help fill existing gaps in knowledge, that provide additional anchors for evaluating the accuracy of information yielded by more revere research methods, and that identify important issues and unresolved problems.

We also tend to ignore or reject research that yields findings that threaten established practices and views of the world. Cradles of Eminence certainly does this. One criticism of the book is that the simple of eminent persons included such despised characters as Mussolini, Hitler, and Trujillo. Perhaps this reminds us too forcefully of the frightening fact that the gifted child is potentially an awesomely powerful force that can become destructive or constructive. This fact should make us aware of the dangers in popular arguments that gifted children need no special services and that if they have a spark of creativity it will come out regardless of neglect, rejection, and coercion. If this creativity learns only to fight, however, there is a danger that it will be lost, or become destructive.

Many find it difficult to accept the findings that eminent persons that are highly opinionative, have failure-prone fathers, are from both troubled and not-so-troubled homes, experience considerable psychological discomfort during childhood, and dislike school. Many of them took “time out from school” and this seemed to serve as a key to future achievement. Many were regarded by their teachers as mentally retarded. Some were outstanding in one field and solved problems. There may be some psychologists who could (or would) lose interest in such a search for they may be (or are) committed to a science that is accurate but valueless, or at least Godless, though the two are not the same. But there seems to be a growing number of persons (if the titles of papers presented at APA each Labor Day weekend are representative) who are concerned with the implications of their own assumptions and who seek areas of experience relatively inaccessible to “the profane man.” One possible result of this newer openness is to minimize the treatment of a scientific account of experience “as if” it were itself sacred or religious or metaphysical.

Awareness, Goodness

Erich Fromm, Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen


Reviewed by John M. Vayhinger

Erich Fromm, Professor at the National University of Mexico and world-renowned teacher of psychoanalysis, received his PhD from the University of Heidelberg, studied at the Berlin Psychiatric Institute and left Germany in 1933. Now, for eight months of the year he trains analysts in Mexico City; the remainder of the year he spends lecturing in the U.S. and Europe. Most of his many books are well known. The reviewer, John Monroe Vayhinger, received an MA and PhD from Columbia University in experimental and clinical psychology and the BD and MA from Drew University in theology and philosophy. He is an ordained Methodist minister and has served for 12 years as pastor and for 21 years as Army Chaplain. His varied teaching experience includes six years as Professor of Pastoral Psychology and Counseling at Garrett Theological Seminary at Northwestern University, and he is currently Professor of the Psychology of Religion and Pastoral Counseling at Iliff School of Theology in Denver.

Many scientists, concerned with man as man, today recognize that the goals they seek through their science, have in this century been radically changed, even sometimes made wilde, by their methods when, as scientists, they have shifted their basic values and beliefs away from religious views formerly held. Now, in “Religious Perspectives,” Ruth Nanda Anshen is editing a series dedicated to a “quest for the rediscovery of man,” with the hope that this rediscovery may result in “the rediscovery of God.”

There may be some psychologists who could (or would) lose interest in such a search for they may be (or are) committed to a science that is accurate but valueless, or at least Godless, though the two are not the same. But there seems to be a growing number of persons (if the titles of papers presented at APA each Labor Day weekend are representative) who are concerned with the implications of their own assumptions and who seek areas of experience relatively inaccessible to “the profane man.” One possible result of this newer openness is to minimize the treatment of a scientific account of experience “as if” it were itself sacred or religious or metaphysical.

With little or no “evangelistic fervor” the Series seeks merely to explore a reality which has, in its own words, “timeless existence or is, added to that which is illusory or ephemeral.” Now to the present book, The Heart of Man.

Man’s inhumanity to man has been a source of concern to men of good will for as long as man has had a history and probably before. Fromm, a psychologist to the present age, develops his former concern over man’s escape into conformity and takes up an analysis of man’s destructive impulses, though in many an exaggerated generalization.
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Two Legitimate Hybrids

Paul A. Dewald

Reviewed by William F. Soskin

The author, Paul A. Dewald, is a physician whose principal position is that of Director of the Treatment Service of the Psychoanalytic Foundation of St. Louis, a low-cost psychoanalytic treatment center. He has just been elevated to the position of Training Analyst by the Chicago Institute of Psychoanalysis, where he is a faculty member; he is also Assistant Professor of Clinical Psychiatry at Washington University School of Medicine. The reviewer, William F. Soskin, is Research Psychologist, Office of Planning, NIMH. He did his graduate work at Harvard and the University of Michigan, taking his degree at the latter in 1948. He has taught at Michigan, Harvard, and the University of Chicago, following at all three places his general research interests in personality and behavior change. His more specific concerns have focused on psychotherapy, on interpersonal communication, on Federal research policy and the organization of science. He has time and energy to concern himself as well with the Negro "revolt," and with the execution of abstract paintings.

PLUS ça change, plus c'est la même chose. Alphonse Karr's enigmatic observation of a century ago is usually cited as a wry commentary on the rarity of innovation. It can also be read as the confession of an inability to recognize increments of change when they occur.

Psychoanalysis—the entire enterprise, theory as well as practice—has been criticized for its orthodoxy, for its failure to grow and change, to be modified by the insights and experiences of its own practitioners. But of course it has changed, significantly, both in theory and practice. The elaboration of ego psychology is only one instance of the former; a book like Dewald's is one evidence of the latter.

Even 25 years ago the chief concern of the main body of psychoanalysts was with psychoanalysis, the orthodox. couch-centered, free-associating, id-uncovering, dream-interpreting fifteen-minute hour and four-or-five-day-a-week variety. This was what the literature and dialogue were mainly about; this was what the masters practiced and what candidates aspired to.

But patients suitable for analysis are few and those affluent enough are fewer still, whereas there is very great public pressure for help for persons who could never be regarded as potential anal-lyands. Hence, while formal theory and orthodox practice were being perfected out of experience with a select group of private patients, novices in their psychiatric residencies were seeing a quite different group of patients under quite different circumstances. Whatever they may have been learning about formal psychoanalytic theory and orthodox psychoanalytic practice, those residents are analytically-oriented psychiatrists depart.
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