

How to Become a Forgotten Intellectual: Fromm, Derrida and Orwell¹

Neil McLaughlin
Ohio State University

¹ For comments and suggestions on earlier drafts and presentations, the author would like to thank Robert R. Alford, Steven Brint, Charles Camic, Mauricio Cortina, Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Uta Gerhardt, Richard F. Hamilton, Barbara Hiesler, Charles Kadushin, Michele Lamont, Barbara Lenkerd, Bonnie Oglensky, Gail McQuire, Rolf Meyersohn, Jennifer Platt, Philip Selznick, Catherine Silver, Gideon Sjborg, Stephen Steinberg, David Riesman, Paul Roazen, Alan Wolfe, Dennis Wrong and my students at Queens College and the Honors Program of the Ohio State University. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C. August 1995.



How to Become a Forgotten Intellectual: Fromm, Derrida and Orwell

The reputations of intellectuals, scholars, scientists, and artists are shaped by historical and sociological factors as well as by the quality of ideas. This assertion remains controversial despite recent debates on academic canons as well as contemporary research in the sociology of culture and science. Yet in matters so close to the hearts of intellectuals themselves, the sociology of knowledge literature on reputations has suffered from polemical excess and a relative dearth of carefully designed empirical research.

Reputation studies, moreover, tend to focus on canonized intellectuals. With the exception of Charles Camic's analysis of Parsons and the institutional economists and Gaye Tuchman's research on Victorian novelists, scholars have largely ignored detailed examination of the sociological dynamics involved in the exclusion of once prominent intellectuals.¹ As a contribution to this project, the ideas and the reputational history of the German psychoanalyst and sociologist Erich Fromm will be examined.

Erich Fromm was a major psychoanalytic thinker, sociological theorist and public intellectual during the 1940s and 1950s. Yet since the late 1960s he has become unfashionable in intellectual circles in the United States. The "rise and fall" of Erich Fromm is a case study in the sociology of knowledge that explores how



intellectual boundaries are constructed within and between disciplines in the modern academy, psychoanalytic institutes and the journal and book reading publics.² An explanation of Fromm's "fall from grace" will be outlined and compared to the reputational histories of Jacque Derrida and George Orwell with relation to recent research in the production of culture perspective in the sociology of culture.³

Sociologist Michele Lamont's production of culture analysis looks at the legitimation of theorists in the interpretive disciplines of philosophy and literary criticism in the distinct academic settings, cultural markets and institutional contexts of France and the United States. The case of Erich Fromm is a useful counter-example that illustrates how ideas are excluded in the institutions of intellectual production in the social sciences and psychoanalysis. Although Fromm and Derrida are from different generations, Fromm's pre-1965 prestige can be explained in similar ways as Derrida's post-1965 reputation. After 1965, however, the trajectory of Fromm's reputation in America is the exact opposite from the case of Derrida.

While the example of Derrida helps explain Fromm's exclusion within the academy, there remains the question of the reception of ideas in the market for social criticism. One of the distinctive aspects of Fromm's reputational trajectory is that he was once viewed as a major social critic and social scientist and lost prestige after the late 1960s both as a academic figure and a public intellectual. Derrida, in contrast, was never a major public



intellectual in America.

In order to put the reception of Fromm's work among elite public intellectuals in a comparative perspective, literary critic John Rodden's reputational study of George Orwell is useful. Rodden's case study takes us outside the academy, focusing instead on the intellectual "worlds" of book publishing and reviewing, mass media fame and the social circles of the American intellectual elite. Fromm and Orwell were contemporaries who today both remain famous outside the academy even while seldom being read in college classes above the undergraduate introduction level. The reception of George Orwell is also similar to Fromm's in the 1950s and early 1960s in America as well as different after 1965. Orwell is an example of a writer who maintained popular fame and a prestigious reputation among intellectuals while being a minor figure in the academy.

How Derrida Became a Dominant Philosopher

Lamont's explanation of the successful legitimation of Derrida's work can usefully be categorized into a levels of analysis framework.⁴ At the macro-level of analysis, Derrida's ideas found an audience in France during the 1970s and 1980s because his complex ideas fit well into the cultural style of elite French intellectuals and the upper-middle class market for cultural capital. Moreover, his nihilist politics and concern with the complexities of power fit into the cultural sensibility of intellectuals in post-1968 France. Derrida's ideas crossed the Atlantic along with various French post-structuralist and post-



modernist thinkers and thus found an audience as part of a broader intellectual current.

At the organizational level, Derrida's ties to the French intellectual establishment and a network of influential American academics at Yale, Cornell and John Hopkins facilitated the diffusion of his work. Moreover, fiscally driven attacks on the prestige of academic philosophy in France and the United States, combined with the vacuum created by the collapse of traditionalist paradigms in American literary criticism, created a context where Derrida's work fit into the needs of academic literature departments. In France, Derrida's sophisticated engagement with the most prestigious European philosophers contributed to a defence of the philosophical enterprise undertaken in the cultural magazines and media in a time of institutional crisis for the discipline. In America, Derrida's work helped the Yale Critics cohere into an influential school of thought within American English departments and this perspective was diffused more broadly in several prestigious literary journals. Moreover, the fact that Derrida's ideas were "ambitious, adaptable and packaged as a distinct product" made them professionally useful for a variety of literary critics, scholars in the humanities, feminist theorists, art historians and anthropologists.

At the micro level of analysis, Derrida's cultural capital and network ties to prestigious intellectuals on both sides of the Atlantic facilitated the creation of his reputation as an important thinker. Derrida was then able to create his "theoretical



trademark" and a charismatic avant-garde image, linking both to the wave of interest in "deconstruction" in America.

Fromm's Rise to Fame

Erich Fromm was born in 1900 and came to the United States from Nazi Germany in 1933. With the publication of Escape from Freedom in 1941, Fromm became a world famous psychoanalyst, sociological theorist and social critic. Throughout the 1940s, 1950s and early 1960s Fromm's many books and articles established his reputation as a major intellectual figure. There were numerous macro, organizational and micro factors that contributed to Fromm's dramatic rise to fame.

At the macro-level of analysis, Fromm's Cold War era writings had an affinity with the dominant climate of the times and intellectual concerns in American society. Escape from Freedom (1941) was a war-time tract on the rise of Nazism that was a major precursor to both modern theories of totalitarianism and the authoritarian personality research tradition. Fromm's concern with the psychological factors that influenced the rise of fascism resonated with scholars and readers interested in exploring the "national character" of the Germans and the Japanese. And Fromm's stress on what he argued were the lower-middle class origins of Nazism fit into the dominant theories of the period, a perspective later institutionalized into the conventional wisdom by Seymour Martin Lipset's Political Man (1960).⁵

Man for Himself: Towards a Psychology of Ethics (1947) and The Sane Society (1955) contributed to the emergence of widespread



social criticism of the cultural conformism and alienation brought about by the growing dominance of market culture and the subsequent commercialization of feelings and the suburbanization of American life. The Art of Loving (1956) was published while America was discovering both social science research on sexuality and paperback self-help books. May Man Prevail: An Inquiry into the Facts and Fictions of Foreign Policy (1961) and Marx's Concept of Man (1961) both became influential as the emerging New Left generation discovered alienated work, bureaucratic multi-universities, the dangers of the nuclear arms race and the interventionism of American foreign policy. Fromm's Old-Testament inspired communitarian radicalism fit well into the religious revival of the 1950s and the zeitgeist of what one historian has called the King era.⁶ Moreover, Fromm's reputation benefitted from his association with a generation of prestigious emigre psychoanalysts and scholars who were helping deprovincialize American intellectual life.

At the organizational level of analysis, Fromm's fame in the 1940s through the early 1960s can be explained by the institutional needs of academic anthropology and sociology, psychoanalysis and Marxism. Fromm's 1930s research on "social character" was part of the development of the "culture and personality" tradition in anthropology and his effective writing in the 1940s and 1950s helped diffuse this work in America.⁷ Although this "culture and personality" tradition would later go out of fashion, in the 1940s and 1950s it helped consolidate cultural anthropology as a distinct and relevant field.



Within sociology, Fromm's work served several important functions in the 1940s and 1950s. Escape from Freedom exposed talented American intellectuals to the power of the sociological imagination and European social theory.⁸ Even though most sociologists would soon move beyond Fromm's work for a variety of reasons, he had a significant influence on mid-century American sociology.⁹ Fromm's work and mentorship influenced David Riesman and his classic sociological analysis of American character in The Lonely Crowd (1950). Moreover, during the "normal science" of 1950s functionalism, Fromm played a pivotal role in developing a challenge to what Nicholas Mullins calls "Standard American Sociology." Following in the tradition of Robert Lynd, Fromm along with C. Wright Mills and Alvin Gouldner laid the foundation for a "critical sociology." In addition, Fromm's insistence on combining social and psychological factors was an early challenge to the Durkheimian influenced hostility to psychology, which had held back the full development of social psychology as a sub-field within sociology.¹⁰

Fromm's work in this period was also important for the institutions of Freudianism and Marxism. Psychoanalysis had begun as a marginal European based sect-like institution, but it had gained legitimacy in America in the 1920s and 1930s among literary and artistic circles and in medical schools after the Second World War. Despite the ideological opposition of orthodox psychoanalysts, Fromm's work in the 1940s and 1950s was instrumental in further diffusing Freudian perspectives throughout the social sciences and



in America intellectual life more generally. Marxist scholars also benefitted from Fromm's efforts at popularizing Marx in America and laying the groundwork for the revitalization of the tradition after the debacle of Stalinism.

Fromm's success in the 1940s and 1950s was aided by the fact that he was institutionally well positioned, networked with some of the major native and refugee intellectuals of the period and was successful at "image management." While Fromm never held a full-time academic position at a major university in America,¹¹ he had been associated with Columbia University in the 1930s as part of the Institute for Social Research (what we now call the Frankfurt School). Through his connections elite intellectuals Fromm was able to secure a book contract for Escape from Freedom with Farrar and Rhinehart, a major New York commercial press. Fromm maintained a successful psychoanalytic practice in New York city throughout the late 1930s and the 1940s, ensuring his financial security and his intellectual independence. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, Fromm moved in the right circles and had a reputation as an exciting and important renegade Marxist and Freudian.¹²

Beyond Disciplinary Orthodoxies

Fromm was unable to sustain his reputation in the social sciences, psychoanalysis and public intellectual life from the middle of the 1960s until the early 1990s. At the macro-level of analysis, Fromm's defence of traditional Marxist influenced humanism was running against the grain of the anti-humanist post-modernist current in American culture that helped create Derrida's



reputation after the late 1960s. Fromm's outspoken defence of libertarian democratic socialist politics left him isolated from both the more militant elements of the New Left of the late 1960s and 1970s and the neo-liberalism and conservatism that come to dominate the political climate among intellectuals in the 1980s.

While Derrida was able to develop an audience for his ideas among the upper middle class cultural market in France, Fromm's work was too popular for the smaller and shrinking high-brow American intellectual audience. Moreover, Fromm's writings were too theoretical and political for the middle-brow market for self-help books, new age philosophy and uplifting futurism.

At the micro-level of analysis, Fromm had a difficult personality that damaged his ability to diplomatically negotiate the complexities of academic politics in modern universities, psychoanalytic faction fights and political differences among networks of public intellectuals. In addition, despite Fromm's socialist politics, he was a relatively old-fashioned individual whose cultural style did not fit the post 1968 New Left or the image of a radical post-modern intellectual.

Fromm's reputational problems were most pronounced, however, at the institutional level of analysis. While Derrida's work was professionally useful for philosophers and literary critics on both sides of the Atlantic in the late 1960s, by this time Fromm was in an academic no-man's land. Fromm argued for an interdisciplinary "science of man" that combined the empirical methods of the natural sciences with the interpretive insights of the humanities. This



perspective went directly against the legitimation strategies of both the humanities and the social sciences. Since the 1920s and 1930s, social sciences in America had been attempting to increase their stature within universities by adopting the rigorous methods of the natural sciences. While Fromm argued for the necessity for empirical evidence and did one rigorous case study (Social Character in a Mexican Village with Michael Maccoby published in 1970), he was a practicing psychoanalyst and popular writer more than a researcher. Most of his work was far too impressionistic, polemical and multi-disciplinary for modern mainstream sociology and political science, disciplines just then professionalizing and moving, from "Education to Expertise"¹³.

Derrida's work was difficult to master but it provided a prestigious theoretical model that young literary critics could use to produce scholarly articles and books. The very ambiguity of Derrida's theories made them applicable to a range of literary topics. In contrast, Fromm's major theoretical argument was that social and individual character are independent causal factors in social life while also being shaped by the socio-economic structures of society. The empirical research required to test and develop this theory is expensive, time-consuming and requires a team of interdisciplinary scholars trained in sociology, anthropology, psychoanalysis and social psychology. Fromm's very distance from disciplinary orthodoxies in the 1950s meant by the 1970s he was marginal to any of the major schools of thought in modern social science that could have provided the resources and



critical mass that could help test, develop and diffuse his ideas.

In sociology, for a variety of intellectual, political and personal reasons, Fromm had little influence or affinity with structural-functionalism, symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, rational-choice theory, or sociological structuralism.¹⁴ Fromm had been extremely influential among critically minded sociologists in the 1940s through the early 1960s. But by the early 1950s, however, it became clear that Fromm was criticising American sociology from the outside. Unlike Mills and Gouldner who positioned themselves as the loyal left-wing opposition within mainstream American sociology, Fromm was never able to develop a coherent following of graduate students and junior faculty committed to building a base for his ideas within the profession. Although Fromm was a central figure in the early Frankfurt School of Social Research, by the 1970s he was no longer taken seriously by Marxist sociologists and was written out of the history of the Frankfurt School just as it was carving a small place for itself on the margins of sociology.

Within anthropology, Fromm had been associated with the "culture and personality" school throughout the 1930s and 1940s. Fromm taught a seminar at Yale in 1949 with the anthropologist Ralph Linton and psychoanalyst Abram Kardiner's early work cited Fromm extensively. By the 1950s, however Fromm was largely rejected by this network of thinkers, just as they themselves lost prestige and influence in the discipline. Kardiner, in particular, disliked Fromm intensely, had a personal loyalty to Freud and dismissed



Fromm's revisionism in his later writings.¹⁵ A negative view of Fromm's work was diffused among young social scientists through the extremely influential Linton/Kardiner "culture and personality" seminar at Columbia University.

Within psychology, Fromm had been a major intellectual figure in the 1950s but his reputation declined dramatically as the discipline professionalized and specialized. Fromm's strength as a psychological theorist was his historical and sociological perspective and his philosophical sophistication. Throughout this century academic psychology has increasingly striven for status as a rigorous experimentally based science, aligning first with behaviorism and then with biological and cognitive models of human behavior. Fromm, in contrast, was a militant opponent of behaviorism, especially in the Skinnerian version that was influential in the 1950s and 1960s.¹⁶ Fromm was critical of attempts to explain human behavior solely with models based on animal studies or laboratory experiments. A young psychological theorist or researcher attempting to build a reputation on Fromm's work in the 1960s through the 1980s would have been swimming upstream with little institutional support.

Furthermore, Fromm's work was even rejected by the relatively marginal alternative schools of thought in academic psychology that he had helped to establish. Orthodox Freudians had once been important in academic psychology but as psychoanalysts lost credibility in the discipline they responded in a sect-like manner by becoming more interested in preserving the purity of their



theory than responding to critics. Moreover, because of internal conflicts and differences among neo-Freudians, Fromm could count on little support from the intellectual followers of Karen Horney or Harry Stack Sullivan.¹⁷ As a consequence, the neo-Freudians declined together within an academic psychology increasingly dominated by cognitive theory, experimental social psychology and biologically oriented research.

Fromm's work was even less relevant to the legitimacy crisis of the contemporary humanities. While the social sciences appealed for societal resources based on the prestige of science and the utility of their research, the humanities could only argue for the value of the "cultural capital" they provide. Derrida was educated at the most prestigious French universities and presented himself as someone with unique and sophisticated things to say about the major issues of philosophy and literature. In contrast, Fromm was a philosophically sophisticated social science critic of positivism who drew extensively on literary sources. Fromm was simply too close to the social sciences for philosophers or literary critics to find useful and his popularizing style undercut the very cultural distinctions on which the academic humanities depend. Many scholars in the humanities built on Fromm's work for dissertations, articles and books from the 1940s through the 1980s. From the 1960s on, however, Fromm was a career liability in the humanities while Derrida was a valued and prestigious intellectual reference.

While Lamont argues that Derrida's strategy of combining an academic base and intellectual audience outside universities was



central to his success, Fromm's reputational decline can partly be traced to his popular non-academic appeal. Derrida aimed his complex and difficult work to a large market of upper-middle class French readers interested as much in status symbols as intellectual insight. Derrida's base in the United States was in the academy not the opinion journals since he understood that the market for intellectuals was much smaller in the United States and was shrinking with the death of public intellectuals.¹⁸ Derrida concentrated his efforts on building a base in english departments in America throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Fromm, on the other hand, wrote most of his works to educate and mobilize not to impress with erudition and complexity. Fromm could be read by a combination of academic specialists, elite intellectuals, therapists, religious leaders, college freshman, social workers, high school teachers and middle class general readers. As a consequence, Derrida's reputation benefitted by his exclusivity while Fromm lost stature among academics who increasingly came to see him as a popularizer.

Beyond Psychoanalysis and Marxism

Derrida's work helped solve a legitimacy crisis for French philosophers and American literary critics. In contrast, Fromm was rejected in the only two settings in American intellectual life where his work could have been institutionally useful after the late 1960s. Fromm had developed internal revisions of Freudianism and Marxism that could have helped preserve the insights of these traditions while moving beyond outdated and damaging orthodoxies.



Fromm diffused the Freudian ideas of unconscious motivation and character analysis while challenging Freud's patriarchal assumptions and ahistorical focus on libidinal instincts. Fromm distinguished himself from Freudians of his time by his open criticisms of the dogmatic and closed nature of the psychoanalytic training institutes. Fromm was an early proponent of innovative ideas that would later emerge within the mainstream of psychoanalysis in the form of object relations theory and interpersonal psychology.¹⁹

In addition, Fromm retained and developed the Marxist insistence on a concrete analysis of historical social relations and the theory of alienation. Yet Fromm avoided dogmatic economic determinism and the classical Marxist blindness to moral, cultural and psychological dynamics. Fromm was an influential proponent of an early version of humanistic Marxism. Paradoxically, it is precisely the institutions that in the long run had the most to gain from Fromm that de-legitimized his theories within the broader intellectual community.

Fromm's innovative ideas are related to his sociologically marginal position and this explains both his rise and decline. Again, the comparison to Derrida is illuminating and raises larger questions about the social and institutional formation of intellectual canons. Lamont argues that Derrida was successful in managing his intellectual reputation because he was able to situate his work in prestigious philosophical traditions. Derrida convinced other intellectuals that his work was an original contribution to



debates that can be traced from Descartes, Hegel, Nietzsche through to Husserl and Hiedegger. Even the opposition of Levi-Strauss and Foucault increased Derrida's stature since this established that he was a player.

Fromm's experience was very different. Fromm drew major insights from both the Freudian and Marxist traditions yet his work challenged central tenets of these respective orthodoxies. Sociologist Lewis Coser argues that "the two most powerful intellectual currents of the modern world" were "nursed within the confines of intellectual sects that ... were intense in their intellectual commitments and even more productive of seminal ideas." ²⁰ The social organization of knowledge within Freudianism and Marxism is thus unusual and not exclusively professionally or market driven. Even today Freudian institutes continue to be organized in the theoretically intense and semi-secret almost sect-like form of their origins. And while most major communist parties around the world have collapsed in disgrace and the democratic socialist current is marginal in America, Marxist scholarship is loosely tied to a movement culture and retains elements of the sectarianism of its past.

It was Fromm's very marginality to these Freudian and Marxist institutions and movement cultures that allowed him to question some of the outdated and questionable ideas of both the academy and these alternative traditions. Fromm developed powerful revisions of psychoanalysis and Marxism largely by synthesizing insights from other intellectual approaches, particularly Durkheimian, Weberian



and Simmelian sociology as well as European existentialism. Many other Freudians or Marxists had their creativity swallowed up or blunted by their institutional need to gloss over the contradictions of their theories. While Fromm was ahead of his time in challenging the blindness of the traditions he worked within, this strategy inevitably alienated him from the institutional gatekeepers for Freudian and Marxist orthodoxies.

Fromm's conflicts with the Freudian establishment in America must partly be understood in the context of the literature on the sociology of the professions. Fromm was continually attacked by orthodox psychoanalysts partly because he was not a medical doctor. Fromm and other "lay analysts" threatened the professionalizing strategy of Freudians who were attempting to carve out a position for psychoanalysis as an elite specialization within medical psychiatry.²¹

Fromm's reputation among orthodox Freudians declined even more dramatically in the 1950s when he published numerous popular articles and best-selling books attacking central elements of orthodox Freudian theory. Fromm criticized the patriarchal bias of Freud's view of gender, questioned the universality of the Oedipal complex and argued that psychoanalysis must engage historical sociology and cultural anthropology in order to transcend biological determinism. In addition, Fromm was one of few psychoanalysts willing to challenge Ernest Jones' hagiographic three volume The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud published between 1953 and 1957. Worse of all, Fromm made these criticisms of Freudian



orthodoxy in mass market books and Saturday Review articles and not obscure clinical journals. He was thus a threat to the client base as well as the ideology of Freudians. For close to 50 years now Fromm has been one of the most hated Freudian revisionists.

Fromm's relationship to Marxism was politically more complex but hardly less troubled. Fromm had been initially attracted to Marxism as a young anti-war German drawn to the libertarian radicalism of Roza Luxemburg. While much of Fromm's intellectual energy had been directed at battling Freudian orthodoxy while defending psychoanalytic insights, Fromm became known in America primarily as a defender of Marxism and not as an internal critic. From Fromm's perspective, American intellectual life was dominated by such uninformed anti-Marxist ideology that it was imperative to attack negative myths about Marx and Marxism. From Escape from Freedom (1941), through The Sane Society (1955), May Man Prevail: The Facts and Fictions of Foreign Policy (1961), Marx's Concept of Man (1961), Socialist Humanism (1965) and To Have or to Be (1975), Fromm played a major role in developing and popularizing a humanistic Marxism based on the philosophical anthropology of the early writings.

Fromm was an unorthodox Marxist, drawing extensively from utopian socialist and anarchist traditions as well as from the sociology of his dissertation advisor Alfred Weber. Fromm defended many of Marx's insights, but was a sharp critique of 20th century Marxist-Leninism as well as the social democratic tradition. Fromm argued that Marx's work was flawed by outmoded psychological and



political assumptions rooted in 19th century European conceptions of progress. Orthodox Marxists were more circumspect than Freudians in attacking Fromm in America throughout the 1950s and 1960s, partly because they were in need of allies in Cold War America. Nonetheless, Fromm's democratic socialism made him numerous enemies among doctrinaire Marxists who viewed him as a "liberal radical researcher caught within the framework of bourgeois thought."²²

Fromm's "fall from grace" was overdetermined since his principled insistence on both the greatness and profound limitations of Freud and Marx prevented him from becoming part of these respective canons. For Freudians, the Oedipal complex, libido theory and the charismatic leadership of an infallible Freud were unnegotiable requirements for genuine psychoanalysis. For Marxists, the demands of "scientific socialism" required more respect than Fromm was willing to give for the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Marxists rejected the moral appeals of utopian and religious socialism, the decentralism of anarchism, and the analytic tools of bourgeois philosophy and social science.

What Znaniecki called "fighters for the truth" among dogmatic Freudians and Marxists thus rightly saw Fromm as a threat to the integrity of their ideas.²³ Fromm had the intellectual credentials to bring "foreign" ideas inside both Freudian and Marxist institutions and networks. Moreover, his public intellectual role gave him a wide audience for his challenges to Freudian and Marxist orthodoxies.

Fromm's commitment to breaking from all orthodoxies precluded



the development of an alternative institutional base for the refinement and diffusion of his own distinctive ideas. Fromm was not willing to frame his revisionism in the language of orthodox psychoanalysis as Eric Erikson did nor would he recant his Marxist heresy as did Lukacs. Fromm also refused to build his system of thought around a return to the "original" Freud or Marx, a legitimation strategy undertaken by both Lacan and Althusser.²⁴

Moreover, Fromm did not establish his own school of psychoanalytic thought as did Adler, Rank, and Klein nor did he form a "cult" like the Jungians.²⁵ In the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s, as we have discussed, Fromm had been associated with a loose psychoanalytic "school of thought" often labeled neo-Freudianism or the "cultural school" of psychoanalysis. Yet ultimately Fromm was too Freudian, Marxist and sociological for Horney and Sullivan. In any case, both Horney and Sullivan were dead by the middle of the 1950s, and younger neo-Freudians split into different psychoanalytic factions. Throughout the 1960s their intellectual stature fell together in the wake of both orthodox Freudian attacks and the general decline of psychoanalysis.

Nor did Fromm establish an alternative type of academic Marxism that was professionally useful as did followers of Gramsci, Althusser, E.P. Thompson, rational choice Marxists, or Immanuel Wallerstein. Fromm had, of course, been a major contributor to the early development of critical theory and a central member of the inner circle of the Frankfurt School. By 1939, however, a series of personal, intellectual and political differences as well as



conflicts over resources, had resulted in Fromm leaving formal association with the Institute. Horkheimer and especially Adorno became bitter enemies of Fromm and attempted to exclude him as best they could from the history of the Institute. Most of the scholarship about the Frankfurt School has, until very recently, underestimated Fromm's importance to the early development of critical theory. Adorno, Horkheimer, Marcuse and Benjamin became the central figures within a revised history, and Adorno's student Jurgen Habermas became the heir to the tradition.²⁶

Without an institutional base in either Neo-Freudianism or the Frankfurt School, Fromm's work was vulnerable to attack by hostile organized Freudian and Marxist schools of thought. The sociological roots of Fromm's reputational problems can be again illuminated by comparison to Derrida. Attacks on deconstruction by its intellectual opponents increased Derrida's stature among his followers as they rallied around the flag. By the middle of the 1980s, an attack on Derrida was a challenge to the careers of many well-connected academics. Even Derrida's critics within the broad intellectual movement of "post-modernism" accepted his claim to being an important and original thinker. Fromm, in contrast, lost stature from attacks on Freudianism and Marxism from outside these traditions as well as being undercut internally by claims that he was neither a "true" Freudian or a "real" Marxist.

Public Intellectuals: Fromm and Orwell

The dynamics of disciplinary orthodoxies and Freudian and Marxist faction fighting can not fully explain Fromm's dramatic



intellectual decline. Unlike Derrida, Fromm was famous in America beyond the academy and this partly explains his lowered status within social science. It is a rare intellectual who is both famous among the general public and regarded as a serious academic within their discipline. Fromm made a strategic decision to write for a popular and not an academic audience and was known in the 1950s as a major non-academic social critic. After the late 1960s, however, he became known as what Lewis Coser calls a "celebrity intellectual." George Orwell's enduring fame and success among the American intellectual elite will illuminate Fromm's decline in prestige.

Fromm and Orwell both found a mass audience in America during the Cold War era because of their analysis of Nazism and Stalinism. Fromm's Escape From Freedom and Orwell's 1984 and Animal Farm helped create the intellectual framework for modern theories of totalitarianism. Moreover, Orwell, like Fromm, gained a reputation because of chance fortune with publishing companies and his image as an interesting and politically engaged intellectual.

There are three sociological factors that explain Orwell and Fromm's different reputational histories among elite public intellectual in America after 1965. First, while both intellectuals wrote clearly, Orwell was a literary stylist and craftsman while Fromm's political books and articles were polemical, written quickly and often lacked a literary and aesthetic sensibility. Steven Brint has documented through content analysis that the style of the elite public intellectual journals is not the polemical



"stance taking" orientation of an "adversary culture." Instead, the major intellectual journals are primarily concerned with educating readers into a complex and ironic understanding of current events, what Brint calls a stance of "particularizing refinement." Orwell did and Fromm did not fit into the style of the major journals of intellectual opinion.²⁷

There was a certain ambiguity about Orwell's politics that helped build a broader audience for his work among elite intellectuals. It was thus possible for cold-war liberals, neo-conservatives and democratic socialists to claim Orwell as a political influence. Lionel Trilling, Norman Podhoretz and Irving Howe all argued that Orwell would have taken their respective political positions during the cultural and political conflicts of the Cold War period, McCarthyism, the 1960s and the Reagan era. Since Orwell died in the early 1950s, he was not forced to make political choices thus his reputation benefitted from an extended battle for his heritage. As John Rodden puts it, "It was not so much that Orwell died "young"; he died at precisely the "right" historical moment." Intellectuals argued at length about what position Orwell would have taken on the nuclear arms race, the Vietnam war and Ronald Reagan just as scholars debated what Derrida "really" meant. Like a Rorschach test, intellectuals read into Orwell what they themselves were looking for.

Fromm, on the other hand, was politically active throughout the Cold War and the Vietnam war protests. Fromm, along with David Riesman, worked to establish a space in American politics for anti-



militarism at the height of the Cold War. Fromm used his fame to become a vocal critic of the American nuclear arms build-up and intervention in Vietnam. Throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, Fromm attacked policy experts like Herman Kahn who were arguing that America needed to prepare to fight and win a nuclear war. In the middle to late 1960s, Fromm spoke at anti-war demonstrations and worked for Eugene McCarthy. Fromm spoke along with Dwight Mcdonald at a counter-commencement in opposition to Richard Hofstadter's official address at Columbia University in 1968.²⁸ As a consequence of these political activities, Fromm made many bitter enemies among the American foreign policy establishment.

Orwell's reputation was promoted by relatively conservative intellectuals with different politics while Fromm was rejected even by those who agreed with his radicalism. Orwell's image as an important intellectual was promoted by some of the central members of the "social circles" of the American intellectual elite.²⁹ Orwell was a hero to Lionel Trilling, Irving Howe, Alfred Kazen, Joseph Epstein and even Norman Podhoretz. Orwell's image as the "common man," the "rebel", the "prophet," and even the "saint" was created and diffused through the writings of New York intellectuals throughout the 1940s through the 1980s.³⁰ In contrast, for a variety of intellectual, personal and ideological reasons, Fromm was very unpopular with some of the most important of the New York intellectuals. Several examples will serve to illustrate the larger point.

The central figure within the American intellectual elite



during the period of Fromm's decline was the literary intellectual Lionel Trilling. In addition to being the most important sponsor of young intellectuals into the informal "social circles" of the intellectual elite, Trilling was a supporter of orthodox psychoanalysis as a tool for literary criticism. Freud's sense of tragedy, focus on sex and the "death instinct," literary flair and emerging cultural capital made him a perfect foil for literary critics looking for a new canonical thinker.

The roots of Trilling's interest in Freud can be traced to his years in the 1930s as a young intellectual and English teacher who was once let go from Columbia University for being a "Freudian, a Marxist and a Jew."³¹ Trilling had entered debates about Freudian revisionism in the late 1940s, when in the course of a review of Theodore Reik's The Psychology of Sex Relations he had attacked both Reik and Horney for their alleged disdain for biology. Trilling regularly reviewed books on psychoanalysis for the Sunday New York Times Book Review, always defending Freud from his critics.³² By the 1950s, Lionel Trilling became, as Marc Krupnick puts it, "an orthodox Freudian in an age of psychoanalytic revisionism," championing Freud's ideas against the "American dilution" represented by neo-Freudianism.

Orthodox Freudians were pleased to have an intellectual of Trilling's emerging stature taking their side against revisionism³³ and defending Freud's contribution to the humanities in The Liberal Imagination (1950). In 1955 Trilling was given the honor of addressing the New York Psychoanalytic Society on the occasion of



the centenary of Freud's birth even though Trilling did not have the medical degree that was usually required for such a privilege. The lecture "Freud: Within and Beyond Culture" was a benchmark in the growing orthodox attacks on Fromm and other Neo-Freudians within the broader intellectual community in the middle of the 1950s.³⁴ When Trilling published his essay as Freud and the Crisis of our Culture (1955), the "voice of the liberal establishment" had, as Paul Robinson put it, pronounced Freud the "prime mover of modernism."³⁵

Trilling helped promote Freud's reputation (as well as his own) also by serving as a bridge to the book publishing industry, the educated general public and the academic humanities. The height of Trilling's relationship with the orthodox psychoanalytic world came with Trilling's glowing reviews of all three volumes of Ernest Jones's The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud in The New York Times Book Review in 1953 on the front page, in 1955 and then again in 1957.³⁶ Several years later, Trilling and his former student Steven Marcus edited an abridged edition of The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud (1961) for Basic Books. While Fromm was criticizing the idolization of Freud among American intellectuals in the 1950s, Trilling contributed to the development of an almost cult-like adoration of Freud among humanities scholars in the 1950s and early 1960s.³⁷ Freud, along with Orwell, had become Trilling's hero.³⁸

There was also a politics to Trilling's interest in psychoanalysis. Trilling can be seen as the major intellectual proponent of mainstream American liberalism in the 1950s as well as



an important, if reluctant precursor to modern neo-conservatives.³⁹ Freud was the perfect thinker for formerly left intellectuals in the process of moving to the right. Both Trilling and later Norman Podhoretz identified with Freud's stress on limits, human imperfection and the inevitable tragedy of life in contrast to the liberal and Marxist focus on human possibilities and the injustices of capitalist society. The irony of all this is that Trilling was drawn into the internal faction fighting of Freudianism just after he and several other New York intellectuals left the sectarian world of Marxist polemics. The ideas were different but the style was familiar.⁴⁰

No-where is the political function of attacks on Fromm more apparent than in the example of Daniel Bell. While Trilling attacked Fromm for leaving Freud, Bell dismissed him for staying with Marx. Fromm's Marx's Concept of Man (1961) contained the first major English translation (by British sociologist Tom Bottomore) of the Marx's 1844 philosophical manuscripts published in the United States. The book included an extended introductory essay where Fromm argued for the continuity of Marx's early and late writings. Arguing that communist scholars and anti-Marxists like Bell shared a common interest in ignoring the humanist roots of Marxism, Fromm suggested both had created the straw man of an "old" Marx who repudiates the "young." Fromm's defence of the humanistic perspective of the early Marx put him at odds with many anti-Marxist ex-socialists.

The consensus among contemporary scholars of Marx's writings



such as Anthony Giddens, David McLellan, Shlomo Avineri and Leszek Kolakowski is that there is a basic continuity in Marx's thought despite a major shift in emphasis in the later economic works. When Althusserianism gained prominence in the 1970s, Marxist scholars became preoccupied with finding a "middle ground" between Althusser's anti-humanist interpretation and Fromm's stress on the centrality of the manuscripts. Again Fromm was caught in political cross-fire. Bell attacked what he viewed as the fiction of a humanist Marx,⁴¹ ignoring Fromm's balanced criticisms and discussion of Marx's personal behavior, political practice and later works in The Sane Society (1955). Althusserians and Moscow agreed.

Fromm could not count on his fellow non-communist radicals to rise to his defense. While Orwell's reputation among elite intellectuals was largely created in the social circles around such opinion journals as Commentary, Partisan Review and The New Republic, the independent socialist magazine Dissent played an important role in the delegitimization of Fromm's ideas. Between the summer of 1955 and the winter of 1956, Dissent published a bitter debate between Fromm and his former Frankfurt School colleague Herbert Marcuse. Marcuse attacked Fromm's criticisms of Freudian theory, arguing that neo-Freudian revisionism led to simplistic and conformist politics. Although Marcuse's argument was weak in retrospect, the charge stuck and Fromm became known in Dissent circles as the "Norman Vincent Peale of the left." And on the eve of the 1960s, Dissent editor and literary critic Irving



Howe had a bitter falling out with Fromm over matters concerning the internal politics of the American Socialist Party. Fromm was now isolated from the Dissent network, the natural home for his moderate democratic socialist politics.⁴²

Fromm's writings helped create the political radicalism of the 1960s, but the New Left ironically played a central role in Fromm's reputational demise. The free-lance writer and anarchist Paul Goodman, for example, had long been dismissive of Fromm's version of Freudian theory, having published a scathing attack on Escape from Freedom in Dwight McDonald's short-lived magazine Politics. Goodman was an ardent Reichian and thus took issue with Fromm's sharp criticism of Freudian libido theory, suggesting that "every part of this general indictment is either wrong or absurd." After it had been rejected by 19 publishers, Goodman's Growing up Absurd was serialized in 1960 by Norman Podhoretz during his radical phase as editor of Commentary. When Goodman then became famous in the 1960s as a proponent of sexual liberation and student rebellion, Fromm's isolation among the left grew. Sociologist Edgar Friedenberg was a more moderate proponent of adolescent rebellion but he also was skeptical of Fromm's version of Freud, arguing against revisionism in a full-length article in Commentary. And Franz Fanon's angry psychological radicalism was part of the "days of rage" that made Fromm pale in comparison.⁴³

The emerging counterculture in the middle of the 1960s further damaged Fromm's reputation. The rise of the counterculture and the sponsorship of Lionel Trilling and Norman Podhoretz



catapulted the classicist Norman O. Brown to fame, and his once neglected Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History (1959) contributed to the growing consensus that Freudian revisionism was an intellectual disaster.⁴⁴ Brown offered the counterculture a politics of Dionysian frenzy and mystical union with the universe, a major precursor to the contemporary post-modern obsession with the body and universal abandon. Fromm's socialist humanism could hardly compete in that market place of ideas.

As the decade went on, Fromm was caught in a no-man's land in the cultural wars of the 1960s, being neither a liberal centrist nor a New Left radical. When Marcuse and Brown became famous as the "gurus" of the 60s movements, a New Left orthodoxy was created and institutionalized. By the late 1960s, Fromm was seen by young radicals as a compromised liberal, while conservatives and many liberals continued to see him as the dangerous enemy of all authority.

The emergence of intellectual feminism in the 1970s further isolated Fromm while barely damaging Orwell's reputation.⁴⁵ While feminists in the 1920s had been attracted to psychoanalysis, the feminism that emerged in the early 1960s was hostile to Freud because of his sexism and biological determinism. From Betty Freiden to Gloria Steinem, Fromm's Freudianism would leave him out in the cold. By the 1970s, however, many feminist intellectuals would use depth psychology to gain insight into the psychological roots of woman's oppression. Psychoanalytic feminist scholars after



the 1960s picked up hostility to Fromm from orthodox Freudian and Kleinian institutes as well as the cultural analysis of the Frankfurt School or Norman O. Brown. Sometimes Fromm simply fell through the generational cracks.⁴⁶ As feminist scholars took a French influenced linguistic turn in the 1980s they tended to ignore older versions of cultural psychoanalysis --- Lacanians were particularly disdainful of Freudian revisionism.⁴⁷ For these reasons even Karen Horney is only now being re-discovered as a "mother of psychoanalysis."⁴⁸ Fromm's work was dismissed by feminist psychoanalysts largely without being read carefully.

Enemies and Allies

The dramatic differences between the reception in America of the work of Fromm, Derrida and Orwell have more to do with the dynamics of intellectual coalitions than the quality of ideas. Derrida, according to Michele Lamont, was successful in managing his image and putting together a network of promoters that were able to build "deconstruction" as an influential school of thought. John Rodden emphasizes how Orwell's fame and reputation was constructed by a combination of media events leading up to and during the year 1984 as well by the efforts of several well-connected elite public intellectuals.

In contrast, Fromm's insistence on challenging Marxist, Freudian, sociological and political orthodoxies simultaneously seriously damaged his ability to forge coalitions in support of his work. Many Freudians, therapists and intellectuals who agreed with Fromm's revisions of psychoanalysis disliked his radicalism. Many



revisionist Marxists either found Fromm's commitment to psychoanalysis unconvincing or were influenced by Freudian orthodoxy.⁴⁹ Most sociologists disagreed with Fromm's critique of positivism (Fromm was a premature post-positivist) and rejected his relative lack of systematic empirical research evidence. The very marginality that allowed Fromm to "escape from orthodoxy" also made it difficult for him to refine his perspective in ways that met established intellectual norms and standards within academic disciplines. Fromm's clear writing and popular success also tended to lose him prestige among academic social scientists. And the readers of social criticism increasingly found Fromm too conservative or too radical, too Freudian or not Freudian enough.

Where Orwell's image as an important and courageous social critic tended to unify diverse political currents around his reputation, Fromm's unorthodox Freudian and Marxist ideas continually made him enemies. Everyone seemed to agree that Fromm's revision of orthodox Freudian and Marxist theory was simple minded and led to bad politics. They could not all be right because they said contradictory things. But nonetheless, throughout the 1970s and 1980s the view of Fromm as a simplistic popularizer was institutionalized as a cliché among American intellectuals.⁵⁰

Unlike Derrida and Orwell, Fromm was largely isolated by the late 1970s. There were numerous intellectuals who had been influenced by Fromm over the years, but for sociological reasons none of them had an institutional, ideological or career interest in promoting Fromm or defending him from critics.⁵¹ Fromm's only



major supporter among the American intellectual elite is the exception that proves the rule. In the early 1940s, Fromm had been the therapist for a young man named David Riesman, a lawyer who would go on to make major contributions as a sociologist and public intellectual. Riesman had gone to Fromm for psychoanalysis at the suggestion of his mother's therapist Karen Horney. While the formal analysis was very brief, unconventional and not particularly successful (at least according to Riesman), it was the beginning of a longstanding intellectual relationship and friendship. Fromm helped introduce Riesman to the European intellectual tradition, particularly Marx and Freud. In the 1940s and 1950s, Fromm was widely known as one of Riesman's mentors.

The publication of The Lonely Crowd (1950) played an important role in diffusing a creative modification and adaption of Fromm's ideas in America. The fame and influence that The Lonely Crowd had created allowed Riesman to build a successful career as a sociologist, expert on undergraduate education and powerful intellectual in the corridors of the American establishment. Riesman was not, however, well positioned to promote Fromm's ideas. Although Riesman wrote about Freud he was not trained as a psychoanalyst and was himself relatively marginal to mainstream sociology as well as to the networks of the New York intellectuals. In addition, Riesman had little reason to associate himself with Fromm's increasingly radical politics.⁵²

While the writings of Derrida and Orwell tended to create followers within institutional settings appropriate to their work,



Fromm's greatest appeal was to intellectuals who crossed disciplinary boundaries and were relatively marginal to the very institutions that maintain reputations. Fromm's work and example had an influence on such intellectuals as the psychologists Abraham Maslow and Rollo May, the social anthropologists Ernest Becker and Edward Hall, the social critics Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich and David Riesman's former student Michael Maccoby. These intellectuals all gained their influence by writing popular books while being relatively marginal to major academic institutions, disciplines, and psychoanalytic institutes as well as to the social circles of the American intellectual elite.⁵³

Thus by the last decade of his life, Fromm had a wide popular audience and numerous "weak" ties to important intellectuals. But he had no institutional base outside of Mexico where he had founded the national psychoanalytic institute. Since Fromm lived and worked in Mexico and commuted to American universities throughout the 1950s and 1960s, he was no longer as intimately networked with important intellectuals as he had been at the height of his career.

Dogmatic Freudians and Marxists were thus able to successfully delegitimize Fromm's work in the specific historical context of the late 1960s and 1970s. Many of the insights that Fromm pioneered entered Freudianism, Marxism, the social sciences and social criticism indirectly through Fromm's influence or they followed a parallel independent path from internal dissidents and innovators within these schools of thought, academic disciplines and networks of intellectuals. Within contemporary psychoanalysis, the cutting



edge ideas stress interpersonal dynamics and object relations not instincts, ideas Fromm played a major role in developing along with Horney and Sullivan. Numerous contemporary Marxists now emphasize culture, morality, a critique of consumerism, communitarianism and the value of the utopian radical tradition alongside the traditional Marxist stress on workplace conflicts and the power of capital. Within academic social science, Fromm was an early pioneer of what sociologists now call the "sociology of emotions."⁵⁴ The "culture and personality" tradition is returning to fashion in a more sophisticated form as the global economy gives rise to more cross-cultural comparative research.⁵⁵ And social critics continue to write about the cultural and personality dynamics of modernity, echoing many of the themes that Fromm raised decades previous.⁵⁶

It is striking that Fromm's reputation declined dramatically while many of his ideas as well as similar perspectives were developed, modified and refined within the appropriate institutional settings. Using Robert Merton's phrase, Fromm was "obliterated by incorporation." By the 1970s, Fromm was a psychoanalyst without a school, a sociological theorist excluded from all canons and a social critic marginal to the major intellectual movements of the day.

Escape from Orthodoxy

Fromm's reputational history in America is an unfinished story for there is a revival of interest in his work for a combination of macro-historical, micro-individual and organizational reasons. The rise of nationalism and neo-fascism, the collapse of many of our



old intellectual paradigms, interdisciplinary and post-positivist trends within academic social science and the efforts of a small group of followers have created a new openness to Fromm's work within psychoanalysis, neo-Marxism, social science and public intellectual life.⁵⁷

The major interest in Fromm's work will come from unorthodox psychoanalysts. Psychoanalysis has suffered many serious setbacks to its stature and institutional health in the last several years. The factional and doctrinal conflicts that isolated Fromm are no longer relevant. Fromm's sophisticated but critical defence of Freud's legacy is useful to intellectuals caught between rampant Freud bashers and dogmatic defenders of the faith.⁵⁸

Contemporary critical theorists are the second major source of renewed interest in Fromm's theory. Fromm is being re-canonized within the network of thinkers associated with the Frankfurt School for Social Research. The ardor of the New Left generation has cooled. Fromm's work is finding an audience among those interested in moving beyond Marxist orthodoxies while maintaining the best insights of the tradition. Fromm is likely to return to canonized status within the history of the New Left and 20th century Marxism more generally.⁵⁹

While Fromm's work runs against the grain of the specializing quantitative academic sociology today, his concern with the synthetic theory, multi-level analysis, a post-positivism philosophical foundation, sociology of emotions, character and the social origins of nationalism fit well within cutting edge social



theory.⁶⁰ And as many academic social scientists are tiring of the narrow perspectives that flow from the dual processes of professionalization and specialization, Fromm's example as an interdisciplinary public intellectual is again becoming relevant.

The final irony of Fromm's career is that efforts to build on his insights will ultimately be unsuccessful if he is canonized as an important thinker within one school of thought. Within psychoanalysis, Fromm was profoundly perceptive about human motivation yet his isolation from ongoing engagement with the theories and clinical work of peers meant that his work never fully developed beyond an insightful critique of Freudian orthodoxy. And Fromm was too quick to let his political vision influence his clinical work and psychoanalytic theories.⁶¹ Bringing Fromm back into the psychoanalytic institutes will also make his work less sociologically interesting. One of Fromm's most important contributions was stressing the links between emotions and larger sociological and historical factors outside of early childhood. This is an insight that psychoanalytic institutes are not well equipped to develop.

Academic social science, not psychoanalysis, is where the potential lies for a sophisticated sociology of emotions. Fromm was successful in laying out an ambitious intellectual agenda for an empirically based psychologically sophisticated theory of the human actor's relationship to culture, history and society. Fromm was ahead of time in his insistence of the importance of a multi-method social science that synthesizes diverse theoretical traditions in



ways that bridge the gap between micro and macro levels of analysis. And Fromm's The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness (1973) was a serious attempt at the end of his life to combine psychoanalytic insights with knowledge from the biological sciences, anthropology and historical sociology.⁶²

The rigor of Fromm's social science suffered, however, from his position on the margins of the academy. Paradoxically Fromm's empirical orientation ultimately isolated him from the emerging post-positivist work in philosophy. But Fromm only touched the surface of the empirical research that would be required to make a persuasive case for his theories within mainstream social science. Canonizing Fromm within the tradition of the Frankfurt School would reinforce his tendency for over-generalizations about modern societies and relative neglect of ethnographic methods and concrete empirical sociological analysis.

Even Fromm's work as a social critic suffered from his sociological position. Although Fromm's analysis of how market culture and modern individualism corrodes morality and community remains powerful, there was a lack of balance in his account of modernity and a certain heavy handedness in the style of his writings. These limitations flowed from the fact that Fromm produced his work largely on his own. In retrospect, Fromm's traditionalist up-bringing and the shadow of Hitler so overwhelmed Fromm's vision that he glossed over too many of the positive aspects of liberal capitalist industrial societies. Fromm's distance from American culture allowed him to resist the uncritical



cheer-leading for American society so popular in the 1950s. Yet Fromm's analysis would have benefitted from regular intellectual engagement with networks of social critics more rooted in the society they criticize.⁶³

Fromm offered the vision of a multi-disciplinary social science that engaged the most pressing issue of the day within a sophisticated historical and sociological context. He drew on some of the most important insights of Freud, Marx and sociology while refusing to defend the dogmas inevitable in a school of thought or an academic discipline. This "escape from orthodoxy" simply cannot be institutionalized without destroying it. Building on Fromm's legacy requires letting his work go.

Marginality and Insight

Intellectuals tied to institutions or disciplines for career or ideological reasons cannot break out of what Veblen called "trained incapacities." Fromm's relative marginality allowed him to point in productive directions in several distinct but related debates within Freudian theory, Marxism, academic sociology and anthropology as well as American politics.

Yet the answer to this dilemma can hardly be a rejection of organized institutions of intellectual production or a romanticization of silenced voices. Fromm's work was flawed by his lack of the ongoing exchange of ideas and the refinement of methods and perspectives possible only within institutions such as academic disciplines, psychoanalytic schools and political journals. Moreover, challenges to theoretical systems tend to



institutionalize into new limiting orthodoxies as in Lacanian psychoanalysis, the Frankfurt School of Marxism or the extreme versions of ethnomethodology in American sociology. And interdisciplinary perspectives produce "post-modern" and "cultural studies" dogma as much as new insight.

There is no single solution to this dilemma. But further research may be able to identify sociological factors that facilitate challenges to orthodoxies within the "cracks" of existing institutions. Academic disciplines and established schools of thought are essential for developing rigorous training and preserving theoretical continuity. Yet over the last 30 years, some of the most exciting and productive ideas have come from such social, political and intellectual movements as feminism, the New Left, psychoanalysis, Marxism and existentialism. Attempts to fully politicize academic thought degrades both scholarship and politics. Scholars influenced by social and intellectual movements must seriously engage the dominant traditions within the academy or they produce marginal "sects" not new knowledge. Yet there may be an "optimal marginality" that allows creative thinkers to gain from the insights of established traditions while transcending received dogmas that are institutionally enforced as well as hidden.



1. Charles Camic, "Reputation and Predecessor Selection: Parsons and the Institutionalists," American Sociological Review (1992, Volume 57, Number 4, August) and Gaye Tuchman with Nina Fortin, Edging Women Out: Victorian Novelists, Publishers and Social Change, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).

2. My manuscript entitled Escape From Orthodoxy: The Rise and Fall of Erich Fromm marshals citation data documenting that Fromm's intellectual reputation declined relative to a systematically selected sample of the major public intellectuals in sociology, anthropology and psychology from the 1950s (for example, C. Wright Mills, Erik Erikson, Margaret Mead, Bruno Bettelheim and David Riesman).

3. This article will draw on and develop the reputational models outlined in Michele Lamont's American Journal of Sociology article "How to Become a Dominant French Philosopher: The Case of Jacques Derrida" and John Rodden's book The Politics of Literary Reputations: The Making and Claiming of "Saint" George Orwell (1989). Ideally one should systematically select intellectuals for comparative purposes although this is seldom done in the literature. Derrida and Orwell (philosophers and literary intellectuals/essayists respectively) are discussed for heuristic purposes because there is good sociological work on their reception.

4. Robert Alford and Roger Friedland, The Powers of Theory: Capitalism, the State and Democracy, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

5. For a critique of this consensus and a compelling alternative account of the rise of Nazism see Richard Hamilton's The Social Misconstruction of Reality (forthcoming Yale University Press). Hamilton argues that there is little evidence for a lower-middle class affinity to Nazism, particularly in urban areas. According to Hamilton's data rural Protestants were the single most important social strata voting for the Nazi party. This can be explained by an organizational model that views Hitler's movement as right-wing ex-military cadre who were able to gain access to potential followers in places with the least organizational resistance. Unions and left parties in the cities and the Catholic Church in the countryside complicated the Nazi mobilization while rural Protestants and the anti-left upper-middle class were the obvious source of potential recruits. For a somewhat different view see Manfred Kuechler, "The NSDAP Vote in the Weimar Republic: An Assessment of the State-of-the-Art in View of Modern Electoral Research," Historical Social Research, (1992, 61:17, pp.22-52).



6. Fromm's work in the 1950s was generally well received among religious thinkers. Fromm was an orthodox Jew until his middle twenties and much of Fromm's early work was concerned with the historical sociology of religion. Fromm's writings were infused by religious themes and appeals despite the fact that he had left religious practice in the 1920s (see Michael Maccoby, "The Two Voices of Erich Fromm, Society, July/August 1995). Paul Tillich reviewed two of Fromm's 1950s era books for Pastoral Psychology. Tillich gave Psychoanalysis and Religion (1950) a positive review and described The Sane Society (a Pastoral Psychology book of the month selection) as a fascinating and profound analysis of modern alienation that is flawed largely by its lack of grounding in a supernatural power that transcends the ideals of love and justice. Fromm did not believe in God. Yet Dan Hausdorf has pointed out that The Art of Loving was a "deeply religious" book that received rave reviews in the liberal Catholic Commonweal and from Rabbi Jakob J. Petuchowski in Commentary (Dan Hausdorf, Erich Fromm, (New York: Twayne, 1972). Fromm tended to be less well received among Protestant theologians because after Escape from Freedom he emphasized authoritarian the aspects of Lutheran and Calvinist doctrines.

7. Barbara Lenkerd, Meanings and Motivations at Work, (Ph.D. dissertation, Anthropology, Catholic University of America, 1994).

8. Parsons read Fromm as part of his interest in integrating Freud into sociology. See Uta Gerhardt, Talcott Parsons on National Socialism, (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1993). Merton discussed Escape from Freedom extensively in his late 1940s lecture course at Columbia "Social Theory and Social Structure." According to Richard Hamilton, Merton used Fromm's work as an example of an important work that was able to emphasize the linkage between social structure and social psychology (personal communication with Hamilton). Fromm had an early influence on many other sociologists including David Riesman, Alex Inkeles, Dennis Wrong and Rose Coser. Somewhat later, Fromm's The Sane Society was an important influence on Robert Blauner's Alienation and Freedom (1964) and the later sociological literature on workplace alienation. See Joachim Isreal, Alienation: From Marx to Modern Sociology, (New York: Humanities Press, 1979).

9. After Escape from Freedom's phenomenal success, American sociologists were concerned with establishing the intellectual boundaries between what Fromm was doing and the mainstream discipline of sociology. Louis Wirth wrote a blistering review of Escape from Freedom in Psychiatry, attacking Fromm's "cosmic" thesis, "ambiguous terms," and "predilection to play with riddles and anomalies." Arnold Green wrote a full length critique of Horney and Fromm in the The American Journal of Sociology in 1944.



10. Nicholas Mullins, Theory and Theory Groups in Contemporary Sociology, (New York: Harper and Row, 1973) and Alex Inkeles, "Sociology and Psychology," in Psychology: A Study of a Science, edited by Sigmund Koch, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963).

11. In the United States, Fromm taught at the New School for Social Research, Bennington College, Michigan State University and New York University.

12. When Escape from Freedom was published it was reviewed glowingly by some of the major intellectuals of the day including Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Dwight Macdonald and Ashley Montagu. Fromm's success was aided by the fact that Fromm had known Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict from his participation in the Zodiac Club, an informal network of influential and soon to be influential intellectuals organized by the American psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan.

13. William Buxton and Stephen Turner, "From Education to Expertise: Sociology as a "Profession," in Sociology and Its Publics: The Forms and Fates of Disciplinary Organization, edited by Terence C. Halliday and Morris Janowitz, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987, pp. 373-406).

14. Fromm was closer to Mills in politics and style than he was to functionalism. Mills, however, preferred Weber and George Herbert Mead to Marx and Freud. Fromm's interest in the "self" was similar to the work of George Herbert Mead. But Fromm, like Dennis Wrong many years later, would reject the overly cognitive orientation of mainstream symbolic interactionism. See Dennis Wrong, "The Oversocialized Conception of Man," American Sociological Review, (1961, 26:183-193) and The Problem of Order: What Unites and Divides Society, (Ill.: Free Press, 1994). Moreover, Fromm would surely have unfairly seen Goffman's analysis of "image management" simply as a complacent description of behavior in an alienated society. While Fromm would share some of ethnomethodology's critique of positivism, his work was more psychological than linguistic and dealt with history and politics, not everyday life. Fromm would agree with George Homans' critique of structural sociology's neglect of psychological theory. Fromm's assumptions about human motivation, however, conflicted with Homans' sociological behaviorism as well as with contemporary rational choice theory. Homans viewed Freud as an overrated thinker while Daniel Burston has documented that Fromm saw himself as a Freudian.

15. Abram Kardiner, My Analysis with Freud, (New York: Norton, 1977) and Abram Kardiner and Edward Preble, They Studied Man, (Cleveland, World Publishing Company, 1961).



16. Fromm attacked behaviorism in Escape from Freedom (1941) and developed an extensive critique of Skinner in Anatomy of Human Destructiveness (1973). The feeling was mutual. In Skinner's autobiography he tells an amusing story of the time that Fromm was a "guest for a day" at Harvard in the late 1950s. Skinner had been annoyed by what he regarded as Fromm's over-generalizations, asserting that Fromm "proved to have something to say about almost everything, but with little enlightenment." But Skinner got angry when Fromm, looking at him from across the seminar table, said that people were not pigeons. Skinner decided that "something had to be done" and claims that he operationally conditioned a frantic hand chopping motion that made Fromm's watch almost slip off his wrist.

17. Fromm and Horney had been lovers and their relationship broke up bitterly. See Bernard Paris, Karen Horney: A Psychoanalyst's Search for Self Understanding, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) as well as Susan Quinn, A Mind of Her Own, (New York: Summit Books). Horney also seems to have been jealous of Fromm's success with Escape from Freedom. In addition, the fact that Fromm did not have a medical degree made him a liability for professional psychoanalysts like Horney. Sullivan and Fromm were never close and Fromm's criticisms of what he saw as the politically conformist implications of Sullivan's writings caused a stir in the William Alanson White Institute and the Washington School of Psychiatry, the institutional homes for neo-Freudians.

18. Russell Jacoby, The Last Intellectuals, (New York: Basic, 1987).

19. Daniel Burston, The Legacy of Erich Fromm, (Cambridge: Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1991); Jay Greenberg and Stephen Mitchell, Object Relations in Psychoanalytic Theory, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983); Mauricio Cortina and Michael Maccoby, "The Neglect of Fromm's Contributions to Psychoanalysis" and Paul Roazen "Erich Fromm's Courage," both forthcoming in Cortina and Maccoby (editors) A Prophetic Analyst: Erich Fromm's Contributions to Psychoanalysis.

20. Lewis Coser, Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View, (New York: Free Press, 1965).

21. Nathan Hale, The Rise and Crisis of Psychoanalysis in the United States: Freud and the Americans, 1917-1985, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995) and Paul Roazen, Freud and His Followers, (New York: Knopf, 1974).



22. V.I. Dobrenkov, Neo-Freudians in Search of Truth, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976).

23. Florian Znaniecki, The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge, (New York: Octagon Books, 1965).

24. On Lukacs see Martin Jay, Marxism and Totally: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukacs to Habermas, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984) For Erikson see Lewis Coser, Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experiences, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984) and Paul Roazen, Erik Erikson: The Power and Limits of a Vision, (New York: The Free Press, 1986). On Lacan, see Sherry Turkle, Psychoanalytic Politics: Freud's French Revolution, (New York: Guilford Press, 1992) and for Althusser see Ted Benton, The Rise and Fall of Structural Marxism: Althusser and His Influence, (London: Macmillan, 1984).

25. Richard Noll, The Jung Cult: Origins of a Charismatic Movement, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

26. Martin Jay, The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1973). Jay attempted to be fair to Fromm but his account is ultimately a version of the Frankfurt School colored by Horkheimer and Adorno. For more information about Fromm's centrality to the early Frankfurt School see Rolf Wiggershaus, The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories and Political Significance, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1986).

27. Steven Brint, In an Age of Experts, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

28. Hofstadter had replaced president Grayson Kirk in order to keep peace with SDS but the moderate Students for a Restructured University insisted on organizing a counter-commencement. For details see Michael Wreszin, A Rebel in Defense of Tradition: The Life and Politics of Dwight Macdonald, (New York: Basic Books, 1994).

29. Charles Kadushin, The American Intellectual Elite, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974).



30. Orwell was exactly the type of old fashioned, non-academic literary and politic intellectual that the New York intellectuals represented. They were running against the historical trend within the professionalizing academic humanities and thus had an interest in promoting and canonizing Orwell.

31. There is a personal subtext to the story, for Trilling was a troubled individual drawn to the insights of psychoanalysis for personal relief. Beginning in the early 1930s, Trilling went into psychoanalysis with several important orthodox Freudians, including Rudolph Loewenstein, a central figure in "ego psychology." Diana Trilling had been analyzed by Mariane Kris, the wife of the prominent analyst Ernest Kris. The Trillings were thus intimately networked with some of the most important figures in New York psychoanalysis, a bastion of orthodoxy. See Diana Trilling, The Beginning of the Journey, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1993).

32. Freud was, according to Trilling, the "pre-eminent among the modern theorists of the mind" while the "antagonists and modifiers of Freud's ideas" cannot "represent as adequately ... the stresses and pain of the soul." See Trilling's review of An Outline of Psychoanalysis, in The New York Times Book Review (Feb. 27, 1949). Trilling's review of Helen Walker Puner's Freud: His Life and Mind defends orthodox Freudians against her criticisms by suggesting that she "dislikes the masculine and heroic character." Trilling takes a swipe at Karen Horney although he does not mention Fromm despite the fact that he wrote an introduction to the Puner book. Fromm was beyond the pale within psychoanalysis and Trilling knew that his name was best left unmentioned. The third major revisionist, Harry Stack Sullivan, however, offers a "genteel version of Freud" according to Trilling (Dec. 14, 1947).

33. Trilling's analysis is another case that appears to have done more for Freud's intellectual reputation than for the patient's mental health, at least if Diana Trilling's account is accurate.

34. Also see Will Herberg, "Freud and the Revisionists," pp. 143-163 in (Freud and the 20th Century, edited by Benjamin Nelson, Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1957).

35. Paul Robinson, Freud and His Critics, (Berkeley: University of California, 1993).

36. Trilling begins his review, "It would be difficult to say too much in praise of this first of the three volumes of Ernest Jones' life of Sigmund Freud." Freud is, for Trilling, "one of the greatest figures of our epoch" who lived by "the inner light," "virtue" and "heroism." Trilling repeats the case that Jones builds against major Freudian revisionists, arguing in his review of the



third volume that both Rank and Ferenczi both "fell to extreme mental illness and they died insane." We now know that this is Freudian spin control, not historical fact. Trilling was a true believer. Paul Roazen has documented that Freud's family and inner circle played an important role in distorting the historical record by doctoring letters and manuscripts, a fact that calls into question Trilling's defence of the Jones work against the charge that it is an "official" biography. Taking no chance, Trilling calls the Puner work a "hostile" biography when it in fact laid out many of the issues that later scholars would develop. See Lionel Trilling, "The Adventurous Mind of Dr. Freud," The New York Times Book Review, (October 11, 1953), (September 1955) and "Suffering and Darkness Marked the Years of Triumph" The New York Times Book Review, (October 13 1957).

37. Fromm's Sigmund Freud's Mission (1959) criticized Jones' misleading accounts of the work and life of important dissident Freudian followers, drawing particular attention to Jones' attempt to discredit Otto Rank and Sandor Ferenczi. Trilling's introduction to the revised edition of the Jones' book ignored these and other criticisms, calling the work of revisionists "simplistic and extravagant" and asserting only now that Ferenczi "died insane" since the Rank charge was even more absurd. For some discussion of these issues, see Paul Roazen, "Erich Fromm's Courage," in Cortina and Maccoby (editors) A Prophetic Analyst: Erich Fromm's Contributions to Psychoanalysis, (forthcoming). For more reliable information on Rank and Ferenczi see Roazen's Freud and His Followers (1974). For the revised orthodox Freudian view see Peter Gay Freud: A Life for Our Times, (New York: Doubleday, 1988). Gay is his generation's Trilling.

38. See Philip French, Three Honest Men: Edmund Wilson, F. R. Leavis and Lionel Trilling, (Manshester, Carcanet Press, 1980); Morris Dickstein, Double Agent: The Critic and Society, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Mark Krupnick, Lionel Trilling and the Fate of Cultural Criticism, (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1986); as well as Diana Trillings' memoirs. One of Trilling's The New York Times Book Review essays on an intellectual biography of Freud was entitled "A Man of Heroic Mold."

39. Cornel West makes this point in The American Evasion of Philosophy, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989). Michael Wreszin calls Trilling the "preeminent master of deradicalization."

40. Norman Podhoretz, Breaking Ranks: a Political Memoir, (New York: Harper and Row, 1979).

41. Daniel Bell, "The Once and Future Marx," The American Journal of Sociology, (July, 1977). Bell attacked Fromm as a matter of "a personal point" in the course of this review essay on Michael



Harrington's The Twilight of Capitalism (1976). Bell was angry that Harrington had repeated Fromm's claim that Bell's "The Meaning of Alienation" had misquoted Marx. Bell was first puzzled why Fromm had quoted from the version from the Indian journal Thought instead of from the original version published in the Journal of Philosophy. Then Bell suggests that Fromm's claim is based on an error made by the Indian typesetters who "often think they know the English language better than those whose native language is English." And Bell is again puzzled why this "did not seem to occur to Fromm." From Bell's account, the conflict seemed to be personal in nature. Their different interpretations of Marx's theory of alienation involved more than this typing error, a misunderstanding that was hardly Fromm's responsibility and could easily have been cleared up with a letter. The obvious answer for why Fromm cited the version published in India is that this journal is where he saw the essay. It is a shame that the political conflicts of the 1930s and 1960s would so distort discussion between two very similar types of thinkers while general public intellectuals disappeared into the academic professions and both of them suffered from unfair polemics from the New Left.

42. Marcuse's attack on Fromm was first published as "The Social Implications of Freudian "Revisionism"" Dissent, Summer 1955 and later in Eros and Civilization (1955). Fromm's response was "The Human Implications of Instinctive Radicalism," Dissent Fall 1955. They both had rebuttals in the Winter 1956 issue. For a useful discussion similar to my perspective, see John Rickert, "The Fromm-Marcuse Debate Revisited," Theory and Society, (1986 15:3, pp. 351-400).

A version of Irving Howe's discussion of his conflict with Fromm is in his autobiography A Margin of Hope, (New York: Harcourt Brace and Jovanovich, 1982). There were personal and intellectual differences between Howe and Fromm but the major cause of the rift was Fromm's arrogance. Howe had initially been impressed with Escape from Freedom but later came to see it as unoriginal, preferring Hannah Arendt's militantly anti-psychological account of totalitarianism. Howe had taken an immediate dislike to Fromm when they first met and viewed The Art of Loving as sentimental. But Fromm provoked the rift by attempting to have a "manifesto" of his adopted as a party program for the American Socialist Party in the late 1950s. The essay would have made a good essay for Dissent since it touched on many of the themes of the early new left. But it was inappropriate as a party program and provoked ridicule among the Dissent network.

43. Paul Goodman, "The Political Meaning of Some Recent Revisions of Freud," Politics, (July 1945) and Edger Friedenberg, "Neo-Freudianism and Erich Fromm," Commentary XXXIV, (October, 1962). C. Wright Mills defended Fromm against Goodman's attack in Politics. See also Franz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth (1961). For the "days of rage" see Todd Gitlin, The Sixties: Years of Hope,



Days of Rage, (New York: Bantam Books, 1987).

44. Brown defended Freud against Karen Horney's charge of patriarchal bias and suggested that both Jung and Fromm offered a misguided "psychology of the autonomous soul." Brown claimed that Fromm and Horney had substituted a simplistic sociology for insight into the body.

45. It is was no accident that all of Orwell's major intellectual promoters were male since he served as John Rodden puts it an "inspirational gender model"

46. Jessica Benjamin, The Bonds of Love, (New York: Pantheon, 1988); Nancy Chodorow, The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978) and Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); Dorothy Dinnerstein, The Mermaid and the Minotaur, (New York: Harper and Row, 1976); and Lillian Rubin, Intimate Strangers, (New York: HarperCollins, 1983).

Benjamin's excellent book dismisses Fromm in one inaccurate paragraph. Benjamin cites only Escape from Freedom, claiming that Fromm's "emphasis on the avoidance of anxiety rather than on instinct" is problematic. When one reads Escape from Freedom one finds Fromm explicitly criticizing Karen Horney's stress on anxiety avoidance. Fromm's alternative to instinct theory stressed existential dread, fear of death and aloneness, and a human need to relate to others in a meaningful way. Benjamin and Fromm share a common concern with the problem of recognition.

Dorothy Dinnerstein claimed that Fromm was an optimist who offered a "cleaned up psychoanalytic framework" that ignored "gender arrangements" and the "untidy details of infancy." Fromm, in fact, had made his reputation by writing about the popular appeal of Fascism and later wrote extensively about human destructiveness. Far from ignoring "gender arrangements" Fromm's life-long interest in the flawed but provocative work of J.J. Bachofen meant that he always put issues of gender and the family at the center of his analysis. This was, in fact, one of the sources of his conflict with Horkheimer and Adorno. Dinnerstein and Benjamin disagree with Fromm about the psychological importance of early childhood relative to later life events and their feminism was far more developed. But their discussion of Fromm's work is, I'm afraid, largely recycled Marcuse and Brown.

47. Juliet Mitchell's Psychoanalysis and Feminism: Freud, Reich, Laing and Women, (New York: Vintage, 1994) totally ignores Fromm as a Lacanian would.

48. Janet Sayers, The Mothers of Psychoanalysis: Helene Deutch, Karen Horney, Anna Freud and Meanie Klein, (New York: Norton, 1991) and Marcia Westkott, The Feminist Legacy of Karen Horney, (New



Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).

49. Sociologists like Parsons, Smelser, Slater, Weinstein, Platt or Chodorow who did integrate the Freudian perspective into their work tended to be drawn to psychoanalytic orthodoxy or more current revisionist perspectives like "object relations" despite Fromm's sociological sophistication. Parson's relationship with the orthodox Boston psychoanalytic institute is an important part of this story (Paul Roazen, Meeting Freud's Family, Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), a topic for another paper. For a contemporary work of social theory that ignores Fromm see Fred Alford, Melanie Klein and Critical Social Theory (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

50. Paul Robinson, The Freudian Left: Wilhelm Reich, Geza Roheim, Herbert Marcuse, (New York Harper and Row, 1969); Russell Jacoby, Social Amnesia: Conformist Psychology from Adler to Laing, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1975); Richard King, The Party of Eros: Radical Social Thought and the Realm of Freedom, (The University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1972); and Christopher Lasch, The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations, (New York: Norton, 1979).

51. Part of Fromm's problem was his tendency to get into personal conflicts with important intellectuals. But this is not an adequate explanation, for one can think of numerous intellectuals who were difficult people but whose reputations have been maintained over the last 30 years: Sullivan, Lacan, Howe, Bell, Goffman and Margaret Mead.

52. Riesman and Fromm had worked together on the anti-nuclear movement of the 1950s, but once "ban the bomb" activities had been eclipsed by the Vietnam War their political differences became more salient. For example, Riesman had tried to talk Fromm out of speaking at the countercommencement at Columbia in 1968. While Riesman admired Fromm's psychoanalytic insight, he (along with Herbert Gans) was skeptical of Fromm's analysis of American society. Riesman was not a socialist or an institutional outsider, and preferred ethnographic detail and local particularities to the Frankfurt School style of broad generalizations. Moreover, since Riesman had political and intellectual ambitions of his own, he had no reason to defend Fromm from the many intellectual enemies he created for himself.

53. Abraham Maslow and Rollo May learned from Fromm but went on to found their own brand of humanistic psychology and existential psychoanalysis respectively. Fromm had very different political and



intellectual commitments and both Maslow and May distanced themselves from him in later years. Ernest Becker had been influenced by Fromm but increasingly became a Rankian, distancing himself from Fromm as he made his own reputation as a public intellectual with his best-selling The Denial of Death (1973). Edward Hall taught with Fromm at Bennington College and he himself was a popular writer on the margins of the academy. Radical educators Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich had both been friends with and learned much from Fromm before they had each become famous along with the New Left upsurge during the 1960s and 1970s. Both Freire's critique of the "banking" model of education and Illich proposals to "deschool" society were influenced by Fromm's critique of modern educational institutions. Fromm became close friends with Freire and especially Illich throughout his years in Mexico. Maccoby had been mentored in social science by David Riesman and he learned psychoanalysis from Fromm in Mexico while working on what would be their co-authored book Social Character in A Mexican Village (1970). Maccoby later became a management consultant and writer. See Edward Hoffman, The Right to be Human: A Biography of Abraham Maslow, (Los Angeles: J.P. Torcher, 1988); Richard Lowry (editor), The Journals of Abraham Maslow, (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1979); Daniel Burston's The Legacy of Erich Fromm, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991); Edward Hall An Anthropology of Everyday Life, (New York: Doubleday, 1994); and Ernest Becker, The Birth and Death of Meaning, (New York: Free Press, 1962).

54. Fromm discusses what he terms the "commercialization of friendliness," in Escape from Freedom (1941) arguing that family socialization, public education and later peer social pressure brings about a situation where,

If you do not smile you are judged lacking in a "pleasing personality" -- and you need to have a pleasing personality if you want to sell your services, whether as a waitress, a salesman, or a physician. Only those at the bottom of the social pyramid, who sell nothing but their physical labor, and those at the very top do not need to be particularly "pleasing." Friendliness, cheerfulness, and everything that a smile is supposed to express, become automatic responses which one turns on and off like an electric switch. (pp. 268-69)

Fromm had spelled out an intellectual agenda that would be developed more empirically decades later by Hochschild and Ritzer. Yet Fromm's place in the sociology of emotions literature has been inadequately recognized.

55. Ronald Inglehart, Culture Shift, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990) and Seymour Martin Lipset, Continental Divide: The Values and the Institutions of the United States and

Canada, (New York: Routledge, 1990).

56. Robert Bellah, Richard Madsen, William Sullivan, Ann Swidler and Steven Tipton, Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985); Lynn Chancer, Sadomasochism in Everyday Life: The Dynamics of Power and Powerlessness, (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1993); Philip Cushman, Constructing the Self, Constructing America, (Reading Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1995); Christopher Lasch, The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations, (New York: Norton, 1979); Cornel West, Race Matters, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993); Alan Wolfe, Whose Keeper?: Social Science and Moral Obligation, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); Philip Selznick, The Moral Commonwealth, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); and Dennis Wrong, The Problem of Order: What Unites and Divides Society, (Ill.: Free Press, 1994).

57. Rainer Funk, Erich Fromm: The Courage to be Human, (New York: Continuum, 1982). Funk is Fromm's German literary executor and has been responsible for numerous recent books by Fromm based on previously unpublished manuscripts both in Germany and in English speaking countries. See The Erich Fromm Reader (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1994) with a forward by Joel Kovel as well as The Art of Being, (New York: Continuum, 1992) and The Revision of Psychoanalysis (Boulder: Westview Press, 1992).

58. See the collection of essays in Mauricio Cortina and Michael Maccoby (editors) A Prophetic Analyst: Erich Fromm's Contributions to Psychoanalysis (Jason Aronson: New Jersey 1996).

59. Douglas Kellner, Critical Theory, Marxism and Modernity, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1989); Steven Eric Bronner, Of Critical Theory and its Theorists, (London: Blackwell, 1994) and Andrew Jamison and Ron Eyerman, Seeds of the Sixties (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); Richard Quinney, "Socialist Humanism and the problem of crime: Thinking about Erich Fromm in the development of critical/peacemaking criminology," Crime, Law and Social Change, (23 1995). Also see forthcoming work by Kevin Anderson.

60. Craig Calhoun, (editor), Social Theory and the Politics of Identity. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994); Thomas Scheff, Microsociology: Discourse, Emotion and Social Structure, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990); and Anthony Giddens, The Constitution of Society, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).



61. Michael Maccoby, "The Two Voices of Erich Fromm: The Analytic and the Prophetic," Society August 1995; Paul Lippman, "The Greatness and the Limitations of Fromm's Thought," in Cortina and Maccoby A Prophetic Analyst: Erich Fromm's Contributions to Psychoanalysis, New Jersey: Jason Aronson, 1996.

62. For a useful discussion in light of contemporary psychoanalytic theory as well as the work of Stephen Jay Gould, see Mauricio Cortina, "Sigmund Freud's Instinctivism and Erich Fromm's Existential Humanism," in Cortina and Maccoby (editors) A Prophetic Analyst: Erich Fromm's Contributions to Psychoanalysis, (forthcoming)

63. Michael Walzer, The Company of Critics, (New York: Basic Books, 1988).

