



Propriety of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.

Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke. Veröffentlichungen – auch von Teilen – bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.

---

## To Ensure Perspectives of Human Beings

Tatiana Panfilova

This article is based on the papers delivered by the author at the XIII and XIV International Fora of Psychoanalysis. Some materials of these Fora and reflections upon them are used. First published under the title "To Ensure Perspectives of Human Beings," in: *Fromm Forum* (English version) 11 / 2007, Tuebingen (Selbstverlag) 2007, pp. 54-58.

**Copyright** © 2007 and 2011 by Professora Tatiana Panfilova, MGIMO, 119454 Prospect Vernadskogo, 76, Moscow, Russia; E-Mail: panta[at-sambol]inbox.ru or kf[at-sambol]mgimo.ru.

Perspectives of human beings are questionable now. Modern forms of globalization challenge humanism and stimulate the processes which I'd like to call "perversion of humanism" because they spoil the very essence of human being. These changes are in process now and humanism needs our protection.

The main point of humanism is an attitude to a person as to a purpose and never as to a means as Kant used to say. So a person must be regarded as a responsible subject of his (her) activity. But the main tendency of modern history is quite opposite. A person is regarded as a means for functioning within different objective structures but never as a purpose of social processes. To ensure perspectives of humanity we must ensure subjectivity and the productive orientation. It is not easy. Common efforts of all people who stand up for humanism are required.

Psychoanalytic movement was always among the supporters of humanism. I hope psychoanalysts are interested in strengthening humanistic tendency. A dialogue between all the supporters of humanism is necessary now. It is not only a matter of the exchange of concepts; it's a matter of man's survival as a human being.

### To revise some points of conventional psychoanalysis

Conventional psychoanalysis must be revised in

some points to cope with the new problems we are confronted with. First of all it is not enough to adapt a person to the social demands. We'll promote a non-productive orientation in this case. The aim of the clinical work must be opposite in my view: to promote the productive social character. Psychoanalysts should bring their practice in accordance with the requirements of the humanistic philosophy and psychology.

Are psychoanalysts ready to respond the challenges of the epoch? I'm not quite sure. I doubt whether the theoretical base of clinical approaches is sufficient to understand properly new problems we are confronted with. Although K. Horney and E. Fromm rejected biological orientation and revised psychoanalysis in a social and humanistic way I'm not sure that all analysts follow the theoretical concepts of the humanistic psychoanalysis. Clinical work seems to be more conservative and analysts sometimes stick to the old-fashioned statements of conventional psychoanalysis, often including a biological orientation.

Let's have a look at perversion. Conventional psychoanalysis states that perversion is a phenomenon of sexual nature due to the conflict between a desire and fear of castration. Freud was sure that there was a universal sexual (or psychic) norm for all people and that he (Freud) had managed to find it out. Perversion was regarded as an aberration from this norm under specific social circumstances.

K. Horney and E. Fromm showed that



Freud's generalization was not correct. Psychic norms are not of sexual (biological) nature and they are not fixed. They are determined by a socio-cultural system and they change according to the whole social situation. A sexual norm depends on socio-cultural conditions. So one can assume that perversions are as changeable as norms both depending on specific conditions of society. If there is no fixed psychic norm we have no absolute criterion of what is normal and what is perverse.

For example, homosexuality was regarded as a perversion several decades ago and that time it was a matter of an individual himself and his (her) psychoanalyst. Nowadays homosexuality is a social problem. In some countries it is practically legalized or it is under legitimation. Shall we consider it a perversion? Shall we still regard it as an attempt to avoid castration as conventional psychoanalysis used to regard it? It rather seems to be an ideologically inspired fashion. Although there are certain clinical cases who need psychoanalytical help I doubt whether homosexuals look for psychoanalytic treatment. They surely consider themselves normal especially in the countries where homosexuality is legalized. Furthermore they certainly consider themselves to be successful fighters for human rights and they feel their lives meaningful. So we see that homosexuality is a successful attempt to solve the problem of existence. Shall we insist now on regarding homosexuality as a perversion while the law defines it as a kind of norm? I think it's a good illustration of social and relative nature of norms, also including sexual norms. It is obvious now that perversion has social roots and biological interpretation usual for conventional psychoanalysis is not sufficient to understand this phenomenon.

Another example - destructiveness. This phenomenon was elaborated by Fromm. Now it acquires new aspects and the problem becomes more complicated than several decades ago. Fromm pointed out that destructiveness was a reaction to lack of creativity. Now human creativity is directed and restrained by computer. Virtual reality is invented by man but man has to submit to its rules in order to take part in virtual processes. Computer becomes a master, not a servant of man. Fromm's worst

anticipations come true. Paradoxically enough we are creative in a lifeless way, our creativity depends on dead schemes. I think Fromm would estimate this dependency as necrophilous and perverse but it looks normal now.

Fromm regarded human destructiveness as manifestation of sadism and necrophilia and a sort of perversion. He paid much attention to destructiveness as rooted in the character structure but he admitted that sometimes it was engendered by social phenomena like political or religious egotism and fanaticism. Such phenomena are well known during all human history. But previously they were local. Modern forms of globalization stimulate such phenomena. They are inadequate reactions to the intensified antagonism between poor and rich countries, to the aggravation of poverty and unjust distribution and other global problems of today. Due to mass media and Internet they become spread over the world. And what is more mass media promote a destructive character orientation. Such values as human relations and development of personality are hardly popularized by mass media but aggressiveness and destructiveness are presented by them attractively. As a result destructiveness turns into a global phenomenon and is perceived as usual and normal. I think we deal with "pathology of normalcy" as Fromm put it. But can we call it "perversion"?

We encounter destructive manifestations, especially terrorism every day. From the psychoanalytic point of view we can regard a terrorist blowing up a building with its inhabitants as a pervert. What shall we do with this person if he (she) is still alive after the explosion: shall we treat him (her) psychoanalytically or shall we prosecute him (her)? I hold the humanistic position and consider a person responsible for his (her) actions, so I believe he (she) must be prosecuted although it does not exclude psychoanalytic treatment. At the same time we must not overlook the fact that terrorism as a phenomenon has nothing to do with sexual desire and fear of castration. It has social roots. Terrorism isn't due to neurotics traumatized with fear of castration in their childhood. On the contrary psychic disturbances are stimulated by some social forces to turn unbalanced people into terrorists. There is a demand for terrorists in our in-



sane society. And prosecuting a terrorist or treating him psychoanalytically we must protest against social circumstances favorable to such manifestations.

Theoretically speaking some notions, and perversion in their number must be revised in humanistic way. It is not enough to consider perversion to be a sexual phenomenon. Until some psychoanalytic terms are revised according to social reality of today we'll delude ourselves looking for attempts to avoid castration while we are confronted with a social problem of globalization epoch. So theoretical aspects of psychoanalysis are as important as practical ones.

One must take into account that the biological point of view usual for conventional psychoanalysis is not accordance with the requirements of humanism nowadays. Fromm emphasized that instinctivistic theories were so popular because many people preferred to feel restricted by the very nature and motivated by biological desires not to be responsible for their style of living. The concept of biologically determined human psyche exempts a person from freedom of choice and from responsibility. So it's not humanistic at all.

### To meet the requirements of humanism

Humanistic tendency appears in clinical work when an analyst treats his (her) patient as a responsible person. Analysts have to review the relationship between an analyst and a patient. Many of them note an active role a patient plays in the analytical process. They speak now rather about interrelation between participants of the analytical process than about neutral analysis of patient's unconscious. This change in the concept of the analytical process challenges two points of conventional psychoanalysis to be mentioned here, neutrality of an analyst in the process and the role of interpretation.

Putting neutrality into discussion nobody means to reject it as a basic principal of any cure. The question is to specify what neutrality is. Must an analyst put aside his (her) system of values, his (her) life experience, his (her) preferences and other aspects of his (her) personality

to be absolutely neutral in analytical process? Is it possible to put all these aside? If it is impossible one must assume that an analyst as a whole personality takes part in an analytical process and has to regard a patient as a responsible participant of their human relations. An analyst plays a role in his (her) patient's life, he (she) influences his (her) patient in a way. So a sort of ethics should be established between analysts and their patients. Dr. Sandra Buechler elaborates these statements and uses the principles of clinical ethics in her practice.

Such treatment is not recognized by everybody but I think it corresponds to Fromm's point of view and is more humanistic than so-called "neutral". I suppose that an attitude to a patient as a whole personality and an interference into patient's life does not exclude neutrality in medical sense. Keeping neutrality an analyst will never refuse to help a patient whether he (she) likes or dislikes him (her). An analyst will keep secret about patient's diseases and will never use his (her) knowledge to harm the patient. Dr. S. Buechler mentions all these points in her working ethics. At the same time one can't confine oneself to "neutrality" considering a patient to be a provider of unconscious material for interpretation and an analyst to be only an interpreter. The participants of the analytical process look as functions, not persons in this case. If we recognize that both of them are personalities we must take into account that human relations can be established between them.

Many analysts consider the role of interrelations in the analytical process. They underline that new meanings are created in the process of interrelations. So it is not enough to regard unconsciousness as something ready-made to be interpreted. We must take into account new meanings arising in the analytical process. Interrelation becomes a matter of primary importance in comparison with interpretation while adherents of conventional psychoanalysis keep on insisting on the priority of interpretation.

I agree with those who do not contrast interpretation with interrelation and regard them as mutually complementary. At the same time I'd like to stress the humanistic content of personal interrelations. I believe that these corrections of conventional psychoanalysis correspond



to Fromm's humanistic point of view which was a result of the productive dialogue between Freudian and Marxist traditions of thinking. This dialogue should be continued in the name of humanism.

### **To develop contacts with humanely oriented scholars**

Fromm stressed Marx's contribution to the concept of man. The fundamental principle of this concept is the idea of human nature as connected with a mode of human activity and social production. If we want to promote humanism we should proceed from the premise of a man as a responsible subject of his social activity.

I know two Russian psychological schools based on this premise. One was founded by L. Vygotsky and developed by A. Leontiev, A. Luria, P. Galperin and others. The other school was founded by S. Rubinstein and developed by A. Brushlinsky and some others.

On my opinion a dialogue between psychoanalysts anxious of humanism in modern world and representatives of these humanistic psychological schools would be useful for both sides in theoretical aspects and in practical realization of humanism. In fact some analysts use the ideas developed by these psychologists. For example the idea of interaction between a child and an adult as the main condition of children development was elaborated by Vygotsky at the first quarter of the XX century. Now it is used and developed in the attachment theory and in the conception of co-creative meaning making during the analytical process.

Some analysts study mechanisms of self-regulation. They pay attention to the fact that these mechanisms are unconsciously produced in the process of interaction. But this idea was elaborated by Dr. Galperin and Dr. Rubinstein several decades ago and there is no need to rediscover it.

Dr. Luria elaborated psychological and neuropsychological aspects of the main processes of memory - encoding, processing and storing of information. Touching a problem of interdependence between implicit and explicit

modes of encoding, processing and storing of information an analyst uses this elaboration and develops it in a psychoanalytic way.

So we see that psychoanalysis and the Russian psychological schools have common interests and joint theoretical elaborations. It's a good base for mutual understanding. In front of the challenges of our epoch such as destructiveness, religious fanaticism, mechanization of mind, lack of subjectivity and so on we must unite to promote humanism.

Postmodernism attracts many psychoanalysts. It looks humanly at first sight because it asserts an active role of social discourse, emphasizes the value of individual development, insists on equal historical possibilities for everybody, speaks against dogmatism etc. Postmodernists are quite right emphasizing the role of objective structures in human activity. Subjectivity is really suppressed by the objective structures in modern globalizing world.

Shall we regard postmodernism as an evidence of the humanistic trend? I don't think so. Let us take the most attractive for psychoanalysts postmodern theory - J. Lacan's one. Lacan regards a subject as a mediator between three instances - Real, Imaginary and Symbolic. There is no such substance as subject according Lacan, it is only an instrument determined and driven by these three instances. Lacan doesn't consider a subject to be an autonomous personality relating other people and changing the outside world according its will. Subjectivity is depersonalized and subdued to some objective structures. It is a typical picture of alienation.

How do Lacan and other postmodernists estimate this situation? They take it for granted. They don't object it. On the contrary they assert that an error is committed when subjectivity is regarded as something substantial. They recognize that depersonalized objective structures and social forces dominate over man but regard it as natural referring to the equality of choice and considering social antagonisms to be an ideological appearance.

While Freud tried to strengthen subjectivity substituting unconscious for consciousness, Lacan confirmed lack of subjectivity. If Fromm developed the humanistic trend of psychoanalysis, Lacan developed the opposite trend methodologi-





cally similar to the instinctivistic theories.

Although postmodernists depict the situation in modern world rather correct their position is a reflection of the disintegrated and alienated mind typical for modern man. So their position is opposed to humanism. It can't be a guide to the humanistic future.

### To promote the productive character

I'd like to touch one more problem - a new social character. I agree with Fromm's concept of social character and follow his tradition of humanistic psychoanalysis. But I think that the social character of the globalization epoch is different from the marketing character Fromm believed to be dominant. The modern social character is based on the system of global intercommunication and interrelation provided with mass media and Internet. That's why several years ago I proposed to call this type of character "information character".

My concept of modern social character is different from the concept elaborated by Dr. R. Funk who called the modern character «I-am-me orientation». I'm afraid this notion expresses only a subjective side of the character structure, a desire to fabricate reality subdued to the person. This notion creates an illusion that a person with such character structure acts as an integrate autonomous personality according his (her) own will and consistent thought. At the same time Dr. Funk calls "kaleidoscopic" the type of perception and thinking usual for such character orientation. He notices that a person of this social character needs continuously permanent outer stimulation and outer integrators. These traits are indicating a lack of subjectivity. To call this lack of subjectivity "I-am-me orientation" means to delude ourselves. I suppose that we must not confine ourselves to the subjective perception of reality, we must find out the objective basis of this social character to call it more exactly.

Dr. Funk shows that such orientation is due to new information technologies. I do agree with him in this point. That's why the other notion - "information character" seems preferable. In my view the main trait of this character is an

ability to receive, to process and to transfer information. An "information man" who enters into relations with the whole world by means of computer will be losing a need, and then an ability to contact other people directly. A person takes for granted everything he is suggested by computer or mass media. So such a person keeps on contacting other people by means of Internet but he loses an ability to meet somebody face to face.

All these reflections looked relevant several years ago. Now I prefer to speak about "virtual" character as a specification of "information" one. The meaning of virtual reality is stressed in this notion. Virtual reality is more real for such a character than reality itself. Reality must be mediated with computer or mass media to look real for modern man. Even sexual intercourse is accessible by means of Internet. There is no need in intimate relations now, a sexual contact by means of Internet seems to be sufficient. This tendency is a consequence of modern forms of globalization and is observed all over the world.

Virtual reality is completely constructed by man. It has no analogue in objective world and it fully depends on the activity of the subject. So it looks like a product of human creative power. Does such a person prove to be a creative one? I don't think so. Virtual reality is programmed by the "information" society. Man is forced to be a bearer of information flows. At the same time such information is perceived by a man as something strange. A gap between information and its subject is determined by the alienated social processes based on Internet.

To be understood correctly it's high time to mention that I have nothing against Internet while it functions as a means of interrelationship. I'm deterred by Internet dominating over us.

A new split in human psyche is outlined. On the one hand a person feels mighty and creative in virtual reality, on the other hand he (she) is helpless in everyday life and in human relations. So he (she) prefers virtual reality to unpredictable human relations full of problems. The more active man is in virtual reality the more passive he is in real life. After all he loses the ability and the need to have relations with real people. Then he loses human essence.



That's why I regard this phenomenon as anti-humanistic. It is a new phase of the tendency to alienation. Human creative potential is placed at the disposal of inhuman purposes. A person is involved into virtual reality to keep functioning within the alienated social institutes. Following this way man will never become a purpose of his own development. On the contrary his development and his apparently free choice are subdued to the globalizing economic system.

We see that new problems arise from the new social character. Psychoanalysts will deal or maybe deal now with new kinds of neuroses. They will encounter a dilemma to assist man's adapting to the main trends of the epoch and to promote "virtual" character on the one hand or to fight against these trends ensuring the humanistic attitude to a person on the other. I realize that psychoanalysis was created to cure people, not to fight against some social forces. But a protest against some social norms was outlined by Freud himself. In his last works such as "Civilization and its discontent" the humanistic point of view in opposition to the social norms and institutes was confirmed. Now the requirements of humanism change according to the changes of history but the problem of choice exists. I'd like psychoanalysis to maintain the humanistic tendency on the base of the productive orientation.

I see some possibilities to promote the productive orientation. First of all I mean the idea of self-analysis developed by K. Horney and supported by E. Fromm. Fromm pointed out the necessity for psychoanalysis to reorient its activity from curing patients to teaching them methods of self-analysis. Having learnt methods of self-analysis a person gets a chance to become aware of himself and to correct his (her) thoughts and actions according his (her) own concepts of values and norms. Following this way a person becomes productively active.

I suppose that such a reorientation will be possible if psychoanalysts take part in the process of upbringing and educating of children. I wish psychoanalysts would work in kindergartens and schools both with children and with

their educators. They would train children to rely on themselves and their fellow men instead of relying upon God or the state or some other idols. Psychoanalysts would convince children that difficulties in life are usual and inescapable and everyone has such problems. So one must solve his (her) problems himself (herself) but it doesn't mean that he (she) is alone being confronted difficulties in life. Everyone can count on his (her) fellow men's help. At the same time psychoanalysts would influence educators to educate children as real subjects of their conduct responsible for its consequences and for their fellow men.

I don't believe that analysts can change the main social character radically but some productive corrections of real characters are possible. I refer to the workings with orphans and underprivileged people carried out by Mexican analysts. Our colleagues encounter with social problems which are unsolved by psychoanalytic methods. An individual destiny can be corrected however. And Mexican colleagues do it promoting productivity of homeless and neglected teenagers. I appreciate these workings as really humanistic.

I think that enlightenment is a factor of the productive orientation. As a professor of philosophy I'm sure that philosophy promotes the productive orientation of the students if we teach philosophy as a system of world outlook well thought over and critically analyzed, not as a set of odd views as postmodernists usually regard it. According to my experience the main task of philosophy teaching is to assist students to reflect critically upon their thoughts and values and to regard other people and themselves as responsible subjects of their actions. I believe that the humanistic system of world outlook is a basis of the productive orientation.

To sum up: we have a common problem to ensure perspectives of humanity. There are a lot of obstacles in this way. Common efforts of all people who stand up for humanism are required.