Daniel Loick

Group Analysis and Consciousness Raising

Two Techniques for Self-Transformation around 1968[*]

Abstract: This paper explores two different techniques of self-transformation that emerged in the context of the global revolts of 1968, namely "group analysis", a version of psychoanalytic self-transformation, pursued in the west-German student movement, and "consciousness raising", as developed and practiced by radical feminists in the US. By comparing these two practices, I hope to show that the problem with some techniques for socially mediating the individual will does not consist in the collective discussion of individual affects as such, as many retrospective accounts of the '68 era now suggest, but can rather be identified as the wrong choice of methods. I thus conclude with a brief defense of the politicization of forms of life against its liberal critics.

Key Words: Consciousness Raising, Group Analysis, 1968, feminism, forms of life, self-transformation, liberalism

Revolutionary praxis, Marx states in the third "Theses on Feuerbach", can only be conceived of and rationally understood as the "coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-changing" (MECW 5: 4). This simultaneity of transforming the world and transforming the self implies, Marx insists, that no one is discharged from revolutionary praxis. There should be no asymmetries in "practical-critical activity," by which one group instructs the liberation of the others. Since everyone is affected by historical praxis, everyone is equally implicated in the transformation of history: "the educator must himself be educated" (ibid.). One of the greatest merits of the global revolts around 1968 was recognizing and consistently pursuing this "coincidence" of transforming

---

the world and the self. Emancipation not only means shaking off external repressions, but also a mutation of the self, which can be described as a process of both subjectivation and desubjectivation— a way of working oneself out of the position of one's given social role and of constructing new ways of existence. Political praxis was thus never conceived solely as a battle against an external enemy, but also as a transformation one's own form of life, which goes hand in hand with a restructuring of everyday praxis and culture, the *psyche* and *physis,* of attitudes and attentions.[1]

In the context of 1968, a variety of historically specific practices emerged, which promoted and advanced the transformation of the subject while conceiving of it as part of a broader social transformation. These practices absorbed elements of bourgeois technologies of the self but integrated them into a broader revolutionary program. The most important of these technologies stemmed from the repertoires of pedagogy (education), medicine (therapy), politics (agitation), and art (aestheticization), though the specific forms would mix, and different emphases would take shape in the varying national contexts. What they all share, however, is the refusal to naturalize existing drives, wishes, and desires, and to elevating them to the status of pre-social facts in the manner of bourgeois liberalism. Rather, these drives, wishes, and desires were problematized and subjected to the process of social mediation. The individual's form of life became politicized and thus made available for conscious transformation. Nonetheless, the process of transforming the self would rarely prove to be less difficult than transforming the world. Given our passionate attachments to our ways of existing, disidentification with the established regime of subjectivity constitutes an anxiety-inducing and, in the most literal sense of the term, life-threatening activity.

In the following, I will present two different techniques of socially mediating one's own volition and confront them with each other. I start by reconstructing the psychoanalysis-inspired practice of group analysis as it was practiced in West-German communes and the so-called *Kinderladen* movement,[2] and I will also describe some of the specific reasons for its historical failure (1). I will then present the practice of consciousness raising developed by radical feminists in the US,

while trying to make a plausible case for why this process was far more successful than group analysis, both subjectively and objectively (2). By comparing these two practices, I hope to show that the problem with some techniques for mediating the individual will does not consist in the collective discussion of individual affects in itself, as many retrospective accounts of the '68 era now suggest, but can rather be identified as the incorrect choice of procedures. I thus conclude with a brief defense of the politicization of forms of life against its liberal critics (3).

1. Group Analysis

Most techniques of the self circulating in the West-German leftist-alternative milieu around 1968 originated—directly and indirectly—within the conceptual edifice of psychoanalysis. In the process, psychoanalysis was freed of its character as the medical procedure Freud once envisioned. It became a source for socio-theoretical and personal reflection, which everyone could draw on democratically. Inspired on one hand by the Freudo-Marxist theorists of the Frankfurter School, and on the other by heterodox therapists such as Sándor Ferenczi and especially Wilhelm Reich, these techniques were not only theoretically influential, but also became an integral component in the experimental search for new ways of existing. Fragments of psychoanalytic theories became guiding principles both in the development of anti-authoritarian educational models in the *Kinderläden* and alternative schools as well as in the collective reflections of the living communities and communes.[3]

In his programmatic "Notizen zur Gründung revolutionärer Kommunen in den Metropolen" [Notes toward to the Founding of Revolutionary Communes in the Metropoles] (1966), Dieter Kunzelmann, who would later go on to cofound Kommune I, bases his argument for the establishment of communal forms of living on the necessity of mediating collective and individual experiences. It was essential to establish the conditions for shared experiences so that activists would no longer be forced back into the "greenhouse […] of individual bourgeois existence" (Kunzelmann 1968, 100). Following on Marx, Kunzelmann proceeds from the premise of a "coincidence" between

transforming the world and transforming the self: "The commune is only able to initiate a form of praxis that explodes the system of the world outside itself when the individuals within the commune have effectively transformed themselves, and they can only effect this transformation by doing said praxis." (Kunzelmann 1968, 100). Alongside the dissolution of relations of dependency and domination in everyday life, it also explicitly entails the "destruction of the private sphere" and the "sublation of bourgeois individualities" (Kunzelmann 1968, 101). Operating across various apartments in West Berlin between 1967 and 69, the famous Kommune I subsequently tried to implement this program. Kunzelmann's demand for a "new quality of mediating the individual" through "all individuals renegotiating themselves in relation to each other" (Kunzelmann 1968, 102) initially involved the practice of individuals serially recounting their biographies to each other in order to break out of the solipsism of bourgeois individuality and get to know each other better (Kunzelmann 1998, 62). Furthermore, the communards aspired to collectively decide all questions of personal life. Even in the K1, however, problems in the process of communal decision making emerged early on. In retrospect, cofounder Dagmar Przytulla, for example, described the consequences of the unquestioned persistence of patriarchal structures within the commune whereby women were not seen as comrades with equal rights, but rather as mere devotees of the male members. This sexism also characterized the process of collective decision making. When Przytulla became pregnant through Kunzelmann and wanted to keep the child, she was accused of not previously discussing the pregnancy with the commune. Kunzelmann's subsequent attempts to distance himself, preferring instead to devote himself to political struggles as opposed to grappling with a child, led to an illegal abortion and Przytulla's subsequent departure from the commune (Przytulla 2002, 210 f.).

The Kommune 2 was founded in Berlin in the same year as Kommune 1 and conceived of itself as an alternative model, albeit with similar theoretical premises about society and subjectivity. K2 extensively documented its group processes in the book *Die Revolutionierung des bürgerlichen*

Individuums [*Revolutionizing the Bourgeois Individual*], which offers an unusual primary resource on the forms and effects of communal living. Much like with the Kommune 1, the Kommune 2's initial aim was to enable political agency: it is impossible to rise up against injustice in the form of a demonstration and then be left to process this experience in the framework of an isolated bourgeois existence. In this sense, the commune served as a "safe haven" in which the conditions for political work were ensured by the members' contribution of material resources and emotional participation. The commune's principles were horizontal revenue sharing, collective planning of consumption, collective distribution of reproductive labor, and collective child rearing.

After half a year, Kommune 2 initiated the practice of serial analysis in which each member would recount the events of the day and their psychological reactions to them as well as childhood experiences and other biographical details one after the other according to a fixed sequence. One group member would ask questions until the analysand demonstrated resistance[4] or blockages, after which another member of the commune would take on the task of asking questions.[5] The psychoanalytic setting was tentatively imitated by having a worn-out mattress serve as the analyst's "couch." The communards soon started to find this procedure too amateur as it led to various problems, including the reproduction of informal hierarchies within the groups, lack of continuity between the analysis sessions, and overly strong affective bonds between the analysands and analysts, who were often engaged in sexual relationships with each other. The inhabitants then consulted psychoanalyst Hans-Werner Saß, who was based in Munich and supplied them with numerous suggestions about how to improve the analytic procedure. The transition from serial analysis to fixed analysis pairs led, on the one hand, to an increased sense of security for the analysands and thus to a greater willingness to open up, but it remained unable to resolve the fundamental difficulties of applying the psychoanalytic relationship to groups. As the commune itself self-critically confirmed in retrospect, they succeeded in breaking through individual "character-armors," but proved unable to newly constitute a collective subjectivity (Kommune 2 1969, 269). The Kommune 2's experiment

ended much like that of the Kommune 1—first with individual retreats, and finally with resigned dissolution.

The communards were already well aware of the dangers of their chosen process of mediation before they founded the commune. They blamed the vocabulary of psychoanalysis for the development of an "inquisitional atmosphere" or an "atmosphere of bourgeois gossip and intrigue," which was already criticized as a kind of "psycho-terror" at the time and produced a situation in which nobody really wanted to reveal anything about themselves (Kommune 2 1969, 18, 21). It was precisely this problem that they were hoping to overcome by setting up the communes. The adherence to the psychoanalytic process may very well have been the main reason for the erosion of K2, a process that the communards have unsparingly reconstructed themselves. Serial and group analysis tried to break with the hierarchy between analysand and analyst by rotating these roles. The formal structure of the psychoanalytic exchange, however, remained intact. This brought about a more general role conflict, since the communards repressed their own feelings as (potential) analysts, while they were nonetheless expected to open up as (potential) analysands. The switching of roles furthermore produced a network of reciprocal transference and countertransference, especially since the analysis relationships existed parallel to other sexual and emotional ones. These dynamics ultimately led to their collective life "becoming overgrown with psychological problems": "Being distracted during a discussion, doodling, misspeaking, and other slips were immediately brought together with the problems from each person's respective analysis and interpreted as such; nobody could leave the table early, close the door a little loudly, or speak to a child impatiently without the others interpreting it in terms of that person's deeper expectations, defense mechanisms, resistances, and the like" (Kommune 2 1969, 270). Contrary to what some retrospective commentaries have suggested, Kommune 2's mistake seems not to have lain in the politicization of the private, but rather the privatization of the political: the space of the political became increasingly occupied by personal problems. This preoccupation with the personal—which was pretty much predestined by the

representational theater of psychoanalysis that exclusively plays out on the triadic stage of mama-papa-me relationships—ultimately thwarted the commune's original goal, namely the development of collective political agency.

2. Consciousness Raising

At around the same time as the group analysis experiments of the West-German student movement, radical feminists in the US were developing the practice of consciousness raising, which can be understood as an alternative solution to the same problem. Much like the German communards, the American feminists were initially interested in breaking out of individual isolation with the goal of developing political agency. The first CR groups developed in private apartments towards the end of the 1960s in the milieu of the New York Radical Women, which would later produce the collective Redstockings, before the radical feminists established branches in many New York neighborhoods. At the 1968 national Women's Liberation Conference near Chicago, New York based activist Kathie Sarachild, cofounder of the first CR groups, presented some basic principles and initial experiences with the practice. These principles were mass distributed along with detailed guides and suggested themes so that the practice quickly spread throughout the whole US, contributing to making radical feminism a relevant social movement—the so-called Second Wave.[6]

Consciousness raising groups usually consisted of six to twelve women who met in a living room once a week. The meetings had pre-established themes, such as marriage, childhood experiences, motherhood, sexuality, sexual violence, etc. Usually, the groups spent three to six months exchanging personal experiences before devoting themselves to feminist projects and campaigns like writing texts, organizing alternative preschools, campaigning on issues such as sexual assault or the right to abortion (Sarachild, 1973, 280). The exclusion of men created a safe space that enabled women to open up without fear, while simultaneously underlining the claim to autonomy and independence from masculine values and institutions (Allen 1973, 271). The program Sarachild presented in

Chicago starts from the demand to take feelings seriously as a political factor. While masculine culture sees itself in a position of domination and control in relation to emotions, consciousness raising registers the affective sediments of domination in human subjectivity and takes the process of reflecting on these sediments as a starting point for political critique. Women's emotional outbreaks— "hysterics, whining, bitching, etc." (Sarachild 1970, 78)—are valid but still proto-political reactions to the experience of injustice. The recognition that other women have had similar experiences should lead to the development of a feminist "class consciousness" and subsequently a mass movement.

Taking one's own feelings as a point of departure has implications for both the selection of themes and the chosen method. The list of themes discussed in CR meetings fundamentally rejects the millenia-old distinction between *polis* and *oîkos*, which had always been gendered. In the process, domestic labor was identified as an essential component of capitalist socialization (a point of sustained interest for socialist feminism) and the political content of the most intimate experiences was revealed. The prolonged effects of sexualized violence, the role of omnipresent sexist imagery in socialization, habitual role expectations in the workplace and the private sphere, internalized denigration of menstruation, and many other things were revealed as the result of a heterosexist culture of dominance. These reflections, however, were not merely restricted to changes in consciousness, but also included concrete transformations of sensual, bodily experiences. Thus, as a continuation of the CR groups, speculum groups began cropping up all over the world during the early 1970s, in which women performed self-examinations in an attempt to emancipate themselves from the objectifying gazes of male gynecologists (Murphy 2012, ch. 1). And while in Germany Dieter Kunzelmann was busy boasting that he wasn't interested in Vietnam because he had difficulties to cum (*Orgasmusprobleme*), the radical feminists in the US were actually deconstructing the myths surrounding vaginal orgasm, and thus attacked one of the foundations of patriarchal sexuality. Carol Hanisch, the originator of the famous slogan "The Personal Is Political" (Hanisch 1969), pointed out

that politicizing private life was also accompanied by a specific idea of temporality which stood in opposition to much of the socialist left: women were no longer willing to accept their oppression as a peripheral contradiction that would somehow resolve itself "after the revolution." This criticism would also be raised by Helke Sander in the German context after Sigrid Rüger famously threw a tomato at Hans-Jürgen Krahl during the 1968 assembly of SDS[7] delegates in Frankfurt (Sander 2010).

The method of the CR groups was also guided by a belief in the primacy of affects. "Let's let ourselves go and see where our feelings lead us. Our feelings will lead us to ideas and then to actions," Kathie Sarachild declared in her programmatic speech (Sarachild 1970, 78). Instead of countering men on the level of science and academia, the CR groups radically tried to take one's own experiences as a starting point. At the same time, this also entailed a rejection of all forms of representational politics (Sarachild 1979, 145). Individual experiences are simultaneously subjective *and* historical. Using the example of a CR group in San Francisco, radical feminist Pamela Allen has described how these insights have been implemented in practice. She names four motifs which subsequently structure the group process: 1 *Opening Up*—the process by which women open up themselves to talking about their experiences and feelings, while at the same time receiving understanding and validation from other women, which enables the first experiences of collectivity and solidarity. 2 *Sharing*—the process by which women intentionally look for commonalities in their experiences and thus realize that many of their "personal" problems are in reality shared problems. 3 *Analyzing*—the process by which objective social and political circumstances are identified as causes for these problems in consultation with external materials such as texts and books. 4 *Abstracting*—the process by which women distance themselves from their personal experiences and conceptualize their role within a larger social context in order to arrive at an assessment of the social situation and develop possible courses of political action (Allen 1973).

Consciousness raising was primarily decried as "therapy" by its opponents, who accused its practitioners of apolitical self-obsession. This charge not only came from men, but also other

feminists (Hanisch 1969; Sarachild 1979, 145). In the face of this, members of the CR groups repeatedly insisted on the explicitly political character of the sessions. Nonetheless, a therapeutic effect was certainly among the goals of the CR process, since it was about transforming one's own subjectivity. This was already evident in the name. The vocabulary of the Marxist critique of ideology was partly used to describe the dominant order as an instance of "false consciousness" that should be overcome through a collective process of becoming aware or conscious. But this has an explicitly affective component: the process transforms the participants from isolated, deluded, and unhappy individuals into solidary, critical, and capable subjects. The radical transformative power of this practice was manifested in the fact that some of the participants changed their names in order to break out of the patrilineal generational model. Kathie Amatniek thus changed her name to Sarachild in 1968, for example, quite literally the child of her mother Sara. Consciousness raising itself has the character of a cure, with which women can particularly overcome feelings of inferiority and self-blame, thus learning to perceive their character traits as positive rather than negative (Hanisch 1969, 4). Such strategies of empowerment were not only used in the feminist movement, but also in other movements based around identity politics, such as the Black Power movement developing in the USA at around the same time, which the feminist movement allied itself with in the form of Black Feminism.

But consciousness raising's political-therapeutic approach was not without its own problems. In addition to external obstacles, which often took the form of denunciation and delegitimization of the practice as such, the structure of the process itself also gave rise to specific challenges. One recurring problem was a lack of honesty when describing one's own feelings, especially when they were negative or aggressive (Allen 1973, 274). Accusatory, hurtful, or aggressive speech acts would also arise during the process. On the other hand, political criticisms would be reinterpreted as political attacks in order to avoid having to engage with their content. Kathie Sarachild used the term "psychological terrorism" to describe conversational techniques of domination in which

emotionalization is used to avoid political discussion (Sarachild 1979b)—a technique that today would perhaps be described as "fragility" and is dangerously capable of paralyzing any attempt at political engagement. In a fundamental act of self-criticism within the radical feminist movement, Jo Freeman condensed this analysis into a diagnosis of the "Tyranny of Structurelessness": in groups that lack fixed institutional structures, informal hierarchies often develop that are all the more difficult to expose and criticize (Freeman 1970).

Despite these specific problems, one can hardly speak of the failure of consciousness raising as a political praxis. The radical feminism of the 1960s and 70s made a fundamental and lasting contribution to the improvement of women's political, social, cultural, and affective situation. The practice of consciousness raising became firmly established as a form of activism for a number of issues (also in queer, anti-racist, and ecological politics) and has even entered the repertoire of self-help groups and therapy. If anything, it was perhaps *too* successful: instead of stumbling over internal contradictions, consciousness raising has by now become professionalized and thus prepared for integration into the existing system of domination. This, however, does not exclude the possibility of reconnecting to consciousness raising's Radical Feminist roots from a contemporary perspective and revitalizing consciousness raising as a collective practice (Firth/Robinson 2016). The feminist movement has itself recognized that in order for this to happen, it is also necessary to reflect on the white, middle-class backgrounds of many members of the women's liberation movement and overcome them through transversal, intersectional alliances with proletarian women and women of color.

The German communes and the US-American consciousness raising groups have a series of commonalities. Both assert a strong connection between transforming the world and transforming the self: without social transformation, engagement with oneself remains elitist narcissism; without self-transformation, the revolution remains dogmatic and hierarchical. Both are concerned with the development of political agency by breaking free of bourgeois isolation. They are thus both founded

on a post-conventional conception of politics which is no longer centered on the state and is subsequently able to put a variety of issues previously discredited as "apolitical" on the agenda. This implies overcoming a traditional form of economic determinism that defers questions about forms of living until "after the revolution" and is connected with a specific conception of temporality that seeks to experiment with new forms of existence in the here and now. In this aspect, both movements are able to generate new modes of political action: revolutions no longer take place on the street or in parliament, but rather in the kitchen or in bed.[8] Group analysis and consciousness raising are both attempts to develop techniques of socially mediating individual volition appropriate for these terrains. And ultimately, they both share an animosity towards liberalism.

At the same time, both approaches also demonstrate fundamental differences, and reflecting on these differences may serve to explain the failure of group analysis and the somewhat ironic success of consciousness raising. While the rotation of analyst and analysand roles in serial analysis left the vertical structural relationship between parties intact—and thus between individuals and the group— consciousness raising strives for an intersubjective understanding of others' needs, or in other words the creation of horizontal relations (Allen 1973, 272). This distinction between verticality and horizontality is also expressed in the relationship cultivated to one's own affects: while the communard's psychoanalytically inspired procedure was about cultivating "ego strength," in other words a rational, self-aware approach to one's own unconscious wishes and desires, consciousness raising takes feelings as the starting point, releasing and validating them. Affects accordingly shouldn't be mastered, but rather identified, reinterpreted, and channeled. This difference was also expressed in the goals of each procedure: while psychoanalysis first becomes productive when subjective resistance or crises emerge which can then be reflected on and overcome, consciousness raising explicitly understands itself as "non-judgemental" (Allen 1973, 274) and thus can only happen in a safe space. It was decidedly not about analyzing the woman reporting her experiences as much as it was about analyzing her situation; changing her individual attitudes and views were only a

secondary effect of this analysis (Sarachild 1979, 148). In the context of these procedures, this distinction was also expressed in the difference between speaking and listening: whereas the transformation of the subject in group analysis took place by verbally expressing what had been experienced, felt or dreamed, the focus in consciousness raising was more on listening (Farinati/Firth 2017, especially chapter 2). Individual isolation was overcome by listening to the reports of others, realizing that one isn't alone and seeing that the situation is not reducible to personal inadequacies but rather generalizable social problems.[9] Ultimately, the logical sequences of both procedures are diametrically opposed: whereas serial analysis undertakes the critique of individual biographies against the backdrop of theoretical insights (from the universal to the particular), consciousness raising starts from personal experience and arrives at a general theory by way of a collective abstraction process (from the particular to the universal). It becomes clear that the respective reasons for the "failure" of each practice—insofar as one can speak of failure at all—do not lie in external circumstances but rather in their respective structures: whereas the communes imploded as a result of psychologizing political problems, consciousness raising politicized personal problems thus opening up a discussion that was partly absorbed by the existing society. The latter is a better kind of failure: it at least enables us, at least in theory, to reconnect with the radical nature of its original promises on the basis of a new assessment of the situation, and also enables us to inquire about the political significance of suffering that is experienced as an individual failure in order to develop a new form of collective agency out of it.

3. In Defense of a Politics of Forms of Life

In his reckoning with '68 published on its 40th anniversary, German historian Götz Aly drew a parallel between the generation of 1968 and that of 1933. The "individual fury for change" and the "desire for a tabula rasa" were, according to him, just "belated offshoots of totalitarianism" (Aly 2008, 8). Aly's diagnosis is just the most extreme form of the currently widespread judgement that the '68

generation went too far: no doors, free love, discussions about every possible everyday topic had disregarded the rights of the individual and tread on their need for privacy. In his study *Authentizität und Gemeinschaft*, which has quickly become a standard work in German history, Sven Reichardt complains of "a permanent state of reflection with totalizing tendencies" (Reichhardt 2014, 391), while the communications historian Joachim Scharloth similarly diagnoses the "post-privacy" of the communes with "a promise of salvation with a tendency towards totality" (Scharloth 2011).

As I have tried to show, such assessments fall back behind the insights of 1968. They re-naturalize individual drives, wishes, and needs in an attempt immunize them against social mediation. Neither the objective importance of consciousness raising for the social emancipation of women, nor the subjective feeling of liberation and empowerment that accompanied it were a result of according the individual an untouchable, pre-political private sphere. To the contrary, consciousness raising strove for a fundamental transformation of subjectivities and inter-subjectivities which explicitly involved addressing the most intimate experiences. The reason for CR's superiority when compared with other similar practices in the West German context lies in its choice of method. We can thus infer from this that the techniques which are most likely to be successful are those based on horizontal mediation between individuals instead of vertical integration into the group, those which develop their analyses on the basis of lived experience, instead of simply trying to force these experiences into some pre-established theoretical mold.

"It is awkward and it is threatening", Lauren Berlant concludes her book *Cruel Optimism,* "to detach from what is already not working" (Berlant 2011, 263). Patriarchal gender relations are but one example of hegemonic identity models that are affectively attractive to us but ultimately only further shackle us to our oppression. The work ethic and compulsory consumption, juridicism and the desire to punish, whiteness and western chauvinism, the domination of nature and human exceptionalism—all these are further dimensions of the dominant regime of subjectivation, which frequently resemble the patriarchy's strategies of individualization and isolation during the 1950s and

60s. Learning from feminism means learning how to win: in all these spheres, we still need techniques of detachment which consciousness raising continues to offer an important model for.

Translated from German by Stanton Taylor

Bibliography

Allen, Pamela (1973): "Free Space", in: Anne Koedt, Ellen Levine, Anita Rapone (Eds.): *Radical Feminism*, New York 1973: Quadrangle.

Aly, Götz (2008): *Unser Kampf 1968,* Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Berlant, Lauren (2011): *Cruel Optimism*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Bott, Gerhard (1970): *Erziehung zum Ungehorsam. Antiautoritäre Kinderläden*, Frankfurt am Main: März.

Farinati, Lucia und Claudia Firth (2017): *The Force of Listening*, Berlin: Errant Bodies Press.

Firth, Rhiannon and Andrew Robinson (2016): "For a Revival of Feminist Consciousness Raising: Horizontal Transformation of Epistemologies and Transgression of Neoliberal TimeSpace", in *Gender and Education* 28(3): 1-16

Freeman, Jo (1970): "The Tyranny of Structurelessness", online: https://www.jofreeman.com/joreen/tyranny.htm

Gerhardt, Uta (2014): "Hedonismus und Revolution. Zur Rezeption der Psychoanalyse in der Berliner Studentenbewegung der sechziger Jahre", in: *Luzifer-Amor. Zeitschrift zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse*, Jg. 27, Heft 54, S. 25-55

Hanisch, Carol (1969): "The Personal Is Political" (1969), online http://www.carolhanisch.org/CHwritings/PIP.html

Horn, Klaus (Ed.) (1973): *Gruppendynamik und der 'subjektive Faktor'. Repressive Entsublimietrung oder politisierende Praxis*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Kommune 2 (1969): *Versuch der Revolutionierung des bürgerlichen Individuums. Kollektives Leben mit politischer Arbeit verbinden!*, Berlin: Oberbaum.

Kunzelmann, Dieter (1968): "Notizen zur Gründung revolutionärer Kommunen in den Metropolen", in Albrecht Goeschel (Ed.): *Richtlinien und Anschläge. Materialien zur Kritik der repressiven Gesellschaft*, München: Carl Hanser, S. 100-104.

Kunzelmann, Dieter (1998): *Leisten Sie keinen Widerstand! Bilder aus meinem Leben*, Berlin: Transit.

Liebel, Manfred and Franz Wellendorf (1969): *Schülerselbstbefreiung. Voraussetzungen und Chancen der Schülerrebellion*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp

Loick, Daniel (2018a): "Gegenhegemoniale Gewöhnung. Modelle zur Transformation der Zweiten Natur", in Thomas Khurana, Dirk Quadflieg, Francesca Raimondi, Juliane Rebentisch and Dirk Setton (Eds.): *Negativität. Kunst, Recht, Politik*, Berlin 2018: Suhrkamp.

Loick, Daniel (2018b): "On the Politics of Forms of Life", in Amy Allen and Eduardo Mendieta (Eds.): *From Alienation to Forms of Life. The Critical Theory of Rahel Jaeggi*, University Park 2018: Penn State University Press.

Murphy, Michelle (2012): *Seizing the Means of Reproduction. Entanglements of Feminism, Health, and Technoscience*, Durham: Duke University Press.

o.A (1973) "Consciousness Raising" in: Anne Koedt, Ellen Levine, Anita Rapone (Eds.): *Radical Feminism*, New York 1973: Quadrangle.

Przytulla, Dagmar (2002): "Niemand ahnte, dass wir ein ziemlich verklemmter Haufen waren", in Ute Kätzel (Ed.): *Die 68erinnen. Porträt einer rebellischen Frauengeneration*, Berlin: Rowohlt, S. 201-219.

Redecker, Eva von (2018): *Praxis und Revolution. Eine Sozialteorie radikalen Wandels,* Frankfurt: Campus.

Reichhardt, Sven (2014): *Authentizität und Gemeinschaft. Linksalternatives Leben in den siebziger und frühen achtziger Jahren*, Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Richter, Horst-Eberhard (1995): *Die Gruppe. Hoffnung auf einen neuen Weg, sich selbst und andere zu befreien*, Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.

Sander, Helke (2010): "Rede auf der 23. Delegiertenkonferenz des SDS", in: Ilse Lenz (Ed.): *Die Neue Frauenbewegung in Deutschland*, Wiesbaden: VS.

Sarachild, Kathie (1970): "A Program for Feminist 'Consciousness Raising'", in Shulamith Firestone, Anne Koedt (Eds.): *Notes from the Second Year. Women's Liberation: Major Writing of the Radical Feminists*, New York: Radical Femism.

Sarachild, Kathie (1979a): "Consciousness-Raising: A Radical Weapon", in Redstockings (Eds.): *Feminist Revolution*, New York 1979: Random House.

Sarachild, Kathie (1979b): "Psychological Terrorism", in Redstockings (Eds.): *Feminist Revolution*, New York 1979: Random House.

Scharloth, Joachim (1998): *1968 – Eine Kommunikationsgeschichte*, München: Fink.

Scharloth, Joachim (2011): "Postprivacy und Kommune: Heilsversprechen mit Tendenz zum Totalen", online: http://www.security-informatics.de/blog/?p=578

---

[1] On the specific nature of a politics of forms of life, see Loick (2018a; 2018b)

[2] *Kinderläden* were small, alternative, self-organized preschools that became popular in West Germany during the 1960s and 70s.

[3] Despite its significance, the role of psychoanalysis as a technique of the self around 1968 has hardly been researched. One exception is Uta Gerhardt's essay (2014); for the important historical documents of the time see Kommune 2 (1969); Bott (1970); Liebel/Wellendorf (1969); Richter (1995); Horn (1973).

[4] The identification of resistance played a decisive role in group analysis. However, it is remarkable that Freud's concept of "working through" played no systematic role here. This is also the case in Horst-Eberhard Richter's pioneering work on group analysis (see Richter 1995).

[5] On the communal conversation as a specific kind of communication, see Scharloth 2011, 198-208; For the significance of serial analysis as a modification of Freudian theory, see Gerhardt 2014, especially p. 42 f.

[6] On the history and principles of CR, see Sarachild 1979.

[7] The *Sozialistische Deutsche Studentenbund* was a socialist student union in West Germany associated with the SPD political party.

[8] For a recent systematic reformulaton of this idea, see Redecker 2018.

[9] Given its supposed passivity, listening (as opposed to speaking) was often considered a feminine activity. Consciousness raising was interested in a feminist appropriation of these feminine resources and thus in developing both a politics and ethics of listening (Farinati/Firth 2017). – I thank Katharina Pelosi for bringing my attention to this point.