forum

Call for Papers

- Future of Psychohistory and Psychoanalysis in the Light of the Demise of the Psychohistory

The Best of Clio's Psyche

The Psychohistory Forum is pleased to announce the creation of The Best of Clio's Psyche.

This 94-page collection of many of the best and most popular articles from 1994 to the current issue is available for \$20 a copy and to students using it in a course for \$12.

It will be distributed free to Members at the Supporting level and above as well as Two-Year Subscribers upon their next renewal.

Call for Nominations

Halpern Award

for the

Best Psychohistorical Idea in a Book, Article, or Computer Site

This Award may be granted at the level of Distinguished Scholar, Graduate, or Undergraduate.

To Join the

Hayman Fellowships

The University of California Interdisciplinary Psychoanalytic Consortium announces

The Best of Clio's Psyche

The Psychohistory Forum is pleased to announce the creation of *The Best of Clio's Psyche*.

This 93-page collection of many of the best and most popular articles from 1994 to the September, 1999, issue is available for \$20 a copy and to students using it in a course for \$12.

It will be distributed free to Members renewing at the Supporting level and above as well as Subscribers upon their next two-year renewal.

T
h
e
H
i
s
t
o
r