

Psychoanalysis, Marxism: Once and Again

GORDANA JOVANOVIĆ, University of Belgrade, Serbia

ABSTRACT *The aim of this article is to analyze the relationship between psychoanalysis and Marxism on the basis of two historical examples at the beginning of the 20th century in the Soviet Union and Germany. These examples are chosen because of socio-political events with long-lasting consequences in which a reference to psychoanalysis emerged as a necessary counterpart of social diagnosis. While Marxism was officially seen as a tool of social change in the Soviet Union, with the rise of fascism in Germany Marxism became both a target of repression and a critical tool of opposition. It will be shown that in both countries psychoanalysis was seen as an important tool whose destiny was shaped by goals set up by political power structures. Therefore, the position of psychoanalysis in these countries underwent dramatic changes. The article asks whether from these historical examples we can draw some lessons for dealing with the contemporary crisis. Copyright © 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

Key words: psychoanalysis; Marxism; Freud; Reich; Frankfurt School

The relationship between Freud's psychoanalysis and Marxism became a topic of vivid intellectual and political interest in the 1920s and 1930s. As a result, two opposing positions emerged: one claiming that it was not possible to combine psychoanalysis and Marxism for various reasons including ideological ones (e.g., psychoanalysis being seen as a bourgeois science); and the opposite position, arguing not only for the possibility but even the necessity of connecting psychoanalysis and Marxism due to their many common features, including dialectical thinking and a complementary focus on both individual and society. Furthermore, it was argued that it was only by taking these two theories together could one provide an appropriate account of complex processes of human and socio-historical development.

The interest in the relationship between Freud's psychoanalysis and Marxism, or, rather, in establishing such a relationship, emerged under very specific socio-historical conditions in Europe, particularly in Germany. These conditions, understood from a Marxist standpoint, were marked by a striking mismatch between subjective attitude and consciousness, on the one hand, and social structure, on the other; the harsh social conditions in which the working class lived should have theoretically led it to take revolutionary actions, but not only did the social proletarian revolution fail, worse than that, the German working class supported the rise of Nazism. This was extremely challenging to Marxist theory and practice. Wilhelm Reich, a Marxist psychoanalyst described the situation in 1933:

*Correspondence to: Gordana Jovanović, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Čika Ljubina 18-20, 11000 Beograd, Serbia.
E-mail: gjovanov@f.bg.ac.rs

In the months after National Socialism came to power in Germany one could notice doubts on the correctness of Marxist accounts of social events also among those who in their deeds over the years proved their revolutionary steadiness and libertarian engagement readiness. (Reich, 1933/1977, p. 27)

There was a similar historical experience in the 1910s before the outbreak of World War 1 when social democratic parties voted for the war. Regardless of other differences, which were politically very important, the situations in 1914 and the 1930s pointed to the same pattern of a mismatch between the Marxist view of class consciousness and the objective social conditions.

It was under such conditions that Marxist social theory recognized the need for a theory of subjectivity. It should also be taken into account that Marx's early *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* (1844/1994), which were written in 1844, were not published until 1932. These manuscripts have been differently judged – as the most important philosophical writings by Marx on the one hand, or as humanist reflections lacking sufficient scientific strength on the other. It was in these manuscripts that Marx developed his ideas on alienation, especially on alienated labor, and also his general anthropological views. In this regard Marx advanced a radical historical understanding of human beings:

For not only the five senses but also the so-called spiritual and moral senses (will, love etc.), in a word, *human* sense and the humanity of the senses come into being only through the existence of their object, through nature *humanized*. The development of the five senses is a labor of the whole previous history of the world. (Marx, 1844/1994, p. 75)

Strikingly enough, even though Marx's early views on the historical development of human beings were viewed as in accordance with official Marxist ideology in the Soviet Union, which relied on historical materialism, "young Marx" was rather dismissed by that ideology for many years. However, the mature Marx, with his focus on the nature of the economy of capitalist society, was understood as a source of tools for the revolutionary struggle.

However, there is another paradox too. The practical social and political situation in the 1920s and 1930s showed the weakness of Marxist theory and its predictions – a proletarian revolution in Germany and other capitalist countries, which was expected according to Marxist theory, did not happen; although, paradoxically enough, the very same situation at the same time – the missing proletarian revolution – proved another Marxist claim, namely that practice is the final criterion of truth. Thus, the practice, or the practical problems in achieving the revolutionary goal, led to insights that Marxist theory needed further development, particularly in the direction of subjective conditions or, more precisely, subjects' positions which are mediated by objective social relations, but also by individual history, uncertainties, fears, etc. As the missing revolution proved that objective social conditions of exploitation and poverty were not enough to induce revolution, the subjective conditions became of increasing interest as it was assumed that they could have intervened.

Reference to the early history of discussions about the relationship between psychoanalysis and Marxism, and especially the socio-political context of these discussions, should not only show the historical relevance of such discussions but, more importantly, serve as an invitation to relate both theories to the present socio-political situation which is experienced by more and more people as a deep, lasting crisis. High rates of unemployment, especially among young people, rising inequalities, the capital–labor split, reduction of worker's rights – these are issues which concern

lay people and experts. A leading economist, Thomas Piketty, has warned of the potentially dangerous consequences of the existing model of the economy and organization of society adapted to the doctrine of neo-liberalism.

Modern economic growth and the diffusion of knowledge have made it possible to avoid Marxist apocalypse but have not modified the deep structures of capital and inequality ... When the rate of return on capital exceeds the rate of growth of output and income as it did in the nineteenth century and seems quite likely to do it again in the twenty-first century, capitalism automatically generates arbitrary and unsustainable inequalities that radically undermine the meritocratic values on which democratic societies are based. (Piketty, 2014, p. 1)

Obviously, these are not just economic issues, as stressed by Piketty himself: “Indeed, the distribution of wealth is too important an issue to be left to economists, sociologists, historians, and philosophers. It is of interest to everyone and that is a good thing” (Piketty, 2014, p. 2).

Nevertheless, in spite of many protests worldwide, no project of radical change is gaining momentum. On the contrary, it seems that capitalism is able to assimilate and thus transform and pacify the opposing and resisting potentials that it is continuously generating. This is a similar pattern as described at the beginning of the 20th century: objective conditions are producing crisis, but radical social change is missing.

In the rest of the article, I discuss some historical moments and debates on psychoanalysis and Marxism.

BEGINNINGS

Even before the Wiener Psychoanalytische Vereinigung (Vienna Psychoanalytic Association) was established at a meeting of Mittwochsgesellschaft (Wednesday Society), on 10 March 1909, members of that Society had discussed a lecture by Alfred Adler on the psychology of Marxism (after Nitzschke, 1999a). Alfred Adler, who at the time still belonged to Freud’s school of psychoanalysis, argued that Marx had recognized the primacy of drives in human life, the sources of repression and exploitation, and the ways of overcoming them and developing consciously (after Nunberg & Federn, 1977). The common feature of psychoanalysis and Marxism was, in Adler’s view, exactly this striving to become conscious. However, Freud was not convinced and replied that besides a striving to become conscious opposite forces produced repression of drives. Thus human development is marked by both more freedom of thought and more repression of drives.

Notably, Freud understood drive repression as a necessary mechanism of cultural development, for example, as explored in “Die ‘kulturelle’ Sexualmoral und die moderne Nervosität” (“‘Civilized’ sexual morality and modern nervous illness”), published in 1908 (Freud, 1908), almost two decades before he extensively discussed that issue in later works, especially in “Die Zukunft einer Illusion” (“The future of an illusion”) (1927) and “Das Unbehagen in der Kultur” (“Civilization and its discontents”) (1930).

Thus Freud maintained his conceptual acceptance of repression as a necessary mechanism of culture. “Maybe we should make ourselves familiar with the idea that there are difficulties inherent to the culture which cannot be avoided by any reform attempts” (Freud, 1930, p. 244). Although Freud addressed social inequality – he used the sociological term “class” – as an understandable source of hostility towards culture to the extent that disadvantaged members of a society are not willing to adopt and internalize cultural demands, he nevertheless did not allow

for or propose a society free of repression. At the same time, repression, dissatisfaction, and their consequences put the very existence of culture at risk: “It goes without saying that a culture which leaves so many of its participants unsatisfied and drives them into revolt neither has nor deserves the prospects of a lasting existence” (Freud, 1927, p. 146).

Thus culture itself requires renunciation of drives which can produce hostility to the extent that its existence can be endangered. Freud did not hesitate to express and repeat such warnings.

CLASSICAL CONTROVERSY

Freud’s position therefore differed from Marxist beliefs that a free society could be achieved through revolutionary actions. Bearing this in mind, it is understandable that Freud’s position was seen as a challenge to the very core of Marxist theory and practice. Eventually, it came to the point that in order to prove adherence to the Marxist position, any position challenging it must be criticized or even rejected – and Freud’s psychoanalysis was criticized by Marxists as being an ideological enemy. The best-known example of such conflict between psychoanalysis and Marxism was the case of psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich in the 1930s: he was excluded from the German Communist Party and even the Danish Communist Party (though he had never been a member of the latter) on the basis that he had published a book with counter-revolutionary content. A review on 1 December 1933 in *Arbeiderbladet* characterized Reich’s *The Mass Psychology of Fascism* as an attack on revolutionary politics (Boadella, 1975). On the first page of his *Mass Psychology of Fascism* Reich (1933/1977) wrote about “the fact of failure of the working class movement” (p. 27). Such an attitude was obviously understood as an attack on revolutionary politics, and its author as an enemy of working class. Reich was also expelled from the German Psychoanalytic Society and International Psychoanalytic Association in 1934 because of his political engagement (for a more detailed analysis of Reich, see Jovanović, 2014).

This was a culmination of a phase in the Marx–Freud debate. While the first debate in 1909 was not public, this second one was with party Marxists and psychoanalysts playing a very important role. The final outcome was that in the Soviet Union under Stalin psychoanalysis was discredited and repressed. In his history of psychoanalysis in Russia, Alexander Etkind referred to a diagnosis given in 1930 by the co-founder of the Moscow Psychoanalytic Society Moshe Wulff, then already exiled in Berlin, who believed that there were chances for psychoanalytic movement to develop in Russia but unfortunately psychoanalysis was officially opposed (Etkind, 1993/1996).

Freud in Lenin’s times

There were, however, events and experiences in a previous time in the history of Russia, or more precisely the Soviet Union, related to psychoanalysis, that in no way predicted such a tragic destiny for psychoanalysis in the country of workers and peasants. Contrary to a belief spread by Ernst Federn that Lenin did not know about psychoanalysis, Freudian scholar Cristfried Tögel (1989) found evidence that Lenin certainly knew some of Freud’s works in Russian translation. In Lenin’s private library were found several Russian translations of Freud’s writings, among them the “Analysis of a phobia in a five-year-old boy”, i.e., Little Hans (Freud, 1909/1913); *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (Freud, 1916–1917), supplemented with remarks by Lenin’s wife Nadeshda Krupskaja; and a collection of nine of Freud’s writings under the title *Fundamental Psychological Theories of Psychoanalysis* (Freud, 1923).

Tögel (1989) pointed out that it would be reasonable to assume that while living abroad from 1895 to 1917, and spending up to 15 hours per day in libraries in Berlin, Leipzig, Geneva, Zürich, Paris, and London, Lenin would have had access to many other works by Freud. Lenin's published works, especially *Materialism and Empiriocriticism* (1908) and *Philosophical Notebooks* (1895–1916), contain references to many psychologists of that time, including William James, Wilhelm Wundt, and Theodor Lipps. The fact that Freud was not quoted in Lenin's published works could be, in Tögel's view, the consequence of Stalin's "washing" of Lenin's work, i.e. the exclusion of undesirable parts.

Nevertheless, according to Tögel (1989), there are other clues that show that Lenin knew about Freud's ideas. For example, Clara Zetkin wrote in her memoirs that Lenin mentioned Freud in their discussions. There were other possible mediated ways in which Lenin could have learnt of Freud's ideas. For example, Trotsky could have been one of the transmitters as he lived in exile in Vienna from 1907 to 1914 and through his journal *Prawda* also met Adolf Joffe, a patient of Alfred Adler's. Trotsky claimed that this was how he learnt about psychoanalysis. In Deutscher's (1965) biography of Trotsky it is said that Trotsky encouraged Soviet scientists, including Ivan Petrovich Pavlov, to approach psychoanalysis without prejudices. It may be that when Trotsky met Lenin he mentioned Freud's work.

Tögel (1989) identified two people who knew both Lenin and Freud and who could have told Lenin of Freud's ideas. One was Levin Osipovich Darkshevich, a neurologist who worked for some time at the University of Vienna where he first met Freud. In Paris, Darkshevich became Freud's close friend and they published a neurological paper together (Jones, 1953). When he returned to the Soviet Union, Darkshevich became Lenin's doctor, though unfortunately not proving to have good diagnostic abilities when treating Lenin's last illness.

The other person to whom Tögel (1989) referred was Viktor Adler, Freud's neighbor in Berggasse 19 and co-founder of the Austrian Socio-Democratic Party. According to Federn, Viktor Adler was sympathetic to psychoanalysis and saw it as compatible with Austro-Marxism. When Lenin was arrested in Galicia in August 1914 and charged with espionage, Viktor Adler tried to help him, responding to a request from Nadezda Krupskaja. It seems his intervention with the Ministry of the Interior was successful and Lenin was released. He thanked Viktor Adler personally when he came to Vienna.

Tögel (1989) also argued that, apart from any personal relationship with Freud and psychoanalysis, Lenin's politics were supportive of all scientific and cultural achievements, including, therefore, psychoanalysis. In our present vocabulary we would say that his politics were inclusive – inclusive of all bourgeois culture on which proletarian culture has to rely in order to develop. Stalin's attitude was quite the opposite, with many tragic consequences. Lenin understood that socialist social development could succeed only in the context and on the basis of the scientific and cultural achievements made by bourgeois society.

Tögel (1989) stressed that Lenin's official politics at the highest governmental level created conditions and support for psychoanalysis, including the translation of Freud's works into Russian and the state publisher publishing books on psychoanalysis by Russian authors. The state publisher created a special psychological and psychoanalytic edition which included most of Freud's works as well as the works of other psychoanalytic authors, including Carl Gustav Jung, Sándor Ferenczi, and Melanie Klein.

Furthemore, Tögel (1989) pointed out that *Psychoanalytic Education in Soviet Russia* by Vera Schmidt was published in 1924 by the Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag. In this work she

reported on her psychoanalytic work with children in a children's home in Moscow. Following this book's publication, courses on psychoanalysis were introduced and the State Psychoanalytic Institute was established. In 1921, the Russian Psychoanalytic Association was founded with the financial support of the Ministry of Education, where Lenin's wife played an important role. In addition, lectures on psychoanalysis were held at the Communist Academy, which was a center for the development of social sciences.

An important forum for discussion of philosophical issues was the journal *Pod Znamenem Marksizma (Unter dem Banner des Marxismus)* (Under the Banner of Marxism), established in 1922 in Moscow (Tögel, 1989). In 1923, Tögel states, Bychowski published in this journal an article on the methodological foundations of Freud's psychoanalysis. He claimed that psychoanalysis was a monistic, materialistic, and dialectic system and, therefore, was in accordance with historical and dialectical materialism. Bychowski was not the only one who defended such an understanding of psychoanalysis: Salkind and Luria had the same opinion (Tögel, 1989).

From all these facts, Tögel (1989) concluded that psychoanalysis was not just tolerated but actively supported in Lenin's Russia. It is possible to go even further: it seems to me that psychoanalysis was seen not simply as compatible with the goals of building a new society, but as necessary for it.

In his study on the history of psychoanalysis in Russia, under the remarkable title *Eros Nevozmoznogo* (Eros of the Impossible), Aleksandr Etkind (1993/1996) stated that psychoanalysis became widely popular, even fashionable, only after the revolution of 1917. Russian translations of some of Freud's works were, however, available before the revolution. Etkind quoted the Bolshevik writer Aleksander Voronski, one of the co-founders of the Moscow Psychoanalytic Association, who claimed that those intellectuals who indulged Marxism and Marxists were also seduced by Freud's work. However, Etkind reported that there were also non-Marxist Freudians – he mentions Viktor Shklovski, the founder of the school of Formalism in Russia, who described himself not as a socialist but as a Freudian.

Famous psychologists Lev Vygotsky and Aleksander Luria, in their preface to a Russian translation in 1925 of Freud's (1920) "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" also acknowledged that Freud was very respected in Russia, both among scientists and a lay audience. They described a new aspect, characteristic of psychoanalysis in Russia: "a new and original trend trying to build a synthesis of Freudism and Marxism, with the inclusion of the theory of conditioned reflexes" (cited in Etkind, 1996, p. 220).

Etkind (1996) also mentioned a practicing analyst, Sara Neiditsch, who travelled from Saint Petersburg to Berlin and published in the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse (International Journal for Psychoanalysis)* a report in which she stated that in spite of the fact that the official representatives of science did not deal theoretically with psychoanalysis, even less practically, the official attitude towards psychoanalysis was not unfavorable. Further, Etkind added that, as in other countries, psychoanalysis entered literary debates in the Soviet Union in the 1920s. References to the unconscious were quite often used in explaining literary works, for example, of Babel, Pasternak, and Pilnjak. Yevgenij Zamjatin himself used a comparison to Freud's theory to describe the process of writing, describing the role of writers as "putting light in the cellars of the unconscious" (in Etkind, 1996, p. 221). Voronski claimed that revolution brought about a new type of hero, with particular conscious and unconscious traits. His emphasis on the unconscious became a pattern named after him: "voronshina" (Etkind, 1996, p. 222).

In Etkind's view, many references to psychology and pedagogy were "disastrous": "What is the use of nice economic and political changes if one has, in spite of all Marxism, to deal with psychological and pedagogical experiments?" (Etkind, 1996 p. 225; author's translation). Thus he saw the openness of Soviet Marxism to Freud in the 1920s as a sign of weakness. When, after Lenin's death, a radically different politics emerged, including very hostile attitudes toward psychoanalysis, this was interpreted as a sign of the weakness and historical failure of Marxism. In my view, Etkind seemed to assume an ideological position toward Marxism as, by definition, an inherent failure, regardless of its activities.

It was the general project of creating a new man within the new society which needed help. Etkind (1996) credited Nietzsche with the philosophical basis for that project but Nietzsche, with all his radical shifts and irrationality, was not suitable to Bolshevism. Etkind claimed that Freud got the chance of providing a theory which acknowledged the power of consciousness in human development. It was this trust in the capability of humans to consciously shape their lives which allowed Marxism and Freudism to come together.

In my view, such an interpretation of psychoanalysis departs from the usual understanding of it as being primarily a psychology of the unconscious, but it is supported in many of Freud's statements – "*Wo Es war, soll Ich werden*" ("Where the Id is, the Ego should be") being the most powerful. Such a view of psychoanalysis sees it as being oriented towards widening the realm of consciousness by helping the patient gain access to his or her repressed experiences. In that sense, I would argue that psychoanalysis, in its striving to widen consciousness over unconscious and repressed subjective realms, could be seen as a critique of personal ideology or false consciousness. On these grounds psychoanalysis meets the Marxist demands for a critique of ideology. From that it follows that Marxism indeed found in Freud's work a good ally.

I would add that there was also another level where Marxism and Freud shared common values: both trusted science as a superior form of knowledge, and therefore as vehicles of progress. It could even be argued that their trust in science was very close to scientism, i.e. a kind of ideology based on uncritical trust in the universal applicability of scientific knowledge modeled on natural sciences. From this perspective it is understandable that in the 1920s the Soviet Union adopted psychoanalysis as a vehicle for the modernization of individuals by raising their consciousness. Unfortunately, as already said, there was no continuity in intellectual openness in the Soviet Union after Lenin's death and it was obviously not only psychoanalysis that was adversely affected.

From the changed position of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union in the first decades of the 20th century, I would conclude that there is no inherent incompatibility between psychoanalysis and Marxism and the socialist project. Unfortunately, developments introduced into the Soviet Union by Stalin after Lenin's death endangered all three of them: psychoanalysis, Marxism, and the socialist project.

PSYCHOANALYSIS IN GERMANY IN THE 1930S

It is fruitful to compare the position of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union with its position in Germany during the 1930s, where the situation was even more complex.

On 10 May 1933, the books of four psychoanalysts, together with about 400 other authors, were burned in Berlin. These books, by Sigmund Freud, Anna Freud, Siegfried Bernfeld, and Wilhelm Reich, were declared as belonging to Freud's school and accused of "un-German spirit" with the

following words accompanying the burning: “*Gegen die seelenzerfasernde Überschätzung des Trieblebens*” (“Against the soul-destroying overvaluation of instinctual life”).

However, at the same time, surprisingly as it might seem, attempts were being made to accommodate psychoanalysis to the Nazi regime. German scholar Bernd Nitzschke analyzed the “fateful policies of the Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft [German Psychoanalytic Society]/International Psychoanalytic Association (DPG/IPA) officers vis-à-vis Nazi-regime as well as the still-repeated biased accounts of that story” (Nitzschke, 1999b, p. 352). Nitzschke documented, with reference to reports by German psychoanalysts Felix Boehm and Carl Müller-Braunschweig, their goal of showing that psychoanalysis could be useful to the new regime. Felix Boehm and Carl Müller-Braunschweig were elected presidents of the German Psychoanalytic Society (DPG) in 1933. Freud himself supported their election, conditional on the removal of Reich from the DPG, as discussed below (Nitzschke, 1999b). Leading figures of the International Psychoanalytic Association including Ernest Jones closely collaborated with Boehm and approved a memorandum, written by Carl Müller-Braunschweig, in which he “recommended psychoanalysis to the Nazi power brokers” (Nitzschke, 1999b, p. 357).

The case of Wilhelm Reich is very telling with regard to the adaptation of psychoanalysis to the Nazi regime and the attitude of psychoanalysts towards Marxism. Anna Freud complained in a letter to Ernest Jones about Reich’s political engagement in Vienna after he left Berlin in 1933, and, indeed, Freud himself approved the exclusion of Reich from the DPG. In Nitzschke’s (1999b) reconstruction of the position of psychoanalysis during National Socialism, it is reported that Reich’s Aryan colleague Felix Boehm came to Vienna in 1933 to seek Freud’s support for the “aryanization” of the presidency of the DPG. Freud granted that support but one of his conditions was the expulsion of Reich. In Freud’s wording, in a letter to Max Eitingon, then president of the DPG: “Since Reich is now causing trouble in Vienna, he should be removed from DPG [and thus from the IPA]. I want this done for scientific reasons, but have no objection to this being done for political reasons as well” (Freud, 1933).

Ironically and tragically, psychoanalysis was forced into politics by the regime Reich criticized, a critique that Freud and other influential psychoanalysts wanted to silence. Indeed, one of the most used measures for the purpose of adaptation was to expel Jewish psychoanalysts from professional associations in order to “save psychoanalysis itself”: “Even as late as 1935 Anna Freud still believed that it was worthwhile to secure the existence of organized psychoanalysis in Hitler’s Germany by renouncing political opposition” (Nitzschke, 1999b, p. 360). Such a strategy resulted in consequences for Freud himself, who also had to leave Vienna. It is indeed ironical that Freud was more interested in saving psychoanalysis than the people who could not be saved by it.

As the contemporary German psychoanalyst Peglau (2010) pointed out, the most widely read newspaper in Germany in 1939 was *Völkischer Beobachter* (Folk Observer), an official organ of Nazi party Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (NSDAP). It published very supportive statements about psychoanalysis and its role in shaping a new model of education opposing the Church’s repressive doctrine on sexuality. Peglau stressed that a new, adapted understanding of psychoanalysis deprived it of its core features:

Related to NS-ideology and linked to reinterpretation, psychoanalysis was actually a pre-Freudian, “Aryan” (Arisch) achievement; even *Völkischer Beobachter* promoted – at least on that day [14 May 1939] – basic knowledge of psychoanalysis and praised not depth psychology but *psychoanalysis as a very modern medical branch*. (Peglau, 2010, p. 346; author’s translation)

More than that, psychoanalysis was seen as an important ally in achieving the goal of creating valuable character qualities in the Nazi new order; as Nitzschke (1999b) observed: "Müller-Braunschweig (1933) recommended psychoanalysis to the Nazi power brokers as an effective psychotherapeutic method for shaping 'disabled weaklings' into 'efficient and active men'" (p. 357). Thus, rather than being forbidden during the Nazi regime, psychoanalysis was adjusted to the Nazi goals.

Comparing the fate of psychoanalysis in Germany and the Soviet Union, some similarities are apparent. Both sides took psychoanalytic tools as usable methods to achieve their political goals, but there was also a reverse situation on both sides. In Germany, starting in the 1930s, another attempt was made to combine Marxism and psychoanalysis within the framework of the critical theory of society, known as the Frankfurt School, with Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Erich Fromm, and Herbert Marcuse in the first generation. They were succeeded by the second generation, represented, since the late 1960s and 1970s, first of all by Jürgen Habermas (1971). The Frankfurt School also understood Freud's psychoanalysis as a theory which provided conceptual, theoretical, and therapeutic means for the emancipation of individuals from repression (see, for example, Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Fromm, 1962; Horkheimer, 1936; Marcuse, 1955, 1965). In their view individual emancipation was necessary in order to achieve liberation throughout society. In addition, psychoanalytic insights into the psychodynamics of drives, desires, reason, reality demands, and internalized social norms made it possible to understand social dynamics. Thus psychoanalysis was an ally in the project of social emancipation.

THE DECLINE OF EMANCIPATION PROJECTS

Another trajectory on which Marxism and psychoanalysis came together experienced a radical adjustment which brought into question the former socialist emancipation project. The tragic shift marked by Lenin's death in January 1924, but prepared already during his illness, brought about a radically changed attitude toward sciences, especially social and human sciences. Psychoanalysis was also affected and started to be interpreted as an idealistic and individualistic, i.e. bourgeois, science. Naturally, psychoanalysis was not the only victim of the post-Lenin era in Soviet Russia.

Unfortunately, that period lasted much longer than the first one. Moreover, in addition to its length, it symbolically occupied not only the whole Soviet period but also the most important intellectual legacy on which it relied: Marxism. Thus Marxism was reduced to and identified with Stalinism, then Stalinism with socialism, and finally socialism with Fascism.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the 1990s gave a new impetus to such an imperial ideological crusade which identified socialism only with Stalinism and dictatorship. Any memory of valuable social, intellectual, and cultural achievements of socialist societies (e.g. free education, a free health system, free child care, principles of equality and solidarity, the Yugoslav self-management system, and the early period in the Soviet Union characterized by a cultural flourishing which can be compared to the most glorious times in human history) had to be eradicated by all means.

However, not only is the socialist past at stake. To use psychoanalytic terms, it could be said that the ideological victor projected the evil into the defeated enemy and assumed the position of virtuous counterpart who inherited the legacy of freedom and is therefore protected from any critique questioning its concept of society and the individual.

The spread of neo-liberalism, which coincided with the destruction of socialist projects, is related to the privatization, not only of means of production, but also of social services (health,

education, child care, elderly care, etc.). These changed social conditions lead to changed consciousness, changed thinking, and changed emotional and value patterns. Contemporary sociologist Zygmunt Bauman (1991) described these processes:

Thorough, adamant, hard and uncompromising *privatization* of all concerns has been the main factor that has rendered postmodern society so spectacularly immune to systemic critique and radical social dissent with revolutionary potential ... What does truly matter is that it would not occur to them to lay the blame for such troubles they may suffer at the door of the state, and even less to expect the remedies to be handed over through that door. Postmodern society proved to be a well-nigh perfect translating machine: one that interprets any extant and prospective social issues as private concerns. (p. 261)

With the general intellectual shift away from the modernist agenda, which included both Marxism and Freud's psychoanalysis, to postmodernism, emancipation projects were both retrospectively and prospectively discredited. In my view, this is profoundly related to psychoanalysis, and especially to psychotherapy as a more and more important source of shaping self-understanding of modern subjects and their understanding of the world.

The privatization of social issues or, more precisely, the translation of social issues into private concerns, means a kind of encapsulation of a subject who assimilates all the problems of society but cannot externalize them, i.e. trace their origin back to society as the source of mass traumatization (Bianchi, 2003). Thus psychotherapy becomes a kind of internalized Leviathan, replacing the functions of society. With the focusing of attention on individual subjects and paying less and less attention to society as a whole, it is more difficult, even conceptually, to re-establish the link between private concerns and the social origin of them – and with postmodern deconstruction the subject is even internally disempowered.

As so powerfully stressed by Terry Eagleton, contrary to cultural relativism, moral conventionalism, skepticism, pragmatism, localism, distaste for ideas of solidarity and disciplined organization, and lack of any adequate theory of political agency, firm foundations are urgently needed. If any hopes for change are seen in such foundations “in confronting its political antagonists, the left, now more than ever, has need of strong ethical and even anthropological foundations; nothing short of this is likely to furnish us with the political resources we require” (Eagleton, 1996, pp. 134–135).

This is, in my view, also a necessary framework within which psychoanalysis and Marxism could reclaim their emancipatory roles. Marxism is a critical theory of society which can reveal hidden structures and ideological manipulations. Nowadays, this is a much more difficult task owing to more complex and differentiated societies. Rising levels of interdependence in a globalized world require an even more holistic approach which can grasp the whole. In spite of the postmodern affirmation of the local, the local is affected and shaped by the global. To recognize the formative function of interactions is not enough to reach societal formative processes.

Psychoanalysis is needed in its full range, from theory and therapy of the individual to cultural theory. It should avoid theoretical individualization and psychologization – and they are growing temptations in a radically individualized and psychologized culture. Subjective outcomes cannot be reduced to subjective genesis and origin. The history of psychoanalysis has shown that psychoanalysis itself has been affected by the society in which it has been theorized and practiced. Therefore it is also in its interest to work towards an urgently needed different society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is part of a research project 179018 funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development, Republic of Serbia.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D., & Sanford, N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and ambivalence*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bianchi, R. (2003). Neoliberalismus als soziopsychischer Traumatizierungsprozess. [Neoliberalism as a sociopsychological process of traumatization]. *Zeitschrift für Psychotraumatologie und psychotherapeutische Medizin*, 1, 51–63(2), 75–85.
- Boadella, D. (1975). *Wilhelm Reich*. New York, NY: Dell Publishing.
- Deutscher, I. (1965). *The prophet armed. Trotsky: 1879–1921* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Eagleton, T. (1996). *The illusions of postmodernism*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Etkind, A. (1996). *Eros des Unmöglichen: Die Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Russland* [Eros of the impossible: The history of psychoanalysis in Russia]. Leipzig, Germany: Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag. (Original work published 1993)
- Freud, S. (1908). Die “kulturelle“ Sexualmoral und die moderne Nervosität [“Civilized” sexual morality and modern nervous illness]. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. 9, pp. 9–32). Frankfurt, Germany: Fischer.
- Freud, S. (1909). Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben [Analysis of a phobia in a five-year-old boy]. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. 8, pp. 9–147). Frankfurt, Germany: Fischer.
- Freud, S. (1917). Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse [Introductory lectures on psychoanalysis]. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. 1, pp. 33–445). Frankfurt, Germany: Fischer. (Original work published 1916)
- Freud, S. (1920). Jenseits des Lustprinzips [Beyond the pleasure principle]. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. 3, pp. 213–272). Frankfurt, Germany: Fischer.
- Freud, S. (1923). *Fundamental psychological theories of psychoanalysis*. Moscow, USSR: Gosizdat.
- Freud, S. (1927). Die Zukunft einer Illusion [The future of an illusion]. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. 9, pp. 135–189). Frankfurt, Germany: Fischer.
- Freud, S. (1930). Das Unbehagen in der Kultur [Civilization and its discontents]. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. 9, pp. 191–270). Frankfurt, Germany: Fischer.
- Freud, S. (1933). Brief an Max Eitingon, 17. 4. 1933. [Letter to Max Eitingon]. Unpublished manuscript available from the Freud Museum, London.
- Fromm, E. (1962). *Beyond the chains of illusions: My encounter with Marx and Freud*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interest* (J. Shapiro, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Horkheimer, M. (1936). *Studien über Autorität und Familie* [Studies on authority and family]. Paris, France: Alcan.
- Jones, E. (1953–1957). *The life and work of Sigmund Freud*. London, UK: Hogarth Press.
- Jovanović, G. (2014). Ein Beitrag zur politischen Geschichte: Deutsch–skandinavische Übergänge am Beispiel Wilhelm Reichs [A contribution to a political history: German–Scandinavian transitions in the case of Wilhelm Reich]. In S. Fauth, & G. Magnusson (Eds.), *Influx. Der Deutsch–Skandinavische Kulturaustausch um 1900* [German–Scandinavian cultural exchange in 1900s] (pp. 381–413). Würzburg, Germany: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Lenin, V. I. (1895–1916). *Philosophical notebooks*. Retrieved from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/cw/prfv38pp.htm>
- Lenin, V. I. (1908). *Materialism and empirio-criticism*. Retrieved from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/cw/volume14.htm>
- Marcuse, H. (1955). *Eros and civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Marcuse, H. (1965). Das Veralten der Psychoanalyse. [The obsolescence of psychoanalysis]. In H. Marcuse (Ed.), *Kultur und Gesellschaft* [Culture and society] (Vol. 2, pp. 85–106). Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.

- Marx, K. (1994). In L. Simon (Ed.), *Selected writings*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing. (Original work published 1844)
- Nitzschke, B. (1999a). Marxismus und Psychoanalyse [Marxism and psychoanalysis]. *Luzifer-Amor. Zeitschrift zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse*, 2(3), 108–138. Retrieved from <http://www.werkblatt.at/nitzschke/text/marx.htm>
- Nitzschke, B. (1999b). Psychoanalysis during National Socialism. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 86(3), 349–366.
- Nunberg, H., & Federn, E. (Eds.) (1977). *Protokolle der Wiener Psychoanalytische Vereinigung* [Records of Vienna Psychoanalytic Association] (Vol. 2). Frankfurt, Germany: Fischer.
- Peglau, A. (2010). “Verbrannt und beworben“: Psychoanalytische Schriften im Nationalsozialismus und das Beispiel Wilhelm Reich [“Burned and advertised“: Psychoanalytic writings in National Socialism and the case of Wilhelm Reich]. *Psychoanalyse – Texte zur Sozialforschung* [Psychoanalysis – Texts on Social Research], 14(2/3), 332–363.
- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century* (A. Goldhammer, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Reich, W. (1977). *Die Massenpsychologie des Faschismus* [The mass psychology of fascism]. Frankfurt, Germany: Fischer. (Original work published 1933)
- Tögel, C. (1989). Lenin und die Rezeption der Psychoanalyse in der Sowjetunion der Zwanziger Jahre [Lenin and the reception of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union in 1920s]. Retrieved from <http://www.freud-biographik.de/frdsu.htm>



Gordana Jovanović is Professor of Psychology at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Serbia. She teaches general psychology and personality theories, qualitative research, and cultural-historical psychology. She was awarded a research grant by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (Germany) in 1984–1985, 1989, 2003, 2011, 2013, and 2014. She was guest researcher at the University in Frankfurt am Main, Free University of Berlin, and Humboldt University in Berlin. She was also awarded a grant by the British Psychological Society in 1999. She is author of *Simbolizovanje i racionalnost* [*Symbolization and Rationality*] (Izdavačko-Informativni Centar SSO Srbije, Beograd, 1984), *Frojd i moderna subjektivnost* [*Freud and Modern Subjectivity*] (Svetovi, Novi Sad & Institut za psihologiju, Beograd, 1997), and *Interpretativni svetovi psihologije* [*Interpretive Worlds of Psychology*] (Plato Books, Beograd, 2012), as well as various contributions in German and English.