

Družbeno relevantna psihologija prihodnosti

Zbornik 3. simpozija kritične psihologije

Bralni krožek kritične psihologije

10. maj 2024

Ljubljana, 2024

Družbeno relevantna psihologija prihodnosti

Zbornik 3. simpozija kritične psihologije

Uredništvo: Ema Bohanec, Tina Kuhar

Naslov in podnaslov: 3. simpozij kritične psihologije: Družbeno relevantna psihologija prihodnosti

Avtorice prispevkov: Ana Cvelfar, Dijana Džamastagić, Hana Hawlina, Dino Manzoni, Ana Reberc, Elena Stevanić, Vanja Štulić, Višnja Tatić, Marja Zakelšek

Simpozij: 3. simpozij kritične psihologije, 2024

Datum in kraj: 10. 5. 2024, Ljubljana, Slovenija

Izdajatelj: samozaložba Ema Bohanec

Tehnično urejanje in prelom: Junoš Lukan

Oblikovanje ovitka: Nina Bašelj

©Bralni krožek kritične psihologije, 2024. Vse pravice pridržane.

Tisk: Prima podjetje za tisk in oglaševanje, d. o. o.

Naklada: 105 izvodov

Izid: Ljubljana, maj 2024

Publikacijo je sofinancirala Študentska organizacija Filozofske fakultete.



CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji
Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

159.9:316.6(082)

SIMPOZIJ kritične psihologije (3 ; 2024 ; Ljubljana)

Družbeno relevantna psihologija prihodnosti : zbornik 3.
simpozija kritične psihologije : bralni krožek kritične
psihologije : 10. maj 2024 / [uredništvo Ema Bohanec, Tina Kuhar
; avtorice prispevkov Ana Cvelfar ... et al.]. - Ljubljana :
samozal. E. Bohanec, 2024

ISBN 978-961-07-2140-6

COBISS.SI-ID 196589315

Kazalo

Building Futures: The Role of Social Psychology in World-Making	
Hana Hawlina.....	2
Metoda so-raziskovanja: Z eno nogo v tegobah vsakdana, z drugo v udejanjanju prihodnosti	
Ana Cvelfar in Marja Zakelšek	4
A Critique of Clinical Psychology: A Necessary Paradigm Shift for Its Future Practice	
Dino Manzoni.....	6
Tovariška ljubezen: Psihologija medčloveških odnosov za komunistično prihodnost	
Ana Cvelfar in Dijana Džamastagić.....	8
Regional Meeting of Critical Psychologists	
Ana Reberc.....	10
Regional Meeting of Critical Psychologists	
Elena Stevanić, Vanja Štulić in Višnja Tatić.....	13

Program simpozija

1. *Panelne predstavitve*

Hana Hawlina

Building Futures: The Role of Social Psychology in World-Making

Ana Cvelfar in Marja Zakešek

Metoda so-raziskovanja: Z eno nogo v tegobah vsakdana, z drugo v udejanjanju prihodnosti

Dino Manzoni

A Critique of Clinical Psychology: A Necessary Paradigm Shift for Its Future Practice

Ana Cvelfar in Dijana Džamastagić

Tovariška ljubezen: psihologija medčloveških odnosov za komunistično prihodnost

2. *Regionalni posvet*

Ana Reberc

Posvet delegacij različnih držav bivše Jugoslavije

Building Futures: The Role of Social Psychology in World-Making

Hana Hawlina

In the upcoming Symposium of Critical Psychology, I would like to discuss ‘Social Psychology of and for World-Making’, a concept pivoting towards envisioning a future-oriented psychology. This perspective emphasises psychology’s role in interpreting and co-constructing social realities, urging a shift from the static, experimental traditions towards a contextual and dynamic understanding of social processes. This new paradigm, grounded in empirical and theoretical groundwork, advocates for a redefined social psychology that prioritises ethical engagement and methodological pluralism to address contemporary societal challenges effectively.

My contribution to the symposium would highlight how social psychology has been historically anchored in static analyses, which, while valuable, restrict our understanding to what is rather than what could be. I argue for a discipline that is not only reflective but also directive, one that actively participates in shaping the future by studying how individuals and societies envision and navigate potential futures. This approach emphasises the necessity for social psychology to engage more profoundly with the lived experiences of individuals, exploring the imaginative and creative capacities that drive societal development.

I will illustrate the practical implications of this paradigm through examples from our research, showcasing how this forward-looking approach can lead to more relevant, impactful, and ethically conscious social psychological research. By intertwining ontological, epistemological, and methodological considerations, our work repositions social psychology as a key player in understanding and shaping societal trajectories.

This presentation would aim to spark a dialogue on reimagining social psychology's role and methods in a rapidly evolving world. By focusing on 'world-making', where psychology contributes actively to the study and formation of future societal configurations, we underscore the discipline's potential to be not just an observer of the social realm but a co-creator of its future. Through this lens, social psychology can emerge as a more dynamic, relevant, and socially engaged field, ready to tackle the complex challenges of our time and contribute meaningfully to the construction of a more equitable and sustainable world.

Metoda so-raziskovanja: Z eno nogo v tegobah vsakdana, z drugo v udejanjanju prihodnosti

Ana Cvelfar in Marja Zakelšek

Pionir socialističnega organiziranja na Nemškem, Ferdinand Lassalle, je leta 1861 zapisal: »Zarja novega časa je vselej v doseženi zavesti o tem, kaj je dotedanja dejanskost v resnici bila.« Razumevanje vzrokov za krivice sedanosti je bistvenega pomena za zamišljanje in doseganje korenitih družbenih sprememb prihodnosti. Teh vzrokov ne moremo zapopasti zgolj z empiričnim raziskovanjem ali na podlagi lastnega čutnega izkustva, mogoče pa jih je razumeti s pomočjo teoretskega aparata historičnega materializma. Dejanskost, ki se nam v vsakdanjiku kaže kot naravna, samoumevna in edina možna, se nam tako razgrinja kot rezultat družbenih razmerij, posredovanih preko temeljnega antagonizma med kapitalom in delom. Ubadanje z zgodovinskimi izvori in aktualnimi variacijami kapitalističnega izkoriščanja v praksi pomeni ure in ure študija, preživete ob prebiranju težko razumljivih bukel. Teoretični študij je torej privilegij posameznic in posameznikov, ki se bolj kot v vsakomesečnih pomenkih o tem, kako plačati najemnino, dobro znajdejo v abstraktnih razpravah o teoretskih konceptih. Socialistična revolucija – po drugi strani – terja delo in angažma množic. Kako se rešiti te zagate?

Začeli bova z marksistično definicijo *ideologije*, nadaljevali s kritiko Lukáčsevega koncepta *razredne zavesti*, ki nas pripelje v teoretsko zanko *napačne zavesti*. Ko bomo skupaj začrtali, ne le kaj ideologija je, ampak tudi kaj ni, bomo skočili v Italijo šestdesetih in sedemdesetih let prejšnjega stoletja ter se seznanili z delom *operaistov*, ki so koncept razredne zavesti nadomestili s konceptoma tehnične in politične sestave delovne sile. Nadgradnji analitičnega aparata

je sledila posodobitev politične metodologije za raziskovanje delovnega mesta med in z delavkami in delavci. Operaisti so v delavsko raziskovanje uvedli metodo so-raziskovanja, ki odpravlja zunanjo pozicijo raziskovalcev in znanje postavlja na stran intervjuvancev. Zaključili bova v vsem dobro znanem vsakdanu, natančneje med policami maloprodajnih podjetij. Predstavili bova, kako metodo so-raziskovanja uporabljamo v Centru za družbeno raziskovanje (CEDRA), kaj nam o vsakdanjiku zaposlenih v živilskih trgovinah pove naša feministična so-raziskava in ali nam s to metodo uspeva prelamljati z delitvami, ki jih delavskemu razredu vsiljuje trenutna tehnična sestava delovne sile.

A Critique of Clinical Psychology: A Necessary Paradigm Shift for Its Future Practice

Dino Manzoni

Clinical psychology is usually defined as a speciality of psychology that deals with the assessment and treatment of mental disorders. Assessment forms the core of clinical psychological treatment, but differs fundamentally from the diagnostic procedures used in medicine.

In our presentation, we will ask how the (psychiatric) medical institution and the hegemonic medical discourse within this institution influence the autonomy of the psychological discipline and its functioning.

Starting from the critique of the positivist paradigm prevailing in psychology and the view of the individual as a being isolated from the world, which opens up clinical psychological treatment and subjects it to the influence of medicine, it is necessary to emphasise the specificity of the object of psychological science, i.e. its conceptual and therapeutic tools, which are fundamentally different from classical medical treatment, its assumptions, methods and techniques. The scientific autonomy of clinical psychology is obviously undermined by the ideological influence of medical science, in particular by the medical model of illness and psychopathology of the psychiatric classification systems, the best known and most representative of which is the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) published by the American Psychiatric Association.

The psychiatric nosology of the DSM type (also of the International Classification of Diseases) is strictly descriptive, without a

more comprehensive theoretical justification and classification of the proposed discrete categories and (differential) diagnostic criteria. For example, the thresholds between the diagnostic categories or between illness and normality are arbitrarily defined, i.e. not theoretically justified. After all, what is the reason for selecting a precise number of diagnostic criteria, the demarcation between categories, the overlap of signs or symptoms and their duration required for a particular diagnosis? In this context, it should be noted that the number of diagnostic categories has increased by more than 300 % (from 106 to 365) since the introduction of the DSM-I to the most recent DSM-VI.

From the perspective of psychology, the atheoretical formulation of the diagnostic system by psychiatry merely leads to a purely technocratic counting and sorting of signs and symptoms into preconceived classification groups and the assignment of persons to disease categories and can be described as a labelling process. However, mental illness is not just ‘a thing in the world’. Paul Verhaeghe notes that in the diagnostic process clinicians usually behave as if they were discovering objective facts, although in their assessments they often uncritically reproduce and record only what they have learned to see in their practical training. Nevertheless, it is possible to assign a precise diagnostic code to mental disorders, to prescribe drug therapies and to give psychiatric diagnoses the appearance of naturalness, objectivity and universality. This type of system primarily serves the purposes of the bureaucratic apparatus, i.e. the evaluation of services provided by healthcare institutions.

Tovariška ljubezen: Psihologija med- človeških odnosov za komunistično pri- hodnost

Ana Cvelfar in Dijana Džamastagić

Aleksandra Kollontaj nam je že več kot sto let nazaj o materialni in kulturni emancipaciji po spolu povedala več kot celotna novejša zgodovina zahodnega kanona feministične teorije. Poleg tega Kollontaj ni le teoretizirala, revolucijo – skozi *objektivno* spreminjanje materialnih pogojev življenja v revolucionarni Rusiji in *subjektivno* spreminjanje človeške psihe po načelih »komunistične morale« – je tudi živila. V akademskem prostoru jo je zato treba izbrskati, nato pa se prebiti skozi očitke vsega, kar naj bi počela narobe (češ, da ne bi pomislili, da sem njena pristašica). Če nam kljub temu še vedno uspe vztrajati, se med drugim dokopljemo do pronicljivih teoretičnih uvidov o materialnih temeljih naših medosebnih odnosov, kritike buržoazne ljubezni in analize psiholoških posledic za »žensko-soprogo« v odnosih podrejanja ter emancipirano »žensko-človeka« v odnosih svobode in enakosti. Skozi pričujoči prispevek misel Kollontaj obujava in aktualizirava; vračava se v preteklost, da osmisli naše naloge, boje, predvsem pa načine skupnega delovanja in političnega dela v sedanjosti. Pri tem sva pristranski – zavzemava pozicijo našega razreda.

Da bi pokazali na zgodovinsko začasnost, spremenljivost in globoko socialen značaj družbenih razmerij, katerih meje in okvire zmerom pogojuje položaj v materialni produkciji, operirava z aparatom historičnega materializma. Ne obstaja korenito in vseobsežno spreminjanje zavesti ljudi brez konkretnega spreminjanja materialnih pogojev, v katerih živimo, zato mora biti naša perspektiva transformacije vedno razredna, ali pa je ne bo. Pa vendar, če si pri

Vidi Tomšič sposodiva in delno predrugačiva njeno tezo, je »merilo za stopnjo revolucionarnosti delavskega gibanja tudi to, v kolikšni meri se mu je posrečilo oblikovati takšne teoretične in praktične borbene temelje«¹, ki skupaj z revolucioniranjem materialnih temeljev korenito sprevačajo oblike medčloveških odnosov v smeri popolne enakosti, svobode in kolektivne solidarnosti, tj. v smeri odnosov, ki ustrezajo komunistični družbi.

Kollontaj v svojih delih razgrinja celovito razredno ideologijo ljubezni, ki jo poimenuje tovariška ljubezen, s čimer cilja na široko in raznovrstno paleto medčloveških odnosov, ki temeljijo na tovarištvu, svobodi, enakosti, solidarnosti in skupni politični viziji komunizma. Tovariška ljubezen kot temelj nove, komunistične odnosnosti izhaja iz analize ljubezni kot politične sile in zato iz podmene, da je takšen tip odnosov v neposrednem interesu delavskega razreda. Takšni odnosi po Kollontaj zahtevajo tudi predrugačenje posameznice in njene psihe, ki je kot »senca« moškega ujeta v podrejenost in odvisnost. Psihološke značilnosti sodobne ženske presegajo strah pred samostojnostjo, njeni interesi pa prestopajo ozek krog družine, doma in romantične ljubezni. V ospredje prihaja individualna rast, ustvarjalnost, politično delo, odnosi enakosti ter skupno delovanje za kolektiv. Skozi afirmacijo tovariške ljubezni kot ideologije, ki gradi in utrjuje kolektiv ter emancipira posameznice, izpeljujeva lekcije za politično delovanje v sedanjosti, vse do komunistične prihodnosti.

¹»Znano Fourierjevo misel o tem, da je stopnja ženske emancipacije v vsaki družbi naravno merilo splošne emancipacije, lahko uporabimo tudi v tem smislu, da je merilo za stopnjo resnične revolucionarnosti nekega delavskega gibanja tudi to, v kolikšni meri se mu je posrečilo oblikovati takšne teoretične in praktične borbene temelje, ki vodijo k odpravi vsakršne diskriminacije med ljudmi glede na narodnost, raso, jezik, vero ali spol idr. in v kolikšni meri je vgradilo odpor doslej zatiranih v skupen boj za spremembo družbenih odnosov.« Tomšič, V. (1978). *Komunistična partija Jugoslavije v boju za emancipacijo žensk*, Ljubljana: ČZDO Komunist, str. 14.

Regional Meeting of Critical Psychologists

Ana Reberc

During the 3rd symposium of critical psychology in Ljubljana, *Socially relevant psychology of the future*, we organized a regional meeting of critical psychologists from countries that were once part of the Federalist Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia. Meeting was held virtually with delegates from Belgrade, Serbia and organizing group from Ljubljana, Slovenia. We exchanged our visions of critical psychology and practices in the field with aspirations of common future undertakings in the field as well as inspiring others to join our endeavour. Meeting consisted of the introduction followed by the presentation of the Belgrade group and Ljubljana group of critical psychologists.

Introduction

After some years of reading and disseminating critical psychology (CP), it is common knowledge that CP challenges underlying assumptions, theories and methodologies of the so called scientific psychology that functions as scientific ideology. CP challenges psychological practices in science and research and as importantly all other practices of psy-complex (institutions, actors, relations), the whole conglomerate of psychology that works as the ideological state apparatus. Due to deep entrenchment of psychology in everyday life, it is also crucial for CP to interrogate common sense, public and everyday uses of psychology. So far in this introduction CP works as a negative critique of mainstream, individualist, USAmerican psychology but it – arguably even more importantly – contains in itself the positive critique: potential to build new psychology that is

emancipatory on all levels from assumptions, methodology, theories, to produced knowledge, goals and practices. CP is an important tool of subject's praxis towards freedom and self-determination. To engage with the CP fully, we have to understand it at the same time as a critique of existing psychology and subjectivities and a construction of a new psychology and subjectivities: emancipatory praxis. Our goals as critical psychologists are then to build a real science (not scientific ideology) with sound ontological and epistemological underpinnings, to research impacts of the psy-complex and contemporary subjectivities in its complexity, to construct emancipatory tools and put them into practice.

For a while it was unclear how to proceed from the negative critiques towards building strong foundations and practices of psychology. Now it seems absurdly easy to understand that the only way forward is through combining our strength, situated praxis and specifically uncovering the vast knowledge produced in our language and cultural spaces in the past, when goals of at least parts of psychology and critical theory were centered around emancipating the subordinated and alienated subjects. It is crucial to uncover and interact with our heritage of a different psychology grounded in historical materialist scientific thought, in other words: we have to know our past to know our future. Our common cultural-historical position gives us a considerate advantage with the resources of knowledge production in Yugoslavia, country where different conceptions of humans, subjectivity and psyche flourished. For many reasons critical or counter-capitalist knowledge is not as easily accessible as propagandist materials with psychological flair (due to lack of digitization of materials, domination of English language and USAmerican perspectives in psychology and knowledge more generally etc.). This severely impacts how we think about the field, others and ourselves, how we orient ourselves in space and time as well as how we act in different situations. By now it is abundantly clear we have to actively and consciously intervene in the world (of psychology) to realize our potentials as psychologists. We are sure that it is impossible to build critical psychology in isolation,

in national contexts, without strengthening our position through working together.

We are oriented towards the future by building stronger internationalist cooperation with the following practices:

- Creating a common virtual space to share critical psychological knowledge and praxis with the wider public.
- Conducting yearly regional meetings.
- Establishing an internationalist reading group.

Regional Meeting of Critical Psychologists

Elena Stevanić, Vanja Štulić in Višnja Tatić

Our reading group presented how we came together (in the Spring of 2023) and what we were reading so far: Thomas Teo, *Outline of theoretical psychology* (2018), chapter from Lauren Berlant, *Cruel optimism* (2011), that we discussed in a meeting together with a friend who is an anthropologist, chapters from Ian Parker, *Revolution in psychology* (2007)). There was also one meeting with a member of the Slovenian reading group (Ana) while she was in Belgrade, where we first heard about this sister reading group. The three of us talked about what attracted us to critical psychology and how we got into it, what topics we are particularly interested in and finally, how we try to come up with practical applications/critical practices in our life and work – through practising psychotherapy, social activism, rethinking and approaching scientific research more critically and thoughtfully and, of course, engaging in a critical psychology reading group.

We were excited to meet a group doing something similar to what we are doing. It was immensely inspiring and encouraging to hear that there are more psychologists passionate about critical psychology, quite close to us (geographically), who see the same flaws as we do in mainstream psychology and had the same dilemmas and ‘conflicts’ with mainstream psychology over the course of their psychology studies. In practice, it meant a lot to us to hear which texts the sister group read and to hear about their public engagement in the form of a radio show and other actions, and get new ideas for our further readings and engagement. We all felt isolated with our ideas and views for a long time, so besides coming together and starting our reading group, this encounter with the

reading group from Slovenia made us feel even more like we are a part of a bigger movement and not 'alone in this'. It was also important for us to hear that the other group encountered similar 'challenges' as we did – drops in motivation, not always managing to read everything before the group meeting, not being a part of the group during a certain period and then coming back to the group etc., which motivated us even more to continue doing what we're doing, even though it doesn't always run smoothly. We are also a lot more motivated after this meeting to organize some actions outside of reading texts together and to bring more people into this. What we particularly found interesting was that the sister reading group referred to themselves as 'we', like they are a real small community, where coming together and doing something together is more important than individual efforts, while we still were talking mostly from our own individual perspectives. We are hoping that our group (that is still 'young', only one year old) will also soon form a sense of 'collective selfhood'. ☺For us this symposium is the first step in connecting with other groups from the ex-Yu-region and it's really meaningful, so we are hoping that in the future we can achieve cooperation on many levels that will help us grow and make changes in societal status quo.