Unfortunately, the tendency, as Fromm states, "is that eventually dogma, ritual and idolization of the leader replace creativity and spontaneity."

Like his other books, this book by Fromm has a great literary and deserves careful study. It underlines the fact that he occupies a special intermediate position. He is a serious critic of psychoanalytic one-sidedness. But, by not going far enough in his criticism of Freudian theories, he remains within their framework and subject to the very faults which he deplores. His orthodox individualistic psychoanalytic critics therefore have an easy time. They can challenge Mr. Fromm's interpretation of the psychoanalytic movement.

The very fact that he tries to explain psychoanalysis by Freud's personality demonstrates that he has not made the decisive step needed to develop psychoanalysis in a truly social fashion. His psycho-social parallels, such as libido with property, are not fully convincing because they remain only parallels. His position, halfway toward a real social orientation, indicates that there exists objectively an impasse in the special scientific field of psychoanalysis. And this impasse can be overcome only when we recognize, as does Fredric Wertham in "The Circle of Guilt," that there is a dialectic interaction between social, economic, historical, and psychological forces.

Among the psychoanalysts who did not obtain a medical education, Erich Fromm occupies a singular and honorable place. Unlike so many of his senior lay colleagues in psychoanalysis, he did not "join" the psychoanalytic movement but entered through the front door, so to speak: he obtained excellent psychoanalytic training in Berlin, as did many Americans. He became a recognized psychoanalyst and soon took his well-observed official place as a member of the International Psychoanalytic Association. The Hitlerian holocaust drove him to the hospitable shores of the United States, where so many of the German-speaking psychoanalysts were received as became their station of carriers of the culture which Hitler wanted to reduce to ashes.

Fromm's name seems soon to have been removed from the roster of the International Psychoanalytic Association; it also failed to find a place on the roster of the American local or national psychoanalytic associations. Be it said here with emphasis that neither Fromm's behavior as a professional man, which was and is exemplary, nor his intellectual and philosophic orientation could be considered responsible for his finding himself outside the official ranks of the psychoanalytic movement. True enough, Fromm might be placed among those who chose the path of Freudian heterodoxy, but many who chose the same path managed to remain within the official ranks of official psychoanalysis, whether they were laymen (a few) or medical men (most). Moreover, a number of individuals and official groups are openly and/or blatantly quite a bit removed from Freudian orthodoxy; there are three psychoanalytic groups in New York alone—all "recognized" by the Psychoanalytic International.

But it is an open secret (particularly since the publication of Jones's biography of Freud) that psychoanalysis, like any other organized movement, is bound to pay heavy tribute to the art of politics, to the Integument for power, to egocentric sensitivities, and to promotional drives. In doing so psychoanalysis may or may not gain ground as a movement, but it is bound to find some of its scientific progress rather frayed at times, and to leave a portion of its best men on the sidelines.

Erich Fromm, after a brief ideological entente with Karen Horney, had to choose his own independent scientific road. The result was: he began to pursue the search for the essence of man, for the meaning of human struggles, and for the roots and growth and efflorescence of love in the deepest and universal, ethico-philosophical meaning of this word. He came to touch the fringes of Zen Buddhism and the planes of existentialism. Fromm wrote and writes well, with peripatetic and psychological forces.