

21. AS HEARD IN SILENCE—ERICH FROMM, LISTENING AND TO-BE-HEARD IN EDUCATION

What I liked in anthropology was its inexhaustible faculty of negation, its relentless definition of man, as though he were no better than God, in terms of what he is not.

—Samuel Beckett 1955, 52

People learn nothing and have succeeded in nothing unless they think this is the most important thing to do.

—Erich Fromm 1994, 76

The Talmud tells us how God told Moses, when Hebrews were trying to get across the red sea, that he should raise his staff, and after that the waters would open. Moses did raise his staff but the waters did not open. The sea was silent and the Hebrews had no way to go. Not until the first person jumped to the water, on that very moment waters gave way for the Hebrews to go. This story tells us at least two things. On the other hand nothing will happen if we are not ready to work together (i.e. to jump) for the goals that each of us sees the most important thing to do in the current situation. We have to have faith and fortitude in order to succeed. But on the other hand I think that this is also the source of the substantial pessimism that the real critic must face. In fact this pessimism should be a part and parcel of the criticism and evaluation of the real possibilities. The point would be to learn to listen for the call of the moment, to hope in face of despair. But how exactly we might learn this in a world that has almost lost the ability for this? What kind of education might give room for the existence of hope that discloses how “the world itself, just as it is in a mess, is also in a state of unfinishedness and in experimental process out of that mess” (Bloch 1986, 221).

Fear has made us stop while facing the sea of time and opportunity, our given historical moment. African-American Nobel Prize-winning author, editor, and professor Toni Morrison described our time with two traits in 2004. She said that our time is characterized by fear and melancholy. She has grown to fear her country—the United States of America. Millions share her fear but they also fear for their own concrete and personal lives. This fear, which springs all around the world, especially in the countries that form the so called axis of evil, show where Morrison’s melancholy springs. Its fountain is the knowledge about what United States of America has become. Fear and melancholy are very much a part of everyone’s lives, if not consciously, then at least subconsciously.

But we can also claim that in addition to Morrison’s two characteristics there are at least four other characteristics to describe our historical moment: risk, uncertainty, human invisibility and instrumentality of human self-relation and the relations

to others. Taken together these six characteristics are the constellation that forms the individual, ordinary human beings view point to the globalization as they are the effects of and reactions to this same process. This is why we need to listen more carefully the experiential dimension of globalization in everyday life world and this also should mean something in the field of education. These characteristics might help us to understand the role of emotional processes in the process of learning and teaching.

Famous social critic and psychoanalyst Erich Fromm (1900–1980) wrote about therapy as an art of listening. But this art of listening was connected as a central part to a larger idea of change from having orientation to a productive orientation—to be as a full human being. This is as I see the fundamental question that we must face today as we face the global ecological, economical and human catastrophe. In the 1960s Fromm began to deepen his idea of the orientations present in western societies that he had already found in the 1930's and 40's. He was able to articulate the fundamental and macabre fascination with death and things that we have in Western-world. Fromm believed that the central driving force behind this was the desire to make up for a lack of authentic being and selfhood. This was done in identifying with the lifeless when enjoying things as long as they are reified and without life.

To describe this orientation toward death Fromm used the concept of necrophilia. He was concerned to go beyond the popular usage of the term that made reference to a sexual contact with the dead; and/or the desire to be near bodily or visually to corpses. Fromm wanted to open up necrophilia as a character-rooted passion: the passion to transform and to see living as something non-living (Fromm 1973, 332). He writes that “Man is biologically endowed with the capacity for biophilia, but psychologically he has the potential for necrophilia as an alternative solution” (Ibid., 366). As Sigmund Freud did earlier in individual level, Fromm set this passion to “tear apart living structures” within a proper social and political contexts.

With the increasing production an division of labor, the formation of a large surplus, and the building of states with hierarchies and elites [...] large-scale human destructiveness and cruelty came into existence and grew as civilization and the role of power grew. (Fromm 1973, 435.)

In his famous book *To Have or To Be* (1976) Fromm argues that two ways of existence were competing for “the spirit of mankind”. The having mode looks to things and material possessions and is based on aggression and greed. The being mode is rooted in love and is concerned with shared experience and productive activity. Fromm (1976, 165) argued that only a fundamental change in human character “from a preponderance of the having mode to a preponderance of the being mode of existence can save us from a psychological and economic catastrophe” and set out some ways forward.

In this article I want to ask can we use Fromm's (1994) writings about therapy as an art of listening, as a way to articulate more carefully the usually hidden dimensions of the relationship between student and teacher—the scream and whisper. With these texts in mind among others, I want to probe little bit the question how

are listening, to-be-heard, trust, responsibility and obligation connected together in a teaching environment and educational counseling sessions in the era of globalizing capitalism. Especially I am interested in the theoretical and practical dimensions of the concept of active listening, and the connection of it to the education aimed to change. Active listening is the vessel of hope, which is the fundamental dimension of every human act directed at change.

If we would practically adopt the idea in the previously told Talmudic story then we would have to ask quite frankly, what would be the starting point of learning that would make it possible for the students to see the common goal and interest within their individuality? I think that this goal cannot be brought outside but has to be developed from the shared historically situated life experiences. By posing this question we see how difficult it would be to formulate such a starting point. Unless we would be able to formulate a kind of norm that every person has a right to full birth as an individual, full growth to her individual potentialities, full aliveness regardless her actual personality.

ACTIVE LISTENING AS A MODEL OF RADICAL COUNSELLING/TEACHING

I think that the best way to start to understand what Fromm meant with his idea of active listening is to open the discussion with a quote from interview that was done by R. I. Evans in the 1960's. In this part of the interview that was published as a book *Dialogue with Erich Fromm* in 1966 Fromm is describing his work as a practicing therapist. Fromm (Evans 1966, 35) says “now I listen you, and while *I'm listening*, *I have responses* which are the responses of a trained instrument. [...] I'll tell you what I hear. This will often be quite different from what you are telling me or intended to tell me. Then you tell me how you feel about my interpretation [...] We move along this way freely. I am not claiming that what *I hear* is necessarily correct, but it deserves attention because of the fact that your words produce this reaction in me”.¹

Fromm (1994, 98) argued that the fundamental point in this relationship is to listen and to say what is heard and not to interpret. Only this way the relationship can be formed as an active interaction between two human beings where different responses are the key element. With these different responses the practical goal of therapy can be reached. Fromm sees that the main practical goal of therapist is to seek a way to penetrate behind the patient's “official goals”. This is imperative if it is intended that the therapeutic relationship should produce real improvement or change in the patient's behaviour. Behind these official goals Fromm sees a “secret plot” that is motivating self-defeating behaviour. With this idea it is intended to activate dialectic between these two aspects of patient's personality as they bear upon an issue that has an immediate significance in the patient's life.

It is easy to see the importance of these ideas within educational philosophy if we want to promote radical learning and change. Quite many recent developments in the field are pointing to same kind of understanding of the teacher-pupil relationship but they lack the idea that what education is primarily interested in doing is not so much to make persons more suited to the social environment, than to make them radically self-aware of their situation and their own resources to act in these situations.

What is quite unique in Fromm's ideas, and in fact was unique in the field of therapy also, is an idea, that the person that produces the dialectic—be it teacher of therapist—does not stay outside the dialectic. Once the process has begun teacher is inevitably part and parcel of the same process and must act accordingly.

But it is obvious that we do not have to encourage or force teachers in a full autobiographical self-disclosure but we do not have to necessary deny it either. Actually there is nothing harmful doing just that, but at the same time it is not actually quite clear what we can gain from full self-disclosure. But what is needed is a certain kind of self-revelation that is fundamental part of the radical learning. What I have in mind is that this self-revelation requires teacher to expose their own strengths and limitations of understanding and their own value systems far more openly and directly than occurs in usual, teacher centered neutrality. The reading of Fromm's texts on therapy reveals us that this was something that he saw also fundamental for therapeutical cure.

LaPlanche and Potanlis (1973, 93) famously described that there are three ways to understand counter transference in psychoanalysis. In fact they saw a term as a cross-road where therapist should decide which of the three roads she should follow. First road is the classical road of striving neutrality so that the possible treatment can be "structured exclusively by the patient's transference". Second road is the road of therapeutics private scrutiny of their counter transference reactions. From these personal reactions they can "interpret utterances of the unconsciousness in other people". Third road is for the analyst to disclose to the patient "the actual emotions felt"—i.e. the personal emotions. LaPlanche and Potanlis add that "this approach is on the tenet that, resonance from the unconscious to the unconscious constitutes the only authentically psychoanalytic form of communication".

Fromm took LaPlanche's and Potanlis's third road even further than they have expected because he saw that this form of therapeutic communication was intended to convey not only a message but a model. It was a vehicle for the patient to experience what Fromm called "authenticity" in human relationship. This kind of "authenticity" should be seen not as in a strict sense of the word, i.e. as something that we truly in a fundamental sense are but as an attitude to be there and actually listen what other human being is saying to us—to be open to other and let her words reach us as a whole human being. In a sense we might argue that in this kind of relationship teacher is taught by the pupil given that they do not treat each other as an object; i.e. teachers have to try to see her as taking part in a same process as her pupil. As Karl Marx (1844, 326) wrote in his so called Paris-manuscripts from the 1844 describing the same experience that Fromm called authentic human relationship:

Assume man to be man and his relationship to the world to be a human one: then you can exchange love only for love, trust for trust, etc. If you want to enjoy art, you must be an artistically cultivated person; if you want to exercise influence over other people, you must be a person with a stimulating and encouraging effect on other people. Every one of your relations to man and to nature must be a specific expression, corresponding to the object of your will, of your real individual life. If you love without evoking love

in return — that is, if your loving as loving does not produce reciprocal love; if through a living expression of yourself as a loving person you do not make yourself a beloved one, then your love is impotent — a misfortune.

I think that some sort of authentic human relationship is also necessary in educational settings. I mean that there must be a way to articulate what it means that we could have an authentic human relationship also to the themes and issues that are in the centre of particular educational situation. This re-articulation may be done from the perspectives of both teacher and pupil as a new shared sensibility. Fromm (1955, 347–352) wrote about "collective art" as a way to rearticulate meaningful relationship with the issues at hand. In Fromm's mind it means for art to be collective that we "*respond to the world with our senses in a meaningful, skilled, productive, active, shared way*". I think that this formulation can be transported to education and learning in general without enormous difficulties. In this kind of activity teacher and learner can together be one with others in "a meaningful, rich and productive way" (Fromm 1955, 348).

The need to this kind of shared sensibility may be seen when we start by pointing out that in fact all learning or acquisition of knowledge is based on fear. With this idea we gain access to the emotional work that is going on all the time in the different stages of educational process in general. This fear may be seen from two different angles. Firstly, it is the minimal structuring dimension of all knowledge acquisition as stated above. All not known is something that we are afraid of. As Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno (2002, 11) write in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, "nothing is allowed to remain outside, since the mere idea of 'outside' is the real source of fear". But at the same time fear is also the fundamental dimension of knowledge thus grown out of fear. By this I mean that when we have certain knowledge we might be afraid if something or someone is threatening this knowledge and identity that we have formed from and for it (cf. *ibid.* 23–24).

Is it too much to hope for that for example regular teacher in her teaching environment with its normal hardships and problematic could form an authentic human relationship that Fromm envisioned? Can we say that this kind of relationship could be taught or is it more the case that it can only be learnt, or more clearly stated, mimetically acquired from the social environment? The premise for this relationship to actualize is that the whole person has a productive character orientation towards others and the world. What if our character orientation is non-authentic, sadomasochistic, non-productive, having-orientation that Fromm diagnosed? Can this kind of person—as teachers are after all human beings—stimulate the needed creative and productive relationship? Can she ever serve as an example of authentic human relationship? The answer is obvious: no.

There is something strange going on when we look at the teacher education in general. The same strange process where the original goal of education vanishes to thin air happens in the education of physicians. What happens is that these students gradually loose from their sights the fact that they are in contact with human beings while practicing medicine. When these doctoral candidates are asked in the beginning of their education that why they want to become doctors the answer is that they want to help other human beings. The reason for this altruist impulse to

vanish might be that the education on doctors is long and the problems that they tackle with are enormously difficult so that they have to develop a technical rationality.² This way they can solve the problems without any distracting emotional elements. But what is strange is that this same process goes through in every level of occupations where other human beings are trying to help others in need of help be it teachers, social workers etc.³

The most debatable and problematic dimension of this method be it in education or in therapy lies here. But I think it is safe to say that the same problems are lurking behind the other roads that can be followed in the field of education because the fruitful interaction is based on the idea that teacher or analyst “is not afraid of his own unconscious for then he will not be afraid or embarrassed by opening up the patient’s unconscious” (Evans 1966, 55).

AM I DRIVEN OR PUSHED TOWARDS SOMETHING?

Fromm (1932) articulated in his work how capitalism fosters anal character with all their special pathologies. He unified social and individual characteristics with his concepts of authoritarian character, hoarding character and marketing character (Fromm 1941; 1945). Fromm (1973, 349) then understood sadistic character and the necrophilious character as a progressively more malignant forms of a “normal anal character”. These extreme forms are produced by any conditions that increase the force that underlay normal banality: narcissism, unrelatedness and destructiveness.

Fromm distinguishes between benign aggression, which mainly take place in self-defense, and malignant aggression, as the urge to be cruel, to exercise power over others, or simply to destroy. This arises, according to Fromm, when person finds it impossible to satisfy his existential needs, i.e. roughly his need to do something significant, in a way that is creative and constructive; and so tries to fulfill him by destroying rather than creating. This may come about of person’s own character, or family relationships; but it may also be caused or encouraged by social conditions. “There are specific environmental conditions conducive to... the development of the life-furthering syndrome... to the extent these conditions are lacking; he will become... characterized by the presence of the life-thwarting syndrome.” (Fromm 1973, Chapter 10, section 4, part 2.)

These conditions are named as “freedom, activating stimuli, the absence of exploitative control, and the presence of ‘man-cantered’ modes of production” (Ibid.). “Activating stimuli” such as “a novel, a poem, an idea, a landscape, music, a loved person” invite a response of active interest and mental or psychical activity, and do not produce satiation or boredom when repeated. Passive stimuli produces immediate thrill, followed by release of tension, followed by boredom and the need for a new stimulus of different kind, since there is no novelty created by response. Hence in the society in which passive rather than active stimuli are the most easily available, there will be a growing tendency to gain easy excitement by arousing malice and destructiveness: “It is much easier to get excited by anger, rage, cruelty or the passion to destroy than by love and productive and active interest.” (Fromm 1973, 10, 3, 4.) This is not determined inevitably by social circumstances, but is heavily influenced

by them: “man is never so determined that a basic change... is not possible... environment inclines, but does not determine” (Fromm 1973, 10, 4, 5).

We might see teacher in an ideal sense as “the activating stimuli”—she produces a strive towards something. This striving is something more than a mere being-driven-towards something that simple stimulus produces. But the teacher needs some intervention or mediation to do just this. In Fromm’s eyes activating stimuli “requires a ‘touchable’ stimuli in order to have an effect—touchable not in the sense of being educated, but of being humanly responsive. On the other hand, the person who is fully alive does not necessarily need any particular outside stimulus to be activated; in fact, he creates his own stimuli.” (Fromm 1973, 270.)

What Fromm was articulating in the previous paragraphs from the psychological viewpoint might be re-articulated in the concrete educational setting by using the concept of “experiential learning” that John Dewey has famously developed in his *Democracy and Education*. Dewey (1916, 141) argues that

To “learn from experience” is to make a backward and forward connection between what we do to things and what we enjoy or suffer from things in consequence. Under such conditions, doing becomes a trying; an experiment with the world to find out what it is like; the undergoing becomes instruction—discovery of the connection of things.

Learning by *doing* becomes in this sense learning by *trying*. Students become active agents of their learning process. This does not mean that the teacher’s role diminishes but even though teachers still has a definite role in this process their role is fundamentally changed. It is obvious that teacher cannot be seen as a sole actor of the situation anymore. Knowledge is not given above but seen as shared in some specific context.

Through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-students and student-teachers. The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. [...] Men teach each other, mediated by the world, by the cognizable objects which in banking education are “owned” by the teacher. (Freire 2003, 67)

Freire (2004, 74) argued that these frame of references are “generative themes” and the role of teacher is to see and articulate those themes together with students. These themes are usually scattered and not fully articulated and it is left to teacher to reframe them into meaningful wholes. But teacher does not do this alone as students will give in this reframing and reorganization work important experiential impulses to serve as a material index.

Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man’s ideas, views, and conception, in one word, man’s consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life? (Marx & Engels 1848, 73.)

Dewey (ibid. 160) saw that “no thought, no idea, can possibly be conveyed as an idea from one person to another”. The only way to do just this is through practice of testing and experiencing. This can be too easily be read as promoting self-centered narcissism but Dewey connected to his idea of experience the must to develop communicative, collaborative and deliberative skills. As Myles Horton¹ (1990, 57) writes:

I knew that it was necessary [...] to draw out of people their experience, and help them value group experiences and learn from them. It was essential that people learned to make decisions on the basis of analyzing and trusting their own experience, and learning from what was good and bad. [...] I believed then and still believe that you learn from your experience of doing something and from your analysis of that experience.

This collaboration within learning practices should be seen not as collectivization of individuals. We might argue that in an inescapable climate of neoliberalism, that “removing ourselves from the influence of others is a revolutionary act” (Brookfield 2005, p. 196). But this kind of removal of oneself should not be seen as an identity political act of self-articulation. Like Peter McLaren put it in his opening lecture of the Paulo Freire Research Center-Finland in the University of Tampere (20.11.2007): in the dark times of neoliberal terror, it is not important to ask, as researchers in “cultural” Critical Pedagogy and other domesticated forms of Critical Pedagogy, Who am I (identity political positioning). But instead to ask the fundamental question, where are you—and to reply: I am here! Even though I have certain reservations of specific ideas of McLaren (i.e. the leader role of teachers, straightforward use of Marxian economical theory) I find it very useful this idea of the need for ethical and real political positioning within educational practices (McLaren & Farahmandpur 2005; McLaren & Jaramillo 2007). This positioning might help students to form better picture of the times where they are living and also help them to develop insight to the role of information production and consumption.

As we have seen in previous paragraphs, the decisions and goals that the specific teaching situation should address are based not only on tacit knowledge of the students but on knowledge gained from shared experience via discussions and collaborative reflection and active doing. For example as a teacher Horton “realized for the first time that he could lead a discussion without knowing all the answers. He sharpened their questions, got them to talk about their own experiences, and found that they already had many answers” (Parker & Parker, 1991, p. 2). I think that such experience plays a central role in education.

We might want to argue that group collaboration and problem solving involve people’s shared experiences that are often solutions that may have already existed in some sense. These solutions were unseen or were pieced together through reflection from the apparent synergy of engaging one others ideas, experiences and knowledge in discussions (Peters & Bell, 2001). Participants “get much more out of what they didn’t come for than what they came for, because they start exchanging experiences” (Kennedy, 1981, p. 107). As Dewey, Horton believed that the best way of learning is by actually doing, which provides substance for reflection and growth. This is something that Hegel already understood while articulating the

development of self-consciousness in *Phenomenology of Spirit* as a necessary self-objectification and return and I think that it might have a productive impact even in different fields of theoretical subjects. This brings about the dichotomy of learning that Dewey brought up in his *Democracy and Education*.

On the one hand, learning is the sum total of what is known, as that is handed down by books and learned men. It is something external, an accumulation of cognitions as one might store material commodities in a warehouse. Truth exists ready-made somewhere. Study is then the process by which an individual draws on what is in storage. On the other hand, learning means something which the individual does when he studies. It is an active, personally conducted affair. The dualism here is between knowledge as something external, or, as it is often called, objective, and knowing as something purely internal, subjective, psychical. There is, on one side, a body of truth, ready-made, and, on the other, a ready-made mind equipped with a faculty of knowing—if it only wills to exercise it, which it is often strangely loath to do. The separation, often touched upon, between subject matter and method is the educational equivalent of this dualism. Socially the distinction has to do with the part of life which is dependent upon authority and that where individuals are free to advance. (Dewey 1916, 389–390.)

HOW TO MOTIVATE LEARNERS TO LEARN AND TO CHANGE

Adam Smith wrote in his magisterial *Wealth of Nations* in 1776 about a not welcomed side effects of the division of labour which he saw fundamental dimension of the well organized and productive societies. The most devastating side-effect was that the division of labour produced stupidity or more generally we might argue that it produced one-dimensionality persons. Smith (1776, 987–994) saw that since the common people are engaged in simple and uniform tasks in the productive system in order to maintain their lives, it is necessary to provoke their minds with mental stimuli which would encourage them to speculate about their own otherwise dull occupations. With this they can gain much wider and richer viewpoint to the world, themselves and the relationship that they have to each other. Smith thought that this overcoming of one dimensionality is needed because otherwise people would start to act socially rebellious and plan upheavals. This was something that Smith despised.

But what drives human being to get used to one-dimensionality? I think that Smith was wrong in that he thought that if living becomes enough estranged, one-dimensional and improvised then people would almost automatically start to do something to improve their lives. Marx shared this optimism in some elementary form. With this problem in mind it might be useful to have a look on Fromm’s argument in his book *Escape from Freedom*. We might want to redirect the central thesis of the book towards our question and argue that fear is one of the central motivators that have taught human beings to learn to love their particular fate. Fromm thought that this fear was specific fear of taking charge of one’s life. As Dewey (1989, 44) once argued “the serious threat to our democracy is not the existence of foreign totalitarian states. It is the existence within our own personal

attitudes and within our own institutions of conditions which have given a victory to external authority. The battlefield is also accordingly here—within ourselves and our institutions.” Thus it is imperative that education starts by acknowledging the shared social and experiential world and tries to meaningfully incorporate this into topics at hand in schools and education in general.

Social and economical conditions shape emotionally and psychologically conditioned needs. As Marx (1859, 28–29) argued in his *Grundrisse*:

Hunger is hunger, but the hunger gratified by cooked meat eaten with a knife and fork is a different hunger from that which bolts down raw meat with the aid of hand, nail and tooth. Production thus produces not only the object but also the manner of consumption, not only objectively but also subjectively. Production thus creates the consumer. (3) Production not only supplies a material for the need, but it also supplies a need for the material. As soon as consumption emerges from its initial state of natural crudity and immediacy—and, if it remained at that stage, this would be because production itself had been arrested there—it becomes itself mediated as a drive by the object. The need which consumption feels for the object is created by the perception of it. The object of art—like every other product—creates a public which is sensitive to art and enjoys beauty. Production thus not only creates an object for the subject, but also a subject for the object. Thus production produces consumption (1) by creating the material for it; (2) by determining the manner of consumption; and (3) by creating the products, initially posited by it as objects, in the form of a need felt by the consumer. It thus produces the object of consumption, the manner of consumption and the motive of consumption.

Fromm (1941, 15) argued that within different needs there is also a strong and fundamental human need “to be related to the world outside oneself, the need to avoid aloneness”. If human being is forced to be without experience of belonging, it will have an effect of psychical disintegration. In a sense you can live among human beings and have in this sense physical communion with them but still be deprived from psychical communion with them or ideas, symbols and social patterns. This kind of spiritual aloneness Fromm (*ibid.*) called moral aloneness.

The more man gains freedom in the sense of emerging from the original oneness with man and nature and the more he becomes an ‘individual’, he has no choice but to unite himself with the world in the spontaneity of love and productive work or else to seek a kind of integrity of his individual self. (Fromm 1941, 18.)

In education it is imperative that this kind of possibility for spontaneity and productive work is maintained even though it is a brute fact that in schools many different structural and personal dimensions work against this goal. One way to see the problematic is to make a distinction between different authorities that are present in educational situations: rational, irrational, and anonymous authority.

Fromm (1941, 225) thought that “*self is as strong as it is active*”. Different authorities promote or hinder this activity. Irrational authority is working to promote the actualization of the interest of authority in question. It does not see any particular use or need for the activity of the subjected person if not the active self-repression of that particular individual or groups of individuals. Whereas irrational authority is working for the authority, rational authority works to promote the actualization of the developmental potentials of the person in question. As Fromm (1957, 176–177) argues “by irrational authority I mean authority which is based on force, either physical or emotional, and the function which is the exploitation of other person, materially, emotionally, or otherwise. Rational authority is authority which is based on competence, and the function which is to help another person accomplish a certain task”.

Rational authority is part and parcel of the real education because in real education educational activity is concerned in nurturing the developmental goals of the persons who are educated. In this sense real education is up-bringing in some fundamental sense while education which is based in irrational authority is not education at all but more handling of the things—the total instrumentality of delicate educational relationship between two persons. Education is “identical with helping the child realize his potentialities” (Fromm 1947, 207). But this kind of real education does not mean that this educational relationship is in some sense biologically based natural relationship and does not need rational control. This would lead to a certain kind of *laissez-faire* where we could not recognize any principle, would not state any value and would obscure hierarchy. This would lead to a much more thorough intervention from society and its regulative imperatives it would give foothold to anonymous authority.

By anonymous authority Fromm (1955, 99) understood “the authority of public opinion and the market”. This kind of authority fosters the need to adjust and to be approved by the some commonly approved value. It produces always present unconscious sense of fundamental powerlessness. As Fromm (*ibid.*, 102) states “there is no overt authority [i.e. irrational and rational authority] which intimidates us, but we are governed by fear of the anonymous authority of conformity. We do not submit to anyone personally; we do not go through conflicts with authority, but we have also no convictions of our own, almost no individuality, almost no sense of self.”

It is obvious that education that is based on rational authority would need much more rational evaluation and control from teachers part than handling of thing which is much more non-rational and based on impulses and regulations coming outside of human relationship in this sense. The critical question in this is, that how can we find out what could be the most productive course of development for the person that is being educated. In face of this question it is imperative that we focus not so much on the positive, regulative principles than on the minimal terms and try to picture what might be most harmful for the growth of individual person.

Education should aim to the goal where human being is able to “give birth to himself, to become what he potentially is” (Fromm 1945, 237). With this idea Fromm is moving quite near what Theodor W. Adorno meant while he used the concept of non-identity. In Fromm’s mind the education is in some fundamental

sense self-education. Only individual person is able to actualize the potentials if the surrounding settings do not hinder that effort. In education we usually think that we are able to form a clear picture of all the aspects of educational situation via mostly empirical research.

Adorno tried to articulate with his concept of non-identity that we are unable to disclose reality fully. We have a strong drive for identifying or even reducing educational reality. This is done nowadays for example in evidence-based educational research that is strongly determined by a causal perspective linking professional intervention and educational outcome (Biesta 2007, pp. 6–8). This has furthered the process that has taken place in western countries where the focus in education (among many other fields of human activity) has fundamentally shifted from the process of creative activity to the end result of that process.

Immanuel Kant famously wrote about legislation of reason most notably in his *Critique of Pure Reason*. Adorno argued in *Negative Dialectics* that this legislation of reason is bound to a separation of mental and physical labor. After Kant all human existence was judged in relation to the mental realm. Enlightened thought tried to show that this realm was the sphere of universal reason, i.e. it is detached from the concrete conditions of social existence.

The transcendental generality is no mere narcissist self-exaltation of the I, not the hubris of an autonomy of the I. Its reality lies in the domination that prevails and perpetuates itself by means of the principle of equivalence. The process of abstraction—which philosophy transfigures, and which it ascribes to the knowing subject alone—is taking place in the factual barter society (Adorno 1973, 178.)

Individuals learn to abstract from their social conditions when judging their specific situations. This is done possible with transcendental subject and the realm of pure reason. Alfred Sohn-Rethel (1985) argued in this connection that the reference to a general subject and pure reason is an objectification that works as a complement to the capitalist principle of exchange.

Beyond the magic circle of identitarian philosophy, the transcendental subject can be deciphered as a society unaware of itself. Such unawareness is deducible. Ever since mental and physical labor were separated in the sign of the dominant mind, the sign of justified privilege, the separated mind has been obliged, with the exaggeration due to a bad conscience, to vindicate the very claim to dominate which it derives from the thesis that it is primary and original—and to make every effort to forget the source of its claim, lest the claim lapse. (Adorno 1973, 177.)

But Adorno's concept says more than only criticize the methods of educational sciences. It tries to articulate to us that the technologically based educational science and some of us who believe in the products of these sciences forget that in education we are dealing with human beings who are trying to articulate what they are experiencing and what they are doing in particular situations (Thompson 2005).

EDUCATION IS NOT THERAPY BUT BECAUSE IT IS NOT THERAPY IT CAN PROVIDE THERAPEUTIC EFFECT

It is obvious that we need to keep in mind that education or counseling is not a form or practice of therapy—its main function is *Vergesellschaftlichung* i.e. preparing people to a life in a *specific society*. The goal of therapy in general is also socialization to the given society. Mostly this is done by restoring the work ability of a human being. And with this function we see also one of the main problems that beset education, i.e. what if the whole society is sick, what then is the role of education, in the process where this socially structured sickness is moved into the individual level? But still we might argue that even though they are not therapy they still can produce a therapeutic effect in student i.e. the need to find a new way of being and acting in the world more responsible way. This is possible when we articulate the process and goal of education from the radical point of view. Then we are able to withstand the goal of therapies in whatever form as fundamentally oriented to cure a person only so that she can function normally within the “pathology of normalcy”.

“Pathology of normalcy” means that we see as normal behaviour the statistically normal ways of being and acting in the world. Education as radical education is oriented in curing human beings from the “pathology of normalcy”. The real cure is outlined as a realization of possibility to gain self-knowledge as becoming aware of myself as part of “pathology of normalcy”. In the age of globalizing capitalism we need this therapeutic effect that education at best can produce. With it we can face the ever increasing division of the world into a well off part and the part that is pushed into evermore deeper poverty driven by the promise of the increase of prosperity. With it we might be able to make counter effect to fear, melancholy, risk, uncertainty, and human invisibility.

The closer I am to reality the more am I capable to live my life adequately.
The less close am I to reality, the more illusions I have, the am I capable to deal with life in an adequate way. (Fromm 1994, 168.)

To be invisible is when people refuse to recognize that you are a human being. To be invisible is when you lose your sense of human dignity. To be invisible is to realize that people no longer recognize your existence and your struggle to live in harmony inside the social world. As Ralph Ellison (1980, 3) wrote in his novel *Invisible Man*: “I am invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see me.” And this invisibility has become a sad fact of life for millions of inhabitants across the globe. When we look at the global situation, we can write without hesitation that today families are invisible, children are invisible, women are invisible and men are invisible. As we awake each morning to a consumer ideology, what is not invisible is the commodity itself. We have become a commodity of flesh and bone—a commodity to be bought and sold on the open market.

Within this objectified commodity fetish, there is uncertainty and life risk. When the human being becomes an objectified form, she becomes a disembodied commodity and as such, becomes a ‘person’ without substance. No longer possessing

a human body we become unseen and unfelt not only in the workplace but also inside the social. And here lies the risk and uncertainty. Every commodity relationship runs the risk of being discarded or being placed in a pile of garbage. A commodity has an uncertain future. Its value is determined by its usefulness. When the human being has a commodity form, her usefulness always comes into question and hence, the uncertainty of life and risk.

But what this means for the thinking and acting in the world? This kind of commodification runs through the whole culture. It leaves nothing untouched. We might still criticize the school system same as we can criticize the whole society because it emphasizes too much the issues of knowledge and intelligence. In fact when the new capitalism production has taken hold of the production and selling of knowledge in the large scale this process will accelerate even more. Fromm (1973, 30) saw that this kind of culture where even the acquiring the knowledge about the surrounding world is seen as a commodity production produces a kind of brain-human-being. This kind of being is in touch with her environment, be it natural or social in nature, only with his intellect. Emotional reactions are missing from her intellectual operations which gradually become one dimensional and dull.

It is obvious that in critical attitude we need certain amount of critical distance from what is given but this does not mean that we have to detach ourselves from issues involved in order to for critical attitude. Like Marcuse once wrote while describing Bertolt Brecht's answer to the problem how theatre could in the present situation bring forth truth:

To teach what the contemporary world really is behind the ideological and material veil, and how it can be changed, the theater must break the spectator's identification with the events on the stage. Not empathy and feeling, but distance and reflection are required. The "estrangement-effect" (*Verfremdungseffekt*) is to produce this dissociation in which the world can be recognized as what it is. "The things of everyday life are lifted out of the realm of the self-evident... That which is 'natural' must assume the features of the extraordinary. Only in this manner can the laws of cause and effect reveal themselves" (Brecht, 1957). (Marcuse, 1964, p. 67.)

Marcuse is talking here about *artistic alienation*. Artistic alienation is a conscious alienation of the alienated existence and hence its meaning is different than Marx's use of the concept of alienation. Marx is pointing out the relationship that human beings have towards themselves, others and the things that they produce in the scheme of capitalistic production. Practical human activity is seen as the formation of the self-conscious humanity. The purpose of which is for the collective assertion in social development on behalf of individual and humanity.

The problematic of artistic alienation brings us to the question concerning the aspects of reason, reasoning, intelligence and experience. To be educated in a fundamental sense human beings have to be in contact with the world as a whole human being i.e. with all of their senses and potentials as Hegel described in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Learning seen as a creative process is very important in this connection as then we are able to shift our focus back to the "only satisfaction

that can give [...] real happiness—the experience of the activity of the present moment" (Fromm 1941, 226). Without this viewpoint we are only chasing phantoms in a constant dissatisfaction.

There is something fundamentally right when Fromm criticized the division between intellect, emotions and the will. This division highlights the difference between reason and intelligence. Intelligence is connected with the immediate goals and it searches the tools of acquiring these goals. It is something that Horkheimer (1938) called instrumental reason or subjective aspect of reason. Here reason takes the form of tool and it operates with the already given set of rules, regulations, and identitarian thought. There is no way to see beyond what is given as all that is recognized is the already familiar. It is as if the world is something that we know as same and everything that lays beyond it is not recognizable at all. This kind of reason "proves to be the ability to [...] co-ordinate the right means with a given end" (Horkheimer 1947, 5). Horkheimer asserts moreover that "however naive or superficial this definition of reasoning may seem," it springs from the "profound change of outlook that has taken place in Western thinking in the course of the last centuries" (ibid. 4).

We need upbringing and education that is versatile in the nurturing of the feeling, willing, creativity and experiencing. It seems that this kind of support is diminishing while the greater part of education is connected with streamlining the intellectual operations of the students to fulfill the regulation and goals of the educational system. Reason in proper sense goes beyond the immediate needs and goals, be it that they are set by the system or individual.

A SCREAM HEARD IN SILENCE

There is the fundamental need to be silent while others talk—to let the silence be heard. Without this silence we are not able to get a hint from the non-identical in the given. But at the same time this silence must be seen as a hidden scream that is written to the very texture of modern life as it articulates the desperation of the individual human being. This is a dialectical nature of silence. As Samuel Beckett (1952, 32) once wrote, in his *Waiting for Godot*, when we "stopped crying. You have replaced him as it were. The tears of the world are a constant quantity. For each one who begins to weep somewhere else another stops. The same is true of the laugh." This is horrifyingly true in global capitalism. This experiential dimension should be brought up in education against the language of profit and personal gain because it is the only way to be able to reach the inner workings of globalized capitalism. Like Holloway once wrote: "When we talk or write, it is all too easy to forget that the beginning was not the word, but the scream. Faced with the destruction of human lives by capitalism, a scream of sadness, a scream of horror, above all a scream of anger, of refusal: NO." (Holloway 2003, 15.)

Finnish novelist and critic Christer Kihlman (1971) introduced the vertical and horizontal screams that articulate out positioning towards the world in the capitalistic society. The vertical scream comes from inside us. It is "a lonely scream of individualism, a scream that stems from the wealth of the unbearable riot of the

market and scam, a helpless scream in front of the facade of conflicts, a scream through the superficial” (Kihlman 1971, 17). Kihlman calls this vertical scream of individualism also ‘bourgeois scream’.

The horizontal scream is a ‘proletarian scream’. It is heard as a distress “from the depths of desperation, poverty and sadness, from the endlessly painful reality of the people who have been cheated, trampled, and humiliated, from the bottom of the well of the final defeat.” The horizontal scream of unprecedented human misery refers to the growth of global injustice and the polarization between the rich and the poor, and wounds also those who try to maintain a decent living in the midst of terrible economic over-development.

The screams of refusal are ethically demanding. Yet the power of the horizontal scream is about how to drown the vertical, for, as Kihlman (ibid.) writes, the horizontal scream “is a scream, which we must listen to, for it is getting louder around us all the time, all over the world, from the throats of millions of starving people, listen, it comes behind the horizon, it is here so close, it goes horizontally into the very ground in which we stand, and hits us at a right angle, challenging like the sound of a storm bell, the scream of an unfulfilled promise, the scream of anger of those from whom both a robe and a rice cup have been stolen, a scream that demands solidarity and justice, the only scream, which really judges.” (Ibid. 18)

It is very important to attain the ability of people to come together to reshape and remold the world in their own image and collective interest in teaching environments. In this sense radical pedagogy is shot through with the firm belief that as human beings, we can change the world into a more humane place for the majority, and not just for the privilege minority. In this the ethically demanding screams are important because with them it might be possible to open up theoretical discussions to the experiential registry of each human being involved.

We are afraid of letting out a scream of sadness, a scream of horror, above all a scream of anger, of refusal because it opens up the possibility that we lose the struggle of self-preservation both intellectually and physically. Grown ups and children alike might be seen as a rope dancers, like those in Friedrich Nietzsche’s *Thus spoke Zarathustra*. We are afraid of falling down, but not only because we might get hurt, or that it might be fatal to us, but because we long for this fall. In connection to learning, the mass that swells beneath us is seen as opposite to autonomous thinking, and the force of our own experiences. It is a merge of us into something bigger than us, renunciation of adulthood or the aloofness that development has brought about, our integrity.

NOTES

¹ Italics mine.

² There are obviously exceptions in this: for example doctors working in the *Medecins Sans Frontieres* and a like. There is quite interesting article by Glannon & Ross (2002) where they argue that when seen from the global scale the real altruists in medicine are still the patients.

³ I have developed this theme more systematically in connection to moral sentiments (especially pity, compassion, empathy, sympathy) in Moisisio 2004.

⁴ Myles Horton (1905–1990) was an American educator, socialist and cofounder of the Highlander Folk School, famous for its role in the Civil Rights Movement.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W. (1973). *Negative dialectics*. New York: Routledge.
- Beckett, S. (1952). *Waiting for godot*. New York: Grove Press.
- Beckett, S. (1955). *Molloy*. New York: Grove Press.
- Biesta, G. (2007) “Why ‘What Works’ Won’t Work: Evidence-Based practice and the democratic deficit in educational research”, In *Educational Theory*, 57(1), 1–22.
- Bloch, E. (1995). *The principle of hope* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: MIT.
- Brookfield, S. (2005). *The power of critical theory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ellison, R. (1980). *The invisible man*. New York: Random House.
- Evans, R. I. (1966). *Dialogue with Erich Fromm*.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Cosmo.
- Dewey, J. (1989). *Freedom and culture*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Freire, P. (2003). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogy of indignation*. Boulder and London: Paradigm.
- Fromm, E. (1932). Psychoanalytic characterology and its relevance for social psychology. In *The crisis of psychoanalysis* (pp. 164–187). New York: Henry Holt.
- Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from freedom*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Fromm, E. (1945). *Man for himself*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Fromm, E. (1955). *The sane society*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Fromm, E. (1957). Medicine and the ethical problem of modern man. In *The Dogma of Christ* (pp. 169–187). New York: Henry Holt.
- Fromm, E. (1973). *The anatomy of human destructiveness*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Fromm, E. (1976). *To have or to be?* New York: Continuum.
- Fromm, E. (1994). *The art of listening*. New York: Continuum.
- Glannon, W., & Ross, L. F. (2002). “Are doctors altruistic?” In *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 28, 68–69.
- Holloway, J. (2003). In the beginning was the scream. In W. Bonefeld (Ed.), *Revolutionary writing*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Horkheimer, M. (1938). The end of reason. In A. Arato & E. Gebhardt (Eds.), *The essential Frankfurt school reader*.
- Horkheimer, M. (1947). *Eclipse of reason*. New York: Continuum.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment* (E. Jephcott, Trans.). California: Stanford university Press.
- Horton, M. (1990). *The long haul*. New York: Doubleday.
- Kennedy, W. B. (1981). Highlander Praxis: Learning with Myles Horton. *Teachers College Record*, 83, 105–119.
- Kihlman, C. (1971). *Ihminen joka järkkyy*. [The Human who Trembled] Helsinki: Tammi.
- LaPlace, J., & Pontalis, J. B. (1988). *The language of psychoanalysis*. New York: Norton.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Marx, K. (1844). Economic and philosophical manuscripts of 1844. In K. Marx & F. Engels (Eds.), *Collected works* (Vol. 3). Moscow: Progress.
- Marx, K. (1859). Grundrisse. In K. Marx & F. Engels (Eds.), *Collected works* (Vol. 28). Moscow: Progress.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1948). *The communist manifesto* (A Norton Critical ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.
- McLaren, P., & Jaramillo, N. (2007). *Pedagogy and praxis in the age of empire*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Moisisio, O.-P. (2004). Saali sosiaalisen siteenä—uudesta solidaarisuudesta. [Pity as a Social bond—notes on a new solidarity]. In T. Helne, S. Hänninen & J. Karjalainen (Eds.), *Seis yhteiskunta—tahdon sisään*. Jyväskylä: SoPhi.

22. TOWARD A NEW DIALOGICAL LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION

In searching for a new language that will rescue Critical Pedagogy from besiege, Ilan Gur-Ze'ev wrote: "What is regrettable, however is that so much of Critical Pedagogy has become dogmatic, and sometimes anti-intellectual, while on the other hand losing its relevance for the people it conceived as victims to be emancipated" (Gur-Ze'ev, 2005, p. 10). Gur-Ze'ev argued, further, that today many critical pedagogues are ready for or actually searching for a new critical language in education that will reach beyond the achievements and limitations of Critical Pedagogy. However, various current versions of Critical Pedagogy do not pursue the attempt of Critical Theory to propose a holistic Utopia. Furthermore, the absence of love, creativity, and a human vista have led Critical Pedagogy into a blind alley.

In this regard, a critical perspective that incorporates the possibility of loosening the chains, as envisaged by Plato, is merely one aspect of Critical Theory, a fundamentally theoretical one, however rich and manifold. This option has the potential to have an emancipatory effect on teachers and educators who feel attracted ideologically to the principles of Critical Pedagogy, and can provide them with a home base in their shunning of normalizing education. However, many feel increasingly more despondent in such endeavors, as described by Elizabeth E. Heilman: "Critical Pedagogy fails to offer stories in which ordinary active citizens and teachers work for positive social change as part of their ordinary lives" (Heliman, 2005, p. 129). Heilman diagnosed the problems of Critical Pedagogy claiming that it is "still very much [a] victim of [...] textualization, loss of the subject, and excessive suspicion of the functioning of power in micro contexts" (Ibid., p. 121). And, further, that the results of these problems are "the absence of immediacy in the move from macro level critique to micro level classroom work" (Ibid).

RETURNING TO DIALOGIC PEDAGOGY

In order to enable Critical Pedagogy to be relevant today, it must—among other things—also be reconnected to the domain of schooling, not abandon or ignore it. Declining to enter this domain may reinforce alienation that will increase delegitimization. It must see itself once again obligated to developing tools and techniques that enable the teacher and pupil to escape, immediately, the extant discourse that resides in the heart of the confusion that abounds and to rejuvenate the language that makes liberation and emancipation possible. In doing so, it would not be, as Nicholas C. Burbules argued, a "truism to say that Critical Pedagogy must be fundamentally dialogical" (Burbules, 2005, p. 193). Indeed, as this essay will argue,