Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Contemporary Psychoanalysis

ISSN: 0010-7530 (Print) 2330-9091 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/uucp20

The History of the William Alanson White Institute Sixty Years After Thompson

Sue A. Shapiro Ph.D.

To cite this article: Sue A. Shapiro Ph.D. (2017) The History of the William Alanson White Institute Sixty Years After Thompson, Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 53:1, 44-62, DOI: 10.1080/00107530.2016.1277502

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00107530.2016.1277502

Published online: 20 Mar 2017.

Submit your article to this journal

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=uucp20

Download by: [Ms Sue A Shapiro] **Date:** 21 March 2017, At: 11:05

Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 2017, Vol. 53, No. 1: 44–62.
© William Alanson White Institute of Psychiatry, Psychoanalysis & Psychology and
the William Alanson White Psychoanalytic Society
ISSN: 0010-7530 print / 2330-9091 online
DOI: 10.1080/00107530.2016.1277502

SUE A. SHAPIRO, Ph.D.

The History of the William Alanson White Institute Sixty Years After Thompson

I am grateful to Donnel Stern for deciding that Clara Thompson's 1955 talk deserved to be published and for giving me the opportunity to respond to Thompson's view of the history of the White Institute. As I read Thompson's talk, I became acutely aware of the limitations of near history, or perhaps the limitations of any single participant's narrative truth. Each talk and article, each product of human thought, is a reflection of both the creator's own psychology and the psychosocial historical context in which it was produced. My reading of Thompson's paper reflects my biases and influences as well as the current historical moment.

I have the privilege of a longer and broader perspective on the history described here by Thompson, even if I lack a first-person experience of the events she describes. My perspective is informed by both my earlier research on the history of feminism and interpersonal theory (Shapiro, 2002) as well as by the work of historians of psychoanalysis (Bergmann, 1983, 2011; Cushman, 1995; Eckardt, 1988, 2005; Goggin, Goggin, & Hill, 2004; Hale, 1995; King & Steiner, 1991; Kirsner, 2000; Nathan, 2015), and biographical work (Allen, 1995; Blechner, 2005; Friedman, 2013; Hornstein, 2000; Paris, 1994; Perry, 1982; Quinn, 1987; Shapiro, 1993; Wake, 2008, 2011). Thus, I am conscious not only of the historical forces at play when the White Institute was formed and the personalities involved, but also—given the sea change in attitudes towards women, sexuality in

Address correspondence to Sue A. Shapiro, Ph.D., 14 E. 4th Street, Apt. 805, New York, NY 10012. E-mail: sueashapiro@gmail.com

general, and homosexuality in particular—I am freer to consider the impact of issues that were too dangerous or taboo for Thompson to consider openly in 1955.

In the 1940s and 1950s, American psychoanalysts and their patients often kept a great many secrets. If analysts were physicians and trained lay analysts, they and their patients and students had to keep it secret from the official psychoanalytic institutes. If they or their patients currently or in the past had left-wing sympathies, both feared being brought up on charges during the McCarthy hearings. Likewise, if analysts or their patients were homosexual, they had reason to be fearful both of the governing bodies of psychoanalytic institutes and of surveillance by the FBI. Homosexuality was illegal in many states, and it was considered a security risk during the cold war (Charles, 2015; Johnson, 2004). Homophobia was so prevalent in psychoanalytic institutes that Wallerstein described how even homosexual dreams could disqualify a candidate from being trained (Nathan, 2015). Both male and female analysts hid childhood experiences of sexual abuse and rape (Thompson, quoted in Shapiro, 1993; Fromm-Reichmann, quoted in Hornstein, 2000; Sullivan, quoted in Chapman, 1976; Sullivan, quoted in Allen, 1995). Sexual mores in America were much more conservative than in Berlin before the War and women's extramarital affairs appear to have been more frowned upon than men's sexual activity. This secretiveness affected not only individual lives but also the stories that psychoanalytic institutes told about their members.

Perhaps nowhere was this more obvious than in the case of Harry Stack Sullivan, whose official biography, by Helen Swick Perry (1982), described Sullivan as interested in both men and women and emphasized his friendships with women. She did not refer to a previous biographical work by A. H. Chapman (1976), in which Chapman suggested that Sullivan's homosexuality was suspected or well-known among his contemporaries and was likely one of the factors that led to his contributions often being ignored (p. 22). Another early biographer, K. Chatelaine (1981), a candidate at the Washington School of Psychiatry, experienced difficulty getting access to Sullivan's notes, presumably while a candidate at the Washington School of Psychiatry, because they did not want him describing Sullivan as homosexual (Wake, 2008, p 156). Open acknowledgement of Sullivan's sexual orientation did not occur until the 1990s (Allen, 1995; Blechner, 2005; Wake, 2008, 2011). Whether this was a factor in the schisms affecting the creation of the White Institute may

never be known. If, in fact, this was a factor, it was a secret, mostly kept by those who knew it. It was certainly not a matter that Clara Thompson discussed publicly. Harry Stack Sullivan was her analysand for some 300 hours and she would have accumulated considerable personal information about him during his treatment, but all that she knew remained, by necessity, private, locked up in the confidentiality of the consulting room. Institutes are full of such secrets told by candidates to their analysts who subsequently become their colleagues and by senior colleagues who have returned to analysis. White is an institute that insists on confidentiality in training analyses. In fact, White was one of the first institutes to bar "training" analysts from participating actively in discussions of their candidate patient's progress: They could listen to supervisors' reports but could not add information from the individual's personal treatment.

We also cannot know with certainty the impact Karen Horney's many sexual relationships with students, supervisees, and younger colleagues (Friedman, 2013, p. 81; Paris, 1994, pp. 141–150) had on the decision to limit her power at New York Psychoanalytic, but certainly Clara Thompson was not about to discuss these issues in 1955. Horney came to the United States in 1932 at the invitation of Franz Alexander, a former student, who was developing a psychoanalytic institute in Chicago. In hindsight, it's clear that Horney did not take kindly to being a team player, working under someone else's rules, especially a former student's. She challenged institutional rules on many levels, including sexual ones. Early in her marriage, she insisted on an open relationship and—through most of her life—enjoyed her ability to be sexually desired by younger men. Despite her "negative self image and sense of homeliness," some men—like Erich Fromm—were drawn to her courage, energy, and directness (Friedman, 2013, p. 80). Paris (1994), citing an interview with Gertrude Weiss, states that Horney left Germany in part because "her practice was shaken by her divorce (she was only separated at that time), and things she did (boyfriends) were brought out" (p. 142). Horney's sexual relations with young candidates, including supervisees and analysands, in both Chicago and New York institutes were well-known (p. 142). Both Friedman (2013) and Paris (1994) suggest that Alexander was relieved when Horney left Chicago because "she had been disrupting analytic relationships" (Kubie, quoted in Paris, p. 142) due to this behavior. It is clear that her sexual liaisons with younger male students and colleagues in Berlin and Chicago were known in advance of her arrival in New York.

There are many factors that contributed to the determination to limit Karen Horney's role at New York Psychoanalytic as well as her decision to walk out with Thompson and others in 1941 and then her subsequent decision in 1943 to insist that only M.D.s could train and be trained at her institute, the American Institute for Psychoanalysis (AIP). Kubie and the traditionalists at New York Psychoanalytic were determined to maintain loyalty to Freud and were therefore highly critical of the cultural school's insistence that there were factors contributing to neurosis that Freud had neglected. There was also considerable envy of Horney's increasingly public success as a writer who could communicate psychoanalytic ideas to a wider audience. And there was jealousy over her popularity with students who clamored for more courses with members of the cultural school. As so often occurs, history repeated itself in 1943 when Horney, angered in part by Fromm's increasing popularity both with the lay public and with candidates at AIP, decided in effect to limit Fromm's role at this new institute by excluding non-M.D.s from supervisory positions. This decision led Thompson, Fromm, and others to leave and form the William Alanson White Institute in 1945.

Abraham Brill and the Medicalization of Psychoanalysis in the United States

In keeping with the cultural school's recognition of the significance of social/cultural factors in human behavior, I will describe in greater depth several significant features of American culture that affected psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic training in the period leading up to 1941.

Arnold Richards (2006) describes a major difference in personal background between Brill, Freud's primary early promoter in the United States, and Freud and most of his early followers in Europe. Both Brill and Freud came from Orthodox Jewish families in Moravia. Freud's father, influenced by the *Haskalah* (Jewish Enlightenment), wore modern clothing, spoke German, and moved his family to Vienna when Sigmund Freud was five years old. Freud's father was sufficiently successful that he was able to ensure that his son got a good secular education and could become a cultured member of society. Later Freud realized that no matter how cultured he was, he was still a Jew and therefore barred from a university appointment. But his secular education was at the heart of his identity as a man of culture. On an intellectual level, Freud could be welcomed by Viennese society. Although he was a physician and retained

an interest in anatomy, his psychoanalytic theory was informed by his knowledge of philosophy, literature, and the classics. He never denied his Jewishness. Yet, although he was more comfortable with his Jewish colleagues, he was also concerned lest psychoanalysis be seen as only a Jewish science.

Brill, on the other hand, born 20 years after Freud, grew up in a *shtetl* with Orthodox Jewish parents who spoke Yiddish at home and never left Galicia. Brill's mother wanted him to be a rabbi. He left home when he was 14 and arrived in New York City at 15 with no money, speaking no English, and equipped with a meager secular education. But, armed with great ambition and in an environment that valued "achievement, competence and accomplishment [as much as] a humanistic education had in Europe" (Richards, 2006, p. 11), he was able to work his way up from sleeping on saloon floors to eventually being admitted to New York University. He graduated from Columbia with an M.D. specializing in psychiatry by the time he was 29. Four years later, in 1907, Brill went to Europe to improve his understanding of psychiatry and found his way to Freud. When he returned to New York, Brill married a non-Jew and began the first private practice of psychoanalysis in the United States. In 1911, he gathered 20 other physicians together and formed the New York Psychoanalytic Society.

Freud was determined to keep psychoanalysis away from psychiatry and to isolate it from the university (which had excluded him from teaching there). He envisioned making psychoanalysis a self-contained institution. Brill, on the other side of the Atlantic, sought legitimacy for himself and psychoanalysis by linking it to psychiatry. To achieve this end, he became active in the American Psychiatric Association and, in 1934, psychoanalysis in America officially became part of the APA.

Brill also was concerned that his authority could be challenged by the arrival of European analysts who were more directly connected to Freud. He successfully defeated an early attempt by Otto Rank in 1924 to become the leader of psychoanalysis in America, and—to further ensure his power—Brill led the fight against lay analysis. Rank had been popular in America and continued to have influence in Boston, but even there, once Freud rejected him as the favorite son in 1926, he was increasingly in disfavor. Rank's lack of medical training made it easier to ban him from any role in training and, at some point, anyone who had been analyzed by Rank was required to undergo a second analysis (Roazen, 2006).

A great deal has been written about the question of "lay analysis" (see "Discussion: Lay analysis," 1927 and Bos, 2000, for a review) and the battles surrounding this issue. Prior to reading Arnold Richard's (2006) article regarding the early life circumstances of Freud and Breuer, I thought, as many do, that financial reasons were at the root of why only psychiatrists could become full standing candidates at institutes approved by the American Psychoanalytic Association. I assumed it was part of the effort to restrict the number of approved psychoanalysts and thus guarantee the size of their clinical practices. Financial concerns became significant during the Great Depression, and increased after Hitler came to power and German analysts began to flee in the early 1930s, but Brill's decision to limit the practice of psychoanalysis in America to M.D.s was made before the Great Depression and before the influx of European analysts. Brill was motivated in part by a concern with ensuring the prestige and respectability of the new profession. I don't think this was the primary motivation behind Horney's decision or the subsequent position of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

This decision by Brill, later taken up by Karen Horney and the American Psychoanalytic Association, to limit the practice of psychoanalysis to M.D.s may have temporarily ensured it greater respectability, but it had other consequences. The most immediate result was that many European analysts were unable to teach or supervise unless they first became licensed M.D.s. This was easier in some states than others because rules and exams for licensing varied from state to state. It also resulted in fewer women being able to enter the profession because many medical schools still did not accept women, and those that did limited their numbers (Jacoby, 1983, p. 18). A further consequence of this requirement may have been to limit the number of American Jews entering psychoanalytic training because there were quotas for Jews in many of the top universities and medical schools (Synnot, 1996). Quotas on Jews entering medical school existed in America until the 1960s.

These factors, however, in no way diminish the significance of financial concerns. The history of psychoanalytic institutes in America over the last 60 years supports the idea that economic considerations have been a major factor in either easing or tightening requirements for admission. When psychoanalysis was held in high esteem, many people sought training in psychoanalytic institutes and, therefore, institutes could limit acceptance

to M.D.s and a small number of research psychologists. As the reputation of psychoanalysis has faltered in the last 30 years, fewer people have applied for training in psychoanalysis and restrictions were eventually eased for psychologists. This easing of restrictions was only partially in response to a lawsuit. More recently, social workers are also granted admission to first-rank training institutes. Likewise, the diminished prestige of classical psychoanalysis and the reduced number of applicants to all psychoanalytic institutes has probably contributed to the willingness of the American Psychoanalytic Association and the International Psychoanalytic Association to admit members trained at institutes developed by non-Freudians, such as the White Institute.

Standardization of Psychoanalytic Training

After visiting America in 1909, Freud became worried about how American society, with its emphasis on money and its relative lack of culture, would influence the practice of psychoanalysis. In Europe, initially there were almost no requirements for beginning to practice as a psychoanalyst—a brief treatment with Freud or one of his closest followers could suffice. By 1910, there were preliminary discussions concerning who could officially call him- or herself a psychoanalyst. In 1920, the Berlin Institute developed what would eventually become the template for psychoanalytic training—a tripartite model consisting of a training analysis, lectures on psychoanalytic theory, and supervision with a senior analyst. In addition to formalizing the training of a psychoanalyst, many members of the Berlin Institute were committed socialists (Reich, Fenichel, Fromm), concerned about improving the welfare of society as a whole (see Jacoby, 1983, for a thorough discussion). In Berlin, thanks to sufficient funds provided by Max Eitingon, free psychoanalysis was offered to people with insufficient means and this created a good pool of patients for candidates. In addition, the Berlin Institute gave lectures to the community at large about psychoanalysis (Paris, 1994; Quinn, 1987). The atmosphere at the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute was more conducive to new ideas than Vienna's, and it was in Berlin that Karen Horney began to criticize Freud's theory of female development. Horney was an admired teacher in Berlin and professionally flourished there between 1920 and 1930, even as her personal life was becoming more complicated. Some of her papers on marriage, monogamy, and distrust

between the sexes may have been attempts to explain some of her own difficulties with men (Paris, 1994; Quinn, 1987).

During the 1920s, psychoanalytic thinking was flourishing in Europe. Senior analysts began travelling to the United States and Canada to teach and often inspired Americans to go to Europe for analysis and psychoanalytic training. Much as this deepened psychoanalytic knowledge in the United States, it also began to pose a problem for the institutionalization or professionalization of psychoanalysis in America. Brill in New York, Hans Sachs in Boston, and eventually, Franz Alexander in Chicago were developing their own psychoanalytic institutes and needed to ensure not only the legitimacy of psychoanalysis as a career, but also the ability of psychoanalysts to earn a living. They made efforts to keep a sufficient supply of patients willing to be analyzed in America by Americans in order to also keep a steady flow of candidates seeking training. This also ensured the viability of psychoanalytic training institutes. Brill's efforts to restrict training to M.D.s helped in this regard because some of the Europeans, such as Rank and Sachs, were not M.D.s and those candidates whose sole training analysis had been with a non-M.D. were required to have a second analysis. Brill and others were aware that psychoanalysis, like any new treatment and any new profession, needed to create a demand for these services and a demand for training in being able to deliver these services. Initially the demand was low and Brill was determined to keep the supply of analysts sufficiently low until there was greater demand. As the 1920s ended and the Great Depression began in America, analysts in Germany, and later Austria, were facing an even bigger crisis: the rise of Hitler and increasing restrictions on the rights of Jews. Rules were put in place that forbade Jewish analysts from treating Aryans and later from supervising the treatment of Aryans. Individual psychoanalysts varied in their ability to see the writing on the wall and leave Germany and Austria while it was still possible.

Although both American and British analysts sought to help their Jewish colleagues fleeing Hitler they were also worried about flooding their own market with more senior analysts. One solution was to have these newly arrived analysts move to secondary locations where there were few practicing analysts and where eventually they could create psychoanalytic institutes in these new locations. Ernest Jones worked at settling analysts in different parts of Britain so that London wouldn't be overwhelmed with the newly arrived European analysts. Jones also refused to help non-Jewish analysts fleeing Hitler settle in England, advising them

instead to either stay and maintain a psychoanalytic presence in Germany and Austria or move to other countries. Likewise, although American psychoanalysts made efforts to save European analysts, they were also concerned lest they overpower their American colleagues. The requirement that the émigrés be medically certified in America meant they would have to pass a licensing exam before they could officially train other analysts. Licensing procedures differed from state to state, but refugee analysts couldn't always choose to settle in a state in which it was easy to get licensed. Some analysts, such as Alexander and Horney, were recruited early to organize psychoanalytic institutes in cities other than New York. Many others, such as Fenichel, Fromm-Reichmann, and Fromm had to leave Germany and Austria to save their lives and—although they received no assurances—hoped to resume their professional activity once they got to freedom in this country. In any event, emigrating to the United States became increasingly difficult as more laws were passed restricting immigration.

Anti-Semitism

Although Jews in the United States did not fear for their lives, they were not exactly accepted and welcomed. Anti-Semitism had been historically less prevalent and less virulent in the United States than in Europe, but it was still part of the Jewish experience in America. Before 1900, most Jews moving to the United States were from Germany and populist anti-Semitic claims focused on allegations of Jewish control of world finances and emphasis on capitalism. Anti-Semitism reached a peak in America during the years between the two world wars The Ku Klux Klan, the America First Committee, Charles Lindbergh, and Henry Ford argued against any American involvement in the fight against fascism, and Father Coughlin gave powerful voice to these sentiments in his radio speeches. In the first half of the 20th century, Jews were routinely discriminated against in employment, social clubs, resorts, enrollment at colleges, and were not allowed to buy certain properties. In 1924, Congress passed the Johnson-Reed Act, severely restricting immigration. More than 80 percent of permitted entries were from Northern European countries in an effort to reduce the number of Jews arriving from Eastern Europe. These efforts succeeded in limiting the number of Jews able to emigrate here and culminated in the horrors experienced by many who attempted to come here to avoid Nazi death camps. While Jewish Americans led rallies in

1933 and 1938 against Nazi intolerance and persecution, Father Coughlin held pro-German rallies, first in 1935 and then in 1939 when he led a massive rally of 22,000 members of the German American Bund. Jews were accused of dominating Franklin Roosevelt's administration and the "New Deal" was referred to as the "Jew Deal." Jews were increasingly accused of being communists. In the United States, starting in 1926, psychoanalysts arriving from Europe were frequently followed by the FBI (Goggin et al., 2004). German-speaking Jewish psychoanalysts faced two forms of prejudice in their new country: fear of Germans and fear of Jews. Some in the U.S. government feared that newly arrived Jewish analysts might spy for Hitler in order to get relatives out of Germany. It is hard to imagine the experience of Jewish refugees fleeing the Nazis, arriving in the United States after losing family members and their homeland, only to be faced with prejudice against them both as Jews and as German speakers. In addition, those who went through periods in hiding in their homeland, fearing they would be discovered, came here only to be followed by the FBI and hunted as enemy aliens or communist sympathizers (Friedman, 2013).

Newly arriving psychoanalysts, no matter how senior, were not immune from these fears and pressures. There were additional pressures for them as well. They needed to become fluent in a new language and needed to adjust to an increasingly structured, rule-driven, psychoanalytic culture. American psychoanalysis was in the process of standardizing training and making it much more difficult to become "certified": the American Psychoanalytic Association was only certifying one institute in any given city. Since 1937, Lawrence Kubie had chaired a subcommittee of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA), tasked with formulating standards for training (Quinn, 1987). Although he was highly involved in helping European analysts emigrate, the committee Kubie chaired also issued stern warnings to all nonmedical analysts that—although they might be allowed to teach at an institute—they could not practice psychoanalysis with adults without a medical license. And European analysts who were already medical doctors, nonetheless had to be recertified before being officially recognized by the American Psychoanalytic Association. All newly arriving analysts could be disqualified from resuming their roles as supervisors and teachers if their own analysis had been conducted by a nonmedical analyst (see Jacoby, 1983). When Kubie became director of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, he was equally stern and controlling, even as he claimed to be open to new ideas. He

insisted that candidates should only be exposed to "unorthodox" ideas in the latter stages of their training.

New York Psychoanalytic, 1934–1941

Britain declared war on Germany on September 3, 1939, and Freud died fewer than three weeks later. The future of psychoanalysis was in question (Bergmann, 2011). Both the conflict that erupted in the New York Psychoanalytic Institute in 1941, including the subsequent splitting off in 1943 of the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis that Karen Horney headed (as described by Thompson), and the epic battle in England between Freudians and Kleinians, occurred in the midst of World War II and in the years immediately following Freud's death. The dual trauma of Freud's death and the world at war doubtless strengthened many analysts' desire for structure and a wish to prove their allegiance to Freud. No one had been designated as his heir and, as Bergmann (2011) notes: "Psychoanalysis faced a choice between two alternatives: to remain frozen at the point where Freud left it and become an orthodoxy, or to make progress at the cost of breaking up into schools in conflicts with each other. As it happens both approaches were tried at the same time" (p. 606).

Horney arrived in New York City just as the push for greater regulation of psychoanalysis was underway and as she herself was getting bolder in her critique of Freudian theory. She and Fromm encouraged each other's intellectual development and each other's writing. *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* (Horney, 1937) and *New Ways in Psychoanalysis* (Horney, 1939) were exceedingly successful. *Neurotic Personality of Our Time* went through 13 printings in one decade. Her next three books were equally popular. She became a sought-after speaker. Such successes did not go unnoticed by her students and colleagues and strengthened her unwillingness to submit to Kubie's control. Candidates at New York Psychoanalytic were also not pleased with Kubie's authoritarian stance and pushed for changes at the Institute. Among their demands were courses by Sullivan and Horney and case seminars representing different points of view. According to Quinn (1987, p. 331), Kubie hated Sullivan and only felt slightly better about Horney. Kubie had been trained at Johns Hopkins University and perhaps he had heard rumors about Sullivan's homosexuality. In any event, Kubie was completely unresponsive to the candidates' requests, and he paid no

attention to Horney and other faculty members' objections to his policies. For a year and a half, David Levy, a member of the education committee and soon to be president of the American Psychoanalytic Association tried unsuccessfully to forge a compromise between Kubie and Horney.[1]

In a pretense of openness, Kubie invited Horney to speak to the members of the Institute, with no candidates present, about her current thinking. She proposed that the first chapters of her book, *New Ways in Psychoanalysis*, be read prior to her talk and that Clara Thompson and Abram Kardiner be discussants. Kubie and his allies responded to both Horney's talk and her discussants by "analyzing" their guilt and ambivalence (Quinn, 1987).

Horney was also criticized for writing in a way that was accessible to the general reader and airing her differences with Freud in a public manner. The battle between the "true believers" and what Bergmann later called "the modifiers" continued for over a year. Students increasingly complained about feeling intimidated and barred from membership in the society if they espoused the ideas of Horney, Thompson, or Sullivan. Gregory Zilboorg, often considered by candidates to be the most intimidating faculty member, would attack a student by telling him "Your unanalyzed homosexuality is apparent. Who was your analyst?" (Quinn, 1987, p. 342). Both Levy and Horney were worried about the closed-mindedness of many analysts who seemed uninterested in facts and more concerned with proving their allegiance to Freud.

The education committee at New York Psychoanalytic was not only unresponsive to student complaints of intimidation but also turned around and blamed Horney and Thompson as the main troublemakers. The committee claimed that "student minds are being poisoned by hostile and irresponsible members of the society" (Minutes of the Meeting of the Society, March 25, 1941, cited by Quinn, 1987, p. 345). In January 1941, seeing the writing on the wall, Horney and Thompson began planning their departure from the Institute. At the end of March, without waiting for the results of a student questionnaire, the education committee decided to change Karen Horney's status from lecturer to instructor. This decision was accepted by a vote of 24 to 7 with 10 abstentions.

[1] This discussion draws heavily from the detailed description of events provided by Quinn (1987, pp. 328–350).

After the vote, Horney, Thompson, and three younger analysts, Harmon Ephron, Bernard Robbins, and Sarah Kelman resigned from the Institute and walked out. Eleven other students eventually left as well. Within the next three years, David Levy, Abram Kardiner, and Sandor Rado also left. Quinn (1987), quoting Ralph Crowley and Maurice Green, writes that Thompson subsequently described this experience to a friend, stating: “It’s the most exciting thing that has happened to me in many years. Not only are the events exciting, but the necessity to have courage to take a dangerous step (one might have been ruined professionally) has made a new person of me” (p. 352).

I have elaborated on many of the themes presented by Clara Thompson in her description of the events that led to Horney’s ouster, but it’s clear that, in addition to concern that candidates were becoming increasingly drawn to the cultural school, there was significant personal animosity directed particularly at Horney. I wonder how much of Kubie’s and other’s dislike of the representatives of the cultural school grew not only from envy of their popularity and concern for maintaining the purity of Freudian psychoanalysis, but also out of their desire to appear respectable and beyond reproach. I’ve already described how Horney’s behavior with candidates and her reputation for sexual involvement with supervisees contributed to Kubie, Zilboorg, and others’ concerns about her influence. I don’t know whether there were similar concerns regarding Thompson’s behavior, but there may have been because she had been chastised during her training in Baltimore for socializing with her first analyst, Joseph “Snake” Thompson. During her second analysis with Sándor Ferenczi—at this point considered a heretic by the psychoanalytic establishment—Thompson was rumored to have described being able to “kiss papa Ferenczi whenever she wanted” (Shapiro, 1993). If I am right that the New York Psychoanalytic Institute was concerned with appearing respectable, and that there was a well-documented homophobic atmosphere at the Institute, then the candidates’ expressed wish for courses with Harry Stack Sullivan might have also caused concern.

Although Sullivan’s homosexuality was officially denied for many decades, I don’t know how he was “read” by his contemporaries. Sullivan was often described as extremely secretive about his personal history but was known to be single and living with his “foster son,” Jimmy. Sullivan had reason to be cautious about revealing his sexuality because sodomy was a criminal offense in many states in the United States until 2003. In addition, homosexuality was viewed as a security threat by the U.S.

government once the Cold War began. Although early biographers of Sullivan (Chatelaine, 1981; Perry, 1982) were encouraged to keep Sullivan's homosexuality secret, as attitudes towards homosexuality changed in this country, Sullivan's sexuality could see the light of day. Gay analysts were finally able to be open about their own sexuality and wondered if their suspicions about Sullivan were correct (Allen, 1995). In 2005, Mark Blechner openly described Sullivan's sexuality and the impact it had on some of his theories and practices. Most recently, Wake—in several articles (2006, 2008) and in her 2011 book, *Private Practices: Harry Stack Sullivan, the Science of Homosexuality, and American Liberalism*—documents not only Sullivan's relationship with Jimmy but also describes some of Sullivan's sexual behavior, which today would be described as predatory. What was the impact on the White Institute because its senior analysts felt obliged to maintain secrecy surrounding one of its founders? How did Sullivan's secrecy regarding his sexual orientation affect his public behavior and the impression the Freudian establishment had of him and the White Institute? Horney, Thompson, and William Silverberg would have had a big problem as part of an institute and a profession that was desperately trying to establish its credentials while still a part of a sexually conservative and homophobic culture.

Within weeks of their departure from New York Psychoanalytic, Thompson and Horney had a name for their new organization, the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis, and began publishing a journal, the *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*. In its first issue, there was a tentative description of courses to be offered to interested students and, by the second issue, a new training institute with Horney as dean was announced. This announcement came with a claim that the atmosphere at the newly formed institute would be much more open, and students would be treated as adults. The faculty included Clara Thompson, Erich Fromm, and Harry Stack Sullivan. William Silverberg, a member of the zodiac group with Sullivan, Thompson, and Horney, also joined the new group. Despite the fact that Pearl Harbor was bombed in December 1941 and many candidates were drafted, enrollment at Horney's institute grew. In the new institute's first year, various social scientists were invited to give talks, and there were panels addressing the fears people had about being at war. Horney was so charismatic that several candidates named their daughters after her (Quinn, 1987). However, the exciting atmosphere and sense of camaraderie at the new association did not last long.

Just as Horney's popularity with students had aroused envy among her colleagues at New York Psychoanalytic, now Fromm's popularity was arousing Horney's envy. It was her turn to pull the M.D. card and take away Fromm's privileges. Not only were Fromm's courses increasingly popular but also his long affair with Horney, 15 years his senior, had recently ended.[2] There is some suggestion (Quinn, 1987, citing Horney's secretary) that Horney was hoping for a more permanent arrangement with Fromm after he divorced Frieda Fromm-Reichmann in 1942. Horney and Fromm had officially broken up earlier and—as mentioned in note 2—both were seeing other people, although they continued to travel together until 1943. During the first three years of that decade, Fromm was in a relationship with the dancer Katherine Dunham but, by 1943, this relationship was also over and he was becoming increasingly involved with Henny Gurland, a photojournalist, active Zionist and—like Fromm—a German refugee. Horney was so distressed that she chose not to remain friends with people who continued to be friends with Fromm. In addition, Horney blamed Fromm, who—at her suggestion—had been analyzing her daughter, Marianne Eckardt, for her daughter's increasing irritability with her mother, increased independence from her mother, and recent marriage. Horney's actions led to another walkout, this time by Thompson, Fromm, Sullivan, Fromm-Reichmann, and Marianne Eckardt, thereby giving birth to the William Alanson White Institute. Personality clashes, theoretical disputes, and splits in institutes continue to beset psychoanalysis until this day.

Once the American Psychoanalytic Association agreed to certify more than one institute per city, some members of the White Institute proposed limiting training at their Institute to M.D.s. In response, beginning in 1952, a number of the Institute's members began negotiations with New York University to start a postdoctoral program in psychoanalysis. The N.Y.U. Postdoctoral Program officially opened in 1961 as a guaranteed place for psychologists to obtain training. The effort to limit psychoanalytic training to M.D.s at the American was struck down in 1988 after a lengthy lawsuit brought by Bryant Welch and three other psychologists in 1985.

The disagreement over training nonmedical candidates was not the only conflict replicated over the years. Most psychoanalytic institutes

[2] The affair ended in late 1941, although they continued seeing each other while also seeing other people (Paris, 1994).

have limited their curriculum to include only the work of particular theorists. This divisive and exclusionary process was repeated many times in the ensuing decades and was not restricted to Freudian institutes. Theoretical bias in curriculum was seen in the curricula of both the White Institute and the NYU Postdoctoral Program, when British object relations theory was becoming popular among students. On the other side of the Atlantic, Anna Freud, the founder and director of the Hampstead Child Therapy Clinic, rejected the work of Erik Erikson because of his inclusion of cultural factors, and opposed the work of Mahler and others who developed theories based on infant observation. And, as a general rule, psychoanalytic institutes have seldom included new empirical findings from infancy research, genetics, or neurobiology in their curriculum. Horney's statement to David Levy in 1939, that "It is more and more amazing to see with what supreme disregard facts are treated in psychoanalysis" (Quinn, 1987, p. 332) remains true to this day.

Kirsner (2000) cites the provincialism of most psychoanalytic institutes in America and Europe as a major factor contributing to the crisis in psychoanalysis and contrasts it to the more theoretically inclusive climate in both South American and French psychoanalytic institutes. Somehow, psychoanalysis in those institutes did not suffer the intergenerational transmission of maladaptive regulations that Eisold (1994) has described.

In conclusion, I suggest that there were many factors involved in the expulsion of Horney from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute and her subsequent expulsion of Fromm from her institute. These splits were initially viewed as based on theoretical differences. But I would propose that—although economic pressures and fears initially were central to the American requirement that psychoanalysts have medical degrees—Horney's limiting psychoanalysis to M.D.s was at least as much a result of her failed relationship with Fromm. I also suggest that the pressure to appear respectable in the postwar years when psychoanalysis was establishing its place in American society, created a conservative environment that led to a concern with secrecy and a focus on appearing to be "normal"—how else could psychoanalysis claim to make people psychologically healthy? Analysts who were known to be "outliers," atypical by 1950s standards and un-American by Cold War standards ruthlessly imposed by McCarthy, needed to be secretive about their personal lives and political convictions. Institutes that were home to less conventional men and women were considered a threat to the more traditional and dominant Freudian institutes and society. This should not come as a

surprise because institutes, like their individual members, replay unconscious patterns through the generations (Eisold, 1994). If for no other reason than this, it is necessary for us to be aware of and revisit the origin myths our institutions hold dear.

REFERENCES

Allen, M. S. (1995). Sullivan's closet. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *29*, 1–18.

Bergmann, M. S. (1993). Reflections on the history of psychoanalysis. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, *41*, 929–955.

Bergmann, M. S. (2011). The dual impact of Freud's death and Freud's death instinct theory on the history of psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Review*, *98*, 665–686.

Blechner, M. (2005). The gay Harry Stack Sullivan: Interactions between his life, clinical work and theory. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, *41*, 1–19.

Bos, J. K. (2000). Notes on a controversy: The question of lay analysis. *Psychoanalysis & History*, *3*, 153–169.

Chapman, A. H. (1976). *Harry Stack Sullivan: The man and his work*. New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Charles, D. M. (2015). *Hoover's war on gays: Exposing the FBI's "sex deviates" program*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Chatelaine, K. (1981). *Harry Stack Sullivan: The formative years*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Cushman, P. (1995). *Constructing the self, constructing America: A cultural history of psychotherapy*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Discussion: Lay analysis. (1927). *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *8*, 174–283.

Eckardt, M. H. (1988). Organizational schisms in American psychoanalysis. In J. M. Quen & E. T. Carlson (Eds.), *American psychoanalysis, origins and development: The Adolf Meyer seminars* (pp. 141–161). New York, NY: Brunner-Mazel.

Eckardt, M. H. (2005). Karen Horney: A portrait. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *65*, 95–101.

Eisold, K. (1994). The intolerance of diversity in psychoanalytic institutes. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *75*, 785–800.

Friedman, L. J. (2013). *The lives of Erich Fromm: Love's prophet*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Goggin, J. E., Goggin, E. B., & Hill, M. (2004). Emigrant psychoanalysts in the USA and the FBI archives. *Psychoanalysis & History*, *6*, 75–92.

Hale, N. (1995). *The rise and crisis of psychoanalysis in the United States: Freud and the Americans, 1917–1985*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Horney, K. (1937). *The neurotic personality of our time*. New York, NY: Norton.

Horney, K. (1939). *New ways in psychoanalysis*. New York, NY: Norton.
Hornstein, G. (2000). *To redeem one person is to redeem the world: The life of Frieda Fromm-Reichmann*. New York, NY: Free Press.
Jacoby, R. (1983). *The repression of psychoanalysis: Otto Fenichel and the political Freudians*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Johnson, D. K. (2004). *The lavender Scare: The Cold War persecution of gays and lesbians in the federal government*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
King, P., & Steiner, R. (Eds.). (1991). *The Freud-Klein controversies, 1941–45*. London, England: Tavistock/Routledge Press.
Kirsner, D. (2000). *Unfree associations: Inside psychoanalytic institutes*. New York, NY: Jason Aronson.
Nathan, S. (2015). Robert Wallerstein MD: 65 years at the center of psychoanalysis. *San Francisco Center for Psychoanalysis*, *1*(1), 4.
Paris, B. J. (1994). *Karen Horney: A psychoanalyst's search for self-understanding*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Perry, H. S. (1982). *Psychiatrist of America: The life of Harry Stack Sullivan*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Quinn, S. (1987). *A mind of her own: The life of Karen Horney*. New York, NY: Summit Books.
Richards, A. (2006). *Creating sociology and psychoanalysis in the Habsberg Lands: Freud, Brill and Fleck*. Presented at the 50th Annual Leo Baeck Memorial Address, Center for Jewish History.
Roazen, P. (2006). George Wilbur: Otto Rank and Hanns Sachs. *Psychoanalysis & History*, *8*, 43–63.
Shapiro, S. (1993). Clara Thompson: Ferenczi's messenger with half a message. In L. Aron & A. Harris (Eds.), *The legacy of Sandor Ferenczi* (pp. 159–174). Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
Shapiro, S. A. (2002). The history of feminism and interpersonal psychoanalysis. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, *38*, 213–256.
Synnot, M. G. (1996). Anti-Semitism and American universities: Did quotas follow Jews? In D. A. Gerber (Ed.), *Anti-Semitism in American history* (pp. 233–274). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Wake, N. (2006). The full story by no means all told: Harry Stack Sullivan at Sheppard-Pratt, 1922–1920. *History of Psychology*, *9*, 325–358.
Wake, N. (2008). On our memory of gay Sullivan: A hidden trajectory. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *55*, 150–165.
Wake, N. (2011). *Private practices: Harry Stack Sullivan, the science of homosexuality, and American liberalism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Sue A. Shapiro, Ph.D., is a psychoanalyst in private practice in New York. She is a clinical consultant and faculty member at the NYU Postdoctoral program in

Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis and a founding member of the Contemplative Studies Project. She is founder and director emeritus of the Trauma Center at the Manhattan Institute for Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis. Sue Shapiro has written on a variety of subjects including sexual abuse, gender in transference and countertransference, embodiment, mortality, the sociocultural context of psychoanalytic theory, and the integration of genetic and biological factors with psychodynamic theory in understanding severe pathology. She is an associate editor of *Studies in Gender and Sexuality* and *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*.