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Foreword

The first maxim of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi was a very simple phrase, yet a very enigmatic challenge to the person: ‘Know thyself’. This injunction is in fact the opaquest of all. Can we confront ourselves directly? Do we not always see ourselves indirectly - *via* our social world, our relationships with other selves and the objects that organise our proximal environment. Are we ever transparent to ourselves?

And of course, there are aspects of human experience that occur without reflection, and ‘spontaneously’. Desire, attraction, phobia, disgust, pleasure, obsession, compulsion, dread, moral feeling, aesthetic tastes, sexuality, gender-identity, ambition, and other life orientations can all be areas that are ‘discovered’ within; the origins of which can be obscure to the individual themselves, and difficult or even impossible for them to explain.

One response to this challenge can be to head into the psychological interior, in an experiential inquiry that seeks an answer to the question: ‘What does it mean to be *me*’? Countless journeys of this kind give us worlds of poetry, narrative literature, and personal philosophies.

Another response is to ask ‘What is the ‘self’ *itself*, in its material reality - ‘material’ in the sense of being social in origin, development, and agency?’ Then ‘What is the ‘personal self’, the identity that emerges in a contextual world of relationships with other selves?’ And, arising from these questions, ‘What kind of materialismdo we need to account for the self; one that can explain types of behaviour in specific historical contexts?’

Glancing ahead, for each of these questions respectively, the answers we will work towards are: ‘self’ understood as social strategy; and ‘materialism’ understood as the challenge of survival, and the concomitant negotiation of social – and existential – risk; with the various types of mental, cognitive, and conceptual repression this entails for the person, and for organisations within class society.

And here also we will say that all aspects of the self are social in origin; and that biology – whilst dictating the absolute material requirements for existence – does not determine interpersonal behaviour.

Our aim ultimately is to describe how a general model-of-mind, can become a socially specific and personal mind, with all that means for ideology, gender, and individual orientations in the world.
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**Introdu****ction**

A ‘historical’ account of mental life must be at once general enough to serve as a ‘model-of-mind’, applicable across all human societies, always and in all places; whilst also adaptable enough to produce an explanation of ‘modes-of-mind’ that are specific to historical settings and geographical locations. Marxism famously offers explanations of historical consciousness and of ideology, and these provide a framing for any discussion of mind as a historical phenomenon. More difficult to locate within Marxism is a structural account of mind understood as a historical and social object: an account of mind *per se*.

This is problematic insofar as so much of our social reality is *experienced* not at the most general historical level, nor at the level of an abstract and atomised individual (that never really appears), but at an intermediate level – and indeed many levels – between the two. It matters for accounts of gender, sexual orientation, individual pathology, aesthetic sensibility, and so forth. In turn these are important for a full understanding of the character of personal liberation within movements of social change and revolution. The problem also has implications for the question of ‘human nature’ within Marxism. The theoretical space that exists here demands a content. One means by which this is filled is with appeals to complex biology in which brain structure, and accompanying inherited traits interact dialectically with social influences, leaving biology as an essential factor in these accounts, albeit socially mediated.

However, there is another hypothesis that should be considered, and that will be explored here. This is the possibility that within the mind and its behavioural manifestations, there are deep and embedded processes that, whilst they originate in society, are hidden from the person’s own self-awareness, their effects being experienced as ‘natural’. Developing such an idea however, requires a model-of-mind, even if only in hypothetical form. This is its why its absence within Marxism is a problem; and one that we will address.

One thinker who did theorise the mind in a structural sense, and also famously, was Sigmund Freud. Putting aside the question of whether one embraces Freud’s modelling of the mind, rejects it entirely, or something in-between, it will serve here as a starting point for critical reflections about the mind by comparing his conceptual logic with that of Marx. This comparison will serve as a heuristic device to organise the discussion that follows. Along the way related aspects will be visited, such as the relationships between mind and brain, the use of biology in explanations of human behaviour and the meaning of social causality.

Marxism provides the theoretical starting and ending points here. However, it is interesting, rewarding and sometimes important to engage with the ideas of Freud, even where we finally put them aside. This is an unfashionable thing to say. Freud is not a respectable reference in Anglophone academic psychology. In the long wake of Karl Popper’s critique in his 1962 *Science: Conjectures and Refutations,*[[1]](#footnote-1)Freud’s ideas are seen as unscientific in failing the test of falsifiability, antiquarian and even quixotic. Freud has also fared poorly under feminist critiques that point to sexual stereotyping and misogynistic undercurrents in his constructions.[[2]](#footnote-2) Especially damning has been the charge that Freud effectively colluded in the concealment of child abuse, rejecting the validity of accounts from his female patients of sexual molestation by their fathers during childhood, and casting these reports into the realm of fantasy.[[3]](#footnote-3)

And there is sport to be had trading in quotations from Freud’s vast complete works stretching to 24 volumes.[[4]](#footnote-4) In the end, for all of Freud’s eloquence as writer his speculative formulations, dream interpretations and pronouncements upon the human condition do not stand up well to a modern critical reading. Indeed, it would be easy to see Freud as important only for his place in European Twentieth Century culture; a figure merely of historical and perhaps biographical interest. But no more.

However, this misses something important about Freud. Whilst his *oeuvre* reflects the Viennese *fin d’siecle* cultural landscape in which he worked and developed intellectually,[[5]](#footnote-5) it is also true that his work offers occasional insights into human behaviour that are thought-provoking; creating novel perspectives that are potentially relevant beyond the intellectual and cultural hinterland from which they came. Moreover, there are ideas and observations about the workings of the mind that should be taken seriously, even as only hypotheses, by any philosophy that is concerned with human oppression and its opposite, human liberation. So, it is the underlying logic of Freud’s formulations that is the focus here, based upon a critical appreciation of his significance as a ‘paradigm thinker’.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Whilst Marx developed an understanding of how ideas are controlled in the interests of ruling classes, Freud examined the fine structure of interpersonal relationships and human passions. Marx traced the social, political and psychological processes by which ruling ideas are propagated in society, and the ways in which exploitation under capitalism is eclipsed by the appearance of fair exchange. Freud suggested an intra-psychical mechanism by which outward familial relations become internalised into the life of the person.

Freud’s theorising of the human mind, and of human behaviour revolves around the pivotal concept of a repressed unconscious. Even where psychoanalytical categories are otherwise incompatible with those that provide the foundations of Marxism, a critical appreciation of this notion, and its incorporation into a historical model-of-mind is something to be considered. Potentially, ‘repression’ can provide an explanation of the relationship between the person and their society that takes account of identities, behaviours, and desires over which they have little or no conscious control and which they experience as fate. Using it in this way we will see however, means reworking it through the Hegelian philosophical categories that influences Marx in his early theorisations of the historical subject.

A key theme developing through this discussion is that the concept of ‘repression’ and of a ‘repressed unconscious’ allows for an explanation of feelings that are experienced spontaneously by the person and interpreted by them as ‘natural’. Obvious examples of this are the sexual urge, sexuality, and gender; and there are other aspects to this. A central contention throughout is that ‘All is social’. In other words that the physical aspects of our bodies and the ‘wiring’ of our brains do not explain the structural aspects of human social behaviour or relationships. Putting biologistic factors aside entirely is provocative. Anticipating this, the general contours of the theoretical position to come are given here, mapping broadly the more detailed argument to follow.

This exploration begins with the acknowledgement that there are indeed types of social experience and personal life that for the individual seem inevitable, merely a matter of inter-generational chance or of familial inheritance. For the Marxist this is problematic. Whilst seeking to avoid appeals to biological causes for things such as sexual feeling and attraction, because of the conservative tendencies they typically suggest, equally any reduction to culture can be dismissed as one-dimensional, idealist or unscientific.

An alternative to biology being used in a reductionist fashion to account for spontaneous human behaviour, is an appeal to the ‘complex biology’ alluded to already; a biology that does not depend upon unilinear causality originating at the genetic level, travelling outwards to create phenotypic and behavioural effects. Rather, causality is conceptualised as multi-directional, causes and effects as changing places, and phenotype capable of influencing gene expression in processes described as ‘epigenetic’. The genome itself is seen as labile, with the transposition of genes occurring with the relocation of sections of DNA along a chromosome or even across different chromosomes; this also resurrecting potentially a version of Lamarckism, where chromosomal changes happen in gametes under the influence of the environment.

A type of complex biologism that became influential on the political left in the 1970s is ‘dialectical biology’. Associated with the work most notably of Richard Lewontin, this draws upon all the insights mentioned above, and more. Whilst such complex biological processes are fascinating, and indeed compelling in the accounts of life-processes by scientists such as Lewontin and his collaborators[[7]](#footnote-7) in their popular publishing, the argument here will be that they should not be applied to human social behaviour beyond the most abstract accounts of human capacity. The issue is that where ‘biology’ resides as an assumption in our interpretations of specific social behaviour, there also will remain the search for the biological element as a necessary explanatory ‘factor’. At a more general level, the traditional ‘mind and brain’ problem in western philosophy, that revolves around interpretations of the relationship between the two, notwithstanding any insistence that they are ‘mutually influencing’ of one another, then gravitates back to naturalistic models. This is increasingly so with each leap of the brain sciences, and with each (amazing) discovery of the neuro-physical events that we experience as – and that substantively *are* - mental activity; and that we experience as spontaneous feelings and drives. The ‘dialectical’ aspect of this complex biology then is unstable when applied as an explanation of any specific human behaviour.

Navigating this wide river of inquiry, requires explorations of the tributaries running away from, though always returning to its main course. The questions involved are old and difficult. ‘What do we mean by ‘mind’?’ ‘Can we speak of an authentic ‘self’ and if so, what might that mean?’ ‘What do we mean by a ‘materialist’ view of the world and of human behaviour within it?’ ‘As the science of the brain advances, can we discern how we might one day explain the mind?’ And ‘What of ‘human nature’, of sex and gender, of our ‘sense-of-self’, and of our inter-personal behaviours: do these aspects of our experience as human beings emerge from our biology, from our social interactions, or as an amalgam of both?’

If we put biological categories aside, the question remains ‘What then is our alternative framework to account for those affective states that we experience as ‘natural’?’ Putting the question differently we can ask ‘What is the plausibility of an *entirely* non-essentialist account of human behaviour, distinct from the essentialism and mediated-essentialism of these different uses of biology?’ Answering this question will require reformulation of some aspects of Marxism itself; and a reworking of the meaning of ‘materialism’ in explanations of human behaviour. But before we embark on that perilous journey, we will survey what has gone before and the most historically prominent and influential attempts to explain the human mind as a social object.

First, we will consider the various speculations on the nature of mind through history. Also, we will discuss how Freud modelled the mind in different phases of his career, how mental life has been treated within the Marxist tradition, the attempts made to bring these two quite different traditions of thought together on this question, and ultimately the impossibility of a synthesis of their foundational conceptual categories; whilst noting the resonances of some aspects of each of their respective theorisations of the self. And we will introduce the important notion of ‘first and second nature’ found within Marxism as one way in which an account of the mind can be framed.

Second, we will trace the historical interactions between Marxism and psychoanalysis. This interaction has been continuous since the early part of the Twentieth Century and is itself something to be explained. The rises and falls of these interactions, the historical episodes in which they happened, and the controversies they engendered, in different ways are each revealing of the struggles from which they emerged. They expressed both the hopes for human liberation in periods of resistance, revolt and revolution, and the despair of the defeats into which those revolutions plunged. They also often exposed the theoretical weaknesses and ideological fragmentations of the dominant interpretations of Marxism at the time.

Third, we will consider an account of the human mind that is located within the major categories of Marxism. However, this will also be with amendments to some of its organising elements. ‘Materialism’ within Marxism for instance, will be premised upon ‘risk’ in relation to social success and survival, crucially involving the principle of psychological ‘repression’ refashioned from its more familiar usage in psychoanalytical theory. The result is a ‘social materialism’ that acts as a third term mediating between the individual mind and its historical context; and one also that illuminates the behaviour of individuals, social groups, and organisations.

Finally, we will evaluate the implications of this model of mind, and the ways in which it supports a setting aside of ‘biology’ understood as a set of factors that combine with social factors to produce behavioural structures. Instead, the primacy of the form of human labour in any given society – and its mode-of-production - will be reasserted as the principal driver of social relationships, operating at a level that is causally prior to the moment-to-moment experiential aspects of conscious activity.

# **Part I. Modelling the mind**

## Views of the mind

The question of ‘the mind’ understood as something ‘non-material’ existing in a material body has vexed western philosophy since the European Enlightenment. Before this, in the ancient world, precursor ideas of the mixing and merging of the non-material and the material infused the symbolism of myth and religion. The towering figure Gilgamesh of the ancient Mesopotamian capital of Uruk, drew his strength from being two thirds god, one third human. In the pre-Socratic Hellenic world, the trade in ideas between Greece, Asia, Africa, and the Near East provided the basis for the mysticism of Pythagoras for whom the soul consisted of three parts: feeling; intuition; and reason. Of these, reason alone, residing in the brain, was immortal. In the *I-Ching*, or ‘Book of Changes’, as it was developed by Wen Wang of the Zhou dynasty of 11th Century BC China, the ordered metaphysics of the yang – the celestial (and male) principle of light, energy, and productivity – and the yin – the earthly (and female) principle of body, matter, and death – provided the key to all reality.

In 5th Century Greece, the status of ‘the soul’ also animated philosophical speculation. Plato held that the soul was insubstantial, and an essence that would survive the end of corporeal existence. For Aristotle, rather the soul was a form essentially inseparable from the human body, as the general aspect of specific human attributes. So ‘behaviour’ was the general aspect – the form – of all behaviours; ‘motion’, the form of all motions; *etc.* ‘Soul’ then, was the form of human life, and so perishable with the human being to which it belonged.

Each of these takes on the question of the relationship between a ‘material’ and a ‘non-material’ aspect to human existence, would later influence different intellectual traditions and historical phases of theological teaching in the mediaeval Christian church. Neo-Platonism was to shape the foundational concepts on the question of the soul – seen as having an existence both before and after corporeality – and its relationship to the body, in the teachings of Augustine. The ancient Hellenic notions of materialism, eclipsed for generations by Christian Neo-Platonist theology, began to find an echo once again in the Thirteenth Century works of Thomas Aquinas. Responding to the late mediaeval encounter with the rationalism of Islamic science and mathematics in the work of figures such as Avicenna and Averroes, Aquinas returned to the original texts of Aristotle, adapting them for the Christian theology of his time. For Aquinas the soul came to represent the form of all living beings. For animals the soul would perish with the body. For human beings however, and departing from Aristotle’s hylomorphic immanentism, the soul was both substantial in this animal sense, but also subsistent, meaning that it continued after corporeal death, remaining also capable of mental activity. In this sense it was metaphysically of two worlds, having an existence rooted in both the material world and in the spiritual world, inhabited by purely subsistent beings such as angels and the heavenly divinities.

**‘Brain’ and ‘Mind’.** These are not the same kinds of object. ‘The brain’ is a ‘discrete object’; having an enclosed, and boundaried status, with an internal structure that can be distinguished from its surroundings. ‘The mind’, by contrast, is a ‘relational object’, existing *between* human beings, and inferred from mental states and behaviours derived from myriad social interactions. This important distinction becomes lost in the application of naturalising biological categories – including those of dialectical biology - in explanations of mental states.

In the modern era, the question of a co-existent relationship between the ‘material’ and the ‘immaterial’ in the human being, was given a new and rationalist expression in the seminal work of René Descartes. For Descartes the body had ‘extension’ in space, was divisible and was material; whereas the mind did not have extension, was indivisible and was immaterial. Whilst animal spirits conducted motion throughout the body, mind was located in the pineal gland, through which also the passions of the soul were transmitted. This ontological dualism came to represent a pivot for much of the European philosophy that was to follow, representing a reference point for philosophers of mind to the present day.

Whilst for Descartes, the mind was substantial – an immaterial ‘ghost’ in a material bodily ‘machine’[[8]](#footnote-8) – for David Hume, the mind did not exist at all as a unified, substantial entity. Rather experiences grouped together in associative ‘bundles’ to create the illusion of a ‘self’.

In contrast to Hume’s ‘Bundle Theory’, Immanuel Kant did hold to a notion of mind; one that was intrinsically involved in his theory of knowledge, setting its limits. However, rather than offering a model-of-mind *per se*, Kant’s scattered comments on ‘mind’ addressed its operations - what it does, rather than what it is.

For Kant, mind provides the conditions of knowledge of the world. Crucially, space and time provide the constitutive framework for the intuitions by which apperception – the bringing of external objects of perception into the mind with self-consciousness awareness of their meaning and relation to other perceptions – creates experience. For Kant, the mind also plays a synthesising role. This refers to the creation of unified constructions from the disparate elements of experience and cognition. This he saw as happening in three connected ways. First, the mind constructs the spatial and temporal structure by which we can apprehend objects in the world: ‘Synthesis of Apprehension in Intuition’. Second, the objects that we apprehend must be brought into a unified field of other objects as they became incorporated into mental (‘imaginary’) processes, understood in relation to one another: ‘Synthesis of Reproduction in the Imagination’. Third, objects must be recognised in the conceptual form in which they can become known to a mind: ‘Synthesis of Recognition in a Concept’. A fundamental function of the mind for Kant, was its facility for the unification of manifold reality into representational singularities within thought.

Whereas Kant’s functionalist view of mind had transcended immediate, local, or temporal context, Hegel viewed mind, not as a universal structure, but rather as developing in time, as historical and as intersubjective. For Hegel mind is essentially ‘activity’. Indeed, it was Hegel’s intention to reconcile historically relativizing categories with Kant’s universalist account of human cognition, that gives his philosophy its animus. He called this paradox of the temporal and the eternal in the human condition, the ‘finite-infinite’.

**Does ‘brain’ cause ‘mind’?** The brain affects mental activity in many ways. The tragedy of neurodegenerative disease makes this abundantly, and terribly, clear. The chemical effects of hallucinogenic and psychotropic drugs provide another example. Tumours in the brain can create disinhibited social behaviour. Another awful example is that brain mal-development caused by *in utero* maternal malnutrition can result in lowered mental capacity later in the infant. Hormones we know can affect concentration and mood. Many people in their older years, will also be familiar with the challenges of new learning as neuronal networks form more slowly and with fewer connections. Finally, as we get older, as our brains lose neuronal networks and connections, we become forgetful. Obviously, brain states affect mental function.

However, it does not follow that the neuronal events that make mental life possible, are therefore responsible for its content; and it is there that mental activity connects with social behaviour. So, whilst brain activity creates the general capacity for mind as well as mental function (focus, agility, clarity, abstractive facility, memory, and so forth), it does not create its specific and social consequences or meaning in ways that are relevant to questions about the relationship between brain and inter-personal behaviour.

For Hegel, the concepts that necessarily mediate the objects of the external world as they enter the mind, allowing comprehension to emerge from apprehension, are the basis of the logic that gives rise to understanding. These concepts require a consciousness to which they belong. More than this however, they give rise to self-consciousness as the holder of the concept becomes aware of it as something distinct from them, whilst simultaneously belonging to them. Fundamental to all of this is the recognition of other self-conscious beings that result from the same concept-object dialectic, and that are also the source of the mediating concepts themselves. These steps in Hegel’s logic effect a shift from the workings of mind-in-itself, to the workings of mind-in-the-world: from ‘subjective spirit’ to ‘objective spirit’. It represents the ‘materialist-side’ of Hegel’s system, taking us from a focus upon the internal dialectic of the subjective self, to processes of intersubjective communication located in family, cultural, religious, and ethical life.[[9]](#footnote-9)

In the Twentieth Century, debates about the nature of mind took different directions, often beginning with starting points provided by these earlier philosophical traditions but influenced also by discoveries in brain research. Common to most however, was a naturalistic paradigm that saw all aspects of mental life as ultimately material; in other words, intrinsically neuronal activity, albeit with different opinions about the types of causation involved.

One approach that dominated the philosophy-of-mind in this period, and that continues to do so, has been ‘functionalism’. Functionalism is an all-encompassing term for a range of perspectives that understand the various aspects of mind in the light of their inputs and outputs. Drawing upon cognition-research, empirical psychology, linguistics and computational science, functionalism, more than any other discourse on mind and its associated states, has drawn upon technological paradigms for support. In ‘computational theories’ of mind, mental processes have been compared to the ‘software’ that provides the informational content to the ‘hardware’ of the brain. Algorithmic, programmatic and logic-based analogies have created overlaps with speculation about the possibilities of artificial intelligence, machine thinking and possible other types of mind. In ‘identity theories’ mental states have been seen as essentially brain states, defined solely by neuronal networks and pathways. Some influential functionalist approaches in modern discussions of the mind, and concordant with thinkers such as David Hume in the 18th Century and Gilbert Ryle and W. V. Quine in the 20th century, have rejected the notion of ‘mind’ itself as a substantive entity. Such ‘eliminative’ positions have been promoted more recently in different ways by philosophers such as Daniel Dennett who rejected the reality of the phenomenal and subjective aspects of mental experience; and Paul and Patricia Churchland who reject the mind of ‘folk-psychology’ by which the mind of another is presumed to be real, based upon their outward behaviours and responses to one’s own intentional behaviour.

If eliminativism is at one extreme of a spectrum of a range of different theories-of-mind, at the other we can position psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis, certainly in its classical early 20th Century form accounted for mind as an existent thing, explained as a substantive structure, and animated by identifiable psychical forces. At different stages of his publishing career Sigmund Freud developed various accounts of psychical processes and human development and behaviour.

Here they are in summary:

* the economic model, characterised by physicalist assumptions of energy balance, quantified energy flows, mechanical force, and electrical discharge;
* the topographical model, organised around different levels of consciousness;
* the psychodynamic model, rooted in drives towards pleasure and gratification, and also inhibitory defences;
* the genetic model, through which the individual develops in psychosexual stages – oral, anal, phallic, latent and genital - linked to the erogenous zones of the body;
* the structural model, comprising separate and rivalrous entities that make up the totality of the individual psyche: the id; the ego; and the superego.

Of these, the two that approximate most closely to what we can recognise as models of mind were the ‘topographical’ and the ‘structural’.

The topographical model, first presented in Freud’s The *Interpretation of Dreams* (1899), comprised: a conscious realm of self-aware mental- and life-activity; a pre-conscious realm of hidden, but easily accessible memories; and an unconscious realm of repressed experiences and traumas accessible only by analysis. The structural model, presented in *The Ego and the Id* (1923), consisted not only of ‘areas’ of mental activity, but of active entities that overlaid these, each with their own strivings and agendas. These were: the id, all-consumed with basic desires and drives; the ego, tasked with navigating a path through reality towards all kinds of wish-fulfilments and goals; and the superego, concerned with higher values and social obligations.

In the modern era what had disappeared from all the most established philosophical positions, was any lingering notion of the ‘immaterial’, and the ontological dualism that had characterised thinking on the mind from Plato’s soul to the Cartesian paradigm. However, whilst ‘materialist’ discourses have come to dominate entirely, seeing all mental activity as ultimately the ‘matter-in-motion’ that is neuronal activity, rather than appealing to incorporeal vital forces, this need not entail mechanical reductionism, and the physicalist tendencies it creates. ‘Dual-attribute’ theories of mind, for instance’, informed by the notions of ‘substance’ and ‘mode’ of Benedict Spinoza, emphasise the different types of brain activity that we can designate as ‘higher mental state’, and ‘basal brain function’, both being located entirely in a neuro-physical material substrate. In this – *differentiated* - materialism, the various types of mental activity, for example those associated with symbolic thinking, abstract reasoning, emotional communication and so on, whilst all understood ultimately as manifestations of the brain’s material processes, are also seen as belonging to different orders of that same material reality.

Still, the characterisation of ‘mind’ as essentially ‘material’, is taken as a given for the rest of our speculations. But what might these terms might mean exactly?

**What is ‘materialism’?**

The statement ‘All is matter’ is not new. The idea that no entity exists, human or otherwise, that is not ultimately reducible to a material substrate, one that does not depend upon anything divine or supernatural for its creation or sustenance, we can trace back at least to the pre-Socratic philosophers of Ancient Greece. The cosmologies of these various philosophical schools all had their different elemental substances. Competing ontologies emerged from the Milesian school especially. Thales of Miletus, teaching in the 7th Century BC held that water was the irreducible basis of reality. For the generation that followed, the students of Thales, Anaximander and Anaximenes chose different foundational substrata: Anaximander, an abstract and featureless substance, *apeiron*; and Anaximenes, air. For Heraclitus of the Ephesian school of the late 6th and early 5th Centuries BC, fire was the source of the flux of the natural world. For Empedocles it was the combination of four irreducible substances – earth, air, fire, and water - that in their different combinations, and organised by the two opposing forces of love and conflict, create the world as we experience it. For the philosophers of 5th Century Elea, Parmenides and Zeno, the multiplicities of our experienced reality were reducible to ‘the One’: a singular, imperishable and unchanging substance. Even Plato, the philosopher of Forms, the immaterial soul, and The Divine Craftsman, offers a materialist cosmology in *The Timaeus*. There, his character Timaeus explains, the world is comprised of the four elements - again of earth, air, fire, and water - each constituted of atom-like polyhedra that combine in different chemical and mathematical amalgamations; albeit supported by the mysterious ‘Receptacle’.

At the heart of these metaphysical systems in each case was a quest for a fundamental and self-supporting realm; a material foundation that was indivisible, so representing an absolute endpoint for analysis. The most prescient of these ancient formulations came with the atomism of Leucippus, and after him of his student, the Thracian Democritus. For both, ‘atoms’ were indeed indivisible, and eternal; assembling, disassembling, and reassembling, to create the objects of human experience as they moved through the void. For the 4th Century BC philosopher and follower of Democritus, Epicurus, also the observable world was the result of the movement of invisibly small atoms; although with the difference that each could move indeterminately, at points ‘swerving’ randomly in its motion.

This philosophical atomism was carried into the cultural undergrowth of mediaeval scholasticism and early Renaissance thought by a single Roman text written in the 1st Century. The *De Rerum Natura*, penned by the Epicurean Lucretius, described the cosmos as having emerged from Chaos; and the material world the result of the churn of an infinitude of materially irreducible particles; the atoms.

Briefly reflecting upon this classical atomism before updating its story, the imagery of ‘the atom’ is thus far a sensory one. That is, the atoms are ‘material’ in the same way that our felt world is material. The atom then, is an extension into the invisibly small scale of our own familiar reality; the meaning of ‘material’ being of a kind with the ‘matter’ we experience.

This ‘materialism of the tangible’ however, is qualified by the notion of ‘force’. Forces are aspects of the material domain, of course; but they are not material in the same sense. Whilst we know their existence through the *movement* of matter, they are not *per se* materially substantial. For the pre-Socratics, the forces that drove the movement of atoms could be animistic: ‘love’ and ‘strife’, for example. The notion of force was to change with the emergence of modern scientific thought. In the 17th Century Newton’s gravitational theory put the idea of force at the centre of a new cosmology; its mathematical exactitude echoing the Pythagorean insistence upon ‘number’ as the root of things. Later, Dalton’s atomic theory and what would become the Rutherford-Bohr model of the atom, required inter-atomic forces that held atoms together in precise mathematical combinations. Force theory has since developed to include strong and weak inter-molecular forces, electrical forces and an array of force-bearing sub-atomic particles and quantum-forces (gauge-bosons) that mediate the motion of material particles (fermions). The strangeness of this modern materialism is only compounded by other counter-intuitive components of current cosmological modelling, such as the mysterious ‘dark matter’, and the even more mysterious ‘dark energy’.

So, ‘materialism’ is not quite the reduction of everything to ‘matter’ (to be precise, the ‘baryonic matter’ of our experiential world). Perhaps better to say that materialism refers to the idea that all is explainable in ‘material terms’; so, matter and what pertains to matter. But again, this tautology throws us back upon the exact meaning of our language; and specifically, upon the meaning of the word ‘matter’, which, given its hazy status in modern scientific thinking (in the lay imagination, at least) is problematic for the clarity we are after. Perhaps we should simply say that all is explainable within the nature of the reality that is independent of the human mind; whatever that turns out to be. Naturally, that up-ends any notion that there is something exceptional about mind itself; something non-material, that is. Into the frame here of course come religious and quasi-religious notions of spirit, super-naturalism and intelligent creation that invest life, and especially human life, with divine charm.

So, ‘materialism’ in this primary sense, is above all a comment upon the status of the human mind. In its classical and modern meanings, and independently of any current theorising of the physical world, it is essentially a philosophical position; one that decentres the human mind from any enthroned special status as being something other than part of the totality of ordinary things. This philosophical materialism is essentially the stance of the opponents of religion.

This is the meaning that unites the materialism of the ancient world with that of its modern proponents; and precisely so. For Epicurus, mind cannot be incorporeal as Plato had taught; mind must indeed be matter. The picture that was painted by Lucretius in *De Rerum Natura* was of a cold universe, indifferent to the suffering of humankind. The gods, though they existed had not created the cosmos, and did not involve themselves at all in human affairs. Moreover, death was the end; no incorporeal substance would remain.

**What is mind?**

What is it that we have in mind when we ask, ‘What is mind?’ Of course, there are many aspects to this: ideas; conceptualisations of objects; self-awareness; decision-making; conscious apprehensions of the world; awareness of other selves; intuitions; mental activity; sense-of-self; *etc.* These and other things can be treated as examples of the *content* of mind, rather than mind itself: ‘mind’ being the substantive structure that accommodates them; or is their sum; or perhaps their articulating medium. For Freud, we would have to consider the term ‘psyche’ as covering these attributes, but also including the sexual and gendered self; and of course, the unconscious. For Marx, we would have to consider the term ‘subject’ understood both in its individual meaning, and its more general status as the active - or conscious - side of history.

So, we are talking of the totality of mental activity, and the inward aspects of humanity’s position in its environment; and of the relationship of the person to their own environment, understood as both the external world that they inhabit and the internal emotional landscape that supports their ‘sense-of-self’. It follows from this that we privilege the mind as a personal entity, and as having an individuality that whilst social in origin and character, nonetheless operates as a thinking, decision-making and ethical centre.

We distinguish here also between mental function that interacts with somatic states and sensations in the life of the person, and the translation of those states and sensations into social meaning and behaviour. Whilst moment-to-moment mental function is experienced in the body as feeling and emotion, these are not seen here as the origin of the individual ‘mind’ *per se*. Of course there is always a physical element in our behaviour. This is materiality of our existence. However, whilst our bodies affect our behaviour, and irritability and mood affect how we interact with others, these aspects of our physicality do not create the relational modes that make up our culture at the aggregate scale and in and out of which we move. The social forms that constitute types of sexual pairing, transactional interaction, ownership-relations, family structure, sub-cultural bonding, competitive strategy, institutional identity, *etc.* make up the behavioural characteristics of any given society, each having their accompanying mental aspects. However, the establishment and maturation of the mind and its consequences for the person are seen here as rooted in ideology and social interaction, introjected as inward mental structure. ‘Mind’ now is understood not something that arises from nature, an intergenerational constant, but as an essentially social formation. And ‘Biology’, understood as *inheritance*, is regarded here as a false and distorting category when used to explain behavioural *structure*.

Later, we will inquire, ‘Is there are commonality between Marx (and Marxism) and Freud (and psychoanalysis) on the question of relationship between the mind and its external world?’

**Mind and matter**

There is a philosophical tradition that sees mind as a direct and immediate product of matter in motion; the result of sensory and motor stimuli alone. This kind of mechanical materialism appeared in publications from the mid-Eighteenth Century into the early Nineteenth Century. Julien de La Mettrie in *L’Homme machine* (1748), had suggested a mechanistic view of human activity, rooted in the nerve impulses of the brain. In his *Systèm de la Nature* (1770) Paul d’Holbach identified cognitive and emotive states as being the result of modifications of the brain. And in *Relations of the Physical and the Mental in Man* (1802) Karl Vogt gave his readers the evocative image of mind as being no more than a secretion of brain activity: ‘The brain secretes thought, the way the liver secretes bile’.

David Hume, building upon John Locke’s rejection of an innate origin of ideas and mind, had argued that experience is the basic source of all mental concepts. For Hume the sensory inputs of the physical world created mental impressions that combined to produce simple and - by the operations of the imagination - complex mental objects.[[10]](#footnote-10) ‘Mind’ for Hume, was no more that the ‘bundle’ of perceptions created by experience, with no underlying substance.[[11]](#footnote-11)

This Humean attitude on the question of mind found its Twentieth Century expression in Gilbert Ryle’s 1949 *The Concept of Mind*. For Ryle, an act of thinking is what thinking is; an act of intelligence, the intelligence itself. In other words, there is no entity (that we call ‘mind’) that is the source, or cause, or ‘I’ that underlies these acts. The physical aspect of mental events is what they are; and nothing more. To think otherwise is to recreate the Cartesian dualism – the ‘two worlds’ of mind and body - that Ryle sets out to close the door on and is to mistake one type of reality for another. It is to confuse categories.

Ryle provided the foundation for the emergence of an ‘identity theory’ of mind, pioneered by the generation of British philosophers that followed. According to the ‘identity’ school what we experience as ‘mind’ is identical to, and nothing more than brain activity. In other words, each mental state, or object of consciousness, equates to, indeed *is*, a corresponding ‘brain-state’. For Ullin Place, all higher conscious functions are analytically (and eventually, empirically) reducible to physical events in the brain;[[12]](#footnote-12) ‘mind’ then becoming an unscientific fiction.

Finally, in the anti-humanist philosophising of B. F. Skinner[[13]](#footnote-13) human beings are treated as no more than the combinations of outwardly observable actions; and in the aggressive materialism of Daniel Dennett (a student of Ryle’s in the 1960s) consciousness is seen as the result of mechanical sensory-input-feedback loops; a type of ‘narrative editing’ process by which our sense-of-the-world is created.[[14]](#footnote-14)

In each of these behavioural models, ‘mind’ has become a redundant term.

**Mind and qualia**

An important objection to the reduction of mind to matter, apart that is from philosophical dualisms that insist upon the mind as a non-material substance, has come from the theory of ‘qualia’.

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, in the 5th Century, in his *Confessions* pondered the strange status of the remembered sensation:

*Yea, I discern the breath of lilies from violets, though smelling nothing; and I prefer honey to sweet wine, smooth before rugged, at the time neither tasting nor handling, but remembering only.*[[15]](#footnote-15)

Here he puzzles over the question of what it is exactly that we are ‘remembering’ when we conjure something into our minds from our previous experience. The object is no longer there. The experience is in the past. The sensations are no longer present. What is it then that is before us, or within us, when we recall the scent of a flower, or the taste of honey and wine? With these questions he was touching upon the modern quandary of the quale.

The quale (‘qualia’ in the plural) is the uniquely subjective aspect of mental experience. When we experience the ‘redness’ of a red object we do not experience light of a certain wavelength, nor sensory neural transmissions, not even the brain processing by which we recognise colour. What we experience is the phenomenon of redness *itself*, in *this* moment, as an attribute of *this* object, and in *this* context, *etc.* And, the argument goes, a phenomenon is different than the events that science tells us are occurring to create it. It has a reality of its own, and one that cannot be accounted for by appealing to the brain states accompanying it. We can take this further by factoring in human meaning. If the ‘redness’ is also the redness of the coat my daughter wore when she was a toddler, bringing back memories of a happy autumn day (and so forth), then the uniqueness of the phenomenon understood as a quale becomes more compelling, forcing us to confront a simple question: ‘Can physical events in the brain adequately account for, or even have relevance to, the experience of redness I am having when I bring such memories to mind?’ If not, then we part company with the physicalism that characterises the identity theory of mind.

The most widely cited argument for qualia comes from a 1982 paper by Frank Jackson.[[16]](#footnote-16) In a thought-experiment Jackson asks us to imagine a character, Mary, who has been raised in an entirely monochromatic environment, learning all there is to know about the world *via* a black-and-white television. She even comes to know the entirety of the physical aspects of the sense of vision and colour. Still however, when she is finally exposed to the colour red, she learns something new: *that* is how ‘red’ looks. The actual sensation of colour then, according to Jackson, is something that a materialist account of experience cannot completely explain.

Daniel Dennett responded to the challenge of the quale in his *Consciousness Explained* (1991).[[17]](#footnote-17) For Dennett the mystery of the quale lies in the limitations of language, rather than in reality. Mary, he argues (he invents a robot version of Mary), could indeed construct for herself an understanding of the experience of redness, if the language available to an interlocuter was fine-grained enough to capture the nuance, subtlety, and uniqueness of that experience. The mystery of the quale then, for Dennett, is one of communication; and so not really a mystery at all. For Dennett the quale does not exist.

As a defence of the materiality of subjective sensations Dennett’s argument is perfectly fine. After all, Jackson’s positing of the experience of ‘redness’ need only be seen as the subjective ‘this-sidedness’ of an entirely material substrate; the manifest, ‘surfaced’ aspect of otherwise hidden events. And yet, Jackson’s qualia (and St. Augustine’s musings on remembrances) have an aura that remains difficult to dismiss. The reducing of unique subjective episodes to electro-chemical events does seem problematic, albeit perhaps from a position of philosophical naiveté. And to see the full richness of human subjective experience as the result only of a series of brain-states does challenge our sense of how it feels to live.[[18]](#footnote-18)

This apparent paradox is resolvable; for the question is not about whether a subjective moment is the experience of a particular brain-state at all. Rather, it is whether a brain-state is the *cause* of that subjective moment. We can straightforwardly say that subjective experiences, cognitive apprehensions of world and emotive associations all have their correlative events in the brain (and indeed the body), without resorting to a reductionist standpoint that eviscerates them of their human meaning. The reason for this is that asserting the materiality of consciousness does not tie us to the hypothesis that the brain is the *cause* of consciousness. Indeed, the argument that mental events are neuro-physical is a trivial one – *philosophically* speaking; to insist upon it may be correct, but it is also banal.

**Where are the ‘causes of mind’?** We must distinguish between the general capacity for mind that is enabled by the brain; and the specific mental aspects we wish to explain. Whilst we can marvel at the unfolding mysteries of the gross structures of the human brain, and our emerging insights into neuronal processes, these do not *per se* explain any *specific* trait of human social behaviour; for these we must investigate the nature of the society in which a behaviour occurs to illuminate its origins. It is in the social structure that we must locate our search for explanations.

It is far more important (and interesting) to address this proposition: Mental events, moments of cognition and consciousness and indeed mind itself, are *relational* objects. Their regularity, predictability and durability are the result, not of the neuronal activity that accompanies them, but rather of the social structures and inter-personal processes that create them. Our explanations of them then will be found in the more appropriate domain of social causality.

**Mind and society**

We can conceive of the contents of mind, and of mind itself, quite differently to their being reducible to physical events in the brain. It is better to understand them as the result of *interactions* of the brain with the brains of others, in socially structured human relationships. Our quandary then lies not *within* the brain, but in the zones of activity created by social relationships and processes. The coagulations of social meaning that emerge are introjected as social complexes, in turn accumulating into associations, social constructions, personal and group identities and behavioural motifs. Moreover, these subjective processes draw for their fullest meaning upon the countless human interactions that have gone before. Mind is material, of course; and – let’s all agree - a mind could not exist without a brain. But to look for ‘*the* mind’ (a relational object) in ‘*the* brain’ (a discrete object) is to create an unnecessary mystery – a ghost that beckons us into a wasted philosophical journey; a category error that belongs to the physicalists in the debate – one of their very own. For a mind is the creation not of *a* brain, but of many brains (and bodies) in interaction. In other words, it is the result of society, culture, and history; and in society, culture, and in history we also find its material (and institutional) reality.

## Marx and Freud: figures of the ‘late enlightenment’

**The question of affinity**

The idea of a marriage between Marxism and psychoanalysis, and Freudianism particularly, has a long and convoluted history. Best described, perhaps symptomatically, as a ‘struggle’, it has produced elegant innovations in thought, as well as excruciating conceptual wrangling; alternately a source of creative insight, as well as of ingenious theoretical acrobatics. In short, the relationship has had the character of the ‘on-and-off’ type that on the whole is ultimately unsatisfying, and some would say was probably best never begun.

And yet, attempts to reconcile these two ways of thinking about the human condition have been made repeatedly since the second decade of the Twentieth Century, in phases that have emerged from and in various ways reflected, the dramas, conflicts and agonies of their day. There has been a recurring fascination with how these two quite different theoretical endeavours might complement, correct, or complete one another. In some respects, the motivation has been the notion that they addressed different areas of human activity exclusively; each therefore having something to ‘learn’ from the other. However, only a highly selective reading of both – and the mistaken view that Marx was concerned only with economic life, and the equally mistaken view that Freud was concerned only with sex - could support such a position. At deeper levels of conceptual focus, some have held that there are voids, structural blind-spots in one or both leading to errors and theoretical directions that in some way ‘get humanity wrong’. For others the issue has been not which is right, and which is wrong, but rather which of these is the more fundamental; assuming then, that whilst both are valid in their own sphere, one is in some sense reliant upon the other.

Before a comparison of logics sometimes comes the suggestion that in intellectual ‘atmosphere’ Marx and Freud are alike; that there is about them an affinity of intellectual temperament, of unsentimental objectivism, and of personal iconoclasm. The unflinching commitment that each had to penetrating the appearances of reality to its underlying essence, enabled the original contributions they made; their respective ‘discoveries’. For Marx, the realisation of the centrality of abstract labour as the source of value under capitalism rather than any one type of labour, the fundamental role of class in history, and the derivation of the power of the state from civil society all involved overturning established theoretical constructions within the fields of the economic, historical, and political sciences. For Freud the discoveries of ‘the unconscious’ as a hidden realm of repressed trauma and dangerous desires affecting the person throughout their life, the reality of an ‘infantile sexuality’ in the pre-pubescent child, and the decisive role of the family in the gendering of the person, all established him as a figure of theoretical controversy, not to mention public scandal.[[19]](#footnote-19)

In Freud’s theorising, consciousness is unreliable, built upon ruses, self-deceptions, and protective defences against reality. Only by the work of analysis can the truth be revealed, and the person achieve self-understanding to be brought into a tolerable life-orientation. In Marx also, human consciousness in a particular society cannot be taken straightforwardly as an illumination of its social truth. Consciousness for Marx is an outward and instrumental expression of the relations of production prevailing in class-based societies, masking the realities of exploitation in the interests of the dominant class. This becomes especially clear at times of revolution and historical transformation.

*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, from the conflict existing between social forces of production and the relations of production.[[20]](#footnote-20)*

Consciousness then does not determine social structure; rather social structure determines consciousness. For Marx, this characterises all hitherto existing and contemporary societies. Only in the communist society will this be reversed, as humankind leaves behind the ‘realm of necessity’ and enters the ‘realm of freedom’. In that liberated state humans will consciously make their own arrangements for life and productive activity, all in full and free mastery of their social relationships. Only then will human consciousness be transparent to the truth of social reality.

Erich Fromm claimed there was a ‘common soil’ from which Marx’s and Freud’s different theorisations had grown:

*These fundamental ideas can best be expressed in three short statements, two of them Roman, one Christian. These statements are: 1)* De omnibus es dubitandum *(Of all one must doubt). 2)* Nihil humanum a mihi alienumputo *(I believe nothing human to be alien to me). 3)* The truth shall make you free*.*[[21]](#footnote-21)

And commenting further:

*… they both had the same implacable distrust of the clichés, ideas, rationalizations, and ideologies which fill people’s minds and which form the basis of what they mistake for reality.*[[22]](#footnote-22)

Marx and Freud did both set out to establish a ‘new science’ of humanity in their very different areas, in the process overturning established preconceptions and ideological mystifications that concealed reality. For both also, going rigorously to the ‘root of things’, stripping away layers of obfuscation and identifying ‘ultimate origins’ of their respective fields were of over-riding importance.

Beyond broad generalities there are ways in which Marx and Freud can be compared. So, ahead of a more critical assessment, we shall duly pay heed to the question of a plausible compatibility between them.

**‘Sciences of humanity’**

The lives of Marx (1818-1883) and Freud (1856-1939) overlapped by 27 years. When Marx died, Freud was a young scientist establishing himself in his first field: neuropathology. There were some overlaps in their German intellectual heritages. Marx famously developed his early thinking through his critical immersion in Hegelian philosophy. Freud did not read Hegel, although there is an argument that a link between Hegel and Freud exists in their uses of the concept of ‘desire’.[[23]](#footnote-23) Particularly in Hegel’s 1807 *Phenomenology of Spirit* ‘desire’ features as a central organising category for the dialectic of apperception and self-consciousness; being in fact treated as identical with self-consciousness. As Hegel puts it “self-consciousness is desire in general”.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Freud did read Kant and referred to him frequently throughout his writings. In his youth he was influenced by the neo-Kantian ideas of the educationalist and early theorist of modern psychology, Johann Herbart. Late in life he came to the gloomy philosophy of Schopenhauer. In Schopenhauer’s irrational Will and its mental representations (‘Vorstellung’), to which the mind is slave, he found a precursor to his own construct of the id. Both Marx and Freud were familiar with the German Romantic tradition. Marx was on personal-familial terms with the poet Heinrich Heine, enjoying for many years a close friendship with him. Freud too, was a great appreciator of the works of Heine. Above all however, both placed their lifeworks in the ‘scientific age’.

For their cultural status Marx and Freud can be seen as ‘late representatives’ of the European Enlightenment. Both pushed at the limits of the established – bourgeoise – theories and sensibilities of their day: Marx overturning the fields of historical, economic, and political science; Freud creating a new terrain of psychoanalytical theory and therapeutic technique.

For Freud psychoanalysis was central to the rationalism of the modern age.

*… intellect and mind are objects for scientific research in exactly the same way as any non-human things. Psychoanalysis has a special right to speak for the scientific* Weltanschauung *at this point, since it cannot be reproached with having neglected what is mental in the picture of the universe.*[[25]](#footnote-25)

For Marx and Engels, their historical materialism was shaped by the notion of a ‘unified science’, and the emergence of humanity from nature.

*We know only a single science, the science of history. One can look at history from two sides and divide it into the history of nature and the history of men. The two sides are, however, inseparable; the history of nature and the history of men are dependent on each other so long as men exist.*[[26]](#footnote-26)

For Marx and Freud then, understanding of ‘history’ and of ‘natural history’ would become increasingly a part of one another in an ever more complete body of knowledge. With these science-centred views, each had religion in their sights both as a target of critique and puzzle to be solved, considering the grip that it held over the mental landscape of the great majority of humankind. Indeed, at one level Marx and Freud say quite similar things about religious worship. In the works of both, the individual is subject to painful social realities: for Marx arising from the alienations of life within class-based society; for Freud arising from the repression of otherwise untrammelled desire under the stern authority of the superego. For each also the individual finds refuge in fantasy, in the imagination of a realm of deities and poly- and mono-theistic beliefs.[[27]](#footnote-27) Religion for both is a salve that eases the pain of the lives to which human beings are fated.

**Alienation and the conceit of the ‘self’**

There are apparent similarities too in Marx’s and Freud’s views of the ostensible autonomy of the person. Freud had analysed the conscious self, the self-aware ego, in dynamic relationship between a powerful but wordless id that influences, pushes and moulds it, and an equally powerful superego that holds it in check as the person navigates a hostile and dangerous reality. The notion the ego has of itself, as making choices, having agency, and so on, is an illusion. So, we follow rather than make our fate; we are slaves to interior forces that are hidden to us. For Marx, the notion of an isolated self, a sort of imaginary Robinson Crusoe figure that inhabited the ‘bourgeoise economics’ of his day, was a fantasy. Whatever sense the person has of their rational, independent self-commanding identity is based upon a fallacy. As with Freud, the self is shaped by unseen influences; though for Marx, these did not come from a psychical interior. They were the result of social structures, exterior processes, and historical forces.

In his early writings Marx had coined the term ‘character-mask’,[[28]](#footnote-28) taken from Greek tragedy, to express the ways in which historical and social persons come to represent or embody larger forces than themselves. He also applied to term to corporate bodies, professional associations, and political parties. The meaning was the same for each case. Human action is mediated by ideas hiding the true – *i.e.* self-serving, interest-based – nature of human motivations; so, as for Freud, the self being opaque to itself. The concept appears in Marx’s analysis of the shifting class alliances of the 1848 revolution in France. Marx explains the concept briefly, alluding to Hegel’s comment that ‘all great world-historic facts and personages appear, so to speak, twice’. ‘The mask’, assumed in the historical moment, is used to make sense of events with reference to the past.

*Thus Luther put on the mask of the Apostle Paul, the Revolution of 1789-1814 draped itself alternately in the guise of the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire, and the Revolution of 1848 knew nothing better to do than to parody, now 1789, now the revolutionary tradition of 1793-95.*[[29]](#footnote-29)

Further on, commenting upon the ascension of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte to become emperor of France, Marx uses the idea to explain what made it possible “for a grotesque mediocrity to play a hero’s part.” In acts of public deception and private self-delusion, political actors don the masks of previous historical sagas, to make sense of their own contemporaneous dramas.

Marx’s understanding of ideology is also centred upon the hiding of true interests behind obfuscating mental constructs. ‘Character-mask’ was later, through Engels’ work, to become the concept of ‘false-consciousness’ by which rationalisations of action and behaviour disguise its real meaning.

The theme of opacity, the hiding of real motivations and venal interests by the self from itself, is linked to another major theme for both Freud and Marx: that of ‘alienation’. In fact, the explicit term ‘alienation’ appears hardly at all in Freud’s work. However, the concept is recognisable in Freud’s central theoretical formulations. It is present for instance in his discussion of the oppressive character of sexual norms as a cause of nervous illness in his 1908 essay ‘*Civilised’ Sexual Morality and Modern Nervous Illness.* The demand that everyone should obey the same ‘conduct of sexual life’ was for Freud an ‘injustice’ and a cause of widespread unhappiness both within beyond the conventional, monogamous, and hetero-sexualised family.

Another example of ‘alienation’ in Freud’s work lies in the tensions between parts of the intra-psychical structure; principally caused by the control of the id by the superego *via* the ego (acting “in obedience to its orders”[[30]](#footnote-30)). For the person this is felt in necessary internal tensions – a ‘tendency to conflict’ - caused by the work of the ego pushing down upon libidinal desires. Talking of the causes of neuroses Freud says:

*First there is the most general precondition – frustration; next, fixation of the libido which forces it into particular directions; and thirdly, the tendency to conflict, arising from the development of the ego, which rejects these libidinal impulses.*[[31]](#footnote-31)

Moreover, where we see the id representing a primordial nature, reined in, and mastered by a cultural superego, we see also the negating of urges and basic instincts by the repressive mechanisms of the psyche to the detriment of self-understanding. These processes, involving structural tension, antagonism, and repression, also render the ‘authentic self’ opaque to the ‘conscious self’. In *Civilisation and its Discontents* (1930) Freud develops this theme in relation to his libido-theory, now structured by a bifurcation between a life-instinct and a death-instinct. The aggressive drives of the death instinct must be controlled by a dominant superego working through a personal ego that it harries and chastises to achieve its goal; the repression of potentially dangerous appetites. The result is dissatisfaction, anxiety, guilt, and discontent. And consequently, the person cannot fully know themselves. We will return to the id, ego, and superego triad in a more detailed discussion of Freud’s theory of mind.

For Marx ‘alienation’ is an explicit, foundational category. It was a central part of his intellectual struggle with the influence of the great figure of German speculative philosophy, Georg Hegel, that was still a cause of philosophical controversies amongst political radicals into the 1840s. For Hegel human consciousness was unable to know itself without the attainment of an ‘absolute knowledge’, a total apprehension of the world; and so, until it had reached this final state, was destined to be estranged from itself. This notion of an estrangement lying within the human being was taken by Marx and turned into one of a social relationship. In the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* of 1844, Marx formulates alienation as that of the worker from their labour power and the product of their labour.

*So much does the appropriation of the object appear as estrangement that the more objects the worker produces the less he can possess and the more he falls under the sway of his product, capital.*[[32]](#footnote-32)

So, the worker’s labour power and labour product are overtaken by the capitalist, who returns wages in the name of ‘equal exchange’. The product, now the property of the capitalist, is hidden from the worker as something they have created. So also is their relationship with their own labour, and that to their fellow workers, as the source of their own essential self, of their humanity. The true relationships that organise their social existence are obscured; all is opaque. They are lost to themselves. We will come back to the concept of alienation later in our discussion of Marx’s theory of ideology.

**Method in Freud and Marx**

Finally, there is the question of ‘method’ as a possible area of overlap between Marx and Freud. Marx’s youthful intellectual development was through a critique of Hegelian philosophy. What Marx took positively from Hegel was that reality is dialectical in character; that it moves through moments of opposing forces, tensions and contradictions that become resolved into new unities *via* changes in material quality. Freud’s work does not generally conform to this description. Freud’s early foundational conceptualisations, associated with his economic model of psychical processes particularly, are informed by notions of mechanistic force, energy quanta, and hydraulic metaphors. In later work, Freud’s use of symbolism and mental representation remained reliant upon the id as an organic force operating beneath outward social behaviour. And in his attempts to raise psychoanalytical insights to the level of society and human history - his metapsychology – he appealed to vitalistic forces.

However, there are some aspects of Freud’s thinking that are quite dialectical in their meaning, if not their explicit articulation. In the early discussion of dreams for example, elements drawn from life-themes and banal details of daily life making up the dream’s ‘latent content’, become the ‘manifest dream’ that we experience. The processes are those of ‘displacement’ and ‘condensation’, fracture and reformation, disaggregation, and symbolic re-assemblage. Freud’s descriptions here often come close to what we can recognise as dialectical. Also, in Freud’s cathexis-theory libidinal energy moves from basic drives and urges that aim to satisfy sexual and other needs, to higher order value-based outlets associated with morality and culture. These processes involve ‘sublimations’ that create qualitative changes in psychical states and outward social behaviours.

*The historians of civilization seem to be unanimous in the opinion that such deflection of sexual motive powers from sexual aims, a process which merits the name of sublimation, has furnished powerful components for all cultural accomplishments.*[[33]](#footnote-33)

And in Freud’s discussion of ‘Trieb’ (drive) theory in *Instincts and their Vicissitudes* (1915) we read that drives can turn back upon the self, become their opposites, and become sublimated into representational symbolic forms or repressed from conscious life. Again, Freud’s accounts suggest principles that remind us of dialectical processes.

A second and related methodological similarity between Marx and Freud just mentioned, is the idea of a ‘scale of value’, with the ‘higher’ orders *i.e.* more developed, more refined, more cultural, more moral *etc.*, being rooted in the ‘lower’ orders of these aspects of life. So, for Marx the most exalted cultural creations may be seen as expressions of, and ideological coverings for class-based interest; and for Freud the achievements of the person in creative, commercial, and romantic life are ultimately made possible by the sublimations of basic sexual drives into the strivings of the superego.[[34]](#footnote-34)

**Materialism in Freud and Marx**

1. *Materialism as method*

The philosophical standpoint that describes all of reality as ‘matter-in-motion’ can only be a starting point in our comparison of Marx and Freud on this question. For although both were indeed philosophical materialists, their ‘materialisms’ were different. Here we approach materialism in another sense: materialism as ‘method’ in the explanation of human activity. Materialism as a way of understanding the behaviour of the human being in its social environment is actually a point of divergence between Marxism and psychoanalysis; that is *generally* - and with exceptions.

Freud’s ‘libido’ and connected with it the ‘cathexis’ by which psychic energy becomes channelled towards a specific object, idea or attachment, are material phenomena. They arise from bodily organic forces as quantised energy transmissions *via* neuro-mechanical processes. Freud’s metaphors used to explain his libido-cathexis model, are coloured by the dominant scientific metaphors of his day. The imagery that runs through many of Freud’s early works is by turns hydraulic, electrical or influenced by the steam-driven technologies of his time; each suggesting mechanisms by which basic impulses exert their force upon consciousness, and therefore personal behaviour.[[35]](#footnote-35) The key elements in the economic model that Freud continued to develop from the 1890s over more than two decades included: energy transformation; drives for the satisfaction of desire; the object-orientation of desire (cathexis); and the channelling of psycho-sexual energy into all areas of life (libido).

To illustrate with some recurring tropes in Freud’s conceptualisations on this topic, libido: can be ‘dammed up’ by the frustration caused by the absence of outlets;[[36]](#footnote-36) forms a ‘reservoir’ within both the ego[[37]](#footnote-37) and the id;[[38]](#footnote-38) is ‘discharged’ by action towards an object of desire (or by neurotic behaviours);[[39]](#footnote-39) and can even ‘flow’ backwards to create masculine tendencies in women.[[40]](#footnote-40) A consequence of these metaphors is a tendency to interpret higher human functions principally as the effects of impersonal and unconscious material forces within the person.

Marx’s historical materialism is not the monist reduction of all things to matter and its motion. Marx was a philosophical materialist, of course. It was the subject of his doctoral thesis; a meditation upon determinism in the materialisms of Democritus and Epicurus. However, for Marx explaining human behaviour - conscious and unconscious – means starting with social structure. And here we distinguish materialism from its opposite for this purpose: idealism.

We are not concerned here with idealism in its empirical, transcendental, and absolute forms.[[41]](#footnote-41) These metaphysical types of idealism refer to the relationship between the mind and reality, abstractly understood. Instead, our interest is the relationship between ideas and the social world and the nature of the mind in its historical setting. So, by ‘idealist’ for this purpose, we mean two things: i. that it is possible to explain personal (particular) behaviour by beginning with the consciousness of the individual; and ii. that it is possible to explain social (general) behaviour by invoking trans-historical mythic narratives. Freud, across each of his models of the human mind, held both positions. Marx held neither. Freud’s basic position then on these propositions and using this *social* definition, is idealist, and Marx’s, materialist.

In fairness to Freud, we will not leave this question just there. Over and above the neuro-physical foundations of Freud’s thinking, there are aspects of his interpretations of the human psyche that are indeed socially materialist. In the Oedipus Complex Freud had mapped out the psycho-sexual drama of the child’s development as they struggled to compete with the father for the mother’s affections; a drama that would lay out their sexual destiny. In fact, the fateful implications of the Oedipus Complex are entirely the result of dense and tortured intra-psychical and inter-psychical struggles occurring within a social structure: the family. To be more precise, we should say the bourgeois Viennese family of the opening decades of the 20th Century. Still, nonetheless a social structure. However, Freud analytically privileges the family over other kinds of structure, and so the social materialism he invokes here is partial, and distorted by his isolating of the family from the wider social matrix which gives rise to it, and in which it is enmeshed.

There is some more to say on this point. Freud does not in fact reduce his analysis to the single-family unit in a simplistic fashion. In his clinical cases the family stories of his analysands are often crossed by forces that enter the specific family dynamic from the outside. In the early case of Dora for example, Freud’s analysis encompasses an interaction of two social units; one, Dora’s own family dominated by a cold and loveless marriage; the other, the couple Herr K and Frau K who are friends of Dora’s parents. Whilst her father and Frau K are sexually involved, Herr K has made repeated advances upon Dora. Dora’s father, in tacit and complicit understanding with Herr K, chooses not to believe Dora when she turns to him for help, so leading to her desperate unhappiness and social withdrawal. It is the transactional status of Dora in this horrible dynamic that is the root of her symptomology, and not *simply* ‘jealousy of the father’. Freud’s analysis then, displays a further social materialist tendency in the behavioural-cultural context in which the family exists; in this case with all its poisonous concealment and hypocrisy.

1. *Materialism as practice*

A second difference between Freud and Marx on the question of materialism lies in their practical aspects. The practice associated with Marx’s critique of class society arises from the struggle to overthrow it, so establishing a new era of classless communism. Marxist practice is primarily an endeavour to change reality itself; a ‘reality’ of course that is independent of the mind, and that will stubbornly resist human consciousness where that is at odds with it. In this sense Marxist ‘practice’ generally is materialist in the social meaning of the term outlined above. It seeks to alter the material world by critical and practical engagement with it.

The practice of psychoanalysis is that of individual therapy, revolving around the relationship between the therapist and the patient. The classical set-up and layout of the therapy room, complete with the analysand’s couch and back-turned analysist’s chair, captures something of the structural isolation of the therapeutic encounter from society. However, it is the underlying logic of the psychoanalytic approach to the patient’s malaise that is important. Whilst there are tendencies within Freud’s cases to acknowledge larger social factors influencing behaviour over and above the internalisation of basic family dynamics, these are no more than observational case-notes. They are not integrated into his larger theory.

Freud’s technique is to bring the intra-psychical traumas of early life to the surface of consciousness, and to resolve the personal and emotional anguish they cause. The concern then is to manage the patient’s pain; it is not to propose an alternative to the bourgeois family structure that is the cause of that pain. So psychoanalysis is above all a symptomology; or more precisely a programmatic approach to the amelioration of painful symptoms and the restoration of mental equilibrium and social function. Its measure of success is the effective regulation of the life of the patient, and their return to the conventions of normal routine. It is not the transformation of the social world; neither for the individual, nor of the whole of society. In this sense Freud’s practice, and psychoanalysis more generally, is not materialist. Insofar as Freud’s therapeutic method deals with the ideational material of repressed trauma without any larger project of social transformation, it is socially ‘idealist’ in its outward professional aspects.

Because Freud’s psychoanalysis does not carry the intention of an overthrow of the bourgeois family structure as the cause of individual pain and malfunction, and certainly not the larger social matrix of which it is a part, its conceptualisations and deeper logic are isomorphic with the oppressive structures that give rise to the symptoms it seeks to ameliorate. At best it is an anodyne to the suffering of the powerless individual struggling to survive in an unforgiving and conflict-ridden emotional landscape. At worst it conspires with the oppressive social structures that are the cause of the patient’s anguish, to return them to the social mainstream, able now to once more take up and maintain their proper place within it.[[42]](#footnote-42)

None of these sceptical observations are intended to gainsay the humanism of psychoanalysis in its heroic early phase. Indeed, beginning with Freud himself, and continuing through the work of the major psychoanalytical figures of the 1920s and 1930s, a deep engagement with the human condition, and by extension with emancipation from the emotional shackles of bourgeois moralism, was evident. One figure who remained particularly loyal to Freud’s legacy on this question was Geza Roheim, who searched for a pre-modern liberated sexual state amongst the Aboriginal Arrernte and Pitjantjatjara of Central Australia. For Roheim, this represented the opposite of the repressed bourgeois family, the root of all neuroses.[[43]](#footnote-43) The political commitment of many psychoanalysts of the 1920s and 1930s also was especially pronounced at the Berlin Psychoanalytical Institute,[[44]](#footnote-44) founded in 1920. Its notable figures mixed Freud’s theories with social democratic, revolutionary Marxist or anarchist ideas. However, the political radicalism of many of the early pioneers did not undo the essentially conservative logic of their therapeutic practice.

After the Second World War, many of the key names in psychoanalysis who had fled the Nazi terror, now found they had a new audience, as well as a market for therapy, in the US. These figures, anxious of their insecure émigré status, were often nervous of their former associations with political radicalism, and particularly Marxism, and either separated their personal politics from their therapeutic practice, or even jettisoned them completely. Psychoanalysis would also be taken up by the North American medical establishment, feeding into various types of programmatic patient treatment, though shorn of any larger social critique. Through the 1950s and 1960s psychoanalysis was to lose its previous political character. It became increasingly a fashionable, and often expensive palliative for the neuroses of the North American middle and upper classes.[[45]](#footnote-45) Finally, we should note capitalist interest in - and abuse of - psychological theory and technique in the service of consumer behaviour, political manipulation, and social control.[[46]](#footnote-46)

**The architects of integration**

Theorised integrations have been constructed from supposed commonalities between Marx and Freud. For Otto Fenichel this was *via* the ‘unconscious enthusiasms’ that underpin conscious strivings. For Wilhelm Reich it was the role of sexual repression in economic exploitation that was key. For Siegfried Bernfeld the psycho-sexual development within the family was central to understanding the education system under capitalism. For Erich Fromm the abandonment of independent autonomy of the self was central to conformism within an oppressive class-based capitalist society.

At points during the histories of Marxism and psychoanalysis there has also been political cross-fertilisation between the two traditions. There have been figures in the socialist movement for instance who have paid attention to psychoanalysis, treating its central tenets with intellectual respect, even if cautiously so. Of these, the most notable is Leon Trotsky, for whom psychoanalysis, although not established in its scientific status, nonetheless offered a rich seam of plausible hypotheses that ought not be dismissed on doctrinal grounds.[[47]](#footnote-47) And across the historical gallery of prominent names in psychoanalysis there have been many who allied themselves with left Social Democracy or stood in the camp of revolutionary socialism. Wilhelm Reich, Paul Federn, Siegfried Bernfeld, Otto Fenichel, Bruno Bettelheim for example, and others identified themselves as Marxists of one stripe or another.[[48]](#footnote-48)

The overlaps and affinities traced here however, are more apparent than real. When carefully excavated we discover always that what appears to be a sameness between Marx’s and Freud’s treatment of a topic at the surface of things, in fact at a deeper level is an incompatibility. We will trace some major themes upon which Marx and Freud differ; themes that run to the core of their works and that must be considered as definitive of each, leaving their assessments of humankind ultimately incommensurable.

## Against a synthesis

**The logic of Freud; the logic of Marx**

In his 1926 Marxist critique of Freudianism, Valentin Vološinov characterised psychoanalysis as a species of ‘subjectivist psychology’ along with others based upon vitalist principles such as the *élan vital* of Henri Bergson, or the Will of Arthur Schopenhauer. No such thing as ‘the id’ he argued, or indeed the individual, could exist outside of society. Rather, what Freud termed the ‘unconscious’ was no more than the projection of *social* experience into the person’s psyche; the contents of the psyche being drawn from the objective world of the person, but then treated as subjective in the processes of psychoanalytical therapy. What was ‘revealed’ in the therapist-patient encounter, through the patients’ speech-utterances’ – the only material for analysis – was the *ideology* of their behaviour, as they reported it in the therapy session. Vološinov rejected the idea and very existence of Freud’s ‘unconscious’, acknowledging only an ‘unofficial consciousness’ that is authentic to personal experience, as distinct from an ‘official consciousness’ that is infused with ideology and that shapes our normal behaviour.[[49]](#footnote-49)

Indeed, the ideas of Marx and of Freud are dissimilar at a fundamental level; and the theoretical categories that form the foundation stones to their philosophies are quite different from one another. This is clear in their respective understandings of the relationship between appearance and reality.

The unreliability of the human mind in grasping the truth of reality has long been acknowledged. In the fifth book of his *Republic*[[50]](#footnote-50) Plato portrays a kind of naïve realism in his story of the chained captives, who can only ever infer the objects of the outside world from the shadows they see moving on the wall of their prison cave. In the early modern era Francis Bacon conjured up ‘four idols’ of illusion that baffle human comprehension. These are: Idols of the Tribe that appeal to intuitive and common-sense understanding; Idols of the Cave rooted in the passions, enthusiasms and ideologies of the individual; Idols of the Marketplace that arise from political manipulation and rhetoric; and Idols of the Theatre that look only to traditions of thought and longstanding received wisdoms.[[51]](#footnote-51) The Enlightenment thought of Bacon’s generation onwards represented an assault on such ‘Idols’, an overturning received ‘wisdoms’, especially those of religion, and a turn to scientific methodologies. Freud and Marx also were concerned with illusions of the mind.

For Freud, whilst our conscious apprehension of the world is shrouded in the *post-hoc* rationalisations and dissimulations by which the ego protects itself from early life traumas, so too is our inner world blocked from our understanding. The id particularly, despite the instinctual drives that originate in it, is unknowable to us in a direct sense. Freud insists there is a radical divide between the self that we experience as ourselves, and the psychical substratum that underlies it, that is inaccessible to our consciousness. They are separate realms. Freud’s conceptualisations here, in the Kantian sense, are dualistic.

For Marx on the other hand ideology is used by a ruling class to mask its real material interests. Such concealing ideologies are propagated through organised religion, the media, the education system and so on. However, ideology cannot eclipse reality, but only distort it in the minds of the exploited and oppressed (and indeed the exploiters and oppressors). Consciousness in Marx’s view does not exist in an experiential vacuum. Rather it interacts with experience of the social world in the life of the person. In other words, there is not an absolute divide between perceptions of the world itself and the ideas by which the person apprehends it. Marx’s conceptualisation is not dualistic; it is dialectical.

This difference of logics between Freud and Marx was important also for their assessments of the potential for liberation. For Freud, therapeutic treatments of neuroses that were rooted life-traumas, could achieve a degree of relative emotional equilibrium for the person. This could be done by bringing to the surface the sediment of repressed psychical material that had been forced into the unconscious, revealing to the patient the source of their distress. Freud’s technique was ‘archaeological’ in character.

*As a rule the physician cannot spare the patient this phase of the treatment; he must necessarily make him re-experience a certain portion of his past life, and must see to it that he remains to some degree above it all so that he remains cognizant at every turn that what appears to be reality is in truth the refracted image of a forgotten past. If the physician manages to achieve this, then the battle is won; the patients accepts the validity of the interpretation, and the therapy – which wholly depends on this acceptance – can be successfully concluded.*[[52]](#footnote-52)

For Marx however, liberation happens only by engagement with the world the person inhabits, and ultimately by changing the world itself. The ideological filters that obfuscate reality are shed in a process of thoroughgoing change – of the social environment and of the person. The oppressive structures of the mind and of society, normally inter-dependent in non-revolutionary historical periods, are overcome together in a process of mutual transformation. Unlike the Freudian notion of neurotic complexes that are revealed to the individual as objects for analysis, Marx’s view of liberation is one of personal and collective change through social revolution.[[53]](#footnote-53)

*… this revolution is necessary, therefore, not only because the ruling class cannot be overthrown in any other way, but also because the class overthrowing it can only in a revolution succeed in ridding itself of all the muck of ages and become fitted to found society anew.*[[54]](#footnote-54)

The logics of Freud and Marx are also different their ‘directionality’. For Freud, the analytical starting point is the interior realm of the person: the psyche. In its ‘topographical’ sense this refers to the structured layering of the unconscious, the preconscious and conscious self; in its ‘structural’ sense it refers to the id (the realm of pleasure-seeking drives), the ego (the self-aware person), and the superego (the realm of morality and higher strivings). From this individualised theoretical standpoint Freud would, in his later works move outwards to explain aspects of the social world and of human history.

Marx’s logic moves in the opposite direction; from ‘social totality’ to the person as a product of society and history. It is not that the person has no independent existence; merely an epiphenomenon of social processes or larger historical forces. Intra-personal processes are real, as is ‘personality’ and individual identity. However, the ‘person’ is a term without meaning unless understood as a part of society, an element of a complex social whole; and its result. For Marx then, there is no abstract individual; the person is born into a social structure through which they grow and develop into their future self. The ‘individual’ is always a ‘social individual’.

**The Individual and society**

So Freud has an ‘atomistic’ perspective on relationship between the individual and their society. The individual is the monadic building block of society; society being the sum of its individualised parts. More than this, these individuals do not by themselves coalesce. Left to their own devices they would devour one another with material self-interest, selfish pleasure, conquest, and destruction. In Hobbesian style, a social order is needed to curb purely self-oriented motivations and behaviour. This it does through the injunctions of self-control and neighbourly decency *via* the superego. Civilisation for Freud requires repression.

*We realized that the difficulty of childhood lies in the fact that in a short span of time a child had to appropriate the results of a cultural evolution which stretches over thousands of years, including the acquisition of control over his instincts and adaptation to society – or at least the first beginnings of these two. He can only achieve a part of this modification through his own development; much must be imposed on him by education.*[[55]](#footnote-55)

Freud’s theorisations of human behaviour can be seen as a radicalisation of the notion of ‘the individual’ – the crucial pivot of classical nineteenth century liberal thought. However, where John Stuart Mill brought the idea of ‘the individual’ from being an isolated construct to having a central place in his idea of industrial democracy, Freud went into the interior. [[56]](#footnote-56) Both then, in their quite different ways, took individualism to its logical end points: for Mill to the end of individualism *per se* in socialism; for Freud to the depths of the individual psyche and its basal structure. [[57]](#footnote-57)

On this question Marx’s position is again different. For Marx, society stands over-and-above the aggregate of individuals that comprise its population. It is greater than the sum of its parts. Of course, there is conflict. However, this is the result of the intrinsic qualities of the social structure itself: its class-based nature; the economic exploitation that lies at its heart; the ways in which it pits individual against individual in competition for employment and the resources needed to sustain human existence. These antagonisms are the creation of the social structure itself. For Marx, the starting point is always the social whole, of which the individual is a part and upon which they necessarily depend; the notion of an *a*social individual, primeval or otherwise, no more than a fantastic imagining of bourgeois ideology. According to Marx, such a being could never have existed.

*The more deeply we go back into history, the more does the individual, and hence also the producing individual, appear as dependent, as belonging to a greater whole: in a still quite natural way in the family and in the family expanded into the clan; then later in the various forms of communal society arising out of the antitheses and fusions of clans.*[[58]](#footnote-58)

So, whereas for Freud the individual and society are counterposed, for Marx they are not. For Marx the type of society in which the individual is economically exploited, socially oppressed, and feels their alienation, is historically specific. The antagonistic relationships that characterise a society are necessary to it only; they are not universal features of human organisation. On this basis, it is possible to imagine a quite different type of society that fosters the free development of the full capacities and potentialities of the person. In this circumstance, one that is different from our own social experience under capitalism, the individual grows and flourishes not as an isolate, separate from all others, but rather as the creation of a liberated society; and as a ‘social individual’ working with others towards their mutual benefit and fulfilment. Such a perspective is inconceivable within the anthropological pessimism of the Freudian paradigm.

**Historical time**

Freud and Marx differ also on the matter of our relationship with historical time.[[59]](#footnote-59) Belonging to Freud’s unconscious, the id is the domain of biophysical urges. It straddles human history and pre-history, as well as traversing different cultures. It is in this sense, timeless. So, whereas the superego is formed within, and operates through culture, and whereas the ego negotiates the world as a self-conscious existent in a concrete – and time-bound – social context, the id knows nothing of history, of past or future. It is concerned only ever with its present desires; and such a state means that time has no meaning for it at all.[[60]](#footnote-60)

Psychoanalysis however does require a notion of time; biographical time that is. For Freud our fate lies in our past; the buried and fixed trauma-related complexes that have been pushed down and locked into a hidden recess. Liberation from their depressive influence involves revealing them to the patient. The repressed material hidden in our unconscious exists as a dead-weight, preventing us from achieving personal freedom. Our only salvation lies in release from its chains through analysis.

For Marx, history is of central importance. We are products not of our personal history, primarily, but of our epochal history. We have seen that ‘the person’, in their sentiments of individuality, in their sense of having the capacity for decision-making and in their mentality are the result of the totality of the social effects constitutive of their point in history, and of the large scale social and economic processes of preceding decades and centuries. More to the point, our understanding of our own history requires us to change our present as we orient towards our future. The contradictions of our social present have emerged from history; and we live, struggle, and strive in and through these contradictions. It also contains the potential of a future that is made possible by the stage of economic, social, and cultural development to which history has brought us. We can realise this potential only in revolution. As we do so, the past becomes revealed to us as old outlooks are shed, ideological distortions removed, and consciousness changed. Georg Hegel expressed this idea in the evocative line that impressed the young Marx, “The Owl of Minerva spreads its wings only with the falling of dusk”.[[61]](#footnote-61) For Marx, our relationship with time is not static; it is one of transformation and historical transcendence.

There is no common ground between Freud and Marx in their respective interpretations of early human history. Freud’s attempts to apply his psychical theory to human history became his metapsychology. In his *Totem and Taboo* (1913),[[62]](#footnote-62) applying a biogenetic principle taken from the German zoologist and embryologist Ernst Haeckel, that ‘ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny’, Freud surmised that the symptomology of neurosis essentially re-ran humanity’s major developmental stages. Working outwards from the inner dynamics of the psyche, Freud theorised the overthrow of the authority of the father - important for the emergence of the properly regulated and socially successful mature person – as originating in an early human saga. He postulated a ‘primal horde’ comprising a lordly father, ruling over his sons and the women of the tribe. These jealous sons killed and ate their father, so establishing a ritual of inheritance, social power, and sexual entitlement. Reflecting upon how social morality might have been rooted in an original barbaric act, Freud says:

*By basing our argument upon the celebration of the totem we are in a position to give an answer: One day the expelled brothers joined forces, slew and ate the father, and thus put an end to the father horde. Together they dared and accomplished what would have remained impossible for them singly. Perhaps some advance in culture, like the use of a new weapon, had given them the feeling of superiority. Of course these cannibalistic savages ate their victim. This violent primal father had surely been the envied and feared model for each of the brothers. Now they accomplished their identification with him by devouring him and each acquired a part of his strength. The totem feast, which is perhaps mankind’s first celebration, would be the repetition and commemoration of this memorable, criminal act with which so many things began, social organization, moral restrictions and religion. [[63]](#footnote-63)*

Freud saw this a real event that had happened (probably many times), and that created the generationally recurring battles of childhood development, adolescence, and maturation in the individual, and given rise to totemic religion. He would later apply this foundational story in his attempts to explain the rise of monotheism by rooting it in the historical exodus of the Jewish people from Egypt after the death of the pharaoh [Akhenaten](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akhenaten) in *Moses and Monotheism* (1939).

In Marx there is no such narrative, whether meant literally or as myth; although there is indeed a periodisation of human history related to the level and type of economic and technical development of particular social structures. Each ‘mode of production’ engenders its own special cultures, beliefs, and types of rationality. The forms of consciousness that predominate in a society reflect the economic relations that provide its basic structure. According to Marxist anthropology also, during early human development - in contrast with Freud’s sexualised and masculinist blood-rite – it is the human manipulation of nature and the codetermining evolution of ‘hand and brain’ that produce the material basis of primitive (and matrilineal) societies. Here technique and labour upon the natural world are key to understanding culture and human behaviour. In his 1876 essay ‘The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man’, Engels explained the evolutionary dialectic involved:

*By the combined functioning of hand, speech organs and brain, not only in each individual but also in society, men* (sic) *became capable of executing more and more complicated operations, and were able to set themselves, and achieve, higher and higher aims.*[[64]](#footnote-64)

The sense of development and ascending achievement in this passage, suggests a picture of human beings as essentially adaptable, able to manipulate their environment and exploit the opportunities presented by nature. It is the opposite of a view of humanity as trapped within a recurring and cyclical prehistorical drama.

**Human nature**

When we talk of ‘human nature’ we mean the full gamut of behaviour in its inter-personal, group and social aspects. From the mundane interactions of people in daily life, sexual coupling, and petty ritual to economic behaviour, religious devotion, and warfare at the larger social and historical scale. Regarding the spectrum of human activity at all scales, the directional logics of Freud and Marx are opposed: Freud beginning with the intra-psychical workings of the singular mind, working outwards to society; Marx taking the ‘social totality’ as his starting point.

Freud’s thinking evolved across several phases of development and amendment of his modelling of ‘psychical structure’. Beginning with the Freudian id, this is a dark realm of basic demands, impenetrable to direct conscious apprehension. It is the root source of the instincts or ‘drives’; the unceasing appetites and desires that demand satisfaction. In his early works Freud described the drives as belonging to two broad areas that are universal to life: self-preservation; and reproduction. In *The Instincts and their* *Vicissitudes* (1915) Freud locates the self-preservation instinct in the ego; that part of us which contends with external reality, with the world. The reproductive instinct, the sex-drive, he locates within the unconscious. Each of these split and differentiate into second-order principles with their own consequences for psychological type and social behaviour.

However, the drives (instincts[[65]](#footnote-65)) involved are not experienced directly. They are also complex, each comprising four parts. The instinct begins in the unconscious as a ‘pressure’, the basic demand for satisfaction. The ‘aim’ of the instinct is the satisfaction of the demand, and its means. The instinct will become fixed upon an ‘object’, whether in the world or in the body, to achieve its aim. And the ‘source’ of the instinct is how we experience it by the mental representations it creates, and in the organs that it stimulates.

The representations in thought (‘Vorstellungen’) of the impulses beneath drives do not arise from a neuro-physical mechanism in Freud’s account now, but rather have their own psychical origin. Rather, moving away from the biologism of his earlier work, Freud sees the ‘drive’ as a predominantly cultural factor existing at the interface between organic impulses and symbolic representation.[[66]](#footnote-66)

*The instinct appears to us as a concept on the frontier between the mental and the somatic, as the psychical representative of the stimuli originating from within the organism and reaching the mind, as a measure of the demand made upon the mind for work in consequence of its connection with the body.*[[67]](#footnote-67)

In his 1920 work, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, Freud altered his drive theory once more – and radically. The libido, the instinct for life (Eros) - differentiated into the sex-drive, the nurturing instinct, and the quest for personal affiliation - was now binarized with an opposing instinct: the instinct towards death (Thanatos) - differentiated into aggression, self-denial, and the urge to destroy. The equilibrating logic of this dual-instinct model was preserved in the tendency of the death-instinct to always bring the activity and achievements made possible by the energy of the life-instincts, back to a nullity; to a final stasis.[[68]](#footnote-68)

Belonging to the death instinct, and governing the interactions between the different active elements of Freud’s theory, is the Nirvana principle (also known as the constancy principle). This drives an essentially homeostatic mechanism that always seeks a balance of demand and satisfaction. Where demand is unmet, the consequence is need and striving towards the object that will satisfy that need, so restoring balance once more. The attainment of equilibrium then, is what satisfies the person; the real source of pleasure.

*However this may be, we must perceive that the Nirvana principle, belonging as it does to the death instinct, has undergone a modification in living organisms through which it has become the pleasure principle; and we shall henceforward avoid regarding the two principles as one. It is not difficult, if we care to follow up this line of thought, to guess what power was the source of the modification. It can only be the life instinct, the libido, which has thus, alongside of the death instinct, seized upon a share in the regulation of the processes of life. In this way we obtain a small but interesting set of connections. The Nirvana principle expresses the trend of the death instinct; the pleasure principle represents the demands of the libido; and the modification of the latter principle, the reality principle, represents the influence of the external world.*[[69]](#footnote-69)

Freud gave a full account of his structural psychical model in his 1923 publication *The Ego and the Id*. The tripartite arrangement of the id, the ego and the superego is still present. However, Freud introduces further complexity into his psychical model. Its dynamics are shaped by tensions between: the id and the ego; the ego and the superego; and the life and death instincts.

It is Freud’s altered view of the ego however, and its relation to the unconscious that is of most consequence. Freud now notes that the ego has its own type of unconscious. This results from its dealings with the world, and from the pressures of the superego. It is the product of repression, as the ego hides difficult experiences and painful memories from itself. Repressed material within the ego Freud now describes as the ‘preconscious’, to distinguish it from the unconscious in which the id is located. Moreover, the ego, as the part that deals with external reality, is an organ of perception whilst also being connected to the id and its demands. This means that the visual aspects of the ego’s repressed mental content are significant for psychoanalysis, as are the word-associations that identify them and by which they can be brought out of the pre-conscious and into consciousness in therapy. Furthermore, the ego as an organ that perceives external reality, projects itself onto the body, identifying itself with the entire person.

And the ego is now also the site of the formation of the superego, as objects of desire that it loses in reality, become internalised as ideal-objects within an ‘ego-ideal’ that precipitates from it; again the result of repression. This psychical mechanism is also for Freud the explanation of gendering processes in the infant and operates at the root of the Oedipus Complex.

Throughout the various phases of Freud’s instinct theory and in each of his formulations, the origins of the instincts, located in the id, cannot be understood in an obvious way; they are prelingual, and so cannot be expressed straightforwardly in language. Rather, we know them indirectly through their somatic effects as ‘pressures’, and by the impressions they produce upon our consciousness. The id presses its demands upon the ego as mental representations. It is by these representations that we experience their force and articulate them in language. Here the physicalist aspects of Freud’s system meet the realm of cognitive apprehension and language; neuro-mechanical forces becoming transformed into symbolic structures.

In short, for Freud the forces driving human behaviour, whilst sublimated into symbolic representations in thought, at their base are non-rational, having a primordial origin that is lost in a pre-historical past. They are also trans-cultural, representing an anthropological continuity, to be found in every type of human society.

For Marx there is no essential human nature; or rather, what is essential to human being is the transformation of nature, and in the process, humanity itself. What is taken to be human ‘nature’ is in fact the modes of behaviour and types of social relationship that belong to a particular society, at a particular historical juncture. So, whereas for Freud the Oedipus Complex and the psychical processes that created it were trans-historical, for Marx there was no such anthropological constant. For Marx, the stable and identifiable aspects of cultural, social, and economic behaviour were historically relative.

This difference between Freud and Marx was a consequence of the originating logics of their systems. For Freud, the structured psyche operated with its own dynamic workings, drawing upon the outside world for its creative material, but was autonomous of the outside world in its internal operations. For Marx, it was the mutually transforming interaction of conscious labour and the resistant outside world that defined the relationship of humanity to nature.

In the 1830s, the matter of ‘human essence’ had been a controversy amongst a group of philosophers - the Young Hegelians - of which Marx was one. In his publication *The Essence of Christianity*, Ludwig Feuerbach had applied an ‘inversion principle’ to argue that what we take to be ‘God’s essence’, is in fact is our own essence, refracted through a theological lens into the idea of a supreme divinity. The attributes of this divinity, those of self-consciousness and thought, the power to act upon the world and to love, were rarefied abstractions of an all-too-human ‘species-essence’.

In Marx’s early theoretical work, this humanist insight became the concept of ‘species-being’, emerging from his theory of estrangement, or alienation. Species-being was what made human beings *essentially* human, more that is than their mundane activities. Self-consciousness, creativity and crucially the recognition of the species-being of others are the qualities of humankind that lift us out of the animal realm. Whilst class-society blocks this connectivity of the individual with the rest of humanity, the sense of this potential in the person becomes instead a sense of a loss, of a disconnect and of a striving to commune with others.

Marx’s reworking of Feuerbach’s philosophy was to become a critique that he would condense into eleven summary statements: *Theses on Feuerbach* written in 1845. For considerations of Marx’s view of human nature, the most important of these is the sixth thesis.

*Feuerbach* *resolves the religious essence into the human essence. But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual.*

*In its reality it* *is the ensemble of the social relations.*[[70]](#footnote-70)

So, for Marx, there is no ‘human essence’ to be found within the isolated individual. Rather the individual and their essential characteristics emerge from the constellation of social forces, interactions and structural relationships that constitute the society in which they live and that has produced them. They are the result of chains of social cause and effect that connect them to a social totality. This is the antithesis of the Freudian framing of this relationship, in which society is the result of interactions between individuals and their separate psychologies.

It would be incorrect however, to conclude from this generalised account, that for Marx the individual was unreal; a marionette moved only by the social strings attached to them. In fact, Marx does address aspects of mental activity that point to an outline of a psychological theory. This is most evident in his discussion of conscious labour. In a celebrated passage from *Capital*, Marx explains the difference between the human process of labour upon the world, and the ways in which other living creatures work upon their environments.

*A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of their cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality.*[[71]](#footnote-71)

So, human labour is conscious and involves a conceptualisation of the work to be done, an idea of the intended purpose of the task at hand. An imagining of the object, to be transformed or to be created, is also required. Labour *qua* labour, must exist ‘in the head’ before it can happen in the world.

This simple postulate hides a deeper dialectic. For the object to exist in thought, to be worked upon or to be created, we require a notion of the self that exists in relation to it; the self that will labour upon the world to achieve the intended goal. The human being cannot perform labour without also becoming a self-conscious agent. The process is one of mutual transformation: of the object by the labouring subject; and of the conscious subject by the work that it performs. The objectifying of the subject to itself involved in this dialectic is social. The relationships that make possible the accomplishment of the task reflect the nature of the society in which it will be carried out. To be successful, the subjective self must understand not only the material qualities of the object, and technical skills involved, but also these productive relationships.

The dialectical change of the self through its own labour – the ‘dialectic-of-self’ - is crucial to Marx’s understanding of ‘human nature’. For in this process of transformation, the subject becomes the means by which the labour to be done will be realised; in its envisioning of the task, the self also becomes an ‘object-for-itself’. The intended object of production in turn determines the nature of the necessary labour; and therefore, the character of the work required. This all depends upon the existing technique of the historical epoch; the raw materials to hand; the tools already created; the skills that are needed; the types of productive and social relationships that prevail; and the knowledge and experience of the processes and materials involved. The determination of the self by the productive process is, once again, social.

To be clear, it is the productive process that structures the subject primarily, not *vice versa*. In-so-doing, it determines not only the person’s sense-of-self in their concrete social and historical setting, their cultural identity, and their instantiation within a concrete historical context, but also their sense-of-need. It is the objective potential and limitations of a society’s productive processes and technical capacity that creates the person’s externalised strivings, and therefore the aim of their labour. Needs that occur in one type of society, are inconceivable in another; with the appearance of a new kind of society, emerge also new types of need; including the sexual.

Once more, this runs directly counter to Freud’s formulations. For Freud we know, needs are fixed and universal. Whilst the way the person endeavours to meet their needs may vary with context, those needs themselves are historically constant, they do not change through time. Alternatively, for Marx the structuring of the self through labour, and more broadly through the form – the mode – of production that prevails, extends beyond their economic identification as a worker. It reaches into every aspect of life; cultural, aesthetic, sensual, sexual, and familial. The objective goal of labour whether individual or collective, has already and previously within a general economic form, created both the need to be satisfied, and the means of satisfying that need; and therefore, the form – the mode – of consumption. They are co-dependent.

This interdependence of production and consumption is explored by Marx in the essays of the *Grundrisse*.[[72]](#footnote-72) He identifies three ways in which production and consumption interact. Firstly, in the essential processes of each, they merge. Production involves the consumption, the decomposition, of raw materials (‘productive consumption’). Consumption makes possible the production of the human being, of the producer, and so also of the process of production (‘consumptive production’). Secondly, in their material (and historical) reality, there is not a simple identity; they are not merely ‘one and the same’ in an undifferentiated manner. They are distinct; however, they shape one another’s processes. Whilst production provides the object-of-consumption, so dictating the character of consumption, there also consumption provides the object-of-production with its destination; its ‘finishing-touch’. Thirdly, they are mediating of one another. As just stated, consumption is the definitive endpoint of the productive process. Consequentially, consumption provides the object-of-production with its intended purpose. Without consumption, the object-of-production would be inert and without human meaning. In this sense, it would not in fact be a product at all. Conversely, the object that is produced creates the desire to consume. So, the process of production, in creating the want of what is produced, also creates the consumer; the need for the fruits of productive labour experienced in consumption. The mode of consumption then, far from being universal, emerges also as historically contingent, creating as it does the historical human subject under capitalism.

Finally, in this discussion of the co-dependence of production and consumption, Marx makes an intriguing statement:

*Hunger is hunger; but the hunger that is satisfied with cooked meat eaten with fork and knife is a different kind of hunger from the one that devours raw meat with the aid of hands, nails and teeth.*[[73]](#footnote-73)

In this succinct and evocative sentence, Marx alludes to the place of human biology in relation to prevailing modes of production and consumption. Biology (here, ‘hunger’), in Marx’s view does not represent a fixed substratum underlying human culture; rather it is influenced by culture. Although it places absolute limitations upon the possibilities of human accomplishment, considering its role in consumption, production, and bodily experience, human biology cannot stand outside of human culture. So it is also with sex. Anthropologically speaking the sexual urge is a necessary and universal principle; a vital aspect of the materiality of human existence. It varies of course with personality, circumstance, age, and health. But in its generality it cannot explain the interpersonal meaning of ‘sex’ in a particular cultural context, for a specific social group or individual. The sex-drive itself does not help us understand variance in sexuality, attraction, or gender orientation. We will return to this topic for a fuller discussion in Part III.

### The mind in Freud

*‘Mechanism’*

Freud’s earliest scientific work contributed to the development neurone-theory, the doctrine that all nervous tissues, and crucially the brain and central nervous system is made up of connected cells – the neurones.[[74]](#footnote-74) Influential scientific figures such as Herman Helmholtz and Freud’s teacher, Ernst Brücke, held to a ‘mechanist’ philosophy, that all mental activity, including at the highest levels of brain function, was the sum of electro-chemical impulses conducted by nervous tissue. Whilst Freud was to later move away from mechanism, its impact upon his thinking at this time was profound, and its trace can be detected in much of his later work.

An appreciation of Freud’s *Project for a Scientific Psychology* (1895) helps to understand the deeper logic both of his early and later theorising of human consciousness. Indeed, this publication is important precisely because it draws upon his empirical observations of non-human nervous tissue, and evidences emergent constructs and leaps of theoretical inference about the mind; and in ways that signpost Freud’s later structural conceptualisations of the psyche, establishing the metaphorical tropes that would characterise his thinking thenceforth: his Theory of Psychic Apparatus.

Freud’s early microscopic observations and theorising of the organic basis of neuronal systems led him to identify three types of neurone that he classified as *phi,* *psi* and *omega*; "φ, ψ and ω". In Freud’s account, a ‘nerve-force’, Qή travelled through these three types of neurone, providing an economy of nervous activity operating upon the principles of conservation-of-energy, ‘inertia’ and a tendency towards equilibrium. Whereas *phi* nerve-tissue was concerned with the receiving of excitatory input, *psi* neurones, acting as ‘contact-barriers’, controlled this input, preventing overload and neuronal chaos. Freud argued that Qή both ‘flows’ through these different sub-systems and also ‘fills’ the different types of neurone involved ahead of their discharge as energy-quanta. These discharges he saw as ‘facilitated’ by neuronal pathways that become fixed, providing stable routes *via* which excessive energy can be cathected away from sites of accumulation. However, new pathways also become established that over time can become dominant, and so the process of ‘facilitation’ is accompanied by a ‘sedimentation’ of redundant pathways, forming a kind of ‘memory structure’ in the vertebrate endo-psychical system. Separately, Freud saw *omega* neurones as being concerned with perception, and the processing of external sensory information. This aspect of the organism’s navigation through its environment required the foregrounding of some informational elements over others, and the submerging of the latter into latent memory.

At higher and more complex levels of neurological and mental function, Freud still saw these different neuronal systems as providing the essential animus of human consciousness, and its interactions with its environment. In his modelling of 1895, the *omega* system is the locus of consciousness in the human being. It receives input from the neurones of the *phi* and *psi* systems that work as a substratum of somatic drives, or instincts. However, whereas the inputs of neuronal stimulation travelling from the *psi* into the *phi* systems are regulated *via* a homeostatic ‘inertia’, the *omega* system, receiving inputs from the *phi* system and the somatic drives that it generates, is afforded no such protection. It is ‘at the mercy’ of the nerve-force of the primary neuronal systems working upon it and, at a higher level, leaving consciousness in need of ‘discharge’ of excessive energy.

With historical hindsight we can see here anticipations of the psychoanalytic modelling for which Freud would become famous. In fact, at this time, in the autumn of 1895, Freud already had a strong sense of the importance of these ideas for modern psychology. In a letter to his friend Wilhelm Fleiss, he described his ambition for this work as being "to peel off from psychopathology a gain for normal psychology".[[75]](#footnote-75)

*Transition*

The shift away from a unidirectional causal logic in which higher mental functions are essentially epiphenomena of primary neuronal systems, was the result of an evolution of thinking and discovery for Freud that happened over more than a decade. The earliest influences in his scientific thinking were teachers and professional supervisors such as Theodor Meynert and Jean-Martin Charcot who were steeped in the ‘mechanistic’ paradigm of studies on psychological disorders and psychosis. For them, all neuroses were ultimately rooted in problems of neurophysiology.

However, Freud began to harbour doubts about a strict adherence to mechanism. These surfaced in debates at the time about ‘hysteria’,[[76]](#footnote-76) a type of psychosis characterised by symptoms such as fitting and paralysis. Charcot’s clinical observations, his own commitment to mechanism notwithstanding, revealed that the paralytic symptoms associated with hysteria did not in fact conform to any known neurological pattern. Increasingly Freud began to speculate about the role of ideas as a cause of physical symptoms; a type of psychosomaticism that ran contrary to mechanism.

Freud’s increasingly unorthodox theorising of the outward symptoms of hysteria cast him in this period into the margins of established medical science. He was to find an ally in his old teacher at the Institute of Physiology of the University of Vienna, Josef Breuer.

For many years, Breuer had been using hypnotism in his therapeutic practice, as well as a technique for which he coined the term ‘cathartic method’. This involved the unearthing and ‘talking-through’ of early childhood memories that lay beneath adult psychological and behavioural disorders. This ‘talking cure’ had the effect of alleviating the neurotic symptoms of the patient. The fact that physical symptoms such as problems with speech and even paralysis, could be improved in this way, confounded the mechanistic view that all such disorders must be rooted in neurophysiology; that all outward manifestations of hysteria were caused by malfunction in the nervous system.

Freud became especially interested in one of Breuer’s cases: that of ‘Anna O’.[[77]](#footnote-77) In this case, that had already been made well known in psychiatric circles, when the patient relived the traumatic experience of nursing her dying father, small details of these memories had become significant for her later symptomology. For example, squinting was revealed to be a symptomatic suppression of the analysand’s memory of looking at their watch in the dark at their father’s bedside. The realisation of this in the patient, allowed the ‘event’ to be brought out of a realm of repressed memory - her ‘unconscious’ - and into a realm of conscious apprehension and understanding; and from this a relief of the pain that had accompanied it. Freud increasingly saw such symptoms, working as self-protective mechanisms of the psyche – understood now as symbolic representations of repressed material – as being of great interest and theoretical importance.

*The ugliest as well as the most intimate details of sexual life may be thought and dreamt of in seemingly innocent allusions to activities in the kitchen; and the symptom of hysteria could never be interpreted if we forgot that sexual symbolism can find its best hiding place behind what is commonplace and inconspicuous.*[[78]](#footnote-78)

Freud and Breuer published their therapeutic findings, based on the case of Anna O and four other case-histories, in their *Studies on Hysteria* (1895).[[79]](#footnote-79) This work forwarded a theoretical stance that was pivotal for Freud’s emerging model of the human psyche. He now saw clearly that a part of the psyche that was hidden from normal daily thought, a subconscious realm, impacted upon conscious life in ways that could be disruptive and harmful to the individual. Moreover, the ‘traumatic memory’ did not simply disappear, but remained in this hidden recess as an active pathogenic presence, causing an accumulation of negative emotional energy which over time could produce terrible mental, behavioural, and psychological effects. However, the repressed traumas that were responsible for the neuroses that resulted were accessible to therapeutic treatment.

Increasingly also Freud was coming to see the repression of traumatic experience, and its relegation out of the domain of normal self-awareness, as a sexual phenomenon; the traumas involved often linked to experiences of one sexual type or another. Here, Freud and Breuer were not in agreement. Indeed, this was the point upon which they were to part company in terms of theory, professional collaboration, and friendship. Nonetheless, Freud’s work with Breuer, and their 1895 publication, marked his shift from the mechanistic theorising of his early scientific career to the symbolism of his later understanding of the mind.

*The Topographical Model*

Freud presented his early theory of the mind in *The Interpretation of Dreams* of 1899. Until he began to study dreams, he had been involved primarily in controversies about neurosis. That work had led him to the idea of an unconscious containing sedimented memories of past traumas that exert a powerful though covert influence upon conscious life. By 1896 however, he had embarked upon a systematic study of dreams because, whilst a normal and familiar experience, they could also be seen as a model of neurosis ‘in miniature’. Furthermore, whilst the person slept, the normal mechanisms of self-control and internal repression that regulated their daily life were suspended. The free rein this gave to the unconscious also made dreams interesting for the intra-psychical dynamics they revealed, for illuminations of illnesses of the mind and also for normal psychology.

*The interpretation of dreams is the royal road to a knowledge of the unconscious activities of the mind. By analysing dreams we can take a step forward in our understanding of that most marvellous and most mysterious of all instruments. Only a small step, no doubt; but a beginning. And this beginning will enable us to proceed further with its analysis, on the basis of other structures which must be termed pathological.*[[80]](#footnote-80)

As far back (that we know) as the Sumerians of Mesopotamia more than 7,000 years ago, dreams have been seen as meaningful and requiring interpretation. Freud undertook a systematic study of dream meaning with the deeper aim of shedding light upon the working of the human psyche. His analytical model of ‘the dream’ comprised several elements and mechanisms.

Freud saw the dream essentially as the distorted expression of desire. This was the ‘wish-fulfilment’ of the dream. Often this was sexual, the result either of early sexualised experiences or traumas, or of adult wants. Even in its sleeping state, however, the mind in Freud’s account exerts a censorship upon the full expression of such memories. This struggle produces the ‘manifest dream’. This is the dream we experience. It is the result of the ‘dream-work’ which, acting upon the ‘latent-dream’, the true or original dream material that is being censored, creates the dream that we remember.

The dream-work, the author of the manifest-dream, operates *via* the creation of symbols. The appearances of objects or words that are quite ordinary and ubiquitous in normal conscious life, become suffused with symbolic meaning in the dream. Such ‘dream objects’ may be taken from the mundane experiences of the day, whilst their meaning may reach far back into the suppressed memories of the persons distant past. So, a comb can become symbolic of a frustrated tryst, a tree symbolic of a father’s gifts, a purse symbolic of a vagina, and so on. There is no prescriptive order to how such symbols are ascribed, only that they always represent something that has been suppressed and put ‘out of (conscious) mind’. The excavation of the unique meaning of each is something that requires interpretation, conducted through the therapist-patient alliance.

Freud’s study of dreams led him to identify four mechanisms employed by the dream-work.

1. Condensation. This refers to the layering of different meanings and symbolic representations onto the same specific element of the manifest dream. So, a dream-character for instance, can in fact represent two, or even several figures from the real-world life of the dreamer. An item from the ‘day-just-gone’ can be infused with meanings that even pull in different directions of interpretation. This means of course that dreams are complex and paradoxical, raising problems always for their decipherment.
2. Displacement. Freud observed that the meaning of an element of a dream, or even of the dream in its entirety, was often not true to the latent dream from which it was derived. Its presented meaning – the story of the dream, the dreamer’s direct sense of the what the dream was about – was often more apparent than real. The actual meaning then, had been *displaced*, from its origin deep in the psyche, onto a canvas of seemingly quite unrelated symbolic objects.
3. Secondary revision. This can be thought of as the ‘editing’ of the manifest dream; the stitching together of otherwise disconnected fragments into some kind of ‘logical’ sense. Where the symbolic elements of the dream represent difficult, painful, or confusing ideational material drawn from life experience that has been repressed, other elements drawn from consciousness are used to ‘fill-the-gaps’ or complete the narrative of the dream. It is ‘secondary’ in the sense that it comes at the end of the dream-work; its task to tidy-up the story.
4. Representation. Freud saw this as the most interesting aspect of the dream-work, and the most difficult to understand. For the dream to be constructed, meanings must be converted into pictorial representations, or definite word associations. Whilst consciousness can only do this with effort, in the sleeping state this occurs quite naturally, with no work required on the part of the sleeper (to their knowledge, at least). It is the job of analysis, to wind this process backwards as excavation and interpretation of the latent dream material.

Freud’s interests had by now travelled from a focus upon neurosis, to one upon ‘normal psychology’. In so doing, he had developed his modelling of psychical structure. Most importantly, through his systematic study of dreams he had made his most far-reaching discovery: the role of the unconscious in the normal life of the person. By the turn of the century, along with his shift to the analysis of symbols, the insights he had gained from his therapeutic work and his study of dreams, Freud had ploughed the ground for a generalised theory of mind.

Freud’s first account of the psyche, his ‘topographical model’, consisted of parts that were in dynamic tension with one another. Beneath our conscious, self-aware mental life, there lay an unconscious (the ‘system unconscious’), an opaque realm of primitive needs and libidinous impulses. These were the result of infantile wishes and the repressed material of forbidden desires in the adult. If not repressed entirely, they could only enter consciousness (the ‘system conscious’) after filtering by the pre-conscious (the ‘system preconscious’), acting as a censor and regulator of potentially dangerous urges. Where especially powerful strivings in the adult were repressed, the result could be a ‘fixation’ causing obsessive and repetitive behaviour.

Moreover, the unconscious was different to other components of the mind in more respects. The unconscious had no sense of time for instance, with material from early life often creating even greater disturbances than more recent experiences.

*The unconscious is quite timeless. The most important as well as the strangest characteristic of psychical fixation is that all impressions are preserved, not only in the same for in which they were first received, but also in all the forms which they have adopted in their further developments.*[[81]](#footnote-81)

The unconscious also did not distinguish between the real and the unreal. Imagined experiences and actual experiences in the person’s life were treated with equal significance and value. This also meant that the logic of normal daily life did not apply, with ideas being merged that would be incompatible in external reality. The ‘system unconscious’ was therefore not directly knowable or accessible. This material could however be detected by its effects in the person’s life, and *via* indirect therapeutic techniques such as ‘word-association’.

*Just as Kant warned us not to overlook the fact that our perceptions are subjectively conditioned and must not be regarded as identical with what is perceived though unknowable, so psychoanalysis warns us not to equate perceptions by means of consciousness with unconscious mental processes which are their object. Like the physical, the psychical is not necessarily in reality what it appears to be. We shall be glad to learn, however, that the correction of internal perception will turn out not to offer such great difficulties as the correction of external perception – that internal objects are less unknowable than the external world.*[[82]](#footnote-82)

Between the unconscious and the conscious lay the preconscious. The preconscious contained repressed memories that could be brought back to consciousness often quite easily, and also through therapy. Moreover, the preconscious was something familiar to us in our normal lives. In his 1901 book, *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, Freud describes the many ways in which material that has been pushed into the preconscious causes parapraxes - slips-of-the-tongue, significant moments of forgetfulness, meaningful errors, and so on. These three elements then, the conscious, the preconscious and the unconscious made up a topography in which the self-awareness of normal day-to-day life sat atop a vast realm of unconsciousness: the tip of the proverbial iceberg.

In this period Freud developed his first formulation of the ‘pleasure principle’. This referred to the tendency of the organism to seek pleasure and to avoid pain. For this early version of the principle, Freud spoke of the organism’s avoidance of ‘unpleasure’. This could refer to the failure to achieve pleasure as much as to physical or emotional distress. In their endeavours to achieve their goals under the influence of the primitive urges of the unconscious, the person could experience unfulfilled desire, undischarged energy, and the nervous tension of unsuccessful strivings. In this circumstance, they could consequently descend into fixated neurosis or alternatively, the ‘unpleasure’ they experienced could be pushed back down into the unconscious as repressed ideational material.

In his 1911 essay, *Formulations on the Two Principles of Mental Functioning*,[[83]](#footnote-83) Freud introduced the ‘reality principle’ that countered the impulses created by the appetite for pleasure. He began his discussion with the observation that at the root of neurosis is a ‘flight from reality’, a turning away from a painful external world, inwards into a realm of hallucination. The very young infant also, not yet able to control its world, takes refuge in the hallucinatory satisfaction of internal needs. It is the inadequacy of this realm in really meeting such needs that leads to a striving to master and manipulate the external environment; so, creating the reality principle. At this stage of development, the sense organs become increasingly important as the young infant displays ‘attention’ to its world, committing what they ‘note’ to memory, and learning how to ‘judge’ the correctness of the ideas they have developed about objects within their reach. During this developmental process, ‘thinking’ becomes important for the child’s self-mastery. Over time the reality principle comes to dominate over the pleasure principle, as the child realises the possibility of the delayed gratification of pleasure-seeking desires.

*Actually, the substitution of the reality principle for the pleasure principle implies no deposing of the pleasure principle, but only a safeguarding of it. A momentary pleasure, uncertain in its results, is given up, but only in order to gain along the path an assured pleasure at a later time.*[[84]](#footnote-84)

All of Freud’s theorising of the mind and its growth from the neonatal stage, through childhood and on to adolescence and adulthood, was related to his emerging theory of human sexuality. In his *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex*[[85]](#footnote-85)of 1905*,* along with his model of psychosexual phases of development, based upon an ‘oral stage’, an ‘anal-sadistic’ stage, a ‘genital stage’ and a ‘latency stage’, Freud also promoted the discovery of infantile sexuality.

*It is remarkable that those writers who endeavour to explain the qualities and reactions of the adult individual have given so much more attention to the ancestral period than to the period of the individual’s own existence—that is, they have attributed more influence to heredity than to childhood.* […] *No author has to my knowledge recognized the lawfulness of the sexual impulse in childhood, and in the numerous writings on the development of the child the chapter on “Sexual Development” is usually passed over.*[[86]](#footnote-86)

In this period Freud also put forward a novel concept based upon the Oedipus myth of ancient Greece that was to capture the imagination of his readership and a wider public. In Sophocles’ play, *Oedipus Rex*,the eponymous hero slays his father, King Laius and (unknowingly) marries his mother, Queen Jocasta. Freud used the story to illustrate a dynamic in human psychosexual development, that he would later term the ‘Oedipus Complex’, holding it to be universal across all cultures.[[87]](#footnote-87) This dynamic emerged with the growth of the young child into awareness of their dependence upon their mother, and their developing sense of rivalry with their father for their mother’s love. For Freud, the Oedipus Complex was the key to the riddle of sexual attraction and coupling in adult life. It was a theory he was to amend and develop over the rest of his career.

*The Structural Model*

The years across the publication of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, the outbreak of the world war and the years following it, saw Freud struggling to address what he recognised as weaknesses in his theorising. The central issue, and the point on which his first model of the mind would falter, was that of repression. Freud’s theorisation of the mind lacked a mechanism for repression, an account of how it was that traumatic memories and painful aspects of the psyche, largely of a sexual nature, could be repressed by the other non-sexual drives in the model, such as hunger. One problem for Freud was his acknowledgement that the reality principle did not in fact counter the pleasure principle; rather it merely regulated it, tempering its immediate demands to achieve satisfaction at some later point. The reality principle served the interests of the more fundamental pleasure principle.

There was also the troublesome question of why it should be that some types of neurotic patient in Freud’s clinical cases, compulsively repeated their traumas, seeking to re-experience over and over episodes that clearly caused them distress. In addition, there were the examples of recurring anxiety dreams (clearly not driven by ‘the wish’), and the repetitively re-lived traumas of war veterans. Freud tackled these issues in his pivotal 1920 publication *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*; and in so doing, put forward his theory of drives, themselves the result of primordial impulses.

The apparent over-riding of the pleasure principle that Freud saw in his patients, as well as in some aspects of children’s play, he labelled ‘repetition-compulsion’. For his cases, Freud found a new purpose to the fixated behaviours that characterised many of the neuroses involved. The repetitive patterns, or ‘reaction-formations’, he observed in his clinical practice he interpreted now as returns to earlier life-episodes that were attempts by the psyche to deal with unresolved shocks and traumas.[[88]](#footnote-88) In such obsessive behaviour, the individual repeatedly re-lived the anxieties associated with painful recollections from their lives. The pleasure principle did not always prevail, and Freud’s observations forced him to accept its dethroning as the commanding principle of the human psyche.

To resolve this impasse Freud elaborated the novel concept of the ‘death instinct’; later to be termed ‘Thanatos’. His reasoning ran as follows. At the most basic and irreducible level of life, covering the entire spectrum from the simplest organisms to complex life forms and onto humanity, a death-instinct reigned, under which life strives to achieve a final entropic stability and stasis, that can only mean its own end; that can only mean death. And yet the organism also strives to survive and reproduce itself. The death-instinct was balanced against a second instinct, this one a life-force; later to be termed Eros. Whilst the overarching trajectory was defined by a drive towards death, the life-instinct checked any premature termination for the organism. The aim of life was indeed death; however not any death. Only one kind of death would be appropriate to an organism in its environment; and, by extension, for a person in their particular life circumstance. Freud’s model of the psyche was now rooted in a dual ‘instinct theory’.

A shift from a model rooted in a striving for pleasure, to one rooted in a striving for death, demanded a revision of Freud’s explanation of the psyche. Freud now altered the topographical model, to focus far more upon on the ego. The ego drew its energy from the unconscious, the site of the competing instincts of death and love; of destruction and creation. In its efforts to manage reality, the ego also created an idea of itself, a self-image of its strivings and achievements. This became an ‘ego ideal’, a psychical precipitate of the ego’s activity; an entity for which Freud coined the term ‘superego’. Whilst, like the ego the superego drew its energy from the unconscious, it also played the role of a harsh and unforgiving critic, standing in judgement over the ego’s failings and shortcomings, and creating a background sense of the guilt in the subconscious life of the person.

In Freud’s new account, the opposition between ego and superego had consequences for psychosexual development and the ways in which the person grows into their social world. This resulted from a difference in how the ego and superego incorporated their formative childhood relationships. Whereas the tendency in the ego was to relate to the object or person of desire by ‘bringing it into itself’, internalising a mental version of it in a process of ‘introjection’, the tendency of the superego was to identify with an abstraction of the object or person of desire, so ‘becoming’ it or them in its imagination. Whereas the ego strove to *have* the object, the superego strove to *be* the object.

*The basis of the process is what is called an ‘identification’ – that is to say the assimilation of one ego to another one, as a result of which the first ego behaves like the second in certain aspects, imitates it and in a sense takes it up into itself. Identification has been not unsuitably compared with the oral cannibalistic incorporation of the other person. It is a very important form of attachment to someone else, probably the very first, and not the same thing as the choice of an object. The difference between the two can be expressed in some such way as this. If a boy identifies himself with his father, he wants to be like his father; if he makes him the object of his choice, he wants to have him, to possess him. In the first case his ego is altered on the model of his father; in the second case that is not necessary.*[[89]](#footnote-89)

The separate socialising mechanisms of the ego and the superego had implications for gendering in the person. Under heteronormative sociocultural cues and pressures, the male child would seek to *have* the mother, to introject her presence into his ego, later in life seeking to *possess* the feminine object, the women, the wife; and as he developed, he would come to *identify with* the father *via* his superego, striving to *become* the masculine object, the man, the husband. In the female child, the process was the reverse. Here, again under heteronormative sociocultural influences, the girl would seek to *have* the father, to introject him into her ego, later in life seeking to *possess* the masculine object, the man, the husband; and as she developed, she would come to *identify with* the mother *via* her superego, striving to *become* the feminine object, the woman, the wife.

The key elements of Freud’s new conceptualisation of the psyche were coming into focus. His structural model was laid out fully in his 1923 essay, *The Ego and the Id.* The third component of the structural model after the ego and the superego, was the id. Whilst the general categories of conscious, preconscious, and unconscious were still present, the new model was centred upon the interactions between these three principal psychodynamic elements. In addition, the id was a powerful entity that contained the two primordial forces – the life instinct and the death instinct - that directly and indirectly governed human behaviour.

So, the three actors of the structural model were locked in tension with one another: the ego and the id struggled for command of the individual’s behaviour; the ego and the superego also wrestled for dominance in the person’s life. In fact, the id and the superego could be seen as working in alliance with one another, in that the higher strivings of the superego drew their energy from the id itself; this cathectic energy now decoupled from sexual objects, was reoriented upon loftier aims in a process of ‘sublimation’.

Between these struggles the ego was caught in the middle, besieged from both sides, as well as having to deal with the threats and dangers of the external world, this being its principal role.

*This superego occupies a special position between the ego and the id. It belongs to the ego and shares its high degree of psychological organization; but it has a particularly intimate connection with the id. It is in fact a precipitate of the first object-cathexes of the id and is the heir to the Oedipus Complex after its demise. This superego can confront the ego and treat it like an object; and it often treats it very harshly. It is as important for the ego to remain on good terms with the superego as with the id.*[[90]](#footnote-90)

The interactions between these constituents were complex, as indeed where the internal dynamics of each. So, the ego was rooted in the id and itself was both conscious in its dealings with the world, and unconscious insofar as it pushed ‘down’ unwanted material into the pre-consciousness realm of the psyche. This detail of the ego’s activity as a ‘defence’ against previous traumas, gave Freud the mechanism of repression that his previous model had lacked.

To engage with external reality the ego operated chiefly as a system of perception, whilst in its interactions with the id it dealt with repressed ideational material. One further consequence of this was that whilst the id was an opaque and impenetrable realm, the ego contained the residue of ‘verbal-images’ that had been repressed, and so could be accessed and brought into the light once more by analysis.[[91]](#footnote-91)

*Freud’s ‘mind’*

Freud’s theory of mind developed through his therapeutic observations and theoretical speculations. His discovery of the unconscious as an object of importance for a scientific understanding of the human mind, and as being accessible to analysis, provided the basis for his ‘topographical model’. Here, the preconscious acted as a conduit of mental material that the conscious part of the psyche found difficult or painful, working to push it into the unconscious, rendering it harmless to the person’s normal functioning. Freud could not however, explain the recurrence of repressed material through cycles of behaviour that repetitively conjured up previous traumatic experiences.

Freud’s later ’structural model’ model of the psyche placed conflict at its dynamic centre. The three entities that comprised the model were locked in a permanent struggle, driven by the restless energy of the id. The ego ceaselessly battled with the id, striving to temper its impulses with its own perceptions of the threats and hazards of external reality. Meanwhile, the superego, the ‘precipitate’ of the ego’s own endeavours, and representing the ego’s self-ideal, stood in judgement over it, creating by its censures a permanent residue of unfocused guilt in the person.

### The mind in Marxism

For Marx ‘society’ is the analytical starting point for understanding human behaviour; social relations being the ultimate source of human consciousness. However, it is the nature of the relationship between the material world and the mind that is in question here; the mechanism by which social experience becomes ideational content.

Within the tradition of Marxist thought on this question, a range of philosophical versions of materialism have been maintained; and, given their revolutionary orientation, normally connected to the question of the position of the mind with respect both nature and to economic structure. So, it is the character of the relationship, between economic and social structure on the one side, and human consciousness and historical action on the other, that is of interest here; particularly in its causal aspects.

Examples of the type of materialism we have already encountered in David Hume, namely that an object of the external world making an impression upon the mind in turn creates a representation of it, can indeed be found in the Marxist tradition; and sometimes *alongside of*, or woven into the different and more dialectical types of philosophical materialism alluded to. An important example comes from no less a figure than Vladimir Lenin.

Throughout most of 1908 and the early part of 1909, Lenin was involved in a polemic against a philosophical tendency within the Russian revolutionary movement: empirio-criticism.[[92]](#footnote-92) Empirio-criticism promoted an epistemology premised upon ‘pure experience’ that did not require non-experiential metaphysical categories, structures, or constructions. More to the point, this ‘naïve realism’ dispensed with any notion of a necessary underlying material reality in favour of a complete reliance upon sensuous experience for our knowledge of the world. For Lenin it was the anti-materialist leanings he detected in empirio-criticism towards subjective-idealism and psychological symbolism that was the problem. He subjected it to unforgiving criticism in his 1909 publication, *Materialism and Empirio-criticism.*[[93]](#footnote-93)

The opening part of Lenin’s attack was organised around a reflectionist version of materialism, that drew upon some key passages in Engels’writings. In this theorisation the external object makes an impression, in a Humean sense, upon the mind, which then creates a mental ‘image’ of it.

*… the materialist Frederick Engels … constantly and without exception speaks in his works of things and their mental pictures or images (Gedanken-Abbilder), and it is obvious that these mental images arise exclusively from sensations.*[[94]](#footnote-94)

And

*Anybody who reads Anti-Dühring and Ludwig Feuerbach with the slightest care will find scores of instances when Engels speaks of things and their reflections in the human brain, in our consciousness, thought, etc. Engels does not say that sensations or ideas are “symbols” of things, for consistent materialism must here use “image,” picture, or reflection instead of “symbol,” …* [[95]](#footnote-95)

Later, Lenin puts things even more clearly.

*Matter is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man by his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them.*[[96]](#footnote-96)

So, for Lenin here the mental ‘object’ was the result of a ‘copying’ of the actual object, a mental construction that reflected the impressions created by the object upon the senses and upon the brain. This was a type of materialism that he equated with ‘objective sensationalism’, a philosophical current in popular pre-War European philosophy.[[97]](#footnote-97)

Lenin’s sensation-based materialism, that he was to jettison in his later philosophical writings,[[98]](#footnote-98) was critiqued at some length by the Dutch communist Antonie Pannekoek. We will survey Pannekoek’s comments upon Lenin’s position in 1909, and indeed his writings on materialism in Marxism more generally. It was a topic he wrote about frequently, returning to it repeatedly throughout his political career.

In his *Lenin as Philosopher* of 1938*,*[[99]](#footnote-99)Pannekoek separates two types of materialism: bourgeois materialism;[[100]](#footnote-100) and historical materialism.[[101]](#footnote-101) The first connects ‘spiritual phenomena’ to the brain’s ‘physico-chemical-biological’ processes. The second relates mental contents to the external world; and to social structure. For this second type, and in familiar Marxist terms, Pannekoek emphasises the *active* – as opposed to *contemplative* - character of the relationship between the mind and the world; a relationship centred upon the transformational character of human labour upon its object.[[102]](#footnote-102) Pannekoek’s charge against Lenin’s 1909 position is that it retains the materialism of the first type in this distinction.

Pannekoek argues that bourgeois materialism opposes itself not to idealism *per se*, but to fideism; it is a critique first and foremost of religion. This is the tendency he identifies in Lenin’s position. And the root of that he sees in the influence of Georgi Plekhanov, the leading Marxist philosopher of the time.

Plekhanov, according to Pannekoek, confuses the meaning of a historically pivotal statement by Marx on the nature of the relationship between consciousness and the world. In the first of his eleven theses on Feuerbach,[[103]](#footnote-103) Marx distinguished between the material object as an object of contemplation, and alternatively as one of human labour.

*The chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism – that of Feuerbach included – is that the thing, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the object or of contemplation, but not as sensuous human activity, practice, not subjectively. Hence, in contradistinction to materialism, the active side was developed abstractly by idealism – which, of course, does not know real, sensuous activity as such.*

*Feuerbach wants sensuous objects, really distinct from the thought objects, but he does not conceive human activity itself as objective activity. Hence, in* [*The Essence of Christianity*](https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/feuerbach/works/essence/index.htm)*,*[[104]](#footnote-104) *he regards the theoretical attitude as the only genuinely human attitude, while practice is conceived and fixed only in its dirty-judaical manifestation. Hence he does not grasp the significance of “revolutionary”, of “practical-critical”, activity.*[[105]](#footnote-105)

For Marx and Engels, and the Young Hegelian philosophers, Feuerbach’s reduction of god and all things religious, to the secular domain of human creation, had been exhilarating. However, Marx came to see this as an ‘inconsistent materialism’. Whilst the relationship between the human being and their world was one of contemplation only, of observation and scrutiny, the sensuous world of experience was simply a given, independent of human action, and reality the result of the churn of worldly objects, and their multiform fixed characteristics. This rendering of the human being, not in their active involvement in the world, but only in their theoretical aspect, retained for Marx the trace of idealism. Only with the re-rendering of the human being in their active relationship with the world, centred upon the transformative role of human labour working upon nature, and back upon consciousness itself, could this last vestige of idealism be finally put aside.

For Pannekoek, the radical break with Feuerbach that the ‘first thesis’ represented, was lost in Plekhanov’s conflation of the quite different ideas of Marx and Engels on the one hand, and Feuerbach on the other. The result, by this argument, was that the importance of the first thesis for the achievement of a thoroughgoing materialism became submerged beneath an otherwise superficial anti-fideism; and the banal observation that the brain is a prerequisite for human consciousness.

*It is a significant indication of the point of view of Plechanov* (sic) *that he does not see this antagonism and that he assigns the main importance to the trivial community of opinion – which is unimportant for the real issue – that thoughts are produced by the brain.*

Other figures in the Marxist tradition have discussed the interaction between mind and the world. A first example, from the standpoint of philosophy, is György Lukács who in his *A Defence of History and Class Consciousness: Tailism and the Dialectic*,[[106]](#footnote-106) written in the mid-1920s, defended his account of consciousness from accusations of philosophical idealism. A second example, from the standpoint of experimental psychology, is Lev Vygotsky, who in his 1934 work *Thought and Language*,[[107]](#footnote-107) suggested a process by which mental concepts come into existence; one that ran counter to the ‘copy’ theory of Lenin’s 1909 materialism. And a third example, from the standpoint of literary criticism, is Frederic Jameson, whose 1981 *The Political Unconscious* suggests an ‘unconscious’ that is non-libidinal, and a source of contradictions that whilst hidden to the self, find symbolic resolution in cultural artefacts.

In his *Tailism and the Dialectic*, Lukács maintains the impossibility of a direct connection between the mind and the objective world. To his critics, this represented a sundering of the dialectic of consciousness from that of nature. This was the ‘idealism’ of which he stood accused in the world of Soviet philosophical orthodoxy. The debate posed a question that is relevant to our broader inquiry: ‘If all our consciousness is conceptual, the result of mental activity, then how can we know the world as it really is, without some type of direct and immediate experience of worldly objects?’[[108]](#footnote-108)

But then how we might locate such ‘immediate’ experience.[[109]](#footnote-109) The question is not straightforward. Experience, even when novel, comes to us with some mental organisation that is proximal to it. A new experience of reality presents itself to us as just that - a ‘new experience’, not yet integrated into our general mental schema, but still recognisable as a part of the world of which we are familiar. Alternatively, we can identify the sensory input in an analytical exercise that separates it out from its mental aspect. But even then, the sense-data involved does not exist in isolation in a pure form. Rather, it comes to us as part of a material environment or social circumstance, reflecting our position within it. It is dependent also upon our physical condition, the health of our senses, and the satisfaction of our basic needs, and so on. Indeed, our search for a pure sensory input into our conscious thought processes, that is not mediated in one way or another, takes us to ever greater abstractions. Ultimately, we can defend the notion of immediate experience of the world only as an inferred *limit*, a ‘zero-point’ that we can treat as ‘real’, but with no content of its own. Reversing this logic and working from the outside world inwards into the mind, we can understand this liminal position as also representing an *origin*; or perhaps a *source* of moment-to-moment information about the world to which the mind responds and seeks to organise for its own survival.[[110]](#footnote-110)

An analogy from chemistry with its language of elements and compounds, can help us to better appreciate this point. So, chlorine can exist in diatomic form as a gas, in solid form as an ionic lattice, and in solute form as a chloride or hypochlorite salt. In fact, ‘chlorine’ does not exist unless in one observable form or another. Even in its highly reactive and unstable free radical form we know it, not directly, but by its oxidative effects. It is itself a non-empirical abstraction generalised from empirical observation, a construct of atomic theory and mathematical modelling. It is real, though *inferred* as such; the various forms of chlorine being what chlorine *is*. The contact between mind and world has this type of philosophical status. So, as sense-data enters the mind it does so in an ideational form. It cannot enter thought in some other way, independently of mental processes. The creation of ‘experience’ then, involves the melding of sensory stimulation with the activity of the mind, instantaneously and in the very moment of entry. It is *the way* sense-data is assimilated by the mind.[[111]](#footnote-111)

So, direct contact with the world stands outside of ‘experience’. We can infer it as a ‘limit’ to our mental apprehension of the world, as well as an ‘origin’ of our organic character as biological beings. And conscious apprehension of the world requires experience, with all the layered mediation mentioned above and more, but also combined with the operational concepts that work upon it to create understanding. And yet, how do such concepts themselves emerge?

We can create a hypothetical scale of mental constructs, from novel sensory inputs not yet integrated into any conceptual schema (‘new experience’), through to highly organised conceptual articulations, informed by sensory inputs that are quite familiar (‘integrated experience’), and that bring no surprise. Drawing upon experimental studies with young children, the child developmentalist Vygotsky created this type of scale to illustrate pathways of mental development and the emergence of concepts.[[112]](#footnote-112) His classification was based upon tests that asked children of different ages to group blocks of different shapes, colours, and labels. It ran as follows:

* Syncretism. The assembling of groups (physical and mental) based upon random selection or spatial distribution but with no objective meaning.
* Complex formation (first type). The formation of groups (physical and mental) based upon objective characteristics observed by the child, that are factual, rather than logical, as in family groupings for example. The principle is one of association.
* Complex formation (second type). The formation of groups (physical and mental) based upon objective characteristics that distinguish sub-groups from one another, or that represent actual similarities, allowing for their organisation into collections. The principle is one of assortment.
* Chain-complex formation. The creation of linked groups (physical and mental), by which the child, having assembled objects according to one attribute, moves into a different grouping activity based upon another attribute of some of the same objects.
* Diffuse-complex formation. The creation of groupings (physical and mental) by the observation of degrees of similarity *e.g.* shadings of colour, composite shapes, *etc.*, that allow these assemblages to shift from one type to another. These groupings are fluid, though they are still based upon observed and factual attributes.
* Pseudo-concept formation. The creation of groupings (physical and mental) that are based upon factual attributes, but that are named by the child using words that are borrowed from the adult. These words for the adult represent a generalisation based upon observation and experience of the world. They symbolise an abstract idea: a concept. However, the child’s use of the word still relies upon objects of experience, despite the *appearance* of conceptual thought.
* Concept formation. The creation of a unified mental concept that works independently of particular observations of the world, and that can be transferred from one experience to another. The concept is represented by a word, standing as its symbol in relation to others, making possible mastery of the environment and rational communication; the word being provided by the child’s social world so integrating them into a culture.

So, the introduction of the ‘word’ (symbol) acting as a mediating third term between the object and the concept enables understanding for the child, and the possibility of communication. This facility becomes apparent at puberty.

In his account of mental development and of the emergence of conceptual thinking, Vygotsky emphasises the active role of the mental operations involved. This is the opposite of the ‘copy’ theory of the development of ideas in which repeated exposure to the object gradually imprints it as a mental representation; the mind being essentially a passive receiver of impressions of the world.

*When the process of concept formation is seen in all its complexity, it appears as a movement of thought within the pyramid of concepts, constantly alternating between two directions, from the particular to the general, and from the general to the particular.*

*… a concept is formed, not through the interplay of associations, but through an intellectual operation in which all the elementary mental functions participate in a specific combination.*

*… the use of the word is an integral part of the developing processes, and the word maintains its guiding function in the formation of genuine concepts, to which these processes lead.*[[113]](#footnote-113)

Vygotsky’s view of the role of ‘the word’ in mental processes, and of language more generally, gives a final insight that is useful for our inquiry. This is the notion of ‘inner speech’. The external speech of the young child occurs in two forms: egocentric speech; and social speech. With egocentric speech the child focuses upon themselves and their immediate environment, often showing little interest in communication with others. With social speech communication and shared understandings occur. Inner speech however, a later stage of development, is not anchored to ‘the word’; it can be wordless, working in ‘meaning’ rather than formal language. Through inner speech such meaning can attach to words, though often in an unstable, fluctuating manner, oscillating between its word and wordless forms. For Vygotsky, this is the nature of thought, and its emergence, development, and maturation.[[114]](#footnote-114)

Vygotsky’s theory of concept formation provides a model of mental development in the individual. However, Marxism is not only a theory of social dynamics, generally understood. It is also a theory of human consciousness in its historical context. Our question now is ‘How do we explain the self that is able to reflect upon its own existence, yet is also unaware of its social origins that remain obscure to it; so being unable to understand its creation as a historical entity?’

For Jameson, there is an unconscious that is the result of the history of a people, that is active in their social experience and that is particular to them. This ‘history’ however, is ‘not there’ in a material sense. There is nothing tangible that can be grasped in any substantive way. Its force as a cause lies in its hidden character, and its effects are political, manifest in human behaviour at the level of the individual, the group and the society in its entirety. Jameson deems history, borrowing a concept from Spinoza, to be an ‘absent cause’; always working on the present; yet always obscure to those that are its bearers.

This ‘history’ however, is not a simple and homogeneous cause. Rather it is full of contradiction, and of tensions and antagonisms that are felt in the moment-to-moment reality of the present; felt as the ‘ideological unconscious’ working its effects upon the conscious mind and the behaviours of social actors. The importance of this for Jameson, is that it enables us to understand cultural works – the artefacts of literature and art[[115]](#footnote-115) – as symbolic resolutions of these tensions, illuminating them with a critical light for analysis and comprehension.[[116]](#footnote-116) This understanding of culture places it in a wider framing, as one part of a complex historical whole. ‘History’ then becomes a ‘totalising narrative’, essential to an understanding of any particular creative work, whilst being itself an inexpressible presence.[[117]](#footnote-117)

*It is in detecting the traces of that uninterrupted narrative, in restoring to the surface of the text the repressed and buried reality of this fundamental history, that the doctrine of a political unconscious finds its function and its necessity.*[[118]](#footnote-118)

This historically relativising tendency is relevant to Jameson’s use of the psychoanalytical unconscious. For Jameson the unconscious is intrinsically time-bound. It is also structural, an effect of the social experience of a community, where for Freud it is libidinal, rooted in desire. Moreover, the historical and non-libidinal aspects of Jameseon’s unconscious are linked. This becomes clear when we look at his treatment of ‘desire’ as itself historical. So, for Freud, desire - understood as ‘wish-fulfilment’ - arises from the restless id. It is a constant, universal, and unrelenting urge towards pleasure-oriented consumption. However, from Jameson’s standpoint desire is understood as a historical creation, bound up with its cultural context, mediations, and production. It exists through industries that belong to a particular social, political, and technological setting. Desire then is never natural; always under capitalism it is manufactured and commodified.

This relativising of desire allows us now to disentangle a non-libidinal unconscious from its essentially sexual expression by Freud throughout his works. Freud’s unconscious - the result of repression that is rooted in the sexualised jealousies of early childhood – we can now re-frame as only one theorisation of an unconscious that reflects Freud’s cultural environment.[[119]](#footnote-119) Analytically, beneath this we can place a structural unconscious; one that arises from the challenges and complexities of life. It is something that results from the repressive psychic mechanism that enables us to survive; the blade that splits and sculpts the subject into empirical character and individual personality. This general form of repression and the structural unconscious that it creates is helpful for a model-of-mind that traverses each historical mode of mental life.

Indeed, this non-libidinal understanding of repression as a psychological mechanism is closer to its pre-Freudian usage. In the work of Joahann Herbart, ‘repression’ (‘Verdrängung’) is the mechanism by which ‘apperceptive complexes’ are pushed ‘down’ below the limen that separates the conscious mind from an ‘unconscious’ realm. Indeed Herbart’s modelling of the mind, influenced by the Newtonian paradigm that served as the standard of modern science at the time, was a highly mechanical and also mathematicised one. This biophysical model of the mind, that was to greatly influence the young Freud *via* his teacher and mentor Theodor Meynert, was premised upon the notion of mental material that comes into consciousness by achieving ‘apperceptive mass’ as it combines with other representation complexes (‘Vorstellungen’). In doing so it finds its place in relation to other compatible complexes, in a process of synthesis leading to the mind’s ‘sense-of-the-world’. Those complexes that are incompatible with dominant complexes are pushed out of consciousness, though they never disappear entirely from the mind’s residue of repressed mental material.

In later work, Jameson locates in the political unconscious residual ideologies that lurk beneath dominant ideologies, whilst newly emergent ideologies rise to compete with and overthrow the ‘ideological dominant’ on a continuously contested terrain. It is the hidden reality of the political unconscious, an opacity lying at the heart of the subjective self, that also makes possible the deceits and manipulations of ideology.[[120]](#footnote-120) These ‘deceits and manipulations’ – the result of the repression of some forms of consciousness by others - however, are also the key to survival in a world of social threats, competitive calculation, and potential annihilation.

**Marxism and ideology**

Marx's theory of ideology is made up of three different conceptualisations. Each captures a different aspect of how the primary producers of any given type of society are persuaded to accept their position within oppressive class structures. These different conceptualisations are: ‘representation’; ‘material practice’; and ‘appearance’. In *The German Ideology* of 1846 Marx outlines a theory by which ideology represents the dominant ideas of a society, corresponding to the economic interests of its ruling class. In this same work, there is a description of human consciousness in its various forms that centres material processes of survival as its source. In later works, and chiefly in *Das Capital*, Marx describes the social appearance of capitalist relations of production that, whilst originating in the lived experience of exploitation, also masks their true character with ‘fetishised’ conceptualisations of reality.

*Ideology and representation*

In the *German Ideology*, Marx gives the following account of the role of ideology in society.

*The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance. The individuals composing the ruling class possess among other things consciousness, and therefore think. Insofar, therefore, as they rule as a class and determine the extent and compass of an epoch, it is self-evident that they do this in its whole range, hence among other things rule also as thinkers, as producers of ideas, and regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age: thus their ideas are the ruling ideas of the epoch. For instance, in an age and in a country where royal power, aristocracy, and bourgeoisie are contending for mastery and where, therefore, mastery is shared, the doctrine of the separation of powers proves to be the dominant idea and is expressed as an “eternal law.”*

This passage is an evocation of the importance of ideas for the power wielded by a ruling class over those it rules and exploits. It highlights the role that the manipulation of mental life plays in class society. It also suggests mechanisms by which this happens. There is the notion of the ‘means of mental production’, by which Marx means the scholastic monasteries of the medieval order, universities, the legal system, and the raft of institutions that he was to bring under the rubric of ‘superstructure’. Connected to this is the ‘distribution of ideas’, meaning the popular press and other media, the education system, the pulpit and so forth. These are essentially social mechanisms.

This passage also suggests mechanisms that are closer to our theme; touching upon how Marx conceptualises the mind.[[121]](#footnote-121) Firstly, there is the conversion of social (‘material’) relationships into idealised forms. This is in effect a ‘mystification’ of social reality, and a re-casting of it into a sanitised imaginary construction. This involves a second mechanism, that is the ‘inversion’ of unjust social reality into an unreal notion, reconfigured as ‘just’. To illustrate, we might consider the mystification and inversion of an unequal social structure into an idealised version of it that is centred upon the concept of equality. The third mechanism suggested here is the ‘eternalising’ of such idealisations. Here, exploitative social relationships are presented as timeless, fixed, and unchanging. This ‘universalisation’ turns historical realities into things of a natural order that cannot be changed; that are invulnerable to human action.

To better understand these mechanisms of mystification, inversion, and universalisation, we can trace their development in an earlier work in which Marx interrogates the philosophical categories of Hegel and his followers. This is *The Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right* of 1844.[[122]](#footnote-122)

Mystification

In *The Critique* of 1844, Marx points to Hegel’s propensity to elevate abstractions above empirical reality; reality becoming derivative of transcendental entities, rather than seen as their origin. Central to Hegel’s system is the Idea, expressing itself through corporeal manifestations in its historical journey towards self-realisation. The Idea, seen as ‘objective spirit’, is the definitive mystification residing at the core of Hegel’s metaphysics.

One result of mystification in Hegel’s philosophy, according to Marx, is that human activity-in-the-world is not seen as being real in itself, but rather as being merely real only for the metaphysical demiurge that is the Idea, or *Geist* (‘Spirit’) moving through history. Human activity then, is afforded not an independent reality but, in Marx’s terminology, an ‘allegorical’ status.

*This inversion of subject into object and object into subject is a consequence of Hegel's wanting to write the biography of the Idea ... with human activity ... having consequently to appear as the activity and result of something other than man.*[[123]](#footnote-123)

And consequent upon all of this, where human activity is the result not of human agency, but of a power that stands over it, upon which it relies for its historical meaning, freedom disappears. The ethical result of Hegel’s philosophy can only be a dumb acceptance of reality as it is, and as it must be. Hegel’s metaphysics Marx argues, becomes the legitimation of an indifferent cosmology, and a fixed and unchangeable social order.

Inversion

Marx took his technique of inversion from Feuerbach. Feuerbach, in his critique of Christianity, had inverted the relationship between ‘God’ seen as the origin of the world, a real entity to be worshipped, and a humankind held in faithful fealty to its creator. With Feuerbach’s inversion, humankind itself was seen as the source of the content of religious belief, and ‘God’ an imagined construction, created to meet the psychological needs of human beings, but externalised into the structures and rituals of religious veneration. Where ‘God’ had been the subject, and humankind the predicate, now ‘God’ was the idealised predicate of the real historical subject; humankind.

Marx subjected Hegel’s logic to this same inversion – or, more precisely *re*-inversion - technique. In Hegel’s formulations of property relations for instance, the person’s right to property is a facet of the working of ‘will’ in history. It is will, embodied in the person, and in the political sense their ‘personhood’, that drives the desire for, possession of, and entitlement to, private property. For Hegel, this is also the expression and fulfilment of its freedom. Marx argued that this was an inversion. Taking the law of inheritance, primogeniture, as his example, he pointed out that the passing down of landed property to the eldest son was not in fact a matter of choice (‘will’) for the landowner, but rather a matter of property law. Property then, was not the expression of will in the person; its determination. Rather it was the inverse; the generational passage of landed property resulting from the power of property over will, and inheritance its determined result.

In similar fashion, Marx reworked Hegel’s view of the relationship between civil society and the state. For Hegel, the state stood above civil society and its constituent parts that included economic relations, familial bonds, and other types of particular and private interest. The state for Hegel was of a higher order, the embodiment, not of private interests, but of the general interest of the whole of society. It was the expression of a universal principle from which institutions of civil society derived their social meaning and juridical status. Again, for Marx this was an inversion of reality. Rather, civil society was the source of the authority of the state, not the other way around. The state in fact did not stand ‘above’ society but was rooted in the private interests of the dominant class it served. Marx had once more re-inverted Hegel; he had found Hegel ‘standing on his head’ and had turned him the ‘right way up’.

*Family and civil society are the presuppositions of the state; they are really active things; but in speculative philosophy it is reversed ... the political state cannot exist without the natural basis of the family and the artificial basis of civil society; they are its* conditio sine qua non*, but (in Hegel) the conditions are established as the conditioned, the determining as the determined, the producing as the product of its product.*[[124]](#footnote-124)

Universalisation

Finally, Marx identifies a tendency in Hegel to find ‘empirical universals’ in particular interests appearing in an idealised universal form. In his discussion of the Estates of the French Revolution Hegel sees in the new bourgeois state the universalised embodiment and ‘general interest’ of the French Republic. Marx argues however, that this is simply the self-representation of the bourgeoisie to itself and to France as the ‘historical positive’ *contra* the ‘historical negative’ that was the feudal *Ancien Régime*. In the popular tumult that was the 1789 Revolution, whilst the bourgeoise class joined the social churn on the streets of Paris, its real historical interests were always going to prevail.

*No class of civil society can play this role without arousing a moment of enthusiasm in itself and in the masses, a moment in which it fraternizes and merges with society in general, becomes confused with it and is perceived and acknowledged as its general representative, a moment in which its claims and rights are truly the claims and rights of society itself, a moment in which it is truly the social head and the social heart. Only in the name of the general rights of society can a particular class vindicate for itself general domination.*[[125]](#footnote-125)

This raising of the class-interest of a particular - and in this case revolutionary - class, to the status of the interests of the nation, the sum of all the particular interests of civil society, and even to those of humanity in its entirety, are instances in reality of the universalisation of the concrete and selfish interests of a dominant, exploiting class.

These ‘mechanisms-of-the-mind’ - of mystification, inversion, and universalisation - for Marx comprise a mode-of-representation; one that supports the creation of an ideology that rationalises the position of a ruling class, making its dominance a matter of ‘reason’.

*Ideology and material practice*

Marx’s observations about the representational content of consciousness – its constructions of reality in the human imagination - illuminate his view of role of social institutions in the manufacture and dissemination of ideology. In other passages Marx also presents theorisations of ideology based upon material practices within historical societies with their distinctive economic activity, behaviours, belief systems and cultures. These are more concerned with how ideas emerge from social processes and how ideology interacts with society as a whole.

In passages from *The German Ideology*, Marx describes an ‘efflux’ theory by which ideas emerge from patterns of economic life. Here, Marx is emphasising that ideology does not occupy a separate realm from practical life. Rather, it is located within the life-process itself, the ways in which human beings sustain and reproduce their existence. In this account ideas are the “ideological reflexes” and “echoes” of a society’s productive forces and its types of social interaction.

*The phantoms formed in the human brain are also, necessarily, sublimates of their material life-process, which is empirically verifiable and bound to material premises.*[[126]](#footnote-126)

This is a spontaneist explanation for the origin of ideas from economic and social practice. There would be no need here for the mind understood as an autonomously active element, an agent, in the creation of ideas. Instead, ideas would emerge, preformed from unreflective human activity.

Beyond this emanation of forms of thought from productive processes however, Marx does see ideas as feeding back into them, affecting, shaping, and even limiting their development. This suggests an active role for ideas in society. In this ‘organic’ account, historical changes are characterised by interactions of ideology with basic productive forces and their social processes.

What Marx calls the ‘theoretical products’ of human material processes, the ideas created by humans as they work upon nature, become interwoven with those same processes. So, historically specific social and ideological forms - of law, politics, religious practice, *etc.* – correspond to the specific character of the material processes that sustain life in an economic mode. Moreover, types of ‘social intercourse’ arising from forms of production also act back upon them, either ‘corresponding’ to them optimally to enable their further development; or acting obstructively to either fetter this potential or to become replaced with new social forms; usually by violence.

Also, the interactions of ideology and material practice, indeed the interactions of all the different facets of a social order, meant that a society could be understood, not just analytically, part by part, but in its totality.

As Marx put in, in summary:

*This conception of history depends on our ability to expound the real process of production, starting out from the material production of life itself, and to comprehend the form of intercourse connected with this and created by this mode of production (i.e. civil society in its various stages), as the basis of all history; and to show it in its action as State, to explain all the different theoretical products and forms of consciousness, religion, philosophy, ethics, etc. etc. and trace their origins and growth from that basis; by which means, of course, the whole thing can be depicted in its totality (and therefore, too, the reciprocal action of these various sides on one another).*[[127]](#footnote-127)

The emphasis on ‘totality’ here means that Marx’s understanding of ideology is not after all a reductionist one, notwithstanding the ‘efflux’ model alluded to earlier. All parts of a society interact with one another and the society itself is more than the sum of its parts; the totality acting back upon the processes that give rise to it. These interactions moreover are ‘mediated’; that is, they work *via* intermediate structures, processes, and social objects.

At its most abstract, the Hegelian category of ‘mediation’ refers to the third term that reconciles opposing entities, otherwise locked in an irreconcilable tension. The movement that overcomes this opposition occurs *via* an intermediary through which the antagonism is eliminated. Applied concretely, it allows Marx’s account of a society to capture the complex interactions between its economic base and the ideas within it. This idea of a ‘mediated totality’ in Marxist theory is developed particularly in the work of Antonio Labriola and his ‘organic conception of history’.[[128]](#footnote-128)

Finally, in corresponding to a mode-of-production, ideology reflects the mind-set of the class that owns and controls it: the exploiting class. So, whilst corresponding to the material base of a given society, the dominant ideology, aided by the psychological mechanisms of inversion, mystification, and universalisation, distorts reality to represent only the interests of the dominant class; conversely, masking the interests of the exploited class.

*Ideology and appearance*

The ‘correspondence theory’ of ideology characterised Marx’s writings from *The German Ideology* of 1845 through to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* of 1859.[[129]](#footnote-129) In the preface to the latter, Marx stated:

*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, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite s of social consciousness.*[[130]](#footnote-130)

From this point onwards however, a different explanation enters Marx’s works, based upon the concept of ‘commodity fetishism’. This was a special case of his more general theory of ‘reification’. Reification resulted from the cognitive transfer of something out of its actual setting in external reality, into an imaginary realm, now experienced as something separate, and intrinsic to itself. This involved a perspectival distortion so that something that was the effect of unseen objective causes, was now invested in the mind with an independent existence.

Reification for Marx was not an ideological trick, nor a simple illusion. It was a result of the structural relationships that defined capitalist production. Under capitalism human relations work through the exchange of things; in the form of trade and commerce; and in the form of the capital-labour nexus in which each party has something to exchange. What is a relationship between human beings becomes seen – becomes experienced – as a relationship between things.

*Even from the point of view of the merely formal relation — the general form of capitalist production, which has its less developed mode in common with the more developed — the means of production, the* objective conditions of *labour, do not appear as subsumed under the worker; rather, he appears as subsumed under them. Capital employs labour. Even this relation in its simplicity is a personification of things and a reification of persons.*

*But the relation becomes still more complex — and apparently more mysterious — in that, with the development of the specifically capitalist mode of production, not only do these things — these products of labour, both as use values and as exchange values — stand on their hind legs vis-à-vis the worker and confront him as* “capital” *— but also the social forms of labour appear as* forms of the development of *capital, and therefore the productive powers of social labour, thus developed, appear as* productive powers of capital.[[131]](#footnote-131)

Marx distinguished between the use-value of the commodity and its exchange-value. The use-value was the non-quantifiable practical usefulness of the object or material in question: the value of a plough to till the soil; the value of bread to satisfy hunger; and so on. The exchange value however, lay behind the quantified ratio in which the item could be exchanged with an item of another type. The equivalence that underpinned this ratio was in the amount of labour involved in the making of each of the commodities, quantified as necessary labour time.

This feature of the commodity - that it was the embodiment of the socially necessary labour time that had created it – gave it another quite mysterious quality; one of appearing to have a ‘life’ - a ‘value’ - of its own. In other words that its exchange-value on a market of other commodities appeared as essential to it, something possessed by it. So, although a diamond is no more than a crystal of carbon, its commercial value is seen as a property of the diamond itself, as something that inheres in it. This is the result of the separation of production and consumption under capitalism: production being the labour required to manufacture (or excavate) the product; consumption represented by the market upon which the product becomes a commodity.

Regarding the worker under capitalism now, they do not own the product of their labour which is expropriated from them; this being the exploitation that defines capitalism. This severing of the process of production from the consumption of the commodity on a market is what makes its true nature – a result of exploitation - opaque. The commodity appears as something of inherent value; this appearance now fetishised as a self-supporting ‘objective’ reality. However, the essence of the commodity is its character as the embodiment of exploited labour. It is the commodity’s appearance free-floating on its market, unrelated to the human labour, that is the basis of Marx’s theory of ‘commodity fetishism’.

*In order, therefore, to find an analogy we must take flight into the misty realm of religion. There the products of the human brain appear as autonomous figures endowed with a life of their own, which enter into relations both with each other and with the human race. So it is in the world of commodities with the products of men's hands. I call this the fetishism which attaches itself to the products of labour as soon as they are produced as commodities, and is therefore inseparable from the production of commodities.*[[132]](#footnote-132)

The implications of Marx’s analysis of the commodity becomes clear when he comes to the labour-capitalist relationship. Here, we need to see the worker as also situated in the capitalist market. The worker’s survival after all depends upon their ability to sell their labour to a capitalist who will employ them. Of course, the capitalist owns the wherewithal – the capital - needed to produce goods for sale: the tools; the machinery; the transportation; the buildings; and so on. However, the worker has something the capitalist needs which is the ability to work with these tools and materials – these means of production; this is their ‘labour power’. It is their labour power they must sell, making it also a commodity, and one of a special kind because it is manifest always through human activity.

This all means that the experience the worker has of the labour-capitalist relationship is one of equal exchange. The worker sells their principal commodity, their labour power, for a return: the wage. The wage-labour exchange has the appearance of a fair bargain. ‘Fair’ here requires a caveat. The worker in fact may see the wage as unfair, but only because it is too low. Then some negotiation or perhaps some industrial struggle may occur that, if successful, raises wages to a level that is experienced as closer to a ‘fair’ rate for the job.

But these very notions of equal exchange and a ‘fair wage’ hide the real character of the exchange. The essence of the worker-capitalist relationship is one of robbery. The capitalist returns to the worker a portion of the value of the labour time for which they are employed; the socially necessary time required to produce a quantity of goods. Beyond this the rest of the worker’s labour time is used to create a further quantity of goods for which they go unremunerated. This time is stolen from the worker and its worth is realised upon the capitalist market as value that is surplus to the maintenance of the productive cycle from day to day, week to week, *etc*. This is the ‘surplus value’ that becomes the capitalist’s profits, but now demystified and exposed in Marx’s critique for what it truly is: the fruits of the exploitation of the worker.

The commodification of labour provides the basis for Marx’s new theory of ideology. This is because the appearance of the worker-capitalist relationship conceals its essence. Whilst the worker understands the employment relationship as one of equal and fair exchange, it is in fact nothing of the kind. The surplus value that is appropriated by the capitalist is not revealed as such. Rather it is taken from the worker as a hidden quantity, taken in an economic sleight-of-hand worthy of the stage magician; except that it is performed day-by-day, week-by-week, *etc*. for the entirety of the worker’s working life. This means that this appearance is not simply an illusion; it is structural to the social experience of working life.

So, the ideological distortion involved is constitutive to the perspective of the worker, and the appearance is an ‘objective appearance’. It is different in this sense from the more psychological character of Marx’s earlier correspondence theory of ideology. This perspectival distortion is the foundation for the host of secondary tricks, ruses and deceits by which capitalists *via* their ideological servants in the media, the courts, universities, and so on, perpetuate their rule.

**First nature, second nature and the ideology of the ‘given’: Adorno, Horkheimer and Sohn-Rethal**

Theodor Adorno had reflected upon ‘first nature’ and ‘second nature’ in his 1932 lecture ‘The Idea of a Natural-History.’[[133]](#footnote-133) These concepts referred to human experience that seems to arise from contact with the world of external objects (at different degrees of removal), and with a pre-determined reality that is prior human activity. Human experience in other words – somatic, cognitive, and aesthetic – that arises directly and indirectly from contact with nature, whether of the outside world, or within us. An ‘ideology critique’ lies in the task of revealing the historical mediations involved, and the inter-subjective constructions really at work, moulded by oppressive social structures and their replications in human thought and behaviour. They are ‘given’ for the individual as they grow and mature through adolescence into adulthood; but are given by society, not ‘nature’ *per se*. Their force lies in their opacity to the person themselves, locked within their historical subjectivity.

Adorno’s early account of the interactions of nature and history was influenced by Lukacs’ treatment of the topic. For Adorno, ‘first nature’ - understood both as external reality and the internal state into which the human being is born – is encountered by the human subject as the world of independent objects and of sensations that the mind takes within itself in conceptual form, so representing the transformation of reality as it enters human consciousness. This process of internalisation creates experiences that the person understands (falsely) as ‘natural’. The subject then, encounters the object as something inert to it, that can only be conceptualised in an alienated fashion for the purposes of comprehension and manipulation. Second nature arises from the subject’s experience of this first nature, as it comes into self-consciousness, reflective now of its own reified internal states. This essentially Kantian (apperceptive) account of the relationship between an apprehending subject and a fixed and unchanging object, interacting only *via* its external properties, gave way to a more Hegelian understanding in Adorno’s later writings with Max Horkheimer in *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*.[[134]](#footnote-134) Here the discussion revolves more on the transformations involved in the creation of both a first nature that is intended as a comprehension of the world we find in its outward phenomenal form and as our given internal states – our ‘biology’ -, and a second nature that arises from it and that makes up our social being; full of fetishised, commodified and alienated inter-subjective states, again experienced falsely as ‘natural’.[[135]](#footnote-135) So, our first (biological) nature becomes by transformation our second (social) nature. Both are experienced as non-historical and immediate; but both are historically mediated. Neither are independent of human activity; neither are ‘natural’ in the sense suggested by the natural sciences. A corollary to this is that as second nature emerges, it does so with the conceptual material provided by a first nature that has already objectified in thought the subject itself - now seen as separate from the world - and that already represents a falsified image of reality. In the construction of the person under capitalism, ideology is the result of the kind of rationality produced by the alienated social relationships constitutive of it. For the modern subject, what is achieved by enlightenment in science, Adorno sees as paid for in consciousness by the descent into myth.

The Hegelian approach to conceptualising second nature is more explicit in the work of Alfred Sohn-Rethal. His *Intellectual and Manual Labour: A Critique of Epistemology*, was finished in 1951, but not published until 1973. In it he gives an account of the creation of ‘self’ at historical junctures. Its importance lies in the dialectical step it makes towards an explanation of human consciousness and behaviour that does not appeal to primordial, biological, or otherwise natural forces. Rather, in Sohn-Rethal’s model, they are result of historical-social processes that are unseen to the subjective mind that they construct.[[136]](#footnote-136)

For Sohn-Rethal, the self arises from a ‘circuit’ in which consciousness of the world of external objects becomes internalised as self-consciousness. In his historical discussion, this return of consciousness back to itself with self-awareness, creates meaning from external processes of commodity exchange. This meaning is unintended and its origin opaque to the person, for whom the forms of consciousness it produces are experienced as given; as natural.

*The formation of thinking which in every respect merits the term “social” presents itself as the diametrical opposite to society* […] *Nothing could be wrapped in greater secrecy than the truth that the independence of the intellect is owed to its originally social character.* (Sohn-Rethal, 1978: 72)

The source of this ‘secrecy’ is a bypassing of conscious awareness of the inter-subjectivity involved in the exchange of commodities. The exploitation involved is eclipsed, creating an ‘automatic subject’ that is unaware of its social origin. The overall result is what Sohn-Rethal terms a ‘practical solipsism’ by which the self experiences its existence internally, without an acknowledgement of the sociality that objectively defines it. The self sees itself as its own creation – the ‘social’ being the external environment in which it finds itself, and which it must navigate as an autonomous cogito.

Sohn-Rethal identifies a ‘real abstraction’ in commodity exchange based upon a quantifiable equalising of value that becomes internalised as an ‘ideal abstraction’ in mental cognition. Such ideal abstractions give rise to the mental categories that create the conditions of consciousness in each historical context. Sohn-Rethal’s particular interest here is the cognitive faculties of abstract space and time that are the foundations of Kant’s transcendental philosophy, and the conditions of subjective experience. In his application of ‘real abstraction’ to mental processes he also goes on to explain the emergence of abstract thinking in 6th Century Greece (consequent upon the introduction of coinage), the foundational categories of modern scientific cognition and the separation of mental from manual labour.

So, from Sohn-Rethal’s circuit that is ‘consciousness-of-world’ to ‘consciousness-of-self’ *via* the unrecognised inter-subjective social interactions involved in commodity exchange, a second nature emerges. This is created as the ‘self-aware-self’ becomes co-constituted alongside the concepts that are internalised from the objective world in motion. As a result the self, though able to reflect upon its own reality, experiences its existence not as the result of the social forces that have created it but spontaneously, complete with forms of thinking, modes of cognition and types of feeling that are historically and socially specific.

Finally, the transformations of first nature and second nature give an insight into social pedagogy, and the transmission of ideology from one generation to the next.[[137]](#footnote-137) For whilst the infant develops within the limitations of first nature, the ‘adult’ world works upon the child with cultural cues, informal communication and formal curricular. They do so *via* the mediations of the second nature that sets the ‘natural’ expectations of how the child ought to develop, so passing on those mediations to the child as they grow into their own second nature.[[138]](#footnote-138) The transformations involved however, are not only those occurring in the change from first to second nature in the child. They are also occurring in the adult as the reinforcement of these same second nature mediations, converted now into didactic methods for the purpose of cultural transmission.[[139]](#footnote-139)

*Marx’s ‘mind’*

Within Marxism there are different views of the nature of the mind and its relationship with reality. In Marx’s published works there are at least two developed theories of ideology: the theory of the ‘correspondence’ of ideas to the social and material processes of class society; and the explanation of ideology as being rooted in commodity fetishism under capitalism.

What all accounts of ideology found within Marx and Marxism agree upon however, is that ideology is specific to each type of society, and therefore specific to its historical context. There is no universal human consciousness. To understand the ‘the mind’, we must understand its society; this being the starting point and the end point of Marx’s historical materialism.

## 

## Anti-humanist ‘Marxism’ and the ellipses of psychoanalysis

The first important engagement with psychoanalysis by Marxists came with the wave of social and legal emancipation that swept through Russia and the countries of its old empire, in the years immediately following the Revolution of October 1917. At that time psychoanalysis was taken seriously for its anti-bourgeois and liberating ideas, as much as for its clinical and educational potential.

Indeed, Marxist interest in psychoanalysis has always been connected to the challenges, traumas, and social convulsions of the time. It has always also reflected the ‘Marxisms’ to hand in those moments, and crucially the distorted forms of Marxism dominant in workers’ movements throughout the Twentieth Century. We can’t understand the historical ‘turns to psychoanalysis’ from within Marxism without an appreciation of these various interpretations.

Countering the distorted view that Marxism gives us a purely structural understanding of human experience, a philosophy of mechanistic laws and determinism, we should consider the young Marx reacting against the metaphysical system building of the Hegelian schools of thought in his own time.[[140]](#footnote-140) It was the feuds over the Hegelian legacy that created the intellectual milieu in which he developed his first critical concepts. The schools of ‘speculative theism’ - seeking to salvage the ‘God’ of traditional Christianity from the abstract Geist of Hegel’s Logic – and of the Right Hegelians[[141]](#footnote-141) - seeking to uphold the Prussian form of government as the fulfilment of Hegel’s ideal state – provided the context for the intellectual revolt of the 1830s. Figures such as Johann Erdmann (1805 - 1892), Johann Rosenkranz (1805 - 1879) and Johann Gabler (1753 - 1826), seeing the modern European state as the endpoint of the historical dialectic, had arrived at world-views characterised by fixed categories, rather than changeability and creative flux. Reacting against these conservative philosophical and political orthodoxies in his early publications, Marx articulated a philosophy of human action and authentic subjectivity centred on the relationship of the self with others. For Marx, consciousness was essentially social in origin, substance, and form; understandable only in terms of relations with other conscious selves.[[142]](#footnote-142)

In Marx’s own lifetime mechanistic modes of theorising had become dominant in both the human sciences, and the socialist movement. These tended towards explanations that reduced human behaviour to external causalities and ineluctable laws. Abstract determinism, empiricism, scientism and simplifying reductionism were everywhere. During the 1850s in Germany Gustav Fechner pioneered statistical approaches to understanding sensory perception and mental processes. In the early 1880s, laboratory studies in psychological research were introduced by Wilhelm Wundt. Empirical methods became established in studies of memory by Hermann Ebbinghaus; and later in studies of conditioning by Ivan Pavlov. Thus, modern psychology emerged as a positivistic science with human behaviour as its object.

In the German workers’ movement, the most influential theorists of the Social Democratic Party promoted philosophies in which human action was relegated beneath economic and political processes created by capitalism. An example was the Iron Law of Wages promulgated by Ferdinand Lasalle, a founder of German social democracy, by which the workers’ share of the profits of industry would always tend towards the lowest levels needed for basic sustenance. The fight for better wages by workers themselves through their trade unions was futile; only political work through legislative avenues by professional politicians would achieve lasting social improvements. And for the most influential Marxists of German social democracy socialism was seen as emerging from developments in industry, the expansion of the factory form of production and the development of democratic government. This optimistic faith in inevitable social improvement was informed by the organic progressivism of Rudolph Virchow and the Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer. Where the revolutionary moment was acknowledged as necessary, it was depicted in theory as something to be always delayed. Reflecting upon his 1918 polemic with Lenin on this question, Karl Kautsky put it in the following way:

*The conflict between the two camps – the proletarians and the profit makers – became ever sharper. It was bound to culminate in a violent clash. But Social-Democracy had no reason to hasten a violent collision. Under the conditions prevailing it was growing in power from year to year. The number of proletarians grew faster than that of any other part of the population. And the influence of Social-Democracy on the proletariat was increasing in the same measure. The number of proletarians and Social-Democrats in the army also increased. And this army was less and less to be relied upon by the government in case of internal war.*

*It was vitally important for Social-Democracy not to disturb this state of affairs by a premature, violent collision with the government. It had to strive to postpone this collision as long as possible*.[[143]](#footnote-143)

The political philosophy of the Second International invoked the spirit of ‘scientific socialism’ distinguished from the utopias of the early socialists by Marx and Engels. For the leaders of German social democracy it meant that socialist consciousness could not come from the workers’ movement but would rather be the work of specialist theoreticians and expert historians; and was something that had to be introduced into the working-class movement from ‘the outside’. One measure of its influence was that Lenin too shared this understanding of the relationship between the social experience of the working-class and the creation and incorporation of socialist ideas within it, though with a very different political consequence. Whereas for Kautsky it meant that capitalism would come to an end by the patient work of socialist legislators, for Lenin it meant that for socialist agitation and education to be effective on a mass scale the intervention of a revolutionary cadre was needed.[[144]](#footnote-144)

And on the ‘Revisionist’ political Right of German social democracy, Eduard Bernstein rejected the revolutionary aspects of Marxism centred upon proletarian historical agency; instead also arguing for incremental legislative steps towards a complete socialist society.[[145]](#footnote-145) In this quietist perspective, politically and industrially active workers were no longer needed for historical change, and were instead positioned as the passive beneficiaries of state enacted social improvements.

With the rise of Stalinism in Russia, and the end of the international revolutionary surge that followed the First World War, a different notion of historical determinism had become influential in the workers’ movements of most countries. Through the 1920s there had been polemics inside the socialist movement over philosophy and the scientific status of Marxism. In 1931 Stalin issued a decree declaring ‘dialectical materialism’ to be the official philosophy of ‘Marxist-Leninism’, to be taught on all university programmes in the Soviet Union, and across all curriculum areas. The very idea of an ‘official philosophy’ signalled its ideological character, this ‘dialectical materialist’ orthodoxy appealing to ‘laws’ of nature and history that once more nullified the human subject. As Joseph Stalin was to express it in his *Dialectical and Historical Materialism* of 1938:

*… if it is not to err in policy, the party of the proletariat must both in drafting its program and in its practical activities proceed primarily from the laws of development of production, from the laws of economic development of society.*[[146]](#footnote-146)

In the Soviet Union and within the political milieus of communist parties around the world, the stultification of original thought, or even observations of reality that failed to support the pronouncements of ‘Marxism’, now used as a codified and rigid ideology, would produce extremes of improbability and absurdity during the height of Stalin’s power. In literature and art only those works that extolled the greatness of Russian achievements in science, technology and other areas of human endeavour were acceptable. DiaMat, a doxa of axiomatic speculative statements, purported to resolve all problems in philosophy. And in the natural sciences conformity with ‘Marxism’ was held up as a test of validity against ‘bourgeois science’, over which ‘proletarian science’ must always triumph. In all these areas and more, problems of theory and practical life had been resolved, and ‘truth’ established. Creative work and experimentation were condemned as unnecessary and indulgent diversions from the task of building Soviet society; and were highly risky for the individual. Nowhere was this more true than in the areas of political life and inquiry into human behaviour. And the political role of the worker was nothing more than to turn all their strength towards industrial success and the goals of ‘socialism’. During the High Stalinism of the 1940s and 1950s this was the meaning of Marxism in the communist world.[[147]](#footnote-147)

It was against this dogmatising and anti-humanistic intellectual atmosphere that a new generation of Marxist social theorists began to investigate once more the role of the active subject in history, and the nature of the human self in political and social behaviour. These new theoretical strivings interweaved with memories of the 1930’s, and the revelations after World War 2 of the gulag and political repression within the Soviet Union, as well as the violent suppression of workers’ risings across East Germany in 1953, Hungary in 1956 and Novocherkassk, Russia in 1962. With each moment of disillusion, and each political shock, Left intellectuals recoiled from the failures of the ‘official Marxism’ of their day and reached for new articulations of human subjectivity.

Against the backdrop both of scientistic and reductionist conceptualisations of human consciousness, social behaviour, and historical change, and of the disasters associated with bureaucratised forms of Marxism, the discovery of one of Marx’s early texts – the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* of 1844 – was important. Published in 1932, these essays explored the human subject as a set of relationships - of self-with-self, and of self-with-others – creating a space for a re-examination of the meaning of human subjectivity within Marxism and a renewed appreciation of Marx’s Hegelian intellectual roots. Along with this new engagement with concepts such as ‘alienation’, ‘fetishism’, *etc.,* and in the work of the key figures of the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research, Marxism was admixed with the work of non-Marxist theorists; Freud’s being only the most prominent. The new theorisations of this movement, and the empirical work connected with it, now foregrounded family structure and the socialisation of sexual relations. By the late 1920s theorists such as Eric Fromm had become interested in the changing characteristics of the family as a way of understanding the retreat of the workers’ movement in Europe. In the 1930s, Wilhelm Reich had focused upon the repression of the sex drive in the German middle-class family to help explain the rise of Nazism.

What the theorists of the Frankfurt School lacked was the analysis of the disastrous Third Period of Stalinist Soviet foreign policy (1928-34) that in Germany threw communist workers into direct political and even physical conflict with members of the reformist SPD, found in the writings of Leon Trotsky on this period.[[148]](#footnote-148) The turn to psychoanalytical categories was the alternative to the political explanations they could not find in the Marxism that they knew.[[149]](#footnote-149) In his 1941 book, *Escape From Freedom*[[150]](#footnote-150) Fromm, drawing upon his pre-war psychosocial empirical research, had centred his analysis of the rise of the Nazis on personality types that had become widespread throughout German society. One common tendency according to Fromm, was ‘automaton conformity’, originating from family structures in which the father figure was attenuated, diminished by their position in mass society. In similar fashion the Marxist psychoanalyst, Paul Federn pointed to the demise of social authority figures for the post-World War 1 generation, something he characterised as a ‘parricide’, representing the ‘loss of the father’ within Austrian society, so making the population susceptible to the seductions of the ‘strong leader’ of the Fuhrer or of Il Capo.

In the 1950s and 1960s a coincidence of revolts, liberation movements and cultural experimentation was accompanied by the opening of new theoretical horizons within the New Left that emerged with them. Anti-colonial movements for national liberation, urban riots by blacks and the poor in the major urban centre of the US, and the hippie, student and anti-war movements together created a new spirit of liberation. The official Marxism of the established pro-Moscow European communist parties did not connect to these developments, and even stood in their way. The political vacuum this created came to be filled with new ideas and a ‘new Marxism’ borrowing from other ‘critical’ theories, psychoanalysis included.

It was in this political ferment that Marxism and psychoanalysis once again became entwined. But if Marxism was to serve the authentic struggle for human freedom once more, it would have to be rescued from its disfigured form used now to cover the dreary repression of life under communism, not to mention the historical horrors of Stalinism. It was under this political imperative that sections of the counterculture in the west would turn to psychoanalysis.

The 1970’s, with the retreat once more of the revolutionary tide, again saw the importation of psychoanalytic concepts into Marxism, and the creation of new syntheses, but for a different purpose. These were variously attempts to explain the continuation of capitalism following the revolutionary surges of the 1960s’, novel theorisations of the possibilities for social emancipation, and alternatives to the overthrow of capitalism. The work of the most influential theorists in this vein - Louise Althusser, Slavoj Žižek, Alain Badiou, Cornelius Castoriadis, *etc*. – were all concerned in one way or another, positively or negatively, with the status of the subject in the historical process.

The 2000s and the 2010s saw the return of mass movements for liberation. The anti-globalisation movement that started with the Seattle protests in November 1999, and that led to the dramatic events of the anti-G8 protests at Genoa in 2001, the ‘Occupy!’ movement that flashed around the world from where it began in 2011 in New York, and the democratic revolutions of the Arab Spring of the same year, all called for new theoretical perspectives for these eruptive movements. One response came in the works of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000; 2004; 2009), that drew their inspiration from the anti-psychiatric works of Giles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. In their conceptual and political conclusions, and appeal to non-hierarchical and ‘rhizomic’ organisational forms of resistance, these latter strangely performative works were more ‘anti-Marx’ and ‘anti-Freud’ in their ‘atmosphere’ and evocative style. Nonetheless, they had grown from theoretical soil created by the encounter between Marxism and psychoanalysis, and the interplay of the critical contents of each.

The engagement of Marxism with psychoanalysis then has been of two broad historical kinds. When revolt has been in the ascendance, Marxists have looked to the Freudian tradition for concepts of personal liberation. When reaction has become dominant, Marxists have looked in a different way to psychoanalysis, to make sense of and come to terms with, the ‘failure’ of the working class to achieve the expected revolution.

These types of engagement raise questions about Marxism itself; or rather the *kind* of Marxism influential in these historical epochs. Two historically dominant forms of Marxism have been: that of the ‘Second International’ of which the German Social Democratic Party which came into electoral prominence after the lifting of the Anti-Socialist laws in 1890, and which represented ‘official Marxism’ for more than thirty years, was the most notable political formation; and that of the ‘Third International’ which by the late-1930s had come to represent the ‘High Stalinism’ that marked the end of the revolutionary opportunities of the first half of the Twentieth Century. Each of these were problematic for theorisations of individual psychology. The political philosophy of the Second International was premised upon a belief in a gradual - but inevitable – progress towards socialism; a philosophy in which the individual had little if any role, given that socialism would come in its own time, *via* the state and without the necessary intervention of a historical subject. The Third International by the late 1930s, rested upon a Stalinised Marxism (Marxist-Leninism) that was inhospitable to the idea that the individual (other than the figures of Lenin and Stalin), had any special part to play in the historical process. And the decline of Soviet psychoanalysis under the ideological strictures of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union saw the closing down of spaces for unfettered thinking in the psychological sciences.

Where mechanical forms of Marxism became the doxa of party teachings, whether those of socialist reformism within the liberal democracies of Western Europe, or of the type of Soviet doctrinal orthodoxy, eclipsing the subjective element, there we can say also that Marx would not have recognised the use of his philosophy of history.

Taking this long view of the different and distinct phases of these theoretical interactions, the limitations and problems of different types of Marxism gives us one way of interpreting their engagements with Freud’s legacy; the interest of the key protagonists being driven as much by the shortcomings of their brand of ‘Marxism’ as anything else. At the Hegelian roots of Marx’s own thinking however, there are the philosophical elements for a model of mind. Crucially, this is the dialectic-of-self, found within Hegel’s texts, fashioned as a ‘social materialism’ with the operation of ‘repression’ responding to real and perceived (and therefore potentially false) risks, and the challenges of survival for the person and social group in their natural or class-ridden social environment. In Part III we will explore this theoretical potential in more depth, by way of a move away from the ‘Marxisms’ of the Twentieth Century, and a return to Marxism at its original philosophical roots. It will also require us to pivot away from the Freudian notion of repression, to one that is more closely associated with the originating categories of Marxism. But first we will consider the interactions of Marxism and psychoanalysis with fuller appreciation of their different historical phases, whether of experimental openness to alternative perspectives on human subjectivity, or of theoretical desperation amid terrifying historical crisis.

**Part II. Revolution and theories of the mind**

## Mind, revolution and reaction

**Sex and the Russian Revolution**

An effect of revolution and of social movements of sufficient depth and scale is that mental and intellectual life are convulsed in ways that previously were unimaginable: ideas deemed ‘foreign’ before, find a new home; theories developed in the cultural undergrowth of repressive states erupt into popular consciousness; and what once was strange and feared becomes familiar and influential. In the intellectual ferment that revolution creates, new vistas appear that overthrow long-accepted forms of creative expression. This was true of revolutionary Russia during the 1920s.

New cultural movements emerged - such as Proletkult (striving to create a proletarian culture that would break decisively and immediately from bourgeois culture), the Scythians (advocating a ‘Revolution of the Spirit’, attached to the left Socialist Revolutionaries, rather than to the Bolsheviks) and Futurism - that became wedded to different aspects of the Revolution The Futurists particularly, the first artistic movement to attach themselves to the Bolsheviks, flourished in the 1920s. Iconoclastic towards all past movements in art, they and their most famous representative, the poet and playwright Vladimir Mayakovsky, saw in themselves the vanguard of the new culture to be created by the Revolution.[[151]](#footnote-151)

Indeed, these years saw an openness to innovations across all the arts, and a flourishing of creative expression without any necessary doctrinal allegiance with Marxism.

*In art and literature, the 1920s were marked by many valuable achievements. Outstanding writers who identified with the Revolution gave it a kind of authenticity by their work: these included Babel, the young Fadayev, Pilnyak, Mayakovsky, Yesenin, Artem Vesyyoly, and Leonov. Their creativity is proof of the fact that the Revolution was not a mere* coup d’etat *but an explosion of forces truly present in Russian society. But other writers who by no means favoured the Soviet system were also active at this time, for example, Pasternak, Akhmatova, and Zamyatin.*[[152]](#footnote-152)

Some of the Russian names of world cinema – Sergei Eisenstein, Vsevolod Pudovkin and Dziga Vertov – appear in this period. At the same time Vsevolod Meryerhold was creating constructionist theatre with techniques that privileged gesture, movement, and rhythm over spoken language to connect with the audience.

Along with novelty in the arts, new ways of organising personal life were thrown up. The progressivism of the Bolshevik government became evident quickly after it took power in October 1917. The emancipation of women in its social, legal, political, and sexual aspects, was a central concern. Issues that arose from or overlapped with questions of gender and sex were framed socially, rather than being medicalised or seen in terms of biological necessity. With respect to medicine, socially oriented types of practice were adopted. Under the Commissar for Health, Nikolai Semashko, the pre-Revolutionary tradition of social medicine associated with pioneers such as A. P. Dobroslavin and G. V. Khlopin became professionally established.[[153]](#footnote-153) Under the Code of Laws, drafted within weeks of the October Revolution, the Czarist ‘anti-sodomy’ laws were repealed. The age of consent for same-sex sexual liaison was reduced to fourteen years.[[154]](#footnote-154) So, where it was a crime in other parts of Europe carrying sentences of up to five years in Germany and ‘life’ in England, in revolutionary Russia in this period consenting same-sex sexual activity between men, from having been horribly repressed before the Revolution, became legal.

The overthrow of oppressive sexual codes is a part of the cultural ferment created by revolution. After the 1905 Russian Revolution popular interest in sexual relations expressed in literary outputs, newspapers, diaries, and correspondences fed into the emergence of a new liberal-civic culture in the metropolitan centres.[[155]](#footnote-155) In 1917, a consequence of the October Revolution was a surge of interest in matters of sexual life from young workers and students.[[156]](#footnote-156) During the 1920s the ‘sex question’ was to become one of intense fascination in all of its ideological, political and literary aspects. Moreover, the subject of sex resonated with the social turbulence of the 1920s *via* the notion of a political ‘collective body’ that served as its ideological metaphor.[[157]](#footnote-157)

The early policy of the Bolshevik government also contrasted starkly with the state indifference to public sexual health that had prevailed under the Tsars. This was especially true of matters such as the horrors of illegal abortions and the abandonment of illegitimate children that had characterised working-class and peasant life before the Revolution.

*Deliverance from this hell was of immediate importance to the revolution. Only weeks after seizing power, with the country slipping into civil war, the Bolsheviks began to institute new laws and codes that reshaped the meaning and function of the family. Church weddings were no longer recognized. Divorce could be quickly granted to one party without explanation. Entering into or ending a marriage meant simply a reshuffling of paper. Doctors could perform legal abortions. Because illegitimacy was no longer a social category, a man was legally responsible for all his children, not merely those fathered in marriage. Later, cohabitation or de facto marriages were recognized as legal unions. The goal was to give women equal status in marriage and to protect them if a union dissolved; to ensure that no one was trapped in a union that had gone wrong; to allow women to terminate a pregnancy if they could not support a child (at this time the state could not always assume charge); and to safeguard all children, regardless of the condition of their birth. Sex was to be recognized in terms of both procreation and pleasure, and it was to be treated openly. A campaign of sexual education would focus on contraception, hygiene, and preventing venereal disease.*[[158]](#footnote-158)

The ’new proletarian morality’ of this period encompassed legal relaxations of the laws of marriage and divorce, so that breaking the marital bond became as simple as entering it, the abolition of discrimination against children born out of wedlock and the lifting of all restrictions on abortion.[[159]](#footnote-159)

It was during the years of the New Economic Policy, between the end of ‘war communism’ and the abrupt impositions of economic centralisation under Stalin by the early 1930s, that we find most evidence of a new climate of sexual liberation amongst the young. Despite the need for the regulation of family life, the responsibility for children, the exhaustions of the civil war period and its effect upon the nervous condition of thousands of young workers,[[160]](#footnote-160) and the difficulties of accessing contraception, experimental attitudes of sexual freedom and free love were influential amongst students, such as those at the Sverdlov Communist University. The attractions of unfettered individualistic sexuality for young workers attending university was in fact seen as a problem by the Soviet government during these years; raising concerns about a perceived new culture of essentially bourgeois self-indulgence that turned the individual away from the tasks of the Revolution.[[161]](#footnote-161) However, even amongst sections of the politically austere Komosol youth movement, these ideas were sufficiently current to provoke controversy and eventually dissension in its ranks.

**‘Sciences of the mind’ in revolutionary Russia**

With respect to understanding the mind and human behaviour, the theorising that had dominated Russian psychology in the years leading up to the 1917 Revolution derived from the work of the neuroscientist Ivan Sechenov. Sechenov had concentrated his scientific work upon physical reflex actions and had conflated mental processes with these. This emphasis upon outward and observable action and reaction made Sechenov’s work a precursor to the behaviourism of later post-Revolution psychologists such as Ivan Pavlov and Vladimir Becheterev. Through the 1920s, this insistence upon observable behaviour would overshadow those types of psychology that focused upon subjective inner states of the psyche. And by the mid-1930s, Soviet psychological sciences operated under a strict state imperative that productivity, industry, and the intensification of labour were the ultimate aims of the human sciences. Similarly, in the study of human movement, whilst Nikolai Bernstein made important breakthroughs in the study of physical reflexes, his achievements were celebrated within the Soviet Union for their contribution to the understanding of biophysical functionality and fine motor control during manual labour.

Despite this dominant behaviourist paradigm, for a decade and a half a new generation of Soviet psychologists pioneered the exploration of the inner world of the psyche. In the wake of the Revolution, it was this widening of theoretical horizons that made possible the introduction of Freudian psychoanalysis and a new enlightenment in the study of human behaviour. The full significance of the Revolution and the opportunities it afforded however, were not immediately apparent to established figures in the international psychoanalytical movement. In his 1921 report to the Viennese Psychoanalytical Society, the most prominent figure in pre-revolutionary Russian psychoanalysis, Nikolai Osipov, gave a picture of a movement in disarray.

*…in fact it has been impossible to collect and publish accounts either of proceedings of meetings or of papers read and discussed. Scientific journals have entirely ceased to appear during the last three years; the only journal concerning itself with Freudian conceptions, Psychotherapy, stopped publication in 1917* [sic] *owing to financial difficulties.*[[162]](#footnote-162)

What Osipov could not have appreciated, having already moved to Prague at the time of his report, was how the political landscape had changed for psychoanalysis, and indeed any discipline within the ‘human sciences’.

The great name of experimental psychology at the time of the October Revolution was Konstantin Kornilov. Kornilov’s work, like that of the behaviourists, concerned outwardly observable physical and mental reactions. Kornilov however incorporated theoretical elements that made his approach distinct from the basic behaviourist model. Human action for Kornilov, could not be conflated with physiological processes; nor was it seen as a simple matter of responsive reflexes to environmental stimuli. Rather, in Kornilov’s ‘reactology’, a dialectic occurred between the external and interior worlds. The interior was no longer a merely an effect of objective causal factors. It was an active element that interacted with the external processes.

This view of human consciousness as active and having a generative character, rather than passively reflective of objects outside of it, had its precursors in a pre-revolutionary tradition of Russian psychology. Within the psychological sciences an Idealist theoretical paradigm that attributed a mental activity with an independent dynamic had been established with the founding of the Institute of Psychology of Moscow in 1912, and in the work of Troitski and Grot.[[163]](#footnote-163) The Institute’s founder, Chelpanov (Kornilov’s immediate predecessor) brought a student, G. Shpet, to contribute to its work. Shpet was later to become a strong influence on a young Lev Vygotsky, emphasising the roles of language and culture in the formation of conscious life.[[164]](#footnote-164)

In the emerging area of child development, the opening up of the psychical interior had made possible Vygotsky’s theoretical speculations and empirical work. In Vygotsky’s theoretical model, intrapersonal experience is the result of the meeting of mental processes emerging from within the psyche and those originating from interactions with the world outside. The processes involved are mediated by cultural artefacts, and crucially language. The infant argued Vygotsky, develops mentally along two lines: linguistic intelligence; and non-linguistic intelligence. In the first phase of language acquisition, the very young child develops a ‘social language’ that mimics what they hear. Later the non-linguistic intelligence they develop crosses the linguistic line, and so they begin to think linguistically, eventually mastering their own inner language or ‘ego-speech’. In this developmental movement, the language they interiorise brings in its social and cultural context, the child now rooting themselves in the world. For Vygotsky this led to the development of ‘higher mental processes’, as the child’s learning made possible the growth of their cognitive framework; this learning itself facilitated by their social environment, or ‘zone of proximal development’.[[165]](#footnote-165) Vygotsky was to alter his theoretical orientations towards a psychological ‘objectivism’ after 1932 as the field of psychology became increasing politicised. During the 1920s however, his work was characterised by a focus upon subjectivity in learning and child development. Affective factors, personality, fantasy, and imagination all feature in this phase of Vygotsky’s output. The concept of ‘perezhivanie’ captured moments of ‘deep learning’ which transform the person’s mental horizons; signs are active elements in complex and discursive subjective processes; and the notion of ‘sense’ as distinct from ‘meaning’ represented the world of feeling conjured up by a word, though not expressed in its formal definition. For the Marxist Vygotsky in this period, social-historical processes provided the cultural mediations that made possible the psychological growth of the child.

By the early 1930s a third position in psychology had emerged. Along with the behaviourist ‘reflexology’ of figures such as Pavlov and Bechterev, and the ‘reactology’ of Kornilov, there was also now the ‘dialectical-materialist psychology’ of Rubinstein, who became the Chair of Psychology at the Hertzen Pedagogical Institute of Leningrad in 1930. For Rubinstein, consciousness and outwardly observable activity formed a unity. Consciousness could not be understood as mental processes that are independent of the objective world, but rather as operating in continuous conjunction with it. Rubinstein’s paradigm became dominant in Soviet psychology throughout the 1930s, and for most of the 1940s. In 1948 however, he was ousted from his academic post as ‘Pavlovianism’ was imposed by bureaucratic fiat as the new orthodoxy for a ‘Marxist psychology’.

**The rise of soviet psychoanalysis**

The flowering of interest in the ‘internal life’ of the mind in experimental and theoretical psychology, as well as public interest in the ‘sex-question’ during the 1920s, fertilised a new movement in psychoanalysis. The concerns of the Russian psychoanalytical community however, were no longer those predominantly of personal neurosis recorded in a catalogue of individual analytical case studies - often of members of the minor aristocracy. Rather, as Russian psychoanalysis was to develop over these years its concerns would be those of social psychopathology, of education and of social settlement. It became rooted in humanist-rationalist enlightenment on the one hand, and in state imperatives on the other. Osipov in his 1921 report to the official international movement was unaware of psychoanalytical work that was in fact becoming established and beginning to flourish. In Petrograd, Tatiana Rosenthal for instance, chief physician at the Institute of Brain Pathology - and, unlike Osipov, a supporter of the Revolution - developed therapeutic techniques for educational work with learning-disabled children that drew upon the Freudian and Adlerian schools of psychoanalysis. She was also to apply psychoanalytical insights to literary analysis in her 1920 publication that explored ‘the unconscious’ in the characters of Dostoevsky’s novellas.

By 1921 Moscow had by now become home to a newly formed psychoanalytical group striving to understand the roots of human creativity. The leading figures in this group, principally Ivan Ermakov and Moshe Wulff, had published previously in Freud’s own journal and so were known in the West. The group soon attracted new members, and by 1922 had refashioned itself as the Russian Psychoanalytic Society. As it grew, its activities became more diverse. So, along with continuing engagement with the roots of artistic expression and clinical analysis there was amongst the newer members an interest in the theory and practice of education and of child development. Otto Schmidt, who was responsible for the pedagogical work of the group was now working with young researchers such as Pavel Blonskii, Stanislav Shatskii and Lev Vygotsky.

Independently of developments in Moscow a second centre of psychoanalytical work had by 1922 become established in the town of Kazan. Under the energetic leadership of Alexander Luria, the work of this group spanned a similar range of medical, psychological, and artistic interests as the Moscow society. By the Spring of 1923, the leading figures of the Kazan group had taken up an invitation to move to Moscow to join the burgeoning psychoanalytical community there. Luria himself took up a position in the Moscow Institute of Psychology. He collaborated with Lev Vygotsky and Alexei Leontiev who was later to develop the cultural-historical model of the analysis of human behaviour. Luria’s new position was effectively a government appointment. Growing in numbers, and in professional status, the society had by the end of 1922 become the Institute for Psychoanalysis.

By establishing a properly constituted training programme, curriculum, and clinic (all required for official recognition by the International Psychoanalytical Association) the Institute for Psychoanalysis had made Moscow the third centre of the international psychoanalytical movement, along with Vienna and Berlin (soon to be followed by London, Budapest, and New York). This official status had been achieved in the face of resistance from the many leading figures around Freud who viewed the Bolshevik government with deep suspicion. Indeed, it had only been with the intervention of Freud himself that the misgivings of the most avowedly anti-Marxist figures of the international society had been overcome.[[166]](#footnote-166) The presence in Moscow of Sabina Spielrein who had been a member of the society in Vienna and whom Freud knew well seems likely to have been a factor in his decision to grant full status to the Moscow group. So also, was the fact that by the end of 1923, Russian membership represented one eighth of the psychoanalytical movement membership worldwide.[[167]](#footnote-167)

The Institute ran introductory courses on psychoanalysis as well as courses on child psychology and literary analysis. An ambitious publishing programme was launched that aimed to translate into Russian the most important psychoanalytical works. An out-clinic was established to which all Russian citizens could obtain access: a reversal of the elitist character of Austrian and German psychoanalytical practice that relied upon a paying clientele. A clinic for disturbed children was also established. This was important in a Russian society emerging from the trauma of civil war. Many thousands of children had been displaced and many had lost their families. These children, the Besprisorniki [the Unattended] were surviving in the ruined tenements of Russia’s cities. Their rehabilitation and settlement posed a significant challenge to the Soviet state. Asja Lacis, a Latvian Bolshevik, had been charged with this task in the city of Orel, and achieved remarkable results with precious little in the way of resources. A clinic that specialised in children’s therapy using the methods of European psychoanalysis was seen as offering something important in the struggling socialist republic.

The Institute was also remarkable in becoming the first state sponsored psychoanalytical institute. The process by which this came about was not straightforward. Key to the success of the application for state support would be acceptance by the State Scientific Soviet (SSS) and its pedagogical arm. In their report of September 1922 to the scientific-pedagogical committee the Moscow group highlighted the contributions that psychoanalysis had made and could make to medicine, psychology, sociology, and the problems of everyday life. They further stressed its relevance to “artistic creativity, labor relations, religious and philosophical formulations” and argued that “in psychiatry, psychoanalysis provides new and fruitful possibilities ...”.[[168]](#footnote-168) This appeal for state endorsement and hoped-for support was followed by a submission of the Charter of the Psychoanalytic Society that outlined its extensive ongoing and planned clinical, pedagogical, and publishing activities. It also explicitly confirmed the Society’s administrative (and by implication, political) subordination to the government. This latter element of the Society’s submission highlights an inevitable tension. Ideological work was intrinsically linked to the solving of practical problems in this period: not least in the areas of psychology and education. Moreover, any position taken within the human sciences had to establish its relationship to Marxist theory and any theoretical stance that could be interpreted as in some senses rivalling Marxism, would find itself caught up in a political game. This was truer still of interpretations of human behaviour premised upon the individualism and implicitly class-based character of Freud’s formulations. One consequence of this situation was the closing down in 1923 of the Institute’s children’s home that had been run by Vera Schmidt and Sabina Spielrein. Notwithstanding this setback, a high level of tolerance remained, allowing these psychoanalysts to continue their efforts for the rest of their programme. The Institute’s publishing through the State Publishing House for example continued unabated, with fifteen volumes of key psychoanalytical works appearing between 1922 and 1923. This publishing fed an eager and expanding readership with each volume rapidly selling out.

**The demise of soviet psychoanalysis**

The clinical and training activities of the staff and associates of the Institute continued through the 1920s. However, by the middle of the decade the relationship between psychoanalysis and Marxism had become an issue of increasingly intense theoretical debate. The defensive position of the Revolution internationally was by now distorting ideological positions in all areas of public life. Psychoanalysis, straddling the worlds of psychiatric practice and medical science on the one hand and ideology and politics on the other, was particularly vulnerable in this situation. Standing within a tradition that had originated in the west and at the high point of the European *fin de siècle*, with its associations of decadence and literary and philosophical irrationalism, the Freudians were becoming politically isolated. Still, it is noteworthy that up until 1925 theoretically sophisticated articles defending psychoanalytical perspectives for the interpretation of social behaviour and religion were still appearing in leading Bolshevik journals such as *Under the Banner of Marxism* and *The Press and the Revolution*.[[169]](#footnote-169) That said, the increasingly polemical and aggressive tenor of the articles opposing ‘Freudism’ from 1924 onwards was a prelude to the onslaught that soon followed. By 1929 Wilhelm Reich was to declare that “It is impossible to speak of a “psychoanalytical movement” existing in the Soviet Union ...”.[[170]](#footnote-170)

That psychoanalysis - and the schools of thought, clinical practice and pedagogy connected to it, often in tension with Marxist orthodoxies - was allowed to exist and indeed flourish at all in the early 1920s, had been made possible by a political tolerance at the most senior levels of the Bolshevik government. In the case of Lenin, the evidence is mainly inferential. The reports of the pedagogical arm of the State Scientific Soviet for example, went directly to the Commissar for Enlightenment and Education, Anatoly Lunacharsky. Lunacharsky, who was on personal terms with Lenin, would have had to approve any decisions regarding the Russian Psychoanalytic Institute. There is also the high governmental level of many of the supporters of psychoanalysis and contributors to psychoanalytical discussion to appreciate.[[171]](#footnote-171) Otto Schmidt for example, was a leading member of the Institute as well as being director of the State Publishing House at the time it produced The Psychoanalytic and Psychological Library of Freud’s published works. Lenin, receiving regular digest reports from all the sections of government, will have known about these developments. For Trotsky, who had been acquainted with psychoanalytic circles during his time in Vienna between 1907 and 1914, we can say much more. In a 1923 letter to Pavlov he describes himself as being impressed by the Freudian approaches to psychological problems.[[172]](#footnote-172) Other explicit statements suggest a supportive intellectual attitude to psychoanalytical theory. For instance, whilst Freud’s formulations could be ‘exaggerated’ and ‘paradoxical’ with respect to the ‘sex-element in the forming of individual character and social consciousness’, they were also ‘significant’ and potentially ‘fertile’.[[173]](#footnote-173) Psychoanalytical theory was, he stated, compatible with materialism.[[174]](#footnote-174) As to its relationship to Marxism “It would be too simple and crude ... to turn one’s back on it.”[[175]](#footnote-175) Furthermore, transformation of the human psyche would be central to any future communist society.

*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.*[[176]](#footnote-176)

Trotsky’s attitude to psychoanalysis can be characterised one of scientific tolerance. He regarded it as having a quasi-scientific hypothetical status comparable (reflecting the science of his day) to that of electrons, ions, and relativity.[[177]](#footnote-177) For Trotsky, it ought not be discarded for reasons of party stricture.

As late as 1932, in a speech delivered to the Danish Social Democratic student group in Copenhagen, we see a now exiled Trotsky celebrating the importance of Freud’s work in presaging the new dawn of a future communist humanity.

*Psycho-analysis, with the inspired hand of Sigmund Freud, has lifted the cover of the well which is poetically called the “soul”. And what has been revealed? Our conscious thought is only a small part of the work of the dark psychic forces. Learned divers descend to the bottom of the ocean and there take photographs of mysterious fishes. Human thought, descending to the bottom of its own psychic sources must shed light on the most mysterious driving forces of the soul and subject them to reason and to will.*[[178]](#footnote-178)

The surge of interest in psychoanalysis, and state support for the professional and literary activities of the Institute and its public readership, was brief. From the mid-1920s onwards the climate became colder for any working psychologists, clinical practitioners and theoreticians associated with the Freudian school. By late 1920’s, the situation had become very difficult indeed for such figures and for most, untenable.

By 1925 the figure of Stalin was looming large within the Soviet leadership. Lenin had died the year before. Trotsky had been sidelined into essentially technical work. Collaborating with Nikolai Bukharin and reacting to the defeat of revolutions abroad, Stalin had formulated the doctrine of ‘Socialism in One Country’. The formal adoption of this slogan in January 1926 inaugurated an era of abrupt industrial realignment. This was driven by an intensive process of sate-capital accumulation and of forced collectivisation of the peasantry in large parts of Russia. The centralisation of political power required for this new direction now reached into all areas of intellectual and professional life. The ‘science’ of any area of activity was increasingly subordinated to political imperatives. In the area of biological and agricultural research, to cite one notorious and well-known case, Trofim Lysenko’s promotion of the idea that vernalisation (the artificial cold treatment that triggers Winter wheat to grow in the Spring) is heritable on Lamarckian principles (which it is not) was given state endorsement because of its convenient ideological overtones.[[179]](#footnote-179) By the early 1930s Lysenko himself had been afforded the status of a hero of Soviet science despite the catastrophic implications of his doctrine for Russian agricultural production.[[180]](#footnote-180)

The politicisation of scientific debate spelt the end for psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union. By the time of the 1930 Congress on Human Behaviour personal associations with Freudianism especially had become professionally dangerous. Speech after speech hammered home the message that the purpose of psychological work was one of socialist construction: to produce a ‘socialist psychology’ grounded in the categories of Marxism. Theoretical work premised upon an integration of psychoanalysis with Marxism, or upon notions of ‘compatibility’, was ruled out of court: reasoned debate was over.

Another motivation for the assault on psychoanalysis lay in state attitudes to sex and sexuality. The stabilisation of the family became an over-riding priority for the new Russian ‘socialism’. Talk of free sexual relations, the need to overcome the repressive functions of the family and acceptance of homosexuality as an authentic expression of love, were now condemned in literature and in government pronouncements. The central concern with sex within Freudian thinking meant that it came squarely into the firing zone for the new generation of Soviet ideologists. In these circumstances, individuals began to look to their own survival. Some, such as Zalkind, defected to the anti-Freudian camp.[[181]](#footnote-181) Others such as Luria and Vygotsky retreated into the safer field of pedology (the study of child behaviour and development). On that basis, active psychological research continued into the early 1930s. Vygotsky especially produced innovative theoretical formulations that were only fully appreciated with the re-issuing of his works after the death of Stalin and their translation and publication in the West. Still, by the end of that decade, notwithstanding the occasional respectful gesture towards its insights in official encyclopaedias,[[182]](#footnote-182) psychoanalysis as a recognised professional discipline in Russia and its affiliated republics was dead.

## Trends in the West

**Western Marxism and the ‘turn to Freud’**

As the Russian psychoanalysists became increasingly politically isolated from the mid-1920s onwards, interest in the potential for fruitful exchanges between Marxism and Freudianism was developing in other parts of Europe. In the early 1920s in Austria a young Wilhelm Reich had established a professional relationship with Sigmund Freud. In 1922 Reich took up a position at Freud’s psychoanalytic outpatient clinic in Vienna, the Ambulatorium, and by 1924 had become its assistant director. In the same year he became director of training at Freud’s Psychoanalytical Institute. Between 1924 and 1930 Reich was to conduct pioneering work in sex-counselling in the working-class districts of Vienna. As part of his ‘Sex-Pol’[[183]](#footnote-183) work he founded six clinics in the city and organised a mobile service that took sex-counselling advice out to its suburbs. This work had two consequences for Reich. The first was intellectual. His observations of the squalor of many of the working-class districts and of the mentally scarred and emotionally traumatised state of many as a result of war, led him to focus upon the role of social environment as a cause of neurosis, rather than looking exclusively to biographical and internal factors. The second effect for Reich was reputational. The advice offered by Reich’s clinics was free of moral tone or inhibition. It was based upon an acknowledgement of unrepressed sexual experience; and the support given was practical and prophylactic in nature with on-the-spot contraceptive fittings for women. In Catholic Austria this was courageous and provides an early glimpse of Reich’s personal radicalism that in his final years would tip over tragically into iconoclasm and borderline insanity. By the end of the 1920s Reich’s commitment to sex-therapy and psychoanalysis was converging with his Marxism. In 1928 he joined the Austrian Communist Party following the shooting down of demonstrators during the Viennese workers’ revolt of July 1927. In 1929 he published his ‘Dialectical Materialism and Psychoanalysis’[[184]](#footnote-184) in the bilingual (German/Russian) journal *Under the Banner of Marxism*. It was during his trip to the Soviet Union that same year however, that he became finally convinced of the need to achieve a synthesis of Marxism and psychoanalysis. His interest in the ideas of Freud in this period was that of the revolutionary thinker committed to personal and social transformation.

Whilst the brief experiment in a Soviet Marxism open to psychoanalytical theory had risen and fallen by the beginning of the 1930s in Russia, a group of Marxist sociologists and philosophers associated with the Institute of Social Research (loosely affiliated to the University of Frankfurt at Maine) were moving in apparently similar directions. Although openness to non-Marxist thinkers was evident, the motivations of this group of theoreticians were different to those of the Moscow psychologists of the early 1920s and of Reich. By the early 1930s the chief names connected to the Institute were concerned above all to explain the retreat of the revolutionary tide in Western Europe, the rise of Stalinism in Russia and of fascism in Italy and Germany, and the stabilisation of capitalism in countries such as France, Britain and the USA by the late 1920s. Their engagements with Freud, critical though they were, tended towards the most pessimistic side of his theorising: repression; deference to the father figure rooted in the Oedipus Complex; and the death instinct that runs through his meta-psychology. Freud was not the only non-Marxist thinker with whom the group engaged. Other influences included Weber, Durkheim, Kant, Simmel, and Tonnies amongst others. Key names of this first generation of what would become known as the (early) Frankfurt School of social theorists and sociologists were: Max Horkheimer; Theodor Adorno; Erich Fromm; and Herbert Marcuse. The wider orbit of the school included Walter Benjamin and Wilhelm Reich himself.

In the years that led up to the Second World War, during the War and in the years that followed, these social theorists through their various research projects and collaborations - and despite the underlying note of despair that was forgivable for a generation of radical intellectuals witnessing the twin horrors of Stalinism and Nazism in their own time – produced analytically insightful and empirically rich sociological studies of capitalist society. These were also studies, in which ‘Marxism’ of a form - that is a form that whilst amalgamated with other theoretical traditions of thought, was also creative and non-dogmatic - was to survive, as ‘official Marxism’ became sclerotized under the rigid control of increasingly Stalinised communist parties across Europe. Some of the Marxists whose names are still with us as reference points of modern social theory, at this time looked to psychoanalysis for answers to the questions confronting them. The published theoretical and empirical work of these figures from the late 1920s through to the late 1940s together represent the foundation of what was to become known as ‘Freudo-Marxism’.

Working under the darkening shadow of the European political scene and seeking to explain the failure of the German working-class to resist Hitler’s rise to power, Adorno looked to Freud for illumination. As early as 1932 he had identified Freudian themes in an analysis of what he called the ‘culture industry’. Massified forms of entertainment for Adorno, employed the introjections of the superego to conjure up images and associations of commoditised consumable products. However, it was in his work with Horkheimer that the full implications of the application of Freudian categories for a social psychology of support for fascist parties - and in relation to consumer capitalism in North America - became apparent. In their joint writing in this period, Adorno and Horkheimer explored the cultural manipulation of the person, already weakened by the incorporation of the family into structures and processes of mass society. In *Dialectic of the Enlightenment* they laid out a blueprint for the ways in which ‘the individual’ becomes increasingly prey to the control of repressive ideologies that oppose their own material interests.[[185]](#footnote-185) By positing the abstract individual - removed from organic collectivities of extended community roots - as the ‘economic cell’ that formed the basis of capitalist society and locating this also within powerful forces of psychological and emotional assimilation into commoditised social relationships they created a picture of the defeated and atomised person, incapable of critical thought. In this mentally and spiritually impoverished state the isolated person becomes vulnerable to the kinds of irrationalism, anxiety and paranoid fears that had once characterised the Dark Ages. With the rise of massified society under capitalism:

*Culture became wholly a commodity disseminated as information without permeating the individuals who acquired it. Thought became restricted to the acquisition of isolated facts. Conceptual relationships were rejected as uncomfortable and useless effort. The aspect of development in thought, all that is genetic and intensive in it, is forgotten and levelled down to the immediately given, to the extensive. Today the order of life allows no room for the ego to draw spiritual or intellectual conclusions. The thought which leads to knowledge is neutralized and used as a mere qualification on specific labor markets and to heighten the commodity value of the personality. And so that self-examination of the mind which works against paranoia is defeated.*[[186]](#footnote-186)

The economic dynamics of this process of isolation and constriction of critical faculties in their turn give rise to reified social relationships, invested in transactionally for their marketised exchange value. Alongside this partially Marxist analysis, and exemplifying the methodological eclecticism that typified their approach, Adorno and Horkheimer introduced psychoanalytical categories. The diminished ‘ego-autonomy’ of the individual in their account arises from the incorporation of the middle class and working-class family into processes of capitalist consumption. In this analysis, echoing the concept of ‘parricide’ used by Paul Federn in his study of social revolt in Germany after the First World War,[[187]](#footnote-187) this results in the erosion of the power of the father as a source of social and moral authority. Without the presence of the traditional figure of the father, the superego develops in an attenuated form, leaving the individual vulnerable to the appeal of an abstract father-ideal in the form of the Fuhrer or Il Capo. It is this bricolage ‘putting together’ of Marxist and Freudian categories – as opposed to a complete synthesis - that characterises the work of Adorno and Horkheimer in this period.

**The Freudo-Marxists: Reich; Bernfeld; Fenichel**

Reich was ploughing theoretical ground similar to the work of Adorno and Horkheimer, though conducted largely independently of them. Throughout the 1920s he had published a series of papers based upon his clinical practice. These works of clinical sexology were laying the foundation stones for his later ideas about the centrality of the orgasm to human happiness and his theory of character formation. However, his psychoanalytical thinking became politically radicalised with a sharp turn towards communism after 1927.

In his essay *Dialectical Materialism and Psychoanalysis,*[[188]](#footnote-188) Reich tackled head-on the question of the compatibility of Marxism and psychoanalysis. He argued that psychoanalysis is an emancipating body of thought, and that psychological insight is intrinsically opposed to reactionary outlooks. More specifically, his defence of psychoanalysis as an intellectual school that is both compatible with, and has something to offer Marxism, took three approaches: that psychoanalysis is a materialist doctrine; that its object of study, namely the human psyche, is a dialectical phenomenon; and that psychoanalytical insights have significance for the future socialist society. For the first part of Reich’s argument, regarding the materialist status of psychoanalysis, Reich pointed to its empirical findings.[[189]](#footnote-189) Chief amongst Freud’s discoveries for Reich were the libido theory - premised upon the sublimating mechanisms by which primordial sexual instincts are transformed into higher social drives - and, related to this, infantile sexuality and the psycho-social processes of the family that he named the Oedipus Complex. Reich argued that the rooting of psychical development and character formation within a social institution, the family, means that since social institutions change historically, so also must the human psyche, now seen as historical and therefore changeable.

*The superego of a woman in the age of Plato was fundamentally different from that of a woman in capitalist society: and to the extent that a new society is ideologically foreshadowed within the existing one, the contents of the superego naturally change also. This applies to sexual morality, say as much to the ideology of the inviolability of the ownership of the means of production; it also changes of course with the position of the individual in the production process.*[[190]](#footnote-190)

In this essay, Reich identifies idealist tendencies within Freudianism, particularly with respect to Freud’s metapsychology and more particularly still, in relation to the ‘death instinct’. Nonetheless, for Reich, basing an understanding of the development and final character of the person, upon biological and social principles made psychoanalysis fundamentally materialist. This moved him into his second defence. The psyche, he argues, is riven with tensions that are its animus. The inner contradictions involved in neuroses originating in the repression of instinctual urges by the ego (under the command of the superego) were one example of the dialectical processes that Reich had in mind. Another was the tension created by the conflict between the ‘pleasure principle’ (rooted in the unconscious or the ‘id’) and the ‘reality principle’ that governs the ego’s calculations negotiating the outside world. Others would include: the intertwining of irrational desires into otherwise outwardly rational forms of social behaviour; the sublimation of basic drives into higher cultural strivings suggestive of the transformation of ‘quantity into quality’; and the transferability of cathectic energy between outwardly opposing expressions *e.g.* from sexual frustration to ambition. This dialectical character of the psyche Reich argued, could never have been discovered without psychoanalysis.

Reich’s third defence of psychoanalysis was its sociological value. An important example was the focus on sexual repression in society. Here Reich makes a direct comparison with Marxism:

*Just as Marxism was sociologically the expression of man* becoming conscious *of the laws of economics and the exploitation of a majority by a minority, so psychoanalysis is the expression of man* becoming conscious *of the social repression of sex.*[[191]](#footnote-191)

With the establishment of capitalism, and the increasing incorporation of the proletarian family by state policy, this sex-repression spreads into working-class life, though never to the same extent as for the lower middle classes - which is “more Catholic than the Pope”.[[192]](#footnote-192) The further importance of psychoanalysis lay primarily in its potential applications for rational insight in three areas: research into early human history and the understanding of myth; the theory and practice of mental health therapies premised upon the principle of ‘libido-economy’ and the elimination of neurosis; and the study of child development and, consequent upon this, the development of principles of socialist education rooted in a comprehensively rationalist understanding of the needs of the person, from the infant to the early adult stages.[[193]](#footnote-193)

Reich was to integrate these ‘compatibilities’ into many of his studies from this time onwards. In his analysis of fascism in Germany he applied his theory of character formation from an early work, *Character Analysis*,[[194]](#footnote-194) using the ‘blocking’ of cathectic energies that congeal into ‘armour’-like rigidities in the behaviour of the person. Combining this theory of character formation with a social analysis of the family under capitalism, Reich described the constraints that acted upon the lower middle-class family: its members struggling to maintain their precarious position ‘above’ the industrial working-class, yet out of reach of the social stratum above them. This hemmed-in position for Reich, accompanied by the repression of sexual desire, gave rise to irrational attachments, mystical outlooks, and a vulnerability to the seductions of the charismatic leader. In his discussion of authoritarian ideology and commenting on the propaganda techniques used by Hitler and Goebbels in their rise to power he observed:

*Again and again we run across series such as this: personal honor, family honor, racial honor, national honor. This sequence is consistent with the various layers in the individual structure. However, it fails to include the socio-economic basis: capitalism, or rather patriarchy; the institution of compulsive marriage; sexual repression; personal struggle against one’s own sexuality; personal compensatory feeling of honor; etc. The highest position in the series is assumed by the ideology of “national honor”, which is identical with the irrational core of nationalism.*[[195]](#footnote-195)

The defence of a ‘compatibility thesis’ as formulated by Reich was echoed by his early collaborator, Siegfried Bernfeld.[[196]](#footnote-196) Indeed Bernfeld, whose work on understandings of child development borrowed directly from Freud’s libido theory as it applied to the infant and combined with specific cultural studies,[[197]](#footnote-197) employed the same three analytical elements. According to Bernfeld, psychoanalysis, in exploring the origins of neurosis and adult character in early experience - its ontogenesis - is historical. It is also materialist, and in a non-reductive and non-mechanical sense. Finally, the antimonies of psychoanalysis – of Eros and Thanatos, of id and superego *etc*. - make it dialectical. All these characteristics together, for Bernfeld as for Reich, meant that Marxist social science and psychoanalysis, were capable of integration with one another.[[198]](#footnote-198) This was a position he was to develop in his pedagogical writings in the 1920s.

In his essay *Sysiphus or the Limits of Education,*[[199]](#footnote-199) Bernfeld deployed Freud’s theoretical formulations, principally the Oedipus Complex, to understand education under capitalism. Comparing schooling in his own time with the initiation rites of tribal societies, he argued that the ‘natural pedagogy’ of the spontaneous development of the infant under its mother’s influence, is insufficient for all human societies. Beyond a certain stage of child development, it is necessary to break up the ‘mother-child group’ to begin social acculturation. At this point a dramatic re-ordering of the child’s psychical make-up begins. The libidinal attachments to the mother, developed in the first years of life, are now redirected towards elders in tribal societies, and the teachers and pedagogical environment of the modern school. The ‘violence’ of this shift from motherlove to the cold processes of social control becomes literal at puberty in many tribal societies, and in some respects also in capitalist society.[[200]](#footnote-200) Under capitalism however this process occurs over a decade at least, and is structured less through specific initiation rites, than through prolonged formal processes of repression and social prohibition. Society, for Bernfeld, as well as being structured by economic class, is also Oedipal.

Another figure of note in this era is Otto Fenichel. Fenichel developed the compatibility thesis to argue further that the integration of psychoanalysis was necessary if shortcomings within Marxism were to be overcome. So, whilst Marx had successfully shown that the means of production in any given historical epoch gave rise to forms of consciousness which then reacted back upon the economic ‘base’ of society, he had not been able to discuss how this occurred in detail. For Fenichel, considering the forms and means of the exertion of ruling class power, it was not enough to simply point to the fact that the ruling class controls the education system, religious institutions, and the press.

[Marxists’] *unawareness of the details of dynamic interactions can become a great impediment of their cause. Hence, they need to study the details of the influence through school, religion, the press, and the radio. In attempting to arrange a hierarchy of “mills of ideology,” they might discover even more effective mills of this sort such as the family and the suppression of sexuality by society.* [...]. *If man is the product of his material relationships, then he is to be understood in the sense Marx had in mind. Economic circumstances influence the individual directly and indirectly through the detour produced in his changing psychic structure.*[[201]](#footnote-201)

From this ‘integrationist’ position, Fenichel goes on to argue that early life events - organised through ‘mills of ideology’ that alter the psychic structure of the individual – produce ‘unconscious enthusiasms’ underpinning the ‘manifest enthusiasms’ of which the person is aware and that make up their conscious self. These are the result of structured processes that regulate self-esteem, partially meet the psychical and emotional needs of the child on the condition of approved behaviour, and simultaneously operate to frustrate the child’s strivings towards satisfaction. They work to block the outlet of aggressive tendencies, moulding the sublimations of basic drives and conflicts towards resolutions that are socially compliant. Importantly also Fenichel repeatedly made the link between child-rearing and processes of character formation familiar in psychoanalytical discourses, and industry:

*There is a great difference between a nursing mother and an industrial employer; nevertheless the employer makes use of the fact that once there was a nursing mother; because it is the memory of the pleasurable dependence of the infant upon the mother which makes people long for external supplies and ready to believe promises and fulfil conditions.*[[202]](#footnote-202)

**Liberation and the ‘New Left’**

Reich, Bernfeld and Fenichel were all central to the development of Freudo-Marxist thinking in the 1930s. However, the figure that connects the work of the school from that era with the generation following the war, in the renewed interest Marxism with the rise of the New Left in the west and of Socialist Humanism in Eastern Europe, was Erich Fromm. Beginning with his earliest empirical work that applied Freudian character analysis to the study of political orientations of workers in Weimar Germany [[203]](#footnote-203) Fromm was concerned with the problem of ‘conformity’ and the question of how the Nazi’s had risen to power in Germany. In *The Fear of Freedom,*[[204]](#footnote-204) a book that was to achieve large readerships on both sides of the Atlantic, he posed the question of freedom as a ‘psychological problem’. Tracing the phenomenon of the ‘individual’ historically both as a political entity and as a felt experience, he identified a lag between the emergence of individuation and the development of the self. Socially atomising economic and political forces, Fromm argued, marched ahead of the inward ability of the personal psyche to cope with the isolation it experienced. In Fromm’s analysis, this resulted in psychical strategies of denial and flight from reality.

*While the process of individuation takes place automatically, the growth of the self is hampered for a number of individual and social reasons. The lag between these two trends results in an unbearable feeling of isolation and powerlessness, and this in its turn leads to psychic mechanisms, which are later on* [in Fromm’s text] *described as* mechanisms of escape*.*[[205]](#footnote-205)

He suggested three such ‘mechanisms of escape’. The first was ‘authoritarianism’. Here, the individual, in abandoning their own autonomy and in fear of social ostracism,[[206]](#footnote-206) seeks salvation by forming ‘secondary bonds’ with a force, whether it be that of a person or a social or material object, outside of themselves. Taking from Freud, Fromm identified both masochistic *and* sadistic personality tendencies as the outward manifestations of this form of escape. The second form of escape Fromm termed ‘destructiveness’. Destructiveness was distinct from sadism. Whereas sadism represented the desire to dominate and incorporate the ‘other’, destructiveness represented the desire to *eliminate* the external object, whether human or inert. Still, like sadism it was also a reflex response to the sense of isolation and powerlessness in the world. The third of Fromm’s ‘escapes’ was ‘automaton conformity’. Here, the person labours under the delusion of a false individuality. The suppression of any critical self-knowledge early in life produces a disconnection with any actual or potential inner self. The result is that the person borrows thoughts, opinions, and feelings from sources and influences outside of themselves in ways that make them susceptible to conforming behaviours, even where these are clearly harmful to their own rational interests.[[207]](#footnote-207) These ‘escapes’ formed the basis of Fromm’s theory of social character.

As Fromm developed his social theory between the wars he was to move by steps away from Freudian orthodoxies, resulting in conflict with the leading figures of the Frankfurt School.[[208]](#footnote-208) Fromm’s major breaking point concerned Freud’s libido theory and, at a more general level, his theory of instincts. Whereas the other principal names of the Frankfurt School adhered to Freudian orthodoxy on the question of the sex-drive and its repression and sublimations as providing *the* key to understanding culture, Fromm increasingly came to see it as one – albeit important - factor amongst a range of others. Departing from the ‘biological materialism’ upon which figures such as Adorno and Horkheimer built their critique of capitalist society,[[209]](#footnote-209) Fromm insisted upon an analytical framework in which biological drives did not only exist as a socially repressed substratum, but rather interacted with other factors such as interpersonal relations and the individual’s conscious ‘relationship to the world’. Fromm was to summarise his modification of Freud’s libido theory in the following way:

*At this point we can restate the most important differences between the psychological approach pursued in this book and that of Freud … we look upon human nature as essentially historically conditioned, although we do not minimize the significance of biological factors and do not believe that the question can be put correctly in terms of cultural versus biological factors. In second place, Freud’s essential principle is to look upon man as an entity, a closed system, endowed by nature with certain physiologically conditioned drives, and to interpret the development of his character as a reaction to satisfactions and frustrations of these drives; whereas, in our opinion, the fundamental approach to human personality is the understanding of man’s relation to the world, to others, to nature, and to himself. We believe that man is* primarily *a social being, and not, as Freud assumes, primarily self-sufficient and only secondarily in need of others in order to satisfy his instinctual needs … Therefore, in our approach, the needs and desires that centre about the individual’s relations to others, such as love, hatred, tenderness, symbiosis, are the fundamental psychological phenomena, while with Freud they are only secondary results from frustrations or satisfactions of instinctive needs.*[[210]](#footnote-210)

Other leading figures in Freudo-Marxism were to sharply attack the position that Fromm laid out here.[[211]](#footnote-211) To his opponents, Fromm’s reformulations of Freud’s key concepts represented a step away from the dispassionate rigour of the Freudian paradigm, and a drift into vague humanism and diffuse commentaries upon the human condition. It is true that much of Fromm’s later writing conforms to this type. Books such as *Man for Himself,*[[212]](#footnote-212) *The Art of Loving,*[[213]](#footnote-213) *The* *Essence of Man,*[[214]](#footnote-214) and *To Have or to Be*[[215]](#footnote-215) addressed largely ethical, humanistic, and existential concerns. However, Fromm remained a strong defender of Marxism,[[216]](#footnote-216) regarding Marx as the intellectually greater and more historically significant figure compared to Freud who “did not transcend the principles of bourgeois society”.[[217]](#footnote-217) Living in Mexico between 1950 and 1973, he maintained some contact with Trotsky’s widow, Natalia Sedova Trotsky. Along with figures such as Marie Langer he would go on to establish a tradition of Latin American Marxist psychoanalysis.

Fromm’s writings caught the mood of intellectual and social revolt that grew in the west throughout the 1950s and exploded over the following decade. For those seeking lives and a world built upon principles of rationality, personal and sexual fulfilment and peace, Fromm assumed the status of a *zeitgeist* figure: and for some a ‘prophet of the age’. More relevantly, he was a bridge for Marxist and socially radical critique from the generation of revolutionaries of the 1920s and 1930s to that of the 1960s.

The other great transitional figure, whose philosophical and political influence - and activism - spanned the decades before and following the Second World War, was Herbert Marcuse, who began to engage with psychoanalysis following the suppression of revolutionary struggle in Spain under Soviet foreign policy, and as revelations of the Moscow show-trials emerged.[[218]](#footnote-218)

In 1955 Marcuse published *Eros and Civilization*.[[219]](#footnote-219) By the time of its re-publication in 1966 it had become an influential literary and political work, its message of a liberated Eros catching the imagination of a young generation rebelling against sexual repression and the social conservatism and hypocrisies of their elders. At the heart of the book lay a re-working of Freud’s libido theory. Freud had argued that the unconscious pleasure-seeking impulses and drives (including the sex-drive) of the id, caused the conscious self, the ego, to collide painfully with ‘reality’. The behaviour and social orientations of the self were modified through the intercession of the superego that began to develop in the person’s eighth or ninth year. The superego, in Freud’s psychical architecture, exerted a repressive force against the id to curb its potentially destructive tendencies. The force of the id then, its cathectic energy, frustrated in its full expression, became channelled or *sublimated* into other, less potentially harmful ends. The outcome was forms of socially acceptable behaviour that allowed the person to make their way in the world, to work and to maintain outwardly successful familial relationships. The culture of a society was the result of these conflicting forces: repression (and accompanying neuroses) the price paid for the stability it afforded.

Freud’s prognosis for humanity was gloomy. The root of neuroses and the various types of psychological disturbance that were evident in the society of Freud’s time as they are in our own, lay in un-reconciled conflicts between competing psychical structures. Most notably, unresolved struggles within the person’s own Oedipal complex could cause deep-seated problems for their ability to form stable relationships, find sexual fulfilment and ultimately achieve personal happiness. Psychoanalysis could intervene to aid the individual in identifying the unresolved complexes that troubled them, bringing into consciousness conflicts that may have lain beneath the surface of their self-awareness for decades. The result however, even with the most successful interventions, could never be more than a normative adjustment to the limits of personal fulfilment. The individual’s happiness and especially their sexual happiness, lay in their acceptance of the inevitability of repression of their desires; in other words, in the acceptance of disappointment.

In a radical re-working of libido theory that would later be taken up within the counterculture of the 1960s and the gay-liberation movement in the 1970s, Marcuse identified its ‘explosive’ kernel, trapped within the social conservatism and philosophical pessimism of its Freudian framing. This explosive potential was described by Marcuse as a ‘hidden trend’ within psychoanalysis, of repressed memory within the individual and their wider culture. In the process of psychoanalysis forgotten memories, coming once more into the person’s consciousness, brought with them truths too difficult to manage over the course of a conventional life. With them also came ‘critical standards’ by which the person could assess their inward states and public self.

*The psychoanalytic liberation of memory explodes the rationality of the repressed individual. As cognition gives way to re-cognition, the forbidden images and impulses of childhood begin to tell the truth that reason denies. Regression assumes a progressive function.[[220]](#footnote-220)*

The challenge as Marcuse saw it was to liberate this revolutionary content. And this he set out to achieve through a historicising of Freud’s theory.

Freud had proposed a ‘reality principle’ that blocked and frustrated the ‘pleasure principle’, continuously forcing it back into the unconscious and semi-conscious parts of the person’s psyche. Marcuse saw in the reality principle an undifferentiated construct that floated above history, constituted as a universal resistance to the deepest strivings of the unconscious self. Of all the elements of Freud’s theorising however, the reality principle appeared to be the one that most obviously required historical contextualisation. In Marcuse’s treatment the reality principle, re-constituted now in relation to social structures and material culture, was something that the individual had to master in their real life, and against which they had to perform. So, the reality principle, for Marcuse, was also a ‘performance principle’ that arose concretely and differently from and for each historical epoch.

This historical reframing of Freud’s libido theory, particularly of its cultural aspects (its phylogeny), would make little difference to the outward result of the competing physical forces in Freud’s model for the greater part of human history. Throughout the millennia humankind had lived in circumstances of absolute scarcity (*Ananke*) that had made psychological repression and even brutality a necessity. Repression had for most of human history been the price paid for civilisation. Moreover, it was only with the repression of the libido and the re-channelling of its energies into work that human society and its cultures had progressed at all. [[221]](#footnote-221) With the rise of capitalism, and especially of the form that was flourishing in the US society that Marcuse observed, this had changed. In affluent consumerist society the repression that was exerted by the superego upon the strivings of the id, whilst crucial for the maintenance of the social order and its systems, was no longer justifiable in terms of existential necessity; it was no longer a matter of survival. This ‘problem’ was captured by Marcuse *via* a modification of the concept of ‘repression’ itself. The normal repression that arose from needs created by scarcity was now accompanied by a ‘surplus repression’ that was imposed by social constraints and required of the individual that they accept its results for their lives: repression in affluent society must function as a *self*-repression. Furthermore, Marcuse argued that the degree of the surplus-repression required for the stability of any society provides a measure of how repressive it is overall.

*Within the total structure of the repressed personality, surplus repression is that portion which is the result of specific societal conditions sustained in the specific interest of domination. The extent of this surplus-repression provides the standard of measurement: the smaller it is, the less repressive the stage of civilization.*[[222]](#footnote-222)

For Freud the striving for libidinal pleasure that emanated from within the id, repressed by the superego, became sublimated into moralities and value systems; this repressive sublimation being the root of (and the price paid for) culture. For Marcuse surplus repression provided psychological mechanism by which consumerism was perpetuated as a mode of social behaviour.

In Marcuse’s modification of Freud’s libido theory as he developed it a decade later in *One Dimensional Man* surplus repression, rather than being sublimated into higher order motivations, becomes *de*-sublimated into libidinal appetites to be met by the consumer products of everyday life and commoditised entertainment and distraction. The partial release of the id in conservative forms that work *for* ‘the *status quo* of general repression’, regulated through processes of ‘institutionalized desublimation’ provides the psycho-social material that fuels capitalist consumption.[[223]](#footnote-223) According to Marcuse, in modern consumerist society the pleasure principle absorbs the reality principle.[[224]](#footnote-224) In no other area of life was this more obviously evidenced than the sexual. In a style that anticipates Foucault’s observations upon the ubiquity of sex and its coincidence with continuing repression,[[225]](#footnote-225) Marcuse describes the false and joyless nature of the uses of sexual imagery so familiar in consumer culture.

By emending the key elements of Freud’s theoretical architecture Marcuse was presenting a new picture of the workings of the psyche; an altered understanding of its mechanics and animus in consumer behaviour. The full significance of this however only becomes clear when, with Marcuse, we understand its implications for Eros. For Freud Eros (the life-instinct) remained forever trapped under the socially necessary control of the superego. Desire could never be satisfied: the human being never fulfilled. The impossibility of human happiness beyond the most borderline and compromised forms, equated for Marcuse with the impossibility of human liberation and as a corollary the futility of belief in the communist society. It was this anthropological ontology that Marcuse had set out to critique and overthrow in his historicising of Freud.

We have seen the way in which Marcuse reconstructed Freud’s universal ‘reality principle’ into the historically concrete ‘performance principle’. In a society structured by repressive systems of social control and sexual regulation, Eros itself could be expressed in only the most constrained and distorted forms. In a free society this would not be the case. Given freedom in a non-repressive society the pleasure-seeking instinct would find creative rather than destructive outlets. Consequently, the libido could become free without ensuing chaos. But more than this, Eros would be freed of the repressively sexualised forms that dominate in capitalist consumer culture. The ‘erotic’, understood as life-enhancing human activity as opposed to exclusively sexual behaviour, would now permeate all areas of life.[[226]](#footnote-226) The rigidifying distinctions between labour and leisure, the aesthetic, and the non-aesthetic, the quotidian and the profound *etc.* would no longer apply. In this Marcusian sense, work itself would become erotic. As he was to put in his 1969 *An Essay on Liberation*:

*Freud's last theoretical conception recognizes the erotic instincts as work instincts – work for the creation of a sensuous environment. The social expression of the liberated work instinct is cooperation, which, grounded in solidarity, directs the organization of the realm of necessity and the development of the realm of freedom*.[[227]](#footnote-227)

We can see Marcuse as a figure who connected the early phase of the North American counterculture and the interest in psychoanalysis within it, with the crises of Western Marxism at that time. His now largely forgotten *Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis* - published just three years after *Eros and Civilisation* - illustrates this.[[228]](#footnote-228) In that text Marcuse identifies what he terms the ‘coexistence’ of the capitalist West and Soviet ‘socialism’ for his analysis of the politics, culture, and social values of Soviet society. Despite outward differences of political form, their interdependence meant that that a fundamental sameness existed between them in the ascendency of ‘technical rationality’ above human happiness, and the domination of the requirements of industrial production over any type of socially ethical culture or individual fulfilment.

*The world-historical co-existence of the two competing systems, which defines their political dynamic, also defines the social* function *of their ethics.*[[229]](#footnote-229)

Ultimately, for Marcuse, the liberated person, developing their creative potential and flourishing through personally fulfilling social relationships, was at once the essence and the justification of the free society. In *Eros and Civilization* particularly, and against Freud’s Oedipal pessimism, communism as the social form of human freedom was restored as both an ethical ideal *and* as a concrete human possibility.[[230]](#footnote-230)

**Lacan and the French ‘****turn to Freud’**

If Marcuse can be seen as the intellectual bridge - both in generational time and geographical space – that produced the Anglo-American river of radical Left psychoanalysis after the war, his equivalent on the European Continent was Jaques Lacan. Lacan’s influence on all aspects of the human and social sciences is vast. Suffice to say here that Lacan created a ‘Francophone river’ of critical psychoanalytical theory.

Lacan’s first important contribution to psychoanalytical thought was his ‘mirror stage’ of infant development that he presented at the 1949 16th International Congress of Psychoanalysis in Zurich.[[231]](#footnote-231) The mirror stage drew upon the empirical work of the French psychologist Henri Wallon who in his ‘mirror test’ had observed the obsessive interest of the infant with their own reflected image between the ages of six to eighteen months. The concept also echoed the ‘looking glass self’ that was a core theoretical category in the work of the American sociologist Charles Cooley, and for the school of symbolic interactionism he was associated with.[[232]](#footnote-232) For Cooley, the ‘reflected-self’ (understood both in literally visual terms *and* as a cultural metaphor) provided the means by which the expectations of ‘the other’, for example the mother, entered into the formative processes responsible for the emergence of self-hood. However, whereas for the symbolic interactionists, the continuous modifications of social behaviour demanded by the literal, social, and cultural reflections of the self still presumed a stable and enduring ‘I’, for Lacan it did not.[[233]](#footnote-233) Taking his theoretical framing of the mirror stage beyond clinical observation, he posited instead a fractured and unstable self, continuously threatened with annihilation. In the introduction to his 1949 paper, alluding to his psychoanalytical practice, he highlighted the philosophical consequence of this methodological starting point:

*It should be noted that this experience sets us at odds with any philosophy directly stemming from the* cogito*.*[[234]](#footnote-234)

The mirror stage for Lacan represents a moment of primary structuration, a ‘rootstock’ of all subsequent constructions, including that of gender. The steps in his formulation, as well as how they align with other aspects of his *oeuvre*, need to be understood to appreciate how this can be so.

In Lacan’s mirror stage, the infant from about six months onwards sees in their reflected image a singular being, and so comes to experience themselves now not as a disassociated set of fluid sensations, but rather as an integrated whole. In the same moment they see in the emerging motor control now obvious to them in their own reflected image, how to overcome the distress of their hitherto helpless condition. Whilst this pivotal formative stage is a moment of self-recognition - a primary narcissism that precedes society - it is also overwritten by the social symbols that constitute the external social world. The infant does not recognise itself in an unmediated fashion. Rather a host of ‘others’ are on hand to welcome the moment with encouraging prompts and social cues. The event is over-determined by the socio-linguistic context of the infant’s family, community, and cultural landscape. This provides a force-field of powerful signifiers that cut into the emerging mentalities of the child and become buried deeply in its socio-cognitive processes. The result is an ego that sits, cuckoo-like, in the psyche of the individual. This notion of the ego as a virtual entity, an extimate (as opposed to an intimate) interloper, falsely presenting itself to consciousness as an authentic self, is for Lacan also the root of a constitutive alienation that haunts the person throughout their life. This primary alienation in turn produces a ceaseless and never-fulfilled striving for self-realisation through the creation of alter-egos and adjustments to the self’s representation *of* itself, *to* itself.

In the person’s early development, what they perceive as their autonomous self - their ego - is in fact an introjected entity created by ‘Others’ who organise their physical, social, and psychological environment. What they take to be ‘social reality’, and including their notions of self-hood, is in fact, to use Lacan’s phrasing, an ‘Imaginary’. In other words, it is a ‘veil of appearance’ that occludes direct perception of the world and therefore the person’s capacity for rational apprehension of things as they really are. This Imaginary, however, cannot operate alone in a pure state of simple delusions. Its development is encrypted by the active involvement of the ‘Symbolic’: the matrix of signifiers that constitute the socio-cultural order into which they were born.[[235]](#footnote-235) It is the combination of the Imaginary and the Symbolic that produces the social reality of lived experience with all its variegated richness and falsehood. Finally, there is Lacan’s ‘Real’. This is not the ‘social reality’ just described. Indeed, the Real in Lacan’s theoretical framework has a mystery about it. It is that which cannot be captured by the Imaginary or by the Symbolic. It eludes both and in-so-doing remains continually ‘beyond’ what the person can know. The opacity of the Real makes it an enigmatic ‘thing-in-itself’ that is known by its effects rather than its cognitively apprehended presence. The tripartite scheme of Imaginary, Symbolic and Real is Lacan’s ‘Register Theory’; and his concerns with each of the three Registers at different points in his philosophical career provide the organising spine to an understanding of his intellectual trajectory.

Of particular interest here is Lacan’s understanding of the unconscious and its implications for interpretations of ideology produced by later thinkers he influenced. Here the Symbolic register is key. For Lacan, the unconscious is not a dark churn of irrationalist impulse and unchained desire (*qua* Freud), but rather is a complicated and highly enmeshed socio-linguistic lattice: the unconscious for Lacan, is ‘structured like a language’.

*Symbols in fact envelop the life of man with a network so total that they join together those who are going to engender him “by bone and flesh” before he comes into the world; so total that they bring to his birth, along with the gifts of the stars, if not with the gifts of the fairies, the shape of his destiny; so total that they provide the words that will make him faithful or renegade, the law of the acts that will follow him right to the very place where he is not yet and beyond his very death; and so total that through them his end finds its meaning in the last judgement, where the Word absolves his being or condemns it – unless he reaches the subjective realization of being-toward-death.[[236]](#footnote-236)*

It is the Symbolic that structures, or ‘writes’, the unconscious. In the French, Lacan says ‘L'inconscient est structuré *comme un langage*". His choice of terms is precise in that ‘comme’ translates into the English as ‘like’ rather than ‘by’; and ‘langage’ (as in *de* Saussure’s original distinction) translates as language *per se* (or, as Lacan emphasises, ‘letters’) rather than any one spoken language.[[237]](#footnote-237) The Symbolic, drawn from the world of social signifiers, is the creation of the ‘others’ that populate the developmental environment of the infant and growing child. The unconscious that results is trans-subjective in character, criss-crossed by a multitude of conflicting and paradoxical social influences. Significantly, this means that along with being linguistically structured the Lacanian unconscious is also non-biological (unlike Freud’s id) and is the result of the work of the Symbolic upon the human subject. Finally, the Symbolic register, animated by the dynamics of language, provides spaces – gaps created by the shifting alignments of signifier and signified – through and between which the unconscious slides.[[238]](#footnote-238)

Lacan’s Register Theory is central to his re-working of Freud’s Oedipus Complex. For Lacan persons outside of the individual’s own psyche come in three types each corresponding to one of the Registers. He distinguishes the first – the Imaginary Register – with a lower case ‘o’. The Imaginary ‘other’ is the other of normal daily interactions. It is the other to whom we broadly attribute the same ‘qualities-of-self’ as ourselves. It is our assumptions about the nature of the others with whom we interact that enable us to move competently within and through our social world. Over against these others there is the Symbolic *O*ther. This is the Other that resembles Freud’s superego. It brings with it the entire sociolinguistic world of norms, expectations, and morality. It most nearly approximates to the parent-carer in the early years of the infant’s life. However, it is more than the parent: it is the bearer of authority and the guardian of the ‘rules-of-behaviour’ that will govern the person’s life. Finally, there is the Real Other. The enigmatic nature of the Real has already been noted. But now we see this played out in the forms of the Mother and the Father. To the infant, the figure of the Mother (or the fixed sociocultural presence the Mother-figure represents), emanating from the unfathomable darkness of the Real, is a source of anxiety. She is the source of life, sustenance, and comfort: in that sense she is the entire world. But by her presence she is overwhelming - whilst if she is absent, she creates terror. In the psyche of the infant there is the constant and urgent question: ‘What does the Mother *want*?’ The Mother in Lacan’s cosmology is always ‘too much or too little’. In its distress the small child turns to the Father seeking a countervailing force to their dominating power. In the child’s growing mind, the Father (or the fixed sociocultural presence that the Father-figure represents: a symbolic Phallus, representing all that the Mother does not have) is the means by which the demands of the Mother can be met, controlled, negotiated or even blocked. To the child, the Father is protector.

Finally, it is this dance of cultural signifiers that structures the libidinal energies and hedonic patterns of the psyche of the person. Each of us has a biological substratum, an ontic body that has needs that must be met to survive. This is manifested as ‘demand’ that goes further than what is physically required to meet this need.[[239]](#footnote-239) The surplus that is left is for Lacan, desire. So, in a mathematically styled expression of desire being the remainder of demand minus need, Lacan brings us to his reworking of Freud’s libido theory.

*What is thus alienated in needs constitutes an Urverdrängung* [primal repression], *as it cannot, hypothetically, be articulated in demand; it nevertheless appears in an offshoot that presents itself in man as desire (das Begehren).*[[240]](#footnote-240)

This ‘desire’ must be understood in its peculiarly Lacanian inflexion. The desire is for an object, naturally. In the child however, the ‘object’ in question is that of the *Mother’s* desire: the phallus (as the representation of that which she does not have). This is the Lacanian *object petit a*.[[241]](#footnote-241) So, the desire of the child is to *be* the phallus: the object of the Mother’s desire. In Lacan’s cosmology, beneath our desires are the desires of the *other*: or more prosaically, we might say the wish to *be* the object that is cherished by another.

For Freud, the pleasure principle had been one of the two primary psychical impulses (the other being the reality principle). For Lacan, it was the perpetually frustrated desires of the subject, always and forever circling their intended objects without ultimate satisfaction. This was the source of what he called *jouissance*: the restless energy that results from the constant failure of subjective gratification. This *jouissance* was the suffering constitutive of the human condition.

## Oppression, revolt, and the remains of a theory

**Psychoanalysis and oppression: of the colonised; of the woman; of the worker**

The influence of the Left Freudian tradition was present throughout the western countercultures of the 1960s and 1970s. Broadly this influence flowed in two tributaries: that of the Anglophone Marcusian school; and that of the Francophone Lacanians. They were to influence various intellectual traditions within social and liberation movements in the post-war era. To take three examples: firstly, the influence of Left psychoanalysis within anti-colonial struggles; secondly, its role in western feminism; and thirdly theoretical developments within western Marxism. For the first we will consider the thinking of Franz Fanon; for the second, that of Juliet Mitchell; and for the third the work of Louis Althusser.

*Franz Fanon*

Before embarking upon a critical appraisal of the thought of Franz Fanon, charting the heterogeneous admixtures of his political philosophy, the extent of his influence should be acknowledged. The readership of his last published 1961 work, *The Wretched of the Earth,*[[242]](#footnote-242) throughout the colonised world and within anti-colonial, national liberation and minority anti-oppression movements was and remains enormous. There have been many armed insurgencies particularly, in which Fanon’s great key work has been cited by leaders and activists as having been an important intellectual reference in their political trajectory. In the jails of apartheid South Africa, the H-Blocks of the Maze Prison in Long Kesh, Northern Ireland and the internment camps of the state of Israel, *The Wretched of the Earth* has circulated as an educational text.[[243]](#footnote-243) Figures of the stature of Malcolm X in North America, Che Geuvara in Cuba and Steve Biko in South Africa were affected by Fanon’s call for cultural renewal and the overcoming of colonial psychologies. A later readership of his earlier published book, *Black Skin, White Masks*[[244]](#footnote-244)grew out of the interest in Fanon that this influence had created. Across these two seminal works we can trace the eclectic philosophical and conceptual layers of his political outlook. More specifically, through them we can see the degrees to which Marxism and psychoanalysis, in differing and sometimes unorthodox ways, shaped his analysis of the colonial psyche and the struggle for mental, bodily and political liberation.[[245]](#footnote-245)

Fanon’s philosophical and political development can be mapped by his geographical journey from the Antilles to France and finally to Algeria. Absorbing and critically assessing the diverse influences of négritude, French phenomenology, existentialism, Marxism, psychiatry and psychoanalysis, Fanon’s thought comprises a patchwork of insights drawn from this range of traditions. It is the influences of Marxism and psychoanalysis however, that is our focus here.

The political character of Fanon’s Marxism is most evident in *The Wretched of the Earth*. This is where we see his analysis of the intrinsic and constitutive role of violence in the position of the colonised and the struggle for liberation. It is there that he warns of the dangers of co-option of the nationalist bourgeois by the colonial powers. It is there also that he provides his assessment of the revolutionary potential of the peasantry and his scepticism of the potential of the industrial working-class of the Third World.

*… it is clear that in the colonial countries the peasants alone are revolutionary, for they have nothing to lose and everything to gain. The starving peasant, outside the class system, is the first among the exploited to discover that only violence pays. For him there is no compromise, no possible coming to terms; colonization and decolonization are simply a question of relative strength*.[[246]](#footnote-246)

In *The Wretched of the Earth* Fanon stresses spontaneity against the control of indigenous elites and importance of cultural nationalism; and shades of psychoanalysis are present throughout. Fanon’s discussion of violence and cultural renewal for example employs the metaphors of libido, cathexis, discharge, and orgiastic release.

*The native's relaxation* [in dance] *takes precisely the form of a muscular orgy in which the most acute aggressivity and the most impelling violence are canalized, transformed, and conjured away... There are no limits -- for in reality your purpose in coming together is to allow the accumulated libido, the hampered aggressivity, to dissolve as in a volcanic eruption.*[[247]](#footnote-247)

In the final essay of the collection ‘Colonial War and Mental Disorders’, Fanon speaks as a psychiatrist, but still with a political purpose. In this discussion, he draws upon his experience as a doctor with the *Front de Libération Nationale* (F.L.N.) in the Algerian War of Independence. From his case notes he identifies four types – or ‘series’ – of psychiatric disorders. These were: ‘reactionary’ cases in which the disorder arises directly from the experience, whether as perpetrator or victim, of the violent ‘event’; cases in which the disorder arises from the atmosphere of violent conflict – of total war - more generally; affective-intellectual ‘modifications’ and morbidities that had resulted from torture; and psycho-somatic illnesses and cortico-visceral disorders that are associated with war. In all of these case-types Fanon treats the associated symptoms, not as the result of personal idiopathies or family histories (*qua* Freud) but rather as the result of environment. For Fanon the psychiatrist, disturbances of the mind arise directly from the injuries visited upon the psyche in the real violence of war.

*The Wretched of the Earth* is Fanon’s political manifesto to the world: his cry to the ‘wretched’ to rise. It is in his earlier work however, that his philosophical and psychoanalytical influences are most evident. The great theme of *Black Skin, White Masks* is the dense and violent dialectic of race that runs through the European Enlightenment. In his discussion of the misrecognitions and non-recognitions that constitute the antagonisms of race, he acknowledges the influence of Hegel’s master-slave relationship. For Fanon, the white colonist creates the ‘Negro’. Fanon rejected the thesis put forward by the ethnologist Octave Mannoni[[248]](#footnote-248) that there can be such thing as psychological colonised ‘type’. Fanon argued that it was the synchronic collision of the European and the non-European in the creation of empires that lies at the root of oppression.

*I believe that the fact of the juxtaposition of the white and the black races has created a massive psychoexistential complex. I hope by analysing it to destroy it.* [[249]](#footnote-249)

For Fanon, the entire architecture of colonial relations, behaviours, tropes of speech and communication, modes of postural deference and social deferment become a ‘psychological-economic system’.[[250]](#footnote-250)

With respect to the influence of psychoanalysis, it is the ambivalence of Fanon’s use of it that is interesting. He rejects for example the ego-psychology of Alfred Adler. Linking Adler’s ‘goal-oriented’ psychoanalysis with Monnoni’s belief in a ‘dependency-complex’ by which a colonised people in some pre-determined fashion, accept their fate, he argues instead that it is environment and society that give rise to passivity.[[251]](#footnote-251) Moreover, citing Malinowski’s studies of the Trobriand people of Papua New Guinea,[[252]](#footnote-252) he argues that Freud’s Oedipus Complex is not found amongst the matriarchal family structure of much of the colonised world. Even repression, so central to psychoanalysis, he argues finds no place in the psyche of the negro:

*Since the racial drama is played out in the open, the black man has no time to* “*make it unconscious*” [[253]](#footnote-253)

If this was all that Fanon had to say on the subject, we could conclude that he had rejected psychoanalysis in its entirety and say no more. However, with respect to the ‘white race’, Fanon remained a Freudian. The deep-seated sexual repression Fanon saw in the interaction between colonised and coloniser for him demanded a psychoanalytical interpretation.

*Every intellectual gain requires a loss of sexual potential. The civilised white man retains an irrational longing for unusual eras of sexual license, of orgiastic scenes, of unpunished rapes, of unrepressed incest. In one way these fantasies respond to Freud’s life instinct. Projecting his own desires onto the Negro, the white man behaves “as if” the Negro really had them …* [[254]](#footnote-254)

Furthermore, the use that Fanon made of Lacan’s conceptual innovations in psychological theory means we should take seriously the psychoanalytical vein in his thought. In an extended footnote[[255]](#footnote-255) Fanon discusses the relevance of Lacan’s ‘mirror stage’ of child development. According to Lacan at around six months the infant develops the singular self-realisation that results from seeing itself in the Other: the Other that is ‘not itself’. In this moment of self-awareness, the multiple and dynamic layers of recognition and misrecognition that drive the processes of socialisation commence. In the context of the coloniser-colonised nexus the *imago* of the Other was infused with an “imaginary aggression”. Fear of the ‘non-white’ then, churned through developmental processes of the ‘colonial infant’ as described by Lacan, ensures that the colonial native enters the imagination of the child as the presence of danger: the negro, in bodily form, is seen as forever a threat.[[256]](#footnote-256) In Fanon’s formulation we can still detect the distant influence of Freud, albeit in a Lacanian form.

*Juliet Mitchell*

In the decades following the Second World War much feminist comment on Freud framed him as representing nothing less than the ‘rationalisation in theory’ of the submission of woman from the origins of humanity. Across Freud’s extensive publications and private correspondences there are quotes aplenty that can be used to present Freud in this light. His focus upon the sexual development of the boy (the ‘masculine model’) in his early work and terms such as ‘penis-envy’ and ‘hysteria’ used to describe normalising gendering processes and female neuroses especially, did nothing to help Freud’s reputation in this respect.

One figure who emerged from the New Left of the women’s movement of the 1960s and 1970s and who stood apart from this consensus was Juliet Mitchell. Mitchell was critical both of Marxism on the question of women, and of the forerunners and contemporaries of the Women’s Liberation Movement. She highlighted what she saw as the eclipsing of ‘the woman’ as a real subject within both the philosophical humanism of the early Marx; and the category of ‘the family’ in its economic function in the later Marx and in the work of Engels.[[257]](#footnote-257) However, amongst other socialist feminists she detected the same tendency towards economistic analyses of women’s oppression: by adopting an ‘evolutionary economism’ that anchored the position of ‘the woman’ in property relations throughout history in the case of Simone *de* Beauvoir; and by treating ‘patriarchy’ as itself a mode of production by Kate Millett.[[258]](#footnote-258)

In her critical sweep of some of the most important names within the women’s movement Mitchell found that overlooking the conceptual core of Freud’s thinking was a consistent feature of their dismissals. Betty Friedan for instance in *The Feminine Mystique*, whilst she acknowledged Freud’s radicalism in shedding light on the importance of sexuality in the development and life of the person whether female or male, nonetheless emphasised the prejudices and offending foibles in his work that can only jar against modern sensibilities surrounding the position of women in society. This raising of what we might call the ‘biography of Freud’ over any more scientific critique of his thought results in a historicism that renders Freud only a product of his times, and then easy to dismiss. Commenting on other accounts of Freud by significant feminist thinkers, Mitchell noted dominant theoretical mistreatments such as the tendency to displace the primacy of sex by losing it in diffuse constructs such as a generalised ‘life-energy’ (in the case of Shulamith Firestone)[[259]](#footnote-259) or in socio-existential categories (in the case of Simone *de* Beauvoir).[[260]](#footnote-260)

With these observations Mitchell was going against the stream within the women’s movement. She was also acting in the spirit of Lacan’s call to ‘return to Freud’ on the matter of sexual difference and its centrality to the structuring of the subject. She adopted an explicitly Lacanian approach to the question of how ‘maleness’ and ‘femaleness’ occur. The question for Mitchell (and for Lacan before her) was this: ‘Are we *born* male or female, or do we *become* so?’ Beyond the anatomical differences between boys and girls Mitchell and Lacan (and Freud before them) were concerned with sexual difference in its behavioural sense. Why is it that humans couple in the way they do? What is working at the root of sexual attraction? What explains the social and personal consequences of our anatomical differences? Beyond the cultural variation of human sexuality, how do we explain its commonalities across cultures. And then, ‘Are our sexual differences, looked at in the general sense, essentially biological and innate, or are they cultural and therefore changeable?’ For Mitchell the answer was that sexual difference was the result of a ‘becoming’ after birth. We can trace the logic of this position through Mitchell’s discussion of Freud’s 1925 essay, ‘Some Psychical Consequences of the Anatomical Differences Between the Sexes’.[[261]](#footnote-261)

In 1905 in the *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex* Freud gave a full account of his theory of the Oedipus Complex. Focused exclusively on the attachments and frustrated jealousies of the boy, Freud had established a ‘male model’ of sexual development. However, the Oedipus Complex had little to say about the sexual development of the girl that helped to understand adult female sexuality. At this point Freud, resorted to a type of parallelism by which, whilst the boy fought the father for the mother’s affections (later transferring these energies to womankind) the girl merely mirrored this dynamic and so ‘therefore’ came to form an attachment with the father (and so later an attraction to the phallus). Freud was aware of the theoretical gap that this created in his account of human sexuality, revolving around an obvious question: ‘Why should it be that the girl, suffering the same disruptive intrusions by the father, should go on to form such an attachment with the father and not, just as in the case of the boy, their mother?’ It was a problem that Freud struggled with for the next twenty years through a series of disputes within his psychoanalytical circle.

Freud’s followers in the International Psychoanalytical Institute tried to solve the riddle in different ways. Working under the theoretical influence of Melanie Klein and led by Ernest Jones, a number of notable figures within the movement began to question the fundamentals of Freud’s account of feminine sexuality based upon his ‘dynamic’ theory of mind and general ‘drive-theory’, and specifically the status of the Castration Complex. Focussing upon the pre-Oedipal months of the infant’s development, Klein had elaborated instead an ‘object-relations’ theory of psychical development in the small child. In the first months of life the object of comfort and sustenance was the mother’s breast. The loss of this ‘part-object’ (‘part’ that is of the mother) during short periods of separation created a psychical trace of the breast as a ‘phantasy’, marking the beginning of the sexual unconscious. With the periodic return of the mother, the infant increasingly understands the breast to be a part of something larger: the mother herself, seen eventually as the ‘total-object’ by the infant. In this first phase of life, the process for the girl-child and the boy-child are the same. Increasingly aware of the social dynamics of the familial relations in which it is enmeshed, and of the gendered differences of those dynamics, the child strives to maintain its access to the nurturing mother. The stratagems eventually adopted by boys and by girls are different however in this ‘already gendered’ family world. This, for Klein and for the British object-relations school, was the origin of sexual identity in later stages of child development and adulthood.

Another position in the controversy came from Karl Abrahams who put forward the concept of ‘vaginal receptivity’ by which, during the girl’s sexual development and by stages, a desire for the phallus (and for a baby as a phallic proxy), occurs as a natural development universally in all human cultures. Freud was to rail against this notion. His objection was its essentialising biologism. If it was indeed the case that psychological structures were the result of undifferentiated bodily impulses, then an original femininity (and by implication an original masculinity) determined the destiny of the person at birth. Moreover, this created also a ‘normality’ that made any complications such as homosexuality, the result of a maldevelopment. For Freud sexual difference lay in its own obscure realm between the biological-anatomical substratum and social influences: the human psyche. Freud wanted to keep biology at the margins of the story.

Other prominent figures such as Jung with his ‘Electra Complex’ (a mirror of the Oedipus Complex) and rival biological accounts such as that of Fleiss, suffered similar rebuttals by Freud; and to the consternation of many of the leading figures of psychoanalysis.

Over these decades of controversy Freud came to the view that the sexual development of the girl was asymmetric to that of the boy. Rejecting direct anatomical sexual determination, by 1924 Freud had arrived at a revision of the Oedipus Complex that radically altered its dynamic. This shift occurred through the mobilisation of a hitherto minor element in the earlier theory that was now to assume centre stage: the Castration Complex.

In his original theory the boy becomes aware at a very young age of the penis as the mark of sexual difference between his mother and father, and between himself and his mother and sisters. Pained also by the dominance of his father for his mother’s affections, the boy develops an anxiety at the realisation that the penis is something that need not exist and so, in his infantile imagination, something that he might lose. It is the suppression of this anxiety that creates the sexualised unconscious in the young boy and marks the onset of the superego by which the principle of law (or authority) becomes established as the beginning of socially regulated behaviour.

This process could not occur in the girl given the actual absence of the penis. Freud had previously talked of the girl’s ‘penis envy’ resulting from her unsuccessful attempts to compete with the father. Freud was not advocating an anatomical reductionism. He was insistent that the penis ‘cannot be the motive, only the trigger of the child’s envy’.[[262]](#footnote-262) In other words, the body could not alone confer meaning, sexual or otherwise, on anatomy or sensations. Nonetheless, Freud did now see anatomical difference as the *trigger* of genderising processes, organised around the principle of castration. In the boy this meant the imagining of the literal loss of the penis as well as the behavioural prohibitions regarding the mother’s affections imposed by the father. In the pre-adolescent girl, it meant the psychical suppression of the clitoris and its sensations, and the discouragement of boyish expressions of rivalry with the father and the prohibitive ‘command’ to remain by the mother’s side. This suppression created the feminine sexualised unconscious. Only with the onset of puberty did ‘sex’ return but now, in Freud’s revised theory, centred on the vagina, the ‘clitoris’ remaining outside the reach of consciousness. This transfer of the primary locus of female sexual identity to the vagina as a site of receptivity (awaiting the phallus), driven by the ‘castration’ of the clitoris, gave Freud his asymmetric model of gendering processes.[[263]](#footnote-263) It was also the point from which Mitchell, following Lacan, took up a theoretical reworking of Freud that would put her at odds with the mainstream of the women’s movement. As she put it, taking up where Freud had left off and summarising the main terms of the debate:

*In the final analysis, the debate relates to the question of the psychoanalytic understanding both of sexuality and of the unconscious and brings to the fore issues of the relationship between psychoanalysis and biology and sociology. Is it biology, environmental influence, object-relations or the castration complex that makes for the psychological distinction between the sexes?* [[264]](#footnote-264)

Lacan saw Freud as having been limited by the conceptual tools available to him. Working within the theoretical legacy of the nineteenth century, Freud’s work was saddled with hydraulic and thermodynamic metaphors that blunted his explanations of the human subject and normalising social-sexual processes. Despite the use of symbols in Freud’s early analytical dream-work and his later biographical interpretations, Lacan viewed Freud’s application of ‘the symbol’ as only partially effective. Particularly, without knowledge of the work of Ferdinand de Saussure, Freud was unaware of the role of the ‘signifier’ fore-grounded by the new linguistics that was developing contemporaneously. Lacan had subsequently applied the type of socio-cultural analysis to Freud that Saussure’s linguistics had made possible, reworking the Castration Complex accordingly.

For Mitchell the gendering processes driving sexual destiny pre-existed the infant in the form of a Symbolic Order. The erogenous zones of the body, not yet inscribed with social meaning, would come into sexual life only as part of a ‘chain of signifiers’ in which the phallus serves as *the* signifier of sexual difference. One consequence of this was that the literal presence of the father was not key to the sexual development of the person. Even with the father weakened or physically absent, normalising processes would nonetheless shape sexual identity. Fundamental to sexual difference now wasn’t biology, sociological influences, or object-relations but a split in the subject that marked both the infant’s realisation of itself apart from the world, and the beginnings of both the male and female sexual unconscious. The ‘subject’ now wasn’t a Cartesian ‘self’; the unified, singular ‘I’ of the Cogito. Rather it was a fractured entity, always unstable and forever seeking an unattainable resolution of its contradictions by union with another. Pulled every way by life and circumstance, the subject’s striving for heterosexual union was ‘normal’ only in the sociological – and not ‘natural’ - sense. Whilst the dominant (*i.e.* more *frequent*) form of union was one of male and female coupling, the fact of homosexuality was not here seen as a confounding aberration, but rather as one cultural variant of a complex universality. Finally, for Mitchell as for Lacan, the subjective ‘split’ from which sexual difference arose represented a primary alienation that launched the person on their sexual life trajectory. It also created the moment of human ontogenesis: the end of nature; and the beginning of culture.

So, Mitchell had answered the question she had started with. No original sexual difference existed. There was no essential ‘male’ and ‘female’. Rather, a ‘primordial split’ in the psyche of the infant created the person *as* male or female within a pre-existent symbolic order. For Mitchell, sex did not arise from object-relations (Klein, Jones, Horney *et. al*), sociological factors (Adler) or a unitary biological drive (Fleiss),[[265]](#footnote-265) but from a sequence of symbolically mediated social interactions. This process was animated by asymmetrical developments for the female and male infant, but in each case genital repression (castration) arising from the intrusions of the father, played a central role: of the penis in the boy; of the clitoris in the girl. In the case of the girl the drama was played out to its end game at puberty with the re-presenting of the vagina as the site of sexual receptivity in the young woman.

The consequences of this analysis were far-reaching. If correct, the sexualised split in the infant’s psyche into male or female at the very beginning of personhood, represented a defeat of the free and unfettered human subject. As such it provided the irrational sub-soil into which ideology put down its first roots. It also meant that in any future socialist society the type of sexual difference created by capitalist society would not simply fall away under socialism: it would require a generational change in modes of child rearing from the earliest stages of the life of the infant.[[266]](#footnote-266) Equally of course, it meant that sexual difference is not a natural fact of human development and can be differently configured in a different type of society. Seen in this light, it secured the possibility of human liberation in its personal, sexual, and social aspects in interdependence with one another.

*Louise Althusser*

Whilst Juliet Mitchell was reconstructing Freud *via* socio-cultural categories in the English-speaking world, ‘across the channel’ (once more) a psychoanalytical re-fashioning of Marxism was underway in the work of Louis Althusser. Althusser’s goal was to overturn the Hegelian legacy within Marxism, to recast Marxism as a science. This involved: scrutiny of the logic and ‘reading’ of Marx’s key-work *Das Kapital*; the question of the historical subject and of human subjectivity in general; the rejection of familiar Marxist concepts such as ‘alienation’; the teasing out of humanism from Marx’s own formulations; and the re-interpretation of the concept of ideology within Marxist sociology.

Althusser adopted a ‘symptomatic reading’ of Marx that, guided by Lacan, he took from Freud.[[267]](#footnote-267) In his practice Freud had paid close attention to the silences of his patients, their elisions and avoidances as well as their explicit statements. These were clues to the ways and means by which the unconscious evaded detection and capture by the conscious self – and by the analyst ‘behind the couch’. A symptomatic reading of *Das Kapital* with careful attention to “the lacunae, blanks and failures of rigour”[[268]](#footnote-268) could reveal Marx’s logic beneath its formal economic analysis and political imperatives. This type of ‘reading’ then could bring Marx’s epistemology to the surface.

Althusser saw parallels in the logic *Das Kapital* and in the work of Freud. In his account of his ‘readings’ Althusser emphasises the historical nature of ‘the objects’ of both: capital in the case of Marx; the psyche in the case of Freud. It is not simply that both exist and develop ‘in time’; rather it is in the character of their *movement* in time that Althusser sees their commonality. For Marx, capital evolves in successive forms from mercantilism in the late mediaeval period, through to fully-fledged commodity production and the factory system. For Freud, the psyche evolves through stages of Oedipal formation and suppression, latency, pubescent crisis and (‘all being well’) successful resolution and sexual transference. For both, the patterns of change are those of compression and intensification, displacement, concatenation, and transformation.

*... I do not mean that this analysis suppresses the problem of the relation between component histories and general history – a problem which must necessarily be solved before it is possible to speak strictly of ‘a history’. On the contrary, it shows that this problem cannot be solved unless history really* constitutes *its object, instead of* receiving *it. In this sense, the term* analysis *used by Marx has exactly the same significance as that given it by Freud when he speaks of the ‘analysis of an individual history’: just as Freud’s analysis produces a new definition of his object (sexuality, the libido), i.e., really constitutes it by showing the variation of its* formations*, which is the reality of a history, so Marx’s analysis constitutes his object (the ‘productive forces’) by constructing the history of its successive forms, i.e., forms which have a determinate place in the structure of the mode of production.*[[269]](#footnote-269)

This observation, drawing on his reading of Marx’s *Das Kapital* and particularly Freud’s 1905 *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex*, suggested to Althusser ‘epistemological analogies’[[270]](#footnote-270) that connected to two figures. Whilst outwardly the projects of each were not at all the same, the underlying logics to their respective critical inquiries were comparable.

Althusser’s symptomatic reading of *Das Kapital* gives his assessment of Marx’s logic the character of linguistic-conceptual technique. His consideration of the ‘object’ of political economy for example revolves around a distinction between the ‘real object’ and the ‘object-for-knowledge’. With this distinction providing the foundation of our approach to political economy we separate the empirical object-world as it is outside of consciousness, and its psychical simulacrum operating as a driver within it, loaded with its own ideological excrescences. Without this distinction made explicit we fall prey to the “fraudulent unity’ of the word ‘object’”.[[271]](#footnote-271) So, just as with Freud for whom the unconscious became comprehensible (indeed apprehensible) *via* his symptomatic psychoanalysis, in Marx the object of political economy, capital, becomes comprehensible by its separation from different forms of value (land value, rent value and so on) and its identification as value itself. By this distinction, between the real object and the object’s ideological expression, a new science is born.

*In this case, it is strictly correct to speak of a* revolution*, of a qualitative leap, of a modification affecting the very* structure of the object *… In fact, this theoretical revolution which is visible in the break which separates a new science from the ideology which gave it birth, reverberates profoundly in the object of the theory, which is at the same moment itself the site of a revolution – and becomes peculiarly a* new object*.* [[272]](#footnote-272)

Regarding the types of object of Freudian psychoanalysis on the one hand, and Marxist political-economy on the other, Althusser appropriated a key category from Lacan: ‘metonymic causality’. Lacan had found in Freud a notion of causality different from that of the sequential ‘X follows Y’ type. In his dream-analysis Freud had used interpretations that identified ‘synchronic’ causes acting also as effects of the ‘dream work’ - to create the ‘manifest dream’ as an entire structure. In other words, the causalities that worked upon the ‘dream material’ (taken from life) did not come from an exterior realm, but rather emerged from the structures of the dream itself. This immanent, metonymic process, operated through mechanisms such as the ‘condensation’ of partial fragments of reality and their ‘compression’ into meaning for the dreamer. This identification of the metonymic character of the psyche in Freud established it as an object of a special type; known only by its effects and self-generative status. For Althusser the same was true of ‘Capital’ constituted as a human relationship, rather than a thing amenable to external identification.

Althusser’s interest in Freudian categories was driven by a wish to find a logic that could break from what he saw as the vestiges of idealism carried into Marxism from the Hegelian legacy. Metonymic causality applied to history for instance, suggested a motive force in which the totality of each historical moment interacts in a complex fashion with its specific effects. *Contra* Hegel, these complex interactions were not ones in which each element exerted equal effect. Rather, a structure inhered within each complex that would determine the outcome of a concrete conjunctural moment. This would always ultimately emerge from the economic realm, though never as a pure isolate of a historical process. This was the ‘structure-in-dominance’ which captured both the contingent aspects of history as well as its underlying determinism. Here Althusser eschewed the Hegelian concept of ‘contradiction’, looking rather to Freud (*via* Lacan) for an alternative theorisation of causality. Eventually, it was the concept of ‘overdetermination’ he was to (reluctantly) adopt for a non-Hegelian articulation of his philosophy of history.

*I am not particularly taken by this term* overdetermination *(borrowed from other disciplines), but I shall use it in the absence of anything better, both as an* index *and as a* problem*, and also because it enables us to see quite clearly why we are dealing with something* quite different from the Hegelian contradiction*.*[[273]](#footnote-273)

Althusser further clarifies his distinction: the Hegelian contradiction is always ‘simple’. Of course, Hegel is aware of complexity in history. The multiple and interacting expressions of historical action and meaning, the accumulation of the past within the present and its presages of future manifestations, all characterise Hegelian interpretations of history.

*However, it can be shown that this complexity is not the complexity of an* effective overdetermination*, but the complexity of a cumulative* internalization *which is only an apparent overdetermination.”*

and

[For Hegel] “A circle of circles, consciousness has only one centre*, which solely determines it; it would need circles* with another centre than itself – decentred circles – *for it to be affected at its centre by their effectivity, in short for its essence to be over-determined by them. But this is not the case.*[[274]](#footnote-274)

So, in Althusser’s view these complexities remain for Hegel reducible to a unified essence-of-the-age; a striving of historical consciousness to become actual as the ultimate quest of Spirit (*Geist*) lying at the centre of the historical moment. This is the simplicity of Hegel’s notion of contradiction. For Althusser, there is no such unified centre that lies undifferentiated beneath the outward variety of consciousness. Rather, it is historical complexity that is real: the result of *de*-centred historical forces and of competing and conflicting determinations that interact with one another, and with the totality of their historical conditions. Expressing this non-Hegelian historical logic was the reason that Althusser looked to Freudian thought.

Beneath Althusser’s concern to shake off the Hegelian residue in Marxism, and with it the notion of an underlying unity to consciousness, was a more basic desire to eliminate historicism. Crucial to that was shedding of ‘the subject’ in history. For Althusser there is no historical ‘Subject’. Our subjectivity, what we experience as our subject-selves, is always emergent; the result of concrete conjunctural factors and forces that shape our circumstance and are beyond our control. Once our contingent subject-identities are constituted, we reach for an attachable essence by which we can root ourselves in the world. And so, we lapse into the universalising tendencies of bourgeois-humanism that seek always to maintain the historical moment ‘in stasis’ (and wedded to capitalist interest) as an unchangeable natural order and organised around the abstract concept of ‘Man’.

*‘Man’ is a myth of bourgeois ideology: Marxism-Leninism cannot* start *from ‘man’. It starts ‘from the economically given social period’; and, at the end of its analysis, when it arrives’,* it may find real men*. These men are the* point of arrival *of an analysis which starts from the social relations of the existing mode of production, from class relations, and from class struggle. These men are quite different from the ‘man’ of bourgeois ideology.* [[275]](#footnote-275)

For Althusser this rejection of bourgeois humanism was driven by imperatives that are both epistemological and political. Abstracting from concrete historical circumstance, speaking of ‘Man’ as an essence removed from its social relationships - as does Sartre, avers Althusser[[276]](#footnote-276) - is necessarily obfuscating and intrinsically inimical to a scientific understanding of both history and human action in the world. It is also dangerous to the destiny of humankind (and by inference, to the workers’ movement). This Althusser insists, was Marx’s meaning.

*Strictly in respect to theory* […] *one can and must speak openly of Marx’s* theoretical anti-humanism, *and see in this* theoretical anti-humanism *the absolute (negative) precondition of the (positive) knowledge of the human world itself, and of its practical transformation. It is impossible to* know *anything about men except on the absolute precondition that the philosophical (theoretical) myth of man is reduced to ashes. So any thought that appeals to Marx for any kind of restoration of a theoretical anthropology or humanism is no more than ashes,* theoretically*. But in practice it could pile up a monument of pre-Marxist ideology that would weigh down on real history and threaten to lead it into blind alleys.*[[277]](#footnote-277)

This makes Althusser’s stance plain: any tendency to essentialise humanity (or ‘Man’) draws upon bourgeois ideology and has no place within Marxism – properly understood. This has consequences for the place of key terms within Marxism. Here Althusser highlights what he sees as the paradox of Hegel’s influence upon the young Marx. Despite Hegel’s historical idealism - his cosmology based upon the self-unfolding of the Idea into manifold reality – there is for Althusser an implicit materialism in the emergent nature of the subject, forever developing out of concrete circumstance, and never ‘forever-fixed’. Regarding the term ‘alienation’ there is no prior subject ‘that *is* alienated’ (*qua* Feuerbach; *qua* Rousseau); rather alienation precedes the subject constitutively as its motive force. It is the historical process itself that is the subject - animated of course by real men and women with all their subjectivities, but with no eternal *S*ubject. This then, and paradoxically, was Hegel’s real inheritance to Marx: the idea of the ‘process (history) without a subject’. It is also a notion that Althusser sees in Freud, declaring that it “underpins the whole of Freud’s work”.[[278]](#footnote-278)

Whilst Althusser acknowledges his debt to Freud, referring in one place to the ‘new continent’ that had been created by his work,[[279]](#footnote-279) it is the influence of Lacan in his theory of ideology that is most pronounced. Echoing Lacan’s Register Theory, Althusser tells us that, like the unconscious, ‘ideology is eternal’. By this he does not mean only that it transcends history and that it has always been with us, but rather that it is ‘everywhere’ and all encompassing, a kind of medium for all mental representations. Indeed, there is a double aspect to ideology for Althusser. Ideology is first the imaginary representation to individuals of their world, their conditions of existence. This is a familiar use of the word that describes the realm of religious belief, notions of order and natural justice, and so on. Although it is a realm that must always correspond to reality on some level, it is principally a sphere of illusion, mystification, and obfuscation of social relations.

*To speak in Marxist language, if it is true that the representation of the real conditions of existence of the individuals occupying the posts of agent of production, exploitation, repression, ideologization and scientific practice, and from relations deriving from the relations of production, we can say the following: all ideology represents in its necessarily imaginary distortion not the existing relations of production (and the other relations that derive from them), but above all the (imaginary) relationship of individuals to the relations of production and the relations that derive from them. What is represented in ideology is therefore not the system of the real relations which govern the existence of individuals, but the imaginary relation of those individuals to the real relations in which they live.*[[280]](#footnote-280)

The direct influence of Lacan becomes more apparent in Althusser’s second aspect of ideology; its material existence in the world. Ideology for Althusser is not just a matter of belief, an essentially mental affair. It is also a practical matter. In Althusser’s schema belief and action are interdependent. Citing Pacsal,[[281]](#footnote-281) he uses the example of the supplicant who kneels in prayer in order to believe. An ideology is a material practice that works within a world of rituals, obligations, and expected behaviours. Together these provide the ‘material ideological apparatus’ by which the individual exercises their belief as action-in-the-world. Ideology cannot exist in abstraction from human activity: and there is no other way it can work. Coming to his central thesis, whilst ideology can only exist for and through subjects, equally subjects must exist in and through ideology. Again, Althusser insists there is no Subject, and now no *subjects*, that can exist independently in abstraction from a specific ideology. The person lives ‘spontaneously’ in ideology; and ideology is constitutive of the subject, and *vice versa*.

Althusser further emphasises the pre-existence of ideology for the person. We do not choose our circumstances, of course. But more than this, in Althusser’s materialist thesis the ideologies that constitute the social world into which we grow and within which we conduct our lives, call upon us in many ways. With each beckoning we respond and in-so-doing become and confirm ourselves as subjects in that structure. This process is an ‘interpellation’. When a friend at the door says ‘It is me’ we answer in familiar fashion, when we bump into an acquaintance we greet one another with mutual recognition and when the policeman on the street calls ‘Hey, you there!’ we turn, not out of guilt, but out of a spontaneous understanding that the hailing is ‘for us’. And as we turn around, we become (once more) the subjects we are.[[282]](#footnote-282) This reality, of the subject’s insertion into the world, means that individuals are ‘always-already subjects’.[[283]](#footnote-283) The individual in other words does not create themselves; rather they are created and recreated as subjects by the ideological forces that interpellate them into a pre-existing social totality.

One consequence of this interpellated status of the subject is a distinction that follows between ‘the individual’ and ‘the subject’. The sense that the individual has of their own self-as-subject, that in some way belongs to them, is a delusion. This separation of the person and the subject brings us back once more to psychoanalysis:

*That an individual is always already a subject, even before he is born … is not a paradox at all. Freud shows that individuals are always ‘abstract’ with respect to the subjects they already are, simply by noting the ideological ritual that surrounds the expectation of a ‘birth’, that ‘happy event ’… it is certain in advance that it will bear its Father’s Name, and will therefore have an identity and be irreplaceable … It is clear that this ideological constraint and pre-appointment, and all the rituals of rearing and then education in the family, have some relation with what Freud studied in the forms of the pre-genital and genital ‘stages’ of sexuality i.e. in the ‘grip’ of what Freud registered by its effects as being the unconscious.*[[284]](#footnote-284)

Althusser is not here making the banal point that the neonate comes into the world through processes and structures they have not chosen. In fact, this entrance is a prelude to an ideological situation that will lay down deep and enduring foundations of identity, socialisation and thought. Here the presence of Lacan is explicit. We have seen that for Althusser (as for Lacan) there is no singular, fixed or eternal ‘subject’ that underlies either social or historical processes. But here we can also discern the influence of Lacan’s Register Theory in his explanation of the mechanisms at work.

In the pre-Oedipal phase of the child’s development interactions with others and crucially the Mother in the early years, create for Althusser, an ‘Imaginary’ realm. This phase (corresponding to Lacan’s Imaginary) precedes the Symbolic Order initiated by the successful resolution of the Oedipal Complex; so ushering social law into the behaviour and life-orientations of the young adult. It prepares the way for the Law of the Symbolic with a thousand ‘Yes’s’ and ‘No’s’, acceptances and rejections and the entire range of “*empirical* modalities of this constitutive Order”.[[285]](#footnote-285) With the entrance of this Order into the life of the person, also comes the Law of Culture. The process of enculturation revolves around an external Subject that lies in wait, intending to ‘centre’ the subject in their ideological world. The Subject, a construction that whilst public in form is also responsible for moulding (or, *qua* Lacan, ‘writing’) the unconscious, may be ‘the nation’, ‘the state’, ‘God’ *etc.* The process is also ‘speculary’ with a ‘mirror-structure’ by which the subject can recognise their own image (present and future) reflected in the Subject, confirming their absorption within it and guaranteeing their place in the Order it creates.[[286]](#footnote-286) Althusser characterises this logic of socio-cultural internalisation as one of a ‘quadruple system of interpellation’.

*The duplicate mirror-image of ideology ensures simultaneously:*

*The interpellation of ‘individuals’ as subjects;*

*Their subjection to the Subject;*

*The mutual recognition of subjects and Subject, the subjects’ recognition of each other, and finally the subject’s recognition of himself;*

*The absolute guarantee that everything really is so, and that on condition that the subjects recognize what they are and behave accordingly, everything will be alright: Amen –* ‘So be it’.[[287]](#footnote-287)

Lastly, the acceptance of the ‘order of things’ for which the Oedipal drama is responsible, also has sexualising consequences. In this process and its final resolution, the person becomes fully ‘male’ or ‘female’. In the Oedipal phase the child tests out its imaginary fantasies against the reality of the Symbolic Order that anticipates its arrival. The child’s realisation of the impossibility of their wishes to rival the Father for the Mother’s affections, become resolved into the assumption of the right to eventually have what Mummy and Daddy have: masculinity (and so feminine attention in the form of a wife for the boy; and femininity (and so masculine attention in the form of a husband) for the girl. So, the ‘ideological-fixing’ of the person to their social order is simultaneously one of ‘sexual-fixing’. Ideology is not only constitutive of the individual subject, it is also ‘sexed’ at its root.

**Modern currents**

*The strange return of vitalism*

For two decades from the early 1960s onwards, the work of Althusser provided the route into French Marxism for psychoanalytical theory represented by Lacan. From the early 1970s the work of Giles Deleuze and Felix Guattari can be seen as a counter-current – an ‘anti-psychiatry’ reaction - to that line of influence which, whilst drawing upon both Marxism and psychoanalysis, also critiques both traditions of thought; and in a most innovative (and on a first reading, confounding) fashion.

In their first collaboration, *Anti-Oedipus; Capitalism and Schizophrenia*[[288]](#footnote-288) (henceforth *Anti-Oedipus*) published in 1972, Deleuze and Guattari addressed themselves to central concepts within Marxist and Freudian thought. For their critique they drew these concepts out from their established theoretical domains and onto new terrain. From psychoanalysis, ‘desire’ was positioned as a generative force that pre-existed the individual subject or social group, pervading the social sphere. From Marxism, whilst ‘production’ retained its historicising status, concretely defining the social structure and its class-character, its use by Deleuze and Guattari led to the concept of ‘desiring-production’, representing a libidinal energy that moulds and flows through and across the social body. So, whilst ‘desire’ emanated from nature as a vital energy, the forms of production it encountered provided the social ‘machines’ (social formations) that sought to both restrain it and to channel it; inscribing it with historical meaning. Where this process fails, where connections between ‘desiring-production’ and the social machines that harness it break down, the outcome for the individual can be catastrophic. The result is the ‘schizoid’ state; or to give it its clinical title, the schizophrenic case. For Deleuze and Guattari this state has a special significance in providing a fracture through which deeper subject-creating processes at work can be observed. This they call ‘schizoanalysis’.

Apart from the vitalistic cosmology central to *Anti-Oedipus*, the work offers a theory of historical development. As a universal principle desiring-production has no particular form; it is a Spinozian ‘substance’, with no concrete modality. This, Deleuze and Guattari express as the ‘body-without-organs’. The ‘body’ in question acquires ‘organs’ as it emerges into a historical setting. In primitive societies, binding patterns of desiring-production are forged as totemic rituals, behaviours and ornament that tie the person and their group to the earth. The flow of desiring-production is territorial. With the rise of class, this social-material flow is disrupted and re-channelled away now from the earth. Instead, it is directed towards the patriarch, the ruler, or the despot. The social meaning created by desiring-production is mediated by systems of exploitation, and the person’s reliance upon them is sealed. This de-locating ‘de-territorialisation’ is taken to new levels by capitalism. Under capitalism a shift occurs from cultural codes that attach symbolically to a person (the despot) to abstract axioms of quantification. These provide the material basis for the calculus of investment and reward that governs the relationship between capital and labour. Desiring-production, harnessed now to the economic realm of exploitation, finds its only cultural outlet in the privatised individual and within the family, so recreating the modern form of the Oedipal dynamic identified by Freud.

In the second major part of their *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* collaboration, *A Thousand Plateaus,*[[289]](#footnote-289)published in 1980*,* Deleuze and Guattari apply these concepts once more, but now developed and differentiated with applications across a far wider range of topics traversing geology, linguistics, biology, and the political state, each constituting ‘strata’ of reality that operate and emerge under their own dynamics. With respect to psychoanalysis a largely negative critique is pursued in which the analyst is portrayed as a dictatorial figure, bolstered by a privileged position from which they can impose dominant discourses and ‘codes’ of interpretation. With respect to Marxism, whilst there are passages that suggest a formal adherence to some Marxist categories, their applications are unconventional. At issue for Deleuze and Guarttari is the very architecture of thought itself. So, whilst they explicitly reject psychoanalysis as an oppressive and reductive discourse, their attitude to Marxism differs in that some purposeful use is made of its concepts. This is true for instance of their discussion of the state in relation to labour in which we see terms such as ‘division of labor’, ‘labor power’, ‘labor flows’ and ‘surplus labor’ appear. In their wider discursions however, their uses of classical Marxist theory are skewed by the fact that Marxism is also a target of their critique, albeit more obliquely compared to their assault on Freud.

For Deleuze and Guattari, whilst both psychoanalysis and Marxism are ‘arborescent’ modes of thought, characterised by a tree-like structure that develops in a linear fashion, schizoanalysis and the broader account that they develop of how things come-to-be, is ‘rhizomatic’; conjuring up the image of an endlessly self-proliferating system of multiply-connecting generative points, without a beginning or an end, and without an organising centre. So, where Freud saw an id, an ego and a superego, Deleuze and Guattari see instead ‘plateaus’ of ‘multiplicities’ of ‘intensities’ (‘properties’) at the micro level of emergent reality that combine to create macro (or ‘molar’) level structures (or ‘assemblages’). To illustrate, in their discussion of the ‘Wolf-man’, Freud’s famous case in which he sees Oedipal significance in the dream-appearance of ‘the wolf’ as having a *representational* meaning (“It’s daddy”), Deleuze and Guattari point out that there are ‘many wolves’ in this dream, each with their own status and meaning for the dreamer. Their emphasis is on the empirical multiplicity, rather than upon the abstracted and, in their schema, artificial categories of interpretation imposed by the analyst (in this case, Freud himself).

*No sooner does Freud discover the greatest art of the unconscious, this art of molecular multiplicities, than we find him tirelessly at work bringing back molar unities, reverting to his familiar themes of the father, the penis, the vagina, Castration with a capital C ... (On the verge of discovering a rhizome, Freud always returns to mere roots.)* [[290]](#footnote-290)

*Freud tried to approach crowd phenomena from the point of view of the unconscious, but he did not see clearly, he did not see that the unconscious itself was fundamentally a crowd. He was myopic and hard of hearing; he mistook crowds for a single person.*[[291]](#footnote-291)

Although these authors are concerned with the micro-multiplicities which they insist are eclipsed by arborescent types of thought, they are also concerned with ‘macro’ reality. As assemblages work upon multiplicities that constitute the inchoate ‘substance’ (the ‘body-without-organs’) from which the modalities of the world are created, two major planes emerge: the ‘plane of consistency’ that exists as the realm of empirical multiplicities driving their cosmology; and the ‘plane of organisation’ of macro-structure, representing a transcendent realm of law and cultural coding. In keeping with their ‘rhizomic’ metaphor, Deleuze and Guattari reject the notion of the singular ‘subject’ that provides a central node around which the person’s sense-of-self become organised. Processes of ‘subjectification’ do occur; however, they do not conform to the model of the Cogito in which a stable Subject, the ‘I’, commands centre stage within the psyche. Their meaning is conveyed in a discussion of the Mexican magical cosmology of Being that revolves around the distinction between the *tonal* (the ‘day’ realm of the conscious self) and the *nagual* (the ‘night’ realm of the forces and animal-spirits from which it must be protected).

*The tonal seems to cover many disparate things: it is the organism, and also all that is organized and organizing; but it is also significance, and all that is signifying or signified, all that is susceptible to interpretation, explanation, all that is memorizable in the form of something recalling something else; finally, it is the Self (Moi), the subject, the historical, social, or individual person, and the corresponding feelings. In short, the tonal is everything, including God, the judgment of God, since it "makes up the rules by which it apprehends the world. So, in a manner of speaking, it creates the world." [[292]](#footnote-292) Yet the tonal is only an island. For the nagual is also everything. And it is the same everything, but under such conditions that the body without organs has replaced the organism and experimentation has replaced all interpretation, for which it no longer has any use. Flows of intensity, their fluids, their fibers, their continuums and conjunctions of affects, the wind, fine segmentation, microperceptions, have replaced the world of the subject … The nagual … dismantles the strata. It is no longer an organism that functions but a BwO that is constructed. No longer are there acts to explain, dreams or phantasies to interpret, childhood memories to recall, words to make signify; instead, there are colors and sounds, becomings and intensities (and when you become-dog, don't ask if the dog you are playing with is a dream or a reality, if it is "your goddam mother" or something else entirely). There is no longer a Self [Moi] that feels, acts, and recalls; there is "a glowing fog, a dark yellow mist" [[293]](#footnote-293) that has affects and experiences movements, speeds.* [[294]](#footnote-294) [[295]](#footnote-295)

This emphasis upon the disorganised realm of the *nagual*, with its ‘flows’, ‘becomings’ and ‘intensities’ (we might also say of ‘multiplicities’ on the ‘plane of consistency’) links the conceptual trajectory of *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus* with their political influence. Deleuze and Guattari see in the ‘State’, any state, an organ (an ‘assemblage’) that seeks to colonise these flows, to over-code them with prescribed and sanctioned meanings, making them safe. Whilst the ‘war-machine’ that is the free movement of resistance and opposition to all types of tyranny proliferates ‘nomadically’ across its fields of action and activity, the State works tirelessly to capture it, reterritorialize it and make it its own. The critique here is of ‘statism’ itself; whether of the political Right or Left. Insofar as the Left espouses any type of political state as being ‘the solution’, the endpoint, or even the ‘means-to-the-end’ it turns itself against the multitude that, by virtue of their sheer number assume the status of an overcoming and liberating force. The resonances here with the ‘Arab Spring’, the ‘Occupy Movement’ and other social movements that have been characterised by spontaneous organisational networks and social media-based modes of communication to great effect, are obvious. The works of Hardt and Negri (2000; 2004; 2009)[[296]](#footnote-296) for instance, were a major influence within the social movements against the institutions of global capitalism in the early 2000s. Against the unaccountable power of the few, they invoke the democratic potential of the ‘many’; working through decentred and networked movements; with a ‘swarm intelligence’;[[297]](#footnote-297) attacking their opponents from every side with unpredictable timing; and merging back into the landscape without trace. The influence of Deleuze and Guattari is evident and sometimes explicit.

The notion of ‘desiring-production’ is central to Deleuze’s and Guattari’s theory (especially in *Anti-Oedipus*), and justifies their inclusion in a study of the interactions of Marxism and psychoanalysis; as does the political influence their works have gained. Thereafter their conceptualisations stray so far from either of these traditions of thought – indeed, regarding their ‘arborescent’ conceptual architecture, rejecting them entirely - that there is a sense of having reached an endpoint for any further pursuit of our inquiry. For their treatment of psychoanalysis and of Freud specifically, they are better left under the ‘anti-psychiatry’ label where they are often found.[[298]](#footnote-298)

*Subject and structure*

There are two final figures we will consider for their relevance to the political interactions of Marxism and psychoanalysis: Slavoj Žižek; and Alain Badiou. In both cases, whilst their Marxist (or more correctly, in the case of Badiou, Maoist) influences are direct (with Althusser being a lodestone for both), their psychoanalytical inheritances have taken more complicated routes, both *via* Lacan. Each, however, in different ways, have as their principal project the restoration of the militant subject as a historical agent.

For Lacan the human subject was characterised by a ‘bar’ (*barre*), borrowed from Saussurean linguistics, that separates the signified object from the signifier representing it. In the Lacanian treatment of this relationship, the signifier is connected, not directly to the object (as in Saussure’s account), but rather to other signifiers in a chain that must be analysed to trace its object. In the socialisation of which this ‘chain of signification’ is constitutive, the suman subject is split, fractured into parts by a Symbolic Order that imposes itself *via* the structuring family processes of neonatal and early infant development. The outcome is a Subject that is defined by what it *lacks* (or cannot access within its unconscious), rather than what it *is*. This ‘lack’, inaccessible to the conscious subject, coincides with Lacan’s Real, residing stubbornly beyond symbolic organisation, and troubling the conscious Self with its uncontrolled effects. And so emerges a weak, divided and ineffective Self that is reliant on an authorising presence (the Father), that it hopes can provide symbolic completeness, to root itself in the world. It is from this starting point that Žižek sets out to restore the Subject to its previously central place in European philosophy, and in the concrete processes of real history.

Žižek, against the tide of late 20th Century and 21st Century Critical Theory and in characteristically idiosyncratic style, positions his work as a defence of the ‘I’ of the Cartesian cogito. His defence is of a Lacanian inflexion; drawing also upon Kant’s critique of Descartes in his discussion of the ‘Transcendental Analytic’ in the *Critique of Pure Reason*.[[299]](#footnote-299) In that critique Kant rejects the notion of a Subject that is separate from the objective world. Rather, the Subject is always attached to, mediated by, and expressed through an object. A consequence of this is that the subject can never confront itself in some pure sense. This impossibility does not stop the subject striving to know itself, to see itself ‘as it is’. The result is Kant’s ‘Empirical Subject’, the subject-as-object or more intuitively, the ‘Self’ that is the emergent construct from this struggle. However, tragedy awaits since the true Subject remains elusive, existing in the Lacanian ‘Real’, beyond the reach of the subject-as-Self that senses always what it cannot attain: that is a true self-image. So, the Subject does not stand alone and is never identical with the Self. Rather, in the ever temporally forward subject-object movement of existence, it represents a ‘turning-back’, a ‘looking behind’ on the part of the Subject, a ‘crack’ or ‘crease’ in the ‘universal field of Being’.

This striving of the Subject to know itself doesn’t occur in a vacuum, but in a social world. In Lacan’s cosmology, this is organised as a Symbolic Order. As the Subject moves through its world, it asks of others ‘Che voui?’ (‘What do you want?’). This question is fundamental to the infant’s social development as it begins to navigate and negotiate the wants and commands of its parents and older siblings. In this early life process, the signifiers constituting the symbolic structure of its world become internalised and incorporated into cultural codes and modes of behaviour. These come to represent the ‘Big Other’ that embodies the norms demanded by society and towards which the developing young child orientates itself. As it learns its place in the world however, the Subject experiences its own ever elusive nature as the Lacanian ‘lack’; the loss of *jouissance*. The object that it seeks, the full transparency of itself-to-itself, is now compensated for with a construct, an object that is inferred from the mystery of the Real that masks the Subject’s own creative agency from itself. This is the *objet petit à*, an object that eludes total capture; that is sublime to the Subject. This ‘sublime object’ becomes a metonymic representative of the *jouissance* that has been lost, but also the way the Subject seeks to secure itself in the world. Despite its opacity, it is a source of fascination and obsession, and its loss a source of terror. Žižek gives as examples of the *object petit à*, of the ‘sublime objects of desire’, God, ‘the king’ and ‘the nation’. For the Self they may include the sexual other, the precious object, the fetish; their ‘reality’ relying not upon their actual status in the world, but rather in the subject’s *belief* that they are real, and upon the performative subjective behaviour they demand.

*The subject is always fastened, pinned, to a signifier which represents him for the other, and through this pinning he is loaded with a symbolic mandate, he is given a place in the intersubjective network of symbolic relations. The point is that this mandate is ultimately always arbitrary: since its nature is performative, it cannot be accounted for by reference to the ‘real’ properties and capacities of the subject. So, loaded with this mandate, the subject is automatically confronted with a certain ‘Che voui?’, with a question of the Other. The Other is addressing him as if he himself possesses the answer to the question of why he has this mandate, but the question is, of course, unanswerable. The subject does not know why he is occupying this place in the symbolic network. His own answer to this ‘Che voui?’ of the Other can only be the hysterical question: Why am I [a teacher, a master, a king …]? Briefly: ‘Why am I what you [the big Other] are saying that I am?’* [[300]](#footnote-300)[Sublime Object of Desire p 125-6.]

The applications of insights from Lacanian psychoanalysis and German idealist philosophy to cultural and political analysis have been extensive and potent in Žižek’s prolific output. However, he insists in some of his most influential texts, that the ‘ontic’ (familiar experience) and the ‘ontological’ (the conditions of the possibility of experience) are separate realms and that the former cannot be derived from the latter. Despite this, in his discussions of types of political regime, as well as in his cinema critiques, there seems to be an affect from one to the other. The manipulations of the ‘sublime object’ by state regimes for instance, is illuminating for our understandings of the irrationalities of political behaviour. However, Žižek defends not only the Cartesian ‘I’, but also the ‘militant Subject’ that critiques, challenges and confronts the social limitations of the Symbolic Order. And so he reasserts the possibility of the Subject that breaches the illusory veil hiding it from itself, that approaches the truth lurking within the Real and that ‘traverses the fantasy’ so making the truly ethical act a concrete proposal.

*… what is so difficult to accept is not the fact that the true act in which noumenal and phenomenal dimensions coincide is forever out of reach; the true trauma lies in the opposite awareness that there are acts, that they do occur, and that we have to come to terms with them.* [[301]](#footnote-301)

Here he connects with a critical philosopher with whom he acknowledges an affinity: Alain Badiou. It is to the work of Badiou that we now turn.

Badiou like Žižek seeks to restore the Subject as an historical agent. However, Badiou’s Subject is quite unlike, indeed stands opposed to, the psychical human subjectivity that would be recognisable from traditional notions of Enlightenment thinking. Badiou’s Subject, far from being a substantive - or indeed human – presence in history, is rather a procedural moment in a larger historical logic. Some stage setting is needed using elements from Badiou’s philosophy of history for this to become comprehensible.

In *Being and Event,*[[302]](#footnote-302) published in 1988, Badiou fastens upon an ontology – a theory of *Being* itself as the condition of the existence of possible beings – that is grounded in mathematics. Commenting upon the replacement of philosophy by mathematics that this implies (and the resentments that result) Badiou suggests:

*The philosophical rancour originates uniquely in the following: if it is correct that the philosophers have formulated the question of being, then it is not themselves but the mathematicians who have come up with the answer to that question. All that we know, and can ever know of being qua being, is set out, through the mediation of a theory of the pure multiple, by the historical discursivity of mathematics.* [[303]](#footnote-303)

This ontology is based upon ‘the count’. In other words, ‘things that are’ become self-identified as a group and, in-so-doing, enter together into a category, or ‘set’, the singularity of which is called by Badiou the ‘Count-as-One’. In this movement, a multiplicity of things becomes unified into an ordered reality. It is by this ordering, this categorisation, that the world becomes something that has structure and, with the accumulation of other categories, or counts-as-one, a meta-structure. It is only with the emergence of structure that reality becomes accessible to our cognition, something that we can know; before structure, knowledge is impossible.

The question ‘What comes before’ structure (and therefore knowledge)?’ is one of great importance for Badiou. This realm that is ‘not structure’ and so unknowable, is not nothing. It is a realm of multiplicity also; but a multiplicity that is disordered, and so uncountable. This is, for Badiou, the ‘inconsistent multiplicity’, represented in his system as the unknowable ‘void’.

The void in Badiou’s system is mysterious indeed. If it is a domain at all, it is one that is beyond apprehension. A first reading recalls Kant’s *noumena* or perhaps even (and relatedly) Freud’s unconscious. These comparisons fail however, in that both constructs are indirectly knowable to us because they affect our conscious experience. This is not true of the void that exerts no such effects. A better comparison is with Lacan’s Real. Again, however there are limitations to the comparison. Lacan’s Real is not an empty space; it is full of signifiers that are yet to be brought into the Symbolic Order. Badiou’s void does not ‘contain’ signifiers in this sense: it is empty of signifiers which are after all already identified as such within our cognitive frame of reference. The void is much more fundamentally an ‘absence’ without substance or meaning: an ontological ‘black hole’ that we can never know. It is from this void however, that the ‘Event’ emerges.

It is Badiou’s Event that establishes the *a*historicism of his ontology. In contradistinction to Hegel - whose *Weltgeist* united historical eras and episodes in a striving towards a final World History - or Heidegger - for whom Being as movement in time constituted a concrete ontology of life – Badiou’s Event erupts from the void unannounced and unconnected with what has been before; its radical novelty is the meaning of the historical rupture that it constitutes. It is ‘the new’ that destroys all previously held certainties, demanding a new sense of the world.

The Event disrupts all previous structures as well as all prior notions: it is a moment of Truth, where before there had been only ‘knowledge’. Here Badiou’s commitment to the possibility of Truth, in opposition to the Nietzchian and post-structuralist fashion for epistemological scepticism, is clear. An advocate of the unified, abstract and clear formal concepts of Plato’s logic, and an enemy of the Parmenidean empirical ‘many’, and its applications across a range of perspectival, epistemological and ethical domains, Badiou in iconoclastic style, cuts across post-modernist scepticism, to assert a commitment to ‘what is’ regardless of ‘what appears to be’. That said, the Event, and the structure that it creates, must be ‘named’ to come into being. In other words, it must be identified as something new. Here a degree of arbitrariness applies, in that the new structure must be decided upon; a ‘decision’ is required as to what is to be the ‘one’ that is ‘Counted-as-One’. The radically new character of the Event and its structure, means there is nothing within the previously existing situation that can be used to identify and name it. The naming is always ‘against the grain’, and seen as non-legitimate; an ‘illegal move’.

Despite its radical singularity however, upon its arrival the Event simultaneously makes a demand upon the past, as it retroactively claims what has gone before to insist for itself a historical meaning. It creates a new sense of place and time, a new situation, and a new knowledge in its wake.

All these moments occur if the Event is ‘authentic’. Badiou distinguishes between the authentic Event and the false event. The authentic Event is the event that brings forth the completely ‘new’, without prior cause or rationale. Though it will claim upon the past retroactively for its meaning, it does not rely upon the past for its existence. Events that Badiou sees as authentic in real history include the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution. However, Hitler’s seizure of power in Germany and the burning down of the Reichstag, was not authentic in Badiou’s schema. The rise of the Nazis in Germany did not in fact usher in ‘the new’. Rather, it intensified the already existing processes of capitalist exploitation and persecution. The same criterion applies to the four domains into which the Event can erupt: politics; aesthetics; science; and love. For each of these domains, the Event is a ‘truth procedure’, self-sufficient in its revelatory power and independent of philosophy.

It is the question of the nature of the subject in history however, which is important here. Here Badiou’s position can be seen as a form of classical structuralism. Similarly to Althusser, his teacher at École Normale Supérieure, Badiou is adamant that all traces of humanism be banished from a philosophy of history. We have already seen that the undifferentiated and substantial ‘I’ of Cartesian philosophy has been jettisoned. The ‘subject’ far from being expressed as the personal and self-aware actor in history, is now the ‘formal procedure’ of historical episodes and processes.

*Of course, the link between truth and the subject appears ancient, or in any case to have sealed the destiny of the ﬁrst philosophical modernity whose inaugural name is Descartes. However, I am claiming to reactivate these terms within an entirely different perspective: this book founds a doctrine which is effectively post-Cartesian, or even post-Lacanian, a doctrine of what, for thought, both un-binds the Heideggerean connection between being and truth and institutes the subject, not as support or origin, but as fragment of the process of a truth.*[[304]](#footnote-304)

This means that the subject is no longer the human agent operating with conscious orientation, albeit through a haze of ideological distortions and politico-cognitive inversions. Now it is seen as ‘not-human’, the sum of its interventions at key historical moments. So, whilst Robespierre ‘the man’ will be seen within conventional historiography as a significant figure and, as a person, more than worthy of biographical treatment, for Badiou it is not Robespierre that represents the subject in history, but rather ‘Jacobinism’ itself along with the Terror, the rise of the *sans-culottes*, and the Convention of 1793. It is the formal and de-personalised aspects of these historical elements that matters.

Badiou identifies three ‘dominant determinations’ of the subject to which he counter-poses his own notion of the ‘formal procedure’. These are: the familiar version of the subject as a ‘register’ of conscious experience; the ‘inter-subjective’ subject that is a ‘category of morality’; and the subject as a fiction by which an ideological state apparatus (*qua* Althusser) calls the individual into existence by its interpellating command.[[305]](#footnote-305) For Badiou, the historical subject is not identified by its personal or peculiar characteristics, but its function with respect to the truth of the Event. It is not the person, with their motivations, biography, strivings and so on, nor the historical group or party with their traditions, organisational forms, or social origins, that is of interest. The subject is instead understood formally, as a rare occurrence in its self-aware form and as an operation that exists in relation to the truth of a historical process – to which it is ‘sutured’ - acting to herald its coming into being, to obstruct its emergence or to obscure it.

*… we can present the figures of the subject right away, without yet possessing the means to think the effective or concrete becoming of a historically determinate subject, which in order to be thought requires a description of the body that functions as its support. We call this presentation of figures, which is indifferent to corporeal peculiarities, the formal theory of the subject. The fact that the theory of the subject is* formal *means that ‘subject’ designates a system of forms and operations. The material support of this system is a body, and the production of this ensemble – the formalism borne by a body – is either a truth (faithful subject), a denial of truth (reactive subject) or an occultation of truth (obscure subject).*[[306]](#footnote-306)

So, whereas we might wish to protest that episodes in history are unimaginable without the people who made them, Badiou would only reply that these people (in their historical moment) are in fact the *result* of the historical Event that calls them into being, and that as a Subject together they are the necessary formal subjective side of impersonal and non-human chains of events. In their historical role their humanity is not relevant; they exist *for their history* as the interventionist structure they represent.

Finally, this structural intervention that constitutes the subject, must occur against the fixed and limiting local-spatial context of the situation that is overturned by the Event. Whilst *l’esplace* (the ‘space-place’) of the situation is fixed and rigidifying, *hors-lieu* (the ‘outside-place’) represents the movement that overturns it. This distinction is important for our understanding of Badiou’s historical subject. For example, the working-class is a socio-economic construct that belongs in its *l’esplace* as a socially static and historically inert object. Only as the proletariat, the revolutionary subjective procedure that accompanies the Evental revolution, do workers break down this rigidity as the *hors-lieu* that overcomes all spatial limitations.

**Returning from ‘Marxisms’ to Marx**

We have taken here a historical rear-view mirror view of the interactions of Marxism in its broadest sense, and psychoanalytical theory also in its broadest sense. Our timeframe has not been defined by publishing activity alone, but rather by the meaning that this type of theory has had for social movements, working class struggle and historical periods in which the possibility of human liberation has been tangible, or conversely tragically unattainable. We have seen in some detail how for each phase in which psychoanalytical theory has found an audience and a readership within movements of the left, often it has met political needs not adequately met by the available ‘Marxisms’ of the time.

The diminution of the role of, and by extension the liberation of, the person as a properly theorised possibility in a political and historical vision of wider social transformation, is one crucial aspect of this problem. It results from the absence of a fully conceptualised framing of how the individual is constructed in their world. And yet at the philosophical roots of Marxism the elements of such a theorisation exist. It is these roots we will next explore, moving towards the Marxist model-of-mind we need, and which Marx’s early work makes possible.

**Part III. Towards a Marxist model-of-mind**

Finding the mind in Marx

Marxism emerged from the crisis of Hegelian philosophy, and as a result is rich with psychological themes. Indeed, the psychological mechanisms in Marx’s theorising of ideology in the 1840s – inversion, mystification, and universalisation – are comparable in theoretical status to those of Freud’s theorising of neuroses and dreams in the early 1900s – with processes such as condensation, displacement, *etc.* and with Herbart’s non-libidinal structural ‘repression’. They are inferred from observed phenomena: historical analysis in the case of Marx; neurotic symptomologies and dream narratives in the case of Freud; and ‘introspective technique’ in the case of Herbart. That one set of mechanisms belongs to the analysis of history, one (merely) to the therapist’s surgery, and one to empirical psychological is secondary. All are aspects of different observational understandings of the human mind.

Marx did not develop an explicit model of the human mind in the way of structure, or underlying articulation. In one sense this flows from his methodological starting point: the ensemble of social relations. Instead, Marxism begins with the whole of society and works back to the individual as an endpoint, the final node of a chain of social causalities. However, without a general model-of-mind the processes by which external social factors become integrated into the interior life of the individual to create a personal mind cannot be brought into focus. Social effects can be finely traced and applied for the comprehension of real events and personal dramas, of course. And this is the substantive character of much left-leaning sociological work. However, without an account of the psychological mechanisms that internalise the influences entering the mental life of the individual, the forces that create the emergent human mind in its concrete aspects remain unresolved in analyses of social phenomena and historical change.

There are recurring questions and controversies within Marxism that are connected to this enduring issue. Adequately explaining the power of ideology to create deep mental rivers of irrationalism that fly in the face of reality, is one example. Fully accounting for the external and internal drivers of human sexual behaviour and gender, is another. Understanding the nuances of mental illness and individual pathology is yet another. Yet, attempts to provide answers in these areas that rely on ‘complexity’ can act as a cover for this theoretical lacuna; and shallow appeals to a ‘dialectical’ take on things, evasions of the concrete matter at hand.

Historically this issue has also been at the root of a fissure within Marxism itself, causing a bifurcation into two ‘Marxisms’: one that emphasises objective economic and structural causalities that are external to the individual; and another that emphasises instead the role of subjective agency and historical decision. Each historical iteration of these conundrums and impasses revolves on the missing ‘third term’ - the model-of-mind that is difficult to locate within Marxism. The elements required for the construction of a model-of-mind however are present within Marxism at its philosophical roots. The job of making explicit this otherwise implicit construction, is helped by a conceptual reworking of the theoretical element of ‘repression’; a factor that is foregrounded in psychoanalysis, but unused it its psychological sense by Marx.[[307]](#footnote-307)

This use of repression to explain the formation of mind works at the level of ‘strategy-for-survival’ as the individual grows towards their destiny within their ‘total society’. The emergence of personal identity within a community is one aspect of this, as some potential characteristics are eclipsed and pushed out of consciousness as possibilities for the person, whilst others become established as dominant, socially successful and rooted in personality: gender being one important example of this. The operative processes here, revolving around questions of strategy and survival, constitute a kind of materialism – ‘social materialism’ – that involves the repression of risk-prone possibilities for the person.

**Risk, the mind, and ‘social materialism’.** Orientations towards the world involve assessments of risk, both existential and social. The imperative demands of survival, whether in body or in social role and position, entail navigations of treacherous terrain and strategies for the avoidance of harm and social threat. These in turn are premised upon decisions that are defining for the individual as much as for the group; so, forming primary strategies of social organisation and personal identity. From these, secondary and tertiary strategies emerge, that form the substance of group socialisation, familial interaction, and daily coping for the individual. Where some strategies become dominant, along with their accompanying behavioural modes and identifications, others that are incompatible with these must be repressed. The management of risk for the purpose of survival and success for the individual in their allotted social role, is a ‘social materialism’ that connects materialism at the historical scale with the creation of the personal mind.

The use of ‘repression’ here is already different from its Freudian usage. The emphasis here is upon its socially strategic aspect, acting as a regulatory mechanism within the social group, rather that is, than its role as an individualised defence against traumatic memory. It is also now temporally different, insofar as it is future oriented, rather than being focused upon the person’s historical pain.

The result is a type of mind that is premised upon the eclipsing of entire ways of thinking, believing, and feeling, and its appearance to its owner as natural. And the psychological material that is repressed need not have been entirely extinguished, but rather may exist as a residual element that whilst lost to the person’s conscious mind, remains to create conflictual tensions and anxieties that are unfathomable to the person themselves. Finally, this mode-of-mind must derive from a more general model-of-mind that operates over and above its particular social context, and in a way that links effectively to materialism at the historical scale.

**Transactions of the mind**

The first step towards a Marxist model-of-mind must be to position ‘mind’ as a historically relative phenomenon. For this, we are helped by Marx’s discussion of the co-dependence of capitalist ‘production’ and ‘consumption’ in the essays of the *Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*: the *Grundrisse* (1857-8).

Marx sees production and consumption as two moments in a cycle of economic activity; moments that mediate one another, and that are co-determining. Whilst production in an obvious sense creates the goods that will take their places upon the capitalist market, it is consumption that gives them their ‘destination’. Without consumption the product of labour is inert, an object without meaning. So, whilst production creates the object, it is consumption that creates the commodity.

The distinction between production and consumption affects the human being as much as the commodity itself. Whilst in their labour - occupying their place in a capitalist chain of production - the individual is a worker, their role as consumer is positioned instead outside of productive processes. In their consumption they are a member of a community, part of a faith-group, a citizen (assuming a democratic polis), and so on. They are a person; impoverished, exploited and oppressed perhaps, but a person, nonetheless. And the consumer does not consume in a vacuum; rather, their consumption is contextual and is mediated socially, culturally, geographically, and ideologically. Moreover, consumption happens through a unit-of-consumption, that is reflected with tedious regularity today in advertising tropes. It may be the individual but is just as likely to be the young couple or the nuclear family. Within the logic of capitalism, consumption provides the domain in which the personal self is constructed.

Consumption is also transactional. Of course, there is the ‘corner shop-model’ of the relationship between the purchaser (the consumer; the private individual), and the seller (the supplier; the shop-worker), with a shop-counter between them. In reality of course, the ‘private’ individual is manipulated by a very public retail industry; and the ‘shop-worker’ is a proxy for the company that exploits them, and that has the major share in the price of the product at the end of a long chain of production and transportation. We should also add that the ‘counter’ is just as likely today to be a screen on a smartphone. But it is the *transactional* character of the relationship that is important, regardless of setting.

This transactionalism seeps into every aspect of our experience within the realm of consumption. In the most intimate area of human experience, sexual coupling, transactional interactions abound. Once the closed rural communities of late feudal society had been ripped apart, uprooted, and scattered by the enclosures of the early capitalist era, people have had to purchase the opportunity to meet. Beyond the workplace (important of course) there has been ‘the dance’, ‘the fair’, ‘the outing’, ‘the lonely-hearts page’ and so on. Today, there is the nightclub, the 18-30 holiday, and the dating-site. Whilst some may hold out for the romantic encounter whilst walking in the park, the reality for the great majority of people is that meeting one another is an activity that generates a profit for someone who isn’t there. And if the goal is to finally arrive at something stable, that works for the longer term, then the transactions involved go to new levels of entanglement, financial commitment, and indebtedness, as the successful couple take up their given role as a functioning unit-of-consumption.

This world of transactions is a difficult terrain, and the psychological contortions and alienated emotional states involved in navigating it are harmful to health and happiness. At every turn, human relating within capitalist society is mediated by commerce, ownership-relations and possessiveness. This is one explanation for the sub-cultures and alternative identities that emerge as strategies of avoidance of, and refuge from the unattractive prospect of consumption in the mainstream of capitalist society. The daunting challenge of conquering the obstacle-course that is the pathway to personal enjoyment of another, and fulfilment in a life of mutual endeavour, requires learnt knowledge and social skilling that for most begins in the second and third decades of life.

In this short-hand account of the coupling game, there is something to emphasise: its historically specific character. The description just given of course reflects the way of things as they emerged in the late Twentieth Century and early Twenty-first Century in western capitalist societies. For a fuller picture we would have to factor in changes to family structure, demographic change, cultural trends, human migration, *etc.* In each phase of such a historical timeline, changes in socialising structures, new types of livelihoods and widening cultural spaces would influence the strategies available for personal survival and success. Shifts have occurred from rural extended family structures to the familial anarchy of the early industrial era, to the urban nuclear family of the first decades Twentieth Century, through to the breakdown of that family type and the rise of increasingly work-oriented family formations of the later Twentieth Century, and on to the diversified family types of today. Each has provided strategies of gender and coupling that are either dominant over others suppressed by society and - for most - repressed out of consciousness, or that are emergent, escaping from under dominant strategies that previously eclipsed them.

All aspects of a mental structure are connected to its era. This means that where we talk about a *mode*-of-production, and a *mode*-of-consumption, we must also talk of a *mode*-of-mind that, whilst it is made possible by a general model-of-mind (or capacity-for-mind), is nonetheless historically specific. This will bring us shortly to a central component of our general model-of-mind: the dialectic-of-self.

**The variable mind**

Before a discussion of the dialectic-of-self, we will consider the variability of the human mind. That the human mind *is* highly variable is a truism. It is a familiar enough observation in geographical and historical comparisons of human culture. However, what is proposed here is that the variability of the human mind is limitless.

How can we understand such a claim? To do so, we need to consider more than the outward, phenomenal aspect of the mind, its manifest expression in social behaviour. Rather we require a hypothesis about its fundamental character. For that, we will describe the mind (and necessarily also the brain) as having self-organising totipotency. This means seeing the mind as something that can create its own operative rules, the principles by which it regulates itself, and psychical systems underlying conscious mental processes. The mind then is meta-logical, able to reconfigure not only the obvious processes of thought, but also the modes of thinking that make them possible within forms of rationality. The logic and systems of mind can themselves be altered, replaced, and jettisoned; or equally promoted into dominant mental forms, relegated to subordinate ones; or ‘folded’ within other logics and systems into densely organised psychical structures. There is also the mind’s propensity for abstraction from experience, interpretation, and symbolism, as well as its ability to resolve mental paradox by higher reasoning. The capacity for such variable patterning, recursion and parallactic arrangements in the assembling, disassembling, and reassembling of mental content is the basis, not only of human intelligence, creativity, and scientific thinking, but also of the structural flexibility of the mind in a historical sense, and of human adaptability itself. It also means that the range of conceptual possibility far exceeds the material possibilities of a human environment; this imaginative redundancy beyond practical tasks finding expression in religious ornament, artistic fantasy, scientific hypothesis and symbolism; this being also the meaning of ‘limitless’ in this context.[[308]](#footnote-308) Moreover, we can infer types of variability that defy available linguistic description; ‘the mind’ then constituting a ‘front’ that can move ahead of conscious expression. Finally, there is the ability of the mind to *fix* its underlying structures into the stable and enduring systems of thinking, cultural habit, and emotional regulation that we recognise as cultural-historical types, and psycho-mimetic symbolic representations of reality existing at the pre-conscious level. In other words, we must understand the general capacity of the human mind to create a historically specific *mode*-of-mind.

There is an affinity here between the ‘limitless variability’ of the human mind, and the notion of the ‘radical imagination’ found in Castoriadis’s schema. For Castoriadis the radical imagination is a source of primary mental representations that go beyond the ‘ensidic’[[309]](#footnote-309) (or ‘typical’) logic of normal conscious reasoning. In this formulation, beneath the structural aspects of the mind and the forms of thought that mirror the social interactions of the person in their world, there exists a creative spring of conceptualisations – a ‘magma’ of formless mental fluidity - that gives mind a general creative autonomy, so enabling it to produce those specific forms.[[310]](#footnote-310)

Moving once more to historical context, the character of a mode-of-mind for each type of society, and the forms of thought that constitute it, is a matter of anthropological and archaeological investigation. Marx was certainly interested in this topic, as his studies of non-capitalist societies found in the hundreds of pages of his *Ethnological Notebooks* testify. At the most general level we can identify cyclical modes of thinking as compared to linear, object-related forms of knowledge compared to abstract and transferable types of reasoning, ways of thinking rooted in place compared with those associated with movement, and so on. In the ancient world for instance the notion of change at the centre of the prevailing cosmology was different from our own. So, in 4th Century BC Greece peoples’ sense of ‘future’ was essentially repetitive and did not stray far beyond agricultural cycles.[[311]](#footnote-311) And the mental ‘temporal scheme’[[312]](#footnote-312) of a society affects, not only culture but also cognition. The fact that the astronomers of ancient Greece believed the heavens to be timeless and unchanging meant that they did not record (did not ‘see’) extraordinary stellar events such as supernova and new comets, that were observed in other parts of the world.

We can also identify different kinds of human relationship that are the social aspect of the mode-of-mind of a type of society: ‘relationships’ with ancestors;[[313]](#footnote-313) inter-generational relationships; sex and gender relationships; kinship relationships; self-society relationships; and so on. What any one of these modalities presupposes of course are capacities for it to emerge and become fixed into an enduring mental type.

**Historical brain; prehistorical brain.** There is an important distinction between the ‘pre-historical brain’; and the ‘historical brain’. The brain has changed over time. However, for this statement to purposeful we must be clear about the spans of time we mean, and therefore also the rates - and types - of change. For example, over durations of millions of years we can see from the casts of skulls in the pre-historic record that the brains of our Hominidae ancestors evolved language and speech centres essential to the emergence of human social organisation. We know also that the cerebellum, the region of the brain that controls the sensory and motor functions essential to tool-making and -use, has expanded over hundreds of thousands of years. However, these sorts of gross structural change, essential to the general capacity of the brain for higher mental functions, are different to the changes involved for instance in the learning of specific tasks, habituation to specific environments and enculturation within specific communities. The latter will occur in the pre-frontal cortex – the site of higher reasoning, abstract thought, and personality - over spans of time that define the life courses of individuals and the inter-generational histories of communities. This latter type of change represents the changing brain in its historical sense. Such changes may well involve changes to neural networks, with variations of local brain function responding to external pressures, material influence, or repeated stimulation. They are nonetheless changes that occur over relatively short, non-evolutionary, periods of time.

When the modern form of mind came into existence is a subject of debate. Evidence of complex behaviour exists in the material record of Sapiens settlement sites from around 100,000 years. A leap in innovation appears along the coast of southern Africa at around 77,000 years with decorated ostrich shells, jewellery, ochre, and the use of glue. Complex speech within Sapiens groups is also present by now. And there is evidence of complex behaviour and possibly symbolic thought in the Neanderthal record in the form of aesthetic manufacture,[[314]](#footnote-314) tool decoration and at funeral sites.[[315]](#footnote-315) It may be that the general model-of-mind that characterises modern human beings came into existence during the Upper Palaeolithic period, between 35,000 and 45,000 years ago.[[316]](#footnote-316) By this era, the Archaic Human Neanderthals and Denisovans have disappeared from the archaeological record; and we are looking now at an exclusive Sapiens record across Asia, Africa, Central Europe and Australia. We see over this small window of archaeological time a ‘creative explosion’ or ‘Transition’ evidenced by the advanced character of ritualistic and cultural artefacts at the excavation sites of this period*.*[[317]](#footnote-317) The parietal art of the caves of Tuc d’Audoubert, Chauvet and Lascaux for example, depicting abstract patterns,[[318]](#footnote-318) petroglyphs and therianthropes,[[319]](#footnote-319) as well as hunting scenes, uses types of symbolic expression that we can recognise as non-literal, as opposed to being simply object-base. The emergence of symbolism and decoration will in turn have created the possibility of gendered identity for individuals within these early human gens, linked also to differentiations of social and productive roles for the effective survival of the group.

The relative abundance of artefacts containing artistic decoration that transcends the technical skills required for hunting and tool-based manufacture found in the archaeological record of this period, suggest a leap in human cognitive capacity. We do not know the neurophysiological cause of this leap. One hypothesis comes from Steven Mithen’s ‘cathedrals of intelligence’ model.[[320]](#footnote-320) Here, the ‘chambers’ of the cathedral represent different types of intelligence: technical; linguistic; social; and natural-historical. Before the Transition, goes Mithen’s argument, these chambers were blocked from one another, with no communication between them being possible. At some point, and probably many, the neurological door-less walls that had separated these chambers came down, unleashing cascades of connections and pathways, releasing in turn new waves of generalisable intelligence, creative expression, and inventive ability.

Whatever the neuro-physical basis of this shift, the changes involved and therefore the biological (brain) substrate created made possible new orders of variety in human technique, socialisation, and cultural formation.[[321]](#footnote-321) It is the radical variability of the human mind that makes possible the dialectic-of-self that in turn creates, and continuously recreates, the mode-of-mind of a society. It is this general property that allows the historically specific mind to come into existence.

## Dialectic-of-self and the role of ‘repression’

We have seen that for Marx conscious human labour relies upon a dialectic that creates an awareness of self. As the task of labour is envisioned, the self, orienting towards its end-goal, the product of the work-to-be-done, comes to see itself as an object. Thus, the self duplicates itself in thought as it performs tasks in the world. It is the result of the mobilising and internalising of social and technical skills, social and cultural orientations, empirical and theoretical knowledge, and forms of belief, interpretation, and ideology.

This is the social character of labour in a specific historical context. It is the origin of self-consciousness as the human subject becomes a person in their culture. It is also pivotal for sexual identification as early realisations about economic and social destinies (and the consequences of failure) take on the gendered aspects special to each; gender again understood as having strategic meaning for technical function, family position and personal bonding.

Again, there is an outward resonance with Freud’s account of mental processes. In *The Ego and the Id* (1923), Freud had proposed the process of introjection by which the ego internalises an object of its desire, to have and to own it within itself, within the psyche. This introjection of the object into the ego, comparable to Hegel’s ‘real within the ideal’,[[322]](#footnote-322) forms the basis of gendering attachments in Freud’s discussion. Abstracting from it, we can see a process of greater significance, as something that commands also social and emotional regulation in the world, enculturation, and personal equilibrium; a mechanism by which the individual finds stable ground for the purposes of survival, social bonding, and temporal orientation. Freud’s concern however, is not only with the desire to possess, and its regulation, but also the person’s need to *be*; their tendency to *become* therefore forming an identity in an autopoietic process of ego-idealisation.

The similarity of these two accounts at first is striking. It appears that a dynamic that Marx recognised in human labour, Freud recognised in gendering processes. As the human subject pushes out into the world, it incorporates representations of external reality into itself in a process of internalisation-introjection: for the purpose of labour in the case of Marx; and the purposes of coupling and attachment in the case of Freud. In each of these accounts, the result is a separation of a subject (Marx) or ego (Freud), into a self-conscious subject or a superego, respectively.

We can see it in this way: the ‘subject’ internalises the world simultaneously as it reaches out into it, whether as an infant developing cognitively during normal growth, or as an adult working upon nature. In the process an objectification occurs creating a ‘subject-for-itself’ by which the human subject comes to regard itself, and to know itself. It is the ‘intended self’ towards which it strives. The ‘I’ produces an ‘I*o*’ (‘*o*’ for ‘object’). The mechanism involved is necessarily historical, a relativising process that employs the culturally mediating artefacts to hand as it internalises productive and social technique. It is the site of mediation. It also represents a gendering process as the adolescent begins to intuit their future place in their society, and the social strategies needed if they are to succeed in the transitions required of them. And it is infused with ideology; all the mediating factors being culturally and socially specific and riven with contradictions and internal tensions that inevitably affect personal development and the dynamics of the social group.

**Language, repression and culture.** Many important theorists of human consciousness, and especially of the relationship between brain and mind, have focused upon language to propose ways in which sensory perception and cognitive apprehension of the external world is represented in the mind, to then emerge as symbolic thought, identification, and reasoning. Freud’s concept of ‘word-sense’ for example reflects this concern. The Marxist psychologist Lev Vygotsky especially, accorded language acquisition a central mediating function in the incorporation of culture in the mind and life of the developing child. Language, understood as a primary means of enculturation, may also provide a ‘fixing mechanism’ by which some strategies of risk management and survival that become dominant by the repression of others cognised as less reliable or more risk-prone, are cemented into the social constructions that give solidity to social aggregations and total social structure.

However, there is a central difference between the Marxist and psychoanalytical understandings of the process involved. For Freud, drawing upon the non-dialectical notion of ‘repression’ found in the Herbartian conceptual framework, it worked in a mechanical fashion, pushing down unwanted mental content into a psychical mass, this then forming the sedimentary content of the unconscious.

With a Marxist lens however, we can resolve ‘repression’ differently as one moment in a more complex dialectical process that results in a *transformation* of this material into something new. To understand this better we can take a detour through the Hegelian master-slave dialectic of the *Phenomenology of Spirit* that influenced Marx’s early theorising about subjectivity and history.

From the Kantian standpoint Johann Fichte in his 1795 *Foundations of the Science of Knowledge* [[323]](#footnote-323) had suggested a groundless, ‘self-positing I’ that counterposed itself to the external world – including other selves - as its limit. In Hegel’s system however, the emergence of self-consciousness would be seen as involving an interpenetration of the consciousness of the subject with that of other subjects in an essentially historical process. So, in the *Phenomenology* of 1807, in a section called ‘Self Consciousness’, Hegel traces the logic of a primordial encounter between two conscious selves. Each recognising the self-consciousness of the other, they *vie* for dominance in an existential struggle in which one emerges as dominant – the master – and the other as subordinate – the slave.[[324]](#footnote-324) Now the slave in bondage must sustain its master, doing its bidding, providing for its appetites. In this first moment of a developing dialectic the master is unaware of this relationship as one of dependence. The slave however, becomes increasingly aware of its productive capacity and comes to realise itself through its own creativity and nascent power. The master, its existence a hollow sham of dormant creativity and unrealised potential, comes to sense its reliance upon the work of its slave. In this state the two co-exist in a historical relationship, each growing in awareness of the truth of their relationship.

In his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* of 1844 Marx discusses and critiques this dialectic. Whilst for Hegel the movements involved are those of thought, for Marx they are the result of social reality. And the transformations involved are those of the slave’s work-upon-nature, the products it creates the result of material processes and of labour; and those products now alienated from them by the exploitation they suffer. Moving towards the revolutionary logic that would develop throughout his life-works Marx sees the root of this alienation in the form of private property itself, and in the very existence of capitalism. This logic Marx would take to its conclusion in *The Communist Manifesto* of 1848, with its call for the overthrow of capitalism and the end of all property relations.

At the heart of this dialectic is the concept of ‘sublation’ (‘Aufheben’), capturing the transformative character of this dialectic. Sublation here has both a negative and a positive meaning. So, whilst the sublated object is eclipsed, suppressed or negated, its essence also remains to become something new and resolved into a ‘higher’ unity with the forces that opposed it in the external world. The process is a dialectical one of destruction, preservation and creation. So, in the master-slave dialectic, the suppression (the ‘negation’) of the slave (the worker), becomes the origin of its emerging power to overthrow (a second ‘negation’ of the first ‘negation’) it’s master (the capitalist) in a historical move that resolves these dialectical tensions towards a higher realm of freedom for both. The transformations involved in these historical negations then usher in the era of communism.

And once more we return to our model of mind, but now with ‘repression’ understood differently, not merely as a negative defence mechanism against a hostile world, as in its Freudian sense, but also as transformative, and closer in meaning to ‘sublation’ in the Hegelian schema. It is now seen as the destructive moment in a more complex dialectic that also creates new manifests that come to the surface of the personal psyche in the hosts of feelings, expressions and orientations with which we began our journey of inquiry. Whether these are pro- or anti-social, fulfilling or dangerous, happy or tragic, is a separate question, and would depend on the contingencies and circumstances of the life of that person. They would also depend on the times of the person, the historical movements that shaped them, the social trends of their generation and the spaces for liberation they experienced. But the meaning of ‘repression’ has changed, the processes involved no longer the cause simply of a static sediment of forgotten trauma. It is now the cause of a creative unconscious producing personal feelings, social meanings and symbolic associations that daily influence the mind of the individual in ways they do not immediately comprehend.

Here there is a further change from the Freudian libidinal ‘repression’ we earlier considered. The repressive moment that occurs in the mind of the person striving to survive in their world, framed in the categories of the Hegelian roots of Marxism, is no longer a simply a mechanical step as understood in the Herbartian-Freudian paradigm, but is now both a non-libidinal and a transformative dialectical force. And whilst Freud did move to symbolic theory, he was never able to theorise the connections between the individual and larger society, trapped as his thinking was within an individualised Kantian framework and limited by the mechanism that continued to lurk in his thinking; his efforts to explain history lapsing always into mythic romanticism.

We have departed now from the psychoanalytic theorisation of repression by four orders. Firstly, our Marxist understanding of repression is primarily social in the sense of being strategic for the survival of the person in their social group; opposed that is from its theorisation as an essentially individualised intra-psychical defence mechanism. Secondly, and relatedly, it is a process by which the person anticipates the tasks ahead of them and the challenges they face; different therefore to being focussed upon the distress and personal traumas of their past. Thirdly, repression in our model is not primarily about sexual or gendered identity (although it is relevant to each of those); unlike its use in the Freudian framework, it is non-libidinal. And fourthly, it is one moment in a complex dialectic that involves transformations of repressed mental content, new combinations of ideational material and symbolic reworkings that reemerge with new expressions and meanings in the conscious life of the person; as opposed to a mechanical force that holds down and keeps troublesome mental content ‘out-of-mind’ in an irredeemably negative fashion. In our Marxist model-of-mind repression, as a mechanism of orientation and personal regulation within the social group, is part of a complex and transformative dialectic that produces an unconscious that is creative, playing an important role in the vast possibilities of the Sapiens mind for productive technique, cultural expression and varieties of gender and personality type.

The dialectic-of-self we have traced here, understood as a mediated process of activity and personal change, is close to Vygotsky’s theorising of the acquisition of the ‘psychological tool’ in the development of the child or young person. Distinguishing this from the ‘technical tool’ by which the person works upon an external object, Vygotsky emphasises the total alterations of internal mental state and behaviour that psychological tools introduce as the developing person achieves self-regulation to become effective as a producer and social actor.

*The most essential feature distinguishing the psychological tool from the technical one is that it is meant to act upon mind and behaviour, whereas the technical tool, which is also inserted as a middle term between the activity of man and the external object, is meant to cause changes in the object itself. The psychological tool changes nothing in the object. It is a means of influencing one’s own mind or behaviour or another’s. It is not a means of influencing the object. Therefore, in the instrumental act, we see activity towards oneself, and not towards the object.*[[325]](#footnote-325)

These calculations of risk and survival involved represent a contextual social materialism, embedded within a more general historical materialism.

And finally, there is Vygotsky’s insight into the role of language in enculturation, and of ‘the word’ as the mediating artefact (of a special type) incorporating the symbolism and abstract thought by which the subject becomes a self-aware person, whilst simultaneously fixing the outcome of the dialectic-of-self as a stable social construction.
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I = The self, experienced as ‘I’

I*o* = The intended self, experienced as the ‘objective I’

Where this cycle is completed, where the I*o* ‘returns’ to the I, the process is one of ownership of self by the subject, of labour by the producer, of fulfilment, and even of liberation. Where this cycle is blocked the I*o* cannot return; it is externalised, owned, and manipulated by another. The result is exploitation and arising from this an alienation of the personal self, experienced in the realm of consumption, from the objectified self, lost now in the realm of production.

Moreover, this cycle, whether completed as personal fulfilment or frustrated in an alienated failure of fulfilment, also involves cognition: so, the person ‘sees’ the cycle in which they are enmeshed. How they see things will be a matter of interpretation: they may see things as they really are; or they may see things through an ideological lens that distorts their understanding. And such interpretations will influence assessments of risk, calculations of success and survival, the strategic choices and behaviours that emerge; and the associated identifications that are either foregrounded as dominant or are repressed.

With this last point we move from a theoretical framework to an ‘empirical self’, that does not remain obediently within our categorical boundaries. This placing of the personal self within the mode-of-consumption does not mean that the person’s experience as a producer is not also involved in the formation of their mind, identification, and outlooks. The world of work can be and often is a major influence upon outlooks, attitudes to life and personality. However, it is in their role as consumer that their personhood is socially-intended - and *pressured* - to develop. In work, the role of personality and ‘mind’ understood as authentic self, is suppressed to one degree or another. It is the tension this creates for the self in their roles within each domain, that provides the field of forces in which the empirical self emerges, either in flight from the world of work into identifications of family, region, religion or pastime; or as an embracing of work in identifications of vocation, profession, individual advancement, or trade union commitment.

**‘Differentiated social determination’.** ‘Social determination’ itself is a familiar enough term of Marxist social analysis, based upon the tracing of external structural causes for mind-sets, social orientations, cultural beliefs and so forth. However, the idea of social determinations of different orders, some being more or less obvious, or more or less opaque than others, is less so. So, whilst outward social causes of internal affective states can be recognised and analysed as such, causes that become internalised or introjected to create a substratum of determinations within the life of the person, whilst they have their origin in external social processes, can work as hidden forces that are experienced as ‘natural’. The concept of ‘repression’, familiar in the psychoanalytical tradition, helps make this comprehensible as an alternative to the naturalising tendencies of dialectical biology when it is applied in discussions of human consciousness.

In Freud, ‘repression’ is an explicit factor in personality formation. The repression of traumatic experience in his model-of-mind creates the ‘system pre-conscious’ - a sedimentation of mental material that remains as an active and disruptive psychological presence. This model began with studies of neurosis and Freud’s conceptualisations, and his terminology reflects this. However, detached from its original conceptual ecology, this construction suggests a realm of internal social determination that, whilst it is opaque to the conscious mind, creates psychological expressions that enter the person’s consciousness as transformed mental content that had been previously repressed, and is something they experience as a natural part of themselves; the rootstock of personality.
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***r***= Repression

***sd i*** = Internal social determination

The historical nature of Marxism means that it can go much further in its application of repression as a psychological mechanism than Freud’s use of it, limited as that was to the individual. For Marxism, it supports a proposition; a mechanism by which a general model-of-mind can produce a specific mode-of-mind. This involves a reworking of the idea of ‘repression’ itself. Freud’s use of it is intrinsic to his *libidinal* model of the human psyche, and an unconscious rooted in early sexualised childhood trauma. However, that is merely one historical example of this dynamic, describing aspects of a particular family form. Repression, (now our ‘repression-transformation’) along with the unconscious that is its consequence, can be understood as a more fundamental psychical mechanism that makes possible many types of unconscious, and many forms of consciousness. It is no longer seen as essentially libidinal. Moreover, whereas for Freud repression provides an account of how painful experience is shut-out by the mind, for a Marxist model-of-mind that acknowledges also its creative potential it can explain how a mode-of-mind can become embedded; in other words, it can help us explain the historical structuring of the mind.

The word ‘repression’ itself comes with the caveat that it may not properly describe what happens. The suggestion that something is actively ‘pushed down’ into a structure (that both Herbart and Freud called the unconscious) is only one way to hypothesise the mechanism involved. It may be that our phenomenon is in fact an aspect of memory.[[326]](#footnote-326) The mechanism may be a failure of integration of mental material, or perhaps a differentiation or gradient of degrees of integration of different types of mental material. Troublesome repressed mental content then would be the result of incompatibilities with other mental content in memory, or conflicting logics. This would also lead to the existence of a stubborn residue of unresolved, unintegrated, and forgotten (or half-forgotten) mental conflict, as opposed to a more structural notion with its suggestion of a metaphorical locked basement.[[327]](#footnote-327)

However repression works, as the mind engages with the world it learns through its calculations and navigations how it must organise itself. If all contents of mind are indeed intentional and outwardly oriented, including those arising from strategic imagination, this means the creations of the human mind will compete with one another for dominance. Just as one strategy will preclude another, so there will be irreconcilable possibilities for mental structure; some necessarily becoming repressed into a domain of submerged internal social determination, *sdi*. (*‘i’* for ‘internal’) Simultaneously, an ideal-self will separate out in a process comparable to Freud’s ‘ego-precipitation’ by which the ego-ideal appears, and by which identity becomes established. This ideal self, the I*i* (‘*i’* for ‘ideal’),becomes the site of personal and group identity, infused by ideology, so cementing the person’s relationships with others and positioning them in the social totality. Moreover, the I*i* will vary in its relative social weight, cultural importance, and influence in the person’s life, depending upon the type of society and its culture, they were born into, and through which they have grown and developed.
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ΔI*i* = The culturally relative ideal ‘I’

By a combination of conscious apprehension and realisation, and the unconscious repression of risky, unfeasible, and dangerous modalities of mind, one will become established as optimal for survival; this being the most basic aspect of the ‘materialism’ of historical materialism. This is the set of external and obvious social determinations arising from the modes of production and consumption that define a society; and that also historicise its specific mode-of-mind.
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Although the true complexity of the structuring of the mode-of-mind will bring us to a limit where language fails us, still we can sketch some of the contours to its variability. We have already outlined the role of the mode-of-consumption as a historicising factor, and its consequences for the formation of the personal mind. And we have considered a dialectic-of-self and the role of repression within it.

There are two further processes that organise the cultural variability of mental formation. Firstly, there is the range of forms of internalisation and introjection of the objects of the world, their groupings into mental complexes, and the ‘foldings’ and organisation of these mental representations into systems of intra-psychical structure; and the symbolic meanings they bring with them from external culture. Secondly, there is the axis of ego-identification that defines a mode-of-mind. This means the creation of the I*i* from the I as it interacts with society, and its degree of importance in its society; its relative social weight. So, within mainstream western consumer experience, capitalism works to position us as individuals detached from any collective society, with all the alienations, vulnerabilities and neuroses that follow from such a construction. It does so imperfectly and competes with other more collective identities that are part of the realities of class, culture, and community. Nonetheless ‘the self’, experienced in its consuming role, is a powerful psychological force in our lives. This contrasts with societies in which the I*i* that stands alone hardly occurs. Indeed, the absence of ‘individuality’, experienced as something separate and non-collective in many types of society, has been well-documented in numerous anthropological studies.

**The reality of the mind**

Recognising the variability of the mind is not the same as a jettisoning of the self as something real. B. F. Skinner, in *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*,[[328]](#footnote-328) casts the notion of an interior self as a relic of medieval notions of vital forces and animal spirits. For theoretical purposes, the positing of ‘inner man’ (*sic*) for Skinner achieves no more than a filling of explanatory gaps; an analytical dead-end. In the pursuit of an account of human behaviour that uses only externally observable traits, he recommends that we shake-off the ‘autonomous man’ within, living on in the ‘literatures of freedom and dignity’.

*His abolition has long been overdue. Autonomous man is a device used to explain what we cannot explain in any other way. He has been constructed from our ignorance, and as our understanding increases, the very stuff of which he is composed vanishes. Science does not dehumanize man, it de-homunculizes him, and it must do so if it is to prevent the abolition of the human species. To man* qua *man we readily say good riddance.[[329]](#footnote-329)*

Another influential version of this rejection of an authentic human self is found in Daniel Dennett’s *Consciousness Explained*. Dennett subjects the idea of ‘mind’ itself to a sustained critique in favour of replacement by a computational model of mental processes. Dennett rejects *tout court* the Cartesian Theatre; a focused self that controls the psychology of the person and orients them in the world. Instead, cognition and what we experience as ‘consciousness’, is the result of ‘multiple drafts’, internal narratives that rival one another. Moreover, in this framing there is no ‘Central Meaner’ that can adjudicate between these competing drafts. Those that become dominant by continuous testing and re-testing against reality (recalling Skinner’s Operant Conditioning), emerge as winners that achieve a metaphorical ‘fame’ as they organise our mental horizons. In the spirit of Ryle, Dennett says that what we experience as ‘mind’ is no more than the end result of a process of Narrative Editing in which the mental representations we believe to be our own creations, are in fact the end-product of a chain of events in the brain. Dennett’s position is an ‘eliminative materialism’ that rejects the concept of consciousness itself, making it an effect of material events of which we are not, and cannot be conscious. ‘The mind’, for Dennett does not exist as a coherent theoretical construct, nor indeed an existent entity.

What these philosophical dismissals of ‘the self’ and ‘the mind’ – and, by implication, ‘the subject’ (for Marx), and ‘the ego’ (for Freud) – have in common is an underlying philosophical mechanism that defines them. A mechanistic paradigm seeks to establish the brain as the cause of all mental processes. So, an idea, a mental representation, an emotional state, must each be explained by the electro-chemical events and neuronal pathways associated with them. The causal logic travels from brain to mind, or what we *experience* as mind. Moreover, within this way of seeing things, for a mental phenomenon or psychological trait to be treated as amenable to objective study and worthy of scientific analysis, it must at least in principle be locatable as a structure or an event in the brain. If is not, then it does not exist, except as a psychical deception or an illusory artefact.[[330]](#footnote-330)

Whilst no Cartesian dualism of material and mental substance is suggested here, there is a reversal to this logic that is being proposed as an alternative (and better) conceptualisation. This has two aspects: causal direction; and absolute and relative ontological status.

First, the matter of causal direction. We have already seen that in this mechanical model brain is posited as the cause of mind. This is taken to be axiomatic and incontrovertible. However, it is not. We can also say, that ‘mind is the cause of brain’. This may seem a casual abandonment of materialism, and a wild jump into idealism. Again, it is not. Mind is of course something that *happens* in the brain, and that cannot exist without billions of neuronal ganglia, connections, and pathways. Indeed, with each advance in neural imaging and electroencephalography we come to have an increasingly detailed understanding of the ways in which brain structure and function enables and animates the general capacity for mind. Roaming glial cell for instance, once thought to be of secondary significance, and as having an auxiliary function to the important work of the neurones themselves, are now understood to contribute to human intelligence.[[331]](#footnote-331) Brain activity is now also known to display non-linear, ‘fractal’ dynamics that may account for the possibilities of creative thought, imagination and the swiftness of our mental responses to changes in our immediate environment. Consciousness itself may be distributed throughout the brain, rather than occurring in a structural centre.[[332]](#footnote-332) And it may be that the interactive dynamics of consciousness and ‘the unconscious’ in the Freudian sense, is enabled by the neuronal networks that have been observed connecting the pre-frontal cortex to the amygdala-limbic system within the deep structure of the brain.[[333]](#footnote-333)

However, this steadily improving picture of how the brain works continues to leave open the question of the location of the causes that drive neuronal processes. The causes of the nervous pathways associated with social behaviours – their growth and their moment-to-moment activity – still need not reside in the brain itself. In this sense we have not progressed from the point that Freud reached when he abandoned the mechanistic scientific paradigm for symbolic theory.

In rejecting neuronal ‘mechanism’ as a paradigm, we instead locate our explanations of the specific aspects of consciousness in society, in the social interactions of the person, mediated by their memories, identities, tastes, biography, culture and so on, and those of the others with whom they share a social world. If this, we call ‘mind’ (perhaps ‘outward mind’) - something that happensin the higher cortex of the brain under the stimulus of social interaction (its cause) - then we can hypothesise its role in moulding the deeper processes of the brain into structures that become fixed as our historical mode-of-mind (perhaps ‘inward mind’). Linguistic processes may then play an important role in fixing these constructions into a stable mental architecture. However established, they are then active in the continuous processing of the stream of information constantly entering the person’s experiential and perceptual fields. And so, the social structure into which the person grows, the instruction they receive, and the learning that results provide the creative impetus towards enduring cognitive and affective systems. From this vantage-point, it is ‘mind’ (the cerebral-cortical correlates of conscious social life) that is the primary cause of the deeper neural structuring of the brain in its historical context; and not the other way around.[[334]](#footnote-334)

Second, the matter of ontological status. In the Dennettian model, only the neuronal events that produce the mental processes we call ‘mind’ are substantively real. The ‘drafts’ that compete with one another for dominance have an agency of their own that does not require any supervening consciousness to function. What we call our ‘mind’ then, is no more than an effect of the underlying processes that are doing the thinking, responding to stimuli, and navigating in the objective world that we believe (falsely) our ‘selves’ to be doing. We are zombies; complicated zombies, but zombies nonetheless. We do not steer ourselves in the world, we are steered; we do not think, we are thought. Such a robotised (and nihilistic) account of human consciousness results from the idea that for the mind to exist it must do so as a distinct entity that can be identified and located within the brain, and that can be positioned as a prime cause for subordinate mental processes. This is a mechanistic notion. But again, there is an alternative way of looking at things.

Returning to the distinction between the general capacity-*for*-mind and a particular mode-*of*-mind, the brain obviously provides the capacity for a mind to come into being. This is something that can be – must be – conceived structurally, and explored with empirical, neurological study. A particular *mode*-of-mind however, belongs and is specific to the social and historical context that has produced it. In its adaptations the elements that comprise mind in this model – I, I*o*, I*i,* sd*e*, sd*i*, *etc.* – have variable weighting to one another. So, the sense-of-self as something separate from society (I*o*) for example, Skinner’s ‘autonomous man’, is not the pretender to a structurally constant anthropological throne; a fraudulent homunculus to be exposed. Rather it is historically variable, and in some types of society may barely exist. It has a *relative* ontological status. Furthermore, it need not be a ‘thing’ in a neurological-structural sense at all. Within the radical variability of the mind, it can be a *functional* centre that emerges through memory as a mode from the regularity of decisions, influences, worldly actions and reactions, desires, and ambitions of a real person in a concrete social setting.

‘Mind’ then, understood in its singular sense, comes into being as an attribute of general mental activity through a dialectic-of-self. It need not be a structural centre, but instead an ordered patterning of higher cortical processes; these may be structurally unique to the individual in-so-far as the radical variability of brain allows for many and various neuronal pathways to achieve the same systemic result. Whether many or few, these cortical processes produce a foveal minds-eye that views the world from a central vantage point as a part of a social group, or simply as an individual. This active precipitate of a life experience within a given culture so becomes the real ontogeny of the person, understood as an authentic self with agency, rationality, and moral perspective.

**The historically relative ‘I’**

Whilst the self is a powerful factor in human behaviour within a marketised capitalist society, it is not a historical constant. Indeed, it is sometimes something that is largely absent in the cultural traces left by early human societies. Marx and Engels in their later writings commented upon the ‘primitive communism’ of pre-capitalist clan and tribal societies. Examples could be found in archaeological evidence around the world. Engels particularly traced the cultural and sexual-pairing rituals of these communal, ‘gentile’ societies in *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*[[335]](#footnote-335) of 1884. Highlighting the suppression of common ownership by the rise of capitalism and imperialist powers, Engels wrote:

**The mind, the self and repression.** A ‘model-of-mind’, assembled from the key conceptual elements of Marx’s historical theory is enhanced by the psychoanalytical concept of ‘repression’. The key elements then are the following: ‘mode-of-consumption’, framing the domain in which subjective ‘experience’ is constructed separately from formal economic identity, and so providing the basis for a *personal* self; a ‘dialectic-of-self’ found in Marx’s early texts, drawing upon key Hegelian concepts; a historically relative and variable concept of ‘self’ (or ‘I’) found in Marx’s *Ethnological Notebooks*; and a notion of social determination differentiated between the ‘external’ and the ‘internal*ised*’. Such a general model must be both sufficiently transferable across the vista of human historical and cultural contexts to maintain its theoretical validity, and sufficiently pliable to explain any given cultural formation, particular mind-set, or social behaviour. In other words, from a general *model*-of-mind, we must be able to derive a *mode*-of-mind that is historically specific.

*It prevailed among the Germans, Celts, Indians — in short, all of the Indo-European peoples in primeval times; it was only recently suppressed by force in Ireland and Scotland, and although it is dying out, still occurs here and there in Germany today.*[[336]](#footnote-336)

The absence of individual or even family possessions in such societies points to a mode-of-mind free of the elevated ego characteristic of the self under capitalism; and so quite different to our modern-day experience of ourselves.

However it is configured, a mode-of-mind, with varying degrees of separation of individual identity from the collectivism of the tribe or clan, *etc.* must be ‘fixed’ into an enduring operational structure, embedded at an early stage of individual development, in order to internalise, introject and idealise correctly the material and cultural objects of the group. The mode-of-mind, once established, will align the child, the adolescent, and the young adult successfully towards their social position. It belongs to the type of society that it serves.[[337]](#footnote-337)

**A Marxist model-of-mind: the basic elements**

To summarise, we can hypothesise a Marxist model-of-mind using the following elements seen as axes along which different aspects of the human mind can be mapped.

1. A specific **mode-of-production** and aco-dependent **mode-of-consumption** determine the historical field within which mental structure develops.
2. Mental structure emerges as a **mode-of-mind** that belongs to a concrete historical and social setting.
3. That a specific mode-of-mind can be derived from a general model-of-mind is the result of the **radical variability** (and adaptability) of the human mind.
4. This radical variability makes possible a **dialectic-of-self** by which the individual develops their ability to labour upon the world, and simultaneously to become a part of their society.
5. One aspect of this dialectic-of-self is the limitless range of ways in which the material and cultural objects of the natural and social environment can be **internalised**, **introjected,** and **conceptually** **organised** by the mind, in the process producing the ‘subject-for-itself’ (I*o*).
6. A further aspect of the dialectic-of-self is **identification** as the ‘ideal I’ (I*i*) emerges and splits from the subject (I); and the relative social weight of identification as a ‘separate (asocial) individual’ (ΔI*i*), against the ‘collective (social) individual’.
7. As the person develops into their material and cultural world along these axes, they come to master **symbolic meaning** through the medium of language, moving from object-related understanding and communication to more abstract thinking and self-identity.
8. **Inner speech** that precedes fixed word-associations, symbolic structure and social communication provides a fluid substratum of meaning (a metaphorical **semio-plasm**) beneath formal and codified speech, culture, and behaviour, so enabling the mode-of-mind to happen.
9. The creation of a mode-of-mind with a social structure of internalisation-introjection and identity-formation, leaves a sediment of mental material caused by **repression**, continuing to work as a force in the life of the society and within the person; it represents an area of **differentiated social determination** existing beneaththe more explicit influences of a society and its culture, and one that is opaque to the individual and their group.

The Marxist model-of-mind can create different structures of mental life – modes-of-mind – that fit different forms of society, that are organised along lines of object-internalisation and identification. It is trans-historical in its general capacity to create the mode-of-mind; and historical in any of its actual modalities.

# **Part IV. Biology’s exit and the final bow for ‘Nature’**

## Dealing with ‘Nature’

Our model-of-mind has implications for issues that have been, and are today, topics of controversy within Marxism and in social movements. These have often touched upon questions of ‘nature’, and by implication the position of biology within Marxism. Three are of particular interest here. ‘Is there a human nature that plays a role in social formation and behaviour?’ ‘Are there individual pathologies that are to some degree heritable?’ And ‘Do explanations of gender and sexuality within Marxism require a biological element to be included?’

We will address these next in the light of the model that has been described, with the intention of dispensing with biology entirely, as the model-of-mind offered here now allows us to do. Finally, we will reflect upon how the role of repression in our model-of-mind creates the possibility of the return of submerged traditions of resistance at moments of urgent historical decision.

**Humans *and* nature**

Interest in the interaction between humans and nature is evident in the earliest publications of Marx and Engels and continues through both of their lifeworks. In *The German Ideology* (1845) they contrasted their own understanding of this relationship to that of Ludwig Feuerbach who had counterposed nature to the human being, making it something external to human activity. For Marx and Engels this was not the case. Rather nature was worked upon and changed by human activity, by industry. Forests became sources of timber; rivers sources of power; grasslands became grazing pastures or arable land; *etc.* Nature became transformed by human labour. Only in the remotest zones could nature be said to exist untouched by human activity. But more than this, in the process of working upon nature, human essence itself became transformed. In other words, as humans worked upon nature, changing it in the process, they also changed themselves. So, whilst the entire history of human industry was envisaged as nothing but the ’humanisation of nature’, it was equally understood as the ‘naturalisation’ of human essence. The conceptualisation of ‘human nature’ here was not the notion of fixed and unchanging being, but one of constant conditioning and alteration throughout history, contingent upon the types of industry prevalent in any given epoch. As Marx was to put it later against Proudhon:

“ … *all history is nothing but a continuous transformation of human nature* …"[[338]](#footnote-338)

And whilst external nature and the natural endowments of human beings provided the conditions of survival, setting the limits of human possibility, the type of society that was specific to any concrete setting was the result not of interior or exterior nature, but rather of the form of labour which had created it. Unlike Feuerbach, Marx and Engels did not see an absolute opposition of humanity and nature; humans had emerged *from* nature, changing both it and themselves simultaneously. And crucially, once again, this meant there was no intrinsic human essence - biological or otherwise - that was separate from the capacity of human beings to work upon the world or from the process of labour itself.

An illustration of this for their general anthropology is given in Engels’ 1876 essay, ‘The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man’, part of the larger work *Dialectics of Nature* first published in 1925. As we have seen, Engels hypothesised a developmental dialectic between the challenges and opportunities presented by nature for species survival, and the adaptive power created by the evolution of the human hand: a dialectic driven by, and simultaneously expanding, the emergent capacity of humans to work upon and so change their environment.

Both Engels and Marx were interested in the scientific progress of their time. Engels particularly kept abreast of the latest advances, and Marx acknowledged his debt to him for his scientific knowledge.[[339]](#footnote-339) Both were enthusiastic about the revolution in biology represented by the publication of Charles Darwin’s *Origin of the Species* in 1859, and Pierre Trémaux’s *Origin and transformations of man and other beings* in 1865 that anticipated the modern evolutionary theory of ‘punctuated equilibrium’. Significantly, both saw these works as representing an ‘end of teleology’ in theorisations of human pre-history that had implicitly suggested a determinism of ‘natural development’, whether understood as external and environmental or internal and bodily. This naturalising tendency was evident in the ‘progressivist’ philosophies of the Victorian era. By contrast the emphasis in Marx’s published writings particularly was based upon a dialectic *between* human society and nature, such that transformations of social being occur with changes in the character of labour.

However, whilst nature provides the conditions of human labour, it is not the driver of social and behavioural change. It is the capacity to *work* upon nature that is essentially human, and labour (not biological factors) that produces changes in social being. Such changes then arise from revolutions in productive technique and industry rather than emerging under the influence of biological factors, evolutionary pressures or necessary historical stages.[[340]](#footnote-340)

Putting this differently, whilst humanity at every stage of pre-historical and historical development of necessity interacted with external nature, meaning that nature was *reflected* in culture, and culture in nature, the *essence* of a human society – the necessary social forms and relationships that sustained the group – were not determined by this interaction. Rather this was the result of the form of labour and productive technique central to the group’s survival; with divisions of labour shaping the social, gender and class relations particular to that group. So, a pre-settler North American community that relied on a vegetarian diet and the cultivation of crops such as the Choctaw would develop a quite different social structure and internal culture to another that relied more on hunting and the cooking of meat such as the Apache. Despite the comparable technological capacities of each, the social relationships would vary, reflecting the very different forms of labour involved: the Choctaw having a clan-based hierarchical social structure, a centrally defined leadership and a culture of collectivism; the Apache having a more family-band based social structure, a decentralised leadership and a culture of individual-merit. Seen in the light of this distinction, the essential character of ‘human being’ does not arise from the interaction of ‘biology’ as one set of factors that interact with ‘society’ as another set of factors in a kind of amalgamation. Rather, it arises from the mode-of -production upon which it depends and that creates the ‘ensemble of the social relations’ that defines it, working as the fundamental causal principle shaping social structure and behaviour prior to and beneath other material and cultural influences; this being the meaning of ‘essence’ in Marx’s definition.

And for Marx the relationship between humanity and nature was not one of immediate contact. The interaction is constantly mediated by labour, nature always presenting a practical horizon that both obstructs and constructs our perceptions of the world and of our own human essence. Whilst there could be no unmediated knowledge of nature, equally there could be no pure contemplation of the self. For both Marx and Engels this was an anthropological principle that characterised the entirety of human history for as long as human existence was dominated by the struggle for survival, and within the realities of class society.

Furthermore, under capitalism, whilst labour was an alienation of the worker from their labour power and its product, human *essence* – the transformative potential of creative labour – was separated from human *being* in its concrete social manifestations, and in the life of the individual. This alienation also had its corollary in the relationship between humanity and nature. The emergence of capitalist property relations, and as a direct consequence the enclosure of land and the commodification of the fruits of nature, represented a break of human beings from their natural environment. The ‘metabolic’ interaction between humans and nature had been severed, resulting in an estrangement from their environment in social relationships now dominated by commodity fetishism, and the despoiling of nature through the exhaustion of soil by intensive farming for markets, and voracious extractive capitalist industries and their waste products.

*Capitalist production collects the population together in great centres, and causes the urban population to achieve an ever-growing preponderance … it disturbs the metabolic interaction between man and the earth, i.e. it prevents the return to the soil of its constituent elements consumed by man in the form of food and clothing; hence it hinders the operation of the eternal natural condition for the lasting fertility of the soil.*[[341]](#footnote-341)

For the capitalist the original state of nature was a matter of pure indifference, the object of nature valued only for its contribution to the creation of the commodity. With each round of increasingly intense capitalist competition the natural world became ever more separate from the social form of production (alienated labour), valued only as a source of power and raw materials. Furthermore, the ruination of natural environments and the destruction of ecosystems could only worsen under capitalism, and with it the debasement of human relations now subject to the predations of capitalist exploitation of both the individual worker and of nature’s gifts.[[342]](#footnote-342) Only in revolution and the establishment of communism would human essence be reunited with social being, and people with nature, as humankind achieved full actualisation of its potential as a creative species and a free historical subject.

But it is the status of the idea of a ‘human nature’ with respect to social behaviour that concerns us here; in other words, the question ‘Are the social forms that organise relations between humans the result to some degree of a fixed anthropological character, given by an unchanging natural principle found in all human societies?’

**Is there a ‘human nature’?**

In his 1983 publication *Marx and Human Nature. Refutation of a Legend*,[[343]](#footnote-343) Normal Geras took Marxists to task where they maintained that Marx had rejected the idea of a ‘human nature’, pointing for their evidence to the sixth of his *Theses on Feuerbach*.

Marx’s sixth thesis runs as follows:

*Feuerbach resolves the essence of religion into the essence of man. But the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In reality, it is the ensemble of the social relations. Feuerbach, who does not enter upon a criticism of this real essence is hence obliged:*

1. *To abstract from the historical process and to define the religious sentiment regarded by itself, and to presuppose an abstract — isolated - human individual.*

*2. The essence therefore can by him only be regarded as ‘species’, as an inner ‘dumb’ generality which unites many individuals only in a natural way.*[[344]](#footnote-344)

Geras conducts a thorough secular exegesis to establish that this does not mean a rejection of the idea of human nature. He points to other passages across Marx’s works that refer to natural and enduring human characteristics. Whilst recognising the emphasis Marx places upon social relations in shaping human behaviour, Geras insists upon his acceptance of an unchanging, nature-given set of attributes that belong to human beings in any given time or place. And he finds a normative value in the idea of human nature: a measure against which capitalism can be judged and condemned; and a way that socialism can be defended as a goal worthy of effort.[[345]](#footnote-345)

Despite Geras’ defence of a Marxist notion of human nature, the term is at best unhelpful for our understanding of human experience, and at worst is obfuscating. ‘Human nature’ is of course commonly used to ridicule the idea of socialism as a possible state of human affairs and organisation. Humans are naturally selfish, it is said, each seeks personal advantage over others, and they are naturally acquisitive, so making nonsense of the idea of a free and equal society. This wearisome usage of the phrase won’t detain us here; it is an argument dispatched daily by socialists in the normal course of their activisms and personal lives. In recent years however, a version of the idea has lurked beneath public controversy around questions of gender; and crucially the matter of self-identification by those who change theirs by declaration.

Before we look at why the notion ‘human nature’ is unhelpful for our understanding of human sex, sexuality, and gender, we will lay out the terms of this debate and their meaning.

*Human nature: terms of the debate*

By the term ‘human’ we are referring to the highly intelligent, tool-making Homo species of the Homininae family that evolved into existence in Africa at some point between 90,000 and 160,000 years ago, to then migrate into Europe and the Middle East, and on into Asia, Australia, and the Americas over the subsequent decamillennia. This is the species from which *Homo sapiens sapiens* was to emerge, the species we know to be ourselves.

By the term ‘nature’ we mean aspects of reality that have not been created by human action. Such reality is the ‘given’ element of the external environments human beings have adapted to. This reality moves under physical, chemical, and biological principles, independently of human action. We do not mean here the effects of human action on the environment that they alter, but rather to an underlying material substrate. Whilst human beings can and do affect nature by their activity, they cannot create it; so, whilst plastics can be created by a natural product (oil), the chemistry involved is something that is fixed and unchanging (despite the best efforts of the alchemists from the Greco-Roman era to the European Renaissance).[[346]](#footnote-346)

And by ‘human nature’ we mean the idea that there are aspects of interpersonal behaviour that are historically unchanging, that we inherit from our evolutionary past and that are constitutive, in some sense at least, of what it is to be human; aspects that are wholly or partly, genetically determined.

*Human nature: what might it mean?*

Geras’ logical exposition of the ‘sixth thesis’ is very clear. The thesis is indeed prey to the possible interpretations that he lays out, that whilst Marx heavily emphasises the role of social factors in determining the essence of humanity, this does not preclude non-social factors *per se*. As he moved away from the dominant philosophical paradigms of his intellectual youth, Marx distinguished his own thinking on this point. Many of the great names of the European Enlightenment such as Jean-Jaques Rousseau, Johann Herder and Georg Hegel had tended strongly towards historicising discourses that understood all-things-human in terms connectedness; interconnections that is of the individual and their society, of identity and mythic pasts, and of the nation and its culture. In this Romantic Historicism, the brute reality of human need and means of survival was eclipsed, whether understood as a theoretical starting point or destination. It was against this ‘historic*ism*’ that Marx would come to contrast his and Engel’s ‘historical *materialism*’.[[347]](#footnote-347)

Geras gives examples where Marx uses expressions such as a ‘nature of man’ or a ‘natural essence’ and so on, even if just in passing. He presents certain features as coming under the rubric of ‘human nature’, understood not as transformational potential, but rather as fixed and universal aspects of the species. We can evaluate these from the most basic material conditions for life, through to those that affect the higher needs of human beings for health and fulfilment. Following the structure employed by Geras, we will consider ‘form’, ‘metabolism’, ‘needs’, ‘instinct’, ‘behaviour’, and ‘capacities’.

* *Human form and metabolism*

Shall we agree that the human form is of the bipedal, upright standing, bilaterally symmetrical type? Variations occur because of injury or accidents of birth. The normalising of the human form has an ideological aspect. And conditions such as amelia (the absence of limbs) and polymelia (having extra limbs) arise from a range of chromosomal, hormonal, and environmental causes. However, we are talking now of the human form as it has developed over evolutionary spans of time, covering the transition from its pre-historical origins to the modern day, and understood in terms of its most general and recognised characteristics.

With respect to ‘metabolism’, shall we also agree that the human being is an omnivorous creature, adapted to consuming many types of vegetation and meat; this having been important for the adaptability of the earliest Hominini to a wide range of environments, and their ability to migrate across continents? Certain vitamins are essential to the human diet; and there are specific requirements also for minerals that are important for metabolic and immunological processes. Again, there are variations: the non-functionality of the gene responsible for aldehyde dehydrogenase in some Asian populations; metabolic disorders linked to ethnicity; *etc*. Still, variations notwithstanding, there remains an obvious global conformity of human metabolism.

With respect to both form and metabolism (and discounting speculations about the potential of hybridising technologies, artificial intelligence and cyborgism that move us towards science-fiction), we are dealing of course with attributes that have not changed for many thousands of years. These are constant features of the species *Homo sapiens sapiens*. Some are essentially attributes of our mammalian, animal nature. Others, whilst biologically given, have been of evolutionary significance for our pre-human and early human development; this is true of some aspects of diet with respect to brain development, and of bipedalism for the freeing of the forelimbs and the evolution of the hand. This latter factor was an essential co-requisite for the emergence of Hominin tool-use at least 2.5 million years ago. Also in this ancient archaeological record, there is the first evidence of the neurophysiological basis for language capacity, in the form of the Brocca and Wernicke speech areas that appear in skull endocasts of *Homo habilis*.[[348]](#footnote-348) These aspects of the corporeal form and brain structure of the Homo genus, and others, created the biological template for the emergence of modern humans.[[349]](#footnote-349) Such characteristics, and others like them, are consequential features of form and structure that both create our human potential and set its physical boundaries.

This range is true also at the chemical scale: whilst the possession of DNA polymerase is a characteristic of all cellular life, and that of cytochrome oxidase necessary to all aerobic organisms, the possession of the genes that code for the endorphins, vasopressins and other hormones associated with mood and affective states are important only for social animals. From these observations we can resolve our species-specific biological inheritance into characteristics of the ‘animal’ type necessary for life, and those of the ‘consequential’ type - consequential that is, for the emergence of human intelligence and social structure.

* *Human needs*

Turning our attention to ‘needs’, we also find a range of types. Here we should separate out obvious basic needs from higher social needs shared by all humans - as does Geras. Of course, we need a stable supply of food that provides us with the right combinations of food types, vitamins, and minerals. The child of a woman who was undernourished during pregnancy may be born with defective brain development that will affect its intelligence. We need shelter, warmth and protection from the elements and the vagaries of climate. To function we need to be free from infection and disease. With respect to sex, although a highly enculturated area, there are physical urges to be met at the individual level; and a need to successfully reproduce at the level of the group. All these basic needs, and their fulfilment or otherwise, occur in a social context; all are socially mediated. However, as Geras emphasises, they remain obvious physical requirements for human survival. Considering higher social needs there is the need for human conviviality, playfulness, inventiveness, varieties of consumption and of work, intellectual stimulation, and so on.

Marx explores this distinction between basic and higher needs in his account of the emergence of consciousness and of ‘history’ in the *German Ideology* of 1845. In a celebrated passage aimed at the speculative philosophies still fashionable at the German universities, Marx outlines four ‘moments’ that must occur before human consciousness, and therefore human history, become possible. The first is the meeting of the most basic needs for human survival. The second concerns the emergence of ‘new’, higher needs as the first are met. The third is the need to reproduce the next generation. This last need differentiates into sexual reproduction in its dual aspect: as a natural relationship; and as a social relationship. Only once these four moments are complete can consciousness emerge, firstly as group-, or ‘herd’-consciousness, and then, as productive technique advances and divisions of manual and mental labour emerge, as ideologies, philosophies, theoretical systems, ethics and so on, as historical consciousness.[[350]](#footnote-350) Here we see references to natural and biological factors that contribute to the emerging capacity of human beings for culture. However, Marx is clear: ‘history’ begins only when humans separate themselves from their origins in nature.

* *Instinct and behaviour*

In the daily tropes of cultural life within capitalism, we hear often that behaviour is ‘natural’, a part of our fundamental make-up. We are told - in crude and explicit ways by tabloid newspapers and public-house common-sense, and in the more round-about, implicit messaging of ministerial speechmakers, educational curricula and popular science - that human beings are inclined towards selfishness, competition and personal opportunism. Moreover, individuals can feel this within themselves, taking it to be natural. The logic of these ubiquitous sentiments and viewpoints can be based upon observations of, and assumptions about, animal behaviour. We behave instinctively, we are asked to believe, because this is a part of our animal make-up. Inter-personal sexual behaviour apparently is the result of our evolutionary past, and something we share with higher animals in our instinctual makeup.[[351]](#footnote-351) The ethologist Konrad Lorenz[[352]](#footnote-352) argued that aggression had emerged as a positive group-binding attribute of social animals, transferred by the phylogenetic evolution of instincts into human behaviour. Influenced by Freud’s libido-cathexis model, Lorenz argued that aggressivity accumulates up to the point where it is discharged, either literally in intra-species aggression, or in ritualised behaviour.[[353]](#footnote-353) For Lorenz, observable and consistent ‘behaviour patters’ found in animals have been carried by evolutionary trends into the human species. Another mechanism is suggested by the ‘Baldwin Effect’ discussed by Dennett (1991), by which advantageous phenotypic social behaviours become selected for in a neo-Lamarkian fashion, to become ‘hard-wired’ into the genotype of the animal as heritable instinctual traits.

And what is ‘instinct’ itself? By ‘instinct’, we mean behaviours that have a predictable character and are innate to a species. Such set behaviours are often in response to different kinds of stimulus, such as threats, feeding opportunities or seasonal cycles. The behaviours of the males and females of a species will revolve around breeding times and the protection of the young. Hierarchical behaviours will be evident in the group dynamics of social animals. These are the kinds of patterns that arguments for a ‘human nature’ position will appeal to, as telling us something about ourselves. It is also the stuff of the Disneyesque anthropomorphisms of popular entertainment; and even explains the fondness that we have for our pets. However, the use of animal, instinct-based behaviour as a template to understand human behaviour makes little sense.

Firstly, ‘instinct’ is not only species-specific; concomitantly it is usually environment specific. This means that the instinctive behaviour of an animal is what suits it to its environment. In a stable ecosystem of predator-prey relationships, biotic and abiotic substrata, and seasonality there is a regularity in the life of the animal to which its instincts have adapted it. Of course, there is also animal learning, which in a habitat may enable the adult animal to distinguish between the edible and the non-edible, the poisonous and the non-poisonous, places of exposure to danger and places of safety, and so on. In artificial environments however, animal intelligence does not rise above the level of elementary tool-use and puzzle-solving in multi-stage tests. A very small range of animal species have become town and city dwellers, where they can transfer their instinctive behaviours to environments that in some essential ways resemble those of their long-lost environmental origins. And animals that have a social structure in the wild, may indeed transfer their bonding instinct to their human keepers. Some domestic pets will devote themselves to loving owners, echoing a distant evolutionary past of hierarchical group dynamics. By contrast, human beings not only adapt to almost every type of environment on Earth, but also to alter them by their labour. Moreover, within specific modes-of-mind humans change also the ‘instincts’ they experience as natural. Seen in this light, comparisons of human behaviour to the fixed-pattern instinctual behaviour of animals are nonsensical.

Secondly, similarities in the outward behaviours of human beings with those of animals do not evidence that they are the same phenomena. Indeed, a basic evolutionary principle illustrates the point. Convergent evolution of phenotypic characteristics can belie quite different evolutionary routes to the same adaptive solution in different species. And truer still when we compare human behaviour to that of higher mammals. If the group dynamics of higher primates sometimes remind us of our own, this is not evidence of a common stock of genetic drivers. In some human cultures, animal behaviours may be replicated, or mimicked, in rituals. Human beings may ‘make-sense’ of their own behaviour by analogous reference to animals they have a close relationship with. Ideological forms may travel into modern life as historical ‘hangovers’ from earlier societies based upon farming. In animalomorphic fashion individuals and social groups can act into ideological roles that take animal behaviour as their rationalisations. And human behaviour can be degraded into types that we describe as animalistic, or bestial, because of various kinds of immiseration and brutalisation. In each case, whilst the outward form of the behaviour may suggest sameness, the underlying motivations and drives will be different for humans and for animals.

This can be true also of human traits across the span of human history, modern and ancient. So, the avarice for which “ships are rigg’d, Seas travers’d, and fierce battles waged”[[354]](#footnote-354) has a meaning that belongs to the 8th Century Homeric period of which it is a part. It is the avarice of tribal aristocracies of the ancient world, based upon the conquest of lands and the subjugation of entire peoples to slavery. This is different to the avarice of the modern financier speculating wildly on the money-markets of modern capitalism. In both cases the individual may seek to enrich themselves without limit. However, the modes of production and consumption are different, and the economic, social, and cultural dynamics are particular to each. The ‘avarice’ in question then, is the effect of these dynamics, not their cause. What is continuous is the word itself; its historical meaning different in each case.[[355]](#footnote-355)

* *Human capacities*

Finally, there are human capacities. This is something that Geras makes central to his case. Geras’ argues that the needs humans have for variety of activity and for the free play of creative faculties, are trans-historical continuities, and can be found in all human cultures.

*Extant amongst his preoccupations, finally, is ‘the worker’s own need for development’: therefore the time available for ‘the free play of the vital forces of his body and his mind’: and a variety of pursuit – for ‘a man’s vital forces … find recreation and delight,’ Marx says ‘in change of activity’.*[[356]](#footnote-356)

Where these kinds of higher need are denied and repressed, as they are for most in class society, there also are human beings found in their most unhappy states. Geras points to may quotations from Marx that express a rage at capitalism for the distorting effect it has upon human life and development.

The model-of-mind being proposed here in fact goes much further than Geras on the question of the variability of the human mind, and how it configures itself into specific modes-of-mind. Crucial to this is the proposition that the human mind is capable of fantastic adaptability; that in its general range of possible expressions it is far from fixed. Only with the emergence of specific modes-of-mind does the human mind become fixed in its underlying structure.

Further to the point, this characterisation of the human mind suggests a continuation across the span of human existence. Here Geras is right: this aspect of humanity is indeed an enduring constant, found in every type of society. However, this does not mean that the idea of a ‘human nature’ finds any sensible application in understanding specific human behaviours at the levels of the individual or of the group.

The constant is one of ‘capacity’ only or, on this theorisation, ‘model-of-mind’. It cannot be ‘mode-of-mind’ since this is historically specific. Yet it is only mode-of-mind that is ever manifest; that can have a content of mental representations and underlying configuration. The model-of-mind cannot have a content of its own because it never exists in isolation; it is an inferred object. Revisiting our earlier discussion, we should say that it is the limit point to the concrete analysis of any given type of mind, in relation to its society. Looked at from a different angle it is the origin of the mental representations and mental structure belonging to any given society; the mode-of-mind that rises from it. The model-of-mind, that is indeed a human constant is also however an abstraction.

Next, we will consider the term ‘nature’. We have seen that Geras’ uses it with several meanings connected with biochemistry, biophysics, basic (animal) needs, behaviour, instinct, higher (human) needs, and human capacities. Some of these are obviously basic material aspects of human life. However, as we ascend from organic forces, through the basic animal functions and upwards, we arrive at aspects of human life that cannot be so straightforwardly categorised. So, human behaviour may show outward similarities with some animal behaviours without there being any substantive commonality. The term ‘instinct’ with its meaning rooted in the specific stimulus-response reflexes of animals in their habitats, cannot be properly applied to human beings who alter their environment by consciously working upon it. The fact that ‘human nature’ is used to cover this range of meanings, gives it the character of an overdetermined phrase; and one moreover that is saturated with ideology.

It is when we come to human capacities that Geras’ argument for the idea of human nature is most problematic. Where we are addressing capacity created by the neurophysiology of the brain the situation is straightforward and is ever emerging with steadily advancing brain sciences. We know for instance that the human connectome – its neurological map – possesses 33 specifically human connections that are peculiar in their length, connecting many parts of the brain that in other primates are unconnected.[[357]](#footnote-357) This super-interconnectedness of the human brain helps make possible the higher reasoning that is beyond even our cleverest nearest cousins in the animal kingdom. We can also consider here the endocrinal capacity for subtle and wide-ranging emotion, for the communication of feeling in speech and nuances of facial expression, and for social reciprocity.[[358]](#footnote-358)

However, the significance of the biophysical substrate enabling the flexibilities of thought and imagination is that it lifts humans *out* of restrictive behavioural structures. It makes possible the overcoming of fixity and the breaching of previous limitations. The capacity it provides supports a mental form that enables culture to emerge, and the ability of humans to adapt and to change. This is mind *per se*, understood as a general anthropological characteristic that has existed for around forty millennia, and is our general model-of-mind.

Beyond brain substrate, this is a necessarily abstract and inferred construct that enables concrete configurations of mind, giving it a strange and unique ontological status. So, it is the (abstract) continuity (model-of-mind) that makes possible the (concrete) discontinuity (mode-of-mind). It is this general human capacity that makes possible the vast range of social and cultural variety, and that has allowed human beings to proliferate so spectacularly. To include this characteristic of the human species under the rubric of ‘nature’ with its connotations of fixity and limitation, is to stretch the meaning of the term to a vanishing point. If the essence of humanity is its ability to change reality, then the meaning of ‘human nature’ as Geras would have us use the term, opposes the idea of fixed reality: its meaning in this context is one of ‘anti-nature’, and overcoming of limitation. Human capacity does indeed represent a constant; however, it is one that provides the potential for human beings to work upon nature, in a process of reciprocal transformation. It does not support the notion of an unchanging essence, but rather of the capacity of human beings to re-define the natural limitations of their environment and of themselves. It is a feature of the general human condition, but it is not an example of ‘human nature’, because *that* is an illogical coupling, empty of content.

*The ‘biological’ and the ‘social’*

Under our alternative framing of these questions we will put aside ‘human nature’ as a term that is logically incoherent, empirically obfuscating and irretrievably ideological. However, there is a related topic that requires attention before moving on to further consequences of the Marxist model-of-mind. This is the matter of genetics and human behaviour. Here we arrive at the most ideological and political aspect of this discussion; and indeed, the proposition upon which it is centred: ‘There are no specific types of social behaviour to which we are biologically pre-disposed.’

Maintaining this position demands two preliminary things: an account of the ideological aspects of ‘biology’ itself as a scientific discipline; and an acknowledgment of the ways in which biology is used ideologically to rationalise and justify existing social norms.

In their *The Dialectical Biologist* (1985),[[359]](#footnote-359) Lewontin and Lewin critique what they call the ‘alienated world’ of biology (and science, generally) that prevails under capitalism. The conceptualisations that characterise biology in this paradigm are based upon: the framing of the ‘object-of-study’ as static, self-enclosed and homogeneous; the analytical separation of organism and environment; and a unidirectional idea of causality ascending from gene to organism. In a dialectical view of biology, organisms and the components of life supporting them, are understood developmentally, as always changing in time. They are heterogenous and defined as much by dynamic tensions within them, as they are by the physical boundaries that demarcate them from their surroundings. Also, the distinction between organism and environment is not absolute; rather they are inter-penetrating and mutually co-dependent. Finally, in the dialectical conceptualisation of life, many levels of reality are in constant and multi-directional causal relationship with one another. Lewontin and Lewin summarise this dialectical understanding in five aspects which are: historicity; universal interconnection; heterogeneity; interpenetration of opposites; and integrative levels.[[360]](#footnote-360)

This means that the organism defines its ‘environment’. As Lewontin (2000) explains:

*Just as there can be no organism without an environment, so there can be no environment without an organism. There is a confusion between the correct assertion that there is a physical world outside of an organism that would continue to exist in the absence of the species, and the incorrect claim that environments exist without species. The earth will precess on its axis, and produce periodic glacial and interglacial ages, volcanoes will erupt, evaporation from oceans will result in rain and snow, independent of any living beings. But glacial streams, volcanic ash deposits, and pools of water are not environments. They are physical conditions from which environments may be built. An* environment *is something that surrounds or encircles, but for there to be a surrounding there must be something at the centre to be surrounded. The* environment *of an organism is the penumbra of external conditions that are relevant to it because it has effective interactions with those aspects of the outer world.*[[361]](#footnote-361)

Moreover, all species by their activity alter their habitats. The relationship is normally one of interpenetration, rather than the interaction of otherwise internally unrelated entities; in other words, it is one of mutual and interdependent change. So, the organism and its environment are each constantly influencing and changing the other. The activity of an organism over time will influence biotic factors such as ecological balances, predator-prey relationships, food-chains, *etc.* and abiotic factors such as soil pH, water turbidity, rock surfaces, *etc.* Lewontin describes this view of the relationship between an organism and its environment as *constructionist*; as opposed to its conventional characterisation as *adaptionist* in popular evolutionary theory.[[362]](#footnote-362)

The ‘alienated’ framing of biology is intrinsic to its ideological *use*. In *Not in Our Genes* (1984),[[363]](#footnote-363) and moving now to the human significance of biology, Rose, Lewontin and Kamin critique the popular idea that genetics provides an adequate basis for explanations of society. Traversing the topics of social inequality, intelligence, patriarchy, and mental illness, and targeting particularly ‘sociobiology’, they reject all theoretical attempts to reduce social structure to biological factors, and effectively so.[[364]](#footnote-364)

One part of their argument is that there are ‘levels of explanation’, each with their own appropriate and proportionate ontologies, scientific methodologies, and theoretical focuses. At each level, biological factors belong to, and become manifest through, a proximal environment that mediates their consequences in the material world. So, the gene does not determine anything alone. Rather it operates, often in combination with other genes, within an enzymic environment upon which it relies for its expression. So too the cell, in higher, multi-cellular organisms works within an environment of biochemical nutrients, thermal regulation, and hormonal regulators. This logic can of course continue through many such levels: organs; organ systems; the body in its biotic and abiotic environment; the individual animal in its social group; the human being in their gens, their familial group, their tribe, *etc*; the social group in its larger society; and so on. No single level can be causally reduced to the level ‘beneath’ it in some simple manner. Rather each has its own laws of motion and material interaction. Moreover, although these levels may be separated analytically for the purpose of scientific scrutiny, in reality they all work at once, in a total process that is vastly complex. The notion that ‘a gene’ or even the human genetic substrate, can ‘determine’ events at the level of the individual, let alone society, acting through all these differentiated domains, stretches credulity beyond breaking point. It is not a feasible proposition.

More concretely, the relationship between an organism and its environment is not a causally equal one. An organism’s environment is resistant to the change it effects upon it; it will change slowly, over often enormous spans of time. As the species evolves, its environment will eventually become altered by its activity - in combination with great forces of geological and climatic change - as its resistant properties give way to the long-term effects of the prevailing flora and fauna.[[365]](#footnote-365) The dependencies involved are asymmetrical: living organisms *depend* upon their environment whilst also changing it. Abrupt changes to the environment such as ice-ages and hot-ages also make this clear in the reverse sense, with the disappearance of entire ecosystems from the fossil record.

In the case of human beings this environmental resistance has led to both innovation and migration. So, whilst non-human organisms survive with behavioural instincts that tie them closely to their habitats, humans alter their habitual and also unconscious behaviour to conquer new environments through intelligent adaptation.[[366]](#footnote-366) Whereas for higher animals, instinctual behaviour is optimally adaptive for specific habitats, human evolution has meant the ability to adapt to a huge variation of environments; something made possible by the replacing of instinct by intelligence and social organisation.

A second component to this critique of genetic reductionism is lies in causal direction. In reductionist accounts, this travels from the genetic level ‘up’ to animal behaviour; the behaviour being its result. With respect to human behaviour what such theoretical models do not recognise, and something that Rose *et al.* emphasise, is that causality also moves in the opposite direction. This follows from the ‘levels of explanation’ in their theoretical framing of ‘biology’. So, whilst the expression of a human gene may alter its immediate environment by protein synthesis, nutritional status for example will alter the chemical environment of the gene itself, potentially influencing its expression in absolute or relative terms. Causality can and does work from the level of the individual or social group as they interact with the external environment, ‘down’ to organs, cells, and chromosomes.

Rose *et al.*’s framing however, is not that of ‘interactionism’; rather it is one of mutual transformation of organism and environment. This is especially the case for explanations of human behaviour. Their argument is not that any given behaviour, for example sexual behaviour, is influenced partly by biological factors and partly by societal factors, interacting to produce outwardly observable traits. Rather, they are co-determining of one another; each one an aspect of a unified reality, and human behaviour being simultaneously *both* biological *and* social. This ‘dialectical determinism’ is the principal conclusion they reach. Moreover, it rejects all reductionism, cultural as well as biological. Their final chapter includes this observation that is directly pertinent to the task of developing a Marxist model-of-mind:

*What is true of the organism in general is all the more accentuated in human psychic development. At every instant the developing mind, which is a consequence of the sequence of past experiences and of internal biological conditions, is engaged in a recreation of the world with which it interacts. There is a mental world, the world of perceptions, to which the mind reacts, which at the same time is a world created by the mind.* […]

*Further, our behaviour in response to that self-created mental world recreates the objective world that surrounds us. If we perceive others to be constantly hostile to us and behave toward them as if they were hostile, they indeed become so, and the perception becomes reality. As a child develops, its psychic environment comes into being partly as a consequence of its own behaviour.*[[367]](#footnote-367)

This dialectical use of biology in understanding human behaviour complements the Marxist model-of-mind, but at the general level only, and in relation to the capacity-for-mind that must be its starting point. For Rose *et al*., biological factors are always mediated by social and cultural factors, all aspects of human behaviour being at once biological and socio-cultural. However, our model-of-mind goes much further than a ‘mediation-based’ analysis in that ‘the biological’ is pushed into the most abstract category of ‘capacity’ with respect to social behaviour. So, whilst the biological element – interpenetrating with social factors - provides the neuro-physical and anatomical possibilities of human activity, it is not the part of human activity that explains the specificities of any particular social behaviour. And it is social behaviour in its specificity within a given type of society, which is our main interest.

Human society, industry and culture naturally have their corporeal substrate. Form and physiology set the parameters to human evolution and historical development. As Lewontin (1991) entertainingly points out, the six-inch tall Lilliputians of *Gulliver’s Travels* could not have smelted iron, mined minerals with miniature pickaxes, sustained fire with tiny twigs or mined to extract ores. Indeed, their tiny brains, he goes on, would not have been capable of even conceiving of such things.[[368]](#footnote-368) Whatever disservice Lewontin may be doing here to the intellects of the fictional inhabitants of Lilliput, his serious point is of course correct. Our technological achievements may overcome our biological limitations; but they do not eliminate them.

However, biology does not give human activity its social meaning. In other words, whilst our biology provides the most general potential for mental existence, it does not create mental content, all of which is attributable to social, cultural, and institutional structures and processes. Whilst all mental processes are ultimately the matter-in-motion that is the neuronal activity of the brain, as well as the physiological processes operating at higher levels of brain organisation, the question is not whether biology is involved in human behaviour at this general level, but rather whether it can be said to be the *origin* of any particular interpersonal behaviour, rooted in intergenerational inheritance. Leaving this question open creates a theoretical slipperiness that doesn’t resolve the position of ‘the biological’ as a factor, allowing it to float free in the debate.

The task of dealing with the ‘biological’ factor then is not quite finished. To explore this point, we will go to Lewontin and Levins (2007), where they identify a space within a false polarisation of biological reductionism on the one hand, and social constructionism on the other.

*For determinism, all social phenomena are merely the collective manifestation of individual fixed propensities and limitations coded in human genes as a consequence of adaptive evolution. At the opposite pole, subjectivity claims that all human realities are created by socially determined consciousness, unconstrained by any prior, biological or physical nature, all points of view being equally valid.*[[369]](#footnote-369)

They fill this gap with their ‘mediation-based’ conceptualisation of the relationship between biology and society. And there are areas where this indeed is a cogent ‘third term’ between the two, for example for certain physical- and mental-health outcomes at the individual and statistical levels; poor health status obviously interacting with social circumstance. But for behavioural categories, for example sexual, this leaves biology in the picture as a determining factor.

*Whereas human sociality is itself a consequence of our received biology, human biology is a socialized biology.*[[370]](#footnote-370)

However, the extension of ‘socialised biology’ into human behaviour here is necessary because of the theoretical lacuna that lingers in a mediation-based framework; a space left unfilled between drives that we experience as ‘natural’ and behaviours we consciously choose. A view of social construction that differentiates between overt and obvious social influences, and the unconscious and concealed forms of social determination that result from repression, completes this task.

Biology sets limits for, and is intrinsic to, social being at the level of general capacity. However, the notion that any *specific* behaviour is created by biology is rooted in the explanatory gap between the individual and society. The repressed unconscious underpinning our model-of-mind, and the social materialism this supports, removes that gap, suggesting a differentiated notion of social determination and a behavioural substrate that we experience spontaneously, making such appeals to biology, albeit complex biology – or the scientifically agnostic position of ‘We don’t know’ – unnecessary. So, whilst biology is ‘always there’, it is not where the explanations of our inter-personal behaviours lie, nor is it the source of their social and personal meaning.

**Mind and health**

For Rose *et al.* all aspects of human behaviour are at once biological and social. This is the result of their dialectical determinism which locates human behaviour at the ‘interpenetration’ of biological and the socio-cultural factors. It is the basis of their critique of the reduction of causal explanations of human behaviour to the genetic level. They have a great deal to say particularly about the reductionist therapeutic logic that has permeated psychiatric medical practice throughout its history. However, they have no theory-of-mind *per se* upon which to hang a more thorough-going rejection of the purported explanatory power of biological factors. The differentiated causalities of our model-of-mind however, introduces a ‘relative indeterminism’ into how we understand human behaviour. For whatever mode-of-mind emerges in each historical and social setting, we see the mind itself as real. In other words, whilst its origin is social, the result of familial and developmental factors that are introjected from the external world, it becomes nonetheless an ‘internal site’ of self-awareness, cognition, interpretation, understanding, struggle, and decision. It is authentic as a strategic and self-determining entity, albeit (apologies to Marx) never in circumstances of its own choosing.

Asserting the reality of mind here, restates the rejection of the eliminative materialism that was touched upon earlier. However, a differentiated social determinism that structures the mind gives us more to say about it as a social entity, and of the problems of mind rooted in social contradiction and conflict.

In the first modern studies of psychosis, Emile Kraepelin (1856-1926) had pioneered an approach to the study of mental disorders premised upon neuro-physical abnormalities of the brain, that were biological both in operation and in origin. Today, the notion of the human mind as a quantifiable entity, amenable to measurement and determined ultimately by innate, biological structure remains a bedrock of modern psychology. This paradigm supports entire industries of psychiatric intervention and pharmacological treatment.[[371]](#footnote-371) However, the technological intensifications of social and personal life, and our experience of ourselves as we align with these trends, are associated with much contemporary unhappiness. Marx noted the ways in which such modernising developments make of the worker one cog amongst many, manufacturing for the market, but not for human need, so creating an alienation in which the human being becomes increasingly machine-like in their activity and physical processes.[[372]](#footnote-372) From the earliest scientific speculations, seeing the mind as trans-historical in nature - opposed to the historical relativity of the ‘model-of-mind’ hypothesis - has represented an obstacle to a social understanding of mental illness; the decontextualised framing of the person ultimately having reductionist consequences for how mental illness is understood in therapeutic practice.[[373]](#footnote-373)

The Kraepelinian paradigm today is supported by three main areas of research. Firstly, there are studies that assume psychosis to be the result of structural abnormalities of brain structure, such as enlarged frontal ventricles. Secondly, those that locate causes in imbalances of brain neurochemistry; specifically related to the dopamine-system of the mid-brain. Thirdly, those that point to cognitive disorders and social-perceptual mal-functions. In all cases the working assumption is that maladies of the mind are the result of defects of the brain.[[374]](#footnote-374)

**The ‘intentional mind’.** All specific mental content is treated here as ‘intentional’. In other words, there is an assumption that all ideas orientate towards the outside world; either directly in the normal sense of intended and obvious action, or indirectly in the sense of the mind’s working upon objects that have become internalised as ‘ideal-objects’ - including the social objects that are the introjected and mentalised versions of others from our lives, creating a social ‘theatre-of-the-mind’. This general proposition becomes especially important for accounts of mental illness, where the mind is split between conflicting and irreconcilable orientations towards the world, each triggering competing motor signals, and each of which demand fulfilment to the detriment or destruction of the other; either in reality or within an imaginary, though still tortured, arena. It becomes even more distressing, and even terrifying, to the person when such competing intentional strivings – drawn from the paradoxes and contradictions of the social structures that have moulded them - are buried deep within the hidden recesses of a repressed unconscious.

In his critique of the ‘Kraepelin model’ of the human mind, Richard Bentall (2004; 2010) defends instead the ‘social brain’. He points out that in all key areas of brain research, there is little, if any, reflection that the structural, neuro-chemical and cognitive effects associated with psychosis, may be correlative symptoms that arise from other, social, causes. Social stressors as well as trauma and re-trauma (arising from triggering in the memory of previous painful episodes), may themselves be causative in the observable features of brain and brain function.

Bentall’s emphasis upon trauma as an alternative hypothesis to ‘brain disease’ to explain mental illness, returns us once more to the mind as social in origin rather than reducible to brain function. This accords also with a Marxist take on the question. The concept of ‘alienation’ in particular, bridges the divide between the external world and its structuring, and the felt experience of the person’s interior, daily life under capitalism. For Marx, alienation originated in the obscured economic relations of capitalist exploitation. Moreover, these economic relations were rooted in social conflict and psychological tension. On a Marxist understanding, this harsh reality defines the experience even of the normal, well-adjusted, and outwardly ‘happy’ person. When crises of one kind or another, personal tragedy, and chronic anxiety and depression are added to the mix of factors that causally affect the individual’s state of mind, it is not difficult to understand why the mind goes awry for so many in capitalist society.

To complete this social hypothesis of mental illness, a further step is needed. Whilst external social causes of mental illness can be traced and studied by observation, their effects are not all of the same order, generality or type. More to the point, whilst some may be obvious to the person, others will be hidden from conscious apprehension, buried in the recesses of their psyche. The tensions that become locked into this structural realm - originating from without, introjected into the shadowy realms of the mind, and repressed from everyday self-awareness - become sinks for psychological energy, disrupting psychic equilibrium and even erupting into shattering collapses of normal mental function.[[375]](#footnote-375) Here, social determinations operate at many levels of human experience, from the proximal cultural cues and pressures of life in their immediacy, to the more profound influences that have remained as traces of early life, of which the person is only dimly aware; or entirely unaware. These influences lurk in the realm of the repressed unconscious. They are the second type of social determination of our Marxist model-of-mind.

**Mind and gender**

This ‘second type’ of social determination is important also for explanations of gender. Its significance lies once more in providing an alternative hypothesis to biology in the creation of ‘natural states’ within human experience.

From his earliest writings Marx leaned towards, and increasingly emphasised a non-essentialist, and non-biologistic perspective on humanity. Marx also critiqued the ‘culture/nature’ dualism in the most influential philosophies and literary tropes of his time. For Marx this was a dialectical pairing, whose dual aspects developed in reciprocal fashion, each (as we have seen) reflecting the other. Although Marx has been criticised for holding to a hierarchical view of the relationship between culture and external nature,[[376]](#footnote-376) in which humanity, given the correct social and technological conditions, will transcend - or even *conquer* - it, in fact this misunderstands him. Rather, Marx saw nature as a part of humanity, and labour as driving the transformation both of nature and simultaneously of humanity itself.

*Just as plants, animals, stones, air, light, etc., constitute theoretically a part of human consciousness, partly as objects of natural science, partly as objects of art – his spiritual inorganic nature, spiritual nourishment which he must first prepare to make palatable and digestible – so also in the realm of practice they constitute a part of human life and human activity. Physically man lives only on these products of nature, whether they appear in the form of food, heating, clothes, a dwelling, etc.*[[377]](#footnote-377)

However, this co-dependent relationship, did not refer only to external nature providing the material means of subsistence and survival, but also to the ‘nature’ of humanity’s relation to itself. So, since humanity always has some notion of its own nature – historically contingent, and relative to the prevailing modes of production and consumption – the individual’s relationship with others is conditioned by this conceptualisation. Herein, for Marx lies a measure of the level of emancipation of humanity both within any given historical mode, and in general; and conversely a measure of the degree of alienation of the individual - of themselves from others, and of themselves from themselves. In other words, a truly emancipated state could only be said to exist where individuals consider one another as members of the human species in the fullest sense, striving towards the highest realisation of their creative potential. Where instead the behaviour of individuals towards one another remains conditioned by fixed notions of natural behaviour, there also will instrumental relations prevail, in which the individual values others for the uses they may have for them.

This brings us to the question of relations between men and women. For if human emancipation is to be realised at all, it can only come about if all individuals, male, female, and others are equal. Where this is *not* the case, where notions and structures of inequality are wrapped in biologistic ideologies, there also will human alienation continue for the sexes, so degrading their relations. Where it *is* the case humanity - *as a whole* - can be free. Here is the point, for Marx, at which nature - including such basic animal drives as the reproductive - becomes now fully human; in other words, something that is no longer a fixed substratum, a ‘given’ that determines human behaviour as a matter of biological fate, but rather something that is thenceforth transformed by non-alienated labour and by interactions with others in a free social totality.

*In the approach to* woman*as the*spoil*and hand-maid of communal lust is expressed the infinite degradation in which man exists for himself, for the secret of this approach has its*unambiguous*, decisive,*plain*and undisguised expression in the relation of man to woman and in the manner in which the*direct*and*natural*species-relationship is conceived. The direct, natural, and necessary relation of person to person is the*relation *of* man*to*woman*. In this natural species-relationship man’s relation to nature is immediately his relation to man, just as his relation to man is immediately his relation to nature – his own*natural*destination. In this relationship, therefore, is*sensuously manifested*, reduced to an observable*fact*, the extent to which the human essence has become nature to man, or to which nature to him has become the human essence of man. From this relationship one can therefore judge man’s whole level of development.*[[378]](#footnote-378)

Earlier we saw how within class society the creation of ‘the individual’, with their subjective and personal characteristics of gender, cultural identity, and sense-of-self, occurs *for them* in the realm of consumption; the result of a *mode*-of-consumption. As we have also seen, modes of production and consumption are co-dependent; and the character of work in a society also plays a decisive role in the creation of gendered roles within it; something that Marx and Engels comment upon frequently. And we have seen how the ‘empirical self’ in its real development, moves between these domains, though under external drives and pressures it does not control. Still, *for the person*, the realisation of their gender as something they experience spontaneously, and as ‘natural’ – or indeed as disruptive as in the experience of body dysphoria - brings us once more to our mode-of-mind, and so also to the role of repression in its construction - but now with respect to a pivotal issue, which is the relationship between gender and alienation. For if we are to say that relations between men and women - *i.e.* gender *per se*, rather than gender only in its bi-modal social or economic aspects - are historically specific rather than universal, then for any given type of society we must also explain the creation of men as individuals that feel themselves to be male, and the creation of women as individuals that feel themselves to be female. In other words, we must explain the strange phenomenon of statistical heterosexuality.[[379]](#footnote-379) And to do that, we must understand men and women as they form - or *are formed* - within their society.

Several of Freud’s publications focus on the origins of gender, alongside of his more general theorising of human sexuality. From 1899, with the publication of his *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud developed his theory of the Oedipus Complex in which the boy-child is consumed with jealousy against his father over his mother’s affections.

*He begins to desire his mother herself in the sense with which he has recently become acquainted, and to hate his father anew as a rival who stands in the way of this wish; he comes, as we say, under the dominance of the Oedipus Complex.*[[380]](#footnote-380)

Freud gives his most generalised account of gendering in *The Ego and the Id* of 1923. Here, the dialectic of ‘to have’ (possession *of* the parent) and ‘to be’ (identification *with* the parent), played out respectively in the male child and the female child, comprises the competing forces that eventually fix gender in the person.

And there is Freud’s less well known 1925 essay, ‘Some Psychical Consequences of the Anatomical Differences Between the Sexes’. Here, Freud foregrounded the Castration Complex to account for the transference of pre-pubescent clitoral sexual pleasure in the girl-child, to vaginal sexual pleasure and receptivity in the young woman, within his general theory.

What each of Freud’s theoretical phases have in common is the element of repression, not only as the source of an unconscious realm (though it is that, of course), but also as an active factor that moulds the landscape of the inner self in its sexed and gendered aspects. It is this element of repression – and especially the way Freud applies it in *The Ego and the Id* (1923) - that can complement Marx’s account of how the individual is formed in their society; providing us also with a model-of-mind that is sufficiently flexible to account for the variety of human cultural behaviour across historical time and geography.

With respect to gender in relation to sex, the bodily sensations involved are forceful and even compulsive. For instance, there is the continuing relevance of endocrinal system to human sexuality; and for cis-women specifically variations of the sex-drive in the different phases of the menstrual cycle. The eclipsing of oestrus and outwardly obvious ovulation represented an evolutionary break from breeding cycles in Hominidae and early human groups. The extended sexuality this made possible is also evident to some degree at least in some higher non-human primate species such as chimpanzees and gorillas. On this spectrum humans lie at the most extreme end, with the possibility of sex being present throughout the menstrual cycle. However, heightened sexual interest in the late follicular peri-ovulation phase of the human menstrual cycle is also well-documented and a commonly – though not universally - reported experience for cis-women. Experimental studies also show peaks of sex-related hormonal states - with high levels of oestradiol and low levels of progesterone particularly - associated with reported increases in sex-drive. This has led researchers to propose a ‘dual sexuality’ in cis-women, comprising conceptive (ovular) and non-conceptive (extended) phases that have different behavioural dynamics and motivations.[[381]](#footnote-381)

The experimental literature suggests two possible accounts of the endocrinal dynamics of human cis-female sexuality that are relevant to the debate in this highly contested field. Firstly, there is the idea that hormonal state directly affects libido, meaning that raised sexual interest in the conceptive phase is the result of an internal drive only. This reductive hypothesis would be an example of ‘simple biologism’ in which organic impulses straightforwardly determine outward behaviour. Secondly, there is the idea of ‘incentive motivation’ in which hormones, rather than determining sexual behaviour, have a regulating function. Here hormones create dispositional states that moderate the behavioural outcomes of aspects of the external environment, such as attraction, relationship experience, sexual opportunity, and so forth. This more complex hypothesis would be an example of ‘dialectical biologism’ in which organic and social factors are mutually influencing of one another.

In cis-men too, levels of the sex-related hormones prolactin, oxytocin and oestrogen change during the lead up to the birth of the child, and in the months following, and are associated with ‘paternal feelings’ in the father’s emotional experience. Such feelings, it is important to note, again are not universal, can vary greatly in strength for individuals and across cultures, and can be entirely absent. Still, there is evidence of an endocrinal correlate to the paternal experience for many cis-men. The question of causal direction however, again is not clear.

An assumption underpinning many studies of the interactions of hormones and sexual behaviour is one of ‘Darwinian individualism’. With this evolutionary framing behaviour is seen as informed by a calculus of fitness and genetic advantage. In relation to extended sexuality in human beings, representing a relaxation of endocrinal control of sexual appetite, the reasoning is that this allows for bonding with a ‘caring mate’ that will invest in the family group, so maximising the prospects of long-term genetic success. Along with the expulsion of dangerous toxins or pathogens, this may be relevant to the original evolution of a menstrual cycle in some simians and early hominids. The notion of individualised genetic strategy however misses the significance of the nomadic character of early human groups. Animal breeding cycles are linked to seasonal and other cycles in habitats and ecological biomes; birth periods being timed optimally for food sources and migration patterns. The emergence of extended sexuality in humans broke this link, creating a relative independence of the cyclical dictates of nature. This leap will have been hugely consequential for the development of human capacity. Along with hominid bipedalism and the co-evolution of the brain and the hand in the Homininae line, changes in the female endocrine system were fundamental to the eventual evolution of *Homo sapiens sapiens*; metabolism, form, capacity, and functional changes comprising the multiple dialectical processes that ultimately created the modern human. And crucially, survival would become dependent upon the viability of the group over and above individual genetic advantage. From this point it was collective strategy and intelligence that was key, and group adaptability now the essential characteristic of human beings.

An issue for Marxism in the incentive-motivation model is that the biophysical substrate to sexual experience remains as an essential driver of behaviour. It is of course mediated by a host of contingent factors. But it is *essential* nonetheless. If this holds, then what follows is a necessary acceptance that there exists in all women and men a natural drive to reproduce. Seen in this way, the entire range of sensations, appetites and desires involved in sex together represent *natural* urge to have a child; so being understood as a type of organic need along with hunger and thirst. Framing the sex-drive of modern humans like this means accepting the principle of maternal and paternal instincts that arise from our biological inheritance.

However, there is a third possibility that our model-of-mind hypothesis allows for, and one that avoids the naturalising tendency in theorisations of human sexual behaviour. It may be that sexual impulses associated with the endocrine system, are not the result of a residual evolutionary effect, in women an incomplete release from oestrus, but are substantively ideological. Whilst the bodily sensations involved are real enough, the ‘translation’ of these in the modern human into sexualised perception and behaviour can be cultural. The effect we know is not universal. Moreover, behaviour can override and contradict these impulses. This suggests the possibility of an *a priori* mechanism hidden from consciousness, acting as an experiential ‘lens’ that is infused with ideology; the mental representations this creates in their turn leading to sexual cues that orientate behaviour. In the manipulated sexualised culture of capitalist society, conversions of sensation into impulses then occur as a matter of involuntary reflex; impulses experienced spontaneously, and as ‘natural’. Whilst the basal biological processes are a given, the product of an ancient evolutionary line,[[382]](#footnote-382) the modern meaning of the behaviours correlated with them can originate in society, becoming part of the sexualised unconscious *via* mechanisms of psychological repression. They are then the outcome of aggregations of ideologically organised and socially gendered behavioural responses ‘returned’ to the sexual domain from which they evolved, but now cemented into constructed cognitive fields and somatic experience in the familiarity of ‘sex’ in its modern form.

Where it is mental structure, whether hidden or unhidden from consciousness, that organises behavioural responses to organic sensations, rather than *vice versa*, there biology gives way to culture. And where this is the case, it can be gender that organises outward sexual orientations and responses, and not the other way around. Whilst a moment of passion may be experienced as something that overcomes all inhibitions, the expression of spontaneous bodily impulses, that ‘moment’ in fact can have been created by years of childhood psychosocial influences, a saturation of sexual cultural cues, and decades of intergenerational cultural transmission and expectation.

And here an isomeric conceptual inversion is required; a different way of thinking about the mind from that of common-sense (or ‘folk-‘) psychology. For our mental content is laden with ideology and naturalistic notions, and as argued here, the anatomy of sex does not dictate its social meaning. The assumption that sex in our hyper-capitalist present is a continuation of prehistorical sex is a stubborn one. However, when we look around us, we see the ubiquity of sex in all aspects of our culture, used to manipulate opinion, create appetites and sell commodities. These are nothing to do with human reproduction. Even for the couple planning their family, motivations – interpreted as natural parental urges – revolve upon the notion of the happy, successful and thoroughly commoditised home. Again, the drivers are not those of a primordial instinct or genetic inheritance, but rather those of consumption. The biological sex by which the continuation of the species occurs becomes the commoditised sex of life under capitalism. It is a different thing, ideologically packaged and re-presented as natural desire and gendered parental instinct. The ‘limit’ endpoint of ‘biological sex’ in the pre-human hominin line becomes the ‘origin’ of the construction of ‘encultured sex’ in the earliest Sapiens groups and eventually of ‘commoditised sex’ in the modern human being. So, by removing the ideological rationalisations of our bodily experience and its naturalising mental representations (*re*-presentations), we clear a space in which real, but previously obscured, social meaning can emerge. [[383]](#footnote-383)

One influential modern theorisation of gender that aligns with our model-of-mind comes from Judith Butler in their 1990 book, *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Femininity*.[[384]](#footnote-384) Butler emphasises the unstable nature of the gender/sex distinction. Sex, after all, they argue, ‘happens’ *via* gender in its social aspect. More than this, sex as *sexuality*, develops through gender, and in its outward representation is shaped by gender. In a manner that brings to mind Freud’s ‘Some Psychical Consequences of the Anatomical Differences Between the Sexes’, they further suggest a view of sex (over and above mere anatomy) as constructed *by* gender; areas of the body being encultured as erogenous zones, infused with sexual meaning by the erotic codes of their society; anatomy then becoming the ‘site’ of sexual culture and behaviour, rather than its determination.

This leads Butler to question ‘woman’ as a reliable category within feminism. Indeed, Butler’s radicalism lies in their questioning of representational identity (what they call the ‘metaphysics of substance’) *per se*, for any understanding of sex, sexuality, or gender. Taking a cue from de Beauvoir they argue that ‘woman’ is a category without a foundation.

*If there is something right in Beauvoir’s claim that one is not born, but rather* becomes *a woman, it follows that* woman *itself is a term in process, a becoming, a constructing that cannot rightfully be said to originate or to end. As an ongoing discursive practice, it is open to intervention and resignification.*[[385]](#footnote-385)

Here then, ‘sex’ – meaning to *be* a sex - is the ‘discursive pre-discursive’, or the ‘constructed unconstructed’. So, one’s sex, experienced as a given fact, is the result of a historical (and pre-historical) layering of gendering processes that, over great spans of time, produces something that is felt as ‘natural’.[[386]](#footnote-386)

Crucially, Butler emphasises that this ideological sexing eclipses its own genealogy. For it to work we must experience our sex as *sui generis*, self-sustaining and emerging from its own ontological ground. And for that it relies upon repression. Seen as it really is, emerging from constructive social and psychological processes, and without a primary foundation, the sexual binarisation of ‘male’ and ‘female’ fails in its allotted role as a regulator of reproductive behaviour - and human reproduction. Its ruse is essential to its success.

Finally, Butler moves to a hard anti-essentialism in which the purported gendered interior is no more than a phantasm. Gender for Butler does not emerge from a pre-existent self, but rather through its performative aspects as a strategic social act. The body now becomes the ‘surface’ upon which gender is *inscribed* in pose, dress and decoration, and the vector by which it is incorporated into the life the person. Gender then, is not something that the person *has*, but rather that which they *perform* in time; and which becomes internalised from without *via* cultural processes.[[387]](#footnote-387)

On this last point there is some departure in what Butler says from what we have proposed for the mode-of mind as something that allows for a substantive self. Anti-psychological, behaviourist and eliminative positions in philosophy have already been criticised. Now we see that Butler seems to move in a similar direction as Skinner, Ullin and Dennett on the question of a stable interior; a self; or a *cogito*. Against this, we have recognised an authentic and deciding self; albeit one that is historical in origin and character. Butler’s nuanced position in fact does allow for a relativistic notion of a gendered intra-psychic, performing agent, although many of their concluding statements on this topic lean towards its temporal, repetitive and outwardly performative aspects, rather than its presence as an enduring, internal - though always contextual - self.

With Butler, we arrive at a position where sex, far from forming a natural substratum that is overlaid with gender, is rather organised *by* gender. Gender, and by extension culture, provides the causal impetus for sex in its behavioural aspects; sex then becoming the result of gender, not *vice versa*. But what sense can we make of this with respect to human origins, and the proposition that this position appears to require; that with the invention of gender human sexual behaviour left behind its animal evolutionary past?

Whereas the material record of the earliest humans from remains and sites of habitation gives us a picture how our pre-historic ancestors looked, travelled, and survived, there is little that gives such clues about sexual behaviour and the origins of gender. One type of evidence that does exist comes in the form of figurines and fertility symbols found at sites of early human settlement, identifiable by the exaggerated primary and secondary sexual characteristics they exhibit.[[388]](#footnote-388) But what helps us here is plausible scientific imagination. We can say that for the earliest hunter-gatherer groups, pregnancy, neonatal care, and weaning would have been a matter of group survival. Moreover, the development of technique for hunting, cooking, and the manufacture of clothes, of course (we do know from the material record) required the fashioning and effective use of tools and the practical knowledge that made this possible; knowledge that needed to be transmitted to the youngest members of the group over the extended period of maturation that is distinctive of the human species. Hidden ovulation and female receptivity throughout the menstrual cycle also would have added to the problems of unregulated pregnancy and childbirth for social groups that had to withstand and overcome extreme challenges of climate, environment and sustenance during the great dispersals of the Middle- and Upper-Palaeolithic era. Under these circumstances it is hard to imagine that the kinds of pansexualism observed in some higher primates would have been viable for the ancient Homininae groups from which modern humans emerged, or in the early nomadic bands as they moved into new and demanding environments.[[389]](#footnote-389)

With respect to reproductive regulation, we can imagine that by around thirty-five to forty-five thousand years ago, during the Transition that saw the emergence of abstract reasoning and higher intelligence, humans achieved control of child-birth at the level of the group: and that gender was one part of this, along with related social and productive roles.[[390]](#footnote-390) Likely by this stage having a basic comprehension of paternity, perhaps by now humans had also learnt from brutal and fatal experience, the genetic hazards of incestual sexual relations, leading to the near universal taboo of sexual union between close relatives. The emergence of consanguineous clan-type societies also would also have raised the problem of inter-breeding; the exchange of women between clans, and the emergence of exogamous heterosexuality being a combined solution to that.[[391]](#footnote-391)

**The special place of sex.** The brain continues to develop, certainly into a person’s early twenties. But puberty is a stage of extremely rapid change, as neural networks proliferate at an extraordinary rate. The leap in general capacity that this represents has profound consequences for the individual. It is not only one of ability. Rather, many things are occurring at once, with the emergence of abstract reasoning, and the establishment of personal identity and social attachments.

Human societies have long understood the significance of this not only for the individual, but also for the group as a whole, and have laid out clear pathways for the child ahead of this determining stage for social function, gender and social orientation. It is the ‘dialectic-of-self’ involved in the emergence of sex, that shapes outcomes for the individual, giving them their specific social and historical meaning; a dialectic that requires the repression of some possibilities in place of others that emerge as dominant.

This is speculation. The point however is that we are now talking about intelligent humans, consciously dealing with the challenges of survival they were faced with. Group behaviour was obviously hugely significant for the maintenance of effective social relationships, supporting strategic orientations in the group’s natural environment. This would have required behavioural regulation and control in all areas of life, including the sexual. Here, we can plausibly imagine that the organisation of ‘male’ and ‘female’ became important along with the social, cultural, productive, and reproductive roles allotted to each. We are helped here by the customs of cultural transmission of gender by puberty rituals found until quite recently in forest and tribal societies. Colin Turnbull, in his 1961 classic anthropological work *The Forest People*, described the initiation rites of the BaMbuti pygmy tribes of the Angolan Ituri Forest region for adolescent girls.[[392]](#footnote-392) During the *elima* the girls decorated their bodies, battled with the boys, and then entered a special house for some days, protected and defended by the older women. The boys would then seek to fight their way into the house, only to be accepted if they had killed significant game such as an antelope. In other examples, the boys of the North American Quinault people would paint rocks with the water monsters they had seen in visions, and amongst the tribes of California pubescent youngsters would ingest hallucinogens such as jimsonweed, and paint rocks with images influenced by their visions – the girls painting representations of rattlesnakes (their spirit-helpers), and the boys painting circles, nested curves and human figures.[[393]](#footnote-393)

*A key aspect of these rituals is that the boys and girls focused on different entoptic phenomena. Both sexes would have had the neurological potential to see the full range of entoptics, and we may be fairly certain that the boys’ entoptic forms would have flashed in and out of the girls’ visions, and vice versa. But the guidance given by the shamans who were conducting the rituals encouraged each sex to focus on what were considered to be its appropriate images.* [[394]](#footnote-394)

In these delirious states these youngsters were being guided towards their gendered destinies.[[395]](#footnote-395) However, the dialectic-of-self underpinning our model-of-mind would already have been at work in the formation of adult influenced strivings of identification and possession. Amongst the BaMbuti people for instance, the skills involved in developing gendered roles emerged from play, the games becoming incrementally more serious through adolescence. With maturation beyond puberty this dialectic would have been closely intertwined with anticipations of social, cultural, productive, and reproductive functions, and the acquisition of the skills appropriate to each. In the inhospitable landscapes that our earliest ancestors encountered, the gendered regulation of sexual behaviour, along with gendered technical skills and essential knowledge that were passed down from elders to youngsters, will have been of vital importance for the survival of the group.

Indeed, a distinction between early life ‘primary socialisation’ processes that are foundational for the person’s development, and ‘secondary socialisation’ processes that orientate the person for their future roles within their social group and wider society is an established one in theories of social construction. These secondary processes occur during adolescence and are often also accompanied by rituals that intensify the transformations involved.[[396]](#footnote-396)

Whatever the exact course of events, the central argument here rests upon a proposition, located at a limit-origin transitional boundary. The proposition is that the ‘limit’ in question represents the end of biological causation of human behaviour, over and above the limitations dictated by anatomy; and that the ‘origin’ represents the start of social and cultural causation for all aspects of human behaviour, including the sexual. This means not only a reversal of the biology-culture dichotomy that makes biology a cause of sexual behaviour, but a setting aside of that dichotomy. ‘Biology’ here is no longer a factor that explains human sex beyond its obvious mechanical aspects, even as socially mediated; human sex being seen now as socio-cultural in character.

**Human sociality, adaptability, gender, and survival.** The pivotal moment of early human evolution was the emergence of ‘sociality’ itself. The ability of human beings to survive in extremely varying environmental conditions, was connected to the emergence of ‘the social group’, with collective intelligence, intergenerational transmission of knowledge, shared technical ingenuity and bonds of solidarity. This moment represents the endpoint (the ‘limit’) of biological evolution, and the starting point (the ‘origin’) of cultural evolution; in other words, a moment of discontinuity made possible by the qualitative leap in intellectual capacity now superfluous to basic physical existence. Prehistoric music, ritual, dance, art and so on, can be understood without any reference to biology in their specific manifestations. Rather they are seen as arising from the creation of shared meanings that tied the individual to their group with bonds of collective memory, group-identity, common belief, story-telling and myth, and group love and sacrifice. For all of this, it was the emergence of psychical processes enabling ‘identification’ with others as a general human attribute, that made it possible for the human species to transcend biological evolution. Finally, a crucial aspect of human social attachment was the emergence of ‘gender’, a topic given helpful illumination by the dialectic of ‘to have’ and ‘to be’ found in Freud’s key works.

We can get a sense of the relevance of a gendered ‘mode-of-mind’ from Marx’s analysis of the rise of the patriarchal family following the conquest of clan-based societies by the early Roman Republic. In the *Ethnological Notebooks*[[397]](#footnote-397)Marx comments extensively upon the anthropology of his day. Johan Bachofen had proposed a ‘mother-right’ that had once prevailed in tribal, or clan, societies. This suggested both a matriarchal and matrilineal character to these societies: an idea that was transmitted into 19th Century anthropology by Ludwig Lange, Henry Sumner Maine, and Lewis Henry Morgan. The societies traversed included the Iroquois of North America, the Hibernian Celts,[[398]](#footnote-398) the Kānaka Maoli tribes of Hawaii, and the Brahmin clans of India.

These consanguineous societies were more egalitarian than the state-based societies that would eventually replace them. Marx was fascinated by anthropological speculations upon the changing social position of women resulting from this historical shift. However, his comments on the works of Lange and Maine were critical, insofar as these anthropologists tended to essentialise ‘the family’; seeing historically particular relations between men and women as natural.[[399]](#footnote-399)

Marx, along with Engels, was more sympathetic to the work of Morgan who treated the family as historical, and as something that varied (and radically so) from one epoch to the next. Here, a distinction between the comments of Marx and those of Engels on these anthropological models is needed.[[400]](#footnote-400) Whereas Engels tended to accept uncritically Morgan’s thesis of ‘mother-right’, Marx was more attuned to the contradictions of the place of women in clan-based societies, and indeed the probability of struggle within them.[[401]](#footnote-401) Actually, the idea of matriarchy and matrilineality in such societies is complicated by any number of examples of inequality and, for the Celts in particular, it is likely that the position of women varied greatly from one tribe to another.

The key theme here is the changing status of women in clan-based societies, as the relative egalitarianism that had prevailed in some was suppressed within emerging or conquering class-based states. Whether we consider the eclipsing of the Aegean tribes of the Homeric era by the city-states of the time of Plato and Aristotle,[[402]](#footnote-402) or the subsumption of the Celts under Roman law, changes to the position of women in each case are profound. With the emergence of the patriarchal family specifically, rights of marriage-choice, inheritance, property-ownership, divorce, status within the marriage family, *etc.* were all lost or severely eroded.[[403]](#footnote-403)

In the case of 5th Century Athenian society, the hidden status of women was almost total, with women being exclusively restricted within the domain of the marriage home, along with children, concubines, servants and slaves.[[404]](#footnote-404) Moreover, the removal of boys from the gynaecium from the age of six, into and beyond puberty meant that outside of marriage men were rarely exposed to women socially or sexually; which goes some way to explaining the celebration of male homosexual love in the Grecian society of the Periclean era.[[405]](#footnote-405)

In the case of the Roman Republic, the *manus* - the Roman legislative code that provided the *paterfamilias* with his legal power – at its height in the era of the Punic Wars, gave the male patriarch nearly absolute rule over his family members. With respect to a wife this included entire rights to her dowry, the right to sell her and in certain circumstances (and with the agreement of her family) to end her life.[[406]](#footnote-406)

That external, physical repression was necessary in the shift to these absolute patriarchies seems highly probable.[[407]](#footnote-407) However, this violence will also have resulted in internalised repression, by which new and extremely oppressive gender-relations became normalised; the new intra-psychical structures of men and women in Roman society cementing a triumphant and naturalised family norm, and with it a new mode-of-mind with respect to gender and sexual relations.

An erosion of the power of the Roman patriarch occurred over time by the incremental transfer of legal powers from the family to the state. With the development of trade and commerce, women were also found increasingly in occupations that, whilst they lay outside of legal sanction, were afforded *de facto* toleration in the developing Roman economy.[[408]](#footnote-408) The anomalous position of women in these economic roles was mitigated by a slow process of legal amendments that increasingly sanctioned the position of women-of-means as independent, affording some the status also as *personae* with a degree of legal entitlement.[[409]](#footnote-409)

The social, economic, and political processes would over time weaken the power of the patriarch. However, the women of the ancient world also had agency in changing their position *vis-à-vis* men. Whilst the female characters of Aristophanes *Lysistrata* provide a comedic picture of women withholding sex to prevent their men leaving for war, the play is revealing for what it suggests about how its audience understood the potential of women to act collectively. Indeed, it may have referred to real moments of resistance, long since lost from the historical record. In the case of Rome, when women stormed the Forum in 195 BC, demanding the repeal of the *lex Oppia* that restricted their rights of adornment, Cato the Elder remarked “We have not kept our women individually under control; we now dread them collectively.”

In the *Ethnological Notebooks* Marx reflects upon the probable resistances of women to their unfree status under patriarchal law. Along with socially overt struggle and resistance likely to have accompanied both the implementation of patriarchal oppression, and its erosion, we can further hypothesise a psychical struggle, as different modes-of-mind clashed between groups and individuals, and within the interior life of the person.

In the modern era, we see the equivalent social and psychological processes with the emergence and historical development of capitalism. Each stage in the British context has created shifts in demographic patterns and family type with implications for gender norms. The break-up of the rural extended family with the enclosures of the late 18th was one stage, as its victims poured into the hellish conditions of the new urban conurbations with little or no intact family structure. The rise of the small nuclear working-class family that could move for work, was another. The entry of women into the workforce in large numbers over the course of the Twentieth Century profoundly altered relations between the sexes, and the associated perceptions of legitimate gender roles. Each of these successive changes - from the large extended form of the family to the small nuclear form, and then to the single-parent family so common today – has loosened previously rigid norms. The de-localisations involved and the struggles they have given rise to have resulted in the appearance of new gender roles and identities (including dominant female, non-binary, and gender-fluid types) that compete with the traditional hetero-stereotyping of ‘dominant male – submissive female’ gender-relations. This has meant a cultural drift away from normalising binaries towards more complex alternatives. Always, the elements of our model-of-mind have driven the process, as the changing forces of the modes of production and consumption shape the dialectic-of-self, in turn creating conscious apprehensions of social roles and survival strategies; these then being shaped by interwoven economic and gender identifications in the mind of the developing person.

**Freedom, memory and the ‘return of the repressed’**

In each of our examples of mode-of-mind, repression has been an indispensable element. It is repression that suppresses possible modes-of-mind as unrealistic, unfeasible, or even dangerous; allowing some (or one) to emerge as dominant, to be expressed outwardly, as the person takes up their place in their social group. This mode-of-mind has been shaped by a dialectic-of-self that moves between the poles of a self (I) that is experienced moment-by-moment, and an anticipated self - the ‘objective I’ (I*o*) towards which they strive.

From this process emerges (‘precipitates’) an ‘ideal I’ (I*i*), representing an intended self the person strives to be. This ‘ideal I’ is drawn from the processes of identification described by Freud in *The Ego and the Id* (1923), as the mind of the child and the developing adolescent gravitates towards one parent or the other, or towards one significant adult or another.

These intra-psychical processes are also interwoven with anticipations of a future self that are more outwardly social, cultural, and economic in character; anticipations that reflect the modes of consumption and production of their society.

All of this involves the repression of psychical material that is problematic for the mode-of-mind that eventually emerges as dominant, or that must be hidden from the conscious life of the person for them to be successful in their society. The result is determinations that are known to the person only by their effects, whilst remaining unrecognised explicitly. These internal determinations become crucial to aspects of their identity they experience spontaneously, and as intrinsically personal – gender being the most obvious example. Where they contain unresolved tensions and ‘forgotten’ traumas, they may be sources of anxiety, disturbance, and unhappiness.

This repressed material however, although not normally consciously apprehended, does not disappear. Instead, it remains as an active force, hidden from consciousness. It can also be expressed culturally and at the social level, as well as the individual. Myth and legend for instance, can carry repressed memories of earlier cultures that are separated from a society even by many generations. In the *Ethnological Notebooks*, Marx speculates that despite the unfreedom of women under the 5th Century Athenian state, collective memories of lost freedoms remained in the goddess stories of Hestia, Hera and Athene Pallas.[[410]](#footnote-410) Indeed, memories of historical traumas, or of great struggles and triumphs, are present in the oral traditions of pre-literate peoples and in the folk-lore of rural communities. Within urban societies, working-class traditions carry the memories of significant battles and victories from one generation to the next. These traditions may disappear, ‘forgotten’ from any conscious recollection within communities. And yet, with the eruption of new struggles, these traditions and their stories will reappear with a new relevance, indicating that they had never been fully forgotten. Rather they had existed still in a repressed collective memory, awaiting their time once more. In the case of the Black Lives Matter movement of 2020, triggered by the murder of a black man by a police officer in Minneapolis, the movement that exploded in the US and around the world became quickly about interpretations of history. Old grievances and local controversies that had been eclipsed by the mundanities of daily survival in black America, were reignited as stories half-forgotten were reawakened with urgent and vivid relevance.

In all these examples we see not only repression at work, and the creation of a collective repressed unconscious, but also how repressed material can ‘return’, reminding us sometimes with sudden force that it had never really disappeared.[[411]](#footnote-411)

Finally, there is an ethical dimension to these reflections upon a Marxist ‘model-of-mind’, the ‘mode-of-mind’ that is its consequence, and the role of repression within it. Our general model-of-mind is built upon a human mind that is totipotent in its capacity, characterised by a ‘radical variability’ that allows for imaginative possibilities that go far beyond the literal limitations of the person’s social and physical environment. In this sense the human brain is seen as an organ of limitless configurations of thinking, behaviour, theory, and hypothesis. This potential for creativity is intensive as well as extensive, reaching into all aspects of human behaviour and inter-personal relationships, as well as into outward behaviour directed towards the external environment.

We have also seen that the ‘dialectic-of-self’ ends in the intra-psychical structures of the person, becoming fixed into a mode-of-mind that enables them to function in their society, and survive the challenges they face. They are shaped by the social relations into which they develop, structures of the mind being isomorphic with the fixed social relationships that have produced them.

It is here we find our ethical imperative, underpinned by a co-dependence of fact and value. For where social relations are oppressive, the minds of all within the fixed social relationships involved are trapped within a social and psychical logic that is inimical to further creative development. For the oppressed the result is agonies of mind and of body, of course. For the oppressor the cost of their advantage and luxury is the loss of their creative freedom. Whilst our sympathies are entirely with the oppressed, it is worth acknowledging the self-deceptions and neurotic perversions of thought that characterise the mind of the oppressor. The resulting situation for humanity is one of debasement (value) and destruction (fact). Here our desire for a better world, interweaves with our notions of self and identity, understood objectively and dispassionately as constructed entities.

## Society, self, and the return to Marx

Key to the hypothesis developed here has been that the concept of repression, a central theoretical factor in the psychoanalytical tradition, is useful to a Marxist model-of-mind, helping to explain how a mode-of-mind emerges that is adapted to specific historical circumstances. The consequence is that the associated category of the unconscious must also be treated seriously within Marxism. This is not Freud’s libidinal unconscious. Rather it is a structural unconscious that precedes it analytically, and that makes it - and other iterations of ‘the unconscious’ - possible. The type of historical materialism that emerges, provides in turn a potentially fuller account of the dynamics of human subjectivity in the historical process.

However, it does something else in providing an account of how spontaneous feelings of identity, sense-of-self, gender, and so on, can be given without any reliance upon biology, complex or otherwise. Correctly speaking, the stance here cannot be ‘Biology does not play any role in human behaviour’, in an unqualified sense. Such a non-empirical statement would be dogmatic. It is rather that the use of biology – particularly dialectical biology - within Marxism to explain for instance the origin of sexual behaviour, betrays the absence of a Marxist model-of-mind that is comparable to Freud’s modelling of the psyche. It is an absence that allows a naturalising tendency to appear that is as unhelpful as it is unnecessary. Moreover, the kind of object that is ‘mind’ (relational) is different to the kind that is ‘brain’ (discrete), meaning that the application of biology in causal explanations of specific social behaviours is also a flawed proposition.

Revising the element of ‘repression’ taken from psychoanalysis - substantially adapted as a process of ‘repression-transformation’ - allows for a conceptualisation of social determination that is differentiated; so, enabling its application to feelings and aspects of mental life that are opaque in their origin to the person themselves. These feelings and aspects may indeed be sexual; but they are not exclusively so, being modes of the unconscious made possible by a non-libidinal repression that is more fundamental. The dialectical process that makes this basal structural unconscious possible is anthropological, belonging to all human cultures. The specific contents of this unconscious, including the introjected social determinations that are hidden from the person, but that shape their mental states, sexual desires, gender orientations, appetites and revulsions as a creative force are historical, belonging to contextual settings. This way of modelling the mind provides an alternative to biologistic assumptions used to explain mental processes and human behaviour.

There are also political consequences to this emended historical materialism. One important example is the question of self-determinations of gender and sexual identity. Whilst ‘gender’ might be acknowledged as something that the person can choose (male/female), ‘sex’ (man/woman) is a more contested terrain, in which stubbornly biologistic assumptions prevail. However, the distinction between gender and sex is an unstable one. Sex then, understood as drive, attraction, coupling and so on (rather than anatomy), along with gender, has been framed here as socially constructed, albeit with social determinations that are obscure, and that emerge from otherwise hidden recesses of a repressed unconscious. It also emerges within mediating social forms, crucially the family. This means it is a relativised phenomenon, subject to historical change.

This approach to an understanding of sex and gender can equally be applied to analyses of mental distress, and to forms of consciousness belonging to different types of society. This requires an account of what mind is at the general level. Such an account must explain not only the political control of mental life, but also the mechanisms by which external factors influencing the development of the infant, the child, the adolescent, and the behaviour of the mature adult, become internalised as spontaneous feelings and social orientations. This is what the hypothesis that has been proposed - the general Marxist model-of-mind that can explain the historically specific mode-of-mind - does; presented here as an alternative to the ‘biology-of-the-gaps’ where that is used to explain social behaviours that are otherwise difficult to understand.

Moreover, a dialectic-of-self is involved that happens within a historical mode-of-consumption and its co-dependent mode-of-production. The dialectic-of-self orientates the person within their social group and environment, identifying *with* or *as* others as they develop. They also incorporate not only life perspectives, group identity, gender, and social place, but technical skills and knowledge. In that process, repression ‘pushes down’ (or ‘out’) some life possibilities in favour of others in the interests of success and survival. The result of this repression is that social factors, changed as they enter the hidden mental structure of the person as representations in thought, become obscure to the person themselves, and experienced as ‘natural’. This represents a ‘social materialism’ that operates as a third term between the individual and determinations at the larger historical scale.

And finally, sex has a special role to play, in that after a period of childhood preparation, much of this happens ‘all-at-once’ during puberty and becomes entwined with the gendering processes of early adolescence as the individual begins to take up their place in their social group. So, this general model-of-mind, itself an aspect of our ‘general capacity’ of mind, allows for the emergence of historical *modes*-of-mind that explain the particular social behaviours characterising a society at a given historical juncture. In this hypothesis, biological inheritance plays no role beyond the general capacity it provides; it does not explain specific structural forms of behaviour.

Ever since its emergence, whether seen as a purported science of humanity, or as a cultural movement, there have been Marxists who have allowed a space for psychoanalysis. The commitment to reaching into the deepest recesses of the mind, and the intolerance of the deceits and hypocrisies of bourgeois sentimentality about sex, the mind and the individual associated with psychoanalysis, have always attracted the attention of some within the Marxist tradition. The motivations have reflected their times. So, when the movement for social liberation and revolution has been on the rise, the appeal of psychoanalysis has been the emancipatory potential it offers. When reaction has been in the ascendant, some in the Marxist camp have looked to psychoanalysis for explanations they have struggled to find elsewhere. Usually this has also revealed distortions and shortcomings in the forms of Marxism politically dominant during much of the Twentieth Century.

The concerns that have motivated engagement with psychoanalysis here are relevant to some contemporary questions within the Marxist Left: around gender and self-identification; about the nature of mental illness; and the use of ‘dialectical biology’ in explanations of human behaviour. The element of repression that is potentially useful for Marxism is now shorn of its libidinal - and so Freudian - connotations, just as with the notion of the unconscious itself. The meaning ascribed to it is also closer to the notion of ‘sublation’ found in Hegel’s account of the origin of self-consciousness in *The Phenomenology* of 1807. And it is non-Freudian in being dialectical in function, rather than mechanical, so therefore retaining a creative aspect producing as it does an unconscious that not only locks away unwanted representations of trauma, but also allows new formations of thought, identity, expression and orientation in the world to enter consciousness.

It is repression-transformation then, as an organising psychical mechanism, that sustains the dialectic between the model-of-mind enabling our creative, innovative, and productive potential, and the mode-of-mind that is the historical realisation of that potential. And it is the structural unconscious it creates that holds the inward mysteries of the self, understood now as entirely social in origin, whilst also opaque to the person themselves. These recesses are the social determinations - the external social origins of which are lost from consciousness - known only as ‘always there’ by the person and experienced as natural.

In all of this, it is not any ‘already present’ pre-social principle that makes us what we are beyond the most basic organic requirements for life, in any specific cultural or personal way. Rather it is our *social* being – and our social being *only* - that ultimately explains our experience of ourselves; that is the Alpha and Omega of being human, and the source of our potential liberation.

**Appendix I. Notes on Marx and Freud**

1. Incompatibility
   1. In their formal logics and foundational categories, the theories of Marx and of Freud are philosophically, methodologically, and anthropologically incompatible. Like oil and water, they will not mix.
   2. Freud’s theorising conforms to a type that implicitly seeks verification by ‘narrative concordance’, *viz.* my account of my internal narratives (and those of ‘my patients’) is recognised by an audience who agree that it accords with their own internal experience of themselves. Similarly, to any speculative system.[[412]](#footnote-412)
   3. Freud was an ‘inconsistent materialist’. Across his life-works there are extended periods of neuro-physical reductionism, of various levels of social materialism, and of abstract speculation. In his early career he worked within a ‘mechanist’ paradigm that reduced mental activity to neuronal action. His dream work and instinct model saw his thinking move towards symbolic theory that elevated psychology above a biological substratum. In his later work Freud employed cosmological principles that moved his theorising towards a type of vitalism.
   4. Freud’s thinking lacks the notion of ‘totality’, causing a tendency to syncretism to resolve theoretical impasses. The notion of ‘totality’ is central to Marxism.
   5. In many of Freud’s published works his theorising tends towards essentialism: Marxism is non-essentialist.
   6. Freud encountered difficulties and impasses in his theory of the human mind that only a Marxist account of the same issues could have resolved and can resolve today.
   7. There are however areas of resonance between Freud’s speculations and those of Marx. Examples include: the psychological mechanisms of Freud’s dream-theory, and those found in Marx’s correspondence theory of ideology; the descriptions of psychical introjection and internalisation found in Freud and Marx respectively; and the splitting of the ego in Freud’s structural model-of-mind, and the splitting of the subject in Marx’s dialectic-of-self.
2. Critical appreciation
3. Marxists can recognise in Freud a courageous thinker who breached the boundaries of bourgeois respectability in his earnest endeavours to understand humanity. Specifically, Freud’s recognition of prepubescent psychosexual development, his identification of the role of the unconscious in the life of the person and his focus upon repression as a source of neurosis and human misery are important for understanding human experience.
4. Marxism is not a self-enclosed theoretical system and can absorb scientific insight from any empirical field to illuminate the world and better understand humanity *e.g.* Engels made use of the anthropological insights contained in *Ancient Society* (1877) by Lewis H. Morgan; Marx admired Darwin’s work on evolution. *Critical appreciation* of the achievements of science (including the human sciences) outside of Marxism, is a part of Marxism.
5. Marxism can incorporate specific insights from the Freudian theory-of-mind, *retheorising* and integrating them to complete and strengthen some aspects of its account of ideology.
6. Freud’s psychology (as opposed to his early neurological work or his later vitalism) is potentially useful for Marxism in providing a full account of the mind-in-society, historical consciousness, and ideology.
7. Those aspects of Freud’s theoretical system that Marxists can critically appreciate and rework *via* categories of historical materialism, include:
   * 1. an account of mind;
     2. a symbolic theory-of-mind and human behaviour;
     3. a set of descriptive psychological facets, mechanisms and processes;
     4. an account of object-internalisation (concrete; ego-related) and object-identification (abstract; superego-related);
     5. an account of gender and genderising socio-psychological mechanisms.
     6. the significance of an active unconscious.
     7. the theorisation of mental repression.
8. Psychology
   1. Marxism contains a psychology. This is derived from Hegel’s philosophy of subjective spirit.
   2. The Marxist ‘correspondence’ (‘representation’) theory of ideology contains psychological mechanisms that are comparable in type to those found in Freud’s theory of dreams, parapraxis, and normal psychology.
   3. Marxism offers a mechanism of instantiation that roots the person in their particular social, cultural, and technological context. This is the dialectic-of-self.
9. Mind
   1. Despite the psychological content of Marx’s and Engels’ theorising of ideology, an explicit *model*-of-mind is difficult to locate across their published works.
   2. Without a model-of-mind fully explaining the creation of the individual and of gender in the person, is problematic.
   3. Marxism does however, contain the elements of such a model including: the Hegelian dialectic of subjective spirit, and recognition/misrecognition: the dialectic-of-self in Marx’s early works; the dialectic of the ‘concrete and the abstract’ found in Vygotsky’s model of concept formation, and the origin of full concept formation (abstraction) with puberty; *etc.*
   4. This is a general scheme that analytically anticipates Freud’s theory of gender formation - the introjection-identification dialectic that determines gender in the Freudian model.
   5. The mind strives to integrate sensory-input and concept to orientate in the world. Where integration is impossible, where reality confronts the mind, where previously integrated conceptualisations decompose, where object defies concept, there aggression begins; the urge to destroy what is real, to restore internal conceptual equilibrium.
   6. Freud’s model-of-mind does not require validation or otherwise from Marxism. It can be treated (as Trotsky would have us say) as a hypothesis. It can be accorded a scientific status, without any further validating commitment.
   7. Freud hypostatises mental constructions such as the Oedipus Complex, seeing them as universal. However, there are examples of societies in which the Freud’s Oedipal drama evidently does not exist. (*cf.* Malinowski, Mead).
   8. Marxism cannot accept a ‘universal’ mind, beyond an abstracted and contentless form (the model-of-mind)
   9. For Marxism, any model-of-mind must be historicised. This becomes a ‘mode-of-mind’, belonging to a mode-of-production and a mode-of-consumption. Marx’s dialectic-of-self, combined with the co-dependence of production and consumption, and including a role for ‘repression’ provides a mechanism by which a historical mode-of-mind can emerge with each epoch, underpinning the types of sexual behaviour, gender and social attachments that characterise it.
   10. A mode-of-mind can be theorised along intersecting axes: i. productive relations (work patterning; mode-of-production); ii. reproductive-relations (family patterning; mode-of-consumption); iii. introjection-identification; and iv. the dialectic-of-self.
10. The unconscious
    1. Marx’s ‘correspondence’ theory of ideology implies a notion of a structural (social) unconscious - an organised ‘forgetting’. Marx provides social mechanisms for this in his correspondence and ‘commodity-fetishism’ theories of ideology.
    2. In Freud the id of the unconscious is a restless and vital force. There is no sense of this in Marx. Rather, the implied (and un-theorised) unconscious in Marx can best be understood as a reservoir of latent (implicitly repressed) mental material; and an (epistemic, perceptual) effect of mind.
11. Repression
    1. Marxism does not contain an explicit theory of or mechanism for mental repression.
    2. In Marxist theory the notion of a ‘repressed unconscious’ is implicit in key concepts such as alienation, reification, commodity fetishism, *etc.* It is not explicit. In Freud it is an explicit construct, given primary importance.
    3. Marx’s ‘commodity fetishism’ theory of ideology does not require a mechanism of repression of mental material, in-so-far as it is premised upon the construction of appearance. It does however require the repression of critical thought that might otherwise tear down the misrepresentations involved.
    4. Conflict within the person is recognised by both Freud and Marx. For Freud this is the result of: i. the internalised family drama and ii. the eternal and structurally conflicted character of the psyche. For Marx it is the internalised conflicts of class society. (An example of a convergence between Marx and Freud at the level of phenomena; but a divergence at the level of theorisation).
    5. Internalisation of the conflicts of class society is the source (though not the mechanism) of repression. The absence of this concept in Freud’s thinking led to his inability to understand repression as a social and political phenomenon.
    6. One mechanism of repression can be hypothesised as based upon intentionality.

*Thesis*: All mental content is directly or indirectly an orientation in relation to external reality.

*Antithesis*: Reality does not allow for all such mental content to find expression in external action (due to risks, threats - real and perceived - prohibitions, *etc*.); orientations in the world can be mutually excluding; orientations can also be away from the world, a retreat from painful reality *e.g.* religion, narcissism, *etc.*

*Synthesis*: Some mental contents must be repressed, to allow others to become dominant for survival.

* 1. For the general ‘model-of-mind’ the repression of some mental contents in order that others may become strategically dominant is the basis of a ‘social materialism’ that serves as a mediating third term in theory, between materialism at the historical scale, and the emergence of the personal (empirical) self as a specific ‘mode-of-mind’.
  2. This provides a hypothetical, (non-Freudian) mechanism for the creation and maintenance of a repressed (non-libidinal) unconscious.
  3. The ‘repression’ used as an element in a Marxist model-of-mind is different to its meaning within psychoanalysis, in the following ways:
     1. its role is socially strategic, as opposed to being an element of solely individualised and internalised psychology;
     2. it is future oriented, rather than being focused upon historical trauma;
     3. it is essentially non-libidinal, sexual repression being one (important) physical use of the mechanism it provides;
     4. it has a transformative potential, understood as the negative moment in a more complex and dialectical intra-psychical process.

1. Biology
   1. The use of ‘biology’ – understood as intergenerational inheritance – in explanations of social behaviour can be categorised in two ways: as an ‘essentialism’ in which biology directly drives behaviour; as a ‘mediated essentialism’ in which biology affects behaviour under the influence of social and cultural factors.
   2. A third ‘non-essentialist’ possibility exists, based upon cognition, risk and repression, in which biology plays no causal or originating role in any specific human behaviour.
   3. The role of labour and productive technique in determining ‘human essence’ (the form of social relations) works at a fundamental level beneath and prior to the interactions of social and biological factors in the moment-to-moment reality of life and felt experience.
   4. In his symbolic theory Freud provides models of how gender (and other aspects of personal behaviour) can be explained without recourse to biological determination, whether complex or reductionist.
   5. The liminal position of an inferred non-mediated contact with the objective world introduces the notion of an abstracted *limit* to consciousness, and an equally abstracted *origin* of sensory input to consciousness. The point at which sensation enters consciousness is simultaneously a moment of change as conceptual mediation begins. Conceptual mediation brings its own dynamic; it is not passive. Mediation *works* upon its object. (Understood as ‘active labour’, *contra* Feuerbach).
   6. Somatic sensory input is a special case of material flow into consciousness; though still actively mediated (by socialisation, by ideology, by identity, by gender, *etc.*).
   7. An aspect of conceptual mediation is *interpretation* of somatic sensory input. This means that mediated (interpreted) sensory input, experienced spontaneously as ‘natural’, being ‘of nature’, can be returned in the form of ideologically guided behaviour, experienced (spontaneously) as ‘human nature’. This applies to sex and to gender.
   8. So, bodily sensation flows into consciousness and is separated from its liminal point of origin by conceptualising processes, in a social world that is saturated with cultural mediations, and returned to the body as ‘natural feeling’, ‘instinctive impulse’, ‘involuntary desire’, *etc.* Ideology accesses and mobilises the autonomic nervous system.
   9. Ideology does not create sensory input; it does however create its meaning. It is the *meaning* of sensory input (its interpretation) that guides behaviour.
   10. This is addressed in theory by the concepts of ‘first nature’ and ‘second nature’ found in Marxism.
2. Determination
   1. ‘Social determination’ is of two orders: outward and obvious; inward and opaque (sedimented and experienced spontaneously as natural).
   2. Beneath structure (symbol) there is fluidity *cf.* Vygotsky’s concept of ‘inner speech’, that fluctuates between ‘the word’ and wordlessness. A metaphorical ‘semio-plasm’ (‘thinking’ in meaning).
   3. The mediating concepts and mechanisms that interpret somatic-sensory input are drawn from others (society; *cf.* Lacan). Mind is (unlike the brain) a relational object.
   4. This dispenses with the need for biology (complex and reductionist) as explanatory of any specific social behavioural form.
3. Gender
   1. Marx’s theory of the co-dependence of production and consumption can be mobilised to analyse socialisation, enculturation and genderising under capitalism. This involves an expansion of the meaning of the term ‘consumption’ to cover the construction of the personal self and of identity; consumption understood now as the way the individual orientates in their world in their non-productive human relations. The person ‘consumes’ in a capitalist marketplace of material and social goods (including sex), and life-strategies (including gender). These are co-dependent with production.
   2. The co-dependence of production and consumption, applied to gender, helps to explain historical genderising tendencies and trends.
   3. The ‘empirical self’ does not conform mechanically to this analytical framework; rather in its development it moves between these organising domains, that nonetheless set the terms for its development.
   4. Family-type(s) can be placed under mode-of-consumption and positioned for Marxism as a primary site of psycho-sexual development. Family structure changes with changing productive relations, allowing for a historical treatment of sex and gender. This borrows elements from the Freudian model, whilst refashioning them within overarching Marxist categories.
   5. Marx’s dialectic-of-self offers a general model of gender and genderising processes at the social scale.
   6. This is also true of all other domains: culture; taste; sexuality; *etc.* Each have their historical mode beneath phenomenal variation.
   7. Gender is a material practice, an orientation in the world.
   8. The behavioural structure of gender is relational; and gender is a relational object. It exists between persons and within a social structure.
4. Tradition
   1. Mental repression applies also to class, tradition, and the ‘control’ of history. It applies, because to hold on to traditions of struggle and revolution brings risk in the face of threats and antagonism.
   2. However, the repressed can ‘return’. There is ‘compression’. This is true of the person, and it is true of the group and/or class. ‘Return’ depends upon the structure of the social context and that of the episode. When past and present unite, knowledge, stories and narratives ‘forgotten’, can reappear to consciousness, and to the tongue.
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