History of the unconscious in Soviet Russia: From its origins to the fall of the Soviet Union[1]

Alberto Angelini

via Costabella 26, I–00195 Rome, Italy – albertoangelini@infinito.it

(Final version accepted 31 January 2006)

Russia accepted the notion of the unconscious and psychoanalysis before many Western countries. The first Russian Psychoanalytic Society was established in 1911. After World War I and the Russian Revolution, for a short happy period, the following psychoanalysts were active: Sabina Spielrein, Tatiana Rosenthal, Moshe Wulff, Nikolai Osipov and Ivan Ermakov. Scholars associated with Soviet ideas participated too, including Aleksandr Luria, Michail Rejsner and Pavel Blonskij. Lev Vygotskij himself dealt with the unconscious. A second psychoanalytical society was set up in Kazan. Unfortunately, at the end of the 1920s, repression dissolved the psychoanalytic movement. Even the word 'psychoanalysis' was banned for decades. Nonetheless, interest in the unconscious, as distinct from psychoanalytic theory, survived in the work of the Georgian leader D. Uznadze. His followers organized the 1979 International Symposium on the Unconscious, in Tbilisi, Georgia, which marked the breaking of an ideological barrier. Since then, many medical, psychological, philosophical and sociological scholars have taken an interest in the unconscious, a subject both feared, for its ideological implications, and desired. Since the 1980s, psychoanalytic ideas have been published in the scientific press and have spread in society. The fall of the USSR in 1991 liberalized the scientific and institutional development of psychoanalysis.

Keywords: ideology, Marxism, paedology, psychoanalysis, reflexology, Russia, set theory, USSR, the unconscious

Origin and repression

Russia was one of the first countries to welcome psychoanalytic ideas, before psychoanalysis was accepted or even known in many Western nations. Furthermore, the notion of the unconscious was already present in the tradition of 19th century Russian philosophers and in the 'objective psychology' school, whose most predominant member was Ivan P. Pavlov. The latter, despite his distance from psychoanalysis, was nevertheless cited by Freud (1905 [1972, p. 176]), as regarding the psychic anticipation of a motor act. Meanwhile another member of the objective psychology school, Vladimir M. Bechterev, through his interpretation of perversions and inversions based on reflexology, attracted the attention of Otto Fenichel (1924). On his part, the 19th century founder of objective psychology, Ivan M. Sechenov, had on several occasions expressed important reflections on the theme of the unconscious.

From the beginning of the 20th century, psychoanalytic ideas began to spread in Russia. Only relatively recently have studies on the history of the subject been written (Angelini, 1988, 2002; Etkind, 1993; Miller, 1998). The crucial year is 1908, with three significant events. Firstly, an important psychiatric journal, *Psikhoterapiia* [Psychotherapy], was launched in Russia, with Vyrubov as its editor. The latter was

[1]This paper has been translated by Giovanna Iannaco; the bibliography has been translated by Antony Wood.

Published by Blackwell Publishing, 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK and 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA on behalf of the Institute of Psychoanalysis

a psychiatrist who had shown an interest in the suggestive–persuasive method used in Berne by Paul Dubois (1904) and in the Freudian theories which were then starting to appear on the scientific horizon. In the following years, *Psikhoterapiia* regularly published information on the progress of the psychoanalytic movement, as well as full psychoanalytical articles, including various translations of Freud's writings. Also in 1908, a military doctor from Odessa, A.A. Pevnitskii, held the first conference with a psychoanalytic subject in St Petersburg. Finally, in that same period, the *Korsakoff's Journal for Neuropathology and Psychology* published two articles by Nikolai J. Osipov (1887–1934). Osipov was to become known in the official history of psychiatry as one of the most important pupils of Bechterev. These articles dealt with Jungian studies on the concept of complex, the associative experiments, and the most recent works of the Freudian school (Osipov 1908, 1909).

Osipov had studied in Switzerland and had worked for some time at the Burghölzli Hospital in Zurich canton, Jung's workplace. He had met Freud in Western Europe, and in Russia had been a student of Bechterev. He had worked as an assistant in the University Clinic of Moscow under Professor Vladimir P. Serbsky, an open-minded psychiatrist who had not opposed his psychoanalytic interests. Osipov was soon surrounded by young colleagues interested in the therapeutic applications of Freud's ideas. In this same period Osipov organized, with the support of Professor Serbsky, a series of fortnightly meetings, the 'Little Friday Psychiatric Group', in which psychoanalytic topics were discussed. These meetings were attended by physicians and other professionals from related disciplines, such as psychiatry, sociology, and psychology. Osipov, a real pioneer of the psychoanalytic movement in Russia, together with O.B. Feltsmann (who was temporarily interested in Freudian theory), founded in that same period the 'Psychotherapeutic library', a project publishing several Russian editions of Freud's and Jung's works, starting from 1909. Despite their enthusiasm, neither Osipov nor Feltsmann had personally undergone training. Freud himself, in *On the history of the psychoanalytic movement* (Freud, 1914 [1975, p. 406]) mentions the Russian M. Wulff with these words: 'Only Odessa owns, in the person of M. Wulff, a trained psychoanalyst'. In fact Wulff was the first Russian psychoanalyst to be fully trained, having completed his personal analysis with Karl Abraham in Berlin. Back in Odessa, his native town, he carried out, from 1909, several years of intense analytic work.

On 2 May 1911, Freud informed Ferenczi that he had received, that same day, Doctor Leonid Drosnés, who had told him that in Russia a psychoanalytic society, based in Moscow, had been formed. Its founders were Osipov, Vyrubov and Drosnés himself (Jones, 1953). Drosnés was in fact the doctor who in 1909 in Odessa had consulted the young patient with neurotic episodes later described by Freud in his clinical case of the Wolf-Man (Freud, 1914). Drosnés had accompanied the young man on his long journey from Odessa to Vienna.

Another member of the emerging psychoanalytic society in Moscow was P.A. Ermakov, the new director of the Moscow University clinic, who had replaced Serbsky. The latter had resigned from the organization, together with Osipov, because of political tensions. Between 1912 and 1915 Wulff, Ermakov and Osipov translated into Russian almost the entire works of Freud. Meanwhile, the German journals *Zentralblatt, Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* and *Imago* published about a dozen Russian contributions. In those same years, other young Russian students had come across psychoanalytical ideas in the course of travels

related to their intellectual and political development. Amongst them was Tatiana Rosenthal who, when very young, had emigrated to Zurich and was part of the Bolshevik movement. She had graduated as a doctor in 1911 and, after a period as an active member of the Psychoanalytic Society in Vienna, she went back to Russia after the Revolution. Another woman who had a relevant role in the history of Russian psychoanalysis was Sabina Spielrein. Born in 1885 in Rostov-on-Don, Spielrein was hospitalized at the Burghölzli in Zurich, Jung's hospital, between 1904 and 1905, suffering from 'hysteria'. Later, she studied medicine at Zurich University, graduating in 1911 and devoting herself, thereafter, to psychoanalysis. It was Spielrein who, at the meeting of 26 November 1911 of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, presented a paper in which she proposed the concept of the death instinct. On that occasion Freud rejected the idea, as he considered it misleading to base explanation of such a concept using biological rather than psychological motives. After a few brief visits to Russia, Spielrein finally returned to her native country after 1923.

For many years, the violence of war and, later, of the revolution interrupted all intellectual and scientific connections between Europe and Russia. After a period of confusion and isolation, the psychoanalytic society reconstituted itself in 1921, in Moscow. It only consisted, to begin with, of eight members. Its programme was orientated around the three fields of aesthetics, medicine and pedagogy. We find here names such as Wulff and Ermakov, who, together with A. Bernstein, comprised the first medical group. In 1922 the number of the members had already risen to 15. It included members with a philosophical background and other of various affiliations. The pedagogical current of the Russian psychoanalytic movement found its greatest expression in the person of Vera Schmidt. In 1921 she founded the legendary experiment of the Psychoanalytic School of Moscow. Spielrein too was temporarily part of this project. Among the school-children were Schmidt's child and, according to some witnesses (Faenza, 2003), even Stalin's child. To begin with, this project was in line with the post-revolutionary climate and with the aspiration to create a new kind of human being in a new kind of society. It was hoped that the educators involved in the project would try to understand and interpret the unconscious derivatives of the infantile unconscious and separate them from conscious manifestations. Transference phenomena between children and educators were taken into account, and there was an attempt to create a relationship founded on affection and trust rather than on authority. Furthermore, the educators were also expected to maintain an analytic attitude within themselves.

Punishments were avoided, as well as excessive manifestations of love. In the main, there was an effort to adapt the physical environment to the needs and the age of the children. Children enjoyed maximum freedom of movement and their toilet training was not constrained by any rigid or artificial control. The same level of open-mindedness was shown towards their sexual manifestations and curiosity (Schmidt, 1924). It was probably this latter aspect of Vera Schmidt's pedagogical project that provoked a reaction on the authorities' part. It is an established fact that spiteful accusations of pornography and sexual abuse caused, after various upheavals, the closing down of the Psychoanalytic School in 1924. The Moscow Psychoanalytic Society had met twice (November 1923 and February 1924) in order to discuss the problems of the school, while Schmidt, in 1923, made a journey to Berlin and Vienna to inform the psychoanalytic movement of its existence.

Her courageous initiative had been allowed to develop beyond, perhaps, what was imaginable, partly because she enjoyed, in the Soviet world, a solid position. Her husband, Otto Schmidt, a mathematician, was a member of the Soviet of Moscow and of the State Soviet of scientists. He too was a member of the Moscow Psychoanalytic Society and as director of state publications had made materially possible the publication and diffusion of many psychoanalytic writings.

The most prominent personality of the Psychoanalytic Society of Moscow in those years was Ermakov, particularly through his commitment to the aesthetics section. His numerous works on aesthetics were to prompt reactions some years later from Lev Vygotsky (1925) and Valentin Voloshinov (1927), whose name is thought by many to be the pseudonym for Mikhail Bakhtin. Both were very interested in psychoanalytic theory. The second section of the Society was the clinical one, directed by Professor Wulff, secretary of the Society and a training analyst. For a while in 1923 he shared this task with Spielrein, who, after brief and intermittent visits to her country, had finally left Switzerland and returned to Russia. Spielrein had founded, in Lausanne in 1919, a psychoanalytic study group called 'Cercle Interne' [inner circle]. For over a year, she lived in the Student Residence, in the centre of Moscow, with her husband Pavel Scheftel, a physician, and their daughter Renata. In 1925, after the birth of her second daughter Eva, Spielrein moved to her home town, Rostov, where she specialized in the psychoanalysis of children. The last of her works to appear in Western Europe was published by *Imago* (Spielrein, 1931). She and her two daughters died during the German invasion of Rostov in 1942. Another significant female character within Russian psychoanalysis was Tatiana Rosenthal, a follower of the Bolsheviks, who had taken part in the revolutionary movement. Rosenthal, in 1919, had participated in setting up a psychoanalytic clinic in the new Institute of Brain Pathology based in St Petersburg, formerly the Neurology Department, of the Military Academy, each in turn directed by the eminent scientist, Vladimir Bechterev.

In 1922, Ermakov and Wulff founded a State Psychoanalytic Institute. To begin with, this incorporated the psychoanalytic school in which Vera Schmidt was involved. Later, it opened a psychoanalytic clinic directed by Wulff. The Russian Psychoanalytic Institute was, after those of Berlin and Vienna, the main centre of psychoanalytic training and activity. In 1924, this Institute proposed a programme of 10 seminars and organized supplementary courses at Moscow University and at the Psychiatric Clinic. Ermakov himself, launched, in Moscow, the publication of a series called *The Psychological and Psychoanalytical Library*, which appeared until 1929 (Vasilyeva, 2000).

As well as finding a home within the Moscow Psychoanalytic Society and its programmes, Freudian ideas were met with interest by many scholars. Under the impetus of the revolutionary movement, they welcomed psychoanalytic theories as an innovative methodology with implications for many disciplines, such as sociology, law and criminology. Obviously the term 'psychoanalysis' had a different meaning from its use today. Rooted in various, fundamentally philosophical disciplines, psychoanalytical thought was totally divorced from clinical practice. Some of these scholars were also part of the Moscow Society. However, historically and methodologically, they are best characterized as attempting to put psychoanalytical ideas to use in reinforcing the Marxist and Soviet perspective within their particular discipline. Some of them worked at the State Institute of Experimental Psychology in

Moscow, while others were prominent, historically important figures from other fields. This is the case, for instance, with Pavel P. Blonskij, who appears in the list of Moscow psychoanalysts published in 1922 in the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*. In the period in which psychoanalysis gained his attention, Blonskij, a Bolshevik, was professor in the Second State University of Moscow, at the Krupskaia Academy for Communist Education, and in various other pedagogical institutes. He was the founder of paedology, a discipline that is to pedagogy, he said, as botany is to gardening. His intention was to found a new pedagogy capable of educating a self-aware and active 'new man', an idea strongly resonant with the developing Soviet world. Psychoanalysis was considered reinforcement for his theory of psychic development.

Another member of the Moscow Psychoanalytic Society was Mikhail A. Reisner, a jurist and professor of law. Engaged in the People Commissariat of Justice, he tried to use psychoanalysis to establish links between the psychologies of individual and mass behaviour, and he was the precursor of some ideas that would later be explored by Otto Fenichel and the Frankfurt School (Angelini, 1996; Etkind, 1993).

The work of B.D. Fridman is situated in philosophically similar ground. Fridman, who was for some time active in the Psychoanalytic School of Moscow, tried to explain the underlying mechanisms in the formation of social ideologies, equating them, fundamentally, with the psychoanalytic concept of rationalization. An even more philosophical line was taken by Bernard E. Bychovskij, who tried to link psychoanalysis to the energetist philosophy being expressed in those years by the German chemist-physicist Wilhelm Ostwald, winner of the Nobel Prize for Chemistry in 1909. Historically, some connections have been made between psychoanalytic ideas and those of W. Ostwald (Angelini, 1985; Dimitrov, 1971), even though Freud never expressed openly any adhesion to Ostwaldian theory. Finally, Aron B. Zalkind, also listed as a member of the Moscow Society tried to produce a wide transformation of psychoanalysis, translating it – and distorting it considerably – into the terms of reflex theory elaborated by Ivan Pavlov.

Generally speaking, the concept of psychoanalysis proposed by these scholars was not only divorced from the clinical field, practice being virtually impossible in the prevailing political context, but was often forced and ideologically biased. However, psychoanalytical ideas, with their innovative power, did become widespread, and were not restricted to Moscow. In those same years individuals or small groups interested in Freudian thought appeared in various other Russian localities. Information on these more peripheral activities is, however, limited. It is well known that in Kiev, apart from Zalkind who was a resident, there were active figures such as Vinogradov, Goldovskij and Hackebusch, the director of the University Clinic. As for Odessa, we know of two physicians, Chaletzky and Kogan, who promoted psychoanalytic concepts. In Leningrad, all psychoanalytic activity ceased in 1921 when Tatiana Rosenthal, who had established herself there, committed suicide. She was 36. Her colleague Leonid Drosnès, also active in Leningrad, then moved back to Odessa, his home town.

One of the most significant psychoanalytic centres, after Moscow, was that of Kazan in the Tartar Republic. It became a Psychoanalytic Society in 1922 on the initiative of a young psychologist, who was to become known in Western Europe as one of the fathers of contemporary neuropsychology: Aleksandr Romanovic Luria. He had previously described his project to Freud, who, when answering his letter,

greeted him with 'Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident' [Dear Mr President]. Luria's psychoanalytic activity, first in Kazan and then in Moscow, where he had settled in the autumn of 1923, is shown by his numerous contributions to the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* (Luria, 1924, 1926, 1927). This work includes accounts of the general principles of Freudian thought, descriptions of the characteristics of anxiety, an analysis of a piece of theatre, and various other topics. From an historical perspective, Luria also belongs to that group of young Russian academics who arrived at psychoanalysis through the impetus of Marxist historical materialism. This is shown, in particular, in Luria's essay, *Psychoanalysis as a system of monistic psychology* (Luria, 1925). Despite his laborious and problematic input of ideology, Luria's great merit was that he understood and emphasized the epistemological power of psychoanalysis, giving it the ability to develop an overall approach to the human personality, thus overcoming the limits of 19th century experimental psychology. The latter was at the time the object of fierce debate, taking place also at the philosophical level. In the list of the psychoanalysts belonging to the Moscow Society and reported in the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, there also appears the name of one of the most prominent personalities of 20th century psychology: Lev Semenovic Vygotsky, founder of the historical–cultural psychology school. According to the reports of the above journal, Vygotsky presented at least two papers to the Society: one reviewed by Luria (1924), related to the relationship between psychoanalysis and literature, and the other, reported by V. Schmidt, to the aesthetics strand in Freud's work (Schmidt, 1924, 1927). Furthermore, in 1925, he wrote, in collaboration with Luria, a brief introduction to the Russian translation of *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (Freud, 1920; Vygotsky and Luria, 1925). In this work he expresses various positive opinions towards Freudian ideas, although interspersed with many criticisms, especially towards the concept of the death instinct. In truth, Vygotsky, unlike his other colleagues, never fully accepted psychoanalysis, not even briefly. He did however engage with the theory, though in a limited way. His critical attitude towards Freudian thought was revealed even when he dealt with the problem of psychic, unconscious phenomena in *Psikhika, soznanie i bessoznatel'noe* [Mind, consciousnss and the unconscious] (Vygotsky, 1930). In this work he acknowledged the methodological importance of psychoanalysis, particularly its denial of the dichotomy, characteristic of 20th century thought, between psychological and physical processes. However, he expressed some worries about Freudian psychic determinism and voiced concerns that it might open the way to biologization. In fact, Vygotsky, the theorist of consciousness as an historical–social phenomenon, did not deal with the unconscious in a systematic way, but accepted it as a given, thus opposing those who identified consciousness with the psychic in a reductive way. At any rate, the huge reach of Vygotskian conceptions, in the second half of the twentieth century, has produced many ideas which have also interested psychoanalytic theory. Without being overly detailed, it is worth remembering that the historiography of psychoanalysis possesses a growing literature that aims to understand possible points of contact between psychoanalytic thought and historical–cultural theory. These reflections have begun to have their impact on psychoanalytic theory.

James Wertsch, an author interested in psychoanalysis (1985, 1991, 1998), has developed Vygotskian ideas, studying the idea of the regulation of human behaviour through language, signs and other cultural artefacts. Wertsch (1990) has also

attempted, using a psychological perspective, to make a cautious link between Vygotsky and psychoanalysis, emphasizing in particular the interaction and the exchange of meanings between the child and the adult. This can be witnessed in the special issue of *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, which is entirely dedicated to the relationship between the great Russian scholar and psychoanalytic thought. In that issue, other authors, closer to psychoanalysis, offer a variety of reflections on the relationship, even suggesting, as did Tanzer (1990), that, in the wider context of G.H. Mead's writings, it is possible to make an analogy between Vygotsky's thought and that of H.S. Sullivan.

Subsequently, in the *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, Wilson and Weinstein (1992a, 1992b) wrote a detailed study, including a clinical perspective, on the Vygotskian view of the acquisition of language. In this article different aspects of the unconscious dimension are taken into account, such as phantasies, identifications and defensive mechanisms. In 1996, these same authors, proposed a link between the concept of 'Zone of Proximal Development' (ZPD), elaborated by Vygotsky in the context of his child studies and the notion of transference (Wilson and Weinstein, 1996). We should realize that, within the academic field of psychology, beginning in the 1980s, there has been a wide and systematic growth of Vygotskian themes. This new interest was caused by the publication in English, in 1978, of an anthology of various writings by Vygotsky, *Mind and Society* (Vygotsky, 1978). Since then, following this trend, numerous psychologists have highlighted the close relationship between the environmental context, emotions and development (Bruner, 1990; Cole, 1990; Shweder, 1990; Valsiner, 1995).

These studies, which explore the relation between individuals and their socio-cultural environment, have urgent and important methodological problems which produce conflicting theoretical positions. Within psychology, an open attitude (Cole, Engestrom and Vasquez, 1997), inclined to methodological pluralism and interdisciplinarity (Cole, 1998; Rogoff, 2003) has up to now predominated. In this study, however, which constructs a historical context to psychoanalytic thought, actual psychological theory – and thus its methodological themes – cannot be described in any depth. As far as history is concerned, the fact is that, at the start of the 20th century, Russian psychological and philosophical thought was substantially influenced by Freudian ideas. However, while on the one hand psychoanalytical theories moved into wide areas within Soviet culture, they were, from the 1920s, the target of strong criticisms. These criticisms, philosophical in nature, arose because of the relation of psychoanalytic theory to Marxism and are linked to a complex international situation.

Psychoanalytic conceptions were often used to support critical revisions of Marxism, especially in Austria and Germany. The Soviet orthodox Marxist philosophers vehemently attacked the 'Austro-Marxist revisionists', condemning at the same time almost all the theories that the latter had supported, including psychoanalysis. It can be said that these attacks came from the faction engaged in the fight against Trotskyism in the scientific field. This extremist faction criticized and banned from the Soviet cultural horizon most of modern science's developments, including Einstein's relativity theory, Planck's quantum theory and modern biology. The attack on psychoanalytic conceptions and on numerous psychological theories carried on for years and culminated, after psychoanalysis had been eliminated, with the Central Committee of the Communist Party formalizing, on 4 July 1936 a 'severe

criticism' of any 'anti-scientific and bourgeois principle'. As a result, psychoanalysis, as well as Blonskij's ideas, and the historical–cultural concepts of Vygotsky disappeared from the landscape of Soviet Russian psychology. In a society which was restructuring itself on authoritarian lines, and which only allowed a single set of ideas, one could not expect the survival of initiatives based on psychoanalytical ideas, such as Vera Schmidt's school. Psychoanalysts disappeared from the scene. Some of them emigrated; others, like Tatiana Rosenthal, came to a tragic end. From the second half of the 1930s Soviet repression became so violent and all-encompassing that it struck not only the psychoanalytic movement, but even its adversaries. In other words, the concept of the unconscious could not be mentioned, not even in criticism.

From that point, the whole of Soviet psychology remained, until after the Second World War, substantially confined within the context of Pavlovian physiology. However, within this general context, there were some researchers who, although distant from Freudian thought, stepped outside the Pavlovian framework. They laid the basis for the re-emergence of those repressed concepts, belonging to both the scientific and the affective spheres, which were going to find some formal space only in the second half of the 20th century.

The return of the repressed

Among the scholars who, though not psychoanalytically oriented, became interested in the notion of the unconscious, and thus distanced themselves from Pavlovian orthodoxy, was Sergei Leonidovich Rubinstein (1889–1960). He was a critic of Freud, but he acknowledged his importance in confronting psychology with new problems, and had, at least, the courage to talk about him. Rubinstein saw theoretical relevance in the notion of the unconscious and he attempted a conceptual distinction between instinct and drive. He seemed to fear that the biological aspects might gain a philosophical autonomy. In his view, the subject and the world were linked in a dynamic interaction (Koltsova et al., 1996).

These ideas were collected in *The Foundations of General Psychology* (Rubinstein, 1940) which had a wide circulation, especially when reprinted in 1946. Despite all this, the official theoreticians of Marxism, in particular E.T. Chernakov, accused him of supporting psychoanalysis, thus deviating from 'historical Marxism' (Wortis, 1950). These extreme Marxists aimed at the total historicization of the human being, including its biological and instinctual aspects. At the same time, the contributions of those Marxists, such as Lukács (1923), who had explored the importance of the 'subjective factor' in history, were ignored. This dismissal of the importance of subjectivity meant putting into question not only psychoanalysis, but the methodological autonomy of any psychological inquiry or perspective in the scientific field. An important scholar of the period was aware of this risk: V.N. Miasichev (1893–1973). He showed some familiarity with psychoanalytical theories and, after Stalin's death, was appointed director of the prestigious Psychoneurological Institute of Leningrad, named after its founder, V.M. Bechterev. He was also a professor of psychology at Leningrad University and he claimed, contrary to the dominant physiologists, that the treatment of some patients, in particular those with obsessive and hysterical phenomena, would require a fundamentally psychological perspective.

According to Miller (1998), some of Miasichev's published cases are influenced by psychoanalytical theories, even though there is no explicit reference to Freud in them. Because of his tacit sympathy for the 'Western science', he was never accepted into the Academy of Medical Sciences, rigidly dominated at that time by orthodox Pavlovians.

Meanwhile, in far-away Georgia, Dimitri Uznadze (1886–1950), aided by his geographical isolation, had been systematically researching unconscious phenomena since the 1940s. He proposed his own theory as an alternative to the dichotomy between psychical determinism and physical causality. However, in his research, both on unconscious phenomena and on psychical events more generally, he claimed to adhere to the experimental validity of the objective cause. The key concept in Uznadze's theory is what he calls '*ustanovka*', translated as 'set'. This term describes an unconscious psychical configuration that governs an individual's relationship with his environment. Sets are formed in the course of development, when the person's organism reacts to certain situations. They possess, therefore, the characteristic of historicity. They can change, come into conflict with each other and so on. Uznadze always had a critical attitude towards psychoanalysis and underlined the historical aspect of the sets because the theorists of Soviet Marxism accused Freud of overlooking the social determinants. When, in 1978, the First International Symposium on the Unconscious took place in Tbilisi, Soviet Georgia, and re-launched the theme of the unconscious in post-war Russia, Nancy Rollins's (1978) rejection of these accusations was somewhat paradoxical. She claimed that psychoanalysis considers the superego to be mainly an effect of the environment and of the education received by the parents in a family context. Seen in this context, psychoanalysis could be said to overvalue the role played by social factors. Distinguishing himself from reflexology and other branches of behaviourism, Uznadze rejects the atomistic approach to the human psyche and deliberately proposes a holistic theory.

When in the middle of the 1920s, the debate about the theory of consciousness had become lively, two opposite positions could be defined. The first suggested the abandonment of the concept of consciousness, as a mentalistic superstition, in favour of an objective study of behaviour. The second position attempted, in some ways, to save such a concept. Uznadze considered that the notion of consciousness was necessary as one of psychology's instruments; but he proposed also that the non-conscious set be considered a self-sufficient psychical entity. For contingent reasons, not least the geographical isolation in which research on sets theory was being carried out, and the fact that Uznadze's publications were all in the Georgian language, more than 30 years went by between the conceiving of the set theory and the publication in Russian, in 1961, of Uznadze's main works (Uznadze, 1961). On the other hand, Georgian psychology accepted the set theory almost uncritically and viewed it as a national source of pride. For these reasons, and perhaps also because Stalin was Georgian, the set theory remained unscathed through the ideological wars of the 1930s and 1940s and was also relatively untouched by the vigorous revival of Pavlov-oriented studies that occurred in the 1950s. Towards the end of the 1950s, however, the orthodox Pavlovians compared the notion of the set, with its unconscious dimension, to ideas expressed by the philosopher E. Mach (1838–1916). In the Soviet context, this methodological consideration implied a heavy accusation, because Mach, in his time, had been attacked by

Lenin himself. Despite this, Z.I. Khodzava (1957) wrote a long article in defence of Uznadze's ideas and of the concept of the set. The latter remained an important presence in Russian psychology.

On a more general level, in those years, any psychological perspective not in line with Pavlovian physiology was criticized. This period, referred to as the 'Pavlovian revival', had developed from the *Scientific session on the problems of physiological doctrine by the academic I.P. Pavlov*, organized by the Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Medical Sciences, and held in Moscow from 28 June to 4 July 1950. This 'session' remained a point of ideological and methodological reference for more than a decade. The philosophical reference consisted in psychophysical integration.

In 1957, D.D. Fedotov, Head of the Psychiatry Institute of the Soviet Minister of Health, was invited to write an article for the American journal, *The Monthly Review*, in which, along with the predictable criticisms of Freud, he confirmed, in Leninist fashion, that the 'psyche is a reflex, in the brain, of a reality which exists objectively' (Fedotov, 1957, p. 252). In October 1958, under the auspices of the Presidium of the Soviet Academy of Medical Science a conference was held in Moscow on the *Problems of Ideological Struggle with Modern Freudianism* (Bondarenko and Rabinovich, 1959). On this occasion the usual range of neurological, psychological and philosophical criticisms of psychoanalytical theory was re-affirmed. However, the influence of Freudian thought had started to be felt, in both scientific and cultural contexts. The scholars, V.N. Miasichev and P.K. Anokhin, claimed that, in order to be able to criticize psychoanalysis, it was necessary to study it in depth. After the death of Stalin, as the general political situation changed, many authors supported the re-establishment of a methodological autonomy in psychology, and criticized orthodox Pavlovism as mechanistic and reductionist. However, in 1959, during a congress in Czechoslovakia, which reunited Western and Eastern scholars, psychoanalysis was again criticized in favour of Pavlovism. It was only in May 1962, on the occasion of the *All-Union Session on the Philosophical Problems Linked to the Physiology of Superior Nervous Activity and to Psychology*, held in Moscow, that the mechanistic positions assumed in the course of the two Academies of 1950 were finally attacked. Psychology was officially rehabilitated and given the status of an independent science. The problem of the unconscious resumed its importance and attention was focused again on Uznadze's model. His works had been translated from Georgian into Russian a few months previously. Also, contacts with the Western world, interrupted by the Cold War, were resumed. In 1964, in East Berlin, a symposium was held dedicated to a more specific theme: *Cortico-visceral Physiology, Pathology and Therapy*. 'Cortico-visceral' was the official replacement term for 'psychosomatic', the latter being ideologically contested by the Soviets. The congress was attended by several Western psychoanalysts, for example, Wittkowen, who were interested in psychosomatic phenomena.

On that occasion, according to Chertok (1982), the Soviet anti-psychoanalytic movement lost its coherence. Despite the traditional attacks on psychoanalysis, made by I.T. Kurtsin, director of the Institute of Cortico-visceral Research, the anti-psychoanalysis polemics were weakened by authoritative personalities such as Birinkov, director of the Institute of Experimental Medicine of the Academy of Medical Sciences in Leningrad and Cernigovsky, director of the Pavlov Institute, whose contributions centred on the psychological question of human emotions.

In 1965, Kurtsin himself reconsidered his anti-Freudian position with his *A Critique of Freudianism in Medicine and Physiology*, in which he acknowledged that psychosomatic medicine found its origin in the spread of psychoanalysis into the fields of physiology and neurology (Kurtsin, 1965). The same year, A.M. Kaletsky published a philosophical article in the prestigious *Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Psychiatry* (Kaletsky, 1965). In this article he analysed the relationship between psychoanalysis and existentialism and criticized both on ideological grounds. In 1967, I.S. Kon, an eminent sociologist of Leningrad University, published the *The Sociology of Personality* which contained an entire chapter dedicated to the psychoanalytic theory of personality, which was criticized from a Soviet sociology perspective (Kon, 1967).

Between the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, some precise research questions in relation to the brain and the psyche were defined. On one side there was an 'anti-psychological' group, with a psychiatric background, connected to the Moscow Academy of Medical Sciences. This group was essentially interested in psychosis and stressed its organic cause. This was at a time when the psychosocial perspective was gaining ground in the West. On the other side, there was a psychologically-oriented group, which proposed further developments in Uznadze's set theory. Meanwhile, the interest towards non-pharmacological psychiatry and the various psychotherapeutic methods, including psychoanalysis, as used in the West, was growing.

In the same period, Aleksandr R. Luria's School of Neuropsychology was also flourishing. Since the 1930s, Luria had abandoned his interest on psychoanalysis, because of ideological repression, and had dedicated himself to the study of the brain, in particular, of the cortical functions. Leòntiev was also fundamental in the development of this perspective. In the 1970s Leòntiev's 'activity theory' became virtually the official Soviet doctrine. From that time, within an essentially psychological perspective, some researchers developed a conception of human personality which was attentive to the contributions of the now-flourishing Georgian school and which incorporated Vygotskian theory (Asmolov, 1998). During this period the debate on the theme of the unconscious was kept alive mainly by the Georgian school and all the followers of Uznadze's set theory.

The work of Filipp Veniaminovic Bassin marks, both theoretically and historiographically, a milestone in the debate of the unconscious at that time. His book *The Problem of the Unconscious* (Bassin, 1968) is the first Russian work, since the 1920s, to contain the word 'unconscious' in the title. This was symptomatic of a widespread need for scientific theorization. However, Bassin never accepted the Freudian psychoanalytic perspective. Rather he considered the unconscious as a manifestation of the 'higher nervous activity', which needed empirical physiological and neurological study. For this reason, he considered Uznadze's set theory to be 'the only conception of the unconscious which has been demonstrated at an experimental level' (Bassin, 1968 [1972, p. 137]). On the whole, he was concerned that psychoanalysis placed the unconscious in a position too far removed from the notion of consciousness; he linked the notion of lapsus to latent motivations of the set, and he saw a risk of anthropomorphism in the symbolic significance of dreams. He was thus adopting the perspective of the Russian I.E. Volpert (see Bassin, 1968), who, in the 1960s, had organized research and experiments on dreams (Volpert, 1966).

Convincing arguments rejecting these criticisms can be found in the work of Cesare Musatti (1959, 1960). He had responded to Bassin's accusations of psychoanalysis in

several, widely circulated articles, adopting an open and scientific dialogue. Musatti defended Freud's choice of the psychological interpretative criterion, highlighting its essential methodological value. It should not therefore be positioned as an alternative to the physiological perspective. Furthermore he underlined Bassin's lack of congruence in his evaluation of Freudian conceptions, particularly in relation to catharsis and dream symbolization.

Two years later, Emilio Servadio (1961) was also engaged in a debate with the Russian over the question of the relationship of psychoanalysis to literature. However, the Russian positions themselves were not homogeneous. In those same years, A.E. Sherozia (1969, 1973), a prominent figure of the Georgian school, distanced himself from Bassin by claiming that, on matters of basic principles, there were some common interests between Uznadze and Freud. He asserted that both scholars had opposed the 19th century tradition, which conceived the various conscious psychic functions, such as perception, will, cognition, and others as separate parts of a mosaic. They both considered that unconscious processes formed the basis of the content of psychic activity and they both shared philosophical conceptions of a monistic kind. Finally, they both had conceived a more general psychological system.

This current which attempted to find a common ground between Freud and Uznadze was later resumed by some Western researchers, in particular, Nancy Rollins (1978). In the 1970s the political and cultural atmosphere in the USSR was gradually changing. The theme of the unconscious was starting to find space, even if it was from a perspective critical of Freud. An example of this was the new and expanded edition of A.M. Sviadoshch's *Neuroses and their Treatment*, originally published in 1959 (Sviadoshch, 1971). Despite the inevitable criticisms of Freud, and in particular of his theory on infantile sexuality, some interest in Alfred Adler was emerging, perhaps because of his closeness, at the beginning of the 1900s, to the socialist movement, and for his clinical introduction of group psychotherapy. The latter was very popular, and was appreciated also from an ideological viewpoint. In 1977, A.E. Lichko, of the Bechterev Institute of Leningrad, wrote an article which emphasized the importance of the psychological relational aspects of childhood (Lichko, 1977). In 1978 A.H. Boiko, in Kiev, with his book, *The Problem of the Unconscious in Philosophy and the Concrete Sciences*, though still critical of Freud from an ideological viewpoint, identified a real function of the unconscious as allowing the human organism to adapt to the social environment (Boiko, 1978). In that same period a new generation of sociologists started to show an interest in psychoanalysis, particularly in Eric Fromm and Jacques Lacan. It is Fromm, appreciated for his Marxist roots, who was the point of reference for the work of V.M. Leibin, a philosopher at Moscow University. Leibin (1972) wrote *Conformism and Respectability of Psychoanalysis* in which he criticized the tendency of psychoanalysis to social conformism. At the same time, he introduced Russian readers to the work of personalities such as Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan, Erik Erikson and Herbert Marcuse. A young sociologist from Moscow, V.N. Dobrenkov (1972, 1974), in two works which described Fromm as a 'liberal–bourgeois theorist', offered nonetheless an exhaustive account of neo-Freudian theories in the European and American cultural context. N.S. Avtonomova (1973) published *The Psychoanalytic Concepts of Jacques Lacan*, a broad-ranging article introducing the Russian readers to the complex thought of this author, without accusing him of being a 'bourgeois antagonist of socialism'.

During the mid-1970s other works on Lacan, who was appreciated for his closeness to Marxism, continued to appear; but the most authoritative work, with its broadness and depth, came from V.M. Leibin who, in 1977, published *Psychoanalysis and the Philosophy of Neo-Freudianism*. This remarkable volume examines the influence of European and American psychoanalysis on various fields, such as psychiatry, philosophy, sociology, and art, and emphasizes the importance of psychoanalytic competence in the clinical as well as in the social and cultural contexts. Furthermore, the volume contains an account of Wilhelm Reich's theories and a philosophical speculation on the relationship of psychoanalytic theory to the work of great Western thinkers, from Kierkegaard and Bergson to Sartre and others (Leibin, 1977). The theme of the unconscious had become an object of interest for a great part of the Russian scientific world. The need for general reflection on this topic in order to legitimate this kind of research in the political and cultural contexts, culminated with the organization of a major congress held in Tbilisi, Georgia, in 1979. Historically, this symposium represented for Russia a turning point in the study of the unconscious. It was promoted by the major exponents of the 'Georgian school', in Uznadze's homeland, and was possible because of a relatively less rigid political atmosphere. The main organizers of the conference were F.V. Bassin, the most prominent theorist of the unconscious of that period, A.S. Prangisvili, a research psychologist at the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Georgian Republic and A.E. Sherozia, a psychology lecturer at the Tbilisi State University. Another Soviet organizer was Sergei Tsuladze, a Georgian psychologist who had undergone psychoanalytic treatment in Paris. Amongst the foreign backers were Nancy Rollins, an American psychiatrist who had studied in Moscow, and Léon Chertok, a French psychiatrist widely trained in psychoanalysis and psychosomatics.

The First International Symposium on the Unconscious, held in Tbilisi, from 1 to 6 October 1979, was attended by over 1400 delegates. The participants came not only from medical and scientific fields, but also from literature, art, sociology, philosophy and from 'different schools of psychoanalysis'. As well as from the USSR, they came from Europe and America. One of the covenants was the well-known linguist Roman Jakobson, who impressed the audience by giving his talk in the Georgian language.

Jacques Lacan and Cesare Musatti, also expected, were unable to attend. This event represented a victory for all those Russian psychologists who had tried to oppose the dominant Pavlovian doctrine and promoted the study of psychoanalytic theory. Returning from Tbilisi, George Pollack (1982), director of the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis, commented appreciating the curiosity and the enthusiasm shown by his Russian colleagues for this extraordinary event. The proceedings of the symposium consisted of four volumes with a total of 2710 pages, edited by Prangisvili, Sherozia and Bassin. The date of publication, 1978, was one year earlier than the actual event (Miller, 1998; Prangisvili, Sherozia and Bassin, 1978). The fact that the Tbilisi Academy of Sciences had been working for several years on the problematic organization of this Symposium (Lobner and Levitin, 1978) is perhaps the technical explanation for this formal discrepancy. The fourth and last volume appeared after a considerable length of time, in 1985, and was dedicated to the memory of Sherozia, who had meanwhile died.

The first volume is entitled *The Development of the Idea* and is divided into three sections. The first deals with the question of psychological reality of the unconscious

and includes numerous contributions of the Georgian researchers of the Uznadze school. The second deals with the evolution of this concept before, during and after Freud; it also contains the contribution of Nancy Rollins. The third section illustrates the neurophysiological mechanisms relating to the unconscious and includes Cesare Musatti's contribution (Musatti, 1978).

The second volume is essentially oriented towards clinical applications and experimental studies and is entitled *Sleep, Clinic, Creativity*. It includes studies on the activities of the unconscious in conditions of hypnosis, a topic cherished by the Russians, as well as reflections on the relationship between the unconscious, clinical states and artistic creativity. Louis Althusser's work appears in this context (Althusser, 1978). This volume contains several contributions of American authors, as well as works by Russian scholars, such as Sviadoshch, Fedotov and Lichko. Previously they had expressed themselves very critically, both in content and form, towards psychoanalysis. In this volume, while still basically very critical, they were, in the form, less aggressive.

The third volume is entitled *Cognition, Communication and Personality* and features a laborious attempt at an integration of Vygotsky's and Uznadze's theoretical conceptions. It also contains the contributions by Silvano Arieti and Roman Jakobson.

The fourth and last volume, *Results of the Discussion*, appearing several years later, in 1985, consisted of a deeper analysis of the differences between what were thought by the Russian scholars to be the two basic approaches to the phenomenon of the unconscious: the Freudian/post-Freudian psychoanalytic orientation, and the research methods used by Uznadze's followers. A version of Uznadze's 'set' theory, elaborated by Sherozia, was proposed as the most advanced scientific method for studying the functions of unconscious mental activity. At the same time, Freud's concepts were considered necessary to the achievement of this enterprise.

Despite the various controversies among different schools, the criticisms of the ideological constraints which had limited research and the complaints about the resulting slow growth of scientific knowledge were unanimous. All this was happening in an intellectual environment in which the existence of unconscious psychic mechanisms was still largely denied. The Tbilisi Symposium represented a milestone in the history of the unconscious in Soviet Russia. For the first time since the 1920s, a genuine effort was made to compare the psychoanalytical theories developed in Europe and in the United States, with the parallel research on the unconscious carried out in the Soviet context (Chertok, 1982). The Russians showed a particular interest in those psychoanalytical theoretical orientations which implied a criticism of metapsychology. In particular, the three curators of the Symposium expressed in the Introduction a certain appreciation of George Klein's ideas, which were then spreading. As is well known, Klein (1973, 1976) proposed, in essence, a separation of metapsychology from the clinical field. The latter was given priority, in order to enable the discovery of new instruments for grasping the subjective experience of the patient in the therapeutic relationship. This meant for the Russian a departure from the instinct theory, and support for the implicit task that they had set themselves: the separation of psychoanalysis from neurology and from any biological orientation. At the same time, they needed to do so while avoiding offering any opportunity for the so-called orthodox materialists to accuse them of idealism. In trying to achieve this difficult balance, they also embraced some of the concepts expressed in that period by Wallerstein (1976), who claimed that the

specific field of psychoanalysis is one of meaning, significance and intention, all of which cannot be explained in a biologically determinist context. Lacan also, with his concept of the unconscious structured like a language, obtained some success, as such a principle appeared to offer potential openings to the social dimension. Of course, these new directions were followed unevenly, with strong differences among the different factions. All the factions still kept their distance from the psychoanalytical world. A common denominator easily perceived in the writings of the curators was the concern that an acknowledgement of the scientific autonomy of psychoanalysis might drift towards a philosophical idealism, thus re-imposing the feared dichotomies between brain and mind, and mind and body. It was not so much a question of justifiable philosophical doubts as of archaic ideological rationalizations stimulated both by fear and curiosity of what Freud himself had called 'the plague'. Psychoanalysis was an object feared and strongly desired at one and the same time. The Tbilisi Symposium marked an historic breaking of the banks, the demolitions of barriers to a psychoanalytic knowledge that was, ultimately, profoundly needed. According to Tugaybayeva, after Tbilisi, 'the guarded and uneasy attitude toward the unconscious started to disappear, and the ground' (Tugaybayeva, in: Koltsova et al., 1996, p. 265). Besides, it should be remembered that there were already contexts in which psychoanalytical ideas had surreptitiously filtered through. Throughout the 1970s at the Moscow Institute of Neurology, Bassin and other researchers, devoted to the study of so-called psychosomatics, had used concepts such as 'psychological defence' and 'unconscious motivations', even though these terms were avoided or modified in the texts. In this context, the lack of an autonomous Russian psychoanalytical tradition was widely felt. Predictably, an anti-psychoanalysis group, led by L. Kukuev (1980) soon emerged. However, from 1980 onwards, psychoanalytic topics were debated both in scientific journals and in more popular publications.

The *Literaturnaya Gazeta* of May 1980 widely publicized the themes of the Tbilisi Symposium. In an article by the three organizers, the sociological interpretations of psychoanalysis were criticized, while its specific and positive therapeutic virtues were fully recognized. Similarly, Russian cinema dealt, for the first time, with psychoanalysis. Andrei Zagdanisky, in 1988, produced a documentary with a psychoanalytically informed sociological theme, entitled *Interpretation of Dreams* (*Tolkovanie Snovedeniia*). This film closed with these words on the screen: 'From 1929 to 1989, Freud was not published within the USSR'. Furthermore, the *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, in June 1988, published an excerpt from Jean-Paul Sartre's screenplay *The Freud Scenario* together with an exhaustive biographical portrait of Freud and an introductory article by Aaron Belkin, director of the Psychoendocrinology Institute of Moscow. In January 1989, the widely circulated journal of popular medicine *Meditsinkaya Gazeta* published a special issue entirely dedicated to Freud. The literary revue *Neva,* based in Leningrad, published an article by Leònid Gozman and Alexander Etkind (1989) presenting a social criticism of the USSR which included psychoanalytic concepts. From then on there have been numerous articles on psychoanalysis, both in the scientific press and the popular one. Freud's writings and those of his followers have been published. All this was made possible by the new political climate of 'glasnost'.

In August 1989, the International Association of Psychoanalysis held its 36th congress in Rome. For the first time, since the 1920s, the congress saw the presence

of Russian scholars, including Aaron Belkin, director of the National Psychoendocrinology Institute, in Moscow. Belkin reported the renewed Russian interest in psychoanalysis, even as a therapeutic tool, especially in Moscow. On that occasion the author of this article personally interviewed Belkin, who emphasized the extent to which psychoanalysis had always been, in the USSR, an underground presence, also in the clinical field. He himself, as a young psychiatrist in Irkutsk, Siberia, in the 1950s, had noticed that the director of his clinic, I.S. Sumbayev, was interested in psychoanalytic theories and aspired, in certain instances, to put them to use clinically. Therefore, there had been an attention to psychoanalysis and, possibly, a 'secret' practice of it even in distant times. Unfortunately there are no reliable historical sources which can document this exceptional phenomenon.

In the second half of the 1980s, Belkin, together with some young colleagues attracted by psychoanalysis, had started to apply a psychoanalytic perspective in the Institute that he directed. In that same period, at the end of the 1988, the participants of a seminar led by Boris Kravstov formed the Association of Psychologists which was to become the current Psychoanalytic Society of Moscow in 1995. There currently exist several Russian members of the IPA, coming from various fields, including the above-mentioned ones. Furthermore, young Russian scholars are applying for psychoanalytical training. This suggests, in a historical perspective, that the currently lively development of psychoanalysis in Russia has its roots in the past. Evidence for this is provided by all the research offered by this paper. The demise, in 1991, of Soviet regime has left a space for a vigorous development of psychoanalysis, also at the institutional level. The fortunes of psychoanalysis are subject now to the vicissitudes of day-to-day events. Their study involves a methodology different from that of the historical perspective. Our hope is that their analysis, using the right methodological framework, will be possible in the near future.

Translations of summary

Geschichte des Unbewussten in Sowjetrussland: von ihren Anfängen bis zum Untergang der Sowjetunion. In Russland wurden die Konzepte des Unbewussten und die Psychoanalyse früher als in vielen westlichen Ländern anerkannt. Die Gründung der ersten Russischen Psychoanalytischen Gesellschaft erfolgte 1911. Nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg und der Russischen Revolution waren in einer kurzen, glücklichen Phase folgende Psychoanalytiker aktiv: Sabina Spielrein, Tatiana Rosenthal, Moshe Wulff, Nikolai Osipov und Ivan Ermakov. Beteiligt waren zudem Wissenschaftler, die mit den Ideen der Sowjets sympathisierten, nämlich unter anderem Aleksandr Luria, Michail Rejsner, Pavel Blonskij. Lev Vygotskij hat eigene Untersuchungen des Unbewussten durchgeführt. Eine zweite psychoanalytische Gesellschaft wurde in Kazan gegründet. Ende der 20er Jahre wurde die psychoanalytische Bewegung mittels repressiver Maßnahmen zerschlagen. Selbst die Benutzung des Wortes 'Psychoanalyse' war über Jahrzehnte mit einem Verbot belegt. Gleichwohl hat das Interesse am Unbewussten – das es vom Interesse an der psychoanalytischen Theorie zu unterscheiden gilt – im Werk des georgischen Führers D. Uznadze überdauert. Seine Schüler organisierten 1979 das Internationale Symposium über das Unbewusste in Tiblis, Georgien. Damit wurde eine ideologische Mauer eingerissen. Seither interessieren sich viele Mediziner, Psychologen, Philosophen und Soziologen für das Unbewusste – ein Thema, der wegen seiner ideologischen Implikationen sowohl Angst als auch Faszination weckt. Seit den 1980er Jahren werden psychoanalytische Überlegungen in wissenschaftlichen Fachzeitschriften veröffentlicht und in der Gesellschaft verbreitet. Der Untergang der UdSSR im Jahre 1991 hat die wissenschaftliche und institutionelle Entwicklung der Psychoanalyse liberalisiert.

Historia del inconsciente en la Rusia soviética: desde sus orígenes hasta la caída de la Unión Soviética. Rusia aceptó la noción de inconsciente y de psicoanálisis antes que muchos países occidentales. En 1911 se fundó la primera Sociedad Psicoanalítica Rusa. Depués de la Primera Guerra Mundial y la Revolución Rusa, por un breve y feliz periodo, estaban activos los siguientes psicoanalistas: Sabina Spielrein. Tatiana Rosenthal, Moshe Wulff, Nilolai Osipov e Ivan Ermakos. También participaron académicos asociados con ideas soviéticas, entre ellos: Aleksandr Luria, Michael Rejsner, Pavel Blonskij. El propio Lev Vygoskij lidió con el inconsciente. Se fundó una

segunda sociedad psicoanalítica en Kazán. Desafortunadamente, a finales de los años 20 la represión disolvió el movimiento psicoanalítico. Incluso la palabra 'psicoanálisis' fue prohibida durante décadas. Sin embargo sobrevivió el interés por el inconsciente, como diferenciado de la teoría psicoanalítica, en el trabajo del líder georgiano D. Uznadze. En 1979 sus seguidores organizaron el Simposio Internacional sobre el Inconsciente, en Tbilisi, Georgia, que marcó la ruptura de una barrera ideológica. Desde entonces muchos académicos médicos, psicólogos, filósofos y sociólogos se han interesado en el inconsciente, un tema tanto temido por sus implicaciones ideológicas, como deseado. Desde los años 80 ideas psicoanalíticas han aparecido en la prensa científica y se han difundido en la sociedad. La caída de la Unión Soviética en 1991 liberalizó el desarrollo científico e institucional del psicoanálisis.

Histoire de l'inconscient en Union Soviétique: de ses origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Union Soviétique. La Russie a accepté la notion de l'inconscient et la psychanalyse avant bien d'autres pays occidentaux. La première Société Psychanalytique Russe a été fondée en 1911. Pendant une brève et heureuse période se situant après la première Guerre Mondiale et la Révolution Russe, plusieurs psychanalystes ont été actifs : Sabina Spielrein, Tatiana Rosenthal, Moshe Wulff, Nicolai Osipov et Ivan Ermakov. On retrouve également des lettrés partageant l'idéologie du régime soviétique, comme Aleksandr Luria, Michail Rejsner, Pavel Blonskij. Même Lev Vygotskij s'est intéressé à l'inconscient. Une seconde société psychanalytique a été créée à Kazan. Malheureusement, dès la fin des années 20, la répression a dissout le mouvement psychanalytique. Le terme même de « psychanalyse » a été banni pendant des décennies. Toutefois, l'intérêt pour l'inconscient en tant qu'entité distincte de la théorie psychanalytique a survécu grâce aux travaux du leader géorgien D. Uznadze. Ses successeurs ont organisé en 1979 un Symposium International sur l'Inconscient (à Tbilissi en Georgie), qui a marqué la dépassement d'une barrière idéologique. Depuis lors, de nombreux universitaires, médecins, psychologues, philosophes et sociologues ont marqué leur intérêt pour l'inconscient, un sujet à la fois craint, en raison de ses implications idéologiques, et désiré. Depuis les années 80, la presse scientifique et la société se sont ouvertes à la psychanalyse. La chute de L'URSS en 1991 a libéralisé le développement scientifique et institutionnel de la psychanalyse.

Per una storia della nozione di inconscio nella Russia Sovietica: Dagli esordi alla caduta dell'Unione Sovietica. La Russia accettò la nozione dell'inconscio prima di molti paesi occidentali. La Prima Società Psicoanalitica russa si costituì nel 1911. Dopo la Prima Guerra Mondiale e la rivoluzione russa, per un breve periodo, furono attivi i seguenti psicoanalisti: Sabina Spielrein, Tatiana Rosenthal, Moshe Wulff, Nikolai Osipov, and Ivan Ermakov. Vi presero inoltre parte studiosi come Aleksandr Luria, Michail Rejsner, Pavel Blonskij e Lev Vygotskij. Fu proprio quest'ultimo ad occuparsi del concetto di inconscio. Una seconda societá psicoanalitica si formó a Kazan. Purtroppo, alla fine degli anni venti, una dura repressione dissolse il movimento psicoanalitico. Per decenni fu rimossa perfino la parola psicoanalisi. L'interesse per l'inconscio, separato dalle concezioni psicoanalitiche, sopravvisse comunque nell'opera del caposcuola georgiano D. Uznadze. Tramite i suoi seguaci, nel 1979, a Tbilisi, in Georgia, si tenne il 'Simposio Internazionale sull'Inconscio'. L'evento segnò la rottura di un argine ideologico. Da allora, molti studiosi, in campo medico, psicologico, filosofico e sociologico, si interessarono all'inconscio e soprattutto si avvicinarono alla psicoanalisi; oggetto ideologicamente temuto, ma ambivalentemente molto desiderato. Dagli anni ottanta le idee psicoanalitiche hanno fatto la loro comparsa sulla stampa scientifica e si sono diffuse socialmente. La caduta dell'Unione Sovietica, nel 1991, ha liberalizzato lo sviluppo scientifico e istituzionale della psicoanalisi.

References

Althusser L (1978). *La découverte du docteur Freud dans ses rapports avec la théorie marxiste* [Discovering Dr Freud in his rapport with Marxist theory]. In: Prangisvili AE, Sherozia A, Bassin FV, editors, *Bessoznatel'noe*, Vol. 1, 239–53.

Angelini A (1985). La psicoanalisi e l'energetismo di Wilhelm Ostwald [The psychoanalytic work and energism of Wilhelm Ostwald]. *Giornale Storico di Psicologia Dinamica* **17**:91–106. Naples: Liguori.

Angelini A (1988). *La psicoanalisi in Russia* [Psychoanalysis in Russia]. Naples: Liguori.

Angelini A (1996). *Otto Fenichel: Psicoanalisi, politica e società* [Otto Fenichel: Psychoanalysis, politics and society]. Bologna: Cosmopoli.

Angelini A (2002). *Pionieri dell'inconscio in Russia* [Pioneers of the unconscious in Russia]. Naples: Liguori.

Asmolov AG (1998). *Vygotsky today: On the verge of non-classical psychology*, Wertsch JV, editor. New York, NY: Nova Science.

Avtonomova NS (1973). Psikhoanaliticheskaia kontseptsia Zhaka Lakana [The psychoanalytic concepts of Jacques Lacan]. *Voprosy filosofii* **II**:143–50.

Bassin FV (1968). *Problema bessoznatel'nogo* [The problem of the unconscious]. Moscow. [(1972). *Il problema dell'inconscio*. Rome: Editori Riuniti.]

Boiko AN (1978). *Problema bessoznatel'nogo v filosofii i konkretnykh naukakh* [The problem of the unconscious in philosophy and the concrete sciences]. Kiev: Izdatel'stvo pri Kievskom gosudarstvennom universitete.

Bondarenko PP, Rabinovich M Kh (1959). Nauchnoe soveshchanie po voprosam ideologicheskoi bor'by s sovremennym freidizmom [A scientific conference on the ideological struggle with contemporary Freudianism].

Voprosy filosofii **2**:164–170. [(1959). Freud and Pavlov: Report of a Soviet conference. *Soviet Survey* **29**:29–37.]
Bruner J (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
Chertok L (1982). La riabilitazione dell'inconscio in Unione Sovietica: il convegno internazionale di Tbilisi [The rehabilitation of the unconscious in the Soviet Union: The international conference in Tbilisi]. *Storia e critica della psicologia* **1**:41–62. Rome: CNR.
Cole M (1990). Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline? In: Barman JJ. *Cross-cultural perspective: Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1989*, Vol. 37, 279–376. Lincoln, NE: U Nebraska Press.
Cole M (1998). *Cultural psychology*. Cambridge, MA, London: Harvard UP.
Cole M, Engestrom Y, Vasquez O (1997). *Mind, culture and activity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
Dimitrov C (1971). W. Ostwald und S. Freud [W. Ostwald and S. Freud]. *Psichiatrans Neurol Med Psychol, Lipsia*: **23**:401–12.
Dobrenkov VI (1972). *Kritika neofreidistskoi kontseptsii Erik Fromm* [Critique of the neo-Freudian concepts of Eric Fromm]. Moscow: Znanie.
Dobrenkov VI (1974). *Neofreidizm v poiskakh 'istiny'* [Neo-Freudianism in the search for 'truth']. Moscow: Mysl'.
Dubois P (1904). *Les psychonévroses et leur traitement moral* [Psychoneuroses and their moral treatment]. Paris: Masson.
Etkind A (1993). *Eros nevozmozhnogo: Istoriia psihkoanaliza v. Rossi*. Moscow: Meduza. [(1997). *Eros of the impossible.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.]
Faenza R (2003). *Prendimi l'anima* [Take my soul]. Rome: Arcana Srl.
Fedotov DD (1957). The Soviet view of psychoanalysis. *Monthly Review* **9**:249–54.
Fenichel O (1924). Review of V. Bechterev, Die Perversitäten und Inversitäten vom Standpunkt der Reflexologie [Perversions and inversions from the standpoint of reflexology]. *Int Zeitschrift für Psychoanal* **3**:331.
Freud S (1905). Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten [Jokes and their relation to the unconscious]. SE **8**. [Italian trans., 1972, p. 176.]
Freud S (1914). Zur Geschichte der psychoanalytischen Bewegung [On the history of the psycho-analytic movement]. SE **14**. trans., [Italian trans., 1975, p. 406.]
Freud S (1914). Aus der Geschichte einer infantilen Neurose [From the history of an infantile neurosis]. SE **17**.
Freud S (1920). *Jenseits des Lustprinzips* [*Beyond the pleasure principle*]. SE **18**.
Gozman L, Etkind A (1989). Ot kul'ta vlasti k vlasti liudei [From the cult of power to the cult of man]. *Neva* **7**:156–79.
Jones E (1953). *The life and the work of Sigmund Freud*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
Kaletsky AM (1965). Freudianism, microsociology and existentialism. *Soviet Psychol and Psychiatr* **6**(1):45–53. [(1965). trans. in *Zhurnal nevropatologii i psikhiatrii* **65**(4):624–30.
Khodzava ZI (1957). O teorii ustanovki Uznadze (D.N. Uznadze's Set theory). *Voprosy Psikhologii* **3**(1):18.
Klein G (1973). Two theories or one? *Bull Menninger Clin* **37**(2):99–101.
Klein G (1976). *Psychoanalytic theory: An exploration of essentials*. Guilford, CT: International UP.
Koltsova VA, Oleinik YN, Gilgen AR, Gilgen CK (1996). *Post-Soviet perspectives on Russian psychology*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
Kon IS (1967). *Sotsiologia lichnosti* [The sociology of personality]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.
Kukuev L (1980). O nekotorykh teoreticheskikh aspektakh nevropatologii i psikhiatrii [Some theoretical aspects of neuropathology and psychiatry]. *Zhurnal Nevropatologii i Psikhiatrii im. Korsakova* **1**:3–8.
Kurtsin IT (1965). *Kritika Freidizma v meditsine i fisiologii* [A critique of Freudianism in medicine and physiology]. Moscow, Leningrad: Nauka.
Leibin VM (1972). Konformizm i respektabel'nost' psikhoanaliza [Conformism and respectability in psychoanalysis]. *Voprosy filosofii* **4**:143–47.
Leibin VM (1977). *Psikhoanaliz i filosofia neofreidizma* [Psychoanalysis and philosophy of Neo-Freudianism]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.
Lichko AE (1977). Psikhologia otnoshenii kak teoreticheskaia kontseptsiia v meditsinskoi psikhologii i psikhoterapii [The psychology of relationships as a theoretical concept in medical psychology and psychotherapy]. *Zhurnal nevropatologii i psikhiatrii* **77**:1833–88.
Lobner H, Levitin V (1978). A short account of Freudism: Notes on the history of psychoanalysis in the USSR. *Sigmund Freud House Bull* **2**(1):5–30. [(1980). Note sulla storia della psicoanalisi in Urss. *Giornale Storico di Psicologia Dinamica* **4**:56–117.]
Lukács G (1923). *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein* [History and class consciousness]. [(1967). *Storia e coscienza di classe*. Milan: Sugar].
Luria AR (1924). Russische Psychoanalytische Vereinigung [The Russian Psychoanalytical Association]. *Int Zeitschrift für Psychoanal* **2**:136–7.
Luria AR (1925). *Psikhoanaliz kak sistema monisticheskoi psikhologii* [Psychoanalysis as a system of monistic psychology]. Moscow: Gosizdat. [(2002). *La psicoanalisi come sistema di psicologia monista*. In: Angelini A. *Pionieri dell'inconscio in Russia*, 179–213.]

Luria AR (1926). Die moderne russische Physiologie und die Psychoanalyse [Modern Russian physiology and psychoanalysis]. *Int Zeitschrift fur Psychoanal* **3**:40–53. [(1979). La moderna fisiologia russa e la psicoanalisi. Giornale Storico di Psicologia Dinamica 6/1979, 147–60. Naples: Liguori.]

Luria AR (1927). Russische Psychoanalytische Vereinigung [Psychoanalytical movement: Russia]. *Int Zeitschrift für Psychoanal* **2**:266–7.

Miller MA (1998). *Freud and the Bolsheviks*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP.

Musatti C (1959). I fondamenti della psicoanalisi nella critica di F.V. Bassin [The fundamentals of psychoanalysis in the criticism of F.V. Bassin]. *Riv Psicoanal* **2**:125–41.

Musatti C (1960). *Per un dialogo con gli psicologi sovietici* [By way of a dialogue with Soviet psychologists]. In: *Psicoanalisi e vita contemporanea* [Psychoanalysis and contemporary life]. Turin: Boringhieri.

Musatti C (1978). *Interprétation de l'inconscient: critères d'objectivité* [Interpretation of the unconscious: Criteria for objectivity]. In: Prangisvili AS, Sherozia AE, Bassin FV, editors. *Bessoznatel'noe*, Vol. 1, 528–39.

Osipov NE (1908). Psikhologia kompleksov i assotsiativnyi eksperiment po rabotam tsiurikhskoi kliniki [Psychology of complexes and association experiments after the publications of the Zurich Clinic]. *Zhurnal nevropatologii i psikhiatrii* **8**(1):1021–74.

Osipov NE (1909). Posledniia raboty Freudovskoi shkoly [The recent works of the Freudian school]. *Zhurnal nevropatologii i psikhiatrii* **9**:526–86.

Pollack G (1982). Psychoanalysis in Russia and the USSR: 1908–1979. *Annu Psychoanal* **10**:267–79.

Prangisvili AS, Sherozia AE, Bassin FV, editors (1978). *Bessoznatel'noe* [The unconscious]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 3 Vols.

Rogoff B (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York, NY: Oxford UP.

Rollins N (1978). Consciousness, unconsciousness and the concept of repression. In: Prangisvili AS, Sherozia AE, Bassin FV, editors. *Bessoznatel'noe*, Vol. 1, 266–81.

Rubinstein SL (1940). *The foundations of general psychology*. Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 2nd edn.

Schmidt V (1924). *Psychoanalytische Erziehung in Sowjetrussland* [Psychoanalytical training in Soviet Russia]. Vienna. [(1972). *L'asilo psicoanalitico di Mosca.* Milan: Emme Ed.]

Schmidt V (1927). Russische Psychoanalytische vereneigung [Psychoanalytical movement in Russia]. *Int Zeitschrift für Psychoanal* **3**:370–1.

Servadio E (1961). Risposta su Freud ad un saggista sovietico [Reply to a Soviet scholar on Freud]. *Europa letteraria* **8**:5–18.

Sherozia AE (1969, 1973). *K probleme soznaniia i bessoznatel'nogo psikhicheskogo* [On the problem of unconscious and unconscious psychic activity]. 2 Vols. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Shweder RA (1990). Cultural psychology, what is it? In: Stigler JW, Shweder RA, Herdt G, editors. *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development*, 1–43. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Spielrein S (1931). Kinderzeichnungen bei offenen und geschlossenen Augen [Children's drawings with open and closed eyes]. *Imago* **16**:359–91.

Sviadoshch AM (1971). *Nevrozy i ikh lechenie* [Neuroses and their treatment]. Moscow: Meditsina.

Tanzer A (1990). Vygotsky and psychoanalysis. *Contemp Psychoanal* **26**(1):16–23.

Uznadze DN (1950). *Osnovnye polozheniia teorii ustanovki* [Basic principles of set theory]. In: *Eksperimental'nye osnovy psikhologii ustanovki* [Experimental bases of the psychology of set]. Tbilisi: Akd, Nauk SSSR, 1961 [(1972). Fondamenti sperimentali della psicologia del set. In: Uznadze D, Prangisvili AS, Bassin FV, Razran. *L'inconscio nella psicologia sovietica* [The unconscious in Soviet psychology], Mecacci L, editor. Rome: Editori Riuniti.]

Valsiner J (1995). Irreversibility of time and the construction of historical developmental psychology. *Quarterly Newsletter of Lab Comp Human Cognition* **1**(1, 2):25–42.

Vasilyeva N (2000). Psychoanalysis in Russia: The past, the present and the future. *AIM* **57**(1):5–24.

Voloshinov VN, with Bakhtin, M (1927). *Freidizm. Kriticheskii ocherk* [Freudianism: A critical study]. Leningrad, Moscow. [(1977). *Freudismo.* Bari: Dedalo.]

Volpert IE (1966). *Snovideniia v obychnom sne i gipnoze* [Dreams in normal sleep and hypnosis]. Leningrad. [(1968). Cited in: Bassin FV; translation: (1972), 264–92].

Vygotsky LS (1925). *Psikhologiia iskusstva* [The psychology of art]. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1965. [(1968). 2nd revised and corrected edn, Moscow: Iskusstvo. (1972). *Psicologia dell'arte*. Rome: Editori Riuniti.]

Vygotsky LS (1930). Psikhika, soznanie i bessoznatel'noe. In: *Elementy obshchei psikhologii* [Elements of general psychology], B.Z.O, editor, with the Pedagogic Department of Moscow State University, Moscow, 48–61. [(1982). Reprinted in: Voprosy teorii i istorii psikhologii [Problems in theory and history of psychology]. Moscow: Pedagogika. [(1997). Mind, consciousness, the unconscious. In: *The collected works*, Vol. 3, *Problems of the theory and history of psychology*. New York, NY: Plenum, 109–22. (2002). Psiche, coscienza e inconscio. In: Angelini A. *Pionieri dell'inconscio in Russia*, 237–56.]

Vygotsky LS (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Vygotsky LS, Luria AR (1925). Introduction to: Freid Z, *Po tu storunu printsipa udovol'stviia* [(1920). S Freud, Al di là del principio del piacere]. Moscow: Sovremennye Problemy. [(1988). *Rassegna Sovietica* **1**:17–26.]

Wallerstein RS (1976). Psychoanalysis as a science: Its present status and its future tasks. In: Gill M, Holzmann P, editors. *Psychology versus metapsychology: Psychoanalytic essays in memory of George S. Klein*. Monograph **36**, 198–228. New York, NY: International UP.
Wertsch JV (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
Wertsch JV (1990). Vygotsky and psychoanalysis. *Contemp Psychoanal* **26**(1):53–73.
Wertsch JV (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
Wertsch JV (1998). *Mind as action*. New York, NY: Oxford UP.
Wilson A, Weinstein L (1992a). An investigation into some implications of a Vygotskian perspective on the origins of mind: Psychoanalysis and Vygotskian psychology. Part I. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **40**:349–79.
Wilson A, Weinstein L (1992b). Language and the psychoanalytic process: Psychoanalysis and Vygotskian psychology. Part II. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **40**:725–59.
Wilson A, Weinstein L (1996). The transference and the zone of proximal development. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **44**:167–200.
Wortis J (1950). *Soviet psychiatry*. Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins.

