

What is mental health?

(What Freud and Fromm talk about) sound very similar and can be summarized in two words: love and work. However, when you begin to analyze what Freud meant by love and work and what Fromm means by love and work, you come to very different conclusions. When Freud talked about love, what he basically talked about was what he would call genital sexualality, which meant the kind of person whose sexuality was not pregenital, was not based either in the oral area or the anal area, or not phallic also - some people, many people when they discuss Freud confuse the concept of phallic and genital, which Freud made a distinction about. In other words, for Freud, just because sex had to do with the male sexual organs didn't mean it was necessarily healthy - it might be phallic in the sense that the male sexual organ is used as a kind of aggressive implement. Now that's true for many people - for many men, the penis is really like a knife, which is used to stab the woman to show aggressive superiority. When Freud talked about genital sexuality, he was thinking of the kind of sexuality in which the male sexual pleasure was in the genital organ but which involved a relatedness between the sexes that was not aggressive, though he always felt there was a certain amount of aggression in life, but it was not due to sadism or any perversion, but - how many of you read Civilization and its Discontents? Well, I hope the rest of you will because when you read that Freud felt that in the human being there's a certain amount of aggression, which comes out at all times, and indeed you'll see that civilization is the battle ground between man's warring instincts and loving instincts, Eros, and his aggressive instinct, or the death instinct. And this was a constant battle in which the question remained, who would win, in man would the destructive instincts or the loving instincts win, with civilization as the battle ground. But I must say that when you look at society, Freud certainly had a lot of basis on which to say this. I mean, he felt that if you consider how destructive human beings have been, as Bertrand Russell once put it, "Man has never not done anything destructive that he's been able to do". There's a very well written statement by George Bernard Shaw, in Man and Superman, in the part of the play which is "Don Juan in Hell", where the Devil is arguing with Don Juan whether human beings are really more interested in love or destruction, and the Devil says "Human beings make a big game about talking about love but you see where the real affection lies when you look at, for example, the peasant, who in his work and his family and his food lives no differently and sometimes worse than he did 2000 years ago. But when this same peasant goes out to fight a war for his country, he carries machines which are the marvel of technology. And so just compare where man puts his greatest love -

in machines of destruction or in machines of life. And the answer is very clear. So I would say that Freud's point of view about destructiveness in human beings is one which must be taken very seriously, and the question remains whether man can be different. Freud very clearly - you remember on the questionnaire I gave you, one of the questions was whether man was destructive ... or could be good. In Civilization and its Discontents Freud very clearly talks about man the work, and it is very clear in his view.

Now when Freud talks about work, in effect it's really rather ambiguous. If you take note, there's a long footnote in Civ. and its/ Disconts. where he talks about work. And he says in effect that work has a great enjoyment for people when it's freely chosen, and that this enjoyment goes beyond merely the realistic need to stay alive, that in work man is able to fulfill himself in many ways. But then he goes on to say that most people don't like the work they're doing, and they're forced to work, and it's a problem for civilization and so forth, and he never puts together the two statements, that work freely chosen is satisfying, and on the other hand that most people are miserable in their work and society has to force them to work. But he just leaves that, as he often does - he leaves an implication which is a very radical and humanistic statement, because if you carry this to its conclusion, what it means is that human beings, if they're freely allowed to choose their work, can really enjoy it, while what society does is force them to do work which makes them lazy and unhappy. But Freud who fundamentally was never radical, politically, even though the implications of what he says is often very radical, leaves this. And then goes on to talk in his model, which is a mechanical, economic model of life, which is what Fromm would call a model of scarcity, and I think this is a very important concept. The point Fromm makes is that Freud's model of human motivation is correct, if you think of a world of scarcity, of limited things, of limited goods. For example, take Freud's long discussion of love, where he attacks the Christian concept of "love thy neighbor as thyself" and "love thy enemy" and says very clearly this is so absurd that one wonders why anybody has the nerve to talk this way, about loving thy neighbor and loving thy enemy. First of all, if you loved all these people, it's really like an inflation, and he uses this term - he very often uses economic terms. An inflation of love, in which there'd be less for everybody else. I mean if you loved a lot of people, you'd have less love for the people who you really want to love very much. And the second thing he says is why should I love everyone if people don't deserve it? Then he goes on to say that there are some people who have managed by some kind of tremendous effort and some tremendous talent, like Saint Francis, to take pleasure in

loving rather than in being loved, but these people are so rare, and what they've managed to do is something that you can never see as a general concept for other people. So, in other words, Freud's model here is a model of scarcity, in which the more you use, the less you have. Indeed you can see in The Interpretation of Dreams, in Freud's first great work, his whole model of the id and the energies of man and the ego which is the reasoning part of the mind, is an economic model in which he even says that the ego is like the entrepreneur who must somehow persuade the id to give him capital ~~in~~ which he then invests in objects in the world. And it's a model in which there's just so much energy in the system, like money, in which the ego is the little entrepreneur who must persuade the id which controls all the energy to give him enough energy to put into some object, which is the person that he loves or some activity, on the basis that he'll get ~~a~~ ^{paid} ~~pay~~ ^{back}. So in other words, if ego fails, puts his capital into a person that doesn't love him back, he may never get capital again from the id. And it's interesting if we see more of how much psychology often reflects the economic models of the time, and in this sense Freud not only used a model of physics but a model of economics, and both, perhaps, use the same model of physics. The economics of the day may have had, as some people have pointed out, an indebtedness to the hydraulic physical model of the time.

Now, Fromm's point of view is very different. As I pointed out before, his viewpoint is based on an idea that human beings can live in a world of psychological abundance as well as in a world of scarcity, ~~I think~~ In Escape from Freedom he discusses this in quite a bit of detail, also he's concerned with a humanistic interpretation in terms of human experience, and also is much more concerned about the healthy individual than Freud was. Freud wrote, in effect, very little in the concepts such as psychology, of the concepts such as love and work, while Fromm spends a great deal more time and effort trying to develop the idea of what love is and what creative work is. For Fromm, and he wrote a little book called The Art of Loving in which he deals with this concept, that love involves an interest and a concern, not only in another person but for anything - a person can have a deep love and interest in work as well as in other people. And it's interesting - my experience has been, for example, I gave you a question on what is love in your own words which I haven't gone over yet but we will go over the answers, but I gave this question to about four hundred peasants in a Mexican village. Now these are people who certainly live in a world of scarcity, and yet you could see there were people who gave answers that were very much like those Freud would give, if you love one person you can't love another, and so forth, while other people gave answers very much like Fromm's would be. One woman answered the question, for example, what is love?, by

saying there are many kinds of love: there's love of children, love of animals, love of a husband, love of parents, love of God, love of plants, and then she said "Nothing will grow without love", because without interest an animal or a plant can't grow, can't live without love. And then she said "People can't live without love, they'll even commit suicide if they don't know how to love". And her final statement was that "God sends us love in the form of understanding." Now this was a woman who had no education whatsoever, she couldn't read or write, and yet her own experience was one of psychological abundance, and not scarcity, in which she saw very clearly how people lived too in this village. For them, love was interest and a creative feeling while for other people it was an illusion - one person said "Love is like wanting something very much and once you have it, you're no longer interested in it." Or one woman said, "Love is a feeling I have for those people who do things for me, I can't have it for anyone else." Or another woman said "Love is, what the men call love is the fact that they want the women, but what it really is is that the men are all live butterflies, and the women are like flowers, and the women have to guard their honey because the men want to go and suck it out of each flower." It's interesting how the people in this village really took the concept seriously, of love, and all their answers, whether they're Freudian or Frommian are very real - they're not alienated in the way that I was describing, they're not intellectualized, they're answers that are based on their own experience because it's something that concerns them. I wonder how many people in this society when asked what love was would give some answer that somebody told me, and not feel really worried about the question for themselves, what it means to love, or what love means to them, not just because it was a question on a questionnaire, but because this is a question of importance, as much important as what kind of parties you go to, for example. And I would doubt, really, that in this society there are many people that take the question what is love seriously as there are who take seriously the question what kind of car should I buy.

Now, when you consider the question of what is health, Freud is much more oriented to health in terms of adjustment to social reality. Again, there's ambiguity in Freud. And you'll see, in Civ. and etc., near the end of the book he says, well, it's possible that some societies may be neurotic and sick, but we can't deal with this question. Because if we dealt with this question, then we'd have to ask ourselves whether people who are neurotic, who are against society, are really neurotic at all. Maybe someday somebody will deal with that question - and he goes on. Now this is exactly the question that Fromm has dealt with, and it's interesting how, if you read Freud closely, he brings up absolutely everything. He

XXXXXXXX

against

brings up all the arguments ~~for~~ himself, but he never deals with them - but it's all there if you want to look closely. For Freud, because of his system, he had to see neurosis in terms of the person who refused to see reality, and he kind of makes the neurotic a person who refuses to accept society's prohibitions on sexuality. That's probably his fundamental definition of neurotic: somebody who really is a rebel in terms of sexual freedom. But it's a kind of futile rebellion, which leads to regression, which leads to the person going back to stages of infancy, and leads to him being completely unable to function in the society. Now Fromm is quite different on the view of what neurosis is. He would say that what Freud calls the sexual desires or that rebellion is the result of a conflict - though it's true, of course, that some people are in sexual rebellion, and rightly so - as Freud points out in Civ. etc., the society is very unjust in its sexual demands, there are some people for example who may be born with constitutionally homosexual tendencies, and the society by forcing these people to be heterosexual or to frustrate themselves entirely is being very unjust, from any human standpoint. Because if somebody is certainly born with certain kinds of sexual tendencies which are not the normal, there seems to be no human reason why these people should be forced into a certain pattern which fits the majority. But sexual rebellion, as Fromm points out, is not the only kind of rebellion that is important to human beings. Because somebody might rebel not only against the sexual prohibitions of the society, but also against its moral standards in general, against its values, against what it considers to be important. A person may be rebelling, for example, against the theory that he should sell his talents to the highest bidder rather than being what he wants to be, even though that implies a lower standard of living ~~and~~. These conflicts may become centered, for example, in a family, where the mother or father may take the standpoint that it's realistic for you to go on to medical school, for example, or it's realistic for you to go to work in this business, where the son feels that what he would really like to be is a writer, or an artist, or whatever. So that the conflict which is really a conflict of values becomes centered within a family, within a particular parent who comes to stand for the society.

Now, in these kinds of moral conflicts, the result is often that the person is unable to become conscious of the conflict, because, as I pointed out the other day, he may be frightened of the mother or the father, he may be frightened of what it might imply to resolve the conflict - people are such that very often, as long as you're unaware of what's going on, you all right, but if you become aware, for example, that your interest in the person over there is really an exploitative

one and that it's what you can get from him, it's much harder for you to keep on the relationship. As long as it's unconscious, you can tell yourself that it's all right, but if you make it conscious, then you feel that it's a moral problem and then you feel it's not so easy. But many people who are neurotics are people who don't want to be conscious of the fact that what they would really like to be is an artist, let's say, and who don't want to be conscious of the self betrayal in what they're really doing, so instead of becoming conscious they remain unconscious and have a symptom. And it may be a sexual symptom - I can think of one person who came to see me, a young college student, who was sexually impotent. And he wanted to talk about sex, he'd read a lot of Freud, but the dreams that he told me and talked about showed very clearly that he was two people - one person who wanted to conform and do what his mother wanted him to do and be dependent, and be in the group that he was brought up in, and another part of him was very radical, which was against all the values he had been brought up with, which meant rejecting his mother and father, and this scared him. And these two sides were in conflict. One dream which he had showed two boys walking along together, and one was very brave and did brave things, and one was very frightened and stood behind, and the one in front couldn't stand it any longer, and took a knife and killed the brave one. And when I asked the boy what his associations were, he said "Well, these two people are me." And it was very clear, in this case, that the sexual symptom was the symptom of a deep moral conflict between two sides of his nature.

In other words, it's very difficult to say that normality or health is adjustment to society, because the society itself may make such demands upon the real nature of the individual, it may in effect force the person to sacrifice himself, what he really wants to be, to such a degree that the neurotic, although he's neither one nor the other, he's really not a person who's taken a stand against the society, nor has he submitted, in some ways is healthier than the person who's normal, who's adjusted. Let me give you an example which is one that Fromm sometimes gives. Let's take a hypothetical society which is a cannibalistic society. And what these people do is they have a dance and then they go out and go to a neighboring tribe and kill people and eat them. Now let's take this one person in this tribe, let's call him Joe, who every time they get ready to go out, gets sick, and he vomits. Now, everybody in the society thinks he's very neurotic, because he's not adjusting, he doesn't like hunting, and he has a feeling in himself that he doesn't like eating people, which makes him a deviant and maladjusted. So they call in a cannibal psychiatrist, who talks to him. Now, if he were a Freudian psychiatrist, what would he say? He might say some-

thing like, "Well, Joe, when did this start? When did you start not liking to eat people?" And Joe would say, "Well, you know, when I was a little boy..." and the Freudian might say "Your father likes to eat people, doesn't he?" And he'd say "Yeah" and then the Freudian might say "So you don't like your father, you like to criticize him, you're a rebel, you don't like authority, Joe." And Joe would say, "Well, I guess...", and it would all come out that Joe really was a rebel and that he didn't like authority and didn't know how to be realistic, and that he should submit himself and enjoy eating people, and he might be cured. In effect, he might be cured in such a way that people who knew him before would say that in some ways he's duller, less creative, less interested in things, but still happier, he's not so disturbed, he doesn't vomit anymore - he's become a nice guy. Nobody has anything against him. Now, you see, the other alternative - by the way, there's a science fiction book written called Level Seven, which is about a society in which we have everybody in levels waiting for atomic war, and in the lowest level are the people who press the button to send the nuclear weapon to destroy the world. And in this story, there's one of the men on this level, they have an alert and he's supposed to press the button to destroy the world, and he gets a paralysis and can't press the button. And they call in a psychiatrist, who says that it's perfectly clear that he's always had a rebellion against authority, never adjusted well, and he keeps saying "But I don't want to destroy the world." And they say, "Well, that's a rationalization." Now, what's the alternative to this? The alternative would be that another kind of psychoanalyst might say to him "Yes, you really don't like to eat people. Now why not?" And it might turn out that he doesn't like to eat people because this is really against what he believes in, he has a deep feeling that it's not civilized, but to be aware of this he would have to ... Well, you shouldn't laugh about it, because it happens in societies, there have been primitive Indian societies, in which one figure, one chief has come along who was really opposed to the whole culture. There was one in one of the California tribes, I forgot his name, does anybody know?... Well, one in the Aztec civilization, Quetzalcoatl who was a great king who opposed human sacrifice, and really turned the whole society around, but was destroyed by the people - and you saw what happens to reformists, to Christ also, in the same sense - of somebody who really opposed the practices of a society and is destroyed because of it. In other words, it takes a lot of guts for somebody who opposes inhuman practices in a society to become conscious of it and to do something about it - which is why most people don't become conscious of it. Because as I can stay unconscious of the fact that things are going on around me which are inhuman, I don't feel such a moral conflict. But the minute I become

conscious of it, not doing anything about it makes me a coward, and I know it, and that's not so easy to take. And that's why most people stay unconscious about it. So if we take Joe in his cannibal society, it's easier for him to stay unconscious of the fact that he doesn't like eating people, and in effect it's much easier for him to accept the psychiatrist who tells him he's got a problem with his father, he's got a sexual problem. Which is why, in effect, a certain amount of Freudian analysis and psychiatry has become so popular in our culture today, because it takes people who are in conflict with the society, and tells them it has to do with sexuality or their childhood, and never forces them to think what they really think of ~~of~~ things going on around them, and it kind of adjusts them and makes them less interesting, but also more hep and more in tune with things, so that's why people are willing to pay forty or fifty dollars an hour to see a psychoanalyst.

In other words, psychiatry today often puts people to sleep rather than wakes them up, and tranquilizers certainly do this, and so does much of the kind of therapy which avoids bringing to consciousness immediate conflict between what I see, what I feel, and what I know to be the "realistic" thing to do. Now, if you recall in Harrington, he discusses the study done by Hollingshead and ~~Spick~~^{Spick}, on the relationship between psychiatry and the poor. Now, they point out when you read this book that psychiatrists usually think that poor people aren't good patients, and he points out in many ways how psychiatrists reject poor patients, or they just put them on drugs, they refuse to do psychotherapy with them, and the fact is that the poor people are often people who have a real gripe with society. They're not gonna take this kind of talk about problem with their father, they're not going to take this, that or the other thing, they don't talk in the same middle class language as the psychiatrist, and therefore the psychiatrist doesn't want anything to do with them - they're not good material to be made into the typical kind of successful person. In other words, what the psychiatrist often does in society, and by the way that's often what religion does too, is to support what the social character is in that society - what are the traits that are really the going currency of the society, what are the kind of character traits that you need to get along?

Now, that leads us into the question of what is character? Now, we could define character in two ways. One way would be a more abstract definition which you could say, the substitute of people for the animal instinct that human beings don't have - that would be one definition. In other words, what people learn - the learned motives, the learned ways of reaction that is a

substitute of human beings for what animals have in an instinctual sense - that's one definition. Another definition that's abstract would be the structuring of the motivational energy in a person, that's another definition which I think is an important one because if any one of you is ever interested in the study of character and psychoanalytic theory in detail, you'll see that there's a great deal in common with this kind of theory of character and structure of energy, and the kind of theory of, well, if you take for example, the structure of the forces in society, the structure of the economic forces, that you can see a relationship this way. Now if we look at character from another point of view, not from an abstract point of view but from a humanistic point of view, we can say that character can be called really the solution to life. Now, what does that mean - the solution to life? To start with, we should keep in mind that for many people, it's a problem, of what is the solution of life, or what is the meaning of life. Now both Fromm in Escape and Freud in Civ. discuss this. Freud discusses what is the meaning of life, and comes to the conclusion in one sense that for some people, really it isn't a question. For other people, it should be happiness. But he himself comes to the conclusion that the meaning of life is in the battle between the life instincts and the death instincts, and which will win., and that the meaning of life is civilization, and that each human being who wants to put his weight, in this battle, in effect, either in the side of life or the side of death. For Fromm, the problem of life is that each person must, in one way or another, solve the problem of how he's going to relate to people, how's he going to stay alive, how's he going to assimilate things, how's he going to relate to the economic reality he lives in in order to stay alive, and over all, how is he going to solve the problem he has, which is the problem of being a human being who has certain potentialities, a certain self, which he can develop or not, and at the same time, has a life which is short and in which he's going to die, and the whole thing, in one sense, is meaningless. In other words, each human being has an existential problem, all of us, that we have a possibility of developing our potentiality, our talents of our own selves, but at the same time we have an awareness that we're going to die. And this is a dichotomy or a question that each individual must resolve for himself.

Now, in fact, most people don't care about resolving these questions, they say to themselves why worry, what difference does it make, and they live their lives in a way in which these problems are resolved for them by the society. I think it's an illusion to think those problems aren't resolved, the problem of how you're going to relate to people and how you're going to assimilate things, whether you decide them or not,

are going to be decided for you, because they're not things that you make a decision on every time. In other words, nobody has such a mind like an IBM computer, that every time he meets a new person, he can decide for himself all the possibilities of how he's going to relate to this person and how he's going to react with him. What happens is, that the human brain is such, that it's always trying to limit the possibilities, and limit the work, and limit the amount of energy that we have to put into each task, in a way that early in life, there is a certain patterning of energy, a certain structuring of energy, so that we relate and assimilate in a certain manner. So that, for example, what Fromm talks about as the sado-masochistic character implies a certain mode of relating. Now, this may not be the mode of relating that a person relates on contact that's not very profound that's quite superficial, but it is the mode of relating in any relationship which is deep and profound., that's intimate.

Well, let me stop here just for a minute, because I think it would be a good thing about this first definition of character, before I go into some specific points about the relationship between character and poverty. Just to find out whether you understand what I'm talking about, or whether I can make it clear.

Boy: You said that the right society was one in which it might be possible for man, for the character of people that are in the society, but at the same time, am I correct in thinking that Fromm makes character a very important... makes it a point that character is shaped by the society, so when you have the emergence of character created by society and at the same time frustrated by society?

Macoby: I'm glad you brought that up because I would like to make the distinction between character and the whole personality., which is an important distinction, one that Fromm makes in detail in Man for Himself, which is on reserve for those of you who are interested. If we consider the whole human personality, this includes not only what's learned by people, but also temperament and constitutional factors such as intellectual capacity, talents, and so forth. Now temperament, for example, is something which is often confused with character, and wrongly so. Fromm points out that for Hippocrates, there were four basic types of character: the phlegmatic, the melancholic, the sanguine, and the choleric. Now these words today have meaning which are just based on one aspect of these characters. For example, we say that a choleric type of

person is a person who gets angry, or a melancholic person is a person who gets depressed, but in the sense that Hippocrates used these terms, they had both a positive and a negative side to them, so that a choleric type of person was a person who was quick to any type of emotion. Now as Fromm points out, people confuse this with character. In other words, you could find a person who's sadistic, and who is either melancholic, or choleric. Now a person who is sadistic, and quick to anger, and a person who's sadistic and rather slow and sad, have really no difference in their character traits, and from an ethical point of view, no difference in them. But from an aesthetic point of view, from the point of view of what you might like, you might find that a person who is jolly and sadistic you consider nicer than the person who is rather broody and sadistic who you think is nastier, when they're both exactly the same. Fromm gives the illustration of Goering and Goebels, and he says now here are two sadistic people - one is fat and visceratonic and the other is schizophrenic, and some people preferred Goering to Goebels because he seemed jollier, he was fatter, when in reality they both had the exact same types of character traits. So this is one thing that must be always separated, and people don't often do that, they confuse what is temperamental with what is characterological.

Another thing is the type of talents that a person has, which the society may not allow them. It's not just that a society doesn't allow a person to be a character trait, because as you rightfully put it, the society supports the character that a person has, what the social character a person has. It may not support the individual character that a person has, and we can make a distinction between the social character, and that part of society which is common to a group, a culture, or social class, and those aspects of character which are very individual, which may or may not be supported. But when we deal, for example, with constitutional tendencies such as the sexual tendency or artistic tendency, here a society may or may not support, temperamental, or talent, or certain aspects that they have. Also the society may force the character in such a pattern that it's humanly destructive. We see, for example, if you take different societies, we see different rates of alcoholism, different rates of suicide, different rates of mental illness - the fact is, in the United States, the rates of mental illness have been rising alarmingly. I think the fact is that one out of every ten beds in hospitals in the U.S. are filled with mental patients. Now, that's an index of a society which of often not taken into account. At the same time that a machine runs smoothly, what are the victims of the machine, what is the result of this society, what does the society do to its deviants? In primitive societies, there is often a very strict social char-

acter, with very little deviance allowed, and yet there's often a role for a deviant, which is set up by the society. For example, the Sioux, which is a people that demanded, and I'll talk a little more about the Sioux in relation to laziness, the Sioux is a society which demanded men who were very brave, and very masculine, and took great risks, and yet for those men who were effeminate, there was a role in the society called the burdatch (?) which, it was a man who would dress in skirts, and who might or who might not be a homosexual, and who had a kind of a priestly role, and an emotional role in society, which was very important and had some respect. This often happens in primitive societies, that although the social character defined may be narrow, there are certain roles for deviants which are accepted and which are respected. Does that answer your question?

Boy: How does character relate to personality?

Macoby: Well, character is a part - you take personality as the larger concept. Personality includes, let's say temperament, habit, and character.

some staff?

Another boy: I really have three questions, but they're all inter-related so ... The first is, where do Freud and Fromm derive their data, their evidence for their conclusions? That is, are they scientists, artists, do they invent, is it some combination of the two? What justifies their conclusions, that's first. The second, on what basis do you justify that Freudian psychology which is only mechanical is wrong, and that the Frommian psychiatrist was right You implied that. And following from that, why are the psychiatrists and the religionists wrong when they give out aspirins in the form of psychiatry to the poor, and say adjust to society - you can begin with why they're wrong instead of right, as again you seemed to imply. And I suppose there's a fourth question, is it psychiatrists who are additional... or is it sociology (?? rest unintelligible)

Macoby: Now the first which is on what basis are these things studied? Freud's basis was the study of neurotics, and Freud in effect said "My conclusions are based on either truth or falsity, my theories are based on the fact that I can cure people and other people can't." Now I don't think that's a very valid way of judging a scientific theory, and, if you go deeper into it, Freud that the scientific (also said that) method of psychoanalysis was also to be able to form a kind of logical structure which would account for the facts. Now, this is different from what the academic psychological theory of science, which is, like the early physics, one should have a

theory, an hypothesis set up the experiment with a test and a control group, and prove it or disprove it, Which even in physics today is no longer considered a scientific method. And I think we would have to go into a great deal deeper discussion, discuss really the proof or disproof on which it's based. But let me say that these theories are ideas which are constantly tested therapeutically with patients, and constantly tested in the form of case histories, of whether they're consistent, of whether they take account of the behavior of somebody who's ill, and whether they work in the sense of curing him, making him conscious. And psychoanalysis in my mind, its major purpose, is as an investigation tool - I don't think you could justify psychoanalysis on the basis that it helps people, because it helps so few people, so few people can afford it, there are so few psychoanalysts and even of those who are in psychoanalysis, so few are helped, so that as a therapeutic tool there is no payoff. But as an investigative method, it has great payoff, because it allows somebody to know very deeply what's going on in another human being, to analyze symbols and dreams, in a way which scientifically, which borrows a great deal from the humanities, for example, the study of symbols in dreams, folklore, and literature, but whose ultimate criterion and truth is whether you can make a theoretical model and understanding which fits the facts and is really internally consistent. And this is, I think in this sense, very similar to modern day physics.

Now, the second question was why is the Frommian psychiatrist right and the Freudian wrong, with the cannibal. I didn't say they were right or wrong, I tried to point out what the results would be, of each one. Now, I'm willing to discuss at any lengths the question of whether I'm right or wrong or what the results would be, and I leave it to you which you would prefer, because I can see very clearly that some people believe morally not to rock the boat, to have people tranquilized, they would feel that it's too dangerous for people to be aware of conflicts that mean rebellion, they could take positions which even would have some support from Civ etc. which is that aggressive impulses in man are so strong that he better be tranquilized, ~~xxx~~, or they could take the position of the Grand Inquisitor in The Brothers Karamazov, which is that human beings really can know only so much at this moment and it's better that they don't know too much, and it's better that they be given lies, that they must be treated like children by the leaders, those who know the bitter truth, who hold a tremendous burden and guilt, but must take that responsibility of power, knowing that all power is corrupting, and knowing that all power is destroying, take the responsibility on themselves in order to protect the children and people from themselves. And

I certainly think that's a position that you might find yourself taking, and might want to take. The other position is that, in the long run, civilization is consciousness and man develops by those people that are aware of everything, and who have courage to point out the truth, and to build a system on truth rather than on lies, and in the final analysis that the truth will only help man to be more related to other people, that it's connected, that truth and relatedness and love are somehow connected rather than different, and that only in this way of being aware is it possible to have a society in which man will not be destructive and destroy himself. Because it's just these lies, just this attitude of paternalism, which in the end stimulates their destructiveness underneath, and makes them unknowingly want to destroy the whole system and themselves.

I think these two positions both have power, and they both have some very respectful respectable people and deep thinkers who have written about it and have taken one position or the other. It's perfectly clear I take the second position. I think that lies are very dangerous, and to repress the truth and to tranquilize is the most dangerous thing imaginable, because it's like putting people at the wheel of a huge powerful car and they're asleep, and that the idea that people can be run by leaders and who are responsible and take the weight on their shoulders is an illusion made by such leaders who are power mad - that's my own position. But I think this is a question that can be debated, and should be so.

Sister Marie: Could I just push that a little further? In the example that you gave of the cannibal, the indication was that not only that it wouldn't bother him any more, but that he would go on eating people. And you've already defined health in Fromm's terms as loving, and having a relationship to one's work. Now the indication here of Fromm, that shows the ... between Freud and Fromm, was that with Fromm it was the case of not just an imitation to feel better ..., it is the case of abundance. Therefore, if there are more people around, to try to build a healthy society would be eating them, destroying the potential object of your (work?) And I think it's ... in the kind of sense that we share the value, that why people have potential love even and a better kind of world to live in, then ~~(xxxxxx)~~ people. But then you may not be inclined, in modern economic theory, that if you eat people who are in the next tribe, then this conflict, this battle, of group against group will continue for a long time and you have to use ... in destroying you neighbor, and this was deducted from the creativity of building up your own tribe. So it is certainly ... true that eating people in the next tribe, you're taking the health of

work and love, (when you ?) say Erich Fromm's good.

Macoby: Now just wait a minute now. (laughter) I would go further and say that from Fromm's point of view it's very clear that the love of life itself is one of the aspects of health and love. And I would say that the proof of this is not in just that these are good things, not just that it's not good to eat people, or eating people's bad, or it's nice to love people. I tried to make the point also, that from the point of view of the individual's whole self, that a person who adjusts in a way to a society which is against life, or against his developing his own potentials, is a person who becomes more depressed, more prone to alcoholism, more alienated, less happy, less alive. Now this is an empirical question. This is my experience as a psychoanalyst, the experience of my colleagues, this was Freud's experience, that a person who repressed too much of the sexual side of life, which Freud felt was a lot of life, was a person who would be found in a sense, depressed, without the ability to do many other things, and in the sense of mental health, any criteria of mental health that you can name, was a person who would be sick.

Mr. Dowd: I think that one of your problems, Dr. Macoby, is that you meet many people who are not with it. In order to make decisions, you have to (meet people? Beat people etc?) - that's what I raised my hand to speak on. You raised another question for this course that is also a very important one. That is, is it sociology or sociologists, religion or religionists? (Macoby: Very good question). I'd like to say a word about that.

I think that one contribution that social science can make to understand society is to understand, is to state (?), say, that if there are disciplines, whether the social science discipline, if there are organized activities that have to do with thought and attitude, church activities, psychiatric activities and so on, it would be, in socially scientific terms, implausible to believe that the disciplines themselves would be disruptive in society. It would be equally implausible to believe that all those, all those, who are trained in discipline, whether priests, or professors, or psychiatrists, that all those would function, so to speak, in the socially conservative terms that all discipline as such function in. That the mere fact that the change could take place, the mere fact that awareness, so to speak, would be tuned and ..., would mean that some people probably think this is an important question, and I certainly don't ..., some people for psychiatric reasons, would be found rebels within their own disci-

pline, but couldn't be unless their disciplines existed.

Macoby: Yeah, I would like to answer that by going on to discuss character, because it runs into the whole question of social character.

The question leads into the point that, in a sense Fromm's position on social character, as distinct from Freud's, Freud's position was that a character is formed due to particular kinds of fixations or frustration and periods of psychosexual development. And in his paper in 1908 on the anal character, he discussed how the traits, the character traits of parsimony and orderliness come from a kind of reaction formation of a person who would like to play with his feces. And he goes on to talk about how in a society money and excrement are really the same things, and so forth. Now, Fromm's point of view of character development - just as he would say that the psychosexual aspects are expressive forms of character, which are formed by society, which trains people in effect to want to do what pays off for them in that society. So in Fromm's sense, the essential basis of character is an economic basis. From here, you get social character, and social character leads to ideas and ideology. However, he would point out that ideas themselves can eat back on the economic basis or on social character. So that is one system. Now, what does this mean? Fromm would say, for example, that you can see in different societies or in different historical periods the development of character traits or character syndromes, social character, that fit that society and lead to a form of thought which supports the character. He rejects the idea, for example, that people's ideas are just made to support the economic system. In other words, he rejects the idea that economic systems lead to rationalizations that support that system. Rather, he points out, economic systems produce the character, which says things which satisfies the individual - that this does not go directly from economics to the ideas, as a kind of simple-minded Marxist would say. You wouldn't say that, would you?

Mr. Dowd: Well, I'm simple-minded but not a Marxist.

Macoby: Now, for example, in the nineteenth century in the United States, where the system supported a capitalism which was much more real than the capitalism described by Mr. Dowd in the society today, which still has some of the ideology of that 19th century capitalism without its reality, the kinds of traits that were necessary included saving and included the ability to take risks, but also this kind of worldliness in parsimony and so therefore people talked in terms of "Cleanliness is next to Godliness", and all kinds of ways which today

would be very square. And also, they acted in such a way so that the kind of person who saved things, who didn't spend much, was considered a good person. And people said "Now look at Mr. Jones, or look at our neighbors - they don't spend anything, they save a lot of money." Now today it's the opposite - it's "Look what the Joneses have, look what they're buying", and the person who buys a lot - the kind of character traits that are supported by our society is consumption and those of the marketing character rather than these traits of early capitalism.

Now, the study that I've done in Mexico with Fromm, among peasants, shows very clearly that the kind of traits that make a successful peasant are the character traits of the hoarding, productive individual. Let me make a note here that what Fromm means by work is productive work. He makes a distinction between character traits in the mode of assimilation, which are unproductive, which are basically those of scarcity, which are receptive, exploitative traits or marketing personality, which I'll explain slightly, versus the productive individual who creates. (jokes about the dog in classroom)

Boy: I don't really understand neurotic, in respect to the cannibal ... with the witchdoctor ... open end. You wouldn't let these other people ..?

Macoby: No no, what I said was that he would help him to make conscious the conflict. See, this person's not conscious that he doesn't like eating people, the only thing is he vomits. He would say "I like to eat people, I'm just like the rest of you guys." Let's take an illustration in our society - the movie Football that you saw the other day. Now there what kind of character trait is the man who is going to play and do a thing like that, play on a football team like that - to take that kind of talk that the coach gives him, who will want to bang up against other people, and carry the football and take a great joy in scoring and jump up and down among his friends - now those aren't character traits that belong to everybody in the world - there are many people in the world who think those are crazy. You could show that to some societies and people would say "What are they doing?"

Girl: How would you draw the line between a person who would be insane and frustrated - in the societies, you know, did they have them ... who were frustrated to (remain?) insane? What's the difference between a person who would be frustrated - if you said a homosexual would be accepted in society, but in

Mr. Dowd: I think it would be interesting for the class to know that the same time Freud was beginning to develop this theory, Veblen, and I'm not being facetious when I say this, Thorstein Veblen whose writing ... a book called The Theory of the Leisure Class that antedated Fromm. (who was writing in 1899 - above) That is to say, Veblen was writing along lines of constructiveness and destructiveness, thinking as an economist and what we would call today a sociologist. His instinct of workmanship, for example, is the counterpart of love and work, and ...

Macoby: That was productiveness, right?

Mr. Dowd: Yeah, productiveness, and he distinguishes between people who are exploited, and so on and so on - there is a real parallel all the way through. And it's really quite interesting that this would have developed at that time. Another thing, that you know very well, Veblen himself was in the tradition of Marx, and Fromm, in his Marx's Concept of Man, of course, is going back to early Marx, who is speaking in psychological terms, productive terms rather than economic. And you find the sharper social character and economic basis you will find in Marx, although neither of them had the advantage of Fromm's psychology and Fromm's research.

Macoby: Well, I would have put Veblen in this course but I knew that you would object to it. (laughter)

I think in the end of this lecture I'd like to bring in a question such as that of Bateson's (?), that is, how would you approach the problem, the question, hypothesis that many of you have made: the poor are poor because they're lazy. From a psychological point of view, how would you begin to study, from a point of character, what laziness is, first of all, and its relationship to a certain group? Now the first thing I think we must point out is that laziness is not a character trait. From a clinical point of view, from all study, from an anthropological point of view, laziness is the result, is a symptom. Laziness is like alcoholism - it's an illness. You don't find, for example, little children who are lazy, unless they are suffering from malnutrition, depression, terrible conflict, and that's true in adults too. Now, if you find someone who is lazy, the question you should ask yourself first is what's really going on in the character to produce this symptom? Now, psychologically, there are a number of possibilities. One is, that the person has a deep conflict, and that it's caused, in a sense, it's tied up all his energy, this conflict, he can't do anything, and the result is this feeling of inertia, just lack of energy - a conflict of any sort, a conflict

of a value versus submission, let's say. And the result of this conflict is intense. For example, this cannibal illustration might have been a very lazy man, because the conflict was so great that he could do neither one thing nor another. So that's one kind of conflict. Another underlying cause of laziness may be depression. Now depression is probably one of the most destructive and widespread diseases in society. I think depression is probably the least understood and one of the most devastating diseases known to man.

Boy: Isn't depression a state of mind, a mood, usually caused by direct results? For example, if you do something and come away unhappy afterwards, that would put you into depression, as compared to happiness.

Macoby: Well, that's a good question. Let me make the distinction immediately between unhappiness and depression - they're not the same thing. Unhappiness is feeling - it terms what I was talking about, unintellectualized real unalienated feeling. Unhappiness is really feeling something deeply. A person can be unhappy when he's not depressed. I don't know if any of you have been both unhappy and depressed - you know what I'm talking about. To be unhappy is to feel something deeply - you may cry, you may feel tremendous sadness. But rather, but it's the opposite of depression, because depression is the lack of any feeling - depression is the state in which you feel nothing, there's a total lethargy, life isn't worth living, there's a total lack of hope, while in sadness or unhappiness, it's the opposite - you feel like doing something, you feel alive much more so. One trouble with many people who are depressed is that they're unwilling to feel the sadness or unhappiness that they're repressing, that they would have to feel if they weren't going to be depressed.

Boy: ... but I can't understand neurotic, but I got some relationship between neurotics being able to change society and temper social ...

Macoby: No, they're not people who change society, they're people who can be neither one thing nor the other. Let's take somebody, for example, who's ambitious and at the same time has high values. One side of him wants to have power, and to push people around. He knows that to have power, it demands certain sacrifices - you can't be nice to people, you can't be a good guy. He's aware of that. The other side of him has very high values - he went to Sunday school, he feels bad, he'd like to be loving, he'd like to be a good guy. But he

both of these things take real determination, take courage, take risk - if he takes the risk of living for power, he could take the risk of being stepped on by other people who are also out for power, and rubbed out, and he's gotta be really tough. If he takes the risk of trying to be himself, to be loving, he takes the risk of not being a success, not having as much as he wants. Both of these things take courage, and he can decide on either one.

Boy: You say they're both ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ not healthy?

Macoby: No, I say they're ~~not healthy~~ but somebody can, say, who just submits, for example, to a job, which is like the cannibal, where he sells himself out, where he does what's asked for, with the result of a kind of mild depression, of a lack of any joy in life, a sense of on-your-knees, a sense of defeat. I say that from a humanistic point of view. I say that the person is still in conflict, he has not resolved his conflict.

Miss Joseph: In speaking of a laziness, how about learned laziness?

Macoby: Yeah, you can talk about that too. For example, you can take one kind of laziness, a Negro in the South, for example, was taught to be lazy. He was rewarded for being lazy, because for the Southern slave owners, if he had been a really alert alive Southern Negro he was a threat. So you get illustrations - someone was telling me about a very distinguished Negro college president today, who still, whenever he talks to a white man, says his head itches. Why is that? Because he was brought up in the South, where he was taught whenever you talk to white men, you kind of scratch your head like this. Submissive. And even though he's completely left that system, when he's talking to a white man his head still itches, as a conditioned reflex left over of this learned submission.

Woman: Is it necessarily true that if people lived better, the poor as you say, they would relate to each other better? Like Doestoyevsky, you mentioned, doesn't think so, that people would get along better if they knew that...

Macoby: Is that true, @gene?

Mr. Leichtenstein: You say that Doestoyevsky says that if people were able to confront the truth, they would get along

better. Which book are you talking about? You talking about

Woman: Well, yes, but also in most ones he wrote.

Mr. L: Well, I think that's true. I mean I think those were Doestoyevsky's ideas, and I think that ~~Buzhkin~~(?) more than Doestoyevsky - I mean, you have it right in front of you. One of the ... about love, ..., work, seem to me to be value judgments and not facts - and maybe good value judgments, but maybe not, and I don't think you can say...

Macoby: Well, all I can say now is ~~to go~~ into detail in the cases and prove ~~this~~ is something that can't be done right now. What I can say is I don't think they're value judgments. They're something that I, fit in from experience, and I didn't believe before, because I come out of the same society you do, in which these are value judgments. But also I can say that there is no proof, that is worth anything, which is based on alienated truths, on statistics or this or that or the other thing - we wouldn't convince anybody. But if you experience yourself what it means to become aware of something, in yourself and another person, and have an experience what it means relatedness, then it's gonna be convincing. And if you don't have that experience, it 's never going to be convincing, no matter how many papers and proofs and so forth are made. I think this is the central point I want to make right now. Now we're not going to solve the world's problems in the psychology part of an introductory course on poverty. But I do hope to give you an idea of what it takes, what you have to go through, in order to decide a problem one way or the other. The reason I've been going into the problem of alienated versus unalienated thought, or intellectualized versus real thought, is to say to you I don't think you'll ever be convinced one way or the other unless you are so interested in this that you will want to find out, and you want to find out by feeling it. Because if you have the attitude that well, it's an interesting question -if somebody gives me a book that has statistics one way or the other, maybe I'll agree with him, maybe I won't - this is like an opinion poll, and this is where the society has set us up so that knowledge is like an opinion poll - if people agree, then it's knowledge, if people don't agree, then it's not knowledge.

Boy: Doestoyevsky is writing not out of some data, but out of experience, not the same kind of methodological experience that you're referring to, but experience and insight.

Woman and man who I called last boy in 22 have unintelligible discussion up to

Man: Does the awareness of truth, does being open to truth, necessarily make it one of the "Are you able to live", more effective... And the counterevidence is Doestoyevsky in "The Grand Inquisitor" in the Brothers K.

Macoby: No, but the Grand Inquisitor is the story of a ^{man} guy within the Grand Inquisitor, which is the position that Doestoyevsky obviously doesn't accept.

Man:; And, he says, Doestoyevsky says this is not necessarily true, and you wouldn't have to say Doestoyevsky alone, you could say a great many other artists and writers who are saying that the truth, perhaps, on some basis, is too painful, and anyway, it doesn't necessarily lead to ...

Sister Marie: Could I just respond to that. What we're really testing is something like the Platonic statement that you can (admit?) truth... may not be true... Which could, in the history of the world, experientially, may not yet have had an adequate environment in which to develop this hypothesis. So that when Doestoyevsky raises the question can a person compete with things too and still stand together, that's a myth, just with the question of which culture ... given the situation of culture at that time, and the whole way you come to grips with a person, the problem as I see it if you want to develop some human... So it's still an open question today and I'm pretty sure what Fromm is doing is trying to experiment with something...

Macoby: Could I just make a suggestion that we deal with this question in section, keeping in mind that this is a question with two very powerful sides. In one side is all humanistic religion - on the side, truth does lead to more love and more productiveness, and more relatedness. This is true of Jesus, this is true of (the) Buddha, is the whole central part of Zen Buddhism and Christianity and Judaism: the Bible says "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Now this is one position. There's another position which is that truth just gets in the way of relations, people need illusions about each other, many patients say to me, "you take away my illusions, life wouldn't be worth living. "Now," I need my to get along - where would I be without my illusions?" This is a theme that Tennessee Williams writes, very often. I'd just like to finish this discussion of laziness, and how to approach that subject.

I've suggested that laziness may be the result of conflict, it may be the result of depression, it may be the result

people who in their strivings, the society does not allow them to do the kind of work or the kind of activity that would make them happy. And so the result is they will do nothing. Now this, anthropologically, can be seen in two cases, perhaps others. One is the case of the Siouian Indian, the other is the case of the Benda. Both these groups are tribes, cultures, in which men felt proud and happy because they constantly made war. In both these cultures, when they were cut off from the possibility of hunting and making war, they people became "lazy", and many people went out to them and said "Look! These people are lazy", "they won't do anything, we give them land and they won't farm it." In reality, these were cultures in which there was a depression, such a depression for example, in the Benda, that they refused to eat food that was right there - it wasn't a case of being lazy. These people were so cut off from their characteristic ways of enjoying life that they went into a wide depression. Now, this is true also of children, who are so lazy in school, let's say - who can't stand the system of constraint and of punishment and end up really in rebellion, which looks like laziness, a kind of passive rebellion. You could see, for example, in experiments such as Summerhill, where they have - how many of you know about Summerhill?

Well, Summerhill is a school run by a man named Neal who's a very remarkable individual who has a school in which every child can do whatever he wants. Nobody has to go to school, none of the children have to work; nobody has to do anything, the only kind of laws - the students themselves have committees which if somebody does a destructive thing they punish him for it or I don't know what they do.

Boy: They have strong property rights, in other words of standing among students...

Macoby: The kids protect their rights. Now, Neal has found some children who after a number of years of not going to school, suddenly decide they want to learn, and in one year make up all the material necessary to get to Oxford or Cambridge. This has happened. Now, this says a great deal about the system of going through all these grades, which is a (mythology?), and it says a great deal about what we think laziness is. Because here are kids who look lazy to everybody - everybody says this was a lazy kid, while in reality this was a kid who had been knocked down, beaten down, so furious and angry inside that he couldn't do anything. And very often people who look lazy are just furious. Laziness and passivity - my experience most often is in this society, is a passivity covering a fury and a hatred that would explode... I can think

of one case, where a patient of mine who was always very lazy, always passive, for the first time, the first time he really wanted to do anything, said "I want to pick up my mother and I want to throw her through a plate glass window."

Mr. Dowd: May I just make one comment on ... I agree with the kinds of comments about alienated knowledge, the necessity for experience and involvement in a situation in order to have any meaningful ... But I think that it's also important for people to understand in a course like this that there are some kinds of knowledge, which, although they might be classified as alienated knowledge, or either useful in becoming knowing in the real sense, or necessary in some cases to spur people, to move (over?) to nonalienated knowledge. For example, in this course, when the students are trying to get some kind of grip on the nature of poverty in various ways in this society, one thing that they ought to know is that factors, the economic factors, for example, which is the statistical... Now I agree very much with you - that isn't enough, but it is a necessary condition, but not a sufficient condition for the students to have a grasp on some alienated knowledge which is statistical, some alienated knowledge which is theoretical. I think you've got to explain that only, that's always useless...

Macoby: Well, I certainly agree with you, and I think that's a great danger always, for students coming to a new position to kind of take it in a radical way, and also in a way which I don't think is realistic. I would say even more in agreeing with what Mr. Dowd says, that one can know these facts in psychology and sociology and economics and also political science in a way which is alienated or in a way which has deep interest. That's the real key. In other words, it's important to know the facts to come to any sort of conclusion about things like this. One thing is to feel the truth and the relationship between the truth and love and productiveness. That's one area of life - or the relationship between laziness and conflict. But if one wants to talk of a large scale problem, or even now, for example, of where laziness exists, in which parts of the country, in which people, what are the conflicts that these people go through, what is it, social character - you have to do the kind of social study, for example, we've been doing in Mexico for six years, in which you study each individual and get statistics and see the relationships. But you have to do this in a way of interest. What I'm saying, is that alienated knowledge is a kind of knowledge where you really don't care, where what you're doing is saying "Well, show me". Now, this is my opinion. And instead of looking at something with interest and saying "I really want to know what's going on here"... Also contrast this

to the attitude that some of you have, which is the attitude of prosecuting attorney rather than scientist, which is also in one sense alienated, and that 's the attitude of saying "I'm gonna find the facts that are true", or "I'm going to find the facts to disprove him", or "I'm gonna get my theory". Now this is also in a sense alienated, because the theory in a sense doesn't belong to anybody - nobody owns a theory, no one owns a conclusion, no one owns a point of view. There is something that's true - if it's true it belongs to everybody, and to know it, to really make it yours, you have to win it. It's like a love affair - to really make knowledge yours you have to love in a certain way, have an interest, a relatedness with that knowledge that is just like a relatedness with a person. You have to really have interest in knowing the answer to a question, really want to know it, and it would really make a difference to you whether you know it or not - otherwise, it just doesn't matter whether you're talking about psychology or economics or anything else whatever you learn is going to be something that's on the top of your head and doesn't make any difference - it's like an opinion. And if you take somebody's point of view today, you'll take another one's point of view tomorrow - whoever is more convincing or whoever feeds you better or whoever is more attractive, because nothing you learn will be yours, but by your own interest and your own work.

