

PREREQUISITES FOR HUMANISM OF THE 20TH CENTURY: EXISTENTIALISM VERSUS DEPTH PSYCHOLOGY

Vitalii Liakh

INTRODUCTION

In the postmodern era, when previous ethic largely lost its validity and prescriptive power, humanities were challenged to find new ways of development, to define new connotations and meanings for it. This became especially relevant after M. Foucault's famous statement that "man died" or another thesis of the same content about the "death of the subject". In the second half of the twentieth century there emerges even theoretical antihumanism, which testified a turn from understanding a person as a self-sufficient being, who unaidedly determines his path to authenticity, to comprehending him as a being dependent, deterministic, predetermined, independent. This process began at the end of the 19th century, when, under the influence of a certain depreciation of the individual and the general atmosphere of decadence, the philosophy gave rise to the concepts in which a person is interpreted as something imperfect, dependent, incomplete. Darwin's theory of the origin of species, critique of biblical texts from the perspective of historical context, the formation of ideas about spiritual entities as derivatives of socio-economic development, the work of F. Nietzsche "Beyond Good and Evil", Z. Freud's "The Future of an Illusion" – all this contributed to the destruction of previous values. In Nietzsche's nihilistic conception, we find a critique of prior morality and a direct contrasting of this position with the previous humanistic intentions of classical philosophy. After Freud's discovery of the realm of the unconscious the philosophy has faced another problem: the unconscious contains such a negative energy that the conscious is almost unable to keep it within the limits of traditional decency. According to Freud, the unconscious is a dark cellar in which evil, dark forces rage. And the presence of such an argument is another blow to the previous concept of humanism, in which man was given certain qualities by nature: the "divine" reason, the desire for justice, the ability to recognize good and evil, etc.

All this contributed to the fact that in the early 20th century philosophy underwent a so-called "anthropological" turn, resulting in a peculiar movement – philosophical anthropology, which began to study man both in terms of his natural inclinations and in the context of his spiritual transformations.

In the end, it expanded the boundaries of knowledge about biological, genetic, historical, socio-economic, socio-cultural, psychological dependence of a person, and therefore it is more difficult for him to determine the main intensity of his life, and thus his humanistic orientation. Such dependence undermines the moral and ethical basis of the individual's values. In addition, the very reality of the twentieth century with its two world wars and cruelty testified in favour of the thesis about the anti-human nature of man. The old problem of ancient Chinese philosophy: "Man by nature is good or evil?" suddenly came to a clear decision: "man by nature is evil". All grounds for allegations of humanism and of the moral progress of mankind have disappeared. As E. Neumann, a representative of depth psychology, wrote about this, "our epoch has another distinctive feature: the collective manifestation of evil contained in man on a scale not known by any of the earlier eras of world history"¹. So, it appears quite logical to conclude that during the twentieth century a man seems to be definitely degrading or in a "moral crisis".

In addition, depth psychology has shown the imperfection of the position of the human Ego, its overweight in the formation of worldview. It turned out that the role of consciousness in the formation of vital landmarks was exaggerated. Moreover, such an orientation to rational positive values alone entails some danger. Because as soon as reality ceases to conform to these attitudes, one tends to rush in the opposite direction and begins to see only the negative aspects of being everywhere. Therefore, the idea of a new humanism in the middle of the twentieth century is again on the agenda, and is being addressed by representatives of existentialism, "humanistic psychology", the Frankfurt School, and others.

1. The Concept of Humanism in Existential Philosophy and in Humanistic Psychology

The ideas of existentialism, as a certain trend, which advocated the uniqueness of the individual, became popular in the mid-twentieth century in response to the total alienation, convincingly described by the representative of the Frankfurt School. In particular, H. Marcuse, in his work "One-Dimensional Man", pointed to a comprehensive process of dehumanization that touched all aspects of human life. The widespread regulation and dominance of technological rationality leave no room for personal development. Moreover, the influence of society is so effective that man seems to be dissolved in the social. As Marcuse noted, "Our society distinguishes itself by conquering the centrifugal social forces with

¹ Neumann E. (1999) *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic.* – St. Petersburg, Progress. – P. 23.

Technology rather than Terror, on the dual basis of an overwhelming efficiency and an increasing standard of living”². The author consistently substantiates the opinion that a man in such a society does not have his own needs and interests. In his view, “Indeed, in the most highly developed areas of contemporary society, the transplantation of social into individual needs is so effective that the difference between them seems to be purely theoretical”³.

The same trend was pointed out by another representative of the Frankfurt School E. Fromm, who wrote that “like a cog in the production mechanism, a man becomes a thing and loses human qualities”⁴. As a result, a person loses his activity, becomes indifferent to everything, loses interest in life. Human passivity is one of the hallmarks of total syndrome, which Fromm calls “alienation syndrome.” That is, dehumanization is becoming a widespread phenomenon in a technology-oriented society.

Therefore, the general conclusion made by the representatives of this school was that the Western technologically advanced society adversely affects the person suffering from this dehumanization. Hence, it is quite legitimate to pose the question of how this total alienation can be overcome. H. Marcuse proposed the “Great Refusal”, that is, when everyone has to say “No!” to the whole system of public oppression. E. Fromm proposed to cultivate “radical humanism” in society. But overall, their diagnosis was fairly straightforward: society is sick, and radical measures are needed for its recovery.

Existentialists, generally agreeing with the above diagnosis, offered their own way of overcoming total alienation and their vision of the humanistic transformation of man. In particular, J.-Sartre’s work “Existentialism is a Humanism” (1947) draws a distinction between classical humanism and its existentialist version. This distinction manifests itself in the process of comparing perceptions of the essence of man: if previous humanism regarded man as the highest value, as a being destined to produce positive benefits for all mankind, then existentialism proceeds from the thesis that there is no predetermined essence in man, or in other words “existence precedes essence.” That is, man does not have a constant, nature-defined kernel of self. Man is what he does himself, what his original choice is. The person is constantly in the making. This is his absolute feature: to constantly be on the move, to design himself. Humanism here is that if a person continually transcends, goes beyond himself (the so-called phenomenon of intentional

² Marcuse H.(1966) *One-Dimensional Man*. – Boston. – P. X.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 10-11.

⁴ Fromm E. (1996) *Revolution of Hope // Contemporary Foreign Social Philosophy*. – Kyiv, Lybid. – P. 146.

orientation), then human subjectivity is essential for human existence in the world. It is a reminder to a person that the meaning of the world goes through him, that he is responsible for everything that happens around him. As Sartre noted, “When we say that man chooses himself, not only do we mean that each of us must choose himself, but also that in choosing himself, he is choosing for all men”⁵.

Thus, humanism is manifested here in the fact that man assumes responsibility for everything created by him. In the process of initial choice, it is the person who creates values. And if a person assumes this responsibility and makes his choice, then that choice contains a humanistic potential. Sartre insists that a priori a man cannot choose (at the time of a spontaneous “initial choice”) something that can have negative consequences.

The initial choice is always a good one. For Sartre, “To choose to be this or that is to affirm at the same time the value of what we choose, because we can never choose evil. We always choose the good, and nothing can be good for us without being good for all”⁶. Sometimes this Sartre’s statement is interpreted in a vulgar way, and then it seems that he doesn’t understand the obvious: what is good for me may be bad for another. However, Sartre and the existentialists generally insist that this choice is pre-reflective and is at the very core of human existence. It is not a rational choice when we are hesitant in choosing between the best and the worst. It is an intentional choice of a person that does not go through the sphere of rational thinking. The choice should be made not on the basis of rational calculation, under the pressure of circumstances or predefined rules, but by recognizing that each individual is the creator of human values and that his primordial (“ontological”) freedom is the basis of all values. It is in this choice that the existential nature of man manifests itself.

That is, it is humanism that manifests itself in the process of human self-formation, and not the result of predefined positive qualities of man.

M. Heidegger interprets this problem somewhat differently, although there are some related points. Defining the etymology of the word “humanitas”, Heidegger indicates that the term appears in Ancient Rome in order to distinguish a Roman from a barbarian. And the renaissance of humanism during the Renaissance also bears the mark of contrasting “humanity” with the “inhumanity” of barbarians, or the previous inhumanity of scholasticism. This formulation of the question implies that there is some “humanity” as the “essence” of man. Or, as Heidegger points out, “the first humanism, namely, the Latin, and all the kinds of humanism that have emerged from that time up

⁵ Sartre J.-P. (1996) *L’existentialisme est un humanisme*. Paris, Gallimard. – P. 22.

⁶ Sartre J.-P. (1996) *L’existentialisme est un humanisme*. Paris, Gallimard. – P. 32.

to the present presupposes that the most general “essence” of man is self-evident”⁷. If we try to clarify the “essence” and find out what this *humanitas* manifests, then the question arises about the “existence” of human being. That is, “man belongs to his essence, only insofar as it is existence, that is, a constant going beyond. Thus, in contrast to the previous metaphysics, which believed that it knew what the essence of man is, existentialism emphasizes that the essence of man is existence, a certain primordial incompleteness, openness of being.

But even in this sense, the intention of the previous metaphysics is still felt: it seems to us that when we say: “the existence of man is his substance,” we supposedly find an adequate form for the definition of man. However, here we are told by the desire evoked by the previous philosophy to define something substantial, as something permanent, predetermined. Yet, existentialism emphasizes the fundamental difference between existence and any human traits. From this perspective, Heidegger even criticizes Sartre, who, turning the thesis of previous philosophy “essence precedes existence” to the opposite: “existence precedes essence,” still seems to be in the thrall of the old paradigm of philosophy. In fact, according to Heidegger, there is no opposition of existence and essence: man is only to the extent he exists.

It turns out that there are no direction signs, no landmarks. Man is thrown into being, and he only has to heed the call of being. “A man in his being-historical essence is a being whose existence consists in pointing towards Being”⁸. It is here, Heidegger believes, that the origins of a new humanism must be sought. “It is humanism that thinks humanity of a man as pointing towards Being”⁹. That is, Heidegger denies humanism in the metaphysical sense, and argues for humanism in service to the truths of being.

Thus, in existentialism, great hope was placed on the original intentional acts of man, and these acts form the basis of a new type of humanism. This idea of intentional acts of self-expression of human nature and of their humanistic nature was taken up by representatives of “humanistic psychology” (W. Frankl, K. Rogers, E. Fromm, etc.). In particular, W. Frankl’s book “Man’s Search for Meaning” further elaborates this idea. He notes that there are three basic “existentials” (synonymous with intentional acts – V.L.) in man, which have an intentional nature: freedom, spirituality, responsibility. K. Rogers, another representative of the same movement, also

⁷ Heidegger M. Letter on Humanism // The Problem of Man in Western Philosophy. – M., 1988. (in Russian). – P. 321.

⁸ Heidegger M. Letter on Humanism // The Problem of Man in Western Philosophy. – M., 1988. (in Russian). – P. 338.

⁹ Heidegger M. Letter on Humanism // The Problem of Man in Western Philosophy. – M., 1988. (in Russian). – P. 338.

believed that a man has an intention for self-expression, for self-actualization. He emphasized that this self-actualization is done on the basis of intentional acts, not on the basis of reason, rational calculations, willpower and so on.

However, this position has a certain ambiguity: if the basis of humanism is the very process of “existence”, that is, the manifestation of pre-reflective intentional acts, then it is unclear where there is the boundary between the truly “human” in man and those manifestations of negative character (“bestial”) which are also demonstrated by modern reality. Existentialists have eliminated the difficulty here by dividing human existence into “true” and “untrue”. And if a person is in the mode of “true” being, the result of his intentional expression will be definitely positive. (Let us recall the words of J.-P.Sartre: “To choose to be this or that is to affirm at the same time the value of what we choose...”¹⁰).

Approximately the same context is proposed by E. Fromm division of human life into two modes of existence: “being” and “having”. According to Fromm, the “being” modus is quite specific, since it cannot be reached by conscious choice. “Modus of being” is an analogue of true being, and “Modus of having” is a certain type of deviation from true existence. The characteristics of this “mode of being” are determined at the level of pre-reflective consciousness. It cannot be grasped on the basis of reflective thinking. It cannot be interpreted clearly. In relation to this, Fromm said: everything I say about it would be wrong. It can be understood only at some subconscious level.

Fromm thus explains his position: in the course of the development, humanity has lost its original contact with nature, and social life forms have adversely affected the individual, as a result of which man nowadays suffers from “alienation syndrome”. The dramatic nature of the situation is compounded by the fact that neither at the level of social existence nor at the individual level did the person have the opportunity to avoid deformities and depressive states. Hence, the only possible way, according to Fromm, to find the lost quality of life and mental health is a radical transformation of personality through “humanistic” or existential psychoanalysis. We have an alternative: “either enlightenment or illness,” Fromm wrote¹¹.

However, in his opinion, it is the dramatic nature of this situation that will push people to choose a society with a humanistic orientation. Fromm’s position here is presented quite radically: in almost all possible forms of

¹⁰ Sartre J.-P. (1997). Existentialism is a Humanism. – Retrieved from: <https://learning.hccs.edu/faculty/david.poston/phil1301.80361/readings-for-apr-14/jean-paul-sartre-existentialism-is-a-humanism/view> (in English).

¹¹ Fromm E. (1992) Psychoanalysis and Zen Buddhism // Philos. i Sociol. Dumka . – No. 3. (in Ukrainian). – P. 15.

worldview, due to their social involvement, people behave inappropriately. They are constantly under pressure, experiencing various forms of alienation. This involuntarily evokes a thought that the social form of life is the cause of all inadequate reactions of the individual. (By the way, existentialism also insisted that social reality was alien or even hostile to humans).

In order to counteract the negative impact of the social, Fromm proposes to turn to existential psychoanalysis. Moreover, it is not a traditional psychoanalysis with its setting on the treatment of deviations, but on the contrary, it is a philosophical doctrine, which aims to help a person to open a new world view and achieve full existence. It is a certain “art of living” that can be mastered only after a long and complicated process of self-transformation. Fromm compares it to the process of transformation experienced by a man who has entered the path of “enlightenment” in Buddhism.

In comparing existential psychoanalysis with Buddhism, Fromm formulates some conditions under which radical transformation of personality is possible. Noting the shortcomings of the Freudian understanding of the unconscious as a cellar in which dark forces are imprisoned, Fromm supports K. Young’s idea of the need to bring the unconscious to the level of consciousness, seeing this as an opportunity to reveal the productive forces of the individual.

2. Grounds for New Ethic and Humanism Offered by Representatives of Depth Psychology

E. Neumann, a follower of the analytical psychology of K. Young, offered his understanding of the moral crisis of the 20th century man. In his opinion, the crisis is connected with the fact that in our time the old ethic and its methods of solving moral problems were destroyed. Moreover, he tried to prove that the old ethic not only ceased to correspond to the reality of the new age, but also lost its effectiveness as a mechanism for adapting the individual to collective values. The concept of “old ethic” Neumann understood as the general moral precept according to which the world appears as split into two parts: good and evil, light and darkness, holy and sinful. There is a constant struggle between them, which ultimately ends with the victory of good. However, evil is constantly reviving, and like the mythical Hydra, new and new heads grow out of it. Humankind has found itself in a paradoxical situation: although the higher powers of darkness are not capable of overcoming the forces of light, there is also no evidence that the latter will ever overcome evil in this world.

In this ethic, it is quite right to assume that we are on the side of good and are constantly fighting evil. However, since the values of the old ethic are

“absolute” in nature, and they do not involve any compromise (i.e., not adapted to the reality of personal being), then adaptation to these values is one of the most difficult tasks in the life of any man, while playing an important role in his adaptation to collective values¹².

The researcher proposes to consider how traditional ethic, formed on ancient Greek and Judeo-Christian principles, solved the problem of combating evil. First of all, it was thought that the embodiment of moral virtues is the image of a sage or saint, pious or orthodox advocate of the law, hero or person who is able to possess himself. In any case, good (in any of its hypostases) acts as an absolute value that must determine human behaviour. It was accepted that such an ideal can only be achieved through the consistent and systematic elimination of all negative qualities. That is, the moral structure of the individual, his perfection is formed through a conscious emphasis on certain positive values. Conversely, all that is incompatible with the moral ideal must be eliminated. Such elimination occurs either by suppressing negative qualities or by repressing them.

When *suppressing* ego consciousness eradicates all the negative. In traditional ethic, this happens through austerity, the restraint of natural impulses, the sacrifice of something, through some suffering. Suppressed instinctive reactions continue to play a role, but through their denial. In the process of applying this method, it is constantly improving, but, characteristically, the suppressed content and its components retain a conscious connection with the Ego (we are aware of our sinfulness).

Unlike suppression, repression is characterized by the fact that the rejected, incompatible with the dominant value of the content and components of the individual lose their connection with conscious structures and become unconscious or forgotten. In such cases, the Ego is unaware of their existence¹³. Although, according to Neumann, as shown by the so-called depth psychology, they lead quite active lives. Despite the fact that on a conscious level they do not show themselves, after all, sooner or later, the displaced content somehow makes itself known, and this leads to more tragic consequences than in the case of suppression. As for an individual, this manifests itself in the form of neurosis, as for the collective, then here also we have something similar to mass psychosis. In particular, psychologists such as K. Jung, E. Neumann, W. Reich, and others tried to comprehend such phenomena.

¹² Neumann E. Depth Psychology and a New Ethic. – St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian). – P. 35.

¹³ Neumann E. Depth Psychology and a New Ethic. – St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian). – P. 33.

That is, E. Neumann believed that this analysis that seems legitimate solely for the individual could be applied to collective communities. (“The individual (and his fate) serves as a prototype of the collective”¹⁴. Accordingly, the same mechanism of ethical principles that takes place in the field of individual psyche, works in the field of social relations. For the sake of social order stability, the collective imposes certain values on the individual. As E. Neumann noted, “the role of authority through which the old ethic inflicted its commandments on the individual was fulfilled by “conscience”¹⁵. “Conscience” appears as something that compels a person to reconcile his actions and aspirations with collective values and attitudes. Psychologists distinguish between “conscience” and “inner voice” (the latter characterizes the individual characteristic of human being). The purpose of traditional ethic is to develop in the individual a set of values that are acceptable to the society. Therefore, the individual is split into what is unique to him and what is collectively sanctified. The old ethic is based on the struggle between good and evil, light and darkness. And only one party is accepted. If the human ego fully identifies itself with collective values, then it has a “clear conscience”. But this leads to exaggeration of one of the sides (Ego), to its “inflating”. Or, as Neumann wrote, “Ego imagines itself to be in complete harmony with those values of its culture which are accepted as positive. Ego feels itself to be the bearer no longer simply of the conscious light of human understanding but also of the moral light of the world of values”¹⁶. This results in different types of fanaticism (holiness, orthodoxy, legitimacy, fascism, communism, etc.).

The suppression and repression we talked about earlier also work here. When suppressed, “conscience” shows its force in the form of guilt, when repressed, this feeling is unconscious. However, guilt is driven out of the system by both the individual and the collective. This happens by way of the Shadow projection. That is, the Shadow is perceived not as something own, though another, but is transferred to an external object and is perceived as a foreign object. Here we can recall the classic example of such a transference, namely, the finding of a “scapegoat”, to which all the sins are transferred (in Judaism, they sent it into the desert, to Azazel). But in the modern world we have similar examples of shifting our troubles to another (to an enemy, to a neighbour, to an opponent, etc.).

¹⁴ Neumann E. *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*. – St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian). – P. 28.

¹⁵ Neumann E. *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*. – St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian). – P. 33.

¹⁶ Neumann E. *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*. – St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian). – P. 39.

E. Neumann is based here on the teachings of K. Jung, according to which the structure of the psyche consists of several archetypes, which form the primordial schemes, foretypes of fantasies, representations and the so-called collective unconscious. The central archetype is that of “Self”, which embodies an integrated, holistic personality structure. However, along with it there are other archetypes – “Persona”, “Shadow”, “Anima”, “Animus”. In our analysis, the archetype “Shadow” is of paramount importance, because it is the embodiment of the hidden, suppressed, inferior and guilty part of the personality that reaches its roots to the animal world, the world of our ancestors, and thus embodies the historical layer of the unconscious. Shadow formation occurs in childhood, when the child is confronted with certain prohibitions and is forced to repress or suppress those traits that are forbidden in this culture. However, from time to time they make themselves known, and this poses a challenge for both the individual and humanity as a whole. Therefore, dealing with these unconscious cravings and instincts creates a particular problem for different ethical teachings.

E. Neumann traces the process of becoming a new ethic in the context of the development of consciousness from its original form (where the unconscious and mythological dominated the Ego) to the formation of the consciousness of the individual, which is carried out with the help of the collective and its instructions, receiving from it the “existing values”. After all, the Ego, as the centre of this consciousness, usually becomes the bearer and representative of the collective values existing at that time. That is, if in the first stage of this process the influence of the Ego was almost insensible, and the collective form of consciousness dominated the individual, then the role of the Ego further increases, and accordingly the split between the conscious part of the psyche and the sphere of the unconscious is outlined. E. Neumann notes that because of this, two mental systems are formed in the personality, one of which remains completely unconscious, and the other, with the active support of the Ego and the conscious mind, becomes an important organ of the psyche. The unconscious system in K. Jung’s psychoanalytic concept was called “Shadow” and the other was called “Persona” or external personality. In a civilized society, the formation of the “Persona” is a necessary process that adapts the individual to the requirements of a particular historical age.

E. Neumann believed that the very approach of old ethic, when the world is split into two parts, one of which is supported and the other is depreciated and discarded, is the cause of modern problems. The contents driven out of consciousness become regressive, they accumulate and gradually create tension that can lead to negative consequences. As Neumann wrote, “the more dogmatically the old ethic is imposed on individuals and societies, i.e. the

stronger the influence of conscience, the more radical the repression becomes, and the greater the gap between consciousness with its value identification and the unconscious, which in the form of compensation takes the opposite position”¹⁷. After all, the danger is the way in which old ethic seek to eliminate the sense of guilt and ease the tension in the sphere of the unconscious. Even wars and revolutions, according to Neumann, are manifestations of the unconscious forces that have accumulated in society and need to be discharged (“Wars serve as a correlate of old ethic, since they clearly manifest the activation of the unconscious, shadowy side of the collective”¹⁸. Similarly, the fight against heretics, political opponents, enemies of the people, etc., is a struggle against our fears, vulnerabilities and insecurities. That is, we are trying to find a way to identify ourselves with ideal values. The easiest way is to destroy the Shadow in the form of a “scapegoat”. Various segments of the population are offered to the role of the victim of this scapegoat psychology: the morally defective, ethnic minorities, foreigners, etc. For greater efficiency, the punishment ceremony usually has a solemn appearance. As Neumann noted, “Church and state representatives are involved in executing sentences against the unfortunate victims of scapegoat psychology, feeling a sense of pride that their “conscience is clear”. The elimination of “external evil” has always brought clear relief to both the individual and the collective”¹⁹. Of course, all this can be explained as the development of culture and civilization. However, Neumann insists that it is this scapegoat psychology that has played a catastrophic role in the history of mankind, since any people who are convinced of their divinity believe that they work for the benefit of all mankind.

Therefore, in his opinion, the old ethic should be responsible not only for the negation of the shadow side, but also for the splitting of the individual, which in this case occurs. Splitting leads to an unconscious sense of inferiority, which is offset by the tendency to exaggerate self-justification. The Shadow projection becomes systematic and manifests itself in the form of fear of persecution by other people or the whole world.

We can say that the old ethic is the ethic of conscious attitude, the ethic of “clear conscience”. That is why it is a partial ethic because it does not take into account the influence of the unconscious. That is why the old ethic has

¹⁷ Neumann E. *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*. – St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian). – P. 48.

¹⁸ Neumann E. *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*. – St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian). – P. 57.

¹⁹ Neumann E. *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*. – St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian). – P. 53.

proved its inability to solve the urgent problems of morality of modern man²⁰. Another danger of the old ethic is that it does not take into account the compensatory relations between the conscious and the unconscious, which, according to Neumann, is the main cause of the current crisis in the social sphere. He points out that in the last one and a half century we have a breakthrough of the dark unconscious part of our psyche into society. There is interest in various forms of “evil” or experimentation with the “demonic”. In the view of Neumann’s, the new ethics is to consider an integral human having concatenated both individual and collective, as well as both the conscious and the unconscious.

CONCLUSIONS

Therefore, while comparing the position of the existentialists with the findings of the depth psychology researchers’, it is necessary to point out the fundamental difference in spontaneity being interpreted as an authenticity criterion for an individual behaviour.

Existentialism is rooted in the initial thesis of a human being’s key characteristic being humaneness, the latter emerging in the process of continuous self-transcendence, while approaching to the authentic existence. The criterion for such an authenticity can imply a spontaneous non-reflective behaviour. However, as Neumann’s analysis demonstrated, both orientation at the values of the conscious, and spontaneous dark sides (“Shadow”) manifestation, can be detrimental.

This particular issue gives rise to the idea of the new ethic, which will be free from the shortcomings of the previous ethic and will be able to respond appropriately to the challenges of today. The way out of this split position means changes of the basic ethical settings and negation of the absolute nature of goodness, holiness, heroism, as well as trying not to fight with the Shadow, while making attempts of understanding it as an inner archetype. In the new ethical situation there should be presented various coexisting elements, both constructive and destructive, instinctive and spiritual, religious and atheistic. The main requirement of the new ethic is not “goodness” of an individual, but rather his psychological independence, health and integrity. Or, as Neumann wrote, “in this case, the values of the new ethic can be formulated as follows: whatever leads to wholeness is “good”; whatever leads to splitting is “evil”. Integration is good, disintegration is evil”²¹.

²⁰ Neumann E. *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*. – St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian). – P. 75.

²¹ Neumann E. *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*. – St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian). – P. 130.

Thus, in this case, the process of manifesting the “humanistic” nature of man is associated with the mastery of art to come into direct contact with reality, bypassing rationalist filters and psychological protections. That is, the new paradigm of humanism is connected with the development of a certain attitude to reality, where intentional acts, pre-reflective actions, direct contact with reality are the basis of human activity.

SUMMARY

The article is aimed at the transformation of the humanism principles in the context of the twentieth century realities when the previous ethical principles and rules mostly lost their prescriptive power and effectiveness.

Certainly, the whole situation was not such a straightforward one. Thus, exactly during this period there have been attempts of finding a new basis for humanism. In particular, Jean-P. Sartre in his work *Existentialism is a humanism* (1946) distinguishes between the classical humanism and its existentialist version, and tried to find out a new reason for this humanism. E. Fromm, the “humanistic psychology” representative, also sought to justify a new humanism. According to Fromm, the only way to find a lost human existence and mental health lies within the radical transformation of an individual through “humanistic” or existential psychoanalysis.

In this respect, this approach differs radically from the position of E. Neumann, the follower of so-called depth psychology who investigated the causes of the moral crisis having impact on a human being during the twentieth century. In his view, the crisis lies within the fact that the old ethic and the methods of solving moral problems tend to collapse nowadays. In particular, he tried to prove that the old ethic has not only ceased to meet the realities of modern times, but lost effectiveness as a mechanism aimed at adapting an individual to the collective values.

The way out of this situation means changes of the basic ethical settings and negation of the absolute nature of goodness, holiness, heroism, as well as trying not to fight with the Shadow, while making attempts of understanding it as an inner archetype. The old ethic should be responsible not only for the denial of the shadow-formed side, but for the dissociation of personality resulting from the situation. In the new ethical situation there should be presented various coexisting elements, both constructive and destructive, instinctive and spiritual, religious and atheistic. The main requirement of the new ethic is not “goodness” of an individual, but rather his/her psychological independence, health and integrity.

REFERENCES

1. Fromm E. (1996) *Revolution of Hope // Contemporary Foreign Social Philosophy*. – Kyiv, Lybid.
2. Fromm E. (1992) *Psychoanalysis and Zen Buddhism // Philos. i Sociol. Dumka* . – No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
3. Heidegger M. (1988) *Letter on Humanism // The Problem of Man in Western Philosophy*. – M., Progress. (in Russian).
4. Neumann E. (1999) *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*. – St. Petersburg, (in Russian).
5. Sartre, Jean-Paul (1996). *L'existentialisme est un humanisme*. Paris, Gallimard. (in French).

Information about the author:

Vitalii Liakh,

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor,
Head of the Department of History of Foreign Philosophy,
H.S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy of NAS of Ukraine
ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0003-4683-0838