

FROMM'S CONTRIBUTION TO UNDERSTANDING AND TRANSFORMING WORK

Richard Margolies

For large numbers of young people involved in the movements for radical change in the 1960s, the subsequent years proved their expectation of 'revolution' to have been illusory. As these young people moved from university and youth culture into the world of work and family, it was often difficult to express their humanistic aspirations in their new lives as professionals, educators, or employees. Compounding this is the fact that there may be fewer jobs in the future appropriate for the large numbers who sought higher education as training for them. This frustration may lead to resentment and downward mobility for millions of young adults. The movements of the 1960s were largely focused on the non-work areas of social life and on issues of policy and social behavior which did not alter the fundamental relations and structure of work. The new left did not equip people, intellectually, emotionally, or practically, for the world of work they entered.

This paper assumes that a major element of revolutionary humanist praxis is the transformation of work to serve the human development of those who perform it. Political movements which achieve power without involving people in transforming their work to optimally serve their development delay, if not prevent, the fundamental re-ordering of social life which has always been one of the highest humanist goals of socialism. Such movements will lead to the creation of new dominant classes (e.g., the so-called 'red middle class' in Poland) and new bureaucracies.

It is a question how much work can be transformed without a change in ownership. Some have never tried to change the workplace because they believe you can only effect desirable changes after ownership or control has been achieved. And some say it



is not desirable to change the workplace before a revolutionary transformation has occurred because it will dilute class consciousness. The Project on Technology, Work and Character in Washington, D.C., where the author is a member, believes there are real possibilities in democratic, capitalist societies to develop the strengths and consciousness of employees and workers, and to move toward fundamental humanization. We believe that neither greater participation nor ownership/control are alone sufficient, though both have the potential to contribute to greater self-activity and social transformation. By involving themselves, therefore, in the transformation of work within the institutions that now employ them, many in the new left generation of the 1960s, and others, can find a major path toward realizing their humanist aspirations.

This paper approaches these issues with the aid of Erich Fromm's theories. First, we describe Fromm's contribution to the psychoanalytic understanding of work. Second, we will appreciate Fromm's distinction between the rebellious and the revolutionary characters, while extending his discussion. We will endeavor to distinguish between revolutionary character in a situation of naked oppression (as in the Third World) versus revolutionary character in an advanced economy of relative affluence and democratic rights. Lastly, we will describe projects in the U.S. to increase self-activity at work which have been based on principles of fairness, security, participation and individuation.¹

I

Psychoanalysis can contribute to a more profound and comprehensive understanding of work by illuminating the complexity and diversity of human motivations. Psychoanalysis distinguishes between behavior and hidden passions, between ideologies and the historical realities of character and society which they disguise.

While Freud recognized work as one of two major roads to happiness, he and his followers only delved lightly into a



deep psychological understanding of work. Nor have most conventional psychoanalytic thinkers been willing to look behind the anxious mask of modern society to discover the human costs of our contemporary lives. Psychoanalysis cannot make its potential contribution to a "genuine social science" (Freud) as long as it is only defined by clinicians who, perhaps because of their specialized training, believe it can only be a psychotherapy.

Fromm contributes a missing general psychological framework for psychoanalysis. He is, furthermore, committed to the transformation of ideologies, institutions, and structures that do not stimulate the growth of our full human possibilities for mutuality, cooperation, activeness, and the love of life.

Both orthodox psychoanalysis and ego psychology have developed their conceptions of work based on clinical examples of psychopathology, not with so-called normal people. These theories offer no concepts on the relation between character formation and work. They offer no view of society, or social theory, which distinguishes between social arrangements that foster human development and those that stall or stifle it. Thus, conventional psychoanalytic theories provide only a narrow, static, and uncritical view of adaptation. They are unable to describe a normative conception of mental health distinct from the definition of conformity to a particular society. This means they do not have a theoretical aid for understanding alienation as a historical and social phenomenon (refer for more detailed discussion, Margolies, 1981).

The sociopsychanalysts, Fromm and Maccoby, appear to resolve these conceptual problems in a way consistent with recent progressive developments of theory. This recent trend reformulates the language of psychoanalysis by eliminating the metapsychology which consists of superfluous reified, anthropomorphized, intrapsychic agencies and energies (Schafer, 1976, 1978; Klein, 1976). The goal of this reformulation is to place people as agents of their own lives who think, choose, and act at the center of explanation. Klein (1976) has spoken of two theories of psychoanalysis, the metapsychology and the clinical. There



is also a third, a general psychology, often overlooked, which is in need of development. By describing the historical and existential dichotomies inherent in human life, Fromm (1947) provides a general psychological framework for psychoanalysis which is broad enough to be culture-free and applicable to 'normal' people. In addition, Fromm's work is almost devoid of metapsychology, and entirely in tune with the trend toward writing psychoanalytic theory in terms of human agency and action language.

Fromm's major theoretical contribution is the concept of social character (1947, 1955, 1970). Social character is a functional concept which shows how the mode of production affects individual motivation shared by a group or class. Fromm understands people as primarily motivated by desires to grow, be active, express their talents, and be related to others. The striving for relatedness, and the means of survival and growth are largely formed by the values and emotional attitudes of one's family. The character of the family is primarily a consequence of the work of the parents; the social functions they perform through their work, the values and attitudes they must have to do this work, and the location of the family in the class system. The family character is also affected by ethnic, national, and physical constitutional factors, as well as unique experiences in the family's history. Nonetheless, in any society, at a particular point in history, there are a specific number of social character types, which are clusters of traits common to a particular group or class.

The concept of social character shows, in the Marxist tradition, how work, class, and history structure values, passions, and character. Fromm has focused on people as active agents of their lives, pursuing opportunities and goals afforded by their place within the social system. More than any other psychoanalyst, he has illuminated adult development and recognized the alienating effect of modern work.



Employing a sociopsychanalytic research methodology, Fromm and Maccoby (1970) provided evidence of the relation between work and character by studying everyone in a Mexican village. They found a direct relationship between the social character of the villagers (their values, emotional attitudes, symptoms, and behavior) and their work. The three basic social types were the non-productive receptive (who planted sugar cane), the productive hoarding (who planted rice), and the exploitative characters (who set up shops).

This study, done over seven years by an interdisciplinary team, is based on both psychoanalytic and Marxist theory. It can be seen as a pioneering work in a 'genuine social science' - what Freud hoped would result from the expansion of Marxism by the greater incorporation of psychological factors (Freud, 1933, p. 179). The practical value of the study was soon grasped by people working in rural economic development and social transformation in Cuba, socialist Chile (1970-1973), and throughout Latin America.

In 1973, Maccoby helped initiate one of the first cooperative labor-management experiments in a U.S. factory. The goal was to improve work so that it both increases participation and satisfaction among employees, and enhances organizational efficiency. This social research and development project yielded an understanding of the social character of employees in the modern corporation. The findings show the utility of social character research, and provide practical knowledge for those interested in transforming institutions in a democratic, humanistic direction.

Among managers, Maccoby (1976) found four basic types. The gamesmen and gameswomen are flexible, quick-witted people skilled at developing team spirit and getting others excited about organizational goals. Approaching life with adolescent enthusiasm as if it were a game, they thrive on challenge, though they are often detached, depressed and have unproductive love relationships. Their character fits the fierce competition of high-technology corporations where they must motivate large numbers of highly educated employees and make wise strategic



decisions about new products and markets. In these industries, such as electronics and aerospace, gamesmen and gameswomen have the traits necessary to rise to the top.

The companymen and companywomen are organizational loyalists. They are modest, responsible mediators who often provide the needed service of encouraging disparate factions to work together for the collective goal. Lacking the detachment, energy, confidence, and risk-taking needed to make top management, companymen and companywomen are usually in middle management.

The junglefighters' goal is power over others to gain profit or influence. Like the productive exploitatives in the village, they act to exploit possibilities for their own gain. They do not have friends, just accomplices. During the rise of modern capitalism there were two types: the 'lions' were patriarchal empire builders who took care of loyal employees, and the 'foxes' were crafty robber barons.

Craftsmen and craftswomen are oriented to work and family. They like hands-on experience and enjoy being competent, doing a good job, and building something that is valued. They are more at home with themselves. There are three types. The receptive craftspeople are democratic, like people, and need human contact. The dutiful craftspeople are authoritarian, withdrawn, and judgmental. The corporate scientist craftspeople, brilliant but often self-absorbed, are interested in knowledge and creating; they hunger for admiration, are self-idolatrous, but are among the most independent.

Fundamental differences of character, values, and attitudes to work were also found among factory workers and supervisors. Action-research in an auto-parts factory in Bolivar, Tennessee, (Maccoby, 1975) found two basic character types which were expressed in six differing modes of adaptation to work. The predominant character in this small, rural, Southern town was the traditional hoarding craftsperson whose life was organized around the Protestant ethic of duty, hard work, family and Bible. The secondary social character in the town was the modern ambitious



type, more rootless and oriented to meritocratic values of advancement,

These two basic social characters were expressed in six identifiable modes of adaptation to work, with people easily recognizing which type best described them. The receptive craftspeople are centered on the work itself and doing a competent, respected job. They also like human contact. The ambitious craftspeople are similar except that they want to advance in the hierarchy and are usually production foreman or office managers. The farmer-workers take jobs in the factory only out of the need to gain capital to develop their small farms. They are usually in factory maintenance and machine repair; they are not at home in the factory and rush to work on their farm at day's end. The unionists have a strong sense of justice, and most are active in the union where they fight for fair, secure and safe working conditions. The sociables, not particularly interested in the work, enjoy the opportunity the factory provides for being with others. The dutiful craftspeople like to work by themselves where they can prove their competence and skills. They are withdrawn, unquestioning of authority, and believe everyone should follow the rules like they do.

Fromm's theory of social character has stimulated these studies of character and work. This knowledge of character has practical consequences. Experience has shown that increasing employee participation and democratic, cooperative management will only lead to lasting change where it is recognized that people vary significantly in their values, aspirations, and attitudes to work. Attempts to encourage workers to develop their talents, aspirations and self-activity in their work require knowledge of personal differences. Projects to transform work which overlook major differences among workers will cause deep psychological resistances to change and therefore will not involve the hearts and minds of the very people they are intended to stimulate and enliven.



Knowledge of how the various character types are related to each other structurally within an organization illuminates the process whereby people are advanced, leadership is developed, and misunderstandings occur between different levels of the organization. Maccoby (1976) calls this structural relationship of character types within an organization its psychostructure, a psychological x-ray of the division of labor.

Attempts to build political or social movements on mechanistic concepts of class consciousness which assume that all workers are alike, experience the same frustrations, and have similar aspirations tend to feed into hierarchical, bureaucratic, and central state types of solutions. Mostly, they do not even interest workers. Attempts to build movements based on an understanding of human differences, however, have the possibility of enlivening and involving people in their own development. They therefore build the practical basis for the creation of new, decentralized, human-centered, democratic institutions. This brings us to the often-overlooked question: what is revolutionary character in our era and situation?

Fromm's Contribution to Understanding and Transforming Work

II

Fromm distinguishes between revolutionary and rebellious character. Rebels are a type of authoritarian character. They are deeply resentful of authority for not being loved and appreciated and want to overthrow the authority in order to become the authority themselves. Rebels are fanatics, filled with narcissistic rage, who rigidly defend, submit to and worship their cause as an idol. They are flamingly passionate about their cause but coldly unrelated to others. Rebels may talk about revolutionary changes needed to free others but they are really on private missions to win love and save themselves.

Revolutionary characters, on the other hand, are different in motivation, attitudes and the quality of relatedness to others. They are independent as people, free of symbiotic ties to authority, family, nation, race, class, party or religion. They do

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.



not secretly hunger for love and attention because they experience the center of their well-being and activeness within themselves. They are identified with humanity, transcending the narrow limits of their own origins, and want to contribute to genuine progressive, humanistic developments.

The revolutionary feels a deep reverence for life and is critically aware of how conventional practices and institutions can stifle human development, or threaten nature's ecological balance. The revolutionary's critical consciousness is not hostility or cynicism, which is the pseudo-realist attitude of one who accepts conventional wisdom and the status quo. The revolutionary is not morally impressed by power, does not sanctify it, and is capable of disobedience to its dictates. The revolutionary character is therefore the "sane, alive, mentally healthy person" (Fromm, 1973, p. 153), which is a development of what he has also called the productive character (1947).

While the distinction between the rebellious and revolutionary character is essential, Fromm's analysis needs to be extended. First, although he has discussed briefly aspects of Marx's character (Fromm, 1961, pp. 80-83) and referred to the traits of a capacity for hard work and a sense of responsibility in Marx, Engels, Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg and Mao Tse-Tung (Fromm, 1973, p. 388), Fromm has not elaborated an understanding of the character of political revolutionaries. Such a person recognizes that concern for humanity and love of life may require the social and political transformation of institutions which oppress, stifle, and prevent human development. Secondly, Fromm's concept of the productive or revolutionary character is presented in abstract, idealist terms. He does not describe the historical limits and nature of a particular revolutionary character produced by a particular society. Here we are applying Fromm's own social character analysis to that part of his thought which is idealist (see Maccoby, Praxis International, this issue).

In discussing the political revolutionary we must distinguish between situations of naked oppression (as in developing countries) and those of relative affluence and democratic freedoms



(as in the Western industrial countries). Countries under the domination of Stalinist bureaucracies present yet a third situation (with the movement for democratic and humanist goals in Poland today a possible revolutionary model). These fundamentally different social and historical contexts produce different social characters and thus the traits, attitudes and behavior of revolutionary character will be different. A failure of the new left in industrial countries in the 1960s was the attempt to find role models in revolutionary character from the developing world (e.g., Ché, Fidel, Mao).

While the traits Fromm described abstractly may apply in a general way, revolutionary character traits fostered by oppressive social conditions, such as Latin American military dictatorships, tend strongly to be themselves military in nature. Most political revolutionaries in that situation experience the need to develop the skills to build a party and army: the willingness to take great personal risk and accept sacrifices; shoulder great physical stress and hardship; to act and live clandestinely; a willingness to fight and use violence; to give and take orders; and live within a hierarchical, military organization focused on the concrete goal of removing the oppressing class.

It is also important to recognize that there are other revolutionary vocations or ways a person can contribute to social transformation under oppressive conditions. People such as Dom Helder Camara, Oscar Romero, Danilo Dolci, Paulo Freire and Julius Nyerere come to mind, but there are also thousands of unknown educators, journalists, priests, nuns, professionals and workers. Nonetheless, the fact that one is a militant party builder, guerrilla fighter, or active in some other revolutionary vocation does not prove the existence of revolutionary character. Revolutionary movements often attract people who are deeply rebellious, resentful, adventurous or destructive. This is always a problem for leadership and organization of these movements. And even a cursory look reveals real problems in the character of many well-known revolutionaries.



The traits and attitudes of revolutionaries from oppressed countries cannot, however, be the basis for revolutionary character in a non-oppressive situation where there is affluence and democracy. Where there is no obvious oppressing agency, like an oligarchy, dictatorship, or ruthlessly exploitative class, revolutionary character requires a subtle understanding of how people are alienated from the deeper sources of their feelings and potential development. Good leadership in any situation, and certainly from a revolutionary humanist perspective, requires an understanding of the social character potentialities, both positive and negative, of people. Such a leader is interested and skilled in stimulating people's best, progressive development by encouraging their activeness and self-activity (Maccoby, 1981).

The political revolutionary character in a non-oppressive situation of affluence and democratic rights is therefore someone who understands the progressive possibilities within the social character types of his or her culture. He or she is related to people in a way which stimulates their independence and self-motivating desire to develop and act. This requires traits of understanding; respectful relatedness; a democratic and non-authoritarian way of working cooperatively with others; an ability to think and speak clearly; to listen to others; patience; a non-selfish interest in seeing people develop; realism; and a minimum of narcissism.

Also missing from new left thought is the recognition that revolutionary character can be expressed in different work and vocations. The traditional image of the revolutionary, amplified by 1960's youth who idolized Third World revolutionaries, is the militant party-builder and guerrilla fighter. This is inappropriate for Western democracies and Eastern European societies, although small bands of elitist fanatics and terrorists are still living out this fantasy, irrespective of the absence of the expected popular support. The point is that one can develop the traits and praxis of the democratic revolutionary character in any work whether it be a teacher, professional, manager, employee, skilled or unskilled worker. Anyone who works can develop coopera-



tion among his or her fellows to begin to transform their work to cultivate greater participation and human development.

This brings us to a different definition of revolutionary consciousness. Under brutal, total oppression, revolutionary consciousness-raising usually requires helping people become fully aware of their oppressors and the need to support an often clandestine militant party and armed opposition. In the democratic, affluent situation, revolutionary consciousness-raising means helping people become aware of the possibilities for growth within their social character and encouraging them to develop their activeness, sanity, and desire to develop themselves. A part of this active attitude is the recognition that others have different, equally valid goals of self-development and that one needs to cooperate with them to transform those institutions, such as work, which prevent mutual development.

Such an enlivening praxis, which helps people become active agents for their own human growth, begins to build the basis for a decentralized, participatory, democratic society organized on humanist principles. Such a praxis may be able to touch people by encouraging them to experience being more alive, when previously they had believed themselves so satisfied with the comforts, conveniences and liberties of modern life. In addition, with the increasingly intrusive use of electronic surveillance equipment, computers, domestic spy and provocateur activities, and the state's ability to mold public opinion, it may be only such a mass-based, participatory praxis that has the possibility of creating the pre-conditions for a democratic, socialist, humanist society.

III

Efforts to involve people in transforming their work, informed by Fromm's humanist orientation, have begun in the United States in the past decade. The Project on Technology, Work and Character, directed by Michael Maccoby, has been fostering joint management/



union-sponsored programs to involve employees and workers, at all levels, in transforming work to serve their human needs, as well as enhancing organizational efficiency. These work improvement programs, which make use of the techniques of Einar Thorsrud and the Work Research Institute of Oslo, Norway, have been in factories, offices and government bureaucracies. The Project believes these programs, if actively supported, can strengthen unions and make them more appealing to the new work force, which is demanding more participation and challenge in their work. Management enters these programs because they want greater productivity and quality: reduced costs, waste and worker turn-over; increased organizational effectiveness; greater allegiance and harmony from the workforce; and because they offer managers an opportunity to express their religious and philosophical ideals. The Project has found many managers support these programs because they recognize their moral and human basis and want to live according to their ideals, but have often found it difficult to do so in their work. Workers enter these programs to express their ideas, participate in decisions that affect their lives at work, achieve better communication and pride in their work, and realize opportunities for personal development. Unions enter these programs because they can extend and strengthen their involvement with workers and their work. Many unions have also come to recognize that by developing new competencies in these programs they will be better able to organize the new workforce which is younger, more educated and increasingly in technical and service work.

Each party to these programs is aware of the possible benefits to themselves and the possible risks. People who fear working with management would gain by recognizing that there is no risk-free praxis which leads unalterably to social transformation or to a better future. These programs help break the grip of authoritarian management in the workplace and encourage everyone to develop the skills, traits, and attitudes of democratic character. To aid this development these programs follow an ethical structure of principles.



First, the Project on Technology, Work and Character is not aligned with any political party or ideology. We of the Project staff stand independently for the process which increases participation and human development. Secondly, we require that these programs be jointly sponsored by the unions in the workplace and will end our involvement if either side withdraws. We will not work with any organization which wants to create a work improvement program in order to undermine a union or prevent potential unionization. We have come to recognize that unions and government are the only organizations which can represent and institutionalize values of human development in the workplace. Under certain circumstances, we will work with a non-unionized organization, such as government or a worker-owned cooperative, if the rights and security of the workers can be assured. This policy has earned the Project the responsiveness of unions and recently led a major American union to invite the Project to aid them in developing a whole strategy of participation.

After both top management and union leaders sign an agreement to cooperate in the area of increasing participation and work improvement, it is usually put to a vote of the employees. The principle is that it is not possible to force participation; it must be entirely voluntary. A joint labor-management working committee is established after the employees approve the program. The working committee includes top managers and union leaders as well as rank-and-file workers and employees. This committee creates overall program policy and plans the various organizational innovations and structures which involve all employees.

While the actual content and structure of the programs vary according to the needs of the organization, a set of guiding principles is established by the working committee. While they are not always the same, they usually include the following in some form. Fairness refers to fair rules, regulations, and compensations and to overcoming discrimination because of race, sex or age. All parties should participate in designing the nature of the rewards of improved productivity, and these rewards



should be shared fairly with all those involved. Security means changes in the workplace should not endanger one's job, safety or physical and mental well-being. Participation means that all employees and workers involved in a work improvement project should regularly participate in its design, implementation and evaluation. With greater participation from below, managers are encouraged to develop their abilities to be responsive leaders, resources and teachers. Individuation means work improvements should be based on a recognition that different people in any workplace have differing aspirations, values and attitudes toward work. Work improvements that embody these different human needs have a greater opportunity to lead to increased trust, cooperation, satisfaction and productivity.

The working committee usually initiates work teams throughout the organization so that those managers, supervisors, employees and workers who want to meet during working time to communicate their needs and ideas can regularly do so. These work teams are the basic unit of worker participation. Proposed changes in the organization of the work or the working conditions, once approved by the working committee, are tried for a period of time and then evaluated by all who were involved, according to criteria they have created as a group. If the changes satisfy the criteria, they become permanent. In this way, employees and workers cooperating with managers, participate in proposing, designing, implementing and evaluating changes in the workplace.

While changes vary widely in kind, degree and scope, some have been: the creation of a school within a factory where both managers and workers can teach and study; the merging of clerical and professional work in a government bureaucracy; and the creation of semi-autonomous teams in a factory which do their own quality control, rotate jobs, and supervise themselves. More important than specific changes, however, is that such changes only occur where new conditions of trust, equitable rewards, dignity and participation have been created.



All work team and working committee decisions are by consensus. This requires that everyone understand and agree to all decisions. This helps avoid power struggles, split decisions which might mean people being forced to do something against their will. Consensus is different from majority rule, which many consider the only democratic process for decision-making. In the consensus process, people take more seriously a minority view and are stimulated to research the issue further and reformulate it. It leads, therefore, to a more critical design and planning of alternatives.

The Project staff functions as researchers-educators to facilitate the process of the work improvement program, without making any decisions about content or policy. It follows the model of Paulo Freire (1970) of creating a dialogue with the people about the aspects of their situation which limit their development. It raises questions but does not provide answers, so that people become thoughtful and active in working out their own solutions.

The Project staff has also done research by interviewing a sample of people throughout the organization. This provides knowledge of the structure and organization of work, the technology and the work flow, as well as knowledge of the different values, attitudes and aspirations of the people in the workplace. This yields a picture of the organization of work and how it conflicts with or stifles the different types of people that comprise the organization. This knowledge is written up in non-technical language that is easily understood (Fromm always wrote in non-elitist language) in a report distributed to everyone. This report provides a basis in knowledge for making informed decisions about changes. In some situations, the Project staff has encouraged and taught the people themselves to do the research.

The Project attempts to understand the productive possibilities of the organization and its technology as well as the productive potentialities of the people. In modern organizations, it is increasingly possible to design technology to provide for



greater teamwork, which the modern social character seeks and responds to. It is therefore possible to make changes which are productive both economically and humanly, although this requires group training in problem-identification and problem-solving.

However, there remain social characters of an older type, more oriented to craftsmanship, loyalty, duty, security, family and religious values, who resist this kind of development because it does not interest them. There is a danger that some people may make work improvement programs into an ideology and demand that everyone participate in the same way or to the same degree.² This would wrongly assume that the resistance of these character types is to greater participation in the rules, control systems and rewards at work which, in fact, they want to have a say in designing. This also overlooks the positive contributions that each character type can make.

How do these programs relate to building the basis of a new society? The answer is by encouraging the development of democratic character, and the structures and education that support it. Building on Fromm's study of authoritarian and democratic character in Germany in 1930 and following the principles, strategy and structures outlined above, these programs cultivate democratic character by encouraging people to listen to and tolerate others; to increase their confidence to speak out and develop their ideas; to tolerate ambiguity; to mature their feelings of empathy and responsibility; to develop a non-moralistic attitude; to increase their consciousness and critical awareness; and to strengthen their willingness to work cooperatively with others in finding practical solutions to group problems. Democratic character therefore means developing the traits of cooperative community based on a respect for human differences and a concern for others' human development. This is different from pursuing one's narrow economic self-interest, an activity promoted by capitalist democracies which has little to do with cultivating democratic character. Voting in representative democracies does contribute, in a limited way, by encouraging citizens to inform themselves, analyze public policies and



politicians, and make choices. Capitalist democracies thus contain a contradiction which can be worked with: voting, education, welfare, access to culture, job retraining, etc., are provided but without an orientation or values which would cultivate participatory democratic character. By developing participation at work one encourages genuine democratic character which begins to build the foundation, rooted in people's drives and values, for a mass-based praxis.

The description above of the principles and structures of a typical work improvement program has been general since there is a variation, by necessity, from one program to another. What frames and focuses it all, however, is the psychological understanding provided by Fromm's concept of social character, and his distinction between the idolatrous, ideological rebel and the revolutionary humanist.

December 1, 1981
Washington, D.C.

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.



NOTES

1. The author would like to thank the following colleagues and friends who took time out of their active lives to read this essay and make many helpful corrections and suggestions: Norman Birnbaum, Philip Brenner, Mauricio Cortina, Ruth Fort, Charles Heckscher, Barbara Lenkert, Michael Maccoby, Cynthia Margolies, Jody Palmour and Marilyn Stahl.
2. In Western capitalist democracies there has been in recent years a Quality of Working Life movement which runs the risk of becoming an ideology and a manipulative tool of management which promises but does not deliver. The Project offers a possible method of avoiding this problem by continuing to study, from a humanist perspective, the changing nature of, and relation between, character, work, and technology.



REFERENCES

- Freire, P. Pedagogy Of The Oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.
- Freud, S. Standard Edition Of The Complete Psychological Works Of Sigmund Freud, Vol. XXII, 1933. London: Hogart Press, 1964.
- Fromm, E. Man For Himself: An Inquiry Into The Psychology Of Ethics (1947). Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett, 1970.
- Fromm, E. The Sane Society (1955). Greenwich Conn: Fawcett, 1970.
- Fromm, E. Marx's Concept of Man. New York: Ungar, 1961.
- Fromm, E. The Dogma Of Christ: And Other Essays On Religion, Psychology And Culture (1963). Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett, 1973.
- Fromm, E. The Crisis Of Psychoanalysis: Essays On Freud, Marx and Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- Fromm, E. The Anatomy Of Human Destructiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- Fromm, E. Greatness And Limitations Of Freud's Thought. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.
- Fromm, E. and Maccoby, M. Social Character In A Mexican Village. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1970.
- Klein, G.S. Psychoanalytic Theory: An Explanation Of Essentials. New York: International Universities Press, 1976.
- Maccoby, M. "Changing Work: The Bolivar Project," Working Papers For A New Society, 1975, 3(2), 43-44.
- Maccoby, M. The Gamesman: The New Corporate Leaders. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- Maccoby, M. "Work and Human Development," Professional Psychology, June, 1980, Vol. II, #3, 509-519.
- Maccoby, M. The Leader: A New Face For American Management. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981.
- Margolies, R. "The Psychoanalytic Meaning of Work." Unpublished dissertation, Yeshiva University, New York, 1981.



