



Introduction: Erich Fromm's Life and Work

Fromm has been called „one of the most influential and popular psychoanalysts in America.”¹ „Of all the psychoanalytic theorists who have tried to formulate a system better suited than Freud's to problems of contemporary life, none has been more productive or influential than Erich Fromm.”² Even one of his sharpest critics, John Homer Schaar, had to admit that Fromm's writings „make his name a prominent one in any serious discussion of modern social problems.”³

The increasing number of dissertations on Fromm is testimony to the ongoing scientific discussion of his thought and discoveries. Their authors come from the most varied scientific disciplines and are interested in determining the relevance of Fromm's insights to their field of specializations.⁴ The breadth of this interest in Fromm reflects the breadth of his writings and his thought.

A short sketch of his life and intellectual antecedents is in order before we undertake a summary of his literary work.⁵ Erich Fromm was born on

March 23, 1900, in Frankfurt am Main, the only child of Orthodox Jewish parents. He characterizes his parents as „highly neurotic” and himself as „a probably rather unbearable, neurotic child.”⁶ The Jewish faith practiced by his parents (his father came from an old rabbinical family), and Fromm himself up to his twenty-sixth birthday, had a profound influence on him. Fromm studied the Old Testament intensively and was especially fascinated by the prophets Isaiah, Amos, and Hosea because they had promised universal peace. As a young man, he studied the Talmud with Rabbi J. Horowitz, and later, as a university {002} student, he took instruction from Salman Rabinkov in Heidelberg and Nehemia Nobel and Ludwig Krause in Frankfurt. The influence of these teachers was considerable: Rabinkov's socialist and Nobel's mystic orientation are thematically present in Fromm's writings and fields of interest.

The suicide by which a twenty-year-old female friend of the family thought to assure her burial alongside her recently deceased and excessively loved father is mentioned by Fromm as the childhood experience that was responsible for his later interest in Sigmund Freud and psychoanalysis.⁷ There is probably also a connection between that suicide, which occurred when he was twelve, and Fromm's reinterpretation of the Oedipus complex, his profound skepticism concerning all irrational and symbiotic relations of dependence, and his the-

¹ J. S. Glen, *Erich Fromm: A Protestant Critique*, p. 11. Computer technology now makes it possible to arrive at a proximate judgment about an author's popularity because it can provide lists of all the reviews of a new book. Cf. G. C. Tarbert, ed., *Book Review Index*. There are also large-scale indexes that list all those passages in which one author quotes another. Cf. *The Social Sciences Citation Index*, 1970.

² E. Z. Friedenberg, „Neo-Freudianism and Erich Fromm,” p. 305.

³ J. H. Schaar, *Escape from Authority*, p. 3.

⁴ Even in the Soviet Union, interest in Fromm has recently increased, although the material is largely apologetic. An example would be V. I. Dobrenkov's study, *Neo-Freudianism and the Search for Truth: Erich Fromm's Errors and Illusions*.

⁵ The biographical information comes from E. Fromm, *Beyond the Chains of Illusion* (1962a), pp. 3-12; „Im Namen des Lebens” (1974b); Fromm and R. I. Evans, *Dialogue with Erich Fromm* (1966f); B. Landis and E.

S. Tauber, eds., *In the Name of Life*, pp. x-xiv; E. Z. Friedenberg, „Neo-Freudianism and Erich Fromm,” pp. 306f; M. Birnbach, *Neo-Freudian Social Philosophy*, p. 234; *Munzinger-Archiv*. Internationales Biographisches Archiv. H. J. Schultz, „Humanist ohne Illusionen.”

⁶ E. Fromm and R. I. Evans, *Dialogue with Erich Fromm* (1966f), p. 56.

⁷ Cf. E. Fromm, *Beyond the Chains of Illusion* (1962a), p. 4.



sis that there are two possible life projects, the biophilous and the necrophilous.

Fromm's sympathy for the prophets and their messianic visions of the harmonious coexistence of all nations was profoundly shaken by the First World War, which made him increasingly distrustful of all official doctrines and vainglorious prophecies of national victory. „When the war ended in 1918, I was a deeply troubled young man who was obsessed by the question of how war was possible, by the wish to understand the irrationality of human mass behavior, by a passionate desire for peace and international understanding. More, I had become deeply suspicious of all official ideologies and declarations, and filled with the conviction 'of all one must doubt.'”⁸

His political interests deepened when he became acquainted with the work of Karl Marx, for in it he saw „the key to the understanding of history and the manifestation, in secular terms, of the radical humanism which was expressed in the messianic vision of the Old Testament prophets.”⁹

Considering the problems that preoccupied him, it was only, natural that Fromm's scientific career should have begun with the study of psychology, philosophy, and sociology. After two semesters spent at the University of Frankfurt, he went to Heidelberg in 1919 to study under Alfred Weber, Karl Jaspers, and Heinrich Rickert. As early as 1922, he obtained his doctorate in philosophy with a dissertation on the sociopsychological structure of three {003} Jewish Diaspora communities: the Karaites, the Hasidim, and the Reformed Jews.¹⁰ After further studies in psychiatry and psychology in Munich, he married Frieda Reichmann in 1926, but this marriage was brief. From 1928 through 1929, he received psychoanalytic training from Dr. Landauer and Dr. Wittemberg in Munich, and also in 1929, he became a student of Hanns Sachs and Theodor

Reik at the psychoanalytic institute in Berlin. In 1930, Fromm and others founded the South German Institute for Psychoanalysis in Frankfurt am Main. In that same year, he became a member and *Dozent* at the Institut für Sozialforschung (Institute for Social Research) at Frankfurt University, where he taught psychoanalysis. It is from this institute that the „Frankfurt School” emerged.

The important role Fromm played as a member of the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research seems to have been deliberately ignored after he left it toward the end of the thirties, especially by Max Horkheimer. Setting this record straight would be a much appreciated piece of historical research. Horkheimer was so reluctant to acknowledge Fromm's membership that when Oskar Hersche asked him in 1969 who the members of the institute had been around 1930 (M. Horkheimer, *Verwaltete Welt*, p. 11), he could answer: „There were a number of people. I should begin by mentioning Friedrich Pollock, Franz Borkenau, Henryk Grossmann, Karl August Wittfogel, Leo Löwenthal, Karl Korsch, Gerhard Meyer, Kurt Mandelbaum, all of whom except Löwenthal had been hired by Grünberg. All of them published books in the Institute series; there were also some psychoanalysts who belonged to the Institute for we realized that sociology and psychoanalysis would have to work together. But their association was less close. Karl Landauer, Heinrich Meng and Erich Fromm and some others were members of this group. They held seminars on psychoanalysis, though not at the University but at the Institute.”

But it is not true that Fromm's association was „less close,” nor was he just one among a number of others. In 1930, Horkheimer had invited him, as an expert on psychoanalysis, to become one of the four members of the core group of the Institute, and to become an associate for life. Fromm accepted and spent the following years working on his study of the authoritarian character structure of German workers and employees before Hitler (Cf. Fromm, *Arbeiter und Angestellte am Vorabend des Dritten Reiches. Eine sozialpsychologische Untersuchung*, 1980a; English edition: *The Working Class*

⁸ Ibid., p. 9.

⁹ B. Landis and E. S. Tauber, eds., *In the Name of Life*, p. xi.

¹⁰ E. Fromm, *Das jüdische Gesetz* (1922), published 1989 in German (Weinheim: Beltz Verlag); cf. GA XI.



in Weimar Germany. *A Psychological and Sociological Study*, London: Berg Publishers, 1984.). That Fromm's scholarly work in the „Frankfurt School“ was forgotten may have been due to the odd treatment of dissidents by those institute members who were in charge at the time. But the desire to have people forget Fromm and his work must also have been connected with the intent to disavow the Marxist methods and psychoanalytic discoveries of the study on the authoritarian character structure of German workers and employees on the eve of the Third Reich. Especially in the case of Horkheimer, there are indications that he abandoned his Marxist beliefs and turned (or returned?) to bourgeois convictions as early as during his stay in the United States, quite simply because he was afraid of being considered a leftist or a Marxist where this was inopportune. This is also--according to Fromm--the reason the expression „Marxist theory“ was replaced by „critical theory,“ and „capitalist society“ by „alienated society.“

Another important event in Fromm's intellectual life before 1930 was his reading of Johann Jakob Bachofen's (1815-1887) *Mother Right*. Bachofen's insights into the link between matriarchal or patriarchal social structures and cultural and psychic phenomena influenced Fromm's ideas on the reciprocal influence of social and psychic structure, which went beyond Freud's.

From 1930 on, Fromm's research was directed toward a synthesis of these various insights and sciences. „I wanted to understand the laws that govern the life of the individual man, and the laws of society--that is, of men in their social existence. I tried to see the lasting truth in Freud's concepts as against those assumptions which were in need of revision. I tried to do the same with Marx's theory, and finally I tried to arrive at a synthesis which followed from the understanding and the criticism of both thinkers.“¹¹

For this project, Fromm developed his own sociopsychological method, which--in contrast to Wilhelm Reich's and Herbert Marcuse's--did not re-

ly on Freud's sexual theories. When one surveys {004} Fromm's large literary output, one notices that all his later works are explications and--albeit far--reaching modifications of these spiritual and intellectual antecedents and methodological discoveries.

National Socialism forced the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research to emigrate, first to Geneva, and then in 1934, to Columbia University. After a rather long illness during which he stayed at Davos, Fromm accepted an invitation by the Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute to give a series of lectures in 1934. When the Institute for Social Research found its new home in New York, he moved there and resumed work at the institute while continuing his psychoanalytic practice.

In New York, Fromm made the acquaintance of Clara Thompson, Harry Stack Sullivan, and William Silverberg.¹² From 1935 to 1939, he was visiting professor at Columbia. His connection with the Institute for Social Research continued into the late thirties, when Max Horkheimer and Herbert Marcuse came out against his elaboration of the Freudian theory of drives, the latter denouncing him as a „neo-Freudian or neo-Freudian revisionist.“¹³ Fromm continued to develop his thought, which, though bearing some kinship with that of the so-called Neo-Freudians, Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan, and Abram Kardiner¹⁴, in its emphasis on

¹² Cf. M. R. Green, „Her Life,“ pp. 358f.

¹³ H. Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization*, p. 238. The critique of Neo-Freudian revisionism has recently been published as an epilogue in *Triebstruktur und Gesellschaft. Ein philosophischer Beitrag zu Sigmund Freud*, pp. 234-269. The dispute between Marcuse and Fromm was quite violent and found expression in a variety of publications. Cf. Fromm, „The Human Implications of Instinctivistic 'Radicalism' (1955b); „A Counter-Reply to Herbert Marcuse“ (1956b); *The Crisis of Psychoanalysis* (1970a), pp. 25-31; O. Schatz, ed., *Der Friede im nuklearen Zeitalter*, pp. 227f.; E. Fromm, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* (1973a), pp. 463f, n.24; *To Have or to Be?* (1976a), p. 75.

¹⁴ On the now extensive literature on „Neo-Freudians,“ cf. especially C. Thompson, *Die Psychoanalyse*; and

¹¹ Fromm, *Beyond the Chains of Illusion* (1962a).



„culture,” did not prevent him from clearly distancing himself from these thinkers: „Although Horney, Sullivan, and I are usually classified together as a ‘culturalist’ or ‘Neo-Freudian school, this classification hardly seems justified. In spite of the fact that we were friends, worked together and had certain views in common—particularly a critical attitude toward the libido theory—the differences between us were greater than the similarities, especially in the ‘cultural’ viewpoint. Horney and Sullivan thought of cultural patterns in the traditional anthropological sense, while my approach looked toward a dynamic analysis of the economic, political, and psychological forces that form the basis of society.”¹⁵

The reserve, especially vis-à-vis Karen Horney, is due to disputes within the psychoanalytic movement in the United States during the war years. While in 1941, Fromm and Horney, among others, opposed the New York Psychoanalytic Institute and contributed significantly to the establishment of the American Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis, personal reasons lead Fromm to break with Horney in 1943. Together with Clara Thompson, Harry Stack Sullivan, and others, he then formed a New York branch of the Washington School of Psychiatry that was supported by the William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation. (On this, see M. R. Green, *Her Life*, pp. 361-366.)

During the war years, Fromm tried to enlighten the American public concerning the real intentions of the National Socialist system. In 1945, he and others founded the William Alanson White Institute of Psychiatry, Psychoanalysis, and Psychology, and from 1946 to 1950, he was chairman of

the faculty and chairman of the institute’s training committee. All through the forties, he taught extensively. From 1945 to 1947, he was professor of psychology at the University of Michigan, and in 1948-49, he was a visiting professor at Yale. From 1941 to 1949, he also was a member of the faculty of Bennington College, and in 1948, he became adjunct professor for psychoanalysis at New York University.

Fromm had married a second time in 1944 and had become an American citizen. On the advice of a physician that his ailing wife would benefit from a more favorable climate, he moved from Bennington to Mexico in 1950 and became professor at the {005} National Autonomous University in Mexico City, where he established the psychoanalytic section at the medical school. He taught there until 1965, when he became professor emeritus. In addition to his teaching duties in Mexico, Fromm attended to his responsibilities at the William Alanson White Institute, held a position as professor of psychology at Michigan State University from 1957 to 1961, and was adjunct professor of psychology at the graduate division of Arts and Sciences at New York University after 1962. Despite his extensive teaching activities, he kept up his psychoanalytic practice (for more than forty-five years), remained active as a supervisor and teacher of analysis,¹⁶ and participated in sociopsychological fieldwork in Mexico over the years.

Since childhood, Fromm had been passionately interested in politics, and in the middle fifties, he joined the American Socialist party and attempted (fruitlessly, as it turned out) to provide it with a new program.¹⁷ Although he recognized that he was temperamentally unsuited to practical politics, he did considerable work to enlighten the American people about the current possibilities and intentions of the Soviet Union. This effort found expression especially in *May Man Prevail? An Inquiry into the*

also *Interpersonal Psychoanalysis*, esp. pp. 95-99, 361-366; M. Birnbaum, *Neo-Freudian Social Philosophy*; E. Z. Friedenberg, *Neo-Freudianism and Erich Fromm*; W. Herberg, *Freud, the Revisionists and Social Reality*; J. Rattner, *Psychologie der zwischenmenschlichen Beziehungen*; R. Wiegand, *Gesellschaft und Charakter*; Th. W. Adorno, „Die revidierte Psychoanalyse.”

¹⁵ E. Fromm, *The Crisis of Psychoanalysis* (1970a), p. 21, fn.; cf. Fromm, *The Heart of Man* (1964a), p. 14; and Fromm and Evans, *Dialogue with Erich Fromm* (1966f), pp. 58f.

¹⁶ Cf. M. Norell et al., *Reminiscences of Supervision with Erich Fromm*.

¹⁷ Cf. E. Fromm, *Let Man Prevail—A Socialist Manifesto and Program* (1960b).



Facts and Fictions of Foreign Policy (1961a), in which Fromm unmasks fear of Russian aggression as a fiction by analyzing the Communist social structure at the time. As late as 1974, Fromm, acting on the suggestion of Senator William Fulbright, wrote a paper on the policy of détente for a hearing held by the U.S. Senate Committee for Foreign Relations which deals with American relations with Communist states.¹⁸

Fromm taught a socialist humanism that rejects both Western capitalism and Soviet Communist socialism and sympathizes with the interpretation of socialism of the Yugoslav „praxis” group.¹⁹

His strongest political interest was the international peace movement. In this, he was motivated by the insight that the present historical situation will decide whether humanity will take rational hold of its destiny or fall victim to destruction through nuclear war.²⁰ He was a co-founder of SANE, „the most important American peace movement, which not only fought against the atomic arms race but also against the war in Vietnam.”²¹ His last important political activity was his work on behalf of Senator Eugene McCarthy during the 1968 campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination.²²

After 1965, Fromm concentrated more and more on his writing. Beginning in 1968, he spent the summer months in the exceptionally benign climate of the Tessin, to which he moved permanently in 1974. He and his wife Annis took up residence in Muralto, far from the hectic pace of mod-

ern life, and it was in Muralto that he died on March 18, 1980. But solitude and retirement on the Lago Maggiore did not lessen Fromm’s interest in contemporary problems, a fact that is clearly evidenced by his literary productivity during the last years of his life.

As one surveys Fromm’s literary output, one is struck by the variety and breadth of his interests and research. The sociologically-oriented dissertation he wrote as a twenty-two-year-old doctoral candidate examines the „correlation between social structure and the (religious) idea entrusted to its charge”²³ among the Jews of the Diaspora. A number of shorter essays written between 1926 and 1930 reveal Fromm as an orthodox Freudian.²⁴ The treatise „Die Entwicklung des Christudogmas. Eine psychoanalytische Studie zur sozialpsychologischen Funktion der Religion” („The development of the Dogma of Christ. A psychoanalytical study on the sociopsychological function of religion”), written in 1930, demonstrates his interest in the relevance of religion and the religious idea for social and cultural reality. This essay represents the first instance of Fromm’s particular type of sociopsychological analysis of these phenomena. It is a method that differs from both the vulgar Marxist base-superstructure theory and the psychologizing cultural analysis *à la* Freud.

In his next essays, Fromm explicated the method of „analytic social psychology.”²⁵ An understanding of the importance of Bachofen’s and Robert Briffault’s theories of the matriarchy plays a particular role here, and the investigation on authority and family that utilized this sociopsychological method represents a kind of testing of it.²⁶

After a few years during which he wrote nothing, Fromm published his first important sociopsy-

¹⁸ Cf. Fromm, „Remarks on the Policy of Détente” (1975a).

¹⁹ On the concept of socialism in the work of Fromm, cf. especially E. Fromm, ed., *Socialist Humanism* (1965a).

²⁰ Cf. E. Fromm, „The Case for Unilateral Disarmament” (1960c); „Afterword” (1961c); *May Man Prevail?* (1961a); Fromm and M. Maccoby, „A Debate on the Question of Civil Defense” (1962b); E. Fromm, „Zur Theorie und Strategie des Friedens” (1970h); „Epilogue” (1970g).

²¹ H. J. Schultz, *Humanist ohne Illusionen*, p. 37.

²² Cf. the preface to the German edition of *The Revolution of Hope* (1971a).

²³ E. Fromm, *Das jüdische Gesetz* (1989b), p. 237.

²⁴ This becomes very clear in the short essay „Dauernde Nachwirkung eines Erziehungsfehlers” (1926a).

²⁵ Cf. especially E. Fromm, „Über Methode und Aufgabe einer Analytischen Sozialpsychologie” (1932a).

²⁶ Cf. E. Fromm, „Sozialpsychologischer Teil” (1936a).



chological monograph, *Escape from Freedom*, in 1941. Based on an analysis of the relation between Protestantism and the development of early capitalism, the work demonstrates modern man's incapacity to value his „freedom from” as a „freedom to.” Instead, Fromm wrote, modern man attempts to escape from freedom by placing himself in authoritarian relations of dependency, and in the process becomes destructive and conformist. The book's insights into the contemporary situation in Nazi Germany made a considerable impression on the American public, although Fromm's sociological interpretation of the Reformation provoked sharp criticism from some.²⁷ {007}

There followed years of intensive effort to shed light on the connections between socio-economic structures on the one hand, and human needs as psychic necessities in the process of orientation of assimilation and socialization on the other. In this effort, Fromm developed a characterology that widens the perspective of Freudian libido theory and its narrow human image, while simultaneously indicating the ethical relevance of the various character orientations. The results of this research found expression in what may well be Fromm's central work, *Man for Himself- An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics*.

The Sane Society, published in 1955, develops the themes found in *Escape from Freedom* and *Man for Himself*. Written from the viewpoint of a humanistic ethic, the book points to the socio-economic reasons that today prevent the realization of the human project. An analysis of the modern capitalist and bureaucratic social structure lays bare the universal phenomenon of alienation that can be overcome only if economic, political, and cultural conditions are fundamentally changed in the direction of a democratic and humanist socialism.

In addition to these three works with their abundant observations and discoveries, Fromm wrote a number of monographs during the fifties

and sixties in which the horizons of his thought emerge more clearly. In 1950, he published a shorter work, *Psychoanalysis and Religion*, in which he discusses his understanding of a humanistic religion as influenced by psychoanalysis and Buddhism in greater detail. *The Forgotten Language*, a discourse on fairy tales, myths, and dreams²⁸ as universal and revelatory phenomena of human existence, appeared the following year. Fromm's best seller was the short *The Art of Loving*, first published in 1956, which was translated into twenty-eight languages and had sold more than one and a half million English-language copies by 1970. Using the concept of „productive love,” Fromm here shows the consequences of a humanistic ethics for the understanding of self-love, love of one's neighbor, and love of one's fellow man.

In three further books,²⁹ Fromm paid tribute to Freud and Marx, while at the same time attempting to define his position in relation to these seminal modern thinkers. His *Marx's Concept of Man* is of special significance because it drew the attention of the American public to Marx's early writings. {008}

The importance of religion for a successful human existence and the future of man is clarified in two works: the essay „Psychoanalysis and Zen-Buddhism,” which reflects Fromm's study of the latter; and *You Shall Be as Gods*, a „radical interpretation of the Old Testament and its tradition”³⁰ that pleads the cause of a nontheistic religion. Fromm develops a historical-philosophical perspective that views the Old Testament account of God and man as a process in the course of which man comes increasingly into his own. Thus God as idea becomes identical with man's complete „being at home with himself,” and belief in a revealed god is understood as a stage on the path toward a „humanistic relig-

²⁷ Cf. especially the reviews by T. H. Gill, A. T. Boisen, L. B. Hill, P. Mullahy, M. F. A. Montagu, L. Wirth, and E. E. Hadley in the journal *Psychiatry*.

²⁸ E. Fromm, *The Forgotten Language* (1951a); see also Fromm, „Der Traum ist die Sprache des universalen Menschen” (1971a).

²⁹ *Sigmund Freud's Mission* (1959a); *Marx's Concept of Man* (1961b); *Beyond the Chains of Illusion* (1962a).

³⁰ This is the subtitle of *You Shall Be as Gods* (1966a).



ion” that develops in and through itself.³¹

Subsequently, Fromm focused principally on two problems, one of which is the historically decisive question whether man will once again become the master of his creations or whether he will perish in an overtechnicized industrial world. Fromm’s writings on politics, especially on nuclear armaments and the peace movement,³² and his *Revolution of Hope: Toward a Humanized Technology* (New York, 1968), which can be considered a continuation of *The Sane Society*, address this question. The second problem relates to the syndrome of decay of the individual and of mankind as a species. Using the types of nonproductive life that Fromm had previously explicated (principally in *Man for Himself*, *The Heart of Man: Its Genius for Good and Evil*) presents a systematic treatment of the polarity of possible orientations on the basis of character. The related questions concerning the antithesis of instinct and character, the inherent human destructive instinct postulated by behavioral research, and the skepticism concerning man’s potential goodness that this view entails (and the doubt this skepticism casts on humanism) were the interests that guided Fromm’s research for some five years. The results of his work over this period are summarized in *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*.

His last major publication, *To Have or to Be?*, is an attempt to synthesize sociopsychological insights and humanist religion and ethics. Here, Fromm identifies two fundamentally antithetical orientations of human existence--having and being--and links his abundant insights into the individual and society’s psyche to the tradition of humanistic

religion and of significant historical figures. {009}

Again and again, Fromm has been reproached for being excessively „speculative,” for not providing enough scientific data.³³ This criticism derives, in part, from his occasional predilection for not quoting sources in detail and failing to reflect adequately on what the pertinent intellectual traditions have had to say about the specific problems he is discussing. Then, too, his language is clear and uncomplicated, although with no loss of depth in either the formulation of problems or the presentation of insights, and this makes him suspect in some quarters. There is every reason to believe Fromm when he says, „There is not a single theoretical conclusion about man’s psyche, either in this or in my other writings, which is not based on a critical observation of human behavior carried out in the course of this psychoanalytic work.”³⁴ The same applies to the insights into character structures that his sociopsychological method helped him formulate: a study on *Social Character in a Mexican Village*³⁵ that is based on five years of fieldwork is persuasive because of the extensive coincidence of findings and theory. So it is not the lack of rigorous research that inspires the charge of unscientific speculation. Rather, such attacks are the result of Fromm’s disputes with positivistic tendencies that have no use

³¹ On the final statements concerning the function of „religion,” see Fromm, „Einige post-marxsche und post-freudsche Gedanken über Religion und Religiosität (1972b); and the concluding part of *To Have or to Be?* (1976a).

³² Cf. E. Fromm, „The Case for Unilateral Disarmament” (1960c); „Afterword” (1961c); *May Man Prevail?* (1961a); Fromm and M. Maccoby, „A Debate on the Question of Civil Defense” (1962b); E. Fromm, „Zur Theorie und Strategie des Friedens” (1970h); „Epilogue” (1970g).

³³ As, for example in B. M. McGrath, *An Examination of Erich Fromm’s Ethics with Implications for Philosophy of Education*, pp. 59f. M. Birnbach says in *Neo-Freudian Social Philosophy*, pp. 191f: „One is left with the feeling that in the constructive parts of his writings, he verbalizes more than he analyzes; the voice he speaks with is that of the prophet rather than that of the scientist. On this judgment, see also B. R. Betz, *An Analysis of the Prophetic Character of the Dialectical Rhetoric of Erich Fromm*.

³⁴ E. Fromm. *Beyond the Chains of Illusion* (1962a), p. 10.

³⁵ E. Fromm and M. Maccoby, *Social Character in a Mexican Village* (1970b). There is a correspondence in method between this piece of fieldwork and Fromm’s major sociopsychological study from the thirties, *Arbeiter und Angestellte am Vorabend des Dritten Reiches. Eine sozialpsychologische Untersuchung* (1980a).



for anything but precisely demonstrable, objective insights confined to a single discipline. Fromm believed that responsible scientific work cannot ignore the ends of its activity or refuse to synthesize insights from a variety of disciplines. Neither can it be

neutral toward the ethical relevance of its findings. Science therefore requires a frame of orientation that is ultimately not deducible from the insights of any single humane discipline. {013}

Copyright © 1978, 1982 and 2009 by Dr. Rainer Funk
Ursrainer Ring 24, D-72076 Tuebingen / Germany
E-Mail: frommfunk[at-symbol]aol.com.