

Michael Macoby
Psychoanalyst

BIBLIOTECA
EL COLEGIO DE MEXICO

Before I begin to lecture, I think it would be useful for you to know a little about me - what I do. Now as you've heard, I'm a psychoanalyst. I was trained as a social psychologist, at Harvard, and then I went to Mexico to study with Erich Fromm and was graduated as a psychoanalyst from the Instituto of the National University of Mexico. And I've been living in Mexico for six years, doing a study with Fromm on a peasant village, in which we've been trying to study the relationship between the work and social problems such as violence and alcoholism of the peasants, and their character structure. And I'll tell you something about those studies in another lecture, because they're very relevant to the problems we're dealing with: the kind of poverty that we see in a Mexican village I think is even more extreme than the worst poverty in the United States. I also work as a psychoanalyst, mainly with Mexican patients, and also some Americans.

Now, as we try to deal with the question of the course in psychological terms, we can begin by asking what are the psychological questions that come to mind when you ask "Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?" And in many of the answers that you've given, it's perfectly clear that you look immediately for psychological answers to these questions. And the questions that come up are questions such as these: Are people poor because they are lazy? Are people who get rich more intelligent? Do they have more drive? Do they somehow have charactertraits that are different from those of poor people? Are the poor unhappy - perhaps they want to be poor? Going further, here are psychological questions that come up such as this: would solutions to the problem of poverty, which involved the government, would these have an adverse effect on the character of people, on their psychology? Somebody might argue - well, you know, we could solve the problem of poverty by giving everybody a guaranteed income, but this would have a terrible result on everyone else's motivation - nobody would work hard. All these kinds of statements assume tremendous amounts of psychological ideas about why people act, what their motives are, what makes them do things, why they don't do things, and it's perfectly clear when some of you write these remarks that you're making a great number of assumptions about human nature, and why people act as they do, without really examining them. But it's very possible that to answer these questions, we have to know

a great deal more about psychology. For example, it is possible that the same system which produces poverty also is the optimal condition for producing people with initiative, who are self-reliant, and that any system which got rid of poverty would also get rid of self-reliance and initiative. That's a possibility. How do you decide whether it's true or false? How do you decide whether people who are poor are poor because they're lazy, or because they have character traits which make them poor? In other words, psychological questions are questions which have to do with the motives and feelings of people.

And I think all these problems are intimately related to the economic system, and that's something that we're going to have to see as we discuss more psychological questions. The motives are developed in a way in which people learn to behave and learn to want things to help them stay alive. And what allows a person to survive, what allows a person to stay alive, depends a great deal on the economic system he finds himself in. Now you'll see Fromm discuss that in the reading, so I think we can go into it even more.

Now how do we study motives and feelings? First of all, we have to make a very important distinction between studying motives and feelings and studying behavior. Because much of psychology has tried to study behavior and tried to build a theory around behavior and has said in effect that it really isn't important whether you study motives and feelings. Now the fallacy in this is that really behavior doesn't make sense unless you know what the motives are behind it. Let's take, for example, an act of bravery. Well, that act might be motivated out of a deep conviction, self sacrifice. On the other hand, it might be motivated out of ambition. On the other hand, it might be motivated out of fear? How do you know the difference? It might look like the same act. And yet, unless you know what the motive of the act is, you can't predict what that person will do in another situation. For example, a person who is brave out of ambitions, obviously is not going to be brave when there's nobody around who could tell anybody about him and give him a medal. The same thing is true of acts of self affirmation, against oppression, for example. Somebody might act this way out of rebellion; another person might act this way out of a really destructive nihilism- he hates everybody; and another person might act this way out of a sense of conviction and an idea of a better world. How do you know the difference? You look at some leader who gets up and says, we've gotta change this and do away with this and so on - how do you know he's not a destructive person who just is against anybody in authority? How do you know the difference between Thomas Jefferson and a destructive rebel?

Both of them were against authority.

Well, these are questions that demand an understanding of what it is that motivates people, and fundamentally it demands an understanding of character. Now, this is very difficult, and it's one of the things that everybody thinks he's an expert at, as is very clear from reading your papers. Just the way that before Copernicus, everybody thought that he was an expert in astronomy, everybody was sure that the sun moved around the earth, and if somebody were to tell him it wasn't true, he would have thought he was crazy. Before Freud discovered psychoanalysis and unconscious motivation, everybody was sure that he knew just what was going on in his own mind, and other people are still sure of it. As Freud said himself, there are three discoveries that really upset the human race. The first one was the discovery that the sun didn't go around the earth, which was incredibly upsetting to everybody. The second one was Darwin's discovery that men were descended from animals, and that there was a process of evolution, and that man was not created as a special being by God, and that was the second blast to humanity's self esteem. And the third blast was Freud's, where he said people didn't even know what was going on in their own heads. And I must say that that's one of the most difficult things for a student to learn, and I must say that in my experience even psychoanalysts have a difficult time learning it. Because there are so many ways of getting around the fact of how much that goes on in us is unconscious.

There's one kind of illustration that's often very dramatic. You could take somebody and hypnotize him, and say to him - "When you wake up from this state, you're going to close the window." And the person will wake up, and he'll go and close the window. And then ask him - "Why did you close that window?" And he will invariably say "Because I thought it was too cold in here", or "I thought people would appreciate it" - any kind of reason other than the real reason, which was that he was told to do so. And I would doubt that any of us are aware how much of our behavior is exactly that, all the time - exactly post-hypnotic suggestion, which are rationalized as "I thought it was too cool in here", or "I thought other people would appreciate it". But really in effect, it's hypnotism. Cause the problem of hypnotism is really the process of repetition, of somebody who has a certain authority, has a certain level of competence, repeating something. And when we go into the study of socialization process, I'll talk more about how much the way parents bring up children is hypnotism, brainwashing, how similar it is to what the Chinese do, how often what a parent does is just repeat and repeat and repeat add repeat the same thing. And ~~then~~ we see

the results of this in persons who are very neurotic. For example, take a girl who hates men. (laughter) Does that sound strange to you? I hope so. And, as she begins to think back, what she discovers is, very often, that she had a mother who just said that anything that was wrong - "Well, that's what the men did", "Your father did that", "That's a fault of you father's, a fault of men", "Can't trust any man." And it's repeated and repeated and repeated and repeated and repeated, until this becomes a basic belief of this girl. And really, it has nothing to do with her own experiences. I'll talk more about this in a moment.

But before I do I think it would be useful for you to have some idea of the origin of the psychoanalytic method, because the psychoanalytic method, and dynamic psychology, is really the first psychology which has studied motives and feelings. Before this, psychology was mainly an academic subject: people like Helmholtz, who studied the relationship between sensation and stimulus such as a tone or a color, and who produced graphs showing the relationship between ... psychophysics, really. The other kind of psychology which is behavioristic as I was saying never gets into the question of what's the motive behind the behavior but looks at the behavior itself. Psychoanalysis is the first time that psychology had been a science in the sense of looking at the underlying forces that determine behavior. And in doing so, as I've been indicating and will say more about, it has been forced to come to grips with a difficulty of people in becoming aware of things that are difficult to become aware of. In other words, unlike other sciences, psychoanalysis has the problem of becoming aware of painful things - the mere process itself demands an attitude in people and demands a maturity in people which is very difficult, and has to go against the fact that most people think they know a great deal about psychology when they really know nothing at all. And I would add another thing, that the process of learning about psychology is not the process of learning a great number of facts - that's a misleading process. ~~XXXXX~~ The process is learning things really deeply. Now that's an idea very far, especially for most people in this society to grasp - that you know something, but you can know it much better - not something else, but that you can know the same thing more and more and more deeply. Now I don't know of any other subject in which that's true, with the exception of religious and philosophical thought. For example, I have read the book Escape from Freedom which all of you are supposed to have read, about four times. Every time I read that book it's as though I read it for the first time, and I discover something new about it. And I see something that I thought I knew before, and I say I didn't really know that before. And yet, the time before I thought I knew it. Now this demands an

attitude of both being able to stand the fact, it's kind of vivid, that you don't know anything that you think you know, and at the same time wanting to learn it more and more. And it's a very difficult attitude, hard to describe - in some ways, it's as hard to describe as it would be to describe passion and love to a five year old, to somebody who's sure he knows.

But before I begin to discuss the problem of knowledge, in more detail and in its relationship to poverty, let me just give you a little history of psychoanalysis and of Freud. Now Freud's original training was as a physiologist: as a matter of fact he did some very interesting work on neurophysiology before he became a practicing psychiatrist. He came very close to inventing or discovering the use of cocaine as an anesthetic for eye operations, and made some rather important discoveries in neurophysiology. He left neurophysiology because he couldn't make a living from it in the Vienna of his time, and became a practicing psychiatrist. He studied with Charcot (?), a French psychiatrist who was the leading psychiatrist of his day and who used hypnotism. And Freud, as he began psychiatry, began to use hypnotism as a method, and he discovered that by hypnotizing people you could also discover memories and ideas that had been, that they were not aware of in a waking state, and you could help them to resolve conflicts that had to do with repressed ideas. However, Freud gave up hypnotism, because he felt that a patient who was cured through hypnotism became very dependent on the person who was curing him, and that this was a relationship in which there was a constant need for the doctor to keep on helping the patient, and it didn't make the patient free. There's a theme throughout Freud's work, which is very important, which is the theme of people becoming free by becoming aware. And I think that any criticism that one might have of some of Freud's conclusions and some of the things he says, which I do and which I'll tell you about, there's one thing that's central and that's one of his really great discoveries, which is that the absolute truth makes people free (which is a pretty old idea - it's in the Bible - tell the truth and the truth shall make you free). It's an old idea, but it's one that people have a great, great difficulty in accepting; even in the section discussion which I was in yesterday, one of the students said "Well, you know, maybe you can know a lot of things about yourself... why should you know - we'd be happier?" And the answer is: maybe not, maybe you won't be happier. As we'll discuss in a little while, it's certainly true that people don't want to be aware of things, they must have a good reason for not wanting to be aware of them. It must be very painful. I don't know how many of you say the movie that was made about Freud's life called The Far

Country - did any of you see that? I haven't seen the movie, but I say the play, which was quite a good play, which showed how Freud worked with one of his first patients, who was a patient who had an hysterical paralysis. Now that was a very common condition in the days when Freud began - of a person who was paralyzed in an arm or a leg or being unable to walk because, with no physiological reason, but because of an internal conflict. That's quite rare today, you hardly ever see a person with an hysterical paralysis - in Mexico I've seen a couple of them, but the whole level of awareness in the society is too great today to allow that. In Freud's day, when no one was aware of unconscious motivation, people could - for instance, women always fainted. If a woman was in a situation which she found difficult, she could always faint. Now if she did that today, people would really laugh at her, you know - "What's wrong with you, are you so delicate?" But in those days, the whole way women were treated, as one sees in a play like Ibsen's The Doll House, were like they were little dolls in the society, and therefore were sick and delicate and could use these methods for getting out of tight situations. Now women have gained a number of rights and privileges and they've lost that one.

Freud discovered in his hypnosis, however, that the most important cause of neurosis was repression, was the repression of thoughts, of impulses, and I think the most important thing to think of is the repression of impulses. Because what Freud discovered was that there was a dynamic energy, that a person wanted to do something, that he had a thought which was really the idea of doing something, which he found impossible to do, or was afraid to do, or didn't want to recognize that he wanted to do. For example let's say that a boy wants to strike his father. And there are cases in which today that wouldn't be a problem, he'd just do it. But in those days in which fathers were feared and respected, it might be inconceivable to do it - if you take, for example, a really patriarchal society, like Yugoslavia, a Yugoslavian peasant boy will not even smoke a cigarette in the presence of his father, that'd be considered insulting. A grown man of say 20 or 25 - he would step out of the house to smoke a cigarette. And when Freud grew up in Vienna around the turn of the century, that was quite a patriarchal society, which is very important to understand in relationship to some of his theories, and to see why Freud, for example, always considered women to be inferior beings, really in effect castrated men. They were always envious of not having a penis, and this explained their psychology. Now this really comes a great deal from Freud's

society, from a strong patriarchal society. If we study other societies today, we find in many societies that men are jealous of women, and it's probably much more common to find men frightened of women than vice versa. And I'll go into that later (laughter). And if you read closely in Michael Harrington, one sees that one of the results of poverty is matriarchy. Harrington describes this among the Negro, the Moynihan report shows that 25% of Negro families are pure matriarchies, in which there is no father. The same is true of the Mexican peasant, that's a very important factor. It's true of the white Ozark migrant of St. Louis, it's true of many societies which go from a peasant society to an industrial society. Why - because the women can immediately get work, either as domestics or in light industry, and the men have the kind of character traits that don't allow them to work in heavy industry, because you can't take a peasant and put him on a bulldozer that costs thousands of dollars - he'll probably destroy himself and probably destroy the bulldozer. So his wife can work in sewing or as a domestic and make a living, while the husband, who has been brought up in a society let's say with a very strong patriarchal ideology, in which it's very important that the man run things and it's very important for the man to be able to earn a living, finds himself economically unable to do this. And the wife takes over control of the family. This is probably one of the most single important psychological factors in the formation of character, and has a very important relation to poverty. Well, Freud had no conception of this type of situation, he saw society from the point of view of a Victorian patriarchal family structure.

Well, Freud moved from hypnotism and suggestion to discover that it was possible for people to become aware of their real motivations and their real conflicts by analyzing their free associations, by analyzing slips of tongue, and by analyzing dreams especially. And I would say that probably Freud's greatest work, most important work, is The Interpretation of Dreams, which was written in 1900, which is truly one of the few works of genius ever written. And it is also a work of great personal heroism, because Freud analyzed his own dreams, and in The Interpretation of Dreams he was brutally honest with himself, because he wanted to show that the things he found of neurotic people were not just true of sick people, they were general principles that are true of all people. And he found that in ~~xxx~~ dreams, his theory was that in dreams people found the real wishes of people and their fears of fulfilling these wishes. I won't go into the whole theory of dreams, but I will say that now we find, and Jung, Adler, Freud, and Fromm especially have seen dreams in a slightly different way, have said that Freud's discoveries

, Freud's real discoveries that dreams are reality, that they say what people really feel - this is true, but that dreams are more than wishes. If one analyzes a person's dreams, one sees what his real feelings are about things, about life. Now, just recently, there's been a lot of work on the neurophysiology of dreams, and for example, William Demet at Standford has done a number of studies on what happens to people when they can't dream, when they're kept from dreaming. And he discovered that people who are kept from dreaming become very very irritable and finally become almost psychotic - it's as though people have to dream. Now many people don't remember their dreams, but Demet has discovered and his work at neurophysiology has discovered that people generally have about four or five dreams a night, and you can tell this because you can put little electrodes on the eye, and when somebody dreams there are rapid eye movements. It's as though the eye moves as though they were seeing the picture in the dream. And if you wake somebody up when he has rapid eye movements, he can always tell you what he's been dreaming. But most people never remember their dreams. I would say that most people can become sensitive - my experience in psychoanalysis that of people who don't remember their dreams, it takes them about two or three weeks of thinking about it before they do begin to become aware of their dreams. But neurophysiologists have discovered now, that in a state of dreaming the higher centers of the brain are more active and more awake than they are when people are supposedly awake. In other words, for most of us, we're probably more awake when we're asleep than we are when we're awake. And we're more realistic, and we're more aware of what's really going on. That's like, there's a famous Chinese philosopher who used to say "Every night I dream I'm a butterfly, and I don't know whether I'm a butterfly dreaming I'm a Chinese philosopher, or a Chinese philosopher dreaming I'm a butterfly". In this way, he was saying metaphorically what many people have seen through the ages, that dreams show a greater awareness of reality, but they speak in a symbolic language, and I believe we can discuss that sometime. But the way, before I forget this, the questionnaires that we gave yesterday - I would like to invite anybody who is interested in working with me in analyzing the results of those questionnaires to tell me so at the end of the hour. We will have to score them and find the statistical relationships between answers and so forth. If anybody who's interested in this would like to learn how you go about analyzing a psychological questionnaire, tell me after class.

So Freud's great discovery was to see that in dreams and in free associations that people could become aware, they could become aware of what the problems were that made them, of

what the conflicts were that made them neurotic. Now Freud's theory changed, in the years between 1900 and the time he died in 1938. His first theory was that there were two realities, really, a principle of reality and a principle of pleasure, and that there were two types of instincts - ego instinct, as he called it, which were instincts such as self-preservation, hunger, and these instincts, and pleasure instincts, which were basically what he called sex instincts. But it's important to keep in mind, that when Freud talked about sexual, he was talking about sexual in a very special scientific sense which had to do with any kind of pleasurable sensation on the surface of the body, and Freud discussed the development of sexual pleasure in human beings as a development from oral sexual pleasure, anal sexual pleasure, to phallic sexual pleasure or genital sexual pleasure, and there's a whole theory involved. If you're interested in reading about it, one of the books we have downstairs is Eric Erikson's Childhood and Society in which he discusses Freud's sexual theory and in a way brings it up to date.

Let me just summarize Freud's three theories, and then go back and discuss them. Obviously, in a short time I can only briefly sketch them. The second theory Freud had was that really there was one type of instinctual pleasure which was all sexual, but part of it became ego energy, that it was originally all a kind of narcissistic energy but that part of it became ego energy through the process of learning about staying alive and so forth. That's a very complicated theory which Freud kind of discarded, more or less, after the First World War, and developed his final theory, which was never really related much to his first theory, and that was the theory of two instincts: one instinct of life which he called Eros, which was the sexual instinct, which are instincts toward unity, and the other is the death instinct which he called Thanatos, an instinct that all things which are organic have an instinct to become inorganic. And he felt that in man there was a constant battle between instincts of life and instincts of death, and that man's destructiveness came because he had to turn these instincts of death away from himself and to the outside world, and destroy other people to keep from destroying himself. Now that's an incredibly pessimistic theory; it's a tragic theory of man, a theory in which man is fated, either to destroy himself or destroy other people, that he is constantly at war in himself with desire to live and desire to die. And Freud had a correspondence with Einstein about this, in which Freud felt after the First World War, which he felt made no sense, that man just had to destroy himself. I think that Freud's pessimism and tragic sense - you could say in one sense Freud was a great realist, one of the

great realists of history. But in another sense, he never understood society, he never understood the forces in society which had to do with forming character and had to do with ~~solely~~. And this is something that this course, in one sense, is very un-Freudian, because with Freud, man had to be explained in terms of his biology, fundamentally. Society is something that molded the individual in one way or another, but didn't have any determining effect on man's nature. It was like some societies could mold him so that he could look a little different - people would have a little more pleasure and a little less pain, some societies had more pain and less pleasure, and so forth, but that society could never produce a man, for example, who didn't want to destroy people, that in society there's a limit to how much cooperation people could have, and no matter how good a society was, could never really produce human beings who really loved each other. Loving each other for Freud might be in a sense a reaction-formation, so that you wouldn't kill your neighbor, or it might be a fear, the super-ego the conscience that the society managed to put in the children to cripple them. The most that a human being could hope for was sublimation, which very superior individuals could sublimate their physiological instincts so that they would take pleasure out of creative things and work, and one of the readings that I want you to read is Freud's book Civilization and its Discontents. It's a short book, but very clearly describes Freud's theory and Freud's pessimism. And it's very important that we deal with this: it's an eloquent and brilliant argument against any kind of socialism, and anybody who believes in socialism must come to grips with Freud's argument. (Dowd's comments, laughter) But I think we can see clearly that Freud's not taking into account economic and social factors, that on the most elementary level he made a number of mistakes. Just on the level, for example, of patriarchal bias, the inability to see women in their different roles, the inability to see men, for example, in a matriarchy, matriarchies in their whole social structure. Fromm, analyzes, for example, the Oedipus complex, which Freud considered to be the fundamental formation of conscience, and also the formation of neurosis. Now he took this from the myth, the play of Sophocles Oedipus Rex, in which the Oedipus complex is, according to Freud, there's a little boy who wants to marry his mother and wants to have his mother as a sexual object and is frightened of his father, and somehow instead of opposing the father - he can't oppose the father because he's frightened of being castrated by the father - and therefore he identifies with the father and incorporates the father's values into his mind, which becomes the super-ego, the conscience. Now, there are many people

who that happens, to, alot more than you'd think of whom that's really true, but it's probably one of the plots in life, not the only one, and it's one that was much more true in a patriarchal society, the one Freud lived in, than it would be true today. For example, instead of the Oedipus complex, today you often find boys who don't want to have their mothers as sexual objects, what they want to do really is remain little children, and the conflict is not between being the strong father, the stronger father taking over the mother, the conflict is between regressing back to the womb and growing up. Now that sounds very irrational, and it sounds, to somebody who is not use to thinking in terms of the unconscious, like it's crazy. And it's certainly true that today in our society, the only people who believe that are psychoanalysts and psychotics, because psychotics know that's true - you find somebody that's crazy in a hospital, he knows that's true, that he wants to go back to the womb, when everybody says he's crazy because he's saying what is true but which nobody is supposed to talk about. Did any of you see the Hitchcock movie Psycho? A very good movæe, by the way, and psychologically very accurate. Here was a schizophrenic who thought he was the mother. Sometimes he became the mother and would kill people, and sometimes he was the boy. And it was a case of the combination between the destructiveness and the symbiosis with the mother, so that he could no longer distinguish whether he was the mother or the mother was he, and it looked crazy and it was, but it was true. Fromm sometimes says that the difference between a psychotic and a neurotic is that a psychotic says "Two and two are eight" and a neurotic says "Two and two are four, but it bothers me". (laughter)

Now, Freud never put together his final theory of the life instinct and the death instinct with his earlier theory which was the theory of the pleasure principle versus the reality principle, And in the next lecture I will discuss a little about the difference in Freud's theory of motivation and the humanistic theory such as Fromm's. I would say right now that the major difference between Fromm and Freud is that Fromm feels that Freud, in trying to make his theory scientific used a model of physics which is no longer really true, used a 19th century model of physics of a sense of tension, of a type of hydraulic model in which people had sexual pressures which had to be relieved in certain ways, a model full of tubes and pressures and hydraulic systems and so forth. And this was an attempt by Freud who had been a physiologist to try to make his new science a science and not to be a mythology and he was very worried that it would be taken up by quacks and that it would be literary and not scientific. But in doing so, he really distorted his own discoveries, and one finds, if

one reads the case histories of Freud, how often the results he comes to are quite humanistic, and yet they don't fit into his theory. One beautiful example is the case of an obsessive compulsive neurosis in which he discusses as he comes to the end of the case trying to explain it in terms of sexual impulses and anal fixations of this young man and so forth, and at the end he says "But you know, the main problem of this young man was his doubt". The obsessive compulsive's main problem is a sense of constant nagging doubt. And what was this young man's doubt? His doubt was whether he loved. And anybody who fundamentally doubts whether he loves somebody is a person who lives in misery. And this was a beautiful, exact, very humanistic conclusion, but it didn't fit in his theory, and Freud would make these things. And what happens is that his followers, lacking the genius of Freud and lacking his humanistic orientation, took out the most mechanistic parts of Freudian theory and made it into an orthodox religious system - this is what happens in church all the time - you get somebody who comes along and sees reality in a way, with great insight and humanism, and his followers tend to make it into a church, and say "This is what the master said, exactly this, and you can't deviate from this, that, and the other thing" and what was alive becomes dead. And that's happened a great deal to the orthodox psychoanalytic school today: instead of trying to develop Freud's theory in terms of insights and anthropology and psychology and economics and sociology, which Freud did not understand but which if he had understood he would have developed his theory, but instead of doing this, they take the most mechanistic, really the part of Freud which was his mistake, and make that into the orthodoxy. And any of you who go on in psychology will have to fight against that - the mechanism of psychology, trying to make it into a mechanistic, inhuman thing, one of two things - either seeing man as a machine, or this descriptive, behavioristic point of view which never looks at the underlying level, the character.

Now, the central concept of Freud, which withstands any criticism, and which is the most important discovery he made, is unconscious motivation. Now let me make one important point that I hope you never forget for the rest of your academic careers, that by unconscious-conscious, we're talking about a process and not a place. There is no such thing as The Unconscious. There is no such place as The Subconscious. People go around saying "It's in the unconscious, or it's in the subconscious" - this is a great error. It's not only an error of words, it's an error which cripples thinking, because if you begin to think of things that are in the unconscious, or in the subconscious, you don't

think in a dynamic way. In other words, you can ask a question "Why are things unconscious?". But you can ask another question that's just as good - "Why is anything conscious?" The whole history, perhaps, of civilization, is the history of consciousness, is a history of widening consciousness. Early cave man, for example, was not aware of, I think, more than four or five colors. You can see in the whole history of humanity an awareness of fine distinctions in color, in taste, in smell. In other words, part of history, part of civilization is awareness. And this is not just to take, on the one hand those things which are unconscious - why? because we're afraid of them, it's painful to see them (this is true in life, it's true in foreign policy), people, for example, can't be aware of something that is politically dangerous to be aware of. I remember this was very clear around 1960, 61 when people had the idea in Washington that the Russians were our enemy, total enemy, out to conquer the world, and that it was impossible to have any agreement with the Russians. This was absolutely believed. Now today, we have a test-ban treaty, and people will say you can make deals with the Russians, the Russians understand this and this and this, it's the Chinese that want to conquer the world and you can't make any deals with them. But if you see the difference in what was even possible to think about The Russians, then it's incredible. And this all came because, politically, people were able to accept the idea that you could make deals with the Russians - then the people in Washington could think it. But if it was felt that the public would destroy anybody who said this, they wouldn't even think it. It's not that they would think it and decide against it, they wouldn't even think it. And it's very important to understand how people can't even think thoughts that are dangerous. In China, for example, I'm sure that people, that it's even worse - that a Chinese Communist couldn't even think a thought against Mao Tse Tung, even the idea of such a thought would produce such anxiety - well, you wouldn't even have the anxiety, because they wouldn't even get that far. Now, we in this country get as far as the anxiety. When we start looking at things as they are, we get a little scared thinking thoughts - because it's dangerous to even think those thoughts.

Now, if you can imagine what happens politically in a family, where a little child is completely dependent upon two big giants, who give him his food, drink, shelter, survival, to think negative thoughts about these people, you can have some idea of how difficult it is. Just think how difficult it is to have a thought that's different from the group you're in, which would be radically different from what

all your friends think, which would be hard enough and we'll discuss later that there are experiments to prove it. Just think how difficult it is for a tiny child to have an idea which says, for example, that his mother is a tyrant - to even think such a thing. Now of course, none of your mothers are destructive, none of your mothers could be criticized, but you all know that there are some mothers of other people who could be (laughter). That's one alternative. The other alternative is that, once a person becomes a mother, they are absolutely wonderful, and mothers are never criticized. But I've seen for example psychotic patients who, when they're crazy, they say "My mother's trying to kill me, she's trying to poison me", and when they're sane they say "My mother loves me" - and they're right when they're psychotic. Because to accept this is to destroy their whole view of the world - if their mother's trying to destroy them, what can they believe? Nothing. Well, we'll discuss some of that later.

I wanted to say before I stop that it's very important to have an understanding of what it means to be conscious or unconscious, to be aware of how much all of us are unconscious, or repressed, or unaware, or half asleep, or don't really respond. And how much our thought, especially in industrialized society, are just ideas that are cut off from people, isolated ideas which I would call alienated thoughts. And how much the science that we have is alienated science. And by this I mean thoughts or conclusions that are just based on manipulating concepts, and not based on thinking through something, or experiencing it. How much, for example, when someone says "The poor are lazy" - this is a statement which is an alienated statement. It's based on somebody telling you something, and I don't care who or when, which you accept as an idea that you have and you believe which you've never experienced, never thought out, never tested, but just taken on. It's like saying "Coca-cola is good", or "The new x super y car is faster", or that "We're defending democracy in South Vietnam". Now whether or not we're defending democracy in South Vietnam, I would wager that 99% of the people who make a statement like that have never thought through the question, have never questioned themselves "What is democracy", "Are we defending it in S. Vietnam?", "What would it mean if we were, how could we prove if we were or we weren't?" - in other words, they're full of alienated thought. It's something that's told just the way Fromm gives the example of the weather. That you ask a peasant, for example, what kind of weather he thinks it's gonna be, and he looks up, he smells the air, he feels it, he looks around and he says "Well, I think it's gonna rain". And you ask somebody

who's just heard a weather report, and he says "I think it's gonna rain". Now he doesn't say the weather report says that, he says "I think it's gonna rain", with a sense that he knows that. But he doesn't know anything, he's got some thought that was put into his head. Now most of the thoughts we have are put into our heads that way. Just the way the mother said "You can't trust men, what do you expect there's a man around, etc", or just like Mao saying "Imperialist capitalists are responsible for all the problems we had with the last rice crop". I mean, these things are not just true of the United States, they're true throughout the world. I think that sometimes we are disgusted with our own policies, we can get to a point of just criticizing the United States, but I think these things are true of all countries; all nations have the same actions and the same belief that they're better than other people, and some nations worse than ours. We have higher ideals - probably one difference between the United States and many other countries is that, other countries, if you even brought up the question of being idealistic and democratic, they'd laugh in your face. Nobody ever thought that was anything you should do. In our country, we have the illusion still that we believe in democracy and human values - that's something that in many countries just wasn't thought of or thought necessary to talk about., or believe in.

Well, I'll leave for our discussions any more questions about the issue of alienated thought, because I think that if there's one thing I wanted to teach you in this whole course, just one thing, it would be to know the difference between a thought, an idea, a conclusion that's based on your experience, and something which is intellectualized, and alienated, and abstract, and not really seen. And I think if you could just think a little bit about how much you see this in your life around you - for example, if you saw somebody who came up and said "I'm getting married" and you said "Tell me about your girl", and he said "Well, this and this, mumble mumble - I love her very much", I think most of us would question how deep this love were, and how much was just words. Now we don't question ourselves how much we say that, how much we just make statements, formulas, feel very good about them, which have absolutely no relation to anything. And how much this is the illness of the society, this is related to being cool, for example, which means, in effect, having no convictions whatsoever, not knowing anything deeply, never trusting anybody. I've had so many cases of people today - see, today, in Freud's time people were repressed about sex, so people talked about sex. Today when people are repressed, there's emptiness, anxiety, feeling

nothing, feeling impotent - I mean if you really felt what you felt, if you were really awake, most of you wouldn't be able to sleep tonight, I could guarantee you, if you were really awake to what was going on around you. If you really felt what the odds were that we'd all be blown up, if you really felt how much we were manipulated by the system, how much you've been manipulated all your life, how much what you believe are pure lies - you would be so terrified you wouldn't be able to sleep. So there's very good reason to want to repress a lot of things and stay half asleep. Now, when I bring up these points to some students, they get very frightened and worried and say "You know, if we start thinking this way we won't know what to believe, - you can start doubting everything". Well, you will, and that's probably a good sign. As a matter of fact, if you've got a disease and it begins to hurt a little bit, that's a much better sign medically than if there's no pain.

Discussion

Mr. Dowd: Mike, if I could ask if you are planning to give your next lecture in our next meeting?

Macoby: I think I should

Mr. Dowd: So that the students should know that the next lecture will be given by Mr. Macoby, too...

Macoby: And I hope you'll finish Escape from Freedom for Monday.

Boy: In Sophocles' story of the Oedipus complex, didn't he do it like unconsciously everyone could get away from, that it was like fate, that Oedipus did everything in the world he could think of to prevent it. So isn't this the kind of opposite, that Freud said - I couldn't understand how he based it on this, cause it's kind of the opposite...?

Macoby: Yes, that's a very good point. The question is this - in the myth of Oedipus, in the play of Oedipus Rex, Oedipus does everything that he can to escape this fate. The story begins, for example, that the King of Thebes hears that his son will murder him, he tries to destroy the son, the son is saved by huntsmen and brought to another kingdom where he is adopted by the king and queen, and the boy grows up, "Oedipus"

meaning he was lame in one foot because of his experience, and the young boy learns as he's growing up that he's going to kill his father, according to the oracle. And he thinks that the king he's living with is his real father, he doesn't realize he's been adopted, and he runs away and on the road he meets his real father and kills him. But he doesn't know it's his real father. And then he goes back, he becomes the king in place of his real father, he marries his mother who was the queen, and then the plague comes and he learns that it's because he's fulfilled his prophecy. And he's done everything, everything possible to escape it. Now, Freud uses this myth to say in effect that this was man's fate, whether he wanted it or not, the Oedipus complex. But if we look at this from a different point of view, not Freud's view but more a sociological historical point of view, we could see that there's been a change historically in the concept of man's role in his own destiny. The Greeks have the idea that man was the subject of fate, that the gods decided - well, Fate was even above the gods, if you take the Greek gods, they're rather human, they're not really very strong gods, they have vices, they get into trouble among themselves, and they themselves are subject to the Fates. And man is even weaker than the gods. But human beings have no control over their own destiny. Then we get to after the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, we start getting a concept that man really can control everything. For the first time, philosophers begin to say man can control his destiny, and Marx has some of this in his ideas, man can really change his destiny if he understands the forces that run his life, he can make a good society, we get Utopian thought and the new rationalism. Freud came along and he really put a damper on this. He said, yes it's true that we can control our lives more than the Greeks thought, but there's a lot which is irrational in man. There are a lot of things in man which are not rational, which cannot be easily controlled, human beings do have deeply irrational motivations, like regressing to the womb, or like destroying, which have no relation to any rational reason. And human beings can only go so far in controlling their own destiny. Part of their destiny is determined by their nature as human beings, which is not totally irrational, which is part crazy (voice softens). So that I think it's important to keep in mind the different views of man, and how Freud, in using the Oedipus myth, was accepting part of it against rationalism, and at the same time saying that one can be more aware of the Oedipus complex and resolve it. So he's part rationalist, part irrationalist.

Boy: I was wondering if the life and death forces can be put on a scale where as the desire to life increases, the desire for death decreases. Statisticians have shown that during World War One, the rate of suicides went down remarkably in the United States, people could project their aggression forces in it, and I was wondering if you agreed to this sort of theory?

Macoby: Well, I tell you. What occurs to me when you say that is, that's ingenious, but quite mechanistic - it illustrates the part of mechanistic thinking that might have some truth in it, but it's a way of looking at things which I would object to. And I would object to it from the point of view that you would have to know a great deal more about why people commit suicide, and a great deal more about why people are aggressive, and what it means to be aggressive, and what are the types of aggressiveness. For example, some people react when their life is in danger, they defend themselves - that's one type of aggression. Somebody else doesn't just defend himself - he gets a pleasure out of hurting other people. Let's take the difference between two little boys, they're both standing in a room, and another little boy comes and pushes them. One little boy pushes him out of the way and keeps going. Another little boy pushes him out of the way and steps on him. Now both of these things are aggression, and yet they imply two different characters, two different character traits, two different ideas. And then you take another person whose aggression has become a deadness and a desire to have everything else dead, who's opposed to life, who feels really a sense of annoyance when people are enjoying themselves, who wants everything mechanized, everything ordered. You get somebody like one of the Fascist generals in the Spanish Civil War, General Mianastre (?), who said "Viva la muerte!" - Long Live Death. Well, this is the range. Let me say this to you - it's terribly difficult to understand even one person. Psychoanalysts often spend years in psychoanalysis trying to understand one person, and learns things after years that he didn't know before. Anybody who really tries to know another human being must feel the difficulty and the complexity of each individual person. It's possible to know certain things about character, about social character as Fromm writes, about a popular issue - one shouldn't fool oneself that this is really knowing another human being deeply. This is just a level of abstraction which could be useful. But even to get to this level of abstraction, it's necessary to know individual behavior, and how human beings do act, and how

the society in which they're in, what it demands of them, what part of their behavior is a reaction to social and economic forces, what is really characterological, what is really a kind of cultural cliché conventional response, and what's a deeply motivated response - all of these questions have to be answered. So to take a simple formula like this is really very mechanistic and really does violence to the nature of human beings.

Miss Joseph: What's all this going to have to do with poverty?

Macoby: Well, we started out by asking some questions that came up, are poor people lazy, what motivates and how do ~~poor~~ people get rich, are poor people happy or unhappy, and I said to understand it we have to understand motives and feelings. And to understand motives and feelings we have to understand unconscious motivation. And to understand unconscious motivation, we have to understand why some things are conscious and unconscious. And to know anything at all about people, we have to understand how much everything we know is alienated thought, which is really empty shell, empty abstract words. And what I'm really saying here is to even ~~begin~~ begin to understand these questions in relation to poverty, we have to start questioning what we know, what it means to know anything, psychologically. Because it would be better to know one little thing, really to know what it is, than to know a lot of things and not really know them.

Girl: I believe you said that absolute truth makes people free. What do you mean by absolute truth?

Macoby: No, I didn't say absolute truth, I said truth.

Audience: Yes you did, etc.

Dowd: jokes. Michael, toward the end of your formal discussion you made a distinction between Freud and Fromm, and you didn't get to Fromm. You tried to distinguish the two...

Macoby: What I was going to say was in Freud's attempt to be scientific, he stuck himself really with a physical model of behavior, which was even out of date as he was using it.

because the physics of today is not this kind of hydraulic coarse physics, it's much more theoretical and it has a much different concept. Fromm, in distinction to Freud, believes first of all that each science should really formulate its ideas in terms of its experience, and not in terms of another science. Now this is true, for example - biology is formulated in terms of the kind of experience biologists have and what they study. They don't formulate their concepts in terms of physics - if they do, it's physics, or biophysics, it's a different field. And sociologists shouldn't formulate sociology in psychological terms, but in terms of the sociologists' experience, or economists, or whatever. Now psychologists have often had the desire, like Freud, to try to make psychology more scientific by using terms from another science. But instead of making it more scientific, it makes it less scientific, because the only scientific science is to systematize and understand the experience that one has within that discipline. And in psychology, the experience that one has is a human experience, the experience of feelings, the experience of fear, what people actually experience. And if you start dealing in detail with this experience, you can systematize it, you can have concepts such as character and regression, which have to do with what people actually feel and what they actually experience. And that's what Fromm means by humanistic. So in other words, you don't begin talking about motivation in terms of some kind of metapsychology, in terms of ego and id, which may or may not exist but which is a hypothetical concept. We begin by human experience - what is that that people want, that makes them frightened, what is it they can't stand?

Mr. Rensinbrink: I would like to know a little bit more about the relationship that you say exists between the conscious and the unconscious. You say it's not either-or, that's something is not in the unconscious but it's a process of relationships to the conscious.

Macoby: How do things become conscious? Well, one way things become conscious is, as I was saying, becoming aware of something you're frightened of - derepression, that's one form of making things conscious. Now, in other words, the child would have the impulse to hit his father but repressed it, because he was frightened. He might become aware that "Yes, in that moment I really felt hatred and fear and I wanted to hit my father". So that's one form of becoming conscious. That's derepression, something that was made unconscious by fear.

Mr. Rensinbrink: You mean unconscious supposed a repression?

Macoby: No no, I'm just saying this is one form - something that is repressed. Now another one is something that never became conscious because you couldn't see it, because the culture never taught you to see it, never had a category. Somebody might feel, for example, uneasy in front of another person. But he's grown up to believe that everybody's a good guy, that anybody who smiles or gives you a drink or asks a couple of questions is a nice guy. So he says So and so is a nice guy. But that night he has a dream and So and so is knifing him in the back. Now why didn't he see it? He would have to begin to look for things that he's never been taught to look for, that the illusion of giving you a drink or saying some nice things has no relation at all to whether somebody's a nice guy. To be trained for certain things that he feels, perhaps, and unconsciously is aware of, but he's never learned to make that. For example, just the fact that some people are dead inside. Now I think many people respond to this, politically, respond to leaders in terms of characterological attitudes that they are not conscious of. They couldn't say really, why it is they don't like Nixon. But they don't like him - there's something about him. So they say he's got a five o'clock shadow, or he's got a funny smile. But it's something else, that they're not aware of. Or Goldwater - if you've ever heard Goldwater talk, there's a deadness to his face that many people didn't like, they felt that was dangerous. Or Roosevelt, for example - he had a great love of life. Now of all the things you might say about Roosevelt, he had this trait of a tremendous enjoyment and gusto in living. Now, psychologically, you could call this biophilia, the love of life - a great deal of biophilia. But most people never learn to see things in those terms, and they're not conscious of them, because the culture... Just the way you take a primitive culture, the Benda for example - they name every fruit tree, but they've only one word for flower, because the culture has never taught them to look at different flowers. So they're unconscious of the fact that there are more flowers than one, because the culture has never made this conscious. Now, Roosevelt, for example, there was something very interesting, recently they put up a stone monument to him. And Harriman said at the inauguration "You know, Roosevelt, wouldn't have liked this" They said why, and he said "You know, he once said to me 'I don't even like the Grand Canyon, I prefer any tree at Hyde Park to the Grand Canyon, because for me it's just a lot of rocks'". Now that's a statement of somebody who has a tremendous love of life, who prefers anything that's alive and growing to rocks, to any monument.

Mr. Rensinbrink: If you take that a little further, Socrates said "I have no business going out into the rural areas to see the trees. My place is in the city with human beings." Is that an example of the same thing?

Macoby: It might be. I think you can't take a particular statement out of context. In Socrates' case, yes, there's a great love of life, but you can't take anything out of context. You have to see everything in the context, and that's another important thing in psychology - any trait in itself, any symptom, doesn't mean anything unless you know the structure. For example, even if you take something like anxiety - you take two people, one's more anxious than the other. The one that's more anxious may be healthier, because he's coming to grips with the problem. It's very similar to medicine - you take two people, one who has a high fever and one who has no fever. The person who has high fever may be healthier medically, because he's fighting the disease while the other one isn't. So, in psychology as in medicine, common sense is no good. Common sense isn't something you can ... you can't look at a person and look at his symptoms and know how sick he is. The person who looks sicker may be healthier, in a deeper sense than the person who looks fine and happy.

Boy: Is the person who's susceptible the most a person who submits to authority? (Jackson)

Macoby: There have been a number of studies on that - I don't think that's necessarily true, anybody I think theoretically can be hypnotized, and it would depend much more on the confidence in the person who's doing the hypnotizing. And some people refuse to be hypnotized. They refuse to be hypnotized because they don't want to submit to authority, or they might refuse to be hypd. because they're frightened of their own impulses, or because they're rebels - again, the same thing, you can't make a hard and fast statement like that.

Boy: (Mark Finkelstein): You dwelled briefly on psychotics and psychoses. Both times you seemed to mention that these people are more willing to see things as they actually were. And you said that these persons are crazy. I mean, what is crazy, is there simply a thing that a person is crazy?

Macoby: Yeah. (Dowd and jokes, laughter)

Mark: I mean, how could you arbitrarily call a person crazy?

Macoby: Well, I guess what we'd have to say is that somebody who's psychotic is crazy, is somebody whose only reality is what's going on in him. It's not, any reality that's not related to him, that's not in him, doesn't exist for him. So he becomes autistic. That doesn't mean that what he feels about himself or what's going on in him isn't true, but he doesn't see, he takes no account of, or he distorts everything else in terms of his reality. So in other words, if he feels threatened, anybody who comes in is threatening him, there's no even attempt made to see the reality of another person - he can't know anyway. Now, all of us are more or less crazy in this line, because to really be sane, to really know somebody deeply is the highest type of sanity, which is quite rare because most people don't know anybody. Now for the adolescent, this is a problem of development, and most of you are passing through the type of problem Erikson talks about as the problem of ego-identity or the beginning of the problem of intimacy with someone, there is the problem of a kind of adolescent craziness, which all adolescents pass through, it's a period of not really knowing, doubting everything, not knowing what's true anymore, of having the only reality what's going on in you and not really being concerned with what's going on outside. This is a process that is resolved only by a sense of say getting to know somebody very well, deeply, beginning to trust a person of the opposite sex, for example, or through relationships with teachers sometime also, learning to trust somebody, or learning what you believe, your own convictions, but this is the time, and if it doesn't happen now, it probably never will.

Randy: I think that you have to make it clear, in answer to Mark's question, that the definition of crazy is determined by the culture you're in. How does psychology describe an Indian who would be considered crazy, you know...

Macoby: Well, I doubt that. This is the LSD Craze, the idea that psychotics are holy men I think there's a basic difference, for example, if you take Zen Buddhism which is often used as an illustration. These are people who work at becoming more aware of other people, and are frustrating their own greed, their own impulses. The psychotic gives up the world - he doesn't want to be ... He's just interested in what's going on in himself, he's just interested in his own impulses and feelings, he's totally uninterested in anything else. He has

no deep interest in the world, and it's not even a real interest in himself, because a real interest in himself would be one in which he would see which parts of himself are put in and what parts of himself are true conviction. For example, as I was saying, Freud found people were trying to repress sex. Today, people repress impotence, loneliness. They also repress feelings such as a real pride and self-respect. Now people find it hard - how do you repress those things? You could see, if you start looking, how often people, to do something, to give into say a friend or a group, to do what they want to do, really goes against what one really feels inside is right. You repress that; you get to the point where you're no longer repressing it, it's dead, one no longer has self-respect, one becomes cynical, and has the kind of attitude "Ah, what's all this stuff?", pride, which really means that it's all dead. You can see this in the Iriquois nations. Anthony Wallace, the anthropologist of Pennsylvania, did a study of the dreams and mythology of the Iriquois before and after their conquest. And he says that before the conquest, what they repressed were dependent impulses, the impulses to take it easy, the oral satisfaction, so forth. After their ~~defeat~~, when they no longer had the self respect, they no longer felt like warriors and men, they began to repress dignity and self respect, and they repressed all the impulses to be independent and self-respecting.

Mr. Dowd: I'd like to take a break in a second, but I think Randy's question, either you misunderstood it, Michael, or maybe you're repressing your desire not to answer it. She asked essentially, as I understood her question, aren't there different definitions of craziness in different cultures?

Macoby: Let me just say this. I think there are different definitions of what is normal - that is certainly true. But I thought her example of the holy man in India being called crazy in this culture isn't really true. I don't think a real holy man, say a Buddhist holy man, would be called crazy. He might be called neurotic, but I think psychosis is a pretty fundamental thing, pretty cross culture: somebody who really gives up reality, and no longer responds to reality, that ... just is in himself, in any culture would be considered crazy. Now, if I took some primitive culture which would look for ... from such a person and put him in a position of shaman or something, now even that's rather doubtful. I went through an account of primitive psychiatry in different cultures, and there's a distinction between the shaman who has these images and this type of experience, and a psychotic, who really is totally narcissistic, totally within himself, Now, it is certainly true that neurosis, and normality, is a culturally defined concept, and I think I'll begin the next lecture discussing that point, what it means to be neurotic, and also what it means to be healthy. And also, the difference between Freud and Fromm in this respect.