

Fromm's Revival: What is to be Done?

Neil McLaughlin

Sociology, McMaster University

Address correspondence to Dr. Neil McLaughlin, Assistant Professor, Sociology, McMaster University, KTH 620, 1280 Main Street, Hamilton Ontario, Canada L8S 4M4. Email: nmclaugh@mcmaster.ca

Professor McLaughlin has published widely in the sociology of knowledge and intellectual history, sociological theory and the work of Erich Fromm. He is presently writing on the contributions and reputation of the American sociologist David Riesman, as well as undertaking a major research project on the Canadian Intellectual Elite. His most recent publications include "Critical Theory Meets America: Riesman, Fromm and *The Lonely Crowd*" forthcoming in *The American Sociologist* and "Revision from the Margins: Fromm's Contributions to Psychoanalysis" in the October 2000 issue of *The International Forum of Psychoanalysis*. He is working on a book entitled *Escape from Orthodoxy: The Rise and Fall of Erich Fromm*.

Fromm's Revival: What is to be Done?

Erich Fromm was once a forgotten intellectual, but all that is changing. The dominant intellectual currents and political realities of the 1970s and 1980s were not kind to the reputation of Fromm, who was once a prominent social scientist, psychoanalyst and social critic (Burston 1991; Cortina and Maccoby 1996; Funk 1982; McLaughlin 1998b; Richert 1986; Roazen 1990, 1996). While Fromm was central to undergraduate liberal arts and social science education throughout the 1940s, 1950s and early 1960s, especially in North America, he largely disappeared from the university curriculum after the social and political turmoil of the 1960s (Hausdorf 1972; McLaughlin 1998b; Roazen 2000). Fromm was a well-known and influential, if controversial, psychoanalyst during the peak of Freud's intellectual influence in America. Yet Fromm's influence among psychoanalysts declined even as his critique of Freudian theory and practice took on new relevance throughout the 1970s and 1980s within the institutions, organizations and networks devoted to depth psychology (Burston 1991; Cortina and Maccoby 1996; McLaughlin 1998a; Roazen 1974). Moreover, Fromm's reputation as a sophisticated public intellectual has declined dramatically over the last 25 years at the expense of such allegedly more hard-edged critical theorists as Adorno and Marcuse, and the post-modern and neo-conservative intellectuals who have dominated much of our public discourse over the last couple of decades (McLaughlin 1999).

The tide appears to be turning. Within sociology, for example, there is now

an enormous interest in the sociology of emotions, a perspective that is quite consistent with the critique of mainstream social science Fromm articulated in *Escape from Freedom* (1941) and *Man for Himself* (1947) (Hochschild 1983; Wrong 1994). A new feminist psychoanalytic sociology, a rediscovery of Fromm's criminological perspective, and a growing reassessment of the legacy and history of the critical theory of the Frankfurt School created small pockets of interest in Fromm's ideas within North American social science (Anderson and Quinney 2000; Benjamin 1988; Bronner 1994; Chancer 1992; Chodorow 1978, 1989). The prominent sociological theorist Stjepan Me_trovi③ has made a strong case for the ways in which both Fromm and his friend David Riesman prefigured the recent explosion of post-modern and critical theories. Me_trovi③ also points out that "Riesman is not typically read as a critical theorist" even though "Erich Fromm, a critical theorist, was Riesman's most important mentor" (Me_trovi③, 1997:43). And Me_trovi③ has recently built on Fromm's theory of social character to help illuminate recent violence in the Balkans (Me_trovi③ 1993). Moreover, there have been more panel discussions on Fromm's work at North America sociology meetings in recent years than during the height of his fame.

The case for Fromm's contribution within psychoanalysis is once again being made with force and vision. Paul Roazen's historical imagination and willingness to challenge Freudian orthodoxies has created space within the world of psychoanalysis for a new look at Fromm's legacy. Contrary to his Freudian detractors, Fromm was a psychoanalytic theorist of profound originality, a point powerfully articulated in Daniel Burston's *The Legacy of Erich Fromm* (1991).

Fromm's contributions to psychoanalysis are being developed in a number of recent events and conferences in New York City, Mexico City and across Europe, as well as in the on-going activities of scores of committed and thoughtful therapists, writers and theorists.

Finally, after decades of excessive specialization created by an academic revolution in modern universities, there appears to be a renewed interest in precisely the kind of public intellectual represented by Fromm's example (Jacoby 1987). In retrospect, Fromm's fame and influence as a social critic came at a unique time in the development of the modern intellectual. Economics, technology and culture has created a large market for sophisticated social criticisms throughout the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s that has been undermined by mass culture and the professionalization of academic life. Fromm's *Escape from Freedom* (1941) and *The Sane Society* (1955b) along with Michael Harrington's *The Other America* (1962), Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), Herbert Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man* (1964), David Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd* (1950) and Daniel Bell's *The End of Ideology* (1961) were examples of how a particular social structure of intellectual production from the 1940s to the 1970s created new hybrid forms of intellectual fame and influence. Each of these examples, and there were many more, were intellectuals on the margins or outside of academic discourse but who gained tremendous influence on the educated public through paper-back publishing, the rapid expansion of undergraduate education in universities and the influence of social movements such as the new left, social democracy, feminism, liberalism and neo-

conservatism. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, this type of public intellectual became unfashionable as academic disciplines professionalized and social critics became media spin-doctors with the expansion of TV political coverage and the P.R. intellectual culture (Ewen 1996).

Again, this tide is turning, at least to some extent. More and more professional academics and social scientists are becoming frustrated with the consequences of the hyper specialization and the fragmentation of knowledge created by the academic revolution of the 1950s and 1960s (Alford 1996). Universities and professors must justify the knowledge they produce to an increasingly skeptical public. And a new discourse about "public intellectuals" popularized most prominently by Russell Jacoby's *The Last Intellectuals* (1987) has created a new demand for social critics who write outside the boundaries of academic disciplines, taking sophisticated knowledge directly to the public through clear writing and non-technical analysis. Some of the specifics of Fromm's idea may, or may not, be outdated. But his example as a social critic and popular writer has never been more relevant to our intellectual life.

So what then is to be done with the Fromm revival that appears to *be* happening around us? The paradox is that now is the time to fight for Fromm's ideas but also to learn to let him go. No one has done more to preserve Fromm's psychoanalytic humanism than Rainer Funk (Funk 1982, 2000). The work of the Fromm Society is essential in efforts to expand the influence of Fromm's ideas. Keeping books in print, publishing previously unavailable texts, biographical and historical work, and conferences, archives and study groups are essential to

ensuring Fromm does not remain a forgotten intellectual. We must continue these efforts, while simultaneously resisting efforts to establish a Frommian school or orthodoxy. The paradox, of course, is Fromm's own enormous creativity came out of his sociological positioning on the margins of several important intellectual currents (McLaughlin 2000). Fromm was able to put together a creative and powerful synthesis of Marx, Freud, existentialism, Jewish prophetic thought and German modern sociology because he had deep roots and connections in these intellectual currents, without becoming committed to them as orthodoxies. Trying to create Frommian orthodoxies would destroy the power of Fromm's own insights. Yet ignoring the need for institution building will undermine our ability to preserve the ideas as part of a larger debate and dialogue going on in modern intellectual life. But institutions give rise to orthodoxies, a sociological tendency as close to a "law" as the social sciences are ever likely to develop. A tension we must learn to live with.

There is no easy answer to this dilemma. And the devil is in the balance, as much as in the details. But as part of the efforts to contribute to a revival of interest in Fromm's ideas and legacy, let me offer here three suggestions for what is to be done over the next couple of decades. First, I think there is much more work to be done in understanding the sociological and historical context and dynamics that created the particular creativity that we think of as Fromm's legacy. In particular, my concept of "optimal marginality" might be helpful in thinking about the sources of Fromm's unique insights (McLaughlin 2000). Second, we need to think in a disciplined way about the different "Fromms" that

scholars, therapists and intellectuals need to dialogue with in order to engage in debates within different and distinct spheres of intellectual activity. Attempts to identify the "true" Fromm are intellectually suspect, and will do damage to efforts to move a Fromm revival forward. Finally, we need to think in broad historical terms in order to have a vision for a legacy of Erich Fromm that we can argue for with clarity and purpose. How might we want a future intellectual historian looking back at Fromm's legacy, and how should this long-term perspective shape our intellectual work today? I will make the case for each of these points in turn, assuming a readership convinced of the value of a revival of interest in the legacy and ideas of Erich Fromm.

Revision From the Margins: Fromm's Optimal Marginality

A profound paradox emerges when one is drawn to ideas as creative and innovative as the ideas articulated by Erich Fromm. On the one hand, Fromm's work has inspired so many of us that it would be difficult to resist making him into an intellectual hero. As Paul Roazen has rightly emphasized, Fromm showed enormous courage in standing up to Freudian orthodoxy throughout the middle of the 20th century, while still maintaining a commitment to the core insights of the psychoanalytic tradition as he understood them (Roazen 1996). Moreover, Fromm's political activities against the nuclear arms race and the Vietnam War, for democratic socialism and in opposition to tyranny of both the left and right were undertaken with integrity. Fromm sustained real costs to his time, reputation and professional advancement because of his radical political commitments. Fromm was not simply a "tenured radical" but an active participant in movements

for social change even if his talents and personal inclinations did not lead him in that direction. Finally, Fromm's insistence on escaping from ALL intellectual orthodoxies represents a role model for intellectuals that is as inspiring as it is intellectually powerful. Fromm was, indeed, a first-rate intellectual and thinker, worthy of admiration.

At the same time, it would be a mistake to create a myth of Fromm as a great individual intellectual hero, thus ignoring the sociological factors that facilitated his creativity and will sustain new ideas in the future. A sociology of creativity does not deny the individual talent, insight, or the sacrifice that particular human beings bring to the process of intellectual production. At the same time, great ideas are not the product simply of individual genius and courage, but must be sustained by networks and organizations of intellectuals that span generations. Far from taking Fromm down a peg, this sociological perspective links him to the many known and unknown thinkers who influenced his thought, as well as to us today who are trying to maintain, preserve, expand, and develop his legacy. Creative ideas are developed within organizations and networks, and these networks create the heroes they need. The problem with intellectual heroes, of course, is that their creation often blocks and limits new ideas that have a living future not a glorious past. Moreover, focusing on individual genius can lead us to ignore the hard work of institution building that sustains the journals, institutes, societies, study groups and conferences that are central to passing on ideas and networks from the past as well as developing new insights that fit different times.

In order to contribute to both the Fromm revival and efforts to understand intellectual creativity, I have offered the sociological idea of "optimal marginality" (McLaughlin 2000). This sociological perspective is worth spelling out here. There is a long history, especially in the West, of seeing intellectual creativity as coming from the margins. Beginning with the Judeo-Christian imagery of religious inspiration coming from Jews on the margin of the Rome Empire as well as the example of Jesus, we are predisposed to seeing insight coming from the edges and margins of established power and institutions. This tendency has been reinforced with romantic inspired images of the poverty stricken artistic genius. This theme has been given social scientific status by generations of sociologists from Georg Simmel to Lewis Coser to recent post-modernists who have argued that marginality creates intellectual insight (Coser 1965, 1984; Galliher and Galliher 1995; Kauppi 1996; Lamont 1987; Simmel 1950). Recent trends among the political left have once again emphasized how insight comes from marginalized groups such as racial minorities, women, and the margins of the world economy (McCarthy 1996; Wolfe 1996).

Alongside this romantic tradition, historians, sociologists of ideas and Mertonian sociologists of science also have long understood that intellectual progress often depends on resources, organizations and networks linked to established and centrally located traditions of knowledge production (Collins 1998; Merton 1949, 1972; Turner and Turner 1990; Whitley 1984). Great ideas require resources. Governments, religious institutions, great universities and various schools of thought and intellectual traditions are vital to the sustaining of

intellectual projects. Moreover, we know that individuals we have come to call great thinkers are often linked to each other in networks of influence, mentoring and debate, conflict and dialogue (Collins 1998). Ideas are not created in a sociological vacuum, and some forms of marginality simply create more marginality not new insights

The question, it seems to me, is not whether marginality or centrality creates more powerful ideas. Better questions are: what kinds of marginality create insights? What types of marginality leads to marginalized ideas? When does centrality in organizations and networks block new ideas as links to established orthodoxies squash innovation? When can ties to core nations, organizations or networks bring resources and intellectual traditions that sustain creativity? A full answer to these questions would involve an interdisciplinary team of researchers looking at issues of how location in the world economic and political system, ties to major institutions and organizations, network connections and social and personal identities shape, sustain or block intellectual creativity. This project is well beyond the scope of this essay, but the case of Erich Fromm does suggest that there may be an "optimal marginality" that helps create intellectual innovation.

The readers of this volume will not need reminding of Fromm's intellectual contributions and enormous influence. Revisionist Freudians, critical theorists, radical humanists, green activists, Marxist philosophers and millions of general readers can attest to the scope of Fromm's insights and the power of his ideas. It would be easy to make the case that his creativity came from his location on

the margins of established intellectual institutions. A German Jewish Marxist, with an orthodox religious background, which he rejected, was exiled as he fled the Nazis. This young man refused to support communism, while maintaining links to the left. And he found psychoanalytic ideas powerful, while being disgusted at the rigidity of Freudian dogma. The result was a thinker who resisted all intellectual orthodoxies. A psychoanalyst, who refused to allow depth psychology and institutions to remain fixed in time. An innovative, thinker trying to prevent Freud's insights being overwhelmed by the limitations of 19th century positivism and the hero worship of its founder. A critical theorist, who insisted on retaining Marxist insights into alienation, economic inequality, injustice and the need for popular liberation movements while resisting communist authoritarianism, Frankfurt School elitism and the limitations of a theory that emphasizes the economy to the exclusion of psychology and culture. A profoundly religious thinker, who rejected the institutional authority of major established religions while retaining a spiritual perspective. A psychologist, who insisted on a sociological and historical humanist perspective, while rejecting the platitudes of humanistic psychology, the excessively technological perspective of modern "scientific psychology," and the narrowness of professional history and social science. Fromm was once a widely regarded intellectual figure central to 20th century intellectual history but was attacked and vilified for decades by defenders of various intellectual faiths (Burston 1991; McLaughlin 1998a). Fromm's courage does indeed provide almost a textbook case of how one becomes a "forgotten intellectual" (McLaughlin 1998b; Roazen 1996). It is easy

to see how Fromm's insights came from the margins.

Yet Fromm was also a thinker linked to central intellectual traditions, institutions and networks. It is true that mainstream history of 20th century psychoanalysis is likely to leave Fromm on its margins, despite Paul Roazen and Daniel Burston's first-rate historical research. The outlines of the orthodox position are clear. Fromm never met or worked with Freud directly, and never played a central role in core psychoanalytic institutes. And Fromm challenged too many "core" ideas of the psychoanalytic canon to be fully a Freudian. Yet Fromm did study at the famous Berlin Institute, and he had many personal, professional and intellectual connections to thinkers and therapists close to the center of the creativity forged in the excitement of the early years of the psychoanalytic movement. Fromm's relationship to the William Alanson White Institute provided him a link to the core psychoanalytic tradition. He was both marginal and central to the psychoanalytic tradition.

I have told the story elsewhere as to how Fromm was marginalized from the institutions and history of modern critical theory (McLaughlin 1999). At the same time, Fromm's Frankfurt School years and long-standing intellectual involvement in the Marxist and socialist movements linked him to the creativity that flowed from the intensely motivated followers of Marx and Engels. It is not an accident, I suggest, that Fromm's ideas were developed by someone with indirect and direct links to the great German idealist philosophical tradition and the sociology of Alfred Weber. Fromm's intellectual development was forged in the unique organizations that were late 19th century and early 20th century

German universities, a model of academic organization that created the modern research university and scores of powerful intellectual traditions (Collins 1998). Even when Fromm came to the United States as a political exile, he quickly developed institutional and networks connections to great universities such as Columbia, first-rate commercial publishing houses, and networks of such famous and influential intellectuals as Margaret Mead, Karen Horney and Harry Stack Sullivan (McLaughlin 1998a; Quinn 1987; Sayers 1991; Westkott 1986). Fromm created many of his ideas on the margins, but he was never marginalized.

It was Fromm's unique combination of marginality and centrality that helped facilitate the insights and passion that we have come to know as the Frommian tradition. If Fromm had been more centrally involved in Freudian institutes, the Marxist movement or elite German intellectual life, he might have never had the motivation or inclination to articulate powerful and straightforward critiques of each of these intellectual traditions. Yet we should not indulge in romantic illusions about the positive consequences of marginalization. If Fromm did not have tenure with the organization that we have come to call the Frankfurt School, he would have been under enormous pressure to give in to the pressures of orthodoxy within psychoanalysis (McLaughlin 1999). Fromm's ties in the 1930s to both Karen Horney and the American sociologist Robert Lynd at Columbia University were important elements in the creation of the well-known writer. Fromm soon would be able to make a living through book publishing, further isolating him from pressures that limited the creativity of less well-connected Freudians.

These dynamics played the other way. Fromm's psychoanalytic practice in New York and then in Mexico City was with well-healed and influential cultural and intellectual clients. This private practice gave him an independence from the orthodoxies of critical theory not available (at least until the 1970s) to such thinkers as Herbert Marcuse and Theodor Adorno. It is this dialectic between marginality and centrality that helps explain the importance of Fromm's Mexican years in the development of his thought (Millán and Gojman 1981, 2000). Mexico provided Fromm a free space away from the demands of Freudian orthodoxy, American academic and celebrity culture and the distorting lens that emerges from seeing the world only from the perspective of the core of the modern world system. And Fromm's socialist commitments were sustained by his connections to the Latin American left and links to anti-poverty efforts undertaken in Mexico. Yet Mexico City provided Fromm with opportunities to dialogue with world-class intellectuals and cultural workers, while contributing, in small ways, to the debates about alternative development (Silva-Garcia 1988). Fromm's marginality and his centrality worked hand in hand, and his courage emerged alongside these sociologically created options.

Finding the "Real" Fromm: A Sociology of Knowledge Perspective

If Fromm's creativity was forged from both the margins and centers of these different intellectual organizations and networks, where lies the "real" Erich Fromm? Is Fromm primarily a Freudian loyalist, set on defending and developing the core insights of the psychoanalytic tradition (Burston 1991; Fromm 1950, 1951, 1959, 1970, 1980)? Or is Fromm, in contrast, at the core a Hegelian

critical theorist rooted in the Marxist tradition as modified by the philosophical concerns of such thinkers as Lukacs, Horkheimer and Adorno (Anderson and Quinney 2000; Bronner 1994; Fromm 1955a, 1956b, 1961a, 1965)? Can Fromm be best understood as a religious prophetic thinker, shaped by orthodox Judaism and the Rabbinical thought of his youth (Funk 1982; Fromm 1950, 1976; Maccoby 1995)? Were Fromm's political activities central to his identity, or was the radical Fromm simply the moral obligations he paid on his way to creating his intellectual contributions and his work as a therapist (Fromm 1961b)? Were Fromm's empirical research projects such as the German workers study and *Social Character in a Mexican Village* attempts at creating an interdisciplinary social science that was either central or peripheral to his project (Bonss 1984; Fromm and Maccoby 1996; Maccoby 1995, 1996)? Does Fromm's social science represent unrecognized contributions to mainstream sociology and anthropology? Or does Fromm's collaborative work with the local Mexican community activists and the local community he studied suggest that his work is an early contribution to what sociologists today call action research (Fromm and Maccoby 1996; Millán and Gojman 1981, 2000)? Which Fromm is the real Fromm?

As the Fromm revival continues, we can only hope that we do not engage in needless polemics trying to answer this question. One need not become a post-modern relativist to argue that Fromm's insights came from the multiple identities that he created and with which he learned to live. These various perspectives merged into a new way of looking at the world that cannot be

reduced to its component parts without destroying the insights themselves. Fromm's psychoanalysis was so powerful *precisely* because he refused to think that the world can be understood solely with a depth psychology, an approach that ignores sociology, history and politics. Fromm's radicalism gained its strength from his refusal to ignore the psychological and emotional levels that those on the left tend to minimize as they focus on exploitation, structures, injustice and social change. Fromm refused to be primarily concerned with spiritual values and concerns, at the expense of analysis of society and efforts at social change. Yet Fromm's existential concern with death and its meaning infused his sociology, psychoanalysis and political activities with a passion and a depth seldom seen in traditional social science, therapy and activism (McLaughlin 1996). And Fromm's concern with empirical evidence set him apart from the overly speculative work that often passes for social criticism, while he never allowed his work to become technical for the sake of technique. A Freudian and a therapist, a Marxist and prophet, as well as an activist, action researcher, sociologist, social theorist and moral philosopher. Many Fromms, and all are real.

One of the things that is likely to happen as the Fromm revival takes shape, is that various writers and thinkers will attempt to "claim" the "real" Fromm (Rodden 1989). There are powerful institutional forces that will help create this pressure, as professional demands push Fromm's followers to frame his contributions in the language of particular forms of knowledge production. So there will be Fromm the Freudian, Fromm the "relational" theorist, Fromm the

critical theorist, Fromm the moral philosopher, Fromm the radical humanist, Fromm the action researcher rooted in Mexico, Fromm the German intellectual, Fromm the "social character" theorist and Fromm the sociologist. Right now, most of us are pleased to see more interest in Fromm's work. But as this revival continues, there will come a point where conflicts will emerge over who represents the "real" Fromm. Egos and reputations will be at stake, even if not much money, so we should commit ourselves now to spirited but cordial debate. Let a thousand Fromms bloom as we remember that it was Fromm's refusal to defend any rigid orthodoxy that drew many of us to his work in the first place.

Fromm's Future Reputation: Having or Being?

What then are the larger stakes involved as we contemplate what Fromm's intellectual reputation might look like in the 21st century and beyond? As Fromm's intellectual reputation grows once again after a couple of decades of decline, we will increasingly be asked to articulate a vision regarding Fromm's ultimate place in intellectual history. Do we see Fromm as a great psychoanalytic theorist alongside Jung, Rank, Klein and even Freud himself? Does Fromm belong alongside the great 19th and 20th century socialist intellectuals such as Marx, Engels, Kautsky, Lenin, Gramsci and Marcuse? Does Fromm's central role in the development of the authoritarian personality research tradition earn him a place among the great academic psychologists of the past 100 years (Bonss 1984; Burston 1991)? Will Fromm's activities as a public intellectual leave him remembered as one of the great public intellectuals of the 20th century (Fromm 1955b, 1956a, 1976)? Will Fromm's legacy be a

chapter or a footnote in the intellectual history of the 20th century? What do we mean when we suggest that Fromm has not gotten the recognition he deserves? What recognition *does* he deserve?

These questions, framed in this manner, will lead us down the wrong path. The case for Fromm's originality and insight can easily be made. Fromm was clearly an important and original theorist who helped pioneer the "relational" approach to Freud's theory, an innovation that is likely to dominate 21st century psychoanalysis (Burston 1991; Cortina and Maccoby 1996; Greenberg and Mitchell 1983; Mitchell 1988, 1993; Roazen 1974, 1986, 2000). Humanistic psychology and the authoritarian personality research traditions will figure prominently in any history of 20th century psychology, and Fromm was an original (and often unacknowledged) contributor to both theoretical approaches (Burston 1991; Funk 1982; Hausdorf 1972; McLaughlin 1998a, 1998b). The Frankfurt School critical theorists will figure centrally in any history of neo-Marxist thought as well as any account of left wing political movements of the 20th century. Despite the fact that Fromm has been left out of the "origin myths" of critical theory, his original contributions to this intellectual tradition are now beyond dispute (Anderson and Quinney 2000; Bronner 1994; Burston 1991; McLaughlin 1999). My own view is that Fromm's major intellectual contribution may lie in the way he pulled out the core insights of the existentialist tradition, linked them to the most useful aspects of Freudian theory and then put together a theory of human motivation that, at least in theory, could be combined with empirical sociology, anthropology, evolutionary psychology and comparative historical

sociology (Fromm 1941, 1947, 1955b, 1973; Fromm and Maccoby 1996). This view would lead to defining Fromm's original contributions as flowing from his position and role as a sociological existentialist and a historical psychologist.

All this, however, will not ultimately matter. The problem, of course, is *all* intellectual history obscures one central sociological reality: great ideas are simply not created by individuals at all but by intergenerational networks and chains of thinkers, known and unknown (Collins 1998). It is in the nature of intellectual life that human beings must simplify the contributions of generations of thinkers, picking certain "great thinkers" to represent collective contributions. What Randall Collins has called "the law of small numbers" forces us to compress intellectual contributions into manageable chunks (Collins 1998). And human beings have a tendency to need idols and rituals, as the sociologist Emile Durkheim and Fromm himself reminded us. So when we worship Freud or Marx, we are really paying homage to the generations of psychologists, biological scientists, philosophers, therapists, political activists, social workers, workers and intellectuals who created psychoanalysis and Marxism respectively. A closer look at the ideas of both Freud and Marx always shows earlier or contemporary thinkers who developed similar ideas or had unacknowledged influence on the great thinker himself (Ellenberger 1970; Kolakowski 1978). The question of how original Fromm's ideas were partly depends on how deeply one looks at the question, and the same is true for all major intellectuals. Originality is a matter of degree, and the lines are often blurred.

The problem, at a deeper level, is that the strategies that intellectuals

follow to gain credit for intellectual contributions or maintain schools of thought are strategies that often undercut efforts to develop the most useful and powerful ideas (McLaughlin 1998b). Fromm himself understood this, and that ultimately is why he did not want to form a school of thought of his own. So let's build on Fromm's ideas and honour his memory and inspiration. But we should not worry too much about where it all is heading. We'll have to just wait to see what happens in our lifetimes, and trust future generations to make their way and honor the heroes they choose. And we should always remember to not allow Fromm's inspiration to limit our own creative powers. What reputation Fromm will "have" is far less important than what his ideas can help us "be."

References

- Alford, Robert. 1996. *The Craft of Inquiry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, Kevin and Richard Quinney, eds. 2000. *Erich Fromm and Critical Criminology: Beyond the Punitive Society*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Bell, Daniel. 1961. *The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties*. New York: Collier Books
- Benjamin, Jessica. 1988. *The Bonds of Love: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and the Problem of Domination*. New York: Pantheon.

- Bonss, Wolfgang. 1984. "Introduction to Erich Fromm *The Working Class in Weimar Germany*," Warwickshire: Berg Publishers.
- Bronner, Stephen Eric. 1994. *Of Critical Theory and its Theorists*. London: Blackwell.
- Burston, Daniel. 1991. *The Legacy of Erich Fromm*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chancer, Lynn. 1992. *Sadomasochism in Everyday Life: The Dynamics of Power and the Powerless*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Chodorow, Nancy. 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1989. *Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Collins, Randall. 1998. *The Sociology of Philosophies: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cortina, Mauricio and Michael Maccoby, eds. 1996. *A Prophetic Analyst: Erich Fromm's Contributions to Psychoanalysis*. New Jersey: Jason Aronson.
- Coser, Lewis. 1965. *Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View*. New York: Free Press.
- _____. 1984. *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experiences*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ellenberger, Henri. 1970. *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ewen, Stuart. 1996. *PR!: A Social History of Spin*. New York: Basic Books.
- Friedan, Betty. 1963. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Norton
- Fromm, Erich. 1941. *Escape from Freedom*. New York: Farrar and Rhinehart.
- _____. 1947. *Man for Himself: Towards a Psychology of Ethics*. New York: Rhinehart.
- _____. 1950. *Psychoanalysis and Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- _____. 1951. *The Forgotten Language*. New York: Rhinehart.