ANNUAL REVIEW OF CRITICAL PSYCHOLOGY
ARCP 12 (2015)

MARXISM & PSYCHOLOGY

Editors

David Pavón-Cuéllar, Leonardo Moncada and Desmond Painter

Marxism & Psychology

Edited by

David Pavón-Cuéllar, Leonardo Moncada and Desmond Painter

Table of contents

Convulsive Times, Revolutionary Subjects: Reflections on Marxism and Critical Psychology

Desmond Painter
Department of Psychology, Stellenbosch University, South Africa

David Pavón-Cuéllar
Faculty of Psychology, Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, Mexico

Leonardo Moncada
Faculty of Psychology, Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, Mexico

Abstract. *This article introduces an edition of the* Annual Review of Critical Psychology *made up of papers originally presented at the* Second Conference of Marxism and Psychology *held in Morelia, Mexico, from 9-11 August 2012. We begin by introducing Marxism as a resource for critical psychology, one that is uniquely positioned to link the refusal of psychology, which lies at the core of critical work in the discipline, to a broader refusal of social relations and forms of subjectivity under capitalism and the ideological role psychology itself plays in their reproduction. We then sketch a panoramic overview of critical and reconstructive encounters between Marxism and psychology in various contexts around the world ever since Marx's own reflections on the nature of the psyche, serving as a background to the equally diverse encounters with Marxist theory and politics in the articles making up this edition of the Review. Finally, we zone in on the immediate context of the conference itself, giving substance to the idea that a Marxist critical psychology is one that both inspires and is further developed from forms of collective action, which locates its critique of psychology and capitalism not just in theory, but in practices of everyday life that already articulate and live this double refusal.*

Although no single definition of critical psychology exists that could bring together under one banner the disparate and at times contradictory efforts claiming this name, there would be no meaning to the designation at all if it did not entail, at the very least, some sort of *refusal* of psychology in its dominant forms. What gives critical psychology the semblance of a shared agenda, of something approaching a collective practice, despite its diversity, despite often being at odds with itself, is that it positions itself and articulates its refusal of psychology *from within* psychology, seeking to overcome the strictures of the discipline and its practices, and to develop alternatives in and to psychology both through critique and reconstruction. Refusal, of course, can and does take many forms in critical psychology: epistemological, theoretical, methodological and political critiques cohabit in an uneasy relationship with the discipline, ranging from outright rejection to forms of institutional complicity by which critical psychology, as a more or less loyal opposition to the mainstream, plays its role in the diversification, exportability, and further academic and cultural entrenchment of psychology (Parker, 1999a).

Undeniably, critical psychology is small compared to many other areas of the discipline, but it has certainly gained in visibility and even status over the last number of years and has proven viable as a source of academic distinction for a growing number of individuals employed in departments of psychology around the world. One illustration: at the International Union of Psychological Science' most recent congress, the International Congress of Psychology held

in Cape Town, South Africa, in 2012, critical psychology was for the first time included, alongside developmental psychology, neuropsychology, etc., as a freestanding sub-disciplinary division, an achievement many critical psychologists understandably celebrated. One could add to this the existence of conferences and journals (such as this Annual Review) and the publication, by prestigious academic publishers, of book series, textbooks and, in recent times, a handbook (Parker, 2015) and an encyclopedia (Teo, 2014). It is certainly not outside the realm of possibility that critical psychology might one day even achieve, as happened to qualitative inquiry as recently as 2013, recognition in an APA Division, perhaps with an associated APA journal. The point is that psychology's academic and professional ambitions, and its desire for internationalization ("International Psychology" has long since become an APA Division…) do not preclude the incorporation of *critical* psychology. On the contrary, academic markets in the time of the corporate university are replete with niche offerings; older tokens of academic standing are making way for marketability and commodity value, for and ethos of constant innovation, transformation and rebranding.

The hazard here, for critical approaches that remain unaware of or unable to theorize the political economy of psychology, and to account for its own role within it, is what Parker (1999a) refers to as recuperation: "the process by which radical ideas become neutralized and absorbed; […] become part of the machinery that they attempted to challenge" (p. 78). The threat is not simply that by becoming an established sub-discipline that peacefully co-exists with other sub-disciplines, critical psychology will unwittingly add momentum, by trading on psychology's institutional success and cultural spread, and by offering it legitimacy and further applicability in some contexts, to the reproduction and further entrenchment of the discipline still primarily in terms of its dominant assumptions and practices. The threat, instead, is that the surplus value afforded the discipline by a 'critical psychology' that distinguishes itself in ameliorative terms by promoting qualitative alongside quantitative styles of inquiry, by focusing on embodied experience and affect instead of exclusively on cognition and behavior, and by theorizing and rendering knowable the self as a relational, distributed, discursive achievement rather than a stable, transcendental entity, reinforces psychology's entanglement with a capitalism increasingly invested in the local, the affective and the commodification and remaking of identities, experiences and lifestyles. Critical psychology, as an upgraded psychology, in this manner

often contributes to the shaping of neoliberal subjectivities and cultures under capitalism rather than to its critique and undoing: "the 'critical' take on mainstream psychology brings the discipline closer to the requirements of contemporary capitalism" (Parker, 1999a, p. 85).

It is here that Marxism re-enters the scene to play an important, perhaps even necessary role in the critical refusal of psychology. Rather than merely an established theoretical tradition in the institutionalized social sciences and even psychology (see the next section below), Marxism as a still open frontier of political invention and modes of collectivization and revolutionary action, as a living and growing source of social movement oriented theory and practice, never fully captured by the insular interests of academic disciplines and the academic careers they support, forces even *critical* psychology to own up to its entanglement in the political economy of psychology and the university, and to how it profits from a deeply psychologized contemporary capitalism. Parker (1999a) goes as far as stating that Marxism – and he specifies a revolutionary Marxism – is the *only* theoretical resource "left that can tackle the problem and reassert once again a properly radical stance toward academic, professional and cultural aspects of the discipline" (pp. 86-87). Some readers may feel that Parker is guilty here of hyperbole, or that he neglects to take into account that Marxism itself is not immune to recuperation in many different ways, including even facile forms of academic identity politics, the radical chic of an insular campus politics – however, even such readers would be hard pressed to suggest a theoretical and political resource more suitable, especially when engaged and developed in dialogue with many other critical traditions, as is displayed so richly in the articles in this edition, to interrogate psychology's entanglement with capitalism, and to extricate from it a truly critical approach to subjectivity and the difficulties we face as individuals and collectives in this world. Marxism, accordingly, functions for us in a manner similar to the role attributed to it in relation to philosophy by Balibar (1993), namely Marxism "not as a philosophy, but as an alternative to philosophy, a *non-philosophy* or even an *anti-philosophy*" (p. 2, emphases in the original).

Significantly, Balibar does not therefore attribute to Marx an *abandonment* of philosophy; Marx does not leave philosophy to remain itself while he departs for political economy. Instead, his refusal shifts the very coordinates of philosophy: Balibar (1993) writes, once again in relation to philosophy, that "*after Marx, philosophy is no longer as it was before*. An irreversible event has occurred, one which

is not comparable with the emergence of a new philosophical point of view, because it not only obliges us to change our ideas or methods, but to transform the practice of philosophy" (p. 4, emphasis in original). This too captures for us the role we want Marxism to play in relation to psychology. Marxism in psychology, or the effect of a Marxist refusal of psychology, is neither merely an abandonment of psychology as an academic enterprise, nor solely concerned with the reconstruction of a "better" psychology in its place. Marxism in psychology is rather a vector along which psychology is forced to become worldly: to be challenged, disrupted, detoured, forced beyond itself, occupied, deprovincialized, decolonized – from the perspective of subjects in struggle and in relation to their timely desire for change, not as effect of the unilateral implementation of a scholarly tradition. This is perhaps nowhere better illustrated than in the planning, celebration and after-effects of the Second Congress of Marxism and Psychology itself, and we spend some time towards the end of this article to discuss this event. For now it is useful to be reminded of Parker's (1999a) claim, that "critical psychology will mean nothing at all if it is not a space for us to find alternative forms of collective practice" (p. 80). This is precisely what was achieved in and around the Congress, namely the opening up of a clearing beyond the sedimentation of an academic tradition and a canonical body of texts, for a confrontation in psychology with local struggles and the formation of collective practices in ways which not only baffles dominant forms of psychology, but continues to expose that psychology, in the immediacy of insurgent experience, for its betrayal of that experience and for the role it plays in the very forces of alienation that produces the (societal) "need" for psychologized interventions in the first place.

It is clear even from a cursory perusal of the papers included in this edition of the Annual Review that there is no single "Marxist psychology", nor even competing paradigms of "Marxist psychology". In fact, the development of such a psychology is not even on the agenda. The contributions all display what Williams (2013), in a recent volume about Marxism in the 21st century, describes as a Marxism that is "not dogmatic or descriptive" but "is open, searching, dialectical, humanist, utopian and inspirational" (p. 3). Marxism is brought into dialogue with a range of other critical traditions, and brought to bear on many different political struggles. However, all these interventions occur against the background of a long history of Marxist refusals and revolutions in psychology, and it is to a brief survey of this history that we now turn.

A Panoramic View of the Relationship between Marxism and Psychology

Any effort to trace back the origins of the relationship between Marxism and psychology has to begin by going back to the works of Karl Marx himself, in order to examine his conception of the psyche as, in essence, social, founded upon concrete activity and the material conditions of life, inseparable from cultural and ideological factors, cloven and, at times, torn asunder by sociopolitical conflicts, and determined by the unfolding of history and economic forces and relations. This conception of the psyche is revealed in the work of the young Marx through his analysis of the dehumanizing and alienating aspects of capitalism: how human beings come to be subordinated to money and commodities; how bonds among people are reduced to relations among things; the visible deployment of psychology in industry; the idealist substrate of madness, and the multiple divisions that separate the existence of individuals from their essence, their labor from its products, and society from the State (Marx, 1843, 1844; Marx and Engels, 1845). Later, the mature Marx would complete, rectify and deepen these ideas by elucidating, inter alia, commodity fetishism; the determination of consciousness by existence; the production rather than simply the satisfaction of needs; personality as the personification of economic categories; the acquisition of will and consciousness of capital through the capitalist; the imbrication of material and spiritual power; the instinct to accumulate as an intrinsic tendency of capital that leads to its growth, and the sedimentation of past experience in present states of mind (Marx, 1852, 1858, 1859, 1866, 1867; Marx and Engels, 1846, 1848).

Many of Marx's followers developed an interest in issues related to psychology, though the earliest Marxist psychology was not developed by academic or professional psychologists but, rather, by the great thinkers and political leaders of Marxism. Engels' research, for example, is clearly of a psychological nature, not only in its explanation of the role of work in generating human consciousness (Engels, 1876), but also in its probing into the sexual-familial and patriarchal background of private property and the modern State (1884). Plekhanov (1907) was concerned with the psychological mediations between the economic base and the ideological superstructure. Lenin (1902), in turn, preferred to focus on such topics as class consciousness and the psychological aspect of interactions between the masses and the vanguard, while Lukács (1923) turned to psychology to help explain his

conception of human practice as a concrete synthesis of reality and thought.

Marxist psychologists, in the strict sense of the term, first emerged in Russia after the 1917 Revolution. The first paradigm of Soviet psychology was embodied in the *reflexology* of Pavlov and Sechenov. By rooting all psychological processes in physiological reflexes it enabled the objective experimental research championed by Vladimir Bekhterev (1925) and conceived as the only form capable of satisfying the epistemological and methodological exigencies of the Marxist materialist approach. Shortly afterwards, and as a result of his questioning of reflexology, Konstantin Kornilov (1930) developed his theory of *reactology*, which sought to overcome philosophical subjectivism and reflexological objectivism by centering psychological research on individual reactions understood as disequilibriums and exchanges between the internal subjective world and the external objective world. Here the psyche no longer resides as an interior in which the exterior is passively reflected, but has been shifted to the reactive relation between interiority and exteriority.

This same interest in the relation between the interior and the exterior appears in the work of Lev Vygotsky (1931). In his paradigmatic *sociocultural* or *historical-cultural* proposal, Vygotsky explains intrapersonal psychological processes as an interiorization of interpersonal processes in which both cultural and historical factors intervene. For Vygotsky, this interiorization, mediated by language and other instruments of culture, determines individual development, which can thus be conceived as a cultural construction realized through social interactions in shared activities. Vygotsky, therefore, offers an *interactive-social* explanation of the psyche that is clearly distinguishable from Kornilov's *reactive-individual* description and Bekhterev's *passive-reflexive* approach.

Among the circle of Vygotsky's itinerant collaborators and followers in Moscow, Leningrad and Kharkov, two stand out. The first was Alexander Luria (1925), a pioneer not only in contemporary neuropsychology, but also in Freudo-Marxism. The second was Alexei Leontiev (1978), who represented human activity as a complex, socially-situated phenomenon whose meaning is reflected in mental activity. Leontiev's distinction of three levels of psychological processes is well known: the highest and most complex level of activity and its motivations, the intermediate level of actions and their goals, and the most basic, elemental level, of operations that serve as means to achieve higher-order objectives.

But it is important to recall as well other followers of Vygotsky and their contributions: Bluma Zeigarnik (1938), who gave a name to the effect through which one remembers better that which is interrupted; Alexandr Zaporózhets (1965), who studied the active character of perception, rejected the acceleration of learning and proposed instead an amplification of the capacities characteristic of each age; Lidia Bozhovich (1976), who probed deeply into the internal and sociocultural determinants of personality; Piotr Galperin (1979), who defined the object of psychology as orienting mental activity that is an effect of interiorization and that originates in practical material activity; Daniil Elkonin (1980), who studied the importance of infant play in development and in the origin of social roles, and Piotr Zinchenko (1983), who demonstrated how involuntary memory is determined by action and motivation. In recent decades, aside from the Vygotskians who worked in the Soviet Union, there were many others in the Western world, some of whom openly adopted Marxist positions. Fred Newman and Lois Holzman (1993), Andy Blunden (2010) and Carl Ratner (2011), among others, come to mind. These Vygotskians, like their predecessors in the Soviet Union, tend to manifest a Marxist influence, with greater or lesser degrees of fidelity to dialectical materialism and the amount of attention they give society, activity, and historical and cultural factors. Their decisive contributions to psychology are likewise contributions of Marxism.

In Soviet Marxist psychology, developing parallel to the Vygotskian tradition, we find the emergence of another school, one that originated with Sergei Rubinstein and his theory of activity. Rubinstein (1940) set out from the principle of the unity – not identity – of consciousness and activity, which holds that activity is a social phenomenon through which consciousness and the psychological are not only formed but actually expressed. Thus, in contrast to Leontiev's view, they must be studied in their own right and not be assimilated to activity or its reflection. Consciousness does not cease to reflect activity, but regulates and, therefore, determines it. Among Rubinstein's principal disciples we could mention Elena Budilova, Ksenia Abuljanova, Ekaterina Shorojova, Boris Lomov and Andrey Brushlinski.

While Marxist psychology was imposed on and came to predominate in the Soviet Union and other socialist-block countries, it also succeeded in penetrating and establishing a solid foothold in academic circles in the Western capitalist world. From the 1920s to the 1960s, France witnessed the emergence of influential psychologists that explicitly defended their Marxist postures and offered valuable critiques

of other theoretical-psychological options. First among them was Georges Politzer (1927), who in addition to questioning the abstractionism and animism of psychoanalysis and of the different schools of psychology of his time, proposed a *concrete psychology* that would be truly materialist: one that would focus on the dramatic events of human life instead of replacing it with abstractions like the mental processes of classical psychology or the psychic instances of Freudian metapsychology. By criticizing all forms of mechanistic and organicist approaches, Henri Wallon (1941) developed an infant psychology inspired in Marxist-Hegelian thought which analyzed the dialectical synthesis of biological-natural and historical-social factors, and highlighted ruptures over the continuities and transitions on which Piaget insisted. Wallon also accepted the possibility of regressive processes, not only progressive ones, and investigated the original and fundamental role of emotions rather than focusing solely on interactions, as emphasized in Vygotsky's work. Finally, in the late 1960s, Lucien Sève (1969) advanced Politzer's work by reconstructing a Marxist theory of personality that aspired to be materialist, but without collapsing into biologism; an approach that recognized an intimate imbrication of individual personality and social behavior, that accentuated historical determinism, and that questioned any supposed atemporal, universal human essence, as defended by diverse forms of humanism.

While these Marxist psychological theories were being developed in France and the USSR, German-speaking countries saw the emergence of proposals to fuse or articulate Marxist theoretical approaches with the Freudian psychoanalytical perspective, which, from the outset, tended to disassociate itself from mainstream psychology. Psychoanalysis seeks to go beyond the grand themes of Marxist psychology, including consciousness and activity, and enter a field of inapprehensible objects, such as the unconscious and the drives, which in diverse Marxist-Freudian orientations are reconsidered in light of capitalist exploitation. Wilhelm Reich (1929), the most famous representative of Freudo-Marxism, attempted to overcome the alleged bourgeois limitations of Freud by postulating that class domination entails also sexual repression and neurotic disorders. Another important Freudo-Marxist author of that era, Otto Fenichel (1934), well known for his role as a protagonist in the secret letters [*Rundbriefe*] that circulated among Marxist psychoanalysts around the world, came to understand Marxism and psychoanalysis as sciences that unmask the true causes concealed behind pretexts. Indeed, he proposed Freudian theory as the nucleus of a future dialectical-materialist psychology while defending the interesting hypothesis that the material base is transformed into superstructure in human psychism. Also deserving of mention here are the Marxist and Freudian philosophers of the Frankfurt School, especially Herbert Marcuse (1953), who vindicated the pleasure principle, questioned an alienating *performance principle* distinct from the reality principle, and denounced – beyond a certain necessary repression – a *surplus repression* for consumption and yield, for exploitation and capitalist accumulation.

In this same Austro-German tradition of Marxist psychoanalysis, two original thinkers who settled in Latin America and had a decisive influence on the diffusion of Marxism in Freudian circles in this part of the world, stand out. The first is Erich Fromm (1955), who resided in Mexico from 1949 to 1974, where he promoted a humanist reading of Marx and a culturalist interpretation of psychoanalysis, which led to a conflict with the Frankfurt School where he began his intellectual career. Marie Langer (1971), an Austrian, lived first in Argentina before moving to Mexico and, later, Nicaragua. She chose not to renounce the revolutionary struggle in favor of psychoanalytical practice, though this meant a break with the International Psychoanalytical Association and led to her becoming involved in some of the most interesting Marxist experiences in Latin American psychology and psychoanalysis in the second half of the 20th century, including the collective *Plataforma* and the *Coordinadora de Trabajadores de Salud Mental* in Argentina, the Mexico-Nicaragua Mental Health Initiative, and the Encounters of Marxist Psychoanalysis and Psychology in Cuba.

From the 1970s to the 1990s, while efforts to articulate Marxism and psychoanalysis continued in Germany, the Free University of Berlin gave birth to an important Marxist current of critical psychology. One of its founders and principal representatives, Klaus Holzkamp (1985, 1991), questioned mainstream psychology and how it served the interests of the power elite by refusing to consider the perspective of the subject, by abstracting the world, and by accepting the context as something fixed and unchangeable, that is, as an independent variable or given condition, thus effectively eliminating mankind's capacity to transform vital circumstances. Holzkamp (1988, 1996) took up notions from Marx and various Marxist authors, principally Leontiev, and eventually proposed a psychology from the perspective of subjects situated in the world that centered on the subjective reasons for action and how this is understood socially. Holzkamp's vision took center stage in development of and debates within this Marxist current of

critical psychology, to which, in addition to Holzkamp, such figures as Ute Osterkamp, Morus Markard, Frigga Haug and Ole Dreier would also contribute.

In a current distinct from Holzkamp and German critical psychology, the British critical psychologist Ian Parker (2007) places himself more or less discretely in the Marxist camp by questioning the political and ideological complicities of mainstream psychology. His complex and multifaceted critique reveals itself as being anti-capitalist, anti-racist, anti-colonialist, and anti-sexist, while recurring to ideas, concepts and arguments from Marx, Trotsky, Žižek and diverse Marxist authors, whilst also utilizing discourse analysis, Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis, contemporary feminism, and the post-structuralist thought of Derrida and Foucault. In the intersections of his multiple theoretical and political references, Parker's critical psychology (1999b) promotes a Marxist analysis of commoditization, alienation, and individualization, while positing the fundamental incompatibility of Marxism and psychology, which results in his commitment to Marxist revolutionary practice instead of creating a Marxist psychological theory which, he holds, would be as impossible as it would be undesirable (1999c). Like psychoanalysis, Marxism serves Parker by allowing him to effect a critical and reflexive distancing from the discipline of psychology. Such a procedure, which can also be detected in the work of other English-speaking scholars (e.g. Kovel, 1988; Hayes, 2001), has antecedents in the Frankfurt School (Adorno, 1949) and the elaborate critiques of psychology by Latin American Marxist psychoanalysis (Sastre, 1974; Braunstein et al., 1975).

In the Latin American context, Marxism has also long served as a platform from which to criticize psychoanalysis, as, for example, in the work of Bleger (1958), who takes up and reformulates some of Politzer's categories; and that of Revueltas (1950) and Carrión (1970), who reject the utilization of Freudian categories to essentialize national characters. This second critical application of Marxism, the history of which can be traced back to Voloshinov (1927) and other Soviet authors, has co-existed in Latin America with the aforementioned Marxist-Freudian critiques of the psychological discipline, and with critical approaches to psychology and/or psychoanalysis which ended up producing positive, alternative theoretical constructions. This is the case, for example, of Merani's – a follower of Wallon – dialectical psychology (1968), and the conceptions of subjectivity and personality found in the work of Fernando González-Rey (2002), who trained in the Soviet School.

Conference and Convulsion: Looking Back and Looking Ahead

The Second International Congress of Marxism and Psychology was held from 9-11 August 2012. No more appropriate term occurs to us to describe the events that transpired there than *convulsive*. And it seems even more suitable when we consider its nexus with associated terms such as *subversion* and *revolution*, all of which are salient to historical, political and economic analyses of social transformations, and which we simultaneously link to the events that occurred in Michoacán and Mexico before, during and after the Congress. Convulsed was the organization, convulsed its effectuation, and convulsed have been its repercussions; but convulsive, above all, is the social reality that surrounded the Congress. To some degree, the organizers anticipated this, as we were well aware of the diligent labor that organizing such an event would entail, foresaw that its production promised to be both problematic and stimulating, and expected that it would be a genuine landmark, indeed a watershed for the intellectual, academic and social institutions and actors interested in taking part, not only in Morelia, but throughout Michoacán and the country as a whole; and not just in the field of critical psychology or Marxism, but in a much broader intellectual and practical milieu. However, our expectations came nowhere close to approaching what actually, and finally, occurred as each moment came, as even the most radical predictions fell far short of reality. And, of course, no one could have imagined what was about to transpire, in the months after the Congress, in the state and across the country.

In a broad ranging report on the Congress, "Psychology and Marxism in Mexico", Ian Parker (2012) situated, with superb accuracy, its celebration in the context of the entire complex of social phenomena occurring at the time in Michoacán and Mexico. Clearly it is not possible to reflect on this intensely collective event from a perspective that disregards all the things that were going on at the time on a broader social plane, for these determined several of the key characteristics of the Congress. And today, at almost three years' distance, we intend to do just that, *but* taking into account everything that has transpired during this interval.

According to some witnesses, the celebration of such a Congress was rather inopportune. Voices were

heard to say that its focus was "obsolescent" or "out of touch" with the times in which we were living. In fact, during the preparatory phase and even in the opening speech itself we heard claims that "Marxism itself had expired" together with "Marxism's nexus to psychology". But in reality everything that happened during and after the Congress would reveal the falsity of such assertions.

As organizers, we sought to subvert the usual formats of international academic congresses, beginning with our preparatory work, though this entailed enormous efforts: organization was handled by a collective of professors and students at the Faculty of Psychology of the Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás of Hidalgo, all of whom worked diligently despite the conditions of austerity and limited resources, striving throughout to guard against academic and institutional inertias influencing the event. For example, we made virtually all the papers, plenary sessions and conferences available to the vast majority of attendees through consecutive translation, instead of presenting them only in English, since virtually the entire audience was made up of Spanish-speakers. And before the event, we edited a bilingual information booklet. Though familiarity with English varied greatly among attendees, there was a common denominator: due to cultural factors, a lack of familiarity with that language was generalized. Unfortunately, and despite our best efforts to *not* make this a totally academic event, certain "academicist" inertias were activated by unexpected occurrences, such as impatience caused by deficiencies in the translation process.

Representatives of the indigenous municipality of Cherán played a prominent role at the Congress, especially in the organization phase and at the opening and closing ceremonies. Their presence was an attempt to give greater visibility to their struggle, a case of local resistance to capitalism and its nefarious effects on the poorest sectors of society. As Parker (2012) perceptively points out, their participation caused a great deal of discomfort among the university's authorities and the emissaries sent by the state government, at a time when tensions already forebode the unleashing of repressive violence against indigenous people who had risen up in resistance. In 2011, people in Cherán, an prominent Purépecha municipality in Michoacán, had decided to establish an *autonomous municipality* that they would govern on the basis of their "uses and customs", thus rejecting the violence that was ravaging the town (leading up to their declaration of autonomy, the homicide rate there had reached one per week, in a population of only about 16,000, and residents had repeatedly been stripped of

their land, had their cattle stolen, and had witnessed illegal timber-cutting in its forests, while the women were frequent victims of unspeakable abuses at the hands of organized crime) and conventional forms of government and, along with these, a political class in collusion with criminals and deeply immersed in corruption. In a first act, the representatives of all levels of government were expelled from the municipality, followed quickly by the dissolution of all political parties and the police force. In their place a new, community-based organization was instituted, controlled by the community through a "council of government". Today, almost three years after the Congress, which coincided with some of the tensest and most menacing moments of the crisis that Cherán's inhabitants faced, we can appreciate how radically things have changed since that declaration of autonomy, as the diffuse expectations posited during discussions at the Congress took on ever-clearer forms.

According to information provided by residents, to date there have been no reports of crimes (robberies, brawls, murders), a situation that contrasts starkly with the circumstances that reign in the rest of Michoacán and Mexico. Safety has improved so greatly that indigenous peoples from other regions of the state have sought, and found, sanctuary in Cherán; refugees from the rampant insecurity in Michoacán, where murders, assaults, kidnappings, extortions, usurpations, and rapes are the order of the day and enjoy the active complicity of the different orders of government and formally-organized security forces. After receiving the Suprema Court's "authorization" in 2014 to elect its authorities according to "uses and customs", Cherán's residents expressed their wish earlier this year to maintain this form of community organization, and therefore did not allow voting stations to be set up in their region for the coming state and federal elections. This is, of course, but one reflection of their deep mistrust of all government authorities who have failed, thus far, to satisfy the people's three basic demands: restitution of Cherán's illegally-exploited forests; clearing up of cases of deaths and disappearances; and guarantees of public security.

The example of Cherán not only preceded the emergence of other self-defense movements throughout Michoacán, but in fact seems to have inspired them during the years immediately following the celebration of the Congress. This was largely a response to the security crisis attributed to the collusion among organized crime, the private business sector, and all levels of government. Of diverse origins from the outset – not all involved indigenous peoples as in Cherán, and some were supported by the government

itself, others by drug-trafficking mafias with economic interests, and still others by groups that took up arms in authentic reactions to the public security crisis, the rampant poverty, and the corruption that are ravaging the state – these self-defense movements have experienced very different destinies during the last three years years. After a grand heyday and statewide proliferation, they have recently entered a landscape marked by uncertainty. A few, coincidentally those formed by indigenous peoples, are still active, while others have been coopted by government or have given rise to new mafias that replaced previously dominant cartels. Today, more than 100 members of these self-defense movements are in prison, including their principal leaders.

In summary, we must recognize that none of this necessarily bears any direct relation to the Congress, but clearly it is important to point out the coincidence of the timing of that event with the emergence of distinct struggles and resistance movements in the state and the country that constitute an integral part of a generalized awakening of consciences that, without doubt, had long been apathetic and dormant. There is no question that these events re-oriented some of the lines of discussion, involving many of the Congress' attendees, concerning the most pertinent kinds of research and political action within, and beyond, psychology. However, there are even clearer relations to be discerned between what happened during the Congress and the immediate future of those who participated in it.

Clearly, as Parker (2012) observes, many of the organizers, and a good number of attendees (around 700 people) were students; at least a few of them were activists or militants of distinct ideologies (Marxists of different ilk, anarchists, etc.), while others – the majority – were only beginning to wet their feet in the knowledge bases and practices of distinct critical perspectives in the discipline of psychology and beyond its borders. Among the latter were members of the student group #YoSoy132, launched in 2012 by a large group of students at Mexico's Iberoamericana University in denunciation of then presidential candidate – now President of Mexico – Enrique Peña Nieto and his and his party's (the PRI) dismissal of their protest. That movement proliferated with astounding speed and expanded to include students from around the country. Michoacán was no exception. A large contingent of students from several universities, especially the Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, with a strong nucleus established in the Faculty of Psychology, consolidated an organized and very active local protest movement that fought to resist what it perceived as a corrupt candidature, one

void of content and stained by collusion with the most nefarious interests. Later, that same movement would seek to impugn a presidential election widely considered fraudulent due to innumerable irregularities. One especially interesting aspect is that, as at other moments in the history of social movements in Mexico and the world, students were at the forefront, organizing and leading the struggle, while other sectors – university professors, for example, including some of the Congress' organizers – stood side-by-side with them as equals in a common front that still exists today.

In addition, the Congress posed a challenge to some of the biases and hardline ideological nuclei of its organizers. As Parker (2012) notes in his review, the final session of the event turned into something of a carnival or, more precisely, escaped completely from the control of its organizers. The members of the #YoSoy132 movement, which was showing some signs of decline at the time, participated in an exceptional manner at the main plenary session that ended the Congress, where they occupied the seats previously assigned to a series of special guests, who ceded their chairs to these young people. But that was not the only unexpected and unplanned event to alter the program and turn things chaotic and carnivalesque, for it was soon followed by the abrupt entrance of a woman who was not part of the organizing group, an invitee, a speaker, or even registered as an attendee, but who vociferously began to shout claims, demands and grievances. And just like that she was incorporated into the plenary session, beside the #YoSoy132 students, in the very center of the panel discussion, accentuating the surreal nature of the scene. Despite the critical, militant and open orientation of the organizers, that savage interruption of insanity into reality, we must admit, filled us with misgivings, unease and discomfort, for it forcefully uncovered the never-questioned ideological bases behind our habitual educational, political and academic practices.

Today, two and a half years after the Congress, the students of #YoSoy132 have spawned other groups based on this experience and have been demonstrating increasingly radical tendencies. This has largely dissipated our doubts and fears that the Congress might have constituted merely the final agonizing throes of an incipient and perhaps frustrated awakening of consciences. Despite their divergent ideologies (some identified with classic Marxism-Leninism, others with diverse forms of anarchism, or social, communitarian, libertarian or critical psychology, still others with diverse forms of feminism, etc.), many students at the Faculty of Psychology have led valuable struggles to defend free education, to protest

against the generalized violence that target women, and to show solidarity in reaction to the recent murder and disappearance of nearly 50 students from the Rural Normal School Raúl Isidro Burgos in Ayotzinapa, Guerrero, presumably at the hands of organized crime in a conspiracy that involved police forces and levels of government.

Also, these students, together with new and increasingly politicized generations, have proceeded to organize assemblies of representatives at the Faculty of Psychology and other schools and faculties at the Universidad Michoacana that give a voice to students and that, thanks to their authentically democratic and rebellious character and stubborn resolve to resist co-optation, and thus emerging as a permanent focus of discussion and debate, of accusations, and of alternative proposals to dominant policies, have become a true pebble in the shoes of university authorities. Their most recent success, achieved only after a long, hard fight, was to oblige the university's current authorities to respect the right to free higher education. Meanwhile, the woman who intruded, interrupted and, rather uncomfortably, joined the final session of the Congress was not heard from again until just a few months ago, when one of us saw her once again abruptly burst into the offices of a political party to challenge, in acts and words, the institutional order that few dare to question.

While analyzing these political incidents we cannot lose sight of the Congress' obvious effects on the way in which the surrounding community conceives of psychology. More than ever before, in professors' research projects, students' theses, papers, academic forums, publications, roundtables, social networks, and even everyday co-existence, psychology is being questioned by its own practitioners, students and professors, due to its openly ideological and disciplinary character; criticisms based on concrete cases of daily events in the country. The discovery of flagrant cases of corruption and conflicts of interest that reach up to the President of Mexico himself, a prostrate economy that shows no growth, alarming rates of poverty and unemployment, and the aforementioned insecurity that extends nationwide, have triggered an ideological response based in part on the knowledge and techniques of the predominant, hegemonic forms of psychology. In addition to returning to means of overt and covert repression, powerful groups in Mexico had as never before – or, at least, never with such vehemence and insolence in discourse and practice – turned to hegemonic psychology and the knowledge of the psychological discipline (that is, to psychology as a discipline, as a disciplinary form) in an attempt to demobilize an angered, protesting citizenry in ways

that have explicitly laid bare psychology's commitment to the capitalist system and the ideological role that it plays within it: from the construction of categories of pathology that affect those who demonstrate and protest to the proliferation of discourses that seek to discourage people and wipe away memories of multitudinous aggressions, murders and disappearances (e.g., "we must better ourselves as individuals"; "each one must contribute her/his grain of sand"; "change is inside us"; "instead of protesting we should get to work"; "we must get over the trauma"; "think ahead"; "think positively"; "a group of misfits does not represent the voice of all Mexicans", etc.).

But at the same time, also as never before experienced in Mexico, and close to us in Michoacán, there arose a broad, indeed overwhelming, dismissal of these psychological apparatuses and discourses. They are viewed with unprecedented suspicion, one that recognizes the role of a psychology generally committed to the worst; as if at this time of profound crisis the dialectical tension among the parties in conflict made it possible to heighten the ideological and normative character of psychology and thus, simultaneously, reveal its true face. In all of this the psychologists (students and teachers alike) who participated in the Congress have played a fundamental role. In that dead-end alley which prior to 2012 offered only the alternatives of hegemonic academic psychology and "pop" psychology, psychologists in Michoacán seem to be leaning more and more strongly towards diverse forms of critical psychology whose common denominator is that it is always in tension, in a relationship of refusal, with other psychologies and with a social reality in which all these actors and phenomena occur.

In effect, just as Parker (2012) reminds us, for Marx human essence is not individualizable, but must be understood as "the ensemble of social relations". The Second International Congress of Marxism and Psychology, through a series of acts that spanned its preparation, realization and aftereffects that we are still feeling today, demonstrates this with clarity and force: it was, and still is, a collective event, one made possible by the organized work of many, situated in a specific, problematic and conflictual social, economic, political and intellectual context; but one that, fortunately, has had consequences which we believe are revolutionary in this field of social relations. A Congress, in other words, that turned out to be more revolutionary than had been anticipated; and a revolution that becomes visible for those of us who remain in Mexico, in Michoacán, in Morelia, in the transformation of many attendees, of their ideologies, of their

practices, and of their forms of collective organization. Though almost three years have passed, we still cannot visualize the definitive scope of this subversion of thought and practice, it has most assuredly not been something minor. And today, in the texts included in this issue of the Annual Review of Critical Psychology, our aim is to offer others a glimpse of that revolutionary event, confident that the unforeseen effects in those who read them will completely surpass the expectations we hold as we consolidate these texts for publication.

References

Adorno, T. W. (1949). *Minima moralia*. Madrid: Taurus, 2003.

Balibar, É. (1993). *The philosophy of Marx*. London: Verso, 2007.

Bejterev, V. M. (1925). *Psichologiia, Refleksologiia i Markzsizsm*. Leningrado: Giz.

Bleger, J. (1958). *Psicoanálisis y dialéctica materialista*. Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión, 1988.

Blunden, A. (2010). *An interdisciplinary theory of activity*. Leiden: Brill.

Bozhovich, L. I. (1976). *La personalidad y su función en la edad infantil*. La Habana: Pueblo y Educación.

Braunstein, N., Pasternac, M., Benedito, G. & Saal, F. (1975). *Psicología: ideología y ciencia*. México: Siglo XXI, 2006.

Carrión, J. (1970). Un ensayo de autocrítica. In *Mito y magia del mexicano* (pp. 109-123). México: Nuestro Tiempo, 1978.

Elkonin, D. B. (1980). *Psicología del juego*. Madrid: Visor

Engels, F. (1876). El Papel del Trabajo en la Transformación del Mono en Hombre. In *Obras Escogidas de Carlos Marx y Federico Engels en Tres Tomos. Tomo 3* (pp. 66-79). Moscú: Progreso, 1981.

Engels, F. (1884). *El origen de la familia, de la propiedad privada y del Estado*. México: Colofón, 2011.

Fenichel, O. (1934). Sobre el psicoanálisis como embrión de una futura psicología dialéctico-materialista. In H.-P. Gente (Ed), *Marxismo, psicoanálisis y sexpol* (pp. 160-183). Buenos Aires: Granica, 1972.

Fromm, E. (1955). *Psicoanálisis de la sociedad contemporánea*. México: FCE, 2011.

Galperin, P. Y. (1979). *Introducción a la psicología: Un enfoque dialéctico*. Madrid: Pablo del Río.

González-Rey, F. (2002). *Sujeto y subjetividad: una aproximación histórico cultural*. México: Thomson.

Hayes, G. (2001). Marxism and psychology: A vignette. *Psychology in Society* 27, 46-52.

Holzkamp, K. (1985). Basic concepts of Critical Psychology. In *Psychology from the standpoint of the subject: Selected writings of Klaus Holzkamp* (pp. 19-27). New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Holzkamp, K. (1988). The development of Critical Psychology as a subject science. In *Psychology from the standpoint of the subject: Selected writings of Klaus Holzkamp* (pp. 28-45). New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Holzkamp, K. (1991). What could a psychology from the standpoint of the subject be? In *Psychology from the standpoint of the subject: Selected writings of Klaus Holzkamp* (pp. 46-59). New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Holzkamp, K. (1996). Psychology: Social self-understanding on the reasons for action in the conduct of everyday life. In *Psychology from the standpoint of the subject: Selected writings of Klaus Holzkamp* (pp. 233-341). New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Kornilov, K. N. (1930). Psychology in the light of dialectic materialism. In C. Murchison (Ed.), *Psychologies of 1930* (pp. 243-278). Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.

Kovel, J. (1988). *The radical spirit: Essays on psychoanalysis and society*. London: Free Association.

Langer, M. (1971). Psicoanálisis y/o revolución social. In J. C. Volnovich & S. Werthein (Ed), *Marie Langer: mujer, psicoanálisis y marxismo* (pp. 65-76). Buenos Aires: Contrapunto, 1989.

Lenin, V. I. (1902). ¿Qué hacer? Problemas candentes de nuestro movimiento. In *Obras completas. Tomo 6* (pp. 1-203). Moscow: Progreso, 1981.

Leontiev, A. N. (1978). *Actividad. Conciencia. Personalidad*. Habana: Pueblo y Educación, 1983.

Lukács, G. (1923). *Historia y conciencia de clase. 2 volúmenes*. Madrid: Sarpe, 1985.

Luria, A. R. (1925). Psychoanalysis as a system of monistic psychology. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology* 16(2), 1977, 7-45.

Marcuse, H. (1953). *Eros y civilización*. Madrid: Sarpe, 1983.

Marx, K. (1843). Sobre la cuestión judía. In *Escritos de juventud* (pp. 461-490). México: FCE, 1987.

Marx, K. (1844). *Manuscritos: economía y filosofía*. Madrid: Alianza, 1997.

Marx, K. (1852). *Las luchas de clases en Francia de 1848 a 1850 y El dieciocho de Brumario de Luis Bonaparte*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1995.

Marx, K. (1858). *Elementos fundamentales para la crítica de la economía política (Grundrisse) 1857-1858*. Mexico: Siglo XXI, 2009.

Marx, K. (1859). *Contribución a la crítica de la economía política*. México: Siglo XXI, 2013.

Marx, K. (1866). *El Capital. Libro I. Capítulo VI* (inédito). Resultados del proceso inmediato de producción. México: Siglo XXI, 2009.

Marx, K. (1867). *El Capital I.* Mexico: FCE, 2008.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1845). *La Sagrada Familia.* Madrid: Akal, 1981.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1846). *La ideología alemana*. Montevideo: Pueblos Unidos, 1974.

Merani, A. L. (1968). *La dialéctica en Psicología*. Mexico: Grijalbo.

Parker, I. (1999a). Critical psychology and revolutionary Marxism. *Theory & Psychology* 9(1), 71-92.

Parker, I. (1999b). Marxism, ideology and psychology. *Theory & Psychology* 9(3), 291-293.

Parker, I. (1999c). Psychology and Marxism: Dialectical opposites? In W. Maiers, B. Bayer, B. Duarte Esgalhado, R. Jorna, and E. Schraube (Eds.), *Challenges to Theoretical Psychology* (pp. 477-484). Toronto: Captus University Publications.

Parker, I. (2007). *Revolution in psychology. Alienation to emancipation.* London: Pluto.

Parker, I. (2012). Psychology and Marxism in Mexico. *Socialist Resistance.* http://socialis-tresistance.org/3891/psychology-and-marxism-in-mexico

Parker, I. (Ed.). (2015). *Handbook of critical psychology*. London: Routledge.

Plejánov, J. (1907). *Las cuestiones fundamentales del marxismo*. Santiago de Chile: Ediciones de la Federación de Maestros de Chile, 1933.

Politzer, G. (1927). *Crítica de los fundamentos de la psicología*. Barcelona: Roza, 1969.

Ratner, C. (2011). *Macro cultural psychology: A political philosophy of mind*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reich, W. (1929). *Materialismo dialéctico y psicoanálisis*. México: Siglo XXI, 1989.

Revueltas, José (1950). Posibilidades y limitaciones del mexicano. In R. Bartra (Ed), *Anatomía del mexicano* (pp. 215-234). México: Random House Mondadori, 2006.

Rubinstein, S. L. (1940). *Principios de psicología general*. México: Grijalbo, 1982.

Sastre, C. L. (1974). *La psicología, red ideológica*. Buenos Aires: Tiempo Contemporáneo.

Sève, L. (1969). *Marxisme et théorie de la personnalité*. Paris: Éditions sociales.

Teo, T. (Ed.). (2014). *Encyclopedia of critical psychology*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Voloshinov, V. N. (1927). *Freudismo, un bosquejo crítico*. Buenos Aires: Paidós, 1999.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1931). *El desarrollo de los procesos psicológicos superiores*. Barcelona: Grijalbo, 1979.

Wallon, H. (1941). *L'Évolution psychologique de l'enfant*. Paris: Colin, 2002.

Williams, M. (2013). Introduction. In M. Williams and V. Satgar (Eds.), *Marxisms in the 21st century: Crisis, critique & struggle*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Zaporozhets, A. V. (1965). The development of perception in the preschool child. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 30(2), 82-101.

Zeigarnik, B. (1938). On finished and unfinished tasks. In W. D. Ellis (Ed.), *A source book of Gestalt psychology* (pp. 300-314). Oxon: Routledge, 2001.

Zinchenko, P. I. (1983). The problem of involuntary memory. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology* 22(2), 55-111.

Psychology and Marxism in Mexico*

Ian Parker
Leicester University, United Kingdom

Abstract. *This paper is a report on the Second Conference on Marxism & Psychology, organized by the Psychology Faculty of the Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, and held in Morelia, Michoacán, Mexico, from the 9th to the 11th August 2012. A discussion is offered on the political context for the conference, and in particular the Cherán and #YoSoy132 movements.*

Keywords: Keywords: Marxism; psychology; Cherán; solidarity; #YoSoy132.

Marx famously argued (against the view that 'religious essence' could be resolved into and thereby explained by 'human essence') that the human essence cannot be treated as something fixed and then taken for granted as if it were an 'abstraction inherent in each single individual'. Instead, Marx (1846) pointed out, this apparent human essence is 'the ensemble of social relations'. This elementary starting point of a Marxist approach to human ontology – that is, the nature of the thing that is a human subject – poses big problems for the study of individual psychology. The discipline of psychology which came into being at the same point as capitalism has revolved around investigations into the 'human essence' and attempts to fix it in place, and to adapt or exclude those who do not fit. Psychology makes each individual human being (whose psychology is assumed to be an 'abstraction inherent in each' of them) understandable to those in power.

As psychological ideas spread through society, and are now globalised so that Western psychology becomes the model for individuals in other cultures to also understand themselves, it embeds itself in ideology and necessary false consciousness of a political economic system in which everyone must believe that it is normal and natural that some individuals should exploit others. Psychology is bourgeois ideology at its purest condensed into models of development and personality and mental disorder, and packaged as 'self-help' so that as you work upon yourself and your own psychology you come to believe at an even deeper level that alienation is your problem and it is

your responsibility to make your little prison of the self a happier place to live.

Many Marxists have avoided 'psychology' for this reason. Why bother trying to work out how the bits of the jigsaw at the level of the individual fit into the bigger picture if all you will end up with is a little shape that is already cut to size in such a way that it seems like competition and violence is universal, hard-wired, and so here to stay? But we do experience this inhuman world through our everyday relations to others, and keep it going by buying into the idea that there is no alternative and deep down this is what our psychology is really like. And then, when we can stand it no more and crack, our misery and distress is here in full at the level of the individual. This is why some Marxists work as psychologists, and they know that as they patch things up their task is also to open up the possibilities of social change, perhaps of understanding the psychological reasons why people attach themselves to power as a survival strategy. It includes the task of encouraging collective action that will resolve that 'psychology' into historical transformation of society and what we today think of as the 'self'. To do that some Marxists have tackled psychology itself, tried to grasp how it works as a key component of capitalism, interpreting it so that it might be changed, might change itself.

Academic and professional psychologists from different Marxist approaches to psychology gathered at the beginning of August 2012 at the Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo in Morelia,

Mexico, to work on these questions at the second Psychology and Marxism conference. The conference brought together representatives of the Russian 'activity theory' tradition that developed in the wake of the October Revolution in the open space for new ideas about the human subject as 'ensemble of social relations'. They spoke alongside versions of this tradition that have been forged through revolutionary practice in different places ranging from New York to Ciudad Juarez as 'social therapy', and debated with German historical materialist 'science of the subject' researchers and with those taking up Frankfurt School attempts to turn Freudian psychoanalysis into a Marxist theory of the individual. Lacanian psychoanalytic attempts to link up with some form of Marxism (or in some cases to try and supplant it) jostled alongside discussion of the work of the radical psychiatrist Frantz Fanon (the Lenin of Africa, it is sometimes said) on how colonialism and racism insinuate themselves into the individual. Latin America is also site of a 'liberation psychology' inspired by the Brazilian 'liberation theologies', and this makes any abstract discussion of individual change quite impossible, for to be Marxist it must take the form of 'action research' that makes academic work part of the real world.

In different ways, deliberately and despite itself, the conference was no mere academic conference. The reality of life in Mexico today should have made that impossible, and the organisers made that impossibility evident right from the start. The conference inauguration was a Purépecha ceremony led by representatives of the town of Cherán (a ceremony the Universidad Michoacana authorities did not want to happen) and which gave an additional edge to an already charged situation. The state of Michoacan pretty well corresponds to the territory of the pre-hispanic Purépecha, and there are communities that still speak the language and today they are retrieving this as a heritage of collective struggle against the conquistadores and now against neoliberal capitalism.

Michoacan is also site of one of the most powerful of the Mexican drug cartels 'La Familia Michoacana', now in an uneasy informal truce with the state administration following the recent election of the PRI (Partido Revolucionario Institucional), the party La Familia themselves endorsed. Cherán, a town of about 16,000 people high in the mountains of west Michoacan, was subject to illegal logging and murders in which La Familia were involved and against which the police and army would do nothing until April 2011. Women from Cherán took power into their own hands, took some of the loggers hostage, burnt the trucks, set up blockades, and the town now still operates with some other surrounding villages as a self-governing autonomous community. State security forces cannot enter the town, volunteers staff the defence posts, and decision-making is through popular assemblies.

Now Cherán (which, they remember, rose up during the Mexican revolution) is at the forefront of indigenous peoples' resistance. The Mexican constitution defines the state as 'pluricultural', and in response to the Zapatista movement – one of the enduring visible successes of the movement throughout Mexico – a federal law was passed in 2001 which gives indigenous people autonomy over natural resources and the judiciary. The town leadership is uninterested in branding and marketing itself (selling Cherán honey would be an option if they went down this road) to the consternation of some reformists who want to help it become self-sufficient. The remittance economy (in which about a third of the population go to the United States and then return with ideas about individual self-sufficiency, competitiveness and success compatible with the worst of Western psychology) threatens to corrode the community. The participants at the conference recognised that this is an ongoing political question, and were keen to use the conference to internationalise the struggle, to make their activity a centre for a different kind of globalisation antithetical to capitalism. This does not mean that the 'Cherán K'eri' – the collective leadership of Cherán – is Marxist, though it does include Marxists. It has shut out all political parties, but the Town Council welcomed the National Encounter of the Autonomous Anti-Capitalist Resistance in May (Carolina, 2012). At our conference Cherán K'eri were comrades learning about Marxism and we were learning from them.

One of the striking things about the conference was the active participation of students, as organisers from the university and as visitors from different parts of Mexico. Of the 700 who packed out the parallel sessions, a majority were young local activists and radicals learning about activism and political debate. The conference organisers oriented to the local autonomous movements (such as Cherán K'eri) rather than the 'Casas del Estudiante'. (These are halls of residence, some of which are party-affiliated, to which the university claims to devote a large proportion of its budget but in fact currently devotes only a minimal amount, about three percent, and which the university did not defend during recent police incursions when the students demanded more funding). In plenaries and the closing session, for example, the student movement #YoSoy132 were invited to contribute. The PRI which held power in Mexico for just over

seventy years until 2000 has just succeeded in getting back into power (nationally, in Michoacan state and so also, as a consequence, in the university administration and the lecturers union) following a ruthless and corrupt election campaign.

Effective resistance to the patently unfair rigged election began in May at the Universidad Iberoamericana (an expensive elite institution where the PRI presidential candidate Enrique Peña Nieto felt safe), and the student protests at that campaign meeting were condemned by the PRI and the media (Televisa and TV Azteca were notoriously in the pockets of the PRI) as being orchestrated by 'outsiders'. The Ibero students responded by posting 'Video 131' in which they held up their student cards to prove they were actually students, and this was followed by postings by supporters who identified themselves as 'student number 132', hence 'yo soy' (I am) '132' as the name of the movement (http://www.yosoy132media.org/). In July, just before the Psychology and Marxism conference, the Morelia Assembly hosted the seventh interuniversity assembly, and in alliance with some lecturers in the Universidad Michoacana (most significantly those who were organising our conference) #YoSoy132 has become a focus for open left political debate, arguing now for broader political challenge to corruption and consumerism. If the key signifier of Cherán is 'autonomy' (with democracy through the popular assembly as a necessary element of the struggle), then the signifier that animates #YoSoy132 is 'democracy', and it is being activated in diverse autonomous forms that effectively break from bourgeois fake-democracy (atomised 'voting' every few years for a different 'representative' in a market-place of corrupt parties) and from bourgeois psychology (atomised individual existence in thrall to the market).

The conference sessions oscillated between theory and practice, and the fact that this took place in Morelia now was what forged a link between the two. The final plenary session chaired by Cherán K'eri and with interventions by #YoSoy132 saw a most bizarre slow carnival upending of academic conventions as the invited psychologists (myself among them) were bit by bit replaced by student organisers from the audience who came up on stage during the discussion. We had longer time for this rather chaotic process because the plenary talk before the final one had been cancelled; that speaker had been unable to get to Morelia because the main highway from Mexico City had been blocked by La Familia and an army operation to try and stop them.

An academic conference, even on 'psychology and Marxism' is a rather protected space, and it is tempting to for those inside that space to romanticise the 'real world' and then, looking back, to romanticise the conference as if it were itself a free space. There were reminders day after day during the conference that even psychologists can be dangerous to those in power and can be endangered themselves. No more so than in this final session where a call went out to demand that the authorities take seriously the disappearance of three community psychologists from the town of Paracho in Michoacan the month before. These three had come to work in the community at a local festival. Blood and signs of struggle in the hotel from where they were abducted were dismissed by the police (http://nomasvictimas.org/abduction/). A petition was signed, and letters of support are now being sought from psychology and community organisations from inside Mexico and abroad. A national demonstration took place in Mexico City at the beginning of September.

The surreal atmosphere in the final session of the conference culminated in students chanting 'Yo Soy Ciento Treinta y Dos' and Cherán K'eri congratulating the organisers for making this a forum for change, a forum in which change took place. If something significant did happen here then it might have involved some 'psychology' and in some ways 'Marxism' was part of what happened, but what was most radical was the opposite of what we know about the discipline of psychology and what it tells us about ourselves. It was a collection of surprising collective events, events that Marxists today do not have ready responses to but will be forced to engage with if social and individual change (at a local, national and international level) are ever to be linked in revolution.

References

Carolina, X. (2012). Autonomous Paths Converge in Cherán. Available at http://elenemigocomun.net/2012/06/autonomous-paths-converge-cheran/

Marx, K. (1846). *Theses on Feuerbach*. Available at http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm

The Spectre of Communism is Not Haunting Psychology

Grahame Hayes
University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

Abstract. *In the last few years a number of thinkers have been advancing the idea/s of communism, or the "new" communism as it is often put; for instance, the recent work of Alain Badiou, Slavoj Žižek, Boris Groys, Jacques Rancière, Bruno Bosteels, and Jodi Dean amongst others. There are many reasons for the resurgence of interest in promoting the idea of the "new" communism: the breakup of the Soviet Union; the defeat and decline of many left parties, especially socialist ones; the recent crises of capitalism and the current European debt crisis; the challenge and excitement generated by the Occupy "movement". And yet, according to Antonia Birnbaum, objectively there are no "real forces or conflicts that directly call for a reappraisal of communism". Given that over the last 20 years, and especially the last few years (of capitalist crisis after capitalist crisis), critical psychology has not been a particularly vocal nor articulate critic of life under capitalism, this paper will explore some of the implications of the ideas of the "new" communism as a critique of the ravaging consequences of contemporary capitalism, as well as what might be pre-figured for a different theory and practice of psychology.*

Keywords: Communism, Marxism, Capitalism, Psychology.

Many Marxists would be delighted to hear that the spectre of communism is *not* haunting psychology. Communism has been the subject of quite a lot of bad press, and in many societal instances deservedly so. And furthermore, many Marxists would claim that communist societies, and the societies of what were called "actually existing socialism" were a very poor example of "Marxism in practice." In short, where Marxism might still retain some respectability (amongst left intellectuals), communism has mostly been discredited, especially if viewed from the *practice* of many extant communist parties. Where I come from, even the South African Communist Party doesn't talk about communism, which is not that surprising seeing as they don't really speak about socialism either! Along with the Chinese Communist Party, the South African Communist Party is not a communist party at all, but in its *practices*, a pro-capitalist party.

It is true that a commitment to Marxist analysis, and especially a politics informed by Marxism, is not inherently connected to the social outcome of a communist society. It might also seem somewhat presumptuous to be discussing communism, especially given how far off the political agenda it is. As Antonia Birnbaum (2011) wrote recently: "In the immediate conjuncture, there are no real forces or conflicts that directly call for a reappraisal of communism. However, certain questions linked to its reappraisal do appear to be at stake in conflicts that are taking place" (p. 21). So, it might be wondered, what the point is of raising (the spectre of) communism, given that it is clearly *not* haunting psychology. However, I would contend that we – *Marxists in psychology* – don't seem to talk enough about the *nature* of society, and especially the (future) society that we would like to bring about, and closely linked to this, we don't talk or write enough about *politics*. It seems that as Marxists, and Marxists in psychology, we should talk about the nature of society, that is, *current* social relations, and *future social relations*; that we should also talk about politics, and especially the politics of emancipation and transformation; that we should talk about alienation; that we should talk about ideology and subjectivity; and that we should talk about methodology and theory.

Marxism, the New Communism, and Psychology

The commentary here will be limited to a brief discussion concerning the nature of society, and about politics, or the political. The range of recent texts, as

well as the conferences on communism, raise some critical and potentially exciting questions about the nature of current conflicts, and how we might want to engage with them as Marxists in psychology (see for instance, Badiou, 2008; 2009; 2010; Bosteels, 2011; Douzinas & Žižek, 2010; Groys, 2009; Žižek, 2009). It is noteworthy that in these forums there has been little participation from psychology, even the left in psychology.

While it might be true that a commitment to Marxism (in psychology, or other disciplines for that matter) does not necessarily entail a commitment to the development of communism, the obverse isn't true. For historical and conjunctural reasons, one can't really talk about communism *without* talking about Marxism. And Marxists in psychology still need to critically discuss the appropriation of Marxist theory and practice, and the implications this has for the theory and practice of a psychology that is in the service of the common good. But, be this as it may, in the meantime it is possible to suggest some areas where there could be general agreement about what we might want to think about as people with an interest in Marxism and psychology. For instance, it seems that an interest in Marxism and psychology would include *at least* the following:

- a concern to fight against the de-politicisation of psychology and psychological matters, both practically and theoretically;

- a critique of the deformatory and alienating effects of capitalism on everyday life;

- a certain scepticism towards the notion that Marxism has a soteriological role to play in psychology;

- the development of a materialist theory of subjectivity;

- an interest in prefiguring "something like" a communist society.

If it is too bold and problematic to suggest that we should think about a different, non-capitalist society being "something like" a communist society, then we at least have to think about what kinds of social relations would need to pertain for people to flourish, and for the eradication of most forms of inequality.

Life under Capitalism

However, it seems that *Marxists in psychology*, at a conjunctural level at least, need to do two things: the first is to study (and criticise) the effects of life under capitalism for ordinary people; and the second is to identify and imagine alternative societal and collective arrangements that would make our lives less miserable, less alienating, and more filled with a sense of commitment to what is "in common," filled with hope and joy, and love.

Quite a lot has been written about the former (the psychological effects of life under capitalism), even starting with Freud. And while Freud was not a self-conscious social theorist, and generally a pessimist regarding the possibilities of transforming the human condition, he was not unaware of the effects of different forms of social life on the psyche, and especially with regard to the processes of repression. For example, his *Civilisation and its discontents* (1930) is a marvellous account of what "we give up" to become part of our society, or of "what the costs of being socialised" are. And earlier even, in the first lecture of his *Introductory lectures on psychoanalysis* (1916-1917), Freud writes: "We believe that civilization has been created under the pressure of the exigencies of life at the cost of satisfaction of the instincts [drives – GH] .. [and] .. each individual who makes a fresh entry into human society repeats this sacrifice of instinctual [drive – GH] satisfaction for the benefit of the whole community" (Freud, 1991, p. 47). So Freud, and many of the other early psychoanalysts (for example, Otto Fenichel, Wilhelm Reich, Lou Andreas-Salomé) were interested in the intersection of the social and the individual, and how the structuring of the unconscious was affected by this. We would do well to keep mining this rich tradition of "social analysis" in psychoanalysis's (early) history, without succumbing to its defeatism regarding the possibilities of social and human transformation. The history of psychoanalysis shows us that a strong universalising and clinical trend dominated, and still dominates, at the expense of a more socially articulated account of our (inner) lives. The tradition of a social psychoanalysis was most forcefully taken up by the theoreticians of the Frankfurt School. The Frankfurt School theorists, from the more radical Marcuse to the humanistic Erich Fromm, used psychoanalytic concepts to analyse (and criticise) life under capitalism. The nature of capitalism of the 1950s through to the 1970s (in the USA), and the then focus on a growing consumerism, is quite a different animal to the capitalist beast that currently "terrorises" much of the planet. The tradition inaugurated by the Frankfurt School continues as evidenced by a range of people currently working within a critical theory perspective, on the social and psychological analysis of contemporary social problems, from a psychoanalytic and non-psychoanalytic perspective (for instance, cf. Alford, 1989; Kelly Oliver, 2004; Sloan, 1996; Whitebook, 1996).

The other impressive tradition of social psycho-analytic work is of course that emanating from Lacanian influenced social theorists and Marxists. This is not the place to assess the impressive range and depth of Lacano-Marxist work on the social ills of our societies, but instead to raise two concerns or points for discussion regarding some of this work.

Firstly, many of these studies are not conjunctural, that is, they tend not to be empirical analyses of specific social problems and issues. These studies and writings tend to be overly theoretical, and/or philosophical. Their accounts are often too general, and not specific enough. This is not intended as some mindless critique of theoretical work, on the contrary I am particularly interested to get us to *think* about what our practices (theoretical and empirical) are, and what they amount to. This is also not some disengaged critique from a theoretical or moral high ground that I am lucky to inhabit, and by implication others don't. For example, a recent piece of my own work is precisely guilty of this problem of being too theoretical and too general, and too un-political (see my chapter, entitled, "Desire in the time of AIDS," published in Aydan Gulerce's edited (2012) collection (Re)configuring psychoanalysis). The point of mentioning this work is not some act of hubris, but rather should be read as a self-critique that explicates the *symptomatic* nature of much left analysis, in psychology, and elsewhere for that matter (see Bosteels, 2011). In other words, it is worth asking, why is it that politically engaged work ends up being so un-political? What are the structural and political reasons that inhibit a clear or explicit political focus? The answers to these kinds of questions will be common across many different sites of analysis, and yet the particular or local instances of "inhibition" or political quietude will be revealing. For instance, in South Africa, organised and professional psychology offers very little critique of the workings of the society. There are at least two reasons for this: one is that many psychologists occupy an uncritical bourgeois class position and thus they "don't notice" what the problems of society are that affect the majority of poor and working class people; and the second reason has to do with the very vexed issue of how "race" operates in post-apartheid South Africa, and what it would mean (especially for black psychologists) to criticise the policy and practices of the (black majority) ANC government.

This "lack" of specific conjunctural analyses leads to the second concern that the overly theoretical nature of our work, or maybe more accurately, the current *nature* of our theoretical work, ironically ends up being quite politically impotent, or at least easily disregarded as not having any bearing on pressing social issues. The response of many capitalist countries to the deep-seated malaise of contemporary capitalism is to operate seemingly within the law, and yet beyond the law. Increasingly, the capitalist state in many countries, as per norm, functions as a "state of exception" (cf. Agamben, 2005; Bauman, 2011). Besides the insecurities and vulnerabilities that this creates, it also makes it very difficult to be, to act, politically. Already in the mid-1980s Ulrich Beck (1992) pointed out that individuals, in what he called "risk society," are expected to seek *biographical* or personal solutions to systemic contradictions. Capitalism, as a social system, takes no responsibility for people's mental health, and prefers to see these problems as "natural facts" (cf. Fisher, 2009, p. 19), as the unchanging way of the world. A recent study by Davies (2011) points to the inextricable link between the political economy of capitalism and current levels of depression. Quoting mental health statistics since 1996, Davies (2011) notes that "we might say that if 'immaterial' labour is now the hegemonic form of production, depression is the hegemonic form of incapacity" (p. 67). Furthermore, he suggests that "[u]nhappiness has become the critical negative externality of contemporary capitalism" (Davies, 2011, p. 68). And as many commentators have noted, this "unhappiness" manifests itself as mental health problems, mostly depression, as well as a generalised form of anxiety brought on by the insecurity of everyday life under neo-liberal capitalism – and especially that persistent anxiety of never finding a job! (cf. Neocleous, 2011). Capitalism finds itself increasingly within the clutches of a contradiction that it can't resolve, namely that while it "produces" millions of unhappy, depressed, and anxious subjects, it at the same time implores us all to enjoy the "benefits" of life under capitalism: consume, enjoy, be happy! This contradiction is in part responsible for the widespread anti-capitalist protests around the world, as well as other forms of resistance to social inequality, exploitation and oppression as seen for example in the uprisings in the Arab Spring countries, the Occupy movement's "indictment" of the 1%, the resistance to imposed austerity measures in the Eurozone, and not to forget the almost daily protests regarding the lack of basic service delivery in South Africa.

The Return of the Political

Bauman (2000) has forcefully argued that there is a growing gap in modern life (or what he prefers to call

"liquid modernity") between the condition of the individual *de jure* and their chances to become individuals *de facto*. This gap is also what accounts for the alienation and insecurity experienced by many people these days. Bauman (cf. 2000, p. 39) contends that the reasons for this are that the public space(s) of social life have become individualised, and that increasingly public spaces are less public, and colonised by life-politics and other forms of privatisation. Ironically it is the public realm, politics with a Capital P, that needs to be re-claimed, re-built to ensure the chances for individuals to be (to "become individuals *de facto*"). For Bauman (2000) this is the role and task of critical theory as it critiques life-politics, the privatisation of the public realm, and secures the public realm as a space for collectivity and the *de facto* becoming of individuals. Thus being political, at least in the sense of ordinary people participating in decisions that affect how their lives are organised, and lived, has become fraught with difficulties. What constitutes "legitimate" politics now has become incredibly narrow, and circumscribed. And yet there are openings, there are windows to look through for alternatives. But a massive problem confronts us, and that is knowing how to think differently about the *politics* of our work, and move closer to more egalitarian modes of association. Birnbaum (2012) captures this most eloquently when she notes that "Even in the struggles that do take place, there is an enormous, almost insurmountable difficulty in subjectively stepping out of the capitalist framework. So, another symptom: the more frenetically we search for the place-holders of communist aspirations, the more these aspirations seem to fall back into formal, purely potential, even speculative modes" (p. 21).

The tendency to fall back into "speculative modes," or rather, what Bosteels calls "speculative leftism" (following Jacques Rancière – cf. Bosteels, 2011, p. 23), is what concerns him in his critique of recent work about communism, the communist hypothesis, and the idea of communism, and simultaneously Bosteels wants to salvage the meaning of communism as "something more than a utopia for beautiful souls" (ibid., p. 19). Bosteels (2011, p. 15) is not averse to seeing the future actuality of communism as an "impossible possibility," or as Badiou and Žižek suggest as the "art of the impossible." What the "actuality" of Bosteels's communism entails is taking seriously the history of communism, what *actually* existed under this name, as well as looking for *actual* possible alternatives in the present so as to build a communism of and for the future. Bosteels (2011) writes: "It is with an eye on understanding the relation between the actual and the possible that […] I will

study a series of thinkers and trends that all somehow claim to contribute to the reinvigoration of a tradition of thought for the Left" (p. 40). He notes that these radical leftist writers also "propose that a socialist or communist mode of doing politics must necessarily pass through the detour of a prior ontological investigation into the very being of politics" (ibid., p. 40). Bosteels starts the first ("The ontological turn") of the five chapters that make up his book with this project of ontology. Suggestively what is contained in these reflections about ontology is to think about the *subject* of and for politics, that is, an ontology of (the political) being. And for psychology a materialist ontology of being that is recovered from the fractured and fragmented identities under capitalism, together with the imagined (and immanent) possibilities of an emancipated and flourishing human being under the new communism.

Writing about the invention of communism in the early Marx, Birnbaum (2012) makes a related point when she asks: "How does the dominant feature in Marx's communism – class antagonism – connect with the associative, fraternal moment?" (p. 22). The actuality of communism in this instance is the political struggle against capitalist exploitation, the struggle of one class, proletarians, against another class, the bourgeoisie or capitalist class. This is one irreducible moment of communism, the persistent political struggle against class exploitation for the benefit of the *whole* of society. The other moment is grasping whom the being is that "emerges" in the associative, fraternal and social dynamics of struggle. What I am alluding to here is the Marxist notion of the transformatory nature of practice, both for theory and practical living: social beings (proletarians) violently fighting against the violence of capital, and doing this in a common and comradely way. Holding the tension of antagonism and struggle with the sharing "inherent to communist aspirations" seems what unites many writers, from Marx through to Žižek, Badiou, Bosteels, and others.

These are complex matters about the political ontology of being in the (communist) struggle against capitalism, and are invoked in their negativity as ideological interpellations of the various subject positions of everyday life, and in their positivity as creating the "new person," the emancipated social being, or the "beautiful souls" envisaged by communism. Although often dismissed as "immature," or too humanistic, some of Marx's early work, namely the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848), and even the later reflections on the Paris Commune (1871), would be a fruitful place for us to start (re-)thinking

the ontology and politics of the person under communism.

The New Communism: Badiou and Žižek

I want briefly now to refer to the work of two of the "big names" currently promoting the communist idea and the communist hypothesis: Slavoj Žižek, and Alain Badiou. For instance, Žižek (2009) notes that, "If communism really is an 'eternal' Idea, then it works as a Hegelian 'concrete universality': it is eternal not in the sense of a series of abstract-universal features that may be applied everywhere, but in the sense that *it has to be re-invented in each new historical situation*" (p. 6, emphases added). Is it preposterous to suggest that Marxists in psychology might find something worthy in *re-inventing* what communism might mean for us, here, now? Why is it that psychology is not one of the most critical disciplines of capitalist excesses and barbarity, everywhere, and consequently, at least, simultaneously adumbrating an alternative social order? Some answers to psychology's silence regarding the ravages of life under capitalism, from "within psychology," are advanced by Ian Parker's (2007) important text, *Revolution in psychology,* where he elaborates the various forms of subjectivity that maintain the status quo. He poignantly reveals psychology's imbrication with capitalism, both epistemologically and ontologically, when he writes, "A close analysis of the development of psychology can actually enable us to understand something about the nature of alienation in capitalist society and the role of different forms of oppression within it" (Parker, 2007, p. 5). And again, "capitalist society is exploitative and alienating, and for sure it intensifies individual experience, but it also constitutes that individual experience as something 'psychological', as something that operates as if it were inside each person" (ibid.).

And "outside of psychology" Slavoj Žižek (2010) is frequently at pains to point out the functioning of capitalist ideology, and how ideology operates under capitalism to keep us content and docile. While we need to continue to expose and critique psychology's complicity in oiling the creaking machinery of contemporary capitalism, we should also be giving some thought to joining in the discussions about communism, and what it might mean to be a person in a society free from the constraints of capitalist social relations. However, the *name* of communism is still shocking, still spectral, still haunting! We should note that haunting also means evocative, memorable, stirring, unforgettable. The real of communism, the actual as Bosteels (2011) calls it, or the past history of

communism *should* haunt us as we try to hold a dialectical tension between "the two names of communism" (see Roberts, 2012). The two names refer to "communism as a (failed) political tradition and set of strategies, and communism as an (emergent) emancipatory theory" (Roberts, 2012, p. 9). Many participants in the discussions of the "new" communism are keen to "remove" the stain of failed political practices of state communism from communism's name. Developing this argument somewhat Roberts (2012) writes: "The new name of communism in politics must *subtract* itself from history, from any notion that the remnants of a revolutionary tradition represents a feint red line of 'progress towards' (as if we were now 'back on track'). The re-engagement of philosophy and politics emerges as a *constitutive break* with both a failed Communism and a failed capitalist state. Without this break, there is no process of renaming/unnaming" (p. 12, emphases added).

The troubling question is of course, *how* do we subtract ourselves from history, and constitutively *break* with the failures of communism and capitalism? This sounds at least too large a set of things to do, assuming even that we might know how to subtract communism from its history. Furthermore, this strikes me as a form of speculative leftism that wants to "clean up" politics via philosophy, rather than engage with the politico-philosophical, and the politico-psychological dynamics of the haunted history of the two names of communism. The only way we might "subtract" communism from its history, is by engaging its problematic history, remembering also that not *all* of its history was problematic, and ensuring that we knowingly create a different communist future, a future as always becoming.

In a related vein, Badiou (2008: 34-35) poses the question: "What is the communist hypothesis?" and answers: "In its generic sense, [...] 'communist' means, first, that the logic of class – [...] is not inevitable; *it can be overcome*. The communist hypothesis is that *a different collective organization is practicable*, one that will eliminate the inequality of wealth and even the division of labour. The private appropriation of massive fortunes and their transmission by inheritance will disappear" (pp. 34-35, emphases added). This is not some starry-eyed plug for the communist utopia, as both Žižek and Badiou are painfully aware of what is at stake. It is because of the success of capitalist ideology that we so easily imagine that there is no alternative (TINA), or that the alternative to capitalism is too horrific to imagine – and for capitalists the end of capitalism *is* too horrific to imagine. Žižek (2009) points to two consequences of doing nothing, of accepting defeat. The first is about the

Left itself, and he writes: "There is a real possibility that the main victim of the ongoing crisis will not be capitalism but the Left itself, insofar as its inability to offer a viable global alternative was again made visible to everyone. It was the Left which was effectively caught out. It is as if recent events were staged with a calculated risk in order to demonstrate that, even at a time of shattering crisis, there is no viable alternative to capitalism" (Žižek, 2009, p. 16). The challenges facing us in thinking about alternatives to capitalism, both in theory and practice, are quite daunting; and yet as Žižek remarks right at the end of his book, it is time for us to get serious again about what communism might mean. For millions of people around the world things are so bad under actually existing capitalism, that we have no choice but to get serious about imagining a different future. And in any case, it seems that the feint outlines of an alternative are immanent in many of the critiques and refusals of the anti-capitalist movement, and other social and political struggles of a more local nature, and even in our theoretical work.

The second, even gloomier, consequence of the Left's inertia that Žižek points to is the ruling class asserting itself in ever more brutal and violent ways, and we are not short of examples of this going on everywhere: for example, the current South African government's violent responses to protests about the lack of basic services; the militaristic surveillance of public space in London during the Olympics in July 2012; the racist attacks on African immigrants in Greece; and on and on. As Žižek (2009) says, "The primary immediate effect of the crisis will not be the rise of a radical emancipatory politics, but rather the rise of racist populism, further wars, increased poverty in the poorest Third World countries, and greater divisions between the rich and the poor within all societies" (p. 17). This sounds very much like Žižek had contemporary South Africa in mind, where the ruling, pro-capitalist ANC government, erstwhile revolutionaries, struggles to deliver a better life to ordinary poor and working class people, and often resort to (anti-white) racist populism as an "explanation" for the failures of redistribution and social equality.

Badiou's (2008) diagnosis of the malaise of 21st century capitalism and its history is considerably darker than Žižek's, and yet at the same time he offers a politics of hope. Capturing the "dialectics of disaster" as a necessary "preface to hope," to use Ronald Aronson's (1983) evocative phrases, is important lest we hope in the dark, or worse, lapse into a politics of the will (voluntarism) without any critical reason. And so to conclude with a comment from Badiou (2008) where he suggests that we seem a lot closer to the conditions of the 19th century: "A wide variety of 19th-century phenomena are reappearing: vast zones of poverty, widening inequalities, politics dissolved into the 'service of wealth', the nihilism of large sections of the young; the servility of much of the intelligentsia; the cramped, besieged experimentalism of a few groups seeking ways to express the communist hypothesis … [and so] … *[t]his is our task, during the reactionary interlude that now prevails: through the combination of thought processes – always global, or universal, in character – and political experience, always local and singular, yet transmissible, to renew the existence of the communist hypothesis, in our consciousness and on the ground"* (pp. 41-42, emphases added).

For psychology not to be haunted by the spectre of communism, we might want to engage with what a "new" consciousness might amount to that is not subject to selfish forms of individualism, and to disengage the notion of what a person is from the determinations of socialisation under capitalism. Part of this project of renewing the conditions for communism is for us to critically engage with the discussions of the communist idea and what this might mean for, and in, psychology. As Badiou (2008) has suggested, it requires that we hold a dialectical tension between the *political experience* of our everyday lives and struggles, and *the development of critical ideas* that help us make sense of our world and how to transcend it. Parker (2007) notes that "[r]evolutionary changes require social and personal change that prefigures a better world, and this means that detailed analysis, reflection and theory have always been necessary; this analysis, reflection and theory should not be *mistaken for psychology,* however" (p. 6, emphases added). The other part of the project of renewal requires a political engagement, "on the ground" as it were, with the social reality of everyday life in the hope of creating an egalitarian society and the conditions for the flourishing of social being.

References

Agamben, G. (2005). *State of exception.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Alford, C. F. (1989). *Melanie Klein and critical social theory: An account of politics, art, and reason based on her psychoanalytic theory.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Aronson, R. (1983). *The dialectics of disaster: A preface to hope.* London: Verso.

Badiou, A. (2008). The communist hypothesis. *New Left Review, 49,* 29-42.

Badiou, A. (2009). Is the word "communism" forever doomed? Available at http://www.lacan.com

Badiou, A. (2010). *The meaning of Sarkozy.* London: Verso.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2011). *Collateral damage: Social inequality in a global age.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity.* London: Sage

Birnbaum, A. (2012). Between sharing and antagonism: The invention of communism in the early Marx. *Radical Philosophy, 166,* 21-28.

Bosteels, B. (2011). *The actuality of communism.* London: Verso.

Davies, W. (2011). The political economy of unhappiness. *New Left Review, 71,* 65-80.

Douzinas, C., & Žižek, S. (Eds.). (2010). *The idea of communism.* London: Verso.

Fisher, M. (2009). *Capitalist realism: Is there no alternative?* Winchester, UK: Zero Books.

Freud, S. (1917/1991) *Introductory lectures on psychoanalysis.* Volume 1 of the Penguin Freud Library. London: Penguin Books.

Freud, S. (1985 [1930]). Civilization and its discontents. In *Civilization, society and religion.* Volume 12 of the Pelican Freud Library. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.

Groys, B. (2009). *The communist postscript.* London: Verso.

Hayes, G. (2012). Desire in the time of AIDS. In A. Gulerce (Ed.), *Re(con)figuring psychoanalysis:* *Critical juxtapositions of the philosophical, the sociohistorical and the political.* Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1971 [1848]). Manifesto of the Communist Party. In D. J. Struik (Ed.), *The birth of the Communist Manifesto.* New York: International Publishers.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1971 [1871]) *On the Paris Commune.* Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, K. (1977 [1844]). *Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844.* Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Neocleous, M. (2011). Anxious resilience. *Mute, 3*(2). Available at http://www.metamute.org/editorial/articles/anxious-reslience

Oliver, K. (2004). *The colonization of psychic space: A psychoanalytic social theory of oppression.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Parker, I. (2007). *Revolution in psychology: Alienation to emancipation.* London: Pluto Press.

Roberts, J. (2012). The two names of communism. *Radical Philosophy, 177,* 9-18.

Sloan T. (1996). *Damaged life: The crisis of the modern psyche.* London & New York: Routledge.

Whitebook, J. (1996). *Perversion and utopia: A study in psychoanalysis and critical theory.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Žižek, S. (2009). *First as tragedy, then as farce.* London & New York: Verso.

Žižek, S. (2010). *Living in the end times.* London & New York: Verso.

Marxism, Subjectivity and Cultural Historical Psychology: Moving Forward on an Unfinished Legacy

Fernando González-Rey
Universidade de Brasilia, Brazil

Abstract. *This paper discusses different moments and positions assumed by Soviet psychologists in their attempts to define a Marxist psychology. The paper also intends to bring into the light moments, concepts and contradictions that have remained overlooked in Soviet psychology for a long time, and from where it becomes possible to advance a new definition of subjectivity from a cultural-historical approach.*

Keywords: Marxism, objectivity, subjectivity, Soviet psychology, Cultural-Historical psychology

Introduction

This paper discusses the main paths taken by Soviet psychology in its search for becoming a Marxist psychology. Despite the various moments that characterized this search for a Marxist psychology, this effort was monopolized since the mid-1920s by the identification of Marxist psychology as a natural science, following the principles of positivism that ruled to a great extent the natural sciences in that epoch and remained evident in the works of some of the more well-known Soviet psychologists (Vygotsky, 2012; Leontiev, 1975). The complexity of assuming one philosophy as a universal theoretical support for a concrete science always represents a great challenge; dogmatism is almost always the main result of such an approach. Scientific theoretical constructions should instead advance through dispute between different theoretic-hypothetical paths in the ongoing movement of scientific production. There is no scientific theory that could be defined a priori as the right path based purely on a philosophical position, because there are many ways in which the principles of one philosophical approach could be taken up within a concrete science.

The Search for an Objective Approach in Soviet psychology

The influence of neurophysiology on Soviet psychology was not only due to its strong tradition of efforts to achieve an objective psychology since Russian times, but also to the political recognition that Pavlov and Bekhterev received – deservedly – as leaders of that movement in the Soviet era, which translated into political power and institutional recognition during that time. Unlike Pavlov, Bekhterev devoted time to psychiatric practice, which enabled him to be closer to the psychological challenges presented in practice. Bekhterev's theoretical positions, despite its neurophysiologic reductionism, led to a systemic explanation within which social and individual levels were integrated in the explanation of human behavior.

In Moscow and Leningrad respectively, the influence of neurophysiology and reflexology on psychology had its counterpart in strong university departments of philosophy that were being ruled by an Idealistic approach. These departments were the first to educate psychologists, before the October Revolution, an effort that significantly contributed to the institutionalization of psychology in Russia. Troistki, one of the main representatives of that movement, and his follower, Grot, founded the Psychological Society of Moscow. Some years after this event, Grot founded the journal "Questions of Philosophy and Psychology" (1899) and became its first editor (Koltzova, Oleinik & Tugaeibaeva, 1997). Chelpanov, who shared the theoretical position of the previously mentioned authors, founded the Institute of Psychology of Moscow in 1912, which became the most important institution of psychology in Moscow.

That Idealistic approach attributed an active and generative character to human consciousness and also

emphasized the relevance of language as an important link between culture and consciousness (Budilova, 1983). Both topics, consciousness and culture, were to turn into relevant principles for Soviet psychologists some years later, particularly through Vygotsky's works. The fact that these topics had entered Soviet psychology as a result of the influence of Idealistic philosophers was completely omitted in the official history of the discipline.

Chelpanov, the founder of the Institute of Psychology in Moscow, invited his disciple, G. Shpet, to join him in the organization of the Institute. Shpet was Vygotsky's professor at the Shanyavsky People's University for two years, and exerted an important influence on Vygotsky's works. According to Zinchenko (2007, p. 212):

> Despite all these connections, there is only one reference to Shpet in Vygotsky's works (in the *Psychology of Art*), and even this only in passing. And Shpet's books *Phenomenon and Meaning* (1914), *Aesthetic Fragments* (1922), and *The Inner Form of the Word* (1927), in which he discussed thinking and language, thought and word, meaning and sense and the external and inner form of the word were all published significantly earlier than Vygotsky's *Thinking and Speech* (1934).

Without any doubt, consciousness, language and culture were topics that characterized Russian Idealistic approaches to psychology before the October Revolution. Nevertheless, the way in which Marxism was increasingly endorsed politically as the basis for Soviet psychology emphasized the objective world as the basis for the development of consciousness, a principle whose elaboration within Soviet psychology led to a representation of consciousness as an epiphenomenon of objective causes. These causes could be internal, such as neurophysiological processes; or external, such as practical activity with external objects, a focus which replaced neurophysiological processes as the cornerstone for the definition of an objective psychology since the end of the 1950s of the 20th century. This materialistic reductionism in the explanation of consciousness led to a non-dialectical dichotomy between the external and the internal, which propelled a psychology centered on behavior rather than a dialectical psychology. As history has amply demonstrated, dialectic as method and power are always antagonistic, because dialectic always implies the relativity of the present time, whereas power seeks to freeze the present as the explanation of the future.

As a result of the replacement of Chelpanov by Kornilov as the director of the Institute of Psychology in Moscow, the "reactology" introduced by the latter became another strong pole in the dispute about defining psychology in terms of Marxist principles. Unlike reflexology, reactology was based on the study of behavior and reproduced a stimulus – reaction scheme as the main explanation for human behavior.

Since the 1920s two forces evolved which both claimed the right to be considered the best Marxist explanation for psychology: the reflexology developed under Bechterev's leadership in Leningrad and the reactology spearheaded by Kornilov in Moscow. Luria and Leontiev were among the young psychologists who surrounded Kornilov in Moscow. In 1925 Vygotsky joined this joined this group as a staff member on the invitation by Kornilov. The prevalence of Kornilov's positions in that moment of Soviet psychology is clear in this comment by Luria (1928):

> The psychologists as a rule share the objective positions of physiologists but carry on their work on a much broader basis, approaching psychology from the point of view of that structural behavior which is determined by social conditions. To that wing belong most of the Russian psychologists who do not accept the mechanistic point of view of the reflexologists. It will suffice in this connection to mention the names of Professor Kornilov, Professor Blonski (his psychological work is of a distinctly genetic character), Professor Basov and L.S. Vygotsky. (p. 347)

Three things should be remarked regarding this quotation: first, the fact that Luria did not mention Leontiev, who was a collaborator of the Institute before Vygotsky; second, the rapidity of Vygotsky's ascension; and third, the fact that after eleven years of Soviet power, Luria still referred to Russian psychology, instead of Soviet psychology.

Aside from the dominant objectivist orientation adopted by Soviet psychology, which extended from its beginnings to the mid-1970s, there existed different theoretical positions in Soviet human sciences at the same time, for example, Bahktin and Voloshinov in linguistics and Krupskaya and Ushinsky in education. The following quote by Krupskaya remarks on the relevance of Freud's thought for Soviet education: "The question of the translation of some subconscious impulses of human behavior to consciousness is very important from a pedagogical point of view" (Krupskaya, 1932, as cited in Koltzova, Oleinik & Tugayeva, 1997, p. 62). Although Krupskaya had been Lenin's wife, the latter had already died in those years, and she did not have the sympathy of Stalin. Bakhtin and his group also could not count on Stalin's sympathy…

Kornilov's theoretical stimulus – reaction scheme had much in common with the behaviorism of that time. This reductionist position also characterized some of Vygotsky's main writings between 1928 and 1931, precisely at the moment when Luria's paper was published. The following statement by Vygotky (1995) is a good example of this:

> It is true that the sign in the beginning is a means of communication and only later becomes a means of personal behavior, it is completely evident that cultural development, based on the use of signs and the sign's inclusion in the general system of behavior initially takes place in a social, external way… The primary psychology of the function of the word is a social psychology and if we want to know how the word functions in individual behavior, we should analyze, first and foremost, its prior function in the social behavior of the person. (p. 147)

This statement belongs to moment in Vygotsky's work that I have defined as an "objectivistic turn" in his overall trajectory (González Rey, 2011). In that moment Vygotsky omitted some of the main topics he discussed during the initial stages of his work, such as emotion, fantasy, imagination and personality. His narrow definition of the social is evident in how it is identified here with the external. Communication is merely an instrumental device through which signs are exchanged during speech. Signs enter communication as external objects and are later internalized and become mediators of psychological functions. The sign is reduced to a mere behavioral device, rather than being a symbolic piece inscribed in the complex network of social, subjective and discursive processes.

In 1913, Rubinstein, another prominent figure of Soviet psychology, returned to Odessa from Germany, where he simultaneously concluded his graduate studies in philosophy and his doctoral degree in the specialty of psychology at the University of Marburg. Working mainly in philosophy, he did not participate as a protagonist in the discussions that occurred in psychology during the 1920s; but he did serve as a professor at the University of Odessa in 1920 in the chair of philosophy and psychology.

The conflicts between members of the department resulting from their different interpretations of Marxism forced Rubinstein to resign. As a result of this stumble, Rubinstein abandoned philosophy and began to work in psychology (Abuljanova & Bruschlinsky, 1989). Rubinstein won notoriety in Soviet psychology in 1930 when was invited as the head of the chair of psychology at the Hertzen's Pedagogical Institute of Leningrad.

According to Abuljanova and Bruschlinsky (1989), Rubinstein, in his paper "The questions of psychology in Marx's works", "applied the main positions of Dialectical Materialism and Marx's definition of activity to psychology, formulating the essential methodological principle of the unity of consciousness and activity. He defined personality as the subject of this unity" (p. 9).

Rubinstein and his group thus became another important pole in Soviet psychology at the beginning of 1930s. A historical fact that had remained unnoticed until today was that Rubinstein invited Vygotsky to join the Institute, where Vygotsky taught until the end of his life. The prestige of Rubinstein rapidly increased and as a result he was invited as head of the Department of Psychology of the University of Moscow in 1942. In 1945, simultaneously with this responsibility, he founded the sector of psychology within the Institute of Philosophy of the Soviet Union's Academy of Sciences. Once in Moscow, Rubinstein invited some of his students in Leningrad to join him at University's Department of Psychology, such as Yarochevsky and Komm; and he also invited A.N. Leontiev and other followers from the Kharkov group, such as Galperin and Zaparochets (Bruschlinsky, 2001).

In 1943, Rubinstein was elected as Member Correspondent of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union, the highest honor bestowed on scientists in the Soviet Union at the time.[1] Psychology was in expansion in Moscow despite the "purges" in Soviet scientific institutions brought about by the polemic about genetics started by Lysenko at that time (Sheehan, 1985). "Lysenkoism" was progressively extended to the rest of the Soviet sciences with its main purpose being the development of a genuine Marxist approach for all the sciences. In 1948 Lysenkoism was officially endorsed as Marxist genetics, leading to the repression of all geneticists who were opposed to this point of view. The new climate of "ideological cleansing" extended to psychology as well, turning

---

[1] Rubinstein was the first Soviet psychologist to be elected as Member Correspondent of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union. After him only Kravkov in 1946 and Lomov in 1976 also achieved this status. The Academy of Science was the center of academic politics and decision making in the Soviet Union, and its activities and orientations was always mediated by the interests of Soviet political circles.

Rubinstein into its main victim. Rubinstein was removed from all his academic and institutional duties.

Related to the above-mentioned events, in the beginning of 1950s a meeting between the Soviet's Union Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Medical Sciences was jointly held; known as Pavlov Session, it was part of the legacy of Lysenkoism. As result of the meeting a "new physiological turn" was officially imposed as the basis for a Marxist psychology. For the first time one concrete approach was endorsed as the official Marxist psychology, in much the same way as it occurred in genetics.

As a result of the Stalin's death in 1953, critical turmoil extended to all the spheres of Soviet society, reaching a peak with criticisms raised by Kruschev against Stalin during the 20th Congress of the Communist Party. Based on these criticisms, new priorities emerged and the conclusions of the Pavlov Session lost their political relevance. However, the dominant social subjectivity generated by Stalinism would continue to rule Soviet life until the end of totalitarian rule in that socialist state. In psychology, the idea of a Marxist psychology remained alive after Stalin's death. Concrete activity with objects filled the vacuum left by Pavlov's main concepts for the explication of an objective psychology. The concept of activity in Leontiev's understanding was defined as external, practical, concrete and objective; attributes that made it a good option for replacing neurophysiologic processes as the key for advancing a new approach to an objective psychology. This understanding of activity was clearly expressed by Davydov: "The genetically early and fundamental type of activity is external, sensuous, practical activity with objects, from which all types of internal mental activity of individual consciousness derive" (1981, p. 26).

Activity was taken as a system in itself with its own structure and objective laws: activity functioned independent of its subject, just as mind functioned as a processing system of information for the first representatives of American cognitive psychology of the 1960s. The more than casual parallel development of these theories is pointed out by Davydov (1981):

> Some attempts in this direction have been made in Soviet psychology (for example in the Leontiev study of the development of sensitivity) and in the work of some representatives of cognitive psychology (for example, J. Gibson; A. Neisser; and others). Of course, Piaget has studied this principle systematically, exploring in depth the *objective* foundations of operative structures. (p. 24, emphasis added)

In fact, there were many similarities between Leontiev's main positions, those of Piaget and the American cognitive psychologists mentioned by Davydov. For all of them, mind appeared as an impersonal and de-psychologized system of operations. Leontiev's definition of activity created a gap between external operations with objects and consciousness, on the basis of which consciousness resulted from the internalization of external operations. Among the multiple weak points I see in Leontiev's definition of activity, the analysis of which is beyond the scope of this paper, I would like to pause at two which clearly illustrate his *mechanistic objectivism*.

First, in his attempt to overcome any remnant of Idealism, Leontiev identified internal and external activity by its structure, as a result of which internal activity became an epiphenomenon of the external. As result of this identification, subjectivity was reduced to being the image of concrete objects: "In the processes generated by these relations, objects are posited as subjective images in the human brain, as consciousness" (Leontiev, 1975, p. 31). The identification of consciousness with the images of concrete, material objects keeps consciousness prisoner within a scheme of "activity-object" within which the subject and its subjectivity are definitively suppressed.

With the above definition Leontiev, paradoxically, is left with no theoretical resources for explaining needs that are specifically human from a cultural-historical standpoint. In discussing needs, he made the mistake of defining them as preceding activity; as being inherent to the organism. He understood needs as states of biological functioning. Needs will become motive for Leontiev only as a result of their encounter with "material objects": "…need is only a state of necessity of the organism that in itself is not capable of giving rise to any specific activity… Only as a result of its 'encounter' with the object corresponding to it is it able to become capable of directing and regulating activity" (Leontiev, 1975, p. 87).

The characteristics of the activity function previously mentioned highlight the contradictions resulting from this mechanistic, dogmatic position. Leontiev defined need as an intrinsic biological state in such a way that he did not leave space for explaining the *specific* character of psychological needs. Cultural needs, unlike biological ones, are not inherent to the functioning of human bodies. Only after the meeting of a need by its object does the need become a motive, in what like a magical solution rather than a psychological explanation. The need becomes the motive without any reference to a change in its structure. Be-

hind this position is a dichotomy between the biological, given by the need, and the social, represented by the object, from which a different qualitative process that could be ontologically recognized as psychological can't emerge.

The person's feelings, memories, reflections, positions and decisions have nothing to do with the definition of motive sustained by Leontiev. As Davydov pointed out: "Objects *themselves* guide the transformations of this activity in the process of the subject's practical contacts with them" (1981, p. 14, emphasis added). The person as subject of activity is completely replaced by the object and activity in itself becomes a mere link between needs and objects.

Activity theory, more so than any other approach in Soviet psychology, implied the exclusion of subjectivity, turning itself into a pinnacle moment in the effort of developing an objective psychology. After the 1970s a new era began in Soviet Psychology, as a result of which the role attributed by Leontiev to activity as the key concept for the definition of Marxist psychology was questioned by different authors (González Rey, 2012). This new moment brought to light concepts and topics developed initially by Vygotsky and Rubinstein that had remained overshadowed during the previous decades, to be joined with concepts discussed by other classic Soviet writers like Ananiev and Bozhovich, who had created the premises for the theoretical emergence of subjectivity in Soviet psychology. The concept of subjectivity was thus made explicit by a new generation of Soviet psychologists who were disciples of the previously mentioned figures (Abuljanova, 1973, 1980; Brushlinsky, 1994; Chudnovsky, 1988; Lomov, 1984).

Advancing on the Topic of Subjectivity from a Cultural-Historical Standpoint

Since the 1990s my work began to be oriented towards a definition of subjectivity from a cultural-historical position. At the beginning this attempt was greatly inspired by Vygotsky's definitions of sense and "perezhivanie" as well as by the interpretation of Vygotsky's legacy developed by Bozhovich to advance the study of personality and motivation. Being critical of the cognitive reductionism of Vygotsky's definition of "perezhivanie", Bozhovich advanced further the close relationship between the concepts of social situation of development and "perezhivanie", which she articulated with her own definition of "psychical formation". As a result of Bozhovich's work these concepts advanced a different definition of mo-

tive than that which was given by Leontiev as the object of activity (Bozhovich, 1968). With these concepts as base, Bozhovich and her era also overcame the central place given to the concept of "leading activity" as the cornerstone for explaining psychical development in Soviet psychology. The concept of "leading activity" is inseparable from Activity theory as a whole (Chudnovsky, 1976).

The concept of sense, in turn, was restored to relevance by A.A. Leontiev (1992) for discussing a new moment of Vygotsky's thought. However, both these concepts, sense and "perezhivanie", remained overlooked by Vygotsky's followers until very recently, the reason being that neither concepts fit in with the dominant interpretations of Vygotsky that prevailed in both Soviet and Eastern psychologies (Fakhrutdinova, 2010; González Rey, 2009, 2011; Yasnitsky, 2011).

The relevance of aforementioned concepts to the development of the topic of subjectivity results from the new representation of consciousness that they implied (González Rey, 2009, 2011, 2012). Based on these concepts, it is possible to understand consciousness as a self-generative system rather than as a mere reflection of external activities. This position, in turn, might lead to an overcoming of the explanation of the genesis of consciousness as a result of internalization.

When Vygotsky argued that: "a word's sense is the aggregate of all the psychological facts that arise in our consciousness as result of the word" (1987, p. 276), he emphasized that "meaning is only one of these zones of the sense that the word acquires in the context of the speech" (p. 276). This claim enables the advancement of a definition of consciousness on new ontological premises: consciousness is formed by processes that are essentially different from those that characterized external operations with objects. Sense opens the window for a definition of consciousness as simultaneously organized in human action and as a psychical organization (González Rey, 2012).

Vygotsky referred to sense as a psychological formation, not as an operation or a function. This is not a trivial detail, since behind each concept rests a different definition of mind. One is operational, as mind was defined by Piaget, by the first generation of the so-called cognitive revolution, by Leontiev, and by Vygotsky between 1928 and 1931. The other, which was never made explicit in Soviet psychology, may be formulated on the basis of concepts like sense, "perezhivanie", psychical formations and the unity between consciousness and activity, as these were treated by some Soviet psychologists like Vygotsky,

Rubinstein, Ananiev and Bozhovich. In the latter definition, consciousness might be represented as a self-generative system within which the different psychological functions are organized in terms of qualitative processes which define the qualitatively different nature of consciousness as such. In our work, the specific qualitative nature of the human mind is defined by those unities of symbolic processes and emotions defined as subjective senses and subjective configurations.

Since *Psychology of Art* Vygotsky was aware of the need to develop new concepts that are able to bring to light the relevance of the affective processes for the comprehension of the human psyche, an idea strongly emphasized by him throughout that text:

> This way, all our fantastic and unreal *"perezhivanie"*, in essence occur on an emotional basis completely real. So, we see that feeling and fantasy do not represent two separate processes, but essentially one and the same process. We correctly observe fantasy as a central expression of an emotional reaction. (Vygotsky, 1965, p. 272).

Vygotsky here took an opposite route from the realism that prevailed in Soviet psychology at the time. Despite his youth, Vygotsky took a step further on a key question regarding the development of subjectivity in psychology: the recognition of fantasy as an emotional expression. Because fantasy is a complex symbolic production, its inseparability from emotions makes it a subjective production that is clearly distinguished from those psychical functions defined as psychical operations. Fantasies carry out the qualitative character that distinguishes any psychical process which is subjectively configured as a moment of the person's personality expressed in action. That is why fantasy taken together with imagination is considered in my work as a quality of any psychical process or function once it appears as subjectively configured. Such assumption allows for the integration of emotion as essential for the definition of human psychical formations.

However, the brilliant Vygotsky's intellectual insight regarding fantasy did not find subsequent development in his later work, despite the new ideas developed by him after 1931. In *Psychology of Art* Vygotsky reiteratively returned to the idea that emotional states are as real as any other concrete reality, an important idea for overcoming the rationalism and naive objectivism that characterized Soviet psychology.

These ideas of Vygotsky's were not consolidated within a new theoretical representation of psychology. They were ideas in process that might be considered expressions of a transitional moment in Vygotsky's thought. Indeed, Vygotsky never used his later definitions of sense and "perezhivanie" to advance further on other main issues treated by him. Both concepts remained relatively isolated in his later works.

Unlike sense, as Vygotsky coined the term, *subjective sense* is defined by the symbolic emotional nature of human experience (González Rey, 2002, 2005, 2008; Mitjans Martínez, 2000, 2005). It represents experience as it is subjectively lived. Subjectivity, from this cultural-historical standpoint, does not only represent a new concept, but a new ontological definition for understanding human experience – whether individual or social. If the psyche develops throughout the evolution of living creatures as the progressive capacity to answer to the signals of the natural world, subjectivity in turn implies the human capacity to produce differentiating subjective senses as human production within the cultural realities that characterize human existences.

This definition of subjectivity implies transforming the way in which psychological concepts have traditionally been developed. In regard to the need to think new concepts for psychology, the works of Danziger (1997) and Koch (1999) represent a valuable source. Starting from this definition of subjectivity, for instance, reference to cognitive processes loses its meaning because all human functions that effectively motivate human behavior are subjectively configured in such a way that cognition is inseparable from other subjective qualities, like fantasy and imagination, through which our concepts and representations turn into emotional living productions. Cognition should be reserved to define those automatic sequences of psychical acts that are not subjectively configured as operations embodied by the subject of the action (González Rey, 2011, 2012).

Our definition of subjective sense was also influenced by Bakhtin's definition of sense: "It could be neither the first, nor the last sense; it always exists between sense, as the link of a sense chain… In historical life, this chain endlessly develops" (Bakhtin, 1997, p. 350). The emphasis in defining subjective sense as a process has also been influenced by Mitjans'[2] position of viewing subjective senses as processes of action.

Considering sense as embedded in the process of language, as Vygotsky did, is particularly attractive

---

[2] Personal conversations.

for our attempt to develop new psychological concepts. Upon these we can advance in the knowledge of the complex dynamics of multiple symbolical–emotional configurations, as the main units for understanding social and individual subjectivity. The replacement of sense by the concept of subjective senses points to human action as a moment of the person's subjective configuration rather than as a partial psychical production driven by an external stimulus or a situation.

Subjective configurations represent a network of subjective senses in movement. These subjective senses represent only a moment within an endless flux – which characterize the ongoing subjective configuration of the action. Subjective senses never appear explicitly in behavior; thus, for example, sadness is not a subjective sense. The subjective sense can only be trapped in the fluid course of a person's expressions through which elements can be identified. Putting these elements together through interpretation, subjective senses can be hypothetically considered as embedded in subjective configurations of sadness.

Sadness, like any other subjective state, is subjectively configured to appear in the course of human action through many different subjective senses, the limits of which are given by the integration of one subjective sense into others as a result of the self-movement of its subjective configuration. These subjective expressions should be taken in its whole to advance on the intelligibility of its subjective configuration.

Subjectivity, in this definition, is not restricted only to the processes of a single person. Subjectivity is common to individuals and social scenarios, practices and processes generated in human life. Based on this principle, we are setting out the terms of social and individual subjectivity not by positing the one as being external to the other, but as two different levels of functioning that recursively are configured into each other in the subjective configurations than simultaneously emerge in individuals and in social scenarios.

The symbolic nature of socio-cultural existence is the basis on which human subjectivity emerges as an ontological definition that cannot be explained by anything external to the influence of ongoing subjective configuration. This generative character of subjectivity represents one of the ontological pillars of human culture. Social productions such as race, gender, and class are simultaneously configured as different subjective senses into different social and individual subjective configurations. Those social symbolic and subjective productions influence human experience only in the condition of a subjective state. Individuals only become subjects of their action in the course of their own action, during which subjects' decisions and positions become new moments in the subjective configuration of the action.

Some Final Remarks

Marxism was intentionally assumed by Soviet psychology as its theoretical and methodological foundation in such a way that the Marxist character of psychology was recognized in its objective definition as science. The exclusion of Idealist philosophers and psychologists from that psychology led to a dogmatic one-sided approach that did not allow for the emergence of subjectivity. The attempt to present objective conditions as primary and determinant in regard to psychological functions, as materialistic Marxism did, completely excluded the dialectical approach to this complex matter.

Philosophies cannot be taken as doctrines in which human action should be inscribed. On the contrary, they represent living models of thinking that permit advancement on new "zones" of intelligibility over the studied questions. When philosophies become doctrines, they turn into dogmatic principles aimed at preserving the current status of knowledge as well as human realities. This was exactly what happened to Soviet psychology.

Finally, there is no concrete psychological approach that could be legitimized wholesale as Marxist. There are many approaches for which Marxism can be relevant through its different theoretical constructions. This process is sometimes accessible to knowledge only through retrospective interpretations, in which a particular theoretical influence is detected more by its consequences on a given theoretical function than by the intention of its founders.

Subjectivity as such cannot be defined as Marxist; but Marxism, as discussed in the present paper, can carry out a dialectical and complex understanding of human life that permit going behind the classical dichotomies which traditionally have characterized dominant psychological interpretations.

References

Abuljanova, K.A. (1973). *O subjekte psykjicheskoi deyatelnosti* (On the subject of psychical activity). Moscow: Nauka

Abuljanova, K.A., & Brushlinsky, A.V. (1989). *Filosofko-psykjologisheskaya kontsepsiya S.L.Rubinsteina* (Philosophical-psychological conception of S.L. Rubinstein). Moscow: Nauka.

Bakhtin, M. (1997). *Raboty 1940-nachala 1960 godov. Sobranie Sochinenii* (Works from 1940 to the early 1960s. Selected Works Vol. 5). Moscow: Smysl.

Bozhovich, L.I. (1968). *Lishnost e ee formirovanie v detskom vozraste* (Personality and its formation in the child age). Moscow: Pedagógika.

Brushlinsky, A.V. (1994). *Problema psykhologii subjekta* (The problem of the psychology of the subject). Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Science).

Bruschlinsky, A.V. (2001). *Camaya Shitaemaya Oteshestvennaya kniga po psykjologii: triumfy, tragedii, paradokcy*. (The more reading national book in psychology: triumph, tragedies and paradoxes). *Psykjologuishesky Jurnal* (Journal Psicológico), *22*(6), 5-13.

Budilova, E.A. (1983). *Sotsialno-psykjologisheskie problem v Ruskoi nauke*. (Socio-psychological problems in the Russian sciences). Moscow: Nauka.

Chudnovsky, V.E. (1988). Problema subjektivnosti v svete sobremennyx zadash psykjologii vospitaniya (The problem of subjectivity in the light of the current tasks of education). *Voprosy Pkykhologii* (Questions of psychology), *4*, 15-24.

Chudnovsky, V. E. (1976). O vozrastnom podjodii v problemy formirobaniya lishnosti u schkolnikov (About aging approach to the problem of the formation of personality i in students). *Voprosy Psikhologii* (Questions of Psychology) *4*, 41-54.

Danziger, K. (1997). *Naming the mind. How Psychology found its language*. London: Sage.

Davydov, V.V. (1981). The category of activity and mental reflection in the theory of A.N. Leontiev. *Soviet Psychology* XIX(4), 3-29.

Fakhrutdinova, L.R. (2010). On the phenomenon of "Perezhivanie". *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology,* 48 (2), 31-47.

González Rey, F. (2002). *Sujeto y subjetividad: una aproximación histórico-cultural.* México. Thomson.

González Rey, F. (2005). O valor heurístico da subjetividade na investigação psicológica. In F. González Rey (The heuristic value of subjectivity in psychological research) (Ed), *Subjetividade, Complexidade e Pesquisa em Psicologia* (pp. 27-52). São Paulo: Thomson.

González Rey, F. (2008). Subject, subjectivity, and development in cultural historical psychology. In B. Van Oers, W. Wardekker, E. Elbers & R. Van Der Veer (Eds), *The transformation of learning. Advances in Cultural-Historical Activity Theory* (pp. 137-154). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

González Rey, F. (2009). Historical relevance of Vygotsky's work: Its significance for a new approach to the problem of subjectivity in psychology. *Critical Practice Studies Outline, 1*, 59-73.

González Rey, F. (2011a). A re-examination of defining moments in Vygotsky's work and their implications for his continuing legacy. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 18*, 257-275.

González Rey, F. (2011b). *El Pensamiento de Vygotsky: Contradicciones, desdoblamientos y desarrollo*. México D.F.: Trillas.

González Rey, F. (2012). Advancing on the concept of sense: Subjective sense and subjective configurations in human development. In M. Heidegaard, A. Edwards & M. Fleer (Eds.), *Motives in children's development. Cultural–Historical Approaches* (pp. 45-62). Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Koch, S. (1999). The concept of "value properties" in relation to motivation, perception and axiological disciplines. In D. Finkelman & F. Kessel (Eds.), *Psychology in Human Context. Essays in Dissidence and Reconstruction* (pp. 192-232). Chicago, ILL: The University of Chicago Press.

Koltsova, V.A., Oleinik, Y.N., & Tugaibaeva, B.N. (1997). Razvitie psykjologii v Rossii v 20-30-e gody. (The development of psychology in Russia in the 20-30s). In A.V. Bruchslinsky (Ed.), *Psykjologisheskaya nauka v Rossii XX stoletiya. Problem teorii i istorii* (The psychological sciences in Russian in the 20-30's of the 20th century: Problems of the theory and history) (pp. 49-104). Moscow: Institute of psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

Leontiev, A.N. (1975). *Deyatelnost, Coznanie, Lischnost* (Activity, Consciousness, Personality). Moscow: Politizdat.

Lomov, B.F. (1984). *Metodologisheskie i teoretish-eskie problemi psykjologii* (Methodological and theoretical problems of psychology). Moscow: Nauka.

Luria, A.R. (1928). Psychology in Russia. *The pedagogical seminary and Journal of Genetic Psychology, 35*(3), 347-355.

Mitjans Martínez, A. (2000). *Criatividade, Personalidade e Educação*. Campinas: Papirus.

Mitjans Martínez, A. (2005). A Teoria da Subjetividade de González Rey: Uma expressão do Paradigma da Complexidade. In F. González Rey (Ed), *Subjetividade, Complexidade e Pesquisa em Psicologia* (pp. 1- 26). São Paulo. Thomson

Sheehan, H. (1985). *Marxism and the philosophy of science. A critical history.* Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press International.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1965). *Psykjologiya Iskustva* (Psychology of Art). Moscow. Iskustva.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. Rieber & A. Carton (Eds.), *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky. Vol. 1* (pp. 43-287). New York: Plenum.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1995). *Historia de las funciones psíquicas superiores*. Habana: Editorial Científico Técnica.

Zinchenko, V.P. (2007). Thought and word: The Approaches of L.S. Vygotsky and G.G. Shpet. In H. Daniels, M. Cole & J. Wertsch (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Vygotsky* (pp. 212-245). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Marxism and Psychoanalysis: Attempting a Brief Review of an Old Problem*

Raúl Páramo-Ortega

* Translator: Herdis Amelie Wawretzko

> Hitherto men have constantly made up for themselves false conceptions about themselves, about what they are and what they ought to be. The phantoms of their brains have got out of their hands.
>
> Marx and Engels (1845/46, pp. 26-27)

Abstract. *A brief attempt is made to locate Marxism and Psychoanalysis in the history of ideas. In both there is an evident and radical break with a magical, metaphysical and mystical idea of nature. Both postulate the coalescence of theory and practice, and both also share an eminently dialectical point of view. In Marx's work we can find elements that might appear as Freudian thought and vice versa. Very few authors throughout the history of ideas have been the objects of such passionate rejection as Marx and Freud. They also seem to be condemned, by their own quantitative characteristics and qualitative complexity, to a certain category of being quite unmanageable.*

Keywords: Marxism, Freudo-Marxism, Psychology, Psychoanalysis.

Introduction

There is an old joke that says if anyone wants to ridicule the ignorance of his opponent, the easiest way is to propose the topic of Marxism or Psychoanalysis. I am convinced that the works of Marx and of Freud are absolutely unmanageable for their extension as well as for their complexity. Here I admit that I have once mocked an important marxologist from a prestigious university myself: I sent him a paragraph written by Freud and maliciously asked him to pinpoint it in Marx's work. He was enthusiastic about the task, until I wrote to him later that the lines I had sent him were not of Marx's authorship, but of Freud's. There are many possibilities for further mockeries by just inverting the procedure, i.e., by presenting texts by Marx that might appear to have been written by Freud. The magnitude of these two important figures

of cultural history is an involuntary insult against us as it reveals our ignorance.

An Impossible Task: to Comprise Marx and Freud

The complete works of Marx/Engels known as MEGA 2, a project that was taken up in 1975, will not be finished until in approximately ten years from now. The Marx/Engels works edited and known as MEW consist of 42 volumes, were published in Berlin and, little by little, are being displaced by the MEGA 2. This new critical edition includes formerly unpublished material. Several international institutes and universities are collaborating in the project. By now there have appeared only 59 of 150 planned volumes.

In psychoanalysis nothing similar has been achieved regarding Freud's work, even though his

oeuvre is not as extensive as that of Marx/Engels in terms of quantity. There does not exist any publication that is comparable to the *HKWM* (*Historisch-kritisches Wörterbuch des Marxismus*) by Fritz Haug. This project was initiated in 1994; 18 thick volumes are planned and nine have appeared so far.

Psychoanalysis and Marxism have been declared dead as many times as they have been resurrected. The criteria employed to consider them rejuvenated are ultimately epistemological ones, as both Psychoanalysis and Marxism have shown their capacity *to keep generating new insights* (see Sloterdijk, 2010). The original theoretical premises have resisted and survived many of the whims of their well-intentioned disciples, the nonexistence of translations, and the persistent nonobservance of those who do not want to read or investigate.

It seems paradoxical that we would find coincidences/divergences and theoretical complementarities between these two geniuses that remain stubbornly overlooked. Both are Jews and deeply rooted in the German language, which contains dialectical elements in its structure. On the other hand, the Jewish spirit is rebellious against any kind of domination except from God, but neither Marx nor Freud accepts submission to any god, just as they reject the dictatorship of capitalism (Marx) or of the unconscious (Freud). Both are – due to their condition as atheist Jews – twice exiled. Marx and Freud were revolutionaries, rebels in their theories.

In Marx's work we can find elements that might appear as Freudian thought and *vice versa*. This is thoroughly ignored even by serious biographers such as Edmundson (2009). Among us, who are their epigones, periods of mutual disregard, of misunderstandings, and also of attempted alignment went by. Neither for Marx nor for Freud ahistorical truths exist; they stand out for their capacity for self-criticism. Psychoanalysis is a cognitive method that aims at understanding unconscious, social, political and cultural phenomena. One of its most important contributions is based on its method and on its effort to fathom the pathogenic aspects that have arisen out of an oppressive civilization. Another core element consists in the investigation of childhood as the determining source of the adult's behavior. The real motives of an adult person are less rational than he might think. The human being only appears to be an entirely rational one. The motives that underlay his behavior are frequently irrational and inaccessible to his conscious self. It is a vulgar and common mistake to state that the whole spectrum of social dynamics can be reduced to the Oedipus complex; that was not Freud's opinion at all.

Nevertheless, the image of God as a father can hardly veil his dictatorial condition and Mary, incarnation of the incest taboo, is also an advocate before the almighty and irate Father. Mary is Christianity's favorite symbol of asexuality. There are different cultural versions of the Oedipus conflict, though. By all means, the prohibitions derived from the Oedipal family core, braced in biological conditions, are also engraved in the super-ego. The Homo sapiens is a historical being after all, and biologically modifiable.

Marxism rigorously analyzes the material relations of production: "In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society (...) It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness" (Marx, 1859, par. 6). Ideas are products of history, even though they also have an impact on its course.

Marx continues with a sentence that combines his own thoughts with that of Freud. Concerning the conflict between the real economic forces and their ideological deceptions it is convenient that "just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life" (Marx, 1859, par. 7).

The implication, namely the historically determined transformation of the human mind, is well taken into account in Marxism, as we can see in Trotsky's following statement: "There can really be no doubt about the fact that the humans of the future will be *communitarian citizens*, much more interesting and attractive beings with a very different *psyche* from ours" (Trotsky, 1923, p. 7). In a letter to Pavlov, dated 23 September 1923, Trotsky writes that he was sufficiently close to Freudians and that their way of handling psychological problems impressed him (Tögel, 1989a). This makes it clear that Trotsky represented the seed of a Freudian wing in Marxism. Evidently, social pathologies (e.g. the absence of real democracy) with particular structures are reflected in disease patterns with the same axis. Trotsky admits that psychoanalytic contributions were promising, especially concerning the incorporation of Freud's theory of the unconscious, in order to build up an ever less utopian socialism. Since 1934, Fenichel has

pointed out that whoever intended to connect the psychoanalytic and Marxist perspectives had to fight between two opposite forces. On one side would be a philosophical idealism that claims anything material to be radically opposed to and separated from the psychological, which, furthermore, clings to something vaguely superior and transcendent. One the other side would be the perspective of a vulgar Marxism, from where Psychoanalysis is considered as nothing more than a "neutral" psychotechnique (see Fenichel, 1934, p. 276).

Marx and Freud: Remarks about their Insertion in the History of Ideas and the History of Science

Here we make a brief attempt to locate Marxism and Psychoanalysis in the history of ideas. In both there is an evident and radical break with a magical, metaphysical and mystical idea of nature. Both postulate the coalescence of theory and practice, and both also share an eminently dialectical point of view. Freud substantiates his dialectical vision in the psyche and practices dialectics without any recourse to any *absolute spirit* (Hegel). Marx, when he studies Hegel's idealist and mystical dialectic, radically distances himself from it. There is another similarity: their doctrines proceed from Enlightenment assumptions; Marxism takes it to political action, whilst Psychoanalysis takes it to a mistrust of any reason that is only based on the conscious mind. Both theories seek to incorporate the irrational aspects of person and society, but warn us against the risk of turning rationality, or *logos*, into a new God.

It is well known that the Enlightenment has neutralized the power of religions by interpreting them as myths, literature or chapters of cultural anthropology. Marxism and Psychoanalysis both pursue emancipatory purposes. Let us point out one more fundamental confluence: *There is no nature without history*. Neither does there exist any tangible history without the inner subjectivity of the subject who is reciprocally interrelated with her environment. Historical reality is singular, irreversible and of limited constancy. We should not forget that anything that had occurred throughout history might have taken a different turn and have had a different outcome. There are clefts where coincidence leaks through, however difficult its definition may be. Coincidences obey explicable causes, but do not establish any normativities. Put in different words: it is *determined*, but not necessarily *determining*. We should remember here that Marxism came to be accepted in the working class movement due to its separation from utopian socialism, Proudhon's communitarianism, Bakunin's anarchism and,

obviously, from the mechanistic materialism and the economic reductionism proposed by the Second International, which was criticized by Engels himself in this aspect. Psychoanalysis is delimited from psychiatry and medicine and is located between natural and social science.

The Vienna Circle (Carnap, Schlick, Neuraht, Hahn, Mach), formed at the time when Psychoanalysis was also being developed in that city, explicitly acknowledged psychoanalytic inquiries about the unconscious as an important auxiliary to science in general. With his logical positivism and his affinity for the unity of all sciences, Neurath was the first to use the term "overall science"; Zilsel in turn proposed the concepts "total theory" and "unitary science" (see Dahms, 1999; Dvorak, 1981). All these authors represent the *Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung*; that is, the *scientific worldview*. We could talk here of a genuine situation of *communicating vessels* (Breton) between the different sciences. The Vienna Circle was expressly open to Psychoanalysis and it turned to an analysis of language that brought them really close to the Freudian method. Just one example: *We do not say that what you are saying is right or wrong, but we explore the meaning of what you are saying.* Contemporary to Freud and also in Vienna, the transcendental works of Fritz Mauthner and of Ludwig Wittgenstein evolve.

Very few authors throughout the history of ideas have been the objects of such passionate rejection as Marx and Freud. Occasionally this rejection is well described by the term *bashing*; the systematic reviling, aspersing and misinterpreting of an author. It is noteworthy that the cells from where this bashing has proceeded have been mostly France and the USA (see von Tippelskirch-Eissing et al., 2011). It is comparable to the famous book burning in May 1933 by the national socialists where Freud's and Marx's works were obviously included. These coarse distortions and extremely intense reactions would make an exquisite object for further studies in the field of the sociology of knowledge. The original, unfinished character of Marx's immense critical work has been subjected to the pressure of an allegedly "official doctrine" by some of his epigones, who inevitably produced several distinctive dialects. The same has happened with Psychoanalysis. Marx and Freud have created *open systems*, which is a nonfinite process subjected to constant self-criticism (see Musto, 2011).

Marx and Freud seem to be condemned, by their own quantitative characteristics and qualitative complexity, to a certain category of being quite *unmanageable*. Furthermore, the transcendence of their

ideas unleashes uncountable discussions and rivalry between their followers and interpreters. When speaking about Psychoanalysis, one should mention which school or which cultural-national formation one is talking about. Something similar occurs with Marxism. It seems to be forbidden to talk about the great scandal of our ignorance about both disciplines.

Together with Bernfeld (1926), Reich (1934; see also Peglau, 2013), Fromm (1962) and Reiche (1968), among others, Horkheimer and Adorno (1944) have become the unexpected guests to the never completely consummated wedding of Marxism and Psychoanalysis. They actually ask themselves, in their *Dialectic of Enlightenment*: Is it then so that the individual who lives in a sick society is not sick himself? Compare also Marx's attitude towards suicide as a symptom of a society gone awry. Critical theory has, since its beginnings, attempted the convergence of the two disciplines (see Lohmann 2006a, 2006b; Decker & Türcke, 2007). Helmuth Dahmer (2002; 2012), who is adept at both, assigns to Psychoanalysis a kind of bridging status: without completely abandoning natural science, Psychoanalysis approaches the so-called "humanities" (or "social sciences") and combines in its procedures the (causal) explanation of natural science (*erklären*) with the interpretive approach of the humanities (*verstehen*). In other words, it also applies a hermeneutical method. Freud challenged the mentioned categories of knowledge and firmly installed himself on the borderline. Freud's profound hermeneutics is about making new meanings visible. The right interpretation replaces or complements the anterior one (see Todorov, 1992, p. 12). By the way, this was also stated by Marx. Marx abandoned the Hegelian realm of the "absolute spirit" in order to turn to a materialist conception of history. Psychoanalysis aims to strengthen the functions of the ego by confronting the inner and outer world to achieve the best possible change. We must remember here that, for Marx, work is the metabolism between man and nature (see Marx, 1858/1973) and the capitalist's money-god is "the excrement, that is the final product of the work process" (ibíd., p. 214). The *metabolic disorder of work* – keeping up with Marx's metaphor – occurs when the remuneration is inadequate in relation to the quality and quantity of the job. This inadequacy –euphemism for injustice – goes both ways: there is poorly compensated work as well as there are stratospheric salaries. The absence of empathy and the exorbitant thirst for money are symptoms that favor capitalism and thereby somehow created it. Marx (1867) makes the following statement: "avarice, and desire to get rich, are the ruling passions. (…) More-over, the capitalist gets rich, not like the miser, in proportion to his personal labour and restricted consumption, but at the same rate as he squeezes out the labour-power of others, and enforces on the labourer abstinence from all life's enjoyments" (par. 6). The instinct of accumulation encroaches on human relationships and sexual love.

The human being can act, work (in a broad sense) and fight against death; that is, assume all possible distance from the tendency towards the inorganic, towards death as the triumph of entropy that equals everything on a level of inferior organization. Marxism tries to rectify the course of history by dismantling class conflict and reconciling the person with her intrinsic social nature that debates itself between aggression and solidarity. The conciliation of man with nature, with his physical environment called planet Earth, is of vital importance. It is all about achieving "the social anarchy of production [that] gives place to a social regulation of production upon a definite plan, according to the needs of the community and of each individual" (Engels, 1882, par. 37). This is a basic statement paving the way to a socialist society. In Freud's work, the goal is to turn the unconscious finally conscious, so that "where there was id, there shall be ego". This conceptual system has its analogy in Marxism in Ernst Bloch's *utopian function*: "the possible has to become real" (Bloch, 1959, p. 167). History is ultimately the work of people modifying the given situation. Bloch draws a model based upon the classless society, sustained by a culture that exponentially transforms the human potential into concrete realities with the ingredient of realistic hope (see Bloch, 1968, p. 242).

The *utopian function* and the *principle of hope* have their Freudian correlative in the constitutive desire of dreaming itself and of daydream fantasies that revolt against the given situation. Evidently, the aim of Psychoanalysis is to increase the *sense of reality* without any kind of illusions. This is, ultimately, the origin of any revolution. Our condition of greediness is always present in our psychical structure, and the aim is to fight against what is intolerable about what exists: *exploitation* from a Marxist viewpoint; the *repressive defiance of sexuality* for Freud, and plain *evil* in Christian discourse.

The Unity of Sciences as an Epistemological Postulate against the Fragmentation of Knowledge

Marxism and Psychoanalysis are complementary, but not by decree. This complementarity is postulated not only as wishful thinking, but as a path of investigation

that still lies ahead of us. Our basic postulate is sustained by Humboldt's ideas exposed in his work *Cosmos*: the entire society stands in tight dependency with natural order (Humboldt, 1845/2011). Marx said the world's true unity consists in its condition of "materiality". From a dialectical viewpoint, if he had been forced to "define" what *truth* is, he would have answered to that with the following Feuerbachian formulation: Truth would be equivalent to *totality*, which is something unreachable and unmanageable. One could also say that dialectical processes attest to a new order derived from the disorder that was caused by the contraries that preceded it.

In quantum physics, the *principle of complementarity* of contraries was studied by Niels Bohr (1926), and there have been important advances in the field since that time. One such later development is research into so-called resonance (see Cramer, 1998), which reminds us think of what happens in psychoanalysis between two peoples' unconscious, such as the transference-countertransference relation. The phenomenon of *resonance* depicts a mode of "energy" transmission that requires a constitutive coupler for the resonant. A vivid example is that of what happens between chlorophyll and solar energy. The same thing can be said about our eyes and sunlight. The constitutive coupler can also be called a *complementary system*. Let us recall the metaphor of the telephone in Freud, where there takes place a communication, a transmission between two unconscious. In the same way there exists a resonant system between the individual and society. According to Feuerbach, even thinking itself cannot be the act of an individual, but an evident and intrinsic social expression. Up to now, reality has shown us an architecture that has the structure of an intimately interconnected *totality*. This is implicitly self-evident in Marxism as well as in Psychoanalysis. Niels Bohr observed this phenomenon in relation to corpuscular theory and physical optics in the constitution of light, but he gave it a bold epistemological, universal value. The unitary vision connects everything that exists in external and internal reality (see *Russell-Einstein Manifesto*, 1955), which makes the frontiers between body and soul, object and subject, matter and spirit, observant and the observed permeable. In the area of Psychoanalysis, this includes transference and countertransference and, finally, time and space. Reductionism and the alleged predictability of the so-called exact sciences are called into question here. Since quantum physics we rather speak of *probabilities* or accidental *possibilities* than of absolute *predictabilities* and allegedly fixed laws. Reality is inconceivable without taking into account its relational aspect; that is, *its relation with…*, *its relation to…* Thereby, quantum physics extenuates any possible theoretic incompatibility with the so-called social science or humanities like Marxism or Psychoanalysis. Subjectivity does not admit its reduction to being only physical. Extreme positivism has received a forceful blow from Planck and Einstein. Just as the solar mass generates the gravitation from which not even light is able to escape, nothing escapes the "gravitational force" of the economical basis or the function of work in general (Marx), or nor the "gravity" of the unconscious (Freud) and its energetic basis, which I call the *libidinal economy*.

Our history and development are included in the unpredictable march of the whole of reality, which obviously is not "independent" from matter. This is also true on a biological and social level. High technology and low civilization are a very dangerous combination (remember Hiroshima and Nagasaki) that we are also observing in climate change. The relation between the capitalist way of production and the irrational exploitation of the planet is evident. A low level of consciousness and a big material power is synonymous with a global catastrophe. Marxism, from Engels' quill, takes a stand against the vulgar interpretation of "historical laws": "Our knowledge of the history of economy is still in diapers" (Engels, 1890). He pronounces himself against laws, too, when he leaves the door open for coincidence. He does not confuse the accidental with the allegedly ahistorical, though, but shows how processes in history evolve in a webbing of chaotic elements, accidents, conscious and unconscious human interventions and, last but not least, the economic factors studied by himself.

In *Outlines of the Critique of Political Economy*, Marx (1858/1973) takes his distance from the misunderstood concept of laws of history, sustained amongst others by the bourgeois historian Leopold von Ranke. It is a basic Marxist postulate that it is not the state which conditions and regulates civil society, but the other way round. Or at least, it is all about relations of reciprocal conditioning.

For Marx, the construction of a classless society is not something which just falls from the sky. It is necessary to thoroughly study the social and economic causal relations. The *market laws* are not an unquestionable fate, but result from human actions aimed at radical modifications of the system as a total. Interrogating and disarticulating the alleged destiny of the progressive impoverishment of the proletariat and Third World nations is a condition *sine qua non* of any social revolution.

For Freud, complementarity is about ambivalence and, obviously, Eros and Thanatos. But as Heisenberg has once said: Dialectic is unbearable for the majority anyway. In other words, dialectic is the core of tragedy and, at the same time, complies with the Nietzschean definition of tragedy, namely *facing the unsolvable and unintelligible conflict of our existence without turning to a unworthy refuge such as religious [or nonreligious] illusions.* According to Nietzsche, the original tragedy consists in assimilating the fact that whatever emerges must necessarily perish. This is nothing else than the struggle between the contraries: being and perishing, life and death. Life tends to unite and death tends to take apart. In his *Dialectics of Nature*, Engels (1886) tells us about nature as something that expands by means of incessant connections and that advance or decay through contradictions. He speaks of dialectic as a science of connections between opposites. In the social sciences and humanities, the investigation of *dialectical complementarity* has to consider nature as an ongoing process with no completely predetermined or secure branches, not even in Newton's classical physics. In all disciplines that have the human as their object of research it is well known that predictability is only limited, with any statement restricted to the condition of mere possibility or probability, or of a potential still to be explored. On the other hand, there is also Heisenberg's *uncertainty principle*, which states that *through the act of observing, the observer modifies the observed and therefore there cannot be any observation that is absolutely exact.* This has been related to the concept of countertransference in psychoanalysis. Later, in Marxism, it has been related to a notion of accident or coincidence that goes beyond the simple ignorance of causes (see Hawking, 1994). Lenin (1922) recommended studying the theory of relativity for its relation to *historical materialism*, or rather with the *materialist conception of historical processes*. Back to Heisenberg: the limitations of human knowledge are greater than what we generally suspect or can bear without building ideologies, not even to mention the feebleness of human language. It was clear to Lenin that the implementation of communist ideals in the Soviet Union was condemned to failure if during the attempt to abolish capitalist order all the scientific and cultural achievements of the capitalist opponent were also abolished (see Tögel, 1988b).

Any science cut off from the social context it is inserted in is unthinkable (Marx), just as it cannot be independent from the subjective condition of the scientist (Freud). The invisible complementarities must become visible as a result of rigorous research. Wilhelm Wundt and Wilhelm Dilthey (1931) stood out in this respect, just as Marx and Freud. Concerning the importance of social issues, Freud (1930/1961) asserts in a frankly Marxist tone: "I too think it quite certain that a real change in the relations of human beings to possessions would be of more help in this direction than any ethical commands" (p. 143). And in another place: "In abolishing private property we deprive the human love of aggression of one of its instruments, certainly a strong one, though certainly not the strongest" (p. 113). Freud also pointed out, though, that socialism did not contemplate sufficiently the innate aggressiveness of man. On the other hand, Marx seems to be a psychologist when he indicates some negative psychological repercussions of capitalism. He affirmed that the adjustments and crisis of the relations of production affect "all social relationships" and expressly mentions their negative repercussion on the human relations inside a family. In this context he also criticizes capitalism most severely when he says that it has resolved personal worth into exchange value. Here and there obvious hints to a relation of complementarity between Marxism and Psychoanalysis come through. The difference is just one of perspectives from different shores. From the psychoanalytic viewpoint there has been a consolidation of the knowledge of how the unconscious exerts a force that restricts and perturbs the free course of our thoughts, actions and imaginations. The tight connection of this force, which is the operative force of the economic structure that is unconscious, is only suffered in its fell effects and clashes with major resistance that impedes its uncurtaining (see Bruder, 2005, p. 634).

To Marx, the unitary science *par excellence* is history: "We know only a single science, the science of history" (1845, par. 8). History, like knowledge itself, is an ever ongoing process. Even so we have to point out here that history in Marx only exists as an abstraction. There is really only *concrete history* as the result of the action of man in the elaboration of what he has received from previous generations and the environment. For Horkheimer psycho-analysis is clearly an auxiliary science to Marxism. It studies the subject in its distinct social and historical aspects. Psychoanalysis was born on the limit between natural and social sciences (see Bastide et al., 1972). Dilthey (1931) is the living example of the organic tendency to the unity of sciences. He detects the basis of our cosmovision in the personal and social biography. Dilthey's perspective provides – unintentionally – a hinge between Marxism and Psychoanalysis. Facing the impossibility of capturing all the aspects of reality at the same time, our reason fragments the

unmanageable – just like a spectrometer – into different areas of knowledge (see Buchholz & Göddel, 2005). Freud (1926/1975) mentioned how scientific discoveries expire and need to evolve towards integration as "in itself, every science is one-sided, that is, restricted to certain subjects" (p. 230). The dialectical point of view has no room for metaphysics, dogmas or revelations. There is no safe harbor to shelter us from the open sea of uncertainties, but only small ports that allow us to take a short breath. The complementarity of sciences cries out for us not to become shipwrecked in our unilateralism. It is an attempt to turn necessity into an epistemological virtue.

In Marxism it is understood that the social reality of nature and the natural science of man are expressions that converge. History itself is a real part of nature as a process in which *nature* becomes human. *Psyche* as a totality is traversed by the unconscious and the socioeconomic structure that determine it. In general terms, we are talking about a "cultural unconscious" (*Erdheim*) to designate what each different culture represses.

In dialectical materialism, matter – even the apparently inert – "hides" the movement inside; in Freudian psychology consciousness is the cover of the unconscious. The unity of science is based on the unity of nature. Dialectical materialism is the theoretical core of Marxism, and it states that the pivot of the unity of science is matter and its properties. That is precisely what we might call the *base material* of any reality. And movement is the form in which matter exists.

We recall with Mühlmann (2011) that cultures as well as other social formations such as Marxism or Psychoanalysis are living organisms. Cultures evolve to favor or to restrain certain genetic changes (*evolutionary reinforcement learning* (ERL)). Mühlmann thus connects social issues with biology.

The Georgian philosopher Merab Konstantinowitsch Mamardaschwili (1999) points out: "What we know as consciousness is only the final product of the metamorphosis of a vast and multi-dimensional unity. When we consider the psychical conscious we must always take into account the invisible components it is connected with and depends on; these are social mechanisms as well as unconscious ones, and the codified systems of each culture" (p. 224). As an analogy, the analyzed person says more than he thinks, and the analyst has to understand these expressions beyond their literal meaning.

References

Bastide, R., Baran, P. A., Brown, N. O., Caruso, I., Federn, P., Mitscherlich, A. (1972). *Psychoanalyse, Marxismus und Sozialwissenschaften*. Gravenhage: ROT-Druck.

Bernfeld, S. (1926). Sozialismus und Psychoanalyse. In Hans-Peter Gente (Ed.), *Marxismus, Psychoanalyse, Sexpol* (pp. 11-29). Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer, 1970.

Bloch, E. (1959). *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Bruder, K-J. (2005). *Das Unbewusste in der aktuellen Diskussion*. München: Psycho-Sozial Verlag.

Dahmer H. (2002). Regression einer kritischen Theorie. In *Geschichte nach Auschwitz* (pp. 143-164). Berlin: Unrast Verlag,.

Dahmer, H. (2012). *Die unnatürliche Wissenschaft – Soziologische Freud-Lektüren*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Dahms (1999). Einheitswissenschaft. In J.H. Sandkühler (Ed), *Enzyklopädie Philosophie* (pp. 292-293). Hamburg: Meiner.

Decker, O. and Türcke, Ch. (2007). *Kritische Theorie – Psychoanalytische Praxis*. Giessen: Psychosozial Verlag.

Dilthey, W. (1931). *Weltanschauungslehre – Abhandlungen zur Philosophie der Philosophie, Groethuysen, 6. Auflage, Gesammelte Schriften, Band VIII*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Dvorak, J. (1981). *Edgar Zilsel und die Einheit der Erkenntnis*. Wien: Löcker.

Edmundson, M. (2009). *Sigmund Freud Das Vermächtnis der letzten Jahre*. München: DVA Verlag.

Engels, F. (1882). *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*. Available at https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1880/soc-utop/ch03.htm

Engels, F. (1886). *Dialectics of Nature. Marx/Engels Collected Works*. Available at http://www.marxist.org/archive/marx/works/cw/index.htm

Engels, F. (1890). Letter from Engels to Schmidt (August 5th, 1890). *Marx/Engels Collected* Works. Available at http://www.marxist.org/archive/marx/works/cw/index.htm

Fenichel, O. (1934). *Über die Psychoanalyse als Keim der zukünftige dialektischen-materialistischen Psychologie*. Olten Freiburg: Walter Verlag, 1979.

Freud, S. (1930/1961). *Civilization and its Discontents*. London: Hogarth Press.

Freud, S. (1926/1975). An Autobiographical Study, Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety, Lay Analysis and Other Works (1925-1926). London: Hogarth Press.

Fromm, E. (1962). *Beyond the Chains of Illusion: My encounter with Marx and Freud*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Hawking, S. W. (1994). *Einsteins Traum – Expeditionen an die Grenzen der Raumzeit*. Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T. W. (1944). *Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente*. Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer, 1969.

Humboldt, A. (1845/2011). *Cosmos: ensayo de una descripción física del mundo*. Editorial CSIC-CSIC Press.

Lenin, W. I. (1922). *Ueber die Bedeutung des streitbaren Materialismus*. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1976.

Lohmann, H.-M. (2006a). Marxism. In H. M. Lohmann and J. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *Freud Handbuch – Leben,Werk, Wirkung* (pp. 373-376). Stuttgart: Metzler.

Lohmann, H.-M. (2006b). Kritische Theorie. In H. M. Lohmann and J. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *Freud Handbuch – Leben,Werk Wirkung* (pp. 377-382). Stuttgart: Metzler.

Mamardaschwili, M. (1999). Bewusstsein. In W.F. Haug (Ed.), *Historisch-Kritisches Wörterbuch des Marxismus* (pp. 292-293). Hamburg: Meiner.

Marx, K. (1845). The German Ideology. Available at https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm

Marx, K. (1858/1973). *Grundrisse. Outlines of the Critique of Political Economy*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Marx, K. (1859): *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Available at https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm

Marx, K. (1867). *Conversion of Surplus-Value into Capital (Chap. 1.24.3)*. Available at http://genius.com/Karl-marx-conversion-of-surplus-value-into-capital-chap-1243-annotated

Marx, K., and F. Engels (1845/46). *Deutsche Ideologie.* Available at http://www.mlwerke.de/me/me03/me03_009.htm

Mühlmann, H. (2011). *Die Natur der Kulturen*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

Musto, M. (2011). La *Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe* (mega²) y el redescubrimiento de Marx. In Musto, M. (Ed), Tras las huellas de un fantasma – *La actualidad de Karl Marx*. Mexico: Siglo XXI.

Peglau, A. (2013). *Unpolitische Wissenschaft? Wilhelm Reich und die Psychoanalyse im Nationalsozialismus*. Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.

Reich, W. (1934). *Dialektischer Materialismus und Psychoanalyse*. Kopenhagen: Verlag für Sexualpolitik.

Reiche, R. (1968). *Sexualität und Klassenkampf: zur Abwehr repressiver Entsublimierung*. Frankfurt: Neue Kritik.

Russell, B. and A. Einstein (1955). *Russell-Einstein Manifesto. Potsdamer Denkschrift*. Available at http://gcn.de/download/denkschrift_de.pdf

Sloterdijk, P. (2010). *Scheintod im Denken – Von Philosophie und Wissenschaft als Übung*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Von Tippelskirch-Eissing, D.C., Schneider, G. (2011). Diskussion von M. Onfrays *Anti-Freud*. *Psyche Z-Psychoanal* 65, 1211-1231.

Todorov, T. (1992). *Simbolismo e Interpretación*. Caracas: Monte Ávila.

Tögel, C. (1989a). Lenin und die Rezeption der Psychoanalyse in der Sowjetunion der Zwanziger Jahre. *Sigmund Freud House Bulletin* 13, 16-27.

Tögel, C. (1988b). Lenin und Freud: Zur Frühgeschichte der Psychoanalyse in der Sowjetunion. Available at http://www.freud-biographik.de/lenin.htm

Trotsky, L. (1923). The Tasks of Communist Education. *Communist Review* 4(7), 3-17

Vienna Circle (1929). Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung. Verein Ernst Mach. Available at http://neurath.umcs.lublin.pl/manifest.pdf

The Freudo-Marxist Mission

Rosario Herrera Guido

The people of Madrid themselves, years after their revolt against Napoleon, shout "*long live the Chains*". The very people of Paris follow the processions of the goddess of reason and are not satiated watching the action of the guillotine. The People themselves?

(Zambrano, 1958)

Abstract. *This essay presents a balance that hopes to show that despite the impasse between dissimilar discourses, the Freudo-Marxist mission does allow us to salvage its philosophical and practical program so as to continue rethinking the postures that led to the difficult encounter between two discourses: psychoanalysis and Marxism, their theoretical principles and their political consequences. This approach demands the discussion of four moments: 1) the Freudo-Marxist pronouncement; 2) Wilheim Reich's Sex-Pol mission; 3) Gérard Pommier's Freudo-Marxism; and 4) its political legacy.*

Keywords: philosophy, psychoanalysis, Freudo-Marxism, politics

Freudo-Marxism

The main features that Freudians and Marxists deem common are: 1) Their objectives: psychoanalysis and historical materialism are both demystifying critical theories of the subject of consciousness, of its future-less illusions (Freud) or inverted visions of reality (ideologies) and alienation in commodities (Marx); both propose emancipation: one of the repressed neurotic (psychoanalysis), the other of the exploited proletariat (Marxism). 2) Their means: gaining consciousness of contents repressed by consciousness that return in the form of symptoms (Freud), and of the oppressive relations of production that keep the working class subjected to exploitation, thus rescuing the subject of alienation (Marx). 3) Their materialist method: drives are the motor of history (Freud), the means of production and the satisfaction of human needs that of social history (Marx). 4) Their dialectics: the struggle of opposites, drive and defense (Freud), exploiters and exploited (Marx). 5) Their reading of history: the destinies of the drives determined by the vicissitudes of infant history that lead to the Oedipal drama (Freud), and the destinies of humanity: the modes of domination and exploitation (Marx). 6) Their models: topical (Unconscious-Preconscious-Conscious and Id, Ego and Superego)

(Freud), and the economic infrastructure, the base of the ideological superstructure (Marx). 7) Their dynamic model: the antagonistic Life Drive [*Lebenstrieb*] and Death Drive [*Todestrieb*] (Freud), and class struggle (Marx).

The dis-encounters that cause insufficiencies and require a profound theoretical revision are of two types: 1) Analytical practice: the etiology of neurosis uncovers the pathogenic action of the patriarchal family, authoritarian pedagogical methods and conditions of life, housing and unemployment, all of which demand a change; but while psychoanalysis frees the subject and allows him to work, society offers but a denigrating job or unemployment. To obtain prophylaxis and a cure, the social system must be transformed, which obliges psychoanalysis to integrate historical materialism. 2) Political practice: the emancipation of the working class lacks a theory of the mechanism through which the material conditions of existence are converted into ideology in the human consciousness, and an explanation of why the exploited majorities not only accept their conditions, but even "kiss their chains". If Marx had developed this phrase, his opus would have followed the route of Etienne de La Boétie's (1576) *voluntary servitude*; and he would have acknowledged that people "fall

into such complete forgetfulness of their freedom that they can hardly be roused to the point of regaining it, obeying so easily and so willingly that one is led to say, on beholding such a situation, that this people has not so much lost its liberty as won its enslavement" (p. 21). Or, as Lacan shows, the masses do not rebel against the master because they are promised enjoyment (*jouissance*). But the Marxist worker's movement believed it needed psychoanalysis as a scientific, practical and technical auxiliary of consciousness.

As we will see later, the Freudo-Marxist project, judged unviable, was aborted. The genuine, though delirious, aspirations that sought to forge a single theory out of psychoanalysis and Marxism had the best of historical and political intentions, but they were unaware of the inalienable foundations of the two discourses. For this reason Armando Suárez (1995) was led to observe that:

> The psychoanalytical movement, having just overcome its stage of ostracism and marginalization from the city of science, was beginning to consolidate positions in Europe and the United States [but] was still too fascinated by its discovery of itself and too jealous of its autonomy to allow confrontations with a theory of society and history that already occupied all the positions that applied psychoanalysis hoped to conquer. (p. 146).

Here, Suárez confirms that Freud is unfamiliar with Marxism, though not with its utopian proposals, which he denounces in *The Future of an Illusion* (1927) and *Civilization and its Discontents* (1929): since human beings are exiled from nature by the law of culture, which prohibits incest, the project of happiness is unachievable. However, Freud (1929) opens a path towards wellbeing in culture: "The program that the pleasure principle imposes upon us, to be happy, is unachievable; but it is not licit – or, better, not possible – to abandon the effort to approach, in some way, its fulfillment" (p. 83).

Vladimir Lenin ignored psychoanalysis. Leon Trotsky tried to understand it, but only in order to combat Stalinism with a critique of the masses, the imaginaries that redress the leader, and the struggle between love and hate that is inevitable in culture, as evoked in Arthur Schopenhauer's (1819) *The World as Will and Representation* with its porcupines that never cease to fling their quills in winter.

But the greatest impediments to the Freudo-Marxist movement were the sinister arrival of Nazism in Germany and the annexation of National Socialism in Austria. The rabid opposition that Wilhelm Reich faced in the world of psychoanalysis was not so much due to his deformations of Freudianism, but because his political militancy led all psychoanalysts into the Nazis' talons. The psychoanalyst Marie Langer expressed the panic that Freud himself felt, even recommending that his colleagues not receive militants in analysis, or that they prohibit them from practicing militancy. But not even Freud's cautiousness could prevent the destruction of psychoanalytical publications, the dissolution of the Psychoanalytic Society of Vienna, or his death in exile.

After the Second World War, the empire of psychoanalysis was installed in North America, after vaccinating Freudianism through the introduction of the adaptation to reality and normalization focus, such as the psychoanalysis of Ego. Also, the International Psychoanalysis Association (IPA) extended its branches the world over. Psychoanalysis thus became institutionalized and conquered the psychiatric order; psychoanalysts became "mental health" workers. From the culturalist current to the adaptation approach, leaving aside the folds of subjectivity produced by the unconscious, the path to the supposed psychoanalysis of Ego and its reinforcement (Hartmann, Kris, Loewenstein and Rappaport) established the empire of the *reality principle* in the here, the now and the with me of the Kleinian school; the annexation of psychoanalysis to cultural anthropology (Margaret Mead); functionalist sociology (Parsons); dynamic psychiatry (Alexander), and semiological-juridical critique (Thomas Szasz) – until psychoanalysis was globalized and, in the words of Eugenio Trías (2001), transformed into a "Global Casino", having interred the horror that fractured it in the period of German fascism, and having castrated the letter of Freud, the critique of culture, its rebellious and liberating nature, as well as the radical opposition of the desire for power.

In Argentina, under the leadership – both theoretical and practical – of Pichon-Rivière and José Bleger, psychoanalysis took hold as in no other Latin American country. They realized all the deformations and innovations imaginable: the psychoanalysis of groups, the family and couples, which are analyses of Ego and the imaginary group, and that only examine the dynamics of the group and not those of the subject of the unconscious, which is not collective but excluded from the discourse of the subject through repression in neuroses [*Verdrängung*], denial in perversion [*Verleugnung*], and expulsion and repression for psychosis [*Verwerfung*].

In France, despite resistance by psychoanalysis, Louis Althusser (1965) and Michel Tort (1970) introduced Marxist intellectuals to Freud and Lacan, thus conceding to psychoanalysis a theoretical place by affirming that it was "a new continent of knowledge". In 1965, Althusser published his text *Freud and Lacan* in the *Nouvelle Critique,* wherein he argues for the scientificity of psychoanalysis, on the condition that it is read like Jacques Lacan (Althusser, 1965).

In the French May of 1968, the watchwords of Wilhelm Reich (1934) and Herbert Marcuse (1955) began to be heard once more, like banners of social liberation. But after the May 1968, the relation between psychoanalysis and Marxism was brought back to the discussion table by Lacanian leftists with their theorization of the improvisation of the masses and *schizoanalysis*, a proposal to blow up power with *the machines of war* that fracture the State (Deleuze & Guattari, 1972, 1980).

The Mission

Mission comes from the Latin *missio-onis:* dispatch, commission, charge; and from *mittere:* to send. Since the 12th century it has meant delegation, crossing. I shall take all these meanings in order to reflect upon the intellectual and practical movement of Freudo-Marxism as an ideological pronouncement, led by a group of psychoanalysts and second-generation thinkers who carry out a program of ideas and practices at the seat of Austro-German culture and politics (between 1926 and 1933), and whose project is to integrate the theory and practice of psychoanalysis into historical materialism and the workers' movement that emerged from it.

Among its leading figures, Siegfried Bernfeld (1926), Erich Fromm (1932), Wilhelm Reich (1934) and Otto Fenichel (1934), as well as Paul Federn, Annie Reich (Reich's partner), Richard Sterba and Georg Simmel, all stand out. A signifier generation that lives through the First World War, fight in it (except Fromm), and includes critical witnesses of the division of the workers' movement between social democracy and the communist party. The Freudo-Marxists sympathized with the Bolshevik revolution, knew the violence of the Nazis' anti-Semitic movement and the cruel irrationality of capitalism after the crash of the New York stock exchange in 1929.

In the wake of the defeat of the workers' movement that brought the Nazis to power and the triumph of the Bolsheviks in Russia, it became historically necessary to discuss the importance of subjectivity in revolution. If, as according to Marxist thought, the objective conditions were given for the socialist revolution, then there was no choice but to ponder, and debate, what it was that impeded historical subjects – leaders and masses – from achieving the expected results. And this begged the question: what is happening to class consciousness? To which the Freudo-Marxists responded. From psychoanalysis it was possible to elucidate the enigma of social repression and construct a program that took into account consciousness as commanded by unconscious life in *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), the dynamics of the masses hypnotized by the leader in the *Psychology of the Masses and Analysis of the Ego* (1921), and the second theme of *The Ego and the Id* (1923), where consciousness is the most superficial aspect of psychic life. Here, the Freudo-Marxist movement sets out from a Freudian theoretical base without, of course, forgetting psychoanalytic practice.

Wilhelm Reich opens his dispensary in Vienna in 1922, where he treats the sexual and psychic misery of the proletarian masses and impels a praxis through a passionate political militancy after the brutal repression of a workers' demonstration in Vienna (July 15 1927) that left 83 workers dead. Erich Fromm, though resisting political militancy, is one of the key contacts with the Frankfurt School of critical philosophy, together with Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer and Herbert Marcuse.

The theoretical and practical wager of the Freudo-Marxists on psychoanalysis is produced without reserve. Perhaps its understanding of psychoanalysis is superficial, regarding subjectivity and sexual repression, but still it was able to extract political consequences and a liberating praxis. Likewise, the psychoanalysts' knowledge of Marxism was but superficial, as they did not understand the posture of the *II Socialist International*, positivist, mechanistic, economicist and voluntarist. Thus, Freudo-Marxism as program and praxis unfolded amidst incomprehension by both psychoanalysts and Marxists, though most of them suffered exile for political reasons, not due to theoretical confusions.

The most committed of them is Reich, who is expelled from the German Communist Party in 1932 and from the International Psychoanalytic Association of Vienna in 1934. He settles in the United States, where he develops the *orgone* theory and the practice of *vegetotherapy*, which had lost their psychoanalytical and Marxist foundations. Bernfeld and Fenichel remain in the International Psychoanalytic Association of Vienna and renounce all political militancy. Fromm abandons the International Association of Vi-

enna and proposes a humanist psychoanalysis, without metapsychology, but with a humanist Marxism bereft of class struggle and economic determinisms, a religiosity without God, based on the concept of *social character* and committed to human values. Despite these variants, schools multiplied, at the cost of forgetting the letter of Marx and Freud (Suárez, 1995, pp. 142-166).

Wilhelm Reich

Reich represents not only the possibility of a dialogue between psychoanalysis and Marxism, but also a program for a common praxis. Upon leaving the ranks of the socialists to join the Austrian Communist Party as a protest against the socialists' absence from the ruthlessly repressed 1927 march in Vienna, Reich organizes his psychoanalytic practice with a view towards the demands of the impoverished masses: abortion and contraception, though this leads to constant harassment. After his trip to the USSR, financed by the German Communist Party, he founds the Socialist Association for Sex Hygiene and Sexological Research. The fame of his Sex-Pol mission attracted 200,000 militants to his dispensaries. The theory and praxis most widely discussed was *The Sexual Struggle of Youth* (1932), though his key thoughts on the relations between psychoanalysis and Marxism are contained in his *Dialectical Materialism and Psychoanalysis* (1934), where he attempts to integrate a "total knowledge" of the human condition through Marxism (with its social perspective) and psychoanalysis (that attends individual phenomena).

The conceptual errors of Freudo-Marxism and Reich's psychosis revealed the deficiencies of the encounter between these two discourses with respect to its practice. With Reich's expulsion from both the Communist International and the International Association of Psychoanalysis, the bridge between Marxism and psychoanalysis suffers a mortal wound. But added to that were the fractures within Marxism and psychoanalysis themselves: "Marxist" currents that deformed Marx, and the many schools of "psychoanalysis" that forgot the letter of Freud. Thus, Freudo-Marxism is burdened with conflicts over interpretations and practices.

However, Eric Laurent (1986) does justice to Reich by updating his Sex-Pol mission in the French psychoanalytic journal *Ornicar?* The name Reich sounds like an empire and represents the technique of *bio-energy* that is adopted by the rebellious generation of the 1960s. The Sex-Pol mission is not born as a theoretical and conceptual development, but of the coincidence between Reich's personal crisis and a social crisis. Sex-Pol is a signifier that brings together progressive pragmatic activities, adopted later by all democratic societies, which have striven to foster them from the 1960s to today. Progressive organizations succeeded in including Reich's program in European Constitutions and now in some Latin American ones. The Sex-Pol mission is more than a bundle of practical sexual measures; it is a signifier that provokes rebellion.

Reich's mission – according to Laurent – reminds the psychoanalytic community and the world of phallic enjoyment [*jouissance*], the subject's entry into the symbolic order, into the enjoyment of language and the phallic function: the phallus, signifier of enjoyment and the desire for the Other. Reich wishes to make the phallus exist as a signifier destined to designate all the effects of the signified as one whole. For this reason he is expelled from every psychoanalytic brotherhood in 1934. In response, one starry night in 1941, in the city of Main in the United States, Reich hallucinates a blue light, the energy of which extends over the entire world, and in which he perceives the *orgone*, not a concept, but a point of contact with reality, a possible relation with the scientists of his time, a signifier that forms a social bond to subject itself to culture and shirk psychosis. Because – and here I follow Freud – that which is expelled from discourse [*Verwerfung*] returns in the real, as in the case of Schreber, like a blue light hallucinated on the horizon.

The Recognition of a Radical Absence of Man's Essence

Freudo-Marxism… an impossible project? I share with Gérard Pommier (1987) the lucid thoughts that he expresses in his book *Freud Apolitical?*, especially the thesis that Marx and Freud have only one point in common, one that refers to an anthropological aspect that underlies their discourse: the recognition of a radical absence in man's essence; being is absent, not only because the human cub becomes a being, but because its being is represented by a signifier that represents it before another signifier.

In this regard, it is worth recalling the pertinent clarification that Jacques Lacan presents to philosophy students at the Sorbonne in Paris, namely that the object of study of psychoanalysis is not man, for it is not an anthropology; but, rather, something that man lacks: the enjoyment lost upon being dragged out of nature by language through the fundamental law of culture: the prohibition of incest; a lack that cements

the division of the subject between its being and the signifier that represents it, such that he becomes subject to language and of language. For Marx, meanwhile, the essence of man is reduced to the set of his social relations. Suffice to recall that in Marx' 6th Thesis on Feuerbach the human essence is not an abstraction that is inseparable from singular individuals, for its reality is the set of social relations.

Unlike Marx, in the field of psychoanalysis, and especially since the teachings of Lacan, what we find is the absence of being, the absence *in* being of the subject [*manque à être*, says Lacan] as a result of the effects of language; of the symbolic structure that makes family history. Absence of Being not only because once we became beings of Being hardly anything remains of us as subjects, but because when someone asks, *who am I*?, there is no possible answer, given that language backs up against the limit of what is sayable: being. It is because of this that the end of an analysis has as its ethical imperative *to make this being that is lacking.*

Although the lack of human essence in Marx's case is rather evident, in the sense that he only defines alienation in relation to the group, it would seem that the lack of being in Marx only concerns Ego, or the individual, conceived as product and effect of social life. It deals with the dispersion of human essence, though it is not abolished completely. There is a displacement of human essence in the set of social relations, but this does not impede the establishment of a kind of fixing of being. Human essence is not the final explanation of things; it is a historical product. For Marx, the being of man is relative, though it endures as economic activity. Marx sets aside the optical problem, leaving it at the mercy of relations with one's peers and the relations of production.

Something distinct occurs in the case of Freud, for whom the subject of the unconscious depends on the symbolic system. And this is because the order of language is incomplete, for no being can define itself on such an inconsistent basis. It is to this radical incompleteness of language that the historical future responds; the unyielding search for social identity and the class struggle itself; the reason why Gérard Pommier points out that Marxism explains effects, not causes. And this is why the encounter between the theses of Marx and Freud comes to be so extremely forced:

> There exists no direct articulation between Freudianism and Marxism. What we are dealing with, between the individual and the social, [is] a relation of failure: since enjoyment has failed, a tentative recovery in the group is produced, class struggle. There is a fissure that makes all union between the subject, as a being of desire, and any of its imaginary identifications, principally the social one, unrecoverable. (Pommier, 1987, pp. 182-183).

It is not possible to posit a direct articulation between Freud and Marx, for what exists is an abyss, an *impasse,* between the individual and the social. Given that the subject fails in its search for the plenitude of its being, it throws itself into recovering it in the group, in a search for relation and for belonging, where specular alienation becomes inevitable: Ego is similarity, made in the image and resemblance of the other. Thus it is inevitable, since in its multiple identifications Ego is asymptotic (as Michel Foucault points out), that what is produced is an insurmountable failure that impedes the subject from identifying itself fully with the image that Society offers it.

Both the class-free state of socialism and the free enterprise of capitalism subscribe to the assumption that, thanks to the virtues of these systems, men and women can put an end to servitude. This species of Utopia is sustained in a mode of production that, paradoxically, seems to accentuate and aggravate the interdependence of men and women.

Undoubtedly, the passionate struggle for freedom responds to the existence of previous oppression, whose existence in capitalism, feudalism, slavery and even socialism, it would be folly to deny. But it is also important to point out that oppression becomes less evident once direct, individual coercion ceases. However, it is equally undeniable that there exists a mode of industrial slavery that exerts a merciless oppression upon an entire social class.

Following Gérard Pommier, it is important to recall some of Marx' theses; such as the one that holds that social classes are defined as a function of the ownership of the means of production. Their formation responds to a certain mode of production in a given period of history. Social classes confront one another directly, transversally, or covertly at certain historical moments, to put an end to the exploitation of man by man and to free men and women from all oppression and servitude.

Psychoanalysis is also expected to provide liberation from the symptoms and suffering that are produced. To obtain this, analysis leads to the alleviation of repression. This is precisely where Freudianism and Marxism touch to constitute a grand impasse, *Freudo-Marxism,* one of the most ambitious attempts: the confluence of two dissimilar, even antagonistic, discourses. For the aim is to establish a parallel between social repression and sexual repression. Up to a short time ago, it was said that Marx and Freud

joined hands in defining history: *the history of class struggle* and *the history of sexual repression.* However, the prohibition of incest, the foundational law of culture, has no parallel in social repression, because the prohibition of incest is not enunciated. Sex-Pol is denouncement and a program of political militancy in the shadow of Reich and his theory of *orgone* to liberate sexual repression; however, it suffers limitations both theoretical and practical. The objective of social repression is to preserve, ruthlessly, the political power of the State. A repression achieved in many ways: *with bread and the circus*, soccer, spectacles, bribes, abandonment of symbolic obligations, or the cowardice of the masses…

For psychoanalysis, sexual repression is not a direct, immediate effect, nor one that can be localized in social subjection, because for psychoanalysis repression is not produced by any injunction. When parents anticipate all their child's needs and desires, believing that they have satisfied all their demands, they deny him all that which is beyond the demands, because they cannot – and do not – want to recognize that the child's desire is sexual. This is why repression is imposed, though no prohibition exists. For psychoanalysis, repression is not the effect of the injunction. Thus, political power is not linked to psychoanalytic repression.

No revolution has succeeded in eliminating repression, and none ever will. Political liberation does not mean emancipating oneself from a mode of production or from the reigning tyrant but, rather, from the Master and the power structure. For this reason, political liberation is utopian, in that it seeks to achieve something beyond eliminating repression, for it demands the fall of the unifying symbol of the social group that makes the social bond, the chief (who can be deposed, even assassinated, but only to be replaced by another to preserve social cohesion). As Pommier (1987) affirms, "though economic liberation is historically viable, political liberation is, in contrast [and] in this sense, absolutely utopian" (p. 185). Perhaps this is why Trotsky proposed, in addition to the economic revolution, the political one, the permanent revolution to impede Stalin's dictatorship. A project that evokes a phrase from Milan Kundera's (1981) novel, *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting*: "the struggle of man against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting".

The subject produces an *impasse* in Freudo-Marxism, a stalemate, a difficulty apparently insurmountable; for the subject cannot be reduced to a theory, a social system, a political project, since it is for-

ever gestating something unexpected. A subject radically opposed to society and even to culture itself, for it is the irreducible, that which introduces discontinuity and difference in what is homogeneous, uniform, and stable in every society.

A subject that is not pure negativity, pure difference, but a *plus*, an excess that creates something new in the bosom of the society conceived as Unity, tearing it apart with its invention. Something that goes beyond the economy, the field of conservation and dominion, and that Freud calls the unconscious; the desire that goes beyond necessity, an anti-economic point of view, an excess of the *drives*; a beyond the homeostatic equilibrium, a *Beyond the pleasure principle*. A subject that surpasses life, through an excess of potency, that by limiting itself identifies itself with the Other. A subject that, in order to realize itself, must make a new being. A subject that does not rest, that does not subject itself to the being of any State, as Eugenio Trías points out, because it is restlessness until death, as Georges Bataille's philosophy of excess teaches.

Conclusion

It is possible to recognize Freudo-Marxism in the programs of the proletarian movement, for it promises economic, political and sexual equilibrium: *the full realization of the subject*, through which society as a whole must achieve the same objective. The Freudo-Marxist mission reaches an *impasse* due to the fact that it demands the sacrifice of this subject (for the good of the community), conceived as alienated in bourgeois individualism, and the repression of its drives. This means sacrificing the luxury of living differently, for the good of a State that claims to be and not to exist, for a society where no subject has any reason to differ and oppose but only to renounce all difference. If what is demanded is the sacrifice of this singularity that is the subject, which is subject to language, it is because the great value of this subjectivity is recognized. If it is asked to sacrifice itself – as María Zambrano (1958) holds – it is because this subjectivity is capable of sacrifice. That which is unacceptable in political parties, psychoanalytic associations, universities, factories, schools, concentration camps, forced labor camps, and prisons is suppressed. Zambrano's radical position is shared by psychoanalysis, so that the subject may distance itself from the specular alienation that the enjoyment of group demands. The place of the subject is society, but with the freedom to enter its interior space, which allows it to dissent and risk changing that with which it does not agree.

The subject is unpredictable, it does not pertain to the future (which is predictable), but to the future that is insinuated with a new light. Its time is the future because it is the space of freedom. This subject distances itself from the group and retreats into its interior solitude, to the space that creates difference and the time of freedom, though it is impossible for it not to enter into conflict with society, which lives in the past. The subject goes beyond her, with her customs and traditions. The drama of the subject is that it must confront the past through a society that does not pass, but that sustains itself through its rites and fears, its way of being and enduring, of returning and embracing its ancient masters.

However, thanks to the thought and practice of Freudo-Marxism, there emerge social demands and struggles that gestate reforms that socially humanize capitalism. These changes make possible diverse inquiries into subjective life, that before this movement were excluded from social and political discourse. Freudo-Marxism, with its program of sexual and political liberation, is in the constitutions of all modern states and is gradually making inroads into those of Latin American countries as well.

References

Althusser, L. (1965). *Écrits sur la psychanalyse: Freud et Lacan*. Paris: Stock, 1993.

Bernfeld, S. (1926). Socialismo y psicoanálisis. In *Marxismo, psicoanálisis y sexpol.* Buenos Aires: Granica, 1972.

Fenichel, O. (1934). Sobre el psicoanálisis como embrión de una futura psicología dialéctico-materialista In *Marxismo, psicoanálisis y sexpol.* Buenos Aires: Granica, 1972.

Freud, S. (1900). *La interpretación de los sueños. Obras completas.* Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 1979.

Freud, S. (1921). *Psicología de las masas y análisis del yo. Obras Completas*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 1979.

Freud, S. (1923). *El yo y el ello. Obras Completas*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 1979.

Freud, S. (1927). *El porvenir de una ilusión. Obras Completas*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 1979.

Freud, S. (1929). *El malestar en la cultura. Obras Completas*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 1979.

Fromm, E. (1932). Méthode et tâche d'une psychosociologie analytique. *Hermès 5-6,* 1989, 301-313.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1972). *El Anti Edipo: capitalismo y esquizofrenia*. Paidós Ibérica, 2004.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1980). *Mil mesetas*. Barcelona: Pre-textos, 2004

Kundera, M. (1981). *The book of laughter and forgetting*. New York: Penguin.

La Boétie, E. (1576). *Discours de la servitude volontaire*. Paris: Mille et une nuits, 1995.

Laurent, E. (1986). Mission Sexpol. *Ornicar?* 35, 125-132.

Marcuse, H. (1955). *Eros y civilización*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1984.

Pommier, G. (1987). *Freud ¿apolítico?* Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión.

Reich, W. (1934). *Materialismo dialéctico y psicoanálisis*. México: Siglo XXI, 1989.

Schopenhauer, A. (1819). *The world as will and representation*. New York: Courier Dover Publications, 2012.

Suárez, A. (1995). Freudomarxismo: pasado and presente. In Armando Suárez (Comp.), *Razón, locura and sociedad.* Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1995.

Tort, M. (1970). La psychanalyse dans le matérialisme historique. *Nouvelle revue de psychanalyse 1*, 146-166.

Trías, E. (2001). Ciudad sobre ciudad. Madrid: Destino.

Zambrano, M. (1958). *Persona y democracia: la historia sacrificial.* Madrid: Anthropos, 1988.

The Metapsychology of Capital

David Pavón-Cuéllar

Faculty of Psychology, Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, Mexico

Abstract. *Upon observing that there are psychic or mental configurations inherent to the capitalist system, the general thesis that capitalism is also a state of mind is accepted. This idea justifies not only the direct analysis of capitalism by students of the psyche, but also the elaborate theory of the capitalist mind foreshadowed in the theory of capitalism that Marx presents. By examining Marx's theoretical elaborations concerning the psyche it becomes possible to distinguish two levels, one psychological, the other what we shall call metapsychological, to indicate that it goes beyond the psychological, overflows it, transcends it, constitutes it and explains it. That one can announce the existence of a metapsychology of capital, in which some of the principal defining aspects of Freud's metapsychological domain are found, including the fact that it constitutes an unconscious conceived as a mental system and a logical localization in the psyche. This article will show how this metapsychological domain of the unconscious can serve to explain and frame, in Marx and Freud, the psychological sphere of consciousness, and through it, though indirectly, elucidate that which occurs at the metaphysical summits of religion and mythology.*

Keywords: Marxism, Psychoanalysis, Marx, Freud, Capitalism, Psychology

Introduction

Just as a Marxist metaphysics would be manifestly aberrant, so also there is an obvious aberration in a Marxist psychology that does not question, critique and reflexively transcend itself. This reflexive relation of psychology with itself is one of the most important lessons we receive from the approach to the psyche found in Marx (1818-1883). What he teaches us is to probe deeply into the psyche to reach the point where it crosses psychology. His radical epistemological gesture is one of rupture with the psychological, and not just with the metaphysical. *Nearer than the metaphysical and beyond the psychological, the Marxian position is essentially metapsychological.*

We consider that Marx ventured into metapsychology for he neither deserts the psychical nor falls into the metaphysical by going beyond a psychology understood as it has generally been comprehended since the 19th century, namely, as a sphere and science of a subjective and objectifiable psyche, one isolatable and understandable, immanent to individual or social subjects and relegated to their consciousness and inner life, their cognitions and conducts, their behaviors, thoughts and sentiments, personalities and character traits, sensations and motivations, actions and interactions, etc. Like Freud (1856-1939), Marx transcends all this, doing so by penetrating the psyche down to its very economic, historical, trans-individual and cultural depths, as something unconscious and necessarily exterior to the subject and its psychological sphere. It is from here that a Marxian metapsychological theory emerges, one whose innumerable coincidences with Freudian metapsychology would suffice in and of themselves – even in the absence of other decisive factors – to understand the insistence and perseverance of explorations that date back to the pioneering works of Reich (1923), Bernfeld (1926) and Fenichel (1934), and that continue in the current Lacanian left (see Stavrakakis for a good review, 2007), having traversed the Frankfurt School (e.g. Marcuse, 1953), French structuralism (e.g. Althusser, 1964-1969) and many other perspectives, some virtually forgotten, such as those of Bleger (1958) and Caruso (1974). In addition to pushing these inquiries forward, this article attempts to explain and defend them, in a basic, elemental way, by

detecting some elements at the base of Marx's meta-psychological inquiries into capitalism that coincide with the ideas of Freud.

Capitalism and the Psyche

Capitalism is not merely, as the dictionary states, an "economic regime based on the predominance of capital as an element of production and creator of wealth" (translated from the *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*, 2001, p. 438). In capitalism, to begin with, capital prevails not only as an *element of production and creator of wealth*, but also as a *beneficiary of production and destroyer of wealth*; as an *element of exploitation and creator of misery*. Capital exercises its power as a promoter of production, a determining factor in distribution and representation of wealth, a producer of necessities, an apparatus for the organization and domination of society, a form of relation and interaction among people, a lifestyle and a worldview. Given that capital is all of this, capitalism, founded upon the predominance of capital, cannot be simply an *economic regime*.

In addition to an economic regime, capitalism is a social reality, a political option, a historical horizon, a cultural model, an ideological matrix, and a symbolic system. As if this did not suffice, we are also sure that all of this is endowed with psychic elements, aspects and effects, and even determines and configures a certain *psyche* or state of mind that is suitable for its context and necessary for the capitalist system to function well. Capitalism, in effect, can never dispense with a complex made up of conceptions and representations, expectations and fears, motivations and emotions, desires and drives, attitudes and behaviors, interactions and relations, identity constructions and personality structures. These "nervous devices" are indispensable for the economic organism. The capitalist body could not function without the medullary performance of a mental disposition in which we find, for example, highly specific forms of exchange, interest, avidness, dissatisfaction, ambition, appropriation, retentive individuation and competitive socialization.

We argue that there is a state of mind inseparable from capitalism, tied to it, molded by it, even inherent to it. Indeed it is not even possible to distinguish the soul from the capitalist body. How can one distinguish capitalism from certain mental calculations of industrialists, businessmen and bankers? Is not the capitalist's compulsion to accumulate intertwined with the accumulative propensity of capital? And how can we conceive of capitalism without pondering avarice and the lust for lucre of those who embody it? Without its state of mind, what is left of the capitalist system?

Capitalism as a State of Mind

It can be stated categorically, then, that *capitalism is also a state of mind*. This affirmation has two important consequences for those of us who follow Marx into the study of the psyche:

- If capitalism is also a state of mind, then as students of the psyche we have a right to study capitalism as such and not only its incidence in the psyche.
- If capitalism is also a state of mind, then as followers of Marx we can disentangle a theory of the psyche from Marx's theory of capitalism.

Discovering the first indications of the Marxian theory of the *capitalist state of mind* requires no great effort. They are easily discerned, for example, in Marx's profound characterization (1867) of the capitalist as a subject "whose heart resides in his pocket" (p. 173), a being whose "soul is the soul of capital" (pp. 178-179), a "conscious agent" of the "movement of capital", "capital personified, endowed with consciousness and will, such that its operations have no other propelling drive than the progressive appropriation of abstract wealth" (pp. 108-109). If the capitalist thus stands out because of his "absolute thirst for enrichment", his "insatiable appetite for gain", and his "unbridled race in search of value" (p. 109), this is because his soul is "that of capital", and "capital has but one instinct: the instinct to increase, to create profit" (p. 179). This is the instinct that finds expression in the capitalist's "absolute instinct to enrich himself" (p. 499). It is not the "individual mania" of the "hoarder", but the "social mechanism" of a capital for which our capitalist "is nothing more than a spring" (pp. 499-500).

Capital's instinct to increase is what becomes manifest in the *capitalist's thirst for enrichment*. When the capitalist achieves wealth, it is because he obeys a capital that grows. But in obeying it, increasing it, and thus enriching himself, our capitalist not only increases *what he has*, he also dilates *what he is*, amplifies what he personifies, develops his personality, his soul, capital. Thus, we are dealing with a question of identity, not simply of property. While property is precisely where identity lies, there comes an inversion of the roles of proprietor and property, since

in *being what he has, the capitalist becomes possessed by his possession*, bows to it, personifies it, and abandons his soul to it, together with his consciousness and will. Thus, the psychological arises from, and depends on, the economic, which is in turn mediated and performed by the psychological.

In the extreme of economicism, which does not exhaust Marx's materialist theory, the economic fact is the material that gives the subject his psychological profile. The professional spirit of the rich banker tends to be as hard, cold and insensitive as the metallic materiality of the wealth that possesses him. The unstoppable expansion of capital becomes, in the capitalist, insatiable ambition. Miserly bourgeois reciprocity reflects the purely formal equality of commercial exchange. Commodity fetishism is at the origin of the idealism of the merchant. Assertions like these are nothing more than diverse formulations of a single postulate that is central to the Marxian theory of the capitalist state of mind. But this theory has other postulates, as well as a dense constellation of conceptualizations, deductions, demonstrations, argumentations and elucubrations.

Psychology and Metapsychology

In the complex theory that Marx elaborates in relation to the psyche we can discern two levels: one superficial, strictly *psychological*; the other more profound, which we venture to name *metapsychological*. This level is metapsychological not only because it is located beyond the psychological level, overflowing and transcending it, but also because it is implied within it and expressed through it, because it *constitutes and explains it*. In the previous section, for example, we came to appreciate how the psychological profile of the possessor is constituted and explained by an economic fact of possession that, precisely because it is *constitutive and explicative of the psychological*, merits the name *metapsychological*. Another metapsychological factor, the intrinsic tendency of capital to increase, is an economic – not psychological – propensity, though one implicated and expressed at the psychological level of a conscious impulse towards enrichment that is constituted and explained by the increasing of capital. It is for this reason that here, too, we find a phenomenon that is metapsychological, not just economic.

By focusing his attention on the economic, Marx centers it as well on the metapsychological, but in order to concentrate on the metapsychological, he must first disengage attention from the psychological. It is

as if the psychological surface allows the metapsychological depths to be perceived by unfocusing, erasing, fading and making itself transparent in Marxian theory. In Marx, the psychological evanesces, vanishes and disappears. And it disappears because it is left unattended, for it turns out to be secondary and seems even irrelevant. Psychology tends to be obviated and to serve primarily to be crossed over in order to gain access to metapsychology.

In the Marxian theory of the psyche, the interpsychological confrontation between capitalists and workers, between their respective behaviors, thoughts and feelings, serves only to unravel the metapsychological contradiction between existence and an alienated essence (Marx, 1844), between dissolution and consolidation of social classes, between truth and ideology, between subject and object (1847, 1858), between "live labor" and a "dead labor" that feeds, like a "vampire", by "sucking live labor" (1867, p. 179). The development of capital at the cost of labor, of the undead at the cost of the living, of ideology at the cost of the truth, is what truly matters in the ensuing conflict between capitalists and workers. What matters is not the psychological plot of roles and interactions of personages in the well-lit scenario of society, but rather the somber metapsychological fabric wherein that plot is woven, where we can explore, behind the scenes, the structural positions and relations that underlie personal roles and interpersonal interactions (1858). In other words, what matters are the personified "economic categories", not the "persons" that emerge from "personification"; the "interests" of those of whom one is but a "representative", not the representation itself; the "relations of which the individual is the social offspring", not the individual who "is subjectively considered far above them" (1867, p. xv). What matters, in sum, is not the psychology of "the economic roles represented by men", but the metapsychology of "economic relations within which individual men confront one another" (p. 48).

The Unconscious of Capital

In their emphasis on metapsychology, Marxian and Freudian theories coincide, for both transcend the psychological sphere to seek its elucidation in the metapsychological domain. Marx conceives this domain exactly as does Freud (1898, 1901), namely, as something "behind consciousness" (1898, p. 316), as the logical space of "the unconscious" (1901, p. 251), as "the unconscious" in the topical sense of the term, as a "psychic", not "anatomical" locality, situated in a "place" distinct from "consciousness" (1915, pp. 170-171). The "consciousness" of capitalists is thus

found *in another place* than the capital they "personify", and this capital, which acquires consciousness through them, naturally has no consciousness in itself, nor is it capable of acquiring it for itself (Marx, 1867, p. 109). Similarly, in the Marxian representation of the psyche, the tendency of capital to increase is found in a recondite, enigmatic, paradoxical metapsychological region, one intimate yet alienated, essentially unconscious and topically distinct from the psychological region of the conscious impulse towards enrichment. In Freud's terms (1915), what we find here is a "topical divorce" between two "regions of the psychic apparatus" (p. 170).

In both the Marxian and Freudian approaches, the unconscious metapsychological domain is more basic, fundamental, and "profound" than the psychological region of consciousness (Freud, 1915, pp. 169-170). In Marx, this justifies the vertical distinction between the ideological-psychological "superstructure" of consciousness and the material-economic "base", the unconscious infrastructure where we locate metapsychology (Marx, 1859). It can be postulated, in general, that the metapsychological is the "base" of the psychological, a postulate valid for both the representation of the psyche and theoretical elaborations concerning this representation, and both in Freud's theory (1917, p. 221, note 1) and in Marx's (1867, pp. 44, 410).

In the psyche as conceived by Marx (1867, 1885, 1894), the psychological superstructure of the capitalist's consciousness is founded upon the metapsychological base of a capital whose psychic functioning is "inapprehensible" (1867, p. 14), "invisible" (pp. 57, 452), "bereft of meaning" (1885, p. 47), "inexplicable" (1894, p. 461), and "unconscious" (p. 614). But this does not mean that capital simply escapes consciousness. In addition to being *unconscious*, capital corresponds here to what Freudian terminology calls *the unconscious*. What we are dealing with is "a psychic system" – in this case the capitalist system – whose unconscious character is not only a state, a situation or attribute of the system, but its very existence, its logical localization, distinctive structure, immanent activity, and "endowment with certain properties" (Freud, 1915, p. 168).

The Consciousness of the Unconscious

The unconscious is the only form in which capital can fully exist, as a system, in the psyche. The soul possessed by the capitalist system can only consist in *the unconscious* as a positive, substantial and substantive form of being, of organizing and of operating, and not just as a negative quality that would indicate the lack of consciousness. It would not even be correct to affirm that consciousness is lacking in the capitalist system. This unconscious never ceases to perspire, to secrete conscious effluvia. Consciousness forms part of a system whose "mechanical automatons", for example, not only have "unconscious organs", but also those "conscious organs" we call "workers" (Marx, 1867, p. 347). Working consciousness is just as crucial as the accumulating, speculating, consuming consciousness, among many others. It is through all these that capital acquires the conscious faculties it needs in order to function.

The system possesses our consciousnesses, but not for this does the unconscious cease to be what it is. All its consciousness is ours, is pulverized among us, and in each one of us is incomplete and uncommunicated, truncated and limited, focused and confined exclusively to one specific task and to one precise point of the system itself. Our consciousness is consciousness of the unconscious and of those doings of the unconscious of which we are conscious. This determination of consciousness by the unconscious is what is formulated, in apparently simplistic terms, as the determination of the ideal superstructure by the material base, of forms of thought by modes of production, of the ideological contents of consciousness by the capitalist system that we assimilate to the unconscious.

Since the unconscious of the capitalist system determines the ideological contents of consciousness, we understand that the metapsychology of capital can serve Marx by explaining the psychology of capitalists. We must recall that these are nothing more than "personifications" of a capital that needs them so as to "endow itself with consciousness and will" (Marx, 1867, p. 109). The conscious and willful psyche of the capitalist pertains to, and obeys, the unconscious system of capitalism. Even if the systemic functioning may be perturbed and transformed by insubordinate and uncontrollable forms of psychic movement, these forms arise from, and struggle in, what is perturbed and transformed by them. Hence it is in the metapsychology of the system that we must resolve the psychology of the individual with his consciousness and will, but also with his impulses, appetites, representations, cognitions, behaviors, thoughts and feelings. This psychology, which is most studied in psychology departments throughout the world, has its base, foundation and explanation in that which is the subject matter of economics, history, anthropology, ethnology and other fields of knowledge into which Marx and Freud inquired as they probed more deeply

into psychology, until they traversed it, though without falling into metaphysics.

Metaphysics and Metapsychology

Metaphysics is the great temptation that Freud and Marx resisted when going beyond psychology, beyond which – according to them – there is nothing subtle and ethereal, spiritual or celestial, but *only what there is*, material and body, life and desire, needs and drives, individual and collective histories, family and cultural configurations, symbolic and economic relations. This "nearer to here" is the "over there" of Marxism and psychoanalysis. Psychology is thus surpassed from within. It contains its own horizon, is transcended as it is explored more deeply, and it is this deepening that leads us to the domain of the metapsychological, beyond the psychological sphere, but not beyond the psyche. Simply put, we reach "the dimension of the deep psyche" (Freud, 1915, p. 170).

The deep psyche does not cease to be strictly psychic because it is economic or historical. History and economics are metapsychology. However, in this metapsychology we transcend psychology and dissipate its illusions, among them metaphysics, mythology and religion, which Marx and Freud conceive in ways that are both consonant and complementary:

- As "a religious reflection of the real world", where "products of the human mind look like beings endowed with life, with independent existence" (Marx, 1867, pp. 38, 44).
- As "a psychology projected onto the exterior world", where "it reflects" the "obscure discernment" of "psychic factors and constellations of the unconscious" (Freud, 1901, p. 251).

In both conceptions, metaphysics is reduced to a psychology that is not only illusory and distinct from the *real or exterior world*, but implies a psychically *produced* or *projected* truth that remits us to the *human mind*, to *psychic factors* and *constellations of the unconscious*. Marx and Freud attempt to unravel this metapsychological truth in the psychological-metaphysical illusion. Both wish, as Freud (1901) would say, "to transpose *metaphysics* to *metapsychology*" (p. 251). Both yearn to arrive at a metapsychology by delving more deeply into the psychology of metaphysics. This is exactly what Marx (1867) does, for example, when he explores the psychology of "the real timidity" that "is reflected" metaphysically and "ideally in natural and popular religions", which then allows him to posit the metapsychological theory of

the "umbilical cord", of the "natural link" in the "lack of development of man within its material process of the production of life" (p. 44). This historical-economic circumstance is the metapsychological factor through which the psychological trait manifested in metaphysical creations is explained. It does not suffice, as in ancient modern science, to dissolve metaphysics in psychology. Rather, *psychology must now be dissolved in metapsychology*. This second critical-reflexive gesture is the one represented by Marx, and not only by Freud, in the crisis of modernity and its concept of science.

Conclusion

When Marx and Freud go beyond the psychological sphere to intern themselves in the metapsychological domain, we witness a critical-reflexive return of culture in relation to itself in a historical stage of cultural crisis that we have not yet overcome. This crisis of modernity makes the obvious fall into the category of the ideological, and makes science understand that it cannot subsist as such without extracting that which lies latent and underlies the evident object. It is then that the psychological ceases to be convincing and to suffice in and of itself; it becomes suspicious and demands that we cross it, go beyond it. This *going beyond* is a fundamental principle of any radical critique in our time.

The radical critique of Marx and Freud goes beyond psychological ideology to develop a de-ideologizing metapsychological science that we have only barely begun to sketch out. It is necessary to inquire into this science, to continue exploring it, and to find the additional coincidences between Marx and Freud that lie in its interior. The coincidences are there among the divergences. It is not even necessary to look for them. It will suffice to continue finding them through explorations of a metapsychology that, in reality, is neither of Marx or Freud, but of culture in the historical stage in which these two authors coincide, and where we discover coincidences between them. Each coincidence found justifies not only our own explorations, but also those that came before.

References

Althusser, L. (1964-1969). *Écrits sur la psychanalyse.* Paris: Stock, 1993.

Bernfeld, S. (1926). Socialismo y psicoanálisis. In *Marxismo, psicoanálisis y sexpol* (pp. 15–37). Buenos Aires: Granica, 1972.

Bleger, J. (1958). *Psicoanálisis y dialéctica materialista*. Buenos Aires: Paidós, 1988.

Caruso, I. (1974). *Psicoanálisis, marxismo y utopía*. Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1985.

Fenichel, O. (1934). Sobre el psicoanálisis como embrión de una futura psicología dialéctico-materialista. In *Marxismo, psicoanálisis y sexpol* (pp. 160–183). Buenos Aires: Granica, 1972.

Freud, S. (1898). Carta 84. In *Obras Completas I*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 1998.

Freud, S. (1901). Psicopatología de la Vida Cotidiana. In *Obras Completas VI*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 1998.

Freud, S. (1915). Lo inconsciente. In *Obras Completas XIV*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 1998.

Freud, S. (1917). Complemento metapsicológico a la doctrina de los sueños. In *Obras Completas XIV*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 1998.

Marcuse, H. (1953). *Eros y civilización*. Madrid: Sarpe, 1983.

Marx, K. (1844). *Manuscritos económicos y filosóficos de 1844*. Madrid: Alianza, 1968.

Marx, K. (1847). *Trabajo asalariado y capital*. Madrid: Aguilera, 1968.

Marx, K. (1858). *Grundrisse o Elementos fundamentales para la crítica de la economía política*. México: FCE, 2009.

Marx, K. (1859). *Contribución a la crítica de la economía política*. Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1997

Marx, K. (1867). *El Capital I*. México: FCE, 2008.

Marx, K. (1885). *El Capital II*. México: FCE, 2006.

Marx, K. (1894). *El Capital III*. México: FCE, 2009.

Real Academia Española (2001). *Diccionario de la lengua española*. Madrid: RAE.

Reich, W. (1923). *Materialismo dialéctico y psicoanálisis*. Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1989.

Stavrakakis, Y. (2007). *The Lacanian Left*. Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press.

Marx, Ideology and the Unconscious

Hans Skott-Myhre
Brock University, Canada

Abstract. *This paper addresses the question of why the current ruling ideology is more potent and dangerous than simply being a set of ideas. It will engage this topic through an investigation of the evolution of ideology within late capitalism. It will suggest that the difference between ideology and a "belief system" has actually shifted since the late 1960's as capital has refined its ability to mine the unconscious, stripping it for resources. Through a reading of Marx, an argument is made that we must rethink the relationship of the conscious and unconscious minds. A proposal is made for the deployment of libidinal revolutionary desire as a way to challenge late stage capitalist ideology on its own terms.*

The question of ideology under late stage capitalism or what Hardt and Negri (2000) have called Empire is a vexing one. It raises the specter of Spinoza's (2007) question as to why we fight for our servitude as though it were a form of liberation. Our lives and actions both personally and politically seem increasingly saturated with the faux common sense of capitalist logic. In spite of extensive interventions, over generations, by Marxists and communists to challenge false consciousness and assist the people in understanding the true and actual nature of the conditions of their own oppression, billions seek nothing more than to become successful capitalists large and small. Even the most wretched seek to obtain microloans so that they might employ their neighbors and engage in the most oppressive of capitalist relations; that of becoming the boss.

Of course, there are counter movements and a constancy of revolt that has thrown capitalism into a seemingly endless cycle of crises. Despite this, the regimes of capitalist control continue to appropriate and turn revolutionary struggle into market opportunities under the guise of democratic aspiration and political reform. With the facility of a magician, capital displaces the realities of the suffering of an ever-increasing segment of the population onto a field of political discourse and empty sloganeering.

Pignarre and Stengers (2011) refer to this as the sorcery of capitalism. They argue that capitalism as a social form casts a certain spell of capture over its subjects. A form of domination that imbues its subjects with a certain sense of historical fatalism where "you can't turn back the clocks … the liberalization of the world [is] inscribed in history as inevitably as gravity in nature." A sense that "the party is over, we have to be pragmatic now, accept the hard reality … finally accepted after an orgy of ideological dreams" (p. 43).

This invocation of a kind of spell cast by the sorcery of capitalism is, like all black magic, an appropriation and reversal of its subject's most profound desire. In this case, the enchantment is founded in the materialism and historical determinism of Marx himself. The twist is that, rather than actually engaging the material struggles of living beings and turning their creative force towards an opening of history as the infinite creation of modes of immanent sovereignty, the sorcery here opens the signifier to an abstract outside of domination and control; a field in which all creative force is appropriated to the abstract code of capital itself. The functional mechanism by which such a spell is cast is, of course, ideology.

In the classic iteration ideology is "the means by which relations of power, control and dominance are maintained and preserved within any society" (Augustinos, 1999, p. 295). In any given society there are common sets of linguistic signifiers that reify the existing sets of power relations. Because language is by

definition what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) refer to as a system that inherently orders the world, in a certain sense all beliefs are ideological. They are ideological, because they are derived out of the system of language and definition common to the system of rule and domination of that historical period. Such definitions, of course, lead to hegemonic discourses that prescribe practices and actions. The inculcation of the complex of definition, discourse, practices and beliefs is not one that is consciously assembled. Rather, one is born into it and operates within it as the proverbial fish in water. All forms of social belief that support the existing system of rule are neither inevitable nor the only possible way to organize the social world. As Augustinos (1999) points out, this has been "one of the long standing strengths of Marx's critique of capitalism: its capacity to demystify the phenomenal and objectified forms of the market and to reveal the historically and socially specific relations" (p. 306).

Ideology, if it is simply one way to describe the world, should reasonably respond to a conscious form of critique that reveals its shortcomings and false assertions. In short, it should be responsive to the light of reason and rational critique. However, as any psychologist who has worked in clinical practice knows, a deeply rooted psychotic complex does not easily lend itself to the incisive insights of the reality-based practitioner. I use the term psychotic with some degree of intentionality. I would argue that capitalism is a rather specific case of psychotic process. Psychotic, not in the sense of primary process, per se, although that case might well be made, but psychosis in the sense of a belief system composed out of actual elements of material actuality composed in an entirely disconnected and self-contained system of abstraction. Put simply, capitalism is a mad parasitic system that is immanent to its own effects irrespective of its impact on its host. Without question, such a system, fundamentally composed out of abstract signifiers must constantly adapt its vernacular in keeping with the material struggles, innovations and strategies of its host: living beings.

As with any truly paranoiac system premised in lack and negation, capitalism operates through a mechanism of blank signification. Just as the paranoid schizophrenic has an astonishing capacity to integrate new and disparate challenges to his/her closed and homogenous system, so capitalism appears to have a similar capacity to integrate and modify scientific and rational critique to its own ends. Certainly, we can see this in current political discourse in the "debates" on climate change, the invasive force of pharmaceutical assaults on consciousness and affect, as well as in the contestation over genetically based crops. The ability to take the massive and potentially genocidal effect of global warming and make it an issue that demands more nuclear plants, hydro-dams and hydrofracking is clear evidence of an abstract system that operates with no regard for living things, whose only purpose is its own expansion and continued existence. As Marx (1987) has noted, capitalism is just such a parasitic system and this is indeed the logic of a parasite, who will kill its host even though it is a suicidal course of action. Of course, from the perspective of sentient beings this is irrational and psychotic behavior and yet it persists and proliferates in the face of rationale discourse and reasoned objection. Perhaps this is partially because as Pignarre and Stengers (2011) point out,

> For the most part, the words available to us trap and are trapped. Most often they turn around the notion of "ideology," which means that they affirm the possibility of distinguishing between (false) "ideas" and what those ideas bear on … But the minions [of capitalism] … are not blinded by ideology. It would be better to say, borrowing from the vocabulary of sorcery, that they have been "eaten up," that is to say that it is their very capacity to think and feel that has been prey to the operation of capture. To be blinded implies that one sees "badly" – something that can be corrected. But to be captured implies that it is the capacity to see itself that has been affected. (pp. 42-43)

This distinction between being blinded, with the possibility of coming to see, and being captured, with one's very capacity for sight being compromised, is critical. It is akin to what we might describe as the addict's dilemma. To become sober, one must quit using the substance, but the use of the substance impairs the capacity to become sober. It isn't that the addict is not capable of processing the information being shared with them about the ill effects of their substance usage. A professional addict can rehearse these arguments and in fact incorporate them into their system of denial in ways that allow their continued usage of the substance in question. However, the addict does not use on the basis of rational reflection; the addict is functioning within a constellation of lack. Their motivations are premised in the belief that the substance will fulfill its promise to flatten and homogenize life's stresses and difficulties. The substance is not capable of fulfilling this promise, but in the face of repeated failures, the addict persists. Their capacity to see outside the system of addiction has been seriously compromised as the addiction steadily and stealthily incorporates all aspects of the addict's life into the logic of addiction.

Similarly, capitalism operates as a system that compromises the very capacity to critique its operations. It does this, not by denying the critique, but by incorporating it within its logic and homogenizing it into the smooth operations of its appropriation and exploitation of human consciousness. Like most complex adaptive systems, capitalism has a significant degree of contingent evolutionary force. Indeed, its modes of symbiotic enmeshment with living consciousness have shifted over time since its inception. The open signifier of the money sign continually expands its scope of capture and appropriation to include an ever increasingly complex of linguistic code. As Guattari (2010) notes:

> The "miracle" of capitalism is that it has succeeded to direct language, such that it is spoken, taught, televised, dreamt etc. in a way that ensures it remains perfectly adapted to its own evolution. Thus, this operation always appears to be self evident: the syntagms of power, its presuppositions, it threats, its methods of intimidation, seduction, and submission are conveyed at an unconscious level, a little like those "subliminal" images. (p. 38)

Jameson (1991) among others has described our contemporary moment as a new stage in capitalism's development. He tells us that the consumption of commodities has been superseded by the production and consumption of signs and symbols. Capitalism is dominated no longer by the exchange value of products, but by their symbolic or sign value. While this is undoubtedly a polemical over statement, there is little doubt that the emerging global economy is increasingly dependent on a new mode of production, domination and control. Indeed, Jameson (1991) notes that within contemporary consumer capitalism, people are increasingly dominated by signs and media images.

The proliferation of signification as a mode of social control is, of course, not new. As we have noted, ideology in all historical period works within this domain. However, I would argue that what has shifted is the both the centrality and force of both signification and code within what Hardt and Negri (2000) have referred to as Empire. This production of the socius through the production of beliefs that enslave and discipline sentient beings has always been the force operating more or less visibly. However, until advent of a fully global and digitally connected and driven mode of control and production, signification and belief were placed largely in support of the management of bodies and their deployment. For example, Deleuze (1997) points out in his essay *Postscript on the Society of Control* that the ideological controls

of industrial capitalism functioned largely to contain and discipline bodies utilized in factories in various ways. Consciousness and belief were a means to an end, both politically and economically. In our contemporary moment, capitalism emerges fully into visibility as a system that is only peripherally interested in laboring bodies. Such bodies are only of interest to capital, as a ruling system, to the degree that they serve its primary function, which is the proliferation of itself in its fully immanent form as abstract code.

Capitalism, in this sense, is less a system of acts per se (i.e. getting people to do things) than a system of ontological fantasy. Working at the level of the unconscious, capitalism inducts its subjects into a state of infinitely deferred belonging. Of course, one cannot belong to an abstract system of code, but as Deleuze (1997) points out in *Postscript on the Society of Control*, late stage capitalism operates by promising social inclusion for anyone who is a successful capitalist, an entrepreneur, a hard worker, a competent functionary, and so on. The codes and instructions for how to belong to society are perpetuated and disseminated across the social through the mass media, the schools, the family and the political systems as simply normative modes of living. This means that subjects under capitalism do not consciously know that they are carrying out instructions, since as R.D. Laing (1971) has pointed out, "one instruction is not to think that one is instructed" (p. 79). We might note that this is a classic technique in hypnosis.

As a clinical hypnotist, I am aware that a suggestion can be given that instructs someone to experience an event, memory or sensation and simultaneously to forget they have been told to have the experience. The person under hypnosis has the experience, but does not know where it came from or that it was an instruction. Indeed, often the hypnotist will offer suggestions indirectly in such a way as to avoid any possible resistance. This is accomplished by offering multiple suggested experiences. The choice between experiences appears to give control to the hypnotized person. However whatever choice is made is still within the selection chosen by the hypnotist. One can even offer the possibility of resisting the instruction of the hypnotist, but in resisting, the hypnotized person is inadvertently following instructions without realizing it.

The parallels with the faux choices provided to consumers, in terms of commodities, lifestyles and political systems under late stage capital are extensive. Capitalism in this sense functions as system of trance. It instructs its subjects in how to behave, while simultaneously successfully suggesting to them that

such behavior is their idea. It follows the same logic of the hypnotist in offering a proliferating array of options premised in the subject's own libidinal desire. In this sense, capitalism inducts or captures its subjects through holding open and infinitely deferring libidinal investment. It codes all materialist desire into its own abstract code. It functions seamlessly as a state of trance equivalent to Pignarre and Stengers' (2011) sorcery, that is the "name for something that manages to produce a coincidence between enslavement, the putting into service, and subjection, the production of those who do freely what they are meant to do" (p. 45). In this sense, capitalism, like hypnosis, operates on the border between conscious and unconscious desire. In short, capitalism functions as a social preconscious filtering all desire into a singular abstract code, mining the unconscious as it emerges into consciousness.

This is facilitated by the nature of the unconscious, which in the work of the clinical hypnotist is a rich field of resource to be turned towards any struggle or limit to the creative force of the subject. For capitalism, it is a similarly rich field, but a field to be psychically stripped and codified to its own ends. In our current age, the advent of what Baudrillard (1981) calls "homo cyberneticus" (p. 100) engages what Marx (1978a) presciently described as human consciousness embedded as a node of connection in a network of global machinery. The world of cyborg form places us deep within a literal machinic unconscious that holds all of the revolutionary force of the unconscious and all the amplified possibilities of capitalist sorcery. It is not a battle that can be engaged at a fully conscious level. The struggle is, as it always was, centered on the battle for the libidinal force of the uncoded; the not yet of what could become. To beat the sorcerer one must have a strong sense of a countervailing state of trance, one powerful enough to awaken the imagination and to oppose any flattening, homogenizing or foreclosing of the heterogeneous creative force of the unconscious.

Building a Counter-Trance

How might we engage such a struggle? We might begin by remembering Marx's (1978b) contention that, "for the communist, it is a question of revolutionizing the existing world, of practically attacking

and changing existing things" (p. 169). Such existing things are not composed of idealistic or universal elements but are the productions of an ever changing and shifting field of composition and production. Consciousness and, so I would argue, the production of the unconscious, are composed precisely in this way.[3] Marx (1978b) tells us in the German ideology that "we find that man has consciousness but … not inherent, not 'pure' consciousness." There is no consciousness for Marx that stands outside the realm of production. Consciousness is founded in the mode of production in any given historical period and holds a close relation with language, both of which, Marx (1978b) notes, "arise from the need, the necessity, of intercourse with other[s]" (p.158). Consciousness is "therefore, from the very beginning, a social product, and remains so as long as men exist at all" (p. 158). Consciousness as social production, then, also experiences the same contradictions and antagonisms as other elements of material production when subjected to capitalist divisions of labor and the imposition of the regimens of private property.

It is in the encounter with the historical contradictions and social antagonisms of capitalism that European theorists develop their unique and peculiar configuration of the unconscious. Specifically, in the creation of the unconscious as a space of thwarted desire, repressed memory or frustrated drives; a space of lack.[4] However, none of these projects, in their attempts to account for the unconscious as a space of social production, meet the criterion laid by Marx for a communist accounting of consciousness.

Consciousness, in my reading of Marx (1978) in *The German Ideology*, is not bifurcated. Consciousness only becomes bifurcated as result of social contradictions and antagonisms. Consciousness in all its forms is socially produced and actually existing. The division between the conscious and unconscious in European thought is essentially a division of labor produced under particular historical conditions. Such division is initiated in the first division of labor between material and mental labor. This initial division Marx tells us leads to the severing of consciousness from existing practice and opens its capacity to be fully representational and symbolic. In another term, consciousness is opened to the realm of the transcendent. This is a complicated moment in Marx, because

---

[3] See Marx (1978b, p. 158, footnote 4): "Men have history because they must *produce* their life, and because they must produce it moreover in a certain way: this is determined by their physical organization: their consciousness is determined in just the same way."

[4] Of course, Freud (1963) did mark the unconscious as a space of infinite resource and production. Both Lacan (2007) and Jung (1996) made valiant efforts to create the unconscious as a collectivity or productive common.

as we have noted, he has suggested earlier that language and consciousness are not one and the same:

> Language is as old as consciousness, language is practical consciousness that exists also for other men, and for that reason alone it really exists for me personally as well; language *like* consciousness only arises from the need, the necessity of intercourse with other men. (p. 158, emphasis added)

It is clear that while language and consciousness are related, they are not the same. Language has a functional relation in carrying out the tasks of consciousness, but while it is *like* consciousness, it is not consciousness. What is at stake in distinguishing consciousness from language is whether or not consciousness, in all its forms, is representational or symbolic, or if language, representation and the symbolic hold a functional but separate relation. This is important for us in challenging the sorcery of capitalism, which functions thoroughly in the realm of representation, symbolism and code. If we can go beyond the traditional psychoanalytic construction of the unconscious as founded in code, representation or the symbolic, then we might be able to conceive of the unconscious (and consciousness generally) as having a surplus that functions beyond the reach of capitalist coding and appropriation.

To propose a logic of surplus is to step aside from dialectical constructions of both history and consciousness. Instead, we engage the immanentist politics of force where that which capital would appropriate to its own ends constantly overflows any attempt to contain it. It is the moment in Hardt and Negri (2003) where they rewrite Foucault to suggest that resistance precedes domination, because the act of domination is one of attempting to contain and control creative force. Resistance arises simultaneously with domination in the same way water resists being dammed. To call such a moment resistance, is perhaps to give forces of domination too much credit. It is not life that pushes back against capitalism, but as Hardt and Negri (2003) point out, capitalism that must constantly reconfigure itself to contain the infinite productions of life. It is, in this sense, capitalism that is resisting life, not the other way around.

The implication of this is that there is an important distinction to be made between the mode of production and the forces of domination that operate within any given historical period. Too often, we conflate the two when we conceive of modes of liberation, rebellion or revolt. There is of course, a perverse productive relation between what is produced and modes of appropriation and exploitation. Just as the prisoner is infinitely creative in exploring physical, emotional and psychological modes of escape and flight in response to being incarcerated, so the prison in all its modes constantly finds new innovations responsive to the prisoner's efforts. When we frame the question of liberation in these terms, we inadvertently draw the field of production into a binary relation of mutual causality that, at times, may appear to be a homeostatic relation.

While some portion of the social field is precisely founded in this binary relation, I would argue there is a much richer and complex field of production that operates irrespective of the mode of domination. It is this field that we might term the proper mode of production. If we are to explore the question of surplus outside the axiomatics of capitalism, this aspect of the social needs to be radically scissioned from the mode of domination.

To be clear, the rich multiplicity of micro-activities that produces any given mode of production precedes any mode of rule that will seek to dominate, appropriate and control it. The rich common of creative life force will continue to produce itself in every historical period. While some portion of this activity will be responsive to the threats of the mode of domination, this is a small part of the infinite contingent and aleatory field of living production.

When we theorize our politics as holding a primary relation to the antagonisms and contradictions inherent in our relation with the mode of domination we run the risk of losing sight of the actual conditions of production. This is not to say that we can ignore the brutal effects of capitalism on our lives and on the lives of all things on earth. It is to say, instead, that it is important to remember that capitalism is not life, but gives life orders.[5] We, on the other hand, are life and stand in common with all living things. The function of capitalist axiomatics, like those of the church and the monarchy before them, is to convince us that our world is comprised outside of ourselves in hierarchical realms of Gods, Kings and money. Perhaps we might read Deleuze's (1997) assertion that our belief in the world has been taken from us in precisely this way. To believe in the world is to act upon the productions of life, as thought and act. Deleuze goes on to say, "If you believe in the world you precipitate events, however inconspicuous, that elude control, you engender new space-times, however small their surface or volume" (p. 176).

---

[5] With apologies to Deleuze and Guattari (1987).

To precipitate an onslaught of events and micro-events, in a mode of consciousness powerful enough to elude capture by the axiomatics of capitalist sorcery, may well require that we recover all elements of our consciousness as components of our common force together. For this to become a possibility we might well make an effort to think the modes of our consciousness in terms of their actuality. Deleuze and Guattari, following Foucault (1991), define the actual as "not what we are but, rather, what we become, what we are in the process of becoming" (p. 112). The force of our actual consciousness, then, is not primarily in its ability to factually comprehend the world. It is in its ability to *produce* the world; that is, consciousness as pure production. Such a becoming consciousness is not subject to the historical bifurcation into conscious and unconscious, nor is it limited to the sphere of the symbolic. It cannot be contained within the limited sphere of the individual or self, those historical artifacts that are already passing into the long and dead history of dominant axiomatics.

Our consciousness is determined, as Marx (1987b) noted, by the way in which we produce our life. In this, we are life itself and cannot reasonably be separated from it, except through dominant definitions of a transcendent outside. Indeed, we might well restate Marx by saying that our consciousness is determined by the way that life produces life. That is to say, as a thoroughly immanent system of production that, as we have noted, both precedes and overflows any attempt to contain it.

In another vernacular we might well describe this as libidinal force, which Deleuze and Guattari (1983) tell us is fundamental to bringing revolutionary potential to fruition. It is specifically "the efficacy of a libidinal break at a precise moment" (p. 378). Such a break opens a field whose sole "cause is desire" (p. 378). In this moment, history is rewritten "on a level with the real" (p. 378), opening infinite possibilities of action and multitudinous enunciations. Deleuze and Guattari tell us that it is specifically uncoded, or one might even say pre-coded desire, that undermines capitalism. To access such libidinal force and "the new irruption of desire" (p. 378), we need to produce far more permeable boundaries between what we have come to know as the conscious and unconscious.

This, of course, is not news to the minoritarian multitude comprised of all the bodies that are constitutively at odds with the ideological force of dominant consciousness, such as aboriginal healers, shamans, witches, sages, artists, dreamers, musicians, and poets. Those bodies whose revolutionary vision and wisdom was cast aside in the rush to modernity by psychology and Marxism.

This is not to valorize such alternate modes of knowledge over reason, rationality or science. It is to suggest that any hegemonic force that precludes the production of desire through a savage clearing of the landscape of possible consciousness is fascistic at its core. To engage the possibility of living counter to fascism, according to Foucault (1983), it is necessary to "withdraw allegiance from the old categories of the Negative (law, limit, castration, lack, lacuna) which Western thought has so long held sacred as a form of power and an access to reality" (p. xiii). If, as we have noted, capitalist ideology is premised in the "old categories of the Negative," precisely as they construct the relation between the constructs of the conscious and unconscious, then an alternative spell that breaks the sorcery of capital would hold all modes of knowing to the same standard. Such an incantation would reconfigure science through opening reason and rationality on a plane of immanent desire. In fact, Spinoza has already sketched the diagram for us here. While other minoritarian forms already breach the divide between forms of consciousness, their revolutionary force lies in their capacity to step aside from forms of the Negative as well. The breach is founded in desire not lack. As Deleuze and Guattari (1983) remind us, "revolutionaries often forget, or do not like to recognize, that one wants and makes revolution out of desire, not duty" (p. 344).

One cannot challenge sorcery as a matter of duty. Such a stance merely trades one sorcerer for another. Instead, to break the spell one must come to understand that our desire is not derived from the realm of the social or economic. The social and economic are derived from our desire. Our desire is not composed of codes, symbols and representation, but is the ground out of which their very nature is derived. Our conscious and unconscious are not binary formations but mutually productive machinic sites of infinite production driven by libidinal force and creative desire. To break the spell we must turn ideology on its feet and cease to produce it as an outside. Like the shaman we must willingly engage the trance from the inside and through the force of our desire open it back onto the realm of life itself.

References

Augustinos, M. (1999). Ideology, false consciousness and psychology. *Theory and Psychology*, *9*(3), 295-312.

Baudrillard, J. (1981). *A critique of the political economy of the sign*. New York: Telos Press.

Deleuze G. (1997). *Negotiations*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze G., & Guattari, F. (1991). *What is philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *Thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Freud, S. (1963). *General psychological theory: Papers on metapsychology*. New York: Collier.

Guattari, F. (2010). *The machinic unconscious: Essays in schizoanalysis*. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism. NY:* Verso.

Jung, C. G. (1996). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lacan, J. (2007). *Ecrits*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Laing, R. D. (1971). *Politics of the family and other essays*. London: Tavistock Press.

Marx, K. (1978a). Grundrisse. In Robert Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engles Reader* (pp. 221-293). New York: Norton.

Marx, K. (1978b). The German Ideology Part One. In R. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader* (pp. 146-202). New York: Norton.

Pignarre, P., & Stengers, E. (2011). *Capitalist sorcery: Breaking the spell*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Spinoza, B. (2007). *Theological-political treatise*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

On Violence Governed by the Imaginary Ideological Order of Property

Mario Orozco Guzmán
Faculty of Psychology, Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, Mexico

Abstract. *This paper makes some reflection efforts about ways in which one ideology turns into violence, a violence that finds its justification on the standstill of the meaning of propriety. This violence can be found under allegations of ownership, duty, and power and/or in the name of what is considered to be fair or true. The consequences of these ideologies can be translated in different acts such as: acts of war, violence against civil population and violence against women and children.*

Keywords: violence, ideology, property.

Perhaps positing ideology as rooted predominantly in the imaginary order entails an equivocal slip. The growing, even overwhelming tide of violence invites us to ponder inscribing ideology in reality. In the case of the ideology of property, Mao Tse-tung situates ideology, understood in its immutable state, in the forefront of the sociohistorical transformations of the world:

> In China, the metaphysical mode of thought expressed in the adage, "The sky does not change, nor does the path", was long upheld by the decadent, dominant feudal classes. (1977, p. 36)

Following Mao's ideas, one could argue that ideology lags behind, or anticipates, that which properly speaking is the order of the event which it contradicts. In contrast, Wilhelm Reich (1973) holds that in order for an ideology to influence the economic process it "must first be transformed into a material power" (p. 29); that is, it is indispensable that it first becomes discursive material.

Muchembled (2010) points out that domestic violence began to increase from the 17th century. Excesses committed within the family became more visible as institutionalized vigilance on the part of a community's inhabitants became more acute. But towards the 18th century with "the development of a mercantile capitalist economy" there appeared "uncontrollable outbreaks of robberies in order to survive" (p. 297). Homicidal violence became more and more "domestic" as the horizon of crimes against property continued to widen. It was to these historical-social foundations that Engels turned when he posited his delimitation of the modern family as, citing Marx, a function of the nucleus of servitude that it contains; thus:

> This form of family signals the transition from collective marriage to monogamy. To assure the woman's fidelity and, therefore, the paternity of the children, she is turned over without reserve to the power of the man: when he kills her, he is doing nothing more than exercising his right. (Engels, 1976a, p. 247)

In this way, the violent homicidal act of killing the woman is presented as the exercising of a right of male power. It is an exaltation of a right over the ruins of the overthrown maternal right as "the great defeat of the female sex the world over" (p. 246). Given that it is impossible to guarantee fidelity, the act of femicide is, therefore, always more or less latent and guarded within a right that authorizes and even legitimizes it in advance.

Although property is a concept subsidiary to those of production and work, it tends to ensconce itself in an ideology in which the registers of the imaginary and the real are intertwined. We might say that the imaginary is realized in a powerful but porous manner. It is realized *violently*. This is the warning found in Proudhon's (1973) musings concerning God in relation to human production and appropriation:

> But man, after having created a God in his image, wished to appropriate it; not content with disfiguring the Supreme Being, he treated it as his patrimony, his property, his thing. God, represented in monstrous forms, came to be in all places property of man and the State. This was the origin of the corruption of customs by religion and the source of religious hatreds and sacred wars. (p. 29).

What transpired was that human beings had invested in God as a narcissistic property; as proof of their supremacy over the world. There could be no other representation of God distinct from that held by men.

The studies conducted by Michel Wieviorka (2005) on the relation between violence and loss of meaning have led him back to the question of ideology, which makes it possible to join the meaning to the act through discourse as material power. The experience of terrorism reveals these links between ideological production and violence:

> The discourse of the protagonists of violence, principally in certain political experiences, may also be draped with the appearance of an abundant, even super-abundant, ideological production, to the point that it takes on the aspect of a logorrhea. Ideology, then, constitutes the justification of acts consummated, or yet to occur, whether its priority seems to be destined to convince one's own – i.e. those in whose name the actor speaks – or to perturb or weaken the enemy. In this case, discourse is expressed without having to suffer the test of the real… Here, the actor constitutes himself in the movement itself, in his discursive production, and in his practice of violence; it thus pretends, simultaneously, to utter that which is true and just, and to put his thought into action; undifferentially conjugating power with knowledge. (p. 229).

Crimes committed as a function of a legitimate right are the correlate of crimes of duty; of crimes sealed with a supreme sense of obedience. Crimes of duty may subscribe to Hannah Arendt's thesis concerning the banality of the evil cultivated by the extreme violence of the Nazis. According to Arendt, this violence corresponds to a culture of obedience, of the most abject submission to authority, accompanied by a process of devaluing the victim that allows a psychological justification and validation of the cruelty. The executor of the act buries the condition of being a subject by reducing himself to an instrument of destruction. In its edition of July 19 2012, the daily Mexican newspaper *La Jornada* published a photograph that bore the following caption: "Most Wanted Nazi Criminal Detained". The image refers to the capture in Budapest of the former chief of the Nazi police, Laszlo Csatary, who was responsible for deporting almost 16,000 Jews during World War II. The text that accompanies the photo narrates how Csatary rejected all the accusations against him by arguing that "[he] only followed orders and fulfilled his obligation"; therefore, no guilt or responsibility could accrue to someone who simply assumed the condition of a mechanical apparatus as the nucleus of their individualism. As Marcuse points out: "I, the individual person, am but the instrument. And in no moral sense can an instrument be responsible or find itself in a state of guilt" (1978, p. 121).

Raúl Páramo-Ortega (2006) has ventured, in a surprising fashion, into the analysis and elucidation of the violence sustained by "eluding responsibilities… always with an alibi at hand" (p. 31). To illustrate what he calls the psychopathology of the conscience, or the superego, he cites the alibi that Lieutenant William Calley supposedly used to justify the massacres of civilians during the Vietnam War. He says he never killed a single human being. He says he acted in the name of his fatherland, the United States of North America. Those that were annihilated were not children and women, but an ideology, that of communism. And he culminated his discourse by exempting himself of all guilt, alleging that, "I obeyed orders. That's what the army is for" (p. 32). Páramo-Ortega stresses "that an ideology can blind those who are inside it" (p. 34) to such an extent that they become capable of extinguishing the lives of those who do not share that ideology and exalt their acts as an exercise in fulfilling one's duty to the supreme authority. The joy of fulfilling a duty and commitment to an authority, the joy of obedience, simply overwhelms any sense of responsibility for an act that destroys the life of another human being. And this alibi is monolithic, for it is inscribed in an ideology that sustains and legitimizes this violence as heroic and sublime because it is directed, not against human beings, but against another ideology which is considered an emblem of evil.

It is this ideology of obedience and submission to authority that absorbs and suppresses all ethical orders of responsibility and guilt. If men believe that they have the right to kill women, it is because this belief corresponds to an equivalent ideology. There is a worldview in play here that entails conclusive judgments and leads to the commission of acts of violence. This is affirmed by the novelist Isabel Custodio (2008) in her recent literary work entitled *La Tiznada*: *"El feminismo nunca mató a nadie… El machismo mata todos los días"* (*Screwed: "Feminism Never*

Killed Anyone… Machismo Kills Every Day"), which argues that, as a worldview, machismo presupposes this process of the devaluation of the victim and leads those who sustain this discourse to assume that what they say is true and just. Engels (1962) holds that "Each new advance of civilization is at the same time a new advance of inequality" (p. 129). What progresses is the society of opulence. But economic inequality becomes more acute and the "code of enlightened patriarchal despotism" (Engels, 1962, p. 102) endures for long stretches of time. Machismo reproduces patriarchal despotism, though not necessarily of the more enlightened kind. And even the most illustrated or enlightened succumb before it, though what it purveys is a conception of the world marked by paradox: that of situating women as both a good to be possessed and dominated, and as something that must be alienated in order to be desired.

The march of civilization towards monogamy mirrors the reinforcement of the inequality of the sexes: "In the family the man is the bourgeois; the woman represents in her person the proletariat" (Engels, 1976a, p. 261). Monogamy is a recourse that emerges due to economic motivations; to assure the transmission of the wealth that is concentrated in the hands of the man. Hence, it is only monogamy for the women, which is why one of the first forms of ideology, as "an attempt to order the world" (Moreau, 1980, p. 15), a positing of the power of the dominant class as the dominant ideology, is precisely matrimonial monogamy. If the class struggle is reproduced in the bosom of the bourgeois family through the asymmetry of the sexes in relation to power then, since Freud, it is also the stage upon which the battle between love and culture is played out. Love does not tolerate the limitation that culture imposes upon it, because this consists, fundamentally, in possession of a narcissistic order. Woman, bearer of the banner of the cause of love, is also girded with the ideal of family integration. The ideology of integration and family integrity becomes mythologized in the figure of the woman-mother. And although woman sees herself, in Freud's words, "pushed to a second plane by the exigencies of culture, and enters into a relation of hostility to herself" (1929, p. 101), yet she represents the family values of cohesion and attachment. But this does not impede monogamy from unfolding under the contradiction identified by Engels:

> By the side of her husband, who brightens her existence with heterism, we find the woman abandoned… Together with monogamy there appeared two social figures, constant and characteristic [but] unknown up to that time: the permanent lover of the woman and the cuck-

olded husband… Adultery, prohibited and rigorously punished, but indestructible, emerged as an irremediable institution, side-by-side with monogamy and heterism" (1976a, p. 255).

But there is yet another assiduous companion of bourgeois monogamy: *feminicide*, sustained, as we stated above, by an ideology that legitimizes, validates and encourages it.

Violence against women personifies an ideology that authorizes and even impels it: for example, natalist ideology and Christian convictions concerned with the duties of spouses, as posited by Sara Matthews-Grieco (2005, p. 193), were the impetus for the massacre of women and mothers up to the early 18th century. But, above all, it is rape committed with impunity that best demonstrates the ideological circuit that justifies it: "rape was the product of a culture in which women were considered not only inferior to men, but also, quite simply, as present on earth for the sole purpose of satisfying the needs of the stronger sex, especially those of modest social status" (Matthews-Grieco, 2005, p. 199). This author also points out that, to our surprise, throughout the Ancien Régime the legal conception of rape classified this act as robbery, as a crime against property! Acts are codified according to the economic conditions upon which a historically determined society and epoch are founded: "sexual violence is understood, above all, in relation to sequestering and the damage done with respect to the owner. The act was thus doubly typified: by the status of the possessor [and] by the perversity of the theft, which sum up two of the basic aspects of rape in the Ancien Régime" (Vigarello, 1998, p. 81). What we wish to formulate is that if any one act of violence captures the sense of an assault against the property, goods, or rights of another, or against that which one considers one's own, it is the act that takes women as objects.

This was true to such an extent that Freud himself discovered that there existed a kind of amorous choice based upon the condition that the woman desired should be someone "over whom another man could pretend rights of property in his condition as husband, fiancé or friend" (Freud, 1910, p. 160). In this case, desire is fostered because what is in play is a woman who belongs to another. Clinical psychoanalysis has gathered testimonies of the erotic dalliances and affairs of men that effectively reveal this discourse, as the material power of ideology, of the "injured third party".

Though this might well appear to be false consciousness, a consciousness that infatuates and deceives, the ideology that underpins violence is ascribed to a position of certainty, one that sustains a just and true utterance that does not require, in any sense, proof of the real. This is what Lacan (1990) proposes as the insensibility of delirium:

> [They] must train themselves to find that delirious certainty wherever it may be. Then they shall discover, for example, the difference that exists between the phenomenon of jealousy when it occurs in a normal subject and when it presents itself in a delirious one. There is no need to evoke in detail that which is humorous, even comical, in jealousy of the normal kind that, if you will, rejects certainty with full naturalness, regardless of the realities presented to it. It is the well-known story of the jealous man who follows his wife to the very door of the room where she is with the other. This contrasts sufficiently with the fact that the delirious one, in turn, exempts himself from all reference to the real. (p. 112)

Thus, ideology as certainty resolves that which Engels deemed the "grand cardinal problem of all philosophy, especially modern [philosophy]; the problem of the relation between thinking and being" (Engels, 1976b, p. 363). That which one thinks is what one is. And so if the grand macho thinks that his woman is cuckolding him he has no need to follow her to the room where she might be holed up with the other. Of this there is no doubt. And if he kills her it is because he believes he has the right – indeed, even the duty – to do so. His ideological rationality justifies his act beforehand, even exalts it, thus exempting him from all guilt: "a rational individual will always act such that he need never feel guilty, regardless of how things turn out" (Žižek, 2004, p. 79).

It is interesting that the phenomenon of jealousy is the keystone of an ideology that is posited with certainty, and as certainty, in relation to property; to such a degree, in fact, that it emphasizes the useful or utilitarian character of jealousy:

> In its origins, jealousy was not necessarily a phenomenon linked to love but, rather, a need that assured conditions of survival. Thanks to this, the man who had always considered the woman's body as his property could, in effect, defend himself from the risk of raising offspring that were not his. And, with respect to the woman, she secured for herself and her progeny food and security thanks to the man's jealousy. (Galimberti, 2011, p. 134)

By virtue of jealousy, then, bonds that went beyond a simple amorous commitment became established; bonds based on the protection of their properties, bonds that could ensure the permanence of a regime of dominion of the man over the woman, and of the mother over her children; a property regimen anchored, therefore, on the tornado of passion and, often, on the delirium of jealousy.

If the bourgeois family confers to the husband the right to kill his spouse, it likewise reaffirms the will of the absolute power of the mother over her children. And this discord –as Freud emphasized – between women and men is supported by the corresponding subrogation of the family and culture, of their reciprocal hostility. Women in the condition of mothers wish to retain their children against the demands of culture, which requires them to do so in order to extend its emancipatory units in the social field. The Medea complex (Depaulis, 2008) ratifies the ideology of the rights of the mother over the life of her children. To avenge the affront caused by the abandonment into which she has been thrown by a companion invested with the phallic statute, a mother may defend her right to kill his children. This is an extreme exercise of power, of the power to abandon after reaping the benefits of the property of the other, of having the other as property. Filicide is thus the tragic act that is the end result of this alienation in, and by, an ideology of absolute dominion over the other.

References

Custodio, I. (2008). *La tiznada*. Mexico: Planeta.

Depaulis, A. (2008). *Le complexe de Medée*. Bruxelles: Boeck

Engels, F. (1962). *Antidühring*. Mexico: Grijalbo

Engels, F. (1976a). *El origen de la familia, la propiedad privada y el estado*. Moscow: Progreso.

Engels, F. (1976b). *Ludwig Feuerbach y el fin de la filosofía clásica alemana*. Moscow: Progreso.

Freud, S. (1929). *El malestar en la cultura*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 2000.

Freud, S. (1910). *Sobre un tipo particular de elección de objeto en el hombre*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 2000.

Galimberti, U. (2011). *Qu'est-ce que l'amour?* Paris: Payot.

Lacan, J. (1990). *Las Psicosis*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Mao Tse-Tung (1977). *Cuatro tesis filosóficas*. Mexico: Ediciones de Cultura Popular.

Marcuse, H. (1984). *La agresividad en la sociedad industrial avanzada*. Madrid: Alianza.

Matthews-Grieco, S. (2005) *Corps et sexualité dans l'Europe d'Ancien Régime, en Histoire du corps*. Paris: Seuil.

Moreau, P.-F. (1980). *La ideología del progreso*. Mexico: La red de Jonás.

Muchembled, R. (2010). *Una historia de la violencia. Del final de la Edad Media a la actualidad*. Madrid: Paidós.

Páramo-Ortega, R. (2006). *El psicoanálisis y lo social. Ensayos Transversales*. Universitat de València: Valencia.

Proudhon, P.J. (1973). *¿Qué es la propiedad? Investigaciones sobre el principio del derecho y del gobierno*. Buenos Aires: Proyección.

Reich, W. (1973). *Psicología de masas del fascismo*. Mexico: Roca.

Vigarello, G. (1998). *Historia de la violación. Siglos XVI-XX*. Madrid: Cátedra, Feminismos

Wieviorka, M. (2005). *La Violence*. Paris: Hachette.

Žižek, S. (2004). *Violencia en acto: Conferencias en Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

The Feminization of Labor and the DSM-5

Kathleen S.G. Skott-Myhre
University of West Georgia, United States

Abstract. *In the recently published iteration of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, there is a new mood disorder called Premenstrual Dysphoric Disorder. This paper will argue that this diagnosis is closely related to what has been called the feminization of labor and represents an ideological form of warfare on women's bodies. The paper will argue that under the current mode of production, such an attack is not designed to dismiss the force of the female body (as was so often the case under industrial capitalism) but to discipline and shape the affective force of women's sociability to the desires of new modes of immaterial production. Finally, it will argue for a "minor" psychology in response to such trends.*

Keywords: Labor, Women, DSM, Diagnosis, Psychology.

There is little doubt that the social and economic relations of late stage capitalism have entered a highly contentious and unsettled transition. The specifics, the scope, and the exact nature of this transition are both opaque and a question of considerable debate. However, the fact that modes of production, revolution, resistance, oppression, exploitation, and dominance are, at the very least, in flux seems self-evident. The precise nature of the crisis may be unclear, but the fact that it has spawned brutal repression, movements of liberation, flows of people, different modes of labor, and networks of international capitalist rule and revolutionary dissent, is not. I would assert that the crisis is manifest in the currently ongoing global warfare and insurrectionary struggle across the face of the planet.

This struggle is profoundly multi-faceted and affects us all, to varying degrees, in both common and divergent ways. For my purposes here, I would specifically like to address a shift in a particular mode of domination that is designed to affect women. As a feminist psychologist who has spent my career working with women who struggle to survive under the dual and largely integrated rule of capitalism and patriarchy, there are two trends that trouble me deeply. The first is what has been called the "feminization of labor" (Hardt & Negri, 2011) and the second is the complicit role of psychiatry and psychology in this process. Before I engage in the particulars, let me make some general comments about the political stakes for women under the current regime of late stage global capitalism.

In her book, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation,* Silvia Federici (2004) discusses the debates within the feminist movement concerning the roots of women's oppression and what sort of political strategies might be appropriate to achieve liberation. She discusses two basic positions, neither of which she finds adequate in theorizing the social and economic exploitation of women. The first is the position of what she calls the "radical feminists"; the second is the position of what she calls the "socialist feminists". She argues that that the radical feminists miss the mark because they focus on sexual discrimination and patriarchal rule, but do not look at class and social relations.

The socialist feminists do recognize that there is a history of women that cannot be separated from the history of systems of exploitation and they give priority to women as workers but, she suggests, they do not look at the sphere of reproduction as a source of value creation and exploitation. The socialist feminists look at women as workers in the classic sense as in factories and in workplaces, but they do not look at the sphere of reproduction.

Federici turns her attention to the idea that women's exploitation has been a key factor in capitalist accumulation, as women have been the producers and reproducers of labor power. Following Mariarosa Dalla Costa, Federici claims that "women's unpaid labor in the home has been the pillar upon which the exploitation of the waged workers, 'waged slavery,' has been built, and it's the secret of its productivity" (p. 8). Marx (1978), in *The German Ideology*, also famously asserts that the origins of all forms of slavery and property can be found in the division of labor in the family, "property: the nucleus, the first form, of which lies in the family, where wife and children are the slaves of the husband. This latent slavery in the family, though still very crude, is the first property, but even at this early stage it corresponds perfectly to the definition of modern economists who call it the power of disposing of the labor-power of others" (p.159).

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2011) articulate this relationship between gendered servitude and private property under the current mode of production as the feminization of work. The feminization of work is defined as the expansion of those affective, relational, and emotional tasks that are traditionally carried out by women throughout the work force. They argue that the economic distinction between productive and reproductive work is eroding and that greater weight than ever is falling on women across the globe. Women are expected to carry out emotional tasks both on the job and in the home, to "tend to hurt feelings, knit social relationships and generally perform care and nurturing" (p. 134).

This expansion of the labor of women, both in terms of the number of women in the waged labor market and the collapse of temporal distinction between private and waged time, has had an enormous effect on the ways in which women manage their daily lives. In particular, this shift has been profound for women dependent on waged labor for sustenance and survival. It has encompassed a diverse array of social sectors and classes from women involved in migrant labor, manufacturing, domestic work, and elder care to "professional women" in managerial roles within corporate structures. This transition is premised on the betrayals of women's liberation movements in which the struggles of women for economic parity and social justice were transmuted by capital into the necessity to integrate them into the waged labor force at lower wage scales.

The entry of women into the workforce has done little to modify the fundamental division of labor in the family described by Marx. In spite of drives for wages for housework by Dalla Costa and James (1975) and others, the secret labor of women remains very much that. This is not to say that there has been no debate about the degree to which men should be involved in the management of the domestic sphere, but the fundamental colonial relation of capital to social reproduction remains obscured. Federici (2004) argues that this relation is a question of the way in which women's unpaid labor in the home is largely responsible for the reproduction of physical workers both in terms of social and cultural function and literal birth. She says that the power differential between men and women in capitalist society cannot be attributed to the irrelevance of housework for capitalist accumulation. An irrelevance which isn't irrelevant because of all the rules, laws, strictures and disciplining that go into trying to control women's reproductive rights, women's control of their bodies and how women raise children.

In our book, *Writing the Family: Women, Autoethnography and Family Work* (Skott-Myhre, Weima & Gibbs, 2012), Korinne Weima discusses what Donzelot termed the psy-complex. She delineates how talk shows and psychology play a role in taking over the private sphere and turning women into the disciplinarians of children on behalf of society. She argues that this can be seen in the juxtaposition of the incompetent single mother who is responsible for producing the criminals and delinquents and the successful soccer mom who is responsible for producing the lawful and the virtuous. All of these icons that have to do with being representative of the morality of the society and the morality of the state fall largely on women as parents.

The expansion of the private sphere through appropriating mothers as instruments of the state, in terms of moral and psychological hygiene, has metastasized under the new modes of production promoted and exploited by postmodern global capitalism. In this historical moment, both Michel Foucault (1995) and Gilles Deleuze (1995) tell us that the traditional disciplinary enclosures of modernity (the factory, the home, and the workplace) open up and begin to spread across the field of the social.

An example of such an enclosure of modernity spreading in this way can be found in the mental hospital. The mental hospital is, at first, an enclosed asylum for people living within. With the shift from industrial capitalism to global cyber-capitalism the old style asylums are closed and madness is spread across the face of society and called liberation. In reality what happens is that more people begin to be included

in the category of madness. We are then able to diagnose more people and give a greater number of people medications. So, indeed, there are still asylums, but they are driven by the needs of investors and are increasingly flexible in both intention and duration. What has happened is that the space of the asylum as a disciplinary enclosure has actually become a global state in which *everyone* is now in the asylum and *everyone* is a profit center for the pharmaceutical industries and corporately managed health care.

Correspondingly, the enclosed spaces of social reproduction in the home, in which women have always undertaken unpaid labor, opens up and its functions are spread across all sectors of society. Now, the management of affect, reproductive rights, bodies, and birth control cease to be a private affair (to the degree that it ever was a purely private affair) that happens in the home under the control of women. Instead it is now found everywhere as a sphere of capitalist exploitation, appropriation, and discipline. Of note is the relation of the asylum and the home as parallel sites of moral and psychological hygiene whose functions and functionaries are distributed across the social. What Foucault (1995) would call the social diagrams of the asylum and of the home are increasingly taken up by corporate structures and their marketing instruments. The affectual resonance of the fast food restaurant or chain motel is marketed as both a safe haven from the world (a home) and as a space of psychological respite where parents and children can come together in a morally and physically hygienic space (an asylum).

Not surprisingly, the predominant figure in the advertisements presented as most nurturing and caring in these mythical portrayals of capitalist paradise are women of childbearing age. Absent from the marketing of women as caregivers for everyone's family are those that Federici (2004) notes as "the heretic, the healer, the disobedient wife, the woman who dared to live alone, the obeha woman who poisoned the master's food and inspired the slaves to revolt" (p. 11). Women like these – who do not carry out their assigned affectual, emotional, and relationship tasks – are, as Hardt and Negri (2011) note, portrayed as "a kind of monster" (p. 134).

And who are the monsters? Federici (2004) notes attacks on migrant workers and the return of "witch hunting" in Central and South America as well as in Africa. She asks, "Why after 500 years of capitalist rule at the beginning of the third millennium are workers on a mass scale still defined as paupers, witches and outlaws?" (p. 11). Even in this period of the 21st century where we are moving to supposedly

immaterial labor, the populations that are most threatened are, once again, those who are poor and women. For evidence, one needs only to look at the Republican agenda in the United States and the legal attacks on reproductive rights and freedom from rape. In her analysis of this phenomenon, Federici (2004) draws a parallel between the social function of the witch-hunt in the transition from feudalism to capitalism and contemporary assaults on women:

> It is generally agreed that that the witch-hunt aimed at destroying the control that women had exercised over their reproductive function and served to pave the way for the development of a more oppressive patriarchal regime. It is also argued that the witch-hunt was rooted in the social transformations that accompanied the rise of capitalism. But the specific historical circumstances under which the persecution of witches was unleashed, and the reasons why the rise of capitalism demanded a genocidal attack on women have not been investigated. (p. 14)

In our own historical period, the phenomenon of the witch-hunt, in either the literal sense or as in the media frenzies over various permutations of incompetent or bad mothering, includes shows like *The Nanny* and portrayals of neonaticide and filicide. Undeniably, the monstrous mother who kills her children is not as uncommon as we are told by reporter Trish Mahaffey in a newspaper article in 2010 (Mahaffey, 2010). Portrayals of women as insensitive and callous casual consumers of abortion are commonplace in North America with a recent meme showing feminist Gloria Steinem grinning and wearing an "I Had an Abortion" T-shirt, without any acknowledgment of the documentary film context surrounding the photo. Clearly, monsters and witches are on the rise.

Why is there this attack on women's emotions, on reproductive rights, and on sexual protections from rape and sexual assault? Why is there a rise in attacks on witches in the developing parts of the world and why is there a new genocidal attack on women in various forms around the world?

We might well argue that it is directly related to the desire to control the affective force of women as they enter into broader participation in the waged world economy. Federici (2004) argues that "the persecution of witches (like the slave trade and the enclosures) was a central aspect of the accumulation and formation of the modern proletariat" (p. 14). Likewise, and in this current period, women are responsible for producing a new kind of worker and a new form of proletariat. In this sense, women remain cen-

tral to the social reproduction of both physical workers as well as the social roles those workers will inherit. Clearly then, "Reproduction remains a crucial ground of struggle for women" (p. 14).

The ways in which this role has been disciplined and managed across various economic and social systems include mechanisms such as a rank ordering of human faculties and the conception of the body as a site of perversity and danger. Women's bodies and affects remain highly suspect and in need of remediation and discipline. If the current deployment of women across the world of waged labor includes, as Hardt and Negri (2011) propose, an expanded role for the traditional role of nurturer and caregiver, then what are the mechanisms to control and channel this set of functions? If women are released from the confines of the home, in what ways can this newly released affective labor be exploited?

We can see examples of this across the corporate environment with the expansion of social skills training and affective management. It's no longer just a matter of the production of goods and services, but literally the production of social relations. Social networking, for example, or the importance of teams at work and that it is necessary to take courses in anger management: all these previous functions that were once relegated to the home or the psychologist's office now arrive at the workplace. Workers now have to manage their feelings; learning how to be happy at work becomes part of your "job" and part of your evaluation. It doesn't matter how well you run a machine as long as you are a "team player", have good social skills and can effectively communicate. Moreover, the management of this falls increasingly to women both at the level of the shop floor and in middle management within Human Resource departments.

If affective labor becomes a central part of waged labor then it is not a big leap to assume that the pharmaceutical companies and their clinical allies in psychiatry and psychology will not be far behind. If historical precedent is followed, we can assume that it will be women and the poor that will serve as guinea pigs for new diagnosis and treatments. For women this will undoubtedly include the discipline and management of the social reproduction role both at home and in the work place.

In the recently published iteration of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American psychiatric Association, there is a new mood disorder called Premenstrual Dysphoric Disorder. The fact that it has been moved out of Appendix B of the DSM-IV and developed into a full category has been a point of much controversy. The diagnosis includes a list of complaints, which include irritability or anger or increased interpersonal conflicts, marked anxiety, tension, and feelings of being "keyed up" or "on edge". In addition, there are symptoms that are associated with clinically significant distress or interferences with work, school, usual social activities or relationships with others (e.g. avoidance of social activities and decreased productivity or efficiency at work, school or home).

Of interest to us here are two components of this diagnosis: 1) the fact that it is aimed at women of childbearing age (potential mothers) and 2) that it pathologizes any affect that might interfere with work, school, usual social activities or relationships. These two aspects of the diagnosis intersect at the point of the feminine body. As Parker (2007) would point out, there is no consideration of the social genesis of these troublesome affects. The possibility that a woman living under the conditions we have been describing might experience some "irritability or anger or increased interpersonal conflicts, marked anxiety, tension, feelings of being 'keyed up' or 'on edge'" is eluded by the fact that this woman is having her period. This is a stunning reversion to the classic husbands-in-a-bar conversation about their wives' complaints – "well she's probably on the rag". Only, here we have a psychiatric diagnosis that takes this out of the domestic sphere and cynically acknowledges the new roles women play in work, school, social activities and multiple relationships. However, in order to be healthy a woman must sustain her primary role as a happy, nurturing caregiver, or, if that is not possible she must not let her dysphoria interfere with her job of social reproduction.

This kind of diagnosis reconfigures an old pattern in the relationship of psychiatry, psychology, psychoanalysis, and women. It is once again a new effort to silence the "heretic… the disobedient wife… the obeha woman who poisoned the master's food and inspired the slaves to revolt" (Federici 2004, p. 11). The question for me as a critical psychologist is how to challenge this narrative, how to proclaim my apostasy and disobedience and how to join with my sisters in calling for an end to the witch hunts and turn *psychology on its feet*. We must find the way to poison capitalism at the very source of its sustenance. Since we know that it is a parasitic system, then the very poison is our non-compliance and refusal to take on our new role of producing an even more brutal capitalist social. Instead, we must take on the healing ways of the obeha and inspire revolt and insurrection.

The relation of healing and poisoning can be at times a subtle and nuanced question of how ingredients are combined and administered. The same substance applied in one instance with a certain dosage can either lead to recovery or, with a different dosage, to death. The idiosyncratic corporeal strength or weakness of the patient must be taken into account and the dosage moderated accordingly. The unpredictable and contingent aspects of the combination between the organism and the administered substance have confounded both poisoners and healers across history. It is this complex set of relations that produces change and production as both unpredictable and unstable. The healer can become the poisoner both intentionally and unintentionally.

We might do well to heed the warning of Eugene Holland (2012) when he suggests that revolt and insurrection might best be thought of as the slow motion development of alternative forms of living rather than violent ruptures against the dominant form of governance. I would contend that this is particularly true of the role of women within the realm of social production.

The question of poisoning a parasite without damaging the host organism is a delicate matter. Capitalism and its ideological distributive mechanisms, such as psychology, function through producing a pseudo-symbiotic relation with the host. In the case of psychology, this is achieved through the assimilation of the actual mechanisms of social production traditionally carried out, as we have noted, by women. The functions of care, nurturance, and the inculcation of cultural habitus produced and sustained over millennia by women are appropriated by psychology and distributed back as a pseudo-mutual project.

In order for this to function, women must be assisted in coming to understand that they have always lacked competence in these areas and are in need of professional assistance. Certainly, psychology as a discipline has no on-the-ground experience with the actualities of women's day-to-day role in social production. The discipline is entirely reliant upon appropriating information about these processes by intruding into the living experience of women.[6] The point of access for such an intrusion, like all parasitic attachments, comes through a process of weakening the host. For women, the cultural parasite of psychology

weakens the host through inducing self-doubt and profound insecurity. We can see this in the long tradition of producing women's activities as the root of pathology in psychoanalytical and psychological theories and practices.

What is important for our discussion is that the cultural parasite of psychology feigns a healing function, when in fact its activities are toxic to the wellbeing of its host. The pseudo-symbiotic relationship induces the host to believe that there is a necessity for an ongoing engagement with the parasite in order for the host to be healthy. Of course, the obverse is actually the case; much of the malaise of the host is due to the invasion by the parasite. We can see this in our example above of the latest iteration of the DSM and the diagnosis of Premenstrual Dysphoric Disorder. This medicalization of women's affective experience powerfully implies a lack of capacity on the part of women to manage their own bodies and affects.

Holland (2012) argues that one of the key elements in the expansion of capitalist regimes of control is the attack on all forms of self-provisioning. The powerful mediation of the money form can only be sustained if all capacity for self-sustenance is translated through wage relations and surplus value. There cannot be any element of the social that is comprised of use value without the mediation of the capitalist market. Increasingly, as I have argued above, this extends into all modes of social production including the feminization of labor. Even the most intimate affective physical experiences must be commodified and controlled. The capacity to provide care or healing must be translated into a monetary form. Self-care cannot be left to the self.

To assure that an appropriate pseudo-symbiotic relationship sustains this mediated set of relations, the self is individuated and alienated from collective possibilities of self-care. Women have collectively managed premenstrual and menstrual activities for countless generations in the same way we have collectively managed social reproduction.[7] However, under the parasitic sets of relations we are following here, premenstrual dysphoria becomes the province of capitalized medical care for profit rather than the domain of collective self-provisioning. Each woman should deal with her "problem" alone in the privacy of the con-

---

[6] This is not to say that there are not psychologists who are women and who have direct experience with these matters. It is to say that the discipline of psychology makes every effort to mute or divert any subjective accounting by female psychologists into objective scientific study.

[7] The movement towards women's collective reproductive health was a hallmark of the emerging women's liberation movement in the late 60's and early 70's. See *Our bodies, Ourselves* (Marshall, 1996) and the ongoing work of planned parenthood (now under the kinds of attack and demonization discussed above).

sulting room with a trained professional and the possibility of "effective" evidenced based treatment and chemical mediation.

The force of this symbiotic enmeshment of psychology, capitalism, social production and women's health has been relentlessly advanced and expanded over many years. To disentangle ourselves, so as to starve or poison the parasite, requires careful and strategic experimentation. How might we, as women, reclaim our capacity for self-provisioning and collectivity?

I would propose that women's history of struggle, against both capitalist relations of force and the appropriative and exploitive mechanisms of primitive accumulation, clearly demonstrates that we are not limited to the social architecture of deferred desire promoted by what Marx (1978) referred to as the primal scene of all forms of slavery to follow. While women's role in social production within the family might be seen as perverted and distorted by both patriarchal and economic discipline, the necessity for the levels of control they are subjected to would not exist if the force of women did not constantly exceed any attempt at domination. As we know from Deleuze (1995) and Negri (1996), in their writing premised in the Marx of the *Grundrisse*, all social forms hold a set of capacities for domination and control. Just as important, however, is that they also express a creative impetus that dominant systems attempt to harness. It is important to note that the ontological forces of production always exceed the capacity for dominant systems to contain them. The subversive role women play in continually producing the social, redolent with deviant subjects, inclusive of themselves, that must be both demonized and marginalized, exemplifies the revolutionary ontological force of the becoming other. Part of the strategy for disentangling ourselves from the parasitic engagement with capitalism and psychology is to engage a new form of the psychological that functions outside the regimes of capitalist logic. In the same way that Deleuze and Guattari (1986) call for the development of a "minor literature", I would like to call for a "minor psychology".

A minor psychology would have the same characteristics as a minor literature. First, it would not come from a minor set of conceptual frameworks or theories about human experience. Instead, it would be composed of the ways in which people construct their experience within a major system of dominance and control. To this degree it would be composed of "a high co-efficient of deterritorialization" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986, p. 16). To re-think women's role in

social production in this way is to engage a minor psychology as a mechanism to explore the ways in which women's experience is constructed as a constitutive impossibility within capitalist patriarchal frameworks. In other words, a minor psychology would investigate the ways in which women continually produce an alternative social in the face of every effort to suppress and deny this very possibility.

Second, in a minor psychology "everything is political" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986, p. 17). In a "major psychology", women's struggles are individualized and contextualized against the background of normative social structures and expectations. The actuality of social relations and experience serve only as a background or environment that may, or may not, influence the psychology of the individual. In a minor psychology, all individual concerns "connect immediately to politics" (p. 17). Individual struggles and concerns "become all the more necessary, indispensible, magnified, because a whole other story is vibrating within it" (p. 17). A minor psychology would take seriously subjective accounts of experience and elucidate the ways in which these struggles connect to all other social systems that either valorize or suppress the validity of each individual story. The subjective accountings of experience, currently relegated to the realm of raw data to be processed into objective fact, would be valorized as essential to our understanding of ourselves not as facts, but as a living productive force.

This developing awareness of commonality, not through abstraction but through idiosyncratic and connected experience, brings us to the third characteristic of a minor psychology: "everything takes on collective value" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986, p. 17). In the simplest sense, this refers to an acknowledgement that there is no actual capacity to understand a body separated from other bodies. What happens to one has value for all. This is not to propose a subjugation of the individual to any collective will or identity such as the Party or the state or some form of identity politics. Nor is it to pursue the construction of systems or environments to see the way they impact on the development or wellbeing of the individual as is done by the major psychologies. Instead, a minor psychology would explore the rich web of interconnected life as a field of complex assemblages that hold both political and social force.

Here we are in the realm of what Hardt and Negri (2011) have referred to as "the common". They define the common as being composed of all of the elements of the material world upon which we depend for sus-

tenance as well as all the elements of social production, such as "knowledges, codes, informations, affects" (p. viii). They suggest that the common does not rely on modes of separation but instead on "practices of interaction, care and cohabitation in a common world" (p. viii).

On these terms, a minor psychology would investigate ways in which we might subvert modes of command and control premised on division and hierarchy. It would acknowledge difference but not in abstract or hierarchical terms. Instead, difference would be understood in terms of differential and complementary productive capacities that might be put to common purpose. It would valorize and seek out forms of connectivity and collective self-provisioning in the realms of emotional and psychological well-being.

A minor psychology cannot be the province of any set of majoritarian practices, theories, or disciplinary apparatuses. It operates tactically below the surface of major psychology in the daily reconfiguration of new collectivities. It does not seek any universal concepts or a particular teleological trajectory. It is a nomadic project, as delineated by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), and extended by nomadic feminists such as Rosi Braidotti (1994). The characteristics of a nomadic feminism have clear implications for the ways in which women might construct a minor psychology as what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) call a rhizomatic structure: a set of social practices that spread in all directions at once under the surface with no central point of origin. As a rhizome, minor psychology is composed of an infinite number of acts of creative transgression by women everywhere and connected through a multiplicity of productive encounters and collisions. It is organizationally contingent and holds no stable form, but acts as a site of indeterminate collective enunciation of insurrectionary desire.

Braidotti's nomadic feminism (1994) extends the notion of rhizomatic organization through a nomadic form of political transformation premised in Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) concept of the nomad. She calls for a tactical approach to identity that allows for subjects that can operate and move across occupied spaces while eluding capture through consistent violations of the dominant axiomatics of such spaces. What needs to be noted here is that tactical operations that undertake violations within a dominant regime of rule, such as capitalism, and that rely heavily on rewriting the axiomatic code of all it encounters, needs to account for what Deleuze and Guattari call passwords. Passwords constitute the production of an al-

ternative recoding of the fundamental capitalist axiomatic – the money form. Such recoding is premised on the failure of the capitalist axiomatic to fully capture the force of material living desire, and it is in this excess of force that new forms of sociability exceed the grasp of capitalist recoding. Furthermore, passwords need to be transient to avoid being recaptured and axiomatized into the ever-expanding domain of global capitalism.

For Braidotti (1994), the nomad functions through the kinds of contingent connections and constant social reconfiguration that I have delineated as rhizomatic. However, the nomad does not eschew

> …those necessarily stable and reassuring bases for identity that allow one to function in a community. Rather, nomadic consciousness consists in not taking any kind of identity as permanent. The nomad is only passing through; s/he makes those necessarily situated connections that can help her/him to survive, but s/he never takes on fully the limits of … fixed identity. (p. 33)

Tactically, Braidotti's political proposal is founded on an acknowledgement of a minor politics with a significant resonance for the minor psychology we have been sketching. A minor nomadic politics engages the subject in both macro- and micro-political tactics. On the one hand, a broader politics of engagement with major politics – that aims to reconfigure and subvert dominant axiomatics by building solidarity across subjugated populations – is premised on the very definitions of exclusion that define these populations. On the other hand, it proposes to assemble a minor register where there is a

> …figuration for the kind of subject who has relinquished all idea, desire or nostalgia for fixity... [It] expresses the desire for an identity made of transitions, successive shifts ... without and against an essential unity. (Braidotti, 1994, p. 23)

In terms of the minor psychology we have been describing, Braidotti's (1994) proposal for a nomadic feminism suggests that our tactics in relation to major psychology must account for its capacity to recode our lived experience into capitalist vernacular. That is, that major psychology may seek to turn all of our activities into the axiomatic of waged labor. In this regard, the feminization of labor cannot be accounted for in terms of revolt by simply asserting the rights of women to be paid for the activities of social reproduction. While this is a reasonable macro-tactic to improve overall living conditions for women within the broader context of the capitalist social, it is only a partial tactic. The role of major psychology might well

be seen as opening a coding of women as social laborers operating within the vernacular of the good worker. As we have noted, the DSM-5's Premenstrual Dysphoric Disorder appears to set the conditions by which women are seen as affectively and socially deficient at precisely the moment they become what Negri (1996) has called social labor. While a direct frontal assault on the majoritarian vernacular of this diagnosis through protests by feminist psychologists and their allies is both important and tactically necessary, it is also a temporary and partial measure.

The production of a minor psychology is the other part of the tactic. It is to subvert the dominant axiomatic through the living production of nomadic and rhizomatic social reproduction. It is through the production of alternative spaces premised upon experiments in new social forms. However, such work requires that the parasite within us be poisoned or expelled. Perhaps the most profound tactic here is to create an environment toxic to the parasite. I propose that this can be done by careful experimentation under the surface through the collective lived experience of women. It is in the discovered capacity for the collective self-provisioning of our physical and emotional wellbeing that we re-produce a social that poisons capitalism and its minion psychology and opens the social organism to new life, to new capacity, and to a world that is to come.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, (DSM-5).* New York: American Psychiatric Association.

Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic subjects: Embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dalla Costa, M., & James, S. (1975). *The power of women and the subversion of community*. London: Butler and Tanner.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1986). *Kafka: Toward a minor literature*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations 1972-1990.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage.

Federici, S. (2004). *Caliban and the witch: The body and primitive accumulation*. New York: Autonomedia.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2011). *Commonwealth*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Holland, H. (2011). *Nomad citizenship: Free-market communism and the slow-motion general strike.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Mahaffey, T. (June 18, 2010). Mother's who kill their children aren't so uncommon. *The Gazzette.* Available at http://thegazette.com/2010/06/18/mothers-who-kill-their-children-isn%E2%80%99t-so-uncommon/

Makdisi, S., Casarino, C., & Karl, R. (1995). *Marxism beyond Marxism.* New York: Routledge.

Marshall, H. (1996). Our bodies ourselves: Why we should add old fashioned empirical phenomenology to the new theories of the body. *Women's Studies International Forum* 19(3), 253-265.

Marx, K. (1978). *The Marx Engels Reader*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Negri, A. (1996). *Marx beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse.* Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia.

Parker, I. (2007). *Revolution in psychology: Alienation to emancipation*. London: Pluto Press.

Skott-Myhre, K.S.G., Weima, K., & Gibbs, H. (2012) *Writing the family: Women, autoethnography and family work.* Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.

Working Identity Vicissitudes: Difficulties in Symmetrical Relationships – A case study*

Roberto Mendoza
Universidade Federal de Campina Grande, Brazil

> Yo tengo sangre roja y cerebro igual a los patrones, y si ellos administran, yo también puedo hacerlo.
> M., Obrero de la Cooperativa Z.
>
> Where the worker is subject to bureaucratic discipline from his infancy and believes in officialdom and higher authority, it is above all a question of teaching him to walk by himself.
> Karl Marx

Abstract. *Our goal is to analyze the new identity dilemmas faced by female workers in the Cooperative Z collective. Identity is socially defined from the outset. As stated by the theory of value, while individual identity refers to use value, collective identity refers to exchange value. This paper constitutes a preliminary case study. We have adopted a psychosocial/dialectical framework to carry out an analysis of the cognitions, beliefs and values of this workers' collective. The corpus consisted of primary data taken from four interviews conducted in locus. The data was organized into different categories of dilemma such as dichotomous pairs and pivot representations; both of which extend through the text implicitly and express the dynamics of identity. The results showed the narrative axes to be related to three different aspects; namely, production ("Our work makes us autonomous, independent and complete"), rules ("Solidarity and equality should not be transgressed") and generational turnover ("Watch out! Our identity is in jeopardy!"). As additional staff becomes a necessity, the moral dilemma of whether hiring or not hiring family relatives arises. If the decision is for non-relatives, the question becomes whether they should be added as full partners or workers?*

Keywords: Social identity; Self-management; Values; Moral Dilemmas

Introduction

The Recovered Factories Movement (RFM), emerging in Argentina in the first decade of this century, had a major international impact and nowadays it involves approximately 20,000 workers spread across the country. This spontaneous movement has occupied more than 200 factories that were either abandoned or declared bankrupt. According to the Fajn report, in 90% of cases the occupation, or more suitably called recovery, occurred after employers had filed for bankruptcy. While 80% of the factories are considered small, the remaining 20% can be regarded as large, as they have more than 100 workers (Fajn, 2003).

The factory analyzed in this case study (Cooperative Z) belongs to the textile sector. Though it can be currently classified as a medium-sized company, in its heyday it employed 350 workers, 90% of which

were women. Most of them had extensive experience in the field and were middle-aged. Within the production market, the factory specialized in fine clothes, having among its customers the most renowned domestic and foreign clothing brands and upmarket boutiques in the most exclusive neighborhoods of Buenos Aires. Nowadays its staff amounts to 70 employees.

The workers' collective this paper analyses has earned international visibility due to the self-managed nature of their claims and achievements, and to the fact that it is a cooperative made up mostly of women who have fought tirelessly to fulfill their aspiration (and necessity) towards avoiding unemployment and continuing with production. *The main relevance of this group lies in the fact that it can be held as an example of how a new collective identity emerges out a specific socio-political situation; and how, as new solutions are found, new dilemmas arise which the social actors have to confront and find a solution to.*

As we mentioned in our first paper (Mendoza, 2013), the Cooperative Z workers unwittingly introduced some of the most novel management principles in the business world. To begin with, these principles state that unnecessary hierarchical levels are to be eliminated. Secondly, the workers' creativity and involvement have to be encouraged and stimulated; and finally, the employees' empirical knowledge should be taken advantage of to increase the company's competitiveness.

With one single stroke, then, these workers demystified the managerial ideology of democracy and worker participation, from Elton Mayo to Toyotism/Volvism and the latest *Theories of Knowledge Management and Organizational Commitment*, which extolled (and still do) the organizational strategy of the subsuming of labor, not only physically, but also emotionally and cognitively (Zangaro, 2011). From this perspective, qualified workers would be those who are *trusting of, involved with, committed to* or *integrated with* the company's values. Employees would no longer be just workers, but collaborators, internal customers or self-managers committed to their own work (Empowerment). *Involvement* was transformed into a feature and an attitudinal quality needed for the qualification of workers, where each

one, individually, would become his/her "own boss" and would become involved with the company by "wearing the colors of the company".[8] A good employee would now not only imply a given "know-how" (the necessary technical expertise required by the company) but also a certain "know-how to be", that is, he or she would know how to regulate his or her emotional nature and his or her intimate self in order to define his or her collective/corporate identity on the basis of the aims that characterize the organization the worker is immersed in. In this manner, the identification becomes complete; the worker is the organization. His or her uniqueness consists in being a "corporate citizen". This would be the best social identity possible and the most effective path toward the integration of employees (Gurgel, 2003; Zangaro, 2011).

In practice, the cooperative workers avoided all senior positions and became true self-managers committed to their work (*Involvement*). Filled with this new confidence, they created a new identity and new values for the organization. They became *empowered*, to use a common expression of the business jargon, and "wore the colors of the company", but not until they had abolished the figure of the employer. The "colors" and the company itself came to be legally in their hands. The organization evolved from a traditional *heterogeneously managed* company to an egalitarian, self-managed one, free from employers and run by the very same work collective, after a heroic and arduous socio-political struggle.[9] This was not an individual decision made by each employee; rather, it was a collective one, arrived at and emerged from the particular socio-political crisis of a given country at a specific historical moment. Under these circumstances, the workers assumed a new socio-collective and individual identity. They fought for and reclaimed their social, economic and political rights. They experienced, through their socio-political activity, a new mode of doing, seeing, feeling and knowing. Marx (1976) identified this as arising from the doings and practices of real individuals. These innovative experiences had already been acknowledged by Marx[10] in the Inaugural Address of the International Working Men's Association. While referring to cooperatives, he stated:

---

[2] This idiomatic expression means to be loyal to the company.

[3] See the film documentary *Las mujeres de la Brukman*, winner of honourable mentions in several international festivals.

[10] The 1st international conference in 1864 asked Marx and Engels to write the inaugural manifesto. Their attitude was to support the cooperatives as a practical experience by the

workers in their social and political struggles, though they criticised the theoretical and political proposals that considered that they might achieve a communist society. In *Capital* Marx states that cannot abolish capitalism, but violate the law of capitalist ownership. Lenin voiced the same idea in the socialist congress in Copenhagen in 1910. As this is a practical problem, however, we have tried to study some of their internal contradictions.

This is one of the "changing forces of present society". We speak of the co-operative movement, especially the co-operative factories raised by the unassisted efforts of a few bold "hands". The value of these great social experiments cannot be overrated. By deed instead of by argument, they have shown that production on a large scale, and in accord with the behests of modern science, may be carried on without the existence of a class of masters employing a class of hands; that to bear fruit, the means of labour need not be monopolized as a means of dominion over, and of extortion against, the labouring man himself; and that, like slave labour, like serf labour, hired labour is but a transitory and inferior form, destined to disappear before associated labour plying its toil with a willing hand, a ready mind, and a joyous heart. (Marx, 1976, p. 5)

The theoretical framework adopted here aims at exploring, without excluding other socio-historical factors, the almost material force of social cognitions, especially if they are deeply rooted in social identity, both collective and individual, and have been operating with the tenacity and secular strength of prototype matrices.

Social Movements and Identity Games

Social identity can be defined in different ways depending on the philosophical, political and epistemological stance that a given research team adopts.

Our position is that the study of identity within a socio-psychological framework has to do more with political and practical issues, because identity is produced and reproduced among the tensions arising from the interactions between the different social actors/authors and as such it is always an on-going process. Lenin, while ratifying Hegel's claim, used to state that the only absolute thing is change, movement. This is a movement which does not flow in a smooth, straight line but rather with jumps and starts and is full of the internal contradictions typical of any real phenomena or any given society or group (Lenin, 1960).

In that sense, social movements which do not spring up from institutions search for a new social identity that habitually goes beyond a mere economic claim and which in order to consolidate itself as such, depends upon their doings as a new movement, that is, on their capacity to reveal an innovative alternative of change and to become the center of debate, on their internal consistency and their ability to relate to other groups, movements and political institutions and civil society. Melucci (1994) concludes by stating that the importance of the role played by affective aspects should not be underestimated, especially the commitment individuals evidence as new identities and new values are being forged.

Touraine (1981), on the other hand, considers that "a social movement is constituted by the organized collective behavior of a class actor that fights against a class antagonist to seize the control of the historicity of a given community" (p. 177). To this author, then, any movement that does not constitute a class actor or establishes itself as such cannot be defined as a social movement. Diani (1992), in turn, in an effort to integrate these theoretical positions, states that social movements are characterized by a specific social dynamics "by means of which the different social actors, either individuals, informal and/or formal groups are able to elaborate through joint action or communication, a collective identity; that is they have a shared definition of themselves, the perception that they stand on the same side in the face of a social conflict". Social behavior can also be analyzed at the level of individual relations and relations among groups (Tajfel, 1998). The first refers to situations in which the relationships between two or more individuals are mainly determined by the unique characteristics of the people interacting and the history of their relationship. The second refers to types of social behavior which is determined by the social categories people belong to (professional groups, gender, social class, etc.). In that sense, social identity is constructed through an emotional, cognitive and evaluative identification process of the individual with the membership group he or she belongs to. This "in-group" identity enables the group member to compare himself or herself with individuals of other groups, "outgroups", which might be similar, opposite, inferior, superior, and in so doing he or she maintains his or her individual self-esteem and a positive collective identity of himself/herself and his or her group.

Rouhana (1997), however, believes collective identity is something that lies more in the group than in the individuals that make it up. This identity becomes more salient or it is more socially visible in a given historical period, because its centrality is based on a positive or negative value which is a product of intergroup conflicts. The collective identity integrates cognitive and affective aspects. Different levels are to be distinguished within the cognitive aspect; namely, formal-legal, political and socio-cultural. Within the affective aspect, we have to differentiate between group loyalty, affective attachment and common destiny certainty. The cognitive aspect is elaborated by the group, while the affective aspect serves to provide unity and cohesion to the collective identity structure.

For Simon (1997), however, the conceptualization of identity has to go beyond the initial dualism that considers individual identity as opposite and prior to collective identity. This author believes that the collective self would be centered upon a single dominant aspect of the self; while the individual self would be centered upon a single configuration of the several, not redundant, aspects of the self.

It is our view that it is not enough to assert either that collective identity resides more with the group than with the individual, or that both the collective and individual identity are social, as the previous authors claim. We believe that one contains the other; they constitute in fact an inseparable contradictory unity. That means that the relevance of one of them can vary depending on the concrete sociocultural and historical form present (such as the individual mode of being in the modern liberal capitalist society or the individuality mode of the Xabante aboriginal community from the Amazon region where the concept of "me" does not exist).[11] It also means that in all the circumstances of social life, one is constantly producing the other. Both create and re-create each other and exchange positions within a given socio-cognitive script depending on the tasks the person/group has to resolve; the dilemmas they have to face in a historically concrete community.

Besides, we think the objective causes that foster the emergence of social conflicts should not be separated from the subjective ones that enable cognitive-affective-evaluative identity change. The former can act as such only through the latter and vice versa. We consider, in contrast to what Simon (1997) states, that singular identity can encompass the whole of the collective identity. In other words, the latter is more comprehensive, complete, complex, rich and multilateral than the former though this might not be immediately obvious to the individual.

From an historical-dialectical point of view, we consider that social identity is shaped by the indissoluble and lasting bond between the singular aspect (the idiosyncratic aspect of individual identity) and the multiple, richly diverse aspect of the collective identity. Since the conception of the fetus, both phases are social. They constitute and interpenetrate each other, as it is demonstrated by research in the field of child psychology.[12] However, it should be pointed out that children are sociocentric in the early stages of their cognitive development (Spirkin, 1965; Tran Duc Tao,

1974; Vygotsky, 1996; Iannaccone & Mendoza, 2009).

By paraphrasing Marx's theory of value (Marx, 1985), we consider that the part of the identity that has needs, projects and aspirations, that spends body energy – emotional and mental – for multiple uses in life, is the *singular identity*. The *collective identity*, or the "inner group" that is found within that singularity as part of *the self* and without which there wouldn't be any singularity at all, is the set of internalized social relationships – both symmetrical and asymmetrical – of a given collective that forms or deforms us, and gives account of our belonging to a specific group and not another, gears us towards the exchange of practices, ways of thinking, feelings, senses and meanings, in one way and not in another.

Thus, the worker's personal identity can in this case only be configured as such insofar as it acquires multiple collective identities in the course of its real life – in a continuous and contradictory process of observance/disobedience and qualification/disqualification. Correspondingly, collective identity can only exist if it is expressed by the unique actions of each individual (Mendoza, 2013).

In other words, in order to give shape to a social and labor identity, one must acquire the technical, affective-cognitive and moral skills needed to observe or disobey the prevailing social norms and values, the notions of right and wrong, of the desirable and the undesirable, of authority, etc., which are generally hybrid and contradictory. Only in this manner can a person have a social identity which is at the same time individual/collective, singular, unique and yet multiple and plural (Therborn, 1989).

Our goal is to analyze what new problems the now recovered cooperatively self-managed companies have to deal with once they have overcome the stage of their struggle for *appropriation and consolidation of their new identity and employment status*. In other words, we aim at exploring what dilemmas the workers currently have within those internal conditions of *self-managed egalitarianism*, how these dilemmas are perceived by them and what type of strategies they are considering to overcome them.

For the purposes of this article we will first discuss only those difficulties related to forms of production. Secondly, we will consider normative dilemmas; and finally, the dilemma of generational turnover.

---

[11] This means, in short, that the way in which we think, not just the cognitive content of our thoughts, depends on social and historical conditions and it changes with them (see Iannaccone & Mendoza, 2009).

[12] See the "Vygotsky-Piaget" debate on the concept of "egocentrism", a central tenet of Piaget's theory criticized by Vygotsky.

Although other controversial categories were identified in the interviews we carried out, such as assembly democracy, economic dilemmas, public policies, family, occupational health and technological upgrade, they will not be dealt with in this paper due to space limitations.

Methodology

This article constitutes a preliminary case study by means of which we intend to obtain an account of the sense the workers ascribe to the problems they have to face at this stage of the cooperative life.

For the analysis, we resorted basically to a corpus of raw data gathered from a set of four interviews to female workers as well as from our own impressions and the notes taken during two visits to their workplace. The first visit was in 2003 at the time when the workers were struggling to achieve ownership and legal recognition, and at that moment we looked into the mutation process of the social identity of this work collective. The second visit was recently conducted, nine years after the first one, in May of 2012, and then we studied the problem of factory self-management. We will also be analyzing, as secondary data, some reports from different delegates attending the 2nd Conference of Cooperatives, held a few days before our visit in the city of Buenos Aires, and the film documentary mentioned above.

It should be pointed out that the interviews were carried out at the interviewees' workplace, specifically in the sewing sector located on the 2nd floor of the factory, while workers were performing their productive tasks. The workers agreed to the interview because we had an introduction letter from the University Professors Association (ADUF-CG; acronym in Spanish).

On the basis of a historical-dialectical and psychosocial framework (Lenin, 1960; Viana, 2007; Dunayevskaya, 2010; Reicher, 1987), we conducted an analysis of the cognitions, beliefs and values of the social and labor identity of the workers of Cooperative Z.

We believe the speakers' argumentative strategies reveal a series of oppositions (real/possible, affirmative/negative, etc.) that refer to the perception of the self as a collective identity of the in-group, and to the perception of *the other* as a collective identity of the out-group. For the analysis, categories are organized as dichotomous pairs which extend through the text and express the dynamics of identity. The first term of each dichotomous unity is the manifest part of identity, that which is publicly expressed for others

and for oneself. The second term of the dichotomous unity is, in most instances, the implicit part of the identity, that which remains unspoken or omitted to others and to one self. These dichotomous pairs are the constituents of a primary category totality. Starting from these dichotomous elements, we highlight pivot representations of collective identity, which arise as narrative axes of the experiences lived (Pêcheux, 2006, Adams, 2011).

We understand these axes or representations as narrative paradigms that delimit the different ways in which social actors (operators-speakers) shape both their own social identity (collective/individual) and the social identities of the different groups they relate to within the social topography.

Dilemmas Present

According to the principles of social psychology, every intergroup dispute has extraordinary implications for the intra-group life and vice versa (Mendoza, 2011). In the case of the group case studied, once the stage of the socio-legal and political dispute against former employers and managers had been overcome, internal cohesion came out strengthened since the fundamental values of cooperation and solidarity, in the form of self-management, became hegemonic as intra-group principles and practices. On the other hand, differences latent within the group tend to come to light, given that the inner activity and its dynamics have come to the fore and gained visibility for its members.

Let's analyse this further:

a) The Productive Dilemmas

Within the production process we see a major transformation in relation to the previous period, i.e. from the moment when they were a heteronomously managed corporation and their work was alienated, in the sense that they didn't own the instruments and means of production, their time or pace of work, and not the final product. This is evidenced in what one of the workers, Macario, observed nine years ago:

> We used to work 9 hours per day... We worked in the production line: a jacket was made by 45 people. I used to make the front part, 220 pockets per hour. In total, we produced 60 jackets per hour. The woman in charge demanded us to produce 1000 jackets a week...

The same worker voices a different reality nowadays:

> We have redesigned the factory; we have placed all the machines on the same floor to save energy and to be all together... Here we work with a mutual agreement to do everything we need to do, to be able to deliver our products and get the money to pay our wages. We all receive the same salary.

The workers redesigned the layout according to their knowledge and experience of more than 10 or 15 years of production. They have now become a collective of workers/partners/managers of an egalitarian cooperative in the textile sector.

Within the new internal conditions of production, labor is also cooperative. The whole process of manual and intellectual work lies in the hands of the workers and the same goes for the capital gain produced by them. It is a kind of objective cooperation but re-appropriated in their practical, legal and psychosocial aspects.[13]

What is the dynamics of such cooperation like? According to Alba:

> (...) let's say that... here you cannot say 'no'... since we do not have bosses or supervisors, it is each one's own responsibility to make things work out (...)

> Here we must work…work the whole 9 hours…

> You don't see difference in the final amount of production, because besides getting your job done, you have to replace the ones who are absent…

> When you are in a situation like this, in a co-operative, you have to be over here and over there, covering tasks, you have to hurry up and deal with all the work (...) If there's a partner who has less work to do or if I'm faster in some other task, then I say to my partner "you go over there, and you come over here so I can get that done for you"… let's say… we organize ourselves… here you must run against time to reach the end, this way, step by step. In the past, our employer came, assigned you a task and you knew how much work you had to do per hour and nothing more.

The workers are now doubly cooperative: objectively, by the running of the productive process replanned by them, each worker makes some part of the pieces of the final product and, subjectively, because now they cooperate voluntarily, according to the needs and challenges of a given situation, carrying out a partner's tasks if she is absent or if she is slower.

> We don't have fixed positions [on the production line]. In my case, for example, right now I'm here because I'm finishing details, but after I finish I'm going to sit by a machine. I keep working [in every task needed] to make sure the production line never stops… because (…) it's not like when the employer was around anymore, as I said, you don't carry out one single task. (Alba)

> We also rotate positions at the workplace, although each one already knows her job ... but this way the function of work gets multiplied. (Yuri)

They have now diversified their tasks in an attempt to overcome their extreme division together with the work monotony imposed by the Taylorist/Fordist model. Not only have they reclaimed the machines, but they have also attempted to appropriate ways or methods of production. The worker's rationality reveals itself to be much more effective than the instrumental rationality of the employer. However, we observe that nowadays, even after nine years of self-managed production, they still work 9 hours daily.

That means that the appropriation of their working time is relative because this does not depend only on the before mentioned factors, but on an external factor, the market. The cooperatives end up subsumed in a financial/capitalist context that is beyond their power.

We can observe that the dichotomous categories appearing in this narrative are: *more responsibility, reciprocity and multilateralism vs. irresponsibility, negligence, unilateralism.*

Respondents were aware and conscious of the first term whereas the second remained more or less implicit, its likelihood being reflected in the concern and the unavoidable extra commitment expressed in the sentence "*here you cannot say 'no'*".

Actually, workers could not say "no", that is, refuse to work, when they were employed either, because it entailed risking their jobs. The difference resides in the type of authority the individual worker confronts and the consequences that a negative response like that might have for the rest of her partners.

---

[7] Before, under the yoke of the boss-employee relation, work was also cooperative, since everyone worked in an organized way to achieve a common goal, the manufacturing of a particular product, but the appropriation of surplus value was private. It was an alienated, objectified cooperation imposed by the work-capital relationship.

The pivot representation acting as axis at this stage of the identity process is: "We are autonomous, responsible and develop our full potential in our jobs".

That is to say, in the situation of egalitarian self-management, tasks are more complex and everyone has more responsibilities. However, though they are now autonomous, they have more tasks and assignments than before. This fact, which is indeed a very positive change, creates nonetheless a number of new dilemmas, not only in production and management practices, but also in the perception and interpretation of those problems. The reclaiming and control of working time issue is barely hinted at in the interviewees' narratives "*Here we must work… work the whole 9 hours… You don't see the difference in the final amount of production*". This is still indeed implicit. After nine years of the workers' self-management, they have not been able to include the issue of working time in their agenda.

b) Normative dilemmas.

> For the time being, you have doubled the responsibility. You have the responsibility to produce and the responsibility to organize the tasks, bringing some order to the work. That's the difference… The benefits under an employer's management are that when you finish your working hours, you go home and you forget about it. 15 days later you receive your pay and that's it. (Alba)

It should be pointed out that in former times, under the employer's management, if anyone was absent or lingered in the bathroom – absenteeism and resistance strategies to intense work were high under Taylorism in general – these were considered acts of irresponsibility by the peers. Now, however, in the new situation, the same act is interpreted differently, for it means that tasks are not done and someone else has to do them, at the expense of her very own time.

> The more internal problems [are], the issue of attendance and the restrictions to the time schedule. It is not habitual, but there are partners who have problems of one type or another… But they have to adapt to the rules of the factory. There's no alternative, because there should be an internal regulation for places where people work together, and that sets many guidelines; sets the limits of respect towards your partners. (Yuri)

Matilde said in the film documentary: "Some partners want to take advantage and miss work too often!" Sanctions had to be imposed since, according to Matilde, transgressions were too frequent.

> [There's] a new reorganization of production, the production depends on our partners… you see… [Depends] on discipline, there must be a working discipline, attendance, punctuality; respect among all. (Yuri)

> Yes, for example, people who are late get suspended. If you are late three times, you have a one-day suspension. That's the discipline we have and has already been applied. The workforce here is so much needed. (Alba)

One of the reasons why they had to implement the full-time 9-hour work day was because when they had their lunch break at noon, the workers went to bars or parks near the area and took too long to return to work. An assembly of all of them decided to implement the full-time scheme again.

The reasons most frequently cited for tardiness or absenteeism were personal issues and health problems:

> As it happens everywhere, you know, problems always arise and well... This fellow couldn't come because he had some errands to run… or because he is feeling sick... and well… all of us cover him. (Alba)

Workers have to clock in when they arrive to the workplace. That way, at the end of the fortnight or at the end of month, the committee monitors tardiness and deducts it from the salaries of those who were late.

We don't know whether the system of sanctions (and the absenteeism) is similar to the ones existing in the previous period or not, but even so, we do know what is at stake. These sanctions are related more to the values and feelings that justify them than to compliance with a given norm, which is cold and equally imperative for all (Livet, 2009).

The requirement of compliance with regulations imposed from within the group of workers is much more imperative and stronger than one produced by an external authority. The weight and moral authority of the group is much greater, especially in the consolidation stage of a new collective identity which was forged in major scale inter-group/class conflict. The demand to work at a certain pace and to produce a given number of pieces does not come from a supervisor or an employer. That role and its demands have been internalized and adopted by the workers, assimilated by the moral conscience of each worker. The employer figure, in this case, has "been diluted" or "evaporated", now it is "abstract" or generalized.

We observe that the dichotomous categories appearing in this narrative are: *acceptance of the new values of self-management vs. transgression of these values.* "They must adapt to the rules of the factory… That's the discipline we have and has already been applied. The workforce here is so much needed". Although they are conscious and aware of the first term, the second is implicit and its presence arouses anger and affects the collective as a whole.

The pivot representation acting as axis at this stage of the identity process is: *solidarity, equality and compassion are core values.*

According to research in the field of social psychology, when an in-group member breaks or transgresses group norms, it causes major moral indignation, shame, disgust and anger. Consequently, there is a tendency to brand the transgressor as the black sheep. This insistence on justice and universal rules characterizes more those groups and cultures that stress equal norms, i.e., that assign little value to hierarchy and emphasize universal benevolent values (Mendoza, 2011, Petrovsky, 1984).

For the concrete situation of the workers' collective under study, transgressions are mainly related to the working hours. In that sense, we observe that they only dominate their working time externally. This evidences that this dimension is essential to understand whether a self-managed social movement in a given situation can overcome (or deny) within itself the nature of work as a commodity. We can see how the values of solidarity and equality are conditioned by the dominance, or lack of it, over factory working time.

We don't know who the ones who cause more absenteeism are. Are they either the junior or the senior workers? Are they the youngest or the eldest ones? Are they those who participated in the struggles during the consolidation period of the cooperative or those who did not? However, what we were able to find out is how workers perceive or try to confront the dilemma of generational turnover which is also related to discipline.

c) Generational dilemmas

Most of the workers are middle-aged and several are already close to retirement. This poses the problem of generational turnover which means nothing less than the need to select new partners to replace the older ones. Celia states that at least 40% of the staff has been replaced in the last seven years for various reasons, although some of the workers have been re-hired. The dilemma is what criteria should be followed to carry out this renewal.

> Other people left, other people died. We have middle-aged and older people (...) they [new workers] join because workforce is needed. (Celia)

> Frequently, new workers are selected because they are family relatives and have learned the trade; others are hired because they already know the trade. (Alba)

> Yes, we are more like the "founding members" (...) Perhaps, if work doesn't go well, it may be our fault, because we have incorporated too many new workers. Some of them still have a lot to learn and not everyone has the same availability or the same willingness to work. Perhaps not hiring experienced workers didn't turn out so well. [People hired] are relatives and first they just come to learn the trade. Our motto is that we are all equals, and sometimes that plays against us. (Celia)

Clearly, the most logical course of action, from the point of view of production needs, would be to hire experienced workers. However, the prevailing criterion has been to hire relatives "*that first just come to learn the trade*". In other words, between the logic of instrumental rationality and the logic of affections, it seems that the latter prevails. There is, however, a very important detail in Celia's response, who is perhaps the most recognized leader of the cooperative: "Our motto – she says – is that we are all equals, and sometimes that plays against us".

Why could a value so fundamental to a self-managed cooperative "play against them"? Although neither Celia nor the other respondents have said it explicitly, what plays against them is that, since most of them are founding members (by the time being), new incorporations to the staff based solely on the criterion of experience, without having a deeper knowledge of the workers (who, logically, besides being younger, have not shared with them the experience of recovering the factory), would jeopardize the foundational collective identity, forged by them in such a heroic struggle. Therefore, they would rather hire relatives with no previous experience than risk the possibility of ending up as the minority if they incorporate new and unknown partners. Moreover, Celia adds:

> As sometimes we talk with other cooperatives and ask them how they pay the new staff and they tell us that 'new people are hired employees, not partners. Only founder members are considered as partners and we are doing well with that...

> We never wanted that methodology of work...
> though I'm not saying it's wrong, doing some
> analysis, we don't say it's wrong, because
> sometimes it may happen that people come for
> a month and then stops coming, may be those
> people are not responsible enough, and that in-
> terrupts the production chain. That happened
> to us, it happens to us, and is happening right
> now…

This narrative unmasks the problem or essential dilemma faced by the founding members of the cooperative, namely: Do we preserve our collective identity, won with so much sacrifice throughout the past decade in defense of our source of work; or do we let it become blurred by incorporating new workers who are unfamiliar to us? Are we willing to transgress an essential principle of cooperative values such as the principle of equality between partners to preserve that identity? What Celia is saying, if we consider her actual words above ("We never wanted that methodology of work... though I'm not saying it is wrong") is in fact: "I don't know" or "we don't know; we have doubts".

Besides, the incorporation of relatives has another substantial implication as the cooperative belongs to the founding members and their families. This could probably lead to the hiring of salaried workers who would not have the same rights and duties as founder members have, and clearly would not receive the same salary. In other words, the cooperative and its partners/relatives will become the new employers, that is to say, the "abstract capitalist".

We find that the implied dichotomous categories appearing in this narrative are: *Preservation of hard-won values vs. transgression of these values to "preserve them"*.

Obviously this dilemma refers to the values of egalitarian management and wage policies, which in order to be preserved should be, as contradictory as that may sound, transgressed; for instead of being universal, those egalitarian values would only be valid for former members and their families.

The pivot representation acting as axis at this stage of the identity process is: *Either equality among us or inequality towards others.*

Our collective identity (assessed as positive by the group and recognized as such by the others) must not change.

Although the demands of the market require that specialized labor be hired in some areas, which Celia calls "experienced people", they opted for hiring in-experienced relatives because these would be more responsible than non-relatives and could eventually be added as partners, which appears to us as a clear endogamous attitude. In other words, they contemplate the possibility of keeping the collective identity of equal partners unmoved, even though this might only be true for the founding partners.

Conclusion

Firstly, we presented the qualitative differences between two forms adopted by the identity of the group of workers at a time of extraordinary economical and socio-political instability. Their collective social identity went from being perceived as a group of helpless women abandoned by their employer, to standing as a social movement with a common destiny and collective universal interests and in so doing leading a movement that stands for the self- management of work and society and upholding the political slogan of grass-roots democracy.[14]

Secondly, this research shows how, in a time of relative economic stability, the cooperative workers of the case study analyzed had to face specific dilemmas as an egalitarian work collective which were qualitatively and intrinsically different from the ones they had to confront under their employer's management, when they were exploited as workers. These dilemmas as such were also confirmed by other case studies such as those by Cornforth (2007), Lima (2007), Novaes and Sardá de Farias (2011), and Wyczykier (2009).

Currently, these workers face dynamics that are new to them and to productive agents in general. On the one hand, they confront the internal dynamics of the collective itself; namely, self-managing the productive process under symmetrical/horizontal conditions. They have to encourage and strengthen the anti-hegemonic counter values of equality, solidarity and autonomy. It is no doubt a whole new experience for them since it is a place "without place", with no hierarchies, which Marx refers to as "*abstract capitalism*" (Marx, 1985). On the other hand, the other dynamic is external and has to do with competing with other traditional heteronomously managed companies of the sector, both domestic and foreign; i.e., it entails

---

[14] In the first study we observed how the workers defined themselves as helpless girls left to themselves by their employer when, at the beginning of the conflict, he abandoned the factory without any explanation and without paying

their last weekly wages. During the last phase of the conflict they defined themselves as a workers' collective indispensable to the struggle against capital in Argentina (see Mendoza, 2013).

surviving as corporation in a capitalist or market context where the hegemonic values are exactly the opposite (competence, heteronomy, inequality, submission, etc.) and which requests from and depends on the State for its incentive policies, which vary with the different governments.

Under these conditions, the way problems are perceived is characterized, as psychosocial studies suggest (Mendoza, 2011), by a tendency from its members to be more demanding with their peers, co-workers/partners, since they all have the same duties towards themselves and the group in order to preserve the new values acquired with so much effort.

For this study, only internal dynamics were considered. For example, when faced with productive dilemmas, the workers acquired more responsibility, reciprocity and multilateralism, which can lead to anxiety and an inescapable extra commitment: "*here you cannot say 'no'*". The narrative axes at this stage of the identity process were: "we are autonomous, responsible and fulfill our potential in our jobs, but we have more tasks and assignments".

With regard to the normative dilemmas, the workers had to reschedule from double shift to fulltime workday since many workers delayed returning after lunch. Likewise, whenever possible, they hold the assembly meetings during working hours because many workers don't want to stay overtime. However, this creates another problem: the decline of weekly productivity or absenteeism on assembly day.

The dilemma faced is the *acceptance of the new values of self-management*. Here the lack of acceptance is perceived as transgression: "*they have to adapt to the rules of the factory*". Such transgression would not be a sign of non-compliance with an unfair situation, but rather a transgression of values considered positive and the rejection of a brand new revolutionary situation, namely egalitarian self-management. In other words, a complete change in values can be observed. Lack of acceptance and transgression are now equivalent to embracing the values of bourgeois society.

The transgression of these values by the members of the group produces moral indignation, disgust and all kinds of negative emotions, which end up affecting the collective group as a whole. This is particularly characteristic of groups that stress egalitarian norms rather than hierarchy, emphasizing universal and benevolent values.

The productive and normative dilemmas have as a background the impossibility of controlling a fundamental aspect of the work process, the working hours needed to produce goods. In that sense, we observe that the workers only own their working hours externally and this shows that this dimension is essential to understand whether a self-managed social movement, in a given situation, is able to go beyond (overcome or deny) the nature of work as commodity.

We observe thus how the values of solidarity and equality enunciated as central values, depend on the dominance, or lack of it, of factory working time now controlled by an "employer" re-embodied by the market, that is, the corporate and capitalists clients, and the central and provincial state.

In other words, though the figure of the employer as the owner has disappeared, its function of regulating the use of working time has not. Formerly imposed by the company's private owner, regulations have now become self-imposed. It does not matter that this self-imposition coincides with the demands of the market, that is, with other invisible employers present in the generic abstraction of the market or the state.

Another dilemma concerning the generational turnover they are facing is, what should be the right criterion to select new workers? Should they be considered full partners or not? Or, on the contrary, should they simply hire a salaried workforce or employees? How can new members be trusted if they have not participated in the struggle for the cooperative? An alternative was to invite relatives to work, as these would be more reliable than total strangers. "*Better the devil you know than the devil you don't*"; so goes an old proverb. On the other hand, shouldn't new members "pay their dues"? How should new members be integrated into the cooperative?

In conclusion, this dilemma has a central axis that extends through the entire narrative discourse: *Watch out! Our identity is in jeopardy! We want to preserve the values of cooperation, solidarity and egalitarianism so hard won forever, but we are not sure about which shortcut we should choose to continue our walk.*

"The worst enemy, after opting for a cooperative organization is the mindset of each partner", said a delegate to the 2nd Meeting of Cooperatives. However, we must not consider this just as a subjective problem.

Dilemmas related to the context of capitalist practices and values (which we couldn't present in this article, such as the diverse relations with the State, the market, the family, etc.) frequently put into question the social identity (collective/individual) of the workers of the cooperative and have a powerful

influence on each and every one of the possible choices. *Old values*, which are still a present burden, are also in force and remain a part of the social identity, as we have observed the workers ask themselves at every time during the productive activity of the factory.

Brecht (1985) beautifully expresses this dilemma when he says in a poem:

> I stood on a hill and I saw the Old approaching, but it came as the New. It hobbled up on new crutches which no one had ever seen before (…). Round about stood such as inspired terror, shouting: Here comes the New, it's all new, salute the new, be new like us! And those who heard, heard nothing but their shouts, but those who saw, saw such as were not shouting. So the Old strode in disguised as the New, but it brought the New with it in its triumphal procession and presented it as the Old. The New went fettered and in rags; they revealed its splendid limbs.

What new social identities will be assumed by this group of workers? The new one, which was born out of a heroic struggle, or the old one which disguised as new pushes them back into the past? An egalitarian and direct democracy is much more demanding than a representative democracy and does not stand on its own. Identity is thus questioned from multiple angles. It is paradoxical that its success as self-managed economic collective is dependent upon the success of a society based on the capitalist free market. Simultaneously, that success jeopardized the continuity of the egalitarian experience,[15] especially if this experience remains isolated from other similar experiences in the country or the region (Cruz Reyes, 2013).

As we understand it, social identity in its two aspects, collective/singular, remains dynamic and in state of permanent metamorphosis although the workers might tend to deny these dynamics as inherent to the identity of the self-managed movement itself.

As Marx, Lenin and Dunayevskaya would state it, the only absolutes are change and motion.

References

Adam, J.M. (1992). *Análisestextuais e discursivas: metodologias e aplicações*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

Brecht, B. (1985). *Poemas 1913-1956*. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2004.

Cornforth, C. (2007). Alguns fatores que afetam o sucesso ou fracasso das cooperativas de trabalho: uma revisão das pesquisas empíricas no Reino Unido. In Jacob C. Lima (Ed), *Ligações perigosas, trabalho flexível e trabalho associado* (pp. 19-54). São Paulo: Annablume.

Cruz Reyes, J. (2013). Cooperativas en el capitalismo, desarrollo y contradicciones. *Temas, Cultura, Ideología y sociedad 75*, 28-36.

Dunayevskaya, R. (2002). *El poder de la negatividad*. Buenos Aires: Biblios, 2010.

Diani, M. (1992). The concept of social movement. *The Sociological Review, 40*(1), 1-25.

Fanj, G. (2003). *Fábricas y empresas recuperadas: Protesta social, autogestión y rupturas en la subjetividad*. Buenos Aires: Centro Cultural de Cooperación.

Gurgel, C. (2003). *A gerência do pensamento*. São Paulo: Cortez.

Iannaccone, L., & Mendoza, R. (2009). Psicología Cognitiva: del mentalismo funcionalista a la dialéctica psicosocial. *Ariús, Revista de Ciências Humanas e artes*, *15*(1), 59-71.

Lenin, V.I. (1960). Cuadernos Filosóficos. *Obras Completas 38*. Buenos Aires: Cartago.

Lima, J. C. (2007). *Ligações perigosas, trabalho flexível e trabalho associado*. São Paulo: Annablume.

Livet, P. (2009). *As Normas*. Petrópolis: Vozes.

Marx, C. (1985). *O Capital*. São Paulo: Nova Cultura.

Marx, C., & Engels, F. (1976). *Obras Escogidas*. Moscú: Progreso.

Mendoza, R. (2011). *Control social subjetivo, valores, creencias y actitudes políticas: el efecto oveja negra. Un estudio experimental, transcultural en Iberoamérica*. Bilbao: Argitalpen Zeritzuaren.

Mendoza, R. (2013). Mutaciones de la identidad laboral: de la alienación a la auto-apropiación del trabajo. In Silvânia da Cruz Barbosa & Thaís

---

[15] It should be reminded that we have studied this experience from a social movement perspective. In this way, it is observed that several networks of self-managed companies or confederations have emerged, some more politicized and progressive, both in Argentina and the rest of Latin America.

Augusta C. de O. Máximo (Ed.), *Faces e Interfaces entre Saúde Mental e Trabalho* (pp. 85-109)**.** Grande: EDUECG.

Novaes H.T., & Sardá de Farias, M. (2011). Para onde vão as fábricas recuperadas? In E.T. Novaes (Ed), *O retorno do caracol a sua concha, alienação e desalienação e associações de trabalhadores.* São Paulo: Expressão Popular.

Pêcheux, M. (2006). *O discurso, estruturaouacontecimento*. Campinas: Pontes.

Petrovsky, A.V. (1982). *Personalidad, actividad y colectividad*. Buenos Aires: Cartago, 1984.

Reicher, S.D. (1987). The St. Paul's riot: An explanation of the limits of crowd action in terms of a social identity model. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 14*, 1-21.

Rouhana, N. (1997). *Identities in conflict*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Simon, B. (1997). Self and group in modern society: Ten theses on individual self and the collective self. In R. Spears & P. Oakes (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life* (pp. 318-335). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Spirkin, A. (1960). *El origen de la conciencia humana**.** Buenos Aires: Platina, 1965.

Therborn, G. (1978). *La ideología del poder y el poder de la ideología*. Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1987.

Touraine, A. (1981). *The Voice and the Eye*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Viana, N. (2007). *Escritos metodológicos de Marx**.** Goiânia: Alternativa.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1993). *Estudos sobre a história do comportamento. Símios, Homem primitivo e criança.* Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1996.

Wyczykier, G. (2009). *De la dependencia a la autogestión laboral*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo.

Zangaro, M.B. (2011). *Subjetividad y trabajo*. Buenos Aires: Herramienta.

Dialectical and Dialogic Processes in Psychological Development: Toward an Understanding of Student Experiences*

Lara Margaret Beaty
LaGuardia Community College, City University of New York, United States

Abstract. *In an effort to make the process of psychological development the topic of research, the dialectic as introduced by Lev Vygotsky is compared to the dialogic concept as first introduced by Bakhtin. The conflict between authors who find the dialectical and dialogic perspectives complimentary are considered alongside authors who find them contradictory; and Werner's orthogenetic principle compels an examination of developmental processes that facilitates a comparison. An examination of the ways Vygotsky and Bakhtin elaborated their views in terms of concept development and mediation versus the mastery of genres and development of will in the form of voice tests their compatibility and the implications for revealing developmental processes. The analysis suggests that the theories may lead researchers to focus on different phenomena, but that they create the possibility of a more complete analysis when focused on processes. They hint at two developmental processes that are akin to Engeström's horizontal and vertical development.*

Keywords: dialectics, dialogue, dialogic, Vygotsky, Bakhtin

A Marxist psychology, however conceived, must in some way attempt to explain how systematic change occurs within the lives of socially and materially embedded individuals. Whether the goal is revolution or a more academic understanding of psychological development, knowing how people change is essential, because individual development creates and is created by a changing society. Nevertheless, mainstream psychology has tended to neglect the underlying processes of change. The conception of humans as information processors has led to a focus on discrete bits in the form of variables. As Engeström suggests, "Causation is understood as a systematic relationship between variables rather than a causal process. In contrast to variable-based research, process oriented research believes that causation can actually be observed and reconstructed as a real sequence of events" (2006, p. 2). Thus learning about developmental processes is only possible through the creation of circumstances that promote change, allowing researchers to observe the intricate relations and events that shape the emergence of what we might consider higher psychological functioning. Variables, on the other hand, are inherently static, and their use has led to endless lists of variables as explanation, neglecting processes, because the study of actions and activities does not fit with dominant models or with the needs of leaders who are committed to the status quo. The focus on *processes* can reveal structural impediments and new routes to influencing development, clarifying the interdependence of personal and societal revolutions.

Marx, however, did not focus on individuals. Stetsenko claims that Lev Vygotsky made "the first attempt in psychology and education to apply the principles of Marxist dialectics in developing theory of human development and learning" (2010, p. 70).

Cultural-Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) is a perspective based on the work of Vygotsky and the contributions of his followers (Cole, 1996; Engeström, 2009), and dialectical processes are foundational to its explanations of human development (Roth & Lee, 2007). Dialectics are not understood consistently, but in an effort to develop analytical tools, central tenets include: the use of opposites, endless movement, and different levels. Dialectics conceives of "mutually exclusive category pairs including individual-collective, body-mind, subject-object, agency-structure, and material-ideal; that is, the opposites are theorized as non-identical expressions of the same category, which thereby embodies an inner contradiction" (Roth & Lee, p. 195). Development can therefore be viewed as the resolution of contradiction such that the interdependence becomes a resource (Packer, 2008; Beaty, 2013). Stetsenko similarly discusses a "unity in difference" but emphasizes movement as an essential part: It is the "basic underlying processes of ceaseless flux of motion" that keep these pairs from becoming static (2010, p. 76). Furthermore, Roth and Lee use "an analogy of threads, strands, and fibers" to conceive of different levels that repeat the contradictions (p. 195). Dialectics, therefore, is necessarily about contradictions that move us forward and the different levels that reflect and depend on one another.

Wertsch (1991) pointed out, however, that Vygotsky "did not succeed in providing a genuinely sociocultural approach to mind" (p. 46); Wertsch therefore turned to the work of Mikhail Bakhtin to connect individuals more securely to the social world. This merging of theories connects Vygotsky's (2004) ideas about concept development at the intrapsychological level to the ways in which meaning is contextualized within the action of an utterance and the activity of dialogue (Wertsch, 1991, p. 50). An utterance brings to life the intentions of a speaker through the creation of a "voice" that is always in concert with other voices while also being constrained by a particular "speech genre" (Bakhtin, 1986). Bakhtin argues that individual development is social and material: "The word is interindividual. Everything that is said, expressed, is located outside the 'soul' of the speaker and does not belong only to him [or her]. The word cannot be assigned to a single speaker" (1986, p. 121). Thus Bakhtin shifts the focus from an individual who uses mediating tools originating in social activity to processes of collaborative dialogue, targeting utterances rather than the word. To some degree Vygotsky, with his focus on concepts, was focused on people working on the material world using social tools, while Bakhtin focused on the social process of understanding the material world.

Wegerif (2008) argues, though, that the dialectics of Vygotsky and the dialogic processes of Bakhtin are incompatible. "Vygotsky's account of development involved the dialectical overcoming of participatory thought. A dialogic perspective, on the other hand, assumes such 'participation' as the ineluctable context of thought" (Wegerif, 2008, p. 355). Consistent with Elhommoumi's (2009) declaration that the "dialectic is the activity within which meanings compete for mastery and control" (p. 51), Wegerif contrasts dialogic thinking as that which involves multiple participating voices. The effort to *control* in dialectics is distinguished from "the basic idea that meaning always implies at least two voices," which maintain their unique identities and are *not* unified (Wegerif, p. 348). Most importantly, Wegerif argues that a voice is not a tool, as Wertsch had suggested, "but an answer to the question 'who is speaking?'" (p. 355).

The questionable compatibility of dialectics and dialogic processes is complicated by the phenomena to which they are applied. I initially viewed Bakhtin's (1986) concepts of *voices* and *genres* as tools for revealing developmental processes rather than as a description of a process. Later I began to appreciate the significance of Bakhtin's work for connecting different levels of development (which I further associate with Latour's (1996) ideas about Actor-Network Theory). The way that *speech genres* originate in social interactions, in distant places and times, reveals how moments of conversation are filled with a history of other genres and *voices*. Both Vygotsky and Bakhtin describe a process of the social becoming personal, but research tends to focus on a single discussion and ways of relating that are part of developmental processes but not actually about *how* the change occurs. For instance, Ferholt and Lecusay (2010) distinguish types of dialogue within a classroom that create different relationships at different points in time, but the emergence of something akin to "higher psychological processes" is beyond their scope.

The first problem is about *how* to study "developmental processes." As mentioned, Engeström (2006) has argued for *creating* development as a way of studying it. My project attempts this by involving students in collaborative research and studying their development. The second problem is about how to escape circular arguments in which development is defined in such a way that it is certain to appear. My solution is to use Werner's (1957) *orthogenetic prin-*

ciple as a standard for comparing theories. Werner argued that *differentiation* and *hierarchical integration* are the two defining aspects of development: "Rather than being able to start with language, cognition, logic, or whatever, Werner started with the notion of an organism, which would eventually develop […] differentiated functions" (Glick, 1992, p. 560). The "what" of development is therefore not expected to exist at the outset. In this project, evidence of an emerging academic discourse is sought to reveal underlying processes.

Wegerif (2008), though, does not focus on *process* as he argues that a dialectical perspective is modernist while a dialogic perspective is postmodern. He presses for multiple truths because all voices are equal in exploratory talk, creating a "space of reflection." This space is not development – though it may promote development better than other types of dialogue. Wegerif argues that the discussion does not serve as a *tool* in exploratory talk but that it creates space for reflection; and that reflection is an activity, not a process of change.

Engeström argues, "Development is a burdened, yet necessary concept" (2009, p. 312), and indeed, there can be reluctance to consider development. Few would argue that children are as equipped as adults in their psychological functioning, but the determination by researchers who are not supporting the status quo to value difference can interfere with bringing about change. Wegerif's focus on exploration suggests that dialogic processes would add new voices and genres to one's repertoire – a process of addition – as opposed to the dialectical focus on contradiction – an apparent subtractive. Both Wegerif and Elhommoumi (2009) discuss dialectics in terms overcoming differences, but Stetsenko (2010) describes *constant* motion and Roth and Lee (2007) discuss *unity in contraction*: The differences are not erased but become parts of a common idea. As new contradictions appear and old contradictions are re-experienced at a higher level, it can be argued that both offer additive processes.

Concepts and Utterances

An examination of how Bakhtin and Vygotsky described specific developmental changes reveals the nature and role of process more clearly than a decontextualized description; and they both focused on language. For Vygotsky (2004), the role of words is explicated in his model of concept development. The meaning of a word moves from associations to complexes and then to concepts – from meaningless connections to vague ideas to abstractions that are connected to a history of the word and its relations to other concepts. The word makes full abstraction possible, opening the way to higher mental functioning and allowing consciousness and agency (Packer, 2008; Beaty, 2013). Werner's concept of differentiation can be seen in the discovery of which word is used – differentiating the milk from the cup and the cat from the dog – and as the meaning emerges, a hierarchical relation connects concepts to other concepts. As they develop, they become more finely tuned tools for thinking.

By contrast, Bakhtin focused on the "utterance" and its relation to past and future utterances as well as *audiences*, *speech genres*, and *voices*. The past and future are equally a part of Vygotsky's ideas about concepts, but audiences are irrelevant because Vygotsky was not describing concepts as parts of discussions; instead concepts were tools used in object-oriented activity. Speech genres, though frequently not made explicit, also require learning and development. An individual would need exposure to and possibly direct instruction in the use of a genre; schools frequently take on these tasks. Genres must be differentiated from one another – perhaps defining one another in how they are different – and a hierarchical structure links them together as different forms of letters, essays, and stories are introduced. In acknowledging that speech genres require mastery, Bakhtin (1986) argued that the speaker's "speech will" can be expressed first in the selection of genre and then in the "nuances" expressed (p. 79). He continued,

> The better our command of genre, the more freely we employ them, the more fully and clearly we reveal our own individuality in them (where this is possible and necessary), the more flexibly and precisely we reflect the unrepeatable situation of communication – in a word, the more perfectly we implement our free speech plan. (p. 80)

Genres create a structure from which individual freedoms emerge. A similar process exists as signs mediate the relationship between stimulus and response, giving people the freedom to change their responses from that which was conditioned (Vygotsky, 1994). Both Vygotsky and Bakhtin view *will* or *agency* as the result of using the structure of language to achieve individual purposes.

Wegerif (2008) described a "dialectical overcoming of participatory thought" (p. 355), but Bakhtin (1986) also recognized a process by which individuals transform past dialogues into single voices:

"Others' words become anonymous and are assimilated (in reworded form, of course); consciousness is *monologized…* This monologized consciousness enters as one single whole into a new dialogue (with new external voices of others)" (p. 163). The language of others is unified to allow for new dialogues. This process sounds remarkably like "overcoming participatory thought," at least in the moment of a particular dialogue.

The idea of a dialogue such as exploratory talk is not so different from Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development (zoped). The "adult guidance" or "more expert peers" use dialogue and other actions to facilitate the completion of an activity that the child would otherwise not finish (p. 86), but the developmental process for the child is described as internalization. To accomplish this, the word, genre, or other action would require differentiation – to be made distinct from other actions in the activity – and to really be able to use the action, it would need to be understood hierarchically as a specific part of the activity. The differentiation of concepts and genres necessitates comparison and recognition of the conflicts that distinguish differences, suggesting the necessity of a dialectical process. The question of whether or not contradiction is part of the social relations that shape development is a separate one.

Zopeds and Dialogues

The ultimate purpose of this comparison is to develop an analysis of a series of discussions that will reveal developmental processes at both the group and individual level. Vygotsky and Bakhtin presented different points of focus: words as a way to consider the changing nature and use of concepts, and utterances to understand the mastery of academic discourse as a genre and the expression of a voice. The following excerpt will be approached differently depending on the perspective:

> One of the important questions that we looked at in terms of the interview was high-school preparation. You know, you have some students who come in, and they're better prepared. They're better prepared for college. You'll have, you'll have, you know. It's not just that, but you know you have a student who, once you say, the fact that you gave them a handout means connect the dots. That handout has some significance. You know what I mean? Making those connections. And knowing and listening and paying attention. And you know, I've had professors say to me, Oh, you must have not been here for that class. You're absolutely right; I wasn't. So I fucked

it up. What can I tell you? Right? But it's not, you know, it's college preparation. And I think part of it is, you know, temperament. Or what you're used to. It's, you know, it's a combination of things. I think it's a very hard thing to look at and to definitively say you know it's one thing or another. It points to that though. It points to not being prepared. You know?

The focus on words suggests that "college preparation" is important. In this excerpt, the student offers examples: using a handout, making connections, knowing, listening, and paying attention. She demonstrates the idea of "ascending to the concrete" by applying the concept of college preparation to a specific action – using a handout provided by the professor. She attempts to use the word to explain the example she has given, but then she recognizes the role of "temperament" in the actions she has just discussed. She acknowledges that college preparation is not a sufficient explanation for the activity – she differentiates the idea from others – by offering a second word. The way to pursue whether or not she demonstrates change then is by looking for other uses of these words and ideas connected to these words in some form. Are they used as tools more frequently and do they offer a more differentiated and hierarchical relation to other ideas as time passes?

By contrast, focusing on this excerpt as an utterance means we examine how it is related to the utterances before and after in the immediate discussion as well as in earlier discussions. Many explanations were considered over the academic year for why few students graduate from community college, and it is interesting that in this moment she attempts to give the definitive explanation but cannot follow through. Multiple voices arise in this utterance as she undertakes a dialogue with herself – with the different voices that she has taken as her own. Yet the nature of scientific work demands a push for the "best" theory. This is the academic genre she attempts to use, but as the mentor of the group, I pushed for exploration and intended to put more effort into having them question their ideas than offer hypotheses (analysis will reveal how often this occurred). Perhaps this multi-voiced utterance demonstrates a conflict between two speech genres – a failed effort to differentiate – or perhaps she is employing an effort at one genre but experiences a conflict between the structure of the genre and her voice that she cannot yet resolve. An examination of how hypotheses, variables, and critique are discussed, how particular genres are used in earlier discussions, and how often utterances involve multiple voices will allow the emergence of a pattern that may or may not show the mastery of genres and an emergence of voice. Does the structure of

genres make the voice possible? Or is it a more social marker?

In this case, the speaker nearly always asserted her position when she spoke, but she did not express herself in a way that was "academic." She has highly developed speech genres for other types of dialogues, but she resisted many aspects of academic discourse, most notably in the choice of vocabulary that was expected. Her resistance is a topic of its own to be more fully considered elsewhere, but the apparent need for her to take on new genres so that she could move from an accomplished counselor who lacked formal education and had been dependent on other people's grants into someone who could apply for grants herself, demonstrates a social purpose.

As written above, Wegerif (2008) alluded to the idea of multiple truths that often comes into conflict with modernist views of science and the idea of psychological development. The mastery of new genres, however, can be considered developmental "progress" that is movement in different directions. Engeström (2006; 2009) has proposed this with the concept of "expansive development." "Horizontal or sideways learning and development" recognizes how alternative ways of thinking can be incorporated into an individual's activities (Engeström, 2006, p. 153). This is a process of taking on a new way of acting and thinking and is visible when considering the different approaches professionals of different disciplines take to a common problem. This developmental expansion is perhaps more consistent with the dialogic process. A new speech genre – in this case – is not about developing higher psychological functioning, but about mastering the new ways of expressing these capacities. It is an example of multi-linearity in psychological development – horizontal movement onto new lines. The progress of mastering a particular genre, however, will still involve differentiation – making the way of speaking more clearly different from other ways of speaking. If this student is to become a psychologist and gain the respect of institutions that can offer grants, she will need to speak the language that is expected and understand the problems of the youth with whom she had previously worked in ways psychologists are expected to – or to speak well enough to demonstrate why they are insufficient – even though she had sufficient understandings to make a difference in their lives without a formal education.

Conclusions

Dialectical and dialogic processes are not categorically different when we examine how concepts, genres, and voices develop. The terms, however, are oriented to different levels: an intrapsychological process that is dialectical and an interpsychological process that is dialogic. At the interpsychological level, there can be an effort to collaboratively find the Truth or there can be an effort to expand each voice in the collective and try different perspectives without an effort to resolve the tensions. At the intrapsychological level, vertical development – that which is traditionally discussed when considering the differences between children and adults – seems to draw out a similarity between dialectical and dialogic progression whereas horizontal development is akin to acquiring new genres that remain independent of other lines of development or that share important concepts but involve switching the focus or terminology.

The problem of transference may necessitate yet another developmental process as concepts are integrated across borders without losing the structure of genres. People have been known to maintain contradictory positions without ever recognizing the contradiction, but this suggests a lack of differentiation. Interestingly, Bakhtin (1986) made his own comparison:

> Dialogue and dialectics. Take a dialogue and remove the voices (the partitioning of voices), remove the intonations (emotional and individualizing ones), carve out abstract concepts and judgments from living words and responses, cram everything into one abstract consciousness – and that's how you get dialectics. (p. 147)

Based on Bakhtin's own approach to analysis, it is difficult to know the full meaning of this utterance, because it was taken from his "notes," removed from a larger dialogue. Yet, even though Bakhtin seems taking a negative view of dialectics here, the distinction he made may hold to some extent without the negativity.

Dialogue is fundamentally about the conversations people have; dialogue is about relationships. Dialectics, on the other hand, is about a process of developing the capacity for abstractions and the continued development of consciousness, giving individuals the ability to regulate their actions and make choices rather than just respond to stimuli. There is a distancing in this process (which can exist at a collective level) that allows us to think abstractly and look "objectively" at ourselves. Reflection in this sense is not a dialogic process, which is necessarily about

maintaining concrete voices. This abstraction and materiality, however, work together in a dialectical unity of opposites.

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* Austin, TX: University of Texas.

Beaty, L. M. (2013). Confronting school's contradictions with video: Youth's need of agency for ontological development. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies, 14*(1), 4-25. Available at http://ojs.statsbiblioteket.dk/index.php/outlines/index

Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2006). Development, movement and agency: Breaking away into mycorrhizae activities. In K. Yamazumi (Ed.), *Building activity theory in practice: Toward the next generation.* Osaka: Center for Human Activity Theory, Kansai University (CHAT Technical Reports #1). Available at http://www.chat.kansai-u.ac.jp/publications/tr/v1_1.pdf

Engeström, Y. (2009). The future of activity theory: A rough draft. In A. Sannino, H. Daniels, and K. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Learning and expanding with activity theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferholt, B., & Lecusay, R. (2010). Adult and child development in the zone of proximal development: Socratic dialogue in a playworld. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 17,* 59-83.

Glick, J. A. (1992). Werner's relevance for contemporary developmental psychology. *Developmental Psychology, 28*(4), 558-565.

Latour, B. (1996). On interobjectivity. *Mind, Culture, and Activity: An International Journal*, *3*(4), 228-245.

Packer, M. J. (2008). Is Vygotsky relevant? Vygotsky's Marxist psychology. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, *15*, 8-31.

Roth, W.-M., & Lee, Y. -J. (2007). Vygotsky's neglected legacy: Cultural-historical activity theory. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(2), 186-232.

Stetsenko, A. (2010). Standing on the shoulders of giants: A balancing act of dialectically theorizing conceptual understanding on the grounds of Vygotsky's project. In W.-M. Roth (Ed.), *Re/structuring science education: ReUniting psychological and sociological perspectives* (pp. 69-88). New York: Springer.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, and E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp. 79-91). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (2004). Development of thinking and formation of concepts in the adolescent (M. J. Hall, Trans.). In R. W. Rieber and D. K. Robinson (Eds), *The Essential Vygotsky* (pp. 415-470). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Vygotsky, L., & Luria, A. (1994). Tool and symbol in child development. In R. v. d. V. J. Valsiner (Ed.), *The Vygotsky Reader* (pp. 99-174). Oxford: Blackwell.

Wegerif, R. (2008). Dialogic or dialectic? The significance of ontological assumptions in research on educational dialogue. *British Educational Research Journal, 34*(3), 347-361.

Werner, H. (1957). *Comparative psychology of mental development* (Rev. ed.). New York: International Universities Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.