

REVOLUTION WITHIN PSYCHOANALYSIS:
A HISTORY OF THE WILLIAM ALANSON WHITE INSTITUTE

by Ralph M. Crowley, M.D. and Maurice R. Green, M.D. ¹

The Institute began with Clara Thompson's vision and the people she attracted to her vision, not only of psychoanalysis but of life. So we must understand what her vision was in order to understand the beginnings of the Institute.

Her vision is well expressed in an unpublished paper written in 1947 entitled "Anxiety and Social Standards", in which she discusses definitions of maturity and goals in therapy.

In contrast with the concept of a mature man as one who adjusts to his culture, Thompson defined the mature man as a "person sufficiently anxiety-free to be able to deviate from the culture when he finds it necessary to maintain his integrity or when he is convinced that the aims of the culture are bad for man."

She believed that the goal in therapy and analysis "is not successful conformity but successful fulfillment of what is best for man." This meant that a person in a destructive culture may have to be a deviant, or in a less destructive culture a revolutionary.

Clara Thompson was an example of this type of maturity and those who associated themselves with her shared, in varying degrees, in this concept, in her example, and in her vision.² The story of the White Institute begins and continues with Clara and her beliefs in "what is best for man."

In the spring of 1943, Clara Thompson, Erich Fromm, David Rioch, Janet Rioch, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann and Harry Stack Sullivan made a beginning of a new teaching and training facility.

1. See p. 1a for acknowledgements.

2. When Dr. Thompson resigned from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute in 1941 and associated herself with Karen Horney in the newly formed American Institute of Psychoanalysis, she wrote a friend (Sept. 1941): "...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."

The next spring, April 1942, she wrote this same friend, "I have learned about leadership, I have written papers, taught classes and learned about group politics. I have learned how to fight - I guess a thing I Never really did before."

By April 1943, Drs. Fromm and Thompson resigned from the American Institute and Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis over a disagreement concerning the role of Erich Fromm, Ph.D. as an accredited training analyst, supervisor and teacher of analysis. On April 23, 1943, remaining faculty members, Drs. Horney, Silverberg, and Robbins faced the students in a discussion of the issues involved. They maintained that the



Acknowledgements:

To Maurice R. Green I am indebted for a chapter entitled "The Interpersonal School of Psychoanalysis", from which I borrowed freely for the early history of our Institute. He also went over the entire manuscript for its improvement in fact and style.

Others to whom I am indebted for helpful information and for corrections of fact are:

Milton Mazer
Ruth Moulton
Leopold Rosanes
John L. Schmel
Edward S. Tauber
Richard H. Wels
Sondra Wilk
Earl G. Witenberg

RMC

-
1. This chapter is no. VI of an unpublished book on The Intellectual History of Psychoanalysis.



This facility in name and in function was a direct extension of the Washington School of Psychiatry and was called, therefore, the New York Division of the Washington School. This meant it was also the New York Division of the Washington, Baltimore Psychoanalytic Institute, inasmuch as its psychoanalytic training program was identical in reality with that of the Washington School of Psychiatry, although in 1943 it was separated on paper. Many people originally with Clara Thompson and Erich Fromm, when they were teaching with Karen Horney, were now enrolled in the new facility even though they were unable to be present because of the necessities of military service.

Who were these people, who, with Clara, helped found what was to become in 1946 the William Alanson White Institute of Psychiatry. Without attempting to give a biographical sketch of each one, let me say that all of them were connected with the Washington School of Psychiatry. All of them were Fellows of that school, that is, senior faculty and members of the professional policy-making body. All of them, with the exception of Sullivan and David Rioch, were active in the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis, which was formed in 1941, when Horney resigned from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, along with Clara Thompson, Bernard Robbins, Harmon Ephron, and Sarah Kelman, and with many of their students who had been enrolled in that Institute. The Association was intended to be a national organization, and in the beginning attracted as members a number of people from various corners of the United States. Horney had published her book The Neurotic Personality of Our Time in 1937, which together with her 1939 book, New Ways in Psychoanalysis led the New York Psychoanalytic Institute to restrict her training activities with students. Two major works published in 1940 and 1941 were Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry by Harry Stack Sullivan and Escape From Freedom by Erich Fromm. These books, along with the stimulating influence of the Horney group in New York, the Blitzstein group in Chicago, and the Sullivan group in Washington and Baltimore, furthered a move away from the dull, confining libidinal preoccupations of earlier psychoanalysis.

issue was Fromm's demand for recognition of lay analysis through his having full training analyst status, while Dr. Thompson and her supporters, including Dr. Moulton, then a student, maintained that this was not the real issue. Even the issue of medical school acceptance of analytic training by New York Medical College was described by Dr. Thompson as a red herring. As a matter of fact, a year later, 1944, Horney discontinued her teaching connection with New York Medical College, at which time Silverberg and Robbins continued to forum the Comprehensive Course in Psychoanalysis at New York Medical College (Flower-Fifth Avenue group). Before this meeting, and following it, a number of faculty, students, and members of the association resigned. In addition to Fromm and Thompson, these included Drs. Sullivan, J. Rioch, Rosanes, Maskin, Tauber, Crowley, Moulton, Foster and G. Goldman. All except the latter became associated with the White Institute first organized in May, 1943.

(Information from documents in the possession of Ruth Moulton, M.D.)



A more dynamic and open approach to personality and culture, characteristic of the beginnings of American psychoanalysis, became a rallying point for people who later were referred to as neo-Freudians. Clara Thompson was part of the Sullivan group in Washington: students of Blitzsten, like the authors of this history (Crowley and Green) found her sympathique, and, of course, she with Fromm, Horney, and Silverberg was the backbone of the Horney group. Clara Thompson was thus a leader among revolutionary-minded psychiatrists and psychoanalysts. Perhaps she herself would have characterized herself rather as an independent, around whom some of the other independent dissidents congregated.

What precipitated the first split in the American Association for Psychoanalysis was Horney's denying training credit to Erich Fromm's case seminar in psychoanalysis, much as Horney herself had been denied training credit in the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. Thompson, Fromm, Fromm-Reichmann, and Janet Rioch, now Bard, resigned. Sullivan and David Rioch from the Washington School joined these four to found the New York Division of the Washington School, in order to carry on the original dream of the William Alanson White Foundation of Washington for research and teaching in psychiatry and psychoanalysis, based broadly on an integrated program of psychoanalysis with biology and the human sciences of anthropology. The Washington School in addition to training psychoanalysts, had always been interested in giving reliable and responsible teaching of psychoanalysis to those in allied professions. This tradition was carried on by its New York Division from the beginning, and thenceforward to the present by the White Institute, which today offers 36 courses to such professionals as physicians, ministers, nurses, teachers, psychologists and social workers.

Such, in the midst of a world war, were the beginnings of the White Institute, a name that is today frequently misconstrued as having to do with a current and national racist power struggle. As with any new organization born of revolt, the problem is that of continual furthering of the principles for which it revolted. Has it furthered those principles or has it settled back in an orthodoxy of its own? In what ways has it maintained its freshness and appeal to new revolutionaries and in what ways has it not done so? In some measure I must allow you to judge from what I am about to relate.

During its first year, 1943-4, Clara Thompson taught Psychiatric Concepts of the Twentieth Century. This was described in the Bulletin of the Washington School (she taught in Washington as well as in New York) as follows:

The development of psychoanalytic psychiatry is the twentieth century contribution to the understanding of emotional disorder. Beginning with Freud's earliest work, the evolution of psychoanalytic thinking will be traced. Special attention will be given to the factors bringing about alter-

1. And so did Leo Rosanes, a graduate and two students, Ruth Moulton and Ruth Foster. Dr. Moulton was graduated from the New York Division in 1946 and Dr. Foster from the White Institute in 1947. Others who finished up their analysis and supervision in the New York Division, after having been students at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute were Eugene Eisner, Meyer Maskin, Leo Rosanes and Edward Tauber.



ations in theory and the emergence of new ideas. Psychoanalysis originated from the study of symptoms and was primarily concerned with their treatment. It has become a study of the structure of the total personality, and in its therapy it now aims at favorable modifications of the character structure.

Janet Rioch gave a course in Pediatric Psychiatry utilizing modern concepts. Erich Fromm taught a course entitled Psychoanalysis of the Character Structure. Harry Stack Sullivan gave a course on the Theory of Interpersonal Relations in Therapy and Research and a seminar entitled Reasonable Expectations in Psychotherapy. Sullivan's dry, precise approach is well represented in the description of this seminar that appeared in the 1943 Bulletin of the Washington School:

Any attempt to exert a favorable influence on the life course of another by chief virtue of more or less communicative verbal interchange may be called psychotherapy. This includes everything from cheery reassurance in a brief office contact or "advice" given at the dispensary, to the prolonged and sometimes highly ritualistic procedures of psychoanalysis. There are certainly many patients who cannot secure the benefits of prolonged and intensive psychotherapy, some at least who could benefit greatly from well-directed efforts that would take relatively little time. This seminar is intended to explore the reasonable basis for recommending and undertaking particular psychotherapeutic efforts for the relief of patients' difficulties. Its success largely depends on the adequacy and completeness of information supplied by the participants.

.....The session itself will open with a statement in which the reporting psychiatrist distinguishes between the difficulties for which the patient said he desired treatment and the therapeutic change which the psychiatrist undertook to bring about.

Frieda Fromm-Reichmann gave a case seminar entitled Principles of Intensive Psychotherapy. David Rioch presented a series of lecture discussions entitled Interrelation Between Anatomical Physiological, and Psychiatric Data on the Functions of the Nervous System.

Candidates in psychoanalysis and non-candidates could take any of the classes at this time. Clara Thompson felt no problem then about mixing candidates and non-candidates saying each could get out of it whatever he could.

Courses did not remain the same from year to year. In 1944, Sullivan taught a new course entitled Basic Psychiatry. Since the description of this course in the 1944-5 Bulletin is a masterful summary of Sullivan's theoretical position it is quoted here:

The considerations which lead to defining psychiatry as the study of interpersonal relations are outlined. The subject is then amplified along three principle lines: the developmental history of the person's living; the dynamisms which are useful abstractions in organizing one's participant observation and thought about another's personal problem; and the reasonably probable influence on subsequent life of various situations of personal interaction. The genetically given developmental possibilities of the infant and time-pattern of their maturation is coordinated with the cultural influences that make the human animal a human being. The system of dynamisms making up the self and its functional activity are outlined and the origin and role of anxiety made clear. There follows a consideration of alertness, awareness, attention, and the peculiarities of recall and recollection: of the gamut of

Propriety of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.
Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke.
Veröffentlichungen - auch von Teilen - bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.



implicit symbolic operations in and outside of personal awareness; of sublimatory, substitutive and dissociated processes; and the establishing of the relatively durable pattern of interpersonal relations which may be said to characterize the person. The parataxic elements in the person's relations with others are shown to imply the type of recurrent difficulties he experiences, the way he thinks and speaks of them, the foreseen and unnoted goals toward which his behavior will be addressed as an approach to intimate acquaintance develops, and the course of events that can be reasonably expected to relieve his major difficulties. The proper meaning of many unnecessary technical terms appears and the rationale of presumptively therapeutic interpersonal activity is formulated.

Frieda Fromm-Reichmann added a new course, Assets of the Mentally handicapped. Her attitude was well exemplified by the following statement taken from her description of her course: "The specific assets and the practical limitations of the person are much more important than is the place to be accorded him in some ideal scale of degrees of mental health."

By 1945, the New York Division had grown considerably with the addition of 69 new registrants, 10 of them psychiatrists. A new faculty member, who was also added to the Council of Fellows of the Washington School was Ernest Schachtel, the Rorschach authority. Courses were added in Cultural Anthropology (Hortense Powdermaker), Problems of Adolescent Guidance (Park and Thompson) and a seminar on philosophy, psychology and psychiatry (Patrick Mullahy).¹

In 1946, registration totaled 254, including over 60 psychiatrists registered for intensive psychoanalytic training. The majority of these psychiatrists had recently been released from duty with the armed services. Naturally they wanted their training to be partially supported by the recent GI Bill. While the Washington School was eligible to enroll students under this bill, legal technicalities prevented its New York Division from doing so. It was required that students taking courses in New York be enrolled in an educational institution approved by the State Board of Education. This, together with other legal and administrative complications, led to the New York Division applying for a provisional charter from the New York State Board of Education under the name of the William Alanson White Institute of Psychiatry, in honor of the late Superintendent of St. Elizabeth's Hospital, who was instrumental in furthering the studies and genius of Harry Stack Sullivan. On October 18, 1946, shortly after the year's classes had started, this provisional charter was granted, the first charter ever granted to a psychiatric institute by the Board of Regents of New York State. The White Institute was on its own, although it for a while maintained some reciprocal relationships with its parent organization, The Washington School of Psychiatry. It remained, however, for psychoanalytic training purposes, the New York Division of the Washington Baltimore Psychoanalytic Institute provided they presented a case to the satisfaction of the

1. Patrick Mullahy, a philosopher, is a student of Sullivan. Besides being co-author with Clara Thompson of Psychoanalysis, Evolution and Development (1950), he has published Oedipus Myth and Complex (1948) and edited A Study of Interpersonal Relationships (1949), and The Contributions of Harry Stack Sullivan (1952).



Educational Committee of that Institute. Prior to 1946, membership in the American Psychoanalytic Association was automatic on acceptance by a local institute, but during 1946, reorganization within the American Psychoanalytic Association made it necessary for all local graduates to submit credentials to the admissions committee of the American Psychoanalytic Association before membership was granted.¹

In order to meet the greatly increased enrollment, the White Institute rapidly expanded its administrative and teaching staff. In the meantime, Baltimore and Washington had decided to dissolve partnership in their mutual institute, and to organize their own separate institutes. This meant that both lost recognition as training institutes with the American Psychoanalytic Association and had to accept provisional status until formally recognized again. Meanwhile Washington was having a difficult time with their parent organization, which had long looked with disfavor on this Institute so under Sullivan's influence.² And by this time, Sullivan had long abandoned the term psychoanalysis, looked on its jargon with intense disfavor, and had made this abundantly known to members of the American Psychoanalytic Association. In order to meet its own problem with the APA, the Washington Baltimore Institute suggested in 1948 that the White Institute apply for independent status as a training institute in its own right to the American Psychoanalytic Association; it declined to accept any White Institute candidates as candidates in its Institute, and, to graduate any of the already accepted candidates. In other words, the White Institute was no longer to be the New York Division of the Washington Baltimore Institute, and the listing of its curriculum which heretofore had been part of its Bulletin, was dropped. So the White Institute duly applied to the American Psychoanalytic Association for Training Institute status.

To finish this story before returning to the burgeoning Institute with its severe growing pains, it turned out that the application was anything but a routine one. No action was taken by the APA, until 1950; and by then Ernest Hadley of the Washington Institute had officially notified, on May 29, 1950, our four training analysts, (the minimum number necessary for recognition as an Institute under the APA), that they were dropped as training analysts for New York students. These were Clara Thompson, Janet Rioch, Ralph M. Crowley and Erich Fromm. So the Institute was notified it did not have the requisite number of training analysts to make it eligible for consideration as a training institute. In 1952, the APA's Institute Committee spokesman (Dr. Therese Benedek), stated that, of course, if our Institute were acceptable, then these analysts would be reinstated as training analysts and the technicality disposed of, as if the whole thing were a minor matter.

1. Three candidates graduated after a personal appearance and cross examination from the Washington Baltimore Psychoanalytic Institute by 1946 were granted membership in the APA automatically: Leo Rosanes, Ruth Moulton and Meyer Maskin. Other caught by the 1946 reorganization had a more difficult time with the APA. These included Edward S. Tauber (1948), Kate Frankenthal (1948) and Edward Kasin, the last (1950).

2. Harry Stack Sullivan died in Paris on January 14, 1949 while laboring in the field of international tensions and mental health. He no longer took an active part in the activities of the Washington Psychoanalytic Institute, nor, for that matter, in the White Institute, except for giving an occasional course.



Without detailing the efforts made by the Institute to collaborate with this Committee, suffice it to say this committee agreed to meet in New York City with representatives of the White Institute on November 1, 1952 to discuss our impasse. At this meeting one of their members, Merton Gill, made heroic efforts to clarify the situation. He helped elicit that the American was convinced that the White Institute's teachings were too deviant from Freud's to constitute analysis, and that our technical requirements of three times a week did not, and would not satisfy theirs of four to five times a week. What we did about training Ph.D.'s in psychology was no concern of theirs, except of course, these Ph.D.'s were not eligible for consideration by the American. Two weeks subsequent to this meeting, the White Institute withdrew its application to the American, and eventually went on to help organize a new national psychoanalytic association, now known as The American Academy of Psychoanalysis. But that is another story, and comes later.

To return to the problems of the White Institute overwhelmed by a post-war influx of students, Erich Fromm agreed in 1947 to be chairman of its expanding faculty, to which was added, among others, Ralph M. Crowley, Eugene Eisner, Meyer Maskin, and Edward S. Tauber, who had returned from war service. To the professional policy-making board, the Council of Fellows, consisting of the original six founders were added Ernest Schachtel (1946) and Ralph M. Crowley (1947).

During this year (1947) the Fellows explored two possibilities both of which were vigorously supported by Erich Fromm, as chairman of the Faculty. One was that of accepting Ph.D.'s with background in clinical psychology, who in addition had internships in mental hospitals and experience in doing therapy in outpatient settings comparable in some respects to the clinical training of residents in psychiatry. The other was that of establishing a psychoanalytic service for people with limited income. By 1948, the Fellows had agreed to establish such a service. One of its purposes was to be a community service, which up to that time had been provided only by the Institute for Psychoanalysis in Chicago, the Topeka Kansas Psychoanalytic Institute, and the newly formed Institute for Training and Research at Columbia University in New York City. A second aim was to provide the psychoanalytic candidates of the Institute with patients from a cross section of the socio-economic population rather than just from those who could afford private fees. A third purpose was embodied in a provision that priority be granted to those applicants who dealt with children, such as teachers, or who had children of their own. This service was inaugurated March 1, 1948 under the directorship of Ralph M. Crowley, and continues today as part of the much expanded Clinical Services of the White Institute.

As to psychologists, they were first accepted as candidates for psychoanalytic training in 1948, although at that time there were few who could meet the requirements for clinical experience. Nevertheless, to our knowledge, our Institute was the first recognized educational institution to train openly non-M.D.'s in psychoanalysis, a revolutionary step, especially for a group composed mainly of M.D.'s itself. The policy of the American Psychoanalytic Association and its institutes was opposed to training of non-M.D.'s, and in this regard was non-Freudian, as Freud was not in favor of allying psychoanalysis with medicine only; he always favored the training of lay analysts. Some of the American's institutes managed to get around the official policy, however, by training Ph.D.'s as research students, with the understanding they would not go into practice. Some of these did go into practice, and even achieved eminence as psychoanalysts. From the White Institute was graduated its first psychologist-psychoanalyst in 1950 and psychologists have been graduated as psychoanalysts ever since.



Theory was not being neglected. In 1947, Clara Thompson was writing her book, Psychoanalysis: Evolution and Development, revising each chapter as she gave it as part of a lecture course in the White Institute and the Washington School of Psychiatry. As she wrote a friend in November, 1947, "I think we really have a constructive theory...." The book was published in 1950, co-authored with Patrick Mullahy, a philosopher and writer on Sullivan and interpersonal theory.

1948-49 saw another huge enrollment for courses, including the curriculum for psychoanalysts, due to utilization of the G.I. Bill. It was not the optimum time for admitting psychologists to an analytic curriculum. Classes had become unwieldy, so large were they. Faculty complained; students grumbled. So the Institute decided that no new admissions would be accepted for the psychoanalytic curriculum in the fall of 1949. This did give us some freedom to examine what we were doing, but large classes still obtained. I (RMC) remember having seventeen in a psychoanalytic case seminar several years later. In addition the elementary classes for analyst were also open to those interested in furthering their knowledge of psychoanalysis without becoming analyst themselves. These people included enrollees in other curricula, such as those for social workers, physicians, ministers, and teachers. The trainees in psychoanalysis objected to these large mixed classes. So the Institute was confronted with growing pains associated with its sudden popularity with students.

In addition, the Low Cost Psychoanalytic Service had its problems. First of all, it was not attracting applications from all socio-economic strata, only the very upper ones. One criterion for admission, that of having children, was not working out. Those who had children were sicker than those who had put off having children until they were psychologically ready to have them. The analytic trainees expected that patients so carefully selected by their mentors would be ideal patients; this was far from true. The clinic patients were often sicker; many were ambulatory schizophrenics; some needed much education before they could accept an analytic situation. They expected verbal medicine, prescriptions for life in short. So the relationship of the clinic service for patients, to its function of training analyst became a focus for study. And while these problems were being studied, they were also being met by the practical everyday decisions of the members of the staff of the Low Cost Psychoanalytic Service, who were well aware of the deficiencies in their operations, and who did their best to remedy them as fast as possible.

In 1950 the Exchange-Visitor Program of the Institute was approved by the State Department for qualified foreign students who wished to obtain advanced training for psychiatry and psychoanalysis in the United States and was approved by the Attorney-General as a school which non-quota immigrants might attend. The Institute was also approved by the Veterans Administration for the training of veterans.

And while the Institute was laboring with its internal problems, its very existence became at stake from the point of view of recognition by the New York State Education Department. The Institute's provisional charter was due to expire in 1951, so we applied for a permanent charter, which necessitated a thorough examination of our educational policies and standards by Albany. Because of the fact that training was given to non-physicians, and because of pressure from medical groups who wished to restrict psychoanalytic training to physicians, the Regents required that we add Psychoanalysis and Psychology to our title and to establish three divisions in our curriculum. While the Education Department, under considerable fire from M.D.'s, refused



to take any stand as to the training of non-M.D.'s in psychoanalysis, neither for nor against, it did, we thought, require us to separate their training in our bulletin, and to grant psychologists separate certificates, labeled certificates in Clinical Psychology. We duly followed this procedure, although the training was identical with that given to psychiatrists. Throughout the years since, some pressure has been brought to bear on the Institute to abandon its training of psychologists in psychoanalysis. About 1955, a group of psychiatrists within the Institute petitioned the Fellows and Trustees to reconsider this policy. The Fellows, sustained by the Trustees, reaffirmed the policy of training Ph.D.'s. About 1962, there was a threat of a suit by Nassau County psychiatrists to restrain Adelphi College Psychology Department from training non-M.D.'s in psychoanalysis. The suit did not materialize.

By 1966, following a petition by the Institute, it was granted permission by the New York State Board of Education, to unite the curricula offered to psychiatrists and psychologists, and to grant graduates of this curriculum the same certificate, namely a Certificate in Psychoanalysis. Psychologist graduates have considerably expanded the influence of the White Institute by establishing psychoanalytic training in connection with several university psychology departments, such as at New York University and Adelphi College. Others teach in such departments along with our M.D. faculty members and graduates. So the Institute pioneered in something that is now becoming more commonplace, but still not accepted by the American Psychiatric Association and many of its members, who represent medical psychiatry.

In 1954, the powers in control of the American Psychoanalytic proposed for adoption by its members amendments which would have had the effect of (1) providing that any member who taught or supervised training at a training institute not accredited by the American would forfeit membership in the American; (2) credits earned by any candidate at an unaccredited institute could not be accepted by an accredited institute thereafter; and (3) would deny membership in the American to anyone who had attended an unaccredited institute.

Clara Thompson organized the opposition to the adoption of these by-laws, and carried the fight to the membership of the American. She carried a majority of the members and the amendments were defeated.

Let Clara Thompson tell the story in her own words in a letter to a friend dated November 27, 1954. "Perhaps you will remember that my institute has not been recognized by the American Psychoanalytic Association because they feel we do not genuflect enough to Freud. Recently, however, they have become more belligerent and threatened that anyone teaching in an unrecognized institute (ours among others) would lose his membership in their organization... So we are threatening to go to court about it under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act..."

On December 30, 1954 she writes, "I think we have won the first round with the APA. At least they did not dare drop anybody from membership after our lawyer's letter. What we hope to explode is their idea that they have a right to say who is a psychoanalyst and who isn't... they can't even agree among themselves (even the inner circle) as to what constitutes psychoanalysis... Yes, we are thinking of starting a new national - or maybe Pan



American. We have a group in Mexico¹ and one in Rio in Brazil..."²

The idea of starting a new national organization was in the minds of many people ever since the organization of the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis in 1941. By 1952, Henry P. Laughlin of Washington, D.C. was actively promulgating such a new organization. On June 5, 1952, Clara Thompson wrote him, "...I had the impression the plan was chiefly an attempt to find a means for people with differing ideas to get together periodically and discuss, and I am still all for that. However, your present plan seems to be much more ambitious and you are in effect declaring war on the American Psychoanalytic Association. The fact that in the last six months an inner revolution in the APA has started makes me question the wisdom of an outer one at this time. Having been through two revolutions I know one is tempted to take in all disgruntled people as if in numbers there is strength - but this ends in weakening the situation. If you organize a group the people should be of superior competence. This is very difficult to determine, but the strength of your organization will depend upon your ability to do so."

In December, 1952, after the White Institute made its decision to withdraw its application to the American Psychoanalytic Association, it explored the idea of a new national again. Jules Masserman indicated that Carl Binger, Abraham Kardiner and Sandor Rado, as well as John Millet, were very interested. By January, 1953, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann had also indicated her support. In order to assure some standard of competence, they believed that the new organization should be based entirely upon people who were already members of the American Psychoanalytic Association, and with this group as a core, criteria could be formulated for admitting others. Many informal discussions were held from 1953 to April, 1955 with people from all parts of the country. Many favored founding a psychoanalytic organization devoted to a forum genuinely committed to a diversity of ideas and experience which would bridge sectarian isolationism, and in which a true exchange of ideas could take place between psychoanalysts no matter of what persuasion. Scientific interchange with prominent scholars of related fields was given importance, in order to promote increased integration of psychoanalysis with the academic community. Irving Bieber urged Clara Thompson to call an organizational meeting. He suggested a name, suggested also by Henry P. Laughlin years before, The American Academy of Psychoanalysis. And it was proposed now that in addition to members of the APA, graduates of the American Institute of Psychoanalysis (Horney), the Comprehensive Course at New York Medical College (Silverberg) and the Psychoanalytic training division of Tulane University Medical School (Heath) also be invited to join. As a result individual meetings of the William Alanson White Psychoanalytic Society and other groups involved ensued, as well as a preliminary organization meeting, which resulted in the first meeting of the Academy of Psychoanalysis in Chicago, in April, 1956. Janet Rioch (now Bard) an active member of the White Institute, was elected the first president. Dr. Thompson, harassed by illness and her other responsibilities, refused to take any executive position in the new Academy except for serving as a trustee for a year.

-
1. Institute directed by Erich Fromm in connection with the University of Mexico.
 2. Directed by Iracy Doyle and subsequently by Horus Brazil, both graduates.



FROMM: Online

Since then many White Institute faculty and members¹ have taken an active part in the Academy and its development in terms of its aims to develop communication among psychoanalysts and their colleagues in science and the humanities, to constitute a forum for free inquiry into the phenomena of individual motivation and social behavior, and to encourage and support research in psychoanalysis, to foster its acceptance and academic integration in universities.

Now we return to 1952, when the Institute received its permanent charter. What was happening inside the Institute, while it was resisting lawsuits by the American Psychoanalytic Association and while it was helping to establish the Academy of Psychoanalysis?

Housekeeping problems which are never ending, had been partially solved through taking up quarters in the Croydon Hotel, 12 East 86th Street, about 1950. So the Institute and its Low Cost Psychoanalytic Service became settled in one place from then until 1964 when it moved into a building of its own. Now we are ahead of our story.

Much energy was devoted to consideration of what an analyst ought to know, and how he ought to be taught it. The curriculum was studied and changed, mainly in terms of the faculty's dissatisfaction with it, not so much in terms of external criticisms, such as those of the Committee on Institutes of the American Psychoanalytic Association. However, these criticisms did lead us to consider whether our teachings were implicitly and explicitly overly hostile to Freud, on whose shoulders we all stood. On the other hand, libido theory concepts had so permeated us, as well as the community atmosphere, we examined whether we were teaching adequately the concepts of Sullivan. Those of us who had worked with him tended to take for granted that our students would know him automatically from being in our Institute. Yet candidates "ready" for graduation seemed not to have adequate grasp of Sullivan.

Many of us felt that in the APA there was too great a dichotomy between the way teaching of analysis was carried on and psychoanalytic principles. This showed itself particularly in the issue of the privileged communications issue in training analysis. Lone voices in the APA, such as that of Sig. Bernfeld of San Francisco, spoke out loud and clear against the training analyst having any influence whatsoever on the evaluation of the candidate for promotions and graduation. He went so far as to say that the training analyst should have no teaching nor administrative connection with the Institute. In as small an Institute as ours this was impractical. We needed our experienced analysts not only as training analysts but also as teachers, and as members of the training committee, and as members of the administration. However, it established a policy that the training analyst shall have no say and no part in any administrative decisions concerning his candidate-analysand. This policy is still in effect, and has been adopted by several other analytic training institutions. The training analysis is thus made as much of a confidential situation as is any other analysis. This is in keeping with the conviction of the Institute that there is no training

1. Earl Witenberg, Treasurer, John L. Schimel, Treasurer, Sidney Goldensohn, Secretary, Ralph M. Crowley, Trustee and President, Ruth Moulton, Trustee, Milton Mazer, Trustee and many others as members of committees and presenters of scientific papers.



analysis that is not a personal and therapeutic analysis. Providing a realistic basis for the candidate to maintain a need for making a good impression on his analyst can serve only to defeat the goals of analysis.

About 1955, a group of graduates, convinced that it was not in the best interests of the Institute and psychoanalysis to train non-M.D.'s as psychoanalysts, petitioned the Fellows and Trustees to reconsider Institute policy in this regard. This attempt to effect change, albeit done in an orderly and democratic manner, aroused for a few months considerable heat, with charges and counter charges flying back and forth between the protagonists. However, with the decision of the policy making bodies of the Institute to continue training non-M.D.'s, the Institute settled down again. No one resigned. With rare exceptions, all those who supported the petition have continued to be active in support of the Institute.

The relative isolation of the Institute from active interrelationships with other community organizations led to considerable exploration of possibilities for affiliations with hospital or university psychiatric departments. One hospital was quite willing for us to run its psychiatric ward, if we would assume full financial responsibility. Other possibilities required our abandonment of our identity as an Institute. The possibility of our running our own day hospital was studied, but seemed to require more outlay of money and personnel time than were available. So by the end of the 1950's no progress was made in these directions. Further progress had to wait until the 1960's when the concept of community psychiatry began making headway.

During the middle and latter 50's the Low Cost Psychoanalytic Service expanded to include a Counselling and Referral Service, a Young Adult Treatment Center for adolescents, and a psychotherapy service for adults over 21. This resulted in changing the name of the LCPS to Clinical Services. The psychoanalytic service remained only one part. This expansion resulted in great financial drain on the Institute at a time when applicants were fewer and tuition income had dropped. The obvious lever for raising funds was the community service offered by the clinic. Application to the City Mental Health Board was turned down as were applications to various foundations. The financial crisis continued to be acute.

Organizational problems due to lack of structure and formulated delegation of responsibility also became acute in the 1950's. Clara Thompson, our director, tended to administer the Institute with as little structure and red tape as possible. The Institute had grown so, that more structure and formal ways of accomplishing Institute business became necessary, and with the help of Edith Alt, director of the social work curriculum, and a Fellow of the Institute, the Institute was reorganized on a more formal and structured basis.

Initially the Board of Trustees was drawn from friends and acquaintances of Clara other than those in the psychoanalytic community. A number of them, particularly in the early days, gave much to the Institute. Among them were R. McAllister Lloyd, Morris Rosenthal, Judge Jerome Frank, Lauchlin Curne, Abe Fortas, and Richard Wels. Mr. Wels is the only one of this group still with us and is presently Secretary of the Board. In later years the Board of course has broadened its membership, and is more representative of the community-at-large in contrast to being an extension of the Administration with some of the faculty and administration being trustees themselves.



To the best of our knowledge no one gave much thought to the problems of filling the post of Director of the Institute should something happen to Clara Thompson. She had thought about it, though, for in January, 1957, following an intestinal resection for a potentially malignant intestinal polyp, Dr. Thompson wrote a friend, "I don't know what really happened but I feel stronger, more decisive than I have ever felt...I think one thing the approach to near death alerted in men - is how to prepare a successor."¹ Those who surrounded her in the Institute never imagined a time when Clara would not be there.² For another year and a half she felt well until June, 1958 when she developed shingles and became easily exhausted. After her usual Provincetown summer, she returned to New York. Following a physical examination she was told she had cirrhosis of the liver and told her friends this.³ She remained active at considerable effort while receiving treatments at home, until two weeks before her death on December 20, 1958. Metastatic carcinoma was the ultimate cause. The Institute was directorless. No successor was in sight. Who was to be at the helm?

The answer turned out to be no one person. With some reservations the Trustees accepted a proposal of the Fellows that an Executive Committee administer the Institute. This committee consisted of the Chairman of the Institute's three large divisions. Curriculum, Training and Clinical Services and a secretary, to be elected by the Fellows. The committee chose its own chairman, namely Meyer Maskin, who was chairman of the Curriculum.

However, it was not so easy as that. Several months had elapsed since Clara died. During that time the one question on everyone's mind was, "What's going to happen now?" Even after there was an authorized committee directing the Institute, the question remained, in the minds of members of the committee too. So, what did happen?

The committee got to work. It met at least weekly. The chairman, Meyer Maskin, had a double responsibility, for curriculum and for the Institute as a whole, especially in relation to the Trustees, who were especially concerned as to whether now the Institute could survive financially as well as without its beloved leader.

In the Low Cost Psychoanalytic Service the trend had been to add services as it became apparent the community needed them and so the name was

1. Apparently she discussed this with other friends also. Leo Rosanes, a close friend, as well as training analyst in the Institute, told one of us (RMC) that Dr. Thompson very much wanted a woman to continue as Director after her and that she was very much concerned over the problem of a successor.

2. Clara expressed about this time to one of her supervisees considerable interest in our Institute branching out into other cities, so that its graduates could move out of home. Cf. her paper "The Emotional Climate of Psychoanalytic Institutes." Psychiatry.

3. Dr. Rosanes is convinced that Dr. Thompson knew by this time that she has a carcinoma.

4. Other members were Edward S. Tauber, chairman of the Training Committee, Ralph M. Crowley, Director of the Clinical Services, and Milton Mazer, a newly elected Fellow, and secretary to the committee.



changed in 1959 to Low Cost Clinical Services to include such services as the Young Adult Treatment Service, the Adult Psychotherapy Service, the Counselling and Referral Service and a research division, which in 1960 was established as a department in the Institute itself, with Joseph Jaffe as director.

In the fall of 1958, in the nick of time, an Administrative Council had been organized to relieve the Fellows of administrative work so that they could devote more time to policies, goals and purposes of the Institute. However, this goal was not achieved until much later.

The new executive committee took on an enormous task of both changing the psychoanalytic curriculum for the fall of 1959 and at the same time revising and changing the whole format of our annual Bulletin which lists our courses. The Fellows reopened the question of having a building and gave it first priority in their recommendations to the Trustees. A second priority was that of having the head of the Institute aided in his time-consuming administrative work by an administrative assistant, who was also to assist in fund raising. The first of these assistants began work in January, 1960. The need for funds was approaching a crisis state mainly due to the costly expansion of the Low Cost Clinical Services, which by 1960 had been renamed Clinical Services, partly because its "low-costs" could no longer be maintained. The psychoanalytic service did remain low-cost, although, there too, maximum fees were raised. Another priority was that of issuing a brochure on the Institute for the purpose of attracting funds. This was accomplished mainly through the aid of Eugene Katz, president of the Board of Trustees, in 1959.

Needless to say the question as to how best to acknowledge our great indebtedness to Clara Thompson was a paramount issue. A Clara Thompson Memorial Lecture series was inaugurated with Erich Fromm the first lecturer in the spring of 1959. Through a special gift, a painting of her was acquired and hung. A memorial fund was started which became part of the building fund, when it was decided the new building we were to move into in 1964 would be a memorial to Clara Thompson. And, also, it was decided to issue a book containing her unpublished work on problems of women, some of her published work and a biography.

Organizationally, the Institute began to be departmentalized. Training, Curriculum, Extension Division, and Research took on identities of their own and Clinical Services more of a one than before. New faculty members from the outside, like Abraham Kardiner, were brought in and much more attention was given to evolve a meaningful course for teachers, this under the aegis of Louis J. Gilbert.

This was not by any means all that happened. The internal changes took place in the atmosphere of what do we stand for, what do we wish to become. In these past ten years, 1958-68, the answers have been expressed in varying ways. At that time it was expressed in terms of becoming an Institute for the Behavioral Study of Man, and not restricting ourselves to being merely a training institute for psychoanalysts. This culminated in a statement by Meyer Maskin for the Executive Committee in the spring of

-
1. "Interpersonal Psychoanalysis. The Selected Papers of Clara Thompson." Edited by Maurice R. Green. Basic Books, New York, 1964.



1960, as to the aims and purposes of the Institute and what steps could be taken to achieve them. The aims emphasized enlarging the number of participants, preserving democratic principles, designating precisely the functions and responsibilities of executives, improving coordination between existing and recommended departments, and ways of bettering communication between faculty and students. For example, in June, 1960, a candidate chosen by the Harry Stack Sullivan Society became a regular member of the Curriculum Committee.

In the course of formulating and presenting a plan for future development of the Institute, something remarkable happened. Each member of the Executive Committee independently decided not to be part of the newly recommended reorganization. While each had personal reasons for his decision, each had concluded, in common with the others, that a fresh start called for new blood. Otherwise the Institute might be drawn unconsciously into functioning in familiar ways, not appropriate to its further growth and development. Each felt that a radical operation was indicated, not only to avoid cliques, but also to get away from the old order and from perpetuating practices of the past.

So in May, 1960, after the Fellows had, in part, approved the reorganization, including a paid executive chairman, nominations were in order. One by one the incumbents of the then Executive Committee declined nomination, and so a new Executive Committee was elected. These were: Earl G. Witenberg, Chairman, Ruth Moulton, Director of Training and Student Affairs, Miltiades Zaphiropoulos, Director of Clinical Services, and Albert Bryt, Director of Curriculum. Over the summer the two committees worked together, and by September, 1960 the new committee was on its own. They were of a new generation of psychiatrists, post-World War II. The Institute was off to a new beginning.

The past eight years has resulted in an internal strengthening of the Institute with many more people making decisions than in the past, thus preserving the democratic principles Maskin spoke of. It has also resulted in a constant attention to and reformulation of Institute goals in relation to the ever-burgeoning mental health needs of our society, in short, in relations to our role in the community-at-large, as well as in the scientific community.

Unfortunately for the new regime a money crisis was at hand. By eliminating any unnecessary outgo, and by enlisting enthusiasm among friends, graduates, and new trustees of the Institute, especially for a building of our own, the Institute not only survived the crisis, but also acquired a building to which it moved in August, 1964. It is known as the Clara Thompson Building in her memory. To no small extent, the emergence from the financial crisis was due to the support of the Institute's professionals, the members of the William A. White Psychoanalytic Society.

The Research Department established in 1960 helped bring in grants not only from the National Institute for Mental Health, but also from a number of private foundations and from individual contributors. The director's own interest in psycholinguistics and its relations to psychotherapy, as well as his reputation for research contributed to this. The fact that at one time half of the Institute's income came from research grants necessitated defining the role and purpose of our research department. An active, so-called research advisory committee has been of enormous help in this. Not only does this committee advise the Research Director on the suitability of research projects for our facilities, but it also has decision-making powers in regard



to whether the rights of human participants are properly regarded; it has control of allocation of some of the funds for research, and it makes policy for acceptance of projects in terms of their consonance with the main purpose of the Institute, the understanding of the human being in depth. As of now, the policy is that one half of the projects are directly related to this purpose and half are indirectly related in that they may be applications of the results of this understanding to other matter so-called applied research. About one half of the committee's members are Institute connected, one half are not.¹

New Trustees have been added each year. The new administration was active in acquiring them from any and all sources on a new basis: namely, not only should they be interested in the idea of the Institute, but they should take active part in fund raising or in its professional activities or both. The trustees now meet every other month instead of 2-3 times a year. At many of their meetings professionals have reported their work to them, serving to acquaint the trustees with what we do. Not only is the Institute itself represented on the Board of Trustees by our Director, but so are the candidates and the graduates. During the last eight years concerted efforts from both sides have considerably improved communication and relationships between the professionals and trustees.

The Council of Fellows has also undergone radical changes. Redefinition of function resulted in the policy that Fellows should not be selected for merit or honor, but for their ability and willingness to work together in the interests of the Institute. Thus the active body of Fellows are working Fellows. There is a tendency to add to the number of Fellows, thus spreading the decision and policy-making to more people. In the twelve years following the granting of the charter on the basis for six founding Fellows, 11 Fellows were added. In the ten years since Clara Thompson's death, 14 Fellows have been added.

One of the first accomplishments of the new regime was a complete revision of curriculum. From a loose arrangement by which candidates could take courses when they wished, they were not required to attend courses specified for each one of the four years. Now candidates feel they belong to a given class and go through the Institute together as a class, resulting in greater feeling of unity and belongingness. Admission requirements were reduced from two years of residency training or its equivalent to one year, thus enabling candidates to begin their chosen training earlier. Characteristic of the Institute has been its constant re-evaluation of itself, including of its curriculum. So in 1966 the curriculum was revised for the third time in ten years. Courses were reduced in number; they were more integrated and related to each other, and their content was intensified to permit the working through of significant issues. First year courses were taught for the most part by senior analysts. Supervised work could begin after six months of course work, thus better integrating the course work with experience. Our conviction that psychotherapy was more difficult than psychoanalysis is expressed itself in having training in psychotherapy follow instead of precede training in psychoanalysis.

1. Research Advisory Committee: William S. Battersby, Ph.D.; Bruce Dohrenwend, Ph.D.; Aaron Kellner, M.D.; David E. Schechter, M.D.; Jerome L. Singer, Ph.D. (Chairman); Edwin A. Weinstein, M.D.; Earl G. Witenberg, M.D. (Ex-officio); Joseph Jaffe, M.D. (Ex-officio).



Beginning in 1960, possibilities for a journal of our own were explored, with the result that in 1964, Contemporary Psychoanalysis came out with its first issue, and has been coming out regularly since, a difficult feat in this day of ever proliferating publications.

In 1961, the Institute became the first to open itself up to a sociological investigation of its structure and operations.¹ Inasmuch as we askor being a secret cult, doing this came naturally.

The sociologist, Joan Dulchin, focused on how new training analysts were added and chosen. After years of work, in which for a time she attended all Institute meetings, and interviewed 150 of us, she acquainted us in June, 1966, with how much our behavior differed from what we thought we did. She made us realize too that a dilemma inherent in a psychoanalytic institute not present in other types of organizations is that the work we evaluate and judge, namely, the psychoanalytic work of the candidate, we never actually see, and yet in our capacity as analysts, we hear much more of thoughts and feelings about people and the work involved than is ordinarily made known to administrators and judges. So we analyst were in our turn analyzed, which no doubt will have its repercussions.

The Clinical Services lent their files to a study by Charles Kadushin on what kind of a person applies for psychoanalytic treatment.²

Due to dissatisfaction with our ways of selecting supervisory and training analysts, the Fellows established a Committee on Establishing Stands for Supervisory and Training Analysts, which reported its deliberations and recommendations in January, 1963. One result of this was a Professional curriculum vitae of graduates so that data would be available by which we could judge who could fill best positions in the Institute, including those of training and supervisory analysts.

Along with internal strengthening went a continuous dialogue as to what do we exist for and recurrently the answer came: to be a professional body interested in man and understanding him. This affected our internal structure, of course, in that there were discussions and actions serving to facilitate closer communication between students and faculty, between professionals and trustees; and there were additions to curriculum in the fields of philosophy, social psychology and normal child development, as contrasted with exclusive interest in the abnormal. This attitude led us to being active in relation to the larger community. For the second Clara Thompson Memorial Lecture, Thomas K. Finletter, former Under-secretary of the Air Force, spoke in 1960 on The Liberal Temperament. In 1962, the Institute held a Symposium on leadership. F.C.S. Northrup, Richard Rovere, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. and Thomas Szasz participated. The William Alanson White Psychoanalytic Society joined an international federation of psychoanalytic societies and members have taken part in several international psychoanalytic forums. The Institute helped a Ph.D. candidate working in our Low Cost Psychoanalytic Service to be upheld in court in his refusal to divulge confidential material learned through psychoanalytic treatment. In other words,

1. The Addition of New Members to the Elite of Psychoanalytic Institute. Joan Dulchin, Ph.D. Supported in part by a grant from the Foundation Fund for Research in Psychiatry.

2. Kadushin, Charles. "Why People Go to Pyshicatrists." Atherton Press, New York, 1969.



FROMM-Online

not only was it recognized that communications to M.D.'s are privileged, but also to Ph.D.'s in like circumstances, an important decision in the protection of the civil rights of patients who seek psychoanalytic help.

The Institute took considerable interest in the role and future of the Extension Division, and in addition to meeting teachers' needs, it inaugurated a course for nurses dealing with interpersonal situations.

By the fall of 1962, it became apparent that we needed a Director who could devote a substantial block of his time to the Institute, and who had the powers and responsibilities of a director. So, much to the delight of the Trustees, the Fellows recommended such a position, in place of Chairman of the Executive Committee, and in due course Earl Witenberg was persuaded to continue with the Institute in this position. Before this he had chaired meetings of the Fellows, but now the chairman of the Fellows was made a separate position with a term of two years and a policy of rotating Fellows through that office. The chairman was also an ex-officio member of the Administrative Council, which had been enlarged and included all those with administrative responsibility within the Institute. This work of this committee enable the Fellows to spend their meeting time on matters of policy, which was always their function.

With Earl Witenberg as Director, things began to hum. Lectures by professionals for the laity, the friends of the Institute, were instituted. Contemporary Psychoanalysis, our journal, was launched, with Rose Spiegel and Max Deutscher as co-editors. Even before this, in 1962, our Institute was the first analytic institute not on the approved list of the American Psychoanalytic Association to receive a \$10,000 yearly administrative grant, which was renewed in 1967 for seven years. Search for a suitable building was successful in 1963, and by August, 1964, we had moved in. Institute projects attracting considerable attention included the College Dropout Project which in the course of giving much-needed treatment to college dropouts also studied them, resulting in papers contributing to a greater understanding of this phenomenon. Under the auspices of the Clinical Services, M. Zaphiropoulos and L. Caligor instituted treatment of workers in the United Automobile Workers Union called the Union Therapy Project showing again that psychoanalytic therapy was not just for the few. This service has recently been extended to the workers' wives and dependents. Its administrators are frequently consulted for their advice in setting up similar services.

The right of the autonomous psychoanalytic institute to exist was and is being questioned by those who felt psychoanalytic training belonged only in medical school settings. Since at this time the Institute was experiencing a decrease in applicants for admissions, self-questioning was in order. The answers that emerged follow. First of all the Institute was in a better position to maintain its stand in favor of awareness of man's humanness. We believe that what comes out of the examination of the mind is more important than what comes out of a machine. It is also in a better position to teach long term intensive therapy with its expansion of consciousness and awareness of the influence of dissociated material; and above all, it is much better estimated to maintain the privacy and confidentiality of the

1. Predictive Studies and Treatment of College Dropouts, Edgar Levenson, investigator, NIMH grant for \$90,000, and continued after 1964 by grants from our own Trustees.



personal analysis. We were also more free to help train much needed non-M.D. personnel to work in mental health. Only one in seven mental health workers is an M.D. and the ratio is expected to decrease. In 1966, the State Board of Education granted a petition by the Institute to give the same training and the same certificate in psychoanalysis to Ph.D.'s as we had to M.D.'s, something we had not been permitted to do before.

In 1966, the Institute, very much a going concern, was challenged by its Director to examine itself and its functioning in extenso and in detail, especially in relation to its future. He raised many detailed questions which space prevents going into here. The overall question was that of the identity of the Institute, which was reaffirmed as being focused primarily on the understanding in depth of the lives of individuals. Dr. Witenberg suggested a two year internal and external study of ourselves related to becoming an Institute of Behavioral Sciences and to the permeation of a Research attitude throughout the whole Institute.

One of the important results was the establishment of a Distinguished Visiting Psychoanalyst program and a consideration of a Distinguished Visiting Social Scientist program, to include, in addition to social science, philosophy, law, religion and the natural and biological sciences. This program is yet to be implemented. The Visiting Psychoanalyst Program brought Ronald Laing as the first Distinguished Visiting Psychoanalyst in 1967, and Harry Guntrip the second in 1968. They gave public lectures as well as teach in the Institute.

A concomitant development was expansion of the Newsletter to more fully represent the breadth and stature of the Institute. It now featured editorials by its new editor John L. Schimel, and by others. Supplements to the Newsletter containing Institute personals were inaugurated. These did not go to the more general circulation of the Newsletter. They permitted room for discussions of more general interest.

As another indication of its increased social participation, a Family Study Unit was inaugurated; Tess Forrest, Director. Hospital affiliation possibilities were considered. A Science of Man Committee began functioning and studied Abraham Kaplan's book, The Conduct of Inquiry. Just this year, 1968, a joint study of concepts of Family Therapy was pursued by representatives of the Institute together with representatives of the Roosevelt Hospital and the Jewish Family Service. A White Society Committee proposed an Institute for Child Development, with emphasis on what occurs "normally." The Fellows gave renewed support to the endeavors of the Extension Division and its courses. It has been renamed the Division for Related Professions.

While the Research Department has been mentioned, its specific activities have not. They are many and varied. At present effort is being made to help the diversity in order to attract the interests of diverse minded and talented researchers and at the same time to focus at least one half the research on the main focus of the Institute, the one to one relationship, that is, the understanding of the individual in depth.

An as yet unmentioned aspect of Institute productivity is that of publication. In 1961 a compilation was made of the publications by graduates and faculty of the Institute. What was astounding about it, besides sheer quantity, was its diversity, not to mention quality, which needs to be judged by others. Since then a number of quite original contributions by members



have appeared in the form of articles and books. In addition there have been organized compilations of psychiatric contributions. Space prevents listing here the specific contributions, not even the most noteworthy.

By this time it seems well established that the Institute stands by the belief that the best preparation for helping the many is a comprehensive knowledge of the individual best learned in psychoanalytic training, and that thorough and ongoing investigation into human individuality is a worthy end in itself. In other words dedication to the knowledge of the individual is not antithetical to dedication to the needs of the many.

During this past year 1967-68 the Institute, inspired by its Director, has devoted itself to a study of what it would like to become in ten years. Each department has met and reported its own views. This has included the Extension Division, the Research Department, the Sciences of Man Committee, the Newsletter, Contemporary Psychoanalysis, the Clinical Services, the Curriculum Committee, the Training Committee, and the White Society. The latter came up with an idea of an Institute for Child Development. As a result, we are at present in the process of formulating the results in terms of a general conception of what our Institute stands for and is to become, what are the priorities, and how do we see our thrust and how do we communicate it. Again the results seem clear that we are primarily experts in interpersonal relations and analytic training is our method; at the same time there is really no limit to how such knowledge and such training can be applied in terms of education of mental health personnel and in the expansion of training opportunities for people working in mental health who are neither M.D.'s nor Ph.D.'s. The present expansion of the Division for Related Professions testifies to this. We foresee as participants in our classes, not only dentists, nurses, clergymen, physicians, teachers and guidance counsellors whom we have known of old, but also vocational rehabilitation counsellors, group workers, parole officers, and college counsellors among others.

Our 25th Anniversary Celebration on "Twenty-five Years of Interpersonal Psychoanalysis: The Logic of Man, Society and Change" was held in October, 1968. As you see from the volume, of which this paper is a part, the symposium covered Theory and its Development and Applications, Therapy and Myths and Symbols. Attendance was over 1,300 65-70% of whom were non-M.D.'s and non-Ph.D.'s.

Our future history must be left to others. Its place in the development of psychoanalysis as a contribution to human living belongs to others to evaluate. It is to be hoped that all those working in the field of enhancing man's humanness to its fullest potentiality may work together in this common goal.

