
The Reception of Psychoanalysis and the Problem of the Unconscious in Russia

Author(s): MARTIN A. MILLER

Source: *Social Research*, Vol. 57, No. 4, Reception of Psychoanalysis (WINTER 1990), pp. 875-888

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40970619>

Accessed: 01-02-2019 02:31 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Social Research*

The Reception of Psychoanalysis and the Problem of the Unconscious in Russia*

BY MARTIN A. MILLER

PSYCHOANALYSIS EMERGED in Russia in the decade preceding the 1917 revolution against a backdrop of unparalleled political upheaval and cultural experimentation. The first articles by Freud's Russian followers appeared in the aftermath of the failed revolution in 1905, at the same historical moment when Andrei Belyi composed his modernist novel *St. Petersburg* and Mikhail Gershenzon was organizing the anti-intelligentsia *Vekhi* symposium.

A similar revolt was at work in the psychiatric division of the medical world at this time, which created the need to find a new explanatory theory to deal with the problems of the mentally ill. The crisis in the profession was evident both at the center and the periphery. Complaints poured in from the provinces through *zemstva* organizations as well as from municipal hospitals via the professional congresses. The discontents ranged from inadequate funding and insufficient staffs to dissatisfaction over the reigning etiologies and methods of treatment. As the emotional casualties of this era of rapid and bewildering change generated by the advance of

SOCIAL RESEARCH, Vol. 57, No. 4 (Winter 1990)

industrial capitalism seemed to expand, the ability of the mental-health professionals to cope with this growing prevalence appeared to contract.¹

The search for a new formulation came from without, as it had so often in the past for Russians agonizing over the limitations of their own solutions. The fascination with Freud was but the most recent phase in a long relationship of Russian discipleship to German cultural theorists. The nineteenth century had witnessed the influence of Kant, Hegel, and Marx, and Nietzsche's impact was already in progress. As was the case with the earlier exemplars, there was a significant disparity between the original and its Russian variation. My concern here, however, is not to compare texts to ascertain precision in establishing degrees of orthodoxies. Rather, I am interested in the manner in which psychoanalysis was received in the confusing world of altered social and psychological identities on the eve of, and in the years immediately following, the Bolshevik seizure of power. As I shall try to demonstrate, what began before 1917 as a predominantly clinical phenomenon with political undertones was transformed after the revolution into a primarily political-ideological phenomenon in which the clinical dimension was thrust into a secondary position. Freudians and Leninists were in fact on a collision course even before 1917 in terms of the abstract concepts of identity they projected in their writings, but this did not pose an obstacle to the attempt at a fusion during the 1920s prior to the decisive division which followed.

Sick Souls

With the publication in 1900 of his masterwork, *The*

¹ See the exhaustive report in Charles Vallon and Armand Marie, *Les aliènes en Russie* (Montevrain: Ecole D'Alembert, 1899), and the discussion in T. I. Iudin, *Ocherki istorii otechestvennoi psikiatrii* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo meditsinskoi literatury, 1951), esp. pp. 163–278.

Interpretation of Dreams, Freud's reputation was internationalized. The interest in his controversial work was confined initially to small circles of dedicated followers, who were primarily interested in the clinical aspects of psychoanalysis. The wider implications of Freud's theory, however, were evident to some, even at this early stage. Perhaps nowhere is this insight better stated than in a comment by Henri Bergson, the prominent French philosopher, when he wrote in 1901 after reading Freud's "dream book":

To explore the unconscious, to work in the subterranean [level] of the mind with especially adequate methods, this will be the main task of psychology in the opening century. I do not doubt that fine discoveries will follow, as important perhaps as those of the physical and natural sciences have been in the preceding centuries.²

The first psychoanalytic publications in Russia (apart from a partial translation of Freud's book on dreams) appeared in 1908, beginning with a series of articles by Dr. Nikolai Osipov on Freud and Jung which were printed in the country's leading psychiatric journal.³ It is evident that Osipov recognized the importance of the new therapeutic orientation that Freud had developed, and felt it necessary to bring it to the immediate attention of the psychiatric community in Russia. It is also clear that Osipov was aware of the challenge that psychoanalysis represented to the medical establishment. Russian psychiatry was, at this time, firmly entrenched in the German tradition of physiological and neurological somatic etiologies. Until this moment, there had been little in the way of alternative explanations along the lines of Freud's emphasis on psychogenic or "psychic" explanations of the causes of

² Henri Ellenberger, *Discovery of the Unconscious* (New York: Basic Books, 1970), p. 321.

³ N. E. Osipov, "Psikhologicheskie i psikihopatologicheskie vzgliady Sigmunda Freud'a v nemetskoj literature 1907 goda," *Zhurnal nevropatologii i psikhiatrii*, 1908, pp. 564–584; Osipov, "Psikhologiiia kompleksov i assotsiativnyi eksperiment po rabotam Tsiurikhskoi kliniki," *ibid.*, pp. 1021–1074.

mental distress rooted in early childhood relationships and the activities of the unconscious in the human personality.

From the outset, Osipov and his colleagues (some of whom trained with Freud, Jung, and Karl Abraham in Europe) were engaged in a reformulation of the traditional definitions of patienthood. Mental illness was broadened to include the less severe disorders—neuroses. Moreover, the sexual content of interrelationships, particularly those involving parents and siblings, was seen as instrumental in examining the patients' problems. In addition, the new treatment method (refined by Freud from diverse sources, including Dubois, Bernheim, and Charcot), known as psychotherapy, placed its emphasis on the analysis of dreams as a means of interpreting the dominating forces of the unconscious.

The difficulties that were soon to emerge, however, had less to do with the purely clinical side of psychoanalysis than with the potential applications of this method to the larger culture and society, whether in theory or practice. It was, as one of Osipov's colleagues put it, the adaptation of Freud's theory "as a scientific worldview" which would bring it into direct conflict with the emerging political powers gathering force in the wings.⁴ Hints of this were present from the beginning, but remained in the shadows as the analysts established themselves in hospitals and private practice, mainly in St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Odessa.

In 1910, the Freudians set up their own journal, *Psikhoterapiia*, which appears to be the first periodical devoted to psychoanalysis beyond Freud's own *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen*. Although initially an "orthodox" Freudian journal with an exclusively Russian editorial board, within the next few years the board became both pluralistic and international, with prominent figures like

⁴ F. N. Dosuzhkov, "Nikolai Evgrafovich Osipov kak psikhiatr," in A. L. Bem, F. N. Dosuzhkov, and N. O. Losskii, eds., *Zhin' i smert'. Sbornik pamiati D-ra N. E. Osipova* (Prague, 1935), p. 34.

Wilhelm Stekel and Alfred Adler participating. *Psikhoterapiia* published original research articles by the Russian psychoanalysts as well as reviews of research in Europe and translations of many of Freud's recent papers. Freud himself was aware of the emergence of a psychoanalytic community in Russia. At one point he wrote: "In Russia, psychoanalysis has become generally well-known and has spread widely; almost all of my writings as well as those of other adherents of analyses, have been translated into Russian."⁵ However, the language barrier prevented him from actually reading the published research. After receiving several papers from Osipov, Freud wrote that all he could understand was "the tangle of Cyrillic signs interrupted every two lines by the name Freud in European letters. . . ."⁶

Political issues gradually trickled into the clinical setting. In 1911, a dispute with the government over the principle of academic autonomy led to the resignation of Dr. Vladimir Serbskii, director of the Moscow psychiatric clinic in which Osipov worked as an assistant physician. Without the protection of Serbskii, who supported the introduction of psychoanalytic treatment, Osipov felt compelled to leave his job. The result was that Osipov created a series of weekly psychoanalytic research meetings outside of the hospital system chaired by Serbskii that, while perfectly legal, took on the air of a clandestine society.

Osipov's own research, like that of many of his colleagues, branched out into new directions. He devoted one paper to the significance of the terrifying phobias, tortuous dreams, and suicidal urges present in the aristocratic characters in Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*.⁷ In another particularly interesting paper,

⁵ Sigmund Freud, *On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement* (New York: Norton, 1968), p. 33.

⁶ William McGuire, ed., *The Freud-Jung Letters* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), pp. 282–3. The letter is dated Jan. 2, 1910.

⁷ N. E. Osipov, "Psikhoterapiia v literaturnykh proizvedeniakh L. N. Tolstoyo," *Psikhoterapiia*, no. 5, 1911, pp. 9–11, 19–20.

Osipov discussed one of his cases in which the patient was rendered dysfunctional by an uncontrollable and embarrassing facial expression. Osipov called this “a compulsive smile” and was able to trace its origins to a childhood trauma. While the patient tried to cast his debilitating and obtrusive behavior in the mold of “the superfluous man,” utterly useless to society, Osipov discovered that the patient suffered from a deep sense of sexual shame rooted in a buried inner conflict between a wish-fantasy of “passion, power, and success” and the reality of his impotence and self-destructiveness. Ultimately, the patient improved with psychotherapy. Osipov called this a process of “liberation from moral demands.” His use of the word *osvobozhdenie* (liberation), with its obvious social and political connotations, was quite deliberate.⁸

Another Freudian analyst, Tatiana Rozental, went much further. A member of the Social Democratic party in St. Petersburg as well as of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, Rozental published a paper in 1911 in which she made use of the female characters of a German novelist to present an unambiguous social critique from a Freudian perspective. Rozental showed, for example, how in one story the circumstances of a mother’s death left her young daughter with a lifelong fear of abandonment. Moreover, the daughter was thrust into a deeply dependent relationship with her father, the object of her unconscious incestuous desire, which produced an unhealthy emotional oscillation ranging from guilt (for seeking to flee from the relationship with her father) to depression (the consequence of the flight). Most important, Rozental interpreted this material as a function of the specific cultural milieu, with its patriarchal values and conflicting moral codes.⁹ To be sure, this viewpoint repre-

⁸ The term had been used in 1861 to describe the emancipation of the serfs, and again at the time of the 1905 revolution when, *inter alia*, it was used as the title of a prominent liberal opposition newspaper.

⁹ Tatiana Rozental, “‘Opasnyi vozrast’ Karin Mikhaelis v svete psikhooanaliza,” *Psikhoterapiia*, 1911, pp. 189–194, 273–289.

sented a minority of the practicing Freudians; it was, nonetheless, the birth of a radical application of psychoanalysis which had not yet appeared even among Freud's European followers.

On the eve of the First World War, Osipov developed two themes which were in fact among the central defining features of Russian psychoanalysis. One concerned the "individualization" of symptoms in his patients. To explain this term he quoted his mentor, Serbskii, who insisted that the doctor's concerns should be with the patient first and the illness second; "each patient is ill in his own manner." Apart from the obvious echo this phrase contains from the famous opening line of *Anna Karenina*, Osipov understood it to mean that the analyst had to emphasize the individuality of each patient's history. The second theme focused on the characterization of psychoanalysis as a "cultural science" and the "sick souls" who constitute its patient population. Here Osipov was attempting to formulate a concept which expressed his conviction that psychoanalysis was not only theoretical as well as clinical, but was a unique part of medicine because of its concern for mind, motivation, and madness. It therefore provided a bridge of knowledge between physical science and cultural values in that it truly was a science seriously informed by cultural factors. Regarding the patients, Osipov sought to show that, within contemporary society, large numbers of people continue to suffer traumatic psychological experiences which, in part, are endemic to the overall cultural situation. The "sick souls" of our time, he wrote, were engaged in daily battle with "the baccilli of neuroses." The soul, like the body, is indifferent to age, nationality, and social class. Psychotherapy, he argued, was the crucial weapon to use to struggle against "these sources of infection," to release the patient from his fears of confronting the unconscious past. Society cannot live by denying, forgetting, repressing, and obliterating in order to survive. Psychiatrists must direct themselves to make use of

psychoanalysis in order to help these victims of society and its culture. "Do not extinguish the soul," Osipov pleaded at the end of this paper.¹⁰

Proscription

By the time of the revolution, the psychoanalytic community in Russia had established a significant presence. Indeed, a new social and cultural construct had emerged, based on Osipov's clinical concept of the "sick soul" and the literary studies done by other Freudians on Gogol (by Ermakov), Dostoevsky (by Rosental), and Tolstoy (by Osipov). For the first few years after the Bolshevik seizure of power, this interest in the unconscious motivations of human behavior was not impeded. On the contrary, there was a clear measure of encouragement at the highest levels of government. A state-supported psychoanalytic training institute was established, and two hospitals specializing in the treatment of disturbed children (one in Moscow and one in Petrograd) were permitted to use psychoanalytic methods. The most prominent psychoanalysts set up public and private practices in several major cities, including Osipov in Petrograd, Moshe Wulff in Moscow, Sabrina Spielrein in Rostov-on-the-Don, and Leonid Drosnes in Odessa. Moreover, there is clear evidence that Trotsky sought to find a place for psychoanalysis which would be compatible with the growing support for Pavlov's neurological orientation to the problems of mental illness.¹¹ There is also a good deal of as-yet-undocumented speculation that Bukharin, Radek, and

¹⁰ N. E. Osipov, "Mysli i somnenniia po povodu odnogo sluchaia 'degenerativnoi psikhopatii,'" *Psikhoterapiia*, 1912, pp. 189–215, 299–306; N. E. Osipov, "O bol'noi dushe," *Psikhoterapiia*, 1913, pp. 657–673.

¹¹ Lev Trotskii, *Sochineniia* (Moscow-Leningrad: Gosizdat, 1927), v. 21, p. 260, and Leon Trotsky, *Literature and Revolution* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960), p. 220.

possibly Lunacharsky were supporters in some degree of the continued development of psychoanalysis.

The situation was altered entirely, and irrevocably, in 1923. Because of the highly visible call at the national level for the formation of a Marxist psychology at this time, psychoanalysis was already being given additional attention. It was, however, the article by a young Bolshevik party philosopher, Bernard Bykhovskii, published that year in the influential journal *Pod znamenem marksizma*, which brought Freud's Russian followers out of the clinical community and placed them and their work on a public and highly political stage which they had never intended to occupy. They were now to be held responsible for the work they had done under the prerevolutionary regime by the authorities and values of the postrevolutionary order. In addition, Bykhovskii's article stimulated a public debate over the ideological content of Freudian theory that went on over the next five years and which was conducted almost exclusively by people without psychoanalytic training.¹² Freudianism, in other words, became more of a political-ideological phenomenon than a clinical-scientific profession not because of its own shift into that mode, but as a result of circumstances external to it in the highly charged and rapidly changing atmosphere of the 1920s. The prerevolutionary political and critical work of Osipov and Rozental noted earlier showed that Freudian theory had "progressive" political potential in the context of being a Freudian left opposition component in a quasi-parliamentary bourgeois regime (similar to the Hegelian left which developed a century earlier in Europe). This, however, was too limited a trend among the Russian psychoanalysts before 1917 to be of use to them after the revolution.

The discussion of "Freudism" during the 1920s is best characterized as an attempt to ideologize psychoanalytic theory. Bykhovskii's main point was to show that Freud's

¹² This debate has been discussed in detail in M. A. Miller, "Freudian Theory under Bolshevik Rule," *Slavic Review*, Winter 1985, pp. 625-646.

concepts were compatible with the central tenets of Marxist historical materialism. He argued that psychoanalysis was an important weapon in the battle against “the psychic sources” of conflict remaining from Russia’s bourgeois past.¹³ M. A. Reisner, a legal expert, published an article in another Bolshevik journal on the common agreement between psychoanalysis and Marxism in criticizing the role of religion in society.¹⁴ Alexander Luria, at the time a young psychologist, argued in a 1925 article that Freud’s ideas offered “a materialist approach to the [understanding] of the whole personality” and represented “an entirely new biology of the mind.”¹⁵

Rather than ensuring that psychoanalysis would remain as a functional part of the new Marxist psychology, these efforts by the “Soviet Freudians” provoked a powerful counterattack. Within a few years, the main psychoanalytic institutions were closed and, as the public criticism of Freud mounted, a number of the leading psychoanalysts either emigrated or disappeared.¹⁶ The criticism was quite comprehensive. Some authors refuted specific points made earlier by the Soviet Freudians while others argued more broadly that psychoanalysis remained fundamentally unproven as a science and utterly idealist and bourgeois as an ideology.¹⁷

Criticism is one thing but officially proscribing an area of knowledge and a medical specialization as unsuitable for any future work is another. Freud was not actually banned, but his

¹³ B. Bykhovskii, “O metodologicheskikh osnovaniakh psikhoanaliticheskogo ucheniia Freida,” *Pod znamenem marksizma*, 1923, nos. 11–12, pp. 158–177.

¹⁴ M. A. Reisner, “Freid i ego shkola o religii,” *Pechat i revoliutsiia*, bk. 1, 1924, pp. 40–60; bk. 2, 1924, pp. 81–106.

¹⁵ A. R. Luria, “Psychoanalysis as a System of Monistic Psychology,” in *The Selected Writings of A. R. Luria*, ed. Michael Cole (White Plains, N.Y.: Sharpe, 1978), pp. 3–41. Luria was one of the few Soviet Freudians who survived this period. He went on to become an internationally prominent figure in the field of neuropsychology.

¹⁶ Osipov went to Prague, Wulff to Palestine, and Spierein’s fate has never been determined, to name only several prominent Freudians.

¹⁷ See V. N. Voloshinov, *Freudianism* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1987, esp. ch. 10, “A Critique of Marxist Apologies of Freudianism,” pp. 117–132.

theories were denounced in such a way at the Congress on Human Behavior, held in Moscow in 1930, that anyone even contemplating working in this area would have been completely discouraged.¹⁸ The concept of the unconscious was attacked as though it were an enemy of the state. Considered by some speakers to be completely unverifiable and by others to be a ludicrous repository of imaginary internal conflicts, the unconscious was declared by one delegate to the congress as a phenomenon no longer to be perceived as having an autonomous existence since its functions were included in the "higher conscious forms" of neurological human activity.¹⁹ With the triumph of Stalinism in the political power struggle within the party, psychoanalysis was effectively abolished.

Marxist Consciousness

At the 1930 Congress on Human Behavior, the keynote speaker (and one of the primary organizers), A. B. Zalkind, provided a crucial explanation for the attack on Freud. Zalkind, a physician who earlier had publicly argued on behalf of Freud during the debate over the creation of a Marxist psychology,²⁰ had since moved into high positions in several important state institutions, including the Institute for Communist Education and the Communist Academy. "For Freud," Zalkind said,

man exists entirely in the past. This past is at war with the present, and it is more powerful than the present. For Freud,

¹⁸ A. B. Zalkind, "I Vsesoiuznyi s'ezd po izucheniiu povedeniia cheloveka," *Zhurnal nevropatologii i psikhiiatrii*, 1930, no. 6, pp. 19–24; A. B. Zalkind, ed., *Psikho-nevrologicheskie nauki v SSSR* (Moscow: Gosmedizdat, 1930), pp. 5–12, 337–343; I. F. Kurazov, "Metodologicheskie itogi povedencheskogo s'ezda," in V. P. Osipov, ed., *Voprosy izucheniia i vospitaniia lichnosti* (Moscow: Gosmedizdat, 1930), no. 1–2, pp. 3–8.

¹⁹ See the discussion, in the appropriate ideological colors, in A. V. Petrovskii, *Istoriia sovetskoi psikhologii* (Moscow, 1967), p. 118.

²⁰ A. B. Zalkind, "Freidizm i Marksizm," *Krasnaia nov'*, no. 4, 1924.

the personality poses an elemental gravitation toward the past, and attempts to fight the past from the standpoint of the present lead to profound tragedy. For Freud, the conscious is subordinate to the unconscious. Man is preserved from the demands of society in a private little world in which he constructs a special strategy of behavior. For Freud, man is a pawn of internal, elemental forces.

Zalkind then asked the decisive question:

How can we use the Freudian conception of man for socialist construction? We need a socially "open" man who is easily collectivized, and quickly and profoundly transformed in his behavior—a man capable of being a steady, conscious and independent person, politically and ideologically well-trained. Does the "Freudian man" meet the demands of the task of socialist construction?²¹

The obvious negative answer to this identity-defining question, we should recall, was not applicable to psychoanalysis alone. The entire profession of psychology was in turmoil and under attack at this moment. What had begun in the early 1920s as a vibrant and pluralistic debate on the intersecting links between methodology and ideology had evolved into a rigid monolith. The criticism was savage and the attempt at resolution proved to be more of a dogmatic political doctrine than a scientifically demonstrated theory.²²

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this historical moment is that the involvement with Freud did not come to an end but rather became transformed into a kind of industry of criticism. Soon after the 1930 congress, articles on Freud resumed in this new mode. In the first number of *Psikhologiya* in 1932, the lead article discussed Freud in the context of Trotsky's earlier mistaken attempt to unify psychoanalysis with Pavlovian

²¹ Quoted in Raymond Bauer, *The New Man in Soviet Psychology* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 99–100.

²² For discussions of this situation, see David Joravsky, *Russian Psychology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), esp. pp. 379–414, and Alex Kozulin, *Psychology in Utopia* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1984), pp. 83–101.

physiology and neurology. Lenin is referred to as recognizing Freud's theory as "a trendy whim" which "in the end was completely bourgeois."²³ Another article appeared attacking currents in bourgeois psychology, of which "the theory of the unconscious" was seen as one of the most pernicious. Here, an effort was made not only to denounce anti-Bolshevik tendencies but to indicate the correct alternative. A new socialist psychology, free of capitalist influences, was to be based on the "new man" of Marxist consciousness, not the "Freudian man" motivated by unconscious drives.²⁴ Another former Freudian, Alexander Luria, also joined the anti-Freudian chorus in a 1932 article called "The Crisis in Bourgeois Psychology." Marxism, he wrote, "approaches the psyche of contemporary man as a product of development, as a complex process emerging as a result of the development of labor and social relations." Freud, by contrast, assumed the psyche to be a "natural product," autonomous from society, history, and the forces of production. With its focus on the unconscious, psychoanalysis stands "outside the boundaries" of science. Freud, Luria concluded, belongs to the tradition of "philosophers of social pessimism," from Schopenhauer to Nietzsche and Bergson, whose interest in the unverifiable terrain of the irrational aspects of human behavior exemplifies a crucial dimension of bourgeois psychology and its "inherent contradictions" with the goals of socialism.²⁵

The crux of this conflict over Freud centers ultimately on several fundamental points of dispute which lie beneath the rhetoric. The psychoanalysts, beginning with Osipov, believed that man was indeed dominated by his past (here Zalkind was

²³ F. Shemiakin and L. Gershonovich, "Kak Trotskii i Kautskii revizuiut Marksizm v voprosakh psikhologii," *Psikhologiya*, 1932, no. 1-2, pp. 3-37, esp. pp. 3-9.

²⁴ A. Talankin, "Protiv men'shevstvuiushchego idealizma v psikhologii," *Psikhologiya*, 1932, nos. 1-2, pp. 38-62, esp. pp. 38-43, 55-57, and 60-62. This article also contains a critique of the psychological ideas of G. V. Plekhanov, the founding theorist of Russian Marxism.

²⁵ A. R. Luria, "Krizis burzhuaznoi psikhologii," *Psikhologiya*, 1932, nos. 1-2, pp. 63-88, esp. pp. 64-73 and 84-88.

correct) and that he could be relieved of his distressing and destructive suffering only by forthrightly confronting and interrogating that past. The Bolshevik authorities who came to power under Stalin were committed to the opposite principle—that the postrevolutionary socialist society has no past; at least, not one that was worthwhile, useful, or instructive. Their past was one of economic systems, forms of political authority and sets of values which had not only to be obliterated, but also transcended in a specifically approved manner.

Moreover, the mechanism of repression, so central to Freud's theory,²⁶ was both threatening and unacceptable to the emerging ideology of Marxism-Leninism.²⁷ Marx had conceptualized an exterior conflict of repression based on social-class warfare, while Freud had posited an internal conflict in which man represses the impact of his infantile sexual dilemmas. In the Stalinist paradigm, unconscious "Freudian man" had to be repressed, finally, by the "new socialist man."

It should be noted, by way of conclusion, that the Stalinist effort to eliminate Freud's influence failed to achieve its goals. Recently, the Soviet Psychoanalytic Association has been officially reestablished with the approval of the government. Training programs are in the process of being created, a psychoanalytic journal is being published, and volumes of Freud's works, the first translations into Russian since the 1920s, are pouring off of Soviet presses. It will be interesting to observe the reception of this rebirth of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union.

²⁶ "The theory of repression is the corner-stone on which the whole structure of psychoanalysis rests" (Freud, *On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement*, p. 16).

²⁷ For a very interesting recent Soviet view of this problem, see V. M. Leibin, "Rasprostranenie Freidizma v SSSR v 20–30 ykh godakh," paper delivered at the conference on Soviet Culture Today, March 30, 1990, at Duke University.

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, in Chicago, on Nov. 2, 1989.