

Retrieving the Past for a Usable Present: Anarchism, Psychoanalysis and Revolutionary Transformation in the Early 20th Century

JOHN LEES, School of Healthcare, University of Leeds, UK

RICHARD CLEMINSON, School of Languages, Cultures and Societies, University of Leeds, UK

ABSTRACT This article examines the relationship between different expressions of psychological therapy, alternative movements such as anarchism, and the potential for revolutionary social and personal transformation. By drawing on the history of socio-political movements in different European countries in the early 20th century, we suggest that approaches to healthcare and to social and individual transformation have much to learn from what is generally a forgotten or underestimated past. While the circumstances that engendered radical movements dedicated to psychoanalysis, therapy, and social change were the product of specific contexts, the current precariousness of European health systems and the increasing incidence of psychological damage invite a critical look to the past for inspiration for our embattled present. Germany in the 1890s and Spain in the 1930s are focused upon in particular with these aims in mind. All translations from the original Spanish in this article are our own unless otherwise stated. Copyright © 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Key words: Rudolf Steiner; Félix Martí Ibáñez; Sigmund Freud; Germany; Spain; anarchism; psychoanalysis

In this article we examine the relationship between psychological therapy, anarchism, and revolutionary transformation, in particular, how early 20th-century thought about human development can help us to understand this relationship. Following the suggestion made by Arthur Mitzman (1977) in relation to the anarchist dissident psychoanalyst Otto Gross, we aim to recover the usable past in order to inform us about the present or, at least, to make some suggestions about the kind of alternative present in which we could be living. Following this, we develop the basis for examining the connection between psychotherapy, what we term “spiritual anarchism”, and revolutionary transformation as expressed at the beginning of the 20th century and its relevance to the psychotherapy profession in Western liberal democracies. Our primary focus is on Spain in the 1930s and Germany in the 1890s. Alongside interest in

*Correspondence to: John Lees LS2 9JT, School of Healthcare, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK.
E-mail: J.Lees@leeds.ac.uk

non-religious schools and Pestalozzi education (Kerschensteiner, 1931), Darwinian and other theories of evolution (Girón Sierra, 1996), radical authors such as Ibsen (Gustavo, 1935), and preparation for the revolutionary general strike that would overturn and replace capitalism and the state, anarchists in Spain engaged with new trends in psychotherapy and psychoanalysis as part of their emancipatory repertoire.

SPAIN AND THE WORK OF MARTÍ IBÁÑEZ

A minority current within Spanish anarchism in the 1930s engaged with contemporary psychoanalytic theory as another element in the emancipatory repertoire, for instance, the influential anarchist medical doctor, Félix Martí Ibáñez (1911–1972). Martí Ibáñez was a member of the anarcho-syndicalist union organisation, the National Confederation of Labour (Confederación Nacional del Trabajo (CNT)), and attained the position of Director of the Catalan Health Services Directorate (Sanitat i Assistència Social (SIAS)) in the revolutionary upsurge in the early months of the Civil War (1936–1939). He remained in that post until May 1937 and, in August of the same year, published a short book analysing the Spanish revolution under the title *Psychoanalysis of the Spanish Social Revolution* (Martí Ibáñez, 1937a), a volume that has largely escaped the attention of historians who have analysed the cultural and political productions of Spanish anarchism.

Martí Ibáñez's usage of psychoanalysis highlights the basic concept which will underpin this study; namely, the relationship between the principles of human development (the mentality of the people) and social praxis. Using fundamental psychoanalytic theory he argued that revolutionary change is driven by the inexorable force of deep-seated and unconscious individual human drives: the so-called life force, sexual instincts, or Eros. In effect, he argued that it is important to become conscious of the effect of our drives in order to understand the forces underlying revolutionary change.

Martí Ibáñez's work was an account of the various stages of the revolutionary process that had evolved from July 1936 using psychoanalytic concepts that had been debated and disseminated widely in society, such as the Oedipus complex. The revolution, a response to the *coup d'état* led by a group of army generals against the democratic Republic established in 1931, saw a displacement of state power into the hands of trade unions, neighbourhood and workplace committees, and armed militias. In some parts of the country, this resulted in what one observer on the ground, George Orwell, described as a situation whereby "the working class was in the saddle" (1962, p. 8) or, in the words of the historian Chris Ealham, as "the greatest revolutionary festival in the history of contemporary Europe" (2010, p. 173). This revolutionary fervour, with factories, fields and workshops seized by workers, lasted until May 1937, a date which many historians (e.g. Graham, 1999) view as crucial in the re-consolidation of state and governmental power, although many agrarian and other workers' collectives continued well beyond this date.

The stages of this revolution, according to Martí Ibáñez (1937a), corresponded to the assassination of the father (the authority of the state), a totemic phase, an Oedipal phase, a fratricidal phase, the appearance of taboos, and a final matriarchal phase when the fruits of labour would be abundant, the land would redeem its produce, and social harmony would reign. He therefore put psychoanalysis to use as an instrument of historical investigation. Nevertheless, he aimed for a grounded explanation, thus distancing himself from the explanations offered by the "fanatics of Freudianism" (Martí Ibáñez, 2004, p. 157) who replaced the contents of History

(with a capital “H”) with psychoanalytic concepts, thereby arriving at an “optical illusion by which the image seen through the lens became confused with the object that produced” it in the first place (Martí Ibáñez, 2004, p. 157).

Throughout his account, Martí Ibáñez was keen to emphasize the individual *and* collective dimensions of both history and psychoanalysis and the ways in which they were related as part of an enlightening project devoted to explaining the tumultuous events of the period. A revolution, he wrote, faithfully reflecting the libertarian tradition, was not about the State and its institutions but about “the mentality of a people” (2004, p. 163). Drawing on meta-narratives about the ancient desires of the workers and the thinking of Freud, Jung, Spencer, Durkheim, and Huxley, among many others, history for Martí Ibáñez became a “huge process of spiritual Biology” (p. 163), in which the people sought land, justice, freedom, and peace. In this way, the process which began with the hatred of the father and proceeded to the matriarchal phase was superimposed on a rather teleological account of the workers’ desire for liberty and the anarchist arcadia. Despite this quasi-mechanical developmental process, Martí Ibáñez’s account, published 13 months after the July 1936 revolutionary response to the military *attentat* (coup), was written from the heart and in the expectation that by means of the “rifle and fist, the brain and the quill” (Martí Ibáñez, 2004, p. 181), the social revolution would triumph.

FROM SPAIN IN THE 1930s TO GERMANY IN THE 1890s

The use of the terminology of psychoanalytic theory to explain the revolutionary transformation of Spain was not customary in the Spanish workers’ movement, but the sentiments that Martí Ibáñez (1937a) communicated and his desire to reflect and substantiate a transformative process certainly were, for instance, his notion of the “conscious worker” (*obrero consciente*) (for more details on this notion, see Litvak, 1981) who would possess the intellectual, ethical, and physical means to transform his or her world. This was exemplified in the anarchist women’s organization, Free Women (Mujeres Libres), established in 1936. As Margareth Rago (2008) has pointed out, it argued that social and personal transformative change went hand in hand, or at least should do if the revolutionary movement was to triumph. Furthermore, new ways of living one’s life “consciously” were essential for new values to inhabit, disrupt and finally reject the old, corrupt world. As one of the founders of Mujeres Libres, Lucía Sánchez Saornil, was to write in her book *Horas de Revolución* (The Hours of the Revolution), published in the same year as Martí Ibáñez’s psychoanalytical analysis (1937a):

If the Revolution is the reform of customs, let us begin there. But then, soon afterwards, let us practice everything that made up our aspirations, our rules and our principles yesterday. We stated in the past that the Revolution should begin in ourselves, and if we do not do this, we will lose the Revolution. (Sánchez Saornil, cited in Rago, 2008, p. 198).

The notion of the conscious worker and the need for personal as well as social transformation brings us to another movement which was contemporaneous with the development of psychoanalysis and was also concerned with individual human development and social praxis; namely, Rudolf Steiner’s science of the spirit, or Anthroposophy (Steiner, 1909/1963; Storr, 1996). Both Martí Ibáñez and Steiner based their work on the importance of individual change

(the mentality of the people and the conscious worker), but they differed in regard to how to unleash this power. Martí Ibáñez's (1937a) use of psychoanalysis saw revolutionary change as subject to inherent drives over which we normally have little control but which, in certain circumstances, can take a socially transformative form. He argued that basic human instincts could be the motive force for large numbers of people. In contrast, Steiner saw revolutionary change as arising out of liberating individual human beings from such drives and, indeed, our habits.

Steiner developed his ideas in the same social context as Freud, namely the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the latter years of the 19th century. Steiner and Freud both lived and worked in Vienna between 1879 and 1889. During this period Steiner studied at the Vienna Institute of Technology and worked as a tutor for a family who were acquaintances of Freud's mentor Joseph Breuer. Steiner wrote his first book, *Theory of Knowledge Implicit in Goethe's World-Conception*, in 1886. The ideas contained in this book had formed the basis of his doctoral thesis, *The Philosophy of Freedom* (1894/1964), and indeed were to inform his life's work, including his views on individual development and social praxis.

Central to Steiner's ideas was a spiritual perspective and a view that, in order to promote social emancipation, we must, first of all, become inwardly free. This would involve becoming free of our habitual ways of being, including norms and habits of moral behaviour. He believed that our actions are limited if they are based on the morality of the past; that is to say, that moral principles and codes of behaviour are redundant:

If a man acts only because he accepts certain moral standards, his action is the outcome of the principles which compose his moral code. He merely carries out orders. He is a superior automaton. Inject some stimulus to action into his mind, and at once the clockwork of his moral principles will set itself in motion and run its prescribed course. (Steiner, 1894/1964, p. 135)

Similar principles were implicit in the ethics of Emmanuel Lévinas (1989), which were based on the ideas of Martin Buber (who in turn dedicated a whole volume to anarchistic utopias) (Buber, 1949); namely, to place the quality of the relationship over and above the content of what was shared, the sense of the presence of God above ideas, rules and conventions and the immediacy of the relationship above any form of spiritual dogmatism (Buber, 1961). This resembled Steiner's concern about human beings becoming automatons. The ability to live without external moral guidance or coercion and how to establish moral and ethical behaviour lay at the heart of Buber's analysis of utopias. Buber, as Marshall noted, shared with the German anarchist Gustav Landauer a concern about developing "the organic community within the shell of the existing State and ... wanted to base social regeneration on a moral and spiritual change" (Marshall, 1992, p. 574). However, where the anarchists rejected the State as an emancipatory vehicle, Buber accepted its role in maintaining external security and in providing conflict resolution between internal groups, thus acting as a *communitas communitatum* rather than a machine (Marshall, 1992, p. 574). At the heart of these concerns was what Lévinas described as the "assignation with the other": a voluntary, as-free-as-possible, non-hierarchical encounter or ethics of relationship (Newman, 2010, 2012).

Instead of one becoming a "superior automaton" who acts like "clockwork", subject to "dogmas and rules", Steiner argued that one would be better served by adopting a particular position in relation to the imperatives of each moment in one's life along with an awareness of the otherness of the other within the framework of one's perspective on the world:

To *live* in love towards our actions, and to *let live* in the understanding of the other person's will, is the fundamental maxim of *free men*. They know no other *obligation* than what their will puts itself in unison with intuitively; how they will direct their *will* in a particular case, their faculty for ideas will decide. (Steiner, 1894/1964, p. 139)

He argued that we have the capacity to “bring forth” actions from within ourselves rather than out of moral codes, relying on our intuitions since “the realization of moral aims” is attained by raising ourselves “to the intuitive world of ideas” (Steiner, 1894/1964, p. 136). He contrasted this with relying on “blind instinct” which is not individual but the “most general” in us. This involves a great deal of self-mastery and painful struggle; arriving at what Newman, providing a new dimension to Étienne de la Boétie's words, has described as “an ethics of voluntary inservitude” (Newman, 2012, p. 47). This requires breaking free of moral codes in order to become truly moral.

This approach to human development is underpinned by Steiner's philosophical outlook, which saw ideas as being both individual and also, in a Platonic sense, as forming part of a universal world of ideas which has a reality which is independent of us but which can nevertheless light up within us. He argued that our direct “vision of the spiritual world has largely ceased or has become decadent” and that the only way to gain access to it once more would be through inner development and the transformation of our rational thinking into a feeling-thinking (Stebbing, n.d., p. 22). Steiner referred to this as developing “ethical individualism”, seeing freedom as the capacity to act in such a way that the reasons for the action “spring from the ideal part of my individual being” (1894/1964, p. 138). This capacity would allow us to connect with other people and to act out of our awareness of the otherness of the other. We can embrace, and become conscious of, our own true nature and the true nature of the other. To the extent that we can connect with the universal world of ideas we are able to see ourselves and others as we are, as opposed to who we want each other to be. It is this which leads to freedom. Steiner viewed individual human encounters as unique and therefore not addressable by any generalized moral code. In a similar vein, Lévinas (1989) referred to the present moment as a “unique event, a momentary present which cannot be connected to other temporal instants in order to form a history or biography” (p. 70).

Steiner's ideas, expressed most fully in his book *The Philosophy of Freedom* (1894/1964), brought him into close contact with the so-called individualist anarchist J. H. Mackay and, through Mackay, the works of Max Stirner (Mackay, 2005) and Benjamin Tucker (Kennedy, 1983). All of these men were connected with the development of individualist anarchism: a peaceful anarchist movement which was concerned with developing individual self-government and self-leadership. Steiner met Mackay in Berlin in 1898, finding they had much in common. For his part, Mackay found Steiner's ideas about ethical individualism similar to his own (Easton, 1980, p. 86). Steiner referred to Mackay's book, *The Anarchists: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (Mackay, 1891), as “a noble work, based on his deep-seated confidence in human individuality” (Steiner, 1925/1999, p. 243). In terms of social life, he was impressed by Mackay's encouragement to the poor to turn “to the good forces in human nature” and, as a result of this, develop the capacity to “work socially in the free community of human beings, without the need to resort to force” (*ibid.*, p. 243).

Martí Ibáñez's psychoanalytically inspired approach to anarchy viewed revolutionary change as emerging from the unconscious galvanization of sublimated drives. Steiner, on the other hand, emphasized the need to liberate ourselves from our drives in order to become free and creative

through self-mastery. We could thereby rise above our everyday human limitations and reach out to an overarching spiritual force underpinning the world.

Freud's basic world view, like Martí Ibáñez's, was based on the notion that our actions arise from unconscious drives and therefore we lack freedom in choosing how we behave. His ideas, therefore, were the polar opposite of the notion of the development of freedom proposed by Steiner. This was implicit in Freud's fascination with the hypnotic clinical techniques used by Jean-Martin Charcot in Paris and also in his close relationship with Joseph Breuer, who also used hypnosis. Hypnotic techniques revealed a level of consciousness of which we are usually unaware and which is outside our control that, nevertheless, profoundly affects our lives. Psychoanalysis recognizes, on the one hand, the potential for anarchic sentiments in these innate tendencies and also provides a clinical method to bring them into the service of society: "where id was, there ego shall be" (a well-known psychoanalytic maxim which was apparently uttered by Freud at the Psychoanalytic Congress of 1933). Martí Ibáñez built on this but also argued that as well as being sublimated to conform to bourgeois society these same primal drives could also be unleashed in a productive way in situations of revolutionary change. Therefore, he differed from the view that gained sway in intellectual and popular circles during the European inter-war period that psychoanalysis tended to reinforce notions of "social dismay" and inevitable destruction and morbidity (Overy, 2010).

STEINER AND MARTÍ IBÁÑEZ

Despite the differences touched on above, both Steiner and Martí Ibáñez adopted a spiritual world view and an approach to human development based on health, not just illness.

Martí Ibáñez's assessment of Freud and his legacy on the occasion of his 80th birthday in 1936 was written for the relatively learned readership of review *Tiempos Nuevos*, an anarchist publication first published in early 1936. He argued that psychoanalysis, unlike eugenics and programmes for the abolition of prostitution, had not yet been hijacked by retrograde politicians and had instead become "an instrument of social struggle" (Martí Ibáñez, 1936, p. 278). He provided a brief overview of Freud's work and development along with a summary of the techniques for which he had become famous: catharsis, free association, the dream theories, and theories of neurosis and hysteria. In spite of the fact that Martí Ibáñez argued in other writings (1937a) that social life was a biological process, in this work he was careful to point out its spiritual dimensions. This led to a double critique of Freud's thought: it had concentrated too closely on material "organic failings" (p. 279) as opposed to spirituality and had interpreted normal psychology from the perspective of *abnormality*. This, Martí Ibáñez argued, resulted in an equivocal and overly complex theory.

These themes reflected Steiner's thought and work in which spirituality, along with the dangers of a biological interpretation of human behaviour, was a central feature. Indeed, his emphasis on spirituality was the primary motive for his decision to break away from the Berlin intellectual circles in which he was unable to convey his spiritual world view. He experienced this as an inner-outer split, much like Jung's consciousness number one and consciousness number two (Jung, 1961/1983). Steiner found it gradually more difficult to reconcile the "factors that determined my outer destiny" and that which "arose inwardly from my experience of the spiritual world" (Steiner, 1925/1999, p. 223), culminating in him removing himself from public life and becoming involved in the German branch of the Theosophical Society (Easton, 1980, p. 112). The theme of health, or salutogenesis, as distinct from illness, is a central feature of current applications of Steiner's therapeutic work (Lees, 2011).

The distinction between Martí Ibáñez's adoption of the notion of drives and collective unfreedom as espoused in the early work of Freud and Steiner's emphasis on the development of individual freedom as a focus of change naturally led to differences in their work. But there were also similarities. Although Martí Ibáñez believed that primal drives operated at an individual and collective level, this view was subtly modified during the 1930s. In particular, as he became increasingly involved in the Spanish anarchist movement, his ideas on the relationship between unswerving biological drives and the ability, indeed need, of individuals to create or craft their own "profile" and "course" were constantly reaffirmed in his writings (Martí Ibáñez, 1935, 1937b). Their world views, therefore, took on similar characteristics. Martí Ibáñez's ideas began to resemble Steiner's ethical individualism (and Mackay's individual anarchism) even though there is no evidence that he was familiar with Steiner's work. There are three other examples of both similarity and difference between their thought.

Firstly, Martí Ibáñez consolidated a tradition of openness towards new thought in general, and psychoanalytical and psychological thought within the Spanish anarchist milieu. The arts, culture, and sociology review *La Revista Blanca*, described by one author as "the most important anarchist theoretical journal in Spain" (Woodcock, 1970, p. 348; see also Cleminson, 2012), was one source for the dissemination of these ideas (Götze, 1931; Levinson, 1931), and the growing and extensive anarchist press of the 1920s and 1930s contributed to this process. For example, the Valencia-based review *Estudios* (1929–1937), formerly *Generación Consciente* (1923–1928), was printed to the tune of some 70,000 copies at its high point (Navarro, 1997), broaching a wide variety of cultural and philosophical issues. It was important in the "self-management of knowledge", especially through its "Question and Answer" pages (Tabernero Holgado, Jiménez-Lucena, & Molero-Mesa, 2013), and was renowned for its modernistic artwork and striking covers (Fernández de Ybarra Esquerdo, 2012). During his time in Berlin, Steiner was also involved in artistic, cultural, and social life as editor of the journal *Magazin für Literatur* (Steiner, 1925/1999, p. 223) from 1897 until 1900, but, as was consistently the case, Steiner's spiritual world view took pre-eminence, as did his espousal of the freedom of the individual. So, as he began to realize that he could not freely express his spiritual views in those intellectual circles and, as those responsible for the *Magazin* became aware of his ideas, the two parted, and Steiner, true to this philosophy, broke free of the constraints of the intellectual circles within which he moved.

Secondly, Martí Ibáñez levelled a charge against Freud which was perhaps more serious. Although he believed that "the masses" owed Freud a debt of gratitude for "illuminating to them the road to the spiritual liberation of sexual complexes" (Martí Ibáñez, 1936, p. 280) and that Freud had "showed scientifically the path that the proletariat would have to take collectively" in its struggle for freedom (ibid., p. 280), he questioned the social engagement of psychoanalysis. Freud, he argued, had retained too much 19th-century materialism and his psychology

was still too biological to be able to assess correctly those moments in the human psychic personality that do not possess a biological foundation and which, therefore, should be analysed in accordance with an integrally psychological form of Psychology and not one based on biological interpretations. (ibid., p. 280)

Such a biological or "biologistic" interpretation on the part of Freud meant that he was timorous when broaching certain social terrains. He failed to construct an advanced expression of sexual sociology and refused, essentially, to break with his "very nineteenth-century bourgeois cultural

background” (ibid., p. 280). Some of Freud’s followers, however, had done precisely that. Paraphrasing Wilhelm Reich, Martí Ibáñez observed that it was necessary to know when to differentiate Freud, the man of science, from Freud, the out-of-date bourgeois philosopher. This conflict meant that Freud would have gazed in wonder at how his theories found a place in the social struggle. As the Norwegian radical psychoanalyst Gunnar Leistikow pointed out, the working class was now creating a new sexual morality in the light of Freud’s ideas. Indeed, a recent theme of psychoanalysis has been how it has become paralyzed in regard to the transformation of social life (Lees & Cleminson, 2013).

The influence of 19th-century materialism and bourgeois values was also a theme in Steiner’s work. Unlike Reich and others, he dismissed Freud’s psycho-sexual theories and especially the notion of childhood sexuality (Steiner, 1915/1991). He was not prudish about sexuality per se but took objection to Freud’s emphasis on it as a motivating factor in our actions. For Steiner the motivating factor was our drive towards freedom and wholeness. He did not see sexuality as a liberation but as a form of imprisonment to our instincts.

In Steiner’s work the notion of wholeness and freedom influenced his views about the relationship between materialism, the bourgeoisie, and the working class. He made a sharp distinction between the direct experience of the working class and the way in which their experience gradually became influenced by the ideas of the bourgeoisie. He took the view that the working class, as it developed consciousness of its social position during the 19th century, became cut off from the “human dignity” which had been “available to the medieval artisan through his craft, to which he felt *humanly* related” (Steiner, 1977, p. 34) and which enabled him to view himself as a “soul-entity existing within a spiritually existential framework” (ibid., p. 35). He argued that this was then replaced by the abstract and disembodied ideas of scientific materialism which had been developed by bourgeois intellectuals.

Steiner’s view makes the distinction between the experience of the educated bourgeois, whom he sees as having access to the long-standing cultural traditions which could still be experienced, and the working class, who were not cut off from these traditions as a result of the development of materialism in the 19th century. The educated bourgeois was able to live “unscientifically”, while the “unlearned proletarian” had no such choice and had to orientate “his entire way of life” to scientific materialism:

the educated person has taken science and pigeon-holed it in a compartment of his mind, but his sentiments are determined by societal relations which do not depend on this science. The proletarian however is obliged by his circumstances to experience existence in a way which corresponds to scientific convictions. (ibid., p. 37)

The bourgeois was able to break free of the influence of scientific materialism on their lifestyle by compartmentalizing it and developing cultural pursuits which, in Steiner’s terms, still retained some vestige of spirituality. But the working class had no such choice.

Thirdly, writing often under the rubric of his column on “eugenics and sexual morality”, it was this new sexual morality that Martí Ibáñez sought to examine and engender. In an exploration of individual psychology (Martí Ibáñez, 1937), a four-page piece in *Estudios* was accompanied by an opening graphic depicting two volumes side by side, one whose spine read “Freud” and the other “Adler”. The usefulness of these ideas for an understanding of historical questions, such as the decadence of the Bourbons in Spain or the particular politics of the anarchist Bakunin, were

placed alongside what Martí Ibáñez believed were the radical directions that Adlerian psychology could take humanity. He argued that, owing to its individualized focus and because, in Hegelian fashion, it had rejected some of the limitations of its Freudian forebears, developing new antithetical approaches, it could move beyond explanations of sexual and social conflict that were rooted in the glands or in a mere spiritualized interpretation of love. An Adlerian approach therefore allowed humanity to discover the linkages between “individual sexuality and our relations with the community” and permitted new ways of correcting “sexual abnormalities” (ibid., p. 13).

In this way, Martí Ibáñez confirmed the words of Reich in *The Sexual Revolution* (1945/1961): the socially sterile man is he who is absorbed by sexual conflict (Martí Ibáñez, 1937a, 1937b). As Reich’s *Mass Psychology of Fascism* (1933/1970) would attempt to show, such individuals were prone not only to sexual conflicts but also to reactionary politics. Although Martí Ibáñez does not say so in his article on Adler, it is clear that, as an activist within the broad libertarian movement, he sought to put such insights into action. His public persona and his detailed responses to young people who aired their cultural and sexual problems in the pages of *Estudios* showed how this approach to individual psychology that went beyond the limitations of a biologicistic approach could dovetail with a revolutionary movement.

The routes, and the failures, that this endeavour produced were, at least in part, we can say now, the result of the particular political and social circumstances at the time. Reich was to be expelled from the Communist Party and his publications banned, not only by the KPD but, eventually, by the Nazis. In Spain in 1936, however, the fusing of psychoanalysis with a programme of social transformation was still in many respects to be implemented. Obviously, the consolidation of the Franco dictatorship effectively put an end to the social transformational programme of psychoanalysis but the efforts of figures like Martí Ibáñez as part of the revolutionary change effected by anarchism are worth recalling.

Steiner saw that “psychoanalysis has made a legitimate contribution to our culture” (1915/1991, p. 69) but was deeply concerned about the materialism that underpinned it. Just as the working class had been overtaken by scientific materialism, he thought that the same thing had occurred in psychoanalysis including the theory of sexuality: “the materialism of the psychoanalysts, however, also pulls the lower human drives into their theory and incorporates them into it. As a result sexual drives, the most subjective element possible, become the motivating impulse in scientific activity” (ibid., p. 69). He even stated that spirituality could be driven by sexual energy and, as such, become a sort of pseudo spirituality which was, in fact, a form of materialism in disguise. An example he gave of this was the work of Emmanuel Swedenborg: “transformed sexual energy is actually the basis of Swedenborg’s clairvoyance” (ibid., p. 78).

Steiner’s view about human development had much more in common with Freud’s abandoned seduction theory (Masson, 1984). In other words, his view is essentially psycho-social (or more precisely bio-psycho-social-spiritual). His views about human development were entirely consistent with those views about human development which see human psychological problems as being created by all forms of socially induced trauma from wars to incest (Steiner, 1924/1974).

The question of energy, sexual or otherwise, is central to many spiritual (and psychological) world views. But it is not so evident in Steiner’s work. Having said this he speaks briefly about kundalini energy in his earlier work but not as an energy but as a substance” which “holds together, within the human being, the forces which lead eventually to the spirit” (Steiner, 1904/1985, p. 127). But, as far as we are aware, he does not mention kundalini again in his work. This

is remarkable in view of the fact that this rare, early statement about kundalini gives it central importance in spiritual development and, as such, presents it as a precursor to individual (and ultimately social) transformation. Yet the key to its importance in Steiner's work lies, once again, in the notion of human freedom and breaking free of constraints in order to liberate ourselves. In particular, he sees kundalini as being created by our capacity to liberate ourselves from "nation, race, sex, position, religion, and ultimately egotism" (p. 126). Such prejudices bind us and leave us unfree. To develop spiritually we are to become classless universalists rather than nationalists, racists, sexists, religious fundamentalists, and dogmatists. When we develop spiritually we go beyond all of these distinctions. And this leads to the creation of kundalini substance which, in turn, leads to spiritual development which, in turn, leads to social transformation.

The essential difference between the approach of Martí Ibáñez and Steiner to social change is that Martí Ibáñez, after Freud, emphasized instinct, drive, and unfreedom whereas Steiner emphasized, in a Platonic sense, the influence of ideas and the notion of freedom which can be likened to Mackay's views about individualist anarchism. This approach involves overcoming the pervasive influence of socially constructed ideas. Our spiritual (and social) development can be overwhelmed – and suppressed – by the ideas of the bourgeoisie, the ideas of scientific materialism which cut off the working class from lived human experience, and the ideas of nationalism, racism, and dogmatic religion.

CONCLUSION: SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR TODAY

The primary aim of this article has been to recover the usable past, as suggested by Mitzman (1977) in order to inform us about the present or, at least, to make some suggestions about the kind of alternative present in which we could be living. The present in which we live is what has been referred to as an atomized, individualized world of "liquid uncertainty" (Bauman, 2007) in which neoliberal capitalism appears to be in the ascendant. So what does the apparent liberatory potential, as envisaged by some revolutionaries of the past, and as discussed in this article, invite us to think about today?

The atomized individualized world is pervaded by top-down technical rational systems which are increasingly influencing professional life from above (Rolfe, Freshwater, & Jasper, 2001). This is exemplified by the New Public Management approach to care based on the principle of managers, markets, and measurement which was introduced into healthcare in the UK in the wake of the 1983 Griffiths report and which emphasized the importance of introducing managerialism into public service institutions (Ferlie, Ashburner, Fitzgerald, & Pettigrew, 1996). Apart from the overt effect on the system there is also an internal effect, which Samuels (2014) has referred to as the profession in the mind of the therapist – "a serious inhibitor of freedom" which cultivates the "internalized professional hierarchies that exist in the therapy world" (p. 320). He is referring specifically to hierarchies within the counselling and psychotherapy profession, although we are extending the principle to include the wider culture surrounding it.

It is possible to think about internalized discourses in a Foucauldian sense. However, in this article, we have focused on a different perspective based on ideas which developed in the earlier part of the 20th century. According to these perspectives there are two ways of responding to the potentially oppressive world of our work. Either human beings unleash the energy of our primal drives and instincts in the sense discussed by Martí Ibáñez or they break free of these internalized discourses in the sense espoused by Steiner – or perhaps do both. Whichever route human beings

take we have, in this article, worked towards developing the notion of the organic intellectual – a notion which, as Holmes (2002) noted, was first developed by Gramsci. An organic intellectual, like practitioner researchers, engages with the realities of life in all its complexity. Such intellectuals are not recognized by the conventional intelligentsia but they nevertheless carry on a form of intellectual activity: their work combines philosophical, artistic and moral elements, generates new knowledge and can even bring about social change (Holmes, 2002). They can develop radical ideas which challenge dominant discourses in professional and academic life. Within the counselling and psychotherapy profession they contribute to individual and social transformation for both clients and practitioners (Lees, 2008) and, needless to say, the general public.

REFERENCES

- Bauman, Z. (2007). *Liquid times: Living in an age of uncertainty*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Buber, M. (1949). *Paths in Utopia* (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.) London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Buber, M. (1961). I and thou. In W. Herberg (Ed.), *The writings of Martin Buber*. Cleveland, OH: Meridian Books.
- Cleminson, R. (2012). The construction of masculinity in the Spanish labour movement: A study of the Revista Blanca (1923–36). *International Journal of Iberian Studies*, 24(3), 210–217. DOI:10.1386/ijis.24.3.201_1.
- Ealham, C. (2010). *Anarchism and the city: Revolution and counter-revolution in Barcelona, 1898–1937*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Easton, S. (1980). *Rudolf Steiner: Herald of a coming epoch*. Spring Valley, NY: Anthroposophic Press.
- Ferlie, E., Ashburner, L., Fitzgerald, L., & Pettigrew, A. (1996). *New public management in action*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Fernández de Ybarra Esquerdo, A. (2012). Knowledge by visual transmission: sexuality and anarchist visual culture in Estudios (1928–37). *International Journal of Iberian Studies*, 24(3), 179–200. DOI:10.1386/ijis.24.3.179_1.
- Girón Sierra, Á. (1996). *Evolucionismo y anarquismo en España, 1882–1914* [Anarchism and evolutionary thought in Spain, 1882–1914]. Madrid, Spain: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Götze, R. (1931). Los grandes hombres de la humanidad. Siegmund [sic] Freud [The Great Men in the History of Humanity: Siegmund Freud. *La Revista Blanca*, 187, 464.
- Graham, H. (1999). Against the State: A genealogy of the Barcelona May Days of 1937. *European History Quarterly*, 29(4), 485–542 doi:0265-6914(199910)29:4;485-542;010099.
- Gustavo, S. (1935). Galería de hombres célebres. Enrique Ibsen [Gallery of illustrious figures: Henrik Ibsen]. *La Revista Blanca*, 318, 177.
- Holmes, C. A. (2002). Academics and practitioners: Nurses as intellectuals. *Nursing Inquiry*, 9(2), 73–83. DOI:10.1046/j.1440-1800.2002.00137.x.
- Jung, C. G. (1983). *Memories, dreams, reflections*. London, UK: Fontana Press. (Original work published 1961).
- Kennedy, H. (1983). *Anarchist of love: The secret life of John Henry Mackay*. New York, NY: Mackay Society.
- Kerschensteiner, G. (1931). La forma de vida en Pestalozzi [Lifestyles and Pestalozzi]. *La Revista Blanca*, 195, 94.
- Lees, J. (2008). A practitioner researcher's view of academic life, emancipation and transformation. In J. Lees, & D. Freshwater (Eds.), *Practitioner-based research: Power, discourse and transformation* (pp. 1–17). London, UK: Karnac Books.
- Lees, J. (2011). Counselling and psychotherapy in dialogue with complementary and alternative medicine. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 39(2), 117–130. DOI:10.1080/03069885.2011.621520.
- Lees, J., & Cleminson, R. (2013). The history and future of psychotherapy and alternative health-related practices: lessons from the past and from the present. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 11(3), 195–209.
- Lévinas, E. (1989). Martin Buber and the theory of knowledge. In S. Hand (Ed.), *The Lévinas Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. (Original work published 1958)
- Levinson, A. (1931). Sigmund Freud visto por Stefan Zweig [Sigmund Freud as seen by Stefan Zweig]. *La Revista Blanca*, 191, 556–559.

- Litvak, L. (1981). *Musa libertaria: Arte, literatura y vida cultural del anarquismo español (1880–1913)* [The libertarian muse: Art, literature and cultural life in Spanish Anarchism, 1880–1913]. Barcelona, Spain: Antoni Bosch.
- Mackay, J. H. (1891). *The anarchists: A picture of civilization at the close of the nineteenth century* (G. Schumm, Trans.). Boston, MA: Benjamin R. Tucker.
- Mackay, J. H. (2005). *Max Stirner: His life and work* (H. Kennedy, Trans.). Concord, CA: Peremptory Publications.
- Marshall, P. (1992). *Demanding the impossible: A history of anarchism*. London, UK: Harper Collins.
- Martí Ibáñez, F. (1935). Psicología del conflicto espiritual [The psychology of spiritual conflict]. *Estudios*, 148, 17–20.
- Martí Ibáñez, F. (1936). Freud. *Tiempos Nuevos*, 6, 278–280.
- Martí Ibáñez, F. (1937a). *Psicoanálisis de la revolución social Española* [Psychoanalysis of the Spanish Revolution]. Barcelona, Spain: Tierra y Libertad.
- Martí Ibáñez, F. (1937b). Perfil y surco de la psicología individual [Profile and course of individual psychology]. *Estudios*, 164, 10–13.
- Martí Ibáñez, F. (2004). *Psicoanálisis de la revolución social Española* [Psychoanalysis of the Spanish Revolution]. In J. V. Martí, & A. Rey (Eds.), *Antología de textos de Félix Martí Ibáñez* (pp. 157–181). Valencia, Spain: Biblioteca Valenciana. (Original work published 1937).
- Masson, J. M. (1984). *The assault on truth*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Mitzman, A. (1977). Anarchism, expressionism and psychoanalysis. *New German Critique*, 10, 77–104.
- Navarro, F. J. (1997). “El paraíso de la razón”. *La revista Estudios (1928–1937) y el mundo cultural anarquista* [The “paradise of reason”: The review *Estudios* (1928–1937) and the anarchist cultural world]. Valencia, Spain: Generalitat Valenciana.
- Newman, S. (2010). *The politics of postanarchism*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Newman, S. (2012). Research methods and problems: Postanarchism. In R. Kinna (Ed.), *The Continuum companion to anarchism* (pp. 41–49). London, UK: Continuum.
- Orwell, G. (1962). *Homage to Catalonia*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Overy, R. (2010). *The morbid age: Britain and the crisis of civilization, 1919–1939*. London, UK: Penguin.
- Rago, M. (2008). Novos modos de subjetivar: a experiência da organização Mujeres Libres na Revolução Espanhola [New forms of subjectivity: The experience of the Mujeres Libres Organization in the Spanish Revolution]. *Estudos Feministas*, 16(1), 187–206. DOI:10.1590/S0104-026X2008000100019.
- Reich, W. (1961). *The sexual revolution: Toward a self-governing character structure* (T. P. Wolfe, Trans.). London, UK: Vision Press. (Original work published 1945)
- Reich, W. (1970). *The mass psychology of fascism* (V. R. Carfagno, Trans.). London, UK: Souvenir Press. (Original work published 1933)
- Rolfe, G., Freshwater, D., & Jasper, M. (2001). *Critical reflection for nursing and the helping professions: A user's guide*. London, UK: Palgrave.
- Samuels, A. (2014). Everything you always wanted to know about therapy (but were afraid to ask): Fragments of a critical psychotherapy. *European Journal of Psychotherapy and Counselling*, 16(4), 315–330. DOI:10.1080/13642537.2014.957227.
- Stebbing, R. (n.d.). *The philosophy of spiritual activity as a path of self-knowledge*. Spring Valley, NY: St George Publications.
- Steiner, R. (1963). *Occult science*. London, UK: Rudolf Steiner Press. (Original work published 1909)
- Steiner, R. (1964). *The philosophy of freedom*. London, UK: Rudolf Steiner Press. (Original work published 1894)
- Steiner, R. (1974). *The kingdom of childhood*. London, UK: Rudolf Steiner Press. (Original work published 1924)
- Steiner, R. (1977). *Towards Social Renewal*. London: Rudolf Steiner Press. (Original work published in 1923)
- Steiner, R. (1985). *The temple legend*. London, UK: Rudolf Steiner Press. (Original work published 1904)
- Steiner, R. (1991). *Community life, inner development, sexuality and the spiritual teacher*. Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press. (Original work published 1915)
- Steiner, R. (1999). *Autobiography*. Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press. (Original work published 1925)
- Storr, A. (1996). *Feet of clay*. London, UK: Harper Collins.
- Tabernero Holgado, C., Jiménez-Lucena, I., & Molero-Mesa, J. (2013). Movimiento libertario y autogestión del conocimiento en la España del primer tercio del siglo XX: la sección “Preguntas y respuestas” (1930–1937)

de la revista *Estudios* [The libertarian movement and the self-management of knowledge in Spain in the first third of the twentieth century: The “Questions and Answers” section in the review *Estudios*]. *Dynamis*, 33(1), 43–67. DOI: 0211-9536.

Woodcock, G. (1970). *Anarchism*. London, UK: Penguin.



John Lees is Senior Lecturer in Mental Health at the University of Leeds, a UKCP registered psychotherapist, BACP senior accredited practitioner, and has edited four books and written numerous peer-reviewed articles.



Richard Cleminson is Reader in Hispanic Studies at the University of Leeds. He is interested in the intersection of radical thought, sexuality, and social movements, and the relations between science and social knowledge. His most recent book is *Catholicism, Race and Empire: Eugenics in Portugal, 1900–1950* (CEU Press, 2014).