

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.



A MIND OF HER OWN

The Life of Karen Horney

SUSAN QUINN

SUMMIT BOOKS 1987
New York · London · Toronto · Sydney · Tokyo

Copyright © 1987 by Susan Quinn
All rights reserved
including the right of reproduction
in whole or in part in any form
Published by SUMMIT BOOKS
A Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc.
Simon & Schuster Building
Rockefeller Center
1230 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020
SUMMIT BOOKS and colophon are trademarks of Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Designed by Anne Scatto/Levavi & Levavi
Manufactured in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Quinn, Susan.

A mind of her own : the life of Karen Horney / Susan Quinn.

p. cm.

Bibliography: p.

Includes index.

1. Horney, Karen, 1885–1952. 2. Psychoanalysts—United States—
Biography. I. Title.

RC438.6.H67Q56 1987

150.19'5'0924—dc19

[B]

ISBN 0-671-47518-5

Quotations from the following Horney titles are used with the permission of W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.:

The Neurotic Personality of Our Time by Karen Horney, M.D. Copyright 1937 by W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. Copyright renewed 1964 by Renate Mintz, Brigitte Swarzenski, and Marianne von Eckardt.

New Ways in Psychoanalysis by Karen Horney, M.D. Copyright 1939 by W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. Copyright renewed 1966 by Marianne von Eckardt, Renate Mintz, and Brigitte Swarzenski.

Self-Analysis by Karen Horney, M.D. Copyright 1942 by W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. Copyright renewed by Marianne von Eckardt, Renate Mintz, and Brigitte Swarzenski.

Our Inner Conflicts by Karen Horney, M.D. Copyright 1945 by W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. Copyright renewed 1972 by Renate Mintz, Marianne von Eckardt, and Brigitte Horney Swarzenski.

Neurosis and Human Growth by Karen Horney, M.D. Copyright 1950 by W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. Copyright renewed 1978 by Renate Mintz, Marianne von Eckardt, and Brigitte Horney Swarzenski.

Feminine Psychology, by Karen Horney, M.D., edited by Harold Kelman, M.D. Copyright © 1967 by W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

From The Adolescent Diaries of Karen Horney. Copyright © 1980 by Basic Books, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.



- male-sidedness of, 207–8
 on marriage, 204
 medical profession and, 138–39
 on negative therapeutic reactions, 292
 in *New Ways*, 314–19, 323–24
 New York Institute and, 278, 286
 on patient's experience, 159
 on penis envy, 206–7, 212, 232
 on phallus primacy, 214, 232
 Rado and, 235, 288, 314
 Sachs and, 201
 sexuality as focus for, 161–62
 style of, 148
 superego theory of, 320–21
 on transference, 158, 293
 in U.S., 247–48
 Wittels and, 337
 women analysts encouraged by, 205
Freud: Master and Friend (Sachs), 201
 Frey, Janet, 373
 frigidity, 210, 227–28
 Fromm, Erich, 197, 269, 329
 in AAP, 353, 363–66
 Horney's romance with, 269–70, 278, 286, 366–68
 lay analysis issue and, 363–65
 Fromm-Reichmann, Freida, 269, 354, 367
From Time to Time (Tillich), 280
- Gay, Peter, 99
 General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, 235, 326
 Germana Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy (Göring Institute), 326
 German Women's Medical Association, 228
 Germany, Imperial:
 art in, 136
 Berlin's dominance of, 135–37
 federated states in, 25
 feminist movement in, 63–67
 industrialization in, 24, 136–37
 new morality in, 165–66
 Protestant Church in, 29–31
 revolution in, 174, 187
 social ferment in, 24, 41–42
 women's role in, 22, 24, 42–43, 102, 137–38
 in World War I, 173–74, 187–88, 189
- Germany, Nazi:
 Berlin Institute in, 240–41, 326
 film industry in, 303–5
 Freud's books burned in, 241
 Gleichschaltung movement in, 267
 Jews in, 237–38, 241, 279, 391
 Kristallnacht in, 391
 psychoanalysts' emigration from, 239–40, 241
 Germany, Weimar:
 artistic surge in, 187–88
 economic crises in, 189–90, 237
 film industry in, 303–4
 "last whistle" desperation in, 188–89
 Nazi party in, 238–39
 Gershtman, Harry, 375
 Gestalt psychology, 282
Gleichschaltung movement, 267
 Goebbels, Joseph, 305
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 31, 81, 419
 Goetz, Albert, 29
 Göring, Hermann, 326
 Göring, Matthias Heinrich, 326
 Gottschalk, Joachim, 391
 Gottschalk, Meta, 391
Gourmet, 375
 Graber, Gustav Hans, 200
 Great Depression, 237, 245
 Griesinger, Wilhelm, 139
 Groddeck, Georg, 214–17, 220
 Groot, Jeanne Lampl de, 226, 232
 Grosz, George, 187, 190, 237–38, 246, 259
 Grote, Louis (Losch), 95–97, 116, 193, 194
 as Danielsen boarder, 113, 115, 119
 Oskar Horney and, 109–11, 117, 119–24
 physical appearance of, 107–8
 Grotjahn, Martin, 324
 Grüning, Ilka, 239, 302
 gynecology, 255–56
- Hale, Nathan, Jr., 198, 285
 Hall, G. Stanley, 247
Hamburger Fremdenblatt, 47, 48
Hamburg General Anzeiger, 64
 Hanseatic League, 25
 Hartmann, Heinz, 318
 Hauptmann, Gerhart, 136
 Hegeler, Edward, 402
 Heilbut, Anthony, 258
 Helmholtz, Hermann von, 139



who suffer no less than the rich from neurosis, but are not in a position to pay for treatment."²⁰

In Berlin in the twenties there were those who believed that psychoanalysis could save the world. The *Kinderseminar* (children's seminar), an unofficial group of young, political psychoanalysts, met regularly to discuss politics and analysis. It included not only such dedicated Socialists as Simmel, Otto Fenichel, and Wilhelm Reich (who later became a Communist for a time) but also Edith Jacobson, whose activities in the anti-Fascist cause landed her in jail briefly in the Nazi era, and Erich Fromm. Edith Weigert, who attended some of the meetings as an institute candidate, remembers long conversations about "finding a bridge between Marx and Freud."

Even among less political analysts, such as Karen Horney, there was great excitement about psychoanalysis, as both a treatment and a method of research. At times analysts were known to pay their patients' carfare, just to continue the sessions. The faith in the curative powers of psychoanalysis is apparent in the 1930 Institute report: patients with all types of disorders, including schizophrenics and sufferers from facial tics and from organic nervous disease, were treated with psychoanalysis at the polyclinic. Of the 363 who completed analytic treatment, over 200 improved, some markedly, and 111 were declared, with an optimism few modern analysts would hazard, "cured."²¹

The members of the Berlin Institute, however, did not confine themselves to treatment. The "*Berliner energie*" Freud had admired in a letter to Abraham overflowed into evening meetings on a dazzling array of topics. There were clinical discussions of everything from transvestism to train phobia to the psychoanalytic treatment of a painter. And there were nonclinical evenings ranging over the whole of human activity. One night a guest spoke on the relationship of Chinese calligraphy to psychoanalytic concepts. Another night the topic was the writing of Oscar Wilde. A third night there was a discussion of the "latest press polemics on psychoanalysis in Berlin."²² Sandor Rado, when he arrived from Budapest, concluded that the Hungarian group had been "not in the clouds but beyond the clouds somewhere" compared to the Berlin group. On the other hand, he noted, the Berlin group sometimes "suffered from overzealousness."²³

According to the Berlin Institute news in *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, Karen Horney was a typically enthusiastic member. The only woman among the six founding members



enjoyed drinking. And since Chicago was becoming a mecca for midwesterners and European refugees interested in psychoanalysis, there were plenty of interesting people to spend evenings with. A number of psychiatrists from other American cities came on weekends to study at the institute. Karl and William Menninger both came regularly from their family's clinic in Topeka, another psychiatrist came from Denver, another from Baltimore. Through the Blitzstens, Horney met Harry Stack Sullivan, who had done original work on an "interpersonal" theory of psychiatry.

The new friends who were most stimulating to Horney's thinking during this period came not from psychiatry but from other fields, especially the social sciences. The importance of the social milieu had been a theme in Horney's writing beginning with her earliest papers on women. But in the Chicago period the papers began to reflect her new appreciation of sociology and anthropology as disciplines. "The Overvaluation of Love" begins and ends with a discussion of "sociological" (a word she uses repeatedly and for the first time) factors. She notes, for instance, that from the "sociological standpoint" women who try to develop their abilities must struggle against not only "external opposition" but also "resistances within themselves" created by the traditional idea of woman as "exclusively sexual."⁶⁸

Even during her first, difficult year in Chicago, Horney showed an increased interest in social factors. That first fall she led a series of discussions at the Institute on group phenomena, which included lectures on culture patterns, delinquency, and the psychology of dress. The sociologist Harold Lasswell, who gave a lecture, "Historical Materialism from the Psychoanalytic Point of View,"⁶⁹ became a friend.⁷⁰ Horney also met and talked with Margaret Mead.⁷¹ But the person who had the most important influence on her work during this period, and for years afterward, was Erich Fromm. Fromm had come to psychoanalysis from philosophy, but his writing and thinking were always grounded in social and historical realities.

Karen Horney had known Erich Fromm and his wife, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, in Berlin, where all three had studied psychoanalysis. Fromm had been analyzed by Hanns Sachs (it sometimes seems impossible that Hanns Sachs was only one person) and had practiced analysis in Berlin, beginning in 1930. In 1933, when he visited Chicago as a guest lecturer, his friendship with Horney, who was fifteen years older than he was, intensified. Over the next decade it is impossible to sort out Fromm's influences on Horney



from her influences on him in the writing they each produced. But a small example illustrates their closeness. The two papers Fromm published in 1933 concerned a three-volume work of scholarship by an anthropologist named Robert Briffault.* That same year Horney cited Briffault's work, which focused on matriarchal societies, in the opening paragraphs of "The Overvaluation of Love." Obviously she and Fromm were sharing reading, as she and Oskar had many years before. It was during the Chicago years that Fromm and Horney's intellectual relationship deepened into a romantic one.

It may have been the company of Fromm and other social scientists that inspired Horney to deliver "The Problem of Feminine Masochism" at the midyear meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association, in December of 1933, in Washington, D.C. The paper, written in her old polemical style, was a forceful critique of psychoanalytic methods of deduction, particularly as applied to women. She addressed herself primarily to two papers on female masochism: a 1929 paper by Helene Deutsch entitled "The Significance of Masochism in the Mental Life of Women" and a 1932 paper by Sandor Rado, "Fear of Castration in Women." Deutsch argues in her paper that "turning in the direction of masochism is part of the woman's anatomical destiny." Deutsch dates this inevitable turn toward masochism from the time of the little girl's realization that her clitoris doesn't measure up to boys' penises. "In place of the active urge of the phallic tendencies, there arises the masochistic phantasy: 'I want to be castrated,' and this forms the erotogenic masochistic basis of the feminine libido."⁷² Rado, in a much longer paper, placed greater emphasis on the particular moment when the little girl "catches sight of a penis." "From her emotional chaos," Rado writes, "emerges the strident desire: 'I want it!' which is followed immediately in fantasy by, 'I have it.' Then comes the humiliating reflection, 'But I haven't';—this knowledge produces severe psychic pain, and terminates in something like a paralysis of feeling." The bulk of Rado's long paper is a catalogue of forms of "genital masochism" which result from this traumatic realization.⁷³

In her paper at the Washington meeting Horney took issue not with the description of masochistic phenomena, which she conceded may occur, but with Deutsch's and Rado's claims of univer-

**The Mothers: A Study of the Origins of Sentiments and Institutions* (New York: Macmillan, 1927).



by providing a long list of credentials. They should *know* who she is without having to be told. On the other side we have the education committee of the New York Psychoanalytic, guardians of Freudian orthodoxy against interlopers of every stripe. Some of its members have direct ties to Freud from days in Vienna. All of them see the New York Institute, the first to be established in the United States, as the standard bearer for all others on their side of the Atlantic. As increasing numbers of Europeans arrive seeking membership, the committee has increased its vigilance, excluding non-M.D.'s from practice and casting a skeptical eye on anyone, even of Horney's stature, who has a reputation as a nonconformist. There are reasons for the rules, as the committee sees it, and the rules—as well as the committee—are owed respect. As Horney sees it, the committee owes *her* respect, and the devil take the rules.

Aside from this undercurrent of tension in her application there was little about Karen Horney's arrival in New York to suggest trouble to come. On the contrary, the New York years promised to be some of the happiest of her life. In the first place, there was a man in Horney's life, Erich Fromm, who was both expressive and intellectually exciting. Fromm came to New York the same year Horney did, and joined the faculty of the International Institute of Social Research, which had been transplanted from Frankfurt to Columbia University. It is possible that Horney chose to move to New York and brave the orthodox psychoanalytic climate because of Fromm. But this can be only a conjecture, since no correspondence between Fromm and Horney has survived. Friends from the early New York days, however, remember them as constant weekend companions. The psychologists Ernest and Anna Schachtel, who arrived in New York a year later, spent many weekends with Fromm and Horney and traveled with them to Lake Tahoe, to Monhegan Island, and later to Horney's country house in Croton.² And Karen Horney's first two books, written during the early New York years, are laden with references to Fromm's works, published and unpublished. Some whispered that Horney was getting all her ideas from Fromm. The exchange, however, was anything but one-sided.³ The two were intertwined, emotionally and intellectually, in a relationship that must have fulfilled, perhaps for the first time in Horney's life, the dream of a marriage of minds, which she had envisioned in her letters to Oskar thirty years before.

And then there was New York itself, a city almost as lively and



which of course had been their own. There were no laymen among them and, by comparison with Europe, few influences from the humanities or the social sciences."²³ As the Institute grew, the leadership became more formal and more hierarchical and the loyalty to Freud more fierce. Paradoxically, the New York Institute, under European-trained Americans, became more stereotypically German than the Berlin or Vienna institutes had ever been.

There were plenty of reasons for such an institute to regard Karen Horney with suspicion. In the first place, she was known to be involved with Fromm, a nonphysician who was practicing psychoanalysis. In addition, Horney had made a teaching arrangement with the Baltimore-Washington Society, whose eclecticism had caused the New York group to try to exclude it from the International Psychoanalytic Association. During her first two years in New York, Horney gave two series of lectures on technique at the Baltimore-Washington Society. What was more, after she came to New York Horney began to meet regularly for drinks or dinner with three former leaders of the Baltimore-Washington group—Harry Stack Sullivan, Clara Thompson, and William V. Silverberg—who had since settled in New York. Some of this group had begun meeting in speakeasies on Monday nights several years before Horney arrived in New York. On a whim of Sullivan's the group took to calling itself the "Zodiac," and members picked animal names. Sullivan was a horse, Silverberg a gazelle, Thompson, because of her love of cats, a puma, and Horney a water buffalo. Horney's association with the Zodiac group, insofar as it was known at the New York Psychoanalytic, was further proof of her nonconformist ways.

Perhaps the least controversial Zodiac member was William V. Silverberg, a New York-trained psychiatrist who had studied at the Berlin Psychoanalytic from 1928 to 1930 and had been analyzed there by Franz Alexander. Back in the States, he had been director of research at Sheppard and Enoch Pratt, a venerable psychiatric hospital in Baltimore, and a founding member of the Baltimore-Washington Institute before coming to New York.

Clara Thompson, ~~the other woman in the group~~, was to be Karen Horney's partner in the struggle ahead at the New York Psychoanalytic. Thompson, eight years younger than Horney, had grown up outside of Providence, Rhode Island, the child of a self-made businessman and his devout Baptist wife. By the time she graduated from college she was resolving "to succeed in my fads and overcome my virtues"²⁴—hardly a recipe for a conventional



fessional training applicable to all of the American societies.”² Around the same time he took charge of the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration, which provided information and assistance to refugees from Nazi Germany.³

The Emergency Committee was justly praised for its humanitarian work: it provided émigrés with vital information and affidavits and raised tens of thousands of dollars to finance the passage and settlement of European analysts in the U.S. What was rarely noted was that, under Kubie’s leadership, the committee also played a policing role, issuing stern warnings to nonphysicians about the dangers of attempting to practice psychoanalysis in the United States. The committee sent out a memo, for instance, to “Psychoanalysts Who Desire to Emigrate,” which warned that while it was acceptable for lay analysts to teach and while it might be possible in some instances for them to treat children, “the practice of psychoanalysis on adults without a medical license and a medical degree is a violation of the law for which severe penalties have sometimes been imposed.”⁴ This statement seems to have been wishful thinking on the part of the committee, since in fact such non-M.D.’s as Erich Fromm and Otto Rank practiced with impunity after coming to the United States. The Viennese who read the memo, in any case, found its pronouncements on the lay issue “tactless and rude.”⁵ Kubie played a similar role on a subcommittee of the National Committee for Resettlement of Foreign Physicians—a group in charge of evaluating the credentials of foreign doctors. Most, but not all, were deemed qualified to practice in the United States.⁶ Thus Kubie was a champion of the refugee doctors’ cause, but only if their credentials were in order.

In all of his leadership positions, including the presidency of the New York Institute, Kubie played this same part—that of a caring but stern and controlling father. He always insisted to his critics that he was not a rigidly orthodox Freudian, that he was in fact a believer in heterodoxy. His point was only that candidates should not be exposed to unorthodox ideas too early, before they were grounded in Freud. It was the need to protect candidates—as it was the need to protect refugees—which made the rules necessary.

What made both Sandor Rado and Karen Horney anathema to Kubie was their tendency to resist all attempts at control and regulation. In a letter to a colleague early in his presidency Kubie complained that although “I value Rado and his teaching highly . . . for the last three or four years I have been pleading with him both by word of mouth and by letter, to be less emotional about it;



would provide training in psychoanalysis.⁵ But plans for an institute, with Karen Horney as dean, solidified over the summer, and the second issue of the journal announced a curriculum “to train psychiatrists for the clinical practice of psychoanalysis.” There were to be clinical conferences and case seminars, like those at the New York Psychoanalytic. But as the announcement made clear, the atmosphere at *this* institute was going to be different. “Students are acknowledged to be intelligent and responsible adults,” the catalogue stated, “full-fledged physicians engaged in post-graduate training. . . . It is the hope of the Institute that it will continue to avoid conceptual rigidities, and to respond to ideas, whatever the source, in a spirit of scientific and academic democracy.”⁶

In December of 1941, just as the new institute was getting started, the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor and impelled the United States into World War II. Soon after, many of the institute’s candidates would be drafted to serve overseas. Yet the ominous prospects of war could not dampen the enthusiasm of Karen Horney and her group for their new undertaking. “I’ve learned to fight,” Clara Thompson reported triumphantly that spring, “. . . a thing I never really did before.”⁷ “They were glorious days,” Harmon Ephron remembers. “The revolution was on.”⁸ There was a feeling of camaraderie between candidates and faculty during those early days that would have been unthinkable at the New York Psychoanalytic. At a party at Karen Horney’s house in Croton one candidate delivered a lecture on a new psychoanalytic concept, “The Oy,” and another sang, meaningfully, “It Ain’t Necessarily So.”⁹

Some of the enthusiasm for the new association took the form of admiration for Horney, its leading light. Walter Bonime, who was in the first institute class, remembers reading *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* and thinking it was “like a swim on a hot day in a cold brook.”¹⁰ When his daughter was born he named her Karen. Ruth Moulton, another candidate, also gave birth, in 1942, to a daughter she named Karen. Karen Horney sent her flowers and “a very nice note saying she hoped I had thoroughly enjoyed the whole experience, which was much the way I felt about pregnancy and childbirth.”¹¹

Karen Horney, however, was not the only attraction of the association in those early years. In addition to Clara Thompson, who was a respected and independent teacher, Erich Fromm joined the association and taught courses there. Harry Stack Sullivan signed



on. And William Silverberg, who had been part of the Zodiac group but never a member of the New York Psychoanalytic, served as the association's first president. During the winter of 1941–42 an impressive roster of speakers appeared by invitation at monthly meetings, including Margaret Mead, Franz Alexander, Abram Kardiner, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, and Horney's defender at the New York Psychoanalytic, David Levy.¹² There was even, in the spring of 1942, an annual convention of the new association at the Copley Plaza in Boston. A formal banquet was held and recorded for posterity in an official photograph. In it, Karen Horney sits at the center of a vast U-shaped banquet table, her face partially obscured by a large flower arrangement, flanked to left and right by thirty members and spouses sporting tuxedos and corsages. The "annual dinner," as it was designated on the official photograph, bore witness to the determination of the new association to be taken seriously.

In truth, the photograph of the "annual dinner" implied a feeling of permanence that had not yet been achieved. The association didn't have a home of its own, and many classes were held in teachers' homes or offices. There *was* the promise of an affiliation with a medical school. During that first year three courses were offered—by Silverberg, Horney, and Thompson—at the Post-Graduate School of New York Medical College at Flower Fifth Avenue Hospital. And of course there were the New School classes and the analytic classes. Given the limited number of faculty members, it is difficult to see how all the promised classes could actually have taken place. And indeed a number of candidates who had been about to graduate from the New York Psychoanalytic at the time of the split were soon pressed into service as faculty members. But there was no denying that the association had managed to put a lively program in place in almost no time at all. Not only that, but the program had twice as many students as had resigned from the New York Psychoanalytic.

The program itself reflected the point of view articulated by William V. Silverberg in his presidential address that first fall. "Psychoanalysis was begun by Freud," Silverberg stated, "and, of all psychoanalysts, Freud has been the most diligent worker, the most original, the most fruitfully productive. But what Freud founded has already become greater than Freud. Freud opened our eyes to a vast new era of knowledge about human nature; psychoanalysis is not merely a therapeutic method; it is a psychology, and





Dissension Within

The worst wounds to the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis were inflicted not by the New York Psychoanalytic or the American Psychoanalytic but by the AAP's leaders, who proved incapable of working out their differences. Factions seem to have developed almost from the start, with Thompson and Fromm angered that most of the new students were taken into analysis by Horney. Horney in turn (according to several students) appeared to resent Fromm's popularity with students. And in the spring of 1943, when students requested that Fromm teach a clinical course in the institute program (he had been teaching only at the New School until then), these rivalries erupted into an open disagreement over whether Fromm, who was not an M.D., should be allowed to teach such courses to candidates in analytic training. Horney took the position that allowing a nonphysician to teach clinical courses would make it more difficult for their institute to be accepted as a training program within New York Medical College. But Fromm and his supporters, most notably Clara Thompson and Harry Stack Sullivan, pointed out that in fact no one at New York Medical College had raised any objections to a lay teacher.

In April of 1943, when the question was put to a vote in the faculty council, Horney's position prevailed. Fromm, who had in



fact been functioning as a training analyst in the privacy of his office, where he was analyzing and supervising students, was officially deprived of training status. As a result, he resigned, along with Clara Thompson, Harry Stack Sullivan, and Janet Rioch, one of the candidates who had left the New York Psychoanalytic at the time of the first split. Together, they immediately made plans to start an alternative institute.¹

Ruth Moulton, who was head of the student group at the time, vividly recalls the meeting at which the announcement of Fromm's demotion was made. After a lecture by Dr. Viola Bernard on peptic ulcer, nonmembers of the association were asked to leave because "Dr. Horney had a special message for us." Horney came forward "with Dr. Robbins on one side and Dr. Silverberg on the other" to explain the circumstances surrounding Fromm's resignation. She explained that as a lay analyst he might jeopardize the association's affiliation with a medical school. Moulton tried to present a counterargument. "I pointed out that our group had given up prestige and status once for the right of free scientific discussion and that it seemed very odd that a liberal group should take this kind of stand only two years later. I suggested that the real issue seemed to be a political one and that we, the students, were not being given all the data." At that point Moulton was branded by the Horney faction as "a representative of the Fromm group."²

But another student, not composed enough to speak up at the meeting, congratulated Moulton afterward on her "hair-raising frankness." Ralph Rosenberg, writing to her a few days later, suggested that "we children should get together and spank our unruly parents for their childish behavior":

The *students* may hold the balance of power in the mess. Thompson expects to recruit enough students from our gang and other sources to start a third school. . . . If the students boycott the third school will we not force them to fold up? If we hold this threat, can we not gently but firmly urge them to heal their differences and rejoin the present group? Similarly, Horney was obviously scared at the violence of the students' reactions that night. She would probably go a long way to compromise with the third group to bring back and restore the students' undivided loyalty. The faculty has little to gain by the split and its accompanying mud slinging. The students lose the services of outstanding teachers. . . . We do not know the actual issues causing the split. . . . I therefore suggest that the students invite the Fromm and



Horney group to discuss their differences in the presence of the students.

At the end he adds a P.S.: "We should act promptly before they get too set in their incompatibility."³

It is a sad letter to contemplate in retrospect. Like a child in the midst of a divorce, Rosenberg overestimates the power of the students to bring the "grown-ups" to their senses and underestimates the grown-ups' intransigence. No such meeting with students was ever held, nor did the "actual issues" involved in the split ever become entirely clear to anyone. But what did become increasingly clear is that Fromm's being a lay analyst had very little to do with it. Horney's daughter Marianne, in a paper written thirty-five years later and entitled "Organizational Schisms in American Psychoanalysis," noted that "the arguments presented at the time by Horney, Robbins, and Silverberg fail to convince, even on rereading, that lay analysis was the sole issue."⁴

It is just possible that Karen Horney convinced herself that Fromm's nonmedical status would be a liability in wooing New York Medical College. Certainly, after being ostracized by the American, she had reason to worry about the AAP's status. Then too Horney had argued against lay analysis as early as 1926; in that way her position was consistent. And yet none of this comes close to explaining her insistence on ejecting Fromm from the faculty of her institute.

As Clara Thompson pointed out in a statement written at the time, other institutes, in Boston and Detroit, had made exceptions for unusually qualified laymen, including them on their faculties and yet continuing to be recognized as medical societies by the AMA (and, for that matter, by the American Psychoanalytic). She suggested that the lay issue was an "effective red herring." The true explanation was that "the group in power (the Horney group) feel themselves politically threatened by the increasing strength of another point of view. I think this has developed very clearly in the faculty council meetings this year, where it became increasingly apparent that any reference to Fromm met with the idea of insuperable difficulty although in the preceding year he had been accepted fully as a teacher. . . . The group in power finally showed its hand quite clearly in a final event, the reaction to the request of the students for a course with Fromm."⁵

Some version of Thompson's view was held by other observers



of the split. Ruth Moulton suggested in a talk many years later that the appearance of Fromm's first book in English, *Escape from Freedom*, in 1941 may have aroused Horney's jealousy, particularly since Fromm drew praise and attention from the same lay audience that admired Horney's work. Fromm was, in any case, the only teacher on the faculty who had Horney's kind of charisma. She remembers that once, introducing him, Horney slipped and called him "Dr. Freud" instead of "Dr. Fromm." Everyone laughed at the time, but it was only a few months later that Horney led the group that ousted him.⁶

A more Machiavellian version of the motives behind the split was suggested by Janet Rioch, in whose apartment the announcement was made. For some time Harry Stack Sullivan had been hoping to establish a branch of his Washington School of Psychiatry in New York. Rioch suspects that he subtly promoted the split because he wanted to draw off Thompson and Fromm to form the nucleus of a new group. Sullivan was present on the night the split was announced and was, she believes, "happy about the turn of events."⁷ Very soon after, a New York branch was established and named after William Alanson White, the prominent American psychiatrist who headed Saint Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington for many years and was a bridge builder between psychoanalysis and the rest of psychiatry.

All of these explanations seem inadequate, however. Thompson came closer to the truth when she referred, rather mysteriously, to the possibility that the actions could only be taken "under emotional stress or when one has a personal axe to grind."⁸ The truth is that the split with Fromm, although a public event, had deeply personal origins.

What Thompson and others surely knew but didn't say is that Karen Horney and Erich Fromm had had an intimate relationship for years, beginning around the time they both arrived in New York in 1934 and ending in the early forties. Their breakup, like the relationship itself, is veiled in mystery. But Horney's secretary, Marie Levy, remembers Horney confiding to her that it was over and that Fromm was a "Peer Gynt type."⁹ Since Horney was writing about Peer Gynt in *Our Inner Conflicts* around the time of this comment, it is possible to elaborate a little on what she meant. The Peer Gynt maxim, according to Horney, is "To thyself be enough. . . . Provided emotional distance is sufficiently guaranteed, he may be able to preserve a considerable measure of enduring loyalty. He may be capable of having intense short-lived relationships, rela-



tionships in which he appears and vanishes. They are brittle, and any number of factors may hasten his withdrawal." As for sexual relations, "he will enjoy them if they are transitory and do not interfere with his life. They should be confined, as it were, to the compartment set aside for such affairs." Or, "He may have cultivated indifference to so great a degree that it permits of no trespassing."¹⁰

Horney's version of Peer Gynt/Erich Fromm suggests that the relationship with Fromm may have ended because she wanted more from him than he was willing to give. Might she have suggested marriage, for instance, and scared him off? On the other hand, however, Fromm couldn't have been entirely averse to marriage, since he married twice after his relationship with Horney ended. Perhaps, since both his subsequent marriages were to younger women, he was looking for a less powerful partner. Horney was fifteen years older than he, had published more books, and was better known at the time. Even though his first wife, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, had been older and further along in her career as well, he may have wanted a different sort of second marriage. It is also true that Horney herself possessed many of the attributes of the Peer Gynt type. Could her typing of Fromm have been a projection? Was it she, not he, who backed off when the relationship reached a certain level of intimacy?

What is known is that Karen Horney was deeply hurt when the relationship ended. Ernst Schachtel, with whom Fromm and Horney had vacationed in Maine and the West, remembers her coming to him before the split in the association occurred and announcing that she didn't want to continue their friendship unless Schachtel stopped seeing Erich Fromm. "I was surprised she would make such a condition," he recalled later. "I continued to see him, because we were old friends. . . . I think she was deeply hurt by Erich Fromm."¹¹ Only a deep personal injury seems consistent with Horney's behavior in the association quarrel. She was capable, in other instances, of remaining socially pleasant to adversaries. She even remained on cordial social terms with Lawrence Kubie after the New York clash.¹²

There was another complicating dimension of Karen Horney's relationship with Fromm during these years. At Horney's suggestion her daughter Marianne had entered into psychoanalysis with Fromm, beginning in 1936 and ending in 1940. To be treated by a man so deeply involved with one's mother would seem to present insuperable difficulties. Even though Freud analyzed his daughter



Anna, and Marie Bonaparte's son was analyzed by her lover Rudolph Loewenstein, therapists generally don't try to treat people with whom they have such highly charged connections.

In a talk given years later Marianne confided that her analysis changed her life. Before analysis, she had been pleasant, conscientious, even-tempered, liked, but detached and without close friends. After two years of analysis, she experienced irritation, not only with her analyst, but also with the artificiality of her relationship with her mother. This was followed by a wish for closer relationships and resulted in new friendships and, a year after the analysis, meeting her future husband and embarking on a "rich, meaningful" life, including "two marvelous daughters." The analysis had not provided a "cure" but had "unblocked . . . the capacity for growth."

Marianne believes that Fromm was able to help her not only because he was "warm, kind, wise, and very generous" but also because he had been a good friend of her mother's for many years, and knew her "erratic relatedness or unrelatedness to people." As a result, he was able to "affirm a reality which I had never been able to grasp."¹³

For Karen Horney the success of Marianne's analytic work with Fromm was a mixed blessing, since it meant that for the first time Marianne expressed some of her unhappiness to her mother. Marianne remembers "one outburst" and another occasion on which she "criticized her openly."¹⁴ But for the most part Marianne simply became more distant. Karen apparently blamed the changes in Marianne on Erich Fromm, whom she suspected of "projecting his antagonism to her onto me."¹⁵ Although Marianne insists this was absolutely not the case, it is easy enough to see how Horney's hurt feelings about her breakup with Fromm might be compounded by Marianne's newly critical attitude.

Since Marianne was a student at the AAP's institute at the time of the split, she was faced with an extremely difficult choice between loyalty to her mother and to her analyst. Her solution was to choose neither. She withdrew over time from the AAP but never became a member of any other New York group. Others were free to express their indignation more openly. Two students, both of whom were Clara Thompson's analysands, resigned (five other Thompson analysands had left for the war by then). Ruth Moulton, one of those resigning, wrote Karen Horney that "until the time of the student meeting, I was honestly looking forward to

