

AL-FARABI KAZAKH NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

A.K. Abisheva

PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS OF PSYCHOLOGY

Educational manual

Almaty
«Kazakh university»
2014

UDC 1(075.8)
LBK 87+88.3я73
A 15

Recommended for publication by the Science Committee of Faculty
of Philosophy and Political Science and Editorial and Publishing Council
of al-Farabi Kazakh National University

Reviewers:

Doctor of philosophical sciences, professor *Z.N. Issmagambetova*
Doctor of philosophical sciences, professor *R.K. Kadyrzhanov*
Doctor of philosophical sciences, professor *A.B. Naurzbayeva*

Abisheva A.K.

A15 **Philosophical problems of psychology: educational manual/**
A.K. Abisheva. – Almaty: Kazakh university, 2014. – 122 p.
ISBN 978-601-04-0663-6

The educational manual represents the review of the most significant achievements of theories of personality in psychology, especially in classical and modern psychoanalysis. The critical analysis of problems of human and his mentality, correlation of consciousness and unconscious in the light of freedom and creativity, choice of senses of human's being is presented by the method of philosophical reflection. In the manual main contradictions revealed in anthropological conceptions of S. Freud, E. Fromm, K. Horney, C.G. Jung, A. Adler, A.H.Maslow and V. Frankl, concepts of "Ego", "personality", "culture" developed by them are discussed, which allows to involve students into a philosophical critical discourse. Much attention is paid to problems of destruction of subject, its internal mental alienation, which are revealed on material of psychoanalytic research of personality bifurcation through the conceptions of neuroses of S. Freud, E. Fromm, K. Horney and other theories.

The educational manual is intended for students, master and doctoral candidates of philosophy, culturology, psychology majors, for lecturers and all those, interested by the issues of philosophical and cultural anthropology.

UDC 1(075.8)
LBK 87+88.3я73

ISBN 978-601-04-0663-6

© Abisheva A.K., 2014
© KazNU al-Farabi, 2014

Introduction

Spiritual reevaluation of values system, spiritual reorganization of all social institutes, including education is presently observed nowadays, in time of social reorientation of society for democratic basis, formation of the state sovereignty where pluralism, freedom of thought, initiative manifestation become acceptable.

Society which tries to turn from closed in opened, overcoming difficulties, and at least realizes this necessity, needs as well in democratic transformation of an education system, formation of the young generation conforming to modern requirements of scientific progress and developed world-view.

The educational manual "Philosophical problems of psychology", is directed on the analysis of the most popular theories of personality in the field of psychology in which author acquaints with doctrine about human, society and culture in these theories in their finished kind, with their general idea-logical structure, seeking to reveal what in them sustained time and makes heritage of modern spiritual culture. On pages of the educational manual main contradictions revealed in anthropological conceptions of S. Freud, E. Fromm, K. Horney, C.G. Jung, A. Adler, A.H.Maslow and V. Frankl, concepts of "Ego", "personality", "culture" developed by them are discussed, that allows not only to learn the content of purely information character, but also to involve being trained in a philosophical critical discourse, to create at them analytical skills, to develop thinking.

The educational manual represents not only the review of the most significant achievements of theories of personality in psychology, especially in classical and modern psychoanalysis, but in it the critical philosophical analysis of problems of human and his mentality, correlation of consciousness and unconscious in the light of freedom and creativity, choice of senses of human's being is submitted, comparisons with philosophical concepts of existentialism and personalism are given.

Much attention is paid to actual problems of destruction of subject, its internal mental alienation which are revealed on material of psychoanalytic research of personality bifurcation through the concept of neuroses of S. Freud, E. Fromm, K. Horney and other theories, critical analysis of structure and dynamics of human "Ego", instances "Id", "Super-Ego", character of contradictions in covering them integrity of psyche is carried out.

It is clear that for study and analysis of such difficult integrity as human mentality can't do without philosophical reflection therefore application of philosophical methods and approaches for examination of such variety of concepts is necessary. The interrelation of complicated structure of human mentality, origination and role of unconscious and consciousness, their relations mainly with social creativity of human, with specifics of various cultures is shown in the educational manual. The analysis of correlation consciousness and unconscious as reflexive integrity of human "Ego" on materials of psychoanalysis within which the unconscious concept was most developed is provided to attention of readers, biology approach to understanding of human being in classical psychoanalysis is criticized, that prevents to see reflexive character "Ego", its spiritual and creative potential.

The first chapter of this educational manual for the students studying philosophy, psychology and trends pertaining to humanities, represents critical analysis of logical development psychoanalytic concept of Sigmund Freud, the known thinker of the XX century who has founded the whole direction – the psychoanalysis, which had become one of the popular concepts of modern anthropology in history of the western thought. He had a great number of the followers, being notable for independent original understanding of a problem of a personality and his mentality.

Psychoanalysis, having arisen at the beginning of the XX century gained wide popularity far outside psychology. Its ideas had and have a certain influence to the Western culture, art, literature, medicine and field of humanities. Freudianism represents the spiritual phenomenon of the XX century, spiritual outcome of people of a certain era with their specific contradictions therefore it is necessary to consider it in correlation with character of social realities.

Relevance of the problems raised by S. Freud doesn't lose value in conditions of social contradictions, up to our days when guidelines of people, their social ideals and system of values are changed.

Within S. Freud's concept the special attention should be paid to an explanation by him bifurcation of mentality of a person, splitting his Ego as a result of the incompatible individual's motivations conflict. Despite a known pansexuality, though inconsistently, Freud considered neuroses and other mental occurrences as phenomena that have internal psychological character, instead of physiological, as interaction of motives. The conflict of these motivations as a result of which one motivations are forced out in unconscious as condemned by public norms and an individual, can provoke neurosis, therefore unconscious motives influence conscious life of individuals, giving it often irrational character. In some especially extreme cases the conflict passes to a mental illness and a person loses character of subject of own mental life and activity.

The second chapter is devoted to the analysis of the most valuable achievements, discoveries made in doctrines of C.G. Jung, A. Adler, E. Fromm, K. Horney, A.H.Maslow and V. Frankl who have developed original theories of personality, the questions which are brought up in which didn't lose the relevance today. Consideration of mass psychology in correlation with the individual nature of human "Ego", identity problems in S. Freud and C.G. Jung's concepts, problems of self-actualization of personality in A. Adler, A.H.Maslow and V. Frankl's doctrines didn't disregard.

This educational manual is intended to acquaint students with the content of the most widespread trends of foreign social thought, the most valuable achievements, potential put in called anthropological doctrines, demanding further comprehension.

*Philosophical
problems
of psychoanalysis*

1. The doctrine about human mentality
in S. Freud's conception

1.1 Beginning of origination of the psychoanalysis concept

Psychoanalysis arose on a joint of two boundaries – yet not declined rationalism and an irrationalism, its duality and contradictoriness follow from here. Unfortunate "Ego" of Freud is in fact that formerly understood as reason and the mind which function is correlation of environment and mentality. However Freud refuses to recognize for the reason the right to define human activity and human nature as he was in agreement with the irrational tendency which had become firmly established in contemporary philosophy.

If during an era of the Renaissance and bourgeois revolutions philosophical thought developed the theoretical principles of creative

activity and personal freedom, substantiated belief in social progress, and looked for the truth at reason, while the modern western philosophy under the influence of deep social and political changes, cataclysms of the World Wars I, II and crisis of cultural values is characterized by disappointment in history, in possibility of reasonable knowledge of the world and expresses a protest against extreme forms of alienation of human personality. It looks for truth in unconscious, in preconscious instead of reason. "The philosophy of sense" is changed by "philosophy of life". The last looks for sense in existence instead in cognition. Now human lost the former values, supporting on objective bases of his existence which gave him or her self-confidence in the future, sense of one's life.

At this situation of acute alienation human being felt deprived of the point of support, thrown and powerless in such conditions of life, where all hitherto created by him: technics, science, all forms of the relations acted as omnipotent anonymous and hostile to him forces. The whole world was presented to a person as a fetish which manages over him completely up to his thoughts, feelings, motives. Abstract rationalism, reasonableness weren't able to solve these problems.

All these moods received theoretical expression in bourgeois philosophy of the XX century. The question was raised thus: what is actually a human, how to be in the world? At the same time the appeal to a problem of a man and refusal of naturalism presupposed refusal of objectness, presence substantiality in definition of a human. There is no human nature whatever. Though there is an essence of person, but there is no forever given definition of this essence. However in fact true in the beginning the understanding of a problem of a human being had a concrete embodiment in the most different concepts of a man – existentialism, structuralism, personalism, phenomenology, pragmatism including psychoanalysis in which, despite positive sides, there happen a big or smaller absolutization, abstraction of some kind of sides of person's essence by influence of social contradictions of the XX century. Naturalistic explanation of man however far have not completely become obsolete and has still broad and deep influence on outlook of the public, particularly sociobiology and many other trends of anthropology.

Since times of the German philosophers A.Schopenhauer and F.Nietzsche all these tendencies begin to be replaced from a reasonable basis of human being to dark, irrational unconscious will or to an

arbitrariness of subject, and have become popular at the turn of the XIX-XX centuries. The address is made not to reason of a human being, but to his internal dark unconscious forces, his mental world, emotions, existential settings. External objective world is only reflection and projection of human's interior world.

A person deprived of a substantiality and all his reality are defined then by such subjective qualities as will, an impulse, "a tendency to", inducements, desires, affect, unconscious inclinations and conflicts, motivations, intuitions, instincts, etc. There an ontologisation occurs, that is penetration of many irrational forces of person in being taken as characteristic features of Self, subjectivity of man.

All these new trends and changes affect on the psychoanalytic doctrine. The founder of psychoanalysis Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), Austrian psychiatrist was born in Moravia (Czechoslovakia) in a family of businessman. He graduated medical faculty of Vienna university, at the same time working at Physiological institute of Ernst Brucke at the university, one of founders of physicochemical school in physiology where Freud acquired the principle of the most strict determinism and approach to an organism as energy magnitude. Freud's first scientific works differed by original approach and novelty in the field of neurology. In 1881 Freud received scientific degree on medicine and was engaged in medical practice in psychiatric clinic of the known psychiatrist T.Meynert. Working then in Paris in Jean Charcot's clinic, Freud paid attention to such phenomenon of a mental disorder as hysteria and to methods of its treatment.

Continuing to make progress in the field of neurology on a problem of the theory of aphasia, mechanisms of nervous system's activity, the doctrine about the children's paralysis which contribution is invaluable, Freud then pays his scientific attention to hysteria research.

Hysteria represented one of kinds of neurosis which treatment only by methods of neurophysiology didn't bring positive results. Difficulties in treatment of similar patients forced Freud address to I.Bernheim's experiences which method consisted in suggestion application during hypnosis, however practical application of this method didn't give therapeutic success too. Then Freud addressed to method of "catharsis" of Josef Breuer. The method consists in after that the patient in a hypnotic state remembered and reproduced the sharp, tremendous emotional experience felt once keenly and forgotten by him so that he

didn't remember it in a usual conscious state, after such sessions symptoms of hysteria weakened, and in certain cases disappeared. It was necessary to explain this phenomenon, to reveal its internal mechanism. Freud comes to a conclusion about existence in mentality conscious, perceived by us and unconscious mental acts, forced out of consciousness as a result of vital circumstances. These forced out, non-admitted in consciousness, suppressed desires, inclinations or thoughts, becoming unconscious, however, aspire to break in consciousness area, but unsuccessfully. Hysteria symptoms are expression of these attempts of break of unconscious impulses in consciousness. " ... Matter was that there some kind of desire was arising which stood in a sharp contradiction with other desires of an individual, desire which was incompatible with ethical and esthetic views of personality. There was a short conflict, and the end of this internal fight was that representation which arose in consciousness as the carrier of this incompatible desire, was undergone to ousting and together with reminiscences relating to it was removed from consciousness and forgotten. Incompatibility of the corresponding representation with Ego of patient was motive of ousting; ethical and other requirements of an individual were forcing-out forces. Acceptance of incompatible desire or, something the same, continuation of the conflict would cause considerable displeasure; this displeasure was eliminated with ousting which is, thus, one of the defensive mechanism of mental personality." [1, p.357-358].

These unconscious impulses, being forced out, however, don't disappear, and constantly are present at psyche of person and have impact on his behavior or are expressed in illness symptoms, in this case – hysteria symptoms. After hypnosis where by method of catharsis (purification) if it is succeed, release of traumatizing emotions in consciousness area occurs, there the relief happens, symptoms become less expressed, and can disappear depending on effect of treatment. Result of collaboration of S. Freud and J. Breuer was their book *Studies on Hysteria* (1895).

However both authors didn't yet think to address psychological reasons, they thought still completely by concepts of neurophysiology, explaining reasons of neuroses with a natural-science way, taking the mental phenomena out of physicochemical processes of an organism. Neurosis was presented to them as violation of balance of nervous energy, and "... symptoms correspond to abnormal communication of a

certain quantity of unsolved energy of excitement (conversion)"[2, p.16], and a catharsis – as the discharge returning to a normal state.

1.2 The Doctrine about inclinations. Pleasure principle

Freud develops the doctrine about inclinations, as a basis of human soul life. Desires and inclinations move behavior of a person which satisfaction brings pleasure to him. Human life and all its tendencies are directed on satisfaction of these desires. Following the principle of determinism and economic approach to regulation of neuropsychic processes, Freud develops the point of view, "... that the course of mental processes is automatically regulated by the pleasure principle, i.e. we consider that this process each time is excited by tension connected with displeasure and then takes such direction that its end result coincides with reduction of this tension – with avoidance of displeasure or with pleasure origination" [3, p.139].

Thus, operation of the psychical apparatus is directed on reduction of amount of excitement, its preservation at probably low level in some stable state. At increase of this amount of excitement displeasure is felt by person. Mental inclinations or desires, however, are considered by Freud as natural, biological instincts of human, it is first of all sexual – instincts of reproduction of human generation which always strive for satisfaction. They are loaded with energy of a libido. Freud even assumes that psychical energy of person will be sometime calculated. He calls them primary urges which human can't cancel as they are an integral part of him. Freud was affected by had become then popular Nietzsche and Schopenhauer's doctrines that person and his destiny are dominated by dark irrational unconscious forces. Freud, being the naturalist, endows biological instinctive desires with irrational force.

These primary urges constantly strive for satisfaction, however encounter the social ban established by society. As society consists of people, each of them seeks to satisfy the dark unconscious inclinations and desires, both, sexual and affective, destructive. However it encounters the same egoistical motives of other people, in such situation war of all against all would begin that would threaten with death of mankind. Under influence of a self-preservation instinct of Ego, Freud considers, people created society with its ban and laws, legal and political institutes which are provided with functions of protection of citizens from attempts on

their life. Thus, in his opinion, in cultural conditions the pleasure principle is replaced by the reality principle with which each individual should take it into consideration. To keep the safety, each individual should put off satisfaction of inclinations, without refusing them, for later terms or to satisfy them in a roundabout ways.

Probably Freud adheres here to guidelines of a bourgeois way of life at a stage of initial accumulation of capital, affected his notions. After all released from primitive fetters of slavery, people aspire to vital benefits, to new forms of freedom understood still as aspiration to a profit. However, having faced reality, it should abstain from the benefits and to put off satisfaction of desires for vast term. Abstention becomes the principle of life.

Thus, inclinations not approved by society, in particular sexual primary urges, being more difficult educated, are forced out in unconscious area, they aren't approved and aren't allowed in conscious part of psychic "Ego". However loaded with energy of a libido, being suppressed, they aren't destroyed, and strive for satisfaction, but as censorship of consciousness doesn't allow it, they use bypass ways and reveal via dreams, misreading, slips of the tongue or symptoms of neuroses which infinitely repeat till become realized, carried out, satisfied. Therefore technique of psychoanalysis aims to help realize the forced-out affective drives.

1.3 Oedipus complex

Freud develops the doctrine about child's sexuality having infantile character. In early childhood psychic ousting are observed as a social ban imposes taboo on manifestations of sexual desires. Freud distinguishes three periods of development of child's sexuality to the adult: oral, anal and phallic. The earliest period he calls autoerotic when object of satisfaction of all his desires is his own body, it is the period when the first satisfactions are connected with important functions serving to self-preservation. The child is fed, looked after, protected. During this period the sexual inclinations at first join to satisfaction of "Ego" drives, here first foundation of narcissism is laid. During subsequent periods these sexual inclinations separate from "Ego" and their libido turns to the objects, the first such sexual objects become faces feeding and preserving child, this is mother or person replacing her.

According to Freud, child directs first sexual inclinations and curiosity on relatives and persons loved by him – parents, brothers, sisters, he doesn't know an abyss yet between an animal and human, manifesting incest attractions. However upbringing at once vigorously suppresses all sexual manifestations of child, and they become forbidden. Therefore, according to Freud, unconscious of soul life is infantile and the analysis of all mental phenomena – the hidden thoughts of dreams, symptoms of neurotics, wrong actions, slips of the tongue, witty remarks and many others lead finally to these initial infantile sexual experiences of the childhood. Neurosis, according to Freud also is regression and fixing on certain sections of the child's period as here conflicts had already been. However he recognizes that there are also not sexual inclinations, inclinations of Ego and that neuroses come from the conflict between sexuality and Ego where Ego follows the reality principle and liable to upbringing influence. At neurosis Ego is undergone to regression on earlier phases of development.

According to Freud Oedipus complex or a parental complex steadily acts as content of early phase of development. Freud considers that the myth about Oedipus, killed father and unwittingly married his mother "arose from the most ancient material of dreams which has the content of painful violation of the relation to parents thanks to first awakenings of sexuality." [6].

Legend of Oedipus, Freud considers, arose as imagination from event really taking place. Little son, feeling special tenderness to mother, wants to take a place of father who is represented to him the exceeded competitor whom he afraid therefore he has desire to eliminate father to own infinitely mother. But one only this spiteful desire causes in him sense of guilt because of ambivalent feelings as on the other hand, he has a tender affection for father, needs his protection, admires his courage, worships to him, wants to become like father. Oedipus complex which solution influences destiny of person is formed of such arisen conflict and sense of guilt. If there an identification to father and owing to a ban the incest relations replacement of mother with other sexual object is happened, it assumes normal development, if not, the consequence of not resolved conflict and other violations will cause neurotic frustration.

The matter is that Freud met phenomena with mechanisms of Oedipus complex, castration anxiety at boys in clinical practice however

it was represented to him that he faced not symptoms of certain patients, but with the phenomena of the deep instinctive beginnings of person and therefore Oedipus complex became firm concept with help of which he explained all neurotic frustrations which etiology he looked for in sexual inclinations. As not majority of neuroses have a sexual etiology and hereby, it seemed some his failures in therapy of these diseases are explained.

However Oedipus complex, according to Freud is not only ruler defining destiny of each certain individual, but also the progress engine, having turned person from an animal into a cultural being, and animal herd in a civilized society.

Later Freud leaves physiological direction in explanation of neurotic disorders. Broad practice and scientific search lead him to independent discovery and conclusions. He develops “a doctrine of repression and resistance, significance of child's sexuality and application interpretation of dreams for cognition of unconscious sphere” [2, p. 22].

1.4 Methodology and method of psychoanalysis

Having refused hypnosis as not always effective method because not all people are exposed to hypnosis enough, and in certain cases hypnosis even is dangerous when there is not an reacting and relief, but, on the contrary, fixing of traumatic affect at failure of its withdrawal in consciousness area, besides, suggestion word of commands change spontaneous directives of personality, Freud does the technical innovation – a method of free associations. The method consisted in that patient in response to leading questions had to in an easy situation, without setting for himself any intellectual tasks freely express all thoughts coming to him, what incongruous they would seem. Freud, probably, adhered to a strict causal relationship, that speech associations are strictly determined. And disclosing unconscious thoughts of the patient tried to find in them logic, semantic contents opening a mental picture of conflict which is the reason of neurosis. Thus, the method of free associations served for Freud as a key of unconscious. Unconscious, therefore, was represented not simply as dark irrational force, but having the logic and sense, dynamic spiritual space of individual, the particle of genuine personality. Freud attached a principal

significance to the motivational directives making color of emotional and mental life of individual. And as we see from his concept, repression, resistance and many other mechanisms are the psychical acts accomplishing thanks to fight of incompatible motives.

Having refused hypnosis and applying method of free associations, Freud faced a certain phenomenon when patient, experiencing confusion which himself couldn't explain, refused further statement of free thoughts because of their forgetting, amnesia. However he noticed that this forgetting proceeded from unconscious unwillingness to remember. Patient as though resisted and refused of treatment under any pretexts as soon as his associations, thoughts approached closer to that fatal event which has inflict soul wounds on him. As this event was absolutely forgotten by him, not realized, patient, naturally didn't understand and couldn't explain unwillingness to associate, he simply felt deterioration of state. It was noticed by Freud that the closer you move ahead to that conflict which has made a cause of illness, the more disease symptoms become frequent. His task was to identify content of this conflict, guide thoughts of associations at this content, to force the patient to remember this event forced out from memory and by that to realize it, in this recovery would consist. He noted paradoxical fact that patient didn't want to recover, he in every way clung illness though his presence initially meant desire to be exempted from the problems. Therefore Freud assumed that there is certain mechanism which doesn't allow release of forced-out content of the injuring event in consciousness that consciousness doesn't admit it in itself. He called this mechanism resistance, and force of this resistance is equal to that force which forced out in time these contents from consciousness. For recovery it was necessary to destroy this resistance.

Own doctrine of repression and resistance Freud calls the central problems of psychoanalysis, its conclusions, instead of prerequisites.

Freud also developed concept of regression which he used in any analysis. Directing attention of patient to that his traumatizing scene, he found, however, that associations of patient didn't stop on it, and went further, back, to earlier experiences from earlier past – youth, and then to childhood experiences which in other conditions couldn't be analyzed. Matter in that, Freud considered, that the earliest experiences of the childhood though in itself don't cause neurotic conflicts, but can affect, transform some experience, an event or even thought of adult into reason of one's neurotic disorders.

As a result of observations from clinical practice Freud comes to a conclusion about a sexual etiology of neuroses and about child's sexuality. In special attitude of patient towards psychoanalyst which he called transferring, he saw sexual motivation: "The fact of the roughly sexually painted, gentle or hostile transferring arising at any treatment of neurosis-transference, though undesirable and not caused by any of parties (patient and doctor), seemed to me always the incontestable proof of an origin of a creative power of neurosis from area of sexual life"[2, p. 20].

Freud came to this conclusion after becoming well-known case in history of psychoanalysis with the patient under name Anna O. She suffered by hysterical symptoms expressed in speech, sight, movements disorders. These symptoms appeared after she had been looked after the seriously ill father, feeling fault for helplessness in this situation. Applying hypnosis and a catharsis method, Freud and Breuer hoped to achieve result of treatment by means of reacting, release from agonizing anxiety by accounting of events and reminiscences of the girl at which as they believed, there discharge of nervous energy will happen. However the patient soon started showing sexually painted feeling of love to Breuer that perturbed them. From here Freud also developed concept of transfer in which, in his opinion, transferring by patient on the doctor of feeling which has been experienced by him to parents is expressed.

Psychoanalytic practice and huge persistent work with purpose to find a way to therapeutic success, showed to Freud that the physiology can't give answer to this question. Reasons of illness of Anna O. consisted not in physiology violations though symptoms could be organic, it was a consequence of other reason. Psychopathology should be explained from psychological reasons. The phenomenon of hypnosis showed that unconscious inclinations can manage behavior of person. So, if to inspire person open an umbrella after hypnosis, he will do it even in a clear sunny weather, however he will incapable explaining why he does it.

Freud thus deepened into area of unconscious of psychic human's life, into complexity of his inner world which is torn by the soul conflicts. Motives and inclinations become objects of his intent attention. All logic of his greatest discovery shows that ways of treatment should be looked for not in impact on an organism but in influence and change of human's identity.

Freud's therapy differed from other schools of psychiatry resorting to somatic treatment. Freud saw the reason of mental diseases not only in functional, somatic disorders of a brain, but mainly – in violations of harmonious relationship of individual's internal own motives. Human can be sick having a healthy normal state of a brain and organism. Therefore, it is diseases of the s u b j e c t, instead of an organism, more precisely, temporary or may be final, partial or total loss quality of subjectivity at individual.

1.5 Concept of the unconscious. Dynamics of human psychics. Psychological sense of slips of the tongue, mistakes in reading, erroneously carried-out actions

Freud considered that dreams, slips of the tongue, mistakes in reading, erroneously carried-out actions and forgetting are strictly determined, instead of are casual that they proceed from motivational tendencies and directives of personality. If person forgets name of district or any event, it is explained by its unwillingness connected with unpleasant reminiscence or any other psychological reasons. For example, Freud writes: "Erroneously carried-out actions aren't accidents, and represent the serious mental acts having own meaning, they arise thanks to interaction, or better to say, to counteraction of two various intentions", "that one of these intentions is undergone suppression, its accomplishment isn't allowed and as a result it is shown in violation of other intention", "... the violating intention is shown directly before slip of the tongue. But in both cases this intention is pushed aside.

Speaker decided not to allow his expressions in speech, and then there a slip of the tongue occurred, that is to say, the pushed aside intention nevertheless was shown against his will, having changed expression of the intention allowed by him, having mixed up with it or even having completely replaced it. Such is slip of the tongue's mechanism"[4, p. 25, 39].

For example, president of Chamber of Deputies opened somehow meeting by following words: "Ladies and gentlemen, I recognize number of attendees sufficient and I declare meeting closed". Here we see action of opposite intention – unwillingness to open meeting as he doesn't expect from it anything good therefore here instead of due "I declare meeting opened" is replaced on "closed". Or: professor speaks:

"I am not inclined" (instead of I am incapable) to estimate merits of my respected predecessor". There is a distortion of sense, intending to say "is incapable" (geeignet), he speaks "isn't inclined" (geneigt), showing opposite sense of the valid intention, relation. Giving a set of examples of slips of the tongue, Freud points to a correlation of sounds and similarity of words and influence of verbal associations which are used by slip of the tongue, but it is not the main moment, the main mechanism of slip of the tongue – psychical, sense.

Erroneously carried-out actions, slips of the tongue, mistakes in reading and writing, etc. – striking examples of action unconscious tendencies, intentions which act irrespective of, individual knows them or doesn't know, i.e., frequently irrespective of their consciousness, they are shown in everyday life of healthy people. By means of their deciphering it is possible to open the content of these unconscious motives and desires.

Freud often analyzed also own slips of the tongue and erroneously carried-out actions. Forgetting constantly to go, for example, on meetings, he opened motivation of own behavior. So, he gives an example of own forgetting: "Recently a case happened to me when I couldn't remember the name of the harmless Moravian city of Bisenzio, and the analysis showed that not direct hostility, but the consonance with the name of a palazzo of Bisenzio in Orvieto where I repeatedly lived earlier was the cause. Motive of the tendency directed against recovery of the name to memory, here for the first time the principle which will subsequently find its extremely great meaning for definition of reasons of neurotic symptoms acts: refusal of memory to remember that is connected with unpleasant feelings, and again to endure this displeasure at reminiscence. Intention to avoid the displeasure which source memory or other psychical acts serve, psychical escape of displeasure we recognize as final motive not only for a forgetting of names, but also for many other erroneously carried-out actions, such, as non-execution of promises, mistakes-delusions, etc." [4, p. 45].

Analysis of mechanisms of many psychical acts, phenomena in their concrete and dynamic manifestations and their explanation from the psychical reasons, instead of physiological, and also techniques and methods of analysis, new approaches, developed by Freud were essential achievement in the field of psychology and psychopathology that defined ways to formation of the independent concept

distinguishing psychoanalysis from other schools of psychiatry.

So, the founder draws conclusions: "Sometimes everything that is possible to observe in soul life call a psychic phenomenon. It is important to find out, whether the separate mental phenomenon is caused directly by physical, organic, material influences, and then it doesn't belong to psychology area, or it is caused first of all by other mental processes behind which, in turn, series of organic reasons are concealed. Exactly in this last sense we understand phenomenon, calling it psychical process therefore it is more expedient to express in this way: phenomenon has content, sense. Under sense we understand meaning, intention, a tendency and a place among psychical connections". And further: "We want not simply to describe and to classify phenomena, but we strive for understanding them as manifestation of fight of soul forces, as expression of purposeful tendencies which work according to with each other or against each other. We adhere to *dynamic understanding* of the psychical phenomena." [4, p. 36, 40].

1.6 The interpretation of dreams

The method of free associations opens possibility of the dreams analysis which Freud successfully used in psychotherapy. Dream, he concludes, is not senseless, not absurd, it represents not somatic, but the psychical phenomenon of full value included in general chain of the soul phenomena. *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900). Any, even indifferent dream isn't casual, behind its manifest content the hidden latent dream-thoughts connected with any experiences, inclinations are concealed. Unlike manifest content latent dream-thoughts aren't known, not realized, they are hidden from us. Freud considers the purpose, task of a dream, its essence is desire execution: " dream represents itself (hidden) fulfilment of (suppressed, forced out) wish" [5, p. 115]. However implementation of wish is shown only in distorted sort as desire fulfilment in a dream is opposed by other mental force executing function of censorship which promotes disguising of a wish. As it is already known, function of censorship is non-admission of unconscious contents in consciousness, it is as though guard of consciousness. Therefore if manifest content is realized, hidden dream-thoughts aren't realized by human before analysis.

However, how the manifest content of a dream is realized? Seemingly that unconscious, hidden thoughts of a dream nevertheless

get into consciousness, but in such distorted appearance processed by censorship that it is impossible to recognize its true content. Therefore, Freud concluded, "awareness is the special mental act for us, different and independent of reminiscence process or idea and consciousness seems to us the organ of sense, perceiving content given to it from the outside. It is possible to show that psychopathology can't do without assumption of these main prerequisites". [5, p. 106].

Ambiguity is general property of dreams, erroneously carried-out actions, and the psychopathological phenomena. "This distortion of dreams is the same process with which you got acquainted at research of hysterical symptoms formation. It indicates that at formation of dreams the same fight of soul forces takes place, as well as at formation of symptoms. The manifest content of dreams is the distorted deputy of unconscious thoughts, and this distortion is business of "Ego" protective forces, or those resistances which in a vigil state at all don't admit the suppressed wishes of unconscious in consciousness area. During weakening of consciousness in a condition of a dream these resistances nevertheless are so strong that cause masking of unconscious thoughts. Having a dream owing to it as less recognizes its sense, as hysteric – relationship and meaning of own symptoms.

To convince of that fact that the hidden dream-thoughts really exist and there are the described correlations between them and the manifest content of a dream, you can in the analysis of the dreams which method coincides with psychoanalytic". [1, p. 365-366].

The manifest content of a dream is often absurdly or simply indifferent, its strangeness and absurd character result from masking work of the censorship processing a psychic material, materials of the thoughts progressing unconsciously. However, of course, this thinking occurs not during a dream, these thoughts result from day soul life, "... imperceptibly for consciousness they can continue and in the period of a falling asleep appear in finished form. From all this we can conclude perhaps only that the most difficult cogitative activity is possible without consciousness participation; however, it is known for us from psychoanalysis of any hysteric or person suffering by obsessive notions. These thoughts hiding behind dreams, itself, undoubtedly, are capable getting consciousness; if we don't realize them during a day, for it there is a number of different reasons. Consciousness is connected with address to a certain mental function – attention which is used, apparently, only in a certain scale." [5, p. 308-309].

Thus, we see that Freud quite right considers thinking, unconscious, consciousness, repression as the mobile, changeable mental phenomena induced by motives, desires and interests of individual. Thinking without target notions doesn't exist, he considered. Psychic of human being appears to our look as complete, compound and contradictory system where the unconscious forced-out tendencies can come into collision with conscious intentions, there is nothing casual and unconditioned which couldn't be explained.

Distorting activity of a dream is carried out by means of dream-works of a condensation, displacement, representability and secondary revision. These types of 'dream-work' transformations submit to the principle of economy, they are characteristic as well for many other mental phenomena, as, for example, for erroneously carried-out actions, witticism, comicalness, etc. Analysis of a dream opens the valid source, an invaluable mental material therefore interpretation of dreams Freud called the royal road in unconscious towards "concealed depths of our mentality".

However, according to Freud, the analysis of dreams, as well as the analysis of neurotic symptoms and all other mental phenomena brings us eventually to sexual desires of the early childhood. Energy of a libido eventually is the main power source of all mental acts. "Almost all energy filling this (psychical) apparatus, originates from instinctive aspirations presenting in it"[3, p.142].

Sexual inclinations hardly ever yield to education, they didn't develop together with a body towards esthetic perfection, they remained animal, culture can't affect them. Having remained without application in the culture conditions, they have an effect in the form of feeling of dissatisfaction. "But exactly this inability of a sexual inclination to give full satisfaction as soon as this inclination submitted to the first requirements of culture, becomes a source of the greatest cultural achievements, carried out thank to farther going sublimation of this inclination's components. For what motives could induce people to give other application to sexual impulses if at their any distribution they could receive entire happiness? They wouldn't depart from this happiness and wouldn't make further progress."[6, p.153-154]. Thus, according to Freud all public life of people, their creativity, thinking, art, religion, science, production act as result of sublimation of natural instinctive inclinations.

2. Problem of interrelation of consciousness and unconscious in psychoanalysis

2.1 Consciousness, unconscious and freedom of human

Nonpredetermination by any reasons, i.e. as the alien reasons with no relation to his own nature, and the reasons expressing his own nature and essence, nonpredetermination once and forever – that is what radically distinguishes human from an animal. This nonpredetermination first of all concerns his basic lifestyle, way of activity, attitude to the world, relations between human individuals. All these relations are not given to individuals initially, aren't given in their biological organization and therefore don't work spontaneously. Mechanisms passing of physiological processes in a human body, functioning spontaneously, are situated below that threshold, beyond the bounds of which motivations, a choice, decision, will, consciousness, and actions corresponding to them are required.

Apparently, K. Jaspers is right that human being can quite be a subject of scientific research outside of own substantial basis, and therefore existence of many sciences, for example, psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc. quite is justified. He can be explained in what he is terminated, ended, has limits up to down, in which cause-effect relationships quite were defined. However it will be an explanation of human only in his finiteness, completeness, doesn't explain him as a whole, in essence. Beyond these bounds there man's infinity, nonpredetermination remain, that it is impossible to explain him from any one or set of reasons, to bring him out of them. Causal explanation is incompatible with nonpredetermination. Comprehension and interpretation of human possibly on other basis. Philosophy stands on this other basis.

If philosophy has to comprehend sense of human existence, then it appears, sense on closer examination is not keeping within a framework of causal explanations. It that doesn't follow from any previous states, especially it is evident in the world where individuals are significantly independent in the decisions, acts, positions, in their choice. In such world in the atmosphere of the general sense-formation of the epoch

variety of meanings is observed in cumulative efforts of people. Each individual specifically creates the sense, changes them during the different periods, up to that sense of individual's life can be anything. However the fact of that sense which dawn upon person, not taken out of both something external to person, and of his previous or existent state, is indisputable. Predictable in many other relations, human remains unpredictable in infinite opportunities of his change, creativity of sense, choice of life positions.

However, having comprehended own life definitely and acting further according to the logic of this sense, he can become anyway predictable. We can expect from that or other individual of certain acts only in this case. It doesn't concern initial self-determination of individual, it becomes possible only as result of such self-determination.

Such sense in life of each individual acquires character of various motives. In language of concepts of S. Freud's psychology these motives form sphere of unconscious. They are driving forces of mental processes, and, therefore, individual actions. As they are connected mainly with biological human nature, and among organic needs primary and leading place is taken by needs of continuation of life, generation of new life, so far as sexual desires make a basis of such motives. Therefore, in most deep bases of life and being of person choice is excluded. These motives express the initial vital aspirations of human which are spontaneous by means that they not become an object of any processing or influence in the initial origin, they are vital. For it is primary, animal beginning in person. At animals, even the closest to human being on the physiological organization, psychic processes occur quite so that they don't become an object for psychic of an animal. Therefore, as many researchers assert, their psychic doesn't comprise such level which we call consciousness or awareness.

Therefore, being even incomparably more difficult and developed, mentality of human according to Freud nevertheless remains in essence animal. Consciousness is only built on over unconscious psychic processes. It isn't main and defining in human mental life. Mental life of human being mainly is unconscious because of vital aspirations always have the object out of themselves, they are directed only on external conditions, having mastered which organism also keeps itself. Consciousness of these processes becomes necessary only when organic life at the level of person creates need and opportunity to make the

object of oneself, own life activity. For the first time it becomes necessary for human being to change and master himself in order to master the outside world. To make himself for himself by an object of development, creation and change through mastering of the outside world, and, therefore, of awareness is that reflection which is inherent to human being.

Only such real reflection of human being in himself is a new way of his life activity. Way of his being in the world becomes a real reflection. According to Freud this reflection arises when there a new structure of mentality – consciousness appears. Freud doesn't speak about a reflection, scrupulously not engaged in clarification of what actually is a consciousness. He is limited in most cases with current, quite vague idea of consciousness, i.e. it is a sphere, where human realizes own mental processes, gives report to himself about them. Unconscious psychological processes are those, about existence of which man doesn't know, doesn't suspect, and in some cases he has (preconsciousness) about them vague feeling.

Moreover, at human conscious is, mainly, perceptions of external, external things, phenomena. In Freud's reflections is often shown only that consciousness or awareness is knowledge of something, including of internal processes. In that, however, understanding of that person not simply knows, but knows that knows – by P. T. de Chardin's expression – isn't shown. That consciousness is a reflection, in which human not only conscious, but also conscious that he conscious, and in it receives reflection both what is realized, and process of awareness, isn't noticed by S. Freud. In a word, it is not noticed that the reflection is such mental, in which the attitude of the person to the world and the world in the relation with the person, and all together attitudes people to each other are covered.

As a result a person and his mentality are not considered in its universality by S. Freud, because the content of things and processes of external world gets into the world of person so far as, it is dictated by need to send to something external the excess of energy of the primary lusts which haven't found satisfaction. The external world in Freud's concept is that on itself doesn't interest the person, it is mainly objects, on which mental forms are projected, find in them their replacement. So, religious god is in what human conscience received a form of its external replacement. Projection of the internal conflicts of "Ego" in the

outer world, in which outer world has sense of either reality limiting us in our lusts, or a replacing embodiment of mental life's contradictions – that is all its meaning for person. This projection is that limited form of a reflection, which is characteristic for a man. In such reflection man deals with the external world, as though without leaving own Self. A human as a whole remains closed in itself, engaged mainly fight against own forces clashing among themselves. Mental human life is filled mainly with content of his initial vital forces. He is imbued with contents of the outer world so far as it is admitted by needs of the internal conflict of "Ego".

Thus in the latter case they can't be realized at all not because are negative from point of view of communication sphere and in consequence of thereof are forced out, but on any other reason. As it was spoken earlier, this reason can be that such motive, as well as all other content of psyche frequently not becomes an object of individual's conscious self-report. And it concerns first of all children and adults undeveloped in spiritual plan.

To unconscious mental processes in the certain moment can be referred as it Freud recognizes, such content of our thoughts, feelings, etc. which constantly passes from unconscious soul movement in conscious and back, and it belongs almost to all content of ours thinking. I.e. they don't belong to one certain area, but are in continuous movement. When such content passes from area, as figuratively speak, of illuminance of consciousness into unconscious area, they not stop being soul or psychical process, as some supporters supposed the opinion that all psychical is conscious, belongs only to consciousness, and having stopped being conscious, thereby they stop being psychical. Therefore, when a certain soul life content directly isn't an object of thinking, analysis, consciousness, self-report, etc., it too belongs to unconscious area, it doesn't stay there simply in rest, without movement, it makes certain activity also can lead to a certain result. Certainly all this movement which is accomplishing out of a field and control consciousnesses, it is subordinated to a certain motive of psychical "Ego". Therefore as S. Freud fairly supposes, unconscious is entirely intensive traffic. Unconscious, so to speak, – not a storehouse, where all repressed content of mentality is situated until a certain time being idle.

S. Freud considers that spiritual creativity in many respects, in the main part is accomplished unconsciously. Apparently, in the actual plan

in many respects he is right. At many known scientists a guess about the nature of the phenomena, studied by them, often have been coming not exactly in that moment, when they reflected on it, but absolutely in other circumstances, when their attention was occupied with other things (for example, a dream of D.Mendeleyev about sequence on the atomic weights in the table of elements, J.Watson's and F.Krick's opening of DNA structure, etc.). It means that the cogitation about this subject goes subconsciously that according to Freud constitutes part of unconscious (he calls it "preconscious"). It doesn't mean, of course, that the discovery goes only and exclusively unconsciously (or it is exclusively conscious), but on what intensively and long reflect, being before in total conscious, then often recedes to the sphere of unconscious processes, turning again and again in completely realized process, etc. As attention of person, movable by his motives, interests, etc. as lamp ray constantly changes the object, i.e. shines it and can to capture alternately everything or nearly all mental space so that a lot of things in it alternately becomes realized, or stops being such.

As many data of modern psychology and other sciences indicate, unconscious area, being very extensive, isn't nevertheless predominating in soul life. Borderline between consciousness and unconscious psychological processes is very mobile. For example, as known psychologist A.N.Leontiev considered, many processes, which man seizes, at a known stage pass in the mental process which is carried out already without participation of consciousness, as far as they stop being an object of consciousness [7, p. 298-299]. Processes, which performance reaches automatism like similar to spontaneously working mechanism, aren't after that consciously regulated, for example, walking, etc.

Appreciably is evident that S.Freud sees distinctive indication of conscious in *ingenuousness of perception* [8, p. 360]. We better acknowledge what is ingenuously given us in perceptions that we directly see, hear, feel. Ingenuous isn't hidden from us by intermediary connections, it isn't shielded with something another. Conscious somewhere coincides with not forced out content of our mental life. It is followed by conclusions, which quite justify S. Freud's relation to consciousness, as to something very simple in order that not to tell the primitive. Own "Ego" is understood by us, it appears because it is also given itself ingenuously. Unconscious can become conscious, having only transformed from mediated to the spontaneity. Such conclusion follows from concept of repression.

"Be conscious" is purely descriptive term, referring to the most immediate and the most reliable perceptions" [8, p. 352]. To be conscious – means to be perceived – in this is, probably, some empirical fixation of consciousness's reflexive nature. However, giving unconscious the primary and defining meaning, S. Freud constantly emphasizes the extremely limited value of the conscious. About all unconscious we finally learn only via conscious, turning it into the realized.

However, according to Freud, all creative, truly productive is accomplished unconsciously. Then function of conscious is reduced to making the already coming true clear and legible for ourselves. Otherwise great discoveries, made by people in depths of unconscious, would remained unknown to their, and, therefore, to all mankind.

Besides, if conscious, i.e. perceived or given in perceptions, according to Freud is mainly representative of the outer world in psychics [8, p. 371], the most top its part, in that case consciousness has to be characteristic for animals, and in general every living thing. Such assumption isn't alien to S. Freud. At least once he expressed such thought, that "Oedipus complex" has to be inherent in animals, may be in more vague look, than at person [8, p. 373]. If it so, why education, culture, moral, religion, language, etc. signs aren't observed at animals, at least primary hint on it? As pleasure principle and reality principle have the same power for all organisms.

For definition of a conscious border S. Freud takes only internal feeling of clarity and distinctness, this feeling's degree, i.e. noncritical reference to states of self-feels, self-sensation of individual reaching level of their data in perception. Therefore, as he speaks, consciousness description has generally quantitative character, than qualitative. S. Freud sometimes as though guesses about reflexive nature of consciousness, but doesn't attach this feature any significance, doesn't speak about that absolutely new quality, doing mentality of human essentially other in comparison with mentality of animals.

Psychoanalysis is entirely a product of the ultimate explanations of human, as entirely causally stipulated being, as well as many other scientific concepts of that time. Within framework, where human being is predetermined, is in one relation the reason, and in the another – a consequence, Freud tries to understand quite honestly, in what is the initial, deep reason of human's actions, in particular neuroses.

Probably, sources of human's freedom consist in universality. It consists of that in the way of human's being there isn't absolute attachment to a certain sort of vital activity that the way of vital activity isn't given him in the structure of his organic body which not works spontaneously more or less after his birth in the right situation. Human being is doomed to create modes of own activity, always to change it, to have multitude ways of own being in the world. Mastering of the external world acts at person at the same time as creativity from the adopted any special way of the own activity and this mastering eventually is his self-development. If in each cardinally another situation human being should react by not simply certain protective measures but to choose and create the actions, it assumes first of all exactly conscious act.

A person creates himself, own abilities in such way which gives them object view or sight of any external fixing opposing to him and his organic body. Therefore, in the form of external to his contemplation, perception and notion objectness his own forces oppose to him: his thoughts, feelings, abilities, needs and aspirations, etc. Certainly, his subjective abilities, feelings and thoughts don't disappear in his organic body after having carried out them externally but in order to develop them or deny, realize, comprehend, etc., they can't stay only in his organic body, they have to appear before him as certain external to him, opposing forces, to assume an objectifying view. Then he can really see them, contemplate, penetrate into them, comprehend, i.e. to carry out a certain conscious process. Even in this case consciousness in many respects is found problematic, limited, defective one. Therefore, to be conscious of oneself, self-conscious and in general consciousness appears to be the result of real contraposition of himself to himself, doubling of a man to himself and his another. Human activity differs essentially from animals life activity namely by this: a person realizes himself that contraposes himself to himself in the certain way or level and by that he can improve himself, his own abilities. Therefore a person also isn't determinated by his organic body, because together with his organic body that world which is created by him enters in the human world. This world is social organization, objectly implemented culture, morality, religion, science, philosophy, etc. For living being, to whom various ways and types of their activity, would be given initially as its corporal (physiological) functions, it would be essentially impossible to watch processes, proceeding in his own body, so it would

be processes which yield to no conscious at all. On such ground consciousness doesn't arise. Animals have perception of the external objects, and the feeling of internal organic states can't be conscious process, namely by their sample human consciousness is considered and understood by Freud, because first of all awareness of himself as conscious being enters in realized field, and then conscious object (not simply knows object, but knows that knows).

Therefore consciousness or the understanding arising on the soil of such activity and becoming then independent and fundamental spiritual activity, isn't peripheral area of mental human life as S. Freud tries to present it, it is an area of creativity, sense formation, purposes and motives. It isn't area of mentality only serving, pacifying and reconciling mutually hostile aspirations though all this also is available in it. It is just primary field of formation of all the main human functions, which after their development and foundation can leave (besides not necessarily via the repression mechanism) in area of unconsciously carried out processes, again and again caused to the conscious sphere every time, when they on to these or those reasons are reconsidered, change, etc. Though cogitative processes, which as S. Freud fairly notices, are often happened unconsciously and even frequently come to fundamental results in an unconscious way, but their object, as object of research tasks and reflections, originally arises consciously and comes to the end also consciously. In an interval between them, thinking, probably, is carried out unconsciously, as part or necessary link in complete mental process. The unconscious mental process in such cases when it isn't repression result, apparently, rather easily passes from one sphere in another, emerging, for example, to the conscious sphere in force simple association, and mostly by conscious "Ego" will.

If the consciousness is the creativity sphere even in cases, when person creates as it is paradoxical, the slavery, i.e. consciously aims itself in slavery, consciousness can take place only at a creature, which initial being is freedom or a choice of his being.

Consciousness doesn't need and it is impossible where initially no freedom, i.e. no possibility of a choice, oneself creation. The consciousness is represented minor part or structure of mental life of individuals only from a position of such concept which sees human as programmed live system like animals, which mental impulses proceed spontaneously and vital aspirations don't develop personally.

However presence of initial possibility of freedom is only condition of emergence of conscious mental processes, but isn't the reason automatically generating consciousness. Freedom of human being initially is only possibility, not really implemented freedom. It as though has more negative character of lack of predetermination and openness for any development.

So the reflection, consciousness, freedom of people are possible if the way of activity, in particular, isn't spliced with corporal structure of living beings, i.e. at whom change and choice of ways, way of life, positions, and also this or that activity aren't connected with change of its corporal organization (including its genetic code, structure) that distinguishes biological evolution from history.

Young Marx saw specifics of this activity in difference from life activity of animals in that if an animal expresses only a measure of own biological species in its life activity, but human being expresses a measure of any other thing in multidifferent types of his activity, that animal makes only its organic body whereas human reproduces all other world, if animal makes under action direct biological need, people produces when he is free from it and in true sense he produces only when he is free from it.[9, p. 93].

Social relations are the relations of beings, which have opportunity to acquire any contents, sense and abilities what his contemporaries have, communicating with them, entering with them in a certain connection via the objected culture. He can acquire them in principle, because such opportunity exists not as an absolute necessity, but, certainly, may not acquire. His freedom consists in this. This freedom means that human is not biologically closed within only necessity. System of diverse public, human relations and communications – is diverse ways on which everyone can enter or to elect them demanding, however, from him of corresponding efforts, duties, as well as rights. Many thinkers of the twentieth century approved that freedom – just extremely the difficult way of human's formation to human. It isn't given to person from the outside, everyone becomes free himself or doesn't become, because, it appears, to be slave frequently easier.

To be slave (in its more general sense of full dependence on external factors) means in particular that this position of human especially doesn't demand consciousnesses sphere occupied a lot of place in his mental life. Motives of life of individual aimed on such

state, often lead to unconscious refusal by him of (conscious) comprehension of sense of main vital problems.

Proceeding from this it would be possible to tell that the more an individual is becoming free, the largely consciousness will play role in structure of his mental activity, such individual will more give himself the report about his thoughts and acts. Consciousness in certain sense is a measure of freedom of human, as only in consciousness sphere human does himself, own acts, thoughts and feelings by an object for himself, only there he can create actions himself instead of following spontaneously to initially given conditions and prerequisites.

Picture of mental human life, thus, looks absolutely another, than it is depicted by S.Freud. Consciousness possesses a leading place in it at all importance and complexity of unconscious mental processes. At person unlike animals almost all psychic content primarily originates from conscious, i.e. realized mental processes, which only then pass into unconsciously proceeding activity. At the being not closed by needs and requirements of the organism, opened to all rest world and absorbing in oneself world content, mental life can't be mainly unconscious.

Social relations and forms of communication which are possible only if human values, sense, feelings, abilities, etc. are freely fixed out organic body of individuals and not fixed in their genetic structures are human ways doing possible assimilation by each individual of that is heritage of another. While at animal that is reached or even is lost by an animal unit can become property of other animal unit (descendant) only through biological (genetic) inheritance.

S. Freud believed that "Oedipus complex", arisen at the first ancestors of mankind, maintains the importance and force and is also eternally actual problem because it constantly passes to subsequent generations which weren't making this crime (murder of father), through biological inheritance.[10, p. 348].

Nature of social relations absolutely escapes from Freud's understanding, because final, deep sense of social organization is reduced by him to give other direction of primary natural aspirations energy. When S. Freud says that consciousness area in mentality is a representative of the outside world, there is, certainly, a part of truth. However, this area, in his opinion, is very scanty part which main function is not the comprehension of outside world and place of man in it, but only the service.

Freud recognizes, therefore, that consciousness on its content is objective, i.e. includes the content of the world external to an individual organism, its influence and requirements to individual. At the same time according to Freud unconscious mental is the representative mainly organism's deep instincts though he also recognized unconsciousness of many cognitive processes. Human "Ego" includes both, that and another. This main scheme was remained for all its inconsistency in all his works. From this position human's mentality looks like collision arena of two absolutely different worlds in which they don't enrich each other, and can only find temporarily reconciliation.

It is obvious that consciousness is psychics sphere enriched with content of external world. But this position prevented to see that not only consciousness, but also all human mentality is enriched and somewhere even completely is created or – better to say – is transformed from contents of mastered external to an organism processes. Otherwise it is not understandable, why creative cogitative processes sometimes occur unconsciously. It rather shows that not only conscious mental processes, but through it all mental activity of a person acts as free, universal process, not limited in itself. Whole human mentality, including unconscious proceeding processes in certain periods, are becoming universal and richer in that measure, in what human individual enriches communications with world and in what he is becoming more and more the valid subject of own life.

However, in Freudian understanding of consciousness the most important isn't noticed. It is that consciousness is the reflexive relation, i.e. reproduction not only that are out of "Ego", but also relations of "Ego" to this other and of "Ego" in its integrity. By Freud consciousness is included in "Ego" only as a certain part, as the representative of the outside world without reflection in itself. Consciousness expresses only clarity degree of psychical content.

The consciousness isn't only a part of human mentality, or part of his psychics "Ego", it makes main kernel of this "Ego" and human personality. For every attitude of individual to other individual to some extent is based on that he can establish this relation, being conformed with all circumstances are present, with peculiarity of other individual and with own interests. Each such act is some kind of his creativity and choice. It is accomplished with understanding of own rights and duties, responsibility and possible consequences, but, certainly, in this process

may be a considerable part of unconscious depending on level of individual and importance of an act. But it can't be completely the result of unconscious act.

The last if takes place, speaks about the individual, not be answerable for his actions and lost control over them. It is impossible to establish human (social) relations with such individual who has stopped being subject and in this sense stopped being man.

Social organization which S. Freud tries to withdraw from existence of "Oedipus complex", is possible only where a kernel of human individual, his mental "Ego" is namely consciousness instead unconscious.

Sphere of consciousness doesn't coincide with understanding only that exist, conscious of some available circumstances, facts, concerning both external in relation to "Ego", and very "Ego", though all this takes place in consciousness and in itself very much important. It is known that consciousness is a sphere of creativity.

It is creativity of the everyday acts, relations too. But most important is a creativity of vital motives, thoughts, feelings, world-view orientations. The last, of course, takes place in ideal cases, when individual is consciously directed to all these values.

Consciousness radically changes all mentality's quality. The psychic main function then isn't reflection¹. Reflection of both external conditions and individual's organism internal state remains as important, but nevertheless a minor function in human mentality. Main function is becoming formation of model that can be, but that actually still isn't present, models of that is desirable and that ought to be. As person is not adapted to available conditions, and by main tendency of his development is aimed at change of living conditions, so the main guiding line for him is not so much the present acts but mainly future, that ought to be. That ought to be, is desirable and may be, will come to life only by that person creates them. Consciousness is that spiritual ability, which function is to create this a new at thoughts and feelings,

¹ In this case application of the term *Reflection* is considered as ability of thinking adequately to comprehend the available world of existing, reality within its datum, to represent in its objective regularity, unlike an above-mentioned reflection as creative ability of consciousness to recreate external and especially internal cogitative process, its correlation with a world outlook and moral choice of personality in her tendency to creation sphere of due, instead of existing.

that actually still not present in reality. Reflection and creativity – two opposite functions on an orientation, but which represent various parties of the same process. Mainly reflection function put forward into the forefront in mechanistic and materialistic concepts, when creativity was denied completely, or at best case for it was allocated service function. As it was already noted, Freud's concept goes in the course of this last as creativity looks at it as a certain by-product that isn't supposed in motives and needs of individual. It is mean, instead of the purpose, casual and external eventually to deep and original experiences, by what individual actually lives.

2.2 Human and society in S. Freud's conception. Origin of culture

In the next years Freud tried to analyse psychology of the peoples or mass psychology by means of individual psychology on the basis of positions of the psychoanalytic doctrine. He considered that individual development of a certain person repeats the main lines, stages of historical development of people and all mankind on that sample as ontogenesis expresses in individual development a phylogeny. For example, psychology of a child repeats common features of primitive people psychology, wild instincts and inclinations of far ancestors are concealed in him. He looked for expression of the same Oedipus complex, sexual inclinations, sublimated in social conditions in the creative beginnings in achievements of culture – customs, sagas, legends, works of art, literature, religion, myths. Thus Freud wanted to give his views objective character. However, explaining thus emergence of society and all social forms, he inevitably faced a problem of a man as philosophical issue, anyway he should resolve an issue of the nature, essence of a human being. However here he remained on former positions, explaining essence of a man as biological essence with all signs of the strict determinism. These views of society and man, his mentality found the expression in his works *Totem and Taboo* (1912), *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (1921), *The Ego and the Id* (1923), etc.

Addressing to materials of ancient totem societies researches, Freud noticed some similarities between an obsessive ban at neurotics and a wild people's taboo, consisting in their lack of motivation, nature of internal coercion as they are complied with in consequence of

irresistible fear and that have ceremonial character of abstention from something. From this similarity to an obsessive ban of neurotic Freud concludes that taboo is directed against the strongest desires of people and has also ambivalent character as at neurosis, that what would be very much desirable is forbidden. These main bans of a taboo were bans of the conjugal relations inside totem, i.e. the ban of incest and ban to kill and eat totem (some animal which name totem had).

Freud considered that there is a direct parallel between savage and neurotic. Neurotic has fixation on infantile inclinations of the childhood where the choice of son is incest – directed on forbidden objects – mother and sisters. Oedipus complex, the attitude towards parents under influence of the incest desires is the complex kernel of neuroses. According to Freud, savages fear of incest turns into unconscious fear at modern people in future period.

Considering that the animal-totem represents father, and two main bans of totemism coinciding with Oedipus's both crimes had killed father and had married mother, he draws a conclusion that the totemic system with its ban originated from the event really taking place which has laid the foundation to an Oedipus complex. "In order that, without reckoning with different assumptions, to recognize probable these conclusions, it is enough to assume that the united brothers were in the power of the same contradictory feelings to father which we can prove at each of our children and at our neurotics as the maintenance of ambivalence of a father complex. They hated the father who was such big obstacle in a way of satisfaction of their aspirations to the power and their sexual inclinations, but at the same time they loved and admired of him. Having eliminated him, having satisfied the hatred and having carried out the desire to be identified with him, they had to get to the power of amplified tender soul movements. It took form of repentance, there was the consciousness of guilt coinciding with repentance tested by all of them. Dead now became stronger, than he was during lifetime; all this occurred as we still can track now on destinies of people. To what he prevented by his existence, they forbade now themselves, having got a mental state of "late obedience" well-known to us from psychoanalysis. They cancelled an act, having declared inadmissible murder of the deputy of father totem, and refused his fruits, having refused the released women. Thus, from the consciousness of guilt of son they created two main taboos of totemism which therefore had to

coincide with both repressed desires of the Oedipus complex. Who acted on the contrary, that was accused of the only two crimes making a subject of care of primitive society.

Both taboos of a totemism with which the morality of people begins, psychologically aren't equivalent. Only one of them: need to spare an animal – totem is based entirely upon motives of feeling; father was eliminated, in reality there was nothing to correct. But another – incest replacement had also strong practical basis. The sexual requirement doesn't unite men, it separates them. If brothers concluded alliance to overcome father, in relation to women everyone remained the rival of another. Everyone as father, wanted to possess them for himself, and the new organization would die in the war of all against all. But the strongest who could assume with success a role of father – was a few. Thus, to brothers if they wanted to live together, didn't remain anything else as perhaps, to overcome strong disorders, to establish an incest ban thanks to which all of them at the same time refused of desired women for the sake of whom they first of all eliminated father. Thus, they rescued the organization which has made them strong and based on homosexual feelings and manifestations which could develop at them during exile. Perhaps, it was the state, making up of opened by Bachofen matriarchal privilege while it was replaced by patriarchal family setup." [10, p. 332-334].

Emergence of a brotherly clan described by Freud was in his opinion the first form of emergence of the society fastened some kind of brothers "social contract", with rudiments of ethical standards, orders which bans laid the foundation to development of legislation.

According to Freud, repentance and sense of guilt consequences after committed crime are religion and moral progress which hasn't been divided yet in a totemism. As the desire to kill is in his opinion one of the main unconscious inclinations, the ban to kill has religious character which through time will have more the general character: don't kill. "Society is based now upon partnership in common committed crime, religion on the consciousness of guilt and repentances, morality – partly upon requirements of this society, partly upon the repentance demanded by consciousness of guilt." [10, p. 335].

Father is presented here as animal totem, only subsequently he will be presented as god in whom he will get the human appearance. With society development the animosity against father weakened, and the

anguish about him increased, he turned as though into an ideal – an embodiment of force, power, the authority, such traits by what father – both as the sovereign and as the defender was endowed. Now the certain excelled people is endowed by traits of the father, in mythology are gods – heroes, and then masters, kings, etc. Freud considers reviving of a fatherly ideal by creation of gods as more serious attempt of atonement of fault, than the contract with totem.

With advent of god – father, Freud considered, society turned in patriarchal which however, didn't lose democratic achievements of a brotherly clan. In a family fathers recovered the former rights as in a primitive horde, they became heads of families. God so had raised over people and became an inaccessible ideal. However, Freud considers, the hostile soul inclinations relating to a fatherly complex didn't disappear, they were simply forced out in unconscious area as condemned by a civilized society, only the thought itself turned against father, existence in the imagination desire to kill him, could cause a conscious protest, feeling of disgust or sense of guilt, they could become provokers of neurotic frustrations.

Both taboos of totem societies – don't kill totem and don't use his women, according to Freud explains emergence and nature of conscience. Conscience is explained by him as arisen out of sense of fault after accomplished crime – murder of father and it is revealed in fear to break a taboo. "Conscience represents internal perception of inadmissibility of known desires available at him; but the accent is put that this inadmissibility doesn't need any proofs that it on itself is undoubted. It becomes more clearer at the consciousness of guilt, perception of internal condemnation of such acts in which we carried out known desires"[10, p. 261].

Thus, origination of society, religion, culture, conscience, ethical standards, art, etc. Freud explains from unconscious irrational inclinations, first of all sexual instincts, animal instincts to kill. Freud considers these evil negative inclinations as the main biological properties of a person which can't be eliminated, they are given to person together with his organism. Perpetrated crime of far ancestors hung forever damnation over mankind, having generated sense of guilt, an Oedipus complex, being shown in destiny of each certain individual which repeats all historical destiny of mankind. It is inherited not only in destinies of people, but also in their acts, creativity. As according to Freud, the released energy of a

libido owing to the first cultural ban (taboo) has to be directed on something, differently the pleasure principle is broken. Libido is sublimated in cultural human activity. Therefore the analysis of creativity, works of art, thinking, science and all mental phenomena, etc. is taken down eventually to sexual experiences of childhood, to the mystical Oedipus complex which origin he explained. Thus, he concludes "... I want to state a conclusion that the beginning of religion, morality, public and art coincides in an Oedipus complex in a full consent with psychoanalysis data according to which this complex is the center of all neuroses so far as they still were available to our understanding. It seems to me extremely surprising, as this problem of soul life of peoples can be resolved if to proceed from one only concrete point which is the attitude to father"[10, p. 345-346]. Freud, however, gave to such fantastic explanation of society and a man surprisingly skillfully rational view.

2.3 Individual and mass. "Ego" and mass psychology

In mass mentality, according to the founder of psychoanalysis, we observe the same soul phenomena as well as in life of separate individual, without mass psychology, without inheritance of all of in what the mentality of people reached the development, psychology of the peoples is impossible. As psychoanalysis proved, Freud considers, each individual has something in unconscious that allows him to interpret or understand soul processes of other people, to eliminate distortions (in slips of the tongue, wrongly carried out actions, comics, witty remarks, etc.). Each individual is capable of unconsciously understanding customs, traditions, ceremonials, all this is explained by him as inheritance of the attitudes and feelings to the forefather.

He explains emergence of mass psychology in the following way. In primitive horde father unlike mass individuals was free, independent in manifestation of the will, his "Ego" to a lesser extent was bind by libido, than at others, he loved nobody except himself, his libido was directed on himself, instead of on others. Satisfying all sexual and other inclinations, he had no goal slowing down sexual aspirations and his narcissism remained at identical level. "We know that love limits narcissism, and could prove how, thanks to this influence, love became a cultural factor.

Forefather of a horde wasn't immortal yet which he became through an idolization later. When he had been died, he should be replaced; his place had been taken probably by one of the younger sons, being to that

time the mass individual, as well as everyone another. There has to be, therefore, an opportunity for transformation of mass psychology into individual psychology, the condition has to be found under which this transformation is made easily as it is possible at bees, in case of need growing up of a larva the queen instead of a working bee. In that case it is possible to imagine only one: forefather prevented satisfaction of direct sexual needs of sons; he forced them to abstention and, therefore, to emotional connections with him and with each other which could grow up from aspirations with slow-down sexual purpose. He, so to speak, compelled them to mass psychology. His sexual envy and intolerance became eventually the reason of mass psychology.

Who become his successor, possibility of sexual satisfaction and an exit thereby from conditions of mass psychology was given to him." [11, p. 120].

Thus essence of mass in this concept is libido communications distributed between all participants of mass. If certain person loves only himself, narcissist, but in mass narcissism restriction occurs, intolerance and hostility to another disappears, the self-love is replaced by love to another, to objects, i.e. his libido is directed on objects instead himself. Freud concludes that love as a cultural factor played a role in turn from egoism to altruism as well as in general in emergence of mass, a social community. In his opinion expelled sons, by identification with each other passed to homosexual object love which until now is a basis of man's friendship, friendly communication of colleagues on service and in general any mass collectivism. What force should be assigned the part in mass forming as not Eros uniting everything in the world.

Relying on properties and character of mass researches and at own psychoanalytic views with psychic-energy approach peculiar to them, Freud tried to find a psychological explanation of soul change of the certain individual under influence of mass. Le Bon's, Mac Duggal's, etc. researches showed that in mass certain individual easily comes under influence, any suggestion, any affect here is infectious, a person follows less mind, consciousness, his will is subordinated to mass, and unconscious impulses and tendencies prevail. Mass is movable by illusions, imaginations instead thirst for truth, mass is noncritical, impulsive and excitable, generally it is deprived of consciousness, is more unconscious, than conscious, it is easy to operate it, individual in mass is deprived of freedom.

Freud concludes that all these properties of mass and its libidinal essence indicate similarity of mass to a hypnotic state, as it is also easily inspired as at hypnosis, it also has an unconscious state. Suggestion, he considers, is "indecomposable praphenomenon of soul human life".[11, p. 89]. Libidinal essence unites mass also with neuroses, but neurosis – the phenomenon opposite to mass. Neurosis makes individual asocial, holds him away from mass, neurotic replaces the mass phenomena with a symptom formation, his libido is directed on himself instead of other objects as in mass, he creates own psychical world, perceiving it as reality. However nevertheless where the mass was formed, there neuroses weaken or the appeal to religion reduces danger of neurosis disease.

At the base of formation of two artificial mass – church and army also the libidinal relations lie, but external coercion in order that they don't break up is necessary. As in any mass there is an illusion that leader – a commander or a deity that according to Freud are replacement of father, equally loves each of them, doing them equal. Each member of the mass is libidinally connected both with the leader, and with other mass individuals. As soon as these communications stop, mass ceases to exist. Freud considers a panic phenomenon, for example, in army as the proof of the termination of libidinal communication of mass. Interconnections stops, everyone starts being cared only for oneself, commands of the leader aren't executed, the released libido which connected mass, without finding more applications develop in huge senseless fear, it is case of neurotic fear.

Libidinal connection of mass individuals is carried out by the identification representing the most initial form of emotional communication with object. It is expressed in an object introjection into "Ego", i.e. "Ego" often adopts qualities of object, namely those qualities in which "Ego" has deficit for achievement "ideal- Ego" or "Super Ego". "Ideal- Ego" arose thanks to a fatherly complex – it was differentiated in due time from "Ego". There is a similarity between mass and infatuation at which also "the object serves as a substitution for never reached own "Ideal- Ego". It is loved for perfections which wanted to be reached in own "Ego" and which in this roundabout way want to get for satisfaction of own narcissism"[11, p. 109]. But unlike mass at infatuation the most part of a narcissistic libido is directed on object, displaying both in direct and in the slowed-down view.

Freud considers relation between mass and the leader in a foreshortening of distinctions between "Ego" and "Ideal- Ego". "Ego",

trying to reach "Ideal- Ego" that in society is presented by the highest ethical standards, ethical and esthetic ideals, applies mechanisms of identification and replacement of "Ideal- Ego" with object. The phenomenon of mass formation is explained by refusal of a person of his "Ideal- Ego", replacing it with a mass ideal. "Forefather is a mass ideal who possess human "Ego" instead of "Ideal- Ego". Hypnosis by right can be called "mass of two"; suggestion can be defined only as the persuasion based not on perception and cogitative work, but on their erotic communication"[11, p. 123]. Under hypnosis hypnotist, instead of the leader is introjected into "Ideal- Ego" place, and hypnosis differs from love by absence of direct sexual aspirations. "... Mass coincides with hypnosis in the nature of uniting primary desires and in replacement of "Ideal- Ego" with object, but identification with other individuals, becoming originally possible thanks to the same attitude to object is joined here.

Both states, hypnosis and mass formation, are hereditary sedimentation of a human libido phylogenesis – hypnosis as predisposition, and mass, in addition, as a direct vestige. Replacement of direct sexual aspirations by the braked aspirations concerning the purpose promotes in both to separation of "Ego" from "Ideal- Ego" that was already given start in a condition of love".[11, p. 137].

Thus, explaining emergence of society and mass psychology from an Oedipus complex, he comes to a certain understanding of a human being and his psychic. Freud ingeniously proved a role of unconscious in psychics, having opened dynamic character of many mental processes mechanisms in contrary to former psychology in which psychics was understood as only conscious mental, rational-mental and cogitative processes. He shows the correlation between unconscious and conscious processes, and also influence of unconscious motivations and inclinations on behavior and conscious psychical life of individuals. He also correctly indicated an unconsciousness of many cogitative processes: "On the one hand, we have proofs that even delicate and hard intellectual work, usually, demanding intense reflection, can be made unconsciously – without getting consciousness. These facts are undoubted; they happen, for example, in the period of a dream and are expressed that the known person knows the answer to difficult mathematical or other problem directly after awakening on which solution he in vain worked a day earlier".[8, p. 364].

Studying by him of neuroses which had not a somatic etiology, but namely the psychological reasons treatment of which was needed absolutely other approaches promoted opening of psychological life laws. As neuroses represented violations in individuals' psychological life, contained the mental conflict. Freud develops a new method – psychoanalysis, namely technique of opening and settlement of the neurotic conflicts understanding that the reasons of neuroses should be looked for in psychological life of individuals, therefore many mechanisms opened by him – repression, resistance, regression, fixation, projections, identifications, etc. express mainly and refer to psychological processes arising from the conflict of mutually opposite incompatible motives. Freud quite right considers neurosis as the conflict of motives, however his mystical understanding of society development regularities, ignoring social character of a person and society origin lead him to incorrect interpretation of a personality and one's psychic nature.

It was connected also by his inconsistent explanation of psychological from psychological, nevertheless he boils down psychological to the biological. He allots to unconscious a predominating place in mentality. Unconscious is presented by him as biological instincts – initial and indivisible first building blocks of psyche as primary desires which he then divides into the Eros – primary life instincts and Thanatos – primary death instincts. According to Freud an individual is dependent on biological inheritance, his unconscious impulses are reduced to two basic – sexual and destructive instincts which find resistance to itself in real life, facing destructive impulses of other individuals. Therefore, by Freud, sadism, masochism, egoism, envy, hatred and generally, evil are unshakable and deep-rooted properties of individuals' life. The conflicts of incompatible motives which are cornerstone of neuroses Freud considered as the conflicts between consciousness and unconscious impulses, more precisely, as the conflicts between social, cultural and ethical standards, bans and biological sexual and destructive instincts of individuals. However ethical social norms, conscience, etc. by him have an origin from biological instincts: "Thus prevalence of sexual inclinations participation over the social constitutes the characteristic moment of neurosis. However social inclinations themselves developed in special complexes thanks to influence of egoistical and erotic components".[10, p. 266]. The following contradiction turns out – the ban to manifestation of biological instincts proceeds from the same

biological instincts, in essence it is the conflicts between unconscious impulses, then why a replacement, resistance, etc. are happen, they can't be happen here as impulses are in essence reduced by Freud to corporal. As mechanisms of resistance, repression, etc. are observed in case of psychological frustration, instead of somatic. We can observe a great number of such contradictions in Freud's conception of human and society.

2.4 Contradictions in S. Freud's conception in understanding of a person and his psychic

It is necessary to notice that S. Freud specially doesn't raise a question about general human nature, its essence in his works, doesn't argue on it vastly and not analyzes, sorting various concepts and the positions out which were available then in science and philosophy. Elucidation of these questions didn't enter in his task, especially at an early development stage of concept of human mentality. He only tried to look on other way on nature of mental diseases, as former, purely physiological vision and corresponding to it treatments technique, in most cases didn't give due effect. Naturally if diseases have only somatic reasons, their treatment is possible only through influence on somatic bases of psychological activity. To this dominating then in psychology and psychotherapy view S. Freud opposed understanding, in which the main reason (though, not only) of mental disorders act internal psychological communications and relations. Now relationship of motives instead of corporal and somatic disorders of a brain comes to the front at Freud. For the first time explanation of nature of such diseases touches on an issue of a human personality.

Nevertheless, as often it happens, in all approach, system of his proofs and justifications, in decisions of more particular tasks his common position of understanding nature and essence of a man, his freedom, specific of his life appears. As a whole it is possible to tell that S. Freud generally divides the point of view of natural sciences dominating in the last century on a man as the most developed species of the mammal class.

It is known that S. Freud proceeds from the fact of bifurcation of human "Ego" on "Id", "Ego" and "Super-Ego". "Ego" exists as fragile unity of oppositely directed motives and desires having absolutely various sources. The first source is a natural beginning in the individual,

his instinctive desires among which the main place takes very widely understood by Freud sexual. These desires are initial, they possess a powerful impulse. Requirements and norms of a social environment of an individual are other source, which also often are sufficiently strong, so, that it is difficult for individual not to reckon with them. The last often put an individual to very rigid framework, to go out beyond which is forbidden to him, threatening with heavy penalties for disobedience. S. Freud considers social sphere and in general culture as a result of sublimation, so social norms and requirements, certainly, in many respects, depend on people. He considers that society and culture with their norms and laws arose in that far time, when primeval communities of individuals lived, still following only to the instinctive natural desires, obeying the only strong. Father was strong who dictates the will to the rests in the primeval clans, all women of a clan, first of all mother belonged to him. Once the grown-up sons decide to put an end to such domination of father, together kill him and were ready to eat him according to custom of that time. However fight between sons ready to begin, brought them to reason. But the most fantastic in this case is S. Freud's assumption, that brothers felt repentance and shame. Captured remorse, brothers decide to establish the ban on incest, which framework is broaden further. According to S. Freud ancient legend of the tsar Oedipus, killed father and entered in marriage with mother, however, the incident happened on his ignorance, that those were his father and mother, is some kind of memory and expression of archaic relation really taking place.[10].

According to S. Freud a beginning the births of social relations between individuals and culture is situated here because culture and society mean the certain order of coordination of individuals relations, without which, as apparently, S. Freud supposes following authors of social contract theories, between them will proceed general "war of all against all". In his understanding this new order arises from need to put an end to chaotic and unrestrained manifestation of deep natural desires of individuals colliding them in irreconcilable hostility. Further. All human activities and creativity arise from collisions of these two, initially different beginnings – natural desires and social norms, especially moral. How?

A man can't cancel and destroy the natural desires. They will declare themselves always, while his organic body is live. They possess

the powerful energy. If this energy and force can't be suppressed simply, they can be directed on other course. This energy is directed on creative activity. It absorbs this energy. According to Freud the ominous contradiction cardinally is solved in such way: from one side it is necessary somehow to bridle wild primeval energy, and with another – it is necessary somehow to spend it for something. According to S.Freud theory mastering of nature by human, his thinking, science, art, religion, all spheres of creativity are happily found displacement for the wild unrestrained manifestation of deep desires of a man. Displacement of the deep natural desires by motives of creativity, repression of the first by the second S. Freud, as we know, calls sublimation.[12, p. 26, 3, p. 172].

Thanks to such repression and displacement the motives, given rise by deep human nature, become in the majority of cases unconscious, because others, from the moral point of view more "noble" motives close or cover them. Energy of the firsts is spent on realization of the seconds.

Therefore, by S. Freud, initial division of human "Ego" arise from that circumstance, that a person on the one hand is a biological or natural creature, and on the other hand – social or public. However, here also are found serious logical discrepancies, as well as mismatches to the well-known empirical, historic facts. It is possible to specify only on one serious logical contradiction. S. Freud proceeds from that originally the wild horde didn't have any, moral, any other norms regulating their relations, forbidding ones and encouraging other acts. Therefore, there were no corresponding moral senses and experiences, in particular that is called as conscience. But in the same time sons, having committed murder of father, afterwards suddenly were captured by sense of guilt, criminality of their deeds, they were tortured by conscience. Where from and how can be such experiences take place in their soul, if there were no any bans before, there was no negative relation to patricide or to an incest as to crime?

Therefore, the conception, trying to define origin of social, first of all moral standards, proceeds at the same time from their initial presence. In the same time if S. Freud didn't proceed from their usual presence, his "Oedipus complex" would be impossible. In opposite case all logical construction is scattered.

However, if to abandon aside his theory of human society, morality, etc., fact of enormously importance really opened by him seems

indubitable. S. Freud opened the most difficult structure of a person psychic in which he attached crucial significance to unconscious. He described really available bifurcation, internal contradiction in psychic "Ego", which sometimes passes into the internal conflict. It seems, he correctly described, therefore, opened mechanisms of repression, displacement and sublimation which inevitably arise in above described situations i.e. when in soul of individual two (maybe it is more) absolutely incompatible with each other motives and aims are clashed.

Freud's common conceptual position consists first of all in that a person is causal conditional being, i.e. it is possible and necessary to understand him as a consequence of the reasons which eventually aren't dependent on him. These reasons, however aren't external to his organic body, they are own organic reasons, it is the instincts putting in his deep nature. At the same time, Freud's concept is a certain attempt of an explanation the psychical phenomena from the psyche itself to show the unconscious sphere ("Id"), i.e. psyche proper as quite sovereign area. Despite the known theoretical effort, this contradiction remains completely not overcome. In result Freud doesn't manage to explain completely the psychical from the psychical reasons.

If to proceed from a theoretical premise that essence of causality is a self-causing, i.e. to be the cause of itself, *causa sui*, and the relation cause-consequence is an external form of manifestation, external bifurcation of essence on cause and effect, but not independent, not substantial or essential relation, from this point of view, for example, a person acts simultaneously both as the reason of own being or existence in the world and, therefore, as own consequence at all his dependence on an external environment, from the biological prerequisite. Such he can be in principle as a real reflection, more precisely, real reflective relation.

In history of philosophy and science also, reflection connected with spiritual and, in particular, conscious activity. In psychology such opinion dominates up to the present time.

In the first half of the twentieth century already in natural sciences there was a point of view, that difficult and maybe even impossible to explain a human being as simply result of biological evolution.

P. Teilhard de Chardin believes that namely reflection does a person essentially another that, therefore, is absent at animals. How he understands it? "From a point of view which we adhere to, the reflection is the ability acquired by consciousness to concentrate on itself and to

seize by itself as an object ... – ability not simply to cognize, but to cognize itself; not simply to know, but to know that you know".[13, p. 136].

From this position Freud didn't define for himself also more global question, whether a man belongs only and exclusively to biological world, fauna at all his empirically observed striking specifics, being only one of *Hominidae* family species or with a person begins an absolutely other world, which necessary to understand under absolutely other laws?

As we know, P. Teilhard de Chardin, representative of natural sciences raised a question about it with all clarity: "From purely positivistic point of view a man – the most mysterious object of science confusing researchers. It should be recognized that science didn't really find to him a place in its images of a universe yet. Physics managed to outline temporarily atom world. Biology managed to bring some order in constructions of life. Relying on physics and biology, anthropology in the turn somehow explains structure of a human body and some mechanisms of its physiology. However received portrait at consolidation of all these traits obviously doesn't correspond to reality. A person in that sight how today's science manages to reproduce him, – an animal similar to another ones. On anatomy he so little differs from anthropoids that modern classifications of zoology, coming back to Linney's positions, place him together with them in the same hominoid family. However if to judge by biological results of his emergence, whether he just represents something absolutely other?" [13, p. 135].

Anyway, Freudianism is also based on statement that a man and his world, as well as the fauna, falls under a causal explanation, his essence is in best a case *causa sui* – the reason of oneself. The external reasons matter the general prerequisite, defining only human being as abstract possibility, but not define his concrete essence. Essence or nature of a thing is a cause of its existence. So it is understood still since Aristotle. In the most general bases of the understanding S. Freud in the spirit of all natural-science thinking of this time goes in course with the traditions put still by antique Greeks. As they thought, and Aristotle expressed it especially distinctly, searches of the reasons of a thing existence out of this thing conduct in the bad infinity (so-called regress in infinity). Such search can be never finished.

On such way we never learn that there is a thing in itself, its own definiteness, because we then will proceed from the supposition that this

definiteness is not in the thing, but out of it, is reported to it by certain external force. That Freud tried to prove an explanation of the mental processes by psychological reasons, instead of physiological, i.e. motives which are initially shipped in a gloom unconscious to which an individual usually be unaware, in the field of psychology was an essential step forward. It had to mean that mental activity of a person, let conditioned in physiology has the own independent nature, not reduced simply to physiological processes. However, physiological process and its structure even if it is physiology of a person, his body doesn't define a man as a man. However at the same time for such consecutive completion his thought didn't reach, and instead we see that in many respects his concept is as though a hybrid and that, and other position. From biologic understanding of roots mental human life he couldn't completely be released.

"Though Freud tore off mental processes from higher nervous activity physiology firstly, he considered this separation temporary (with natural sciences development it will be liquidated), and, secondly, he understood mental processes as rigidly determined and generated by the instinctive inclinations. Freud's 'metapsychology' sees in all mental events manifestation of universal biological "primary" processes. Morality, art, religion appear at his doctrine as illusory originations – through projection and sublimation – of instinct" [14, p. 75]. Freudian understanding of psychical as cause of itself also contains a certain reflection.

At known expansion of a field of consideration, however, it would be possible to recognize a reflection as general property of all living or in general any integrity, because preservation of the live or integrity is always connected not only with movement, directed in out of, but also the movement directed on this whole itself. However, reflection peculiar to a person essentially other: it does itself an object for itself. Therefore creates itself, changes, recreates anew, or, on the contrary, doesn't create itself, doesn't change, regresses, again becomes an animal, and it doesn't occur owing to that way and law of such creation of itself or regressing are put in a person by any external force (by god, nature, and own nature in that number, absolute spirit and, at last, society, considered as certain other creature, subject, than a man).

Freudian "Id" as a matter of fact, is same the external force which is initially defining all man. Therefore, in such understanding a human

being as a matter of fact, is not free being, as well as animal. Individual or "Ego", only relying on his mind, can coordinate the conflict between "Id" and "Super-Ego". For him requirements "Id" on the one hand and requirements of "Super-Ego" on another hand, requirements of own nature, with one the parties, and requirements of society, moral, culture, with another act in the capacity of external necessity. They are external and even in some way alien, in spite of the fact that "Ego" comprises them, consists from these components, they are its structural parts. The matter is that it is possible to recognize an individual as the subject only in force above the given sign that he can find acceptable form, in which contradiction of his mutually excluding aspirations gets a certain solution.

However, a man in his notion remains in necessity kingdom. Moreover, if to follow logic of S. Freud, it appears that natural individual, remaining in much still natural, became a human too forcedly, in force hopelessness of his being, internal conflict, thereby having generated society, culture, the state, morality and art, religion, etc. Thus he isn't confused by that circumstance that the conflict which "Ego" tries to resolve is the conflict between natural and social in a person, and, therefore, that, he tries to explain an origin of that is supposed already available. Elementary "circle in the proof".

If to abandon aside this scandalous paradox with points of view of though formal logic, emergence of social organization, ethical standards, debt, conscience, and etc., are considered simultaneously arisen, and initially rooting in depths unconscious, and eventually in the instincts having a natural and biological origin.

How to combine all this? From where at those sons, that in fight for possession clan women, killed father, the leader of a clan, suddenly there was appeared a conscience that started talking and tortured them so strongly that they decided to refuse that, for what fought? Then they were already people, they lived in socially organized society, but without the state, culture, religion, art, science, etc. That means the moral norms unlike the enumerated types of social life, are initially put in a human. Then why the conflict in soul of each individual is considered as a contradiction between initially natural "Id" in which the main thing make sexual motives, and bans of a social origin, among which moral are on the first place. As "Super-Ego" is first of all conscience of "Ego", it is, so to speak, "ideal -Ego". If sources of an

origin of "Id" and "Super-Ego" are the same, if they initially natural, why there is such irreconcilable conflict between them? All this, as we know, represents one of the central contradictions of Freudian concept. However if we assume that conflict arises between herd instincts and instincts of animal unit that occurs at gregarious animals why it inevitably conducts to origination of culture, religion, art, science, etc. only with human? Why it isn't observed in particular with hominids? Besides, if, for example, at gregarious animals the similar conflict often comes to an end with death of one of males, besides the victim is often found "father", why the winner has no trace of remorse? Assume that we don't know what such animal experiences, but according to S. Freud it has to cause certain institutes significantly changing animals so, that they take in principle other way of development.

Some of these contradictions are specified by the researcher of Freudianism Leybin V.M.[15].

However, anyway, according to Freud, it is not a way of freedom. Though it is a way of creation, creativity, cognition, finding of truth of nature universal forces which become human's forces, continuous expansion of human universality sphere.

More strange and paradoxical is that a man forcedly, forcibly becomes free. Something similar that J.-P. Sartre called to be condemned to freedom. The being who was spontaneously following commands of the own nature about which he didn't know because they don't resist to him in his consciousness as external need, in the relation to which should make a choice, now suddenly it found oneself in choice situations. The situation of a choice arises because a person creates the social world with its requirements, opposite to his natural aspirations, bridling these last. The conflict between natural and social in "Ego" arises only after that. Why, from what need to create the social world, if the conflicts in herd are resolved without that and don't create need in an exit in absolutely other world.

However, apparently, S. Freud probably proceeds from this, that at all these enormous changes with a human doesn't occur anything essential. In spite of the fact that human being accomplishes unprecedented penetration into essence nature processes, develops equipment, changes all Earth look, causes to life quite other world, he, in his opinion, remains the same to animal, only much more developed, these changes don't concern his essence. A human differs from other

species only on degree of development, occupying in an evolutionary row his certain place. S.Freud doesn't speak about it directly and clearly, but it is supposed as something self-evident.

Respectively human creativity as though is supposed a variation of adaptive activity of animal in which it finds simply a way out where it is possible to direct the collected energy of "Id". Creativity is happily found casual way of deliverance of the dark destructive energy which social norms don't allow in its natural manifestation. Specifically human activity has no own value out of this, in essence, serving function, and, therefore, couldn't arise out of a situation of "Oedipus complex".[12, 16, 17]. Human way of being in the world proper takes a place of certain by-product of animal activity.

Same casual and external to understanding of the original of art is C.G.Jung's approach to a problem of creativity. He also, as well as Freud, considers culture as sphere of application of unconscious and agree with him that work of art can be brought out of "complexes" as it do in case with neuroses [18], however thus, he considers, "an essence of the work of art which has roots not only in unconscious of specific person with his experience of individual life, but also at the unconscious beginnings is not explained. The last don't ascend to experiences of the individual prehistory and respectively don't yield to an explanation from personally acquired. These constructions of the imagination without any doubts have the nearest analogs in mythological types. Therefore it is necessary to assume that they answer to known collective (and extra personal) structural elements of the human soul in general and are passed on heritage, similar to morphological elements of a human body. ... I designated this unconscious as collective unconscious".[19, p. 121-122].

However, nature of this collective unconscious, as it has no relation to consciousness, in general is impossible to reveal. It is possible only descriptively to characterize "... structures of psyche which existed still when there was no unity of personality and in general consciousness. This preconscious state can be observed in the early childhood, and just dreams of this period quite often withdraw in Divine Light especially remarkable archetypical motives" [19, p. 122]. Thus, creator here isn't privy to his work, he is based on a priori beginnings. It comes out that if we can't learn the nature of these prehistoric beginnings how we can explain essence of work? It also remains inexplicable.

As it was already noted, by Freud also, as at many other scientists, and in particular, by already mentioned P. T. de Chardin, scheme of internal interaction of "Ego", "Id" and "Super-Ego" have character of a certain reflex. However this reflex, as well as by Chardin mainly internal or, more precisely, internal psychical. That, in what it pours out in the extra mental world is important only so far as it helps to adjust internal conflict, externally incarnated symbol of internal forces. Certainly, external form (god, the objects created by a person, works of art and etc.) is included in this reflex, but it is a form which has no self-sufficing meaning, and as it was already told, acts only in symbol role, and even simply sign. For example, god, its definitions and its requirements to people are symbols of that we call conscience, or that Freud calls "internal ideal Ego". External actions of a person also not have self-sufficient meaning, they remove excess energy, extinguish them or serve too as certain signs, substitutes of those actions which are forced out in a certain cultural environment by its bans. As the unconscious roots in the deep of human nature, therefore, something unremovable and source of all imperative motives which is impossible simply to repress, and is possible to direct on certain other objects, freedom of a man, if in general is possible to speak about it, huddles as though between hammer and anvil, between requirements of the eternal nature and requirements of social ascertainments, between two necessities. Narrow slot in which a man manages (in the majority of cases) to find coordination in collision of two lines of necessities is freedom space.

Characteristically that criticism of Freud, proceeding from many thinkers of the XX century, anyway touches upon the issue of freedom, that external manifestations of a human nature are explained by him from brute beginnings.

Expressing about psychoanalysis, K. Jaspers approached to this problem from absolutely opposite position and in his estimates, it is possible to tell, is generally expressed the relation to psychoanalysis of all direction of existentialism: "... True self-reflection which has reached after long development within framework Christianity the top by Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, here is distorted for discovery of sexual desires and typical experiences of the childhood; it is the masking of an original dangerous self-reflection by simple detection of known types in their imaginary inevitability, which absolutizes human existence in its

low manifestations". And further: "Silently allowed consequence of psychoanalysis is reduced to that not to contrive, but to make notable an ideal by means of which a person doesn't come through tension and effort as it was possible, to himself, but comes back to his nature, and he already doesn't need to be any more a human"[20, p. 383]; "... in Marxism, psychoanalysis and racial theory destroying properties are concluded, as a matter of fact. If Marxism considers that all spiritual existence no more, than the superstructure, psychoanalysis defines it as sublimation the forced-out inclinations; in this case that is called culture, becomes something like violent neurosis" "[20, p. 385].

Expressing have told in the most general schematic form it is possible to tell that if a psychoanalysis position in understanding of a man is reduced to his previous definiteness by necessity, existentialism – to freedom as essence or, as Jaspers speaks, substance of a person. Loss of freedom leads to loss of a human.

And it is valid, in many respects in criticism of psychoanalysis it is impossible to disagree with Jaspers, though some researchers point to likeness of psychoanalysis with existentialism.

So, for example Leybin V.M. writes: "Similar reasonings of Freud contradicting science quite keep within in framework of philosophical reflections about essence of life and death, which are characteristic for modern existentialism, and also are present at some thinkers of the past." [21, p. 53]. In particular, it is interesting that he finds similarity of ways of research "sufferings" of individuals by Freud and Heidegger: "<<fundamental ontology>> of Heidegger is very close to Freud's psychoanalytic doctrine and according to the description beingness of human existence. Like founder of psychoanalysis investigating everyday situations, in which symptoms of manifestation of fear, anxiety, ambivalent feelings of love and hatred, fault and repentance are revealed, Heidegger appeals to such daily occurrence of life, where a person is characterized by <<passive existentials>> like <<care>>, <<abandonment>>, <<despair>>, <<fear of death>>, etc." [22, p. 245]. Heidegger, probably, would protest such similarity since he treated Freud's doctrine critically, considering it absolutely opposite to his vision of human being, especially to a way of his research. He considered philosophical positions of Freud insolvent, as Freud biologized essence of a man. [23, p. 152].

However, all this likeness, in our opinion, consists only in some

identity of problems, on promotion into the forefront problems internal experiences of an individual as main, whereas the real relations out of an individual are perceived as an external projection. This concentration on internal experiences of sincere life as main in a person is peculiar in psychoanalysis generally only to his founder – S. Freud, and in existentialism – to its atheistic wing – A. Camus, J.-P. Sartre, etc. That concerns K. Jaspers, in spite of the fact that he all human being bases on idea of freedom, much and deeply analyzes its essence, he eventually considers freedom as only God-given talent to a person.

However a man by Jaspers is free in that measure, in what he comes nearer to god, in what he is divine, but in the same time can't forever become such divine, he is eternally on a way to it, because on the other side of his existence he is a being limited, dependent on much, but this his limitation isn't closed in itself, it is opened. "God's voice sounds for single person opened for tradition and to world around, it arises as own persuasion. God's voice is audible in freedom of self-persuasion, it doesn't have another organ to report about itself to a person. Where person take over the decision, proceeding from his internal depth, he supposes that he is obedient to God, though doesn't possess the objective guarantee in knowledge of what God please "[24, p. 454].

Though God in K. Jaspers's understanding isn't the Christian god, but he is foundation of the world and a man, he is transcendental both to the world and a person. Freedom source here nevertheless seems out of a man, i.e. that in a man does him actually a human, it is imparted him by certain transcendent force. Though K. Jaspers also explains that a person comes to a way of freedom, incompleteness thanks to the own efforts, he comes to self-persuasion, to his decisions, it all the same as though suggestion of god, his voice and etc.

How right those who consider essence of a man are resistant to scientific cognition and explanation? K. Jaspers contends that substance (essence) of a person isn't something already taken place and settled, eternally identical to itself, that a person is eternal incompleteness. However in a man there is something settled, taken shape, but it in him is not the main thing, minor which can be learned by sciences about spirit, about man. However substance, integrity of a human is freedom, and freedom doesn't know the settled forms, it is the eternal going a person out of his limits, it is an eternal way, transcendence. This main

thing in a person also doesn't succumb to scientific cognition and explanation. As soon as it is possible to give him a certain definition to fix at him a certain essential sign seeming to defining, it doesn't already coincide with him.

When a human is cognized by sciences, he presents for them in quality of a certain object established, completed, closed in itself a whole. Such object stays in network of cause-effect relationship. As sensual being, a human is just that, but in him is divine, from god passed to him, it is freedom, his spirituality, spiritual sense whole, constantly reconsidered, changing by him. This sense integrity of a man, every individual is possible only to understand, interpret, but not to draw a conclusion from something as consequence, it can't be decomposed on structure, analyzed on constituent elements.

Also as well as Jaspers, other scientist M. Scheler considers impossible to define a man because such definition would meant denial of freedom of human, "because any original essence can't be reduced to the final empirical reasons..." [25, p. 63]. He considers, only a human can make an object of his knowledge everything, including itself.

The spirit, which center is in the personality, is defined by Scheler as "-existential independence from organic, freedom, estrangement from coercion and pressure, from "life" and everything that treats to "life" including its own, connected with inclinations intellect." [25, p. 53].

According to Jaspers a man himself comes to God, i.e. to freedom, to spiritual self-creativity, to creativity of his existence sense, but eventually not a person does himself, "God" does a person capable for all this.

Among Freudians C.G. Jung appealed to god as a final source and force thanks to which both the nature and man exist.

"Religious faith as careful contemplation and account of certain invisible and uncontrollable to mind factors belongs to the category peculiar to soul instinctive reactions, which manifestation can be tracked through all history of human spirit". [26, p. 15]. However Jung's "archetypes" of personality in the next way are put by the nature.

"That is "archaic remnants", i.e. archetypical forms of reactions, accompanied by feelings of disgust and fear, rooting in instincts and expressing instincts. They are ineradicable, because they make the necessary base of soul. It is impossible to capture them by any effort of reason and if it is possible to destroy one or another their manifestation,

they manifest again only in "changed kind"[26, p. 26-27]. For Jung a man is in cause-effect relationship row and therefore he is necessary first of all scientifically to explain, his life eventually is possible to organize or transform on the basis of knowledge about his essence. Archetypes of individual mentality though can arise historically, but are passed on to him by natural and biological way, are inherited by him biologically. They can't be eliminated during individual's life, they are a source of all unconscious motives which pretty often come in conflict with social norms also obligatory for human "Ego".

As the instinct is ancient and hereditary, so its form is ancient-figurative, i.e. archetypical. It appears even more ancient and conservative, than shape of a body. "[26, p. 38].

Essential distinction between K. Jaspers and C. Jung at their religious orientation consists that according to Jaspers a person on ways to god becomes free, god is identified with freedom, and for K. Jung in the world of a person as though there isn't a place for freedom or it is understood by him as following to his archetype, i.e. knowledge and on the basis of it submission to necessity of his nature. And even "... activity of consciousness is based upon instinct base, from which it also scoops as own driving forces, and the main forms of his notions..." [26, p. 38]. Thus, following to his logic, C. Jung comes to conclusion: "Public influence as, alas, experience shows, can't change internal system of a man".[26, p. 32].

In both cases, it appears that freedom significantly is limited. Concerning Jung it is quite clear. In relation to K. Jaspers it isn't so obvious, as sciences in many respects investigate a man as such closed in itself completed whole, however a man is such like an animal. Animal just differs from a human being by its completeness in a certain definiteness and therefore it isn't peculiar to it withdrawal from its borders, a transcendence, it is finished, closed in itself whole.

The aforesaid can't be understood in the sense that sense whole in general has no structure, isn't embodied in the certain settled forms. The matter is that sense of human existence always goes beyond the settled forms, structures, never coincides with them.

K. Jaspers in general takes out a problem of a nature and substance of a man out of limits of causal explanation, saying that a man can't be withdrawn from something, as the reason encloses limits of that is defined by it, does these limits closed. It, generally speaking, deeply

truly, but then a man should be understood from his own nature, substances or in our language of essence, and it is a freedom. Then a man is that he made from himself. However K. Jaspers says that a man doesn't do himself, God does him. However it isn't so directly affirmed, and instead to the reader is suggested some idea that the God's voice reports to a person in the form of his self-persuasion. It appears, God as though is in him or he manifests in this case – as God.

From a position of freedom in the basic plan it is impossible to explain a human being even from him, from his own nature, i.e. essence as from the initial cause, as *Causa sui*, reason of itself, in the sense that his essence absolutely predetermines his existence. Otherwise his essence would be that reason of itself which would close his existence by its limits. Namely essence is that a man constantly creates himself instead existence, i.e. creates himself in this sense, creates the sense space, only thus it is possible to understand and interpret him as *Causa sui*. However lameness of this expression for freedom explanation consists in that the settled meaning of term "cause" assumes restriction of its limits.

G.S.Batishchev came to the same conclusion, proceeding from a position of nonpredetermination of a man and his freedom, he wrote: "Respectively, a man has no any predetermined (in the manner of "a logical preformism") primordial and eternal "essence" which it would be possible only more fully to realize, "execute" as the ready project in "terrestrial" empiric material.[27, p. 151]. And further: "... a man is appropriated, mastered and in-himself-accepted subjective world, the world of his essential forces, the world of his objectness, each of which "is occupied" at the same time by him and those subjects, in relation to which he possesses his being, so "is occupied" by the whole ensemble of communications, continuously actively established and transformed. This subjective world doesn't "situated" inside direct individual, on the contrary, it possesses being out of this individual, but comprises him in itself, contains staying in itself. More that, this subjective world is in own way individualized and so far as it is personal (in possibility), but without thanking to initial, direct and naturalistic individuality, but rather contrary to it – through its more or less full removal. "[27, p. 152-153].

Causa Sui can be only one of many determinations of freedom, besides not main because the reason is already settled, in itself ended

form of freedom. Such already fixed, implemented form of freedom can be object of a scientific explanation. Here, of course, already is present a predetermination, essence predetermines own existence. It is possible to tell, that animal stays in exactly such form, as biological life is completed in its specificity form. Openness of human existence by all its opportunities in principle is incompatible with predetermination of him even by himself.

Freudian concept could look freedom concept from the point of view of reason of itself. And not only: any explanation of some objective processes from necessity of their own nature acts then as an image of free current of events on own laws. The essence of being of a thing also is cause of its existence.[28, p. 222]. Noncritical reproduction of current meaning of freedom is reduced to this: as unimpeded manifestation of the own nature of anything.

From this position emergence of "Ego", consciousness and "Super-Ego" remains mysterious. S. Freud simply proceeds from existence of social norms and society in general, whereas their necessity doesn't follow from internal needs of "Id". Deep unconscious desires of "Id" in natural conditions, as, for example, at animals, don't meet internal instances, opposed to them. They encounter only external barriers.

From where and from what need social organizations with their bans, norms and restrictions arise, which generate an inner Self and "Super-Ego"? On this question S. Freud has no answer. He doesn't ask a question about it. Reality in which desires of an individual encounter, on the one hand is the nature, and on the other hand – society, culture. It is necessary to proceed from their presence, to accept them as the fact and all consequences, which follow from this. Animals have no society, therefore, they have also no problems arising from collisions of two realities in the same creature. Since "Ego" and "Super-Ego" are representatives of society in psychic of every human being. Norms and moral requirements get the greatest influence in individual, which, having taken roots in mentality, act already as own, personal. They act in mentality of an individual already as conscience.

However, S. Freud's concept has a mass of inconsistencies, about which was spoken already in other places. In particular "Super-Ego", i.e. conscience of a man has on his own understanding social origin, but sometimes Freud is induced to that it is as though congenital force to man. [8, p. 371].

According to Freud, presence of social norms formed special structure with its function of censorship in mentality of a man – main source and reason of unconscious "Id" existence. Force of requirements of a socio-cultural environment, have become requirements of own internal mental censorships, force them back to the sphere purely unconscious motives.

This is first of all sexual aspirations. Though subsequently he added, that sexual and social motives often merge and form complexes. according to Freud they aren't simply forced out in dark depths of psyche, but are forced out by other motives, purposes acceptable from a point view of cultural requirements which not simply occupy their place, but namely replace the first, taking away on own realization their energy. The conflict is resolved by that aspirations of a man in most cases lose its sexual orientation and acquire decent character.

However, Freud divides unconscious into two parts: that part which is initially unconscious, i.e. which never was conscious, and that part, which once earlier was conscious, it was realized, but which in force of the above reasons was forced out, replaced by another object. That was forced out in unconscious, in principle again can become a consciousness object, be realized, and that part which never was in the consciousness sphere, apparently, never also won't be conscious [8, p. 353-354]. It is possible to draw a conclusion that all these repression, displacements, sublimations concern only the second parts because what there will be a need of repression of that a person in general doesn't know, he doesn't know about existence of that. Moreover, this unknown owing to its character can't contradict to any social ban. A person has to not only know about this unknown before to reject it, but as already noted know that he knows. Initially unconscious never resists to a person as certain opposite to his conscious "Ego", accurately that part "Ego", which is his "Super-Ego", his ideal. Only such opposition can make it an object of consciousness, get as though in the lighten part of an individual soul.

Exactly here, apparently, S. Freud is right, here he for the first time very truly groped both the real problem and real way in which it is possible to explain a consciousness origin. To see oneself, it is necessary to oppose oneself to oneself as certain another, but only as own another.

Initially unconscious that never was and will not be conscious, that is, apparently, on another reason, than repression. However Freud didn't

give due attention to an explanation of this party and it remains not clear. Human cognition itself as though stops before this puzzle. Meanwhile, as it is told already in other place, unconsciousness in general in any form is connected with that it – this area of soul life, – isn't an object for itself, for the time being or, probably, always. As many researchers considered, the course of psychic activity at animals unconsciously for exactly this reason, it is spontaneous.

According to Hegel the general spirit can't contemplate itself, without turning into the nature and history, into a certain external result.

When S. Freud assumes that brothers killed and eaten father instead of managing further infinite war with each other for released place as it happens at many gregarious mammals, suddenly were captured by consciousness of "guilt" before the father [10], he thereby gives up for lost on to the problem of an origin of consciousness, morality, social organization, religion and in general culture. Consciousness, conscience, guilt, duty and consequently, a man with all this are already available. "Oedipus complex" could arise only at human being. Therefore, ban on murder of father, and ban on an incest had already been existed, otherwise as if from nowhere to undertake to sense of shame, "guilt", if not violation this ban? If before this fundamental event in this respect was not any ban and they were established only after this event, it is necessary to explain need of these innovations by any other motives.

2.5 Structure of human "Ego". Mental space of an individual

Freud tried to indicate not only dynamic character of psyche, but also to consider it topically. Psyche is presented by him hierarchically as unconscious, preconscious and consciousness where the leading role is assigned to unconscious, and "conscious intellectual life represents only enough insignificant part of unconscious soul life"[11, p. 74]. And further: "Refusal of an excessive assessment of consciousness becomes the necessary prerequisite of any correct understanding of a psychic origin. According to Lipps's expression, unconscious has to become general basis of psychic life. Unconscious is the big circle including smaller conscious; all conscious has a preliminary unconscious stage, meanwhile as unconscious can remain at this stage and still to make a claim for the full value of mental action."[5, p. 319]. Preconscious is closer to consciousness, than unconscious.

In later works mental structure was presented by Freud by instances "Ego", "Super-Ego" and "Id". "Ego" represents all coherent organization of mentality, the consciousness also concerns to it, it follows 'reality principle' and being a surface of mental device, spatially is closer connected with outside world, it is responsible for adaptable mechanisms of psyche. Therefore "Ego" is corporal, Freud considers, it has approaches to motor reactions, discharging irritations in the outside world. Repressions of some mental aspirations proceed from "Ego" which stop being conscious and resist "Ego". To make them conscious, the analysis needs to eliminate resistances which are proceeding from "Ego" and being the essential reason of repression. However, as we know, these resistances aren't known to patient, he doesn't realize them, i.e. they are unconscious. So, Freud concludes, "Ego" not all is conscious, the part of it is unconscious and manifests as forced out and to make it conscious, analytical work is necessary." "Ego", being situated on a surface of psychological device is close to perception system, however it isn't sharply separated from unconscious, presented by "Id" system, and merges with it. Therefore "Ego" on the one hand is directed on outside world, and on the other hand on processes proceeding from unconscious: "I will tell beforehand that conscious – all perceptions coming from out of (sensory perception), and from within – that we call sensations and feelings". [8, p. 357].

Unconscious "Id" is presented by forced-out and not forced out content. Freud considers, probably there is a part of "Id", which never can become conscious while other part of "Id" can be realized, for example, if this is forced out – by analytical work. Freud recognizes that some unconscious content, for example thoughts or ideas can easily pass from unconscious into consciousness and back, this process is directed by attention, interest and is connected with memory. As all our knowledge is conscious and received by means of conscious acts, but all this huge material doesn't keep in consciousness hourly. When it is necessary to remember the forgotten material, i.e. passed in unconscious, to direct on it attention, and we remember it, causing in consciousness: "... psychological element, for example, idea, usually isn't realized long. On the contrary, characteristically that the condition of consciousness quickly passes; the realized now idea at the next moment becomes unconscious, but under known easily feasible conditions can return to consciousness again. And we don't know, what it was in

intervals; we can tell that it was latent, and imply by hereby that it was at any moment capable to be conscious. However also in this case, if we tell that it was unconscious, we give the correct description. This unconscious coincides then with latent ability to awareness." [8, p. 353].

2.6 "Ego", "Id" and "Super- Ego", their origin, place and role in mentality of an individual

"Ego", according to Freud is understood as unconscious as is only the changed part of "Id", its differentiated surface owing to influence of outside world irritations. Consciousness is reduced only to spontaneous perceptions. "Perception for "Ego" plays that role what an instinct occupies in "Id". "Ego" represents that it is possible to call mind and wariness. "Id", on the contrary, contains passions. ... "Ego" transforms will of "Id" into action, as if it was its own will." [8, p. 362-363]. Therefore Freud allocates for consciousness limited function of self-preservation of an organism and psyche, the consciousness is presented primitive and dependent from "Id", unconscious. Unlike "Ego", "Id" lives on the 'pleasure principle', demands implicit execution of its passions, biological instincts, it is initially immoral, it ruled over by irrational inclinations. "Ego" has to satisfy all requirements of "Id".

However "Ego" is unhappy, it as servant of three masters tries to please at the same time to libido requirements of "Id", conditions of outside world and severity of "Super-Ego" or punishing conscience. ""Ego" offers itself to "Id" as object of a libido, and wants to direct libido of it on itself. It is not only the assistant of "Id", but also his obedient servant trying to obtain love of the master. Where only it is possible, and "Ego" tries to remain in a kind consent with "Id" and covers its unconscious behavior with own preconscious rationalizations; ... shades the conflicts between "Id" and reality and where it is possible, the conflicts with "Super-Ego"" [8, p. 390].

"Super-Ego", as we know, very first and considerable identification of "Ego" with father but though "Super-Ego" also arose from conditions of an Oedipus complex, it vigorously resist to these conditions as itself participated in repression of an Oedipus complex. "Super-Ego" was differentiated from "Ego" and separated from it already at the first identification with father, and further with other authorities, "Super-

Ego" as the part of "Ego" carries out repressions. According to Freud, "Super-Ego" acts as conscience and the most authoritative part of "Ego", as moral censor. In relation to "Ego" "Super-Ego" acts as the parental instance, punishing and forcing out all morally unlawful inclinations and actions, but it is an ideal and authority for "Ego" which "Ego" admire, but also is afraid of it. "Ego" always tries to reach shining tops of "Ego-ideal", following and obeying its requirements, when "Ego" is close to "Super-Ego", it feels triumph. But on the other hand "Ego" obeys unconscious, dark irrational inclinations of "Id" and then the disorder and tension with "Super-Ego", condemnation of "Ego" are observed from this critical instance. Result of tension between "Ego" and "Super-Ego" is sense of guilt, conscience as requirements "Super-Ego" for "Ego" sound as a categorical imperative, a sentence of the judge. Especially, Freud asserts, how "Super-Ego" rage over "Ego", shows a melancholy case. With melancholy, the object, against which hostility of "Super-Ego" is directed, is accepted in "Ego" by identification, therefore anger of "Super-Ego" in essence is directed on "Ego", but "Ego" here unlike in hysteria and neurosis of obtrusiveness recognizes guilty and reproaches itself. Freud adduces mechanisms of manifestations of many forms of neuroses. Freud considers the melancholy conflict even as a case of a dissenting, division of "Ego" on two parts, conflicting among themselves, this is division of "Ego" on parts – "Ego" and "Super-Ego". In persecution mania there already full split of "Ego" takes place where "Super-Ego" is so separated from "Ego" that becomes alien for psyche and pursuing it instance.

"Super-Ego", according to Freud, plays an important role in system of individual psyche. "Thus "Ego-ideal" is heritage of Oedipus complex and, therefore, expression of the most powerful movements and the most important destinies of a libido in "Id". Owing to establishment of "Ego-ideal", "Ego" seized Oedipus complex and at the same time subordinated itself to "Id". While "Ego", generally is the representative of outside world, reality, "Super-Ego" resist to it as the attorney of an inner world, the world of "Id". We are prepared now for that the conflicts between "Ego" and an ideal will, finally to reflect contrast of the real and psychical, outside and internal world.

That biology and destinies of a human genus created and left in "Id", by formation of an ideal is transferred in "Ego" and again individually is endured in it. "Ego-ideal" owing to history of its

formation, has the vast connection with phylogenetic acquisition, – archaic heritage of a certain person. That in separate psychological life was the deepest, becomes by a way of creation of an ideal the highest in human soul, according to our rating scale.

It is easy to show that "Ego-ideal" meets all requirements which are demanded much to the highest being in a man. As replacement of melancholy for father, it contains a germ of which all religions were formed. Judgment about own insufficiency at comparing "Ego" with its ideal cause humble religious feeling to which the believer imbued with a passion of languor refers. In further course of development teachers and authorities continued a role of the father; their precepts and bans remained effectively powerful in "Ego-ideal" and carry out now in the form of conscience a moral censorship. Tension between requirements of conscience and achievements of "Ego" is felt as sense of guilt. Social feelings are based on identification of itself with others because of identical "Ego-ideal" [8, p. 371-372].

Conflicts between "Ego" and "Super-Ego", "Ego" and "Id", their mutual hostility and tensivity show us inconsistent atmosphere of mentality, its splitting and division character. Despite a biologic explanation of a man's psyche by Freud, he opened really available bifurcation of mental "Ego" which in extreme forms is expressed in cases of neurotic frustrations. If the conflict between "Ego" and "Id" is represented by Freud as the conflict between firm natural instincts of a human and requirements and bans of public moral and culture, in neurosis this conflict is expressed extremely sharply and is unsolvable without analytical work. As biological instincts in a person are ineradicable, so the conflict is ineradicable, it will arise always and everywhere. Therefore Freud considers culture as the culprit of such psychological conflicts reaching pathological forms (*Dissatisfaction with culture*, etc.).

The consciousness by Freud has no character of a reflection as a man in his concept doesn't do his activity, thinking as an object, he doesn't do himself for himself an object, after all reflection is when a man realizes that realizes, knows that knows. Only doing himself for himself as an object human being can change himself and the world around, to improve. The outside world by Freud is only result of projection of man's inner mental world torn apart by conflicts. Sublimation of sexual libido which hasn't found direct application in

cultural conditions, generating creative features of a man, art, science, production, moral, religion, other especially human values and relations, are represented by Freud as adaptive activity of an animal as the libido energy which hasn't found application creates the bigger conflict and tension, displeasure. Thus, all established civilization, thinking according to Freud are fed and created thanks to libido energy which hasn't found application, and therefore are explained from biological bases, they have no social essence, aren't self-sufficient. As well creativity, activity of a person has no self-sufficing character. All their sources and sources of destiny of mankind are in an Oedipus complex.

Freud's main contradiction, however, consists that on the one hand he takes natural existence of a man as a basis, and on the other hand – the method of his treatment supposes a person as a subject. The method consists in that unconscious by patient reasons of his illness make conscious, and having realized the deep reasons, motives, he has to change his relation to an illness, reconsider own values, aspirations, that is he has to change as a subject. His recovery consists in it, i.e. Freud nevertheless allows possibility of change of an individual. The method consists that helps a person to reach level where he can reflex over his psychical state, i.e. on self-reflection level. Though, reflection and self-reflection are the same. Therefore, unlike medicine, psychoanalysis assumes subject – subject relation between patient and psychoanalyst, unlike the subject – object as in medicine. Psychoanalysis is directed on treatment of those neuroses which source has the social reasons, conflicts.

2.7 Social alienation and S. Freud's conception of neuroses

As many representatives of post-structuralism and hermeneutics note, problem of destruction of a subject, splitting of its psychical integrity, was opened and described in S. Freud's doctrine. Representative of hermeneutics P. Ricoeur, structuralists J.Lacan, G.Deleuze, relying on achievements of psychoanalysis, tried to consider also a phenomenon of human being in a foreshortening of destruction issues, violation of integrity of a subject, inadequacy of his social manifestations, irrationality of behavior and expression of his sense being in language and its structures. The founder of psychoanalysis himself didn't apply the term "subject", preferring to speak about a personality, integrity of soul, etc. and quite often declared that doesn't

intend to go on an unsteady way of a philosophical reflection. However, investigating a phenomenon of neuroses, he found a tear and splitting of psychical activity of an individual, bringing to disharmony and mental disorders which internal reasons can be realized in various degrees, or not be realized in general by a subject. The explanation of a special role of unconscious by Freud as considerable sphere of psyche by contradictions of soul motives reaching sometimes irreconcilable confrontation, became epochal discovery in psychology. It considerably changed ideas about structure of psyche of a personality. Stratifications which are repeatedly formed layers on each other, depths and surfaces, center and periphery organized in peculiar space of "Ego" were revealed.

Activity of "Ego" which would preserves its integrity following to those purposes, aspirations and actions directed on implementation of its only supreme value or motive, by the presence in its space of two or more motives and values not coinciding, but often opposite on their sense, quite often lead to their confrontation and in extreme cases – to irresolvable conflict that is fraught with disintegration, splitting and even breakup of "Ego" on the parts. It is equivalent to emergence in soul of a certain individual of two or more subjects, everyone with his "Ego", guidelines and purposes that emphasizes a paradoxicality of a similar situation. The phenomenon of bifurcation of personality represents striking picture of disorder of human mentality and his life when in one individual there are (or coexist) two different personalities, everyone with own outlook, vital orientation, plans and action, mood and behavior.

Opened mental contradiction of motives Freud explained as eternal, never solvable contradiction between the biological instincts given to a man by nature which he can't overcome and cultural bans, norms established in social being of a person which are introjected in subject, presented in his mental instance by identification as with accepted by individual and therefore becoming his own motives and guidelines. Mental "Ego" is presented in S. Freud's concept as unfortunate "Ego", seeking to keep unity between various instances on the orientation "Ego", "Id" and "Super-Ego". Each instance tries to seize power, to reach overrule state over others and even to absorb them, breaking a way for its interests, but it is resisted by other not less strong tendencies. And such fight where one or other party prevails over, can infinitely proceed, tormenting the soul, bringing in it various phobias, anxiety and other symptoms.

However social roots, essence of such phenomenon as bifurcation of personality he couldn't open as adhered to naturalistic understanding of a person and society, and also considered that any psychological phenomenon needs to be explained from the psychological reasons. Function of psyche in essence, was reduced by him to providing and service of requirements of primary vital desires. His first followers C.G. Jung and A. Adler expressed disagreement with this position. However his doctrine underwent especially strong transformation by neofreudians K.Horney and E. Fromm. They tried to show that social contradictions lie down at the heart of mental neuroses. So, K.Horney considers that a certain type of culture and specific contradictions inherent in it in which individuals live and were formed, play a crucial role in features and the content of their mental disorders. [29]. A E. Fromm on whom, along with Freud K. Marx's philosophical concept had impacted, tried to explain phenomena of neuroses with social alienation of a man in modern society though not always sequentially adhered to such position, often explaining essence of a person from biosocial positions. [30].

Many works are devoted to criticism of Freudian concept of a man and his mentality. A matter, however, is why his concept received such enormous public response? The theory of psychoanalysis not only get wide dissemination in countries of Western Europe and entered in clinical practice in the USA, but also became part of outlook of people, entered into a daily way of life. Having become an element of mass consciousness of the XX century, Freudianism being exposed to a critical reflection especially in scientific community, had been remained one of many, though the influential directions of scientific psychology. If in the scientific environment psychoanalysis was resisted by a certain estrangement, the psychology mass of individuals was found favorable to it in many respects. It is thought, the reasons of such phenomenon can be discovered, analyzing a social context, its cultural and historical sense more widely.

The social basis of internal mental contradictions and conflicts that Freud considered as an inescapable contradiction between "Ego" and "Id", consciousness and unconscious, in our opinion, is social alienation. Many philosophical works of J.-J. Rousseau, G.W.F. Hegel and other thinkers were devoted to this phenomenon, but especially problem of alienation was developed in K. Marx's doctrine. Despite some contradictions in his doctrine, Marx especially emphasized that his

concept differs from many other concepts that he proceeds from active, initiative individuals actively creating social relations and transforming society and their activity according to their purposes, instead of to be only products and consequences of circumstances and education [31]. Though individuals are formed in society and can't exist out of it, eventually not society defines them and their purposes and actions, but individuals define themselves, form their way of life activity. In this sense active individuals with their individual consciousnesses are primary. That is individuals and their public relations are society, instead of certain abstract. Otherwise it would turn out that society, that is set of all relations of individuals, abstracting from their subjects, turns into a certain special being, independent from individuals, as though precedes them and generates them. It is logic of alienation, irrational logic, logic of a making senseless.

Such logic, according to Marx and other researchers, isn't simply a mind invention, consciousness distortion, and has under itself the objective basis. Alienation is a certain social reality. Its reality consists that all created by people – set of their social relations (that is society), object wealth, their productive forces, forms of their social consciousness, cultural norms and traditions, and the main thing – their own activity as the depersonalized public process, all spiritual and material existent world – act not as own world, not as own result and own being, but as something initially alien. Alienation consists in that own essential forces of a human being, taking the objectifying forms, it would seem, intended to serve a man, his or her development and growth as personality, acquire independent being which isn't coinciding and not serving to the purposes of a person, they have aim at already own development and growth, and a person becomes a mean of their self-development. In this sense alienation is self-alienation of a man, i.e. alienation from himself, opposition of himself to himself.

If doubling of a man on himself and own other is an objective basis of human being in the world, way of his or her creative activity, in the conditions of alienation this objective relation turns over: subject as though becomes an object and vice versa, an object acquires status of a subject. Doubling of a man turns into his bifurcation on himself and on historically collected forces which have escaped from under his control. Such opposition often finds antagonistic character. To individuals with their individual and personal purposes, interests, creative features and

requirements, by diverse creative efforts and relations of which the general subject – society is created, this society resists as over-individual, as if their generating beginning dictating to them its purposes, various directions.

By alienation relations become objectified (become as thing, identify with thing). Process of becoming object, according to Marx, reaches the classical character at development of capitalism stage, commodity-money relations. Thus semblance as quite real relation, but having false character, kind of fetishism is created. Relations created by people and expressed through a commodity-money exchange, start looking as the relation of things – goods and money – in all their evident and sensual representation, and people – only as representatives of these operating parties. Marx exposes this false visibility, analyzing commodity fetishism: "Mystery of a commodity form consists simply that it is a mirror which reflects to people public nature of their own work as corporeal character of products of work, as public properties of these things inherent in them by nature; therefore also the public relation of producers to cumulative work is imagined to them being out of them public relation of things" [32, 82].

The reason of all this is aloof consciousness of people, interpretation of themselves as result and a consequence of object world externally resisting to them as independent and necessary law, the worship of a person for omnipotence of thing wealth, money, capital, their transformation into passion, supreme value giving the power by an identification with it. Irrational logic corresponds to it according to which sense and meaning of the objects created by people, initially is inherent to them, they endow people with similar sense and meaning. As a result not the capital serves to person and his development and enrichment, on the contrary, a man serves to capital, devoting himself, all his abilities to its growth and multiplication. Wealth multiplication for the sake of multiplication, instead of for consumption becomes the purpose. A person, according to Marx, becomes "personification" of the capital, its vested in personality form. [32, p.163]. As a result wealth consumes a person as mean of self-movement instead of person consumes wealth.

That the purposes and values of individual life cease to coincide with the purposes and requirements of public life of people and their communication is result, these spheres separate and even contradict each

other. Two spheres of life arise as result of such splitting not only in public joint life, but also in life of each certain individual: in one he aspires to be oneself in the detached from others, to follow and carry out purely personal (or seeming the personal) motives and purposes, and in other – official – sphere he has to follow as though superhuman, public, the same for all motives and purposes, standing above any individual purpose. In the official impersonal sphere individuals mainly act as means, instead of aim as the society which has gained character of a superhuman organism (frequently the state), has the purposes which often aren't purposes of individuals. Individuals are only mean and a material for construction of its own body for such society-subject.

So, individuals in real life, in real affairs are bifurcated: the public or official individual and the personal individual if it is possible to express so. In each of these real spheres individual behaves and feels and worries differently. His life, status, behavior and thoughts can have different vectors of an orientation, and sometimes to be opposite. In extreme cases he or she can profess even opposite outlooks. Quite often happens so that one of his parties gets domination over his other party, trying to suppress and absorb it, however completely can't destroy it. Alienation promotes more prevalence of official part of an individual over his personal party.

Thus it should be noted that personal in an individual, though it can be suppressed and forced out to unconscious spheres of soul, but never can disappear as personal aspirations to his freedom, choice and identification with supreme values, to his growth, an elevation and development of himself are his subject bases providing his autonomy, creative activity, responsibility. However also opposite to them values as bases of official life directives of an individual occupy the same status of own accepted by him having sense life orientations, also are his internal intention. Otherwise, if the last were external, irrespective to subject, the problem of interior psychical alienation wouldn't exist. And the alienation problem as self-estrangement of a man in itself would disappear.

There is a question arise how that obviously denies individual life, necessity of independence and originality becomes the strongest motive of life of an individual? These motives in conditions of alienation can occupy various status: they can be equal on force to motives of own life, coexist with them in parallel, being irreconcilable, they can be

prevailing and suppressing private motives and interests of an individual. In the latter case individual requirements of personal development can be deeply forced out and not be realized by individual, but thus, without losing the vital importance and force. Both opposite motives can be realized in some individuals, and if some individual, choosing from these two tendencies, chooses nevertheless interests of the personal beginning, its preservation, statement and development, identifying freedom with personal motives, and motives of service of the public beginning condemns, such individual usually consciously or even can openly protect and prove his position. In any case internally he gives the report to himself about the choice, reflects over his state. Usually contradiction of motives in such individuals, though doesn't disappear, but hardly reaches heat and the unsolvable conflict accepting character of a mental disorder.

The discourse, of course, is about that, how the contradiction of incompatible on sense parties will be resolved, what of them will prevail depends on subject, his freedom of choice, on his valuable meanings. Presence of a phenomenon of alienation, including internal mental as it paradoxically sounds, connected with freedom as essential strength of a man, his ability to create variety of spiritual meanings and to choose them as sense of his life. Once the valuable sense chosen by a person, however, doesn't predetermine him or her forever, he or she keeps the reflexive relation to his or her vitally significant value, can reconsider, be disappointed in it and choose other values, i.e. to change, develop, self-determine as a subject. However, as it appears, he can accept not one value as only vitally significant guideline which as a kernel would organize his ego as integrity, but for him there can become vitally significant several values.

Ego, based on two or more valuable senses which spiritual contents can be opposite, and in other cases even mutually excluding, nevertheless, tries to keep though any form of integrity, to find satisfactory or finds seeming satisfactory way of solution of a contradiction. Especially in totalitarian systems, many individuals perceive the requirements of society resisting to their motives of consolidation and expansions of their special sphere of life as unsatisfactory for their personal interests and don't allow them in their soul structure.

However if both norms of society and personal motives become equivalent for individual, but antirected and mutually excluding each

other on sense, so can happen that an individual finds the following solution of a contradiction: in satisfaction and implementation of motives meeting the requirements of society he or she can see partial or in various degree full ensuring satisfaction of his or her personal motives of development. So, at least, he or she avoids possibility of irresolvable conflict and disintegration of ego on the parts. That is his or her personal motives, being most often forced out to unconscious spheres of psyche, nevertheless, find a way out to a consciousness surface, to sphere of implementation and being of oneself not directly, but indirectly, under cover of consciously carried-out official motives. It can be the career growth, occupation of the state positions in which achievement an individual sees opening condition for implementation of his or her personal motives, development of himself or herself as a personality.

However variations and ways of solution of soul and spiritual contradictions there is an infinite variety as each individual, subject has a freedom of choice of valuable senses and can change his choice, reconsider himself, own spiritual bases, changed in a root. In this sense substantive basis of personality is his or her individuality, peculiarity.

In cases when the contradiction doesn't find any form of solution, and develops into the unsolvable conflict tormenting and tearing apart soul of individual, in certain cases it leads to a mental illness. These diseases, as it known, at stages of a serious crisis completely paralyze personality. The psyche of a person then represents the fight arena between various instances of Ego, one of which takes dominant position and power over another. The last is usually forced out to unconscious sphere, however, without losing the vital force and energy as is the same own intention of subject, as well as force which has forced it out, vigorously tries to struggle through on a consciousness surface to carry out own purposes in some extent. However it doesn't manage as resistance of consciousness confronts to satisfaction and implementation of the forced-out intention which forced out it. The forced-out motive again and again makes the break attempts, vainly sweeping away the barriers which are again built by the opposite side, being in the consciousness sphere. It represents the painful process filling soul with anxiety (according to Horney), being accompanied by fears, phobia (according to Freud). Attempts of break of the forced-out motives which are periodically repeating during becoming aggravated crises and their suppression, Freud described as symptoms.

All these contradictions historically arising and possible only in social conditions S. Freud considers as existent data of eternal inescapable conflict of biological and social in a man. Against a background great discovery of the most difficult structure of motivation in the soul sphere of a man this is too simple decision. As needs an explanation how something hostile, destroying his life and blocking his own development, also becomes motive of human life. Existence of unconscious, suppressed or, according to Freud, forced-out motives in psyche of individuals, apparently, is explained by supremacy aloof from individual and hostile to him his own forces.

These or those social dramas are played in each individual soul in a unique way, with features and variety of contents, tinges. Not at each soul it, of course, reaches that hopeless tragedy as it acts by neurotic. Detection in various degree found unsolvable psychological contradictions by psychoanalysis methods in a certain degree is natural, as at normal (that is typical) individuals for given culture which sufferings find this or that solution, this contradiction is considerably veiled. By neurotic it is simply shouting, blocking development of an individual and his productive relationship with other individuals.

According to Freud the same type of the conflict – a mythical Oedipus complex is undertaken instead infinitely varying diversity of spiritual states. He proceeds from understanding of a human being strictly causal conditioned. A human being in Freud's concept is the inhabitant of a kingdom of necessity. His natural instincts – a source of all spiritual variety: origin of society, culture, consciousness, thinking, religion, art, moral, generally, all creative activity of a person is explained by him as a form of displacement of forced out unconscious vital beginnings, powerful instincts which unsatisfied energy, without finding direct application, is compelled to be transformed to the creative beginnings. Thus stress is removed off, and, as a result, there cultural person arise, submitting to its certain norms, bans, living according to cultural values. Culture, as considered by Freud, is only a projection of internal mental contradictions, a form of their sublimation. So, it turns out, people began to be engaged in agriculture as replacement of the incest aspirations as it has symbolical sense of processing of mother earth, etc. [10]. There is a question: from where this initial contradiction is undertaken if at the dawn of mankind there were yet no cultural norms and bans? Therefore the initial conflict between social norms and

biological instincts couldn't arise. Many researchers of psychoanalysis noted about this contradiction in S. Freud's concept, called in logic "circle in proving" [15]. For an explanation of such phenomena, other approaches were necessary.

Alienation from people of their own creations (society, state, etc.) are in the main their self-estrangement, because in kind of external forces dominating over them their own forces comes forward which only have been torn off by them from themselves and opposed to themselves. So far as society, state develop system of a ban, often limiting individuals freedom, they, of course, in the final sense are the bans established by people to themselves, to own development. If all social forms are forms of people existence and if these forms act as something alien and hostile to them (that is sense of alienation), impeding realization their most vital interests, so it is real, in practice going on the events of splitting of individuals both in public, and in individual scope. Unified person and as human race and as separately taken individual really forks on opposite directed own forces, activity parties, motives, guidelines, passions, etc.

So far as individuals in own life and activity, in mutual relations create all this, so far as they build all these structures first of all in own psyche, thinking, etc. Therefore, creating aloof forces from themselves, norms, orders, individuals also create motives corresponding to them, guidelines, norms and bans to themselves in their soul, keeping at the same time in all force personal vital aspirations to freedom, to development, to independence and originality, resisting to the first. Otherwise speaking, they ideally and really split, halve themselves, though, of course, all this process as a whole is not realized by them. It is not a result of consciously carried out purpose. Such situations can promote development in many individuals of internal soul dissonance bringing in certain cases to that Freud calls internal conflict. On the basis of such conflicts depending on individual features there cases of pathological diseases, neuroses crop up. An individual is seized by certain thought, idea, passion, etc., i.e. not he owns over them and controls, but they entirely own over him or her. The illness consists also in that individual tries to be exempted from the internal conflict by that constantly creates barriers on a break way of unconscious impulses driven into deep, but they, being are rather strong, all again and again break through them. This measure to be fenced off from his deep

impulses and by this way strangle confrontation, is expressed in creation of the various symbolical forms: actions, thoughts, images, objects and even other persons, in implementation and relations with which patient as though finds symbolical solution of internal conflict and satisfaction of forbidden desires. S. Freud calls them symptoms, obsessive actions. According to Freud such internal contradictions in the weakened form are peculiar to all normal (typical) individuals, but neurotic differs that at him they reach irreconcilable confrontation and he can't find satisfactory way of their solution.

At the same time it is observed that phenomena of painful "Ego" bifurcation with their tension up to full disintegration in certain cases, increases together with civilization development. Many dates of ethnography, social psychology testify to it, and in the developed civilizations, apparently, it is possible to tell, cases of soul diseases are more observed among people with rather developed intellectual culture and morality.

Neurosis according to description of all psychoanalysts represents a condition of a person when he or she in whole or in part loses ability objectively, to think, make decisions and act in compliance with circumstances. It occurs owing to that a person isn't self-controlled, doesn't define and direct a course of his or her thoughts and acts, and he or she turns out under the power of any thought and related with it passion instead of to own them. Thereof he or she can't adequately react to external circumstances, to their logic, but proceeds only from sense of passions and motives being owned by them. An individual loses qualities of subject. He or she loses first of all internal freedom.

How alienation and self-alienation of people limits a person in his or her realization of oneself as a subject, and in extreme expressions paralyze a personality so, that not a person is the owner of thoughts, mental states, not he or she regulates and directs their course, in contrary, they – certain thoughts, feelings manage in his soul, is possible to observe in neuroses of obsessive actions described by Freud: "Neurosis of obsessive states is expressed that patients are busied with thoughts in which they, actually, don't interested, feel in itself the impulses seeming to them very alien, and motivations to actions, which performance though doesn't give them any pleasure, but they can't refuse it in any way. Thoughts (obsessive ideas) in itself can be senseless or only indifferent for an individual, often they are absolutely

preposterous, in any case, they are result of intense, wearisome for the patient cogitative activity to which he or she is very reluctantly given up. Against his or her will he or she has to be engaged in a self-searching and deliberate as though business goes about his or her most important vital tasks. Impulses which the patient feels in himself, can make impression of ridiculous childishness, but mostly they have the scariest contents, like attempts of perpetration of serious crimes so the patient not only denies them as alien, but in horror runs from them and is protected from their execution by bans, refusals and restrictions of his or her freedom. However actually they never reach execution; As a result escape and caution win. That the patient really executes as so-called obsessive actions, – harmless, undoubtedly insignificant actions, mostly repetitions, ceremonial adorning of ordinary life activities because of what these necessary performances of vital needs: withdrawal to a dream, washing, a toilet, walk become extremely prolonged and turn into almost unsolvable problems, but don't think that you will render service to the patient if you will persuade him to distract, not to be engaged in these silly thoughts, and to make something reasonable, instead of his trifles. He would like it because his consciousness is absolutely clear, he shares your judgment about his obsessive symptoms and he oneself tells you about it. He only can't differently; "[4, p. 164].

The obsessive states described by Freud show us a picture of internal psychical self-alienation of a man when his own forces resist to him which have separated from him, become hostile and alien so that an individual perceives them not as a part of his Ego, but as external unclear force which has lodged in him. Despite to his will and desires, an individual is compelled obey to the same thoughts and ideas seized power in his soul, but can't get rid of them. He realizes their absurdness and purposelessness, and at times even their criminality, is saved by escape, but not in forces to cope with it. He can't understand the nature of this phenomenon and can perceive it as action of certain supernatural forces.

One of the most difficult cases for understanding are neuroses of delirium of observation and in wider plan – persecution. They especially in relief show a picture of sharp bifurcation of personality. These are cases, when a person constantly feels as though presence strange observer in own soul, who fixes, notes, estimates, and often also condemns each his step, act, thoughts, mood, etc., thus it is felt not as own control over himself, but as control of any stranger who is lodging

in him and without ceremony making the judgments about him. In usual conditions it also occurs with normal people, but then this phenomenon is transient moment and a person completely gives account himself that he completely reproduces controlling instance, realizing that it is his own instance. In neurotic this instance constantly makes court, there is a distance and hostility between them, that his Ego does and that this instance does or judges. All question is that neurotic tries to get rid of a watching eye, to hide out from it, but can't. Its presence for him is agonizing, all the more this observing or making court (here variations too are diverse) instance he constantly and obsessively reproduces with tiresome repeatability and monotony. "They complain us that constantly and up to the most intimate functions stand under the dispiriting supervision of unknown forces probably after all persons, and in hallucinations hear how these persons declare results of their supervision: "now he wants to tell it, here he puts on to leave, etc. This supervision yet not the same that persecution, but is close to it, it assumes, that to patient don't trust, wait, how would find him for forbidden actions for which he have to be punished. ... such observing and menacing with punishment instance in "Ego" ... in them is only sharply separated from "Ego" and by mistake is displaced in external reality." [4, p. 338].

As far as the similar inclinations contradicting to moral norms, by origin too are public, so in basis of neuroses most likely social contradictions lie. More real in such explanation, however, it is seemed that as this valid instance aloof society acts, established by it orders and norms, instead of becoming mystical initial sins of our far ancestors.

Existence of observing, creating court and punishing instance in a person but which is perceived as external and otherworldly to patient, bears in itself character of the mirror reproduction of alienation situation: hostility of "Ego" to this instances and fear before it, its incomprehensible power, which paralyze will of "Ego", its exteriority and impersonality.

The forced-out motives of individuals, being unsatisfied, seek to find certain forms of implementation, not always finding a direct and adequate way of exit, and, being at various level of consciousness, continue to work, creating a special background of an emotional mood, depending on in what measure they find satisfaction. In conditions of alienation the majority of individuals, apparently, have two main ways

of solution of this problem. The first way, when in an individual the dominating force, its strengthening, statement and development occupies a place of personal motive. Interests of the state, corporation can be an example. An individual considers the state as the highest beginning, is devoted to it, identifies own interests with interests of the state. Other example is service to wealth, identification of own aspirations with need of self-increase of wealth. In that case individual sacrifices himself as a personality, entirely devoting himself to wealth multiplication, he becomes "personification" of a capital.

Sense of satisfaction his many needs thus is maintenance in a good state of mean of self-development of the state or the capital, that is in his face the state or the capital satisfies their requirements. And an individual satisfies in a certain sense such solution of a contradiction. His personal motives of life don't disappear, they can be forced out to unconscious spheres of mentality or be realized in their aloof and distorted sort when he considers his motives not as the own but as a form of existence of motives of the aloof force standing above him. The forced-out motive nevertheless in this case has satisfaction under the mask of opposite motive that doesn't conduct, of course, to pathological outcome.

The second way, it is already known when individual consciously condemns interests of aloof force and doesn't allow it in structure of his psyche. He does everything for neutralization of its suppressing force and strengthening personal aims, whatever the last were. Personal guidelines also can be various individual contents – from noble to low, selfish or even criminal intents. Here it is said that not necessarily only personal motives can be the humane contents, in this or that soul, on the contrary, personal motives can sometimes win as the aloof selfish purposes antisent to the altruistic purposes of society. As society is also presented by the whole hierarchy of values, certain public layers, the organizations in the purpose of their activity see achievement of harmony, peace, freedom and equality in relationship between people and the states. At such conscious arrangement of priorities between available motives such individuals also find solution of soul contradictions.

In cases when mutually excluding each other on character motives don't find any real (at least partial) satisfaction and an exit, even in a mask of the contrast, and in this case his motives don't stand in a condition of open confrontation as patients with mental disease, according to the

description of analysts, often don't realize own hidden motives, the conflict also is unknown to them, isn't realized. An individual often finds not valid, but an imaginary exit, building certain external actions, objects or even persons, in the relations with which he finds a certain similarity of satisfaction or solution of own problem. However these "decisions" have partially or completely symbolical character.

Creation of symbolical forms is characteristic and creative for human activity in general. Symbol represents and expresses something real and is the functional moment of activity. In conditions of alienation symbol and expressed by it reality can exchange places and a person creating symbols can turn out a symbol of that was created by him, such as, when he acts as a personal image of the capital, i.e. serves as a symbol of his symbol. In typical conditions of normal individual such distortion and canting, though too often isn't realized, but entirely doesn't block achievement of a certain satisfaction of own aspirations by him. Soul sick, building the line of imaginary activity, often turns it into ritual action and into ritual satisfaction that only for some time can calm passion owning him, but again and again catches at a straw. It was shown on the example of neurosis of obsessive actions which can be not only actions, but also thoughts or notions.

Thus, social alienation takes place when the general relations of people connecting their activity together, start standing apart, acquiring character of over individual beginnings, which norms, values and bans acquire ruling position while activity of each individual and his life becomes the private moment of cumulative general process. Then life of everyone, in turn, becomes special being with purely individual motives. According to Marx such isolation at this historical stage signifies a certain level of freedom of a man, appearance of a personality on the historical arena, independent in the acts, capable to use the same developed public relations in own private purposes. Other party of isolation is alienation which, according to Marx can be overcome during natural-historical process, under its objective law.

At the same time Marx has statements where individuals with their individual consciousnesses are authors of historical events, namely they are active creators of world processes and at the same time creators of themselves. In this sense, it appears, it is necessary to understand alienation as self-alienation of people as individuals are subjects of their acts, creators of their values as meanings of life, choosing aloof from

them values, they create being corresponding to them. As the value senses created by people, are diverse according to their contents, they can be true and false, humane or anti-humane, worthy for human being or unworthy it. What world individuals will build, what values will overrule in it depends on their choice.

References

1. *Фрейд З.* О психоанализе. В сб. Психология бессознательного. – М.: Просвещение, 1989.
2. *Фрейд З.* Очерки истории психоанализа. В кн.1. Я и Оно. – Тбилиси.: Мерани., 1991.
3. *Фрейд З.* По ту сторону принципа удовольствия. В кн. 1: "Я" и "Оно". – Тбилиси: Мерани, 1991.
4. *Фрейд З.* Введение в психоанализ. Лекции. – М: Наука, 1989.
5. *Фрейд З.* Толкование сновидений. – Киев: Здоровья, 1991.
6. *Фрейд З.* Очерки по психологии сексуальности. В кн.2. Я и Оно. – Тбилиси.: Мерани., 1991.
7. *Леонтьев А.Н.* Проблема развития психики. – М.: МГУ, 1972
8. *Фрейд З.* "Я" и "Оно". В кн.1: "Я" и "Оно": Пер. с нем. – Тбилиси: Мерани, 1991
9. *Маркс К.* Экономическо-философские рукописи 1844 г. Маркс К. и Энгельс Ф. Соч. т.42. – М.: Политиздат, 1974
10. *Фрейд З.* Тотем и табу. В кн.1: "Я" и "Оно": Пер. с нем.-Тбилиси: Мерани, 1991
11. *Фрейд З.* Массовая психология и анализ человеческого "Я". Кн. 1. – Тбилиси: Мерани, 1991
12. *Фрейд З.* Леонардо де Винчи. – М.: Мысль, 1912. с.26.
13. *Шарден П.Т.* Феномен человека: Пер. с фр. – М.: Наука, 1987.
14. *Руткевич А.М.* От Фрейда к Хайдеггеру: Критический очерк экзистенциального психоанализа.- М.: Политиздат, 1985
15. *Лейбин В.М.* Психоанализ и философия неофрейдизма. – М.: Политиздат, 1977
16. *Фрейд З.* Достоевский и отцеубийство. В кн.2: "Я" и "Оно". – Тбилиси: Мерани, 1991
17. *Фрейд З., Буллит У.* Томас Вудро Вильсон. 28-й президент США.(Психологическое исследование). – М.: Прогресс, 1992
18. *Юнг К.Г.* Психология и поэтическое творчество. В кн.: Самосознание европейской культуры XX века. – М.: Политиздат, 1991
19. *Юнг К.Г.* К пониманию психологии архетипа младенца. В кн.: Самосознание европейской культуры XX века. – М.: Политиздат, 1991

20. *Ясперс К.* Духовная ситуация времени. В кн.: Смысл и назначение истории: Пер. с нем. – М.: Политиздат, 1991
21. *Лейбин В.М.* Психоанализ и философия неотрейдизма. – М.: Политиздат, 1977,
22. *Лейбин В.М.* Фрейд, психоанализ и современная западная философия. – М.: Политиздат, 1990
23. Беседа с Хайдеггером. В сб.: Хайдеггер М. Разговор на проселочной дороге. Пер. с нем. – М.: Высш. шк., 1991
24. *Ясперс К.* Философская вера. В кн.: Смысл и назначение истории: Пер. с нем. – М.: Политиздат, 1991, с.454.
25. *Шелер М.* Положение человека в космосе. В. сб.: Проблема человека в западной философии. – М.: Прогресс, 1988, с.63.
26. *Юнг К.Г.* Современность и будущее. – Минск: Университетское, 1992.
27. *Батищев Г.С.* Понятие целостно развитого человека и перспективы коммунистического воспитания. В кн.: Проблема человека в "Экономических рукописях 1857-1859 г." К.Маркса. Изд-во Ростовского университета, 1977
28. *Аристотель.* Метафизика. Соч. т.1. – М.: Мысль, 1976
29. *Хорни Карен.* Неврологическая личность нашего времени. Самоанализ. – Москва, «Прогресс» «Универс», 1993.
30. Фромм Эрих. Психоанализ и этика. Москва: «Республика», 1993.
31. *Маркс К.* Тезисы о Фейербахе. Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Сочинения. т.3. с.1-4.
32. *Маркс К., Энгельс Ф.* Капитал. Т.1. Сочинения. Изд.2-е. Т.23., – Москва, 1960.

Theories of "Ego" and personality in psychology

1.1 Conception of unconscious and theory of personality in C.G.Jung's analytical psychology

Concept of consciousness and unconscious of C. G. Jung, and also understanding by him structures of psyche and its internal contradictions and such mechanisms, as repression, fixing, transfer, resistance, sublimation, symbolical forms of unconscious manifestation and its big role have many common features with S. Freud's psychoanalytic theory. However, despite of similarity in understanding of structure of mentality, Jung has the essential divergences concerning a soul spiritual world of an individual, nature of interrelation of consciousness and unconscious, their contents. From own positions C. G. Jung refers his doctrine to independent area of researches of a personality, its integrity, creativity, etc.

Unlike the initial motto "where there was id there shall be ego", later S. Freud more inclined to that also to recognize Ego and Super-ego

more unconscious, than relating to consciousness sphere as repressions and resistances originating from these instances, as a rule, aren't realized by individuals. Jung considers Ego as the central link of consciousness. Due to the acceptance of new structure Ego, Id and Super-ego by late Freud, borders of consciousness and unconscious in his doctrine became more and more indistinct and uncertain. Jung accurately defines this border, carrying to the content of the sphere of consciousness an orientation of the reason providing stability, necessary for achievement of the practical purposes of life which often understand as common sense. Everything that doesn't answer common sense, is inapplicable to rationality of the vital purposes based on experience as something irrational, departs in area of unconscious. So, unconscious sphere according to Jung is presented by the contents relating both to external world in relation to subject, and to its internal spiritual psychological. Unconscious, thus, in extensiveness of "territory" and richness of the content much more surpasses sphere of consciousness which, despite the ability to be trained, open the borders for all new, in each concrete situation remains limited. Consciousness – according to Jung – only the small island towering over the sea of unconscious [1, p. 54].

Ego represents an organizing kernel of consciousness, but not all content of consciousness sphere makes Ego. It remains unknown, what then other part of conscious, not relating to Ego adduces itself? Who carries out in this case awareness process, what subject's activity is such process if no Ego?

Jung doesn't solve and doesn't try to resolve such issue at the level of theoretical analysis, considering it as speculative. He considers that psychotherapeutic practice has to be based on the analysis of experience both general historical, and provided by individual one. Therefore he doesn't seek to formulate accurately own position in understanding of consciousness and unconscious nature, being content with general idea that consciousness is that is known to subject about own thinking, and unconscious – area unknown to him, what he doesn't know. To operate with new concepts, he considers, we have to dispose of relevant empirical data.

However, psychotherapeutic practice bringing practical results and also own methods and approaches to their interpretation lead Jung to new suppositions, designing doctrine named by him analytical.

Jung also adheres to understanding that consciousness and unconscious are not absolutely closed areas of psychological, their contents

mutually influence and supplement each other, their interaction is a condition of integrity of psyche, answering its aspiration to unity of the Self. About unconscious content we can learn in principle though it appears to us in a symbolical form and can be interpreted differently in each individual level. However consciousness not always can be ready to contact with a material unconscious owing to what the last is perceived by consciousness as something alien and external to it, the consciousness is compelled to project it on external object. Phenomenon of division, duality of psychical instead of harmony of an individuation is observed. Inadequately apprehended content of the unconscious is mythologized, assuming more or less rationalized kind. Especially such splitting, according to Jung is characteristic to modern person, which extremely rationalized and emancipated reason isn't inclined listen to instincts, internal intuition proceeding from area of unconscious, as exactly unconscious, connecting to consciousness provides integrity realization, this eternal, ineradicable archetype of the Self. Without this connection consciousness loses its roots, a power source and is disoriented.

Thus, considerably, what importance is given to unconscious in Jung's system. Unconscious is presented not only by instincts having a corporal origin, but also by archetypes – archaic prototypes, originating in deep ancient times. These foundations represent type of historical experience among ancestors. It is the anima/animus, the shadow, the Self representing integrity, etc., they continue to live in souls of subsequent generations. The developed stereotypes of behavior in the course of changing living conditions in the form of images depart gradually to unconscious spheres of mentality and later already in the form of a symbol rise from depths of unconscious, again finding life and real force, influencing conscious sphere of an individual. These collective images of a historical origin, however, are inherited by a genetic way and can be general at representatives of certain types of societies. S. Freud, A. Adler, K. Horney and many psychoanalysts also noted about heritability of some signs of unconscious.

Human Ego in Jung's concept is a center of all purposeful conscious activity of an individual and in this sense possesses active spiritual potential. However on the whole function of Ego and all consciousness eventually is reduced by Jung to adaptation to environment. The will and autonomy of Ego as subject of consciousness also turn out relative as the subject on the whole is much broader, than

consciousness, it embraces itself also unconscious, consciousness is represented derivative from unconscious which primary activity is implementation of unconscious contents rising on a surface, turning their hidden sense into will. Jung notes: "... the consciousness is shown as breakthrough function of unconscious psyche. "Ego" as subject of consciousness is found in process as the complex magnitude which is formed partially from inherent dispositions (character components), and partially from unconsciously acquired impressions and the phenomena caused by them. Psyche is pre-existent and transcendent with respect to consciousness. It can be designated together with Dupre as "transcendental subject" [2, p. 101]. So, it turns out that Ego is predetermined in general system of this whole.

At the same time Jung claims that integrity of a personality is reached by junction of contrasts – consciousnesses and unconscious – in a certain transcendental function and here the main subject defining nature of reconciliation is already the ego, instead of unconscious. It would seem, for Ego there keep a choice, freedom of relation and definition itself. However the choice is reduced only to two main tendencies depending on features of an individual, – that is a creative formulation and understanding [3, p. 42]. Supplementing and compensating each other, these tendencies serve as the tool for revelation and form giving to contents and ideas unconscious so that opportunity for interpretation of them by reason opens. Otherwise, if transcendental function isn't carried out, the subject remains divided into two opposite parts where repressions and resistances, transfers are also possible. In collision of these conflicting parties unprepared to a meeting with unconscious reason can become covered by the unclear contents alien to it that leads to obscuration of reason, to neurotic deviations. The last can be observed not only on individual level, but to take collective forms [4].

Human Ego carries out, does visible for intelligence a certain idea and considers itself by a source of such ideas, without suspecting that it processes a material of the unconscious. Unconscious in such understanding acts as the inexhaustible provider of ideas, meanings, their symbols and influences on direction of strong-willed activity of consciousness. The important role is thus assigned to archetypes having character of a collectivity, impersonality, they in essence the notions peculiar and even identical in individuals of a certain community. "Individual consciousness is a superstructure over collective

unconscious about which existence the first ordinary doesn't suspect", – Jung notes. [2, p. 131].

So, it turns out that Ego of a man doesn't possess freedom, possibility of a choice of own foundation, ability of change of, going out beyond the bounds. He remains predetermined by inherited past of mankind, collective unconscious. Freedom of a man is contained within framework of limited consciousness which function is reduced by Jung mainly to regulation of relations between individual experience and the content of the unconscious sphere. Ego, a personality and subject in Jung's concept in many respects don't coincide. If Ego is limited to activity only within consciousness, a personality doesn't limit oneself only to consciousness boundaries, it embraces itself also subconscious sphere. Unconscious sphere, differing by personality manifestations, Jung calls the shadow. The shadow is the main, significant part of a personality, but its contents can't be learned by individual. This unconscious sphere of personality constantly influences on consciousness, trying to assimilate it. The shadow can bear in itself threat for all personality if dark unconscious instincts in it will recover and find the power, and moral guidelines of an individual won't be able to resist of them. Therefore "... to realize own shadow and learn to manage with it – a fate of all people" [5, p. 62]. Jung doesn't try to analyze character of Ego and a person correlation, distinctions or similarity of their contents, he only concludes: "I offer a personality as a whole which, despite of own datum, can't be learned up to the end, to call the *self*. The ego, by definition, is subordinated to the self and concerns to it as part to whole" [6, p. 164]. The self, therefore, acts as the subject in wider plan, than Ego. Though Ego possesses, therefore a free will, a choice within consciousness sphere, but out of a consciousness field such freedom Ego is nullified by nature of the self.

However in many works devoted to practical questions of psychotherapy, instead of theoretical researches, Jung notes that each individual, his Ego is especially individual, represents unique reality which though can be cognized, but it is impossible to comprehend with help of methods of scientific rationalism. The logic of scientific rationalism is aimed at revelation in any reality, including a person, all cause-effect relationships which have settled in it, regularities, consideration of phenomenon as the general average unit. However such approach is unacceptable for a person, his psychical world.

Psychotherapeutic practice shows that each human soul, every Ego isn't reduced to another Ego, it is concrete and unique. Therefore those ways which conduct to comprehension and mutual understanding of one certain soul, can't lead to comprehension of other soul. That makes active and directs soul forces that gives to concrete soul feature, is for this soul only dear and valuable even if it isn't dearly to another, isn't in general socially important, – it is a certain human sense. And only such sense becoming the deep basis of soul, its internal intention, guideline, though, maybe not realized by individual, is reality for this individual. Soul life of an individual is reality, effectiveness of this sense, instead of how it is represented by logic of scientific knowledge as the object determined by external circumstances. The point of view of cognition doesn't give the chance of comprehension of a person, Jung considers, these approaches are diametrically opposite.[7, p. 72-75].

But that is paradoxical, unique deep sense, not reducible to anything another, according to Jung, eventually provided to be the content of a certain archetype inherited from the past. Freedom, will of an individual, all that had to be directed on creation valuable and dear only for this individual in his soul suddenly is found the consequence of forms which have already defined in the past limited in their bounds. How personal, especially individual can be brought out of impersonal collective heritage, socio-historical property of a certain public environment, Jung doesn't ask this question. From his judgments it is possible to understand only that a personality as integrity is presented both the sphere of conscious soul life, and unconscious. Archetypes and ancient instincts of unconscious are often hostile and aggressive and threaten to overtake a personality unawares, subordinate her itself. Eventually individual is predetermined and depends on the inherited past which has strongly lodged in him, presented in genetically inherited mental structures. If by Freud Oedipus complex, its eternal nature is explained by survivability of initial vital impulses, there an ineradicableness of archetypes, prototypes, having the cultural and historical content is not explained in what vital need gives them immortality?

Jung claims right thought that deep sense acts as only valuable, real for an individual instead of something general. This sense is introduced not from environment though maybe socially significant for many, first of all it is effective and significant in soul structure of the specific

individual, is reality of this person which doesn't coincide with other reality, with other person. In the last one other meanings, – from our point of view – other values can be effective absolutely. Jung draws such conclusion from experience of the clinical practice. Being engaged in mental disorders of his patients, he noticed that often they are unreceptive to external circumstances that solution of the internal psychological conflicts is reached not by influence of external conditions, but by change of internal guidelines of personality. Task of the analyst was not to cognize, but rather to comprehend, see through external manifestations that deep kernel of his soul, his original reality which contradictions with Ego of an individual generated neurosis. And in every case it appeared that the content of a complex, character of a contradiction in essence is individually, unique.

Jung doesn't refer sense to the cause. The analysis of cause-effect relationships reveals common, identical in researched phenomena. Despite an originality of each situation from these positions it is supposed that all situations are reduced and explainable in their essence from a single basis. But that is the common in person with other person, other people not necessarily is true in him, his main basis. The sense of each person is unique, it is his special life whereas the general at him though is important, but is minor.

Thus, opening uniqueness and individuality of each human soul, Jung inclined to understand man, his mentality from positions of his spiritual intentions, sense content of values. In this question he sharply diverges with S. Freud, criticizing him for reducing all human motives to biological instincts of a reproduction. Motives providing requirements widely understood sexual, described by Freud, or aspiration to power as a result of the inferiority complex, put forward by Adler or as something characteristic to person and all existing by Nietzsche, aren't universal for all individuals, they can be considered only as one of aspects of human life which take place. However raised to a general principle of human life, they turn into the limited theory which isn't explaining subject in integrity. Jung emphasizes thus that these theories don't consider that basis of other people's life can form other sense life guidelines, and in general an inner world in different individuals can essentially differs. Jung considers that shortcoming of S. Freud's concept of a person and his mentality consists in that "Freud not quite realized that under other widths, in other conditions other values can dominate and other mental dominants work" [4, p. 75].

Emphasizing valuable character of each individual choice, relation, Jung attaches special significance to world outlook. Human history, peculiarity of traits of a certain culture depends on world outlook of certain individuals making it. The world outlook is a basis of a moral choice, ethical and esthetic notions and existential settings of a personality, his or her actions. As the source and the content of all strong-willed efforts and solutions of reason Jung refers world outlook to consciousness area. Nature of integration of elements of consciousness with unconscious tendencies depends on such spiritual installations of personality. Jung considers that only the appeal to world outlook does possible the analysis of a deep kernel of soul, character of psychical conflict which is unique at everyone, therapy has to demand such approach to be successful.

Despite on recognition creative nature of world outlook, its ability to an individual choice, opposition to external influences, Jung however notes that though world outlook guidelines are subjective, but initially they develop because of the general tradition and social environment. However so far as individual borrows only to what he is more internally, mentally inclines, in this way an explanation of uniqueness, freedom of each human choice is limited.

If in practical approaches to treatment of mental illnesses, Jung considered methods of scientific knowledge unacceptable for understanding of a human soul spiritual world as the sense in his opinion consists in world outlook prerequisites, instead of in knowledge, and it is possible to agree with this deeply right thought, however in the works devoted to theoretical analysis, the principles of approaches for understanding of a person, his mentality are constructed by Jung on logic of a determinism. Jung's inconsistency consists in that. Eventually such predetermining basis is unconscious, more exactly its impersonal, collective beginning, consigning roots to the past, influencing to the present of an individual. Archetypes inherited genetically, in principle are based on ancient instincts and express them, they are ineradicable and incognizable, therefore often mentally perceived by individuals as supernatural, alien and external force. So, finally something the general, over individual, making a basis of psyche, defines an individual, sets him a development way, encloses in a rigid framework. From this point of view human being is deprived of freedom, possibilities of a choice

unique way. A person is gripped in a vice of irresolvable conflict between his collective unconscious beginning and his individual consciousness which is also dependent from unconscious, being born already on the prepared soil. Though Jung claims that ancient, rich with the archetype forms, unconsciousness historically previous consciousness gives it impulse, and individuality of consciousness is carried out by nature of its communication and relations with deeply unconscious, as though destiny of connection with the contrast, but such "destiny" isn't freedom understood ontologically, it isn't possibility of a choice of himself, own deep basis, characteristic only to human. Jung himself admits full insolvency of a man: "A person is not creator, but result of creation, a product which isn't capable to modify himself: he doesn't know how his unique personality is constructed. ...The modern person, for example, also doesn't suspect that his consciousness entirely depends on cooperation with the unconscious sphere ... He doesn't know that he in a literal sense is "managed", and in practice he at all isn't that only active force what he considers himself" [4, p. 89].

Thus, in spite of the fact that Jung saw fundamental distinction between methods of research on humanities to which psychology belongs also, and methods of scientific natural sciences and critically treated the principle of causal understanding of a person and his mentality, however, he remained true to naturally scientific method, explaining a man from his natural beginnings. The psychic of a man based on ancient instincts and images serving them, precedes and defines character of personality, consciousness, in rigid framework of which freedom definitely understanding by Jung and individuality of a person consists.

1.2 C.G.Jung's conception of psyche of masses and personality

Being the contemporary of many played political events, social cataclysms of the XX century, fascism and ruling totalitarian systems, C. G. Jung tried to explain such phenomena which had the extremely aggressive character and an anti-human orientation, proceeding from own certain understanding of human mentality. Force and effectiveness of crazy ideas, the madness which have involved wide mass of individuals, whole nations, weren't casual, they, according to Jung, were prepared by development of certain tendencies and revival on their soil of certain mental forces. It, as we know, forces unconscious collective psychical,

presented by the ancient archetypes, threatening to take and assimilate consciousness of a man consumed with confusion, bringing hereby danger of loss his identity, abilities to the reasonable decision and action.

Jung proceeds from certain individual, his autonomy, capable in building of the special life, unique and inimitable, distinguishable from life of other personality. Personality distinguishes in presence of own world-view, spiritual and valuable relation, moral principles. And if the independent, critical relation both to external circumstances, and to internal psychological states is inherent in each separately taken personality, i.e. intelligence is inherent only individual Ego, but as soon as individual Egos, interacting, form mass, such critical ability decreases to primitive forms. In mass consciousness of individual, active center of which acts Ego, is levelled, and unconscious archetypes are revived, being collective, general at representatives of a certain community, nation, etc., they are an uniting and driving force of crowd or the organization of people in any scales, whether it be societies as a whole or the states. Jung carries to such forces as well the shadow, subconscious party of personality. Mass is inspired, noncritical, impulsive, it is more unconscious, than conscious, it is capable in making irresponsible acts. In this question Jung shares basic statements of mass psychology conceptions of G. Le Bon, G. Tarde, S. Freud, etc.

According to Jung, not less important reason of mass psychology development is scientific rationalism, which principle of causal approach remains possible understanding of a man only as abstract, average statistical magnitude, social unit, easily replaceable particle of society [7, p. 74-75].

Whereas the value of a personality consists in a basis of her identity, spiritual and soul reality not reduced to anything or to anybody another, presented by own world of creative ideas and world-view meanings. However considered rationalistically, living in system of rationally arranged forms what, for example, the state and its policy is, a personality can really lose own valuable qualities and become a development tool of abstract ideas imposed from the outside instead of individual development. And then a personality turns into unit of mass, the mass individual.

In system of supremacy of the faceless and anonymous organization, its public norms, people accepting them, loses the right for an individual responsibility for their life, actions, decisions, being the

individual of mass, such statement is interpreted convenient to him, he shifts responsibility onto the highest authorities. Jung emphasizes that in mass an individual is deprived of freedom, first of all, possibility of a choice of vital sense, only significant for himself. However refusal of a freedom of choice, of deep basis of his being conducts to immorality, destruction of personality. "... In the absence of freedom there is no a morality" [8, p. 233]. Only significant value for Jung can be the spiritual world of each certain individual, his individuality, at the level of which only the decisions, a choice himself, own acts and responsibility for them are possible. Connection of mass individuals, their actions and deeds, on the contrary, are based upon the general collective notions. As G. Tarde [9] noted, the crowd is credulous, it is moved by opinion, but also in opinions it is changeable. The crowd needs authority as it is incapable in developing own persuasions, and authorities, in turn, use the crowd, having inspired it with belief in a certain fabricated myth, political or even religious, hereby the power over crowd, its transformation into the tool for a definite purpose is carried out.

So, as Jung truly supposes, for an explanation and understanding of a soul spiritual world of a personality there aren't enough approaches of scientific cognition. As logic of scientific knowledge explains a person from external conditions of an objective reality and hereby essence of a person provided to be determined by an external. For science the only reality is objectivity, a determinability of the cognizable phenomenon by externally settled data. Thus, rationalistic approach can consider a person as object, instead of a subject of his being. To penetrate into the content, deep intention of a personality, into her sense, to understand her essence, there aren't enough methods of scientific knowledge, but comprehension is necessary. Therefore Jung considers that cognition and comprehension – absolutely opposite tendencies. Especially comprehension approach, he considers, is necessary in clinical practice, differently it is impossible to come into contact, to find approaches to spiritual world of patient, to find out the content of the intra mental conflict, contradictions in his Ego. However Jung, expressing deeply right thought, didn't avoid natural-science approach in an explanation of essence of a man as he considered that eventually the reality defining a person is his unconscious collective notions inherited from the historical past of his ancestors.

If the consciousness according to Jung especially individual at each person, but unconscious in a certain community, nation, people is presented by general, ancient archetypes identical to all their

representatives, by collective prototypes developed in the historical past of the people and have gradually departed in unconscious depths of mentality with change of living conditions. Though archetypes have a cultural and historical origin, but, according to Jung, they are transferred by a hereditary and genetic way and therefore are live and keep meaning in mental life of the modern person, influencing his conscious activity and psyche as a whole. The consciousness, which function is reduced by Jung to adaptation to environment, compensates its scantiness, characteristic to it limitation by richness of unconscious content. Exactly unconscious gives to a cold discourse of consciousness impulsiveness, directs its activity, allocates with ideas. Thus consciousness, human Ego as its central link is clueless about unconscious contents, it doesn't suspect that his will depends on the last and believes that it is its own direction. Therefore such ignorance, unpreparedness of consciousness to a meeting with unclear and alien to its content archetypes of unconscious can become fatal, bearing destructive consequences for mentality, leading to mind obscuration, various psychoses which can carry not only individual, but also collective character. Especially moments of consciousness crisis, conditions of individuals, expressed in instability on moral, spiritual and valuable relation promote it.

In similar crisis situations unconscious archetypical formations find own force. They can bear both positive, and negative sense depending on how the ego-consciousness integrates, perceives them. However archetypes are often aggressive, hostilely directed, disintegrating unstable consciousness. Owing to they aren't realized by individuals as their own forces and can't be directed on the individual, they are projected on others. Thus, Jung considers, the hostility proceeding from own depths, is perceived as the threat proceeding from the outside, from the neighboring state, the nation, other individual, etc. In this the reason of eternal aggression between individuals, the peoples consists, existence of a hostile mood on both sides of the "Iron curtain".

From these positions Jung analyzes fascism and totalitarianism, the socio-political situation which has developed in the period of World War II. That the fascism found a fertile ground for its blossoming in Germany, is explained by Jung awakening of bellicose archetypes in Germans because as a result of World War I Germany failed that caused a serious crisis in consciousness of the nation. The restrained consciousness of Germans found itself ready to apprehend ideology of Nazism, allegedly ennobling national spirit.

Though Jung warns about the available unconscious aggressive inducements especially actively displaying itself in the phenomena of mass movement and appeals to be especially vigilant and responsible concerning dark sides of own psyche, however, the next conclusion ensues from his reasonings: human ego eventually isn't self-sufficient, doesn't possess a freedom of choice about which it was already spoken, it is completely dependent and is defined by the contents of collective unconscious, the certain common data magnitude which has developed throughout long history of mankind. The problem of freedom of a human being, uniqueness of his being, irreducibility as we would tell, of his value sense to the general and other values, is distorted in Jung's conception, freedom acts not as ontological possibility of a choice of own way from a set of senses which become values, only taking roots in human ego through which he only can feel himself as a human, to see in them sense of his life, but is limited, according to Jung, by necessity of regulation of ego relations with environment and unconscious impulses. At best case the content of unconscious can be learned and hereby to avoid the conflicts and negative consequences in mass phenomena.

Eventually the deep motive, sense doing a person unique reality, not reduced to other such reality, provided to be, according to Jung, expresses content and requirement of a certain archetype. A man is considered by Jung within cause-effect relationships frame, he is result of the historical past. Human psyche appears as the established datum preceding him and setting an orientation to him. It finds the status of space force, transcendent magnitude, in system which a man acts only as its consequence.

Jung notes that only at intention addressing to internal spiritual mental world, instead of to the outside one development of mass psychology is prevented. A personality with well organized mental structure, developed individuality can show resistance to the organized mass, keep the identity, without transforming into mass individual [7, p. 105].

It is thought, Jung here closely approached to a problem of a subject. Really, if individual is deeply rooted in a certain spiritual and value guideline, his Ego remains self-identical, functions as freedom and a reflection of this certain value sense. This sense is effective only for him, for all his spiritual and soul structure. Being rooted in own inner world, he is capable in resisting influence of outside world conditions,

developing to them the relation from positions of own value guidelines and hereby to keep himself as a subject. The mass phenomenon, transformation of individual in mass in the slave and object of multidirectional opinions and fixed ideas, suggestibility by them, susceptibility for their noncritical perception, in our opinion, is explained by that such individuals are probably insufficiently rooted in the spiritual and value intention, their ego still isn't strong based in the contents which would be deeply significant for them, sense of all life. The reason of reduction of subjectivity level in individuals in mass phenomena can be splitting of personality, intra mental alienation, being accompanied by loss of internal freedom owing to contradictions in ego when space of ego appears as the arena of fight of incompatible value guidelines in personality therefore quite often false values become leading, the motives expressing interests and purposes of impersonal forces prevail over personal purposes, interests of development and formation. Certainly, variations of individual and mental contradictions there can be multitude.

Alienation of people represents their self-alienation as often individuals accept themselves for a consequence of external forces, norms and laws and respectively build the own relation to the world, i.e. dependence relation, reproduce and establish these relations. Therefore alienation is the real relation of people, though expresses itself irrational logic, an overturning of interrelations. Alienation is, in our understanding, a human being's ontological choice one of a multitude of possible ways of development and such choice in most cases is unconscious. And though alienation isn't a way of true human sense, but eventually the initial and final subject of a choice of vital values, quite often, maybe false, capable in changing choice remains a person. So, and in such phenomenon of alienation as mass movement, with characteristic for it decrease in level of subjectivity, at the majority of individuals, the choice remains again for each certain individual, therefore both the freedom of action and responsibility for deeds remains business of everyone, as it isn't important, whether there this choice was conscious or unconscious, but it is a choice of human himself, it is a deep choice.

In this respect Jung also appeals to personality as the initial beginning, the reality making decisions and bearing responsibility for them: "In this collective phenomenon there are also fault of a personality

as the nations consist of personalities But actually only changes in outlook of a personality can renew spirit of nation. Everything is began from personality" [8, p. 232]. However, integrity of personality, according to Jung, makes unity of opposites, it not only consciousness with its central ego, but also the shadow, the dark unconscious side of personality bearing in itself aggressive impulses. Archetypes of the shadow are eternal and not eliminated. A human, his consciousness, freedom of his ego, eventually, are output by Jung from biologically settled historical heritage of ancestors, are defined of it. Human is considered as a result of ready mental reality therefore doesn't remain any other way, except as explanations of him in cause-effect relationships in traditions of scientific cognition methods.

1.3 A. Adler's individual psychology. Inferiority complex.

The explanation of a human being not only by his own biological nature, but also by his social-cultural conditions is already insufficient. In the history, especially West European, the theories outputting essence of a person, his psycho-spiritual beginning, thinking from conditions of his being, norms of society became widespread. These known doctrines, starting from C. Helvetius and finishing K. Marx, proceeded from available state of a man, from this, that in him have already taken place and came to the end, was defined in the cause-effect relationships, however outside such defined in him there is a mass of possibilities what he can become more, his boundless opportunity to choose and change own choice. There is left outside of limits of consideration that a person in principle can put down in the basis of his being other sense and hereby to change his being. Only human can act as a subject of his life.

As regards the founder of psychoanalysis in spite of the fact that he reduced an essence of a man to his natural instincts, but at treatment of neuroses he tried to see the deep spiritual content of the conflict, to find, guess the hidden sense as its reason. Therefore Freud's doctrine about human and his mentality contains many contradictions and inconsistencies. However conceptions of neofreudism of A. Adler, K.Horney, E. Fromm contain not less contradictions according to whom an essence of human, the content of his spiritual world and its contradictions is defined by features of culture, contradictions of society in which he lives.

A. Adler, for example, criticizing S. Freud's position about a sexual origin of motives, forced out in unconscious, emphasizes that the intra mental conflict often takes place between motives and guidelines bearing social contents. In the early childhood a child already faces a problem of discrepancy of his aspirations to surpass circumstances with his real possibilities. Powerlessness of a child compared to adults, impossibility to seize a situation cause in him feeling of own insufficiency, form on terminology of Adler, "inferiority complex". Such complex can successfully be overcome in process of formation, development of the child, but in certain cases failures of his self-affirmation, in unfavourable conditions of his development, the complex can be fixed, generating neurotic deviations.

Features of psychical development, its internal contradictions since the early period of development influence on formation of the vital way which, according to Adler, as a rule, isn't realized, but its traits are looked through behavior of an individual, his acts designating the main aspirations. Among such aspirations it is often possible to note aspiration to superiority, authority directed on compensation of inferiority sense, such aspirations bear in themselves the social contents. Though A. Adler argues the point of view about the social nature of mentality, he is often inconsistent in his position, especially when claims that sense of community inalienable of man given to him by nature resists to the power aspiration. "All power of personal aspiration to authority and a superiority gets in advance at the child the corresponding form and content whereas the thinking can apprehend superficially from this only as much, as many it is allowed by the immortal, real *sense of community* laid in physiology [10, p. 31]. The sense of community underlying public organization of people, any human community, it appears, originates in the corporal organization of a person.

The main idea of Adler was that he denied Freud's and Jung's statement about domination of unconscious inclinations in personality and behavior of person, inclinations, which oppose a person to society. Sense of community with other people instead of congenital inclinations and congenital archetypes, stimulating social contacts and orientation to other people, that main force which defines behavior and human life, was considered by Adler. At the same time Adler was the only thinker who considered as the major tendency in development of personality aspiration to keep own individuality in integrity, to realize and develop

it. The idea entered by him about creative "Ego" isn't less important. Adler represents "Ego" as subjective and individualized system which can change direction of personality development, interpreting its life experience and giving it the various meaning. Moreover, "Ego" itself undertakes searches of such experience which can facilitate for specific person to create his own unique lifestyle.

Adler develops doctrine of inferiority complex. This process takes place in the psychological sphere: people have a subjective sense of inferiority which develops from sense of special psychological or social powerlessness. Sense of inferiority takes sources in the childhood: the child endures very long period of dependence, this trial causes deep experiences of inferiority in comparison with other people in a family environment. Emergence of this sense designates beginning of long fight for achievement of superiority over people around that becomes motivational force in human life. Sense of inferiority can become excessive – an inferiority complex. There three types of suffering arise: inferiority of organs, excessive guardianship and rejection from parents. In the capacity of overcompensation the complex of superiority emergence, which expressing in a tendency to exaggerate the physical, mental or social abilities. Superiority complex – single, fundamental motive; this aspiration is the general for all both in norm and in pathology. Aspiration to superiority is connected with big power expenses – level of tension grows; this aspiration is shown both at the level of an individual, and at the level of society – a person seeks to improve culture of society.

Objective of psychotherapy is to help to neurotic. It consists in studying of inferiority of the individual, his feelings, aspirations to personal authority, superiority over others. The therapy purposes – identification of wrong judgments about him and about others, elimination of false targets, formation of the new vital purposes which will help to realize personal potential. Adler offers own method of treatment neuroses. The purpose of therapy he sees in revelation of distortions in life style of patient. Strengthening of social interest is a main goal of therapy, as a true cause of illness is low ability to the coordinated interaction with others. The therapist trains the patient in interpersonal contact with people around, what promotes transferring of the woken-up social feelings of the patient on other people. It happens through encouragement of manifestation of social cooperation at the

patient, weakening of his sense of superiority with a simultaneous growth of social interest. Strengthening of social interest is the main key factor of reorientation and re-education of the patient.

One of the central concepts of Adler's doctrine is "lifestyle" – the vital way or a guiding image. It includes unique junction of traits, ways of behavior and habits which in total define a unique picture of an individual existence. Lifestyle is based on the efforts directed on overcoming of sense of inferiority and, thanks to it, strengthening sense of superiority; it is fixed in age of 4-5 years.

1.4 Human and society in E. Fromm's doctrine. Existential settings of being of human in the world: to have or to be?

K. Marx's philosophical views exerted strong influence on E. Fromm with Freud. E. Fromm tried to connect problems of neurosis with social estrangement of human in the modern society, both in bourgeois, and in socialist [11, p. 101]. It is thought that it is the most right approach.

The phenomenon of alienation of a human from itself and other people Fromm considers as culture decline. Man doubted in ideas of Enlightenment which were strong incentive to progress. "The arisen doubt in human independence and power of reason caused a condition of moral confusion, when a person more doesn't direct neither revelation, nor mind." [12, p. 23]. In connection with alienation conditions Fromm considers crisis of modern person – he feels anxiety, powerlessness and lost, he got confused in questions of the human existence – what is a human, how he should live. In alienation of a man Fromm sees not less danger in death of mankind, than from nuclear threat, for the first time in the history, he considers, threat proceeds not from nature and external phenomena, but from a person and his heart. "Apparently, nothing testifies so clearly about result of unproductive life, as various neuroses. Any neurosis is a result of the conflict between born abilities of a person and those forces which interfere with them to development. [12, p. 169]. Source of neuroses development Fromm sees also in decrease of the emotional party, in loss connection between thought and affect.

In this system, E. Fromm considers, the question already stands not: "What is a good for man? ", but "What there is good for development of system". [13, p. 38]. Studying features of the alienation phenomenon in modern technically developed world, he finds that "... unilaterally

having concentrated on technology and consumption of material benefits, man lost contact with himself, with life." [14, p. 220].

In such conditions, E. Fromm considers, when the reason becomes scanty, and the intelligence grows, not person operates technology, but the technology operates by person.

As young Marx characterized similar states, being mass when man does own essence the mean of his existence. [15, p. 93].

Remembering system of hired labor, he considered that individual alienates in favor of dominating anonymous forces own freedom in order to provide own physical existence. In such cases contradiction doesn't reach even awareness level, because an individual still at all doesn't consider freedom as something present, that he is initially free, he simply has no ideas of it, not talking even about consideration it as primary value. He identifies his being with own existence.

The attempt of Fromm mentioned earlier in a certain plan to connect S. Freud's doctrine about neuroses with Marx's doctrine about alienation is limited in many respects to the instruction on general connection between them and on their similarity. Besides, in Fromm's understanding an individual eventually also remained derivative with one the parties from the deep natural bases and from the aloof social organization, with another.

Investigating a phenomenon of neuroses and psychoses, Freud finds rupture and splitting of mental activity of individual, bringing to disharmony and soul conflicts which in certain cases can be realized, and can sometimes not be realized by subject. In such extreme cases destruction can be understood as various degrees of loss by individual qualities of subjectivity – from partial to full, destabilization of his internal self or as E. Fromm describes this state as loss of a point of support of subject in himself when not he is self-valuable, but external objects become for him value. Destruction of subject can be understood as loss of internal freedom by him when an individual considers not own self as a self-value, but external social forms, objects does the value, submitting to their certain limited sense, doing it the sense of own being.

Alienation relations also distort the nature of the valid human wants, their needs of self-affirmation and development of various opportunities, turning them into means for achievement of certain statuses and success in society. Certain requirements, abilities of individuals can gain the lawful development and existence if they

correspond to the accepted measures and estimates in society, answer expectations of a certain cultural environment. Consumption in the developed industrial societies gives ample opportunities for development and satisfaction, both needs of natural requirements, and needs of development of the individual features and abilities, creativity. However, as E. Fromm notes, the modern individual often consumes for the sake of aloof social priorities, increasing hereby his image in the opinion of others. An individual strives for luxury, for example, often changing the car not because that it became useless, or, it is necessary for development of his any interests and purposes but because it is necessary for maintenance of his status and prestigious state. [13]. Thus, consumption of a man becomes consumption of certain impersonal statuses, positions, prestige, etc. Consumption in that case doesn't act as a condition and mean of self-development of individuals, turning into the self-value living on own laws, having the scale of the measures, imposed on people, ennobling one and denying others. E. Fromm criticizes type of the society focused on unlimited consumption for the sake of unlimited production, and, eventually, – for the sake of profit where human stops being end in itself, therefore, he considers, it is necessary to direct society on the humanistic purposes corresponding to truth of a human being. According to materials of the “Izvestiya” newspaper referring to the French magazine “Nouvel Observateur”, wealthy clients of “Fashion” shop in Paris would be deteriorated appetite if they knew that, expensive and rare products, the masterpieces of the cookery which have remained unrealized in a day, go to sellers and tramps at an entrance to shop and in general to people not from their circle instead of believed to their destruction as they can't be sold next day. [16, p. 7]. So, the satisfaction of their refined tastes isn't their personal consumption and requirements, but a form of expression of their exclusive status and position of elite in their own ideas about themselves.

E. Fromm considers, existence of the modern person is focused on being or on possession. In directive on being a man is the center and the purpose of own being, he is happy, self-identical even if doesn't own property, he is productive, aspires to the harmonious relation with world around. If the sense of existence of human consists in possession something, without what he feels himself a nothing, loses himself, it generates his infinite irrational aspiration to possession, to pseudo-

requirements which don't coincide with needs of development of him as harmonious personality, and his consumption gets alien character. In an affluent society with an industrial progress, there is an expansion "framework of property which can include friends, beloved, health, travel, works of art, god, own "Ego". Our "Ego" is the most important object on which our feeling of property is directed as far as it includes a lot of things: our body, name, social status, everything, what we possess (including our knowledge), our idea about ourselves and that image which we want to create about ourselves to other people. Our "Ego" is a mix of real qualities, such as knowledge and professional skills, and qualities fictitious which is covered our real "Ego". However the essence not in what is content of our "Ego", but rather that it is perceived as a certain thing which each of us possesses and that exactly this "thing" lies in basis of our consciousness". [13, p. 97-98]

The nature of possession consists that "eventually, statements Ego (subject) possess O (object)", is a definition "Ego" through my possession "O". Subject is not "I am as such", but "I am as that, what I possess" ... In orientation to possession there is no live connection between me and what I own. And object of my possession, and I turned into things, and I possess object as I have force to make it mine. But here feedback takes place: the *object possesses me* because of sense of identity, that is mental health is based on my possession by *object* (and as possible a large number of things). [13, c. 103-105].

However "if I am that I have and if I lose what I have who then am I?" [13, c. 135].

However, "if I am that I am, instead of that I have, nobody in forces to threaten my safety and to deprive me of sense of identity. The center of my being is in me: my abilities to be and realize essential forces are a component of structure of my character, and they depend on me." [13, c. 136].

To man selling himself in the market of personalities as E. Fromm shows, necessary to be free from individual features. Marx wrote on this problem: "The private property made us so silly and unilateral that any object is ours only when we possess it i.e. when it exists for us as the capital or when we directly own it, eat it, drink it, carry it on the body, live in it, etc., – in a word when we *consume* it ...

Therefore on place of all physical and spiritual feelings there became simple alienation of all these feelings – sense of possession". [15, c. 120].

Consumption not as individual consumption which is carried out for the sake of interests and purposes of specific persons, their development, but as consumption for the sake of consumption, which value and sense are separated from individuals and their requirements which rise over them, impose on them themselves as the supreme value and a social priority – such is distortion of the true relation where not being of people as values in itself, but being of things, abstract values and mastering by them becomes primary and main. In such conditions individuals consume not as it would correspond to their requirements, but as it is necessary in certain public circles or in society as a whole, according to norms of aloof system of values soaring in moods of the majority. Thus irrationality of such situation consists that individuals often noncritically not only accept imposed forms of consumption and requirements for their personal needs and consumption, but turn them into such and thanks to what actually become only means and tools of aloof Consumption, consumption as consumption. Such distorted Consumption turned on sense transformed into force owning not only souls of individuals, but carrying out and movable according to the irrational logic in reality, becomes their real relation. Certainly, it doesn't lose the force and is self-value until individuals reproduce logic of its movement and implementation. Consumption of individuals aspiring to aloof priorities, despite its infinite variety and width of opportunities, doesn't lead to freedom of their development, their enrichment as persons as not they are subjects of their consumption and requirements. Consumption as such acts here as the certain independent Subject which is moving and carrying out at the expense of people, their forces and abilities, alienating in own favor their will and activity, turning them into objects of consumption, but it disappears only when individuals realize their true requirements, carrying out the demarcation line between them and false values. Sense of possession owning people, has no borders, it, of course, isn't reduced to a way of consumption of vulgar Gargantua and Pantagruel, and is diverse and the main thing, boundless, without reaching never satisfaction as aloof consumption by the nature is insatiable and many-sided, it as whimsical fashion changes the whims. However such consumption, in turn, generates the same unceasing production which to any degree coincides with needs of development of individuals, their activity, creativity, but placed at service to irrational forms of consumption and requirements, holding complete dominion over individual consumption and disproportionately

exceeding on scale their real needs, such production not having limits sooner or later conducts to irrational use of nature, exhaustion of its resources, to various imbalances and ecological disasters. Relations of alienation of individuals with each other, their eternal fight for priorities doesn't conduct to their harmony with nature.

The irrational logic of movement of pseudo-consumption and pseudo-requirements is that they replace personal needs, needs of consumption of a personality, forcing out and suppressing them so that they become often unconscious or perceived as invaluable and minor. So, K.Horney notes, in the western culture all-consuming requirement of majority of typical individuals is aspiration to wealth. Referring to materials of her researches, she also notices that often motives of hypertrophied requirement to possess wealth, the capital turned out the reason of many mental disorders. However, as it was already noted earlier when personal interests and requirements receive though any satisfaction, being realized in form of consumption and requirements of aloof wealth, such individuals, probably, avoid soul confrontation, rather its desperate forms as between personal and impersonal motives and their requirements a complete separation isn't observed, but simply there a realization of personal motives behind a mask of aloof motive happens. So, sometimes the external motive covering internal, looks and is perceived by individuals as their real, valid motive, but not vice versa. For example, superficial motives of charity, feeling of compassion are sometimes described in literature as given out for valid though actually can express interests of self-movement of wealth. Certainly, such motives can be true, be own motives of an individual.

The nature of the most various in sense pseudo-requirements and pseudo-consumptions has aloof character as their movement doesn't aim at development of individuals, their free self-affirmation as persons. It is rather on the contrary, wealth as that, for example, consumes individuals as means of the self-development and implementation, turning them into the tools and objects.

1.5 "Self-realization" problem of personality in K.Horney's conception

K.Horney's conception is constructed from the same position of predetermination of a man by external circumstances. Trying to keep separate from a biological reductionism, characteristic theory of S.

Freud who, according to her, puts borders for comprehension of a person, his psychic-spiritual life, she brings character of mental contradictions out conditions of concrete society. She considers that a content of individual neuroses depends on character of contradictions of certain culture [17, p. 216]. As a result of broad therapeutic practice and theoretical analysis of its data, K.Horney comes to a right conclusion that content of neurotic conflict often compiles from collision of incompatible tendencies in person, his aspirations and motives of a social origin antidiirected on sense. But at the same time, from her reasonings became clear that these aspirations and motives eventually are defined by features of culture, instead of are result of a freedom of choice at each individual level, at level of separate Ego: "That fact that majority of people in this culture have to face the same problems, suggests an idea that these problems are generated by specific vital conditions existing in this culture. The following testifies that they don't represent problems, general for "human nature": motivational forces and the conflicts in other cultures are different than ours"[17, p. 27]. However provision on cultural sources of deep spiritual inducements is exposed sometimes by Horney to a refutation by inconsistent statements about biological bases of many human aspirations.

Relations of mutual alienation generated by people in this or that system in each with special specifics, eventually, doom each individual to loneliness. It is especially peculiar to our time as representatives of neofreidism K. Horney, E. Fromm, etc. note and that is quite often characteristic feature of mental neuroses.

If for a certain person other individual, his Ego is not value in itself and purpose, but becomes only object for his own purposes, then he has no originally human feelings, relations of friendship, comradeship or love. In researches of numerous neuroses K. Horney emphasizes that except aspirations to power, prestige, rivalry etc., alien to human relations, frequently content of motives deep and hidden from an individual is aspiration to use identity of other individual for own purposes and needs. [17, p. 93]. In description of neurotic attachment and aspiration to love an individual in every way tries to win attention and love from another, but at the same time at achievement of the purpose he doesn't test happiness and satisfaction. A need for love to other person at him has paradoxical character as the slightest casual errors, cause temporary necessary departure of this person increase

uneasiness, fear to be left in neurotic. He will do anything as long as object of his love would be near, showing devotion, readiness to sacrifice own interests for the sake of him and he actually sacrifices himself, actually refusing from own ego, falling into emotional dependence and slavery, however at the same time openly and busily emphasizes how much another is obliged now to him and that his victims have to be highly estimated. However this contradiction isn't realized by him, he doesn't realize that actually his feeling and need for love aren't sincere, he doesn't interested in originality and worthiness of this person, his feelings and experience, and only looks for a support and encouragement in him or her to find rest. He is moved by neurotic requirement to catch hold of someone giving hope for protection against vital difficulties to avoid alarms and sufferings tormenting him.

K. Horney and many prominent psychoanalysts claim that similar aspirations can be inherent to many typical healthy individuals, but, if it is possible to say so, borders of pathology begin where opposite on sense, incompatible tendencies are shown in parallel, at the same time externally in behavior of an individual, however their obvious, evident contradiction, as a rule, isn't noticed by individual. He doesn't play the hypocrite and doesn't hide from others anything intentionally, but, first of all in himself is confident as in above described example that he is ready to make everything for darling, without noticing that his excessive requirements to him or her, and also overflowing him dissatisfaction and alarm open his deep true purposes and motives. He will be in perplexity and can sincerely be indignant if will open to him that his motive of devotion to other, oblivion himself is superficial, not true, covering his valid purposes. As for neurotic, on the contrary, visibility finds the present, valid meaning while he is incapable of analyzing himself and own real values.

That neurosis represents irresolvable conflict of incompatible motives, is a basis of conception of neuroses S. Freud and neofreudians. However they explain reason of these conflicts differently. K. Horney, for example, considers as characteristic feature of neuroses uneasiness from which a person protects, masks by other motives having for him any mental value, but it manages to him expensive price as breaks his integrity as personality. Thus, neurosis acquires mass of rationalized mental phenomena.

That forced-out motive turns into irrational force inducing person to cover it by others allegedly rational motives which actually completely

serve, it is a result of a conflict of incompatible motives. For example, some neurotics overcome shyness by manifestation of aggression or try "to sink" uneasiness in work, thus obtrusive kind of work and feeling of anxiety in days off and holidays reveal their irrationality. And uneasiness can be realized and not realized. K. Horney considers that culture generates uneasiness in people. "The more neurotic man, the more strongly his personality is penetrated and fettered by such protection and the more those things which he isn't capable and doesn't try to do though owing to own energy, intellectual faculties or an education level can carry out them. The more heavier neurosis, the more an internal bans both hidden, and obvious is present". [17, p. 46-47].

That fact is available in neuroses that to some an extent, always in especially individual form partial loss of qualities of subjectivity of individual is observed. Inadequacy of his behavior and acts are explained by that he doesn't possess own mental inclinations, thoughts as own.

As a result neurotic moves away from real world, his behavior is subordinated to internal irrational logic which externally looks confused, inadequate. K. Horney gives a set of examples from her practice: "In people for whom aspiration to prestige is on the first place, hostility usually takes the form of desire to humiliate others. This desire comes to the forefront especially at those people to which self-respect the humiliating blow was struck therefore they became vindictive.

... Tendency to humiliate others usually deeply is forced out because neurotic, knowing on the own aggravated sensitivity as offended and vindictive he becomes when undergoes indignity, instinctively afraid of similar reactions of others. Nevertheless, some of these tendencies can be shown without their awareness: in careless neglect to other people, for example, keeping them waiting, unintentionally putting others in awkward situations, forcing others to feel their dependence. Even if neurotic absolutely doesn't realize his desire to humiliate others or that made it, his relations with these people will be impregnated with vague uneasiness which is found in continuous expectation of reproach or an insult in own address. ... Internal bans arising as a result aggravated sensitivity to humiliation, is often shown in form of requirement to avoid everything that can seem offensive for others, so, for example, neurotic can be incapable of expressing critically, rejecting offer, dismissing employee therefore he often looks extremely tactful or excessively polite.

At last, the tendency to humiliation of others can be hidden behind a tendency to admiration. As the humiliation and manifestation of admiration are diametrically opposite, the last gives the best way radically eradicate or hide a tendency to humiliation. Exactly for this reason both of these extremes often meet at the same person.

... In proprietary tendencies hostility usually assumes a kind of a tendency to infringe upon interests of other people. Desire to deceive, rob, exploit or frustrate affairs of others in itself isn't neurotic. It can be accepted in certain cultures, justify this situation or be considered as an expediency question. However in neurotic people these tendencies have a strong emotional charge. Even if benefit or advantages which they take from them, are insignificant, they feel like winners and come to fine mood, having a presentiment of success. For example, to find a profitable bargain, they can spend disproportionately a lot of time and energy in comparison with the received benefit. Their satisfaction from success has two sources: consciousness that they outwitted others, and consciousness that they caused damage to others".[17, p. 139-141].

Certainly, neurotic realizes that humiliation of other people has negative sense, differently there would not be in him repression of a tendency to humiliate as motive condemned by him, but he doesn't realize that exactly this tendency took control of him completely, directs his behavior and feelings. Round this motive other mental structures which can be infinitely diverse are built also. Unconsciously showing a tendency to humiliate, putting others in an uncomfortable position or in dependence, etc., neurotic at the same time is externally excessively polite or even covers his main motive with opposite motive – admiration. Though this contradiction rather obviously for other people, is imperceptible, unconscious for neurotic. He is incapable in giving himself clear account concerning motives and purposes of own behavior, he acts so, even if doesn't set specific goals to achieve something while in aloof society in norm people too can often humiliate and use others if it is necessary for achievement of his egoistical purposes, but he realizes both the egoistical motive and purpose, and means which he chooses. If means don't justify the purpose or can do harm of his reputation or career, he can temporarily give up them or find other way of achievement of own purpose. Whereas at neurotic means turn into end in itself and find as though obtrusive character therefore he is incapable choosing them according to a situation.

Picture of internal psychological conflict has deadlock character: as that he condemns in himself and others, in this case is motive, aspiration to prestige and humiliation of other people, appears at the same time his driving dominating motive which owing to condemnation by individual and society as a whole, probably, is forced out to unconscious sphere of psyche because these two antirected motives (condemning and driving) become incompatible, hostile each other. Actions which are directed on humiliation of others and carried out by him unconsciously, are condemned by conscious part of his mentality. This conflict has unsolvable character as a result of which an individual acts not on objective logic in relation to outside world, but as though fights with himself. Unconscious thought or passions of individual which have captured him and unclear him, being forced out, find more big force and power, they have destroying character and threat to all mentality of individual.

Neurosis is shown as refusal, disposal of part own Ego that leads to deleting of his individuality, to a mentality splitting. An individual can't display him as personality, to be active, operating subject, he turns into object deprived of own will.

That human stops to be a subject of own development K. Horney explains by repression of uneasiness and hostility which are intolerable for individual in certain situations or because of the moral principles, for example, in relation to beloved persons or condemnation in himself such reasons of hostility as envy, proprietary relation. However uneasiness and hostility after all themselves are a consequence of neurotic frustration which reasons should be explained.

K. Horney considers an interesting example. "Chemist S. was in a state which considered as nervous exhaustion as a result of excessive work. He was the gifted and extremely ambitious person, and didn't realize it. For the reasons which we won't consider here, he forced out the ambitious aspirations and looked very quiet and modest. When he went to work in laboratory of major chemical company, a certain G. who was some more elder than S. and held higher state, took him under the guardianship. Owing to a number of personal factors – dependence on favour of other people, timorousness caused by earlier critical relation to him, lack of awareness of own ambition and therefore inability to see it in others – S. was happy to accept such friendship and couldn't notice that actually G. worried only about own career. He was

vaguely disturbed only once by that circumstance that G. gave out his idea which he reported earlier to G. in a friendly chat, for the own. For a moment S. felt mistrust but as his own ambition actually excited in him excessive hostility, he immediately forced out not only this hostility, but also the lawful criticism and mistrust. Therefore he kept belief that G. – his best friend. As a result, when G. dissuaded him from continuation of a certain line of work, he took this council in all good faith. When G. published invention which by right belonged to S., S. considered that G. is more talented and educated, than he. He was happy to have such remarkable friend. So owing to repression of the mistrust and anger S. couldn't notice that in vital questions G. was rather his enemy, than a friend. Owing to adherence to illusion that he is loved, S. refused readiness to struggle for own interests. He even didn't realize that his vital interests were infringed upon and therefore couldn't fight for them, allowing others to use his weakness".[17, p. 51-52].

Existence of neurotic violations and conflicts K. Horney explained by conditions of personal development of individual in a certain culture with norms and values accepted in it and possibility of transformation of personality as a result of incompatibility of multidirectional motives in one's that, of course, generates neurotic uneasiness and hostility. Existence of hostile motives Horney considers as main active force in neuroses.

However deep reasons of such phenomenon as neurosis, it appears, should be looked for in self-alienation of man, in refusal of own rightful interests for the sake of interests of career, preservation of official state interpreted in false manner. This last, however, is covered allegedly with disinterested friendship, admiration of one's talents.

Neuroses represent extreme cases of expression of alienation or self-alienation of a man, confrontation personal and aloof in him and always have individual character, and, therefore, infinite variety. Therefore problem of neuroses is necessary to consider and solve from a problem of personality viewpoint, as a social problem.

Problem of chemist S. that, being talented, he sacrificed his vitally important, rightful motives of own development and strengthening to mercenary motive of career therefore his achievements and justified ambition, these motives were forced out into unconscious sphere. Lawful, general in him does a concession to aloof motives, accepted by him. However his motive of career, probably, is condemned by him too

as when his imaginary friend appropriates his ideas and discovery, chemist S. owing to his personal qualities – timidity and dependence on people, forces out also originally shown lawful anger and criticism and replaces it with motive of admiration of this friend. This third motive – recognition of talent of the friend and manifestation of disinterested friendship and admiration of him actually is not real, but rather contrived by him even not for this "friend" and people around, but for himself, as cover of opposite – mercenary motive of career.

In this case double repression is observed. Firstly, – repression of his rightful interests of development by his own motive of career or strengthening of official state. Secondly, – as this second motive of service to career also is condemned by him, he contrives for cover of this motive – the third motive – motive of disinterested friendship and admiration, he assures himself that the one who stole his idea, really is the author of this idea that he is talented. Therefore, the thought-up, third motive represses the second – motive of career, covering it allegedly with disinterested motive. But as this cover is weak, the repressed motives are live and threaten to break through each time it. S.'s soul life is full of continuous fight against these broken-through motives, he is afraid that, having broken, they will display in his acts and behavior and it becomes obvious to others, including for "friend". Therefore he constantly tries to suppress them and strengthen cover, the artificial motive of disinterested friendship, to strengthen it and this fight naturally exhausts his soul forces. He is seized by alarm because detection of these motives would mean crash for his valid interest of career. It would mean that he fears not so much that others learn about it, but, first of all it is crash of him before himself, he has moral principles, so he fears own condemnation. He is the chief judge. The third motive here immediately, directly contradicts the first – rightful motive of development, but between them directly the second motive stays as the third motive itself is generated by the second motive. Further, the third motive resists also to the second motive – motive of aspiration to career as condemns it.

In case if motives of career in chemist S. aren't condemned in him, and, therefore, would be realized, approved aspiration, then these repressions wouldn't be carried out. He would know that it is his ideas and achievements, fighting for authorship of own invention and if it impeded to his official state, he consciously would stop fight and

criticism, consciously would pretend to be friendly and showed admiration, in this case he would deceive not himself, but people around, knowing that plays the hypocrite.

After all bifurcation and splitting is characteristic also for the healthy individual in conditions of alienation. So, some careerist on a place of chemist S. apparently, consciously would sacrifice authorship for the sake of interests of career. Naturally, in this case there would be no repression as individual who doesn't condemn own motives, externally would show hypocritically, admiring his "friend". In this case neurosis is impossible as there is no fight of opposite motives in soul of individual, simply such doubled individual consciously leads a double life, he consciously chooses one of these motives. Bifurcation in healthy individuals consists in that, as in them also these opposite motives can coexist and come into conflict among themselves, but aren't in confrontation, they show these motives in different spheres of life. If, for example, mathematician is fond of scientific development in free time for soul, and in the official sphere it isn't necessary and even harms for service, he doesn't show there these interests, and says that it is simple his ardour for soul, a hobby. Certainly, variations can be the most various.

In a case with chemist S., it should be noted that repression of the first two motives doesn't happen at different times as if there was at first a repression of the first motive, and after that later owing to manifestation of the third motive – repression of the second motive. Here can't be such temporary sequence. Double repression is carried out not in temporary but only in structural plan in the sense that the two first motives are forced out at once with emergence of the third motive. Why? Because until the third motive appears covering the second motive, condemned by the chemist S., no repression would exist. Before emergence of the third motive the first motive isn't forced out, otherwise it would turn out as we already noted that S. at all doesn't condemn the careerist tendency, but consciously seeks for its implementation. Therefore, the first motive wouldn't be forced out because in that case the chemist S. would understand existence both the first and second motives in the soul and consciously would hide their existence. Then it wouldn't be a neurosis case.

However in K. Horney's analysis the second repression isn't present. She considers that in this case only repression of the first motive

– interests of own development, protection of own achievements takes place.

In K. Horney's descriptions neurotic who is seized by the aspiration to power, externally shows attitude towards people friendly, seeking to give advice, to direct affairs of others, to lead, but comes sometimes across their resistance. If people behave in own way, instead of follow his advice or expectations or any other trifles can bring him into considerable anger. Thus neurotic doesn't realize that persistent, obsessive character of his councils and desire to manage affairs of others can restrain their purposes and interests, he doesn't aware his hostile motives to the power. On the contrary, he sincerely considers himself as the gentle and kind person that people behave imprudently, trying to resist him. In relations with people neurotic aspires to lead but when it is impossible, he perceives it as defeat. Unconscious suppressed motive of the power in him is so strong that everything that doesn't submit to this motive means defeat for him therefore he looks suppressed and helpless. However and the helplessness he uses as weapon that he is treated cruelly, he is neglected and hereby he wants to achieve much bigger attention to himself and submission of others to his will. As a result he is incapable in establishing equal, friendly relations with others, and constantly dictates them his will and looks like supervisor. [17, p. 136-137].

The forced-out and unconscious motive to dominate as much strong at him as condemned. Being unsatisfied, it constantly breaks outside, displaying in behavior and acts of neurotic. Neurotic thus unconsciously covers it with invented by him for himself opinion that he is benevolent person and tries to help others by advices and manuals and doesn't notice that people around feel not sincere, but a hostile orientation of his motives, it isn't pleasant to them, and that in their eyes he looks the tyrant dictating rules. In his opinion, his kindness and disinterested aspiration to help doesn't receive a due assessment. Following of others to his "kind" advices would mean their submission to him therefore he is terribly indignant in the opposite case. As a result, when even his simple expectations from nothing suspecting people aren't executed, he feels crash, feeling of forlornness that all against him and suffers. Incompatibility of these two directions in his behavior, their inadequacy isn't noticed, they aren't controllable of by him.

The valid, main motive, being even unconscious, nevertheless,

directs his behavior. Alienation here consists that not a person operates and dominates over his motive, subordinates it himself, on the contrary, they dominate over him, they become as though subjects, and a person their object. While doubled, but understanding own defects cynic remains mentally healthy as he doesn't lose the power over own motives, therefore, and own subjectivity.

In certain cases of neuroses motives which took control of individual, can be conscious, but in different degree, but most often they are forced out. In case of sensibleness of these motives their confrontation to other part of mentality isn't excluded and their manifestation is intolerable for all mentality as a whole, it can be perceived as defeat for "Ego". So, manifestation of envy, hostile actions against favourite persons or if it contradicts moral installations of individual, then they can be incompatible with motives of such personality from which he is protected by an internal ban. Guy, who showed rage with jealousy of girlfriend, felt a strong attack of alarm with heartbeat and complicated breath owing to motivation realized by him to push off girl in an abyss. The concession to such strong and imperious motivation would mean for him accident of "Ego".[17, p. 51]. But this case, of course, impossible to consider as a case of a neurotic disease.

As K. Horney, E. Fromm, A. Adler point in various types of societies, cultures with their different valuable orientations and norms aspirations of individuals to the power, wealth, success, prestige, etc. differently correlate.

As K. Horney notes, at the majority of individuals of modern western culture considered by her the purpose frequently becomes a pursuit for so-called success demanding continuous competitive rivalry with others, to be constantly on the alert not to miss own chance.

Though as it is clear to all, success can be result of long-term persistent work and creative efforts, but in some fields of activity can happen so that success comes quite in not that hour when it could be expected, as a result of any casual concurrence of circumstances, because of unexpected changes or events in public life, thanks to changing situations, changes of people, etc. Success can lead to power or wealth as a result of unpredictable turns in structure and movement of positions or in quickly changing conditions of stockbrokerage. Features and qualities of an individual in whom nobody interested before or even

were condemned and were an object of rigid criticism, can rise at such turns of destiny on glory tops, turning from shortcomings into advantages, causing admiration and envy. Individuals, which activity and specific features can act both reason of their success and growth of their social standing, and their condemnation and censure, are on the unsteady ground of changeable system of public values. Success which is, eventually, origination of people, result of their creativity, in such conditions separates from subjects, turning in inaccessible to them and uncontrollable force movable on own whimsical logic which itself decides and manages destinies.

Success is live while is an object of desire and adoration of people. This results from the fact that it not without reason is identified by people with movement of aloof wealth and power, is a mean for achievement of superiority over others, finding of social status and a high appraisal in public consciousness. Therefore attempts of the majority of people to seize success lead to competitive fight of individuals with each other, to their mutual alienation and loneliness. Adaptation of individuals to success movement – a certain mysterious anonymous being is expressed often, for example, by their unconscious following and submission to changeable public opinion, its criteria only because this is opinion of the majority though original creativity and its results not always are suitably estimated by the public and not always lead to success. It means that such inexplicable phenomena as arrival and leaving of success, glory, prestige, etc. are an act of people, their alienation of own creative power and abilities from themselves and giving to them forms of faceless and independence. Human being sacrifices own subjectivity for the sake of aloof priorities.

Not only results of S. Freud's researches, but also many prominent psychoanalysts, such as K. Horney and E. Fromm show that difficulties of neurotic deviations treatment consist in reaching central motive, the reason which has caused conflict and to reveal its sense, it is necessary to open at first by analysis the content of the psychical structures constructed round it and thus, moving on the logical chain connecting them, go down to more deep forced-out contents. These structures layering on the central link of the conflict play a role of protections and bans which are building even at the slightest threat of detection of its contents and sense. Unsatisfied motive, seeking for implementation of own interests, in its turn, tries to displace from its way these barriers and

protections, but often not able to overcome resistance from aloof from it part Ego of individual. Individual, his Ego again and again builds new protections, bans, etc. which accept often obtrusive character. All this represents agonizing process, overflowing soul of neurotic with constantly accompanying fear (a phobia on S. Freud's terminology, and according to K. Horney – anxiety), and all his reactions and protections are as a whole inadequate and don't resolve his problem. An individual as though can't leave a vicious circle, finding not a real way out, but a false way of illusions, building a certain system of external actions or external objects symbolizing solution of his adversities or even persons, in relations with which he sees a semblance of satisfaction and solution of his soul conflict which he doesn't realize, but feels, only for a time, saving from disturbing sensations.

1.6 Problem of value and freedom in A.H.Maslow and V.Frankl's doctrines

According to American psychologist A.H.Maslow, choice, decision, supreme values peculiar to person are put in his nature as biological data. Thus good choice and correct decisions are made usually by personality who has reached level of self-actualization that in turn means that all abilities put in person genetically, such as health, physiological requirements, talent, wisdom, humanity, including values, such as aspiration to truth, kindness, justice found realization forms in him. However supreme values named by Maslow metarequirements can be realized as he thinks only if his lowest physiological or the basic requirements are satisfied. [18, p. 35-36]. There is a question: if nature of values how directly specifies Maslow, has biological origin expressed in biochemical, endocrine processes of an organism [18, p. 25], how human can freely choose to himself a value if it is put in him as necessity? A man, it appears, doesn't differ from an animal (that Maslow affirmatively recognizes), he is predetermined by datum putting in him which, of course, ought to reach and develop.

Maslow considers that psychology as science has to be directed on studying of qualities of the best human exemplars – being self-actualized persons in which all levels both the lowest, and the highest requirements reached the highest development. Then by means of such science it is possible to produce individuals and the society as a whole constructed on the same principles, the highest ethical standards and

values copied from the best personalities as models. Hence the conclusion is suggested itself that perfect society can't be presented by wealth and variety of the public relations resulting from diversity of human meanings. Then there social relations become impossible if the spiritual content of person's Ego is not based in aspiration to affirmation of a certain, individual sense for which he is responsible as the choice of sense or creation of sense was his free act. Spiritual creation of sense as eventually the reflexive attitude towards himself as being established in this sense is impossible without freedom of this relation. As self-identity of Ego which is being reached in this process, is not absolute coincidence, but the relation to this sense in himself, and, therefore, preservation of freedom, opportunity to change this sense, to go beyond himself and own former, available being.

Existence of once and for all given sense and value identical to all souls can't result in uniqueness of individual being and the more so to spirituality, morality and responsibility. As genetically programmed in a body of man these values are previously given, man wants that or not. Maslow notes about identity of human mentality base: "It is empirically established fact that people with high degree of self-actualization far rarely doubt themselves than bulk of people, less reflect on correctly or incorrectly they act. They at all don't confuse that ninety five percent of mankind act in a different way. Also has to notice that these people – in any case those from them which were studied by me, – display a tendency to an identical assessment of the facts, that is well and that is badly as though if they felt the certain highest reality lying outside human consciousness, instead of based their estimates on a knowledge of life which, as we know, often suffers narrow-mindedness and bias. In a word, I used them that they should produce values, or, better to say, they helped me to come nearer to understanding of what is most of all important for human. Speaking in other words, I made the following assumption: that is valuable to these people, eventually will become valuable and to me; I will agree with them, I will accept their values as extrapersonal, universal, as something such that sooner or later life will confirm" [18, p. 23]. So understood values both as data in corporal organization, and found in a big universe (how these two statements are compatible, it is possible to guess only), turn out ultraboundary for man, people here no matter, only instincts here work.

Unlike A.H.Maslow the representative of the existential analysis V. Frankl considers that an existential basis of human being is the

aspiration to sense, giving to it of status of purpose and life value, this aspiration is ineradicable in man and is effective independently from satisfaction of primary requirements of his physiological organism. In his opinion, on the contrary, aspiration to pleasure, to power, etc., are derivatives in relation to will, to sense [19, p. 15]. Only at frustration of existential purpose of a man to search sense of life or its loss can be observed locking of a man on pleasure, thirst to the power, social priorities which in itself, deprived of spiritual value, tending to develop into hypertrophied desire, are destructive for man.

Spiritual in human being as V. Frankl truly notes, is an action of freedom in him, freedom to define himself, to choose and do own content of certain values, it towers over circumstances of life with which human is connected, he can disagree with them, object to them. According to Frankl, spiritual is more the highest, personal measurement which isn't reduced to his lowest requirements, to limited cuts of his existence – physiological, psychological, etc. Therefore at psychogenic neuroses and other diseases the spiritual doesn't collapse in man, it can develop a certain relation to disease state of person, somehow keep separate from it. Freedom as self-transcendence of person, his ability to overstep a present state is carried out by that man himself makes decisions whether to yield to circumstances of life, requirements of a psychophysical organism or become spiritual personality defending own values. In both cases people are responsible for way of being, for own decisions.

If the main sense, i.e. supreme value, for the sake of which man lives is lost, person deals with deep spiritual experiences, he feels in soul emptiness or as V. Frankl calls it, – the existential vacuum which is quite often leading to noogenic neuroses and psychological depressions. V. Frankl notices that unlike psychogenic neuroses where the conflict of inclinations of mentality and its multidirectional instances are observed, character of noogenic neuroses is connected with frustration of spiritual values of person, existential frustration of a man who has lost sense of his existence [19, p. 51]. Therefore Frankl considers the principles of a logotherapy which is developed by him directed on helping man to be defined spiritually in his values, to find sense of own life, to be established in it and to be responsible for it.

From these positions V. Frankl criticizes doctrines of a pan-determinism and reductionism considering man as limited by bounds of

his existent datum in which his lowest registers are effective only. However, he considers, man is free, transcendent, he is open for the world, spiritual value can be his essence.

However his right thoughts about freedom of personality, her spiritual need to find sense of own life, the main value and his critic aren't deprived of internal contradictions to what his statement testifies that "... spirituality constituting man is inherent him biologically and even anatomically – freedom and spirituality lying in base of all humane"[20, p. 125]. In that case way of being of human can't be considered as freedom and openness to various ways of development. However it is impossible to agree with it as ontologically freedom of man is represented by such existential situation when infinite variety of opportunities opens in front of man thanks to that human being acts as subject of multiform senses becoming significant to his life, values of his life, content of his essence. Such freedom can't be compatible to his corporal definiteness which is set by nature, it is incompatible in general with any predetermination, even predetermination to a choice. Human always is at the crossroads, he can choose and change in principle a way of own being or not choose in general, refuse freedom. According to Frankl, it turns out that human has to choose, "... he can't avoid decision-making. Reality inevitably forces man to solve"[19, p. 44].

Moreover, Frankl considers that human doesn't produce, create sense of own being, but looks for and finds it in a universe, in external to him world, generally in surrounding society. Sense in his understanding can't be subjective, only objective sense and value can be true, as at each situation only one sense – true. It turns out, that in the same social, cultural conditions, these situations there can't be a variety of meanings, spiritual intentions of people shouldn't differ, each individual life won't possess the feature, uniqueness which Frankl so insists. Any variety, originality of actions, relations, it appears, is a delusion, while truth is quite rare coincidence of essence, soul intention with its being manifestations. Frankl though truly argues on value as due sense of human, but loses sight that man frequently does by value of his life and sense the content not reflected from existent reality, but first of all especially human meaning given rise in him, he creates in soul something new that else isn't present actually and hereby transforms reality. Human is subject of own uniqueness, originality of a spiritual quality, otherwise, if he only reflected reality, his transcendence, his

development would be impossible, he would limit himself by a framework of available being, would be predetermined. Certainly, human quite often limits himself to a certain framework, he can take available societal criteria for the value, but as it was already spoken, he freely chooses, instead of simply coincides with accepted, it is his decision.

Proceeding from his understanding of valuable sense which human finds outside, Frankl supposes superworld and a transcendental plan always available in a universe which human being is incapable comprehending. A man, his freedom, spirituality, it appears, only a step of a scale of ranks of a universe, he can't know, "... what is "final" purpose of his life, what is "supersense" of the Universe"[20, p. 162], there is nothing else left for him to believe in supersense only. State of man in relation to a universe, superworld is same as position of a tamed animal to person which serves him, but doesn't understand his project.

It is thought that nor understanding of content of the values which have been beforehand set in hereditary structure of an organism, nor taken from environment isn't able to explain the nature of sense of human existence, his spiritual self-determination. Spirituality from the point of view of A.H.Maslow, and also V. Frankl appears as beforehand prepared datum closed in itself, a certain stencil on which the plan of being of human and his essence is under construction, to such logical result probably, can lead understanding of human as certain existing which projects from himself own datum, or reflects the content of outside world, introjecting it in himself. Spirituality in that case is reduced to reflecting function of thinking, it is characteristic intention of the western civilization directed on transformation of nature, external reality for appropriation and utilization it where reflection becomes the main tendency, a learning tool, and, at last, the principle of scientific knowledge. Such principle became general in approaches of cognition of human's essence and his being.

References

1. *Юнг К.Г.* Значение аналитической психологии для воспитания // Собрание сочинений. Конфликты детской души: пер. с нем. – М.: Канон, 1994 (История психологии в памятниках).
2. *Юнг К.Г.* Аналитическая психология и воспитание // Собрание сочинений. Конфликты детской души: пер. с нем. – М.: Канон, 1994 (История психологии в памятниках).
3. *Юнг К.Г.* Трансцендентальная функция // Избранное: пер. с нем. – Минск: ООО “Попурри”, 1998.
4. *Юнг К.Г.* Современный миф о “небесных знамениях” // О современных мифах. Сб. трудов: пер. с нем. – М.: Практика, 1994.
5. *Юнг К.Г.* Борьба с тенью // Избранное. – Минск: Попурри, 1998.
6. *Юнг К.Г.* *Aion* // Избранное. – Минск: Попурри, 1998.
7. *Юнг К.Г.* Нераскрытая самость // Избранное. – Минск: Попурри, 1998.
8. *Юнг К.Г.* Психология нацизма: Эпилог // К.Г. Юнг о современных мифах: Сб. трудов. – М.: Практика, 1994.
9. *Тард Г.* Мнение и толпа // Психология толпы. – М.: Ин-т психологии РАН, КСП+, 1998. – 416 с.
10. *Адлер А.* Индивидуальная психология, ее гипотезы и результаты. В кн.: Практика и теория индивидуальной психологии. – М., 1995.
11. *Фромм Э.* Душа человека. – М.: Республика, 1992.
12. *Фромм Э.* Человек для самого себя. В кн.: Психоанализ и этика. – М.: Республика, 1993.
13. *Фромм Э.* Иметь или быть? – М.: Прогресс, 1986.
14. *Фромм Э.* Революция надежды. В кн.: Психоанализ и этика. – М.: Республика, 1993.
15. *Маркс К.* Экономическо-философские рукописи 1844 г. Маркс К. и Энгельс Ф. Соч. т.42. – М.: Политиздат, 1974. – С.93.
16. Мед с цветов, растущих на крыше парижской оперы, – Известия, №83, 4.05.94. – С. 7.
17. *Хорни К.* Невротическая личность нашего времени. В кн.: Невротическая личность нашего времени. Самоанализ: пер. с англ. – М.: Прогресс, Универс, 1993.
18. *Маслоу А.Г.* Дальние пределы человеческой психики. СПб.: – Евразия, 1997.
19. *Франкл В.* Воля к смыслу. – М.: ЭКСМО-Пресс, 2000.
20. *Франкл В.* Человек в поисках смысла. Сб.: пер. с англ. и нем. – М.: Прогресс, 1990.

Introduction.....	3
-------------------	---

**Chapter 1. PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS
OF PSYCHOANALYSIS**

1. The doctrine about human mentality in S. Freud's conception	6
1.1 Beginning of origination of the psychoanalysis concept	6
1.2 The doctrine about inclinations. Pleasure principle	10
1.3 Oedipus complex	11
1.4 Methodology and method of psychoanalysis.....	13
1.5 Concept of the unconscious. Dynamics of human psychics. Psychical sense of slips of the tongue, mistakes in reading, erroneously carried-out actions	16
1.6 The interpretation of dreams.....	18

2. Problem of interrelation of consciousness and unconscious in psychoanalysis.....	21
2.1 Consciousness, unconscious and freedom of human	21
2.2 Human and society in S. Freud's conception. Origin of culture	33
2.3 Individual and mass. "Ego" and mass psychology	37
2.4 Contradictions in S. Freud's conception in understanding of a person and his psychic.....	42
2.5 Structure of human "Ego". Mental space of an individual	59
2.6 "Ego", "Id" and "Super- Ego", their origin, place and role in mentality of an individual	61
2.7 Social alienation and S. Freud's conception of neuroses.....	64
References	79

Chapter 2 Theories of "Ego" and a personality in psychology

1.1 Conception of unconscious and theory of personality in C.G.Jung's analytical psychology	81
1.2 C.G.Jung's conception of psyche of masses and personality	89
1.3 A. Adler's individual psychology. Inferiority complex.....	95
1.4 Human and society in E. Fromm's doctrine. Existential settings of being of human in the world: to have or to be?	98
1.5 "Self-realization" problem of personality in K.Horney's conception	103
1.6 Problem of value and freedom in A.H.Maslow and V.Frankl's doctrines	115
References.....	120

Учебное издание

Abisheva Aliya Kazhimuratovna

**PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS
OF PSYCHOLOGY**

Educational manual

Выпускающий редактор *К.С. Сәбит*
Компьютерная верстка *Т.Е. Сапарова*
Дизайн обложки: *Р.Г. Шангараев*

ИБ № 7442

Подписано в печать 11.08.14. Формат 60x84 1/16. Бумага офсетная.
Печать цифровая. Объем 7,625 п.л. Тираж 150 экз. Заказ № 1569.
Издательский дом «Қазақ университеті» Казахского национального
университета им. аль-Фараби. 050040, г. Алматы, пр. аль-Фараби, 71. КазНУ.
Отпечатано в типографии издательского дома «Қазақ университеті».