



Judd Marmor:

# Bridge Was Crossed

## REVOLT

Thus while the "classicists" are very positive about what the beginning of psychoanalytic training should be and are willing to enforce this view where they have the power to do so—as in the case of the disqualification of Dr. Karen Horney as a training analyst of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute—the "non-classicists," realizing that any crystallization of this nature is in the present circumstances premature, are of the opinion that the decision should in each case be left to the individual student.

There can be no doubt that there is here drawn a real issue in psychoanalytic education: Shall policy in psychoanalytic training be decided upon the basis of the number of votes that can be mustered in favor of this or that theory; or shall we frankly admit that it is much too early to attempt a definite decision of policy? There is no question in the minds of the undersigned that to choose the first of their alternatives will delay rather than accelerate progress, not only in psychoanalytic education but in psychoanalysis itself. Scientific issues cannot be decided by votes or by political power in any form; one would have thought that the experience of Galileo with the Church had determined this truth once and for all.

We have tried for many years now to combat this dogmatism in psychoanalytic education. Our efforts have increasingly met with frustration; the "classicists" within the New York Psychoanalytic Society and its Educational Committee have become more and more strongly entrenched in their dogmatism, and recent developments have convinced us of the impossibility of persuading them to take a more liberal attitude towards this issue.

We have therefore felt it essential for the future of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic education to disassociate ourselves from a professional organization a majority of whose members are under the impression that scientific issues may legitimately be decided through the possession of political power, and to create a new center for psychoanalytic work, devoted to truly liberal and scientific principles, in psychoanalytic training, investigation and discussion. We invite freely all those of our colleagues who are likewise devoted to such principles to join with us in this endeavor.

(signed)  
Harmon S. Ephron  
Karen Horney  
Sarah R. Kelman  
Bernard S. Robbins  
Clara Thompson''

*Reprinted from the American Journal of Psychoanalysis Volume 1, 1941*

The revolt within the New York Psychoanalytic Institute that took place in 1940 must be seen in the perspective of the ferment that was taking place in American psychoanalysis in the late thirties, particularly around the contributions of *Harry Stack Sullivan*, *Sandor Rado*, *Abraham Kardiner*, *Karen Horney*, and *Erich Fromm*. The emerging emphasis on ego psychology began to shake the foundations of classical instinct theory and as always in such ideological struggles much heat and hostility were generated.

The appearance in 1939 of Horney's openly polemic book, *NEW WAYS IN PSYCHOANALYSIS*, aroused particular irritation in conservative psychoanalytic circles. What Horney said does not seem as revolutionary today as it did then. In retrospect, I strongly suspect that it was not just the content of her book but the tone in which it was written that caused so much resentment. Horney wrote as though there were only two significant protagonists in the psychoanalytic movement, Freud and herself, and made no effort to place her views in a historical context that would have given due credit to some of the prior works that had prepared the soil for her ideas; e.g., Freud's *PROBLEM OF ANXIETY*, *Anna Freud's EGO AND THE MECHANISMS OF DEFENSE*, *William Reich's CHARACTER ANALYSIS*, to say nothing of the contributions of *Sullivan*, *Rado*, *Kardiner*, *Fromm*, and others. Moreover, her book seemed to be addressed more to the lay public than to her colleagues, and thus it seemed to threaten the professional security systems of those who still adhered to classical Freudian doctrine.

The response from the ruling hierarchy of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute was to remove Horney's popular seminar from the required list and to make it an elective available only to third and fourth year candidates. This appeared to be a clear infringement of academic freedom and a punitive reaction to her ideas. There was considerable protest, particularly among the students of Horney, *Kardiner*, *Rado*, and *Clara Thompson*. When the Institute's hierarchy stood firm, a movement for secession began to be discussed among these training analysts. Their initial hope was that a new, progressive psychoanalytic organization of national scope could be formed with help from the progressive Washington and Chicago Psychoanalytic Institutes, then under the

became a member, and Meyer Maskin as soon as he came back from the Army. (All these people were members of the Washington-Baltimore Society and were therefore automatically members of the American.)

When the War ended, we became a large and flourishing institution. The Washington group began to be criticized; they told us that we were now large enough and that with the new rule that there could

be more than one institute in city, we should apply for recognition as a separate institute.

If you have to start your own institute, the tendency is to overemphasize your own point of view and you lose the constructive criticism which goes with talking with people who disagree with you. If it's humanly possible, we should remain in contact in some way with the main psychanalytic stream. —C. Thompson



leadership of Harry Stack Sullivan and Franz Alexander, respectively. Somehow these negotiations never quite materialized and in the summer of 1941 a small group of candidates and members resigned from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute on the issue of academic freedom. In this group, among others, were Horney, Thompson, William Silverberg, Janet Rioch, Bernard Robbins, Frances Arkin, Irving Bieber, Harmon Ephron, Harold Kelman, Meyer Maskin, and Edward Tauber. There was considerable disappointment when at the last minute Kardiner and Rado decided not to join the new group despite their having urged their own analysts to revolt. Sidney Tarachow, one of Kardiner's analysts, commented sardonically that Kardiner wanted his students to have the courage of his convictions!

The new group rapidly organized itself as the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis. Added support to the group as honorary members came from Harry Stack Sullivan and Erich Fromm, the latter also participating as an active member of the faculty and a training analyst. Also among the charter members were Ernest Hadley and Benjamin Weininger of Washington, Lionel Blitzen of Chicago, and Stephen Jewett, Chairman of the Department of Psychiatry of the New York Medical College. The new association set up a full psychoanalytic training curriculum for the academic year 1941-1942 and attracted a small but enthusiastic group of new candidates.

Unfortunately, within a year a new schism appeared over a most regrettable issue. Erich Fromm's growing popularity with the candidates of the new Institute both as a teacher and a training analyst seemed to distress Karen Horney who evidently had an urgent need to be the dominant member within the new group. Although initially she had been quite enthusiastic about Fromm's addition to the faculty, she now raised the spurious issue of the inadvisability of having a non-medical person as a training analyst and insisted that Fromm be removed from this position. This created considerable dismay among all but the most loyal of Horney's followers. Clara Thompson and Harry Stack Sullivan in particular, felt very bitter and betrayed by this action. I made a valiant but ineffective effort at that time to mediate between the two factions, but no compromise seemed possible. When Horney succeeded in voting Fromm out as a training analyst, Thompson, Fromm, Sullivan and Janet Rioch, together with David

Rioch, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann and other students and friends formed in 1942-1943 what is now known as the William Alanson White Institute.

Many of those who remained with the Association did so with considerable ambivalence and largely because they could not tolerate the thought of another split coming so soon after the first. Before another year had passed, however, those members of the Association who were not wholly committed to proselytizing the Horney point of view but rather to an Institute in which differing points of view could be freely expressed and freely taught, broke away to establish a psychoanalytic curriculum under the auspices of the Department of Psychiatry at the New York Medical College.

—Judd Marmor, M.D.

### Crucial Academy Vote Nullified

A referendum conducted by the American Academy of Psychoanalysis in October, 1973 resulted in the overwhelming approval of an amendment to its constitution providing for the membership of non-medical psychoanalysts. However, because constitutional procedures were not correctly followed, the vote was set aside. The matter has been under consideration since the introduction of motions in 1971 by Earl G. Witenberg at a business meeting and by John L. Schimel at the Academy's Executive Council. The issues involved were reviewed by the appropriate committees and discussed in the columns of the Academy's Newsletter, *The Academy*.

Concern was early expressed because, in these troubled and changing times, the Academy's position as a medical organization may be important in influencing the direction of psychiatry and the mental health professions generally. A multidisciplinary society might have less weight in medical councils and less place in the teaching of psychiatry. It was pointed out that "the original concept of the Academy was as a Fellowship of physicians who have embraced the specialty as one of their most important resources for therapy and research (Miller)." There was an expression of heated opposition to the proposal by a few. Nonetheless the size of the total vote on the amendment was modest and the issue was apparently never in serious doubt. The amendment will, nevertheless, have to be resubmitted.

Under the terms of the amendment to the Academy's constitution the newly eligible will be the non-medical graduates of those

Institutes from which the Academy now accepts applications for Fellowship from physician graduates. The designation of those newly eligible will be Psychoanalytic Associates. They will be eligible for all activities in the Academy, both administrative and scientific, *except for voting and holding elected office.*

The following material reviews some of the affirmative issues that have been involved. It is excerpted from *The Academy*, the Newsletter of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis.—Ed.

The question of lay analysis is one that has vexed the psychoanalytic movement for over fifty years. Ernest Jones has reported that this question keenly engaged Freud's interests and emotions during the last years of his life. Freud was in favor of the training of lay analysts, and felt betrayed by those—particularly the Americans—who were adamantly opposed.

A number of Freud's early adherents were not physicians. They came from diverse fields, and made important contributions. The names of Freud's early and later nonmedical colleagues read like a Who's Who in psychoanalytic history; August Aichhorn, Oskar Pfister, Marie Bonaparte, Hans Zulliger, Hans Sachs, Otto Rank, Siegfried Bernfeld, Theodore Reik, Anna Freud, Melanie Klein, Robert Walder, Geza Roheim, Ella Freeman Sharpe, J. C. Flugel, Barbara Low, Joan Riviere, James and Alix Strachey, Erik Erikson, David Rappaport, Erich Fromm, Ernest Schachtel, Rollo May, Bruno Bettelheim, Peter Blos, Harry Guntrip, Ernst Kris.



Rollo May