

C 424

A15044 624748

Special Aspects of Education

A series of books edited by Roy Evans, Rochampton Institute, London, UK

Volume 1

DISADVANTAGED POST-ADOLESCENTS
Approaches to Education and Rehabilitation
Reuven Kohen-Raz

Volume 2

ISRAELIS IN INSTITUTIONS
Studies in Child Placement, Practice and Policy
Eliezer D. Jaffe

Volume 3

PARENTAL PARTICIPATION IN CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION
Sheila Wolfendale

Volume 4

EDUCATION FROM THE MULTI-LEVEL PERSPECTIVE
Models, Methodology and Empirical Findings
Edited by Hans Oosthoek and Pieter van den Eeden

Volume 5

CLASSROOM COMPOSITION AND PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT
A Study of the Effect of Ability-Based Classes
Yechezkel Dar and Nura Resh

Volume 6

CHILDREN'S PLAY
Research Developments and Practical Applications
Edited by Peter K. Smith

Volume 7

RISK FACTORS IN INFANCY
Edited by Alice Sterling Hong

Volume 8

PLAY, LANGUAGE AND SOCIALISATION
Perspectives on Adult Roles
Edited by Sue Burroughs and Roy Evans

Volume 9

MICROCOMPUTERS IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
John T. Pardek and John W. Murphy

Volume 10

LOVE AND HOPE
Fromm and Education
Adir Cohen

In Preparation

Volume 11

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
Theory, Research and Practice
John T. Pardek

Love and Hope
Fromm and Education

ADIR COHEN
University of Haifa
Israel

LB
580
.F742
C 6413
1990
west

This book is part of a series. The publisher will accept continuation orders which may be cancelled at any time and which provide for automatic billing and shipping of each title in the series upon publication. Please write for details.

GORDON AND BREACH
New York Philadelphia London Paris Montreux Tokyo Melbourne

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.



© 1990 by OPA (Amsterdam) B. V. All rights reserved. Published under license by Gordon and Breach Science Publishers S. A.

Gordon and Breach Science Publishers

Post Office Box 786
Cooper Station
New York, New York 10276
United States of America

5301 Tacony Street
Box 330
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19137
United States of America

Post Office Box 197
London WC2E 9PX
United Kingdom

58, rue Lhomond
75005 Paris
France

Post Office Box 161
1820 Montreux 2
Switzerland

3-14-9, Okubo
Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169
Japan

Private Bag 8
Camberwell, Victoria 3124
Australia

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cohen, Adir.

Love and hope.

Translation of: ha-Ahavah vaha-tikvah.

Bibliography. p.

Includes indexes

1. Fromm, Erich, 1900— —Contributions in education. 2. Education—Philosophy. I Title.
LB880.F742C64 1989 370'1 88-24383
ISBN 2-88124-294-4 (France)

No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers. Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

Introduction to Series	vii
Preface	ix
Chapter 1 Radical-Humanist Education	1
Chapter 2 The Human Situation	15
Chapter 3 The Nature of Man	26
Chapter 4 Individuality and Society	34
Chapter 5 Love of Life Versus the Death Wish	42
Chapter 6 The Humanization of Technological Society	47
Chapter 7 Moral and Character Education	64
Chapter 8 Creative Education	72
Chapter 9 The Educator's Image	78
Chapter 10 Educational Thought as Reflected in Judaism	83
Bibliography	105
Author Index	111
Subject Index	113





PREFACE

Love and Hope has been constructed out of the names of two of Erich Fromm's books—*The Revolution of Hope* and *The Art of Loving*. And, indeed, it is on these foundations of love and hope that Fromm bases his educational teachings. Yet, though we have said educational teachings, this is not strictly true, for not one of Fromm's many books is devoted to education. Moreover, a direct approach to educational problems is very rare in his books. Except for a number of chapters mainly devoted to free education and moral education, it seems as if he has purposefully chosen not to deal with education directly, as if to stress the fact that the whole of his psychological, social, ethical, and humanistic teaching is in fact one great body of educational teaching, encompassing as it does the whole of man and presenting mankind with a humanistic vision and a message of self-actualization.

At the end of the sixties, Fromm wrote in the introduction to his book *The Revolution of Hope* that we stand at a crossroads: one way leads to a mechanized society in which man shall be no more than a cog in the machine, or perhaps even to annihilation in nuclear war, the other way leads to a rejuvenation of humanism and hope, to a society which places technology at the service of man (Fromm, 1968). All of Fromm's books direct themselves to this other way illuminated by hope, which is, in theological terms, redemption; in political terms, revolution; in philosophical and educational terms, a revival of humanism. Yet it is not mere expectation and yearning that are meant by Fromm in this concept, for these are the very opposite of hope, being passive and arising when hope becomes but a mantle for submission and ideological impotence.

In coming to describe such submissive hope, Fromm quotes from Kafka's story *Before the Gate of the Law*, adding an educational and humanistic interpretation of his own, aimed at galvanizing us into the activity of humanistic fulfillment.

Kafka describes a man arriving before the gates of the law (the heavenly gates) and asking the keeper posted at the door for permission to enter. The keeper answers that he cannot yet let him enter. Despite the fact that the gate is open, the man decides to wait until the keeper shall give him permission to enter. He thus sits and waits over many days and years, all the while repeatedly begging permission to enter, but the answer remains the same: there is still no possibility of permitting him to enter. Over the long years of waiting, the man constantly looks at the keeper, until he intimately knows even the fleas in his fur collar. Finally, the man grows very old and his death approaches. Only then does he ask for the first time how it is possible that throughout all these years, none but him have asked permission to enter, and the gate keeper answers



INTRODUCTION TO THE SERIES

Increasingly in the last 10 to 15 years the published literature within the field of care education has become more specialised and focussed: an inevitable consequence of the information explosion and the wider scope of theoretical and practical knowledge being required of students in both the traditional and developing areas of professional training. Students within initial and post-initial training evidently need to have ready access to specialised theoretical and pedagogical resources relevant to the context of their future professional involvements which also develop special aspects of an area of study in a critically evaluative way.

In the study of education and pedagogy, the analytical and experimental approaches of psychology, philosophy, sociology, social anthropology, etc., have provided insights into teaching and learning, into schooling and education. Historically these disciplines have focussed their attention on relatively homogeneous populations. Increased worldwide mobility has created a need for a more pluralistic approach to education—particularly in Western countries—and a more broadly based concern for educational issues related to particular contexts. Hence, further literature has developed in recent years which is concerned with the pedagogical and curricular issues raised, for example, in connection with the “urban school,” minority ethnic groups, disadvantaged and handicapped groups, and children who live apart from their families.

What is frequently missing from discipline-orientated studies is a real appreciation of context beyond the “general.” What is often not present in the contextual study is an interdisciplinary analysis of the issue that provides a framework for practice.

The present series—“Special Aspects of Education”—is intended to bridge the gap between the problems of practice, as perceived in a variety of contexts, and theory, as derived from a variety of disciplines. Books accepted or commissioned for inclusion in the series will manifestly be expected to acknowledge the interdisciplinary nature of the issues and problems in the field of education and care and, addressing themselves to particular contexts, to provide a conceptual framework for identifying and meeting special educational needs.

ROY EVANS

that none but him can obtain permission to enter here, for this gate was intended only for him. Now he, the gate keeper, is about to close it.

Fromm adds his own remarks to this excerpt, stating that the man was too old to understand the meaning of the keeper's words, and perhaps he could not have understood them in his youth either. The privilege of having the final say is reserved for the bureaucracy; where the bureaucracy answers negatively, he cannot enter. Were his hope not a passive one, he would not have heeded the bureaucracy and would have dared to pass through the gate. His courage in not heeding the bureaucracy would have liberated him and given him the right to enter paradise. According to Fromm, there are many who live out their lives like the old man in Kafka's story. They hope, yet their hope does not materialize, as they do not act on the urging of their hearts. So long as the bureaucracy will not permit them to actualize their hearts' desires, they sit quietly awaiting its permission (Fromm, 1968).

Fromm's educational teaching is the creed of active hope. We too, in our book, have attempted to deal with an active philosophy, an active psychology, and an active social theory, i.e.: to translate Fromm's thinking into the language of the educational act, the conceptions of free education, the ideas of creativity in education, the principles of self-actualization, the criteria of humanistic education, the creed of creative love. And indeed, love too is active in character and forever enfolds within it the elements of giving, care, responsibility, respect, and knowledge, in its twofold manifestation—contact and knowledge.

In his book *Brave New World* (Huxley, 1932), Aldous Huxley describes the portrait of the well-fed, well-dressed, sexually satiated man, totally lacking in self-awareness, lacking any contact except the most superfluous with other human beings, forever guided by cheap slogans and basing his happiness on consumer oriented entertainment. And, indeed, modern man is losing himself, losing his ties with other human beings and his ties with nature, to become himself a piece of merchandise, forever glued to the breast of the world from which he suckles avidly; constantly consuming, basing his security on herd conformity, fearing to veer away from the mass by any thought, feeling or action, enslaved by rulers, parties and ideologies, suppressing the life of the spirit, missing out on his chance to self-actualization. Human relationships are mainly the relationships of unacquainted automatons. Fromm stresses that the state of affairs in all that concerns love corresponds, of necessity, to this social character of modern man. Automatons cannot love; they can only exchange their personality parcel and hope for a good deal (Fromm, 1956).

The revival of love as a creative force in individual and social life is one of the most important messages in Fromm's educational teaching. This teaching would pave the way to essential and radical change in our social structure if we are to transform love into a social phenomenon rather than a merely individual and essentially minor phenomenon. After man lost his faith, along with the humanistic values that accompanied it, he began to mire himself in technical and material values, losing the human capacity to experience real sensations both happy and sad. The leaders and guides of the present society are the administrative bureaucracy and the professional politicians; mass hypnotism is the driving force behind human activity, with the aim of ever increasing production and consumption. Each and every activity becomes subjugated to economic goals, and means have become ends. Man has lost any deep internal affinity with other people

and with himself. Fromm stresses that, in order for man to be capable of loving, he must be brought back into the limelight. He must be placed in the center of educational and social intentions and permitted to express that which differentiates man and beast. He must be perceived in his human completeness as a free person. The economic machine must serve him instead of being served by him. He must be active, creative, involved. He must be an equal partner and participant in every work, rather than merely partner to profit. The structure and organization of society must be changed in order that man's social nature, man's loving nature, which partakes in a dialogue with the other, shall no longer be separated from the general stream of his social life, but rather merge with it to create the social character. Fromm states that talk of love cannot be considered as "preaching," and the simple reason is that talk of love is in fact talk of the highest and most tangible need inherent in every human being. Belief in the possibility of love as a social manifestation rather than a merely individual, extraordinary one, is a rational belief based on an essential understanding of the very nature of man (Fromm, 1956).

This book on Fromm's educational teachings represents more than an investigation of the philosophical, psychological, and social roots of his educational thinking. It also represents an attempt to construct his teachings from much dispersed building blocks, some of which are deeply buried in the foundations of psychoanalytic thought; some are hidden in commentaries and lectures on Old Testament excerpts, Talmudic debates, and Hasidic stories; some are taken from Marxist social theory and some from the foundations of Freud's theory, while some are the borrowed mosaic tiles of mystic creeds. From some of these blocks we have laid the foundations of philosophy; from others we have erected the pillars of psychology; from many of them we have built a social edifice; with a few we have installed windows of inquiry and with others we have cast ceilings of religion and mysticism, and we have left a wide aperture in the roof, opening out to the heavens and reflecting them. With all of them we have attempted to build a palace for man.

The first chapter attempts to lay the foundations of his humanistic-radical educational teaching; to examine the place of Fromm among the radical educators of the "Freudian Left" school, those representing radical socialism as well as those coming from humanistic psychological circles. We have not disregarded the harsh criticisms directed at Fromm by Herbert Marcuse and many others; we too have hesitated over the question of whether Fromm is no more than a kind of glorified preacher upholding certain political, philosophical and social ideas. We have attempted to raise the fundamental assumptions of his theory, we have dared to compare his theory with Sartrean Existentialism on the one hand and the Buberian theory of dialogue on the other hand, attempting throughout to illuminate his way to a humanization of education, which bears the hope of humanizing the whole of society.

The second and third chapters contend with the human situation through raising basic questions as to what distinguishes humanity from the natural world, as to mutuality versus narcissism, as to creativity versus destructiveness, as to fraternity versus incest, individuality versus the herd instinct and reason versus irrationality. Our understanding of Fromm's educational teachings depends on our understanding of the human situation, and once understood, the various paths leading to self-actualization in a humanistic world are open.

The fourth chapter examines the relationships of the individual with his society and attempts to investigate, analyze and perhaps even formulate, the educational practices of a sane society. In the insane society in which we live, which has in great measure not yet freed itself from its ties to land, blood and race, which bows to political leadership and sacrifices the freedom of the individual, Fromm's social educational teachings constitute a precondition to the return or rebirth of sanity. The sane education crosses all national boundaries and strives to enable man to experience the whole of multi-faceted humanity, its multi-varied qualities and its human manifestations in a state of liberty.

The fifth chapter is dedicated to one of the central distinctions in Fromm's teachings—that of Biophilia versus Necrophilia. He finds that one of the most basic problems of human life is to be seen in the contradiction between love of life and love of death, not as two parallel biological trends, but rather as interchangeable alternatives: Biophilia as the biologically normal love of life, and Necrophilia as its pathological distortion, the hatred of all life and an affinity to death. Fromm fears the increase of necrophilia, especially in times of crisis and change, as has happened in the last generations. Humans are easily caught up in the influence of the necrophilic ideological slogans, which, of course, merely hide and whitewash the real purpose—that of destruction. The lovers of death speak in the name of honor, order, property, the past, the nation, communal memories, the homeland, and sometimes even the future and the national vision. Fromm uses psychoanalytic tools to pinpoint the death-lovers behind their lofty ideological masks and expose their true nature, as well as to find out the lovers of life. His educational teachings present us with ways of increasing the biophilia whose basic conditions are freedom, the student's activation of his own powers and creativity.

The sixth chapter deals with the humanization of the technotronic society, investigates future education, surveys the face of education in light of the "Future Shock," discusses at length the problem of possessiveness versus self-actualization, copes with the problems of value education, and illuminates ways to develop the responsibility of the individual when actualizing himself with an awareness and affinity towards the people about him and the natural world surrounding him.

The seventh chapter is devoted to moral education and to the education of character and contends with our major ethical problem, man's indifference to himself. This indifference stems from having lost our sense of the importance and uniqueness of the individual, from having become tools for external ends, and having become alienated from ourselves. Fromm stresses that we are without conscience in the humanistic sense because we no longer dare to believe our own judgment. We have become a herd, believing that the path we tread of necessity leads to some goal because our eyes can see that everyone else is also treading the same path. We walk in the dark with others and whistle encouragement to ourselves, and all that strengthens our hearts are the voices of all the other whistlers (Fromm, 1947). Fromm's examination of authoritative ethics as contrasted with humanistic ethics, and the sum of his conceptions as to the education of character, provide us with the awareness that it is for man himself to decide. Man is capable of seriously considering himself, his life and his happiness, his readiness to cope with his and his society's moral problems. The decision depends, at

the final reckoning, on his courage to be himself for himself, because only after he becomes I, is he capable of saying THOU, and that saying be that of a true dialogue.

The eighth chapter is dedicated to various aspects of creative education, which is the most complete actualization of education for self-actualization, education for autonomy and critical thinking, education for involvement and an affinity of love—the education of the whole person.

The ninth chapter is dedicated to the personality of the educator himself, examining the educational encounter and the various educational methods, illuminating the complex educational encounter, the warp and woof of which are hope and love.

The last chapter reflects Fromm's almost entire educational and social thinking in the mirror of Judaism. Fromm was well versed in the Old Testament and the Talmud, the Hasidic and cabalistic literature, Jewish medieval thought and the new Hebrew philosophy. The whole of his oeuvre is interwoven with references to the age-old Jewish spiritual heritage, and in his book *You Shall be as Gods* (Fromm, 1966), he is revealed as a talented commentator (or a talented orator?) on the humanistic contribution of Judaism. One cannot direct oneself to Fromm's thinking without acknowledging its deep affinity with the Jewish heritage.

As the motto of his book *Man for Himself* (Fromm, 1942), Fromm quotes from the writings of Baruch Spinoza, whose teachings greatly influenced the formation of Fromm's own thinking, and it seems that one can direct the words of Spinoza with equal right to the educational teachings of Fromm himself when he states that, if the road which he has indicated seems difficult, it can nevertheless be discovered, and that, indeed, it is only fair that the way be so difficult, even if its discovery is so rare. For if redemption were available to all, and could be found without much toil, how is it possible that almost everyone should forsake it? For all that is noble is as difficult as it is rare.

*

I have to thank many people whose assistance and inspiration made it possible for me to write this book, but I owe a very special debt of gratitude to my teachers Akiva E. Simon, Abraham J. Heschel and Carl Frankenstein, with whom I have spent years in mutual dialogue and experienced the true meaning of Humanistic Education.

Many thanks to Shahar Peled, scholar and man of letters who worked with me on the translation of this book from the Hebrew manuscript.

Adir Cohen





CHAPTER 1

RADICAL-HUMANIST EDUCATION

Erich Fromm has published a long list of books and articles dealing in various and diverse areas of thought, research and creative endeavor, contributing much to the sum of knowledge in these subjects. His books and articles are conspicuous in their non-conformist thinking, their radically humanistic spirit, their clarity of expression, the abundance of examples and references gathered from the best of human creative endeavors, both past and modern, and in their persistent striving to reinstate man in a central role in his society and his world. Fromm's subject matter is diverse: Psychology (Fromm 1950, 1956, 1959, 1963, 1970, 1973), Philosophy (Fromm 1947, 1956, 1960, 1963, 1964, 1968), Literature and Linguistics (Fromm, 1955), Biblical studies (Fromm, 1966), Sociology (Fromm 1955, 1961, 1963, 1965, 1970, 1971, 1979), Education (Fromm, 1947), and more. All of his works, in whatever area, are imprinted with the stamp of his creative personality, imbued with his world-embracing spirit, his humanistic openness and deep personal involvement.

Direct reference to educational issues can be found in no more than a handful of publications; some are discussions of educational issues which appealed to him, such as A. S. Neill's educational enterprise; others take up educational issues involved in his discussion of ethics (Fromm, 1947), society (Fromm, 1955), the future (Fromm, 1968) and man (Fromm 1964, 1968). It seems nevertheless that the entire body of his writings contains matter for radical-humanistic educational thought, and is sufficient in itself to lay the foundations of a way of education which is also a way of life.

It is not accidental that Fromm chose to open his book "The Sane Society" with an array of quotations gathered from the works of various thinkers, quotations which complement each other, combining a personal-social vision with an imperative educational mission.

On the one hand, he invokes the words of the Roman Seneca, emphasizing that no art is more difficult than the art of living. Though many teachers can be found to instruct the arts and sciences, learning how to live is the personal task of every man, an art which he must teach himself throughout his life. Paradoxically he must teach himself the opposite too, for in his lifetime he must also learn how to die (Fromm, 1955). On the other hand he evokes Leon Bloom who wondered why, if the human race has had the intelligence to create science and art, should it not create a world of justice, fraternity and peace. Why, if the human species has produced such thinkers as Plato, Homer, Shakespeare, Hugo, Michelangelo, Beethoven, Pascal and Newton whose genius was but to encounter the basic truths, the innermost essence of existence, should it

not also produce those leaders which would lead it in those co-operative ways of life which are the closest to the essence and harmony of the cosmos (Fromm, 1955).

Indeed, it is not the products and achievements of man, such as art and science, which occupy a central position in Fromm's educational intentions, but rather creative man himself, his life, the art of living.

From the viewpoint of radical educational thinking, Fromm is usually affiliated with the "Freudian Left," whose representatives include Herbert Marcuse, Wilhelm Reich and others (Robinson, 1969). Yet his writings contain many ideas which are close to those expressed by Bertrand Russel (Cohen, 1979), Paul Goodman (Cohen, 1983b), Herbert Read (Read, 1944), A. S. Neill (Cohen, 1983), and other representatives of social radicalism. He is close, also, to the ideas of Abraham Maslow (McGrath, 1962), and Carl Rogers (Rogers, 1969, 1954, 1980), who have created psychological and educational theories based on existentialist foundations. In many ways he is close too to the Humanistic psychology of such thinkers as Gordon Allport (Allport, 1955), Kurt Goldstein (Goldstein, 1939), and others.

Fromm's psychological thinking is mainly influenced by his Marxist-Freudian outlook (Fromm, 1955, 1961, 1962, 1965, 1970, 1971), and his researches into the relations between society and the individual. Indeed, some see his original contribution in his psychoanalytic orientation towards social problems.

As a psychoanalyst, Fromm is associated with Neo-Psychoanalysts such as Horney (Horney, 1937, 1939) and Sullivan (Sullivan, 1947, 1953), who have deviated in a great measure from orthodox psychoanalysis established by Freud. Such theorists view the social environment as holding the major shaping influences on the individuals' personality. In departing from the concept of a biological, hereditary, universal basis for human development, a concept of personality formation based on learned, cultural and social elements is preferred. Moreover, the term "Ego" as they employ it refers more to the individual's self image, which includes his opinions, beliefs and habits, than Freud's conception of Ego as the agent of the Id and its representative in reality.

These thinkers have emphasized the central role of interpersonal relationships and the lack of any real possibility of isolating the individual from his relations with others. An individual without social relations is no more than an abstraction and does not in fact exist in any real sense.

Major differences exist between the psychological concepts of Fromm and Freud. Unlike Freud, Fromm is of the conviction that society is more than the oppressor of the individual, his wishes and needs. Society is rather the individual's creator. An individual's personality is shaped by the social and economic structure of his society, and it is to this structure that the biological mechanisms adapt.

In the "Intellectual Autobiography," as Fromm defines his book "Beyond the Chains of Illusion" (Fromm, 1962), he testifies to his own intellectual development and explains that he was much beset by questions pertaining to personality and social phenomena and that he had found answers in the writings of both Freud and Marx, but was tempted by the contrast between the two to try and resolve the disagreements. Eventually, as his investigations progressed and he acquired further experience as a practicing psychoanalyst, he came to doubt certain assumptions in both methods. He wished, in fact, to comprehend the laws which govern both the life of the individual and the laws of society, i.e. the laws of man as a social being.

He attempted to perceive those truths which undeniably exist in Freud's concepts, whilst recognizing those assumptions which were due for revision. Attempting the same in Marx's case, he eventually tried to arrive at a new synthesis stemming from an understanding and a critique of both these two thinkers.

In the course of his efforts at synthesis, an endeavor not limited to theoretical discussion alone, but rather a blending of empirical observation and theoretical insight, he arrived at a deep disagreement with quite a few of Freud's basic principles and at no little criticism of Marx's concepts; particularly the perverse way in which his followers have chosen to implement such concepts in his name.

In his perceptive criticism of the Neo-Freudians, Herbert Marcuse focuses on the differences in the theoretical conceptions of Freud and of Fromm, contrasting Freud's teachings with their inversion at hands of the Neo-Freudians. According to Marcuse, the tendency inherent in Freud's thinking is to move from the conscious to the unconscious, from the personality to its childhood, from the individual process to the generic. It is a theory which proceeds from the superficial to the deep, from the "finished" and conditioned person to his sources and resources. Such a tendency was, says Marcuse, essential for Freud's criticism of civilization. Only by means of a "retreat" behind the misleading manifestations of the adult individual and his private and public existence, could Freud unveil the essential pathology in their very foundations. The Neo-Freudians, in sharp contrast, turn this inner tendency of Freud's teachings on its head, stressing the personality rather than the organism, the ideal values rather than the material foundations. Marcuse sums up the whole as follows: The "cultural orientation" encounters the societal institutions and relationships as finished products, in the form of objective entities—given rather than made facts. Their acceptance in this form demands the shift in psychological emphasis from infancy to maturity, for only at the level of developed consciousness does the cultural environment become definable as determining character and personality over and above the biological level. Conversely, only with the playing down of biological factors, the mutilation of the instinct theory, is the personality definable in terms of objective cultural values divorced from the repressive ground which denies their realization. In order to present these values as freedom and fulfillment, they have to be purged of the material of which they are made, and the struggle for their realization has to be turned into a spiritual and moral struggle. The revisionists do not insist, as Freud did, on the enduring truth of the instinctual needs which must be 'broken' so that the human being can function in interpersonal relations. In abandoning this insistence, from which psychoanalytic theory drew all its critical insights, the revisionists yield to the negative features of the very reality principle which they do so eloquently criticize (Marcuse, 1956).

I have quoted the essence of Marcuse's criticism of Fromm and the Neo-psychoanalysts at some length, in order to emphasize from the outset of our discussion that the very essence of Fromm's psychological, social and educational teachings was subject to harsh criticism and an attempt to destroy its foundations.

Fromm, in turn, defends himself by attacking Marcuse, who to his mind, has misunderstood Freud's pleasure and reality principles, distorting his theory in that the concept of character, in the dynamic sense which Freud intended, is completely absent from all of his writings. Further, that Marcuse has misinterpreted the Freudian concept of repression, has created confusion through misuse of Freudian concepts, wrongly



giving the impression of faithfully representing Freud in all but minor differences whilst in fact creating a theory of his very own which is at odds with all that is essential in Freud's thinking.

Marcuse, according to Fromm, approaches psychoanalysis as a collection of hypotheses about death, life, sexuality and so on . . . , completely negating the essence of Freud's greatness in that he managed to isolate and empirically deal with a number of problems which before had only been dealt with in the realm of the philosophically abstract. Marcuse, in Fromm's opinion, destroys Freud's achievement by retransforming Freud's empirical concepts into philosophical speculations, and rather confused ones at that.

Although there is some justice in Fromm's remarks concerning Marcuse's divorce from the empirical aspects of psychoanalytic theory and his adherence to philosophical speculations and theoretical constructions, no basis exists for his accusations that Marcuse's speculations are "confused." If anything, Marcuse is so methodical in his theoretical presentation as to guard against any confusion which might arise from empirical observations, conflicting as they sometimes are with methodical philosophical constructions.

In contrast to his harsh criticism of Marcuse (not unwarranted in the circumstances), Fromm is highly appreciative of the works of Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan, Erik Erikson and Melanie Klein, and is close in his theoretical constructions to many of their concepts.

He finds merit in Horney's critical approach to Freud's feminine psychology, in her annulment of the theory of libido, and in her emphasis on the importance of cultural factors (Horney, 1937, 1939). Sullivan earns Fromm's favour in his proximity to Horney's concepts concerning the importance of cultural factors, his rejection of the theory of libido and his conception of psychoanalysis as a theory of interpersonal relationships. At the same time, Fromm criticizes Sullivan's concept of humanity, viewing it as limited since its model is essentially that of the alienated man of our times. Fromm sees Sullivan's major attainment to be in his penetration of the world of hallucinations, and his decoding of the communication processes of severely disturbed mental patients.

Despite his proximity to Horney and Sullivan, and despite sharing some of their views, Fromm bitterly resents being classed as a Neo-Freudian along with them. It rankles him that the major differences in their viewpoints on the influence of culture should be disregarded and only the relatively minor similarities—such as criticism of the theory of libido—be considered. Fromm considers that there are more differences than similarities between himself and the other thinkers grouped together with him under the Neo-Freudian heading, and that central to these differences is Horney and Sullivan's traditional anthropological approach to cultural patterns, which sharply contrasts to his own striving to dynamically analyze the economic, political and psychological forces which are the basis of society.

Fromm attaches special importance to the writings of Erik Erikson (Erikson, 1950), and, in particular, his contributions to the theory of childhood, the influence of society on child development, and his research into problems of identity—investigations which have greatly furthered psychoanalytic thinking.

Fromm accepts Erikson's statement that all nations begin in the nursery, and that while making him into a spiritual and technical virtuoso, man's lengthy childhood

also endows him with life-long vestiges of emotional immaturity. "Tribes and nationalize child-training in various ways to attain their own particular form of adult identity, their own unique version of human wholeness, yet at the same time they remain prone to irrational fears which stem from the selfsame childhood situation which they had so readily exploited according to their custom" (Erikson, 1950). Fromm is in agreement with Erikson's conception of the psychoanalytic method as participatory, as "taking part" by Sullivan's definition, while at the same time his major criticism of Erikson is that he had not more radically exhausted the conclusions to which some of his assumptions lead.

As to Melanie Klein and her adherents, Fromm perceives their main virtue in their insistence on the deep irrationality inherent in man, and in that their theories served as an antidote to rationalistic trends which had become increasingly overt in the psychoanalytic movement.

Fairness, though, demands that we re-emphasize the fact that Fromm was not content to find he was being affiliated with new psychoanalytic school, whether the "Neo-Freudian" or the "Cultural" school. Despite all the important distinctions which many of these new movements had developed, he considered that they had also lost many of Freud's most important revelations.

Fromm acknowledges that he himself is far from being an "Orthodox Freudian," and stresses the need for a further elaboration of Freud's ideas, changing their philosophical framework to that of dialectical humanism. He views Freud's great discoveries, i.e. the oedipal complex, Narcissism and the death instinct, as confined by the very foundations of Freud's philosophical assumptions. The separation of these discoveries from the assumptions which serve as their framework, and their assimilation into a new theoretical framework will endow Freud's findings with both validity and meaning.

The theoretical framework of humanistic thought, with its blend of rational faith with uncompromisingly critical and realistic outlooks will, it seems to Fromm, provide a fertile ground for the elaboration and development of the great project for which Freud had set the foundation (Fromm, 1964).

It should be noted here, that Fromm rejects the psychological approach of the Existentialist psychoanalysts who trade Freudian theory for "existential analysis," which draws its concepts from Heidegger, Huserl or Sartre, and which, to his mind, is devoid of any real contact with clinical facts and is therefore revealed as a shallow and lifeless substitute. He harshly criticizes Sartre's psychological thinking which for all its external glamour seems to him both shallow and empty of any valid clinical content. To Fromm's mind, Sartre's existentialism, like Heidegger's, conveys an end rather than a new beginning, expressing the despair of Western humanity in the aftermath of two world wars and the regimes of Hitler and Stalin.

Fromm goes even further, describing Sartre's philosophy as not only the mere expression of despair but also as the conveyer of egotism and a fanatic bourgeois solipsism, and Sartre himself as representing the very spirit of the egocentric society he criticizes and would change. Sartre and his adherents, according to Fromm, deny objective values, valid for humanity in its entirety, and conceive the sum of the concept of freedom as no more than an egotistical whim, thereby negating the greatest achievements of both theistic and atheistic religion, and the tradition of humanism (Fromm, 1964).



In his lengthy conversations with Evans, Fromm emphasizes yet again that Sartre's psychology is shallow, that his attempt to merge existentialism with Marxism is barren, and that ultimately, his philosophy is no more than the elaborate expression of egocentric bourgeois thinking. Sartre to Fromm's mind, has nothing to offer but a curious blend of Marxism, psychoanalysis and existentialism, rent with inconsistencies and inner contradictions (Evans, 1972).

The weakness in Fromm's criticism of Sartre and existentialist psychoanalysis lies in his unfounded generalizations and his reluctance to systematically analyze Sartre's approach. Had Fromm done so, he would surely have perceived that Sartre was attempting to shape an existential psychoanalysis to match his philosophical thinking. The essence of Sarterian psychoanalysis lies in the concept of man as a totality rather than a collection of discrete elements, and the assumption that he therefore expresses himself as a totality, as a whole, even in the most inconsequential behavior. The starting point of Sartre's psychoanalysis is the human experience, and its method is comparative. Sartre emphasizes that since every human action symbolizes in its own way the essential choice which is to be exposed, and since every man simultaneously hides his choice behind the shape that only when one is open to the other, i.e. has an affinity with him, only then can one perceive one's fellow man as a friend, and perceiving means knowing (Fromm, 1962). In order to know man, in order to know the other, Fromm stresses the need for greater openness, yet at the same time the necessity of being "oneself," not in the sense of being full of oneself, which is narcissism, avidity and sentimentality, but rather being simply oneself.

It is impossible to comprehend the fear, sadness, loneliness, hope and love of the other without first feeling and experiencing all these emotions oneself. Without the ability to enlist one's own personal human experience, one can know a great many things about the other, yet never know him. Moreover, this is but the beginning of a process in which one must become oneself, that is, one's true individual self, in order to project oneself outwards, in order to rise above the illusion of the existence of this one individual self. According to Fromm, it is only after one has established one's identity, and has completely emerged from the confines of the womb, the family, the race and the nation, only after one has become an individual by all measures, a free man, can one dispense with this individual personality and thus experience the fact that one is no more than a drop of water in a great flood, a separate entity for but a brief moment. This, Fromm feels, pertains not only to the relations between people, but also to the relations between a man and an idea or an ideal (Fromm, 1962).

It should be stressed, though, that despite the seeming similarities between Fromm and Buber in their discussion of affinity, there is a great distance between the two thinkers, with Fromm mainly concentrating on the individual, the ego, while the affinity with the other and the openness towards him, are ultimately utilitarian and do not serve to create an I-Thou relationship, but are rather submerged in the world of the "other," and it is doubtful if they will ever exceed the boundaries of the I-Other relationship. Fromm, though, stresses that to be close, to participate, entails being interested, and that on a semantic level, the word interested, which he splits into inter-ese, is to be within. By choice has acquired on discrete occasions, and behind its developmental quality—it is only by a comparison of actions and behaviors that one can elicit the special manifestation which is expressed by the above in various ways.

Existential psychoanalysis refuses to acknowledge that anything preceded the original

appearance of human freedom. It attempts to define the primal choice which operates on the planet's surface and which, being a choice of position in the world and preceding all reason, is a totality. According to Sartre, it is this primal choice which determines the attitude of a given personality when confronted with reason and principles, and is therefore proof to reason, mediating as it does the totality of essences existing in a pre-reasoning synthesis and thus serving as the focus to which an endless array of multivalued meanings relate.

Sartre stresses that the environment can influence the personality only to the extent that the subject comprehends it, that is, the extent to which he can transform it into a situation. There is, therefore, no use in an objective description of the environment.

Fromm, who recognized the role of the environment in shaping the individual and the significance of the action of its forces upon the subject, is angered by this idea. Nor can he accept the principle of choice on which existentialist psychoanalysis is founded, rejecting its method which is intended for the elucidation, in an absolutely objective fashion, of the subjective choice by which every living person transforms itself into a personality, that is, causes itself to know itself. Since this method simultaneously seeks both the existence and the choice of existence, it must, accordingly, reduce individual behavior patterns to basic relations—not sexual or power relations, but rather, the existential relations expressed by that behavior.

Considering the fact that the theoretical structure of Sarterian existentialist psychoanalysis is methodical and consistent enough, Fromm's main justification in his attack is not in his criticism of any philosophical lack in the method, but rather in his statements about the method's detachment from empirical practice, in the absence of any adherence to clinical experience to which Sartre was a stranger nor did he aspire to having any familiarity with it.

Fairness though demands that we stress the fact that Sartre's followers, and the developers of existentialist psychoanalysis, have found, over time, various ways of settling existentialist theory with clinical experience.

Both Fromm and his psychoanalytic theories were strongly criticized by psychologists and philosophers alike, with Herbert Marcuse taking the fore in claiming that Fromm's conceptions, whilst appearing in critical guide, are in fact conformist, while his political attitude is merely moralistic. He accuses Fromm of opportunism, compromise and compliance, and, from a Freudian point of view, of being no less than heretical. Other critics, (Schaar, 1961), view Fromm's divergence into so many different areas as indicating superficiality and contend that no theoretically sound, consistent and credible method is to be found in his writings.

Even if there is some basis for a criticism of Fromm in various areas, and even if one can undermine the foundations of his psychological approach, such criticism, however, does not detract from Fromm's worth as an "educator," nor from the possibility of synthesizing a relevant and fertile educational theory from the body of his works.

Both education and instruction are teleological by their very nature. Unlike the scientific approach which attempts to weed out all subjective or value-biased considerations, education must address itself to both "good" and "evil," directing educational practice towards the "good."

One of Fromm's claims against modern psychology is that it upholds moral relativism and stresses adjustment without examining the norms to which it would adjust its patients. Psychology, according to Fromm, must expose warped and misleading value

judgments, and serve as a basis for the construction of objective and valid norms of behavior. Fromm considers the alienation of psychology from ethics as a relatively new development, since past thinkers (whether psychologists or philosophers), believed that the understanding of human nature and the understanding of human values and norms, are interdependent, whereas nowadays psychiatry, psychology and psychoanalysis threaten to become instruments for the manipulation of human beings (Fromm, 1955).

Fromm's concepts of mental health and the nature of good and evil coincide, by his own testimony, with the norms preached by humanity's great spiritual leaders, such as Achnathon, Moses, Confucius, Lao-Tse, Buddha, Jessaiha, Jesus, Socrates and others (Fromm, 1955). The fact that these teachers preached in widely different times and places seems to him to testify to the universally common denominators in their teachings.

To a number of modern psychologists, this coincidence seems proof that Fromm's psychological-theoretical assumptions are, rather than scientific, more in the nature of philosophical or religious ideals. Fromm, though, justifiably contends that the great religions of all cultures were founded on the rational investigation of human nature and on the necessary conditions for its fulfillment (Fromm, 1955).

Fromm returns to this issue in his talks with Evans. Evans presents him with the challenge of "The Myth of Mental Illness" by Thomas Szasz (Szasz, 1961), which claims that our concept of mental illness is tainted by ideology, i.e. that we possess more an ideology than a science of mental health. The sharp question which Evans directs to Fromm is: when does the psychoanalytic thinker cease to be an objective observer and begin interpretation based on his own favored theoretical position.

Fromm acknowledges that he has indeed been attacked and criticized severely for his stance as something of a preacher upholding certain political, philosophical and social ideas, but claims that he finds psychological proofs to the verity and truth of these ideas (Evans, 1966).

Fromm enthusiastically claims that belief or the possession of an ideology, has no bearing on the results of an investigation, nor on the scientific conclusions of the investigator. Proof of causality depends, rather, on the scientific approach used, on the investigator's methods and on the researcher's own self-criticism. Thus, it is not the personal attitude or ideology of the investigator which come into question, but rather the reliability of his research, the merit of his methods and the validity of his conclusions. And, indeed, as a talented and dedicated psychoanalyst, Fromm found himself in the unique position of a psychoanalyst whose foremost and most necessary task is to perpetually analyze himself and his subjective motives, whose primary obligation is to undergo constant analysis intended to reveal the possibilities of error or misjudgment, biasing of data or observation, and so forth.

Fromm testifies to a forty to forty-five minute session of self-analysis every morning, in which tries to be very aware and very critical towards himself. While he does not claim to be infallible, he feels that he is no more fallible than any other honest scientist. He knows, he explains to Evans, the difference between wish and reality, fact and fiction, truth and subjective experience. It seems, in fact, to Fromm, that the central action of analysis, if any, is the gradual liberation of the Ego from its narcissism, i.e. from the muddling of facts and subjective wishes (Evans, 1966).

Fromm's writings lend themselves to the deduction of the four following assumptions:

- a) Man is heir to an essentially unique nature which is grounded in the human situation.
- b) Society was created by man in order to actualize and fulfill this essential nature.
- c) To this day, no society has ever existed which has furthered or aided the development of the special needs of human existence.
- d) The creation of a sane and healthy society is possible.

According to these assumptions, the crisis of modern education stems from the general failing of society and its inability to fulfill the individual's needs. Since the possibility of improvement and rehabilitation exists, education, as an instrument of culture, has an important role in the process of creating that sane society which will actualize man's essential nature. Educational theory must become aware of man's nature, and inform educational and instructional methods accordingly.

Educators and various other thinkers are in general agreement that modern education is in the throws of a crisis. It therefore seems particularly fitting that the optimistic spirit which permeates Fromm's writing should infiltrate educational thought and encourage those engaged in educational practice. Even though it is possible to find fault with Fromm's scientific method and the meticulousness of his analysis, it seems that Zvi Lamm was essentially right when he questioned: "Has educational theory proven that consistent, strict and closed educational methods have been more fruitful for educational practice and have provided more knowledge, than those methods which did not excel in methodological thoroughness, yet showed more sensitivity to real problems, which the more orderly methods, being closed, did not acknowledge?" (Lamm, 1973)

One of the most basic principles of humanistic psychology, an idea loaded with educational connotations, is the principle of self-actualization. Horney, Sullivan, Fromm and others, have all stressed the active nature of the organism and its desire and capability, both actual and intellectual, to actualize the potential inherent in it.

Fromm, as other humanistic psychologists (McGrath, 1962), has made a respectable contribution to modern education, and especially in the area of a greater individualization of education, which derives from the principle of self-actualization.

Stemming from the idea that to approach an individual from a point of inner empathy is the only possible way of knowing him, is the idea of self-motivation in learning as well as the conception of creativity as an inseparable, important and essential part of the educational process, simultaneously with the creation of opportunities for success, the encouragement of self confidence and creativity.

The foundation of Fromm's educational theory is man's definition as being self-sufficient, with special emphasis on his potential for self-actualization, and on the importance of perceiving him on the background of his environment and society. As Akiva Ernst Simon has so well phrased it: "Fromm would make man self-sufficient, i.e. save him from the need to beg for heavenly assistance. Man, in his opinion, must seek within himself for his innate resources and powers, for they can lead him to a positive and creative life, develop his capabilities, and make him strong, happy and good. The moral content of this system of thought is essentially that of the Judeo-Christian tradition, except that the Jewish optimism is rather more pronounced than the Christian pessimism. Man is not governed by any pre-ordained decree—neither good nor bad. He



was not born to be good, but can become good—if only authoritative education not repress his fertile initiative (Simon, 1961).

Fromm does not present his ideas as revolutionary, but to the contrary, emphasizes that they are rooted in mankind's oldest traditions and that all he asks is to awaken and give new life to ideas which great men have already raised in the past. Such an approach paves the way for many and diverse ideas which having withstood the test of time are now at the disposal of teachers and educators who must choose those which suit their own worldview best, whereby a personal interpretation stemming from either the educator's inner affinity with the idea or from his creative thinking, is both possible and desirable.

Fromm, though, is not blind to the limitations of education. Education is an instrument in the hands of society and any change in it would be meaningless, and even harmful, if the appropriate accompanying changes in society, economy and culture, are not also made.

Fromm is close in his conception of the role of human tradition and past tradition in education, to the conceptions of the Humanists and Neo-Humanists. The basic orientation which humanistic education is to provide, according to Nathan Rotenstreich's formulation, is "for the induction of awareness of responsibility towards the greater associations of mankind. Man is responsible for the whole world, for humanity, for every man by virtue of being human, perceiving each individual as but a partial embodiment of the essence of humanity. Since no individual and no historical or national rule exhausts this essence of humanity in its entirety, and since man is responsible for this essence, he is also responsible for every individual who manifests this essence in actuality. Man must be responsible for life and its preservation; he must care for the development of life and the transformation of life's potential from the potential to the actual" (Rotenstreich, 1964).

Fromm believes that the role of education is to acquaint youth with the best traditions of the human race. Like Richard Livingstone, the Neo-Humanist thinker who contends that the further apart humanity has grown from its unifying spiritual heritage, the more egotistic, careeristic, specialized and asocial has education become, so Fromm too recognized that the alienation from tradition and spiritual heritage creates an empty cultural void causing increasing bewilderment and loss of orientation.

Fromm, though, while acknowledging the value of heritage and recognizing its power to mold the character of an individual, cautions that the greater part of this heritage is verbal, while its power can only become manifest when the words which convey it become embodied in a person, in the customs of society and in its structure. Only by becoming embodied in the flesh can an idea influence man. The idea which remains in the realm of words can influence nothing but other words.

A deep affinity with the ideas which he teaches, is demanded of the educator. These ideas are meaningful only in the wider context of character and behavior, and must be examined in light of the actions and total personality of their conveyor.

In a similar manner, Nathan Rotenstreich describes the humanist educator as a man of learning, yet stresses that: "when humanistic education is at issue, it is not erudition which is intended nor the quantitative amassing of knowledge, but rather the person's attitude to the known" (Rotenstreich, 1964).

Fromm emphasizes that a serious attitude of devotion to the ideals formulated by mankind's greatest thinkers, is demanded of the educator and that the lion's share of the responsibility for the transference of man's heritage onto the next generation, lies with education. The knowledge of man's heritage must be both intellectual and intuitive at the same time. It seems that in this, Fromm's definition of intuition matches that of Henry Bergson who describes intuition as: "A sympathy by means of which one penetrates the interior of an object or objects in order to unite with the unique and inexpressible within it" (Bergson, 1957).

Fromm expresses some reservations concerning a development of intellect which is not integrated in the emotional development of the personality. It seems to him that in order to bring down the general level of foolishness, it is not intellect which we need, but rather a different kind of character. Persons who are adventurous, independent and in love with life. In this he is close to Whitehead who notes that traditional education methods are too obsessed with intellectual analysis and the induction of formulated and alienated knowledge.

Fromm joins those educators who believe that intellectualization is a danger in the way of the educational system, and warns against it and against the use of what Whitehead defined as "lifeless" words. Words, considers Fromm, can be but empty shells, so that a man may learn certain philosophical, religious or political ideals in the same manner in which he learns a foreign language. Moreover Fromm believes that the use of words and ideas when a man is alienated from their spirit and meaning, inhibits the realistic perception of reality. "The fetishism of words prevents the comprehension of reality" (Fromm, 1962).

Fromm perceives one of the most formidable dangers in the abuse of words. Usage which does not intend the meaning or intent inherent in them, the muddling of words and facts, or the demagogical use of words.

In a long list of examples, Fromm attempts to prove the dangers of word fetishism in the realm of political and religious ideology. He emphasizes that one must always conceive the words in the general context of the personality and behavior of the speaker. When an incongruence exists between any of these elements, he considers it proof that the words are being used for misleading purposes, concealing and obstructing instead of exposing and revealing.

A study of the language of politics reveals a use of empty words. Words which, emptied of their meaning, becomes an infertile babble, both alienated and alienating. Words which speak of something yet never penetrate its essence. Verbosity empty of action, and worse—verbosity covering up for action, falsifying action or concealing it.

In this, Fromm is close to the views of Paulo Friere (Friere, 1972) and Jonathan Kozol (Kozol, 1967), and the examples he provides from the world of politics and religion recall George Orwell's strong words which so magnificently illuminate the limiting, empty, cynical or indoctrinational use of language in politics. Such uses sin against meaning, separate words from their original content, create an empty phraseology in serious guise, covering up for shallowness of content and emptiness of idea. Uses which rejuvenate dying metaphors, presenting a charade of ideas, masks of ideologies, beneath which lurks frightening emptiness or total sham (See Orwell, 1968 and also Cohen, 1983).



Fromm illustrates this point with numerous examples: Stalin called his regime socialistic, a regime which unflinchingly worked for the speedy establishment of an industrialized Russia whilst totally contemptuous of all those human values which characterized Marxist socialism; Hitler called his regime National-Socialist; Mussolini, the socialist who became a fascist leader, continued using the socialist term, and the list is long and depressing . . .

In his attitude to knowledge and information, Fromm is close to Martin Buber who views the essential meaning of knowledge as that of contact, the existence of a relationship between object and object, an authentic and direct meeting with the object. Knowledge, rather than detachment and objective observation, is based on close contact, on an authentic encounter with the thing. (See also: "The Educational Teachings of Martin Buber," Cohen, 1976.)

Fromm, like Buber, though less strongly and consistently, emphasizes the I-Thou system of relations, the affinity with the other. He considers Buber's definition if one is within, then the world becomes one's subject of interest and the knowledge of being within leads to the desire to help (Fromm, 1962).

Nevertheless, though this state of "being within" might define the therapeutic situation, the desire to help, it does not attain the state of I-Thou, but rather conserves the I-Other situation, with the difference that the intention in this case is to help the other, and this, from the standpoint of the preferred status of the I who is willing to become interested and to help the other standing before him on an unequal footing.

Fromm goes out of his way to stress that this involved and interested position is totally devoid of any self-interest, the only possibility of objectivity being when the "I" wishes nothing for itself. Yet, in this "objective" situation, the flow between the "I" and the "Thou" is marred. Buber stresses that the occurrence of affinity is conditional on the two subjects being independent entities (Buber, 1962). No affinity will form when a dependent relationship exists between the two, and the therapeutic situation creates precisely such a situation of dependency.

According to Buber, being intent on the other in the I-Thou relationship does not provide one with any specific knowledge about him, the perception, rather, is of a whole. The "Thou" appears before the "I" in all its individuality and uniqueness. Such presence is not given to analysis but is tangible and direct. The affinity with the "Thou" is without intermediacy. Neither the intermediacy of concepts, nor that of purpose or phenomenon. Any medium serves to inhibit. Only where all mediums and intermediaries fail and disappear does the authentic encounter occur—an encounter in which two subjects influence each other and are influenced each by the other.

In the "I-Thou" relations, it is as if the "Thou" preceded the "I" is revealed in the affinity itself. Buber stresses that the "I" is first "revealed only in the context of the affinity, in the form of the attitude to the "Thou," in the sense of the delineation of one who yearns for the "Thou" without attaining him, yet sprouts and grows with increasing force, until the subordination is rent and the "I," for a brief moment, faces the "my-self" which has separated, as if facing "Thou," and quickly, he becomes fortified in himself, and from then on will involve himself in the affinity to his own knowledge" (Buber, 1963).

The "I-Other" relationships, from the point of view of their inception, can, in contrast, only occur after the formation of the "I" 's consciousness. Only after the "I"

has formed and stabilized as a separate and independent entity can the "I-Other" relationship come into being. In this, the therapeutic situation as it is conceived by Fromm, and comparably, the educational situation, derives, despite being directed to the care of others, from the world of objects.

Fromm sees the love of life and of man as the foundation of his educational and humanistic philosophy. Hence his great proximity to Paulo Friere, who saw Fromm as one of his teachers and among the shapers of his educational thinking, particularly in the special integration which Fromm effected between his socialistic world-view and the humanistic philosophy he developed in his philosophical and psychological writings (Friere, 1972). Hence also his proximity to A. S. Neill and his educational endeavor in Summerhill (Neill, 1960). Like Neill, Fromm too views "Love" as a primary force in education, when that love above all entails the total liberation of the child; the acceptance of him as he is; a direct and honest response to his actions; relating to all his manifestations without judgment; an authentic, immediate, personal affinity, rather than an impersonal, bureaucratic and pretentious attitude (Dewey, 1916). Similarly to Neill, Fromm too protests against the focus of modern education on the intellect, the "mind," to the exclusion of the emotional life, the world of excitement, dreams and hopes. Fromm, though, is not as ferocious a fighter of non-free education as Neill who is of the opinion that such education almost completely disregards the emotions, and that since these emotions are, by nature, dynamic, the lack of opportunity for their expression inevitably leads to mediocrity, ugliness and hate. Only the mind is educated, a mistake, since if the emotions were to be freed, the intellect would take care of itself (Neill, 1960). Fromm is not prepared to forsake the education of the intellect even for a moment, but rather demands the integration of the head and the heart, in the hope of achieving the desired balance. He advocates a change in the present conditions, a change which can only come about if the present gap, between emotional experience and thought, is bridged and the two aspects united into an integrated whole encompassing both the heart and the brain (Fromm, 1965).

Fromm denounces the existing educational system with its impressive outward show of statistics showing the growth of the student populations of schools and universities. The quantity is indeed exciting, but such excitement quickly fades once the quality of the system is considered. According to Fromm, the educational system has become a mere tool for advancement in society, or, in the best case—an instrument for the exploitation of knowledge in the service of making a living. Instruction in these schools is authoritarian, rationalistic and alienated. Instead of exciting their curiosity, arousing their interest, encouraging them to find out for themselves, fostering their independent thinking or developing their original creativity, students are merely crammed with information.

A change of values in education, a change which will emphasize both the heart and the brain, combine rational and investigative thinking with original creativity, instruct in the humanistic tradition and foster personal decisions, provide the student with opportunities for self-actualization and enable him to realize the wholeness of his emotional-rational-social-humanist personality—will not be effected by such superficial methods as are suggested by some Neo-Humanist educators, like reading one hundred great classics. Such a method is to Fromm's mind both mundane and uninspired. Fromm is convinced that change will take place only if teachers cease to be bureaucrats, covering



up for their lack of vitality with the mantle of knowledge givers. They must become, as Tolstoy has said, the fellow students of their students (Fromm, 1968). Fromm demands that the humanization of the educational system should begin in kindergarten and primary school, and be continued throughout the various educational levels and on to university studies and other forms of higher education. It is in this humanization of education that the chance lies for the humanization of the whole society.

CHAPTER 2

THE HUMAN SITUATION

THE HUMAN ADVANTAGE

In order for education to enable the individual to realize his potential, the educator must be familiar with the nature of man and his special needs, and encourage and develop them. Fromm suggests human needs as a starting point for education. These needs originate from human nature and are anchored in the human situation.

That which differentiates man from the animal world, according to Fromm, is in fact the essential uniqueness of the human situation. He states, The birth of man, from the point of view of the history of the individual, and from the point of view of the history of the race is an essentially negative event. Man lacks the instinctive capability and physical strength to adapt to nature. At birth, he is the most helpless of creatures among all living beings, and is in need of protection for a much longer period . . . The biblical myth of paradise expresses the myth with great clarity. Man, who existed in Eden in perfect harmony with nature, and with a total lack of self-consciousness, begins his history with an initial act of defiance of authority. Through this action, he becomes aware of his solitude and powerlessness. He is banished from the paradisaical garden, and two angels with flaming swords prevent his return. Man's development stems from the fact that he lost his initial home in nature, and can never return to lower animal existence. Only one path is open to him: to leave his natural habitat and find for himself a new home which he would create by his own hand. By transforming the world into a human world, man himself becomes human (Fromm, 1955).

Man has transcended nature and the role of a passive biological creature. His departure from nature turned him, in the biological sense, into a helpless creature. Yet, having freed himself from nature, he has developed an awareness of the uniqueness of his position.

The formation of self-awareness, logic and imagination disturbed the characteristic harmony of animal existence. The development of these capabilities has made the phenomenon of man into an anomaly, existing in nature and simultaneously transcending it—part divine and part bestial, part eternal and part mortal. These contradictions, inherent in man's unique existential position, gave birth to a need to find new solutions, to find improved means of uniting with nature, as well as uniting with his fellow beings and with himself. This need is the source of man's spiritual power and the origin of all his lusts, fears and emotions.

For an animal, it is enough that its physiological needs be filled; hunger, thirst, and sex. Man too is an animal, and the fulfillment of these needs is equally essential to



him. He is, at the same time human, and there is not enough in the fulfillment of these needs inasmuch as he has an additional set of needs which stem from the very fact of his humanness.

According to Freud, every man has a drive to fulfill three kinds of basic needs. The most basic are the physical needs: sex, hunger, thirst, sleep and activity. The second kind are the emotional needs, those needs which grow from the physiological needs and, through a process of sublimation, transcend them. They stem from the human feelings of pain and pleasure. This pain and pleasure, in its sublimation, and in its relation to people, situations and objects, undergoes a transformation to become the emotions of love, hate, arrogance, anger, rage, belligerence, etc. The third kind includes the intellectual needs. The root of these needs is in man's ability to think, to imagine, to know, and to be aware. Man strives to fulfill the totality of these needs in all of the three aspects: the physical, the emotional and the intellectual.

The human situation is unique. Fromm aptly describes this in his portrayal of the prolonged birth of man, stating that birth, in its accepted sense, is but the beginning of birth in a much larger sense. The whole of human life is but a continuing process of giving birth to oneself. Our birth will be complete when we die, but it is the fate of most human beings that they die before they are born (Fromm, 1955).

The newborn child, emerging from the womb, is at first completely dependent on his mother. Slowly he begins to discern the objects surrounding him and respond emotionally, to grasp things, coordinate movements, walk, talk, manipulate objects, react to others, create affiliations, develop love and the power of reason, inspect the world in an objective manner, develop talents, become capable of identification and develop an identity—he begins to live a full life.

Analogically, human history is also but the process of birth of the human race. Man needed hundreds of thousands of years to learn the first steps toward a human existence. He passed through a narcissistic developmental stage in which he felt omnipotent, through totemism and the adulation of nature, until he arrived of the beginning of consciousness, objectivity, and love of his fellow man.

The process of birth is difficult and threatening. Every step on the way to human existence is frightening because it means a constant surrender of a secure and relatively familiar situation, and passage to a new situation which is alien and untested. At every stage of our continuing birth process fear returns to assail us. Fromm stresses, we are never free from the two opposing tendencies: The one to emerge from the womb, from an animal form to a more human form of existence, from slavery to liberty; the other to return to the womb and nature, to security and certainty. During the history of the individual and that of the human race, it has been proven that the tendency to progress is stronger, but the phenomena of mental illness and regression to states which the human race has abandoned many generations ago, tell of the deep conflict which accompanies each new stage of birth (Fromm, 1955). Hence human life is determined by the unavoidable choice between regression and progression—between a return to an animal state of existence, and transcendence to a human way of life. Every attempt to regress to past difficulties inevitably leads to suffering and mental illness, to physiological or spiritual death (which is madness, according to Fromm). Every step forward is frightening and painful until that special point, onwards from which the weight of fear and doubt diminishes relatively.

Actually, man creates a new harmony to replace that harmony he has lost while he was part of nature. Once man has fulfilled his primary needs, he is motivated by human needs. His conscience must command him which needs he should develop and which to repress. While hunger and sex are the body's needs from birth, conscience, despite existing only potentially, requires the guidance of people and principles which develop only with the growth of culture.

Contrary to Freud, who saw the basic force which motivates the lusts and ambitions of human beings in the libido, Fromm stresses that the sexual urge and its implications, strong as they may be, are not the primary human forces. The strongest forces which motivate human behavior stem from man's conditions of existence, from "the human situation."

All cultures create a model system in which certain solutions are dominant, and according to which the urges and the fulfillment of needs is determined. The question is posed: What is the appropriate solution among the many solutions which various cultures, religions and arts offer, and what is the evil or destructive solution? In Fromm's opinion, the choice between good and evil must be made on the basis of our knowledge of the nature of man and the laws which govern his growth and needs.

Let us therefore examine the five basic needs which arise, according to Fromm, from the human situation. In each and every one of them, Fromm presents the two polar opposites which exist simultaneously and can be seen as representing "good" and "evil" or "productive" and "destructive."

COMMUNICATION VERSUS NARCISSISM

Narcissism, in its most extreme form, is manifested as madness in all its variants. The mentally ill person loses contact and communication and retreats into himself. He is incapable of experiencing reality, whether physical or perceptual, as it is. He can only experience it as formed and determined by his own thinking and emotional processes. A total failure to communicate with the world is, according to Fromm, indicative of insanity. Hence, some form of communication is a precondition to mental health.

Of special importance for the educator is Fromm's examination of the various ways in which man expresses his need for communication. One essentially negative method is the enslavement of the individual to another man, to an institution, or to God. In this way, man escapes his loneliness and isolation as an individual and becomes part of a greater whole, identifying with that force to which he has enslaved himself (Fromm, 1955). Examining the accepted forms of education, will we not find that it rather encourages such enslavement to state, party, factory, and society? Does it not stress, in almost all its forms, the individual as a part and as someone who identifies with a power to which he has enslaved himself, as someone who derives his pleasure from the successes of that force, as someone who is no longer brave enough to preserve his individuality, as someone whose communication is not a system of creative interaction, but rather enslavement and submission?

In contrast to communication as enslavement, Fromm presents its opposite, equally as negative: communication as domination. He remarks that the common basis in submission and dominance is the symbiotic nature of the relationship. Both sides con-

cerned lose their freedom and lack in inner strength and self-confidence which are essential for independence (Fromm, 1955; see also Fromm, 1941). Fromm stresses, that the actualization of the desire for submission (masochistic desire) or dominance (sadistic desire) never brings fulfillment (Fromm, 1955).

From a great range of communication, only love allows the preservation of freedom and personal integrity while enabling a unification with the other party at the same time. Fromm states, "love is uniting with someone or something which lies beyond oneself, while preserving the uniqueness and individuality of man's self" (Fromm, 1964).

Narcissism is in contraposition to three qualities of creative orientation: A) objectivity and reason in the realm of thought and appropriate perception of reality; B) love in the realm of the emotions; C) art and artistry in the realm of action. (These last two are the archetypes of creative activity.)

Creative love indicates, according to Fromm, the existence of qualities such as care, responsibility, respect and awareness of one another (Fromm, 1955; see also Fromm, 1947). Loving entails the active interest or involvement in the growth, development and happiness of the other, responsibility for him and respect for his separate existence.

Creative love, which is also the love of a teacher to his pupil, sublime amalgamation of proximity and distance, of involvement and uninvolvedness. Fromm calls that love motherly love since it is similar to the relationship between a mother and son which are paradoxical yet, in a sense, tragic, as it demands of the mother the strongest love possible while at the same time this love itself must aid the child to grow and depart from his mother, and become totally independent (Fromm, 1955). Fromm clearly illuminates this point when he writes in *The Art of Loving*, that the very essence of maternal love is the care for the growth of the baby; that is, her desire of the separation of the baby from herself. Herein lies the essential difference between this love and erotic love. In erotic love, two people who have previously been separate, come together as one and copulate. In maternal love, two people who were one are now separate. The mother must not only be tolerant of the child's separation from her, but must also desire and foster this separation. This stage, in which maternal love becomes quite difficult, requires unselfishness and the ability to give everything and want nothing in return except the happiness of the child.

Because of its selfless nature, maternal love is considered the most lofty of loves. Maternal love to the growing child—a love which asks nothing in return—is perhaps the most difficult form of love to attain.

The world of the newborn is fully narcissistic. The only realm in which the infant feels comfortable is that of its body and its needs. The infant does not yet differentiate the concept of "I" from that of "you." He is still in a state of unity with the world, but this is transient and precedes an awakening of his own sense of individuality. Slowly he emerges from this narcissistic state by a progressive awareness to external reality. At the same time he differentiates a feeling of "I" from that of "you." This change initially occurs at the level of sensual perception, and a relatively long period is necessary to overcome the narcissistic stage on an emotional level (See discussion in Piaget, 1929). Sullivan stresses that it is only at the age of eight or nine that the child begins to perceive that the needs of others are as important as his own (See Fromm, 1955).

From an educational standpoint, there is great significance in Fromm's discussion

of the process of man's differentiation and individualization, using the two methods available to him to overcome the feeling of inferiority and loneliness which is so hard to bear. The one way to attain this "positive independence" is to interact with the world around him in terms of love and creative output, while giving expression to his emotional, sensual and mental abilities. In this way man can again communicate with humanity, with nature, and with himself without foregoing his own independence and integrity. The other choice is recoil and regression, the forfeit of freedom and flight from self-sufficiency, and a more or less complete denial of man himself (Fromm, 1941).

CREATIVITY VERSUS DESTRUCTIVITY

Since man is endowed with reason and imagination, he can not be content with the passive role of an animal. He is motivated by a force which drives him to transcend the arbitrariness and passivity of his existence, which he accomplishes through creativity. The drive to be creative contains the roots of love, art, religion, and material creation.

Fromm maintains that the preconditions to creativity are activity and attention. By "activity," he does not imply external activity, but rather internal activity. To be active means to express the talents and capabilities which man possesses. Fromm discerns between alienated activity and non-alienated activity. In alienated activity, man does not really act—rather, external forces act upon him and he is detached from the results of his action. In non-alienated activity, man himself experiences the process of giving birth to something, the creation of something to which he remains affiliated. Such activity is creative activity. This type of action points to a state of inner activity. It is not necessarily connected to artistic or scientific creation. Creativity is a characteristic which all human beings are capable of developing if they are not mentally unstable. Human beings form and enliven all that falls into their hands. They utilize their abilities and give life to other beings and objects (Fromm, 1979).

Fromm raises the question of how man solves the task of emerging from himself if he is not capable of creativity. One of the methods is that of destructiveness. The urges to destroy and to create originate from the same source. Destruction is the alternative to creation, and both provide an outlet for the need of man to emerge from himself and to transcend himself. Fromm notes that the quantity of destructiveness in an individual is directly proportionate to the measure in which the actualization of the life has been obstructed. For Fromm, "Life has a dynamism of its own: the urges to grow, to express oneself, and to live." It seems that when these tendencies are blocked, the forces which are intended for livelihood are turned to destructiveness. In other words, there is an inverse relation between the urge to live and the urge to destroy. The more that the positive tendencies are blocked, the more destructiveness is strengthened. The more life is self-actualized, the more destructiveness is weakened (Fromm, 1941).

This concept gives rise to the notion that education must provide those conditions which encourage creativity, and that it is responsible for directing the expression of the need for transcendence. The destructive manifestations of the student are expressions of his frustration of the fact that he has not been given the opportunity to create. Hence the great importance which Fromm delegates to education in self-actualization, the



essence of which is a lively experience. That experience means rejuvenating oneself, growing, flowing outwards, loving, stepping beyond the bounds of the isolated ego, being curious and aware, giving and transcending (Fromm, 1979).

FAMILIARITY VERSUS INCEST

According to Fromm, the birth of a human creature entails the beginning of the severance of his natural connections. With this loss of natural contact, man feels alone, rootless and powerless to bear the loneliness and helplessness of his situation. Man can relinquish his natural contacts only if he can develop new human contacts and, on the strengths of these contacts, feel himself at home in this world. Thus it is no wonder than man resists the severing of his natural contacts, struggling against the detachment from nature, from mother, from blood, from earth (Fromm, 1955).

Freud saw, in the force which lies at the root of the infant's contact with the mother, the power of the genital libido which awakens in the child sexual lust and hostility towards the father as a sexual competitor. Because of his competitor's physical superiority, the infant boy represses his incestual lust and accepts the ordinances and prohibitions of the father. At the same time, the desires which have been repressed remain in his subconsciousness. Contrary to Freud, Fromm characterizes the phenomenon as something quite different from the genital desires of the boy. Fromm states, "This wish for incest, in its pre-genital sense, is one of the most basic of urges among men or women, which include man's desire for shelter and his satisfaction from narcissism, his yearning to be free of the dangers inherent in responsibility, freedom and awareness, and his longing for unconditional love" (Fromm, 1964). The mother fulfills these desires. H. S. Sullivan, agreeing with Fromm on this conception, also stresses that if the mother does not fulfill these wants, another maternal figure will take upon herself this function—perhaps the grandmother or another close female (Sullivan, 1953).

The connection with the mother is the most basic among the natural affiliations. This maternal connection has both negative and positive aspects. The negative aspect stems from the fact that the connection of the male to his mother, to nature, to blood and to earth prevents him from developing a whole and rational personality. He remains a child who cannot advance. Psychopathology provides us with substantial proof of this phenomenon of refusal to quit the all-embracing boundaries of the mother, and its most extreme form, manifests itself as a desire to return to the womb.

The family and the tribe—and later, the state, the nation, or the church—perform the same function which the mother originally fulfilled for the child. Among those with more archaic tendencies, nature itself, the earth and the sea become grand maternal representatives. The displacement of the maternal function from the real mother to the family, the nation, the race, simultaneously displaces personal narcissism to group narcissism. There are several advantages in this function: A) The human mother is destined to die, and hence the need to create an eternal maternal figure; B) The application of allegiance to the personal mother leaves the man isolated from others who have different mothers. When the tribe, the nation, the party, race, religion or God becomes the common mother, a great protective unity is created. Fromm notes that the proliferation of the 'greater mother' rituals: the ritual of the Virgin, of nationalism and patriotism, all attest to the power of this displacement (Fromm, 1964).

Fromm stresses that pathological phenomena in the development of the individual have parallels in the evolution of the human race. The most prominent expression of the struggle against this pathology is revealed in the incest taboo which is widespread among all human cultures. The incest taboo is a necessary precondition to all human development—not because of the sexual aspect, but due to the emotional aspect. In order for man to be born and progress, he must sever the umbilical cord and conquer the burning desire to remain tied to the mother. The incestual urge draws its strength not from the sexual desire for the mother, but from the deeper desire to return to the all-embracing womb and to the nourishing breasts. The incestual taboo amounts to nothing more than the myth of the two angels with fiery swords who guard the entrance to the Garden of Eden and prevent the return of man to a pre-individual state of unity with nature (Fromm, 1955).

Nationalism, when defined as the search for roots, is one of the examples of a pathological displacement. Fromm sees in this an incestual aspect, in that it entails a continuing enslavement to the blood and to the earth. Fromm calls for an increase in human universalism and cosmopolitanism instead of the rituals of the tribe, the race or the state.

From his strong Jewish roots and the attitudes which he assimilated in his childhood and which he preserved in his consciousness even in adulthood, Fromm provides a biblical example of the incest taboo in its nationalistic dimension. Though it can be claimed that this example of Fromm's thinking is nothing more than a basis for the circular argument to lend credence to Fromm's personal stance. It is, nonetheless, an eye-opening example and is more than simply an illustration buttressing Fromm's thesis, but in fact contains the conceptual basis for rejecting the reactionary tendency towards symbiotic unification with the race, society, family, tribe, and religion—a tendency which brings about a total weakening of the personality. According to Fromm, the Bible not only strongly tabooed incest, it also tabooed the permanent connection to the land. The history of humanity is described in the Bible as starting from the expulsion of man from the Garden of Eden—from the land in which he was rooted and with which he felt united. The Bible sees the inception of the history of the Jewish people in the command which God gave to Abraham to desert the country of his birth and 'to travel to a land which was unknown to him. . . .' The teachings of the prophets direct against renewed incest, which is inherent in the connection with the land and nature, as it was manifested in the worship of the Canaanite gods. The prophets declared the principle which states that a people who has diverged from the ways of reason and justice, and prostituted itself for the connection with the earth, will be exiled from its country and will thus overcome the incest inherent in the ties to land and nature. Only then can the population return to their homeland, and only then will the land bear fruit—a human domicile, without the curse of incest. The concept of the Messiah is a total victory over the ties of incest, and the creation of spiritual reality, moral and intellectual conscience—not only among the Jews, but among all peoples of the world (Fromm, 1955).

This new form of appropriate domicile will be realized only if man bases his society on a foundation of human solidarity and justice, and accepts the concept of universal kinship. Hence, the education which Fromm upholds is far from patriotic, local or nationalistic, but is in fact an instruction in the love of man as he is, without bound-

aries of blood and nation. It is education for the comprehension of internationality; it is humanistic education. Such education is the learning of a weaning from incestual ties, education for a critical stance, for a sober examination of society, nation and state, inoculating the individual against enslavement to the surrogate "greater mother."

Fromm suggests that, in a personality which reaches full maturity, there exists an inclination towards the merging of the three tendencies: the love of life which is the opposite of the love of death (biophilia versus necrophilia); the love which is the opposite of narcissism; and the independence and freedom of man which are the opposite of instinctual symbiotic fixation. This constellation of syndromes, which reflects the unity of these three tendencies, Fromm calls "the growth syndrome." The goal of education, according to Fromm, is free growth and development.

INDIVIDUALITY VERSUS THE HERD INSTINCT

Fromm defines the human being as an animal capable of saying "I" and capable of becoming aware of his existence as a separate entity (Fromm, 1955). Since he has forsaken his original unity with nature, man must be capable of decision, recognize himself as the subject of his actions and form his own unique identity. The sense of identity is essential to the preservation of sanity.

In primitive tribal thinking, "I" means "We." In the world of the middle ages, the individual was identified with his social function in the feudal hierarchy. With the decline of the feudal system, this feeling of identity was lost. Descartes, in his famous maxim, "I think therefore I am," establishes the concept of identity on the sole basis of mental perception. This perception disregards the fact that we recognize a "self" in the process of emoting and in the course of creative activity.

Modern society has developed substitutes for a true feeling of individual identity. Substitutes include social status, nationalism, religion, professional and occupational identity. A major substitute for the true sense of individuality, which finds its origins in tribal society, is the herd instinct, which entails an unassailable sense of belonging to the herd.

According to Fromm, the issue of identity is not a mere philosophical question, but rather a question of existence. Many people are prepared to endanger their lives, give up their loves, and sacrifice liberty and independent thinking in order to belong to the herd, and for the cause of conformity—in order to form an identity, even if it be a false one.

Fromm grapples with the question: To what extent must one be free of the herd? He favors an orientation which fosters the individual and his self-actualization. This self-actualization in no way entails anti-social behavior or alienation from human and national heritage. On this point Fromm is close to Bertrand Russell, who too raised the question: Should we accept social judgment and succumb to the urge to cooperate with the majority; and is it not the duty of the educator to lessen this tendency? Russell's response was that the desired solution would be the discovery of a proper proportion between the two opposing tendencies, rather than wholly accepting one or the other.

Mutual cooperation is essential, but at the same time, the human being must be able to transcend the social norms and to be capable of acting without fearing rejection and

the loss of respect or love. Quite a number of great pioneers and innovators, for example, were forced to confront the objections of the masses, suffer their enmity and even social ostracism, because of their independent thinking.

Russell stresses that in the life of every man—in lives whose circumstances are entirely ordinary, there must be a wide area in which what we generally call the "herd instinct" will be dominant, and a more limited area in which the herd instinct will have no influence. This more limited area will be the private domain of the individual. Most of our actions require the cooperation of others, and this cooperation must be instinctively based. At the same time, we must be able to uphold personal viewpoints on issues which are clear and familiar to us, and we must be courageous enough to declare unpopular views if we find them to be important and sincere.

One of the most difficult questions is: How can we reconcile the spirit of individual action and enterprise, which is so necessary for advancement, with the degree of social unity necessary for existence? Russell feels that cooperation and group unity are somewhat present in the instincts of every social animal, including man. This is amply clear when one considers ants and bees, who seem never to succumb to temptation to anti-social acts, and never to veer from the total dedication to the hive or nest. To a certain degree, such unswerving devotion to a social cause must be respected. One has, however, to recognize its severe limitations and drawbacks. Russell comments that ants and bees do not create great works of art, do not make scientific discoveries; that their social lives are in fact mechanical, precise and static. He would rather that human life contain a destructive or fermenting unstable negative element, for only thus can we be saved from the stagnation which such a development entails.

Fromm agrees with Russell's view that the education of the individual is more important and authentic than the education of the "citizen." According to his view, the educator is required not to merely accept the social norms, nor to relate to the mere external characteristics of the student, nor to educate towards rote-learning and obedience in an all-inclusive way; but rather to encourage critical and original thinking among his pupils, to foster their good judgment, to enable them to develop the very measure of social involvement and acceptance of society which is the precondition to harmonious existence, and at the same time provide them with that measure of individuality and independence which is the precondition to self-actualization and individual liberty. Only thus will the herd instinct, which is present in every class or group of people and which to this day is fostered in every school, be prevented.

LOGIC VERSUS IRRATIONALITY

Fromm notes that the fact that man is endowed with logic and imagination entails not only the need for an individual identity, but also the need to comprehend the world intellectually. In many aspects of his theories of orientation and actualization, Fromm is close to the views of Buber: concerning the two kinds of attitudes which man has towards his environment, towards other human beings and things, wherein the one attitude Buber terms "Realization" and the other "orientation" (Also see Cohen, 1976.).

The oriented man, according to Buber, is not interested in the thing for itself and its name, but only in the use which he can put it to, its associations, advancements and



knowledge which it provides him. This is the mode in which science or technology relates to objects; this is the way of knowing the world and adjusting within it. In contrast, the actualizing man gives himself fully to the particular object to which he relates, and the very act of actualization is based on an intensive existence, intensive vision and realization. The orientated man knows things, organizes them and forms relationships and connections, whilst in the realization situation the totality of the personality is developed by virtue of experience. The creative man has the strongest power of realization of all.

Fromm attaches great importance to these two areas of life when he remarks of the necessity of an orientation system which enables man to locate himself in the world, in society, in the state and the culture, and the simultaneous necessity of the attitude of self-realization, creative expression and the transcendence inherent in intensive existence—which is in fact the very taste of a full life.

In his discussion of orientation, Fromm differentiates between reason and intelligence. Intelligence, he maintains, is a means for the successful manipulation of the world, whereas reason is man's capability to grasp the essence of the world by means of thought; reason is man's instrument of truth. Reason, as love, must surround all of the world which man confronts, in the sense of being "present" in the world according to the Buberian definition. Reason is a unique human attribute. Reason is not, according to Fromm, a merely cognitive capacity, but rather includes a dimension of intuitive feeling.

A comparison between Fromm's conception of reason and that of Samuel Johnson is not inappropriate because of the proximity of their respective viewpoints. Johnson notes that the human capacity to see things as themselves, to recognize folly and stupidity, and to see the meaningful in all its significance, is called reason. This capacity protects man against loss of contact with his situation and provides him general estimations of both his limitations and capabilities, and thus it tempers the incompatibility which exists between the spiritual and the physical, between the temporal and the transcendental. On an ethical level, reason is the source of the correct choice. The good act is equally as reasonable as the bad act is unreasonable (Also see Zachs, 1977.).

The more that man's reason develops, the more elaborate his system of orientation becomes. Human culture has developed various orientations, beginning with totemism, the belief in rain-gods, and the belief in racial superiority or in forefathers who provide the answer in man's search for meaning, and proceeding to the various religions which provide this answer by relating to the concept of Godhood, and ending in pure philosophical systems such as stoicism.

Similarly to Victor Frankel, who points out the necessity for meaning in his books, Fromm too notes that man needs a frame of orientation, which serves as the object of his relating and his devotion, and which provides a meaning for his existence and status in the world.

How will man know the best choice among the existing solutions? According to Fromm, he can decide according to the analyses of the "systems of orientation" from the starting-point of human nature, and according to the answer these systems provide for man's needs and his ambition for self-actualization.

Fromm does not present any personal preference towards any of these various systems of orientation. According to the principles of his approach, he leaves the choice in

the hands of the individual himself. Each person must choose according to criteria based on his needs. This approach, characteristic of existentialist theory in education, (in spite of the fact that Fromm himself is not an Existentialist) hints to the educator that he must provide his pupils with many possibilities of varied orientations, and leave the choice to them. Thus we see the basis for Fromm's aversion to moral dogmatism, propaganda and the like.

CHAPTER 3

THE NATURE OF MAN

“What is man that Thou art mindful of him? And the son of man that Thou visitest him? For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet. All sheep and oxen, Yea, and the beasts of the field; The fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea. And whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas.”

(Psalms VIII 5–9)

In order to illustrate and analyze the human situation, we have examined the five needs which, according to Fromm are central to human existence, and which are a consequence of man's essence and situation. One cannot fully examine the human situation without considering the question of human nature, about which the poet of Psalms wrote, “Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels.” Erich Fromm, in collaboration with Ramon Xirau, devoted an extensive anthology to this question, in which appear the thoughts of almost 70 thinkers and creative artists and excerpts from some of the basic publications on humanity, all of them dealing with man's nature (See Fromm, Xirau, 1958.).

The anthology begins with texts from the Far East—the Opanishad—which were written before 600 B.C.E., and their philosophical impact, wisdom and spiritual message is alive to this very day. From the philosophy of Buddah and Zen, the anthology proceeds with verses from the Bible, transversing the whole of human creation: beginning with the Greek philosophy and artistic creation of Heraclitus, Empedocles, Sophocles, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, and continuing through the Roman thought and poetry of Lucretius, Epictetus, Plotinus, and from thence to the Christian thought of St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Meister Eckhart, proceeding to the thought of the Renaissance, the formation of humanism, the writings of Erasmus Roterodamus, Martin Luther, Thomas Moore, through to the philosophical writings of Montaigne, Descartes, Spinoza, Pascal, Leibnitz, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, David Hume, Jean Jacques Rousseau, and on to Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, Karl Marx, Kierkegaard, and thence to philosophers and psychologists like Freud, William James, John Dewey, Carl Jung, and existentialistic thinkers like Heidegger, Sartre, ending with the writings of Fromm himself, Simon Weill, David Riesman, and many many others. It is a rich and educative selection rife with inner contradictions, full of insight on the nature of man from many different viewpoints, built on totally different world views and varying philosophical and religious conceptions. All this confronts man himself who is placed in juxtaposition with the whole of nature: “I see the sky, your creation, your appendages moon and stars which you have created.” The question

arises, “What is man that Thou art mindful of him?” but at the same time the realization exists. “For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels.”

Fromm stresses that beginning with the philosophy of the Far East, through the Holy Scriptures of the Jews, Greek philosophy, through of the Middle Ages, up to the time of Immanuel Kant, perhaps even to the middle of the present century, there was a consensus that one can speak of human nature and essence, and of man's uniqueness in creation. There were, obviously, differences of opinion concerning the characteristics of this essence, but there was agreement as to its existence. From the last decade of the nineteenth century, this recognition of the essence and uniqueness of man was questioned. The historical perspective of man has raised doubts concerning the immutability of human nature in all epochs, and has examined the possibility of changes in that nature. Anthropology and the developing study of primitive tribes has raised the question: Is man not comparable to a blank page on which culture and society write the text? The theory of evolution also rocked the basis of the belief in “human nature.” Darwin and his followers spoke of evolutionary change. Modern physicists have gone a long way to prove the changes in the world of matter. It is now difficult to speak of a stable and immutable “human nature” when the whole world is perceived as existing in ceaseless motion, in “process.”

Moreover, Fromm adds, a deep aversion has been created against all use of the concept of “human nature,” since this concept has been used as the cruel vehicle for all possible forms of injustice. In the name of “human nature,” intellectuals have defended slavery up until the 18th century; in the name of this concept both racism and nationalism were born, and it is still used as a basis for various forms of social dictatorship.

On the other hand, Fromm raises the question of whether we are to come to the conclusion that no “human nature” exists. Such a conclusion is very dangerous indeed, because if there is no nature common to all human beings, one can claim that unity of all human beings will never be achieved; one can not propose values which are common to all, nor speak at all of psychology or anthropology, whose subject is the nature of man.

Fromm suggests that a differentiation be made between the concept of “human nature” or “human essence” and certain qualities which are common to all human beings, but which of themselves do not define fully man's essence or nature. These are basic characteristics which do not define the whole of which they are part; they define part of it and are not the essence itself.

From here, Fromm proceeds to examine these common characteristics which shed light on various aspects of human nature by examining the various viewpoints pertaining to that nature. The first outlook, held by Greek philosophers, intellectuals of the Middle-ages, and even philosophers of the eighteenth century, views man as a rational being. This definition was accepted and remained unchallenged until the discovery of the irrationality of man. Although such creative artists as Euripides, Dante, Sophocles, Shakespeare, Dostoevski, and many other recognized this irrationality and dealt with it in their works, it was only Freud and those who followed in his footsteps who placed irrationality at the very center of an empirical scientific study of man.

Another conception of man was to view him as a social creature. This is by nature a

very broad and general definition which does not tell us much about man's nature, except the idea that he is a social creature who needs to be part of a herd.

Another definition is that of man as "homo phaber," the creative man. Man is conceived of as an animal which is capable of creation. This definition is also unsatisfactory since it is too general and diffuse. One can even speak of animal's creations, like bees who built intricate structures of wax to store their honey. Marx pointed out that there is a fundamental difference between the creations of animals and those of man: Animals create according to an instinctual pattern, while man creates according to a plan of his own devising. Another definition of man's creativity is that which speaks of man as a creator and user of tools. These tools become an extension of his body and expand the possibilities of his creativity. In later stages man develops the ability to harness his energy and abilities for his own purposes, and creates more sophisticated tools which are a result of his ingenuity and an extension of human creativity (automation, computerization, cybernetics, etc.)

To these conceptions, one later definition is added—one suggested by Ernest Kasirer and the symbolic philosophers, who stress that man is a symbol-creating creature, and that the most significant symbol which he has created is the word. According to Kasirer, the world which man lives in is no more than chaos unless man can shape that world with his symbols. Man's capability to project symbols onto the universe and to thereby transform it to the cosmos, is what enables man to dominate chaos. If the world is meaningless, then man is the creature who can give it a semblance of meaning. Man does not acknowledge reality by his perception, but rather builds the very fabric of reality with his mind. Symbols are man's tools with which he creates his world.

Ernest Kasirer was the student of Herman Cohen, who wanted to write a book about man but never did so. Kasirer fulfilled Cohen's wish and wrote his essay on man. (An Introduction to the Philosophy of Human Culture.) Fromm, who too was influenced much by Herbert Cohen, and who frequently refers to him and quotes from his writings, is close in belief to quite a few of Kasirer's concepts, and in his thoughts about man (especially in the books *The Heart of Man*, *Man for Himself* and *The Sane Society*) we find similar analyses to those which Kasirer makes, such as the idea that one can describe the whole of human culture as a process of man's gradual liberation. Language, art, religion, and science are but stages in this process. In all of them man exposes and discovers new powers, in order to build a world of his own—an ideal world. Philosophy cannot give up its search for an essential unity in this ideal world, but at the same time, it does not confuse this unity with simplicity; it does not disregard the phenomena of tension and strife, the contradictions and conflicts amongst the various forces of man, for which no common denominator can be found. They have different emphases and operate according to vastly different principles. However, this multiplicity and variability does not indicate a lack of unity or an absence of harmony. All of these functions are fully compatible. Each one of them opens up a new horizon and reveals a new aspect of humanity.

If we stop for a moment at this preliminary stage in the discussion of human nature, and examine the human qualities which we have already presented—rationality and reason, the ability to create, sociability and the capability of social organization, and the capacity to create symbols and project them onto the world—and if we add to these

the definition of Friedrich Schiller in which he states that man acts only when he is truly and fully human, and is truly and fully human only when he acts, (a definition which Kasirer adopts and to which he adds that it is not only a fear of beauty, but also a fear of truth which is revealed in man's behavior), then even at this early stage we can already lay the foundations of humanistic theory of education.

Rationality and reason obligate us to the development of free and critical thinking, the ability to doubt, objective investigation, experimental observation, logical analysis and renewed intellectual activity. Here one should take note of the Platonian concept that truth cannot be seen as predetermined, that one cannot instill truth into the soul of man, because truth in its essence is a function of dialectic thought. Man is a creature who is eternally seeking his self, examining his own existence and trying to comprehend his situation. In the critical attitude towards human life is hidden the true value of existence. Socrates wrote that the greatest good of man is to speak each day of some positive quality, and a life devoid of inquiry is not worth living. Kasirer remarks that the man, as defined by Socrates is that creature who has a rational answer when he is asked a rational question. According to Kasirer, we are dealing here not only with a conscious level, but also an ethical level. It is both man's consciousness and his morality which are involved. His very capacity to account for both himself and others creates of man a creature who is accountable on moral matters.

Hence, educational instruction will no longer be perceived as the transference of information, and the student no longer perceived as someone obligated to absorb all information presented to him. (See discussions of Paulo Friere, who was one of Fromm's followers, on the "banking approach"—Friere, 1972. See also my own volume *Revolution in Education*—Cohen, 1983.) Moreover, the student, rather than learn in school how to answer questions, must learn to raise questions, present problems and cast doubts, constantly experiment, discover new answers rather than repeating existing ones, re-examine accepted answers and formulas, consider them in depth and analyze them for what they are, rather than accept them as normative and sacred. Such instructions flatly reject the didactic fakery which masquerades as the development of the student's capabilities to ask questions, for which the answers are pre-prepared and known in advance; that is, worthless superficial skill, which in no way resembles true investigation, and is no more than an empty didactic device.

What the students receive in this new mode of education is much more than the curriculum itself, than the answers which are rejected and revealed as false, than the solutions which are found as a result of investigation, more than analyses or intellectual competition. The method of investigation is in and of itself significant, is an acquired mental and spiritual stance, is that which penetrates the awareness of the student and becomes his own possession—not as another item of knowledge, but as a quality of the personality, as a mode of behavior, as a means of relating to knowledge, to society, to the world.

Creativity, as a characteristic of man obligates us to the development and fostering of creative education. The creative approach frees the individual from the coercive dominance of authoritarianism, in that it fosters the development of the uniqueness of the individual. The duty of education and instruction is to preserve and encourage the creativity of the child, and to encourage his natural curiosity and vivid imagination without suppression. The limiting of imagination and the freedom to create, to be in-

involved in creative and spontaneous activity, are the main causes which hinder the development of the child's creativity. Education should begin at as early an age as possible and the creative activity of the child must not be encumbered with prohibitions and limitations. Creative education begins at home with the family. It is recommended that the parents encourage the child to perceive things and to think about them, that they encourage him to see, to hear and to feel, and thus they will open before him the world which surrounds him. It is necessary to open all his channels of sensation towards the world and communications.

Man's sociability opens an important path to social education. If we wish man to have a satisfying life, both from his own viewpoint and from the viewpoint of society and the world, two separate harmonies are necessary: an inner harmony of reason, emotion and will, and an external harmony with the wishes of others (and see, in detail Cohen, 1979). Man's behavior as a member of a given society and as a citizen is the product of these two harmonies. He must recognize that his is not the only will in the world and try and create harmony out of the conflicting wills within the society. Notwithstanding Robinson Crusoe on his desert island, or Jean Jacques Rousseau's "Emil" who grew in the depths of the forest, we are all members of a given society, citizens of a given state, and education must direct itself to a social education which will make obligatory the education for self-actualization within society, for true camaraderie rather than the immersion of the individual within society, and his subjugation to rulers. Man must learn to know all his potentials as an individual before, of his own free will, he decides in favor of adjustment to the unavoidable social compromises, and acceptance of the practical aspects of social life. Man's social consciousness depends on a two-fold process of identification and individualism. Although Kasirer states that man can never find himself, can never recognize his uniqueness except by means of social interaction, he sees this mode of recognition as more valuable than that of external coercion. Man, like all animals, submits to the laws of society, but beyond that submission, he has an active role in the formation of, and changes in, the structure of that society.

Man, being a creator of symbols, paves the way for linguistic education on one hand, and the domain of the arts on the other, since every art form is first and foremost a language with its own characteristic symbols. Kasirer clarifies that symbol-creating man is a being who creates distance. The creation of distance means the creation of freedom. Language and the arts, myth and theoretical sciences, function together—each according to its own internal laws in this spiritual process—to keep life at a certain distance. These, according to Kasirer, are the great way-stations on the route which leads us from that domain of activity in which animals live and to which they are bound, to the domain of introspection and thought.

An inherent organic connection exists between language and thought. The word has a much more significant role than that of its meaning in the phrase which it forms. It is possible that abstract thinking develops only simultaneously with the acquisition of abstract vocabulary, and thus one cannot separate the development of thought from the development of language. Kasirer explains that when a child learns to call objects by their names, he does not add a list of artificial symbols to his knowledge, but rather learns to form the concepts of these objects, and comes into direct contact with the objective world. From here onwards the child is on far firmer ground. His obscure,

vague, diffuse concepts, which come and go, and his diffuse emotions, begin to acquire new shape. According to Kasirer, the first names which a child utilizes consciously can be likened to a cane with which the blind man feels his way. The language as a whole functions as a gate to a new world. Every step along the way opens up new horizons, widens boundaries and reaches of tangible experience. The great eagerness to speak stems not only from the desire to learn to use words, but from the wish to discover an objective world and conquer it.

Linguistic education is of great importance, since the danger exists of what Ludwig Wittgenstein called the bewitching of our brains by means of language (Wittgenstein, 1963). Wittgenstein views philosophy as an analysis of language, whilst educators like Postman and Weingartner see one of the major roles of education as the elucidation of concepts, the examination of the relationship between words and their inherent meanings, and the use of words as representatives of experience. Since one cannot separate the process of acquiring knowledge from the use of language, language must be viewed as mediating all human concepts and observations, as the unifying focus of all scholarly investigation (Postman, Weingartner, 1966).

The practitioners of linguistic education must recognize the danger of "verbal" thinking by itself, which is infertile thinking, since it dislocates the word from a context of idea and content. Moreover, the word evinces a strange potential for independent existence and development, almost totally disconnected from thought content. A word can continue to exist even when its meaning has become dull and convoluted. A word can be transformed to infertile forms, devoid of content; it can become a shell without substance, a baseless cliché. Dewey, whom Fromm is close to in many of his views, protested the emptiness of verbal knowledge, the lack of connection between words and experience, and the definition of words as a substitute for experience. According to Dewey, although words are but symbols of concepts, it is quite easy to accept words as concepts in and of themselves. Insofar as spiritual activity is divorced from an active interest in the world, from activity and productivity and the association of action with experience, so words and symbols begin to replace the concepts themselves. We quickly grow used to and accept a kind of pseudo-concept and imperfect perception, until we no longer recognize that our spiritual activity is only half alive (Dewey, 1916).

In this context it would be useful to present the radical concept of Postman and Weingartner, who speak at some length of the theory which considers our perceptions of things and the world as originating within ourselves. As a direct result of this theory, we recognize that every man creates his own unique world. The goals and presuppositions, and hence also the concepts of every man, are unique to him, and no two men in the world hold completely identical concepts. It follows from this, among other things, that no man can be absolutely certain of anything. The most a man can do is to describe how something appears to him. The universe can never provide absolute validation or proof. The principles of relativity and uncertainty are far more than physical concepts. Each and every one of us must live with these principles every single moment of our lives (Postman, Weingartner, 1966). A radical view of education, which should be focused on the individual, on questioning and the use of language, directly follows from this concept.

From all this, we come to the realization that meaning is found only in people. Whatever the meaning of words, this meaning was invested in them by people. This

assignment of meaning is based on people's experiences, and can never exist without some basis in their experiences. Hence, any discussion of the meaning of words other than the intended meanings, obscures and conceals more than it clarifies the relation between words and reality (See also Cohen, 1983).

Man's capacity as creator of symbols also facilitates his education in art. Deprive man of this artistic aspect, and you diminish the depth of his human experience and impair an important part of his life. According to Kasirer, if science organizes our thoughts and ethics dictate our actions, then art manages our perception of the visible, the audible, and the tangible. Unfortunately, art education plays but a minor role in our schooling, and hence the wholeness of human personality is severely limited. Kasirer stresses that in our everyday experiences, we classify phenomena according to informal or finite categories. In accordance with our interest in theoretical reasons or the practical results of objects and acts, we see them either as causes or means. Thus we are often deprived of direct interaction with our world. Art, in contrast, teaches us to make things accessible and not just treat them as concepts or means to an end. Art provides us with a richer, more lively and colorful image of reality, and deeper insight into its structure. It is typical of man's nature that he is not limited to single and specific approach to reality, but rather is able to select his personal outlook and switch focus from one aspect of things to another. Artistic education is not education for the artistic profession, but education of the whole of man—a multi-directional education which enables a multiple vision of reality.

All of these characteristics—reason, creativity, sociability, symbolization—are basic characteristics which do not create the totality of human nature. Even if all these characteristics are present, man can still be free or merely a manifestation of determinism, good or bad, motivated by passions or lusts, or by ideals; common values might exist for all, or it is equally possible that no such values exist. If so, says Fromm, the question which still remains whether there is anything, apart from these characteristics, which can be termed "the nature of man"?

A number of philosophers, like Kirkegaard, Karl Marx, William James, Henri Bergson and others, have stressed that man creates himself, that he shapes his own history. If man indeed creates himself, we can no longer speak of "human nature." Man is no longer rational, but rather becomes rational; he is not sociable, but becomes sociable, etc. . . .

In his efforts to define the nature of man, Fromm borrows the concepts of constants and variables from mathematics. According to him, man possesses an element of constancy which does not vary, and which comprises his nature, but he also possesses a large number of variables which make him capable of innovations, creativity, productivity and progress.

Fromm maintains that man is an animal without sufficient instinct to guide his actions. Despite having reason and self-awareness, man lacks the ability to free himself from the dictates of his nature. Man is an oddity of nature who is simultaneously within nature and without nature, transcending it. These contradictions give rise to conflict and anxiety, the imbalance of man and the need to cope with them in order to rectify that imbalance. Yet, when man does achieve balance, new contradictions arise, and he must once more commence searching for an ever-renewing balance. Hence, the answers rather than the questions are the essence of man.

The education of questing man is one of the central and most difficult tasks of education. We are tempted to provide students with answers, to encourage them to learn by rote, to accept, to quote, to accept the existing and stable, rather than the fluid and changing. A true curriculum is one which brings man to question, and which itself is perceived as an enormous store of questions: not questions regarding information or technical questions which beg for the reference to former knowledge, but rather questions which are worthwhile answering, and which do not have readily available answers. These questions must help the student develop personal attitudes which will help him survive in a rapidly changing world.



CHAPTER 4

INDIVIDUALITY AND SOCIETY

THE ENTANGLEMENT OF DESTRUCTIVENESS AND AGGRESSION

Fromm has a strong fundamental disagreement with Freud concerning the relation of man to society. Freud's assumption is that a basic and immutable contradiction exists between human nature and society—a contradiction which stems from man's asocial behavior. He noted that man is motivated by two instincts grounded in his biology: the desire for sexual pleasure and the urge to destroy. Man's sexual desire causes him to strive for total sexual freedom and places him in constant conflict with the laws and prohibitions of society. Man's incestual sexual desires create too, by their very nature, a confrontation with the father, hostility towards him, and repressed anger for the society's prohibitions against incest. Man's aggression, according to Freud, stems from a dual source: the desire inherent in him to destroy (the death instinct), and from the frustration of his instinctual desires by the dictates of society.

On the basis of his conception of man, Freud inevitably arrives at recognition of an unavoidable opposition between civilization and mental health and happiness. According to Freud, social life and culture exist in a central contradiction to man's needs as he perceives them, and man is thus faced with a tragic choice between happiness based on limitless fulfillment of instinctual desires, or security and cultural attainment based on the frustration of these instincts, and thus give man ample cause for neuroses and mental illness. Freud stresses that culture is the cause of frustration of instinctual desires, and is thus the ultimate cause of mental illness.

The Freudian theory of the species is wholly based on an anthropological concept, which postulates that mutual competitiveness and enmity are inherent in human nature. Darwin expressed this principle in the realm of biology in his theory of the competitive struggle for survival. Economists such as Ricardo and the Manchester school have applied this principle to the realm of economics. Fromm notes that "economic man" and "competitive man" are in fact very convenient inventions. The characteristics attributed to them—isolationism, associability, greed and competitiveness—makes capitalism seem, in the eyes of the masses, a system which perfectly compliments human nature (Fromm, 1955).

Fromm devotes a large and comprehensive volume to the anatomy of human destructiveness (Fromm, 1973) wherein he analyzes and challenges the approaches of the instinctivists, behaviorists, and psychoanalysts from the Freudian school. He recognizes that at the basis of all instinctivist writings, from Conrad Lorenz's text on aggression, to Desmond Morris' books *The Naked Ape* and *The Human Zoo*, and the writings of

Lorenz's students like A. Able-Ablesfield and others, one single theory prevails: man's aggressive behavior, as it is revealed in war, crime, interpersonal skirmishes, and various acts of destruction and sadism, all stem from an inner instinct, phylogenetically programmed, which seeks release and awaits a proper opportunity to find expression.

Fromm notes that it is possible that the neo-instinctivism of Lorenz and his followers might have been so successful, not because of the strength of their arguments, but rather as a result of a public readiness to accept them. According to Fromm, there is nothing more convenient to people who are full of anxiety, and who feel that they cannot possibly change their course which leads to certain doom, than accepting a theory which confirms that the source of violence is in man's animal nature, in an uncontrollable urge to be aggressive. This theory of inherent aggressiveness easily becomes ideology, facilitating the removal of fear of the unknown or fear of the future, and supplying a rational explanation for the feelings of impotence (Fromm, 1973).

In his enthusiasm to protect his own social approach, Fromm criticizes Lorenz and his systematic and methodical research in the world of animal and human existence, which he describes as theoretical and ideological, and which he treats not in the framework of experimental *empiricism*, but rather in the domain of ideology. Fromm rejects the instinctivist theory as simplistic, without any consideration of the data which was collected in Lorenz's biological studies. He stresses that instead of such shallow theory, there is need for serious investigation of the causes of destructiveness. Such a serious investigation entails the reevaluation of the basic assumptions of accepted ideology, i.e. and analysis of the irrationality in the structure of our society and the doubting of the sanctity of meanings which are hidden in certain respected words such as "defense," "honor," and "patriotism." Only an in-depth analysis of the structure of society could possibly expose the reasons for the increment in destructiveness, and point to ways and means of diminishing it (Fromm, 1973).

Fromm contrasts the instinctivistic theory with the behavioristic theory, which reached maturity in Skinner's neo-behaviorism (Skinner, 1953), and which he strongly criticizes. In contrast to instinctivism, this theory does not deal with the subjective forces which motivate man to behave in a certain way; it does not deal with his feelings, but rather, only his external behavior and the social conditioning which forms it.

Fromm does not accept psychology's shifting focus from feeling to behavior, the result of which is that feelings and desires have been removed from the realm of psychological observation and are now conceived of as variables which are of no interest. At least from a scientific viewpoint, he maintains, the choice between instinctivism and behaviorism does not advance the study of aggression. Both positions provide one-sided explanations, rely on biased dogmatic notions, and those researching these approaches are required to provide data for a preconceived explanation, either instinctivist or behaviorist (Fromm, 1973).

Fromm also has an axe to grind with Freud's theory which pertains to the life instinct and the death instinct, which places human destructiveness as one of the two basic drives present in man's soul. Fromm would like to liberate the desires such as the need for love, the wish for freedom, the urge to destroy, the lust to torture, the avidity for power, and the wish to subjugate, from their forced conjunction with the instincts. He stresses that instincts are in a pure organic category, while desires grounded in character are in an historical, socio-biological classification (Fromm, 1973).



In his analysis of aggression, and relations between the individual and society, Fromm is closer to the psychoanalysts who have freed themselves from the binding influence of Freud's theory of the libido and especially from such concepts as id, ego, and super-ego, and who have managed to describe fully the relationships between human beings and the roles of the participants in these relationships. Such were Harry Stack Sullivan, Adolf Meyer, Theodore Leach and especially R. D. Laing whom Fromm says managed to pierce the complexities of personal elements, and to disengage himself from the accepted supposition that contemporary society is a sane society, and to radically analyze the social situation (Fromm, 1973).

SOCIAL CHARACTER

The term "social character," first developed by Fromm in his essay "The Characterology of Psychoanalysis and its Significance in Sociology" (Fromm, 1931) is in fact a basic concept of a character structure common to members of the same culture, which differs from the personal character belonging to different people of the same culture. The purpose of social character is to shape and give direction to human energy within a given society for the purpose of that society's proliferation (Fromm, 1955).

The social character, according to Fromm, is a mediator between the socio-economic structure and the ideals and ideas current in that society, whilst the latter form the structure of social character (Also see Fromm, 1962.). Social character mediates in two distinct directions: from the economic base to ideas and from ideas to the economic base. The following scheme expresses this concept:

Economic Basis ↔ Social Character ↔ Ideas and Ideals

Fromm, however, does not rest with that, but brings up another central element in the shaping of the social character, and that is human nature and its needs. According to Fromm, one can understand the social process only if one acknowledges the reality of man—his various spiritual and physical attributes—and only if we examine the reciprocal relation between man's nature and the character of external conditions in his life, which he must conquer in order to survive (Fromm, 1955).

The structure of society and the individual's role in its framework determine the content of social character. In a certain sense, Fromm sees the family as a psychological agent of society (Fromm, 1947). The family is also an educational agent, one of whose major roles is the transference of social values to the growing child. Since the parents themselves are subject to the limitations of the social structure of their culture, and are part of it, each one of them is an educational agent. This educational role is carried out in two ways: the one—from the very fact that the parents' character is an expression of social character, and the child's character is formed according to his parents' character, and develops according to their actions and reactions towards him; and the second—child-training fulfills the function of the shaping of the child's character in the socially desirable direction.

Since systems of education, according to Fromm, are essentially mechanisms of transference, and are consequently essentially mediators; there is no way to explain social

character as a function of educational methods, nor is there any reason to try to do so. One can understand, analyze, and even shape the method of education only if we know from the outset what kinds of personalities are necessary for any given culture.

A relatively obvious principle of reality is indicated, connected to the limitations of the educational system, in comparison to the general social system. In the same way that the family functions as the agent of social character, so too does the school. The viable and meaningful change is a radical adjustment in the social, economic, cultural, and political spheres, a change which will immediately affect the educational system.

SOCIAL HEALTH AND ILLNESS

The attempts to define a society's mental health—and even to treat it—first appeared in scientific literature only after World War II. The belligerence of Germany and Nazi rule, and all that took place in fascist Italy and in other European countries during the war has provoked interest in this subject.

Fromm's book, *The Sane Society* (Fromm, 1955), is one of the first basic and comprehensive works in this area, which has given rise to further investigation of the subject. The term "a sane society," which he coined in his book, has entered the vocabulary of the literature of political and social sciences, and in political speech.*

The concept of the mental health of a society, from the same perspective as the mental health of an individual, is based on the analysis of an individual in his social framework. One must consider the human basis of a society, and the individuals which comprise it. So, from the healthy personality we can determine the nature of the healthy society. Yoel Shenan writes, "The question is asked: to what extent can we project onto society concepts which stem from definitions of individual mental health, such as normal thought processes, the integration of cognition and emotion, appropriate self-image, instinctual balance, and the like? In any case, any projection of this kind necessitates changing the meanings of these concepts." Shenan continues, "Healthy society is that in which the individual behaves according to the accepted social norms, and hence a state of anomy (life without laws, anarchy) is the sign of a society of diminished mental health. But is doubtful that the simple existence of social norms is sufficient for a society to be considered healthy. In such a case, the mental health of an individual becomes dependent on social values, and hence cannot serve as the starting point for the definition of society's mental health. . . ."

As for a definition based on the structure and role of a society, Shenan justifiably notes, "It is possible that the health of a certain society has been facilitated by the exploitation of individuals, of groups, or of a neighboring subjugated society, or even of a class of slaves. Ethical and psycho-social considerations make it doubtful that such societies can realistically be viewed as healthy."

Hence, Shenan proposes a definition which takes the difficulties of the two previous definitions into consideration—"A mentally healthy society is that whose set of values, its establishments, its social situation, its economics, and its modes of communication

*Hence the word "sane," which is used often by representatives of the left in both Israel and the world, to define themselves and thus differentiate themselves from the "insane" who express, in their narrow nationalistic concepts, their inseparability from the connections of blood and earth



are so organized that they insure its existence without impinging upon the rights of other societies, whilst insuring the basic conditions necessary for the social and mental health of the individual" (Shenan, 1969). Such a definition seems to be a good starting point for the perusal of Fromm's writings on the question of mental hygiene.

The issue of society's mental health has concerned Fromm greatly, and is at the root of all his concepts of education, since he views education as a function of society. He raises Freud's contention that man's natural desires and society's demands are necessarily antagonistic. Freud believes that culture and civilization are constantly developing in the opposite direction from man's needs, and, on the basis of this belief, has coined the term "social neurosis." Nevertheless, Freud was aware that the diagnosing of social neuroses will meet with difficulties. He pointed out that, in the neuroses of the individual, one can see as a root, the conflicts between the patient and his environment, which we presuppose to be "normal." No such comparative background is available of a sick society. Hence we must find such background in a different way, and ask of the therapy, what value is the most astute analysis of social neurosis if there is no man who is able to bring society to adopt a cure for itself? Freud believes that one day someone will dare to investigate the pathology of civilized communities. Erich Fromm takes this mission upon himself.

As for the mental health of the individual, Fromm stresses that it is characterized by the capacity to love and to create, by transcending the incestual attachments to the tribe and the land, and by a sense of identity based on the experience of self as the bearer of man's powers and their agents, in the perception of our inner reality and external reality—that is, it is characterized by the development of objectivity and reason (Fromm, 1964). Fromm acknowledges the difficulty of projecting this generalized definition onto society, but tries to deal with the mental health of a whole society.

Fromm does not accept the position of many psychiatrists and psychologists who refuse to admit that society in general is susceptible to mental illness. He rejects their concept that the problem of social mental illness can be reduced to a number of individuals who do not "adjust," rather than the maladjustment of the culture itself (Fromm, 1955).

He protests against "verification by consensus" of social concepts. According to Fromm, there is no greater mistake than accepting the innocent assumptions of these feelings and opinions. Majority and minority opinions are invalid when it comes to mental health; history is full of examples of whole communities losing their sanity. Fromm notes that the fact that these "sins" are common to millions of human beings does not make them virtuous, and the fact that millions of human beings suffer from the same forms of mental pathology is not enough to consider them as sane (Fromm, 1955).

Analyzing that form of insanity, which is reinforced or at least accepted by society, Fromm stresses that society legitimizes the behavior of many who evince clear evidence of various forms of insanity, and does so by acceptance or even encouragement of such illness. According to Fromm, we are encountering in this age a human being who acts and feels like an automaton—a man who does not feel anything which is really his own, but rather lives his life according to what others expect from him: he becomes a creature whose artificial smile has replaced true joy and laughter, whose meaningless chatter replaces sincere conversation, and whose numb desperation re-

places real pain. This man can be judged in two ways: that he is suffering from an incurable lack of spontaneity and lack of individuality; or that he is simply the same as a million others who have the same symptoms. To most of these people, culture supplies patterns of behavior which allow them to live with their defects without considering themselves mentally ill (Fromm, 1955).

Fromm is firm in his belief that mental illness cannot be defined in terms of the individual's adjustment to society, but rather, the opposite is true: it must be defined in terms of society's adjustment to the needs of man. According to Fromm, a healthy society fosters the individual, develops his ability to love his own kind, provides opportunities and encouragement for his capabilities and creative work, provides means for his spiritual development, gives him a sense of identity based on the utilization of his powers, gives him experience in the actualization of his creative abilities and the experience of self-actualization. The opposites to these are found in unhealthy society, which creates hostility, antagonism, hate and mistrust, transforms man into a mere instrument, suppresses his creativity, strangles his individuality, impedes his spontaneity, subjugates him, and turns him into an automaton.

One of the characteristics of the increase in social insanity is collective narcissism. Fromm devotes much in his writings to the discussion of the pathology of narcissism. One of the most dangerous implications of narcissism is the warping of rational judgment. The object of a narcissistic tie is considered of value not on the basis of objective value judgment, but because it is the property or work of the narcissist himself (or is imagined to be so). A narcissistic value judgment is bias or prejudice.

Group narcissism is more difficult to identify than individual narcissism. Fromm comments that if someone were to tell others that he and his family are the most revered people on earth—that only they are clean, wise, good and fair, and that all others are unclean, ignorant, dishonest and irresponsible—most people would think him impolite, unbalanced, and perhaps even mentally ill. But if a fanatic orator were to turn to his audience, and, instead of the words "I" and "my family," he would use the terms "the nation," "the race," "the religion," or "the party," etc., then he would be adored and revered for his love for his country, his devotion to his god and the like. In collective framework, such adulation of the group flatters the individual narcissism of everyone within it, and the fact that multitudes of others agree with these declarations, causes them to seem "reasonable." Most people accept as "reasonable" that for which there is a consensus. "Reason," for most people, has nothing to do with real reason whatsoever, but rather relates to what is accepted by the majority. To the extent that the group in general requires group narcissism for its existence, it will encourage narcissistic positions and will endow them with morally unique qualities (Fromm, 1964).

The most prominent and frequent characteristic in the pathology of group narcissism—as in individual narcissism—is the lack of objectivity and rational judgment. The analysis of Whites' judgments of Blacks, or Nazis' judgments of Jews, plainly indicates the distorted nature of these judgments. They characteristically include a few correct yet irrelevant facts which, in their totality are nothing but a pack of lies and baseless accusations.

Fromm notes that the wish to overcome narcissism is expressed in the Bible in the commandment "Love thy neighbor as thyself." The message of these words is to strive to overcome personal narcissism towards one's neighbor—a fellow member of the close



community. The Bible goes further than that, when it commands to love the stranger. A "stranger" is one who is not of the family or the nation, i.e. is not part of the group with which the individual has narcissistic ties. Herman Cohen has noted that "It is specifically in his relation to strangers that the human is revealed." Narcissistic love is canceled by love of the stranger, since this is the love of another human creature in his uniqueness and dissimilarity, and not for his likeness to the bestower of the affection.

In regards to education, Fromm makes clear that if the whole of humanity, the whole of the human family were to become the object of group narcissism, instead of one nation, one race, or one political system, this would lead to enormous human advancement. If educational systems all over the world were to stress the achievements of the whole human race, rather than the achievements of one nation alone, it would make human pride a more sensible thing. If the individual could live as "citizen of the world," if he could feel pride for the achievements of humanity, then his narcissism would direct itself to the human race rather than its feuding components.

In this conception, Fromm is rather close to the educational viewpoint of Bertrand Russell, who stresses that the ideal is not education for loyalty to one particular, but rather, for an international loyalty: a feeling of loyalty towards the whole human race as a cooperative unit. Fromm, however, did not go as far as Russell, who had written of the need to create a world-state and an international educational system (See Cohen, 1979.). Fromm stresses education for human solidarity, a pan-human fraternity, and the love of man by virtue of his humanity, but education carried out within the framework of the existing state and without overreaching for utopian ideals.

In order to foster a narcissism for all of humanity and its achievements as a counterbalance against the dangers inherent in nationalistic and ideological narcissism, Fromm suggests that history textbooks should be rewritten as textbooks of world history, with a lively presentation of every nation in correct proportion, depicting reality rather than distorting it. Moreover, it is possible to produce cinema and television films which concentrate on the fostering of the pride of the whole of humanity by means of presenting the achievements of the human race as resultant from separate efforts made by various groups.

In the arena of education, the stress must be displaced from the purely technical trend to the scientific trend, i.e.—the fostering of critical thought, objectivity, the examination of reality, and a concept of truth which is not subject to decrees and which is reasonably valid in any society.

Fromm sees the instruction of humanistic philosophy and anthropology as a second element leading in the same educational direction. According to him, despite the acknowledgement of all the existing differences between the various philosophical approaches, there is a humanistic belief and a humanistic experience which serves as a common denominator. The belief is that every individual carries within him the whole of humanity, that the human condition is common to all people despite unavoidable differences in intelligence, talent, height, and color. The humanistic experience is anchored in the feeling that nothing human is alien, that one human being can understand another because both of them experience the same elements which structure human existence. Such a humanistic experience can be possible only if we expand the horizons of our awareness. Our awareness is usually limited to what society—in whose framework we live—allows us to be aware of, while human experiences which do not fit the

accepted patterns are repressed. Therefore, our awareness basically reflects our society and culture, whilst the subconscious embraces the universal man within every one of us. The widening of personal awareness and the illumination of the area of the social unconscious will enable man to experience the whole of humanity. He will experience the facts of his existence as a sinner and a saint, a child and an adult, as sane and insane in his past and future existence—as the bearer of all that humanity was and will be (Fromm, 1964).

In this last paragraph is encapsulated the essence of the humanistic education which Fromm advocates. Such an education does not deal in sermons and distant visions, moralistic education, and attempts to bring the external humanistic world to the student, but is rather based on that human condition common to all men, founded on human communication which is the shared human experience of existence. Such humanistic education crosses all boundaries of state and rejects the state's limitations and distortions of personal images, and rejects the narrow frameworks into which the human spirit has been compressed. Such an education strives to enable man to experience humanity in all of its manifestations, diverse qualities and human actualization through liberty.



CHAPTER 5

LOVE OF LIFE VS. THE DEATH WISH

HUMAN INSTINCTS

Fromm does not shirk from contending with one of the most basic questions of Western theological and philosophical thought: is man's nature good or bad, from birth? Is he evil and corrupt at the core, or is he essentially good and capable of further improvement?

Fromm rejects the negative outlook of the Freudians, that man is by nature evil, impelled by biological instincts, especially sexual and aggressive impulses, which are only lightly camouflaged by social norms. Nor is Fromm willing to accept the neutral viewpoint of the behaviorists, that man is neither good nor bad by nature, but that his environment shapes him. The existentialist approach too is rejected by him. They contend that man is neither good nor bad by nature, but that each of his actions contributes to the sum which is human nature. Hence, if all human beings do good, then human nature is good, and the same is true of evil.

Like Erikson and other neo-Freudian thinkers, Fromm believes that man possesses a considerable potential for good, but that the manifestations, or lack thereof, of this potential, depend on the nature of the society in which he lives and the attitudes of the people with whom he interacts. Fromm recognizes that social and cultural environment is the major force affecting human behavior. Human beings have the potential for good; social factors determine whether this capacity will be actualized. Human failings and evil deeds stem from the negative influence of society. Because of this, human fate would take a turn for the better if it were possible to transform society so that it would provide an outlet for, and encourage, man's positive qualities. The ultimate goal of human development is the creation of a society in which all human beings could actualize their inherent potential for good.

Fromm is aware of the biblical attitude towards "man's evil nature," but notes that the viewpoint expressed in the Old Testament does not contend that man is essentially corrupt. Fromm analyzes man's act of negation towards God, and explains, according to his system, that the refusal of Adam and Eve to obey the Lord is never referred to as a sin, and that there is no hint anywhere in the Bible that this disobedience has corrupted man. Quite to the contrary, disobedience, according to Fromm, is a precondition for man's self-awareness and his ability to choose, so that this original act of disobedience was in fact man's first step towards freedom. Fromm stresses that the disobedience of Adam and Eve was included in the framework of the Divine Plan, since, according to the perceptions of the prophets, it is specifically because man was ex-

pelled from the Garden of Eden that he is capable of forming his own history, developing his human powers, and attaining a new harmony between himself and nature through a personality which has been allowed to develop fully—instead of a former harmony of which man did not partake on an individual basis. The messianic vision of the prophets indicates that man is not corrupt to the core, and that he can be saved without any special act of divine grace. It does not, however, directly follow that the maximum capacity for good will necessarily be attained. When man acts evilly, he becomes more evil. Thus, for example, the heart of Pharaoh continues to harden as he continues to do evil, to the point where change and remorse are no longer possible (Fromm, 1964).

The accusations that Fromm does not sufficiently appreciate the potential for evil in man, are unjustified. Such sentimental optimism was not for him. As a psychoanalyst with rich clinical experience, Fromm acknowledges the forces of evil and destruction inherent in man. As someone who lived during two world wars, Fromm did not for one moment undertake to ignore the enormous power of the human potential for evil, and of the human urge to destroy and annihilate. At the same time, Fromm warns against accepting the view that corruption and sin are beyond redemption, a view which can be used as a rationalistic excuse for the defeatist opinion that war is unavoidable since it is the product of the forces of evil and man's inherent urge to destroy.

Moreover, Fromm warns of the great mistake in the assumption that wars are essentially the result of man's evil nature—the direct outcome of psychological factors. The mistake here is in the perception of political and social phenomena. War is a result of the decisions made by political leaders, Generals, and businessmen, to fight for the acquisition of territory, natural resources, commercial advantage, the enlargement of their holdings, or the enhancement of their personal prestige and glory. Such people are egoistic, possessive, and egocentric, but are not particularly cruel by nature.

This conception of Fromm's, which does not assume pretext in the pessimism of "man's evil nature," and which is not optimistic to the point of fostering the illusion of the inevitable victory of man's potential for good, which is capable of actualization only if social factors will allow it, assigns education an important role, lending maximum weight to the social situation in the formation of human behavior. It does not free the individual and the society from the responsibility for action, but rather, places a heavy educational responsibility on society, because this responsibility is essential in the formation of the social character of the individual, and hence it must create the conditions in which all human beings will be able to actualize the potential for good inherent in them.

Fromm contends that education shapes the character of the individual so that it will resemble, as closely as possible, the social character, so that his aspirations will coincide with his social role. The educational method of each society is structured according to this goal. According to Fromm, we cannot attribute the structure of society or its members to education, but rather, we should attribute the educational system to the requirements of the social and economic structure of the society. The mode of education, however, has a special significance since it has the power to specify the desirable spiritual and behavioral form required. Fromm states that the mode of education can be seen as the means which transform social requirements to personal attributes. According to him, while education does not lead to any special kind of social character, it is



one of the factors by which individual character is shaped. In this sense, the study and understanding of education are an important part of the study of society in action (Fromm, 1941). Since society is ultimately no more than the sum of all the individuals who comprise it, the interactions between the individual and society are of immense importance; and hence education's important and responsible role.

GROWTH VERSUS DEGENERATION

In order to clarify his basic view of the world, Fromm discusses two central syndromes at length: a degenerative syndrome—which provokes people to destroy for the sake of destruction, hate for the sake of hate; and its opposite—the growth syndrome which includes the love of life (in contrast to the death-wish), love of man (in contrast to narcissism), and independence (in contrast to symbiotic fixation of desires).

Fromm differentiates between biophilic man (lover of life) and necrophilic man (lover of death). Biophilic man is drawn to the very process of living, to growth in all of its manifestations. He is not the type to simply accept and preserve life, but rather, he is the creative man, the innovator, the builder. He seeks the new rather than the old, and loves the adventures of life, including the danger, suspense, and innovation. Biophilic ethics have their own principles of good and evil. The good is all that serves life; the bad, all that serves death. The good entails the cherishing of life, the upholding of life's values, and the fostering of growth and development. The bad is reflected in all that strangles life, narrows it, and destroys it. Joy is the good measure, sadness the sin (Fromm, 1964).

The biophilic principle in its most universalistic form was defined by Albert Schweitzer as respect for life. When he wrote that he was given to deep ruminations, he sat upon the deck of a ship, trying to find the primary and universal definition which he had hitherto not found in philosophy. Afterwards he filled page after page with disjointed sentences in order to explore his thoughts on this problem. At exactly the beginning of dusk of the third day, at the moment when the ship was making its way through a herd of hippopotami (the boat was cruising on a river in Africa), a sudden and unexpected expression loomed large in his mind, an expression which he did not think of before: respect for life. The iron door was blasted open; the path within the amber growth was now visible. He had found his way towards the formation of an idea which upholds the acceptance of both the world and ethics (Schweitzer, 1953).

Fromm also sees as respect for life the acceptance of the world—the moral ties to life. According to him, the biophilic conscience is motivated by its infatuation with life and joy. Moral effort entails the strengthening of the love of life, which resides in man himself, and the fostering of respect for life.

In contrast to the biophilic man, necrophilic man is anti-life. He adheres to that which is secure and avoids uncertainty, he hates life since it is essentially uncertain, unpredictable, and usually not subject to his control. He is drawn to the static; he would turn the organic to inorganic. His approach to life is mechanistic and bureaucratic, as if living people were no more than objects. He prefers memory to comprehension, knowledge to creation, possession to adventure. He is bound only to what he has purchased, to what he possesses since these are certain, stable things, and hence every threat to his property is a threat to his life.

Fromm stresses that the necrophile is immersed in the past and never in the future. His feelings are mostly sentimental—that is, he fosters the memory of feelings (or that which he believes that he has felt) from the past. He is cold, reserved, and devoted to law and order. His values are the inverse of those values which are usually attributed to a good life. Not life, but death is what stimulates him and gives him satisfaction (Fromm, 1964).

Typical of the necrophile is the sympathetic attitude towards power. Power, according to Simon Weill's definition, is "the ability to turn man into a corpse," and the necrophile is of necessity a lover of power. For him, the greatest human achievement is not the giving of life, but its destruction. The use of force is not perceived by the necrophile as a passing act, dictated by circumstances, but as a way of life.

Deep within him the necrophile is afraid of life since it is, by its very nature, disorderly and in defiance of control. Hence, "law and order" are his objectives, and all that threatens law and order seems to him a devilish attack on his most cherished values. Law and order protect him from change, and provide him with a feeling of certainty, which is his ultimate desire, and soothes his fear of life. Yet life is uncertain, unpredictable, and not given to control. In order to control life, he must convert it to death, because death is the only real certainty of life (Fromm, 1964).

Since the necrophile is afraid of life because he cannot control it, he worships accepted theories, laws, and fixed procedures, and is drawn to all that is mechanical—to gadgets and machines, which he can control.

Fromm notes that modern civilization, which is technological, fosters this attitude. According to him, our methods tend to turn human beings to parts of the machinery, or sub-parts of parts—all united by precisely the same programming which is transmitted to all by education, the same radio, the same television, the same periodical. The question arises: where are we heading? If we increasingly lose our vitality, will we not ultimately become frightened, isolated, unproductive entities who are unfit for life and who would ultimately prefer mass suicide to unbearable boredom?

In translating his biophilic concept from theory to educational practice, Fromm stresses that the most important condition for the development of love of life in the child is the child's presence among people who love life. The love of life is contagious (and the same goes for the love of death): it is translated without words, explanations, or sermons on the need for the love of life. One can recognize the love of life according to the general atmosphere characterizing an individual or group of people, rather than overt principles or laws according to which life is organized.

Among the necessary conditions for the development of biophilia, Fromm numbers: a warm and loving relationship during childhood; freedom and absence of threat; education through personal example rather than through moral preaching—for ideals which lead to inner harmony and strength; instruction in the sphere of the art of living; the fostering of willingness to be influenced by others and react to them, a way of life which has real meaning (Fromm, 1964).

The opposite of these conditions fosters necrophilia: growing up among necrophilic people; lack of encouragement; anxiety; conditions which make life drab and uninteresting; mechanical order as a substitute for decision-making based on direct human contact (Fromm, 1964).

A special place is reserved by Fromm for the social conditions of biophilia. He states

that the love of life can be developed to its utmost in a society which is secure—that is, where there is no fear that the basic material necessities for a respectable life might be lacking: justice, in that man will not be the means to someone else's ends; and freedom, in the sense that every man will have the chance to actively and responsibly participate in society. Yet, even a society which ensures security and justice might not lead to the love of life if it does not encourage the creative personal activity of the individual. It is not enough that people are not enslaved, since, if the social circumstances create robots, the result will not be a love of life, but a love of death (Fromm, 1964).

Fromm is consistent with his theory on the issue of education for the love of life and the rejection of the love of death; he sees education as a by-product of social conditions and atmosphere. At the same time, there is a great importance in the education on the essence of biophilia and necrophilia—in the study of the slowing of progress, the adherence to the past, the adulation of the existing and the permanent, the clinging to property and objects, the ritual of instrumentation, the worship of law and order, the addition to ownership—as part of the syndrome of disintegration and distancing from the love of life in its manifold experience of renewal and change, the impermanent and the unexpected, the creative and the actualized, which are the hallmarks of the growth syndrome and the joy of self-actualization.

CHAPTER 6

THE HUMANIZATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

THE TECHNOTRONIC SOCIETY

The immense scientific and technological development of our age, the growing domination of the elements of nature, industrial progress and the harnessing of atomic energy in the aid of man, the perfecting of the computer and the far-reaching electronic developments, have brought us to the beginning of the realization of the dream of a technotronic (techno-electronic) society. This is a totally mechanized society, which dedicates all of its efforts and resources towards material production and consumption, directed by computers, transmitting its messages via electronic media—all of which, in themselves form a message of enormous significance (also see McLuhan, Marshal and Fiore, 1967), a society in which man becomes but a cog in the great machine.

These developments have also brought human beings to experience a new feeling of freedom (partly genuine, partly imagined) and increased control over their own lives (which is also somewhat of an illusion). People assume that the attainment of wealth and leisure will also bring true happiness. The "holy trinity" of unlimited production, absolute freedom, and boundless happiness have created the basis for a new religion: the religion of progress (Fromm, 1979).

Yet it turns out that the industrial age has failed to fulfill the great promise of the concept of progress. Human beings have recognized that the unlimited fulfillment of ambitions does not lead to happiness, joy, nor even maximal pleasure. The dream of becoming independent masters of our lives disappeared when we became aware that we are all cogs in the bureaucratic machine, and that our thoughts, feelings, and tastes are under the supervision of the government and the economy, and the media which is in their control.

The attitude towards life in the modern world is becoming increasingly mechanical. The main goal is the production of things. In the process of this idolization of objects, human beings themselves become "goods." The attitude towards people is as if they were mere numbers. The main question here, stresses Fromm, is not whether people are treated nicely and well-fed (one can treat objects well too); but rather, the question is: are people objects or living creatures? People prefer mechanical objects to living beings. The attitude towards people is intellectually abstract. People are interested in other people as objects, in their general characteristics, in the statistical rules of mass behavior, but not in living individuals. All this takes place simultaneously with the increasing strength of bureaucratic methods. In huge production centers in huge cities in huge countries, human beings are administered as if they were objects. The individ-



ual and his administrator become things and obey the law of things, yet man, according to Fromm, does not intend to be a thing; he is destroyed when he becomes an object, and even before that happens, he gives up and allows the death of his humanness.

Fromm notes that in the future post-industrial society, man will enjoy good food and invigorating entertainment, but will be absolutely passive, lifeless, and devoid of feeling. Privacy and individuality will slowly disappear; man's feelings towards his fellow man will be regulated by means of psychological conditioning, electronic manipulation or the use of drugs; behavior-shaping will direct his actions; and the use of drugs, under strict external control and precise mechanical regulation, might possibly enable a new kind of internal experience.

In an organized and bureaucratically centralized technotronic society, it is possible to manipulate people's tastes so that their consumption will be maximally orientated in predictable, profitable directions. People's understanding and character will be standardized by means of tests which will play an important role in the choice and preferences of the unadventurous, but not for the original and daring (Fromm, 1964). Zbigniew Brzezinski has noted that the technotronic society represents a trend to integrate the individual support of millions of people who are not of the same opinion, and thus easily dominate their opinions and control their awareness by means of the newest communications media, which are used by magnetic, charismatic personalities of great influence (Brzezinski, 1968).

This new social trend was already prophesized by such Utopians as George Orwell in his book *1984* (Orwell, 1971), Aldous Huxley in his book *Brave New World* (Huxley, 1932), B. F. Skinner in *Walden II* (Skinner, 1968), Ira Levin in his book *This Perfect Day* (Levin, 1970), and of course, in the writings of Alvin Toffler: *Future Shock* (Toffler 1970) and *The Third Wave* (Toffler, 1981). We are no longer facing a distant Utopia, but rather a quickly-materializing reality.

The industrial-bureaucratic civilization of our times has shaped a new kind of man. He is the organizational man, the automaton, "homo consumes," and simultaneously "homo mechanicus"—that is, a man of instruments with a great attraction for the mechanical, tending to worship the tool and instrument, opposing all that is full of life, directness and spontaneity.

Fromm is close in spirit to a long line of American Marxist sociologists such as William H. Whyte, as is evident in his book *The Organization Man* (Whyte, 1956), Harold Rozenberg in his book *The Tradition of the New* (Rozenberg, 1959), David Reisman in *The Lonely Crowd* (Reisman, 1950), Vance Packard in *The Hidden Persuaders* (Packard, 1957) and Wright C. Milles in his book *White Collar* (Milles, 1956)—all of which analyze the domination of man, who is no longer an active agent, building himself a whole rather than a partial life, but is rather manipulated by others, the passivity which characterizes him at work expanding to cover all areas of his life. Fromm recognizes that man is being programmed to be a passive creature, influenced by others, reaching decisions not according to his real needs, but according to the periodic fluctuations in fashion and public opinion, pressure from the media and advertising, all of which are guided and directed by huge corporations, multi-million dollar businesses, gigantic industries, distribution networks, and military and governmental organizations

Fromm is shaken by the existence of this inhuman collective which threatens us, as William H. Whyte has defined it, and describes the disintegration of man which is encouraged by others. As David Reisman puts it—a man characterized by his feeling of being someone other than himself. Thus, a man without personality is formed, a man whose natural inclinations have been frozen and petrified, who has accustomed himself to an externally defined role in life—someone who has in fact stopped growing.

Concerning these analyses, Fromm is in agreement with radical educators like Paul Goodman (see Goodman, 1960), Paulo Friere (see Friere, 1972) and others who, following Fromm, described the technotronic world as leading to necrophilia and the destruction of life (See also Cohen, 1983).

According to Fromm, rationalization, quantification, processes of abstraction, bureaucratization, substantiation—all characteristics of the modern industrial society—are not, when directed towards human beings rather than objects, principles of life, but of mechanics. Human beings living in such a framework become indifferent to life and even attracted to death. They are not aware of it. Fleeting sensationalism replaces the joy of life and creates an illusion that the possession and use of as many objects as possible means fully exploiting life's potential for pleasure (Fromm, 1964).

Fromm is aware that man, who has nearly become a monarch in his scientific and technological achievements, has become the slave of his own creations, until he confronts the even greater danger of destruction at his own hands. There is a sense of loss of control of the system, of the implementation of decisions which computers have determined, of full acceptance of the needs of production, of addiction to consumption. The danger of extinction from nuclear weapons is ever-present, along with an impending ecological disaster, and the manifest danger of inner-deterioration owing to man's complete indifference to the fact that the responsibility for decision-making has been taken away from him.

Human attitudes towards nature have become alienated, theological, utilitarian, and hostile. That which separates man from beast—his mind—has brought him to stand apart from nature and try to solve his existential problems by relinquishing the harmony between man and nature, and attempting to conquer nature, exploit it fully, and change it according to his own goals, until this very conquest becomes fully destructive. The spirit of conquest, avarice, exploitation, and hostility has prevented human beings from realizing that natural resources have finite limits, that the disfiguration of nature will lead to the extinction of man, that ecological destruction, in the long run, means the destruction of the human race.

Albert Schweitzer's appeal, when he stepped up to receive the Nobel prize for peace in 1952 serves as a motto for Fromm's writings. Schweitzer called upon the world to contend with the situation created, in which man has become lord of all nature, but in which man's super-human powers have not allowed him to reach a level of super-human thinking. The more man's power increases, the weaker he grows. The fact that the more superior we become, the more inhuman we become, must shock us (Fromm, 1979).

Fromm refuses to acquiesce to this process of dehumanization and the death of man; he poses the question: are we really facing a tragic and unsolvable dilemma? Is it really necessary that people be sick in order for our economy to be healthy, or is it within our



powers to utilize our resources, our inventions and computers in ways that serve the goals of man? Is it really necessary for human beings to be passive and enslaved in order for us to have strong and efficient organizations? (Fromm, 1968)

In his attempt to answer such questions, Fromm diverges from such sober futurists as H. Kohn (see Kohn, 1976; Kohn, Wiener, 1967), Daniel Bell (see Bell, 1968, 1974), Arthur Clarke (see Clarke, 1964), John Maddox (see Maddox, 1972) and others, who realize that there is no escape from the new society and from the domination of the mega-machine, and that humanity must prepare for this new society with new tools. Fromm is closer to the thinking of Jacques Ellul (see Ellul, 1967) and Lewis Mumford (see Mumford, 1954), who believe that it is not inevitable that the new society will emerge victorious and that there is a good chance to avoid the victory of an inhuman society. Ellul stresses, with optimism bordering on naiveté, that it is possible to avoid this danger, if more become aware of the great threat to private spiritual life that the technological world poses, and decide to defend their freedom and prevent this development (Ellul, 1967).

Fromm goes even further than the two, and perceives there to be a very viable possibility of reinvesting man with control of the social system. Fromm stresses that there is a growing feeling of dissatisfaction with the present way of life from its passivity, its boredom, its lack of privacy and loss of individuality. People long for a happy and meaningful existence which fulfills their special needs. These needs have developed during thousands of years of human history, and created the differences between man and animal, and between man and computer (Fromm, 1968). Fromm believes that among human beings, such a search for a new direction and a new philosophy, at the center of which would be life's priorities and an intense search for meaning, is an eventuality. In this respect, one can see a great proximity between this belief and the views of Victor Frankel, who deals with man's needs and search for meaning—yet the routes that each of these two thinkers took are essentially different.

Fromm notes that hope is the critical factor in any attempt to change the existing social situation, to achieve greater liveliness, greater awareness and greater understanding. From this hope stems the chance to reject the dehumanization which threatens us. Fromm rejects and aggressively criticizes the lack of hope which is evident in the writings of his critic and bitter rival, Herbert Marcuse, in *Eros & Civilization* and *One Dimensional Man* (Marcuse, 1970, 1978). Marcuse stresses that a critical theory of society does not provide solutions for bridging the gap between present and future, does not promise anything, and does not indicate a possibility of success; it remains essentially negative and therefore tends to remain loyal to those who have devoted their lives to "the great negation," despite an absence of hope (Marcuse, 1970). Fromm sees, in Marcuse's hopelessness, a symptom of the alienated intellectual who presents his personal desperation as a radical theory. Indeed, no change will come from such a theory, no revolution be brought about, because the source of revolution also lies in hope.

Hope is defined by Fromm as a form of being. It is an inner readiness to be intensively active, an inner readiness which has not yet been actualized (Fromm, 1968). Hope, according to Fromm, is the essential element in the structure of life and the dynamics of the human spirit, and is intimately entwined with faith. Faith, according to his definition, is the devotion to something which has not yet been proved, the awareness

of an actual possibility, the awareness of what is destined to be (Fromm, 1968). Hence, like faith, hope is the vision of the present as pregnant with the future.

Fromm differentiates between rational and irrational faith. Rational faith is the product of the inner processes of emotion and thought, while irrational faith is passive, responsive, and accepting of a given matter without deliberations as to its truth or falsity.

The third element which joins faith and hope is fortitude. Fromm defines fortitude as the ability to withstand the temptation to transform faith and hope to meaningless optimism or to irrational faith. This fortitude makes one capable of saying "no" when all of society expects a "yes" (Fromm, 1968). These three elements together naturally aspire to change the existing situation of the individual and society, and they are the guarantee of what Fromm calls "rejuvenation." Rejuvenation, according to him, is not the creation of a different reality once the present reality has been destroyed, but rather, the altering of the present reality towards an increased aliveness (Fromm, 1968).

The shattering of hope causes the limiting of human aspirations to that which is easily available, to indifference, submissiveness, rigidity, and the relinquishing of vision, which is also the relinquishing of the self. In more serious forms, this state even leads to destruction and violence.

Our century, according to Fromm, is characterized by a lack of hope. There is no progress towards greater privacy, self-actualization and self-realization; the tendency is towards a mass-culture which is vulnerable to manipulation. Our century continues to uphold individualism, yet an alienated and violent bureaucracy dominates and rules our lives. Brzezinsky notes that, in place of the intellectual non-conformist with his humanistic orientation or ideology, we have experts and professionals—or "general integrators" serving as private ideologists in service of the rulers, and providing these rulers with the integration necessary for coordinated action (Brzezinsky, 1968). The administrators too suffer from alienation and anxiety. They are members of an elite group, but this elite is not the creator of culture. The group which creates culture lives on the fringe of society and is not centrally influential.

Fromm delineates the principles of modern technological society. The first principle indicates that all that can be technically accomplished must be actualized. Hence, if one can manufacture an atom bomb, one must manufacture it—even if it has the potential for destruction of the human race. According to Fromm, this principle negates all the values of the humanistic tradition, a tradition which suggests that things should be done because they are needed for man's perfection, his happiness, his reason, and because they are beautiful, good, or real in and of themselves. Technological development becomes the foundation of morality (Fromm, 1968).

The second principle is that of efficiency and maximal productivity. This principle entails the minimalization of individuality, the stressing of the product rather than the producer, the manipulation of individuals as machines, and their transformation into units which can be quantified and personalities which can be described and recorded on computer discs. Bureaucratism and the manipulation of the individual is the rule. From this point onwards, the way to dehumanization is short and sure.

One of the prominent pathological symptoms characteristic of the technocratic society, which is already evident today, is passivity. In this passivity, Fromm recognizes one of the symptoms in a general syndrome which he defines as alienation. Man loses

the feeling of individuality and belonging, and develops instead, a conformism which is nothing but anesthesia.

Another pathological symptom which Fromm discusses is the growing gap between the intellectual functioning of the brain and the emotional experience, between thought and emotion. According to him, reason stems from the merging of rational thought with rational feeling. If the two are separated, thought becomes a split mental process, while feeling becomes neurotic desire, both of which endanger man (Fromm, 1968). Fromm sees an example of an emotionless thought-process in Herman Kohn's book *The Year Two Thousand* (Kohn, 1967), which deals with nuclear war, and coldly analyzes how many human beings America can sacrifice without losing its ability to reconstruct its economy after such a war. The entire discussion is devoid of any feeling, based on statistics like the Gross National Product and figures which describe the relationship between growth and population decrease and the G.N.P. and the like. Human suffering, pain and death are all excluded from the alienated and cold writing.

Fromm discusses at length the attraction to the mechanical, to tools, machines, computers, and robots, which he sees as a symptom of necrophilia. He is alarmed by the idea, supported by so many scientists, to build a computer which is capable of human thought processes. This desire to create artificial intelligence is an expression of the wish to escape from life and the human experience to the realm of technology and pure reason.

Fromm's dread of a computer takeover far exceeds the value of the computer's function as an instrument of man. This fear surpasses the limits of rationality and apparently loses its impact since it is based on Fromm's ignorance of the workings of computers, which leads him to fantasize the invasion and takeover by alien monsters. In this he is close to Lewis Mumford, who wrote, in *In the Name of Sanity* that modern man is now approaching the final act of his tragedy, and that the inevitability and terror of this fact cannot be denied. Mumford states that we have been witness to the close cooperation between the automat and the id: the id which has risen from the depths of the unconscious, and the automat, the mechanical thinker, the machine which is disjointed from the living organism's other functions and reactions—the product of conscious thinking. The force of the id has been revealed as more brutal than any beast of prey, when it is liberated from the totality of the personality. The second force, the automatic force, which is impervious to human anxiety and purpose, concentrates on answering a limited number of queries for which it has been developed, and has not the discretion to cease its activity at the critical point, even though it drives science and the whole of culture to the very brink of disaster (Mumford, 1954).

Fromm's irrational fear of the computer is, in fact, not fear of the instrument itself, but of the man who creates it and would dominate others with it. His warnings of humanity's precarious situation, on the brink of disaster, do not come from the fear of the machine's increased power, but from man's increased ability to manipulate and dominate. Thus, his warnings of loss of individuality and loss of contact among human beings, are far more convincing and reliable. Individuality is a necessary and important precondition to man's full development, the expansion of his personality and the development of his emotions. If all that is individual were to become public, all personal experience would be degraded and become more and more uniform, making people more vulnerable to psychological manipulation which would be determined by means of testing norms of social behavior for desirability and healthiness.

It is worthwhile noting Fromm's contention that psychological tests, which are already today a precondition to entering some professions, are in violation of human rights. Fromm differentiates between psychology whose purpose is to understand man and act for his good, and psychology which sees man as an object and attempts to transform him to a more useful component of technological society. Modern psychologists and various "testologists" abuse knowledge for the manipulation of man. They provide service to the industrial, military and governmental administration, while claiming that they act for man's development. According to Fromm, a considerable number of psychological tests are based on the limited conception of man created by the demands of the dominant system and its administration.

The main educational inference which can be drawn from the whole of Fromm's discussion of the technotronic society is the call for the fostering of thought, free choice, creative activity, and involvement in decision-making. Education must foster doubt, question, contention, and critical thinking in the individual. It must prepare him for critical consumption of the media, for a constant evaluation of the messages which he is bombarded with, and for understanding of the nature of the systems which provide information and shape his awareness. The great danger in the technotronic world is that the individual will very quickly learn to recognize the "correct" responses, the "proper" behavior, the "normal" feelings, the "acceptable" taste. He has but to receive the signals of the electronic media, and he will be safe from making errors. Fashion magazines will tell him what to wear, book clubs will point out which books he should read, computerized matchmaking services will find him a mate. Television will shape his tastes, psychological testing will provide him with his role, and "Big Brother" will take care of him. It is specifically because of this that education's first and foremost role is the casting of doubt, the fostering of the personality which searches and embraces alternatives, the encouragement of non-conformism, and the fostering of the courage to make decisions.

The computer which threatens Fromm and his fellow thinkers is a sophisticated tool indeed, but it is not a god, and the source of all its power is man, who programs and operates it. Man must acknowledge the situation, weigh the alternatives, and decide. The computer aids man in perceiving the various alternatives open to him, but it does not reach decisions in his place. Man must choose from the various options open to him, exercise his reason, determine his preferences, and relate, react and be involved in the reality with which he is dealing, taking from the computer those facts which are reasonable, in the sense that they enrich and enliven his existence and his humanity.

RICH IN POSSESSIONS VERSUS RICH IN EXISTENCE

According to Fromm, empirical and psychoanalytical data tend to support that possessiveness and self-actualization are the two basic modes of experience and the two forces which determine differences in personality characteristics of individuals and societies.

Modern man finds it hard to differentiate between possessiveness and self-actualization. In his mind, in order to live, he must possess things, and this possessiveness is the precondition for pleasure. The very essence of self-actualization, as conceived by him, is in possession, and if man possesses nothing then he is worth nothing.

This possessiveness finds its expression, perhaps unconsciously, in language. Thus, for example, there is growing use recently of proper nouns in place of verbs. Actions



are often expressed in terms of possession, i.e. a noun is used in place of a verb (I have an idea, I have the desire, I have a wish, etc.)

Fromm justifiably stresses that this new style of speech indicates the high level of alienation typical of our times. When we say: "I have a problem" instead of "I am worried," we limit the subjectivity of experience. The "I have" of possessiveness replaces the "I" of experience. One thus changes one's feeling to something that one possesses, e.g. the problem. This form of speech reveals an unconscious hidden alienation (Fromm, 1979). Another excellent example of this is the common English expression: "I have great love for you," a saying which is meaningless. Love is not something that man can possess, but rather, a process, an inner activity. One can love, be in love, but not possess love.

There is hardly an area in which we can not find evidence of this possessive tendency. Even in learning, this tendency is prominent. Students "accumulate" their learning; they write it down in their notebooks so that they can use it in examinations, and not to make it part of their thought-systems and widen their horizons. Knowledge is accumulated, and the student becomes its possessor, and is often alienated from it since it is merely a collection of lifeless pieces of information. Provocative and stimulating ideas bother such students, and are distant from them because they threaten the fixed accumulation of knowledge in their possession.

Education's role in this area of learning is to encourage students who do not have a possessive affinity to learning, but are involved and actualizing. The existing system of education, with its curricula and exams predetermined by the authorities, fosters the possessive character, whilst the desired form of education, on the contrary, seeks the responsive pupil, the one who thinks about the problem which is being discussed and is driven to action by the knowledge which he gains, who thinks about this knowledge, contends with it, creates with its help, examines it and is not indifferent to it.

The same can be said of the process of reading. Many read possessively, without serious reaction, without identification, without relating to what they read. They accumulate information and move on to the next book.

The existing schools have failed in fostering "active" reading, a perusal which reacts, relates, and is involved. The pupils are encouraged to acquire cultural possessions—to read a certain quantity of books and then prove that they have acquired a specific quantity of cultural knowledge or possessions. Students read in order to learn the author's views by heart, in order to know his thoughts, in order to acquire "literary knowledge." Few schools instruct in critical reading, show their students how to discover the contradictions in writings of various authors or thinkers, how to recognize the avoidance of certain questions, to contradict their ideas, argue with their opinions, doubt, discover what is mere affectation and what is truly relevant, expose the charlatans, and recognize the original and courageous. Such revealing and thorough reading should be encouraged at all levels of education, from Kindergarten to University.

There is much educational relevance in the distinction which Fromm makes between possessive authority and authority on the level of self-actualization. There is a great difference between being the possessor of authority and being an authority. Education strives for an authority created from actualization of a personality which has reached a high level of development and perfection. Such a personality radiates authority, and has no need to give orders, bribe, or discipline. With great insight into education, Fromm

states that the problem of education is centered on this development. Were parents more developed and self-reliant themselves, the contrast between authoritative education and open education would almost cease to exist. The child enthusiastically reacts to authority which allows self-actualization, since that is exactly what he needs. The child resists pressure and neglect from people whose behavior shows that they themselves have not invested the effort which they demand of him (Fromm, 1979).

Fromm sees an important educational role in the fostering of the ability of the student to differentiate between empty, possessive authority, which masquerades in uniform, crown, symbol, scepter, and the paraphernalia of domination, an authority which is based in personality. Education, moreover, must foster the pupil's criticism towards the hollow authority and towards the tools which possessive authority uses to subjugate the masses. Such tools are propaganda and brainwashing, which destroy critical thinking, numb the brain, and enslave it with cliché slogans which dull human senses, cause the loss of independent thought, and tempt people by external appearances.

Fromm points to a possessiveness and actualization in the realm of knowledge as well. According to him, to be in possession of knowledge means to acquire and possess knowledge which can be acquired. To "know" is something functional: part of the creative thinking-process (Fromm, 1979). Fromm analyzes the two aspects of knowledge thus: whereas one aspect entails the penetration of surface appearances, and a critical striving to approach (but never to possess) truth, the other aspect is a creative penetration, contact, and a close and sympathetic encounter. Like Buber, Fromm too recognizes that the ancient Hebrew word for knowledge, "yeda," in contrast to parallel European words, essentially means "contact," the existence of a relationship between two objects. Hence, his different attitude towards a concept of knowledge is not based on possessions and does not content itself with distancing to an objective point of contemplation, but rather, denotes close contacts: a true encounter with the object.

Fromm harshly criticizes existing education which, for the most part, attempts to instruct human beings in the possession of knowledge as an object, similar to the accumulation of property or social prestige, rather than active knowledge, close contact, and penetration to the root of issues—not knowledge which stimulates creativity, but rather a reservoir of knowledge. Most of the knowledge provided by schools is in the form of a quota of information which the students are required to know before they can properly function, with the addition of a package of "luxury" knowledge, wherein the size of each such package fits the estimated social prestige of the receiver. According to Fromm, schools are nothing but factories which produce such packages of knowledge, even though the schools themselves usually claim that they are trying to create a tie between students and the greatest achievements of the human mind (Fromm, 1979). Like Whitehead, Fromm protests the lifeless knowledge accumulated by the student, which ultimately blocks his original and creative thinking, instead of inciting him to thought and creation.

In the same way that Fromm rejects possessiveness in knowledge, reading and language, he also rejects possessive belief, which is no more than the possession of answers without rational basis. Such a belief relieves the believer from the difficult task of independent thought and decision. It provides a feeling of security in its pretension to express "the ultimate knowledge," its possession of absolute truth, which is believable because the power of those who propound and protect it seems immovable.



Fromm recognizes man's need for belief, which is not the **belief in certain ideas**, but rather an inner orientation or position.

The greatest actualizer is love. Possessive love limits, **dominates, binds, depresses, oppresses, strangles**, and does not contribute to life. **Actualizing love**, in contrast, is creative, caring, understanding, responsive, encouraging, and in **close contact** with the partner on the level of affinity and relatedness.

Possessive love represents a great danger to the realm of **education, a love** which is egocentricity masquerading as true love for another, when **the true wish** is for dominance and possession. Pedagogical love is a liberating love **rather than a limiting one**, the essence of which is providing for the partner and constantly **relating to him** without dominating him.

Educationally, there is great importance attached to **Fromm's analysis** of the natural rebelliousness against possessive domination by means of **force**. **The tendency** to develop according to one's natural capabilities is common to **all living beings**, and opposition results the moment any attempt is made to block **development according** to the unique natural structure. The use of force against **living beings provokes** various forms of resistance, from overt, active, and direct resistance to **indirect, inefficient**, and sometimes unconscious resistance.

State and society direct such heteronomous force towards **the individual**. By means of the psycho-social agent the family, they restrict the **spontaneous free will** of the baby, the child, and the adolescent, restrict and redirect **his desire for knowledge**, and force him into new social patterns of thought and action. **By means of indoctrination**, a system of positive and negative sanctions, brainwashing and the like, society acts to break the will of man and redirect him without his **awareness of it**, creating within him the illusion that it is his free will which motivates **him, unaware of the fact** that he has but the illusion of free will, and has in fact been **directed and manipulated** by external forces.

Fromm stresses that the heteronomous force which **interferes with the developmental** process of the child and the adolescent is the principle **cause of mental pathology**, and destructiveness in particular (Fromm, 1979). Hence, **one of education's responsibilities**, as suggested by Fromm, is the fostering of the **autonomic personality**, which is free to decide, which reacts to the human and social **situation** which it is a part of, which recognizes the various alternatives and is capable of **decision**, and which actualizes itself through love for the rest of creation.

Fromm resists the concept espoused by consumer **society that one is what one owns**. Following this, if one loses what one has, what is **left of the identity**? According to Fromm, the anxiety and insecurity stemming from **the constant threat of losing** what one has does not contribute to self-actualization. **"If I am what I am and not what I have**, no man can threaten me or take away my self-confidence and identity. My core is within me. My ability to actualize myself and express **my essential capabilities** constitutes a part of the structure of my personality" (Fromm, 1979). Hence, the task of education is clearly the total development of the **individual, in fostering the student's soul**, not as a possessor, but as a creator, as an **internalizer of knowledge and values** for the sake of coping, relating, and becoming **involved, as the builder of his own personality** and the guardian of his own personal core, **rather than someone who surrounds**

himself with implements, ideas, beliefs, and information while his personal core slowly deteriorates, crushed under the burden of possessiveness which he places upon it.

The competition common to all schools, fostered in the classroom, measured in exams, emphasized in diplomas, and rewarded by prizes and commendations of merit, is one of the signs of possessiveness, of the struggle to acquire and possess more. It breeds avarice and jealousy, and leads to antagonism between individuals, between social groups, between peoples. The path from here to increasingly violent social and economic struggles, thence to bloody wars, is short and direct. Education must beware of the nurturing of competition and the glorification of possessive attainment, and in its stead, foster self-actualization in an environment which encourages cooperation, which develops the experience of creative development and preserves the affinity between students who are not competing with each other for maximal acquirement, but rather wish to become much.

Fromm does not fear that the idea of self-actualizing man might lead to extreme individualism, alienation, and egocentricity. He is far from Sartre's conception in his works, wherein one is constantly threatened by others, such as in the famous phrase from his play, *Behind Closed Doors*, "hell is the other." According to Sartre, there is a barrier amongst men which is insurmountable. The subjective divisions remain totally separate. Fromm, in contrast, stresses that one of the deepest forms of human happiness is mutual enjoyment. There is nothing that unites people more (without limiting their individuality) than coming together in the love and adoration of man, mutual participation in an idea, a musical creation, or a symbol, participation in a religious ceremony, or participation in mourning. The experience of participation creates and preserves a lively affinity between individuals (Fromm, 1979).

Fromm's conception of cooperation and participation is relatively superficial, and it may seem that a very fine line separates actualizing cooperation from possessive cooperation. This is especially evident in his discussion of man's adoration of religious ritual and the like. It is quite difficult not to see in man's adoration a possessive element. Fromm himself writes elsewhere that heroes become gods. We transfer to them our capacity for movement, and thereafter remain static, because we are not heroes (Fromm, 1979).

Fromm adheres to a limited definition of "actualizing man," for whom true cooperation with others is not a necessity, but only an increment of his resultant enjoyment. (Is there not some kind of possessive pleasure here?) Fromm, unlike Buber, does not view cooperation as a necessary step in man's process of self-actualization. Buber stresses that the development of the inner self does not stem from man's relation to himself, but from his relation to others, i.e., from togetherness, from the presence of another self within man, and from the acquaintance of that self by others, together with mutual disclosure (In detail, see Cohen, 1976).

Educationally, there is great interest in Fromm's speculations on the question of disobedience. He acknowledges the prevailing concept in the theological thinking of both Judaism and Christianity that sin is essentially disobedience to God. This concept has been transferred from the realm of religion to a social and national level, whence people must accept and obey authority, even to the point of developing a fear of the authority and considering disobedience as an ethical and religious issue—as sin. In



opposition to blind obedience, Fromm presents the example of Prometheus, the Greek hero of the valiant. According to Fromm, Prometheus does not concede, despite the most cruel punishment from Zeus, nor does he feel any sense of guilt. He knew that stealing fire from the Gods and giving it to human beings was an act of pity. He did not obey, nor did he sin. He, in similar fashion to many other beloved heroes (martyrs), of the human race, had solved the equation between disobedience and sin (Fromm, 1979).

Fromm does not go as far as Henry David Thoreau, in his essay on civil disobedience, wherein he questions whether the citizen must give up his conscience, even for a moment or to but a slight degree, in favor of the legislator. He answers his own question by stating that we must be humans first and subjects later. According to Thoreau, the only obligation that a man has is to do that which is proper, and he hence has a full right to rebel against a government or its laws when they or their actions become evil. Nor does Fromm reach such activist conclusions as those of Johnathan Kozol, who agrees with Thoreau's concept, and views the acquiescence with evil laws an obedience which slowly becomes acceptance and agreement, and for which we later develop a complex theory of justification, as being the real danger which we must protest and against which we must rebel because through it the process of our inner-annulment begins. Kozol calls for activism, and like Thoreau, stresses that in the moment that you are asked to be evil's agent or asked to remain silent while evil is being perpetrated on another, when you are asked to consent to oppression or exploitation, then you must break the law. Your life must then become a life of counter-friction, in order to stop the movement of the great machine (See also Cohen, 1983 and Kozol, 1975).

Fromm venerates Prometheus' disobedience, views Adam and Eve's disobedience of God in the Garden of Eden as their birth as human beings, but treats disobedience from an educational standpoint with great caution, stating that the treatment of this issue must be approached with great wisdom, love, and affinity for others. In this context, he raises the concept of responsibility, a concept which has lost its original meaning and today denotes a misplaced sense of duty. Duty is a concept from the realm of obedience, whilst responsibility belongs to the realm of freedom. According to Fromm, this difference between duty and responsibility parallels the difference between authoritative and humanistic awareness. Authoritative awareness is essentially the edict of the rule to which man is subject, whereas humanistic awareness is the measure of man's humanity independent of orders given by any external agent (Fromm, 1968).

Fromm recognizes that the preconditions for self-actualization are independence, liberty, and critical reasoning. According to him, the basic characteristic of self-actualization is to be active—not in the sense of external movement, but rather as internal activity. Being active entails expressing the talents, the human capacities which every man is endowed with, though in differing measure. It entails renewing oneself, enveloping, being outgoing, loving, transcending the limits of the solitary ego, evincing interest, listening, giving. . . . Self-actualization can not be described verbally, and one can only explain it by including others in one's personal experience. The possessive structure is ruled by dead words. The self-actualizing structure is ruled by a lively, inexpressible experience (Fromm, 1979).

In education, one aspect of self-actualization is creative activity, which is non-negotiated activity, and is the process of giving birth to something with which the creator has an affinity. One of the most important tasks of education, according to Fromm, is

the providing of the conditions necessary for creativity, and the encouragement of it. Simultaneously with the fostering of creativity, a process of increasing man's awareness of the world around him, and of his nature within him, must take place. Fromm stresses that consciousness of reality and of various ways to improve it facilitates its correction; every correction of reality furthers the clarification of thought. Fromm has great hope for the effects of the enormous scientific development and the growing stress placed on the development of scientific thought, which will enable man to increase his awareness of himself, his environment, and the world.

Yet Fromm warns against stressing only the intellectual development, and points to the importance of emotional and social development. According to him, man not only has a mind which needs an orientation framework which will enable him to understand the world surrounding him, but he also has a heart and a body which demand an emotional tie with the world, other human beings, and nature. Man, who differs from other animals in his self-awareness and his capacity to feel lonely, would be but dust in the wind, were it not for emotional ties which satisfy his need to belong to the world surrounding him and unite with it (Fromm, 1968).

A central educational issue which hardly ever finds expression in the current educational system is that of self-identity. Schools concentrate mainly on the issue of nurturing a collective identity, and hardly deal at all with individual self-identity. In this sense, the school system is no more than the servant of industrial society and the technocratic society which follows in its footsteps, which turn human beings into objects void of identity. Fromm defines identity as that experience which enables man to say "I" when that word denotes the active center which organizes the totality of the actual and potential activity of the individual (Fromm, 1968).

Fromm differentiates between ego-identity and self-identity, stating that the difference between them is both essential and absolute. The experience of the ego is based on the concept of possession, whilst self-identity belongs to the category of experience rather than that of possession. According to Fromm, one is only oneself in the sense that he is a living, interested, active human being, only in the sense that he has managed to integrate what he is according to his self-image and others' image of him with what he is at the very core of his personality (Fromm, 1968). Education's role is to bring the students to not view themselves as objects, and to not consider their social roles as stemming from their being considered as objects. The only way to do this is to transform the alienated individual into a living person, by transforming him from a passive "adjuster" to an active "do-er," by returning him to a creative life. The student must stop relating to the world with concepts of possession and begin relating to it by way of participation.

Fromm acknowledges that it is not possible to discuss the education of the whole individual, the fostering of identity, the adherence to personal integrity, and the transcendence of the ego to arrive at a self-identity, without discussing one of the central components of the human situation—man's need for values to direct his actions and feelings. According to Fromm, a gap exists between the values which human beings recognize, and those which actually affect their actions, without their being aware of it. On the one hand, there are the values of the humanist tradition such as individuality, love, pity, hope, etc., values which have become, for most people, mere ideologies, and barely affect their behavior; while on the other hand there are the values of



the industrial bureaucratic system such as property, consumption, possession, social status, pleasure, entertainment, etc. The gap between the conscious values, which are ineffective, and the unconscious values, which are effective, brings about the destruction of the personality.

Fromm recognizes that in modern secular society there is no longer any possibility of founding values on godly revelations and assigning them an obligatory significance and power based on a belief in the source of the revelation, i.e. God. Fromm considers at length the possibility of founding a value-hierarchy for the modern world which is based on some concept other than that of godly revelation.

Fromm rejects the absolute relativistic approach, which contends that values are a matter of personal choice and taste, placing in this relativist category the existentialist philosophy as well. Sartre stresses that life has no a priori ethical structure, neither one based on God, nor any other provided by some objective excuse, seemingly independent of man's body and personality. Absolute ethical or religious values, according to which man should conduct himself, are no more than an illusion. Reality recognizes no essence preceding man's existence. The lack of external reason, of a structured theology in life, provides man with a sense of liberty and independence from all that is external to him. Man is free. His free will in life and choice of his perception of reality is essential. Every one of his actions attests to a choice devoid of any predetermined primary structure. Activity is the one thing which demonstrates man's existential aspect and his eternal free will (Sartre, 1946).

Fromm also rejects the view which claims that values are inherent in the structure of society, and that ethical norms are identical to the social norms which ensure the continued existence of society with all of its contradictions and injustices. Fromm greatly fears the dangers inherent in the acceptance of such a view, in that the subjugation of the individual to society and his total enslavement receive the acceptance of sanctified values.

Fromm does not accept the attitude of Konrad Lorenz (see Lorenz, 1967) and his followers, which states that values stem from biological elements. He stresses that biological value systems often give rise to very different results than those which the humanistic viewpoint upholds.

Instead of all these theories, Fromm stresses those values which grow out of what Albert Schweitzer calls "respect for life" (Schweitzer, 1953). According to Fromm, anything that contributes to the development of man's unique characteristics and furthers life itself is good and of value; anything that strangles life and paralyzes man's activity is bad and negative. The norms which have been determined by humanistic faiths such as Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam, and by humanistic thinkers, from the Greek philosophers preceding Socrates, up to modern day philosophers, are no more than the breaking-down of general rules and standards to more specific and minute components (Fromm, 1968).

In his affinity to the humanistic tradition, Fromm is close to such educators as Richard Livingstone and others, who call for a revival of traditional values in order to enable the existence of a society in which there is room for love and personal perfection.

Yet Fromm does not content himself with traditional value systems. He states that the validity of every system of values must be based on human existential conditions. It is especially because of this that we cannot view any specific value system as the only

one possible. The measure of a value system is based on the life of man. According to Fromm, an analysis of the living system which is called man will bring us to the conclusion that the norms which are pro-life are those which enhance his development and growth, while norms which negate life lead to disturbances in man's functioning and to pathological conditions. The objective truth of norms is proven only by the way in which they function to enhance optimal growth, and to create a situation of happiness, cancelling the state of distress (Fromm, 1968).

Instruction in values is one of the most important areas of education. Fromm constantly points out the need for fostering the student's affinity to a humanistic tradition of values, by constant contact with these values, examples of decisions based on these values from history and literature, critical analysis of social systems, and fostering the responsibility of the individual who actualizes himself whilst being aware and feeling an affinity for those who surround him and the world of nature in which he lives.

THE HUMANIZATION OF SOCIETY

Fromm sees one of the most important and fundamental tasks facing us as the humanization of the technotronic society. He quotes Albert Schweitzer at length, and particularly his warnings that our modern society is in a process of cultural self-destruction, and that the well-organized society influences man with a hidden force which was not recognized until recently. Man's dependence on this force has grown to the point where he has almost ceased to live an independent spiritual life. Thus we have arrived, according to Schweitzer, at the brink of new Middle Ages. The free will to function has disappeared, out of common agreement, since many have forsaken their thought as free individuals and are guided by the society which they are part of. By sacrificing our independence of thought we have lost much—and how can anything else be possible, particularly our belief in truth? Chaos rules our intellectual and emotional lives (Fromm, 1979). From these words of Schweitzer, Fromm turns to the writings of F. F. Schumacher (see Schumacher, 1973), who attacks the consumer society and stresses that economy, as the sole basis and content of life, is no more than a fatal disease. He is also in agreement with many of Mamford's conceptions and analyses in his book *The Pentagon of Power* (Mamford, 1970) regarding a variety of approaches to a humanistic social reconstruction.

According to Fromm, we have three possibilities open to us: to continue on our present path and risk nuclear and ecological war, disaster, or severe pathological phenomena in man; to try to bring about change by way of violent revolution, and risk the destruction of the social system in its entirety and the rise of a military dictatorship or fascist regime; or to act to humanize the system by revolutionary changes which are brought about gradually. Fromm recommends this last course of action.

Fromm points out four essential steps towards the humanization of society:

- 1) Planning which takes man into account as a part of the system and is based on norms determined by testing man's optimal functioning;
- 2) Motivating the individual by means of spontaneous activity and assumption of responsibility, by changing the alienated bureaucratic methods which are prevalent today, with methods of human administration;
- 3) Changing the pattern of consumption to a pattern of production and

consumption which enhance activity and prevent passivity 4) Developing new forms of orientation, spiritual and mental devotion, which will replace the present systems of religion (Fromm, 1968). On the basis of these four steps, Fromm delineates principles of humanistic planning which affect a change in the cultural economic and social life in a way which expands and encourages man's development and vitality and transforms him into an active and involved party instead of a passive and submissive one. Man himself is the source for values and norms in Fromm's program, and hence man's knowledge—his nature, potential, and revelations—must become one of the basic sources for the new form of social planning.

It seems necessary to provide here a profile of the new man of whom Fromm dreams, a man who will embody the following characteristics:

- A willingness to renounce all forms of possessiveness in order to live wholly.
- Security and a sense of identity and trust founded on a belief in man and what man is, on the need for mutual affinity for involvement, love, and solidarity with the world around us . . .
- Recognition that no man apart from oneself provides meaning for one's life, but rather that total independence from objects might become the precondition to the most total sense of devotion, care for others, and cooperation.
- Total presence in the place and condition one is in.
- Joy which stems from giving and cooperation, rather than accumulation and exploitation.
- Love and respect for life in all of its manifestations, out of the knowledge that—rather than power, possession, and all that is dead—life and all that furthers life is sacred.
- The attempt to reduce avarice, hate, and illusions as much as possible.
- Life without worshiping God or fostering any illusions . . .
- The development of the capacity to love, together with the capacity to think critically without the interference of emotions.
- The renouncing of narcissism and acceptance of the tragic limitations of human existence.
- The consideration of the full development of the individual and those around him as life's greatest purpose.
- The knowledge that discipline and respect for reality are essential to the achievement of one's objectives.
- The knowledge that no development is perfect or complete if it does not pertain to the structure of man, and the recognition of a structure which contributes to life and one which contributes to lifelessness.
- The development of an independent imagination, not as an escape from intolerable circumstances, but rather as a way of anticipating practical possibilities for a means of liberating oneself from intolerable circumstances.
- Not to mislead or be misled; to be innocent but not naive.

- Self-knowledge and recognition of the part of the self which one does not know.
- The feeling of unity with the totality of life; the relinquishment of the ambition to conquer, subjugate, exploit, rape and destroy nature—and the effort, instead, to understand and cooperate with nature.
- The liberty, which is chosen and not arbitrary, to be oneself: not a collection of passionate desires, but rather a structure of delicate balance, which is confronted daily with the choice between development and decay, between life and death.
- The knowledge that evil and destruction are inevitable results of the obstruction of development.
- The knowledge that only a handful of men have managed to develop all of these qualities, and the living of one's life without striving towards the obtainment of these goals, since that striving is merely another form of possessiveness.
- Joy stemming from life's developmental processes. (Based on Fromm, 1979)

I have outlined the list at length because it is, in fact, a list of Fromm's principles for the education of man, and the whole of the educational process must be dedicated to this image of man which he portrays.

CHAPTER 7

MORAL AND CHARACTER EDUCATION

AUTHORITATIVE AND HUMANISTIC MORALITY

Many of Fromm's writings, and particularly his book *Man For Himself* (Fromm, 1947), are written with the awareness that it is possible to formulate valid moral standards on the basis of man's reason. According to Fromm, there is a great tradition of humanistic moral thinking, which has laid the foundations for value systems based on man's reason and inner ability to act rationally. These systems are based on the premise that in order to distinguish good from evil, man must be familiar with his own nature. If the humanistic moral creed is indeed based on the knowledge of man's nature, then modern psychology, and especially psychoanalysis, must serve as a great incentive for the development of a humanistic set of fundamental beliefs (Fromm, 1947). Yet, psychoanalysis has not addressed this area at all. It widens the breadth and depth of our understanding of man's nature, but does not take into account a concept of the correct way for man to live his life.

In *Man For Himself*, Fromm attempts to show that our knowledge of man's nature does not lead to a relativistic morality, and that this contrasts the relativistic position which recognizes, in moral judgement and ethical principles, a matter of personal inclination, and rejects the possibility of any objectively valid statement in this area. Fromm strives to convince that the essence of norms for moral behavior is found in man's nature itself, and that the edicts of morality are based on characteristics inherent in man.

Fromm differentiates between authoritative and humanistic morality. In an authoritarian moral system, there is one man in a position of authority, who determines what is best for other men, and sets the laws and regulations for human behavior, while in a humanistic system of morals, man is both the provider of the laws and the one to obey them.

Authoritarian morality rejects man's ability to discern good from evil. Laws are made for man by an authority seen as far above him. Man is forbidden to doubt the decisions of this authority, and forfeits his right to decide for himself. It is not reason and knowledge which guide man, but a feeling of weakness and dependence. Authoritative morality determines what is good or evil, first and foremost from the point of view, and in the interests of, the authoritarian himself. Morality becomes exploitative.

Fromm coined the term "authoritarian personality." This personality is formed as a result of the activation of freedom-fearing mechanisms, which come into operation

when the individual is engulfed by feelings of loneliness, solitude, alienation, and lack of contact, which create anxiety that he will lose his position in society, and cause in him fear for his very survival. These feelings accompany the process of individuation. The progress towards individuation fills the individual with anxiety, lest he be disconnected from his human environment, and fills him with the fear that he will lose everything because of his individuality; hence his desire to adhere to the norms of society and to lose himself within it. This process entails giving up one's autonomy and subjugating oneself to authority. Fromm stresses that in such a situation an individual tends to adopt an ideology, in order to identify, through it, with the collective in which he lives, in order to evince feelings of hatred towards alien collectives—based on nationality, religion, social status, etc.—which threaten to harm the collective which protects him. Fromm feels that the individual's adherence to ideology, to the point of obliterating his identity, testifies to a regression in his development and a forfeiture of his personality. In this connection, Zvi Lamm notes, "Education for ideology could endanger the individual's openness of spirit, since such a process entails the diminishment of the individual's essence. One must carefully weigh whether the achievement of ideological aims at this price does not ultimately detract from the social character—assuming that this character is directly connected to the individual's essence" (Lamm, 1969).

Fromm asserts that it is possible to uncover the indoctrination of authoritarian morality at the very inception of the child's education. The child's moral judgement is formed as a result of the accumulation of both positive and negative reactions from adults. Considering the child's total dependence on adults, his fear of punishment and his need for positive reinforcement can easily become the basis for moral judgement. Fromm stresses that strong emotional pressure prevents the child, and later the adult too, from wondering whether, when he passes judgement that something or other is "good," he means that it is good for him or good in the eyes of the authority figure (Fromm, 1947).

The authoritative teacher is one of the most violent indoctrinators of authoritarian morality. Such a teacher praises his student when he is obedient, submissive, and accepting of authority. Yet, it is possible that such a "good boy" is no more than a frightened child, lacking in self-confidence, directing the whole of his behavior towards obtaining the approval of the adult. In contrast, the "bad boy" might be a child with a strong will and real interests of his own, and perhaps it is for this very reason that both parents and teachers are dissatisfied with him.

Since the authoritarian has interests of his own, which depend on the exercising of his authority, he idealizes the virtue of obedience and classifying it foremost among desirable qualities, he denounces disobedience and presents it as the father of all sin (Fromm, 1947).

In contrast, humanistic morality is based on the principle that only man himself can determine his own standards and rules, and discern between good and evil, and that no external authority can do so for him. Good entails good for man, and evil is that which is harmful for him. The only standard for moral values is the benefit it brings to man (Fromm, 1947). Man is the determining factor, and what is good for him is the test of what is moral. Yet, this does not entail man's seclusion and egocentric isolation of



himself. Fromm believes that when man actualizes himself, he is necessarily affiliated to his fellow men, and that he achieves the fulfillment of his personal happiness only through his relationship to others, and his solidarity with them.

Fromm attempts to refute the contentions of those whose theories negate the possibility of objective value judgements, basing his refutation on the morality of the arts. In the realm of every art, there exists an objective system of standards. This system is the product of practical experience, based on theory. Despite the fact that in every art-form, various methods lead to similarly excellent results, the standardized limits of every art are not voluntary, and whoever oversteps these boundaries fails in his attempt at expression. According to Fromm, living is also an art; in the art of living man is both the artist and the object of his art, both the shaper and the shaped (Fromm, 1947).

On the strength of this analogy, Fromm stresses that humanistic morality is the product of the practice of the art of living, based on the theoretical science of man. This analogy is both attractive and tempting, but it is not convincing, and all that can be said about it is that it "will do in a pinch." Coming to discuss the problems of humanistic morality, Fromm's starting point is the assumption that the principle of humanistic ethics is that a good action is based on fulfilling one's duties towards oneself, while a bad action is that which hurts oneself (Fromm, 1947). Many objections, coming from diverse schools of thought, have been raised against this principle. One of them points out that this principle makes egocentricity the standard for human behavior, whereas the goal of morality should be the subjugation of egocentricity. Another objection is based on the assumption that man is inherently evil from birth, and that the only instrument to curtail his evil drives is the fear of authority and punishment. A third outlook views man as a devoted pleasure-seeker, motivated by the pleasure principle, with pleasure itself being contradictory, or at least, indifferent to the principles of morality. Only man's conscience is capable of motivating him to do good, and it seems to have lost its place in the theory of humanistic morality. Another objection to humanistic morality is that it leaves no place for the faith which is so essential to moral behavior.

Fromm considers each one of these objections, and tries to refute them. He contends with the view that man's love of himself is synonymous with egocentricity, and excludes love of others. According to Fromm, if it is good to love ones neighbor as oneself, then it follows that it is good, rather than evil, to love oneself. There is no limit to the concept of humanity which excludes the individual himself. Any theory which permits this exclusion exposes its inner-contradictions. The biblical concept of loving one's neighbor as oneself implies that one cannot separate the respect and valuing of inner-peace and uniqueness—an attitude of love and understanding towards one's individuality, from the attitude of respect and understanding for one's fellow man. The love of one's self is inextricably tied to the love of all others (Fromm, 1947).

A psychological analysis also indicates that our attitudes towards others and our attitudes towards ourselves are not only not contradictory, but are essentially connected. Moreover, man himself must be the object of his own love no less than any other human being. Man's affirmation of his own life, happiness, growth and liberty stems from his ability to love—from his respect and care of himself, responsibility to himself, and knowledge of himself. A man capable of loving creatively must also love himself. If he is only capable of loving others, then he is not truly capable of love (Fromm, 1947).

Fromm attempts to show that egocentricity and self-love are not only far from being identical, but are, in fact, opposites. Egocentric man is not creative, and his attempts to increase his own pleasure, with his total self-involvement, are no more than a cover-up for his failure to do anything for his own good. Fromm states that it is true that the egocentric man is incapable of loving others, but neither is he capable of loving himself (Fromm, 1947).

As for the question of conscience, it is quite complex, due to the many and varied attempts at defining it, per se. Cicero and Seneca described conscience as "an inner voice, prosecuting and defending our behavior according to its moral characteristics." Stoic philosophy sees the survival instinct as the essence of conscience. In the middle ages, conscience was seen as "God's law of reason, which he planted in man." Kant identified the feeling of duty as conscience; Nietzsche saw conscience as man's affirmation of himself, wherein he accepts his individuality; Max Scheller believed that conscience is the expression of rational judgement—the judgement of emotion rather than thought.

Fromm differentiates between authoritative and humanistic conscience. Authoritative conscience, as he defines it, is the introjected voice of an external authority figure: parents, state, or any other authority figure. The laws of the external authority figure become part of man, and instead of feeling responsible to an external authority, he feels responsible to his conscience, which is nothing more than the external authority, internalized. The directives of the authoritative conscience are not determined by the value-judgements of the conscientious person, but are always the results of ordinances and prohibitions decreed by the figures of authority.

Education plays a major role in the indoctrination and establishment of authoritarian conscience. One of the most efficient methods weakening a child's will is the fostering of his sensitivity to guilt. From early childhood onwards we foster feelings of guilt, whether in the areas of sexuality and hygiene, or in the areas of behavior and obedience, and by the age of five or six, the child already has a sensitivity to guilt which suffices the whole of his existence, since the conflict between his natural drives and the moral judgements of his parents is a constant source for the creation of guilt. Modern systems of education have not significantly improved the situation. They have exchanged the overt authoritative with hidden authoritative. Instead of direct orders, the child is convinced, in the name of science, common sense, the need for cooperation, and the like, and his feelings of guilt are engendered by these seemingly objective principles.

Humanistic conscience is not the introverted voice of the authority figure, whose will we wish to obey, but rather our own voice, independent of external reward or punishment. Humanistic conscience, according to Fromm, is the reaction of the whole of our personality to its own proper function or dysfunction. Conscience is thus our reaction to ourselves. It is the voice of our true individuality which calls us to return to ourselves, to live creative lives, to develop fully and harmoniously—in short, to actually become what we have the potential to be (Fromm, 1947).

Fromm also discusses the further objection against pleasure and happiness as standards for happiness. He clarifies that authoritative morality has the advantage of simplicity—the authority determines what is good and evil, and the man who obeys its ordinances is considered good. In contrast, in humanistic morality, man is the sole

judge of values, and hence pleasure and pain become the final arbitrators in the differentiation of good from evil.

Following an analysis of various motivations for pleasure, Fromm arrives at the distinction between irrational pleasure, which attests to avarice, and its opposite, happiness, which is a sign of success in the "art of living." According to Fromm, happiness is man's greatest achievement. It is the reaction of the whole personality to a creative attitude, both towards itself and towards the external world (Fromm, 1947). Hence, in seeking happiness, man faces the most arduous of missions: the full development of the spirit's creative powers. In this, Fromm is close to Bertrand Russell, who devoted much in his theories to happiness and the education of the contented man, as the goals of education (Russell, 1930; see also Cohen, 1979).

Humanistic morality, as propounded by Fromm, is based on the assumption that man is evil from birth. Hence, the goal of humanistic morality is not repressing man's evil nature, but rather, creative use of the forces for good which are also inherent in man.

According to his system, Fromm rejects the conception of those who uphold an absolute morality. In their conception, moral laws have absolute validity, which cannot be refuted or altered. Such a concept of absolute morality is found in authoritarian regimes and viewpoints which accept the superiority of the authority figure as the basis of the validity of moral law. Fromm refutes the conception that moral standards must be absolute in order to be valid. Ethical norms, moreover, are never absolute—not only in the respect that are subject to change, as are all scientific paradigms, but also in that there are certain situations which, by their very nature, are unsolvable and do not offer the possibility of a decision which can be seen as correct.

Fromm sees the role of the moral thinker as that of preserving and strengthening the voice of human conscience, and to know what is good and bad for man, without consideration of whether these are also good and evil standards for society in its particular stage of development. It is possible that the voice of such a moral thinker will be lost in the crowd; only if he perseveres and maintains his position is it possible that he will be heard. The contradiction between morality specific to a certain society and a morality for the whole of mankind will diminish, and a new trend will appear, in which the contradiction will resolve itself completely, once society becomes truly humanistic and cares for the full human development of all its members (Fromm, 1947).

CHARACTER AND ITS EDUCATION

The concept of character is often confused with concepts such as temperament and personality—a confusion which obscures the issue and makes theoretical discussion difficult. It is necessary to differentiate between these terms and to define them. In the concept of personality Fromm sees the sum of the inherited and learned traits which characterize the individual and differentiate him from others. Temperament, according to Fromm, is related to modes of reaction, is essentially based on physiological processes, and is mainly inherited and subject to little change. In his definition of temperament, Fromm is close to Gordon W. Allport's definition, which stresses that the concept of temperament relates to the phenomena characteristic of the individual's emotional nature, including his sensitivity to emotional stimuli, the appropriateness and

speed of his reactions, the quality of his mood, and all the fluctuating states of intensity of mood (Allport, 1955).

In contrast, character, according to Fromm, is shaped chiefly by the individual's experience, especially during childhood, and life's lessons and new experiences can bring about changes in character.

In order to properly understand Fromm's differentiation between temperament and character, one must consider his view that if one is of a choleric temperament, then his mode of reaction is fast and fierce—but what is it that he reacts to in such a fashion? This depends on the quality of his pattern of relating to those around him—that is, his character. Of special interest, in terms of their far-reaching educational implications are Fromm's discussions of the various character types which he divides into two general categories: The Non-Productive Orientations and the Productive Orientation. As Non-Productive Orientations Fromm classifies: the Receptive Orientation, the Exploitative Orientation, the Hoarding Orientation, and the Marketing Orientation.

Persons whose character is of the Receptive orientation believe that the source of goodness is external. They are dependant on authority figures in all aspects of their lives, feel helpless in any situation in which they are asked to make decisions and accept responsibility, and always turn to the external source as an authority, as a crutch, and as the determiner of their ways.

As in the Receptive orientation, the feeling that the source of goodness is external and that man is incapable of creating by himself, also characterizes the Exploitative orientation. Yet, in contrast to the Receptive orientation, Exploitative orientation types do not turn to the external source for help but rather, attempt to take from others by sheer force or cunning.

Persons characterized by the Hoarding orientation do not believe that there is a chance to receive anything at all from the external world. They put their trust in accumulation and hoarding, and see danger in expenditure. It is for this reason that they erect steep walls about them, and their fervent wish is to incorporate as much as possible into their fortified stronghold, and to let out as little as possible.

Those characterized by the Marketing orientation consider themselves both as vendors and as goods for sale. Their self-appreciation is dependant on factors which are beyond their control. If they "succeed," their worth increases; if they fail, they are worthless. Fromm stresses that it is almost impossible to comprehend the measure of insecurity which results from such an attitude. If one feels that one's worth is not determined primarily by one's personal attribute, but only on the basis of one's success in the market of competitors, whose conditions are constantly changing, it is inevitable that his self-respect will be weak and will always be in need of fortification from those around him. It seems that such a man is constantly driven to strive for success, and that any retreat constitutes a terrible threat to his self-esteem. In this way helplessness, insecurity, and feelings of inferiority are created. If the fluctuating demands and standards of the market are the sole determinants of man's worth, his self-respect and dignity are destroyed (Fromm, 1947).

Fromm's descriptions of the Marketing orient' are indicative of the modern system of education, which mainly foster the Marketing character, wherein success is the measure of value.

The Marketing orient' leaves its mark on thought and emotion. Thought is burdened



with the task of grasping concepts quickly in order to succeed in manipulation. Manipulation becomes a way of life, organizing things, "pulling the strings," and "pushing the right buttons."

For purposes of manipulation, there is no need to know anything but the external nature of objects, their features and what is necessary for their operation or use. Truth which is revealed through penetration and introspection, thought and research, becomes outmoded and redundant.

This trend is greatly reinforced—in fact, wholly supported—by an efficient and common educational standard which sees the I.Q. as the most significant measure of the student's ability. This is a narrowly pragmatic outlook, since the I.Q. testing norm is a perfect manipulative tool. Fromm rightly points out that most I.Q. tests are directed towards this type of thinking. Far more than such tests measure wisdom and comprehension, they measure mental adjustment to a given situation (Fromm, 1947). Instead of "I.Q." tests, Fromm calls them "mental adjustment" tests, whose function is not the analysis of essential intelligence nor the testing of qualities, but rather, a quantified measurement. According to Fromm, all "problems" are equally interesting, and there is no sense in assigning varying degrees of importance to different problems. Information itself becomes a commodity. Here too, it seems that man is alienated from his own powers; thought and knowledge are considered as tools for the production of the desired results. Man's knowledge of himself, the psychology which can be found in the great tradition of Western thinking, which has always been considered as a precondition to goodness, healthy living and happiness, has atrophied and become an accessory for the improvement of methods of manipulation, for man's treatment of himself and others. This is achieved through market research, political propaganda, advertising, and the like (Fromm, 1947).

This Marketing orient', the major goal of which is the fostering of manipulative thinking, has contradictory and debilitating influence on the existing educational system. From primary school to university, the goal of education is to inculcate as much practical information as possible. Students are expected to learn so much, that they have almost no time left for thinking. It is neither interest in the subject matter nor the desire to understand, which motivates people to widen and deepen their education, but rather the higher "rate of return" which this knowledge gives them. There is an enormous enthusiasm for education and information, yet a simultaneous attitude of ridicule exists for all areas of thought which are deemed impractical and useless by virtue of pertaining to "mere" truth, devoid of value in the marketplace of maximal returns (Fromm, 1947).

In contrast to the non-productive orient', Fromm presents the Productive orient'. He stresses that man is not only an intelligent and social animal, but can also be defined as a creative animal, capable of changing factors of his environment by exercising his mind and imagination. Yet man not only is capable of creation, but must create in order to live (Fromm, 1947). In order for man to exercise his mind, feelings, and all of his powers, he must be free, independent, unimpeded by any external control of his powers, and guided by reason, whose purpose is the in-depth penetration of the nature of things, the knowledge of their relationships, and the examination of their essences. Man will only be able to utilize his powers if he knows them, and knows how and where to use them.

Since man, by the very essence of human existence, stands alone, separate from the world, he is driven to seek a tie, an affiliation, a connection. The only mode of affiliation, according to Fromm, which does not diminish man's unique being, and which enables him to actualize his personal powers in the very process of becoming affiliated, is productivity. Man's affiliation to the world and to his fellow man is a product of activity and comprehension. In the process of creating things, he exercises his power to control. He understands the world with his mind, with his feelings, with the strength of love and reason. His powers of reason enable him to penetrate through the surface appearances of things and grasp the essential content by becoming actively affiliated with it. His powers of love enable him to break down the wall separating him from his fellow man, and understand him (Fromm, 1947).

Out of these analyses, it becomes clear that Fromm places great stress on creative education, which is the great exposer, and the true actualizer of man's character.

CHAPTER 8

CREATIVE EDUCATION

Fromm agrees with Abraham Maslow, who speaks of the existence of a trend within the human creature towards growth in a direction of self-actualization, and, more specifically, towards the perception of truth and creativity (Maslow, 1962). Together with his humanistic psychology colleagues, Fromm devotes a lengthy discussion to the idea of self-actualization, which is the central concept of humanistic psychology, and the issue of man's incessant striving to actualize his potential and capabilities. Latent potential does not pertain to thought alone. The experience of the "I" as the subject of thought processes disregards the fact that we feel the ego in the process of emotional and creative activity. Man must know the world not only by means of his intellect, but also through his senses, eyes, ears, and all of his body, in order to experience the world as his own.

Developed man is the creative man, according to Fromm, and he is interested in and reacts to the world around him (Also see Fromm, 1962).

The reformation of society and the educational system can be accomplished mainly by actualizing the general personality of man and by allowing for the expression of his intellectual, emotional and social potential. These potentials exist in every man, and can only be actualized through expression. In this process, the role of active education is a very significant one, since the spontaneous activity of the whole personality is a form of positive freedom. According to Fromm, the man who actualizes himself by spontaneous activity thus relates himself to the world, and ceases being isolated; he and the world become a part of one great whole; he finds his place, he learns to know himself as a creative and active man, and discerns the singular meaning and value of life: the process of living itself (Fromm, 1941).

Fromm believes in freedom and man's right to be himself. This freedom is not only freedom "from," but also freedom "to," i.e., the freedom to become independent, the freedom to be much-rather than the freedom to have much or to exploit people and things (Fromm, 1962). Hence, the atmosphere of freedom in education entails no more than the provision of opportunities for creativity and activity, and spontaneous interaction. The word "activity" does not refer to a particular action, but to every creative act, whether it be in the emotional realm, the realm of reason, the realm of the senses, etc. Fromm includes in this category of creative activity, the process of creative thinking, love, productive human relationships, and every other spontaneous form of expression. The renouncement of spontaneity and selfhood causes a cessation of life and, according to Fromm, opposes the goals of education. Education must thus foster spontaneity, originality, and critical thinking in every area.

Fromm notes that Western society does not generally encourage expression of emotion. According to him, the descriptive term "emotional" has become synonymous with "stupid" or "confused." Since Fromm sees man's personality as an emotional and intellectual whole—then it follows that lack of emotional development in the individual causes the weakening and depletion of his mental facilities, and the individual himself becomes significantly weaker. Yet, since society cannot completely uproot emotionalism, feelings exist separately alongside of man's intellect. The kind of cheap and insincere sentimentality which cinema, television, and popular literature are full of, is fed to millions of emotionally-starved people (Fromm, 1941).

Western society's attitude towards feelings is similar to its attitude towards original thinking. From the very outset of man's education, pre-determined thoughts are introduced into his intellect, while original thinking is not encouraged. The insincerity (often unintentional) typical of the average adult in his relations with a child, is a factor which inhibits independent thought. This attitude is rooted in the fictitious image of the world which the child is inculcated with. Apart from the general false world-view, there are many outright lies, intended to cover up facts which, for various reasons, adults would like to hide from children. Insincerity and lies inhibit and disturb the development of a creative and independent attitude.

Fromm points out a number of accepted methods which atrophy original thinking. One is the over-stressing of facts or information, according to the assumption that by gathering more and more facts, one can understand reality. Disjointed and meaningless facts are "crammed" into student's heads, with much expenditure of time and energy, and very little is left for original thinking—or any thought at all. It must be clarified that Fromm considers thought, without correct knowledge of the facts, as meaningless. But, information alone might interfere with thought no less than a total lack of information.

Another method which atrophies original thinking is the consideration of all truth as relative, subjective, and almost merely a matter of personal inclination. According to Fromm, every man has the need to seek truth, and this truth is rooted in the affairs and needs of individuals and social groups. The individual's strength is dependent on his knowledge of the truth about himself, on the optimal adjustment of his personality, and on his transparency to himself. In this sense, to "know thyself" is one of the basic needs, according to Fromm, for the happiness and health of the individual.

In his discussions of the social unconscious, Fromm asserts that the repression of facts is accompanied by the acceptance of many lies. We are being stuffed with various ideologies such as: "our leaders are wise;" "we are good;" "our enemies are evil;" "our government expresses the will of the people;" "the interests of our leaders are our interests," etc. All of these ideologies are indoctrinated in people from birth through parents, schools, churches, movies, television, and media, and come to dominate the souls of human beings as if they were the product of independent thinking or observation. Fromm humorously comments that if this process takes place in societies which oppose us, we term it brainwashing—and, in its less extreme forms, indoctrination or propaganda; in our society, however, we call it education and information (Fromm, 1962).

Educational institutions attempt to instill character traits which are in demand by the personality market, and are opposed to any productive approach. Education must guide



its students in the development of a productive character (Fromm, 1947), since the recognition of truth is not a mere intellectual issue alone, but a question of character. The most important element of a productive character is the courage to say something new, to say no, to disobey the government and public opinion, to fight for an opinion or outlook, to fight those who try to prevent the individual from being himself. An educational atmosphere which will allow all of these—and even encourage them—will educate for creativity.

According to Fromm, existing educational institutions do not succeed in fostering the development of critical thinking and the concept of freethinking in their students. Instead, the primary goal of our educational system is to provide the individual with the information deemed necessary to function properly in an industrialized society, and to shape his character according to accepted norms: a competitive and ambitious character which is also capable of cooperation within certain limits; an attitude of respect for authority combined with "the right measure of independence;" cordiality with a lack of any real affinity to anything or anyone (Fromm, 1955).

In contrast to this suffocating form of education is Fromm's conception of creativity-orientated education, which provides stimulation, arouses curiosity, fosters originality and criticism, encourages its students to search for meaning, and provides them with the necessary conditions for creative development. According to Fromm, creativity is the foundation of liberty, all positive virtues, happiness and joy—the latter being not only the product of creative living, but also the incentive for such a lifestyle.

In contrast to the conception of education through transference, indoctrination, and oppressive learning by rote, Fromm supports the fostering of creativity anchored in the educational process, as a process of individuation by means of self-actualization. According to Fromm, healthy existence can be described as the capacity to be creative, to be aware, to be responsive; to be independent and fully active and thus unite with the world; to be aware of oneself as "being" rather than "having;" to experience joy in the very act of living and to regard creative living as the sole objective of existence (Fromm, 1959). Creativity, according to Fromm, is a way of life, rather than merely a method of education and instruction. It is the only form of existence which prevents the depleting of life's human significance. Fromm, and those who share his approach, tend to give first priority to the creative spirit of the individual according to the principles of knowledge as they have been determined over many generations (Lamm, 1973).

Fromm differentiates between on the one hand creative acts such as painting, composing, and literary writing, which are based on talent, and capable of being learned and improved through practice, and which ultimately bring about the development of a new creation, and on the other hand a creative tendency which is the basis of egoistic creativity, which does not necessarily reveal itself through the creation of any product. This creative tendency means, according to Fromm, a vision of the world as new, without prejudices or biases, without generalizations, and without the limitations of laws and frameworks. One of the most important conditions for creativity is the capacity to wonder. Hence, Fromm stresses, we must return to learn from our children. Courage is necessary in order to be different, in order to free oneself from prejudice and accepted viewpoints. Only when a man is prepared to be reborn everyday, and not to accept any solution as the final solution, only then does he develop a creative atti-

tude towards life. Fromm notes that creativity is a mental function which every human being is capable of, if he suffers from no deformity of intellect or emotion (Fromm, 1947).

Erich Neumann writes in his book *Psychoanalysis and The New Ethics*, "a great part of educational activities is always directed to the creation of a persona which tames the individual, makes him a "good citizen," and teaches him not the whole truth, but what is allowed to be considered as truth. In this process one learns to disregard and avoid the truth, more than one learns to be perceptive and observant, sharpen one's senses, and love the truth." The creative approach frees the individual from the oppressive and manipulative authoritarianism of culture, and fosters the individual's uniqueness. By encouraging this uniqueness, it also does much for the enrichment of culture, for culture is no more than the sum of all the individuals which comprise it. Herbert Read stresses that every man has something unique within him. This uniqueness is not found in anyone but oneself, and is of significant value to society. Yet uniqueness is worthless if the individual remains isolated. Hence, Read's conclusion is that education must assist the process of individualization, which is the essence of creative education, and also encourage the process of integration (Read, 1944). Fromm is fully in agreement with Read's conception.

Carl Rogers also clarifies that a precondition to creativity is the openness of the individual to acceptance of the world without prejudice. Creativity is a product of new relationships which grow from man's encounter with matter, events, or circumstances.

An external precondition to creativity, according to Rogers, is the atmosphere of openness and acceptance which facilitates a feeling of mental security and freedom. The inner conditions necessary for creativity are openness to existence, an inner guide-rule of values, flexibility, and maneuverability (Rogers, 1954).

In fact, many theorists in the area of creativity, Erich Fromm included, draw on the philosophical concepts of Henry Bergson, who considered living as an independent mental process, an activity of creation. Life is constant freedom and creativity. Freedom is achieved by man through living. Artistic activity is an example of the continuous creativity of life, and is a part of it. Reality, which Bergson views as a continuity, is qualitative abundance. One cannot reduce reality to a quantitative framework whose elements are capable of measurement. The measurement of the quality of activity serves as that of the whole of reality. One cannot simplify the multiplicity of reality. Activity and creativity produce this multiplicity. Each creation has its individual character, and the qualitative nature of reality reflects its creative character. Life itself cannot be grasped by anything other than inner-experience. In this experience we do not consider life as a causal necessity, but as an inner-liberty—not as an entity, but as a creative metamorphosis.

The Productive orient', which Fromm discusses at length, relates to a type of character whose main objective is the growth and development of all of his potential powers, while all other activities are subordinated to the fostering of this growth. Fromm contends that the Productive orient' of the personality represents a basic approach, an attitude which pertains to all areas of human experience. It encompasses mental, emotional and sensual reactions of man towards his fellow man, towards himself, and to other objects. Creativity, according to Fromm, is man's ability to utilize his powers and

actualize the forces inherent within him. The creative man is the man who experiences himself as a manifestation of his powers, and as an active agent in the unfolding of his existence, a man who sees himself and his powers as a single unity, rather than separated or alienated from them (Fromm, 1947).

Fromm clarifies that the world external to man can only be experienced by him in two ways: coping by inputting reality; or by way of creation, by perceiving reality with the mind and imagination, by rejuvenation and recreation of what has been perceived, by means of the spontaneous activity of the forces of intellect and emotion. The normal person is capable, according to Fromm, of determining his affiliation to the world through both coping and creating, while the most important product of creativity is man himself.

Fromm devotes much discussion to the role of creative thought. Like other radical thinkers such as Herbert Read (see Read, 1944) and Jules Henry (see Henry, 1963), what characterizes Fromm's approach is divorce from the obligatory rigid structure of knowledge. It is not the rules for the processing of knowledge which set the limits of its applicability, but rather the qualities of the creative person which define the depth, quality and direction of the uses of knowledge.

In this approach, Fromm differentiates between intelligence and reason. "Intelligent" thinking, according to him, is not directed towards the goal of thought nor the basic assumptions of thought, and does not examine them, but rather accepts them as pre-determined. In contrast, the act of reason is to know, to reason, to understand, to grasp, and to determine a relationship to things by perceiving them intellectually. Reason penetrates the surface appearance of things in order to discover their essences, hidden connections, and deeper connotations—their logic. Reason is not two-dimensional, but rather "Multi-perspectived" (As Nietzsche defines it), i.e., it encompasses all the perspectives and dimensions which one can conceive of, and not only those which are meaningful for direct action (Fromm, 1947).

Fromm tends to give priority to the creative individual's spirit, over the principles of knowledge which have been formed through many ages of creativity, stressing the interaction between objectivity and subjectivity. According to Fromm, during the process of creative thinking, the thinker is motivated by his interest in the subject. He is activated by the object and reacts to it. He is concerned, and determines an appropriate response. Yet creative thinking is also characterized by its objectivity, the respect which the thinker feels towards the subject of his thoughts, the ability of the thinker to see it as it is, and not as he would like it to be. This polarity between objectivity and subjectivity is characteristic of creative thinking, as it is characteristic of creativity in general (Fromm, 1947).

Man, according to Fromm, creates art and ritual through his perception of the world, through uniting with it through thought, and expressing his world-view by means of his senses. He creates poetry, drama, paintings, and sculpture. In its accepted modern usage, art is considered as a separate individualistic area which must be understood in order to be appreciated. Fromm sees a division between the artist as an experienced professional man, and the fan or consumer of art. Yet this is a modern separation. In the arts of ancient cultures, there were great artists according to the modern definition, but there were also other sorts of great artists. The cathedral, the Indian raindance, the Japanese flower arrangement, folkdancing, and public singing are all kinds of folk-art.

There is no precise definition for this kind of art, since art, in its greater sense as a meaningful part of human existence, has lost its place in our world. The term which Fromm proposes for this sort of ritual art (in a non-religious context) is "collective art." The purpose of this art is to react to the world with our senses in a meaningful, professional, creative, active, non-alienated way, and especially by means of involvement (Fromm, 1955).

Whereas modern art is individualistic, relates to production and consumption, and is in fact an "appendage to life" or luxury, collective art is creative activity which unites people and is an inseparable part of life, fulfilling a basic human need.

In order to grow and move from a receptive to a creative orientation, man must relate to the world artistically rather than philosophically or scientifically. This art is equally important, according to Fromm, as the knowledge of reading and writing. The transformation of our automated and alienated society to a cooperative one depends on the creation of opportunities for human beings to sing together, to dance together, to "adore" together—together, and not as lonely individuals lost in the masses.

Fromm contends that the development of this kind of art begins with the realization that this art is important to man. When people begin to consider this fact, new seeds will sprout, talented people will add new forms to the old, and new talents will be revealed, whereas without such an orientation, these new talents will remain forever hidden.

The practical solutions which Fromm offers are: that collective art begin in Kindergarten and continue through all of schooling and life; parades, choirs, theatre groups, and orchestras should become permanent fixtures of the educational system, and perhaps then it would also become possible to transform sport into an enjoyable activity, instead of a competitive one performed for the sake of profit.

Here too, as in modern industrial organization, the guiding principle is decentralization. This activity is carried out in fixed groups, whose members meet each other face to face, and in which participation will be both active and responsible.

Fromm contends that the organization of these activities should not be left in the hands who make their living from it, but rather should be seen as educational services, which do not bring profit to anyone (Fromm, 1955).



CHAPTER 9

THE EDUCATOR'S IMAGE

Any attempt to delineate the educator's image, according to Fromm's conception, will be akin to the portrayal of the image of the sane man, who is healthy of spirit. Such an image is, in many respects, ideal, yet incapable of actualization unless the whole structure of society be changed.

The educator is a biophilic man, who loves and is drawn to the very process of living, to growth and development. He is constructive, inquisitive, searching; he is in love with the adventures of life. This man is gifted with the ability to see the whole and not only selected parts, and prefers the structure of the whole to the sum of its elements, since this structure is dynamic.

This man enjoys life, rather than simple excitement. His character is creative and non-destructive. He prefers to examine things rather than disassemble them to understand their mechanics and cause. He likes to build more than to preserve the existing. He is endowed with curiosity and the ability to wonder. He tries to influence and change through involvement, motivation, and activity, rather than the use of coercive force. This man is curious and thirsty for knowledge of the truth which lies beyond the chains of illusion. He is a man who has cast off these chains. His ability to perceive the nature and needs of his students is intimately connected to his ability to know and be himself.

The ethics of the biophilic teacher maintain that all that leads to growth and development is good, whilst all that strangles, hinders, and detracts from life is bad. This conception is close to that of Henry Bergson, who stresses that life is a self-spiritual process and an activity of creation. Life means constant freedom and creativity. The quality of activity serves as a standard for the whole of reality. We cannot abolish the multiplicity of reality. Activity and creativity generate this multiplicity (Bergson, 1957).

The ideal character of the teacher is a productive one, in which the 'Productive orient' is dominant. This 'Productive orient' of the personality suggests, according to Fromm, a way of relating in all realms of human experience. It encompasses mental, emotional, and sensual reactions of man to himself, to others, and to objects. Creativity is man's ability to utilize his powers and actualize the forces inherent within him (Fromm, 1947).

The love of a teacher for his student is an active love; it is a love which is first and foremost based on giving rather than taking; the educator gives his attention, joy of life, knowledge, understanding, and all the manifestations and expressions of what lies

within him, and thus enriches his students. Fromm stresses that giving is the ultimate expression of potential. In the very act of giving, one feels one's power, complexity, and strength. This experience of increased liveliness and potential fills one with joy (Fromm, 1956). In the teacher's act of giving to the student, he enriches him while enhancing his own sense of liveliness. According to Fromm, the teacher does not give in order to receive in return; the giving itself is a great joy. Yet when he gives, he inevitably creates something in the receiver, and this creation reflects him. In giving truth, he must accept that which is reflective of him. Giving entails the transformation of the other to a giver as well, and thus both share the joy over what they have created (Fromm, 1956).

Fromm stresses that beyond the element of giving, the active character of educational love is revealed in the fact that many basic elements, common to all forms of love, are incorporated in it: caring, responsibility, respect, and knowledge. This love is not an affinity to one person or to one special student; it is an attitude, an orientation of character which determines man's relationship to the world in general. The teacher who loves life, in the broad universal sense, prefers to educate his students in joy. Fromm maintains that it is better to educate in joy than through moral sermonizing, punishment, and coercion. Fromm shares this attitude with Bertrand Russell, who also gives priority to the joy of life and enthusiasm in the educational process (see my book *The Educational Teachings of Bertrand Russell*, 1979). This concept of the joy and ecstasy of education has been widely developed by George B. Leonard, who stresses that the artistic teacher seeks reason. According to Leonard, ecstasy is the great ally of education. It provides reinforcement and is, in fact, the very essence of the art of learning.

The restraint of joy which must accompany the revelation is strangulative to the act of education. The most formidable of oppressors are the obligations and coercions of learning. Albert Einstein explains why he was unable to concentrate on scientific problems for an entire year after his final examinations, saying that it is nothing short of a miracle that modern forms of instruction have not completely strangled the holy curiosity of the urge for investigation. It is a grave error to assume that one can encourage the joy of observation and scientific investigation by means of coercion and feelings of obligation.

The educator, according to Fromm's conception, is a man who has made the correct moral choice between oppression, addiction, and active creativity. The educator's role is to instruct in a non-authoritarian and non-coercive fashion, since evil is fostered through the debilitating affects of the authoritarian spirit (Fromm, 1947). The educator must instruct by means of creative utilization of the primal positive forces inherent in the child.

Like Whitehead, Fromm contends that the teacher must arouse enthusiasm in his students by virtue of his personality, and create an environment of expansive human knowledge and stable purpose.

Fromm's attitude as an educator and psychoanalyst assigns great negative connotation to the term "treatment," as it appears in the context of interpersonal relations. The terms "self-education" and "self-help" are more fitting to his approach. (Note also Carl Roger's approach, which suggests direct application of client-centered therapy to the realm of education. See Rogers, 1951). Fromm, who was disappointed in tradi-



tional psychoanalytical methods, assumed a new therapeutic position, which is applicable to education, and particularly to teacher-student relationships. According to Fromm, instead of being an observer, one must become a participant, must show an interest in the patient or student; the educator must develop an understanding with the student from core to core rather than from periphery to periphery, in order to truly understand him, and not just interpret what he says (Fromm, 1962). Fromm is not interested in the subjugation of the patient or student, nor in his "treatment." His therapeutic and educational approach is very close to that of Paul Ritter, who calls therapy "love in education" (Ritter, 1966), whose goal is the fostering of creativity in the child.

The application of Fromm's system in education points to a non-authoritarian educator, who does not try to intervene with the pace and development of the student, even for what he deems to be for the student's own good. Fromm does not believe that one man can save another by choosing for him. All that a man can do for his fellow man is to show him the possible alternatives, out of an attitude of loyalty and love, without sentimentality and illusion. The confrontation with real alternatives can awaken the energy latent in man, and enable him to choose life over death. According to Fromm, there are two ways to make the positive choice: the first is the way of duty and obedience to moral edicts; the second is the development of taste and sensitivity for doing the right thing (Fromm, 1962). In this, Fromm refers to a feeling of increased vitality, in which man rejuvenates his powers and identity. Are we to understand from this concept of the non-authoritarian educator, who does not directly intervene in the development of his students, that the educator is forbidden to try to change his pupils? Or, we had better ask: how can an educator influence his pupils and affect changes in them? To Fromm's mind, a teacher can cause change in his pupil mainly by changing himself, and not by changing everything but himself. It follows from this, that Fromm believes in change by personal example. The educator's awareness of his own unique individuality opens before him the possibility of responding to the student and thus aiding him in his development.

As for instruction itself, Fromm raises great doubts as to the possibility of understanding history, philosophy, religion, and literature at an early age, and doubts that the instruction of these subjects in primary school, or even high-school, is meaningful. According to his conception, the period from ages 8 to 18 are the least suitable for the student's learning, though he does not include in this the learning of the three basic subjects and the learning of languages. Regarding the rest of the curriculum, he stresses that even when the student is in his teens and twenties, at which time these subjects are taught in college, he is not at the ideal age for these studies. In many cases, a man must have more life-experience than that which he has at college age, in order to truly understand the problems in these areas (Fromm, 1955). On this issue, Fromm holds similar views to Paul Goodman, who stresses one must teach philosophy and the principles of liberal arts only to adults who already have a degree of knowledge and experience as a point of reference. Otherwise, as Plato noted, such education amounts to no more than verbosity. Also of the same opinion is the neo-humanist educator Richard Livingstone, who points out the great importance of a return to learning during adulthood, with greater experience and deeper perspective, and recommends further education, in which it would be possible to develop anew through systematic education, by

devoting time to renewed studies, the expansion of knowledge, the reassessment of positions and opinions, and perhaps even the rejuvenation of ideals. Indeed, all three thinkers agree with the advice of Plato: "My lad, you are young of years. The passing of time will cause you to change radically many of the ideas which you now hold dear, so please postpone your decisions in the most important matters . . ." (*The Collected Works of Plato*)

According to Fromm, one must abolish the harmful separation which exists between theoretical and practical knowledge. Such a separation leads to alienation in work and thought. In order to transform work and make it into a meaningful activity, founded on man's awareness and understanding of what he does, a basic change is needed in the current system of education, in the sense of combining theoretical instruction with practical experience from the very start.

These two areas of human activity should not be separated at any stage in the educational process. According to Fromm, no aspect of basic education can be efficient without the student gaining some familiarity with the basic technical processes of industry and production. If we adopt this idea of Fromm's to the needs of the post-industrialized society within which we live, it becomes clear that the student must be provided with the basic knowledge demanded of him in the areas of computer science, electronics, information and communication systems.

Fromm's estimate of the appropriate age for education coincides with the findings of developmental psychology, as it is defined by Piaget, who notes that the lifestyle of adolescents seems to be more intimately connected to interpersonal relations, and their deductive thought system is closer to a form of value measurement than to a theoretical system. Piaget refers to the decisive influence of systematic work and the confrontation with reality itself, which aids the development of abstract thinking.

At the same time, Fromm notes, society must provide possibilities for adult education to the same degree that it provides for the education of minors. Fromm views the role of adult education as the fostering of man's spiritual powers and the encouragement of his total development. The concept of adult education which Fromm describes fits modern reality, which is dynamic and rapidly changing, and in which the individual is expected to learn and change with the times, and as quickly as possible (See also Toffler, 1970).

In contrast with the psychoanalysts and behaviorists who see the organism as essentially reactive towards external events (behaviorism) and internal events (psychoanalysis), Fromm sees man's behavior as occurring purposefully and of his own initiative. Man determines his own fate and is capable of controlling his behavior and choosing his goals and the means for their fulfillment. Fromm opposes one-sided determinism, especially predictive determinism, and stresses the areas in which man is free and capable of self-determination.

Any form of education which is based on the love of life will lead to responsible behavior. The source of the word "responsibility" is the Latin word "responde," and according to Fromm, a human being who responds to what confronts him is a responsible person. In this theory of responsibility, Fromm follows in the footsteps of Buber, who lengthily discusses the concept of responsibility. Buber stresses that freedom is impossible without responsibility. Responsibility is the basic and directing force of freedom. There is an element of responsiveness in the concept of responsibility. Buber, who

sees life as a dialogue, claims that during our experiences we receive a calling. Usually we are deaf to this calling, yet if it somehow reaches us and we respond, there is hope for human liveliness (Buber, 1963; see also my book *The Educational Teachings of Martin Buber*, 1976).

Fromm attempts to clarify the connection between responsibility and freedom by noting that freedom entails responsibility, that responsibility entails the ability to respond, and that the capacity to respond entails vitality. In the concept of freedom and responsibility, Fromm sees one of the central roles of education: the awakening of personal responsibility in every man, and the development of the individual capacity to accept this responsibility—all in an atmosphere of freedom, which is a necessary precondition for the development of responsibility. This principle of personal responsibility obligates the teacher to respect the autonomy and self-determination of every student.

Positive freedom, according to Fromm is essentially the spontaneous activity of the whole well-coordinated personality (Fromm, 1941). Love is the crucial element in this spontaneity—love as a spontaneous affirmation of other human beings, as an alliance between men, based on the preservation of each one's individuality. Fromm stresses that love is born out of the need to overcome separation, and that it leads to unification without weakening individuality (Fromm, 1941).

Fromm sees freedom as a necessary precondition to the development of biophilic tendencies, yet he stresses that "freedom from . . ." is insufficient; we also have need of "freedom to . . ."—freedom to create and build, to wonder and dare, to investigate and discover. This freedom demands that the individual be active and responsible—neither slave nor well-oiled cog in the great machine (Fromm, 1964).

Fromm's educational theory is based on the love of life, self-actualization, creativity, and love. The inventor of "The Sane Society" dreams of humanizing the technotronic society, and presents us with the challenge of the revolution of hope.

CHAPTER 10

EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT AS REFLECTED IN JUDAISM

IN THE SPIRIT OF RADICAL HUMANISM

Erich Fromm was born in the year 1900 in Frankfurt am Main to an orthodox Jewish family. He was raised on the Bible. From a very early age he studied the Talmud under the tutelage of Rabbi Jacob Horowitz, a wise student of the scriptures; he later studied at Heidelberg with Zalman Ribikov, who had roots in the Hasidic tradition, and was a socialist and modern scholar, and with Nehemia Nobel, a mystic versed in the Jewish esoteric tradition as well as humanistic Western thought; back in Frankfurt he continued his studies with Ludwig Krauser, a traditional scholar. Up to the age of 26, Fromm lived a traditional Jewish life, was intimately connected to the rabbinical tradition of his family, and was very much influenced by the world of Jewish creation and thought. He was highly familiar with the world of Hasidism and was captivated by Hasidic history, perused books of the Cabbalah (the esoteric mystical Jewish creed), was much occupied with Jewish philosophy, studied Maimonides, adored the teachings of Spinoza, and was much influenced by Herman Cohen; he was, in short, steeped in the Bible, Talmud, Hasidism, and Jewish thought.

In his "intellectual autobiography" *Beyond the Chains of Illusion*, Fromm states that the bible touched his heart and influenced him more than anything else in his environment (Fromm, 1962). Indeed, not all books attracted him equally, and he expresses his aversion and anger for those passages in the Bible which depict the conquering of Israel, as well as his spiritual indifference to the story of Mordechai and Esther, and the minimal impression which the Song of Songs made on him. In contrast, the rebellion of Adam and Eve as they break God's command in the Garden of Eden, the strong negotiations of Abraham, who begs God to have mercy on the people of Sodom and Gammora, the story of the Israelite revolution, the exodus from Egypt, the war on Paganism, the chapters of prophecy, Jonah's mission to Nineveh, the prophesies of the apocalypse, and other parts of the bible all deeply impress him. Fromm writes that he was influenced more than anything else by the Prophets Isaiah, Amos and Hosea—not particularly by their warnings and tidings of doom, but rather from their promises of salvation when the nations shall no longer practice war, transforming their "swords into plowshares." This vision of world peace and harmony touched Fromm to the depths of his soul when he was 12 and 13 years of age. The immediate reason why Fromm was captivated by the idea of peace and universal harmony can be found in the circum-



stances in which he grew up: a Jewish boy in a Christian environment, forever exposed to various forms of antisemitism, but more importantly, constantly feeling alienation and tribalism from both sides. Fromm describes himself as feeling a great aversion to this tribalism (Fromm, 1962).

Fromm was strongly influenced by the Bible not only during his youth, but throughout his life. In his later writings, he uses many rich examples from the Bible, questions the Bible's actuality, and the discussion of the mission of modern man, living in a world of war, revolution, mechanization, nuclear threat, and armed with a pragmatistic materialistic philosophy which denies religious values.

Fromm sees the Bible as a many faceted book which was written and re-edited by many authors over a period of a thousand years, and which includes within it a major transformation from tribal authoritarianism to the radical idea of human liberty and fraternity. Fromm views the Bible as a revolutionary book, a book of the liberation of man from the ties of blood and earth, tribe and land, the enslavement of paganism, slavery, masters and rulers, kings and monarchs—a book which strives for the freedom of the individual, the nation and the whole of humanity. According to Fromm, in our age, we can understand the Bible more fully than in any other period of history, because these are days of revolution and struggle to be free from all those forms of subjugation which have been sanctified "in the name of God," as "the laws of society" or "the ordinances of state."

Fromm is not a religious man; he does not see the Bible as God's word, yet at the same time, he does see in it an expression of many norms and principles whose validity has been proven over thousands of years. According to him, the Bible is the book which brought human vision which is still valid and waiting to be actualized. The Bible was not written by any one man, nor dictated by God, but rather is a brilliant expression of people who have struggled over many generations for life and liberty (Fromm, 1966).

Having read many of the works which deal with Bible studies, and perused many hermeneutics, both Jewish (worthy of note are Fromm's many references to Rashi, Abraham ibn Ezra, the Rashban, Nachmanides, Maimonides, Ovedia ben Jacob, Sporno and others) and non-Jewish, Fromm is well-versed in the various sources and versions, which though they occasionally contradict each other and present very different viewpoints, have nevertheless been compiled through editing in the Bible. Yet at the same time, Fromm feels that the editing work of those authors which determined the final selection of what would become the Holy Scriptures, is in itself a unifying work of creation, which succeeded in reflecting a developmental process, the contradictions of which were aspects of the whole.

In his theoretical and hermeneutical approach (and in many instances, his sermonizing approach). Fromm views the Bible as a book, which, despite the fact that it has been collected and edited by various sources, has become one volume—not only through the work of the editors, but by virtue of the fact that it has been read and understood, and has continued to exert its influence for the last 2000 years, as a single volume.

In dealing with the Bible, and in his many readings of the book, which occasionally take on a sermonizing character, as well as in the Talmud, the Hasidism, and in later

Jewish theory and literature. Fromm points out a consistently developing model of thought, despite his awareness of scriptures which contradict this model, and of expressions which raise opposing ideas. He strives to prove that humanistic radical thinking is characteristic of all developmental stages of the Jewish tradition, while the pattern of nationalistic conservatism is a relatively invariable vestige of ancient times which remained unaffected by the Jewish thought which has contributed so much to the universal values of man (Fromm, 1966).

Using the concept of radical humanism, Fromm emphasizes a philosophy which stresses the unity of the human race, the capacity of man to develop his powers and achieve internal harmony, and the establishment of a peace-seeking world. This philosophy sees man's goal as his full independence, and is opposed to the use of force, constantly striving for the true and full exposition of reality, through the dissipation of illusions and lies.

Analyzing Jewish history, Fromm notes that what was a tragedy for the Jews—the loss of their land and nation—was a great boon from the humanistic point of view: by the very virtue of their suffering and degradation they were able to develop and preserve a tradition of humanism (Fromm, 1966).

In the spirit of radical humanism, Fromm elaborates upon many incidents from the Bible, issues from the Talmud, and from later Jewish literature. His explanations are not made for their own sake, but for the purpose of illuminating his sociological thought, psychological conception, and educational theory. Most of the major concepts of his educational theory find rich illustration in examples from Jewish sources, wherein his approach molds the sources to fit his point of view, and tailors them to his basic beliefs in psychology, education, and philosophy—and hence he occasionally becomes carried away to the point of sermonizing, which removes the Bible passages from their context and gives them new contextual meaning, which, though sometimes artificially created from a philosophical point of view, are always beautiful and poignant.

RELIGIOUS HUMANISM

Fromm views the concept of God as a poetic expression of the greatest value of humanism. He defines his personal beliefs as "atheistic mysticism" (Fromm, 1966). The questions which occupy him are: To what aspect of human reality does the concept of God relate? Is there an equality of identity between Abraham's God and the God of Moses, Isaiah, Maimonides, and Spinoza? If no such identity can be found, is it nonetheless possible that there was a common experiential basis for their concepts of God? Fromm is aware that the concept of God in the Bible has a life and development of its own, according to the development of people over the course of approximately 1200 years. He believes that there is indeed a common experiential denominator which is connected to the concept of God, but that there has been a constant change in the nature of this experience, and therefore in the meaning of the word and concept at the same time. He stresses that the Gods of Abraham and Isaiah have a common basis, yet are at the same time as different from one another as are a chief of a tribe of nomads, uneducated and primitive, and a universalistic philosopher who lived 1000 years later in

one of the centers of international culture—differences which developed in the course of history, and which became so great that they surpassed the elements of commonality (Fromm, 1966).

Fromm views the biblical prohibition against making any statue or illustration representing God as preventing the actualization of His form. He contends that the purpose of this prohibition is to stress the idea that God is a symbol for all that is in man, and a symbol of all that is lacking in man—a symbol of a spiritual reality which we might strive to actualize within us, which we will never be able to describe or define. According to Fromm, God is comparable to a horizon which limits the distance of our vision. In the eyes of the naive observer, the horizon appears as something real which can be reached, yet he who tries to reach the horizon can be compared to a man who tries to grasp a mirage or an illusion. We move, and the horizon moves with us; if we climb even the lowest hill, the horizon will widen before us, yet it will remain what it was: a limit. It will never be anything tangible which can be grasped physically (Fromm, 1950).

In the first developmental stage God was conceived of as an absolute monarch, the tyrant of a patriarchal tribe, who created the world and man, and who possesses the power to destroy them at will. Even at this stage, however, the idea arises that man is a potential competitor with God. Man could have been as God if he had only eaten from the Tree of Knowledge and the Tree of Life. The Tree of Knowledge could have provided man with Godly wisdom, and the Tree of Life could have provided him with immortality. The cunning snake tells Eve: "Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day you eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil" (Genesis, 3, 4–5).

And indeed, from eating from the Tree of Knowledge, Adam and Eve made the first step which imperiled the superior position of God. God confirms this danger by saying: "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever" (Genesis, 3, 22).

God therefore exiles them from Paradise, punishes them by establishing an enmity between man and nature, between man and the earth and all that is living, and between man and woman, yet does not condemn them to death. They can never return to the Garden of Eden, and the angel with the flaming sword guards the way to the tree of life.

Fromm feels that man is conspicuous in the story, as a challenger of God's supreme dominion. The first human act is one of rebellion. God punishes and exiles them because he must preserve his superiority. Man is forced to submit to God's superior power, but does not express sorrow or regret. Once exiled from the Garden of Eden, he commences to live an independent life. According to Fromm, the first act of rebellion is also the beginning of human history, because it is the beginning of human freedom (Fromm, 1966).

This concept of man's sanctity is a key idea in Fromm's thinking, and hence his great stress that man, by his very existence is rebelling, and that he carries within him a potential godly sanctity. Fromm attempts to prove that the more man develops, the more he frees himself from God's superiority, and the more capable he becomes of being god-like. Moreover, every further development in the concept of God diminishes

his perceived role as "owner" of man. It is because of this that Fromm stresses that the act of eating from the Tree of Knowledge was not a sin—quite to the contrary, later religious developments made the knowledge of good and evil the most important qualities which man should strive for. Man's similarity to God—his knowledge of good and evil—is what provides him with a measure of independence and perfection, and represents one of the basic elements in the humanistic saga which Fromm weaves. It is this capacity of man which endows humanism with an aspect of sanctity, and which gives legitimacy to humanistic education, which places man as its focus.

Fromm finds a crucial turning-point in the relationship between man and God in the story of the flood. God sees that: "the wickedness of man was great in the earth . . . and it repented the Lord that he had made man on earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them" (Genesis, 6, 5–7).

The decision to destroy not only man, but all that lives and grows, proves that the main point here is not any balanced judgement against a specific evil, but rather the wrath of God, who, in his domination, decrees the destruction of everything except Noah and his family and representatives of each type of animal. The principle change occurs after the flood, when the relationship between God and man undergoes a radical transformation. A covenant is made between man and God, wherein God promises that: "neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth" (Genesis 9, 11), and man promises not to murder: ". . . at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man." (Genesis 9, 5)

God is no longer the tyrant who can do as he will, but is now subject to a law which obligates both man and God together. God is now tied to the principle which he cannot abrogate, the principle of life's sanctity. Fromm stresses that the idea of the Covenant establishes the first crucial step in the development of the Jewish religion, a step which paves the way towards the development of the concept of man's total freedom, including his freedom from God (Fromm, 1966). Fromm aptly portrays the situation when he points out the change in God's position as an absolute ruler to a constitutional one, who subject to the same degree as man to the dictates of that constitution. Yet, from this point, to the concept of freedom from God, a concept which detaches the Jewish faith from its roots, there is a great mental distance which Fromm bridges by his fantasies.

Simultaneously, a far-reaching humanistic advance is revealed in this covenant, in which God loses his arbitrary freedom, and man gains a liberty which enables him to challenge God in the name of the very principles which are stipulated in the covenant. It is especially interesting to note Fromm's remark that the first covenant was between God and the human race, not between God and the Israelites. The history of the Jewish people is conceived of as only part of the history of humanity; the principle of respect for life antecedes any special promise to a particular nation or tribe (Fromm, 1966). It is only after the first covenant between God and humanity, that the second covenant is made between God and the Israelites.

Fromm continues with his commentary by stressing that the most dramatic evidence of the radical results of the covenant between God and man is seen in the argument

between Abraham and God, when God wanted to destroy Sodom and Gamorrah. Abraham criticizes God for violating one of his own principles: "That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked: and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from thee: Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" (Genesis 18, 25)

Fromm notes that Abraham's demand introduces a new element into the late Biblical and Jewish tradition. No longer is man a slave, particularly because God is now subject to norms of justice and love. Man can claim from God, in the same way that God can demand from man, because both of them are subject to norms and principles. Adam and Eve also contradicted God by their disobedience, yet they had to submit to His will. Abraham contradicts God—not by disobedience, but by the accusation of the violation of His own promises and principles. Abraham is not the rebellious Prometheus, but a free man who demands by right, and God has no right to refuse him (Fromm, 1966).

The difference between the tale of Adam and Eve's disobedience and Abraham's discussion with God is essential. In the first instance, man was forbidden to know good and evil, and his position in relation to God was one of either submission or disobedience, while in the latter case man utilized his knowledge of good and evil to criticize God in the name of justice, and God is obliged to submit. The ability to argue with God, criticize Him in the name of justice, hold him to the letter of the law (as Rabbi Levi Yitzhak of Berdichev did in later generations), all establish man's position and give an essential basis of values for humanistic education, which is the way to man's liberation and the discovery of his human qualities, as one who has been formed in the image of God, yet forged himself a position of liberty and independence, even from his Creator.

Fromm sees the third stage in the development of the concept of godhood in God's revelation to Moses. At this stage, the new phenomenon of differentiating between God and pagan idols, whose essence is in the idea of a god without name, becomes particularly significant. Moses, who is sent to speak with the people of Israel and deliver them from slavery to liberty, knows the spirit of enslavement and paganism with which his people are imbued. He says: "Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?" (Exodus 3, 13) Moses asks God for a name, because a name is something that can be grasped, that can be worshipped and idolized. According to Fromm, the very essence of a pagan god is his name. A nameless god cannot be accepted by the mob of pagan Israelites, because a pagan god without a name is an inherent contradiction (Fromm, 1966). God accedes to Moses by giving himself a name, and saying: "I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you" (Exodus 3, 14). This name, in Fromm's view, is highly ironical. It does not express anything definite that could be considered the name of anything tangible, but rather expresses the process of existence. In the words, "I am that I am," God is saying that His name is a being without name.

Fromm devotes much in his work to the viewpoint of Moses Maimonides concerning God's various names. In his theology, Fromm sees the most progressive and radical formulation of the development which had taken place in the concept of God, begin-

ning from the role of leader of a tribe, to the nameless and shapeless God. Although Maimonides was not the first to propose such conceptions of God's names, and was preceded by Rabbi Bahai, his thought on this matter is the most sophisticated, detailed, and consistent of all that has been written on this area of Jewish philosophy. Maimonides emphasizes that no positive descriptions should be made of God, since every new name adds something to the description of a specific object, and one should not attribute names which are essentially material to God—for in order to name we must draw on our human experience, and there is no similarity whatsoever between creator and created. Hence, all assignation of positive names to the essence of God—such as: entity, life, force, unity, will, etc.—is a direct act of disrespectfulness towards God himself, the introduction of the concept of multiplicity to the essential oneness of God, and the destructive creation of a godly material entity. Maimonides, however, allows, as does Rabbi Bahai, the use of adjectives to describe God, and goes out of his way to prove that this description does not constitute multiplicity nor harm the unity of God. He permits negative description of God, and states, "And it will become clear to you that all that you learn from the example of negating one aspect of Him, will help you to become more perfect, and all that you attribute to him which is positive, will be an illusion, and you shall lose the knowledge of his verity" (*Guide for the Perplexed*, The Teachings of Maimonides, part one, chapter 59).

Adjectives describe actions which arouse in us associations with certain qualities; they do not directly refer to the essence of God, but only to the continuously changing and fluid manifestation of that essence, which does not stem from any particular quality or impression. Negative descriptions, in contrast to adjectives, refer directly to the essence of God. They tell us nothing of what is to be found in God; they describe, rather what is not to be found in God, and thus negate the opposite. According to Maimonides, negative description is the most apt description of God, avoiding all hints of ambiguity and profanity of his image, while positive description is unacceptable, since it does not fully portray God's essence.

Fromm deals with the problem of reconciling the contradiction between Maimonides' thought and the fact that the Bible refers to God with positive descriptive terms, by referring to Maimonides' response that the Bible had spoken "with human tongue." This rule of Maimonides is evident in his discussion of sacrifices, prayers, etc. He stresses that God permitted man to persevere in some of the accepted pagan ways, i.e., God's creed adjusted itself to the living habits of the nation which was to be the receiver and messenger of the Bible. Maimonides clarifies that it is not in man's nature to suddenly revert from one extreme to another, and that he cannot free himself all at once from the habits in which he has been trained, and to which he has been used all of his life—thus the Bible could not, in one fell swoop, cancel the worship by sacrifice, which was accepted in that period as the central basis for man's relationship with God. Hence Maimonides' emphasis that God did not command man "to relinquish all those kinds of worship, in the knowledge that man would have not accepted such a commandment, as it is his nature that he always tends towards what he is accustomed to; it would have been similar to a situation in which a prophet would appear in our time and call for God's worship saying: God commanded you not to pray to him, not to fast, and not to ask his help in times of trouble, but to let your worship be pure thought without action. It is because of this factor that God left all those forms of worship intact, but

transferred them from their manifestation in the creation of objects and imaginary concepts which lack in any genuine truth, to the service of His hallowed name, and commanded us to perform these same acts in His name" (*Guide for the Perplexed*, part three, chapter 32). From these words, it seems that sacrifices, fasting, and the like, are no more than God's concessions to human nature, conforming to what we are used to. As to sacrifices, Maimonides also refers to the writings of the prophets, which reflects an attitude of reluctance to relinquish the multiplicity of worship through sacrifice, which is unnecessary in God's eyes. The development from Moses' God without name, to Maimonides' God without descriptions of essence, provides a dimension of liberalism of man's attitude towards God. Maimonides does not deal with theological speculations on the nature of God, but rather in God's actions—actions which reflect reward and punishment, love, pity, and judgement. If the theological aspect of the discussion of God and his nature or essence, is an alienating, distancing dimension, the aspect of God's actions is nearer and more open to the human experience, and hence might also serve as the focus of educational experience.

Fromm discusses extensively the war on paganism. According to him, we must first discover what God lacks, in order to understand the essence of a pagan god. Since God is the highest of values, he cannot be a man, a state, an institution, nature, a force, a possession, sexual powers or forces, or anything artificial and man-made. The pagan god, on the other hand, represents the object of man's central passion: the desire to return to Mother Earth, the desire for possession, power, fame, and the like. The history of humanity to this day is mainly comprised of the history of paganism, commencing from the primitive pagan gods of clay and wood, up to the modern pagan gods of state, leader, production, and consumption, which are sanctified through blessings as an adored pagan god (Fromm, 1966).

Fromm stresses that the core of paganism is not the worship of any particular idol, but rather a certain human situation. This situation can be described as the deification or certain objects and aspects of the world, and man's addiction to them. It is not only statuettes of wood and stone which are idols, but also leaders, the state, force, and political groups who can serve this function. Man transfers his desires and attributes to the pagan gods. The more helpless man is, the bigger and stronger the pagan god. Fromm clarifies, referring to Proverbs of the prophets and the book of Psalms, that a pagan god is not alive, while the Judeo-Christian god is a living one. In the words of the prophet Jeremiah, "But the LORD is the true God, he is the living God . . ." (Jeremiah 10, 10) Or, in the word of the Book of Psalms, "My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God" (Psalms 42, 2). According to Fromm, the man who strives to emulate God is part of an eternal cycle, in which one is and will always be seeking to come nearer to God; the man who accepts the authority of a pagan god is part of a closed system, and treats himself as an object. The pagan god is lifeless; God is alive. Ultimately, the contrast between paganism and monotheism is the contrast between love of death and love of life (Fromm, 1966).

This conception of Fromm's leads us to the core of his psychological, social, and educational thinking—to the struggle between the opposing tendencies of biophilia and necrophilia. Fromm's biophilic man represents an open system which is drawn to the process of life and growth in all areas. The biophilic sense of good entails respect for life, a proximity to God which is based on liberty rather than enslavement, along with

the growth and development of dialogue, rather than surrender, submission, and enslavement. Hence, joy is the measure of good, and sadness is sin. It is because of this that the Bible contends, from the point of view of biophilic ethics, that the Israelites' main sin was: "Because thou servedst not the LORD thy God with joyfulness, and with gladness of heart, for the abundance of all things . . ." (Deuteronomy 28, 47)

Necrophilic man, in contrast, is considered part of a closed system, transforming himself into a mere object, submitting to a lifeless god, enslaving life; he is given to the cult of objects, and through that cult, himself becomes an object, loses his liberty and independence; instead of living a life of progression, his attitude is regressive. The regressive solution which necrophilic man seeks ties him to dehumanization, causes him to harm his very essence as a free being.

In order to establish and develop free humanistic education, we must recognize that if the pagan god is an alienated manifestation of man's powers, and that to establish contact with these powers necessitates an attachment of enslavement to a pagan god, then paganism cannot exist simultaneously with freedom and independence. Fromm notes that, along with the development of the concept of God, in the later tradition, fear and submission before God diminishes. Man becomes a partner—almost an equal one—with God. God, of course, remains the lawmaker, the benefactor, and the grantor of punishment. Yet, crime and punishment are no longer arbitrary matters. They are direct products of man's obedience or disobedience to the laws of ethics. Paganism demands, by its very nature, the enslavement of man, while monotheism demands independence (Fromm, 1966).

Fromm realizes that any enslavement, even for what seems positive, might become paganism. It is because of this that concern was expressed in the later eras of Judaism, that the religious commandments themselves might become paganistic. Fromm refers to the words of one of the greatest hasidic thinkers, the Rabbi of Kutzk. He said that the prohibition against the making of an image includes also the prohibition against transforming the commandments into idols. We must never allow ourselves to think that the most important thing is the external form of the commandment itself, and that the inner intention is superfluous. The opposite is true.

As a radical humanist, Fromm stresses the avoidance of paganism and warfare, in all of their manifestations. In our day, the idols are leaders, institutions, states, nations, the goals of productivity, law and order, and the like. What we today term alienation is what the Bible called paganism. Fromm notes that, despite all that separates believers and non-believers, they have one common denominator if they are true to themselves, their common war on paganism, the deep conviction that no object or institution should be allowed to replace God, or, in non-religious terms, to fill the place which is reserved for "emptiness" (Fromm, 1968). Fromm elsewhere vehemently maintains that only to the extent that we are interested in the essence rather than the external shell, the experience rather than the word, the man rather than the church, can we unite in a firm negation of paganism, and perhaps find in this negation more common faith than all the positive declarations about God, and needless to say, a greater degree of humility and fraternity (Fromm, 1950).

Of special interest in Fromm's analysis of the concept of the sons of Noah, in which he sees one of the most important developments of post-biblical Jewish tradition. In the Talmud, it has been said: "Our rabbis have said: The sons of Noah have been guided

with seven commandments—the blessing and cursing of God, pagan worshipping, incest, bloodshed, and tearing a limb from an animal” (Sanhedrien, page 56, col. 1). According to this text, Noah’s generation was already united by common norms of ethical behavior. Four of the commandments relate to matters concerning man and his fellow men, one relates to the prohibition against eating meat from a live animal; only two commandments have religious content: the prohibition against cursing God and the prohibition against paganism. There is no commandment to worship God. The conclusion which Fromm reaches, on the basis of the story of the sons of Noah, is that the human race might obtain salvation, if only it would fulfill the humanistic commandments, not curse God, and not be enslaved by pagan gods. It is not even necessary to cooperatively worship God.

This analysis allows humanistic education to surpass the narrow national and religious limits, to accept a universal conception of man, to emphasize the unifying humanistic values, and to avoid the religious rituals which separate men. Fromm saw, in the religious partitioning which separates humans, one of the obstacles in the way of free man. He strived to destroy these partitions, discover that which is common to all men, which unifies all men, and liberates them from the paganism which is inherent in religious or national enslavement. In the commandments of the sons of Noah, Fromm saw the tidings of the desired human encounter.

AUTONOMIC MAN

In his own analytic, sermonizing fashion, Fromm quotes Proverbs from the Pentateuch and the Prophets which speak of the idea of man’s sanctity and affinity to God. The concept of man’s proximity to God can be seen in the verse: “And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy: for I the LORD your God am Holy” (Leviticus 19, 1–2). Fromm comments on this verse, that if the concept of holiness expresses God’s essential quality which differentiates him from man, and if it is this trait of God which made him, during the primitive stages of religion, into an inapproachable taboo, it is no less than a quantum leap to the concept that man too can be holy. Man might approach godliness by acquiring traits which characterize God’s actions. In the words of the Book of Micah: “He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God” (Micah, 6, 8). By adopting for himself the godly ways of justice and mercy, man is no longer beneath God, but rather walks with God.

Imitating God by following his ways entails becoming like him. According to Fromm, theology is transformed when one studies the Pentateuch; speculative thought about God is transformed by the existence of the Pentateuch, and hence it is easy to understand why study of the Bible and the Talmud became one of the most important Jewish religious responsibilities.

It should be noted that Fromm relegates an important place in his educational theory for the study of humanity’s humanistic sources, with the Bible and the Jewish philosophical and literary writings occupying a place of only minor importance, not only as an encounter with the most intensive revelations of human essence in its formation

through an affinity to God, but also as a practical theory, a way of life to be followed not according to the word of its commandments, but according to its humanistic spirit.

Fromm sees the essence of human development in man’s transcendence of the enslaving ties of blood and earth, and achieving independence and freedom. According to the Old Testament and later Jewish sources, freedom and independence are the goals of human development, and the purpose of human action is the never-ending process of self-liberation from the shackles which tie man to his past, to nature, to his paternal home, to idols.

After eating from the tree of knowledge, Adam and Eve’s eyes are opened, and following this revelation, the original harmony with nature is shattered, and man begins a process of individuation, while severing his ties with nature. The expulsion from paradise is the birth of the individual, his emergence from the protective, nurturing womb which supplied all of his needs. Yet even without this symbolic dimension, the Old Testament straightforwardly and clearly declares the necessity of severing the ties with the parents: “Therefore shall man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh” (Genesis 2, 24). The love between man and woman is only possible after the severance of incestual ties, after man’s coming into his own independence, wherein his love for his partner is no longer symbolic, frightened, and subjugated.

Fromm follows the process of liberation from incestual ties, which is to be found in the beginning of the national history of the Israelites. A striking example of this process is found by Fromm in God’s call to Abraham to leave his father’s home and go to an unknown land. After leaving for the new country, and settling himself in it, a new dimension is added to the liberation from the ties of blood and earth—the liberation from the shackles of society, which make man a slave, dependent on his master. In order to illustrate this separation, Fromm refers to the story of the exodus from Egypt.

Fromm, who views freedom as a necessary and essential precondition for man’s total actualization, clarifies that man’s emergence from nature (his act of disobedience in the Garden of Eden) is a lengthy process. Man remains very much connected to the world from which he has emerged. He remains a part of nature—the land on which he lives, the sun, the moon and stars, trees, animals, and his kindred. Man remains a part of nature. According to Fromm, these ties inhibit his full human development, halt the development of his mind and critical faculties, allow him to know himself and his fellow man only through participation in a sect, an ethnic group, or a religious public, rather than as an autonomic man. Thus man’s development as a free individual, who acts and creates from within himself, is stifled. The primordial ties also have another side to them: the security to be found in belonging and the feeling of rootedness in a structure which assures man of a place.

Fromm clarifies that every step in the direction of man’s individuation threatens people with a new insecurity. Yet, Paradise cannot be returned to. According to Fromm, there is only one possible creative solution to the individual’s attitude towards the world: active cooperation with all people, along with spontaneous activity—love and work which unify man with the world not through primordial ties, but as an independent and free individual (Fromm, 1941). At the same time, there is danger in times when economic, social, and political conditions do not permit such individuation, and there is an increase of insecurity. Freedom seems threatening; loneliness intimidates



and arouses a yearning for flight from freedom. This yearning finds expression in the escape to new forms of enslavement, submissiveness, or other forms of symbiotic relationships between man and world, which create a framework of certainty and belonging, even if they deny the individual his liberty.

Fromm examines the attitude of the Jewish tradition to man's role in the ever-increasing liberation from primal ties, which is expressed in some of the major religious customs and symbols: Passover, Succoth (the feast of Tabernacles) and the Sabbath. Passover is the feast of liberation, the emergence from slavery to freedom, and, in the words of the Haggadah, "Each man must see himself as if he himself had emerged from Egypt." The matzoh is the symbol of nomadism, bread which was hastily baked before the dough could be leavened. The succah is a "temporary residence." By inhabiting a succah, the Jew once again becomes a nomad, free of his earthly ties. The Sabbath is the peak of self-actualization. On this day, man is free from all enslaving ties. On the Sabbath he occupies himself with being *per se*, giving expression to his lively capabilities. The Sabbath is a day of happiness, because on this day man is himself to the fullest. For this reason, the Talmud refers to the Sabbath as the day which heralds the coming of the Messiah, and terms the days of the Messiah as the "Eternal Sabbath."

It is impossible to deal with man's freedom as it is reflected in the Jewish tradition, without giving some consideration to man's duty to obey, wherein disobedience is severely punished. Fromm is aware of this, and settles the apparent (or perhaps real) contradiction between liberty and obedience, by discerning between obedience and instinctual fixation. Obedience, according to Fromm, is the conscious acceptance of authority, whereas fixation is a binding tie to another. Instinctual fixation exists towards the mother, blood, tribe and Earth (See, at length, Fromm, 1964, chap. 5.). Instinctual fixation is, by its very nature, enslavement to the past, an obstacle in the way of full development. According to Fromm, obedience and fixation are not only dissimilar, but opposites; obedience to rational authority is a way to help the archaic pre-individual forces break instinctual fixation. Moreover, obedience to God entails the negation of enslavement to fellow man (Fromm, 1966).

This issue of freedom from slavery has a central role in Fromm's humanistic educational thinking. The concept of freedom is not contradictory to obedience to rational authority. The rationality or irrationality of the authority is the starting-point for the evaluation of obedience. Freedom is not anarchic—quite to the contrary, it can lead to a willing acceptance, out of freedom of choice, to obey the rational authority. Freedom is essentially the freedom to choose. The determinists claim that we are not free because the life of man, like all other things in nature, is predetermined. Those who oppose determinism, however, Fromm included, claim exactly the opposite. First of all, one can make the religious assumption that God gave man the freedom to choose between good and evil, and that therefore man is free. Secondly is the assumption that man is free, otherwise could not be held responsible for his actions. Thirdly—man subjectively experiences his freedom, and the awareness of freedom is proof of its existence (See at length, Fromm, 1964, chap. 6.). It follows from all this that humanistic education is not education for irresponsibility, but rather, education which strives to develop freedom of choice, autonomy, the recognition of rational authority, and obedience to it as a conscious act of choice.

Fromm notes that the principle that no man should be a slave to his fellow man, has been clearly stated in the Talmud by Rav: "A worker can change his mind even in the middle of the day." Rabba explains Rav's words by drawing a parallel to the words: "For the sons of Israel are my slaves, and not the slaves of slaves" (Bava Kama 116, col. 2). The right of the slave to strike is established here on the general principle of human freedom, which is conceived as a direct result of man's obedience to God alone, and not to other men. The idea of obedience to God was the basis of man's freedom from man in the Jewish tradition. Fromm stresses that godly authority is the guarantee of independence from human authority (Fromm, 1966).

Fromm goes farther, by raising the question of man's freedom from God. Although such questions are of course not traditionally found in Jewish ethics, Fromm finds certain statements in the Talmud and later Jewish literature, which indicate a tendency to maximize man's autonomy—albeit not to the point of complete freedom from godly authority, but at least to the degree that man is permitted to argue with God on equal terms. Fromm points to an illustrative example from the Talmud, which emphasizes the humanitarian, rather than the authoritarian and enslaving, aspect of Judaism. A number of sages argued with Rabbi Eliezer over the rules concerning purification: "On that day did Rabbi Eliezer provide all the answers in the world, and they did not accept any one of them. He told them: If what I say is true—this carob tree will prove it! The carob tree was immediately uprooted from the ground and thrown a hundred yards, and some claim it was four hundred yards. Yet the sages told him: This carob tree is not evidence. And he replied: If what I say is true—the water will prove it! The water immediately receded. They told him: The level of the water cannot serve as evidence. So he repeated to them: If what I say is true—the walls of this synagogue will prove it! The synagogue's walls immediately began to fall. Rabbi Joshua chided them and told them: If sages argue with each other so much about the truth, who are you to argue thus? Yet they did succumb to Rabbi Joshua's honor, nor to Rabbi Eliezer's honor—but were still contending their point. So he repeated to them: If what I say is true—let the heavens prove it! Immediately a voice came from Heaven and said: What are you doing with Rabbi Eliezer, whose truth is obvious! Rabbi Joshua immediately stood up and cried: the heavens cannot supply proof. Why cannot the heavens supply proof? Rabbi Jeremiah answered: Since the Pentateuch has already been given from Mount Sinai, we no longer pay attention to any voices from Heaven. Since You have already written, God, in the Pentateuch which You gave us from Mount Sinai, that we should accept the voice of the majority. Rabbi Natan met the Prophet Elijah and asked him: What did God do at that moment? He smiled, Elijah told him. He said: You have won my sons, You have won" (Bava Matzia, 59, col.2).

This story is the paradigm of a perfect educational story. It stresses the independence of man's thought, which even a voice from the heavens cannot sway. God smiles; he is happy of the autonomy which man has achieved, his liberation from fear and authority, his masterhood of himself, and his capacity and determination to make his own decisions according to logical and democratic procedures. We have before us an example of an independent, responsible, determined, and involved theoretical discussion, in which each of the sages proudly defends his own opinion. There is no fear of man evident here, not before the honor of Rabbi Joshua, nor the honor of Rabbi Eliezer—both of them very prominent religious leaders. There is no flexibility of opinion before author-

ity, there is no submission, even to a voice from the heavens, but rather a spiritual independence, and a consistent democratic stance of "the voice of the majority." God is glad of man's maturity as it is revealed in his autonomy, and enjoys saying, "You have won my sons."

Hasidic literature is full of arguments with God, stories in which God is reproved. Martin Buber tells of a story of Rabbi Yitzhak Levi from Berdichev, who once, in the middle of his prayers, turned to God and said: "God of heavens, You must forgive Israel's sins. If You do so, fine and well, but if not, then I testify in the ears of the world, that the phylacteries which you place on your head are flawed. For it is written in Your phylacteres: Where is there one nation in the world which is like the nation of Israel?! But if You will not forgive Israel's sins, then Israel is no longer the only one in Your favor, and if this is the case, then what is written in Your phylacteres is untrue and so they are unfit for use!" (Martin Buber, *Hidden Light*, Jerusalem & Tel Aviv, Shoken, 1977, p. 210).

Fromm refers to the story of "the grandfather from Shpoli" who brought God to a trial before ten Rabbis who gathered in his home at a time of severe famine in Ukraine. The grandfather tells the Rabbis: "I have grievances to settle with God. The Holy Torah commands a man who has purchased a Hebrew slave for a time, to feed him and his household. And You, God of Heaven, who bought us as slaves in Egypt, as it has been written: For the sons of Israel are my slaves, mine . . . I call on you, therefore, Lord, to obey the Torah, and feed Your slaves and their families." The ten rabbis who witnessed the trial judged in favor of the grandfather! Within a few days a huge shipment of grain arrived from Siberia, and the poor were saved (Fromm, 1966).

These stories and others illustrate the idea that God must keep His promise in the same way that man must keep his. If God does not put an end to human suffering, man is allowed to blame Him, and even to "force" Him to fulfill His obligations.

The individual's autonomy, the preservation of his uniqueness, the respect for his liberty, the recognition of his differences, the attempt to provide for his unique needs, the acceptance of his independent position, and the attitude towards him as a free man, all find expression in the Jewish literary tradition. It was written in the Book of Proverbs: "Educate a child according to his own way, and when he is old, he will not depart from it" (Proverbs 22, 6). There is no singular method of education, no standardized treatment of an individual, and every student has his own particular method which is suited to him. In order to educate and instruct him, one must better his nature, character, capabilities, tendencies, and needs—and it is according to this conception that we must approach him.

This idea of the manifold ways of education, is well expressed by Maimonides, in the opening pages of his treatise on pagan worship. He describes Abraham's attempt to save those people who have begun to worship foreign gods, and convince them to desert paganism and return to the faith in the God of Israel. These are the words of Maimonides: "And he stood up and cried in a great voice to the whole world, to notify them that there is but one God for all of the world—and that he is the only one worth worshipping. And he went and called to gather the people, from city to city and state to state, until he arrived in the land of Canaan, and he was calling all the time . . . And since the people gathered about him and asked about his words, he instructed them all, according to the time at his disposal, until he returned them to the knowledge of

truth—until he had gathered about him thousands and tens of thousands . . ." (Maimonides, *The Book of Science*, Thesis on Pagan Worship, chapter 8, C)

We have here an engrossing example of individualistic education, almost pedocentric, in which every individual is central to his own education. The approach to each student is different. The instruction is not a sermon, but rather based on the interests which have been aroused, on the questions which have been posed; the explanations are not general, but take into consideration the nature and understanding of every individual, and his capacity to comprehend. Such a form of education is only possible if man is truly considered as unique in value, if there is respect for his life, a regard for him as a free individual, as the possessor of an autonomous position, and as an active participant and decision-maker in the process of his self-actualization.

Rabbi Kuk stresses that the worship of God is also characterized by the uniqueness of every man's approach—and here too we find appreciation of the free and whole man in all of his rich inner complexity. According to Rabbi Kuk: "Every man must know that he is called to worship according to a special mode of feeling and recognition unique to him, according to the roots of his soul, and that in this world, which includes multiple worlds, he will find his life's treasure. He must not be confused by the concepts which come to him from alien worlds, which he does not grasp properly, and which he is not able to assimilate well into his own sphere of life. These worlds will find their redemption in his absence, with those who can build and perfect them, but he himself must concentrate his life on his own world, his inner worlds, which, for him, are full of everything, and envelop everything" (Rabbi Kuk, *Lights of Sanctity*, part 2, p. 221).

Cabbalistic literature also stresses the importance of the individual, to the point of saying that a personal Torah has been given to each individual according to his powers and the roots of his soul. Rabbi Chaim Vital writes: "Know that the sum of all souls is six hundred thousand . . . And the Torah is the root of the soul of Israel, since these souls have been formed and rooted in it, and it is therefore that the Torah has six hundred thousand explanations . . . And in the future every single one of the people of Israel will know the whole of the Torah according to that explanation which is attuned to the roots of his soul, which have been born and formed of this explanation" (Rabbi Chaim Vital, *Gates to Sanctity*, Gate 8: The Gate of Reincarnation).

These writings, and many others, are of utmost importance in connection to the humanistic education which Fromm outlines. They illustrate the humanization and individuation of educational methods, the stressing of the direct affinity between the learning individual and the material being studied, the understanding that no man learns Torah in any way other than that which his heart desires. The acceptance of the student's needs, his placement in the center of concern, and the attribution of great importance to the active involvement of the student in the learning process stimulates his creative activation, his critical attitude towards the material, and his role as an active and creative partner in his affinity to the learned. "Rava said: A man shall always learn where his heart desires, since it is written: If his desires lie in God's Torah . . . Rava said: In the beginning, the Torah is called by God's name, and in the end it is called by his name, as it is written because he desires God's Torah, and in His Torah he will learn day and night . . ."

Another important question on the issue of humanistic education is that of national-



ism versus humanism and universalism. At first glance, we might think that the Bible and later Jewish tradition present a nationalistic approach, harshly differentiating between the Israelites and the rest of humanity, and naming the people of Israel as the chosen people, superior to all others. Yet this nationalistic stance, which indeed exists, is balanced by the opposing principle which is also present in the Bible and in later Jewish writings—the principle of universality.

Fromm discusses this subject at length, and notes that the idea of the unity of the whole of the human race is first expressed in the story of the creation of the world. One man and one woman were created as the ancestors of the whole of the human race. The second expression of the universality of the human race can be found in the covenant which God makes with Noah. This covenant was made before the covenant with Abraham, father of the Israelites. It is a covenant with the whole of humanity and the animal kingdom, which ensures that God will never again destroy life on Earth. The first challenge of God, in the demand that he not profane the principle of justice, is made by Abraham, on the behalf of the non-Israelite cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, and not for the Israelites. The Bible demands that the Israelite love the stranger—and even in relation to the Edomites, the traditional foes of Israel, it has been written: "You shall not despise the Edomite, for he is your brother." Universality reaches its peak in prophetic literature (Fromm, 1966).

The idea of the unity of the human race appears repeatedly in Talmudic literature, and perhaps its most wondrous expression can be found in the words of Rabbi Meyer, who said of Adam, that his body was created from the soil of the Earth, and that he therefore represents the whole of humanity. "Rabbi Meyer said: The first man's dust was gathered from all the world. Rabbi Oshaiah said: The first man's body came from Babylon, his head from the Land of Israel, and his limbs from all other countries." (Sanhedrene 38, 1–2)

The humanistic and universalistic tradition of the Bible and later Jewish literature, the concept of autonomic man and the sanctity of life, are an inexhaustible source for humanistic education, whose foundations are man's liberty and self-actualization, through personal choice, openness to tradition, and the capacity to make free, independent decisions.

MAN BY HIMSELF AND WITH OTHERS

Fromm notes that man, in all ages and cultures, has confronted one of the central questions of his existence—how to overcome his loneliness, how to become whole, how to reach beyond the bounds of his individual life and find unity. The experience of individuation arouses anxiety, because it entails separation, an incapacity to utilize human forces, an inability to actively grasp the world, and feelings of guilt and shame. Fromm illustrates this issue with the story of Adam and Eve's insight in Paradise, after they had eaten from "the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil." After they became human by freeing themselves from the primal harmony between their lives and nature, i.e., after they were born as humans, they recognized that they were naked and were filled with shame. In their original state, as part of nature enclosed in the womb of the Garden of Eden, they were both naked and unshamed. Fromm rejects the puritan

hermeneutics of the nineteenth century, which states that their shame resulted from the sight of their exposed genitals. According to Fromm, when we interpret the story in a Victorian spirit, we lose sight of its essence. After Adam and Eve recognized themselves and each other, they became conscious of their individuality and differences, and recognized that they were of different sexes. Yet, while recognizing their individuality, they remained strangers to one another, since they had not yet learned to love. (As is testified to by the fact that Adam protects himself and renounces Eve, instead of trying to protect her.) The recognition of human individuality, without the reunification of love, is the source of shame. It is simultaneously the source of feelings of guilt and anxiety. Once Adam and Eve stood before each other as separate human beings, egocentric and alone, unable to overcome their remoteness through love and unity, they felt a deep shame and growing anxiety filling them (Fromm, 1956).

The emergence from egocentricity and the lonely isolated world of the individual, to a state of unity with others and with the world, is one of the important implications of the biblical story, which, for the purpose of education, taking the individual as its point of departure, approaches the meeting of man and his world.

Fromm provides substantial psychoanalytical evidence that the commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself" is the most important commandment in the life of man, and that transgression of this commandment leads to misery and insanity. The inability to love—when we interpret the concept of love as the ability to evince interest, responsibility, respect, cooperation, understanding for others, and the desire for their development—is one of the characteristics of mental illness. According to Fromm, analytical therapy is essentially an attempt to help the patient to discover this capacity for love, or to help him to regain it if he has lost it (Fromm, 1950).

The commandment of "Love thy neighbor as thyself" raises a demand to overcome narcissism to a point at which the neighbor becomes more important than oneself. Yet, the Bible is not content with this, and widens the applicability of the necessity for love, to include even the foreigner, that is, those who are not part of the group to which the individual feels narcissistic ties—towards human beings in general. Here Fromm refers to the works of Herman Cohen, whose thought he respected, and from whom he had learned much, who notes that it is especially in the stranger that humanness is revealed. With the love of a stranger, narcissistic love is overcome, and replaced by the love of another individual in his uniqueness and otherness, and not because he is similar.

Jewish tradition views man as having been created in the image of God, stressing that Adam and Eve are the parents of the whole of the human race, and that all human beings have in common those essential properties which enable them to know and to love each other—to be human. Among the Jewish philosophers, Baruch Spinoza is prominent as the one who created a "model of human nature" which enabled the clarification and definition of this nature, and from which various laws of human behavior and reaction were deduced. Freud and Marx began from a similar assumption, that one can comprehend man's behavior because of the very fact that it is human behavior, a product of a race which can be defined by its psychic and mental character.

Since we are dealing with man and with his behavior, we cannot but note the distinction which Fromm makes between an authoritarian value system, in which a person in a position of authority determines what is good for man, and sets the laws and



standards of human behavior, and a humanistic value system, in which man himself is both the provider and obeyer of these laws and norms.

Baruch Spinoza, on whose thought Fromm bases a substantial amount of his ethical thinking, completely rejects authoritarian ethics. According to Spinoza, man is his own person, and not a device for the use of any authority. According to him, one can only determine values from a position of affinity to the real interests of man, which are liberty and the creative use of his capabilities. Spinoza maintains that all is positive which brings us nearer to the model of human nature which we have determined, whereas evil is in all that inhibits us from following that model. Hence, goodness is represented in the actualization of nature. Reason shows man how that he must behave in order to "be himself," and thus teaches him the positive. The way in which man can perfect his virtue, according to Spinoza, is through active utilization of his forces. This leads to creative activity, which is the source of power, liberty, and happiness. Creativity, however, is impossible without liberty, without a sense of liberation from all superior forces which rule and direct one. The authoritarian conscience, which is a product of authoritarian ethics, causes the man who utilizes his forces creatively, to feel guilty. Fromm notes that the people of Babel were punished because they tried, by means of their united powers, to build a city and a tower reaching to the sky. Man attempts to appease the gods for his sin of creativity through sacrifice. Fromm sees such an attempt at appeasement in the act of circumcision. As a symbol of creativity, part of the male genitalia is sacrificed to God, in order for man to enjoy the right of using it (Fromm, 1947). In exercising his will and his creative powers, man rebels against the sanctified right of the authoritarian to be the sole creator.

Fromm, who rejects authoritarian ethics, stresses the need for fostering man's liberty, and allowing him the right to choose and the force to decide. According to Fromm, the prophets always presented possibilities of choice and freedom. There was never a deterministic prophecy. The most succinct expression of the prophetic idea that choice is in the hands of man can be found in the Pentateuch: "I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing, and you chose life" (Deuteronomy 30, 19).

Man's role and moral mission, as defined by Spinoza, is to diminish determinism and to reach a state of freedom. Man can attain this goal through self-awareness, and by transforming the manipulation which blinds his eyes and ties his hands, into creative activity, which would enable him to act in accordance with his real interests as a human being.

The freedom to exercise his powers and self-awareness, and to act according to his real interests, can bring man happiness. Spinoza's concept of happiness and joy is connected with the concept of nature's vitality. According to Spinoza, happiness is a transformation within man, from a lowly or inferior state of imperfection, to a high state of perfection. Sadness is a transformation in man from perfection to imperfection. Pleasure is concomitant to man's creative activity. According to Spinoza, happiness is not the profits of merit, but is rather merit itself. We experience happiness and joy in the process of our rapprochement to ourselves.

According to Fromm, creative activity is accompanied by happiness. He does not view happiness as a "peak" experience, which abruptly begins and ends, but rather, a state which accompanies man's creative expression of his essential human potential.

Happiness is not a flame which fades in a moment; it is a glow which comes with self-actualization (Fromm, 1979).

Fromm demonstrates at length, that the Bible and later Jewish tradition see happiness as the mental state which accompanies self-actualization. He perceptively analyzes the Psalms, many of which are due odes to happiness (Fromm, 1966), examines the Sabbath as a day of happiness (Fromm, 1979), and discusses the joyful coming of the Messiah (Fromm, 1966). The prophetic literature is also full of expressions of joy, such as: "Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, both young men and old together: for I will turn their mourning into joy" (Jeremiah 31, 13); "... and you shall draw water in happiness from the springs of redemption" (Isaiah 12, 3).

The Talmud also stresses happiness and joy: "One does not pray out of sadness, nor laziness, nor laughter, nor song, nor frivolousness, nor out of everyday things, but out of the joy of the commandment" (Blessings 31, p. 1).

Rabbi Bahai notes that affinity between joy and intellectual activity. He wrote: "When happiness increases, mental power increases, and one becomes more capable of grasping ideas."

The hasidic movement believes in the worshipping of God with joy, and has created a way of life in which happiness plays a major role. The Visionary of Lublin wrote: "Beyond all else, beware of sorrow, because it is more destructive and worse than sin." Rabbi Israel of Rozin says of the biblical phrase, "And if you forget your God," that it is known that everywhere in the Bible where it is written "And if," the implication is of happiness, as it is here. Thus the phrase can be understood to mean that if you forget happiness and become sad, then you are forgetting your God, because it is written: "Power and joy in His place."

It is impossible to understand the totality of man without examining the concept of sin and repentance. The verb "to sin" is used with various connotations: a wavering from the chosen path, leading to temptation, or the violation of prohibitions, felony and crime. At the same time, to sin is human and almost inevitable. The Bible indicates this very clearly, when it describes all of its heroes as sinners, including Moses, David, and others.

Fromm comments that the interpretation of the meaning of sin as the departure from the true or right way, is related to the word repentance, whose root in the Hebrew language means to return or repeat. The man who repents actually returns to the true way to God and to himself. According to Fromm, in the same way that sin does not indicate corruption, nor reason for sadness, nor reason for the acceptance of authority out of feelings of guilt, thus also repentance is no indication of the sinners' humbleness—blaming oneself for one's trespasses and begging for mercy—but rather, man is free and independent. His sin is his sin, his repentance is his own, and there is no place for submission to self-blame (Fromm, 1966).

Rabbi Abahu stresses, that there is no man who is higher than the man who has taken the wrong path, and then repented and returned from it. The Bible and the Talmud stress pity, forgiveness, and the ability of man to repent. All who do evil, then express regret, are immediately forgiven (Hagiga 5, p. 1).

In contrast to authoritarian attitudes, which view sin with enmity, intolerance, and with the anger of retribution, the humanistic approach is sympathetic and understand-

ing of man's sin, does not seek to cause feelings of guilt in him and certainly does not try to avenge his transgressions, but rather tries to stimulate him to do better. The depth of this humanistic attitude towards sin is revealed in the words of Rabbi Yitzhak Meir from Gur: "He who contemplates and contemplates again the mistake which he has made always keeps in mind the evil which he has done—What we think is what we occupy ourselves with, occupy our souls with our thoughts—and thus, that man is occupied with evil. He will probably never be able to repent, because his spirit becomes his heavy and his heart becomes dull, and even sadness might overcome him. What do you expect? If you try to change the feeling in this way or that, it will always remain filth. If you have or have not sinned, of what value is that to the heavens? While I was contemplating my sins I could have been praying jewels for the glory of the universe. For this is it said: Avoid evil and do good—avoid evil completely, do not even think of it, and simply do good. Have you done something which was evil? Contrast it by doing something good."

In the hasidic stories we find many important educational connotations pertaining to the treatment of sin: an accepting approach, an attempt to avoid feelings of guilt, avoiding the self-obsession and wallowing in feelings of guilt which accompany the awareness of sin, and avoiding the continuing process of self-punishment. The central point must be the reallocation of energies to the cause of renewed action, and to the "praying of jewels for the glory of the universe" instead of allowing oneself to turn to filth.

MAN AND HISTORY

Fromm views the act of refusal in the Garden of Eden, and the subsequent expulsion, as the inception of human history. Man places himself in an historical process, the beginning of which is the first act of freedom: the freedom to disobey.

Fromm stresses that in the same way that alienation from the paradisaical home characterizes the dawn of human history, so does Abraham's estrangement from home characterize the inception of Israeli history. The next main event in Jewish history, after the constant wandering between Egypt and the Land of Canaan, is the story of the exodus from Egypt. Fromm stresses that liberation is firstly social, and not especially national.

In his analysis of the Israeli revolution, the passage from slavery to freedom, Fromm points to a long list of important historical psychological questions. How can slaves change so that they feel a longing for freedom? While they are slaves, they do not know what freedom is, and when they become free, they have no need of revolution—which raises the question of whether revolution is really possible. Is the passage from slavery to liberty possible? What is the role of God in the process of liberation?

The biblical stories offer the response that the seeds of freedom lie in man's ability to suffer. A revolution, on the other hand, in its first stage, enables man to develop new forces which he did not have while living as a slave, and these forces help him to eventually gain freedom. As for the role of God in the process of liberation, the Bible shows that God helps—but never by way of changing human nature, never by way of doing that which only man himself can do. In his atheistic terminology, Fromm claims that man is deserted and alone, and that no one can do for him what he cannot do for himself, by himself (Fromm, 1966).

There is particular grace in Fromm's analysis of God's revelation to Moses from within the burning bush: ". . . and behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed" (Exodus, 3.2). According to Fromm, the burning bush symbolizes the paradoxical essence of spiritual existence, which in contrast to material existence, does not diminish in force when it is actualized (Fromm, 1966).

On the story of Moses' reservations about accepting the role of leader, Fromm points to the creation of the priesthood with the nomination of Aaron, who is known for his ability to talk and explain: "And thou shalt speak unto him, and put words in his mouth: and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do. And he shall by thy spokesman unto his people: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth and thou shalt be to him instead of God" (Exodus 4, 15–16). The priesthood is created out of concession to the ignorance of the masses, to the attachments to submission and slavery which still exist in them, and to the customs which they have not yet freed themselves from.

In Fromm's discussion of priests and prophets, he expresses many ideas similar to those of Ahad-Haam on the subject. Ahad-Haam wrote that the prophet is the origin of the creation of an ideal, its support, and its perfection. The prophet concentrates on the ideal, and does not compromise because of the reality before him. The priest is the actualizer, the adaptor, the mediator between prophet and society, the one who translates the prophets words of wisdom to a language that will be understood by all. This is precisely the viewpoint of Fromm, who even goes further, and warns that the prophet might never reach the people's understanding though the priest speaks in the prophet's name, he might nevertheless distort his original intention.

Fromm describes at great length and detail, the development of the various stages of the Hebrew revolution, in which he sees not only a socialist and nationalist revolution, but also a revolution of values and concepts. It is in the desert in particular that he finds one of the most important symbols of liberation; a symbol of life without bondage, without property. The desert is not a home—there are no cities nor property in it, so it serves as an excellent preparation for a life of liberty. The people of Israel, however, yearned for the good life they had in Egypt, for a permanent dwelling place, and for visible idols. Hence, the history of the exodus from Egypt culminates tragically. The Israelites cannot live without ownership. When Moses disappears on Mount Sinai, the Israelites, who are incapable of living without a unifying leader, demand of Aaron that he create for them a visible manifestation of idolatry: the golden calf.

The Hebrew revolution fails. A whole generation perishes in the desert, but the sons of the new generation, like their fathers, could not completely free themselves from bondage, and could not live in a land without being enslaved by it. They conquer the land of Israel, destroy their enemies, yet continue to worship their Gods. They are no longer an enslaved people, but rather a race of masters, yet the burden of power only corrupts them. Fromm declares that the people of Israel would have been obliterated from the pages of history, were it not for the prophets. Revolutionary thinkers, who added new life to the vision of human liberty, who called for a casting-off of the self-made chains of bondage, and who strongly protested against the enslavement to gods created by the people themselves. According to Fromm, the prophets were determined people who prophesied that the people of Israel would be expelled from their land if they attached themselves to it like prostitutes, and if they cannot live on it as free



people—i.e., love it without losing themselves within it. In the eyes of the prophets, the expulsion from the land of Israel was a tragedy, but the only way for ultimate liberation (Fromm, 1979).

In Rabbi Johannan Ben Zachai and his followers, Fromm sees a spirit of preservation of the prophets' visions. In leaving Jerusalem quietly, and asking permission to erect a religious school in Yavne, Fromm recognizes the beginning of a powerful Jewish tradition, and the loss of all that the Jews possessed: their country, temple, priests, army, sacrifices, and religious rituals. All of these disappeared, and all that was left them was their self-actualization: to know, to learn, to think, and to hope for the coming of the Messiah.

Fromm ends his discussion of history, by examining the concept of the Messiah. In this Fromm sees the next stage in the development of history, rather than its cancellation. There is a dialectical affinity between the concept of the Garden of Eden and that of the coming of the Messiah. The Garden of Eden, according to Fromm, represents the golden age of the past, while the days of the Messiah are the golden age of the future. The two ages are similar, in that they both describe a state of harmony, but are completely different, in that the first state of harmony was when man was yet unborn, in the human sense, and his ties with natural harmony were symbiotic ones, whereas the new state of harmony exists after the birth of man, his maturation, and self-actualization—the days of the Messiah are the realization of liberty rather than dependence.

The concept of the coming of the Messiah, the vision of universal peace, of a new harmony, in which man and nature cease to be rivals, and nature becomes part of man's personal world—in the universal aspect, through the tidings of love and friendship which this human world brings—this is a concept with significant educational implications: as a focal point of human aspirations, as directing force for the intentions and goals of the educational process, along with the recognition that the days of the Messiah are not freely given, but are rather an achievement in the process of humanistic actualization and fulfillment of man. This concept of maturation is so powerful that the Rabbi of Starteen said: "Every Jew has inside him an element of the Messiah, which he must purify and care for so that it will develop. The Messiah will arrive when the Israelites bring him to full perfection, purity, and maturity, within themselves" (Fromm, 1966).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, Gordon W.—*Becoming*, Yale University Press, 1955
- Anshen, Ruth Manda—"Authority and Power" Erich Fromm and Herbert Marcuse," *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 5, September, 1974, pp 1-8.
- Bell, Daniel—*The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*, London: Heinemann Educational, 1974.
- Bell, Daniel (ed)—*Toward the Year 2000*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Com, 1968
- Benedict, Ruth—Review of "Escape from Freedom," *Psychiatry* 5, 1942, pp 111-113
- Bergson Henry, *Introduction of Metaphysics*, (Heb.), Legvulam, 1957
- Bloch, Ernst—*Philosophy of the Future*, New-York: Seabury Press, 1970
- Block, Irving—"Radical Humanism and the Bible," *Tradition: A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought*, Winter 1968, pp 131-137.
- Boisen, Anton T.—Review of "Escape from Freedom," *Psychiatry* 5, 1952, pp 113-117
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew—"The Technotronic Society," *Encounter*, Vol XXX, No 1, January, 1968.
- Brown, J A C.—*Freud and the Post-Freudians*, Baltimore: 1961, pp. 145-160
- Buber Martin, "Faces of Man, inquiries in anthropological philosophy," (Heb.), Mosad Bialik, 1962.
- Buber Martin, "Intimate Dialogue, man in face of existence," (Heb.), Mosad Bialik, Jerusalem, 1963.
- Buber Martin—*Paths in Utopia*, Translated by R. F. C. Hall, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949
- Clarke, Arthur C.—*Profiles of the Future*, New-York: Bantam, 1964
- Cohen Adir, *Creative Writing*, (Heb.), Tel-Aviv, Akad, 1979a
- Cohen Adir, *The Educational Philosophy of Martin Buber*, N.J., Associated University Presses, 1983
- Cohen Adir, "The Educational Teachings of Martin Buber," (Heb.), Tel-Aviv, Yahdav, 1976.
- Cohen Adir, *Free Education*, (Heb.), Tel-Aviv, Reshaphim, 1983
- Cohen Adir, *Modern Education. The educational teachings of Bertrand Russel.*, (Heb.), Tel-Aviv, Yavne, 1979.
- Cohen Adir, *Revolution in Education*, (Heb.), Tel-Aviv, Beit Dvir, 1983b
- Dewey, John—*Democracy and Education*, New-York: Macmillan, 1916
- Dewey, John—*Freedom and Culture*, New-York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939
- Dewey, John—*Human Nature and Conduct*, New-York: Henry Holt, 1922
- Dewey, John—*Problems of Men*, New-York: Philosophical Library, 1946
- Ehrlich, Paul R. and Ehrlich, Anne H.—*Population, Resources, Environment. Essays in Human Ecology*, San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1970
- Ellul, Jacques—*Technological Society*, New-York: Vintage Books, 1967
- Erikson, Erik H.—*Childhood and Society*, New-York: W. W. Norton, 1950
- Evans, Richard I.—*Dialogue with Erich Fromm*, New-York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Friere, Paul—*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Translated by Myra Bergman Ramod, London, Sheed and Ward, 1972
- Freud, S.—*Civilization and Discontent*, London: The Hogarth Press
- Friedenberg, Edgar Z.—"Neo-Freudianism and Erich Fromm," *Commentary*, 34, 1962, pp 305-313
- Fromm, Erich—*The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, New-York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973
- Fromm, Erich—*The Art of Loving*, New-York: Harper and Row, 1956
- Fromm, Erich—*Beyond the Chains of Illusion (My Encounter with Marx and Freud)*, New-York: Simon and Schuster, 1962
- Fromm, Erich—*The Crisis of Psychoanalysis. Essays on Freud, Marx and Social Psychology*, New-York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.



- Fromm, Erich—"Die Psychoanalytische Charakterologie in ihrer Anwendung für die Soziologie" in *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*, 1. Leipzig: Hirschfeld, 1931.
- Fromm, Erich—*The Dogma of Christ and Other Essays on Religion, Psychology, and Culture*, New-York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Fromm, Erich—*Escape from Freedom*, New-York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1941.
- Fromm, Erich—*The Forgotten Language: An Introduction to the Understanding of Dreams, Fairy Tales and Myths*, New-York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955.
- Fromm, Erich—*The Heart of Man*, New-York: Harper and Row, 1964
- Fromm, Erich—*Man for Himself. An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics*, New-York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1947
- Fromm, Erich—*Marx's Concept of Man*, New-York: Frederick Ungar, 1961.
- Fromm, Erich—*The New Industrial Society*, 2nd rev. ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.
- Fromm, Erich—"On the Limitations and Dangers of Psychology" in Leibrecht W. (ed.)—*Religion and Culture: Essays in Honour of Paul Tillich*, New-York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- Fromm, Erich—*Psychoanalysis and Religion*, New-Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.
- Fromm, Erich—"Psychology and Human Values," in A. Maslow and P. A. Sorokin (eds.)—*New-Knowledge in Human Values*, New-York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- Fromm, Erich—*The Revolution of Hope*, New-York: Harper and Row, 1968
- Fromm, Erich—*The Sane Society*, New-York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955.
- Fromm, Erich—(ed.)—*Socialist Humanism*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1965
- Fromm, Erich—*To Have or to Be?* London: Sphere Books, ABACUS edition, 1979
- Fromm, Erich—*You Shall be as Gods*, New-York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
- Fromm, Erich and Maccoby, Michael—*Social Character in A Mexican Village*, New-Jersey, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Fromm, Erich and Suzuki, D. T. and de Martino R.—*Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*, New-York: Harper and Row, 1960.
- Fromm, Erich and Xirau Ramon (ed.)—*The Nature of Man*, London: The Macmillan Com., 1958
- Funk, Rainer—*Erich Fromm: The Courage to be Human*, Translated by: Michael Shaw, New-York: Continuum, 1982.
- Galbraith, John K.—*The Affluent Society*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958.
- Galbraith, John K.—*Economics and the Public Purpose*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
- Galbraith, John K.—*The New Industrial State*, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1971.
- Gilwirth, Alan—Review of "The Sane Society," *Ethics: An International Journal of Social, Political and Legal Philosophy*, 66, 1955/56, pp. 289-292
- Gill, Thomas Harvey—Review of "Escape from Freedom," *Psychiatry* 5, 1942, pp. 109-111
- Goldstein, K.—*The Organism*, New-York: American Book Co., 1939.
- Goodman, Paul—*Growing Up Absurd*, New-York: Vintage Books, 1960
- Gotesky, Rubin—*Personality: The Need for Liberty and Rights*, New-York: Libra Publishers, 1967.
- Hadley, Ernst E.—Review of "Escape from Freedom," *Psychiatry*, 5, 1942, pp. 131-134.
- Henry, Jules, *Culture Against Man*, New-York: Vintage Books, 1963
- Hill, Lewis B.—Review of "Escape from Freedom," *Psychiatry* 5, 1942, pp. 117-118
- Horney, Karen—*The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*, New-York: W. W. Norton, 1937.
- Horney, Karen—*New Ways in Psychoanalysis*, New-York: W. W. Norton, 1939
- Huxley, Aldous Leonard H.—*Brave New World*, London, 1932.
- Ilich, Ivan—*De-Schooling Society*, Penguin Books, 1970.
- Jacoby, Russell—*Social Amnesia: A Critique of Conformist Psychology from Adler to Laing*, New-York: 1975
- Kohn, H. et al.—*The Next 200 Years*, New-York: W. Morrow and Co 1976.
- Kohn, H. and Wiener, A. J.—*The Year Two Thousand*, New-York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Kecksemeti, Paul—Review of "The Same Society," *Commentary*, 21, 1956, pp. 176-179.
- Kozol, Jonathan—*Death At An Early Age*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Com 1967
- Kozol, Jonathan—*The Night Is Dark and I am Far From Home*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Com., 1975.
- Lamm Zvi, "Ideology & Education," *Educational Encyclopedia*, V. 5, (Heb.), Mosad Bialik, 1969, pp. 1-12
- Lamm Zvi, "The Place of Knowledge in Radical Concepts of Education," (Heb.), *Iyunim Behinuh*, No. 1, May 1973, pp. 13-25.
- Lamm Zvi, "The Radical Concept of Social Meaning in Education," (Heb.), *The Collective Education*, No. 87, 1975, pp. 22-44.
- Lavi Zvi, "Psychoanalysis," from "Encyclopedia of the social sciences," V. 4, (Heb.), Merhavia, Sifrit Poalim, 1968, pp. 789-798.

- Landis, Bernhard and Tauber, Edward S. (eds.)—*In the Name of Life, Essays in Honor of Erich Fromm*, New-York: Random House, 1970.
- Levin, Ira—*This Perfect Day*, New-York: Random House, 1970.
- Levin Shalom, "Morality and the Formation of Moral Character," (Heb.), Tel-Aviv, Otzar Hamore, 1979
- Lorenz, Konrad—*On Aggression*, Translated by Marjorie Latzke, London: Methuen, 1967
- Maccoby, Michael—"Emotional Attitudes and Political Choices," *Politics and Society* 2, Winter 1972, pp. 209-239
- Maccoby, Michael—*The Gamesman: The New Corporate Leaders*, New-York: Simon and Schuster, 1976
- Maddox, John—*The Domsday Syndrom*, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1972
- Mamford, Lewis—*In the Name of Sanity*, New-York, 1954.
- Mamford, Lewis—*The Myth of the Machine*, New-York.
- Marcel, Gabriel—*Being and Having*, Translated from French by Kathline Farrer, Westminster: Dacre Press, 1949.
- Marcuse Herbert, "Eros & Civilization," Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London, 1956.
- Maslow, A.—*Toward a Psychology of Being*, Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1962
- McGrath, Michael—*Fromm, Ethics and Education*, Lexington, Kentucky, 1962.
- Mesarovic, Mihajlo D. and Pestel, Eduard—*Mankind at the Turning Point*, New-York: E. P. Dutton, 1974.
- Mickleson, Donna—"Bob Dylan, Erich Fromm and Beyond: A Look at the New Politics," in Butz O. (ed.)—*To Make a Difference*, New-York, 1967, pp. 155-174.
- Minkowitz Abraham, "Personality," *Educational Encyclopedia*, V. 5, (Heb.), Mosad Bialik, 1969, pp. 25-45.
- McLuhan, Marshal and Fiore, Q.—*The Medium is the Massage (An Inventory of Effects)*, New-York: Bantam Books, 1967.
- Milles, Wright C.—*White Collar*, London: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Montagu, Ashley M. F.—Review of "Escape from Freedom," *Psychiatry*, 5, 1942, pp. 122-129.
- Mullahey, Patrick—Review of "Escape from Freedom," *Psychiatry*, 18, 1955, pp. 399-409.
- Mullahey, Patrick—Review of "The Sane Society," *Psychiatry*, 18, 1955, pp. 399-409.
- Mumford, L.—*The Pentagon of Power*, New-York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1970.
- Nagler, Simon H.—"Erich Fromm," in Freedman, A. M. and Kaplan, H. J. (eds.), *Interpreting Personality: A Survey of Twentieth-Century Views*, New-York 1972, pp. 193-200
- Neill, A. S.—*Summerhill, A Radical Approach to Child Rearing*, New-York: Hart Pub. Co., 1960
- Nyanaponika, Mahatera—*Pathways of Buddhist Thought: Essays from the Wheel*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1971.
- O'Brien, Kenneth—"Death and Revolution: A Reappraisal of Identity Theory," in O'Neill J. (ed.)—*On Critical Theory*, New-York, 1976, pp. 101-128.
- Orwell, George, "1984," (Heb.), Am Oved, 1971
- Orwell, Sonia and Angus, Ian (eds.)—*The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, Vol 4 New-York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.
- Packard, Vance—*The Hidden Persuaders*, New-York: David McKay, 1957.
- Petuchowski, Jakob J.—"Erich Fromm's Midrash of Love: The Sacred and the Secular Forms," *Commentary*, 22, 1956, pp. 543-549.
- Piaget, Jean—*The Child Conception of the World*, New-York: Harcourt, Brace and Com., 1929, p. 151
- Plato, "The Laws," from the collected works, (Heb.), V. 4, translated from the Greek by Joseph Libs, Shoken, 1965
- Plato, "Socrates' apology," the collected works, (Heb.), v. 1. Shoken, 1955
- Postman, Neil and Weingartner Charles—*Linguistics: A Revolution in Teaching*, New-York: Dell Publishers, A Delta Book, 1966
- Postman, Neil and Weingartner Charles—*Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, New-York: Dell Publishing, A Delta Book, 1969
- Read, Herbert—*The Education of Free Men*, London: Freedom Press, 1944.
- Riesman, David—*Individualism Reconsidered*, New-York: The Free Press, 1954
- Riesman, David—*The Lonely Crowd*, New-Haven: Yale University Press, 1950
- Riesman, David—"Psychological Types and National Character: An Informal Commentary," *American Quarterly*, 5, 1953, pp. 325-343
- Ritter, Paul—*Educreation—Education for Creation, Growth and Change*, Oxford, 1966
- Robinson, Paul A.—*The Freudian Left*, New-York: Harper and Row, 1969.
- Rogers, Carl R.—*Client Centered Therapy*, Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, Carl R.—*Freedom to Learn*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Com., 1969
- Rogers, Carl R.—*On Becoming a Person*, Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1954.
- Rogers, Carl R.—*A Way of Being*, Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Com., 1980.



- Rotenstreich Nathan, "Issues in Education," (Heb.), Jerusalem, School of Education, Hebrew University, 1964.
- Rozenberg, Harold—*The Tradition of the New*, New-York, Horizon Press, 1959.
- Russell, Alfred—"Religion and American Society Today, Review of You Shall Be as God," *Issues*, 71, 1967, pp. 54-62
- Russell, Bertrand—*Authority and the Individual*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1949
- Russell, Bertrand—*On Education*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1926
- Russell, Bertrand—*The Conquest of Happiness*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1930
- Salder, William A.—"On the Verge of a Lonely Life," *Humanitas*, 10, Nov. 1974, 255-276.
- Sarlos, Beatrice—"Alienation as Symptom: Diagnostic Perspectives on a Concept," *Proceedings of Philosophy of Education*, 30, 1974, pp. 88-100
- Sartre, Jean-Paul—*L'Existentialisme est un Humanisme*, Paris: Nagel, 1946
- Schaar, John Homer—*Escape from Authority: The Perspectives of Erich Fromm*, New-York 1961.
- Schacht, Richard—*Alienation*, London 1971.
- Schumacher, F F—*Small is Beautiful. Economics as if People Mattered*, New-York: Harper and Row, 1973
- Schweitzer, Albert—*Out of My Life and Thought*, 1953
- Schweitzer, Albert—*Civilization and Ethics*, Rev. ed., New-York: Seabury Press, 1973
- Shanan Yoel, "Society's Mental Health," *Educational Encyclopedia*, v 5, (Heb.), Mosad Bialik, 1969, pp. 138-143.
- Shell, Kurt Leo—*Erich Fromm's "Escape from Freedom" A Critical Commentary*, New-York 1967
- Simon Akiva E., "Education," *Educational Encyclopedia*, v 1, (Heb.), Mosad Bialik, 1961, pp. 46-185.
- Singer, Milton—Review of "Man for Himself," *Ethics*, 57, 1947/48, pp. 220-222.
- Skinner, B F—*Science and Human Behavior*, New-York: Macmillan, 1953
- Skinner, B F—*Walden II*, New-York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Smith, William Aloysius—*The Writings of Erich Fromm. A Detailed Critique and In-Depth Evaluation*, New-York 1970.
- Stivner, Max—*The Ego and His Own The Case of the Individual against Authority*, Edited by James J. Martin: Translated by Steven T. Byington, New-York, Dover, 1973.
- Sullivan, Harry Stack—*Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry*, Washington: William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation, 1947.
- Sullivan, Harry Stack—*The International Theory of Psychiatry*, New-York, W. W. Norton, 1953.
- Swanson, Guy E.—Review of "The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness," *American Journal of Sociology*, 80, 1975, pp. 1243-1245
- Szasz, Thomas Stephen—*The Myth of Mental Illness*, New-York: Hoeber-Harper, 1961.
- Tauber, Edward S—"Erich Fromm: Clinical and Social Philosopher," *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 15, 1979, pp. 201-213
- Tawney, R. H.—*The Acquisitive Society*, New-York, Harcourt Brace, 1920.
- Toffler, Alvin—*Future Shock*, New-York: Random House, 1970
- Toffler, Alvin—*The Third Wave*, New-York: Pen Books, 1981
- Vayhinger, John M.—Review of "The Heart of man," *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 11, 1966, pp. 24-26.
- Weigert, Edith—Review of "The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness," *Psychiatry*, 38, 1975, pp. 101-103.
- Whyte, William H. Jr.—*The Organization Man*, New-York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.
- Wholman Benjamin, "Psychology, science and profession," (Heb.), *Educational Encyclopedia*, V. 5, Mosad Bialik, 1969, pp. 751-790
- Winthrop, Henry—Review of "The Sane Society," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 1957, pp. 125-134
- Wirth, Louis—Review of "Escape from Freedom," *Psychiatry*, 5, 1942, pp. 129-131
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig—*Philosophical Investigations*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1963.
- Yonker, Nicholas Jr—*Ambiguities of Love, An Inquiry into the Psychology of Erich Fromm*, New-York, 1961
- Zacks Arie, *Life's Emptiness: The state of man according to Samuel Johnson*, (Heb.), Jerusalem, Magnes, 1977
- Zuger, Bernard—Review of "Man for Himself," *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 8, 1948, pp. 63-65.

- Plato, "The Laws," from the collected works, (Heb.), V.4, translated from the Greek by Joseph Libs, Shoken, 1965.
- Lavi Zvi, "Psychoanalysis," from "Encyclopedia of the social sciences," V.4, (Heb.), Merhavia, Sifriat Poalim, 1968, pp. 789-798
- Levin Shalom, "Morality and the Formation of Moral Character," (Heb.), Tel-Aviv, Otzar Hamore, 1979



Author Index

- Abraham, 21, 83, 85, 88, 93, 96, 102
 Achnaton, 8
 Adam and Eve, 42, 58, 83, 86, 88, 93, 98, 99
 Allport, Gordon, 2, 68, 69
 Aquinas, Thomas, 26
 Aristotle, 26
- Bacon, Francis, 26
 Beethoven, Ludwig Van, 1
 Bell, Daniel, 50
 Bergson, Henry, 11, 32, 75, 78
 Bloom, Leon, 1
 Brzezinsky, Zbigniew, 48, 51
 Buber, Martin, 6, 12, 23, 24, 55, 57, 81, 82, 96
 Buddha, 8, 26
- Cicero, 67
 Clarke, Arthur, 50
 Cohen, Herman, 28, 40, 83, 99
 Confucius, 8
- Dante, 27
 Darwin, 27, 34
 Descartes, 22, 26
 Dewey, John, 26, 31
 Dostoevski, Fyodor, 27
- Eckhart, Johannes, 26
 Einstein, Albert, 79
 Ellul, Jacques, 50
 Empedocles, 26
 Erasmus Roterodamus, 26
 Erikson, Erik, 4, 5, 42
 Euripides, 27
 Evans, Richard L., 6, 8, 9
- Frankel, Victor, 24, 50
 Freud, Sigmund, 2-5, 16, 17, 20, 26, 27, 34-37, 42, 99
 Friere, Paulo, 11, 13, 29, 49
- Goldstein, Kurt, 2
 Goodman, Paul, 2, 49, 80
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 26
 Heidegger, Martin, 5, 26
- Heraclitus, 26
 Hitler, Adolf, 12
 Hobbes, Thomas, 26
 Homer, 1
 Horney, Karen, 2, 4, 9
 Horowitz, Jacob, 83
 Hugo, Victor, 1
 Hume, David, 26
 Huserl, Edmund, 5
 Huxley, Aldous L., 48
- Isaiah, 85
- James, William, 26, 32
 Johnson, Samuel, 24
 Jung, Carl, 26
- Kant, Immanuel, 26, 27, 67
 Kasirer, Ernest, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32
 Kierkegaard, Soren A., 26, 32
 Klein, Melanie, 4, 5
 Kohn, Herman, 50, 52
 Kozol, Jonathan, 11, 58
 Krauser, Ludwig, 83
- Laing, R. D., 36
 Lamm, Zvi, 9, 65, 74
 Lao-Tse, 8
 Leach, Theodore, 36
 Leibnitz, Gottfried Wilhelm, 26
 Leonard, George B., 79
 Levin, Ira, 48
 Levi Yitzhak of Berdichev, 88, 96
 Livingstone, Richard, 10, 60, 80
 Locke, John, 26
 Lorenz, Conrad, 34, 35, 60
 Lucretius, 26
 Luther, Martin, 26
- Maddox, John, 50
 Maimonides, 83, 84, 85, 88, 89, 90, 96
 Mamford, Lewis, 50, 52, 61
 Marcuse, Herbert, 2, 3, 4, 7, 50
 Marx, Karl, 2, 3, 26, 28, 32, 99
 Maslow, Abraham, 2, 72
 McLuhan, Marshal, 47

- Meyer, Adolf, 36
 Michelangelo, 1
 Milles, Wright C., 48
 Montaine, Michel, 26
 Moore, Thomas, 26
 Morris, Desmond, 34
 Moses, 8, 85, 88, 103
 Mussolini, Benito, 12
- Neill, A. S., 1, 2, 13
 Neumann, Erich, 75
 Newton, Isaac, 1
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 26, 67
 Nobel, Nchemia, 83
- Orwell, George, 11, 48
- Packard, Vance, 48
 Pascal, Blaise, 1, 26
 Piaget, Jean, 18, 81
 Platinus, 26
 Plato, 1, 26, 29, 80, 81
 Postman, Neil, 31
 Prometheus, 58, 88
- Read, Herbert, 2, 75, 76
 Reich, Wilhelm, 2
 Reisman, David, 26, 48, 49
 Ribikov, Zalman, 83
 Ricardo, David, 34
 Ritter, Paul, 80
 Rogers, Carl, 2, 75, 79
 Rotenstreich, Nathan, 10, 11
 Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 26, 30
- Rozenberg, Harold, 48
 Russell, Bertrand, 2, 22, 23, 40, 68, 79
- Sartre, Jean-Paul, 5, 6, 7, 26, 57, 59
 Scheller, Max, 67
 Schiller, Friedrich, 29
 Schopenhauer, Arthur, 26
 Schumacher, F. F., 61
 Schweitzer, Albert, 44, 49, 60, 61
 Seneca, 1, 67
 Shakespeare, William, 1, 27
 Shenan, Yoel, 37, 38
 Simon, Akiva Ernst, 9, 10
 Skinner, B. F., 35, 48
 Socrates, 8, 26, 29
 Sophocles, 26, 27
 Spinoza, Baruch, 26, 83, 85, 99, 100
 Stalin, Joseph, 12
 St. Augustine, 26
 Sullivan, Harry S., 2, 4, 5, 9, 18, 20, 36
 Szasz, Thomas, 8
- Thoreau, Henry David, 58
 Toffler, Alvin, 48, 81
 Tolstoy, L., 14
- Vital, Chaim Rabbi, 97
- Weill, Simon, 26, 45
 Weingartner, Charles, 31
 Whitehead, Alfred N., 48, 49
 Whyte, William H., 48, 49
 Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 31
- Xirau, Ramon, 26

Subject Index

- Activity, 19, 60, 62, 72, 76, 78, 82, 100
 Aggression, 34, 35, 36
 Alienation, 11, 19, 22, 51, 54, 59, 81
 Art, 28, 30, 32, 66, 75, 76, 77
 Authority, 54, 55, 58, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 94, 99, 100
 Behaviorism, 34, 35, 42, 81
 Bible, 15, 21, 26, 39, 40, 42, 66, 83-93, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103
 Biophilia, 22, 35, 42-46, 78, 82, 90, 91
- Character, 68-74
 Cooperation, 23, 57, 62
 Creativity, 9, 18, 19, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 32, 59, 71-77, 78, 80, 100
 Critical thinking, 29, 40, 53, 55, 62, 72, 74
 Culture, 17, 28, 34, 38, 39, 61, 75
- Destructiveness, 19, 34, 35, 43-46
 Disobedience, 42, 57, 58, 65, 74, 86, 88, 93, 94, 102
 Doubt, 29, 31, 53
- Education, 9, 10, 11, 17-19, 22, 23, 25, 29, 30-33, 36-38, 40, 41, 43-45, 53-59, 61, 65, 67, 71-77, 78-82, 85, 88, 96, 97, 99, 102
 Emotions, 13, 16, 59, 73
 Ethics, 1, 8, 29, 60, 66, 68, 92, 100
 Existentialism, 2, 5, 6, 7, 25, 42
- Faith, 50, 51, 66
 Family, 36, 37, 56
 Freedom, 3, 7, 22, 47, 56, 58, 60, 61, 72, 75, 81, 82, 87, 93, 94-98, 100, 102, 104
- God, 20, 62, 83, 85-104
- Happiness, 34, 68, 100, 101
 Hasidism, 83, 88, 91, 101, 102
 Humanistic Education, 10, 11, 14, 22, 29, 40, 41, 61-63, 85, 88, 91, 92, 94, 97
 Humanistic Psychology, 2, 9, 72
 Humanistic Thought, 5, 10, 13, 40
 Human Nature, 26-30, 32, 36, 42, 64
 Human Situation, 15-26, 38, 39
- Identity, 22, 23, 59, 62
 Ideology, 65, 73
 Incest, 20, 21, 22, 34
 Independence, 18-20, 22, 23, 62, 88, 93, 95, 96, 104
 Individual, 2, 6, 15, 17, 19, 22, 39, 43, 44, 56, 62, 65, 75, 93, 98
 Individuality, 22, 23, 29, 35, 39, 47, 48, 52, 80, 82, 97, 99
 Indoctrination, 56, 65, 73
 Intellectuality, 11, 13, 16, 23, 29, 59
- Jewish People and Tradition, 21, 83-104
- Knowledge, 55, 76, 81
- Libido, 17, 20, 73
 Love, 13, 18, 19, 21, 22, 54, 56, 62, 66, 67, 78, 79, 80, 82, 99
- Maternal Love, 18, 19, 20, 21
 Mental Health, 8, 16, 17, 34, 37-41
 Messiah, 21, 94, 101, 104
 Moral Education, 64-71
 Morality, 64-71
- Narcissism, 6, 9, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 39, 40, 99
 Necrophilia, 22, 34, 35, 42-46, 90, 91
- Personality, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 68, 73, 82
 Possessiveness, 53-61
 Propaganda, 25, 55, 73
 Psychoanalysis, 2, 4, 5-8, 36, 64, 80, 81
- Radical-Humanism, 1, 83-85, 91
 Religion, 8, 20, 21, 22, 24, 28, 62, 87, 92
 Responsibility, 18, 20, 58, 81, 82
- Sanity, 22, 27, 28, 37-41
 Self-Actualization, 9, 19, 20, 22-24, 30, 46, 53-61, 66, 71, 72, 97, 101, 104
 Social Health and illness, 37-41
 Society, 2, 9, 20-23, 30, 34-41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 50, 56, 58
- Talmud, 83-85, 92, 94-96, 101, 104



Technological Society, 45–63
Technotronic Society, 47–53, 61
Tests, 53, 70

Universalism, 21, 22, 98
Values, 27, 59, 60, 61, 64–71, 72, 85, 99, 100

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.

