

Liberatory Psychoanalysis

David Pavón-Cuéllar¹

(1)Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, Morelia, Mexico

Abstract

This entry provides an overview of liberatory psychoanalysis. The introduction responds to common objections, defines the field and emphasizes its explicitly political orientation, including its alignment with liberation movements and its use of their perspective to critique traditional psychoanalytic theories and practices. The text then traces the historical development of liberatory psychoanalysis within and beyond Europe, from the foundational work of Sigmund Freud to contemporary positions against capitalism, heteropatriarchy and coloniality. The entry also outlines major challenges and debates within the field, particularly those arising from tensions between the clinical and the political, theory and practice, center and margins, and involvement and demarcation regarding systems of oppression such as capitalism, colonialism and patriarchy. The last section considers potential and desirable directions for the future development of liberatory psychoanalysis.

Keywords Psychoanalysis -Liberation -Revolution -Freudo-Marxism -Communism -Socialism -Feminism -Colonialism -Capitalism -Patriarchy

Introduction

The notion of a “liberatory psychoanalysis” could be considered tautological. Isn’t psychoanalysis liberating by definition, seeking to free us from our symptoms, our hysterias or neuroses and their causes, including various forms of inhibition, repression or psychic conflict? True, healing, as understood in Freudian theory, constitutes a form of liberation. However, the liberation to which liberatory psychoanalysis aspires, even when it has curative effects, is more than a simple cure. Beyond the treatment of a disorder, liberatory psychoanalysis works with subjects in their effort to politically liberate themselves from certain cultural, historical, social and institutional conditions that can be pathogenic and normalizing in a pathological sense.

Liberatory psychoanalysis is politically liberating. This is not redundant, but could be dismissed as inadmissible in the name of two pillars of the psychoanalytic method, namely, the principle of neutrality, of nonjudgmental receptivity, and the rule of abstinence, of not satisfying the patient’s desires or drives. A misinterpretation of these two methodological

statutes claims that they oblige psychoanalysts to be politically neutral and refrain from adopting a political position. In reality, as conceptualized by Freud, the two principles do not exclude a politicized psychoanalysis, but only prohibit psychoanalysts within the framework of their clinical practice from gratifying their patients by instilling in them values or ideals and responding to their demands or expectations. This does not imply apoliticality, which is impossible, since being apolitical is also a political choice.

Discarding the illusion of apoliticality, liberatory psychoanalysis orients its political character toward a project of liberation (Parker, 2010; Parker & Pavón-Cuéllar, 2021; Malherbe, 2025). The project is not strictly psychoanalytic, but stems from liberation movements such as anarchism, communism, feminism, anticapitalism, anticolonialism and anti-fascism. These movements lead psychoanalysis, which allies itself with them, not only to position itself against oppressive systems but also to turn critically against itself for its insertion into these systems or its complicity with them. There is, then, a critical psychoanalysis in the precise sense of critical psychology within liberatory psychoanalysis.

In short, we can define liberatory psychoanalysis as one assuming its political character and adopting the perspective of certain liberation movements to critique itself and confront power dynamics and oppressive systems in subjectivity, the clinical relationship and the institutional, sociocultural and historical spheres. These spheres include conditions from which the subject must be politically liberated to heal from suffering and normal or abnormal pathologies. It is here where liberatory psychoanalysis locates a cure that requires collective action and the transformation of the world.

Background and Context

The origin of liberatory psychoanalysis can be traced to Sigmund Freud, especially his writings from the first decade of the twentieth century, when he blamed the culture of his era for neuroses and other psychological problems and offered reasons for sexual liberation. For example, in his 1908 essay “‘Civilised’ Sexual Morality and Modern Nervous Illness,” Freud (1959) recognized the urgency of liberatory reform after observing how cultural restrictions foster simulation and double standards, impede the healthy development of sexuality and personality, inhibit human capacities, particularly the fulfillment of women, and ultimately prove counterproductive to civilization. For the good of civilization and humanity, Freud accepted the need to free ourselves from “civilized” sexual morality.

The goal of liberation gradually gave way to the lucid pessimism characteristic of Freud’s cultural critique. This pessimistic critique reached its greatest elaboration in 1930 in *Civilisation and Its Discontent* (Freud, 1961a). Shortly before, in 1927, in *The Future of an Illusion*, Freud (1961b) referred to the oppressed as suffering from a “surplus of privation” (*Mehr von Entbehrung*) and justified their “hostility to culture” (pp. 15–17). He even argued that “a culture which leaves unsatisfied and drives to rebelliousness so large a number of its members neither has a prospect of continued existence, nor deserves it” (p. 17). These lines are striking not only for their pessimism, exacerbated to the point of fatalism, but also for

Freud's political sensitivity to inequality, which brought him into line with the most important liberation movements of his era: anarchist, socialist and communist.

Liberatory movements penetrated the psychoanalytic field very early. In Freud's early circle, Alfred Adler was a socialist who was interested in the situation of the working class. Adler aspired to social transformation and pioneered the connection between psychoanalysis and Marxism. He distanced himself from Freud in 1911 and founded a school of individual psychology distinguished by its vision of a subjectivity less determined by its structural causes and more oriented toward ends, such as liberation (Orgler, *1963*). Contrasting with Freudian pessimism, this vision would be compatible with the liberatory aspirations of the left in Adlerians such as the socialist Margarete Hilferding and the communist Marxists Alice Rühle-Gerstel and Manes Sperber.

Parallel to the Adlerian left, we observe the development of a Freudian left in which the first systematic proposals for a liberatory psychoanalysis were developed. The political purpose of liberation was emphasized by the pioneer of the Freudian left, the anarchist Otto Gross (*1913*), who understood psychoanalysis as a "philosophy of revolution" that "ferments insurrection within the psyche and liberates individuality from the bonds of its own unconscious" (par. 1). This liberation, as conceptualized by Gross, should free the subject from the external authority reproduced by the family and sustained by the patriarchal order.

The end of patriarchy remains a prerequisite for liberation for socialist psychoanalyst Paul Federn, a proponent of family well-being, sexual education and women's emancipation. In his 1919 essay *The Fatherless Society. The Psychology of Revolution*, Federn (*2019*) interprets the end of the empires of his time, democratic revolutions and especially council communism as signs of unconscious patricide, a collapse of the patriarchal order and the rise of matriarchy and fraternity. All this would allow historical liberation from the authoritarianism, power and verticality that Freud associated with the nature of humans as herd animals with a fundamentally hierarchical and patriarchal constitution.

Liberation from hierarchy and patriarchy is at the heart of the utopian–dystopian novel *Eugenia*, published in Mexico in 1919 by Freudian socialist Eduardo Urzaiz. As Urzaiz argued in the following years, psychoanalysis could be allied with Marxism and serve as a precondition for the emancipation of women and sexual liberation for the conquest of communism (Pavón-Cuéllar, *2023*). This same idea was associated with the literary avant-garde and adopted an anticolonial orientation in 1928 in the anthropophagous movement of the Brazilian Oswald de Andrade (*1999*).

Andrade and Urzaiz were among the first Latin American Marxist Freudians. Meanwhile, in Europe's interwar period, Freudo-Marxism produced important forms of liberatory psychoanalysis that can be classified into four categories (for an overview, see Pavón-Cuéllar, *2017*). First, in the early 1920s, there were the revolutionary practical pedagogical proposals of Siegfried Bernfeld at the Kinderheim Baumgarten in Vienna and of Vera Schmidt at the Detski Dom in Moscow. Both proposals aspired to create the new men and women of socialism through nonbourgeois, nonconventional and nonrepressive childhood education.

Subsequently, between the 1920s and 1930s in Austria, Germany and the former Soviet Union, Bernfeld, Aleksandr Luria, Wilhelm Reich, Otto Fenichel and others repoliticized psychoanalytic theory and integrated it with Marxism in a liberating sense. Simultaneously, Reich materialized and collectivized many of his reflections in the German Association for a Proletarian Sexual Policy (SEXPOL), which sought the sexual liberation of workers under the assumption that the repression of sexuality underlies political domination. Finally, in France, Czechoslovakia and Latin America, surrealists such as André Breton, René Crevel, Tristan Tzara, Karel Teige, Xavier Abril and Elías Piterbarg sought a political and aesthetic liberation of subjectivity by emancipating the unconscious, materializing the imagination and *making dreams a reality*, taking Freud's realization of desire in the dream to a revolutionary realization of the dream in waking life.

The Freudo-Marxist liberation impulse did not survive the context characterized by the rise of Nazism, World War II, Stalinism and the repression of psychoanalysis as a cultural-political project in the United States, where Reich, Bernfeld, Fenichel and other exponents of the movement had fled to exile (Jacoby, 1983). Those who could sustain their work during and after persecution, war and exile from the 1930s to the 1960s were associated with the first generation of the Frankfurt School, especially Max Horkheimer, the young Erich Fromm, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse (Jay, 1996; Bottomore, 2002). These thinkers also adopted a liberation perspective by combining Marxist and psychoanalytic theories in their critique of fascism, totalitarianism, industrial society, mass culture and the functioning of philosophy, science and technology in modernity.

The Frankfurt critique, especially Marcuse's version, converged with Reich's legacy in the Western Cultural Revolution of the 1960s and 1970s. This revolution and the resulting counterculture also drew on other strands of liberatory psychoanalysis, including the antiracist and anticolonial approaches of Frantz Fanon (1963, 1967), whose psychoanalytic approach allowed him to discern the operations of racism and colonialism, first among the Martinicans and then among the Algerians (Macey, 2012). Among the liberatory psychoanalytic tributaries that informed Fanonian thought was the questioning and transformation of psychiatric institutions in the institutional psychotherapy of Francesc Tosquelles (Robcis, 2019). Fanon moved from the institutional level to the sociopolitical level when he encountered the victims of the Algerian War and became involved in the Algerian people's struggle for national liberation.

Fanon influenced liberation visions and struggles, such as those of Che Guevara in Cuba, Ali Shariati in Iran and Steve Biko in South Africa. In the same context as the Cold War and Third World resistance to imperialism, the Freudian legacy once again converged with Marx in various liberationist proposals in Latin America, especially Argentina, between the 1960s and 1970s (Carpintero & Vainer, 2004, 2005; Bosteels, 2012). Let us recall some of the most prominent figures of this juncture: Marie Langer, Armando Bauleo, Hernán Kesselman and others participated in the Platform Group, which not only questioned hierarchies and privileges in psychoanalytic institutions but also openly sought national liberation and the construction of socialism. Meanwhile, Althusserians, such as Néstor Braunstein, conducted more theoretical work and sought to free themselves from psychology, conceptualized as an

ideological device at the service of capitalism. Opposing them, León Rozitchner defended the subject and sought to liberate it from both structuralism and the capitalist structure.

Just as Nazism, Stalinism and Americanism had stifled the European Freud-Marxism of the 1930s, so, too, was Argentine Marxist psychoanalysis dismantled in the 1960s and 1970s by the anticommunist paramilitaries and military of a dictatorship sustained by US imperialism. Political oppression once again triumphed over liberatory psychoanalysis. However, this psychoanalysis was able to continue in the individual work of some Argentines exiled to other countries. An exemplary case is Langer, who emigrated to Mexico and headed the Mexico–Nicaragua Internationalist Mental Health Team. From 1981 to 1990, the team placed analytical and psychotherapeutic practice at the service of the revolutionary project of the Sandinista National Liberation Front.

The Sandinista Revolution in Nicaragua was also openly supported by the American Marxist psychoanalyst Joel Kovel (*1988a*), who was equally committed to the liberation of Palestine and became known as an important exponent of ecosocialism. Although Kovel embraced a liberatory psychoanalysis that he described as antitherapeutic and revolutionary, he felt his dual adherence to Marxism and psychoanalysis was a contradiction and an internal division that ultimately led him to abandon psychoanalysis (Kovel, *1984, 1988b*). This abandonment contrasts with Langer's (*2017*) stubborn refusal to choose between psychoanalytic and revolutionary socialist paths.

Besides a socialist and anti-imperialist, Langer considered herself a feminist and used psychoanalytic resources to serve women's liberation. This liberation has many other exponents in psychoanalysis before and after Langer. This is the case, for example, of Karen Horney, Luce Irigaray, Nancy Chodorow and Juliet Mitchell (Saguaro, *2000*; Rowley & Grosz, *2013*). These feminist psychoanalysts seek to liberate women from patriarchy but focus on different levels: Horney on problematic Freudian concepts, such as penis envy; Irigaray on culture conceptualized as a phallogocentric symbolic system; Chodorow on daughters' relationships with parents and Mitchell on a patriarchal structure inseparable from a capitalist one.

If Mitchell (*2000*) in the United Kingdom recognizes that women must also free themselves from a capitalism essentially linked to patriarchy, Lélia Gonzalez (*2020*) in Brazil perceives that the liberation of women such as mulatto women also requires liberation from racist and colonial logics inseparable from sexist and patriarchal ones. Both Gonzalez and Mitchell outline intersectional liberatory psychoanalysis that recognizes the intersection between oppressive systems. The same recognition was already outlined in Fanon (*1963*) and is maintained in recent proposals for liberatory psychoanalysis, such as Lynne Layton's (*2020*) and Max Belkin's (*2021*) in the relational school, or Erica Burman's (*2018*), Ian Parker's and David Pavón-Cuéllar's (*2021*), and Alicia Valdés's (*2022*) in the tradition founded by French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan.

Lacan rebelled against the Americanization, psychologization and adaptation of the psychoanalysis of his time (Zeitlin, *1997*; Parker, *2003*). Although Lacan's political positions were predominantly conservative, many of his current followers have taken them up in their critiques of capitalism, neoliberalism and their ideological manifestations. This is the case

with the aforementioned Ian Parker (2010), as well as Slavoj Žižek (2009) and other exponents of the Lacanian left (Stavrakakis, 2007), including the Argentines Ernesto Laclau (2005) and Jorge Alemán (2013). Both are proponents of left-wing populism, the latter through a concept of emancipation based on the contingency of the subject, the emptiness of identity and the political construction of hegemony.

Alemán and other authors in Laclau's orbit do not subscribe to communism and present themselves as post-Marxists. However, many Lacanians and Freudians in general remain faithful to the heritage of Marxism and to communism as a horizon of liberation. Some organize in collectives such as the Red Clinic in English-speaking countries, the Psychoanalysis in the Street collectives in Brazil, the Laboratory of Politics of the Unconscious in Argentina or Mexican collectives such as the Circle of Psychoanalysis and Marxism in Monterrey or the Network of Feminist–Socialist Psychologists in Morelia. Anarchism also survives on through authors such as the postanarchist and poststructuralist Lacanian psychoanalyst Saul Newman (2001), who proposes liberation from any essentialist, naturalist or humanist guarantees as the only way to resist power.

In addition to anarchism, Marxism, populism and feminism, another liberatory stance that has gained traction in psychoanalysis is that of liberation theologies, philosophies, pedagogies and psychologies, exemplified by authors such as Paulo Freire and Ignacio Martín-Baró. This Latin American liberationist perspective, rooted in the aspirations of Global South communities and their social movements, gave rise to proposals for *subversive psychoanalysis oriented toward liberation psychology* (Pavón-Cuéllar & González Equihua, 2013), *psychoanalysis for liberation* (Gaztambide, 2017, 2019), *psychoanalytic liberation psychology* (Malherbe, 2021, 2024a) or simply *liberation psychoanalysis* (Beshara, 2022). A crucial difference between these proposals lies in their more or less psychological or antipsychological stance, but all of them are directed toward a liberating purpose as conceived in the Latin American tradition. Liberation is defined here in relation to power in its generality, as in anarchism, but without losing sight of some of its specifications, such as capitalist, racist and colonialist ones.

Besides confronting power in general, current liberatory psychoanalysis includes proposals for liberation that target certain oppressive and alienating systems, either in their internal connections, as we saw earlier, or in their very functioning. For example, heteropatriarchy is challenged by Patricia Gherovici's (2017) transgender approach and Silvia Lippi's and Patrice Maniglier's (2023) feminist sororal psychoanalysis, while capitalism is the explicit target of Ian Parker's (2022) and Nick Malherbe's (2024b, 2025) anticapitalist psychoanalytic positioning. Colonialism and racism are at the heart of postcolonial or decolonial proposals, such as those of Ashis Nandy, Ranjana Khanna, Derek Hook, Thamy Ayouch, Robert Beshara, Mrinalini Greedharay, David Marriot, Lewis Gordon, Livio Boni and Sophie Mendelsohn, or Lara Sheehi and Stephen Sheehi (Pavón-Cuéllar & Beshara, 2025). Sheehi and Sheehi (2021) identify their goals of liberation and decolonization with those of the Palestinian people subjugated by the State of Israel, coinciding with other proposals of liberatory psychoanalysis, such as Kovel's (2007) and Jacqueline Rose's (2007).

Debates and Challenges

The proposals for liberatory psychoanalysis we have just recapitulated are mostly marginal. This marginality is explained partially because the purpose of liberation brings these proposals into conflict not only with an arbitrary and often oppressive normalizing psychoanalytic establishment but also with the normalized and dominant forms of psychoanalysis: those that are depoliticized and professionalized, those that center on the individual and those that are confined to the clinic on the couch. Anything that does not conform to this form of psychoanalysis is disqualified and considered politics or philosophy, not exactly psychoanalysis. It is as if psychoanalysis were condemned to be a simple form of psychotherapy that cured symptoms, not addressed them by tracing their causes, which may be institutional, sociocultural and historical.

Psychoanalysis should not be reduced to psychoanalytic psychotherapy. Perhaps it should not be confused, either, with the purely speculative theoretical work of psychoanalytic philosophies, even liberatory ones, such as those we sometimes find in the Frankfurt School and now in the Ljubljana School of Žižek and other Slovenian thinkers. These forms of liberatory psychoanalysis have been questioned both regarding their psychoanalytic character and their liberatory potential, since both psychoanalysis and liberation imply practice and cannot be confined to theory. Psychoanalytic philosophies could also be questioned for being too elitist and accessible only to a very small, educated and relatively idle minority of readers who live mainly in the Global North.

Elitism is not only a problem of psychoanalytic philosophy, but also psychoanalysis in general, which tends to function as a luxury that can only be exercised and afforded by small, privileged sectors. This distances psychoanalytic theory and practice from liberation movements and the most oppressed groups who have the most reason to liberate themselves. Connecting with these groups and movements challenges liberatory psychoanalysis, especially because they can be averse to psychoanalysis for at least two quite understandable reasons. One is the risk of psychologization and depoliticization, a latent risk, even in psychoanalysis and even in its liberatory versions. The other reason for distancing themselves from psychoanalysis is that, due to its elitism, it is associated with the ruling class, with its interests and ideology.

Socialists and communists emphasized the bourgeois character of psychoanalysis (e.g., Voloshinov, *2014*). It is difficult to contradict them when we think of Freudian conceptualizations, such as the child in the Oedipus Complex who attacks the father and competes with him to possess the mother. Doesn't this possessive, aggressive and competitive child epitomize the essential traits of the subject in capitalism? If we adopt this model of subjectivity, how can psychoanalysis help us free ourselves from capitalist oppression? Similarly, how can we base a project of liberation on the psychoanalytic representation of society as a bourgeois nuclear Oedipal family? This Freudian *familialism*, harshly criticized by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (*2009*), has led many radical psychoanalysts to migrate from psychoanalysis to schizoanalysis.

Against the aforementioned detractors of psychoanalysis, we can defend it by arguing that it allows us to understand much of what we fight and what we cannot free ourselves from without understanding it. Only psychoanalysis allows us to understand it. This is Juliet Mitchell's (2000) argument to justify the usefulness of psychoanalysis for the feminist struggles against patriarchy that unfold in Freudian theory.

Psychoanalysis would reveal the inner workings of the patriarchal system; correspondingly, it is essential to fight patriarchy. We could even add a nuance highlighted by Lacan (2002): What is revealed in psychoanalysis is not patriarchy but its crisis. In this crisis, we are already liberating ourselves from patriarchy. Hence, the father appears to fail in Freud: he is the object of the child's hatred; he is mortal or dead, incapable of fulfilling his function, and is challenged and questioned by the hysteric. All this would be a liberation not only from the patriarch, but also from what he embodies: power, hierarchy and authority, norms and normativity.

Besides indicating the crisis of patriarchy, Freudian doctrine signifies the crisis of Western modernity. True, psychoanalysis is a product of the West and only acquires its full meaning in the West or in previously colonized and thus Westernized societies, but the Freudian subject is characterized by its fragility, incompleteness, insubstantiality, constitutive division, contradictions and conflicts within itself. It is neither monolithic nor complete, nor empowered nor self-confident, such as the European–American ideal individual of colonialism and imperialism. Freud's discoveries manifest the crisis of this ideal individual. This is also one reason why psychoanalysis can be useful to decolonize subjectivity.

We can posit that psychoanalysis is as colonial as it is anticolonial, as patriarchal as it is antipatriarchal, as bourgeois as it is antibourgeois, as adaptive as it is subversive and as conservative as it is liberating. Therefore, to serve as the cause of liberation, it must critically turn inward. It must liberate itself to fully realize its liberating potential.

The main obstacles to the development of a liberating psychoanalysis could lie within psychoanalysis and its essential ties to capitalism, colonialism, patriarchy and other oppressive and alienating systems. These ties are often unconscious, as they are part of what Robert Castel (1980) described as the "social unconscious" of psychoanalysis, its structural insertion into a certain society with certain power dynamics. The social unconscious of psychoanalysis resists and defends itself against attempts to make it conscious, as evidenced by psychoanalysts' reaction to their scandalous recent interpellation by Paul Preciado (2021), who showed them precisely much of what they clung to and did not want to free themselves from.

Possibilities

In addressing psychoanalysts, Preciado (2021) suggests several possibilities for liberating psychoanalysis and enhancing its liberatory meaning: Stop affirming the universality of sexual difference and heterosexual reproduction, depatriarchalize and decolonize itself, listen to bodies excluded by the patriarchal–colonial regime, learn from movements such as

the Indigenous, migrant, independent living, #MeToo and Black Lives Matter and enter “into critical feedback with political traditions of transfeminism” (p. 104).

Preciado (2021) also proposes more generally that psychoanalysis “become a technology for inventing dissident subjectivities against the norm” and “bringing the couches out into the squares and collectivising speech, politicising the unconscious” (pp. 103–104). What it means, in other words, is to liberate psychoanalysis from its normative–normalizing function and from its individual, clinical and apolitical confinement.

Preciado’s (2021) interpellation is also important because it identifies new liberation movements with which liberatory psychoanalysis should connect: not only anarchism, communism, feminism, anticolonialism, antiracism and antifascism, but also transfeminism, Indigenous peoples’ movements and independent living movements. Other liberation movements should be added here, such as Mad Pride, environmentalism, ecosocialism, eco-feminism, decolonial feminism and the broad spectrum of LGBTTIQ. All these movements and others can inspire forms of liberatory psychoanalysis that surely will differ from those we have considered here.

The present allows us to envision at least three other desirable possibilities for liberatory psychoanalysis in the future. The first would be to confront two phenomena, the fascistization of humanity and the devastation of the planet, which reveal much of what is challenged by the Freudian legacy, such as the imaginary omnipotence of the ego, its illusion of being master in its own house, its narcissism of small differences and its enjoyment of the death drive. The second would be to decenter itself from the Global North, freeing itself from centers of the Freudian world such as Paris, London or New York, to explore the margins and peripheries of the Global South, where psychoanalysis sometimes manages to adopt liberatory forms by liberating itself from much of what limits and oppresses it in the centers (Boni & Mendelsohn, 2023). The third possibility would be to increasingly venture into the institutional spheres, the social field and the streets of political struggle, outside the familiar, comfortable and safe spaces of psychoanalysis, such as the consulting room of clinical practice and the academy of speculative psychoanalytic theory.

Liberatory psychoanalysis can take different forms depending on the context in which it intervenes. Schools and other institutions devoted to the teaching and transmission of psychoanalytic theory allow us to recall what has been excluded or marginalized, what is potentially subversive and liberating, as summarized here. Individual clinical practice can offer a space in which subjects can resist systems of oppression, questioning and challenging them, undoing their effects of repression and censorship, disobeying their rules or freeing themselves from their logic through techniques such as free association. Society, groups and institutions make it possible to directly analyze, and perhaps transform, the fantasies, forms of enjoyment and power relations that hold subjects captive. Finally, in the realms of mobilization and political struggle, liberatory psychoanalysis can help militants and activists listen to one another, acknowledge the inevitable divisions within each of them and remain wary of psychologizing tendencies with their depoliticizing and demobilizing effects. It goes without saying that there are other possible ways in which liberatory psychoanalysis can intervene in these contexts, just as there are other possible contexts in which it can intervene. The field

of possibilities must remain open so as not to hinder what is perhaps the most liberating: what we cannot even imagine now.

Competing Interest Declaration

The author(s) has no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this manuscript.

References

- Alemán, J. (2013). *Conjeturas sobre una izquierda lacaniana*. Grama.
- Belkin, M. (2021). Toward an intersectional psychoanalysis of race, gender, and sexuality. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 57(2), 206–227.
- Beshara, R. (2022). A liberation psychoanalytic account of racism. *Awry: Journal of Critical Psychology*, 3(1), 77–94.
- Boni, L., & Mendelsohn, S. (2023). *Psychanalyse du reste du monde: Géo-histoire d'une subversion*. La Découverte.
- Bosteels, B. (2012). *Marx and Freud in Latin America: Politics, psychoanalysis, and religion in times of terror*. Verso.
- Bottomore, T. (2002). *The Frankfurt School and its critics*. Routledge.
- Burman, E. (2018). *Fanon, education, action: Child as method*. Routledge.
- Carpintero, E., & Vainer, A. (2004). *Las huellas de la memoria. Tomo I: 1957–1969*. Topía.
- Carpintero, E., & Vainer, A. (2005). *Las huellas de la memoria. Tomo II: 1970–1983*. Topía.
- Castel, R. (1980). *Le psychanalysme*. Maspero.
- De Andrade, O. (1999). The Cannibalist manifesto. *Third Text*, 13(46), 92–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09528829908576784>
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2009). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Penguin.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. Grove.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks*. Grove.
- Federn, P. (2019). *The fatherless society. The psychology of revolution*. The Orange Press.
- Freud, S. (1959). 'Civilized' sexual morality and modern nervousness. In *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 9, pp. 181–204). The Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S. (1961a). Civilization and its discontents. In *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21, pp. 64–145). The Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S. (1961b). The future of an illusion. In *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21). The Hogarth Press.

- Gaztambide, D. J. (2017). A “psychoanalysis for liberation”: Reading Freire as an act of love. *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*, 22(2), 193–211.
- Gaztambide, D. J. (2019). *A people’s history of psychoanalysis: From Freud to liberation psychology*. Bloomsbury.
- Gherovici, P. (2017). *Transgender psychoanalysis: A Lacanian perspective on sexual difference*. Routledge.
- Gonzalez, L. (2020). *Por um feminismo afro-latino-americano*. Schwarcz-Companhia das Letras.
- Gross, O. (1913). *Overcoming cultural crisis*. <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/otto-gross-overcoming-cultural-crisis>.
- Jacoby, R. (1983). *The repression of psychoanalysis. Otto Fenichel and the Political Freudians*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jay, M. (1996). *The dialectical imagination: A history of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950*. University of California Press.
- Kovel, J. (1984). On being a Marxist psychoanalyst (and a psychoanalytic Marxist). *Free Associations*, 1(Pilot), 149–154.
- Kovel, J. (1988a). *In Nicaragua*. Free Association.
- Kovel, J. (1988b). *The radical spirit: Essays on psychoanalysis and society*. Free Association Books.
- Kovel, J. (2007). *Overcoming Zionism: Creating a single democratic state in Israel/Palestine*. Pluto.
- Lacan, J. (2002). *Family complexes in the formation of the individual*. Rowe.
- Laclau, E. (2005). *On populist reason*. Verso.
- Langer, M. (2017). Psicoanálisis y/o revolución social (1971). In I. Parker & D. Pavón-Cuéllar (Eds.), *Marxismo, psicología y psicoanálisis* (pp. 314–326). Paradiso.
- Layton, L. (2020). *Toward a social psychoanalysis: Culture, character, and normative unconscious processes*. Routledge.
- Lippi, S., & Maniglier, P. (2023). *Sœurs: pour une psychanalyse féministe*. Seuil.
- Macey, D. (2012). *Frantz Fanon: A biography*. Verso.
- Malherbe, N. (2021). A psychopolitical interpretation of de-alienation: Marxism, psychoanalysis, and liberation psychology. *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*, 26(3), 263–283.
- Malherbe, N. (2024a). Fantasy and anti-capitalist resistance: Some implications for psychoanalytic liberation psychology. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 21(4), e1894.
- Malherbe, N. (2024b). Anti-capitalist subjectivity: Considerations of fantasy, (in) action, and solidarity building. *Subjectivity*, 31(1), 59–78.
- Malherbe, N. (2025). *Psychoanalytic liberation psychology: Anti-capitalist approaches*. Routledge.
- Mitchell, J. (2000). *Psychoanalysis and feminism: A radical reassessment of Freudian psychoanalysis*. Basic Books.
- Newman, S. (2001). *From Bakunin to Lacan: Anti-authoritarianism and the dislocation of power*. Lexington.
- Orgler, H. (1963). *Alfred Adler: The man and his work: Triumph over the inferiority complex*. Liver.

- Parker, I. (2003). Jacques Lacan, barred psychologist. *Theory & Psychology*, 13(1), 95–115.
- Parker, I. (2010). *Lacanian psychoanalysis: Revolutions in subjectivity*. Routledge.
- Parker, I. (2022). *Radical psychoanalysis: And anti-capitalist action*. Resistance Books.
- Parker, I. and Pavón-Cuéllar, D. (2021). *Psychoanalysis and revolution: Critical psychology for liberation movements*. 1968 Press.
- Pavón-Cuéllar, D. (2017). *Marxism and psychoanalysis: In or against psychology*. Routledge.
- Pavón-Cuéllar, D. (2023). La psychanalyse au Mexique entre 1919 et 1923. In L. Boni & S. Mendelsohn (Eds.), *Psychanalyse du reste du monde*. La découverte.
- Pavón-Cuéllar, D., & Beshara, R. (2025). Psychoanalysis and colonialism: Introducing a special issue. *Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society*, 30(3), 441–459.
- Pavón-Cuéllar, D., & González Equihua, E. E. (2013). Subversive psychoanalysis and its potential orientation toward a liberation psychology: From a Lacanian reading of Martín-Baró to a committed use of Jacques Lacan. *Theory & Psychology*, 23(5), 639–656.
- Preciado, P. B. (2021). *Yo soy el monstruo que os habla*. Anagrama.
- Robcis, C. (2019). Frantz Fanon, institutional psychotherapy, and the decolonization of psychiatry. In *Frantz Fanon's psychotherapeutic approaches to clinical work* (pp. 23–38). Routledge.
- Rose, J. (2007). *The question of Zion*. Princeton University Press.
- Rowley, H., & Grosz, E. (2013). Psychoanalysis and feminism. In *Feminist knowledge* (pp. 175–204). Routledge.
- Saguaro, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Psychoanalysis and woman: A reader*. NYU Press.
- Sheehi, L., & Sheehi, S. (2021). *Psychoanalysis under occupation: Practicing resistance in Palestine*. Routledge.
- Stavrakakis, Y. (2007). *The Lacanian left: Essays on psychoanalysis and politics*. Suny.
- Valdés, A. (2022). *Toward a feminist Lacanian left: Psychoanalytic theory and intersectional politics*. Routledge.
- Voloshinov, V. (2014). *Freudianism: A Marxist critique*. Verso.
- Zeitlin, M. (1997). The ego psychologists in Lacan's theory. *American Imago*, 54(2), 209–232.
- Žižek, S. (2009). *The sublime object of ideology*. Verso Books.