

FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN THE *CLINICAL DIARY*.

Ferenc Erős (*)

ABSTRACT:

The paper discusses some philosophical, ethical and political-philosophical implications of Ferenczi's *Clinical Diary*, with special regard on the concepts of freedom and authority. It examines Ferenczi's early writings that explicitly deal with social and political issues, the central concept of which is "individual socialism". The paper also discusses (and publishes in *Appendix*) two short manuscripts by Ferenczi, written probably in 1920, which attempts to parallel psychoanalysis with Marxism, and with liberal socialism, respectively. It is shown that Ferenczi in the *Diary* avoids using directly political and ideological concepts, but, in the spirit of his earlier writings, he proposes a balance between "ruthless capitalism and fanciful egalitarianism". Finally, the significance of Utopia in Ferenczi's thinking is discussed.

KEY WORDS: *The Clinical Diary, freedom, authority, compulsion, repression, education, individual socialism, liberal socialism, Marxism, Utopia, Aurél Kolnai.*

RESUMEN:

Este artículo aborda algunas implicaciones filosóficas, éticas y político-filosóficas del Diario Clínico de Ferenczi, con especial atención a los conceptos de libertad y autoridad. Examina los primeros escritos de Ferenczi que tratan explícitamente temas sociales y políticos, cuyo concepto central es el "socialismo individual". El artículo también analiza (y publica en el Apéndice) dos breves manuscritos de Ferenczi, escritos probablemente en 1920, que intentan establecer paralelismos entre el psicoanálisis y el marxismo, y con el socialismo liberal, respectivamente. Se muestra que en el Diario, Ferenczi evita el uso directo de conceptos políticos e ideológicos, pero, en el espíritu de sus escritos anteriores, propone un equilibrio entre el "capitalismo despiadado y el igualitarismo fantasioso". Finalmente, se discute la importancia de la utopía en el pensamiento de Ferenczi.

Palabras Claves: Diario Clínico, libertad, autoridad, compulsión, represión, educación, socialismo individual, socialismo liberal, marxismo, utopía, Aurél Kolnai.

Sándor Ferenczi's *Clinical Diary* (1932) is an extremely rich and complex source that can be read and interpreted in several different ways, similarly to many other classical psychoanalytic works, such as, most notably, Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams*, which, according to the historian Carl Schorske, can be regarded as a scientific treatise, while its deep structure "constitutes an incomplete but autonomous subplot of personal history. Imagine St. Augustine weaving his *Confessions* into the *City of God*, or Rousseau integrating his *Confessions* as a subliminal plot into the *Origins of Inequality*" (Schorske, 1981, p. 183).

It is also true for Ferenczi's diary that theoretical statements, clinical observations, self-reflections and personal narratives are inseparably interwoven in it. However, in opposition to *Interpretation of Dreams*, Ferenczi had no intention of publishing his diaries, at least not in the form that it survived. Therefore, he had complete freedom to play and experiment with ideas, thoughts, associations, and feelings. Diaries, private letters, and other personal documents constitute particularly important sources for studying the internal elements of the history of psychoanalysis. Ferenczi's diaries allow us, *in statu nascendi*, a unique insight into his subjective experiences as well as into his intellectual inspirations. It is not by chance that, since

its first publication in 1985, the *Clinical Diary* has evoked such great interest among psychoanalysts and other commentators. It is a highly inspiring, challenging and also controversial text, not only because of its particular place in Ferenczi's whole life and work, but also because it has several important and far-reaching implications for present day psychoanalysis and beyond, for philosophy, and as well as for the social and political sciences.

The *Clinical Diary* can be read *as it is*, nothing more and nothing less, than a *genuine clinical diary* in the strict sense of the word, a practicing psychoanalyst's notes on his own methods, encounters, and therapeutic experiences with his patients¹, an inventory of observations, of case histories or fragments of cases, including his own case. It can be also read as a series of *personal confessions* about his own relations to patients, to Freud the Master, and to other relevant figures of the psychoanalytic movement. Given that the *Diary's* text consists of several autobiographical references, going back to Ferenczi's early childhood and family relationships, it can be seen as a *life historical narrative*, even if fragmented or incomplete. All these layers taken together transform the whole *Diary* into a grandiose but unfinished *self-analysis*.

On the other hand, the *Diary's* intellectual challenges are manifold, too. Before turning on the main topic of my paper, the political and sociological implications of the *Diary*, in relation to some of Ferenczi's other works, let us see a few other important aspects which cannot be discussed here in detail.

The *Diary* outlines a *metaphysical treatise* on the relation between body and soul, passion and reason. These themes are closely connected to Ferenczi's never ceasing interest in telepathy and in other, physically inexplicable phenomena which goes back to his "dangerous excursions" into occultism, so fiercely condemned by the rationalist Freud (Gyimesi, 2012). In the *Diary* he resumed his earlier ideas, described in *Thalassa* (1924), on the phylogenetic trauma as the origin of the soul, and the psyche as being a quality of the organic (and perhaps also the inorganic) material. Ferenczi goes back to Descartes (30 June 1932, pp. 150–153), and attempts to reinterpret the question of the relation between passions and reason from a psychoanalytic point of view, suggesting a solution in the sublimation of egoistic passions through a "circulus benignus" (5 May 1932, p. 99) provided by psychoanalysis and by enlightened child-rearing. The *Diary* from this aspect symptomatically demonstrates Ferenczi's inner fights between the sceptres of his own romantic irrationalism (inherited, among others, from Nietzsche and Groddeck), and his strivings for a new kind of humanistic rationalism that wants to rescue the autonomy of subject from a growing irrationalism in the outside world, with his own words, "the blossoming gangsterism" (31 March 1932, p. 74).

The *Diary* may be also read as an *essay on moral philosophy*, a foundation of psychoanalytically informed ethic, which should be based not on moral prescriptions and the blind following of norms. On the contrary, "there is also a second source of mutual goodwill, more primary, natural, and non-neurotic. This behaviour or feeling, however, apparently so highly ethical, has none of the pretensions of the righteous adult; it is merely a psychic parallel to one's own unimpeded physical and mental growth; so it is no particular achievement nor is experienced as such. Such perfect happiness was perhaps enjoyed only in the womb." (30 June 1932, p. 151). Ferenczi regards "excessive goodness" as a manifestation of overcompensated sadism of obsessional neurotics. As Lacan put it in his essay on "the mirror stage": "For such a task we can find no promise in altruistic feeling, we who lay bare the aggressiveness that underlies the activity of the philanthropist, the idealist, the pedagogue, and even the reformer." (Lacan, 2006, pp. 80–81).

Ferenczi would perhaps agree with Lacan that that there is no such thing as an *ethically neutral position*, the analyst might not be able to avoid having to face ethical questions. Ferenczi's ethics demand the unmasking of hypocrisy on both sides of the couch, as well as in the family and in the whole society. As he already wrote in "Psychoanalysis and Education": "Only when the hypocritical mysteriousness in sexual matters has ceased to exist, when everyone will know of the processes of his own body and mind – i.e. only with conscious cathexis – will sexual emotions be truly mastered and sublimated." (Ferenczi, 1908, in Ferenczi, 1994, pp. 285–286). In his letter to Freud on February 5, 1910, he declared: "Once society has gone beyond the infantile, then hitherto completely unimagined possibilities for social and political life are opened up. Just think what it would mean if one can tell everyone the truth, one's father, teacher, neighbour, and even the king. All fabricated, imposed authority will go to the devil" (Freud & Ferenczi, 1908–1914, p. 130).

Ferenczi's main concern in *Clinical Diary* was, again, to unmask hypocrisy in psychotherapy, in the family as well as in the whole society, and to reach at least a degree of sincerity which must be a precondition of freedom on individual as well as on social level. But the question emerges: how to develop a non-authoritarian, democratic therapeutic attitude, based on mutuality and acknowledgement? How can this goal be achieved in a world where authoritarianism, violence, "gangsterism" dominate? How psychoanalysis can be a "remedy", even when Freud himself could not get free from his own innermost authoritarian tendencies, from his own "protective device against insight into his own weakness" (4 August 1932, p. 186)?

The *Clinical Diary* may also be read as a politico-philosophical essay, an attempt to answer this question. Ferenczi was not a *homo politicus*, however, was fully aware of his moral responsibility as a psychoanalyst towards the whole of society. As he writes in his review on Freud's "Group psychology": "For in dealing with the patient the physician is the representative of the whole of human society. Like a Roman Catholic priest, he has the power to loose or bind..." (Ferenczi, 1922a, p. 376).

To understand the political and social implications of the *Clinical Diary*, it is instructive to outline briefly the broader political and life historical contexts of the birth of Ferenczi's text. 1932 was a critical year in European history as well as in Ferenczi's own life. It was the last year before the Nazi takeover in Germany; in Italy Mussolini's fascist regime has been ruling since 1922. In the same year Hungary's Gyula Gömbös was elected as prime minister with a proto-fascist, anti-Semitic program; in Austria Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss' Austro-Fascist, dictatorial government came to power. In the Soviet Union Stalin's totalitarian system has already consolidated, the cultural and scientific flourishing of the twenties (including many important Russian attempts to renew psychoanalysis) came to an abrupt end. The world economy was still in deep crisis, and among European intellectuals the fear of a "blossoming gangsterism", an atmosphere of general cultural disillusionment, or, as Freud called it, a feeling of "*Unbehagen*" dominates (Freud, 1930). For Ferenczi, 1932 was the last full year of his life. 13 years have passed since 1919 when he was appointed by the government of the Hungarian Councils' Republic as the world's first professor of psychoanalysis at the Medical Faculty of the Budapest University. However, shortly thereafter he had to suffer serious humiliations both for being Jewish and for accepting the university position from the Communist government.² Nine years have passed since the so called "technique debate", the clash over the birth trauma and the developmental aims of psychoanalysis that resulted in a long lasting split within the psychoanalytic movement, and a growing alienation had started between Freud and Ferenczi (Rudnytsky, Bókay & Giampieri-Deutsch [eds.], 1996; Haynal, 2002). All these events, conflicts and bitter experiences, complicated with his rapidly deteriorating physical health, the all-conquering "blood-crisis" (2 October 1932, p.212) had culminated in what he called in the *Diary* as the "terrorism of suffering" (24 August 1932, p. 211).

In the *Clinical Diary* "the terrorism of suffering" is not only the fate of the individual, it is the fate of mankind, too. Is there a way out, is there a rescue from universal suffering? Even if there is no salvation for the individual faced with terror and death, Ferenczi foresees improvements and progress for humanity, based on a "successful interaction of egoistic and universal tendencies" (24 January 1932, p. 18). The idea of this interaction is central to his political philosophy, the main concept of which is *individual collectivism*. The concept itself goes back to his earlier writings on social issues related to psychoanalysis, such as child rearing, education, the judicial system, and criminality (Ferenczi, 1908, 1911, 1913).

The key concepts of these earlier works are the notions of "unnecessary compulsion" and "excessive repression". Repression in contemporary society, Ferenczi argues, demands not only a minimum of instinctual renunciation that the already sufficiently pressing external circumstances require, but also the subjugation of its members, the deprivation of their freedom, human dignity and autonomy. "Excessive repression", speculates Ferenczi, sets free those instinctual forces, which lead to religious superstitions, to the cult of authority and to a rigid adherence to obsolete social forms. In "Psychoanalysis and education" he argues that "liberation from unnecessary inner compulsion would be the first revolution to bring real relief to mankind, for political revolutions have achieved only that the external powers, i.e. the means of coercion, have changed hands, or that the number of the oppressed has risen or fallen. Only people liberated in this real sense will be able to bring about a radical change in education and prevent permanently the return of similar

undesirable circumstances.” (Ferenczi, 1908, p. 283). In his article “The discovery of the unconscious” (Ferenczi, 1911) envisages a future society in which natural strivings and desires would be treated not with negation and repression, but with a sound government that would replace hypocrisy and the blind adoration of dogmas and authority. In his 1913 article “Psychoanalysis and its judicial and sociological relevance” he affirms that “between anarchy and communism, however, between unrestrained individual license and social asceticism, there must be somewhere a reasonable individual-socialistic just milieu that cares also for individual welfare as well as for the interests of society, that cultivates the sublimation instead of the repression of instincts, thereby preparing a quiet path for progress assured from revolutions and reactions” (Ferenczi, 1913, p. 433).

In an article entitled “Psychoanalysis and Social Politics”, published in 1922, Ferenczi hopes that “time will allow for the development of an ‘individual-socialist’ orientation which would take into account the natural differences between individuals, of their aspiration to independence and happiness, whilst acknowledging the need for communal life, and the restrictions, at times difficult to bear, which it imposes” (Ferenczi, 1922b, p. 211). In the same article Ferenczi, answering to the reproaches against him and explaining his motives for accepting a professorial position during the Communist government in 1919, affirms “psychoanalysis has refused to perceive any political party, be it individualistic or collectivistic, as the representative of true human nature.” (p. 212).

Ferenczi delineates even more clearly his own political position in two brief, undated and unpublished manuscripts entitled “Parallel between Marxism, communism and anarchism”, and “Parallel between psychoanalysis and liberal socialism”. (*Manuscript I., II.*) Both manuscripts belong to the Ferenczi legacy that has been recently donated to the London Freud Museum by Dr. Judith Dupont in 2012.³ They both deserve attention even though they are – similarly to the *Diary* – not polished and finished texts, but “experiments”, drafts, preliminary questions and thoughts, probably intending to elaborate them later.

In *Manuscript I.* Ferenczi raises the issue of parallels between psychoanalysis and the Marxist concept of history. He comes to the conclusion that this parallel is unsatisfactory, since the goals of the two schools are basically different. He associates Marxism with “rigid dialectics”, and refuses its alleged economic determinism, as well as the concept of “class struggle”, arguing that for psychoanalysis the *homo infans* rather than the *homo economicus* is the basic structure. He contrasts the Darwinian “selectionism” attributed to Marxism with a Lamarckian evolutionism. In fact, Ferenczi’s critique directs not only against Marxism, but also against a so-called “psychoanalytic mentality” that “is almost equivalent with an anarcho-communist mentality” which dreams of the elimination of all repressions, of the satisfaction of all desires, and envisages a “fatherless society” as the ultimate goal of psychoanalysis. Ferenczi contrasts this kind of “wild” mentality with “the healthy stock” of psychoanalysis whose aim is not the “liberation of instincts”, but is rather “*an instrument for the self-liberation of personality*”. Finally, Ferenczi acknowledges that “a certain historical innovative role, an experiment for a new, more deeply penetrating, more scientific approach to things” are common in both movements, however, “psychoanalysis rather joins to *Durkheim* and not to the Marxist sociology and politics, and, in concrete and actual questions joins to liberal socialism”.

In *Manuscript II.* Ferenczi elaborates further his ideas about a possible parallel between psychoanalysis and liberal socialism. He argues that while the parallel with Marxism failed, “psychoanalysis and liberal socialism share the same worldview, the same ethical sense, and the same task in the service of the welfare of men”. Psychoanalysis, as he argues, cannot bring “salvation”, but only works “on the self-salvation of the individual”. Discussing some basic themes of liberal socialism, Ferenczi points out the discovery of the significance of *land*, attributing the main responsibility for all social diseases to two conditions. The first is an “antirational, rigid *fixation to the land*, which resists industrialism”, and the second is “*the treatment of land as a simple commodity*.” As for the fixation to the land, Ferenczi finds a psychoanalytic parallel for it in “land eroticism”, and in “an incestuous fixation to the mother, which inhibits free consciousness and support the primary despotism of the father”. On the other hand, argues Ferenczi, “the treatment of land as a simple commodity would be equivalent with a helpless *repression*, which is incapable of higher developments”. However, he does not advance in this direction further, and dismiss this speculation as an “unreasonable

game”, asking: “Who would take the courage to give a correct psychoanalytic translation of ‘land tax’, or a sociological, liberal-socialistic translation of ‘urethral eroticism’?”

One might wonder why Ferenczi had yet taken the courage to attempt these “translations”? For what reason had he become interested at all in the question of land, which stands so far removed from psychoanalysis as a typically *urban* phenomenon? He does not betray his sources, but a closer look at the text reveals in it the traces of the ideas of Henry George, a 19. Century American social thinker and economist (1839–1897). He is mostly known for his theory of the *land value tax* as a remedy of inequality in industrial societies. In his most famous book, *Progress and poverty* (1879) George argued that a sizeable portion of the wealth created by social and technological advances in a free-market economy is possessed by landowners and monopolists via economic rents, and that this concentration of unearned wealth is the main cause of poverty. He proposed a “land value tax” or “single tax” in which governments would tax the value of the land itself, thus preventing private interests from profiting upon its mere possession, but allowing the value of all improvements made to that land to remain with investors. George’s program called for *liberating production from taxation, the earth from monopoly, and humanity from poverty*.

In Ferenczi’s age Henry George’s propositions had many followers in Europe, especially in Britain, in the Labor Party and in the Fabian Society whose members included Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Leonard and Virginia Wolf. George influenced, among others, Josef Popper-Lynkeus, the Austrian engineer and utopian social philosopher whose theory on dreaming was acknowledged by Freud as being very close to his own dream theory. George influenced also Theodor Herzl, the founder of Zionism who in his utopian novel *Old New Country* (Altneuland) envisaged a happy communitarian society, the anticipation of the later kibbutzim on the Palestinian land.

George’s proposition for introducing land value tax was a highly attractive topic for progressive and radical circles in the early 1900s in Hungary, in a country where the feudal system, the dominance of landlords still prevailed. George’s theory, along with the theories of Marx, Darwin, Herbert Spencer, Max Weber, Émile Durkheim and other social and economic thinkers had been widely discussed in the forums and groups where Ferenczi belonged and contributed to (Social Science Society, Galileo Circle).⁴ George’s main work *Progress and poverty* had been reviewed and referred to in various journals and was published in Hungarian in 1914. The most important thinker and propagator of liberal socialism was in that time the German economist and sociologist Franz Oppenheimer (1867–1943), a devoted follower of Henry George’s ideas. Oppenheimer was also well known in Hungary, mostly through his main work *Der Staat* (in English 1908), published also in Hungarian in 1912.

Ferenczi might have been aware of George’s or Oppenheimer’s propositions, it is, however, most unlikely that he had studied these authors seriously, at least not before 1920. There is evidence to suggest that he may have become more interested in George’s and Oppenheimer’s ideas through Aurél Kolnai (1900–1973), a Hungarian thinker, who is known in the West primarily as a conservative moral and political philosopher. However, in this time, as a young student of social sciences in Budapest and Vienna, was still member of some radical circles and was, for a short time, intellectually committed to psychoanalysis (although he became an ardent critic a few years later).⁵ Kolnai had visited Ferenczi in early 1920, joined to the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Society, and had soon been invited by him to give a lecture under the title “Psychoanalysis and sociology”. On the day of the lecture, on April 18, 1920, Ferenczi enthusiastically reported to Freud that “we heard an *outstanding* lecture by a henceforth accepted member”, and adds, “One would never have ascribed *so* much psa. understanding from a man who has hitherto been so distant from us” (Freud & Ferenczi, 1920–1933, p. 16).

We don’t know what topics Kolnai was exactly talking about in this lecture, but we can guess its main lines from the fact that a few months later he published a whole book under the same title, *Psychoanalyse und Soziologie*, in Vienna at the International Psychoanalytic Publishing House (Kolnai, 1920).⁶ In fact, the book was a pamphlet against what Ferenczi called in *Manuscript I*. “anarcho-communist mentality”, a response to the theses of the left wing socialist psychoanalyst Paul Federn of Vienna, who already published a book under the title *Zur Psychoanalyse der Revolution: Die vaterlose Gesellschaft* (The psychoanalysis of revolution:

The fatherless society) in 1919. From this aspect, Ferenczi's *Manuscripts* seem to be drafts of arguments used by Kolnai in his book against Marxism and in defense of liberal socialism. Kolnai also discusses the views of George and Oppenheimer, suggesting parallels between psychoanalysis and liberal socialism in a similar vein to Ferenczi's suggestions in *Manuscript II*. We can suppose, therefore, that Ferenczi's *Manuscripts* had been inspired primarily by his interaction(s) with Aurél Kolnai. Presumably, Ferenczi borrowed from Kolnai the concept of *liberal* socialism, which fitted well to his earlier political and ideological views on *individual* socialism. On the other hand, it can be assumed that Ferenczi's ideas about the application of psychoanalysis to social questions could have been instrumental in shaping Kolnai's views on social movements and mass psychology. It should be noted that *Psychoanalyse und Soziologie* preceded the publication of Freud's *Group psychology and the analysis of ego* by one year, and in the debates of the 1920s Kolnai's book was used as a scapegoat for attacks against psychoanalysis in the name of Marxist ideology.⁷

Twelve years after these *Manuscripts*, in the *Clinical Diary*, Ferenczi avoids the use of dubious parallels or attempts at psychoanalytic interpretations of political and ideological concepts. However, by transposing them to a more universal level, he maintains the messianic spirit of his earlier writings on individual or liberal socialism. As he writes: "If one were not ashamed to indulge in prophecies, then one would expect from the future neither the triumph of one sided ruthless capitalism nor that of fanciful egalitarianism, but rather a full recognition of the existence of purely selfish drives, which remain under control but must be partly satisfied in reality; the elimination of a great deal of neurotic, still passionate, one might even say violently excessive goodness (eat-bird-or-die policy), and, finally, perhaps the gradual unfolding of a naïve good-heartedness." (30 June 1932, p. 152.)

These prophecies are "generalized social rescue fantasies", that, as Emanuel Berman warns, "may backfire, in ways that parallel the paradoxical impact of personal rescue attempts" (Berman, 2003, p. 441). Ferenczi himself called his ideas as *Utopia*: "suppression of hate impulses, ending the chain of acts of cruelties (like blood feuds); progressive taming of the whole of nature through control of knowledge." (28 June 1932, p. 146). He was, however, aware of the realistic limits of his own prophecies. He was a cautious or shy utopian, affirming his prophecies and worrying at the same time that he may increase "by one more the number of mad world reformers" (30 June 1932, p. 152).

Ferenczi's utopianism, fortunately, did not feed "mad social reformers". It has, however, essentially influenced object relation theory and other progressive transformations of psychoanalysis in liberal democracies that opened new ways to its application to the problems of persons, families, social groups and institutions. (Rose, 1989). Ferenczi, a premature champion of a "psychoanalyzed welfare state", died in 1933, a few months after the Nazi takeover in Germany. He could not be a witness of the great social experiments which had taken place after the world economic crisis, that is, the New Deal in President Roosevelt's America, and the foundation of the social democratic welfare states after WW2 in Britain and in other Western European countries. These experiments had been answers to the challenge of fascism, Nazism and East European state socialism, and for a long time they proved to be successful inasmuch they could indeed promote a certain balance, as Ferenczi imagined, between a "ruthless capitalism" and a "fanciful egalitarianism". However, as we experience this balance, it seems rather fragile, and this forces us, time and again, to rethink the relation between utopia and reality.

APPENDIX

TWO UNPUBLISHED, HANDWRITTEN NOTES BY FERENCZI

The Ferenczi Archives, Freud Museum, London

I. Parallel between psychoanalysis, Marxism, communism and anarchism.

Our subject is a comparison of the analytic knowledge with the Marxist concept of history. They both attempt to reduce the superior to the inferior, to deduce ideal moments from the more crude ones, in short, to replace the value-laden superstructure with voluntaristic pseudo-constructions in the mechanics

of things. Psychoanalysis finds here the sexual instinct, while historical materialism discovers here the economic instincts. He who wants to study these courses of ideas may stop at the conviction that social life is determined dominantly by “hunger”, while the individual life is determined by love. In the further development of both schools these vulgar notions were replaced by “order of production” and “sexual constitution”, respectively. Class struggle, the real material of history would be equal to the struggle of instinctual pulsations, while the destruction of the subsistent superstructural frames would be analogous with the explosion of repressed material... And so on, the final result of development, the communist ideal would cover the “fatherlessness” of psychoanalysis, while the anarchist one would be the other side of the psychoanalytic removal of inhibitions.

The more we advance forward, the more it will be evident that the parallel is unsatisfactory, or it would be even more important *to separate two concepts of psychoanalysis*. For the first, the elimination of repressions is everything and is equivalent to living out, while the second acknowledges and evaluates the psychological separation of *repression and critical judgment*. Even though the first statement seems to be “extremely psychoanalytic”, the second is the correct one. If psychoanalysis wanted to be omnipotent, if it claimed power for making decisions over instinctual fates, and over the government of life, then we would be tempted to believe that the essence of psychoanalysis is the “liberation of instincts”.

We recognize that this sort of psychoanalytic mentality is almost equivalent to anarcho-communist mentality.

However, the healthy stock of psychoanalysis sharply contradicts to this, both officially and factually: *Freud's* theory of the unconscious and the culture, *Ferenczi's and Pfister's* relevant ideas and a general stance against “wild psychoanalysis”. In this sense psychoanalysis is not the “liberation of instincts”, but “*an instrument for the self-liberation of personality*”. Analysis attempts to make a self-synthesis possible, judgment and sublimation, of which the normal capacity for love, far from being the fulfilment of pathogenic desires, constitutes only a part, since it is not a suggested method, but is a consequence of the self-liberation.

The psychoanalytic goal is not the Marxist goal. Therefore, in psychoanalysis there is nothing from the rigid dialectics of Marxism. According to the latter, the determining role of the production of goods, the economy itself will disappear after the final transformation. As the anarchist dreamer imagines: the elimination of the inhibition of instincts will bring about the full internal domestication of instincts, in fact the lack of instincts, and a childish sanctity. Psychoanalysis has nothing to do with these partly paranoiac, partly infantile phantasies. It is fully aware of *sublimation as being a difficult a complicated procedure that will never be able to lack either a more crude but limited fulfilment or a frequently needed unrelenting judgment*. While the basic structure of the Marxist conception destroys its superstructure, and in this way, it wants to conjure a “fairy land” which consists of “superstructure” exclusively, psychoanalysis attempts at purifying the basic structure and widening the superstructure, with the help of stimulating communication.

The developmental theory of Marxism is completely false, strongly distorted and pathologically determined, while that of the psychoanalysis is true as a whole, it is fitting to the facts, scientific. Since – in our view, and it is the most important – the Marxian “economy” is not an adequate analogue of a psychoanalytic “unconscious”. It cannot be deduced from nature, biologically, it supposes an enormous organization, it is primary for the classic proletarian class mentality, but is not primary for an unbiased investigator. *Homo infans is “basic structure”, but homo oeconomicus is already “superstructure”*. Genetically, only voluntarism is acceptable; the theory of instincts is voluntarism, the theory of economic interests is not. In final analysis, that is the sharpest contradiction between Freud's and Marx' evolutionism; a difference which is similar to the difference between *Lamarckianism and selectionism*. Thus, remains no more from the parallel than a certain historical innovative role, an experiment for a new, more deeply penetrating, more scientific approach to things which is common for both movements. In other respect, psychoanalysis rather joins to *Durkheim* and not to the Marxist sociology and politics, and, in concrete and actual questions to liberal socialism.

II. Parallel between psychoanalysis and liberal socialism.

Liberal socialism has pointed out a factor in our social life, which operates in a hidden way. However, it is not the economic in its non-economic background, but much more on the reverse way, is one part of the economy in the depth of other parts. Liberal socialism discovered the significance of *land*, or what is the same, re-discovered and emphasized it. The developmental theory of liberal socialism is pure voluntarism, since it shows irrational, in fact extra-economic moments of *land eroticism* in its primary manifestations as being a primary moment.

Liberal socialism attributes the main responsibility for social diseases to two conditions, which can be applied to psychoanalytic concepts as well. Its program of action against these pathogenic causes is, in its sort, a duplicate of the analytic helping methods.

One of these ills is an antirational, rigid *fixation to the land*, which resists industrialism. It prevents on the one hand a clever and intensive cultivation of the plough-land, and, on the other hand, it prevents the removal of the landlords who feed all antisocial power. Its equivalent is an incestuous fixation to the mother, which inhibits free consciousness and support the primary despotism of the father.

The other social ill is *the treatment of land as a simple commodity*. It is a typical sin of bourgeois pseudo-liberalism, which, on the hand, prevents the productive valorisation of land eroticism through its rigid neglect, and the other hand, it reinforces the position of the landowners, even of those who live in cities. Its equivalent is a helpless *repression*, which is incapable of higher developments.

Both of these diseases suppose each other, and they cause an internal split which resembles the splits we find in neuroses. Their overcoming is possible through sublimation, development, small farms with tilling, and land tax. The way leading to this aim is a cathartically guided elimination of repressions, the political democracy, the rise of the cultural level, the radical distribution of large estates, and the disarmament of armies and taxes – at the same time pushing back the humanistic experiments. By no means “salvation”, *but working for the self-salvation of the individual, the personality*.

Someone could say that neither this parallel can be unfolded perfectly. We hope that, too, because nothing is further from our expectations than the success of such unreasonable games. Who would take the courage to give a correct psychoanalytic translation of “land tax”, or a sociological, liberal-socialistic translation of “urethral eroticism”? However, the parallel with communism already failed with respect to the tendency, the basic schemes, and the *habitus*. In contrast to this, psychoanalysis and liberal socialism share the same worldview, the same ethical sense, and the same task in the service of the welfare of humanity.

Ferenc Erős

(*) Ferenc Erős: Doctor of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, professor emeritus, head of the “Theoretical Psychoanalysis” PhD program at the Doctoral School of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pécs, Hungary. Editor of the Hungarian translation of the Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence (2000–2005), and co-editor with J. Szekacs-Weisz and K. Robinson: *Sándor Ferenczi-Ernest Jones: Letters 1911–1933*. London: Karnac, 2013. e-mail address: erosferenc@gmail.com

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the conference “Sincerity and Freedom in Psychoanalysis”, Freud Museum, London, October 2013. The research was supported by Imago International (London), and the Hungarian National Research Fund (OTKA project No 109148).

In: The American Journal of Psychoanalysis. Freedom and Authority in the Clinical Diary

Published: 01 December 2014. volume 74, pages 367–380 (2014). DOI: 10.1057/ajp.2014.31.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268987317_Freedom_and_Authority_in_the_Clinical_Diary

REFERENCES

- Berman, E. (2003). Ferenczi, rescue and utopia. *American Imago*, 60(4), 429–444.
- Brennan, B. W. (2013). Decoding Ferenczi's Clinical Diary: Biographical notes on identities concealed and revealed. Presented at the conference "Sincerity and Freedom in Psychoanalysis", Freud Museum, London. [specify reference, paper will appear in the same issue]
- Dunlop, F. (2002). *The life and thought of Aurél Kolnai*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Erős, F. (2001). *Analitikus szociálpszichológia [Analytic social psychology]*. Budapest: Új Mandátum.
- Erős, F. (2012a). Psychoanalysis behind iron curtains. In L. Auested (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis and politics: Exclusion and the politics of representation* (pp. 203–222). London: Karnac, 2012.
- Erős, F. (2012b). Some social and political issues related to Ferenczi and the Hungarian school. In J. Szekacs-Weisz & T. Keve (Eds.), *Ferenczi and his world: rekindling the spirit of the Budapest school* (pp. 39–54). London: Karnac, 2012.
- Federn, P. (1919). *Zur psychologie der Revolution: die vaterlose Gesellschaft*. Vienna: Anzengruber-Verlag.
- Ferenczi, S. (1908[1994]). Psychoanalysis and education. In M. Balint (Ed.), *Final contributions to the problems and methods of psycho-analysis by Sándor Ferenczi* (pp. 280–290). London: Hogart Press, 1955. Reprinted, London: Karnac, 1994.
- Ferenczi, S. (1911). Az öntudatlan megismerése [The discovery of the unconscious]. *Szabadgondolat*, 1(2), 75–78.
- Ferenczi, S. (1913[1994]). On psychoanalysis and its judicial and sociological relevance. In J. Rickman (Ed.), *Further contributions to the technique of psychoanalysis by Sándor Ferenczi* (pp. 424–435). London: Hogarth Press, 1926. Reprinted, London: Karnac, 1994.
- Ferenczi, S. (1922a[1994]). Freud's 'Group psychology and the analysis of the Ego'. Progress in individual psychology. In M. Balint (Ed.), *Final contributions to the problems and methods of psycho-analysis by Sándor Ferenczi* (pp. 371–376). London: Hogart Press, 1955. Reprinted, London: Karnac, 1994.
- Ferenczi, S. (1922b[1999]). Psychoanalysis and social policy. In J. Borossa (Ed.), *Sándor Ferenczi: Selected writings* (pp. 210–213). London: Penguin, 1999.
- Ferenczi, S. (1924[2005]). *Thalassa: A theory of genitality*. New York: The Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 1938. Reprinted, London: Karnac, 2005.
- Ferenczi, S. (1932). *The clinical diary*. J. Dupont (Ed.), M. Balint & N. Z. Jackson (Trans.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Freud, S. (1930). Civilization and its discontents. *Standard Edition* (Vol. 21, pp. 57–146). London: Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S. & Ferenczi, S. (1908–1914[1993]). *The correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi, Vol. 1. 1908–1914*. E. Brabant, E. Falzeder, & P. Giampieri-Deutch (Eds.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Freud, S. & Ferenczi, S. (1920–1933[2000]). *The correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi, Vol. 3. 1920–1933*. E. Falzeder & E. Brabant (Eds.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- George, H. (1879[2009]). *Progress and poverty: An inquiry into the cause of industrial depressions and of increase of want with increase of wealth: The remedy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Gyimesi, J. (2012). Sándor Ferenczi and the problem of telepathy. *History of the Human Sciences*, 25(2), 131–148.
- Haynal, A. E. (2002). *Disappearing and reviving: Sándor Ferenczi in the history of psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac.
- Jacoby, R. (1975). *Social Amnesia. A history of conformist psychology from Adler to Laing*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Kolnai, A. (1920[2013]). *Psychoanalyse und Soziologie*. Wien: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1920. Eden & Cedar Paul (Trans.), *Psychoanalysis and sociology*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1922. Nabu Press, 2013.
- Kolnai, A. (1999). *Political memoirs*. Lanham, Maryland and Oxford: Lexington Books.
- Lacan, J. (2006). The mirror stage as formative of the function of the I as revealed in psychoanalytic experience. In Jacques Lacan: *Ecrits. The first complete edition in English* (pp. 75–81). B. Fink. (Trans.), New York: Norton.

- Oppenheimer, F. (1908[1999]). *The State: Its history and development viewed sociologically*. J.M. Gitterman (Trans.) Second edition, New York: Vanguard Press, 1926. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1999.
- Schorske. C. E. (1981). *Fin-de-siècle-Vienna. Politics and culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Rose, N. (1989). *Governing the soul. The shaping of the private self*. London: Routledge.
- Rudnytsky, P. L., Bókay, A. & Giampieri-Deutsch, P. (Eds.) (1996). *Ferenczi's turn in psychoanalysis*. New York and London: New York University Press.

Volver a Artículos sobre Ferenczi
Volver a Newsletter 26-ALSF

Notas al final

- 1.- On Ferenczi's patients see Brennan, 2013.
- 2.- On the background and consequences of Ferenczi's university appointment see Erős, 2012a.
- 3.- For the English translation of these *Manuscripts* see in Appendix
- 4.- See more details about Ferenczi's intellectual milieu in Erős, 2012b.
- 5.- On Kolnai's life and work see Dunlop, 2002.
- 6.- Kolnai in his *Political memoirs* (1999) gives an account of his encounters with Ferenczi and the psychoanalytic movement.
- 7.- On the Marxist reception of Kolnai's work and the „Freud-Marx debates” see Jacobi, 1975; Erős, 2001.