

cott, by contrast, emerges from Guntrip's report as interpretively creative, flexible, and playful. He was able to capture in his interpretations a wide range of transference communications—from presymbolic enactments of affective disturbance and affective deadness to more developmentally advanced conflict.

My attitude toward this book changed as I moved through it. I began it expecting to find an "interesting read"—psychoanalysis "lite." It is more. This book came to matter to me because Rudnytsky allowed himself to become passionately immersed in his reading of Freud, Lacan, Rank, Fairbairn, Guntrip, and Winnicott. His combination of passion and scholarship yields a one-of-a-kind tracing of the evolution of the hermeneutic and object relational threads that constitute a large part of the fabric of contemporary psychoanalysis.

© PSYCHOANALYTIC BOOKS: A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF REVIEWS

THE LEGACY OF ERICH FROMM

by *Daniel Burston*

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991, xi + 260 pp., \$29.95

Reviewed by *Zvi Lothane, M.D.*

Best-selling author, sociologist, and psychoanalyst Erich Fromm deserves to be better known by psychoanalysts in the United States. Fromm was born at the turn of the century in Germany, came to the United States in 1933, and died in 1980 at the age of 80. Like many others of his generation, this transplanted German-Jewish thinker has been often misunderstood and is now threatened with oblivion. Burston has set himself a task to rescue Fromm from such a fate, to clear up the misunderstandings, and to locate him in relation to the diverse intellectual sources on which he drew. Burston leads the reader on a detailed journey through 19th- and 20th-century intellectual history, a discussion that includes the ideas of such thinkers as J. J. Bachofen, the sociologists Marx and Weber, the early Freudian dissidents Reich, Horney, and Thomp-

son, and existentialists like Buber and Scheler. His book is an intelligent, lucid, and highly readable intellectual biography of Erich Fromm, a highly commendable work of humanistic scholarship.

Fromm was trained in sociology at universities in Heidelberg, Frankfurt, and Munich and in psychoanalysis at the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute. He achieved eminence in the United States lecturing at Columbia and Yale Universities, The New School for Social Research, the William Alanson White Institute, and later at the National University of Mexico. Fromm has made an indelible impression on the public with such books as *Escape from Freedom*, *The Sane Society*, and *The Art of Loving*, winning the deserved admiration of the general public but doing less well with some professionals, especially Freudian analysts. As a matter of fact, the less-than-honorable classification as a neo-Freudian betokens Fromm's dual indebtedness to these two very different magnets, Freud and Marx: to Freud directly, to Marx indirectly, via the neo-Freudism of the Freudo-Marxists.

In analyzing Fromm's thought in its historical context and as a departure from Freud, Burston is also able to illuminate some dark corners of Freud's patriarchally dominated thought, such as Freud's concealment of his indebtedness to Bachofen's matriarchal views, suggested by Freud's quoting Aeschylus' *Oresteia*. This influence of Bachofen on Freud has already been noted by Philip Rieff (1959). Freud himself, however, cites Bachofen in *Totem and Taboo*, where he also expresses his awareness that matriarchy preceded patriarchy.

Burston cannot escape, however, using Fromm as a springboard for his own debates with Freud. But since such an extension is inevitable, given Freud's intellectual stature, it lends an extra human dimension to the book and reveals something of the author's own spiritual odyssey, his encounters and struggles with Freud.

Although Marx has been anathema to Freud and the Freudians and discredited owing to what the author calls the fractious loyalty among the early orthodox Freudians (which he describes with a masterful and witty pen), the hybrid Freudo-Marxism was a



powerful historical trend that captivated such prominent early pioneers as Reich and Marcuse and the more middle-of-the-road Fenichel. Thanks to the sleuthing researches of Russell Jacoby, we now know that a number of faithful in the past were not free of the Marxist taint. As a consequence, Freudians and others today might be interested in tracing the threads that connect Marx's alienation, Durkheim's anomie, and the seemingly philosophical innovations of self psychology. Kohut's lexical staples, "self" and "empathy," words Freud used rather sparingly, clearly reflect Kohut's emphasis on social relatedness, a tacit invoking of the antinomy of self and other.

Here Burston rightly inveighs against the futility of riding the antinomies—individual versus society, depth psychology versus socioeconomics—and illuminates the contribution of Fromm to a much needed appreciation of how culture and society and their values shape the individual. More interestingly, even though this one is not of Marxist provenance, Burston sheds light on another vexing antinomy: mother and father, matricentric and patricentric philosophies. Here he turns his attention to the forgotten legacy of the 19th-century Swiss J. J. Bachofen and his seminal book, *The Mother Right*. While Bachofen's influence on Freud has escaped notice, it was not a mystery in Jung's case.

The other aspect of Fromm's critique of Freud that occupies Burston is the problematics of love. One of the hallmarks of neo-Freudism has been the deemphasis of sex in human affairs and the rejection of the libido theory as the superordinate causal conception of human action. Conversely, it is true that Freud wrote much less on love than he did on sex. While the debate on love and sex cannot be regarded as settled by Burston, surely the filial and loving component of the Oedipus complex needs to be understood no less than the sexual one. In this connection it is heartening to see Burston resurrect our interest in Ian Suttie, the obscure Scottish psychoanalyst and translator of Ferenczi, who was staunchly defended by Michael Balint in his tragic feud with Freud on issues of love.

One problem that was very much on the mind of Fromm, but for which one would search in vain in Marx's sociological canon, is the problem of aggression. Freud was himself late in acknowledging Adler's appreciation, as early as 1908, of aggression in life and neurosis. Freud's belated recognition of aggression may have been aided by the excesses of World War I, personal losses in the family, and, albeit by some indirection, by his own painful siege with cancer of the jaw, all varieties of experiencing evil. Fromm had the benefit not only of Freud's theory of the death instinct, which he renamed necrophilia, but also the shuddering impact of World War II and the Holocaust. Fromm's contributions to the understanding of human destructiveness rank in importance beside his writings about love. The missing element in Fromm, however, is an appreciation of the role of power in human relations, the frequently inescapable connection between the power of love and the love of power. It was again Adler who was first to contemplate the importance of power in human relations, even if we hear in it the echoes of Nietzsche's dialectics of master and slave. Fromm put it in terms of destructiveness; what needs more understanding is evil due to the abuses of power in relations, something clearly understood by de Sade as he delved into the mysteries of power and lust.

Fromm's contributions to clinical psychoanalysis are less original or compelling, except for his writings about human relatedness and empathy. Since empathy is so much on the mind of everybody nowadays as the new gospel, it might be well to remember that Freud wrote about it as early as 1907. Apropos empathy, Kohut owes to Fromm (or to George Meade, for that matter) more than he ever cared to admit or than Burston is willing to acknowledge.

Along these lines, I wish Burston had expanded on how oedipal dynamics were a powerful force in Fromm's own life: in his attachment to his mother, in his marriage—to his former analyst, Frieda Reichmann, and in his love affair with Karen Horney, both older women. I would like to hear more about how these relationships might have influenced Fromm's ideas. I would have also liked to hear more about Fromm's indebtedness not only to gen-



eral existential ideas but specifically to their roots in Judaism and the Haskala. We recently have heard much for and against Freud's Jewish identity. It may be timely to recognize that Fromm, like Marx and Freud, was a manifestation of that tradition of the Prophets of Israel—and its heresy called Christianity—which elevated the idea of universalism, love of mankind, and the zeal to reform mankind to an all-encompassing world view. Modern humanism and existentialism are heavily indebted to this religious tradition, something Fromm himself never tired of pointing out.

My only major disagreement with Burston has to do with his critique of Freud. Burston does not appreciate the essential difference between Freud's method, for example, his dream psychology and Freud's metapsychology, for example, his drive psychology. One may take issue with Freud's drive metapsychology in the spirit that drives determine all symptoms. But Freud's metapsychological sexology has its place, and it surely does not amount, as Burston says, to "sensationalist sexual theories," a common Freud-bashing notion. Freud's reduction of love to sexuality in the service of establishing libido as a preeminent doctrine is not on a par with his conception that a symptom is structured like a dream or that unconscious processes underlie operations of drive and defense alike. In fact, it is an error to maintain that Freud's theories of repression and of unconscious processes are nothing but restatements of earlier intimations of Spinoza and Leibniz. It is true that Schopenhauer and Nietzsche—although not Herbart—knew of the dark role of sexual impulses and the human tendency toward self-deception; but it was Freud who discovered a method of interpreting dreams as the royal road to understanding the meaning of dreams and symptoms; madness, and metaphor; of hysteria, hallucinations, and delusions (Lothane, 1992). We may disagree with many aspects of Freudian theory, but his method has earned him a perennial place in the history of psychology and psychoanalysis.

This book is highly recommended to anyone who wants to become familiar with Fromm's contributions in the historical context; it is a necessary introduction and guide to reading his works.

Its informative and lucid style makes it a book one cannot put down until the last chapter.

REFERENCES

- Freud, S. (1900). The interpretation of dreams. *S. E.*, 4 & 5.
 Lothane, Z. (1992). *In defense of Schreber: Soul murder and psychiatry*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.
 Rieff, P. (1959). *Freud: The mind of the moralist*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

© PSYCHOANALYTIC BOOKS: A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF REVIEWS

THE REVISION OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

by *Erich Fromm*

edited by Rainer Funk. *Interventions: Theory and Contemporary Politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1992, xiv + 149 pp., \$28.95

Reviewed by Daniel Burston, Ph.D.

The Revision of Psychoanalysis consists of several lengthy fragments composed between 1968 and 1970 and can be thought of as a companion to another volume, *The Crisis of Psychoanalysis*, which was published around the same time (Fromm, 1970). Reading this posthumously published book was a pleasure because it substantiates many of my arguments and intuitions (see Burston, 1991). Fromm's sharp ambivalence about being grouped with Horney and Sullivan in the "cultural school" is plain throughout and is countered with insistent reminders that his work is closer to both Freud's and Marx's than theirs is. Equally apparent is his steadfast veneration for Freud—despite his Marxist leanings—which is evidenced by his attempt to salvage what is timelessly relevant in classical theory from what is obsolete or culturally conditioned, by his frequent references to Freud as "the master," and by his occasional lapses into naïve idealization. At the same time he is critical of Freud's patriarchalism, mechanistic materialism, infantilization of patients through reliance on the couch, and so on.

