Historyka, T. XXXIV, 2004
PL ISSN 0073-277X

ARTYKUŁY

TOMASZ PAWELEC
Katowice

HISTORIAN AS A SOCIAL PSYCHOTHERAPIST (ETHICAL ASSUMPTIONS OF PSYCHOHISTORICAL WRITINGS)[1]

Abstract

Tomasz Pawelec: *Historian as a Social Psychotherapist (Ethical Assumptions of Psychohistorical Writings)*, "Historyka" XXXIV, 2004, 5–21.

The Author discussed in his article the problem of ethic foundations of promoters of psychohistory. He argues that psychotherapeutic inclinations of scholars resulted in the alienation of this approach within historical sciences, what — in the end — did not prevent psychohistorians from becoming active outside the closed circle of the discipline.

Key words: methodology of history, psychohistory, psychoanalysis.
Słowa kluczowe: metodologia historii, psychohistoria, psychoanaliza.

Historians of today realize that they do not live in an Ivory Tower. They are forced to accept the fact that historiography, as Marceli Handelsman put it once, "... is a set of attempts to handle issues pervading society [nowadays — T. P.] but projected onto the past".[2] Theorists of humanities have clearly demonstrated how deeply history remains involved in current social order and the shape of culture.[3] "History is a discourse of power", said Michel Foucault. In his lectures at Collège de France he amply demonstrated how historical writing has been legitimizing structures of political power.[4] In addition to historical legitimizing of contemporary processes (and not only those related to politics), Jan Pomorski has noted two other "framework social functions of history":

---

[1] This paper stems from a question which has been puzzling me since the beginning of my research on the history of psychohistory: why has psychohistory, once the vigorous and promising orientation, become marginalized within history?

[2] M. Handelsman, *Historyka*, Gebethner i Wolff, Warszawa 1928, p. 284.

[3] A. Zybertowicz, *Przemoc i poznanie. Studium z nie-klasycznej socjologii wiedzy*, Wyd. UMK, Toruń 1995, may serve as a good introduction into this problem.

[4] M. Foucault, *Trzeba bronić społeczestwa. Wykłady w Collège de France 1976*, Wyd. KR, Warszawa 1998, p. 74, passim.

valuation of current practical activities through relating them to the past and creation of dynamic historical thinking.[5]

The issue of social function of history has always been a part of metahistorical thought of historians themselves and the position taken by a particular scholar in this respect says a lot about his/her value system. That is why this problem could be a good starting point into the study on ethics and values of historians.[6]

So, this presentation deals with some assumptions of psychohistory within the sphere of values which are manifested by a peculiar understanding of social function of historical (or rather psychohistorical) research shared by many adherents of this paradigm. I assume that values are as much important component of "social methodological consciousness" as ontological and methodological principles. It is the difference within the basic dimensions and basic content of this consciousness which makes possible to discern several paradigms, schools or orientations in a colorful landscape of contemporary historical writing.

Psychohistory postulates to use principles of modern psychology and especially psychoanalysis as a theoretical ground for studying the past. That is why it is clearly atypical with respect to its ontology (special character of psychoanalytic view of the man and the world) and to its methodology (mainly because of the application of analytic categories and research strategies of deep psychology into history). In discussing social function of history as seen by psychohistorians I would like to demonstrate that the same holds true in the sphere of values — namely, psychohistorians have been doing their research led by convictions which are different from those usually present within an academic historiography. In other words, they often perceive themselves as social psychotherapists or "healers" struggling with human irrationality and powerful impulses of aggression and destruction which have been shaping human history. They see their own research practice, and its consequent results, as an "advocated research", a kind of psychotherapy of the individual and of the community — and of themselves, as well.

Presenting such stance in some detail, I will also discuss its origins and the impact it has had on the vicissitudes of psychohistory within the historical profession during the previous several decades.

ORIGINS

Studying the origins of the "therapeutic inclination" of psychohistory, one should take into account the beginnings and the development of the paradigm. Psychohistory is an undisputed offspring of deep psychology. Firstly, because of the fact that its

[5] J. Pomorski, *"Społeczna funkcja historii" — analiza kontekstów znaczeniowych pojęcia*, [in:] *Społeczna funkcja historii a współczesność*, ed. J. Pomorski, Z. Mańkowski, Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 1985, p. 16–17.

[6] Introducing a notion of "an ideal of historical science" Jerzy Topolski has described it as historians' beliefs (stated openly or not) on what are the primary goals realized by historical research practice. J. Topolski, *Teoria wiedzy historycznej*, Wyd. Poznańskie, Poznań 1983, p. 130 and next.

practitioners continuously rely on statements made by Sigmund Freud[7] and his followers; secondly, because at the beginning psychohistory remained fully immersed in psychoanalytic movement. The latter have been providing all the indispensable theoretical and organizational resources for it. These sufficiently explain its theoretical and methodological debts to Freudians.[8] But what about psychohistory's ethical affinity to psychoanalysis? After all, psychoanalysis and psychohistory are very different enterprises. While the former is above all a therapeutic approach within the area of psychological clinical practice, the latter may be described as a specific type of cognitive activity aimed at the understanding of the past. The analyst wants to cure his/her patient "here and now"; the psychohistorian seeks an explanation of human motives in the past, hoping to understand the historical process in this way. In order to explain why psychohistorians have become psychoanalysts' heirs also in this respect, one should show the way in which ethical assumptions of psychoanalysts, specific for doctors and therapists, could have penetrated into this new area of utilizing Freudian concepts.

Sigmund Freud himself was a doctor both by his education and his profession. He originated psychoanalysis only when he had found all the other existing therapies for neurotics wanting. Notwithstanding all its developments as an instrument for study and scientific cognition (and Freud indeed saw it very successful in this respect), for its founding father psychoanalysis had always remained a therapy — "... a method of medical treatment for those suffering from nervous disorders..."[9] Bold theoretical constructions created by the author of *The Interpretation of Dreams* (which remain the core of psychoanalytic metapsychology) were based mainly on the comparative study of his numerous therapeutic cases. He was meticulously gathering them during decades of his therapeutic practice. Freud's consulting room was his laboratory — admit Charles Strozier and Daniel Offer.[10] So, to alleviate human sufferings remained the main goal for every day activity of Sigmund Freud. This has also remained the main objective of psychoanalytical therapeutic practice in general. For the most of analysts, the vocation of their profession meant simply to treat patients seeking a remedy for their mental sufferings — and nothing more. Research, building up and revising psychoanalytical theory appealed to few of them only. Analysts perceived themselves as a part of medical profession and shared its ethical presuppositions

---

[7] Actually, some of Freud's own writings are considered to be the first attempts in psychohistory: especially his *Leonardo da Vinci and the Memory of His Childhood*, also his books or articles on Dostoevski, Moses, on the origins of totemic religion and so on.

[8] On these matters see T. Pawelec, *Wprowadzenie. Psychohistoria w poszukiwaniu tożsamości*, [in:] *Psyche i Klio. Historia w oczach psychohistoryków*, ed. T. Pawelec, Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2002, p. 11–31; idem, *Psychohistoria a psychoanaliza (z problematyki wzajemnych relacji*, [in:] *Historia, metodologia, współczesność*, ed. J. Pomorski, Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 1998, p. 117–133; idem, *Psychohistorycy w debacie z historią*, [in:] *Światopoglądy historiograficzne*, ed. J. Pomorski, Wyd UMCS, Lublin 2002, p. 157–183. This topic is discussed more extensively in T. Pawelec, *Dzieje i nieświadomość. Założenia teoretyczne i praktyka badawcza psychohistorii*, Wyd. UŚ, Katowice 2004 (see esp. chapter 1).

[9] S. Freud, *A General Introduction to Psycho-Analysis [Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis]*, [in:] *Great Books of the Western World*, ed. M. J. Adler, vol. 54, *Freud*, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Chicago–London 1991, p. 449.

[10] Ch. Strozier, D. Offer, *The Heroic Period of Psychohistory*, [in:] *The Leader: Psychohistorical Essays*, ed. Ch. Strozier, D. Offer, Plenum Press, New York 1985, p. 22.

so vividly expressed in Hippocratic oath. It was also very important in this respect that in the USA, since mid-1920s, an aspiring analyst was required to obtain a degree in medicine. Eventually, most of American psychoanalysts were graduates of medical schools. This medicalization (to use a non-existing word) of the psychoanalysis clearly strengthened the firm presence of therapeutic stance within its practitioners.[11]

On the other hand, that medicalization has never been complete. Freud himself, although he approached his patients as physician-therapist, did not think of psychoanalysis (especially during the later phase of his activity) as a branch of medicine which was to be restricted to treatment[12] of some clearly defined (mental) illnesses only. For him it was rather a cognition and a self-cognition — a way to get (with the aid of an analyst) a deep insight into one's own psyche in order to unlock internal sources of creativity and self-development. Ultimately, its significance rested on what it revealed in the domain man care the most, that is his own humanity. That is why analysis remains (potentially, at last) an interminable process.[13] Transgressing the borders of medicine, psychoanalysis should not have been the exclusive domain of doctors. In his autobiography (1925) and somewhat later in his *The Question of Lay Analysis* Freud insisted that persons without medical training should be allowed to perform analyses. In a famous letter to protestant minister Oskar Pfister, he confessed: "I should like to hand it over to a profession which does not yet exist, a profession of lay curers of souls who need not to be doctors and should not be priests".[14] That was why he strongly opposed medicalization of psychoanalysis in America till the end of his life. This has become his legacy for those who have been questioning restrictions mentioned above[15] and trying to maintain at least a modest degree of separation between medicine and psychoanalysis. This was manifested in cases of training non-medicals who were sometimes accepted by a handful of psychoanalytic institutes. In this way, clinical competence and therapeutic (or rather medical) ethics of psychoanalysis (functionally related to the former) was diffusing outside the circles of doctors-psychotherapists.

Being first of all a psychotherapy, psychoanalysis is also a certain research method aimed at studying unconscious mental processes. On the other hand, it is also a specific

---

[11] The case of America matters here for two major reasons: (1) since World War II the USA has become the center of psychoanalysis and for the most the American analysts were those who set directions for its further evolution; (2) psychohistory proper has emerged and developed in the USA — and of course it took place within the context of American psychoanalysis.

[12] In medical sense of the word. As he put it: "... we do not consider it at all desirable for psychoanalysis to be swallowed up by medicine and to find its last resting place in a textbook of psychiatry under the headings of 'Methods of Treatment'." S. Freud, *The Question of Lay Analysis*, [in:] idem, *The Essentials of Psychoanalysis*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth 1986, p. 63.

[13] S. Freud stated this in his *The New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (Lecture 34), as well as *Analysis Terminable and Interminable*.

[14] The quotation is taken from R. Fine, *A History of Psychoanalysis*, Columbia University Press, New York 1979, p. 69. On the last page of his paper on lay analysis he wrote: "Perhaps once more an American may hit on the idea of spending a little money to get the 'social workers' of his country trained analytically and to turn them into a band of helpers for combating the neuroses of civilization." S. Freud, *The Question...*, p. 65.

[15] They gradually ceased to be observed in 1970's.

psychological theory — a basis for certain world view which has been aspiring to become a general philosophy of man and culture. Sigmund Freud began to develop this philosophy during the early stages of psychoanalysis and found the issues of history, anthropology and culture an important (though of course secondary) point of reference for his investigations. Approaching these areas with his analytic categories and interpretative strategies he dragged there the therapeutic ethics hidden behind them. In his "metapsychological" papers Freud used psychoanalytical insight to diagnose ailments of the society as a whole or even to propose certain innovation within the sphere of culture. In *Civilization and Its Discontents* he asked:

> If the development of civilization has such a far-reaching similarity to the development of the individual [...] may we not be justified in reaching the diagnosis that under the influence of cultural urges, some civilizations, or some epochs of civilization — possibly the whole of mankind — have become "neurotic"? [...] As regards the therapeutic application of our knowledge, what would be the use of the most correct analysis of social neuroses, since no one possesses authority to impose such a therapy upon a group? But in spite of all these difficulties, we may expect that one day someone will venture to embark upon a pathology of cultural communities.[16]

He was "tracking" such pathologies since the early days of psychoanalysis.[17] So, Reuben Fine was right observing that founder of psychoanalysis "... placed his faith for the amelioration of the human lot in a universal analysis which would be offered by lay curers of souls".[18] "In this way, — noticed on his turn Philip Pomper — Freud created the basis for psychohistory in which historical actors, groups, institutions, ideologies, and epochs became battlegrounds of endopsychic structures and processes."[19]

Some adherents of psychoanalysis have followed this direction of Freud's thought and developed critical studies on culture and civilization, past and present. Their activity has come to be known as so called "applied psychoanalysis". It uses Freudian categories as cognitive tools outside a consulting room and its practitioners are those whom we owe the fact that psychoanalytic concepts and theories are no longer the sole property of analytic circles; in fact they are one of more important elements of contemporary culture. Freudian ideas have become a part of discourse of philosophy and social theory — deep psychology has amply demonstrated its interpretative power there. Thus, in addition to contributions made in this respect by practicing analysts, ideas derived from psychoanalysis were present

---

[16] S. Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, [in:] *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. J. Strachey, A. Freud, A. Strachey, A. Tysen, Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psychoanalysis, London 1953–1974, vol. 21, p. 144.

[17] See e.g. his early study on "cultural" sexual morality (1908) where he documented harm made by so called bourgeois morality to the modern Europeans. Naturally, *Civilization and Its Discontents* and *Future of an Illusion* remain classical examples in this respect. In his *The New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (1933) Freud even ventured to suggest a prophylactic analysis for children widely adopted as a kind of mental inoculation against possible future neurosis. S. Freud, *The New Introductory Lectures...*, Lecture 34, [in:] *Standart Edition...*, vol. 22, p. 148. See also B. Bettelheim, *Freud and Man's Soul*, Vintage Books, New York 1984.

[18] R. Fine, *A History of Psychoanalysis...*, p. 70.

[19] Ph. Pomper, *Structure of Mind in History*, Columbia University Press, New York 1985, p. 168.

within many intellectual trends of XXth century. Sometimes they even formed the core of an argument put forward by a given author within the area of philosophy of history or social theory. In this context one may mention e.g. ideas of Norman O. Brown, contribution of some scholars belonging to Frankfurt School (Herbert Marcuse was surely the most prominent advocate of psychoanalytic insight there),[20] studies made by Erich Fromm, Karen Horney or Jacques Lacan. Of course, the list should include later authors such as Alexander Mitscherlich and Christopher Lasch. Some of them have been doing applied psychoanalysis (because they were practicing analysts — like Mitscherlich), while the others (like Marcuse) not. However we can always find hints of therapeutic attitude in these writings. Herbert Marcuse for example, accepting Freud's conviction that European culture was founded on the repression of basic drives of man, asked: "does it allow the concept of a non-repressive civilization, based on a fundamentally different experience of being, a fundamentally different relation between man and nature and fundamentally different existential relation?"[21] He believed that it was psychoanalytic discourse which, as the basis for constructing critical theory, created theoretical space for discussing this problem and working out a project for the new society.[22]

According to Philip Pomper, preoccupation with an improvement (or, as in this particular case, a treatment) of modern society which was typical for such thinkers, has made them successors of a long tradition of European "intelligentsia" including "... those members [...] of the educated classes who combine advanced or vanguard ideologies with activism".[23] Practically, this preoccupation has often led to linking such ideas with left wing social thought and cultural criticism. In fact, writings of the members of Frankfurt School remain an instructive example.

Given the fact of the existence of such traditions, one can not be surprised that the therapeutic ethics could be found within the core assumptions shared by psychohistorians. It should be added that some scholars (including Pomper) have already listed such thinkers as Marcuse and Brown as psychohistorians. Indeed, many adherents of psycho-history have clearly recognized the fact that their paradigm remained deeply rooted in, as one of them put it, "contemporary therapeutic culture".[24]

---

[20] Christian Schneider notes an early contribution (1932) made here by Max Horkheimer. According to Schneider, the head of Institute for Social Research expected psychoanalytic perspective to become one of the most crucial elements of the critical social theory. Here we may find roots of later attempts made by the members of this group such as studies on authoritarian personality developed by Theodore Adorno and his team. Ch. Schneider, *History and Psychoanalysis*, paper presented at Central European University Summer School "State of Art in Historical Studies: Putting Theories into Practice", Budapest July/August 1999.

[21] H. Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization*, Beacon Press, Boston 1966, p. 5.

[22] "... Freud's theoretical conception itself seems to refute his consistent denial of historical possibility of a non-repressive civilization"; ibidem.

[23] Ph. Pomper, *Structure of Mind...*, p. 4.

[24] See G. M. Kren, L. Rappoport, *Values, Methods and the Utility of Psychohistory*, [in:] *Varieties of Psychohistory*, ed. G. M. Kren, L. Rappoport, Springer, New York 1976, p. 12. See also an introductory commentary made by Robert Brugger on the excerpts from Christopher Lasch's *Culture of Narcissism* reprinted in an anthology *Our Selves/Our Past: Psychological Approaches to American History*, ed. R. J. Brugger, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 1981, p. 385–386.

PSYCHOHISTORY AS PSYCHOTHERAPY: AN ALLEVIATION OF COMMUNAL ILLS

The therapeutic task of psychohistory has been variously defined and described by psychohistorians. Also, not all psychohistorians dwelling on theoretical and methodological problems of their profession were willing to discuss it. What mattered most was to which particular group within the movement a given scholar belonged.

The idea of therapeutic function of psychohistory has been the most broadly expressed in the methodological thought of "radical" psychohistorians, i.e. those grouped around "The Journal of Psychohistory" and the International Psychohistorical Association" (IPA). Lloyd deMause, the leader of "radical" group, insists that "... psychohistory is a science in a hurry, racing against man's spiralling ability to destroy himself..."[25] Given the enormous scale of human irrationality, the potentials of man's aggression and destructiveness pervading both past and contemporary events, psychohistory as a new science should be, he says, no less than "an extension of psychotherapy". It should examine contemporary political leaders (in order to find out possible dangers resulting from pathological traits of their personalities), construct taxology of family types prevailing in a given society (with generalizing on the kinds of personal and political behavior which result from childhood in differing kinds of families) and analyze events of political life as a kind of group process, together with its group-unconscious determinants and its dynamics.[26] Many of his followers have found both the essence of the profession here ("In essence, our role is in many respects like that of a physician"[27]), and subjective reason for practicing it. As Stanley Rosennman and Irving Handelsman have noticed, "countertransference fantasy of yearning to rehabilitate society [...] is a major dynamism recruiting scholars into psychohistory together with pushing them to strenuous efforts."[28] That is why so many of IPA members are social workers, physicians and psychotherapists who remain engaged in various governmental or community programs aimed at providing counseling and help to children, families or victims of crimes. For them psychohistory is not a new detached discipline studying the past but a more radical version of applied psychoanalysis. Here an insight into dynamics of social life should lead to activity oriented toward eradication of evils present within contemporary society: violence,

---

[25] L. deMause, *Foreword*, [in:] *The New Psychohistory*, ed. L. deMause, The Psychohistory Press, New York 1975, p. 5.

[26] L. deMause, *Psychohistory and Psychotherapy*, [in:] *The New Psychohistory*, p. 307–313. Similar formulations could be found in numerous writings of deMause. See also D. Beisel, *From History to Psychohistory: A Personal Journey*, "The Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 6, 1978 no. 1, p. 25–26.

[27] K. A. Adams, *"The Next, Next Assignment" and the Wounded Healer*, "The Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 17, 1990 no. 4, p. 367.

[28] S. Rosennman, I. Handelsman, *Psychohistorians Commissioned by Groups Deformed by Catastrophes: Comments on the Field of Psychohistory*, "The Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 17, 1990 no. 4, p. 370. Compare the other instructive example: S. L. Bloom, *Clinical Uses of Psychohistory*, "The Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 20, 1993 no. 3, p. 259–266). Long-term collaborator and friend of deMause has written: "For me psychohistory is not only a science, but is always and ultimately clinical (i.e. manifestly or by implication preoccupied with improvement of the 'human condition')." C. Schmidt, *The Perilous Purview of Psychohistory*, "Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 14, 1987 no. 4, p. 323.

hatred, intolerance together with their "roots" — abusive and oppressive childrearing practices, which, as these psychohistorians stress, are still a commonplace today.[29] As one of "radicals" has aptly said, there have been a belief evidently present in this writings that "... we approach our subject as therapists, thinking clinically and imagining that our efforts will have a therapeutic effect on man and society".[30]

Even a cursory survey of successive volumes of "The Journal of Psychohistory" reveals that the greater part of articles which have been appearing there is focused on such matters.[31] Historical studies, i.e. the ones intended to investigate, say, human motivation in the past (as goes a definition of psychohistory popular within "radicals") are clearly outnumbered by studies dealing with:

- documenting maltreating and sexual molesting of infants and children in the past as well as at present. An extension of these are inquires into historical changes of "modes of parenting" and childrearing practices — which, according to grand scheme of deMause,[32] are fundamental independent variable of historical process;
- interpreting more important (or rather more hoped in mass-media) events of politics, economy and every day life, together with various creations of popular mass-culture aimed at revealing anxious and aggressive fantasies which unconsciously motivate behavior and emotional reactions of the community;
- interpreting decisions made by public figures (first of all politicians) as well as their behavior, mainly with reference to their childhood traumas and other experiences.

Of those mentioned above, the second issue is maybe the most evident attempt at "therapy". Here radical psychohistorians try to uncover what they have come to call "group fantasies" — unconscious, regressive shared feelings of the members of a given group pertaining to the group itself, its situation, its relations to other groups, relations of particular members to the whole group, its leader, etc.[33] In a striking resemblance to an analyst who tries to uncover repressed feelings, emotions and experiences of his/her patient on order to cure the neurotic symptoms, practitioners of psychohistory want to brought into consciousness those feelings in order to understand — and even predict — not only "twists" of public opinion, fears and expectations but also possible behavior of leaders and other individuals acting as group delegates. They seem to believe that they could bring some more rationality into human action in this way.[34]

---

[29] So they clearly share concerns and attitudes of such analysts as Alice Miller.

[30] H. Lawton, *The Group-Fantasies of Psychohistorians*, [in:] *The Many Faces of Psychohistory*, ed. J. Dorinson, J. Atlas, International Psychohistorical Association, New York 1983, p. 166.

[31] A 25-year index to "Journal of Psychohistory", which covers issues from vol. 1 (1973) to vol. 25 (1998), is available in the Internet (www.psychohistory.com/06a_25year.html).

[32] For a concise presentation of deMause's formulation, the so called "psychogenic theory of history" see his *The Evolution of Childhood*, [in:] *The History of Childhood*, ed. L. deMause, Jason Aronson, Northvale–London 1995, p. 1–74. Actually, many radical psychohistorians tend to see this concept (which, despite the efforts made by its author, belongs to sphere of speculative philosophy of history rather than empirically based theory-building) as a cornerstone of psychohistorians' world view.

[33] The idea is derived from works of psychoanalysts concerned with group process theory like Winfred Bion and others.

[34] On the idea of group fantasy and research strategies adopted in this context see L. deMause, *Historical Group Fantasies*, [in:] *Foundations of Psychohistory*, ed. L. deMause, *Creative Roots*, New

More subtle and maybe deeper formulation of therapeutic function of psychohistory could be found in writings of some psychohistorians with clinical competence who came to the field from psychology and remain distanced from "radicals'" theoretical position. Particularly worth attention are ideas of Robert Jay Lifton, long-term leader of so called "The Wellfleet Group". Starting in 1960s, it was one of the first psychohistorical discussion groups to emerge and such prolific thinkers as Erik Erikson, Kenneth Keniston, Philip Rieff, Bruce Mazlish or Alexander Mitscherlich were meeting there. As Lifton put it in the preface of a volume containing some early proceedings of the group,

> ... we struggled with a constant dialectic between responding to the overwhelming national and international events of the late sixties and early seventies and detailed theoretical exchanges. And we held larger evening meetings [...] which were devoted to such matters as university uprisings, decision-making processes of Vietnam War, relationships between My Lai and Nurenberg, the outer space program and the presidential election of 1972.[35]

The mixture of cognitive stance and therapeutic preccupation is clearly visible in essays as well as transcripts of discussions published there.

As for Robert Lifton himself, it has been rightly pointed out that

> ... he has studied more systematically than any major psychohistorian the traumatic moments which [...] fix the numbed psyche into a posture of mere survival, a kind of death in life.

It stems from his original idea of psychosocial process. The concept of imagination plays for him a crucial role in this respect. He sees it as a distinct human capacity for creation of culture and living within it. Culture then governs human activity by means of symbolic systems, i.e. complexes of developed images ("imagery"). The dynamics of their development rests on dialectic of the most basic imagery — this related to death and life which is always present in human mind and related to life experiences of an individual. The dialectic of basic imagery governs the so called "psychoformative process" which means for Lifton the development of human creativeness and vitality, both on the level of an individual self and the level of the community.[36] Thus, Lifton's research

---

York 1982, p. 172–243; H. Lawton, *Psychohistorian's Handbook*, The Psychohistory Press, New York 1988, p. 177–192; P. Elovitz, H. Lawton, G. Luhrman, *On Doing Fantasy Analysis*, "Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 13, 1985 no. 2, p. 207–228. Some statistical tools aimed at studying group fantasies through a content analysis of mass-media publications, imagery of newspaper cartoons etc. is now available through Internet (on "radicals'" Web sites).

It should be added here that, according to psychoanalysis, an individual gradually develops more matured modes of relating to others and more advanced ways of emotional expression but on group level the situation is much different. Here the most primitive psychological mechanisms are the only ones who are at work. So, here is the need for a therapy.

[35] R. J. Lifton, *Preface*, [in:] *Explorations in Psychohistory: The Wellfleet Papers*, ed. R. J. Lifton, E. Olson, Simon & Schuster, New York 1974, p. 15.

[36] This necessarily fragmentary presentation of some elements of complicated theory of Lifton is based mainly on the interpretation made by Ph. Pomper, *Structure of Mind...*, p. 143–165. See also Ch. Strozier, D. Flynn. *Lifton's Method*, "Psychohistory Review" vol. 20, 1991 no. 2, p. 131–141; T. Ochinowski, *Nie tylko psychoanaliza. Wybrane programy współpracy badawczej historii i psychologii*, "Historyka" XXXII, 2002, p. 63–88; M. Lis Turlejska, *Stres traumatyczny. Teorie i badanie*, Wyd. IP PAN,

has been focused on studying "shared themes", i.e. crucial, traumatic experiences shared by communities involved in historical process[37] because such experiences of prevailing impact (Hiroshima bombing, Vietnam War, genocide, rule of totalitarian regimes) stop the psychoformative process and lead to "psychic numbing" of victims. Then imagery of death prevail within their psychos and, more importantly, their ability to creative adaptation become impaired or even completely lost. The latter often includes loss of feelings, as well. Lifton has insisted that it is the modern epoch which has brought in an unprecedented way such disastrous experiences:

> ... in every age man faces a pervasive theme which defies his engagement and yet must be engaged. [...] Now it is unlimited technological violence and absurd death. We do well to name the threat and to analyze its components. But our need is to go further, to create new psychic and social forms to enable us to reclaim not only our technologies, but our very imaginations, in the service of the continuity of life.[38]

This is the only way to restore creative dialectics of death and life imagery. Thus, doing psychohistory is for Lifton a form of social advocacy,

> ... where intellectually rigorous research is combined with a commitment to and advocacy for broader social principles.[39]

> ... the psychohistorian, as creative survivor [in fact, nowadays everyone is a kind of survivor, at least symbolically — because all of us directly or indirectly meet the experience of annihilation — T. P.], advocate, and community therapist becomes an agent of the creative formative process which mends the breaks and transforms the experience into renewed vitality.[40]

In other words — as T. Ochinowski has put it — he/she helps people "to tame and subjugate" their own history.[41] For Lifton, the obvious extension of such conceived social function of a psychohistorian has been his active membership in various organi-

---

Warszawa 1998. Although Lifton's ideas stems from psychoanalytic tradition (and more precisely from formulations of Freud and Erikson) all the interpreters rightly point to its novelty. Lifton's theory represents an interesting attempt at culturalist reinterpretation of classic psychoanalytical ontology.

[37] See R. J. Lifton, *On Psychohistory*, [in:] *Explorations in Psychohistory...*, ed. R. J. Lifton, Ė. Olson, p. 21–41. More detailed presentation of Lifton's method can be found in his book *The Broken Connection*, Simon & Schuster, New York 1979.

[38] R. J. Lifton, *Death in Life: Survivors of Hiroshima*, Simon & Schuster, New York 1967, p. 541.

[39] R. J. Lifton, *Home from the War: Vietnam Veterans — Neither Victims, Nor Executioners*, Basic Books, New York 1985, p. 15, the quotation is taken from T. Ochinowski, *Nie tylko psychoanaliza...* Many years later he recalled that it was exactly the way in which his study on Vietnam War veterans came into being: "... at a certain point during the Vietnam War, after reading about My Lai, I dropped work on the *Broken Connection* which I had been working on for lots of years and devoted myself more intensely to combating the Vietnam War [...]. I did all kinds of things as an antiwar activist but also began the interviews with Vietnam veterans in various ways. In that case activism led to scholarship and the writing of the book on Vietnam veterans". P. Elovitz, *The Advocacy and Detachment of Robert Jay Lifton*, "Clio's Psyche" vol. 2, 1995 no. 3, p. 45, 56–63.

[40] Ph. Pomper, *Structure of Mind in History...*, p. 160.

[41] T. Ochinowski, *Model analizy przeżyć więźniów stalinowskich na terenie Polski okresu stalinowskiego (1945–1956) w perspektywie psychohistorycznej*, unpublished Ph.D. diss., KUL, Lublin 2000.

zations aimed at preventing destructive and traumatizing events such as Physicians for Social Responsibility or International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

The same holds true for many other prominent psychohistorians with psychological or psychiatric background and clinical competence. They often become engaged in various public initiatives of this kind, including the area of international diplomacy and high politics. As for the latter, an activity of Professor Vamik Volkan, Director of Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interactions,[42] may serve as an illustrative example. Within the International Negotiating Network of the Carter Center in Atlanta, established by the former US President Jimmy Carter, he is engaged in working out solutions for various (often long lasting) ethnical conflicts.

> What we are really interested in — he stresses — is reducing ethnic tensions. If you want to use a medical model, you could say we are trying to vaccinate the process to prevent the spread of further disease. Because of past historical markers, the psychological dimensions involved in ethnic or other large-group conflicts tend to promote rigid barriers. If we can somehow modify these barriers, we can 'immunize' against future conflict and open doors to communication between opposing groups by eliminating the poison in their respective relationships.[43]

PSYCHOHISTORY AS PSYCHOTHERAPY: IN SCHOLARS' OFFICES

Results of psychohistorical studies could, as maintain many of the adherents — somehow alleviate the burden of communal ills. However, the therapeutic function of psychohistory also remains — at least in the opinion of some of them — directly linked to the methodology of historical research. They believe that an application of therapeutic model to history, i.e. a transfer of clinical theorems and cognitive strategies of psychoanalysis to the study of the past would greatly enrich historian's research. He/she would be able to take into account such materials as mistakes and slips of his/her subjects, their dreams and various materials recording their free associations-like activities. These data, often seemed unimportant to historians, may become really meaningful for psychohistorians.[44] There is a therapeutic aspect in a very process of choosing one's subject of study, as well:

---

[42] Vamik Volkan is an example of an interdisciplinary scholar easily met within psychohistory. He is a professor of psychiatry at the University of Virginia Medical School and combines his competence of university psychiatrist and psychoanalytical therapist with broad interests in psychohistory (a psychobiography of Atatürk) and political psychology (numerous publications related to psychological dimension of international relations). He is also a founding member of International Society for Political Psychology and an editor of its journal, "Political Psychology".

[43] P. Petschauer, *The Diplomacy of Vamik Volkan*, "Clio's Psyche" vol. 2, 1995 no. 2, p. 34. One could hardly miss evident "medicalization" of Volkan's discourse on social function of psychohistory — an another piece of evidence pertaining to the fact that for psychohistorians it means the therapeutic function.

[44] This theme appears in most of methodological treatises on psychohistory as well as in numerous concrete studies. Take e.g. dreams: P. Elovitz, *Dreams as a Psychohistorical Source*, "The Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 16, 1988 no. 3, p. 189–296; idem, *Psychohistorical Dreamwork: A New Methodology Applied to a Dream of Sir Humphry Davy*, [in:] *The Variety of Dream Experience*, ed. M. Ullman, C. Zimmer, Continuum Press, New York 1987, p. 253–265; J. D. Hughes, *Psychohistorical Dreamwork. Dreams from the Ancient World*, [in:] ibidem, p. 266–278.

> ... creative effort — notes Howard Feinstein — often emerges from very personal conflicts that seek expression. [...] though I began my work on [William — T. P.] James 'by accident', I soon engaged the subject with intense personal concern because both James and I had problems deciding upon our work, and I hoped, by accepting the discipline of imaginatively approaching his past, to clarify my own present and future.[45]

Similarly, it has been pointed out that for instance Erik Erikson's studies on religious leaders and geniuses, emerged from his problems with his own identity and his preoccupation with the sense of divine.

Clinical "sensitivity" of a psychohistorian — a derivative of his therapeutic stance (and therapeutic competence, as well) could enable him/her to recognize and analyze his/her own subjective, at least partially unconscious, feelings and attitudes toward phenomena under study. This would be analogous to countertransference in psychoanalysis. Peter Loewenberg stresses its cognitive value for history: it makes possible to find conflictive (read: important) material in a historical problem under study.[46]

There is also a more general problem related to supposed cognitive advantage provided by therapeutic analytical insight. Psychohistorians sometimes charge scholars representing more traditional disciplines with deliberate or unconscious avoiding of certain kinds of problems — not necessarily related to psychology — or with approaching them in a distanced and "objective" (i.e. distorted) way. It results from psychological defenses operating on the level of individual personalities of scholars, on the level of paradigms or even the whole academic disciplines because such issues — sometimes quite important — might provoke anxiety or emotional engagement and consequently force a painful insight into researcher's own private experiences, fears and phobias. Eventually, a psychologically safe stance of "neutral" or "objective" scholar which, as it is supposed, characterizes an academician, would become untenable.[47] In relation to this Henry Lawton notes:

---

[45] H. M. Feinstein, *The Therapeutic Fantasy of a Psychohistorian*, "Psychoanalytic Review" vol. 69, 1982 no. 2, p. 225–226.

[46] See P. Loewenberg, *Psychoanalytic Models of History: Freud and After*, [in:] *Psychology and Historical Interpretation*, ed. W. Mc Kinley Runyan, Oxford University Press, New York–Oxford 1988, p. 145–151; idem: *Historical Method, the Subjectivity of the Researcher, and Psychohistory*, "Psychohistory Review" vol. 14, 1985 no. 1, p. 30–35; C. Pletsch, *A Note on the Adaptation of the Psychoanalytic Method to the Study of Historical Personalities: Psychoanalysts on Schreber*, "Psychohistory Review" vol. 8, 1979 no. 3, p. 46–50; E. Schepeler, *The Biographer's Transference: A Chapter in Psychobiographical Epistemology*, "Biography" vol. 13, 1990 no. 2, p. 111–129.

[47] It should be stressed that it is a different question than that of, say, one's own world view, values or ideology. Their decisive impact on research practice is widely acknowledged nowadays. What I have in mind, is a subjective world of one's own deep conscious and unconscious emotions and fears — indeed a dark side of human soul — which we are afraid to provoke and expose in daylight. For instance, see Peter Loewenberg's comments on the use of statistics as a defense against pain and rage resulted from studying losses of German people during the World War I and insightful notes of Aurel Ende on psychological mechanisms of defense operating within the field of the history of childhood. P. Loewenberg, *Psychohistorical Origins of the Nazi Youth Cohort*, [in:] idem, *Decoding the Past*, Knopf, New York 1983, p. 260–262; A. Ende, *Psychohistorian's Childhood and the History of Childhood*, "The Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 9, 1981, p. 173–178.

> Traditional scholarship appears to expect psychohistory to process anxiety-provoking materials it cannot handle and return it in such a way that permits better sense to be made of the world. By containing anxiety provoking material and making it less threatening we aid traditional scholars to reintroject the material in less upsetting form. Also, the questions we raise, the contexts we explore, often arise from an implied attempt to imaginatively change the past for the better.[48]

Thus, a psychohistorian is able to "cure" not only society but the social sciences and humanities as well and the curing effects of his/her studies would be based on the fact that they would bring into scholars' minds those aspects of a given subject which up to now have gone unnoticed, overlooked, denied and repressed — because they have been anxiety--provoking. Again, we can find here an analogy with psychoanalytic therapy aimed at getting insight into patient's repressed memories and feelings. To work them through with the help of an analyst means to reduce the level of patient's anxiety and to enable him to function in more realistic and more creative way.[49] Similarly, "working through" the results of historical, anthropological and other studies with the help of psychohistory would open new insights into culture and human deeds for the practitioners of these disciplines.[50]

CRITICISM

The therapeutic stance presented by many psychohistorians has met with criticism coming from outside and, what especially is worth attention, from within the psychohistorical paradigm. In particular, its most extreme versions (together with an atmosphere of messianic pretensions evoked mainly by L. deMause) have become a subject of critical debate even among radical psychohistorians. As a kind of group "self-analysis", they try to reveal irrational group fantasies shared by the adherents of psychohistory themselves and actually have found "the therapeutic fantasy" and "the millennial, messianic, apocalyptic fantasy" among the most prominent of them.[51]

> Perhaps psychohistory — Henry Lawton concludes with a deliberate caution[52] — [...] could be an influence in facilitating election of more psychogenically advanced leaders,

---

[48] H. Lawton, *The Group-Fantasies of Psychohistorians...*, p. 166.

[49] In the opinions of some of its adherents, an area of childhood studies remains the most striking example of such "healing" influence of psychohistory. It is an interdisciplinary field of study shared by anthropologists, historians, psychologists, pedagogues, sociologists and so on. My own studies on the history of psychohistory have also provided evidence of a stimulating role played by psychohistorians in developing this area of study.

[50] Here, one could notice an echo of deMause's ideas who has postulated a general reform of humanities, elevating psychohistory to the level of its bedrock. L. deMause, *The Independence of Psychohistory*, [in:] idem, *Foundations of Psychohistory...*, p. 84–104. Compare ideas of psychoanalysis as unified theory of human behavior and all embracing, general science on man formulated by some analysts. R. Fine, *A History of Psychoanalysis...*, p. 534–568.

[51] In particular see H. Lawton, *The Group-Fantasies of Psychohistorians...*, p. 162–185. This self-analytic orientation is a deliberate reference to the custom present at first meetings of Vienna Psychoanalytic Society held in Freud's own apartment.

[52] H. Lawton is one of the scholars most concerned with methodological issues among the "radicals"; see his *Psychohistorian's Handbook*.

thereby saving the world from destruction. Because such notions are not totally unrealistic [bold mine — T. P.], it is perhaps understandable that some psychohistorians may be personally living millenarian fantasies. But such beliefs can also be grandiose, naive, and utopian, and have to be carefully dealt with to be kept in proper perspective. Is it bad for psychohistory to have millenarian hopes? Yes, if we allow ourselves to degenerate into becoming prophets of apocalyptic world doom; no, if we realize that while psychohistory may help, it will not 'save the world [bold mine — T. P.].[53]

Indeed, many psychohistorians who remain closely linked to academia (and therefore called "moderate") experience the idea of advocated research, especially if it is connected with some forms of social and political activism, as a threat to their professional identity as scholars. Some of them suggested that "brakes" should be somehow "applied" to such attempts and, particularly, that "wild analyses" with "irresponsible predictions" made by deMause and his followers may bring the whole field into disrepute.[54]

Also, the practice of imitating clinical model in psychohistory has provoked some criticism within the field. For example, Fred Weinstein and Gerald Platt have pointed out that:

... psychoanalytic therapy occurs under unique, specially contrived conditions deliberately organized to evoke the expression of intrapsychic conflict and the study of that conflict, in order to account for symptomatic expression. Normal aspects of development, or the capacity of individuals to act routinely in every day life are only of marginal interest in the psychoanalytic situation. Hence, '[T]he analytic situation is an artificial, tilted one...'[55]

So, they say, research strategies formulated it this context, and especially those based on the phenomenon of transference, are of no use in psychohistorical study. The latter deals with human actions in a real world and transference does not occur there. Moreover, cases of unconscious regression usually coexist with ability to act realistically which is always preserved to a degree. The authors mentioned above believe that in the context of psychohistorical investigation psychoanalysis should be seen as a set of "ready-made" statements attempting to describe some mental processes in a systematic way i.e. as a theory to be adopted by any interested scholar. In this way, they have come to question the significance of clinical stance in psychohistorical study.[56] Of

---

[53] Idem, *Psychohistory Today and Tomorrow*, "The Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 5, 1978 no. 3, p. 339.

[54] For some typical instances of such criticism see e.g. *John Demos Growing up American* [rec.: G. Davis, *Childhood and History in America*, Psychohistory Press, New York 1978], "New York Review of Books" 24.04.1977, p. 11, 41–42; P. Loewenberg, *Psychohistory*, [in:] *The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the USA*, ed. M. Kammen, Cornell University Press, Ithaca 1980, p. 408–433.

[55] F. Weinstein, G. M. Platt, *The Transference Model in Psychohistory: A Critique*, "GUPH Newsletter" ("Psychohistory Review") vol. 4, 1977 no. 4, p. 12–13.

[56] In addition to paper mentioned above see their *Psychoanalytic Sociology: An Essay in Interpretation of Historical Data and the Phenomena of Collective Behavior*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London 1973; *The Coming Crisis in Psychohistory*, "Journal of Modern History" vol. 47, 1975 no. 2, p. 202–228; *History and Theory: The Question of Psychoanalysis*, "Journal of Interdisciplinary History" vol. 2, 1972, p. 419–434; G. Platt, *The Sociological Endeavor and Psychoanalytic Thought*, [in:] *Psycho/history: Readings in the Method of Psychology, Psychoanalysis and History*, ed. G. Cocks, T. L. Crosby, Yale University Press, New Haven–London 1987, p. 237–253.

course, the latter conclusion is shared by those psychohistorians who hope to replace psychoanalysis by some other psychological theories as a conceptual background of psychohistory. In essence, as products of academic psychology they are devoid of immediate therapeutic references.

The idea of the therapeutic function of psychohistory has met with much more opposition outside psychohistorical circles. A historian Richard Ellman, rightly recognized that, "ultimately Erikson's work [*Young Man Luther* — T. P.] was not so much biography as delineation of therapeutic posibility", and ironically noted that there was "no doubt" that "posthumous therapy would help a good many of the dead".[57] One could quote numerous examples of similar opinions. Jacques Barzun, maybe the most outspoken enemy of psychohistory among historians, ridiculed it as just one more instance of naive faith in the potentials of human mind and naive dream of remolding society or steering history. Within this wave of criticism the voice of David Stannard was particularly well heard: he noted that first of all it was psychoanalysis which not only evidently failed as a therapy but also did not meet standards of "good" scientific theory. So, one has no need to talk about psychohistory at all...[58] Also, it would be really difficult to find instances of traditional scholars acknowledging any need of psychohistorical assistance in clarifying emotional issues involved in research in humanities and social sciences.

The intensity of criticism suggests that the idea of therapeutic function of psychohistory has become a troublesome one — both for at least some of psychohistorians and for wider academic circles. This explains efforts toward suppression and denial of this element of psychohistorian's identity undertaken within academia. For example, in a study entitled *The Psychiatrist as Psychohistorian*, published by (and on special request of) American Psychiatric Association, the editors authoritatively stated that psychobiographical and psychohistorical studies focused on contemporary figures and events (so, the ones dealing with living persons) may do harm to the individual and invade his/her privacy.[59] Pointing to real instances of misuse of results of psychological and psychoanalytical studies, the report warned that a psychohistorian doing an advocated research too often was not able:

---

[57] R. Ellmann, *That's Life*, "New York Review of Books" 11.07.1971, p. 4; the quotation is taken from H. Feinstein, *The Therapeutic Fantasy...*, p. 221.

[58] J. Barzun, *Clio and the Doctors: Psycho-History, Quanto-History and History*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago–London 1974. It is not an accident that he actually points to Robert Lifton as a clear case of such uncritical "subjection the work to a doctrine of reform" (p. 79–80). D. Stannard, *Shrinking History: On Freud and the Failure of Psychohistory*, Oxford University Press, New York–Oxford 1980.

[59] *The Psychiatrist as Psychohistorian*, American Psychiatric Association, Washington 1976. It is the so called "Task Force Report", i.e. a report written on request of Association's authorities by a special task force consisted of psychiatrists, psychoanalysts and historians (most of them have been previously engaged in psychohistorical research). Such initiatives — not necessarily representing views of the officers and trustees of the Association — are nonetheless "... considered a substantive contribution to the ongoing analysis and evaluation of problems, programs, issues and practices in a given area..." (p. 2). Although formally the report was addressed to members of American Psychiatric Association, one could hardly miss its significance for all interested in psychohistory and political psychology.

> ... to rise above his personal values and political biases. [...] Indeed, one could hypothesize that in some instances they may damage the public interest.[60]

Although the publication paid lip service to a potential scholarly value of any psychohistorical studies as "enhancing the knowledge of mankind" and avoided unequivocal conclusions, it evidently seemed to recommend studies focused on past events and processes — as the ones more distanced. In other words, it has argued for psychohistory as an another "cold" academic discipline which would kept itself apart from "hot" contemporary issues.[61] Such warnings and admonitions remained in tune with the views of those who wished the psychohistory to be safely anchored within academia. In particular, it refers to these psychohistorians who came to it form history and would like to do psychohistory as a part of historiography. One is not surprised then finding similar attitudes expressed in psychohistorical papers on methodology written by professional historians. Thomas Kohut (a historian with additional clinical training!) wrote:

> In writing about the psychological in history, the historian should relay neither on the psychohistorical method nor on unsubstantiated psychological speculation. Historians need to exercise the same rigorous scholarship writing about history's psychological dimension that they exercise in writing about other aspects of the past. In other words, the historian should write [...] history that is knowledgeable about people, that is psychologically sophisticated but history that is history through and through. [...] Psychohistory will be history and psychohistorians will be historians once again.[62]

Ultimately, to embrace the identity of a professional historian — a distanced student of the past — means to repress and deny the competing identity of a therapeutic scholar.[63] This explains why the whole issue of therapeutic function of psychohistory remains for the most part the domain of those of its adherents who (1) are less strongly tied to academia and (2) have clinical competence. More strongly a given psychohistorian identified himself/herself with the community of academic historians, less willing he was to dwell on this delicate matter. Evidently, it was one of the most troublesome elements of the legacy of psychoanalysis inherited by psychohistory, the one which seemed to threaten the core of the ethos of professional historian. It is quite understandable then, that historians turned psychohistorians, who have been striving to legalize their studies within historiography, wished to hide this irritating inheritance. However, this task has remained unfeasible and in the eyes of many prominent historians psychohistory — as an approach engaged in

---

[60] Ibidem, p. 9–12.

[61] For the criticism of the report voiced by an eminent psychohistorian see R. Binion: [rec.: *The Psychiatrist as Psychohistorian...*] "Psychohistory Review" vol. 5, 1977, p. 44–45; for the response of "radicals" see P. Elovitz, *Comment*, "The Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 5, 1978 no. 3, p. 422–424.

[62] Th. Kohut, *Psychohistory as History*, "American Historical Review" vol. 91, 1986 no. 2, p. 353. For other instructive examples of such attitude see S. Friedländer, *History and Psychoanalysis. An Inquiry into the Possibilities and Limits of Psychohistory*, Holmes & Meier, New York–London 1978; P. Gay, *Freud for Historians*, Oxford University Press, New York–Oxford 1985.

[63] An interesting and insightful personal record of this struggle could be find in D. Beisel, *From History to Psychohistory: A Personal Journey*, "The Journal of Psychohistory" vol. 6, 1978 no. 1, p. 1–65. The author has been trained as a historian of modern Germany to become a close collaborator of Lloyd deMause and the editor of "The Journal of Psychohistory".

changing the world for the better — has remained suspicious. In consequence, they have come to associate it with traditions of left-wing social movements and political protests of 1960's and 1970's. John Walkup has vividly captured this attitude:

> Ask a historian in mid-career to reminisce about the heyday of psychohistory and you are likely to see him (or, more rarely, her) step out of his detached professional role. He will struggle manfully to suppress a grimace [...] Rightly or wrongly, today's feelings about psychohistory overlap with feelings about the sixties so that the two are difficult to untangle. True believers in the ethos of the decade emerged from it embittered, repentant, or still embattled. Those who opposed that ethos watched in triumph or relief as it was abandoned...[64]

Thus, the therapeutic stance of psychohistorians has greatly contributed, after initial success of psychohistory, to the fact that this paradigm has become marginalized within the academic historiography. Paradoxically, at the same time this therapeutic stance has made possible for psychohistory to expand outside academia and to attract many non-academics who would like not only study our world but to change existing human relations for the better.

HISTORIAN AS A SOCIAL PSYCHOTHERAPIST (ETHICAL ASSUMPTIONS OF PSYCHOHISTORICAL WRITINGS)

Summary

The Author discusses the ethical foundations of psycho-historical paradigm in history. This paradigm enriches history with the idea of a special social function. Psycho-historians carried out their work with the conviction of the meaning and social value of their research. They viewed themselves as psychotherapists against the human irrational attitudes, the aggression and destruction, which they saw as inherent part of historical sciences. Psycho-historians adopted for their needs various elements of psychoanalytical methodology, as well as ethic foundations from psychoanalysts' practice. Author's arguments are supported with numerous examples. Concluding, he states that the therapeutic inclinations of psychohistory resulted in it being pushed outside the closed circle of 'scholarly' history, what did not prevent psycho-historians from becoming active outside it.

[64] J. Walkup, *Why Is Most Psychohistory So Bad?*, "Southwest Review" vol. 73, 1988 no. 3, p. 405. For much more sympathetic (but still critical) treatment of the issue see L. Perry, *Has Psychohistory Come of Age?*, "History Teacher" vol. 20, 1987 no. 3, p. 401–423.