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In the following paper an attempt is made to discuss briefly some of the controversial points in the theoretical formulations of Géza Róheim, in conjunction with some of his supporting data. Róheim came to psychoanalysis from anthropology. Having earned his Ph. D. at the University of Budapest, he began his professional career in 1911, working in the Folklore Department of the Hungarian National Museum. Already as early as 1915 he published his first paper of psychoanalytic interest. In his own words:

"The writer of this article was the first anthropologist who fully accepted the psychoanalytic method. This was in several papers in the Hungarian anthropological publication "Ethnographica" (the first of which was published in 1915), in German in the "Imago", and in book form (Giegelzauber, 1919) and in English in the "International Journal of Psychoanalysis."

During that period also, it seems, Róheim became a practising lay analyst and thus he was able to combine his insight gained into individuals in his own culture with his knowledge of ethnographic materials. He had early become interested in Australian ethnography, and his first book, Social Anthropology is essentially an interpretative study of Australian totemism and it contains a great deal of comparative material from ethnography and folklore the world over. This work was based exclusively on the data accumulated in the field by others—in the manner of the older anthropologists. In 1928, however, Marie Bonaparte, Princess George of Greece, offered to finance a three year expedition for Róheim and he proceeded to verify his hypotheses on the basis of first hand materials. He chose to go to Australia, since he had already accumulated a great deal of information about them, and for an important theoretical reason also: he regarded them as the most primitive human group living; he chose Normanby Island to check Malinowski's contention that the 'edipus complex is absent in matrilineal societies and finally he started the field trip by visiting Somaliland, having made a preliminary study of a large number of Somali living in Budapest.
at the time. On the return end of the trip via the U.S. Röheim spent some time with the Yuma Indians. Altogether then his three year field expedition was spent with a total of four widely different groups. The first results of this extended field trip were presented in a series of lectures delivered in the U.S. in 1931. These, together with several articles indicating in an exploratory manner the preliminary outcome of the expedition were published in 1932 as a special issue of the International Journal of Psychoanalysis. Since then Röheim has published several books in addition to a large number of articles in various psychological and anthropological journals in several European countries and in the U.S. In 1936 the Riddle of the Sphinx was published containing some of the theoretical results of especially the Australian field work, including however comparative data from other areas, including Central European folklore, as well as case material from the individual psychoanalysis of European patients. This method of presentation utilizing illustrations from a variety of divergent sources might be considered quite typical of Röheim's writings. The Origin and Function of Culture appeared in 1943 and the Eternal Ones of the Dream in 1945. The former deals with a theoretical discussion of the ontogenetic theory of culture, which is based in part on the author's field work and which was already discussed as early as the Riddle of the Sphinx. The book also deals with the concrete application of the ontogenetic theory to specific aspects of culture, such as economic life. The Eternal Ones of the Dream, Röheim's latest book to date, is a presentation of Australian mythology, totemic and initiation rites, and an attempted analysis of their libidinal content and symbolic significance. It incorporates the revision of the author's views on these subjects since the publication of his Social Anthropology. We shall return later on to a more detailed discussion of these subjects.
In spite of the impressive number of works that Böheim has published since 1922, he still feels that, after 15 years, he has not as yet completed the presentation of his theoretical and observational material derived from his field work. As far as the latter are concerned, that is certainly the case, for nowhere does he offer the reader a systematic exposition of his observations that would indicate the basis of some of his conclusions. A remark may here be in place concerning Böheim's style, which, perhaps is to be considered in part responsible for the misunderstandings of, and opposition to, many of his formulations. Böheim seems to use as his medium in most of his writings unrevised free association. It is not always clear whether he is quoting an Australian or an analysand in Budapest. He speaks of one thing and draws conclusions with reference to another, thus giving the impression of a complete non sequitur.

Another matter which is perhaps not altogether a question of style is Böheim's usage of psychoanalytic vocabulary and phraseology at several levels of abstraction to the detriment to the clarity of his exposition.

The aim that Böheim set himself in his field work seems to have been the empirical checking of the hypotheses postulated by Freud in Totem and Taboo - the relation between primitives and neurotics, the question of evolution and the universality of the psychic mechanisms assumed by psychoanalysts. He attempted to close the gap which "had made itself felt in psycho-analytic ethnology, since psychoanalysts have never been in a position to gather ethnological observations in the field." Böheim attacked this problem through a variety of approaches: he collected and analyzed the folklore and mythology of the people, as well as their dreams and associations to these dreams, which compared interestingly to the mythology of the group. He studied their ceremonies; he observed individuals in action, questioned them and finally he observed their children. He observed the play of the children informally as well as utilizing upon occasion a form of play technique, adapted from Melanie Klein, which in-
volved the use of a number of European toys.

Although "Roheim's orientation is strictly a psychoanalytic one, he is well aware of the many trends in modern anthropology—not only those concerning the study of personality and culture—and he makes frequent references to the most recent investigations of other workers. Thus he states in the preface to his latest book that he has revised his opinion on the historical relationship between the Australian tribes, referring to the work of Radcliffe-Brown and Davidson. Although he is critical of other workers with less clearly defined orthodox analytic orientation, be it Malinowski, Margaret Mead or Kardiner, he is aware and appreciative of their contributions. Furthermore, it is perhaps noteworthy as a mark of Roheim's scientific integrity that, as a result of his field work, he has been willing to revise some of his earlier views, based on Freud.

The most notable of these deals with the development of his ontogenetic theory of the lack of culture and the finding of a latency period among the Central Australians. In connection with the observation that Roheim is well acquainted with the findings of other workers, it might be mentioned that certain distortions of their materials do sometimes occur in his utilization of their work. Whether these distortions are purely a matter of negligence or not need not be discussed here.

Whatever one's personal evaluation and appreciation of Roheim's contribution be, there is no question today that he represents an important point of view in the field; even if his work can not be accepted in toto, the questions raised by him must be considered seriously by modern anthropology. There seems to be no disagreement in this among all the reviewers read, whether psychologists, psychoanalysts or anthropologists. Some of the anthropologists (notably Mead and Fowdenmaker), who are themselves greatly influenced by psychoanalysis, make definite reservations in their appreciation. Let us attempt then, to state briefly Roheim's theoretical contributions.
It has already been noted that an important part of Höflm's field experience was gained in Australia and that the results from that area have been given most attention by him in his theoretical formulations. It is, therefore, the Australian examples that we shall draw upon to illustrate his theory. Having realized that differences in psychological make-up exist not only intra-culturally but inter-culturally as well, Höflm attempts to account for this phenomenon. Thus he states:

"What I believe is that there is such a thing as a group character, and that it is based on the collective sublimation of customary traumas, although of course not without individual variations from the standard type. A primitive society might be defined as a society in which these deviations are small, i.e., in which the behavior of the parents is more uniform than in an advanced society."

And again:

"If we can show that a specific traumatic situation is bound to occur in the infancy of the average member of the primitive tribe we have found a new clue, perhaps the most important clue, to the development of national character."

And in another context he states briefly:

"(The ontogenetic theory states) that the character of a group, like that of an individual, is determined by the infantile situation and that variations in primitive cultures were due to variations in the infantile situation."

These quotations embody the essence of Höflm's ontogenetic theory of culture which views culture generically as resulting from man's delayed infancy and "group character" from the sublimation of the infantile trauma typical for each particular culture. Man's delayed infancy is a product of the process of biological evolution and Höflm takes pains to show this. Höflm is aware of his divergence from Freud in his postulation of the ontogenetic theory, although he is willing to follow Freud in his belief in the "Primal Horde" theory of the origin of culture, at least part of the way. As Höflm himself summarizes it:

"...it (the social organization of the primordial horde) consisted of a strong old male living with a harem and with his sons until they are grown up. Then the jealous sire drives the sons out of the horde and as long as he can remains solelord of the harem. Later they unite their efforts against him, kill him, then fight it out among themselves with one of them remaining master of the situation. This is repeated again and again till gradually in post-mortem obedience to their father's will, the brothers acquire a conscience and forbid themselves to do what their father would
not have them do, viz., marry their mother and kill any member of their own group. This taboo has been inherited in what has been termed a racial unconscious and forms the basic element in human conflict.

Now I still believe Freud was right in his assumption and that human beings probably lived in the primal horror of Freud's Totem and Taboo. But what I find unnecessary is the daring hypothesis of the racial unconscious and instead I attempt to base our understanding of human nature on man’s delayed infancy.

It is interesting to notice that it is precisely this part of the theory, the inheritance of the racial unconscious, that Freud felt least sure of himself.

Thus in Moses and Monotheism he finds it necessary to defend his position at some length against the doubts raised by the biological evidence against the inheritance of acquired characteristics.

As far as Riehl’s acceptance—in part—of the primal horror theory is concerned, we must note the following. First of all, he points out that that type of social organization must have existed for a very long time, over and over again, and that this probably took place among our prehuman ancestors. He therefore discusses at great length the data reported by Washburn and others on the behavior of infra-human primates and finds that they bear out his hypotheses. Furthermore, contrary to Freud, he feels that the specific ontogenetic trauma must be experienced by each individual. It is a trauma in the life of the individual—not in the history of the species. On such a basis of logic as well as on the basis of biological evidence he also rejects—as tentatively—as Verhulst’s theory of the relation between the ice age and the fact of the latency period in the lives of individuals. He says: “so far, words have seduced us into treating peoples as super-individuals and hunting for traumas in their early history.” To Riehl, the origin of culture is:

“...delayed infancy and its function is security. It is a huge network of more or less successful attempts to protect mankind against the danger of object loss, the colossal efforts made by a baby who is afraid of being left alone in the dark.

Furthermore, we find not only delayed infancy but also a development of genital sexuality which is premature in relation to the development of the body as a whole and to the development of the individual’s ego. It is the disproportionate
rates of development which are responsible for the development of the Oedipus complex. These basic causes being biologically determined, Söheim holds the Oedipus complex of necessity to be generically human. Since, on the basis of what is thus given generically and biologically, parents in different cultures do treat their children differently, we find what Söheim calls "ontogenetic traumata." These are thus not only the basis for the formation of a group character but also for the culture as a whole, the culture of each group being, as we have seen above, interpreted as the sublimation of the specific typical trauma. Thus where Freud believes that infantile traumata underlie individual neuroses, Söheim believes that it is these very same traumata which underlie cultural differences.

Söheim goes so far as to speak of "culture as collective neurosis." This neurosis, however, would appear unavoidable by the very nature of human nature, given what Söheim considers to be biologically determined.

It will be easier to discuss the merits and flaws of Söheim's theory if we first inspect it at hand of an example of application. Let us take the case of his most extensive group analysis, namely the case of the Central Australians. Söheim starts out with the assumption that the Oedipus complex and the trauma associated with the child's observation of the 'primal scene' are universal. There is no question of weaning in Australia, nor of harsh phallic control, and as a result Söheim states that the Australian is essentially an oral character, while anal character formations are entirely absent. Thus the two levels of pregenital sexuality, which so very characteristically are traumatic in the experience of the western child, are not dangerous at all to the Australian child. In contrast to European society, the trauma typical of Australia is not one of deprivation and harshness but one of over-satisfaction which is threatening. It is the custom of the Central Australian mother to sleep on her son up to the age of 8 or 9. Söheim points out that this is the closest any human being anywhere gets to the fulfillment
of his Oedipus wishes. However, the libidinal desires invoked in this situation are too great for the child's immature ego and thus the inability to meet the situation involves an implicit threat of castration. It is with this threat from the woman that the child must cope. To Šőheim, the myths of the alknarintja women are the result of this Oedipus situation which involves overfulfillment.

According to Aranda belief and tradition there is a category of women called alknarintja—'eyes turned away.' These are the women who will not look at men, who are 'wild' and run away at the sight of a male being. It is the greatest ambition and achievement of an Aranda if he can either by magic or sheer force subdue one of these women into obedience. This, however, is not the entire story:

When we were talking about dreams and their interpretation, Wolfa, a Ngatatara man, and Urunukakun, a Yuma, both told me that if you dream of an alknarintja woman approaching, you must speedily awake. Why? Because she will make a man lie on his back and she will then sit on his penis. The alknarintja then cohabits with the man, but she takes the role of the male and makes the men play the part of the female.

Šőheim concludes on the basis of associated materials that the alknarintja women towards whom the Australians have such strong ambivalent feelings are the representatives of the mother—the "phallic" mother who lies on her son. As a result of the entire situation:

We begin to feel how powerful an influence the mother exercises on the development of the child, and we get a glimpse of patriarchal society arising as a wall of defense against this influence.

A further important consequence, according to Šőheim, of this particular type of Oedipus situation, is the fact that no latency period was found in their children. This lack of a latency period would indicate a very superficial repression of the Oedipus situation. Whatever the facts of the case may be, we must note Šőheim's definition of latency in this discussion:

...for we may confidently affirm that there is no latency period in the life of these people, no period in which they do not make more or less successful attempts at coitus. If this is the case...
it must be assumed that the difference lies in the ego-reaction to the parental castration threat... Repression is a relatively superficial phenomenon as compared with what it is in civilization. The phallic organization is not submerged in the latency period, it survives into adult age with all its characteristic features. The penis is a spear or knife, love is violence and the repression of the Œdipus fixation is merely superficial.

Passage to adulthood involves strong identification with the father in the exclusively male ritual involving group masturbation, circumcision, subincision and other rites the latent libidinal contents of which Röheim interprets to be intercourse. The symbol of these ceremonies, the clitorus, is the subconscious representation of the phallus. To Röheim subincision represents the addition of vagina onto the penis—thus the turning from the "phallic" mother to the "vaginal" father.

Thus Röheim builds all of Australian characterstructure, as well as the entire culture, out of the infantile trauma—the situation in which the mother sleeps on her son. However, this is only one trauma where one would assume on the basis of Röheim's data that many others would occur. Thus Röheim discusses the existence of cannibal demons in the mythology of the Central Australians, and in his explanatory elucidation mentions the fact that infanticide combined with cannibalism actually does occur in Australia. This danger of being literally eaten would appear to be traumatic, at least to the naive reader; but Röheim mentions these facts only tangentially without going into greater detail. Since this question of cannibalism and infanticide is little discussed in the literature it might be worth our while to investigate it a bit more closely here.

In the Riddle of the Sphinx Röheim quotes the myths of the cannibal demons of the Australians and indicates comparative materials from various parts of the world. He says that such beings can be found in all parts of the world. Elsewhere he explains this statement by saying: "It is the primary oral sadism cannibalism of the child that gives us the clue to the whole complex of Œdipus and the demon world." The implication appears to be that this "primary oral sadism"
is generically human. The sadism of the child is projected upon the parents and therefore the cannibal demons are to be interpreted as the father and mother image. And secondly, regardless of the loving kindness of the mother in any culture, there are of necessity traumata connected with her. In Australia Åheim also finds child cannibals, and this too is explained by the oral aggression of the child. Concretely, Åheim points out for Australia that:

"There is an element of truth in this projection, as there is in paranoid delusions, for the parents' infantile impulses are reawakened by contact with their children. Indeed there is more than an element of truth since the Australian parents actually do eat their children; though this happens is now seen to be more the effect than the cause of the belief in cannibalistic demons."

As for the interpretation of the cause of the oral anxiety involved, Åheim goes on by means of the explanation of a folk tale:

The mother gets up in the night and does something with a man whereby she becomes a hostile and cannibalistic being in the eyes of the child. When the spear penetrates her body she cries out: 'Penis head big!' In other words she becomes a cannibalistic monster because the father's spear disappears within her...

We shall return presently to the question of psychological interpretation raised here. Let us for a moment look more closely at the rather startling bit of ethnography involved here. Thus Åheim states flatly:

Among the Pithcuteren every other child is killed by his father, and eaten by his mother and the other children of the family. The Punupi, Yama, and Ngali of the north do much the same, except that they do not confine this practice to the odd or even child.

The fact that the father's kill the children and the mother and siblings eat them compares interestingly with Åheim's discussion of cannibalism and associated taboos in his Social Anthropology. There he quotes various authors, such as Spencer and Gillen and Somit on the existence of anthropophagy in Northern Australia. These sources discuss the limitations on cannibalism, e.g., fathers do not eat their sons and vice versa, while in other areas women are forbidden the eating of human flesh. Spencer and Gillen state that infanticide is extremely rare, but does occur when the mother is unable to care for
the child. Not only do Spencer and Gillen substantiate the findings with reference to infanticide, but also with reference to the eating of children:

In the Barmah tribe also young children are sometimes killed and eaten, and it is not an infrequent custom, when a child is in weak health, to kill a younger and healthy one and then feed the weakened on its flesh, the idea being that this will give the weak child the strength of the stronger one.

None of these authors however report the eating of children to be as much of a regularized institution as Böheim claims it to be, e.g., the eating of every other child among the Pitchetners. Böheim also quotes what would appear to be personal testimonials: it may be worthwhile to reproduce here his entire statement, including the rationalizations offered:

Fukutivare's wife Yankai had killed four of her children and each had been eaten by another brother. Thus Urukule, Jankiti, Aldinga, and a fourth child whose name was not mentioned because he was dead, each of them eaten one of their little brothers or sisters. Napana had given premature birth, and the embryo was eaten by her and her two daughters. The two daughters ate the arms, legs and the head and it was believed that this would make them grow up quickly. Then the women were questioned about this custom they said that hunger or 'flesh hunger' was the reason why the killed and ate their own children. The men took a more theoretical point of view and said that every second child was eaten in order to give the others double strength...Both explanations are on the line of oral ambivalence; the mother loves (or hates) her child so vehemently that she eats it, and the elder brother not only wishes to destroy but really eats his younger rival, at the same time identifying himself with his victim and thereby gaining double strength.

Böheim's explanation here would indicate an actual acting out of infantile fantasies in adult life; though he assumes the aggressive tendencies on the part of the child to be universal, they remain on the fantasy level elsewhere, their actual latent content being indicated only in a veiled fashion in the mythology. Presumably the original aggression is repressed and one might hypothesize that the actual acting out on the part of the Australians might be related to their lack of latency period, i.e., to their superficial repression of the Oedipus complex.
There is one problem in this connection to which Acheim does not
give the attention one would think it deserves: the reaction of the
individual to eating his siblings—to the knowledge of the cannibalistic
propensities of his parents. According to Acheim the knowledge of the
existence of cannibalism creates anxiety, which however is not important
even enough to affect character formation. Nor is there any evidence, from
Acheim's data, of a realistic fear that one might expect. There are only
the cannibal stories, which one might judge to be of the same intensity
of anxiety—of a socialized variety—as in cannibal tales recorded from
other areas of the world, where the fantasies are not actually acted out.

Another point, raised by Acheim, is the relationship between cannibal
fantasies and the trauma involved in the child's observation of the 'primal
scene.' As seen above (p.10), according to Acheim, an oral interpretation
is given by the Australians to the 'primal scene'—to sexual matters in
general. However, cannibal myths are found in other areas, where the do-
minant personality type is not necessarily oral. Just the same it would
appear that Acheim considers their original interpretation of the primal
scene universal—perhaps because the child at the time of the observation
finds itself at the oral stage. The oral interpretation would seem to
be connected with the original 'Oedipus history of the Primal 'or de la
Freud, for totemism is said to have originated with the eating of the father
by the sons.

We repeat then: Acheim's ontogenetic theory of culture, as illustrated
in his analysis of the Australian material, based on the crucial importance
attributed to one trauma of most decisive importance typical of a given
culture which determines the rest of the individuals' lives. In the case of
Australia it is the relation to the mother involving sexual contact; in the
case of Norway 'island it is the father's playful oral stimulation of the
boys penis. Were no trauma is present to form the basis of a certain kind of character structure, the realistic conditions of the external world will be powerless to change the individual's orientation. Thus the Austrailians are oral optimists there having been no trauma of weaning into their experience; as a result the very poor economic conditions are not able to break their faith in always being provided for. The pattern of life having been thus set by infantile experiences, all adult activities are sublimations of these, or their acting out on the fantasy level. Thus adults not only wanted to eat their mothers when they were children but when they get to be adults they do eat their own children. The same interpretation is given by Abbeim also to such activities as religion and economics.

Despite of this ontogentic theory of culture, which would appear to be complete as far as it goes, Abbeim has not been able to find a satisfactory answer to one question, nor has he beeen able to find anyone else's answer acceptable. It is this the question of the primacy of the individual over culture versus the primacy of the culture over the individual. He avoids the problem which appears to be a real one by calling it a "chicken and egg" question and resigns himself to finding equally significant and valid information regardless which and the question is attacked from. Thus we read:

Thus the hen (culture) come from the egg (childhood experience) or the egg from the hen? Do people develop in a particular way because of what happened to them in their childhood (psychosanalytic viewpoint)—or do parents behave in a particular way to their children because "society" or "culture" makes them do just these things (sociological viewpoint)?...This view (the priority of culture) has been presented with certain modification by Dr. Eardner. ...Dr. Eardner believes that a human being in every society finds himself confronted by certain basic disciplines, a set of institutions, a set of institutions to which he reacts in a certain way and in doing so becomes the author of another set of group phenomena.
To Åheim, "Kardiner's formulation evades the issue, for since neither Kardiner and his associates, nor Äheim himself claim environmental causes of cultural origins, the reasons for the variations found, for, in Äheim's terms, the trauma typical for each culture, is simply moved one step further into the past and no solution to the problem is approximated.

It would appear that this question which causes Äheim so much concern is essentially a false question. The "vicious circle" approach seems to ignore the very important factor of cultural change. If we could assume that parents treat their children as they do because they themselves have been treated in that particular way, we may never get the answer to our problem. Though we know little of the changes in the methods of child training of the Australians and though we may never find out, we do have such information from other parts of the world. Rapidly occurring acculturation of many native groups the world over, as well as the changing patterns in western culture itself, offer us a laboratory situation, in which we are enabled to study the relation between cultural dynamics, child training and character development.

The possibility of finding such a way out of the dilemma, however, is vitiated by Äheim's very concept of the importance of the single infantile trauma. For regardless of what happens to people during their life time, it is this initial trauma which is of major importance in the patterning of their lives.

To the present writer it would seem that fundamental changes in the entire pattern of a culture and child training in particular can occur only if important changes take place in the adults—at least with reference to their ego and to the objective conditions under which they live. Compare, for example, the current breakdown in western culture of the "intuitive approach" to raising children—the effect of "time consciousness"—of the mechanized and industrialized environment.

The fallacy of Äheim's approach appears demonstrated in the very simile of which he is so fond: the chicken and egg comparison. This may be a useful
figure of speech, but as is well known there is, scientifically, no question of
the priority of either involved; such a question would invoke a max max dem
ex machine and the query as to which was created first. On the contrary, we are
dealing here with an instance of gradual evolution through which we arrive at
the present forms. The very same is true of the development of human cultures,
which we know to be constantly changing. By assuming a process of cultural evolution,
one would think that Ahein must admit the existence of constant change.

Unless we can assume that adults are able to modify their behavior according to
the demands of the situations in which they find themselves, unless we can admit
that children are not necessarily brought up in a way identical to that in which
their parents were raised, we have no clue to cultural changes of any kind.

Nor are we able to explain inventiveness, or creative genius, but find ourselves
in the straight jacket of the infantile trauma which must, in identical fashion,
be repeated over and over again, once started. Ahein himself points out that
his theory explains cultural stability—but what about change? As a matter of
fact, the inadequacy of Ahein's approach goes a step further, for there is no
way to indicate by means of his theory, how the present patterns of culture,
including child training, became established, how the various cultures became
differentiated. Thus Ahein fails in explaining not only a specific culture,
but culture in general.

Be it noted here that we are not criticising Ahein for not providing us
with an answer, for much investigation remains as yet to be done. However,
criticism is here levelled against his formulation which would block the road
to further fruitful study of the possibility of cultural and characterological

 dynamics.
Appendix A

Reviews of Rèheim's writings:

**Riddle of the Sphinx**:

Margaret "and in Character and Personality", 1956, vol. 4, pp. 569-99

This is an extensive and careful review, though "and is critical of several points of method and of certain of Rèheim's concepts, she finds his work highly stimulating.

p. 86: "It will be readily from this summary how dysjunctive the argument is.

Nevertheless, although the Riddle of the Sphinx will probably not only not afford such illumination to a novice in the field, but indeed is likely to arouse very definite antagonism and to alienate research workers from its hypotheses, this reviewer believes, that in what it stands for and in the problems which it raises, it is a very important book and a valuable contribution in the borderline field between the two sciences."


"So criticism of this complex argument is here undertaken. It will depend upon the acceptance or rejection of the major premises how the reader evaluates this contribution to social anthropology."


Review by [q] *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 1936 (85) pp. 475-477 Very favorable. pp. 475:

"It is the most thoroughgoing and complete study of any in the psychoanalytic anthropological literature of the world."

Origin and Function of Culture

E. Powndermaker in *American Anthropologist*, 1945 (47) pp. 308-312

Although Rèheim's contribution is considered important there are several points to which exception is taken. Powndermaker emphasizes constant change in culture and denies that "we only grow up to remain children," as Rèheim claims.

'Women and their Life in Central Australia', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, vol. 63, 1956, pp. 207-265


Very favorable, though exception is taken to some of the interpretations. "This is the only one of Rèheim's writings that has been reviewed in Oceanica."

Social Anthropology - reviewed by M.S. Thomas in *Folk-lore*, 1935, pp. 208

Highly critical of "Primitivist" theory and Rèheim's attribution of that period to the higher ages.
Appendix B

Authenticity of quotations by Schein of other authors.

Approximately 20 citations from Social Anthropology, Origin and Function of Culture, and the Eternal Ones of the Dream were checked, all of them referring to questions of Australian ethnography. There was no actual distortion of content. In two cases there was credit given, but no quotation marks were included although the quote was a direct one rather than a rephrasing of the original statement. In two cases there were slight changes.

Inaccurate

Eternal Ones of the Dream, p. 8; citation from G. I. J. Keightley: "Landowners in Northern Aranda," Oceanica, vol. 6, pp. 355-45; Eternal Ones of the Dream, p. 73 inexact paraphrasing of Timbale: "Initiation in South Australia," Oceanica, 1935, vol. 6, pp. 316-3 These might be viewed as slight distortions. The actual changes that seem to occur are only matters of implication—i.e., via the content in which Schein places the cited materials, which are usually factual statements. Thus the implication is that the authors cited offer support to his interpretation, which is not the case at all.
Footnotes:

1. Footnote in: G. Schneir: "Racial Differences in Neuroses and Psychoses," Psychiatry, 1939(2) p. 374


3. New York, 1926


5. English: London 1954; German original: Das Rätsel der Sphinx, 1922

6. ibid. Author's foreword, p. 13

7. N.Y.

8. Mr.

9. N.Y.

10. Eternal Ones of the Dream, Introduction, p. iii

11. cf. especially Origin and Function of Culture, chap. 1, and discussion of Totemic Sites in Eternal Ones of the Dream

12. Ibid., p. 28


15. Eternal Ones of the Dream, p. iii

16. cf. appendix of this paper

17. Margaret Mead: Review of Riddle of the Sphinx, Character and Personality, 1932 (1933) vol. No. 35-36


20. IJPA, p. 93

21. Psychiatry, 1939, p. 275

22. Riddle of the Sphinx, passim, especially chapter on "the Problem of Human Origins"

23. Lorand, p. 383

24. It is to be noted that their view of Australian ritual and mythology and of mythology in general embodying this concept of the primal situation is crucial to Schneir's thinking. See The Riddle of the Sphinx and Animism, Magic and the Divine King.
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*see N.W. Thomas: Natives of Australia, p.178*"Near Adelaide, the children were regularly eaten in times of famine;"
Riddle of the Sphinx, p.169:

"I believe that every culture, or at least every primitive culture, can be max
reduced to a formula like a neurosis or a dream. Thus the Aranda are a
people who have repressed the 'allegorical situation' and, for this reason,
make a vagina on their penises (sublimation) and decorate their Lurumrasa
(penis symbol) with concentric circles (vagina symbols). Similarly, the
Nunngandga and Andamans (Maori) are always dividing food, because in their child-
hood they were seen by their fathers."

Lipsa, p.78

"...the Australian native has never undergone the trauma of being weaned.
The children will go on sucking as long as they like and will easily get
any other woman to let them do it if their own mother has no milk. There-
fore there is no oral character of the pesadistic type in Australian
Central Australia and we have no eternal grumblers, nobody who is always
being frightened or offended, ... The Australian native lives in an environment
that can hardly be called favorable... And yet nobody has ever heard that
an Australian native feels anxious about to-morrow's meal. Facts might
well justify such an attitude, but there is no basis for it in the libido
development. With such yielding mothers, we are all heroes."

Origin and Function of Culture, also by G. Rothem, "Racial Psychology and the

Psychiatry, op. cit.

Lorens, p.302

even Rothem admits that the mission children at Hermannsburg are different
from those who grow up in the bush. Lipsa, p.78

compare such studies as Eric Hambro-Erikson; "Notes on the "Education"
Journal of Oentral Psychology, 1939 1939

Such a process is assumed by Rothem very explicitly, cf. Riddle of the Sphinx
passim, also Lipsa pp.a-5

"A wide gulf divides the Australian from all other peoples (known to me);
only my friends of the Central Australian Desert can be described as
 primitives in the true sense of the word. They are seen as the absence of the latency period, relatively slight
 depth of regression with rapidly ensuing projection and total absence of the anal-reactive character formation. All other 'primitives' whom I know
(Somali, Fueg-Paelo-Malagos, Yana Indians) are closer to us psychologically
than to the Australians. However, there remain, with regard to these
people also, the dominating marks: the strength of their narcissism and
the absence of the sadomasochistic perversion... From primordial man to the
Pitchehants of Australia and from these again to the big capitalists of
New York mankind has gone through a long and laborious journey..."

M. Riddle of the Sphinx, p.170

The following attempted explanation (Riddle of the Sphinx, p.236) appears
entirely infeasible:
Riddle of the Sphinx, p. 170
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The following attempted explanation (Riddle of the Sphinx, p. 253) appears entirely insufficient: "The prolongation of the period of infancy is the cause of a trauma that is common to all mankind. Differentiation in the erotic play activities in different hordes has modified it and so produced the typical trauma and the specific cultures of different groups."