

though psychoanalysts sketched the contours of a pre-Oedipal period of fusion with the mother as early as the 1920s, it was not until second-wave feminists mounted a thoroughgoing critique of Freud's androcentrism in the 1970s that the wide-ranging theoretical implications of the missing mother began to emerge. Whitebook builds on these critiques, amplifying them by locating the roots of Freud's perspective in his early, traumatic experience of his own distant, distracted, and psychically unavailable mother. "The father complex" may have been official Freudian dogma; the split-off "maternal dimension" that haunts the analytic project is here expertly plumbed (9–10).

Exploring his other theme of the "break with tradition," Whitebook situates Freud biographically in the dislocations of modernity—secularization, urbanization—while rejecting Freud's own, and previous biographers', characterization of him as an avatar of the Enlightenment. Whitebook casts him rather as a "dark enlightener," expositor of a more conflicted and "tragic yet still emancipatory tradition" who was yet unable to fully integrate the irrational (associated with early experience) in his thinking (11–12). His inner world roiled by the "daemon of creative speculation" (quoting Ernest Jones on 95), Whitebook's young Freud is a passionate, half-mad explorer, his susceptibility to the fascinations of charismatic others (most important among them his epistolary intimate, the Berlin-based otolaryngologist Wilhelm Fliess) fueling his signal "discoveries"—of fantasy and psychic reality (216), and of the dream as the royal road to the unconscious. Whitebook's more mature Freud tempers his passions and better manages his attachments, evincing a disdain for the helplessness and dependency that were his lot in the last decade of his life, during which he underwent a succession of surgeries for cancer of the jaw. This disdain informs Freud's famous contention that religion is, at base, a system of illusion, or beliefs informed by the wish for omnipotence—and the father's protection—rooted in the infant's original impotence and reawakened by the onslaughts individuals endure throughout their lives.

This is not Freud for beginners. The reader somewhat familiar with the contours of Freud's life and thought will profit most from reading it, as will those seeking clarity on some of the knottiest theoretical issues in psychoanalysis, both historically and today. The chapters on Freud's negotiation of his "official" and "unofficial" positions and on the Freudian concept of the death instinct are first-rate intellectual history, and Whitebook's treatment of Freud's take on religion is exemplary. Whitebook positions himself in the crowded field of Freud biographies closer to the orthodoxy of Peter Gay's magisterial *Freud: A Life for Our Time* (1988), which gives us a thoroughly Enlightenment Freud, than to the revisionism of Louis Breger's provocative and trauma-focused *Freud: Darkness in*

*the Midst of Vision* (2000), despite Whitebook's own extended focus on the traumas of Freud's upbringing. Asking Google whether Freud is dead will yield you over seventeen million hits. Better to spend some time with Whitebook's Freud, who is very much alive in all his brilliant, passionate, and contradictory humanity.

ELIZABETH LUNBECK  
Harvard University

ADI GORDON. *Toward Nationalism's End: An Intellectual Biography of Hans Kohn*. (The Tauber Institute Series for the Study of European Jewry.) Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2017. Pp. xii, 328. Paper \$40.00, e-book \$39.99.

One of the most striking photos illustrating Adi Gordon's well-written and satisfying biography *Toward Nationalism's End: An Intellectual Biography of Hans Kohn* depicts Kohn on the beach, probably in Tel Aviv in the late 1920s, in full suit and tie with dress shoes, bending down to pose with his toddler-age son while appropriately attired beachgoers look on. Kohn appears hot and uncomfortable. The sun beats down on his furrowed brow. He is out of place. The image sets the mood for Gordon's chapter on Kohn's break with Zionism, which traces with care Kohn's despair upon his "[recognition that] this path was wrong" and examines the "political and intellectual crisis" that marked his crucial pivot away from Zionism and toward his development as a groundbreaking scholar of comparative nationalism (144).

Kohn is indeed most well known for his field-defining work *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background* (1944), in which he introduces his theories on civic (i.e., Western, liberal, Enlightenment, positive) and ethnic (i.e., Eastern, organic, Romantic, negative) nationalism, nationalism's modernity, and nationalism's constructed nature. Critiqued by subsequent scholars of nationalism as being Eurocentric, as lacking attention to premodern varieties, as offering too simplistic a dichotomy between civic and ethnic nationalism, and as constrained in his understanding by liberal thought patterns, Kohn's work was seen as outdated when nationalism studies boomed in the 1990s. For all his importance in laying out the theoretical parameters of the field, Kohn's work did not, as Gordon puts it, stand the test of time. Gordon offers up the following argument for this state of affairs: "Kohn's dichotomy could not have been purely academic but rather was ultimately grounded—for better or worse—in a personal political commitment to liberalism" (6). Gordon reveals the broad intersection of Kohn's life experiences and thought in this biographical study, and he shows how Kohn's ideological immersions and political engagement both inescapably drew on and built up concepts of nation and nationalism.

Kohn was formed in the fecund intellectual environ-

ment of early twentieth-century Prague, where as a student at the German-language division of the then bifurcated German-Czech Charles-Ferdinand University he found a home for his convictions in the cultural Zionist Bar Kochba Association for internal Jewish spiritual renaissance. But he soon found himself a prisoner of war in revolutionary Russia before going on to engage as an advocate for a binational Palestine; he then turned to liberal nationalism after the rise of Nazi Germany, and finally, as a Cold Warrior, he served the promise of the triumphant North Atlantic “West.” Gordon confesses in his bold afterword that “witnessing the way the twentieth century repeatedly shattered [Kohn’s] worldview and forced him to retheorize nationalism furnished me with a greater understanding of how encounters with history change our worldviews (mine included) even when sensibilities and thought patterns persist” (256). It is this earnestness of observation that sets the volume apart.

Gordon’s clear-sighted study draws on vast archival research in the United States (where Kohn largely deposited his papers), in Israel, and in Denmark; he looks at sources in German, Hebrew, and English, and the work is supported by a close reading of Kohn’s prolific oeuvre. The biography is organized into three parts, each representing a major ideological “shattering” and turn. There is much here of interest for students of comparative nationalism, nationalism theory, twentieth-century intellectual history, and the peripatetic twentieth-century Jewish experience. Part 1, “Authenticity and Political Ruin, 1908–1920,” explores the relationship between Kohn’s youthful engagement with Prague cultural Zionism and his wartime experience in the First World War with the development of his insistence on national coexistence. Kohn grew to understand the nation-state, in concept and manifestation, as the perversion of nationalism—a concept he continued to view positively for his entire life. It was the political nation-state, not nationalism as an authentic expression of cultural identity, that was the root of war. He held on to a vision of a multiethnic Habsburg federation based on the Austromarxist idea of non-territorial personal autonomy beyond the last gasps of the Habsburg Monarchy. Kohn determined that political justice must be “the ultimate yardstick” of Jewish nationalism, and, as such, only a binational state in Palestine would be acceptable (quoted on 70).

Part 2, “Separating Nation and State, 1919–1934,” examines how Kohn’s rejection of the nation-state led inevitably to his painful break with Zionism “once he concluded that Zionism would henceforth aspire to nothing but a Jewish nation-state” (94). He stepped down from his position in the Zionist Keren Hayesod in 1929, and from the binationalist Brith Shalom in 1930, when he anguished that the latter had simply “become a propagandistic fig leaf for political Zionism, imparting a dovish appearance to the movement” (149). History

favored Kohn with a position at Smith College in the fateful year 1933, and he left Palestine for good.

Gordon examines Kohn’s dramatic about-face in favor of the nation-state, liberal nationalism, capitalism, and individualism in part 3, “An Affirming Flame, 1933–1971”—a reversal catalyzed by the Nazi rise to power and his move to the United States. Traumatized by Britain and France’s abandonment of Czechoslovakia at Munich, Kohn devoted himself to rescuing family and friends. “The League of Nations,” Gordon writes, reflecting on Kohn’s *Force or Reason: Issues of the Twentieth Century* (1937), “was not defeated by the aggressors but by its ostensible defenders” (183). Post-war, at the height of his influence, Kohn legitimized the nation-state as the hallmark of westernization and modernization, advocated for West German reeducation, and after internal struggle, concluded that communism was “an ideology in the service of Russian and Chinese nationalism” (quoted on 223). He believed in progress and in an integrated North Atlantic West. By the early 1960s, the scholarly community found Kohn to be a Cold War conformist whose work had become shallow and insincere.

Gordon opens his afterword with Samuel Hugo Bergmann’s comment that “there is a lesson to be learned from [Kohn],” but asks what lesson that may be (quoted on 254). The world is in flux, times change, ideologies are but political myth, and nationalism remains—as Gordon fittingly puts it—a “Sisyphean struggle” (256).

REBEKAH KLEIN-PEJŠOVÁ  
Purdue University

TIMOTHY J. SHANNON. *Indian Captive, Indian King: Peter Williamson in America and Britain*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2018. Pp. viii, 343. Cloth \$39.95.

Peter Williamson was kidnapped from his Pennsylvania home by Indians in the fall of 1754. He suffered unspeakably brutal torture at the hands of his native captors for months, during which he witnessed the ruthless murder of innocent colonial families and underwent relentless psychological trauma from the threats of those who seemed only a moment away from ending him. He labored as little more than a pack mule as he carried supplies for the Indians during their vicious raids on the colonial frontier. Finally, the naked and starving Williamson managed to slip past his Indian masters, hiding in a hollowed-out tree to evade their pursuit. This Indian captivity tale became the core of Williamson’s later dramatic reenactments—in “Indian” dress no less—in front of British audiences. It was also the crux of the vivid and powerful autobiography that he sold alongside his theatrical performances, which was first printed in England in 1757 as *French and Indian Cruelty*. And after the initial printing, Williamson’s traumatic experiences