

# Hinging Concepts: Between Marxism and Psychoanalysis

RAÚL PÁRAMO-ORTEGA, Guadalajara, Mexico

**ABSTRACT** *Convergences between Marxism and psychoanalysis are tentatively discussed in a new way. After pointing out examples of hinging sciences and hinging authors that may be used as bridges between Marxism and psychoanalysis, the paper elucidates different conceptual points in which Marx and Freud meet. More precisely, it connects Freudian rationalisation and the Marxist concept of ideology, Freudian Eros and Marxist socialism, as well as dialectics in both Marxism and psychoanalysis. Copyright © 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

**Key words:** Marxism; psychoanalysis; rationalisation; ideology; Eros; socialism

## INTRODUCTION

Let me start by pointing out three examples of what I call *hinging sciences*, that is, true bridges between Marxism and psychoanalysis: (a) critical theory and the Frankfurt School (Adorno, Horkheimer); (b) sociology, particularly the sociology of knowledge (Merton, Mannheim, Luhmann); and (c) ethnopsychanalysis (Parin, Morgenthaler).

Ethnopsychanalysis may be considered the most significant advance of psychoanalysis towards the subject matter of Marxism (Devereux, 1978). Concerning sociology, psychoanalysis has to cross the bridges already built that lead to Marxism through different areas of knowledge without paying too much attention to the borderlines that separate them (Bourdieu, 1990). The Frankfurt School uses Marxism and psychoanalysis in order to denounce the civilisatory fervour of *instrumental rationality* (Horkheimer, 1967/1974).

By the so-called instrumental rationality of the technological–capitalist age, man is converted into a machine and/or pathological consumer. Following the same idea, psychoanalysts such as Lorenz, Horn, and Zepf have frequently understood “illness” as the protest or point of minor resistance against the plunging of an excessively demanding and twisted social organisation, especially, as Freud insisted, in its exaggerated claim to suppress drives. For them, as well as for Gross, “health” describes the full development of all faculties bestowed on man since birth. Gross underlined the severe consequences of an authoritarian society with a way of transmission that was precisely the authoritarian family structure investigated by Freud.

\*Correspondence to: Raúl Páramo-Ortega, Reforma 1881, Col. Ladrón de Guevara, C.P. 44600, Guadalajara, Jalisco, México.  
E-mail: paramo.ortega@gmail.com

Among the *hinging authors* we cannot but mention Charles Fourier (1772–1837), Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911), Otto Gross (1877–1920), Otto Fenichel (1897–1946), Wilhelm Reich (1897–1957), and Herbert Marcuse (1898–1979). In my opinion, Fourier deserves a more profound investigation as he precedes both Marx and Freud, and influenced their culture, besides featuring “hinging” aspects between them. Fourier (1830/1971) was obsessed with a cosmic harmony founded on love. “Free love” and “indispensable pleasure” are sparks of Fourier’s mind.

Freud, averse to any kind of illusions, proposed a more real Eros than Fourier. He referred to Eros as an urging state of excitation, not only because of the unreachable total satisfaction, but also as the basis of any solidarity. Freud (1929/1961b) thought the erotic drive, the sexual and amorous pleasure, to abet life in the most excellent way. In the same way, the young Marx (1844/1975d) considered love to be a *vital expression* of the subject.

On the other side there would be thanatos as an amount of aggressiveness that is still undecipherable. Otto Gross (1913/2000), Freud’s heterodox disciple, added something important, when he seized ideas from Freud as well as from Fourier, about the immense topic of impeding the degradation of sexuality. This problem is far from being solved.

## POINTS WHERE MARX AND FREUD MEET

Marx emphasised the maximisation of gains and surplus value, while Freud stressed sexual desire, in the context of the indomitable human aggressiveness that seeks to take possession of the other’s goods, exploit them, humiliate them, take sexual advantage of them without their permission, attack them, etc. (Freud, 1927/1961c). The economic organisation (Marx, 1859/1975b) and some kind of liberation of desire (Freud, 1915/1963a) *de facto* represent a common front against the cultural sub-products of capitalism and Christianity. The non-commercialised, non-vulgarised, non-degraded erotic satisfaction has two enemies: the pursuit of wealth and the Christian perspective that condemns pleasure. In capitalism, there is the tendency to consider love an exchange good.

One of Marx’s elemental self-assigned tasks was to take up the fight against human exploitation by the current economic system and by religion. In his research, Freud paid attention to the harms of self-deceit, religious illusions, and the repression of unconscious impulses, while Marx highlighted the irrational power of the thirst to achieve richness that leads to exploitation, oppression and religion. Urged by the *utopian function* (Bloch, 1989), we claim the need to go down the same road that has turned alchemy into chemistry, astrology into astronomy, magic into science, theology into anthropology, utopic socialism into scientific socialism, and individualism into communitarian solidarity. With Marx (1843/1975a) we have to remember that the criticism of religion is the prerequisite of all criticism.

Schneider (2012) defined psychoanalysis as a criticism of its times as it does not completely adapt to its dominant cultural environment; it is “inopportune” (p. 677) and contributes to decode the social aspects reflected in the private sphere and obviously attends to the heavy weight of the existential condition of being orphaned without turning to any kind of transcendence. From the Freudian point of view, God’s death has to be read as the loss of the primary cultural object (Freud, 1927/1961c).

According to psychoanalysis, to develop an “individual” consciousness alone cannot fulfil the task of creating a socialist society in permanent revolution; rather, its historical origin is

about the purpose to explore the unconscious factors of human behaviour. In the case of Marxism, its origin can be resumed in just a few words: to transform radically all the relations where man is humiliated, enslaved, abandoned, and/or debased. The psychoanalytical counterpart would be to increase the capacity to work and love through a conscience that is as free as possible from individual and social determinations. Personal emancipation is certainly an appropriate basis for structural revolutionary constructions that include the psychoanalytical postulate not to confuse social adaptation with mental health (Gross, 1913/2000, 1919/2006). It is necessary to retrieve the subversive potential and the meaning of indirect protest of “getting ill” when confronted with social situations we are supposed to accept.

Marx and Engels (1848/1975a) showed how the bourgeoisie had reduced social relations to naked self-interest and brutal exploitation. On an international level it is evident that the criminal exploitation of labour force and great natural resources on the so-called Latin-American continent and later on the African continent has contributed importantly to the emerging of capitalism. Colonialism itself is a core expression of the insatiable lust of wealth in capitalism. Nowadays nobody ignores anymore that the financial capital of the big transnational companies – behind the curtains – really governs the world. The capitalist system can only reproduce the conditions for exploiting the labourer by violently forcing him to sell his labour-power in order to live (Marx 1867/1975c).

Both Marx and Freud offer critiques of capitalist violence. This violence can only be countered by socialism in Marx, and by love in Freud. According to Freud (1933/1963b), the power of Eros is the counterpart of human aggressiveness in general, and of the particular kind that is intrinsic of the capitalist system, which is also in charge of justifying and normalising any kind of war. Freud explicitly referred to the importance of communal feelings, which are distinctive emotional ties of the *homo sapiens*.

## **FREUDIAN RATIONALISATION AND THE MARXIST CONCEPT OF IDEOLOGY**

From time immemorial, the “soul” has been considered the battlefield where contrary forces clash, and conflicts and schisms emerge. Contrary to what people usually believe, for Freud, the drives, even the most basic ones, are not forever fixed. Impulses change, at least partially, through concrete history. The concepts ego, id, super-ego, and ego-ideal are inserted into a system with a dialectical structure and are not essence at all. They are not conceptually separated and we have to understand them as instruments in the analysis of psychical conflicts that are historically conditioned throughout the socialisation process. Psychical structures emerge as interiorisations of the object relations that reflect social structures.

According to Freud, the super-ego is the borderline between the individual and society. It is the “other” inside me, the unconscious introjection of normativities from the social environment. Our *need to be recognised*, postulated by Honneth (1995) in his critical theory, had, in Freud’s opinion, a biological base. Strictly speaking, anything biological is also social, and vice versa. The indispensable symbiosis with the mother throughout the foetal phase, as well as the fact of coming into this world in a state of radical helplessness, creates the need to be loved, which accompanies us through the rest of our

life (Freud, 1927/1961c). The super-ego is a compromise solution, a true symptom of the schism between *nature* and *culture*, between *interior world* and *exterior world*. The defence mechanism that Freud called *rationalisation* corresponds to the Marxist concept of *ideology*, which is the immediate attempt to become legitimately part of the protective majority. An ideology *ad hoc*, a super-ego *ad hoc*, is built up. Marx also conceptualised this – as *false consciousness*. However, unlike the super-ego, Marxian ideology is a kind of collective lie as it does not hint at personal guilt. It is a function that protects us against the uncomfortable feeling of disagreeing with oneself and with the society in which we are inserted.

Concerning sexuality, Freud (1929/1961b) acknowledged that “the sexual life of civilized man” gives the impression of being in the “process of involution” (p. 103). He also admitted that “the economic structure of society also influences the amount of sexual freedom that remains” (p. 105). This is even worse when it is conceived in Nietzsche’s words that are obviously also Freudian: “the intensity and the kind of sexuality of any human being ascend to the highest peaks of his spirit” (quoted by Marcuse, 1969, p. 99). Marxist theory confirms that ideology easily enters into the cognitive process and, therefore, is the perfect instrument that justifies any kind of oppression. The social system, as it uses the super-ego (or ego-ideal) as an instrument, vilifies the free and rational use of the ego, and turns the ego and its need for pleasure into a perfidious enemy.

## FREUDIAN EROS AND MARXIST SOCIALISM

Marx (1852/1975e) stated that we make our history ourselves, but under very definite assumptions and conditions and, among these, the economic ones, which are ultimately decisive. Only a vulgar Marxism ascribes to Marx a disregard of the importance of mental representations for any subject.

While, for Marx, the basis of anything that happens throughout history is economic, and the *superstructure* comprises the state, religion, philosophy, and morality, for Freud, the *basis* is the unconscious and the *superstructure* includes consciousness, art, jurisdiction, etc. Engels as well as Marx insisted on the mutual conditioning between both. Through this dialectical perspective they escaped from the unevenness and bias of mainstream economists. The following lines describe this idea: “production will so expand and man so change that society will be able to slough off whatever of its old economic habits may remain” (Marx & Engels, 1874/1975b, p. 374). Only some paragraphs later they attested that the development and the modification of production forms “need and produce a different kind of man” (*ibid.*, p. 376).

Let us take a look at just a few more quotations:

Only from that time will man himself, with full consciousness, make his own history – only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have, in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him. It is the humanity’s leap from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom. (Engels, 1878/1975a, p. 270)

When, therefore, it is a question of investigating the driving powers which – consciously or *unconsciously*, and indeed very often *unconsciously* – lie behind the motives of men who act in history and which constitute the real ultimate driving forces of history, then it is not a question so much of the motives of

single individuals, however eminent, as of those motives which set in motion great masses. (Engels, 1886/2008, p. 256)

Some lines above, Engels emphasised that, in conscious human activities, “the conflicts of innumerable individual wills and individual actions in the domain of history produce a state of affairs entirely analogous to that prevailing in the realm of unconscious nature” (pp. 256–257).

Eros is the core of solidarity and also expression of the *basic need to belong* to any kind of community. Freud (1929/1961b) admitted that “men are to be libidinally bound to one another [and that] necessity alone, the advantages of work in common, will not hold them together” (p. 122). Here the Freudian perspective obviously contradicts a simplistic representation of a Marxist perspective. Nevertheless, both perspectives symbolically converge – and not to our surprise – in the coitus, where the individual aspect (including the individual representing the species) and the social aspect really and symbolically unite. We are an intrinsically social species. The most social and most personal act is (the) loving sexual relation. In this sense, and given the power relations between men and women, treating women well is a sign of a positive trend in the development of any society, as the direct, natural, and necessary relation of person to person is the *relation of man to woman*, and, according to Marx (1844/1975d), from this relationship one can judge man’s whole level of development. Duhm (1998) has rightfully warned us that “there will be no peace in this world as long as the war between the sexes continues” (p. 33).

## DIALECTICS IN MARX AND FREUD

Marxism and psychoanalysis have not left us with “closed systems” but with open, dialectical ones. For Freud as for Marx, reason itself is weak and does not lead to definitive truth. Marx has applied the word “dialectic” as a synonym of *evolutionary thinking*. The manifold ramifications of his theory derive from there. They are partly explained by the complexity of the reality he investigated that is also in constant movement. Every judgment about what is supposed to be *reality* must take into account its condition to stand *in relation with*, to be *related to*, which is the condition of being inescapably linked to its *relational context*. Society for Marx and *psyche* for Freud stand in a relation of mutual conditioning, though with different emphasis. In addition to that, we, the followers who want to study them, have to struggle against our own diversities and important limitations – a point that led to Marx saying “If anything is certain, it is that I myself am not a Marxist” (Engels, 1882, para. 9).

Dialectical thinking is implicitly critical when it comes to considering one’s own and the adversary’s lop-sidedness. Dialectic is nothing more than the *complementary coexistence* of opposites. This can be seen in the defence mechanism of rationalisation Freud mentioned when he asserted the simultaneous presence of *yes* and *no* in the unconscious. Adorno, too, pointed out that irrational theorems are *de facto* complements to a possible rational review of matters. These ideas can be found in Marx, Engels and in Lenin long before Adorno (see Meyer-Abich, 1976; Haug, 2010). It is not a statement by decree but a result of looking beyond the contradictions.

## Why do revolutions fail so often?

Dialectics is inseparable from any form of revolution. The revolutionary process cannot solve its intrinsic contradictions. Therefore, the permanence of the revolution is a necessity.

Trotsky justly developed the concept of the *permanent revolution* (see Trotsky, 1930/2010) and we add here that any revolution not only must feature manifold aspects, but also be opportune. The insufficiencies of the Soviet rule and the iniquities of Stalinism are no secret to anyone and Trotsky subjected them to scrutiny. Later on, there were the aberrations of the so-called *really existing socialism* in the countries of the Soviet orbit. Any revolution must include the revolution of the subject, too; that is, the interior revolution based on the conquest of the unconscious individual and cultural aspects: “The real socialist revolutions have an ever stronger need of a qualitative change towards a greater consciousness” (Goldschmidt, Barker, & Wolfram, 2008, p. 842). In the words of Marx (1845/1975f) himself: “the coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-changing can be conceived and rationally understood only as *revolutionary practice*” (p. 13).

Freud’s comment about the Revolution of 1917, which he tagged as *premature*, but also as a “magnificent experiment”, would have received the full approval of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, who were all well aware of the processes and rhythms of revolutions. Lenin (1929/1976) himself wrote about *the infantile disorder of communism*. Strangely enough, Freud’s appreciation of Marxism is widely ignored. Let us take a look at the following:

The strength of Marxism clearly lies, not in its view of history or the prophecies of the future that are based on it, but in its sagacious indication of the decisive influence which the economic circumstances of men have upon their intellectual, ethical and artistic attitudes. A number of connections and implications were thus uncovered, which had previously been almost totally overlooked. (Freud, 1933/1963b, p. 178)

Every practice needs a thorough theory and vice versa. After all, “for Freud, everyone’s personal history is an imitation, a reflection of the history of society” (Dahmer, 2009, p. 332). Every miscarried revolution, though only partially and temporarily so, has usually failed for not taking into account the unconscious subjective factor (Parin, 2006) or the so-called *objective conditions*. Any psychoanalysis that supposes to be “individual” goes substantially wrong, too. We psychoanalysts must be able to read the sedimentations of history in what we mistakenly call individuals. Nowadays, psychoanalysis – except the so-called *Freudian left-wing* – is rather remiss to its task of social criticism (see Dahmer, 1973; Reichmayr, 2002). Psychoanalysis has frequently repressed its constitutive political dimension (see Brunner, 1995; Buchholz & Göttdde, 2005). Even so, the Freudian left-wing is still alive. We mention here, among many others, Horst Eberhard Richter, Peter Brückner, Oliver Decker, Paul Parin, Elimio Modena, Helmuth Dahmer, Alfred Lorenzer, Ulrich Sonneman, Siegfried Bernfeld, Joseph Gabel, Cornelius Castoriadis, and Igor Caruso.

The core of Freud is very far from being accepted in our culture. This is even truer for another of the *unmanageable* ones, i.e. Marx and, by the way, also Darwin. Darwinism claims that evolution is not the final result *in extenso*, which pursues a predetermined and immotile aim. Freud as well as Marx was a Darwinian to the bone with a certain touch of

Lamarckism. Here is a Freudian paragraph from Engels (1885/1975b) that also has a Lamarckian character:

The fact that our subjective thought and the objective world are subject to the same laws, and hence, too, that in the final analysis they cannot contradict each other in their results, but must coincide, governs absolutely our whole theoretical thought. It is the unconscious and unconditional premise for theoretical thought. ... By recognizing the inheritance of acquired characters [Darwin, Lamarck], it extends the subject of experience from the individual to the genus; the single individual that must have experience is no longer necessary, its individual experience can be replaced to a certain extent by the results of the experiences of a number of its ancestors. (p. 147)

Engels pointed out the consequences of the law of the free market, considered the supreme abstract authority, which had become the conductor of the whole society. Put in different words, the market seems to be devouring society and technology pretends to replace culture. Psychoanalysis, facing these two risks, could contribute to a critical examination of the situation to retard this tendency. On a minor scale, this has already occurred, principally through the *Frankfurt School*, which was enriched by Freud and the *Freudian left-wing*, Karl Landauer and Siegfried Bernfeld among them.

Psychoanalysis particularly looks into the aspect of the unconscious interrelation between “individuals” and between the “individual” and society. Marxism makes the structures of production relations, inasmuch as they determine personality as well as the course of history, its object of research. Both, by emphasising one of these two poles, neglect the other one. They complement and adjust their shortcomings in a difficult and not even intentional encounter. The frailty of our cognitive apparatus, constricted by our own unconscious conflicts and our ignorance of astronomic dimensions, stand in the way of the task to connect two fields of knowledge.

I would like to underline here once again that both keen thinkers are fully aware of the need to radically transform our civilisation. Concerning the difficulties of life in civilisation, Freud (1927/1961c) pointed out: “It is, of course, natural to assume that these difficulties are not inherent in the nature of civilization itself but are determined by the imperfections of the cultural forms which have so far been developed” (p. 6) and, a little further ahead:

If, however, a culture has not got beyond a point at which the satisfaction of one portion of its participants depends upon the suppression of another, and perhaps larger, portion – and this is the case in all present day cultures – it is understandable that the suppressed people should develop an intense hostility towards a culture whose existence they make possible by their work, but in whose wealth they have too small a share. (p. 12)

One of Marx’s most famous summons to social revolution is found in the *Theses on Feuerbach*: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it” (Marx, 1845/1975f, p. 4).

### **Body and sexuality**

In his *Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right*, Marx (1843/1975a) seemed to be convinced that the ultimate fixed difference of one person from all others is *the body*, whose highest function is *sexual activity*. This idea is from Marx, though it could well be Freudian. In its original context, the quote underlines the reproductive function of sex. In other places,

though, Marx spoke of sexuality as the supreme pleasure that was – partially, at least – alienated from the proletariat (e.g., Marx, 1844/1975d).

We have already mentioned that many of Freud's followers do not have eyes for reading the texts that might also be paragraphs of Marx's work. As just one example, here is a Freudian fragment that states the importance of a revolution: "It goes without saying that a civilization which leaves so large a number of its participants unsatisfied and drives them into revolt neither has nor deserves the prospect of a lasting existence" (Freud, 1927/1961c, p. 12).

In his *Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, in the paragraph on sexual theory, Freud (1915/1963a) wrote:

The motive of human society is in the last resort an economic one; since it does not possess enough provisions to keep its members alive unless they work, it must restrict the number of its members and divert their energies from sexual activity to work." (p. 311)

Freud (1921/1959) considered the amorous bond a force that can overcome the differences of social classes without undoing them. He expressed that as follows: "love for women breaks through the group ties of race, of national divisions, and of the social class system, and it thus produces important effects as a factor in civilization" (p. 141).

### Civilisation, religion and society

Marx's critical-epistemological perspective has some similarities to Freudian texts. Freud interprets religion by reducing it to its origin: childish illusions that emerge from our need for protection. He (Freud) also pointed out the impossibility of finding a sign of reality in the apparatus of the *psyche* that guarantees any kind of absolute truth. Similarly, according to Marx, consciousness is a social product. Society conveniently restricts the potential expansion of consciousness. It is restricted and enclosed by social factors that unconsciously lead to its configuration. On the other hand, the social, as a phenomenon, is not at all the sum of the badly so-denominated "individual" specificities. Anything individual is one hub in the social weave and contributes to the construction of historic dimension where there is reciprocal action between spirit and matter. The spirit is the utmost point of expression, the apogee achieved through the organisation of matter.

Freud (1929/1961b) considered that the ideal any civilisation should pursue consists of "a re-ordering of human relations", which would "remove the sources of dissatisfaction with civilization by renouncing coercion and the suppression of the instincts, so that, undisturbed by internal discord, men might devote themselves to the acquisition of wealth and its enjoyment" (p. 6).

In the psychoanalyst Otto Gross's opinion, turning the unconscious into consciousness is destined to become:

the ferment of the socialist revolution inside the *psyche*, that is the liberation of our individuality, which is dominated by the unconscious [and] interiorly preparing us for reaching out to freedom, incrementing our consciousness as a task that is prior to the revolution. (Gross, 1913/2000, p. 59)

There is a passage in *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* where Freud (1921/1959) called attention to the seductive "regression" the masses offer, particularly hosts like the church or the army and even nations, races or social classes (p. 141). Our need for consensus constrains the use of the own reason and makes the possibility to join the masses



so very attractive. This turns Freud into a close relative of the “social heretics” such as Gross, Reich and Fourier himself. Freud never abandoned his freedom of thought in the sense of the words of Goethe’s literary character Torquato Tasso: “In poesy and thought I will be free, in act the world doth limit us enough” (Goethe, 1790/2008, p. 157).

## OTHER JUNCTIONS AND POINTS OF CONTACT

The contact between Marxism and psychoanalysis is, after all, the dialectical relation between the individual and society. Engelmayer even claimed that the solution of individual conflicts is so difficult due to society’s “resistance” (quoted by Breinbauer, 1980, p. 307). In a situation where the psychoanalyst is a vassal to the reigning system that also embraces the analysed, the possibilities of achieving an outcome of emancipation and personal freedom passes through a process of winning the battle against personal or collective unconscious determinations. Psychoanalysis pretends to augment the critical attitude towards the historical moment and the social environment in which we are immersed.

“Making history consciously” is a common task of Marxism and psychoanalysis, and both offer the means to emancipate people from elements that are instituted and/or imposed by the reigning system. One psychoanalytical postulate is resumed in Freud’s famous statement that “the ego is not master in its own house” (Freud, 1917/1961a, p. 143), which refers to the fact that everything in the unconscious sector is foreign to us. The “ego” is not any kind of substance, but a mediating and versatile function between the outer and the inner world. We find an analogue idea in the work of Engels (1886/2008), when he observed that behind the operating motives of men are other motive powers, which have to be discovered. This is a typically Freudian thought in Marx.

In Freud (1914/1963c) “the ego is playing the ludicrous part of the clown in a circus who by his gestures tries to convince the audience that every change in the circus ring is being carried out under his orders” (p. 53). Put differently, even political action may occasionally be only a mask of unconscious motivations of the *psyche*, or motivations that conform to private, individual interests. In Marx, the pauperisation of workers and the disproportionate enrichment of very few is no natural law, but a direct consequence of the accumulation of capital. According to Freud, too, it is no inalienable destiny to be the puppets of our unconscious drives that turn out to be not much more than interiorisations of a society that considers sex and love a badly administrated obstacle of the oppressive machinery that has its roots in the capitalist system as well as in Christian religion. Freud (1927/1961c) commented on religion that:

its technique consists in depressing the value of life and distorting the picture of the real world in a delusional manner – which presupposes an intimidation of the intelligence ... by forcibly fixing [many people] in a state of psychical infantilism. (p. 84)

## CONCLUSION

Freud confessed to not having studied the work of Marx and Engels quite enough:

My opinions on Marxism reveal that ... I do not have a solid knowledge of the works of Marx and Engels. In the meantime I have had the satisfaction to notice that neither of them has rejected the

influence of some of my study subjects, especially the Super-Ego, in their doctrines. This abates the principal element of the opposition against Marxism and psychoanalysis that I had formerly supposed. (quoted by Jones, 1962, p. 403)

To many people's surprise and in the middle of all differences, Freud approached the dialectical complementarity with Marxism:

If anyone were in a position to show in detail the way in which these different factors – the general inherited human disposition, its racial variations and its cultural transformations – inhibit and promote one another under the conditions of social rank, profession and earning capacity – if anyone were able to do this, he would have supplemented Marxism so that it was made into a genuine social science. (Freud, 1933/1963b, p. 179)

Dahmer (2009) was right to point out that “it has now become vital to understand society from Marx's and Freud's point of view”, adding that, “With Marx against Freud and with Freud against Marx. Only this way we will have the opportunity to change this civilization, to find a way out before it is too late” (p. 270).

## REFERENCES

- Bloch, E. (1989). *The utopian function of art and literature: Selected essays*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Breinbauer, I. (1980). Antiautoritäre pädagogik [Antiauthoritarian pedagogy]. *Die Psychologie des 20. Jahrhunderts [The Psychology of the Twenties]*, 11(1), 301–328.
- Brunner, J. (1995). *Psyche und Macht – Freud politisch lessen [Psyche and Power – Freud's political lessons]*. Stuttgart, Germany: Klett-Cotta.
- Buchholz, M. B., & Gödde, G. (2005). Die Psychoanalyse im Dialog mit dem Naturwissenschaften [Psychoanalysis in dialogue with the natural sciences]. In M. B. Buchholz & G. Gödde (Eds), *Das Unbewusste in der aktuellen Diskussion II [The unconscious in current discussions]* (pp. 695–703). Giessen, Germany: Psychosozial Verlag.
- Dahmer H. (1973). *Libido und Gesellschaft – Studien über Freud und die freudsche Linke [Libido and society – Studies on Freud and the Freudian Left]*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp.
- Dahmer, H. (2009). *Divergenzen – Holocaust, Psychoanalyse, Utopia [Divergences – Holocaust, psychoanalysis, utopia]*. Münster, Germany: Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- Devereux, G. (1978). *Ethnopschoanalysis: Psychoanalysis and anthropology as complementary frames of reference*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Duhm, D. (1998). *Der unerlöste Eros [Eros unredeemed]*. Belzig, Germany: Berghof Verlag.
- Engels, F. (1882). *Letter to Eduard Bernstein in Zurich, London, 2–3 November 1882*. Retrieved from [https://marxists.anu.edu.au/archive/marx/works/1882/letters/82\\_11\\_02.htm](https://marxists.anu.edu.au/archive/marx/works/1882/letters/82_11_02.htm)
- Engels, F. (1975a). Anti-Dühring. In *Marx/Engels collected works* (Vol. 25). Moscow, USSR: Progress. (Original work published 1878)
- Engels, F. (1975b). Dialectics of nature. In *Marx/Engels collected works* (Vol. 25). Moscow, USSR: Progress. (Original work published 1885)
- Engels, F. (2008). Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of classical German philosophy. In K. Marx & F. Engels, *On religion* (pp. 213–268). Mineola, NY: Dover. (Original work published 1886)
- Fourier, C. (1971). *Design for Utopia: Selected writings of Charles Fourier*. New York, NY: Schocken Books. (Original work published 1830)
- Freud, S. (1959). Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. In J. Strachey (Trans. & Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 18, pp. 65–144). London, UK: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1921)

- Freud, S. (1961a). A difficulty in the path of psychoanalysis. In J. Strachey (Trans. & Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 17, pp. 135–144). London, UK: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1917)
- Freud, S. (1961b). Civilization and its discontents. In J. Strachey (Trans. & Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21, pp. 64–145). London, UK: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1929)
- Freud, S. (1961c). The future of an illusion. In J. Strachey (Trans. & Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21, pp. 1–56). London, UK: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1927)
- Freud, S. (1963a). Introductory lectures on psychoanalysis. In J. Strachey (Trans. & Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 15, pp. 243–463). London, UK: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1915)
- Freud, S. (1963b). New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis. In J. Strachey (Trans. & Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 5–182). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1933)
- Freud, S. (1963c). On the history of the psychoanalytic movement. In J. Strachey (Trans. & Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 1–66). London, UK: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1914)
- Goethe, W. (2008). Torquato Tasso. In *Collected works of Goethe* (pp. 81–190). Rockville, MA: Wildside Books. (Original work published 1790)
- Goldschmidt, W., Barker, C., & Wolfram A., (2008). Klassenkampf [Class Struggle]. In W. F. Haug (Ed.), *Historisch-kritisches Wörterbuch des Marxismus [Historical and critical dictionary of Marxism]* (Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 836–873). Berlin, Germany: Argument.
- Gross, O. (2000). *Von geschlechtlicher Not zur sozialen Katastrophe [From sexual need to social catastrophe]*. Hamburg, Germany: Nautilus. (Original work published 1913)
- Gross, O. (2006). *Más allá del diván – Apuntes sobre la patología de la civilización burguesa [Beyond the couch — Observations on the pathology of bourgeois civilization]*. Barcelona, Spain: AliKornio Ediciones. (Original work published 1919)
- Haug, W. F. (2010). Komplementarität [Complementarity]. In *Historisch-Kritische Wörterbuch des Marxismus [Historical and critical dictionary of Marxism]* (Vol. 7, No. 11, pp. 1405–1409). Berlin, Germany: Argument.
- Honneth, A. (1995). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Horkheimer, M. (1974). *Critique of instrumental reason*. New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1967)
- Jones, E. (1962). *Leben und Werk von Sigmund Freud III [The life and work of Sigmund Freud]*. Bern, Switzerland: Hans Huber.
- Lenin, V. I. (1976). *Der linke Radikalismus und die Kinderkrankheit im Kommunismus [“Left-Wing” Communism: An infantile disorder]*. Berlin, Germany: Dietz Verlag. (Original work published 1929)
- Marcuse, L. (1969). *Freud*. Madrid, Spain: Alianza Editorial.
- Marx, K. (1975a). A contribution to the critique of Hegel’s philosophy of right. In *Marx/Engels collected works* (Vol. 3, pp. 175–187). Moscow, USSR: Progress. (Original work published 1843)
- Marx, K. (1975b). A contribution to the critique of political economy. In *Marx/Engels collected works* (Vol. 29, pp. 257–417). Moscow, USSR: Progress. (Original work published 1859)
- Marx, K. (1975c). Capital 1. In *Marx/Engels collected works* (Vol. 35). Moscow, USSR: Progress. (Original work published 1867)
- Marx, K. (1975d). Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844. In *Marx/Engels collected works* (Vol. 3, pp. 229–346). Moscow, USSR: Progress. (Original work published 1844)
- Marx, K. (1975e). The eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. In *Marx/Engels collected works* (Vol. 11, pp. 398–477). Moscow, USSR: Progress. (Original work published 1852)
- Marx, K. (1975f). Theses on Feuerbach. In *Marx/Engels collected works* (pp. 13–15). Moscow, USSR: Progress. (Original work published 1845)

- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1975a). Manifesto of the Communist Party. In *Marx/Engels collected works* (Vol. 6, pp. 477–519). Moscow, USSR: Progress. (Original work published 1848)
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1975b). Principles of communism. In *Marx/Engels collected works* (Vol. 6, pp. 341–357). Moscow, USSR: Progress. (Original work published 1874)
- Meyer-Abich, K. M. (1976). Komplementarität [Complementarity]. In J. Ritter (Ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie IV* [Historical dictionary of philosophy IV] (pp. 933–934). Basel, Switzerland: Schwabe.
- Parin, P. (2006). Das Studium des subjektiven Faktor [The study of the subjective factor]. In M. Kronauer, J. Ranc and A. Klärner (Eds.), *Grenzgänge – Reflexionen zu einem barbarischen Jahrhundert* [Crossing borders — reflections on a barbaric century]. (pp. 168–183). Frankfurt, Germany: Humanites. (Original work published 1985)
- Reichmayr, J. (2002). Freud und die Linke. In E. Modena (Ed.), *Mit den Mitteln der Psychoanalyse* [With the resources of psychoanalysis] (pp. 75–99). Giessen, Germany: Psychosozial Verlag.
- Schneider, G. (2012). Die Psychoanalyse ist ein Humanismus [Psychoanalysis is a humanism]. *Psyche*, 66, 675–701.
- Trotsky, L. (2010). *Teoría y práctica de la revolución permanente* [Theory and practice of permanent revolution]. México: Siglo XXI. (Original work published 1930)



**Raúl Páramo-Ortega** is one of the most influential figures in the history of Mexican and Latin-American Freudian left. He was trained at the Vienna Circle of Deep Psychology. His research has been inspired by Freudian psychoanalysis, Marxist critique and the work of Igor Caruso. He founded the Mexican Psychoanalytical Circle in 1969 and the Study Group Sigmund Freud in 1977. He taught at the Sigmund Freud Institute (Frankfurt) and the Psychoanalytical Academy (Munich). He is the author of *Freud in Mexiko – Ein Essay zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Mexiko* (Quintessenz, 1992), *Weltanschauung und Menschenbild. Einflüsse auf die psychoanalytische Praxis* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998) *Ich, Es, Überich. Ein triebtheoretischer Beitrag zur Auseinandersetzung mit dem Marxismus* (*Journal für Psychoanalyse*, 2005) and *El Psicoanálisis y lo Social: Ensayos Transversales* (Psychoanalysis and the Social: Transversal Essays (Universidad de Valencia, 2006).