

TREVOR PEDERSON

ESSENCE, ALIENATION, AND THE ECONOMICS OF
LIBIDO

In Freud's late phase he offers us a view of the economy of libido based upon an individual's characterological or drive-based constitution. He writes:

happiness, in the reduced sense in which we recognize it as possible, is a problem of the economics of the individual's libido. There is no golden rule which applies to everyone: every man must find out for himself in what particular fashion he can be saved. All kinds of different factors will operate to direct his choice. It is a question of how much real satisfaction he can expect to get from the external world, how far he is led to make himself independent of it, and, finally, how much strength he feels he has for altering the world to suit his wishes. In this, his psychical constitution will play a decisive part, irrespectively of the external circumstances. The man who is predominantly erotic will give first preference to his emotional relationships to other people; the narcissistic man, who inclines to be self-sufficient, will seek his main satisfactions in his internal mental processes; the man of action will never give up the external world on which he can try out his strength...¹

Here Freud alerts us to how he sees people driven to seek different forms of happiness based upon their psychical constitution, and how that psychical constitution, created by psychosexual development, is decisive. We all know that even though siblings may have all had the same upbringing and education, that they can still be vastly different. One sister can be very ambitious and career-focused while another is not. Freud doesn't deny the influence of sociological factors, but sees them as always having to be anchored in our economics of libido.

I've included a handout to show how Freud's sense of the economics of libido involves a horizontal axis in his claim of the psychic bisexuality of human beings². This axis revolves around

¹ Freud, S. *Civilization and its Discontents* (London: Hogarth, 1930), 83-84. Emphasis mine.

² In *The Economics of Libido* (2015), I attempt to unpack Freud's ideas in a horizontal axis of psychic bisexuality, and a vertical axis of superego development. In regards to the former, Freud writes:

In human beings pure masculinity or femininity is not to be found either in a psychological or a biological sense. Every individual on the contrary displays a mixture of the character-traits belonging to his own and to the opposite sex; and he shows a combination of activity and passivity whether or not these last character-traits tally with his biological ones. (Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality, p. 219 fn)

[W]e are accustomed to say that every human being displays both male and female instinctual impulses, needs and attributes; but though anatomy, it is true, can point out the characteristic of maleness and femaleness, psychology cannot. For psychology the contrast between the sexes fades away into one between activity and passivity... (New

Regarding the active and passive, Freud contrasts “two sets of emotional impulses... opposed to each other... impulses of an affectionate and submissive nature, but also hostile and defiant ones...” that align with “fear of castration and desire for castration” (A seventeenth-century demonological neurosis, p. 85, 92). Freud explains that submission in the latter is related to the “loss of love [which] plays much the same part in hysteria as the threat of castration does in phobias and fear of the super-ego in obsessional neurosis” (Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety, p. 143). The two poles “are completely ambivalent, both affectionate and of a hostile and aggressive nature” and Freud records that the former came to light because its impulses can also be “changed into anxiety ideas” (New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis, p. 120). In the language of the ego ideal, which “demands perfection”, the active pole compels the individual to be perfect and compete with others and the passive pole compels the individual to devote himself to the perfection of the other and seek affection or approval (New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis, pp. 64–65; Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety, p. 143).

In Freud’s middle period he uses more gender neutral language to capture the functioning of these two poles:

This is the place for two remarks. First, how do we differentiate between the concepts of narcissism and egoism? Well, narcissism, I believe, is the libidinal complement to egoism. When we speak of egoism, we have in view only the individual’s advantage; when we talk of narcissism we are also taking his libidinal satisfaction into account. As practical motives the two can be traced separately for quite a distance. It is possible to be absolutely egoistic and yet maintain powerful object-cathexes, in so far as libidinal satisfaction in relation to the object forms part of the ego’s needs. In that case, egoism will see to it that striving for the object involves no damage to the ego. It is possible to be egoistic and at the same time to be excessively narcissistic – that is to say, to have very little need for an object, whether, once more, for the purpose of direct sexual satisfaction, or in connection with the higher aspirations, derived from sexual need, which we are occasionally in the habit of contrasting with ‘sensuality’ under the name of ‘love’. In all these connections egoism is what is self-evident and constant, while narcissism is the variable element. The opposite to egoism, altruism, does not, as a concept, coincide with libidinal object-cathexis, but is distinguished from it by the absence of longings for sexual satisfaction. When someone is completely in love, however, altruism converges with libidinal object-cathexis. As a rule the sexual object attracts a portion of the ego’s narcissism to itself, and this becomes noticeable as what is known as the ‘sexual overvaluation’ of the object. If in addition there is an altruistic transposition of egoism on to the sexual object, the object becomes supremely powerful; it has, as it were, absorbed the ego.” (Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis, p. 417-8)

For Freud, egoism concerns the “preservation, assertion, and magnification of the individual” (New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis, p. 96). In other places he explicitly ties it to Adler’s “will to power” (A difficulty in the path of psycho-analysis, p. 137; The economic problem of masochism., p. 163). However Freud criticised Adler for “cheerlessly” only seeing egoism or power in every neurosis and having “no place at all for love” (On the history of the psycho-analytic movement, pp. 446–447).

Altruism, as the passive ego drive, can be defined by Freud’s concept of eros – before he later paired it with the death drive – as ultimately based upon “love for parents and children, friendship and love for humanity in general, and also devotion to concrete objects and to abstract ideas” (Group Psychology and Analysis of the Ego, p. 90). Instead of conquering, this pole – *to love* – directs the individual to raise up, or restore, the other who is down, or outside of the group, and establish harmony and enjoy “oneness” with them if they are a part of the group or happy (Freud, Civilization and Its Discontents, p. 66).

Melanie Klein opposes the death instinct (destructiveness) not to sexuality but to the *life* instinct. She was also on guard against reductionists who wanted to make altruistic impulses mere reaction formations to

people having both an active pole of the personality that's tied to mastery, the will to power, defiance, competition, as well as a passive pole that's tied to assisting, restoring, merging with, as well as submission to, others. At his most concise, the active and passive in Freud's model was captured as the contrast between egoism and altruism within a person. Some quotations are there for you, but now I wish to leave jargon and focus on how this shows up clinically.

When I lead substance abuse groups there is a very strong split that can arise between the people in them. On one hand you have what are colloquially called people pleasers. They have problems saying no to others, problems asking for raises after they were promised them by the employer, problems with confrontations with others, and with generally being assertive. They seem to have a problem with existing, taking up space, or feeling like they have power. They can feel inadequate at work, and be quick to blame themselves when their romantic partner or boss gets angry. They fear "loss of love" (in Freud's words) and are dependent on approval (Freud, 1926). The boss who who promised the altruist a raise is expected to be, or has a transference in which, he is felt to be, good and it's presumptuous to ask him for a raise. It's his prerogative to see the altruist's hard work and judge that he or she deserves it.

On the other side you have people who struggle with having to be perfect or already believing that they are. They are defensive if they have problems pointed out to them, they often blame others, they take themselves seriously, they don't want to admit to struggles, and they often see other people as bad and corrupt, or incompetent

aggressive ones and held that "the tendency to make reparation ultimately derives from the life instinct" (Envy and Gratitude and Other Works, p. 74). Klein's use of "life drive" revives Freud's active-egoistic and passive-altruistic poles in new language. Klein goes very far in spelling out the passive-altruistic position in the attributes of reparation, creativity, and the "helpful attitude" derived from the life instincts (ibid., p. 201, 207). Even though her two positions of greed and envy *vs.* gratitude and reparation as well as persecutory anxiety and depressive anxiety could very clearly align with the competitive-egoism and affectionate-altruism, Klein did little to link her work to Freud's psychic bisexuality and the characterological implications have been largely ignored

Other analysts have noted these two poles in Freud's work. For example, Sydney Blatt (1998) gives a very impressive review of the literature on these ideas that lists Karen Horney, Heinz Kohut, and Otto Rank, all who wrote about self and other directedness or power being in the self or other (Contributions of psychoanalysis to the understanding and treatment of depression., p. 725) One Kohutian writes: "one pole consists of the person's most basic ambitions, goals and self-esteem, which develop out of the young child's grandiosity and exhibitionism being mirrored and affirmed. The other pole consists of the person's core values and guiding principles, which develop out of the young child's idealizing and feeling merged with the 'omnipotence' of the parent. A creative 'tension arc' develops between these two poles, motivating each person to fulfill the unique potentialities established in the basic design of his or her nuclear self. Hence, this model suggests an energetic flow between two oppositely charged poles, and underscores a relational matrix of psychic energy which provides the most basic human motivation. Thus, 'the needs of the self', rather than the demands of the instincts, motivate inner activity, growth and movement" (Kill, 1986, Kohut's psychology of the self as model for theological dynamics. p. 20). Horney talks of the compliant or self-effacing trends that "lie in the direction of goodness, sympathy, love, generosity, unselfishness, humility; while egotism, ambition, callousness, unscrupulousness, wielding of power are abhorred" (Horney, 1950, Neurosis and Human Growth, p. 54). In contrast, the expansive trends impart a sense of moral goodness for merely not hurting, stealing, or killing others (thou shalt not). Also see Sachs, 1929, One of the motive factors in the formation on the super-ego in women).

and stupid. In one group, a member said his heroes had been Alexander the Great and Genghis Khan, and in individual therapy he was able to express how he thinks that people are rotten and that instead of applying himself and finding a cure for cancer or something great, he's withheld himself because people don't deserve it. For anyone with empathy, the seriousness or coldness of the stern or grandiose egoist is easily felt, or their competitiveness with others is apparent. The altruist, in contrast, will feel warm or they will strike one as not there, depressed, or listless.

The egoist or altruist never understand each other. When you talk about saying no and standing up for yourself with the altruists, the egoists lose interest, can't identify, or, at the worst, will have contempt for the altruists. When you talk to the egoists about empathy, for example, the altruists can be surprised at their callousness, but they almost never speak up. There are far more altruists in substance abuse groups than egoists, and when egoists get in, they often intimidate the altruists and change the more personal tone of the discussions. They will say simple things like: using drugs is always about choice, and I've chosen to party in the past because it was fun, and now I'm choosing not to use. They tell me that these groups can't help, everyone has to hit their own rock bottom and make the choice not to use. The egoists want to cover up how people often self-medicate to deal with bad feelings or bad conscience, and they don't want to admit the many fears or anxieties that they have to re-enter deeper and more intimate relationships or be part of the community.

In my book 'The Economics of Libido,' I offer the explication of Freud's model of the mind to show how these two different poles also involve a vertical axis of superego development and transference to different levels of societal authority through the ego ideal (Freud, 1921) However, to save time so I can focus on Marx, I won't get into it here. Instead, I'll just point out that these poles of the personality easily map onto the political left and right.

Like the egoists in my group, people on the Right generally feel that people are basically bad and have the position we need strong laws to keep order. Their social positions are often about immigrants wanting to come in and take advantage of us, and when they don't accuse the poor of being entitled, lazy, or taking advantage of social security, they have the basic position that everyone should be self-reliant and only has responsibilities to their family. "You take care of yourself and your own, and I'll take care of mine." They identify with the military strength of the country and will back spending billions on it, but otherwise think that government is incompetent and will screw things up, if not try to control things too much in its other aspects.

Like the altruists in my group, people on the Left expect people to be basically good and are usually pacifists. Their social positions are about giving aid to other countries, and helping the underdogs. They believe that outsiders or people in lower classes should receive help to become insiders or at least some kind of protection. You aren't a good person because you don't kill or steal from others, the egoist's thou shalt not view of morality, but a 'thou shalt view' of showing compassion and being kind to others. This extends responsibility to people outside the family, and they believe that government and taxation should grow if it would help more people who need it, except with the military.

Not every egoist is on the right, nor is every altruist is on the left. An egoist, for example, can be a democrat based upon unthinking allegiance to his parents' political positions, reactions against his parents' politics, because he's influenced by professors or bosses he

identifies with, or because of allegiance to group identities such as race or religious creed. I've also worked with many altruists in recovery who have defended against dependence on, or wanting approval from, others. They've suppressed feelings of self-pity and identified with the egoistic slogans of self-reliance, personal accountability, and no hand outs. Despite voting Republican, they still have issues saying no to others, standing up for themselves, and usually protect themselves by putting up a façade of being misanthropic. Recognizing the possibility of both dynamics in the personality and the input of large group identity, my position is that, everything being equal, an altruist will be drawn to the left and an egoist to the right.

By recognizing that people are driven to find different types of happiness in motivations that we all can recognize in common language (i.e. desires to be admired by others, to be a peacemaker, to raise the spirits of others and make them laugh, etc.) we can understand neglected aspects of Marx's concept of alienation. And, ultimately, have a better comprehension of what he envisions communism to be about.

There is what I will call the hippie interpretation of Marx, that is the popular interpretation of communism that still makes it into some scholarly work. In this interpretation, communism will come about because of altruistic care for people. There is often a perverse denial of authority and the fantasy of democratic control of the means of production, in which workers will vote about all decisions in the production. In the most brazen form, there is the unique snowflake fantasy, in that once narratives of misogyny and racism are overcome, and no longer internalized, that everyone's inner artist will emerge and we will all be creative together in the coming utopia. I'd like to take each point in turn.

Firstly, it is Marx's view that both egotism and egoism, and not altruism, are the motor that runs history. The earliest political-economy, what Marx calls primitive communism, doesn't create history. Today anthropologists still discover such groups who have lived without mathematics or complex trade for thousands of years. Some enjoy greater equality and are matriarchal, some are patriarchal, but history begins when these groups become enslaved. While Adam Smith and other economists spin a naïve tale of people deciding that hunting and foraging takes too much time and it is better to plant one's own food, anthropologists show that the Neolithic revolution shows "conspicuous health differences" between the noble people and the slaves who planted (Cohen, 1984). The slaves show more signs of nutritional deficiency in their bones while the masters don't. There wasn't a democratic process here, but instead lower classes are forced to work the land and in this relation political-economies grow in size as they never had before. From this point in history, Marx, in the Communist Manifesto, draws attention to how it is self-interested antagonism between the classes, combined with technological advances, that allow for lower classes to egoistically demand political power from, or overthrow, the upper classes. Marx, for example, criticizes those who believe that slavery was abolished out of altruism, instead he claims "slavery cannot be abolished without the steam-engine and the mule and spinning-jenny" (German Ideology). White workers couldn't be asked to work beside black slaves on plantations and lower themselves in self-regard. Rather, once the Northern factories arose, the interest of the owners is to see them enter into the South and it becomes acceptable to allow a new discourse of the dignity of the slaves to arise. In contrast, in an idealist interpretation of history, an altruist might imagine that if Abraham Lincoln had only been born earlier, then the blight of slavery would have ended earlier in America, without a sense of the racism that needed to be

overcome. This same principle also applies to the bourgeois self-interest for women to enter into the workforce as cheaper labor for them, and also applies to why the US went into Iraq, for example. The US has worked with several dictators and didn't take out Saddam Hussein out of altruistic concern, but because of real interests the US and private companies had in that region. (This isn't to say that altruism doesn't exist... it's just impotent most of the time, like it is in therapy groups so long as they are afraid or intimidated.)

For the next point, the denial of authority in communism, it's important to look at Marx's neglected positions on alienation. The classic focus of alienation is the employer or shareholders trying to get the surplus value out of the laborer, the worker being forced to work to just survive, and the worker becoming an appendage of the machine. These are self-explanatory, but are not in themselves felt to be alienating. A person may choose to work for the symphony and practice the violin daily, while neglecting other aspects of their potential, earning their money to survive, and making others money, but be relatively happy with their job. I'm not disagreeing with Marx on these issues, but if people have not known anything else, or lack a good sense for history and different divisions of labor, it will be hard for them to feel, or be persuaded that, they are alienated.

Where alienation can often be felt in current jobs, has to do with the corrupting effect that both money and inheritance can have on one's manager or boss. This is not an abstract claim but one that has to do with Marx refers to as a person's "social virtue" or "real human individuality". He writes:

Assume *man* to be *man* and his relationship to the world to be a human one: then you can exchange love only for love, trust for trust, etc... if you want to exercise influence over other people, you must be a person with a stimulating and encouraging effect on other people. Every one of your relations to man and to nature must be a *specific expression...* of your *real individual* life. If you love without evoking love in return – that is, if your loving as loving does not produce reciprocal love; if through a *living expression* of yourself as a loving person you do not make yourself a *beloved one*, then your love is impotent – a misfortune. (Marx, 1844)

To encounter such passages in Marx makes it clear that he recognizes that people have different personalities and different powers or virtues in their personality. Again, Marx has no hippie sentiments about how everyone will learn how to love or be loved in return in communism, nor are their statements that workers will democratically vote about what is to be produced. Instead, we have common sense claims that some people have a stimulating and encouraging effect on others and some don't. Money and inheritance can interfere with having a boss or manager who has the personality to be a leader and so influence the workers in a real human way. I've worked a few construction jobs in which my boss was the son of the owner. At one job, it was clear he didn't care about the quality of the work and he'd leave the site as much as possible to get coffee or "dick around"; morale was low and he had a hard time keeping workers. Similarly, with other construction companies I've worked for, the boss started his own company, and took more pride in it, but he constantly yelled at all his workers and seemed irritable and miserable. It seemed like those who were like him, or became like him, stayed but the rest quit after being embarrassed by him. His incentive to make money is what made him start his own company, but he shouldn't have been a boss.

The political right often talks about the entitlement of the poor, or

the taking or mooching classes, but what about the children of the wealthy who inherit their money. What of their entitlement? It's one thing to talk, in their language, of a job creator being rewarded for his merit and risk-taking, but it's another when laws are set up so their children can hand it over to wall street investors, do nothing themselves, and get more of the wealth that the lower classes produce in their work. Marx mentions the necessary overcoming of the family in many places throughout his work. While we all recognize the ridiculousness of the idea that a king's son should inherit absolute political power, communism begins with the idea that it's the parent's right to decide who they will leave their money to, but a true meritocracy of a person's social virtue, their talent, and hard-work determining whether they get into positions of authority. The left can't ask the right to be more altruistic, but they can appeal to their egoism to ask for a real meritocracy. In what we can call the self-conscious cunning or Ruse of Reason, the redistribution of wealth for meritocracy would also be the same procedure for assisting the disabled and those who need it. However, the left has to lead with talk of merit and not lead with "bleeding-heart" sentiments.

The last form of hippie Marxism, that everyone will become an artist, can sometimes seem like a facile reading of Marx's comments on species-being in his early texts. He writes:

"...man's feelings, passions, etc., are not mere anthropological phenomena in the [narrower] sense, but truly ontological affirmations of essential being (of nature), and... they are only really affirmed because their object exists for them as an object of sense" (Marx, 1844)

This form of alienation, which deals with the aesthetics of production, can best be understood in relation to Marx's statements on alienation in religion and commodity fetishism. Marx praises capitalism for destroying species-ties associated with religion because religion doesn't just represent a means of control of the dominant class, but also what he calls the "alienated human essence" of religion (Critique Hegel Phil of Right). God or the gods didn't create humans, humans created the gods and their personality and character are representations of different human motivations and desires. In ancient political-economies the gods existed as objects of contemplation and formed the basis for cults that had different rituals and symbols for their members to engage in and with. In modern political-economies in which God replaces 'the gods' commodity fetishism becomes imbued with the personality and character of different nation-states.

Thus, as the as the Greeks had Aphrodite as the goddess of love to contemplate, the French culture in Marx's time received the projection of a place that produced romantic lovers or the most beautiful and elegant women or fashion. Another example is in the Spaniards who were seen as hot-blooded, unpredictable, and passionate. This could be seen as inheriting the festival and madness mentality of Dionysus. So, rather than having a community that worships such a god and re-enacts different rituals, the commodity is bought by isolated individuals for similar purposes. The consumer buys it either for conspicuous consumption, or as a symbol of the way he'd truly like to live but is unable to, due to financial, familial, or characterological restraints.³

³ For the European of Marx's day, American leather symbolized the aesthetic of the rugged, adventurous spirit of the new world. I'm sure many men wished that they could live that adventure as we see in many movies and TV shows that similarly satisfy such fantasies. However, to merely own the leather, meant that *it* had that life and *it* stood in relation

An end to alienation comes once humans recognize the different personality types among them and affirm them in production¹. By necessity, to make the subjective essence of different personality types objective, there will have to be different societies within communism with their own relations to nature, aesthetic form, and different games of honor and virtue. If we take Victorian Christianity as an example, we can say that a given culture will create a certain ideal of beauty, of manners, of sexuality and aggression, and this ideal will constitute an important part of how one raises children and how adults play the game of honor in a society. Outside of 19th century Western cultures we can still find people who, by psychological type, very much constitute a Victorian ideal in many respects. However, for others who have a strongly different psychological type, it would be very wrong to impose this aesthetic and very ascetic ideal upon them. Moreover, for many people, their psychological type would allow them to derive satisfaction in many types of aesthetic societies and there isn't a strong need for them to move from friends or family to live somewhere else. As mentioned above, Marx's sense of overcoming the family can be linked to overcoming inheritance, so I don't believe that this means that every child will be assessed as belonging to a certain psychological type, be taken from his parents,

to other commodities that symbolized other ways of life. The man who went horse-back riding with an American saddle or boots, or shot targets with an American rifle, stands in the relation of the masturbator to the porn movie, in which the porn actors live out the sex, while the viewer is the "jerk off" who can't get what he wants.

³ Towards a typology of personality, in *The Economics of Libido* (2015), I expand on Freud's active-egoism and passive-altruism to make four libidinal positions.

Basically, we have a pole of narcissism and a pole of masochism (although I prefer the term echoism from the nymph Echo in the story of Narcissus). Someone can be narcissistic or possess an attitude of superiority (arrogance, vanity) about their physical or intellectual potency, about being richer than others, or about being better at a skill or job, or about being morally superior to others. There's another group that is conceited or vain about how attractive they are, how much more stylish, tasteful, or virtuous they are, and often judge or look down on others.

This is the pole that concerns: power, superiority/inferiority, and relating to others by competing with them, trying to dominate or control them, or strategically removing oneself from competition

On the other side, someone can masochistically (echoistically) put the desires of others before her own, he or she volunteers to help others or can't turn them down, when they are in need of money or assistance, even when they are taken advantage of or don't have the time or money to share. Or, they masochistically desire the approval of others and have the need to be liked or be seen as interesting by others. The former is tied to "people-pleasing", being "self-effacing" etc. and the latter is tied to being a "people person", wanting to fit in, or wanting to be the center of attention, but it is being the center of attention not so others might admire one's skills or potency, but by being funny or talking about things they think are cool or interesting.

This is the pole concerned not with power but belonging, with self-pity/pity (i.e. enablers), they relate to others by trying to help them, fix them, or by having others take care of by them, or they remove themselves and feel like a burden to others or rebel against dependence on them.

Of course pure types are rare, and most people will be a mixture of these traits. I always tell clients that everyone has codependency and hang-ups and that it's the people who have the most who are normal. It's when you only approach the world in the same, unchanging ways that you might have a personality disorder.

and raised by the state.⁴

It would be difficult to try to talk about psychological types to the Right. Those on the Right strongly want to view themselves as in control and making choices. As Freud wrote, finding out the earth wasn't the center of the universe was the first great blow to narcissism, then Darwin's theory of evolution, and he had doubts about whether people were ready to admit that the ego isn't master in its own house. However, there is another self-conscious Ruse of Reason here. Instead of approaching the Right by telling them they aren't free, and that there are psychological types that they might lack the EQ to perceive, there is a better approach. Everyone knows of the crumbling infrastructure in America, and if we do not make money the measurement of a man, then, as Marx writes, we need "poetry from the future", so that great projects, that will go past a single person's lifespan, can be proposed. Different aesthetic visions that will inspire competition between different artists and architects who will redesign their regions, and invest in quality for future generationsⁱⁱ. Our current culture sells aesthetics to the average consumer in the form of cooking shows, singing competitions, and other talent shows. The cultural apparatus has been created for people to watch the aesthetic competition between different regions on TV and internet channels, to have programs that explain the science being used, and to have their vote and input into the process on a more general level. Moreover, a network of instantaneous communication has been erected to coordinate such projects.

In the aesthetic, we have a way to overcome identity in race, class, and creed. The shared personality types of individuals transcend identity and can create pride in a community built around a shared, aesthetic way of life. By the abolishment of inheritance and money, nothing will be passed on through class. Differences in individual merit may still reflect differences in authority, but money and inheritance will no longer put the wrong people into positions of authority without merit. The key to this, in Marx, is to not try to convince the Right to care more about others, but to tell the Right that they aren't being individualistic and egoistic enough. The rhetoric against "establishment politicians," the wealth of the 1%, and the loss of manufacturing jobs are now established in American culture. Either the Left learns to speak the language of the Right and harnesses their malcontent in the great meritocracy and great projects of communism, or reactionary forces of mysticism, fascism, and the patriarchy will erode our current gains.

⁴ Marx is very clear that even if health care is universal and wages are the same then alienation in this sense won't be overcome. He writes:

Indeed, even the equality of wages demanded by Proudhon only transforms the relationship of the present-day worker to his labour into the relationship of all men to labour. Society is then conceived as an abstract capitalist (Marx, 1884).

The state, as the abstract capitalist, neither allows for a real meritocracy, nor for the actualization of essence of different psychological types to allow for new experiments in living. Nepotism still existed in Russia and China, they still possessed money and inheritance, and the state had a single aesthetic agenda there for all of society.

⁴ Additionally, a large group of laborers who have lost their manufacturing jobs strongly resist being educated and trained in new green technologies. Their fathers were factory or coal workers, and their fear of education and pride in these forms of labor is channeled into climate change denial. However, the promise of new jobs in infrastructure and 'poetry from the future' in both greater projects that the world has never seen, and providing more for their children creates a new pride and belief in themselves as parents.

References

- Blatt, Sidney J. "Contributions of psychoanalysis to the understanding and treatment of depression." *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 46, no. 3 (1998): 723-752.
- Cohen, M., & Armelagos, G. (Eds.). *Paleopathology at the Origins of Agriculture*. USA: Academic Press, 1984.
- Freud, Sigmund. (1961). "The economic problem of masochism." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XIX (1923-1925): The Ego and the Id and Other Works*, pp. 155-170.
- . (1955). "A difficulty in the path of psycho-analysis." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XVII (1917-1919): An Infantile Neurosis and Other Works*, pp. 135-144.
- . *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1933.
- . *Civilization and its discontents*. *S. E.*, 21: 57-146. London: Hogarth, 1930.
- . *Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety*. *S. E.*, 20: 75-176. London: Hogarth, 1926.
- . "A seventeenth-century demonological neurosis (1923)." *Standard Edition* 19: 69-105.
- . *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego*. *S. E.*, 18: 65-144. London: Hogarth, 1921.
- . *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*. Translated by James Strachey. Imago Publishing, 1905.
- Horney, Karen. *Neurosis and Human Growth*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1950.
- Kill, Anthony Steven. "Kohut's Psychology of the Self as a Model for Theological Dynamics." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 41, no. 1 (1986): 17-32.
- Klein, Melanie. *Envy and Gratitude: And Other Works, 1946-1963*. Random House, 1967.
- Marx, Karl. *Communist Manifesto*.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/index.htm>
- . *The German Ideology*.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/index.htm>
- . *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/manuscripts/preface.htm>
- . *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/critique-hpr/>

Pederson, T. *The Economics of Libido: Psychic Bisexuality, the Superego, and the Centrality of the Oedipus Complex*. London: Karnac, 2015.

Sachs, Hanns. "One of the Motive Factors in the Formation of the Super-Ego in Women." *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 10 (1929): 39.