

Special issue

Papers from the conference ‘Psychotherapy and Liberation: The Legacy of May 68’, which took place at the Institute of Group Analysis in London on 2–4 May 2008.

Living Politics: Psychotherapies and Culture in a Globalized World

VICTOR JELENIEWSKI SEIDLER, Professor of Social Theory, Department of Sociology, Goldsmiths, University of London.

ABSTRACT *How can we open up a dialogue across generations that shares the experiences, memories and learnings of psychotherapy and sexual politics and ways these were lived in the libertarian politics of the 1970s? Exploring attempts at living politics and the attempts to create more equal relationships and engage critically with traditions of psychoanalysis and humanistic psychotherapies so that they could engage more directly with issues of class, race, gender and sexuality, I explore how concerns around masculinities proved vital in shaping new political imaginations. I go on to raise questions that might open up a dialogue across generations and so learn from the past so that different hopes can be created for the present. This means recognizing the prevalence of complex transnational identities produced through mass migrations that have helped shape multicultural cities and so call for different frameworks to understand relationships between the ‘psyche’ and the ‘social/political’ within a globalized world. Copyright © 2009 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

Key words: bodies, globalisation, masculinities, politics, psychotherapies, Red Therapy, sexualities, sexual psychoanalysis, transnational identities, traumatic histories

CHANGING WORLDS

As the excitements around the Paris events in 1968 and the new political and cultural vocabularies of Situationism that were in the air spread across the planet, there was a sense that the world could change radically and global resistance organized against the war in Vietnam. There was a utopian feeling that life could be transformed and that people could

Correspondence: Victor Jeleniewski Seidler, Professor of Social Theory, Department of Sociology, Goldsmiths, University of London, New Cross, London, SE14 6NW.
Email v.seidler@gold.ac.uk

take action to transform the unequal and unjust relations of a capitalist society. With the global media there was a visibility given to individual and collective action so that a sense of a global community of resistance that echoed in Mexico City and Sao Paulo, as well as in San Francisco and Bangkok. A generation was brought together around a sense that the world could change and that with our efforts it could change *now*. It was a politics of the will that inspired a political generation to believe that liberation as the struggle against global oppression could be realized. These hopes helped shape the experience of a generation and the ways in which they learnt to make connections across the personal and the political. They shaped a particular sensibility and as we reflect back over 40 years it can be helpful to question the cultural memories that it has shaped over time. (For some helpful reflection upon the events of 1968 and the ways they also drew upon the Civil Rights movement in the United States see, for instance, Rowbotham, 1983; Seidler, 1991; Bush, 1999; Kelly, 2002; Collier-Thomas and Franklin, 2003.)

Along with the challenges to United States global power there was a critique of forms of academic knowledge that seemed removed and unable to illuminate the realities of lived experience. There were demands to remake disciplinary knowledges and to revision relationships between theory and practice. There was a call in the late 1960s and early 1970s to learn from experience and with feminisms, black politics and gay liberation, a challenge to the rationalist universalisms that had framed disembodied traditions of knowledge within the terms of a dominant white European masculinity. This was to also challenge the Enlightenment vision that had informed Marx's work 'On the Jewish Question' where he notes that the Jewish Question, as old as liberalism itself, cannot be resolved until the fundamental condition of possibility of liberal society, 'the division of man into the *public person* and the *private person*, the *displacement* of religion from the state to civil society' is itself cancelled and overcome. I have explored ways that 'On the Jewish Question' shows the limits of Marx's break with an Enlightenment modernity, and the difficulties he has in recognizing the integrity and dignity of differences that are too often framed in Kantian terms as forms of unfreedom and determination, in Seidler (1994). It is through disavowing differences that people can supposedly recognize themselves as 'human' so framing a vision of the 'universal' that involves transcending differences and so thinking within the secularized terms of a dominant Christian tradition through a disdain for gender, sexual, racial and religious differences.

Aamir Mufti (2007) recognizes that Marx was the first to point out the paradoxical nature of the relationship between the secular liberal state and the Jewish minority where 'the former continuously produces and sustains, through such constructs as tolerance and rights, precisely that structure of difference which undermines its claims to a universalist project.' He therefore, identified the Jewish Question as itself a fundamental feature of the development of the forms of the liberal state and society, a fact ignored in those contemporary Marxist critiques of liberal citizenship that views its crisis only in class terms, counterposing the fact of wage-slavery to equality-in-citizenship as a means of exposing the later as merely formal and therefore untrue' (Mufti, 2007, 52). This is a helpful insight because it traces some of the limitations that characterized those of us who moved in the early 1970s towards a Marxist libertarian political activism that was largely framed around class politics. There was a tension between feminism and gay liberation and class politics that was difficult to reconcile. But it also helps frame the widespread suspicions about the limits of

liberal conceptions of rights, equality and justice. I explore some of the limits of liberal moral theory and the ways that they can be traced back to centrality of a Kantian ethical tradition in shaping the 'common sense' within a liberal moral culture in Seidler (1986).

As we reflect back 40 years from 2008 and refuse a nostalgia that would castigate those generations that followed for somehow 'letting down' the promises we carried, it can be helpful to frame questions that can open up a dialogue across different political generations. We live in a very different postmodern and multicultural globalized world and I am aware of how few students I now teach at Goldsmiths identify with a feminism that they tend to identify with their mother's generation. Their experience is being shaped through new technologies and different aspirations. Often they want to succeed in their own terms and feel that gender has become largely irrelevant because they can compete on more-or-less equal terms and make their own marks on the world. Sometimes they think the '68 generation was naïve to think they could change the world and they feel more *realistic* about the compromises they feel they need to make. But they can also resent the idea that they are less idealistic and less committed to social change. They might not think of themselves as 'revolutionaries' and even their parents have often stopped thinking about themselves in such grandiose terms but they can *still be* committed to make a difference. They feel that with global warming, threats of terror, genetic modification, global poverty and water shortages they live with very different dangers in a globalized world. With the anti-globalization movements and the Social Forums they feel they are exploring institutional forms that can help shape their own resistance.

Feminisms and gay liberation in the early 1970s disrupted the universalism of the '68 project and the anti-war movement through naming the heroic masculinities that had been generally unquestioned on the left. Through the radical insight that 'the personal is political' they recognized the significance of gender and sexual difference/s and learnt from the Black Power and Black-consciousness movements about the need to 'take pride' in what had been traditionally shamed. But radical politics was generally framed within secular terms and there was little insight into the ways an Enlightenment modernity had encoded a dominant secularized Christianity particularly in its disdain for bodies and sexualities. Within the dominant terms of a secular rationalism Jewish and Islamic difference/s were generally silenced so that certain difference/s remained marginalized and hard to voice politically.

PSYCHOTHERAPY AND LIBERATION

As the past becomes history, it can be difficult to recall the inspirations and particular contingencies that encouraged us to make changes in our lives. Having come back to Britain after a year in the United States in 1970, in Boston, I can recall a meeting we had in a flat in Rosebery Avenue, Islington, in which we were deciding as a potential Big Flame group whether to move to west or east London. Although some people had strong connections in west London and had already begun 'working around' – this was the language we used then – the Lyons plant, we decided to move east. This was partly through a nostalgic sense of Jewish anarchist traditions in the East End. An influential text that we were to reading in the East End was Bill Fishman's *East End Jewish Radicals 1875–1914* (Fishman, 1975). He had been encouraged by Richard Cobb to 'write this down before it was too late.' As Fishman acknowledges, 'The reader will soon detect that this is a labour of love' and so it

is. Fishman recognizes ‘a new generation of altruistic youth, Jew and non-Jew, emerged in the sixties rejecting the acquisitive and competitive *mores* of their parents. In doing so, a minority discarded the old authoritarian shibboleths for an alternative form of communal living, through which, in their turn, they could build from below to create a truly free, just and equitable society.’ He also closes with words from Rudolf Rocker, the German anarchist who learnt Yiddish and became so central a figure in the Jewish workers’ movement, ‘Social ideas are not something only to dream about for the future. If they are to mean anything at all they must be translated into our daily life, here and now; they must shape our relations with our fellows’ (Fishman, 1975, 309).

Influenced by movements on the Italian left, particularly Lotta Continua, we recognized a need to engage in everyday struggles across the boundaries between factories and cities, where people worked and where they lived and so ‘struggle in every area of our lives’. Working with women who had long histories in the women’s movement, feminism and sexual politics, was a central concern for women and men in the work we started to do in the East End organizing on housing estates locally, partly through a food co-op and also doing industrial and agitational work around the Ford plant at Dagenham.

I do not want to recall the details of the time, much of which was written up in Seidler (1989 and 1991) but to reflect upon the moral psychology and relations between psyche and social/political that was at work. We felt a need *to live* our politics and so create more equal relationships between ourselves as well as with the people we were working with in factories and communities. We had to make the changes in our own lives that we wanted to see in the larger society so that alternative forms of living, relating and educating were to be experimented with. We were to *learn from* our own experiences and practices. We felt the intensity of the present moment and with others that a revolutionary change could happen. If we made efforts we could become part of these changes.

We were wary of Leninist conceptions of political leadership and sought to work with and learn from the diverse working-class communities we were engaged with. But there was a shared sense of wanting and being nourished by a different class experience from the middle class. We sought to bring theory and practice into relation with each other as we learnt *with* people we were working with. Though there was an endless intensity, there was also humour and joy as we sought to confront everyday class oppressions. There was an awareness of the *everyday* hardship of working on the assembly line and often feelings of guilt about our privileges. But at some level there was also an escape from having to *deal with* my personal Jewish family histories in the Holocaust and the experience of my parents as ‘enemy aliens’. It was not until the 1980s that I really began to confront some of my family’s traumatic histories in the Holocaust, although it had been a theme in my individual therapy and a concern in Red Therapy. It was also difficult to find the language in which such atrocities could be faced. Finally I wrote it through a journey in Poland in Seidler (2000).

Somehow these unspoken traumatic histories – that were hard to face at the time and silenced still within the larger culture – got washed away in universal dreams of ‘liberation’ that were linked to a vision of ‘the human’ that transcended difference/s. At the time I can recall the intensity of feeling that had to do with the oppressive nature of the assembly line and a drive to do something to interrupt it through political work. Young radical Muslims probably feel something similar about the sufferings of their fellow Muslims in the wars in

Iraq and Afghanistan and the need to 'do something'. It is this identification with the suffering of others that is also linked to compassion. Sometimes it can be difficult to retain a sense of balance or accept the limitations of what you can do as an individual even within the context of a political movement.

There was also the excitement of living on the edge in an adrenalized way. As a group we were also aware that you could not live at such an intensity over a long period of time without showing signs of burnout. Some of us in the group also appreciated the importance of psychotherapy and the need to do 'emotional work' on the issues that were emerging in the group. Some people had experience of psychoanalysis and were interesting in exploring post-analytic psychotherapies that seemed more able to relate to politics despite their individualistic assumptions. It was after a meeting with Jerry Rubin who was making a visit to London from the United States to talk about the relationship between therapy and politics that we formed Red Therapy (see, for instance, Ernst and Goodison, 1981). Some of this work was also to find its way into the Women's Therapy Center in London as explored in Ernst and Maguire (1987). See also the interesting reflections on clinical practice offered by Maguire (1995) and some of the developments in Seidler (2000). This was part of developing a critique of the moralism and self-denial that informed certain strains within libertarian socialisms and a recognition of the ease with which we could 'burn out' unless we learnt how to *look after* ourselves too.

This was to challenge the heroic masculine images of political militancy and to acknowledge *how* personal and emotional histories also shaped experiences and ways of relating in the present. Reflecting back from 2008 this was also a way also of *revisoning* relationships between the 'personal' and the 'political' through an awareness of possible tensions between 'consciousness-raising' and psychotherapy. Through a critical relationship with the 'individualism' of humanistic psychotherapy traditions and assumption about 'creating your own reality' we imagined a different relationship between 'psyche' and 'social / political'. We also framed a vision of individual responsibility for emotional lives and relationships that recognised the realities of class, gender, sexual and racial relations of power. At the same time we questioned some of the dependencies implicit within psychoanalytic traditions and their tendencies to look to causal events in childhood experience.

As Wittgenstein explores in his conversations with Rush Rhees about Freud, as they are recorded by Ray Monk:

There *is* a sense, he stressed, in which the images in a dream might be regarded as symbols, a sense in which we can speak of a dream language, even if the symbols are not understood by the dreamer ... But it was important to Wittgenstein to dissociate this kind of explanation from those given in science. Explanations of dreams ... do not proceed by the applications of laws, 'and to me the fact that there aren't actually any such laws seems important' ... Freud's explanations, then, are akin to the elucidations offered by Wittgenstein's own work. They provide, not a causal, mechanical theory, but: '... something which people are inclined to accept and which makes it easier for them to go certain ways: it makes certain ways of behaving and thinking natural for them. They have given up one way of thinking and adopted another.' (Quoted in Monk, 1990, 437–8)

The significance of the engagement that Wittgenstein has with Freud at different times in his life are explored by Monk in interesting ways, drawing from Wittgenstein (1978). Monk explains that Wittgenstein is talking more generally and possibly more loosely in this work than he would have allowed himself to do for publication.

We readily moved across the boundaries of psychoanalytic and post-psychoanalytic humanistic traditions exploring their different relationships between the temporalities of 'past' and 'present'. In some ways we were implicitly challenging the terms in which the relationship between psychotherapy and liberation is often imagined, including in this anniversary conference. The programme talks of 'seeking some link between internal and external repression, between the internal struggles rooted in early family life, intimate family relationships both past and present and the external political world in which those early experiences and family relationships were formed and conducted.' This way of imaging a relationship between 'inner' psychic worlds and 'external' political worlds can *still* limit ways we think relationships between psychotherapy and politics. Although there are important openings towards the social within group-psychoanalytic traditions there are also limits both in the ways the 'internal' is still linked to 'the familial' so shaping the 'personal' in particular ways and the ways structures of race, class, gender and sexuality can be fully acknowledged as moving across the boundaries of 'inner' and 'outer'. This can encourage us to think the 'familial' in different ways and so shape a psycho-social imagination that thinks across the boundaries of traditional psychoanalytic traditions. Some interesting reflections on the ways issues to do with 'race', class and sexuality were present in the framing of Freud's thinking about psychoanalysis are provided by Gilman (1993). Gilman argues that Freud dealt with his anxieties about his own Jewish identity by projecting it on to others, such as women. In Freud's writings pejorative distinctions between Aryan males and circumcised Jews, found in the medical literature of his day are inscribed on the bodies of women and beliefs about the difference of the male Jew are paralleled by claims about the female as Other.

Freud helps us think about different *levels* of experience as a kind of emotional archaeology as different layers come to the surface and find a different relationship with each other. Though he recognizes the importance of transference and ways that projections can be stimulated through a particular relationship, there are also times when a different kind of recognition and appreciation is called for. Of course there will be limits to each tradition and if there are issues that a group analysis can open up there are also ways analysts can get 'fixed' through their own particular trainings. The vision of human potential and growth as a *process* in time that can also reach beyond the terms of a secular rationalism that traditionally shapes psychotherapeutic traditions can foster a realisation that analysts need more than 'supervision' – rather, they need to continually grow in their own process. Training is its own form of disciplining and people make investments of time, energy and money when they enter particular trainings that have their own hierarchies and blind spots.

Sudhir Kakar (2008) has shared how his sense of difference as an Indian who was being trained in the 1970s in Frankfurt had initially proved an issue within his training analysis. His recognition of how his identity was tied up at different levels with his cultural background and the beliefs and traditions he had inherited gave way under the pressure to win the love and esteem of his training analyst. He gradually gave in to the psychoanalytic assumption that culture only frames identities at a superficial level, but that at a deeper level of experience it has little resonance. This demonstrates the implicit relationships of power at work within a training supervision and the difficulties of a post-colonial resistance. It was only when he returned to India to work as an analyst that he began in his writings

to challenge the forms of universalism that helped shape traditional analysis and that still work globally to silence the potential challenges of cultural and historical differences. He explores a need to question the universalism so often assumed in psychoanalytic theory and its categories of analysis, including the family forms that foster an oedipal complex. Freud sought refuge in Greek mythology that helped to frame the universalist claims of Western culture that have been challenged recently within postcolonial theories.

It is striking how languages of 'oppression' and 'liberation' were displaced within the dominance of post-structuralist traditions through which feminisms and queer politics came to be theorized. This reflected a turn towards language as framed through a categorical distinction between 'nature' and 'culture' whereby identities were framed through available discourses within the realm of culture. This helped to foster Lacan's influence and the understanding of the unconscious as language. But it also fostered a disembodied vision of conscious and unconscious life where bodies were either caste within the sphere of nature and so the 'biologically given' or else framed through the constructions of culture whereby the body became a space framed through specific cultural discourses. The body could not speak for itself so it could not be listened to. It could make itself *felt* through dreams and unconscious life so as displaced within the language of interpretation.

In Red Therapy we were influenced by somatic traditions that flowed from Reich and that have been developed in the practices and writings of Alexander Lowen (1965, 1972), David Boadella (1976, 1987) and Stanley Keleman (1975, 1986) who working in different ways helped shape somatic traditions of body psychotherapies. I drew upon some of this work and some assumptions it makes about gender in Seidler (2000). They somehow recognized both the vitality of bodies but also ways you could work from the emotional lives of bodies towards unconscious processes just as you could work from present conflicts to traumatic family histories. It was not a matter of somehow assuming that the present was always a path leading to more 'primal' conflicts that had their causal basis within early childhood. We had learn from Gestalt about the 'openings' that were possible 'in the present' but also about the difficulties of 'staying in the present'. There was an acknowledgement of the significance but also the limits of working with transference and the need to acknowledge different temporalities.

Through exploring inherited masculinities and recognizing a tension between what men might feel they want for themselves and the ways we were framed through dominant masculinities, there are spaces that post-structuralist traditions find it difficult to imagine. But it is also interesting to explore the masculine assumptions made by Freud in his thinking about sexuality and also in the ways he framed the relationships between conscious and unconscious life. As Sander Gillman has helped us explore, there were ways that Freud was seeking through the universal nature of family relationships to escape from the particular shamings of Jewish bodies and identities. Freud was anxious to confirm Jung's position in the movement because he did not really want to acknowledge the possible connections between Jewish traditions that sought to recognize bodies and sexualities as part of 'the human' rather than to be disavowed as they are within dominant Christian traditions as aspects of an 'animal nature' that is threatening to 'the human'. Freud was prepared to question, at least implicitly, the Kantian rationality that shaped an Enlightenment modernity through sustaining a radical distinction between reason and nature. I have explored some of the implications of a modernity that is framed in the terms of a dominant white

European masculinity for different traditions of social theory and psychoanalysis in Seidler (1994).

But there is a tension that remains in the disembodied conceptions of conscious/unconscious life that Freud works with through an embodied ego but also through absorbing the somatic life into the sphere of unconscious mental life. This can make it difficult to appreciate the differences Reich opens up with Freud which are complex partly because of Freud's tense relationship with somatic life. It was the disciplining of bodies that was partly challenged through the sexual politics of the late 1960s and ideas of freedom of bodily movement through movement and dance. People were interested in exploring different ways of knowing themselves not simply as objects of psychoanalytic knowledge but through exploring different bodily practices and experiences. As a child growing up in the 1950s I knew from my own experience the liberation I achieved through dance and the ways it brought me into contact with emotions and feelings I could not otherwise express or put into words. But it was also through the intensity of movement that a certain form of release was made possible. Something had also shifted inside that allowed me to relate differently.

Somehow Freud is able to reclaim sexuality through making it a feature of unconscious mental life without really being able to reclaim bodies. Part of his challenge to a European modernity that is constructed through a secularized Christian disdain for bodies and sexualities is not through a voicing of Jewish traditions, as I have argued in Seidler, 2007, but through an ambivalence, as Sander Gillman argues, that tends to identify Jewish traditions with traditions of ethical rationalism. But there are also other strands that would recognize bodies as sources of knowledge and which would allow for meaningful distinctions being made between emotions and feelings that are so often identified as 'inclinations' within a Kantian rationalism. Freud recognizes how people can be trapped in their emotions and so repeat emotional patterns they find it hard to break with. But working within a tradition of secular rationalism Freud assumes a universalism that is less able to deal with the emotional resonance of diverse cultural and spiritual traditions. Framed through different familial patterns they help to shape different subjectivities and allow for knowledge to come from different sources within a re-enchanting nature that honours different levels of felt experience.

When Freud was asked about whether a family should baptise their boy child so giving them a chance for success they would not have if they remained Jewish, he warns against it saying that so much energy will be taken up in sustaining the denial that this will inevitably affect the relationship he can have with himself. In this way Freud questions ideas of 'conversion' and cultures of assimilation and so implicitly theories that have framed culture as a matter of adapting well to prevailing norms and values. In this way Freud challenges implicitly the kind of ego-psychology traditions that identify 'psychic health' with an adaptation of individuals to the prevailing norms and values of 'culture'. If Freud can be read as questioning postmodern ideas that people can somehow remake themselves in whatever image they want, he does at times appreciate the significance of cultures of resistance and recognized psychoanalysis as resisting the sexual moralism of the European culture of his time.

Freud is reframing the notion of 'the human' though including bodies and sexualities that would otherwise be experienced as threats emerging from an 'animal nature' within a revised notion of 'the human'. This is a revolutionary break that Freud makes within

an Enlightenment modernity shaped through a secularized Christianity and so he inherits its disdain for bodies and sexualities. He is also tacitly questioning notions of identity as 'social constructions' that fail to appreciate the significance of unconscious desires and positivist traditions that would assume that people are the 'products' of social relations. Rather, Freud opens up a space in which to reject the dualism of post-structuralist traditions that argue that human nature is either 'fixed' or 'given' or else is 'socially and culturally constructed'. He recognizes how people have *to face* emotional histories they might otherwise have disavowed through cultural notions – 'there is no point in dwelling on the past' because it cannot be changed. Rather he learns that through regression people can begin to repair damaged relationships and 'come to terms' with traumatic experiences as through time they begin to feel themselves into more fulfilling identities and relationships.

But it was ideas of *nourishment* and an exploration of *how* people can nourish themselves that also question prevailing cultures of self-denial which are framed through a secularized Protestant modernity. By developing languages of desire, there were connections being made in the early 1970s between liberation and personal growth and nourishment that challenged prevailing cultures of self-denial. But there were also tensions between the languages of desire that informed libertarian politics of the time and the everyday realities of self-denial as people pushed themselves through endless meetings and political demands. Though there was talk about the relationship between 'theory' and 'practice' and need for reflective spaces it was only easy to feel driven through a moralism that was difficult to question at the time. Sometimes it was only with hindsight that people could recover some of the insights of feminisms and question some of the inherited moralisms within traditions of sexual politics. (For some critical discussion of the different forms of moralism and their diverse sources within larger cultural and philosophical traditions see, for instance, Cartledge and Ryan, 1983, and Seidler, 1991.)

Given the identification of dominant masculinities with being independent and self-sufficient it proved difficult for men who had been challenged by feminism to question inherited traditions of masculinity and gendered relationships of power to really let themselves experience how others can 'be there' for them. Rather men – and increasingly women within post-feminist cultures – can feel they need to be 'in control' of their lives and able to 'manage' whatever emotional conflicts emerge for them. But in the 1970s and 1980s men would still largely experience emotions and feelings as signs of weakness and so as threats to their male identities. But unable to allow themselves to be vulnerable, it could be difficult for men to negotiate more equal relationships within straight and gay relationships as men often remained haunted by an unspoken sense that they are not loveable.

Through men's groups and psychotherapies that have become sensitive to issues of gender and sexualities, men can learn to explore aspects of their gendered and sexed experiences that might well have been in/visibilized within more universal psychoanalytic and psychotherapeutic traditions. It has proved difficult to name the masculine assumptions that have framed different traditions and the sources of their blindness to the working of gender relations of power. In different ways and for different reasons both analytic and humanistic traditions have often proved resistant to engaging with their own assumptions about class, 'race', gender and sexuality and the ways they structure some of their conceptual frameworks and mode of practising. But in more recent years, across diverse traditions, training organizations have had to rework some of their assumptions to take account of issues of

gender, sexuality, 'race', ethnicities and religion. Traditionally these concerns that touch on issues of history and memory have been displaced through a focus upon 'individuals' and 'persons' whose emotional histories have to be understood within the context of familial histories and relationships. Too often these have been regarded as 'external', 'social' or 'political' issues that have little bearing upon the 'inner' emotional work that needs to be done in relation to family histories.

QUESTIONS ACROSS GENERATIONS

Of course we have come a long way since the lively discussions about the relationships of psychotherapy and liberation in the 1970s. Those of us who were involved are reflecting back over a period of 40 years and too many of these years have been lived in the wilderness of neoliberal Thatcherism. We know that we are older but the question remains whether we are wiser and what kind of conversation is possible across the generations as young people are growing up into a very different cultural and technological world. It is easy for them to feel that they have little to learn from the politics of the past because the present can strike them as so different and so the terms in which they need to think a politics of the present. But questions remain and it might be helpful to frame them because being able to identify questions can open up discussions. Here are some of the questions that took shape as I was thinking about the conference on 'psychotherapy and liberation' and reflecting upon the questions – if not the answers – that we might want to pass on:

1. How do people change? What models of change and transformation do we inherit within critical traditions of social theory and philosophy? In the early sexual politics of the 1970s people thought they might be able to change as a matter of will – they could, for example, recognize how, as men, they were 'jealous' and 'possessive' so they would seek re-shape their emotions so they could feel in the way they wanted to feel. They would seek to 'eradicate' unwanted emotions but so remained within the terms of a Kantian rationalism and its notions of 'mind' controlling 'matter'. In this way people hoped to create more equal relationships through reorganizing their everyday material lives. But these rationalist models of personal change proved inadequate even if there is some truth in the idea that feelings follow behaviours. But it was not so directly and people turned towards psychoanalysis and psychotherapy as ways of engaging with their feelings in the present and recognizing they could only change if they faced their emotional histories. Are there other models of the relationship between 'psyche' and 'social' that can enrich our sense of how people can change? What have we learnt from our own experiences of parenting and what values have we been able to pass on?
2. How should we think about gender and sexual equality? There was a tendency within 1970s and 1980s sexual politics to think that gender differences were the consequences of patriarchal gender relations and that if these unequal social relationships changed then gender differences would disappear. Along with this went the insight that women only knew themselves through a patriarchal culture and so could become whatever they wanted to be freed from the constraints of patriarchy. In 2008 as we open up a dialogue across different generations it can be difficult to discern the realities of gender differ-

ence/s within a culture that wants to assume gender equality. Often it is through the psychic pain of anorexia, self-harming and substance abuse that gender sufferings find a somatic expression while often being disavowed consciously. Younger women might also question the feminist idea that they could 'have it all' and settle for compromises knowing they want to spend more time with their children than their parents were often able to spend with them. Young men might not feel the same guilt in relation to women as their parent's generation so that feminism is no longer a pressing issue for them but they might still feel uneasy about their inherited masculinities and ways they want to be in their relationships.

3. How do different political generations find a balance between equality and difference/s? Some of the universalist assumptions of sexual politics in the West that tended to think of gender exclusively as a relationship of power reproduced notions of Western superiority and were blind to post-colonial critiques and the diversity cultural masculinities and femininities? Though Jungian traditions retained a sense of 'feminine' and 'masculine' principles it could still be hard to recognize *how* people are to be encouraged to develop relationships with different aspects of themselves. We have also had to learn how certain regimes of gender equality can tacitly work to reproduce certain masculinist cultures, say within corporate workplaces.
4. How do we think the relationship of liberation as a challenge to oppression when these languages so longer seem to have the same currency and power to illuminate a globalized present? Projects interviewing young people reflecting back on their experiences of being brought up in communes show how in the 1970s and 1980s there was often as assumption of the 'natural' child who would grow up 'liberated' if adults left them alone to find their own way. Reflecting back in their late 20s people when they are making their own decisions about whether to have children and in what context they say often felt they wanted more contact and guidance from their parents and though they appreciated their relationships with other adults, wanted more continuity in their relationships with parents. They wanted to have more time spent with them when they were children and sometimes felt neglected emotionally. They appreciated the voice they had and the fact they were listened too, but also felt that 'femininity' tended to be devalued as girls were encouraged to hide their dolls and become more like 'tom boys'. What have we learnt from these communal experiments and also about the impact of divorce and separations that tended to be minimized at the time? (Here I am drawing upon the research that was done by Lucy Rhodes (2008) for her PhD on the experience of women who had grown up in intentional communities in the Britain in the 1980s and the ways they reflected back as young adults on their childhood experiences. There are also helpful discussions about the impact of divorce and separation.)
5. How did traditions of sexual politics help us rethink the relationship between knowledge and power? How are we to speak truth to power? Through Foucault people learnt to question a zero-sum vision of power that meant women could only be empowered through taking away power that men controlled. While it was important to challenge men's power and control over women's bodies within a patriarchal culture, it was also important to recognize that young men *could change* and that there were some traditional masculine values that could also be cherished. Challenging patriarchal traditions

of knowledge opened up a space to interrogate diverse gendered assumptions within class, 'race' and ethnic relations. But potentially it also opened up diverse religious and philosophical traditions that had long been silenced within the assumed superiority of the Christian West and its colonizing impulses. The decentring of the West has been an important consequence of postcolonial theories that have opened up dialogues across diverse traditions that are beginning to be able to hear each other as equals. But this has also raised question about the Eurocentric assumptions that have shaped the conceptual structures of diverse traditions of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy and have been reinforced by different forms of universalism.

6. How are histories of the present making themselves felt where multicultural identities are often complex and people inherit diverse traditions and relationships? How does this encourage us to rethink homogenised notions of 'culture' and so question binaries about dialogue across discrete cultural differences? How do we engage with the complex transnational identities that many people live in the present? Through Gramsci and Foucault we also learnt to appreciate how the archaeologies that Freud recognized as features of mental life go beyond the terms of familial life. There are also issues about whether the personal terms Freud sets in 'Mourning and Melancholia' can be adequate to the catastrophic and traumatic losses suffered during such events as the Holocaust or in the 1947 partition of the subcontinent of India. In this sense are there dangers of the 'political' being reduced to the 'personal' or do we need to imagine quite different crossings across these boundaries if we are to deal with traumatic histories of loss?
7. Through Foucault we also learnt that relations of power are not always repressive and that power can be productive. Though this could be a useful insight it could also work to displace the workings of male power across a globalized world and encourage an assumption that both 'masculinities' and 'femininities' are to be defined discursively relation to each other. But if Foucault was also helpful in the identifications often made between 'being authoritarian' and 'having authority' so that, for example, in parenting it has been important for parents in the 1980s and 1990s to learn *how* to exercise *appropriate* authority and give clear boundaries. Sometimes out of a fear of being accused of being 'authoritarian' fathers have become the friends of their sons, so leaving traditional authority to be exercised by mothers. If the relationship between parents is to be 'in balance' we need to learn *how* power is often 'passed down' in families, as Simone Weil appreciated, so that you can tell something about the 'psychic health' of the family by listening to the youngest child.
8. As Wittgenstein read Freud he appreciated how dreams were trying to 'tell us something' and that there were different ways in which we communicate with ourselves and with others. Language is not the *only* means of communication and in relationships we often have to learn to interpret the different forms communication takes. So bodies, for instance, are often attempting to communicate through stress and illness. The 'immune system' shows the stresses of everyday life and so potentially *shows* the interrelation between somatic, emotional and mental and spiritual bodies. But in this way we can also learn to recognize the singularity of experience and ways that, for example, different kinds of schooling might be appropriate for children with different temperaments and dispositions. The 1960s tended to disqualify differences so that, for example, it was reluctant to identify dyslexia as it might justify differential treatment. Like other

differences it was deemed to be 'unreal' and a 'social construction' that potentially threatened a commitment to equality.

9. Reflecting back upon experiments in *living differently* and attempts to create more equal relationships how do we understand tensions between freedom and equality and so possibly conflicts, as Berlin recognized, between different fundamental values (cf. Lilla et al., 2001). If we have learnt to think relationally in our critiques of new capitalisms we need to recognize, with Sennett (1998), how different characters are shaped through different regimes of power and authority in the workplace. If meaningful work remains central in people's lives we also have to recognise different spheres of human experience and the need to find *balance* between them. In this way we challenge Marx's theory for its blindness to sexualities and emotional lives. But in a world that is still so marked by global poverty we need rethink the sources of human dignity and frame new materialisms that can give due recognition to human needs. We need to question the freedom to exploit that is exercised by corporations in their relationships with countries of the south. If we are to be concerned with issues of global justice we need to rethink the terms of relationship between the 'personal' and the 'political' within the framework of a globalized social theory. But this also means recognizing how people can appreciate both the promises but also the traumatic stresses of transnational identities. There have been massive migrations since the 1970s and the creation of multicultural cities within an increasingly globalized world. This calls for different ways of thinking the relation between the 'psyche' and the 'social' and for new forms of social-psychotherapy to illuminate these complex histories and identities. Often they are in uneasy relationship with each other as people learn to negotiate intimate relationships across diverse cultural inheritances.
10. After 9/11 and 7/7 and the bombings in Madrid, Bali and Istanbul among others we need to come to terms with global terror and the revival of religious fundamentalisms as we rethink the West's relationships with its others in more fundamental terms that deconstruct unhelpful binaries. We also need to engage with both the promises and limits of a multicultural politics as we imagine new forms of future multiculturalism. I have attempted to engage with issues of trauma and loss in the face of the London bombings of 7 July 2005, and the questions this raises for the ways we might imagine multicultural futures and shape forms of social theory that can think across the boundaries of the 'psyche' and the 'social' as they engage with questions of migration and dis/placement, in Seidler, 2007. As we engage with these complex inheritances and imagine dialogue across the boundaries of cultural and religious traditions, so we need to fundamentally rethink the national terms that have often framed the relationship of psychotherapies and liberations. Rather than tacitly reproduce Western traditions of personal change, growth and development we need to listen and learn from diverse moral and spiritual traditions and their own practices of growth and development. It is the very global resonance of '68 that allows for a new kind of dialogue across differences that can challenge the temptations of terrorism with the possibilities of learning and dialogue across a respect for differences.

REFERENCES

- Boadella D (ed.) *In the Wake of Reich*. London: Coventure, 1976.
- Boadella D. *Lifestreams*. London: Routledge, 1987.
- Bush R. *We Are Not What We Seem: Black Nationalism and Class Struggle in the American Century*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Cartledge S, Ryan J. *Sex and Love: New Thoughts on an Old Contradiction*. London: The Women's Press, 1983.
- Collier-Thomas B, Franklin VP (eds) *Sisters in the Struggle: African-American Women in the Civil Rights-Black Power Movement*. New York: New York University Press, 2003.
- Ernst S, Goodison L. *In Our Own Hands*. London: The Women's Press, 1981.
- Ernst S, Maguire M (eds) *Living With the Sphinx*. London: The Women's Press, 1987.
- Fishman B. *East End Jewish Radicals 1875–1914*. London: Duckworth, 1975.
- Gilman SL. *Freud, Race and Gender*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Kakar S. *Culture and Psychoanalysis: A Personal Journey*. Presented at Birkbeck Institute of Social Research, Wednesday 28 October 2008.
- Keleman S. *Your Body Speaks Its Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975.
- Keleman S. *Somatic Reality*. Berkeley CA: Center Press, 1986.
- Kelly RDG. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2002.
- Lilla M, Dworkin R, Silver RB. *The Legacy of Isaiah Berlin*. New York: NYRB, 2001.
- Lowen A. *Bioenergetics*. London: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Lowen A. *The Betrayal of the Body*. New York: Collier Macmillan, 1965.
- Maguire M. *Men, Women, Passion and Power*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Monk R. *Ludwig Wittgenstein: The Duty of Genius*. London: Vintage, 1990.
- Mufti, A. *Enlightenment in the Colony: The Jewish Question and the Crisis of Postcolonial Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Rhodes L. Phd thesis. 'Young women growing up in Intentional Communities in Britain in the 1980s'. Department of Sociology, Goldsmiths, University of London. July 2008.
- Rowbotham S. *Dreams and Dilemmas*. London: Virago, 1983.
- Seidler VJ. *Kant, Respect and Injustice: The Limits of Liberal Moral Theory*. London: Routledge, International Library of Philosophy, 1986.
- Seidler VJ. *Recreating Sexual Politics: Men, Feminism and Politics*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Seidler VJ. *Recovering the Self: Morality and Social Theory*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Seidler VJ. *Unreasonable Men: Masculinity and Social Theory*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Seidler VJ. *Man Enough: Embodying Masculinities*. London: Sage, 2000.
- Seidler VJ. *Shadows of the Shoah: Jewish Identity and Belonging*. Oxford: Berg, 2000.
- Seidler VJ. *Urban Fears and Global Terrors: Citizenship, Multiculture and Belongings after 7/7*. London: Routledge International Library of Sociology, 2007.
- Sennett R. *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1998.
- Wittgenstein L. *Lectures and Conversations in Aesthetics, Psychology and Religious Belief*. Ed Cyril Barrett. Oxford: Blackwell, 1978.