

30.x.'69 Darwin, Marx, FREUD - II

We are moving towards Henry Adams & his remarkable perception in 1906 that the problems of making unities out of the kind of information that was becoming available in the 19th, concerning primitive cultures, science, & the analysis of religion, was becoming impossible; and that you had to resign yourself either to making a selection of facts for a single point-of-view, or accept the fact of discrete events which did not fit a grid, and resign yourself to having failed to discover "laws".

McLuhan: "The content of Plato's work, of his new written form, was the old oral dialogue; the content of the print technology of the Renaissance was mediaeval writing. By the 19th the Renaissance had come into full view. As the industrial environment formed, this progressive time firmly & squarely confronted the Renaissance. The content of the 19th was the Renaissance; the content of the 20th mind is the 19th. We are obsessed with it."

Marx: "working with iron necessity towards inevitable results." Norbert Wiener is aware that the over-organized structure of any kind is a form of chaos, according to the second law of thermodynamics (entropy starts with the loss of heat energy in a system which becomes too rigid). (The second industrial revolution--electronic--version is that a feedback system which is too rigid produces oscillation. Cf. Pynchon.) You must watch carefully whenever a law of physical energy is played back into human relations metaphorically.

The ~~form~~ core of Value for Marx is what he called in a letter to Engels "the formation of an artistic whole", 1865. Favoured images: "shortening & lessening the birth pangs", petrification, crystalization, congealing, masses solidifying, death sleep of the Sleeping Beauty. Money: fetishism, religious magic, necromancy (cf. Ben Jonson, Volpone). Sacrifice of blood & money to "that Moloch, avarice" (Ginsberg, "Howl", pt. 2). City is imaged as place of sacrifice; colonialism is a "sacrifice to a strange god". The end of Capital: "Modern society which soon after its birth pulled Plutus by the hair of his head from the bowels of the earth, greets gold as its holy grail, as the glittering incarnation of the very principle of its own life." (This becomes basic in Norman O. Brown's consideration of money & excrement in Life Against Death. Chapter 15 contains a revised Marxian/Freudian interpretation of money/gold/earth/excrement, which makes a useful connection from Luther through Marx (baptised & trained as a Lutheran) to Freud to Brown, who is attempting to revise the analysis. Capital, vol. 3, has a sub-section entitled "Utilization of the Excrements of Production"

There is in Marx not a desire to set up & glorify automatic systems, but a spirit of inquiry in which the metaphors are at least dramatic & not rigidifying. He rejects Darwinist telology.

The Civil War in France, 1871. Marx had foreseen the commune uprising & warned against it, but then he has to praise its revelation of what the seizure of power by the proletariat meant in practise (the exact equivalent of the shock to leftists of the

Paris revolt of May 1968, & one of the reasons for the rejection of Marxist analysis by the far left & the anarchists--the failure to suggest ways in which the seizure of power by the proletariat could come about.) Marx praised ~~xxxxxxx~~ government by elected working men's councils, the abolition of a standing army & police force, an elected judiciary, & free education for all--a much more radical programme than the Communist Manifesto of 1846. But his language is still tragic: "Working, thinking, fighting, believing Paris, almost forgetful in its incubation of a new society, of this cannibalism at its gates, radiant in the enthusiasm of historic initiative." Atrocities against the commune are "a tearing to pieces of the living body of the proletariat", which are "scattered over the face of the earth": a parody of the dismembering & scattering of the body of Dionysus.

As with Freud, he must fit human action into the structure of myth. His most famous myth, perhaps, is that the proletariat must act as if it had free will; on the other hand the millennium will come about.

A real problem will arise as we move into Freud: how do you move on from the Darwinian/Freudian structures of determinism & teliological dramas? How do you arrive at some sort of praxis? This is where Paul Goodman & N.O. Brown begin: what can be retrieved from Marx & Freud? (The catalytic figure is Reich, who was banned from various psychoanalytic societies for attempting a fusion of socialism & psychology. He joined the Austrian Communist Party in the 1920's, & was interested in two things which ~~the~~ Freud & bougeois psychology were not working on, i.e., the condition of the working class who, given the expenditure of labour, might need psychoanalysis just as much as those who could afford it; and secondly, that the structure of society itself might be analyzed according to psychological principles. He also desired change in societal structure, for the benefit of individuals, which neither Freud nor Jung were willing to think about. But more of Reich later.)

What hope is there for change if you eliminate the Marxist millennium? Marx found his own peace, in private life, with his family, although he attacked the bougeois family as an institution. In his writings, peace in the family means peace in the house, & that means government, property, & a relationship between men, women, & children which is erotic, generational & ideological; he cannot play this back into his general ideology. He posits the family as an island of exemplary comic drama in a social structure which is tragic. This has always been an ideal in America for some: utopian, communal microcosms within the capitalist macrocosm.

Norman O. Brown, "From Politics to Metapolitics", in Caterpillar No.1, 1967. Concerned with the city as a product of the imagination of synthesis: "If, as Blake said, the Fall is into division, the vocation of the intellectuals is to overcome the consequences of the fall. I don't know about the proletariat, but the intellectual as such has no fatherland; or, to use another metaphor, there is a heavenly city. Logos seeks unification; and the fact it faces is division, alienation in the old Marxist

vocabulary; The rents, the splits in the newer Freudian vocabulary, the schisms, the schizophrenia." In Blake, the separation between imagination & knowledge (Jerusalem, Plate 97).

Brown's question is, how do you go beyond all these as "basic" splits built into human nature & into society? Like Reich, Brown understands that what must be done is to cure schizophrenia, to establish a relationship between the body & the body politic. "In the mythology of Marxism, the revolution is from below; those lower classes, lower depths, are the depths of depth psychology, an underworld repressed by the bourgeois ego, a cauldron of energy & violence with the lid on, an anonymous mass or social id." This means that you have permanent schizophrenia, and the problem of society is quite simply madness. (Cf. R.D. Laing, who analyzes schizophrenia as a social disease) So what unification can there be which doesn't separate, or perpetuate separation? (See Michel Foucault, Madness & Civilization, 1961/7) Brown: "There is some obstacle impending the free flow of the unification". "Reason & Revolution" (Marcuse's study of Hegel) is really Reason & Madness."

Bruno Betelheim's book on the Kibbutz hits directly at the family problem in America: if the central bourgeois institution of the family leads to the Oedipus complex & disaster, why keep it going? (See also Society Without the Father, a long psychoanalytic study of children who have been brought up without fathers. This is an area of intense examination. Alexander Mitscherlich, 1963/9)

Right through to Olson, Brown, et al., we are concerned with providing the human body with a history & a morphology. Of importance is Engels, The Origin of the Family, 1884. We are looking for models of human existence which challenge the bourgeois assumption that a discussion of man doesn't include economics & government. Engels' basic metaphor is war, "the social war, the war of each against each". "When a working man starves to death, the police take care he does so in a quiet & inoffensive manner." His picture of life in England, 14 yrs before Darwin's Origin, in "The Condition of the Working Class in England", 1844, is a terrifying masterpiece. The working class are not characterized as yahoos, savages, or Disraeli's potential insurrectory hoard (Sybil, 1845). Compare these two works by Engels & Disraeli, & you will see the plan which will go into the works of James T. Farrell & Dreiser--they're dirty & you can't get rid of them (cf. Brown & Swift).

The Dialects of Nature, 1842-death. Like Darwin, this speculates on what an individual is in a historical-biological programme. He defines life as "the mode of existence of protoplasmic bodies", which isn't bad for 1872!

The Origin of the Family begins with one Lewis H. Morgan, the key man in the 19th rediscovery of matriarchy as a predecessor of patriarchy (cf. the concealed panic in Graves' The White Goddess). Engels says that this was as important as Darwin's evolution & Marx's separate value. He posits a prehistoric primal crime: the theft of rights from the primal mother, in order to reach a "higher" condition, with a taboo against incest as a principle of

natural selection. Remember that Marx took from French socialists the idea of property as theft; Engels places the "theft" myth inside pre-history. This leaves us with "the world's historical defeat of the female sex", paralleling the defeat of the female in the Eden myth. This defeat leads to the patrilinear society, the monogamous family, & private property. (For use in handling Greek myth & drama, see George Thompson, The Civilization of the Aegean & Aesylus in Athens. You can't understand why Electra doesn't recognize Orestes until you know this material.) "The first class oppression coincides with that of the female sex." The family is the microcosm of serfdom in society; the father is the bourgeoisie, the wife the proletariat.

But note that there is another unexamined myth contained within: the myth of original pastoral classlessness, under mum! It can be reconstructed from the pattern of Nobles Savages. He mentions three: the Iriquois, the Zulus, & the Nubians. And there is also the myth that occurs in Mumford et al., that you regain this pastoral classlessness through technology & plenty. Engels vision is of downgrading the father & upgrading sexual freedom. (Reich is very interested in this.) Engles sees (cf. Bataille) that Saturnalia & sexual orgy may be taken as ways of regaining temporarily what he calls "the old freedom of sexual intercourse". This forsees Reich's placing of sexuality within a "sex economy" Brown's idea of "polymorphous perversity". "Sex love in the relationship with a woman becomes, and can only become, the real rule among the oppressed classes, which means among the proletariat, whether this relationship is officially sanctioned or not." "Prostitution disappears; monogomy, instead of collapsing, becomes a reality, for men also." "Society looks after all children alike, whether they are legitimate or not. This removes all the anxiety about the consequences, which today is the most essential social & moral as well as the economic factor that prevents a girl from giving herself completely to the man she loves." These are the C19th ideas that help progressive thinkers far more than Marx, & which are feeding back into C. Wright Mills. Engels admits at one point, "One knows that what is maintained to be necessity is composed of sheer accidents." The so-called accidental is the form behind which necessity hides itself. . . ." An advance, from which he quickly retreats.

B Freud: This is the point from which we can leap off into Totem & Taboo, 1913. Engels pragmatism is guided by human relationship as the central value: "sex love, friendship, compassion, self-sacrifice". His revolutionary optimism & system-making is controlled by an eye kept on happiness, rather than predictive controls: what do you do with the body, which is basically all you've got?

In Totem & Taboo, Freud constructs another myth of origins, in order to relate all life under a single dramatic perpetuated action. "A comparison of the psychology of primitive races as taught by folklore, with the psychology of the neurotic as it has become known through psychoanalysis." This will be impor-

tant when we come to Olson, Duncan, & those who are using backlogs of universal mythology. Which mythologies are they selecting, from which cultures, & what are they selecting inside those cultures?

There is a non-sequitur inside Freud's comparison, since one element is arrived at through social analysis & the other is not, which is where Reich has to start checking. But Freud makes a radical step, which he later partly repudiates.

Interpretation of Dreams, 1899. In this book, Freud speculated on the Oedipal situation (childhood erotic attachment to the parent of opposite sex & rivalry with parent of the same sex). The oracle in Sophocles' play Oedipus Rex (which Freud translated for his secondary school graduation examination) is the predictive curse; in Freud's interpretation, it is the curse of all men's sexual direction towards hatred & murder, "and our dreams convince us that this is so". But mostly, he says, we do not murder; and dreams are fortunate wish-fulfillments, the latent wish to discharge in symbolic dramas these aggressive urges. "Dreaming is a piece of infantile mental life that has been superceded." In 1913 he wrote to Ernest Jones, concerning this book: "Then I described the wish to kill one's father, and now (1913, Totem & Taboo) I have been describing the actual killing." After all, it is a big step from a wish to a deed."

Remember always that Freud was a very honest man who tried always not to fudge himself.

Two years later, in 1915, he starts writing about wars; & all he can say finally is that there is nothing to be done, except stoic resignation to the human condition, which is war-like. Freudian revisionists like Marcuse may do what they like, but there is no answer to this in Freud; nothing but total, irrevocable gloom. Eros & Civilization is a load of tripe from beginning to end; Essay on Liberation is a disgrace. He tries to get the dialectic & Freudian processes going together, but they are basically recalcitrant.

What we are dealing with is the myth of succession by conflict, for survival. But now it is rooted not in historical & biological evolution as in Darwin & Marx, or in prehistoric anthropology as in Engels, but in the permanent psychological structure of the human being.

This, of course, is the basis of tragic drama: the killing off of kings etc., endlessly, for purposes of fertilization, as in Dionysiac rites. So Freud comes under attack in mid-C20th from those who realize that the core of Freud is everything that one means by tragic drama, in sociology, literature, politics, economics, etc.

The first to criticize was the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski, in Sex & Repression in Savage Society, 1927. This is important, because the evidences of the Oedipus complex as a universal are not forthcoming. Freud develops an obsession from schoolboy preoccupation with a play to projecting it as an organic universal! Malinowski's many years of study in the Trobriand Islands indicated that they did not even know the father's

role in procreation! The typical male was attached to his sister & his rival was his maternal uncle. (To which Jones replies that they had merely repressed their Oedipal knowledge.) For further info on this see Man & His Culture: Psychoanalytic Anthropology after "Totem & Taboo", ed. by W. Muensterberger, 1969. See esp. Ann Parsons, "Is the Oedipus Complex Universal?". She reframes the problem entirely: "The question is no longer very meaningful in that particular form. The more important contemporary questions would rather be: what is the possible range within which culture can utilize and elaborate the instinctually given human potentialities, and what are the psychologically given limits of this range? Or, in slightly different terms, what more can we learn about what Claude Levi-Strauss has characterized as the transition from nature to culture?"

The myth in Totem & Taboo has become this: that there was once a "primal hoard" of "higher" apes which consisted of an old male who kept all the females & drove off his rival sons. These brothers banded together to slay & eat the father, & sieze their mothers & sisters. Then suppressed feelings for the old father returned as guilty remorse; thensforth the dead govern the living in that the sons set up the dead father's rule as the new law of obedience. Freud claims to have observed this in psychoanalysis: "They undid their deed by declaring that the killing of the father-substitute, the totem, was not allowed, & renounced the fruits of their deed by denying themselves the liberated women. Thus they created two fundamental taboos of totemism out of the sense of guilt of the son, and for this very reason this had to correspond with the two repressed wishes of the Oedipus complex." Civilization begins with the repression of the Oedipus complex. "Whoever disobeyed became guilty of the only two crimes which troubled primitive society." "The beginnings of religion, ethics, society, & art meet in the Oedipus complex."

Freud's grandiose mania for systematic omnipotent design is quite extraordinary by 1913, just before the war. But, as we have seen, this is characteristic Of C19th thinking as it is still being played into the C20th.

It seems clear enough that men never did live in primal hoards, nor do apes; that unsophisticated people do not necessarily have totems & taboos of this kind. But the point is, who needs historical alibis of this kind?

Freud ends Totem & Taboo with a quote from Faust: "In the beginning was the deed." Original sin is re-theologized; Faust is the hybristic embodiment of forbidden knowledge in action. Again, note the metaphors: "We may say that hysteria is a characature of an artistic creation; a compulsion neurosis, a characature of religion; and a paranoiac delusion, a characature of a philosophic system."

Freud at least understands the nature of tautologies; he knows that his formulation has to include himself & his own theories.

His letters to Fliess show him universalizing his own Oedipal desire. This he does partly by borrowing from James

Frazer's Totemism & Exogamy, 4 vol., 1910. (Exogamy=forced marriage outside the family & clan) Frazer's mythology was suspect in that it was not first-hand, but borrowed from missionary, civil servant, etc., informants from all over the world, who tended to suppress, e.g., sexuality. Exogamy, says Freud, originates in incest taboo, & piles up evidences, all drawn from Frazer. But the evidence for what he wants is not forthcoming. He is searching for euhemoristic evidence which bases myth in the actions of men.

"In acting as they did, these poor savages blindly obeyed the impulse of the great evolutionary forces, which in the physical world are constantly producing higher out of lower forms of existence, and in the moral world, civilization out of savagery." Remember that he did a Darwin course at med school. You also find the old vitalistic stuff: "The myths of exceptional men are myths of those who carry the vitalistic impulses in evolutionary processes a stage further." Therefore heroes are necessary. This is tragic drama, the victims being the savages.

Freud suggests that there is no point in saying, like the anthropologists, that humans have a natural aversion to incest. "We ought to assume, rather, that there is a natural instinct in favour of it, and that if the law represses it, as it represses other natural instincts, it does so because civilized men have to come to the conclusion that the satisfaction of these natural instincts is detrimental to the general interests of society."

But the best part of Freud is a courage of heroic proportion in his detective work concerning the structure of the human (what he calls conscious, unconscious, etc.) & his publication of his discoveries, in spite of contemporary revulsion at any kind of revelation concerning sexuality, particularly infantile sexuality.

In Frazer, the sex ceremonies in mythology, which Freud needed, are constantly referred to as "indescribable", "obscene", of "secret & immoral practices". Freud is ultimately forced to the conclusion that infantile sexuality is the basis of fantasy life. This is where he "lost friends & ceased to influence people"! Once Freud says that the child is not "innocent", i.e. sexless, the whole structure of the continuity of the human has to change. There is no longer any validity to the idea of the adult as "fallen" from the state of the child.

Freud knew what he was doing, & acknowledged Reik's comparison in 1913 with Sherlock Holmes, but said he preferred comparison with Giavanni Morelli, a 19th art scholar who was an expert on forgery. He knew the romantic detective tradition, including Wordsworth's retracing processes, Rimbaud's idea of connecting up with the origins of your senses, Poe, Holmes, etc.

The Freudian dramatic action is a sort of 19th Ibsen play: you make revelations leading to disasters, & then you lower the curtain.

In 1885 Freud worked under Charcot in Paris (F. was 29; note that he was a slow developer & waited a long time before he felt he was ready to publish.) Charcot's field was hypnosis & hysteria.

At this point I want to put Fraud in a line from Mesmer to the present day, as related to the history of control as hypnotic action, whether by doctors, leaders, or whoever. The first "modern" figure is Franz Anton Mesmer. The relevant

B book is Mesmerism & the End of the Enlightenment in France Robert Darnton, 1968, p.142: "Shortly before his death in 1815, Mesmer had given his blessing to the establishment of a Mesmerist course in the University of Berlin." (This is one of Olson's date-lines; if you're going to write history properly, get this one in!) This question of power fascinated all major writers from the 1780's onwards to the present: the idea that you could put people in a condition of helpless control & influence their future actions when they came out of that control. This becomes the analogue of an incredible range of possibilities in politics, economics, sexuality, therapy, literature.

Freud inherits the Mesmeric line from Charcot. Mental healers had a vogue at the end of the 19th & have ever since: Mesmer, Mary Baker Eddy, Freud, etc.! See Stephan Zweig, Mental Healers, 1932. There is a context which includes Mesmerism, Christian Science, & psychoanalysis: the transfer (Freud's word) of energy from one person to another. The situation which Freud constantly faced was that the patient would transfer to him, as a kind of scapegoat, things which were going on in their own unconscious & in society.

In 1888 Freud translated a famous book on hypnotism, suggestion, & therapy; in the Preface he says two things which govern his future career, in my opinion: "Hysterical phenomena are governed by laws" & "We possess no criterion which enables to distinguish exactly between a mental process & a physiological one." Gradually he breaks through causal structures in history to discover laws of symbolic action in psychology. The basic element he got from Charcot was that the hysteric was ill & that there were origins for hysteria which could be unearthed or detected; i.e., they were not malingerers or possessed by an evil spirit. The origin is what Freud called in 1894 "the unbearable sexual idea", which becomes obsession or phobia. He uses electricity imagery for it (like D.H. Lawrence: c. 248 electricity images in Women in Love!).

In Studies in Hysteria, 1895, you find the basic terms: resistance, repression, tripple stratification (Freud the archaeologist). "The task of the psychotherapist is to put it together again in the conjectured organization? He who desires still more comparison may think here of a Chinese puzzle." This is the drama of "cathartic psychotherapy" You dislocate further the dislocated organism & replace it with . . . what? His first patient, Anna O., referred to it laughingly as "the talking cure". Society is virtually irrelevant, & the drama is placed inside. The origins of what Reich calls "the sexual disaster" are strictly not discoverable in the social structure of authority, labour, play, or law. At this stage Freud sees his cases as tragedies, which he enjoys (he is quite frank about this). He speaks of "the pleasures of psychoanalysis," "the method of making conscious what was previously unconscious" (1896).



A spacial stratification, into which you dive like a detective/ archaeologist. (Freud's previous idea of the unconscious seemed to follow Carlisle, who was perhaps the first to use the term.) "The Return of the Repressed", you might call it. The images include "chains of association" & "family trees intertwining" (the latter probably came from Darwin).

In The Interpretation of Dreams he deals with another system of principles: condensation, displacement, disguising. The result of intertwining & association is conflict between various currents, forces, etc. The theory of repression is absolutely central. Neurosis, art, hysteria, civilization are all developments of repression (i.e., of the "primal hoard" instincts). At this stage he says that Sophocles' play "can be likened to the work of a psychoanalyst". He gets fed up with his patients at one point: "all dreamers are insufferably witty".

One sees this in action in Jokes & their Relation to the Unconscious, 1905; a joke is generally a little drama which embodies something which is taboo. (In Freud's book, the jokes are generally Jewish dirty jokes, as in Legman's Rationale . . ., which makes for difficulties.) The psychoanalyst has to be a sort of literary critic in analyzing the dream structure (which is where Wm. Empson started: as in Freud, he unravels the ambiguities inside the wit structure.)

Leonardo, 1910. Based on Leonardo's erotic dream of being attacked by a kite (which Freud mistranslated as vulture) in his cradle. Freud sees in a painting of St. Anne, Virgin, & child, in the shape of a drapery, the same kite figure. This is one of (if not the) first psychoanalytic structuring of art. He portrays a man torn between two impulses, & in a frankly auto-biographical manner. The polarization is between the passions for scientific knowledge & for creating works of art: empirical fact vs. speculation. This has had a fantastic importance for the history of literary criticism: the search for design.

As in the case of Marx, Shakespear & the Greeks attracted Freud enormously, & it is through this that he comes to the invention of the id/ego/superego structure. It is a drama involving three performers: the wild, pleasure-seeking, romantic id & the punitive superego (the voice of the parents). The ego seeks to use both to create some kind of stability. It is a power battle in which the id's energy threatens the superego's stability. The images represent an enormous stream threatening a dam (not surprisingly, after ~~Freud~~ Darwin & Marx, it represents a scarcity economy). Note that Freud was in his early 30's & by no means impotent: this is an inherited cultural accumulation. The product is Sharacter, Neurosis, & Civilization. (Note that Freud never analyzes Oedipus as a drama written at a particular time & place; rather, it is "there" as a World Myth.)

Moses & Monotheism, : here he is moving towards the "collective unconscious". There must be some mechanism whereby you inherit the "primal hoard". (He is not too keen on genetics as a possible explanation.) He invents "inheritance of memory traces", for which he never offers evidence. In this book he wants to find a "unitary source"; he uses large omnipotent meta-

phors such as the "primal crime", "Oedipus complex", towards a "metapsychology". He was not content with psychoanalysis at a clinical level, but searched for a historical context, sources, origins, continuities. His metaphors at this stage are very much from economics, topography, & dynamics: energy, locality, & movement. Images from dynamics of physics, hydraulics, & electricity. There are "streams", "heavy torrents", which have to be "dammed"; there are "charges" & "discharges", which bring electricity & hydraulics together. One of his favourites is of cathetic pressure in tubes (which is where Reich's orgasmic theory becomes rather more interesting). "Sublimation" appeared in 1905, which has to do with how you dam the energy, so that it becomes useable: a utilitarian economic structure. "Psychic forces act as inhibitions ~~xxxxx~~ on the sexual life and narrow its direction like dams."

B Thoughts for the Times on War, 1915. A very important essay; read this if you don't read anything else by Freud. This is the work that must be answered. He sees WWI "not as a chivalrous crusade" but as a "vortex": a scene of primal man, "& therefore not to be abolished". In spite of the fact that Freud was a compassionate, generous man, he felt himself forced to face the "fact" that war has a service because it focuses on death & the "primal scene", & therefor restores tragic richness to life! "We are forced to believe in death." "Life has in truth become interesting again, it has regained its full significance."

This is the limit of Freud's dualism, of fixed law & order: behind it is his analysis of Sophocles & Shakespeare's tragic heroes, without the social/historical context.

The Future of an Illusion, 1927. After WWI, Freud moved towards social man, as did Reich; but the latter sought positive change. But Freud was affected by disaster in Europe (& possibly in his own health). (Remember that Eliot, Yeats, & Shaw are in the same boat. Eliot: "the life of significant soil"; Shaw leaning towards Mussolini. Remember that the Conservative Party hired Eliot to write a pamphlet stating that Burke was the great philosopher behind the Tories; it was never reprinted.)

Because of time pressures, Spengler has been omitted: the cyclic theory that barbarian hoards reenergize decadent civilization. This bit into Eliot, Yeats, et al.; even F. Scott Fitzgerald.

Future . . . : "Culture is something which was imposed on a resisting majority by a minority that understood how to possess itself of the means of power & coercion." This is what Brown is getting at: if you start making your ~~forces~~ from the underground forces in the id, & transfer those to culture, then you have class war, or international war, or between "savages" & the "civilized". "Police" can then become both a metaphor & an actuality. Freud has "discovered" that since human nature is fixed, so is the social structure. "We cannot abandon coercion & the suppression of the instincts." Culture is forever built on "coercion & instinctual renunciation". Hope lies in producing "superior, dependable, & disinterested leaders". These are supposed to "act as educators of future generations". (The old Platonic rubbish once again.)

This is where the revisionists begin: the idea that leaders are our hope in that they will know how to repress us. To make a great leap, a target for further examination would be Lionel Trilling, "Freud & the Crisis of Our Culture". Read that & you'll see why Allen Ginsberg had to revolt against Columbia! And why the big revolt came in 1968. It's also the reason why the Beat Generation was necessary for America, & not a sort of wierd aberration. Trilling's book is from 1955, one year before "Howl!" & same year as Marcuse's Eros & Civilization. There one can begin an analysis of attempt to revise Freud for potential liberatory use. Trilling, e.g., believes that Freud's "residue of human quality beyond the reach of cultural control" is liberating. Marcuse sees Freud's "subterranean current" as producing happiness.

If you still aren't convinced, read Civilization & Its Discontents, 1929, his last will & testament. He still sees civilization based on "the permanent subjugation of the human instincts." I.e., the subjugation of sexual energy as the origin of politics. This is where Brown, Spock, Chomsky, Goodman, et al reject Freud: the methodological sacrifice of the libido, its rigidly enforced deflection to socially useful activities & expressions. Not one word in Freud as to who says what is "socially useful", except the "leaders".

This is where Darwin, Marx, & Freud agree, & where Reich, Brown, B. Fuller disagree. For the latter, work & utilitarian values are not the center of life; & McLuhan would add, it is impossible in an electronic society, because there won't be enough work to go around. For Freud, progress is in inverse ratio to freedom. If you believe that, then Elluel's "autonomous technology" is the form of culture, because it is repressive: the hydrogen bomb & the concentration camp are the extension of man's need for civilization! They are the most repressive, & the most complete harnessing of energy.

The final words of Civilization . . . deal with Eros & Thanatos: the Manachean Conflict built into the structure of human nature & society: "the natural instinct of aggressiveness in man", derived from the "death instinct", which he didn't identify with Thanatos in the book, but did in his letters & conversation.

The alternative to aggression turned on other people is to turn it on yourself. The range is from civilization & jokes to madness, & the struggle between Eros & Thanatos is eternal. Psychotherapy can only be a local limited therapy within this cosmic eternal struggle. "Men have brought their powers of subduing the forces of nature to such a pitch that, by using them, they could now very easily exterminate one another to the last man. They know this: hence arises a great part of their current unrest, their dejection, their mood of apprehension. And now it may be expected that the other of the two heavenly forces, eternal Eros, will put forth his strength so as to maintain himself along side of his equally immortal adversary." The terrible mediaeval wheel of fortune. The battle is exactly like the old Puritain battle within the soul of man between God & the Devil, in which man is the battlefield & has only the illusion of participation.

Marcuse, in Essay on Liberation, is still trying to convert all this into a "biological foundation for socialism". He was trained as a Hegelian at Strassburg, & wants to keep the lot. (trained with Lucacks & Adorno) They all think you can transfer the conflict structures into positive structures; Marcuse searches for a "non-repressive sublimation": "the erotic instincts must work as work instincts".