March 16, 1971

Dr. Virginia I. Douglas
Department of Psychology
McGill University
Montreal, Quebec

Dear Ginnie,

This transcript requires a special letter of explanation. You will recall that my dispatch case was stolen from my room in the Windsor Hotel the evening after I had taped you and Wally and Ed Webster. What distressed me most was the loss of these six hours of used tape. Accordingly, I advertised--and the Hotel detective immediately reported the recovery of the six used cassettes.

After several months of delay while the police held them for evidence, they were returned to me, and I gave a great sigh of relief.

It was not until the secretary started to type your transcript, that we discovered that the first of your two cassettes was empty! Lord known who took it.

So may I please have a date (sometime after your CPA Presidency), to do two things: (1) Try to replace as best we can the first cassette, and (2) Add a third concerning some of your experiences as President? Meanwhile, this portion can be cleared for the Archives.

Sincerely,

CRM:LW

ORAL HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY IN CANADA

INTERVIEW

VIRGINIA DOUGLAS

THIS IS PART OF THE ORAL HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY IN CANADA.
I AM TALKING WITH DR. VIRGINIA DOUGLAS IN HER OFFICE AT
McGILL UNIVERSITY ON DECEMBER 22, 1976.

Q. I should explain that some years ago -- do you remember how many years it is?

A. Quite some time.

Q. Ginny talked to me for two hours and I returned to the Windsor Hotel only to have my case, my recorder, camera and all six of the tapes I had done that day stolen from my hotel room. Subsequently, after advertising in the Montreal press, the hotel detective managed to recover the tapes, which was all I was concerned about getting back, he said in a pillowcase in the hotel room next to ours. When subsequently I came to arrange to have these tapes transcribed, it turned out to my shocked surprise that one of -- the first of Ginny's two tape cassettes had been removed from its case, and therefore we now have to recover as best we can the early reminiscences up to the arrival at McGill, and that will be Tape 1; and then, since we have Tape 2 and it has been transcribed, we then will go on to Tape 3, which has to do with many things that happened in Ginny's life since that time.

O.K., Ginny, let's again start at the beginning. Where were you born?

A. London, Ontario.

Q. And into what sort of a family -- what did your father do?

A. My father was a cabinet maker. Unfortunately he became a semi-invalid shortly after I was born, and so times were tough in that sense, but I guess there was a fair amount of family support around. It's a Scottish family. My grandfather owned a lovely old grocery store in London and I spent a lot of my time selling candy and ice cream and that sort of thing behind the counter there.

Q. Did you have any siblings?

A. No, I was an only child.

Q. And your father was invalided. That meant he couldn't work, he couldn't . . .

A. He worked very little. There was insurance and this sort of thing. Quite a bit of family help from my grandfather. My father did take jobs from time to time, but . . .

Q. Did you live with your grandparents?

A. We didn't live in the same home, but we lived in a sweet old wooden cottage that my grandfather owned, which was quite near to the store, so . . .

Q. Where was the home?

A. That was on Central Avenue, and my grandfather's store was on the corner - near the corner of Richmond Street and Central Avenue.

Q. Long since disappeared.

A. I gather. I haven't been back.

Q. Have you not been back in London since then?

A. No. I was back for a conference the other day, but I wasn't able to get over, and I was anxious to take a look.

Q. London's like Toronto and Montreal. They've been transformed since the war. There's been an awful lot of renovation and I think you'd be interested in the renovating that Labatt's have done of some glorious old homes along the Thames River. They've done a beautiful job of restoring them.

A. I can remember actually playing with some of the Labatt's children when I was young. That was also on Central Avenue.

Q. Well now, in terms of your earliest recollections of your home, I mean if we can get back before you went to school, what sort of a home was it from the point of view of reading material?

A. Well, my father, perhaps because he was ill, had a lot of books in our house. I can remember a beautiful old cabinet with the circular glass -- curved glass front door, and, uh . . .

Q. These would be mainly adult books.

A. Well, yes. He had Tennyson and Longfellow, I remember, and lots of leather-bound kinds of things that quite impressed me, but I also remember a lot of children's books that they obviously

got for me. I think "The Girl of the Limberlost" was one of my favourites at that time, and the usual -- "Black Beauty" and "Alice and Wonderland".

Q. Yes. And "Robinson Crusoe"?

A. I don't think I was that interested in him.

Q. Well now your mother had to work. What did she work at?

A. My mother didn't actually work during that period. I think that my father brought in some, as I said. There was some insurance, and I think the rest of -- it's hard when you're a child (Q. Yes.) to know just where the finances are coming from, but I think the rest of it came from family.

Q. What did your mother -- what had she done before she was married?

A. They married very, very young, and so I don't think she ever really worked.

Q. I see.

A. She helped around my granddad's store.

Q. Well then later what was her attitude towards education?

A. Oh it was very much like a lot of Scottish families. Education was everything, and she pushed me extremely hard. Anything short of an "A" on a report was a failure.

Q. Could you read before you went to school, do you think?

A. I believe so. I remember spending a lot of time -- I had a doting uncle, too, who was unmarried and he used to spend a lot of time drawing and writing and -- with me -- and taking me places and buying firecrackers and things on the 24th of May , so that yes, I think I must have -- again, I don't have any vivid memories but I think I must have because I can remember sitting behind my grandfather's store -- there was an apartment there -- and writing in copybooks, and that would be before I went to school.

Q. At what age did you start school?

A. I think five. I remember going to kindergarten and apparently got in wrong with the teacher very early. My mother loves to tell this story because it fit with all of her expectations, I guess. I told the teacher on about the third day that I had come to learn things, not to play.

Q. The content of the curriculum in kindergarten was something you were already beyond.

A. Yes. It was cut and paste, and I found that rather silly, I gather.

Q. Many people remember that after one day at school, when they started, they didn't want to go back. They had that experience.

A. I don't think I ever rebelled about going. It was just that I wanted more exciting things to do.

Q. You say you were pushed by your mother. Was your father still alive when you started school?

A. Yes, my father lived until I was twelve, and again, partly because he was ill and around the house a fair amount, he had perhaps much more influence on me than fathers often do on daughters.

Q. It wasn't that you were so much of a mischief in kindergarten as that you were hungry for more solid fare.

A. Yes. I suspect I was anything but a mischief. I think I was a very goody-good little girl right up through high school, when suddenly something gave.

Q. You got tired of that too.

A. I got tired of that, yes.

Q. Now did grades, "A's", come easily in elementary school?

A. Yes. I think that the only time I ever remember being in academic difficulty was later, when my mother remarried and I was shifted to a small town with a completely different system, and I remember that for the first couple of months there I felt that I was in trouble, but I had pretty much (Q begins speaking; rest unintelligible).

Q. Prior to that time you hadn't been in difficulty.

A. No. I always expected to be at the top of the class or the middle.

Q. From the first?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you skip any grades?

A. No. I can remember a rather disturbing at the time -- it's even disturbing, I think, when I think back to it -- I remember being in Grade 3 and being told that I probably would skip into Grade 4. I was just sitting there for the first day or so, and I saw the inkwells and an old pen and I started writing in my exercise book with the ink, and a very old maid school teacher -- I remember her name was Miss Smith -- came and gave me a severe scolding because of course I messed up the book -- it was that soft paper and it blotted all over, and she told me that she had intended to put me into Grade 4, but if I couldn't do as I was told I would stay in Grade 3. I can remember feeling dreadfully hurt about that.

Q. Which implies that you had been a good little girl and been very good at your studies. Did you think of yourself as being unusually bright or good at school work?

A. Yes, I think I took that for granted. I had an aunt who had a Master's degree in mathematics that I identified with.

(A - continued)

In those days that was quite unusual for a woman, (Q. Yes.) and I had an uncle who taught Latin in a high school . . .

Q. So you had a coterie in your family of teachers and people with advanced . . .

A. Yes. These were all people I identified with, and although my mother had not had that education herself, she certainly valued it highly, and my father also.

Q. Was your parents' attitude just attaching a high value to education or was there an element in it "I want my daughter to have a better educational opportunity than we had."?

A. I think it was both, although it is interesting -- my mother later, it became clear, only wanted my education to take me so far. She did not want it to take me away from her.

Q. I see.

A. She became a very possessive mother and she was not at all happy when the time came for me to go to university, and I had to fight her to go, because at that time I could have taught in school, elementary school . . .

Q. . . . and stayed at home.

A. And, uh . . .

Q. That's what she wanted.

A. That's what she wanted.

Q. Your father died when you were twelve. (A. Yes.) Your mother remarried when you were what age?

A. About fourteen.

Q. At that time you moved to another town.

A. Yes, to Smiths Falls, Ontario.

Q. (Unintelligible)

A. Yes, at that time it was a terrible come-down.

Q. Yes, and also you, at fourteen you would lose your friends . . .

A. That's right, that's right. I guess -- I was just trying to think -- it must have been thirteen, because I was in Grade 8, and it was toward the end of the school year that I was shifted.

Q. Do you remember strong feelings about your mother's getting married again?

A. It wasn't so much her getting married again that I resented, but I did resent being picked up and taken to what I considered a burg. (Q - Yes.) London to me was just an ideal place. I had watched the students from Western doing their snake dances down Dundas Street and I was thoroughly identified with that, and the thought of going to Smiths Falls, Ontario, was pretty distasteful.

Q. Yes, that would be a long way away -- and down.

A. Yes. And the teachers -- I had a 70 or 75 year old teacher when I got there, a very old lady, who insisted that I learn to write all over again. I had learned to write with a slant, and for her I had to write round and straight, and the percentage sign couldn't be joined, it had to have a circle and a line and a circle all separately. She really cut me down to size.

Q. What was your relationship with your stepfather?

A. It was ambivalent, mainly because he turned out to be an alcoholic, and like so many alcoholics, when he was good he was very, very good, and when he was bad he was horrid, just horrid. He put both my mother and me through hell for a short while, before the marriage broke up.

Q. And what did your mother do about this -- did she desert or . . .

A. No, she got a legal separation and he -- his job actually shifted him out of the town where we lived, and so he sort of literally disappeared from our lives.

Q. But you and your mother stayed there.

A. We stayed in Smiths Falls. By that time I loved the place. I had been forced to write -- well, that was a terrible insult -- I had been forced to write the high school entrance exams. In London of course I would have been

(A - continued)

automatically put through; but I did very well on them, and by the time I hit the high school the teachers knew I was coming. As a matter of fact, they made it very miserable for me because they told the other students about the examinations I had written and . . .

Q. How well you had done.

A. Yes, and it . . .

Q. That does not make any child popular.

A. It doesn't go over well in a small town, particularly. But it worked out all right. I actually came to -- I thrived in that high school. There were some excellent teachers in the high school. One of them, Miss Marion McCollum, was given an honorary doctorate by Queens University, and she was a very, very driving teacher, a tremendous perfectionist.

Q. What did she teach?

A. She taught English and History -- a lady full of soul. She loved what she was doing, and she certainly inspired me to think about university.

Q. Were you -- in high school do you remember being particularly good at or particularly fond of some subjects and not so fond of others?

A. Yes, I -- in the first years I took the prizes in practically everything. I had so many school pins I didn't know

where to put them, and medals and things of this sort, and public speaking and verse speaking trophies; but I remember that in about the fourth year of high school I did begin to realize that I was not that fond of physics. Chemistry wasn't quite as bad. Geometry I could not visualize in space, and still can't, and so I had trouble with that. I mean, I got respectable grades, but certainly not outstanding grades in those subjects.

Q. My daughter had great difficulty in geometry, and I remember trying to help her with her homework and she'd sit there and she'd try something, and turn to me to see if it was right, because she . . .

A. Just about -- it was very much -- whatever I did there was not through true comprehension. I did it by rote. It just didn't speak to me at all.

Q. But the more humane subjects like English . . .

A. English, history, French, Latin -- I won the Latin prize. Even music -- I had had no training in music but I won the music prize. I certainly never would have won any prizes -- actually, I dropped physics and chemistry and the math in the final year.

Q. Now what about other things? You mentioned music; what was this -- instrumental?

A. No, this was just the usual high school course in music appreciation.

Q. They didn't have a band, or . . .

A. I sang in the choir and was in the operetta, this sort of thing; and theatre we had, and I was in the school play, but I never did play an instrument, no.

Q. What about sports?

A. Well, I had been frightened of sports, partly because of this sort of goody-good quality, and my mother had terribly over-protected me, but in high school I discovered basketball, and it turned out by sheer luck that I was very good at it, and so I did have a lot of fun playing basketball and was on one of the teams within the high school, and I really enjoyed . . .

Q. What else was there for girls in high school? Field hockey?

A. I don't think so. Certainly it would never have appealed to me. That would have been too rough.

Q. Track and field?

A. There was, but it wasn't my thing. No, basketball was the only glimmer of the athlete. I hated swimming at that time, and yet now I swim for miles.

Q. I forgot to ask you what your parents were politically. Were they . . .?

A. I don't have any strong memories. I would think that they would be somewhere centre or slightly left of centre. I'm not really sure.

Q. But it wasn't very active.

A. Not at all. They were always interested in the mayor's election and things of this sort, but I don't remember associating with politics.

Q. . . . much talk about provincial or federal . . . O.K. What about religion? Now we're moving back to pick that up.

A. Religion was a rather strange thing in our family. I don't think my mother and father ever took it very seriously and certainly my grandfather didn't, but I was sent to Sunday School, and later I sang in the choir and I taught Sunday School, but I don't think it was ever with any great conviction or commitment. It was more of a social thing, I think, and I went to several different Sunday Schools, actually. I went to Presbyterian, United, and I think one or two others during my childhood -- Anglican; I remember being wrapped up in mufflers and being sent off to Anglican Sunday School. I had a nice lady down the street who used to take me. My mother would muffle me up to the nose in big ugly things and she would say "O.K., Ginny. Get ready," and she would grab one end of the muffler and I'd twist and twist and turn until she got it all off me, and then she'd put a lovely little white silk scarf on me and away we'd go. She had to pack me up again before she took me back to my mother.

Q. Good Lord! O.K., now back to high school. At what point did you decide you wanted to go further than high school graduation?

A. I don't think it really shaped up clearly in my mind until the last year.

Q. Well, that's when most children begin to think of what they're going to do next.

A. Particularly since there was no money and my mother didn't want me to go, and I feel pretty sure that if it hadn't been for Miss McCollum -- and also I had by that time -- I was going with a boy; maybe that helped too -- who was a mathematics student at Queens. He was the brother of my best friend, and I had been to visit him at Queens and so had seen the place and had begun to think of it as a real possibility.

Q. Did you at this stage ever encounter the word "psychology" to have it have any meaning for you?

A. Absolutely not. I didn't know it existed.

Q. This came at Queens.

A. It came at Queens.

Q. O.K. Now, how did you manage to go to Queens?

A. I won one scholarship, and here my mother must have helped me once she knew I was wanting, you know, was determined to go, because somebody obviously contacted the Masonic Lodge. My father had been a Mason, and they loaned me money to go.

Q. At no interest?

A. No interest. And then I worked every summer.

Q. At what?

A. I worked two summers in the five-and-ten-cent store in Smiths Falls, and then the third summer I was determined not to spend any more time at home than I had to and I got a job in Kingston doing a survey of the city housing, which was quite interesting, and ah . . .

Q. O.K. Paint a picture of Queens when you first went there.

A. It was a pretty beautiful place. You know, lots of green lawns and lots of white limestone. Lovely people. I remember Dr. Tracy, my Latin professor, knew my name the first day. I met him on the campus and he called me by name, which absolutely impressed me no end, and even the principal later, whom I met in Toronto one time years later and he knew me.

Q. Who was the principal?

A. Wallace.

Q. Oh yes. He was that kind of . . .

A. He was just a lovely, lovely man. I knew his daughter there and . . . Professor Roy in English -- a jovial, also a rather alcoholic old chap -- red nose.

Q. He taught my wife tennis.

A. Did he? And then the Shakespearian expert -- I can't open up with his name. It was very funny because I went into Queens in Honours English and History and later met this professor at Michigan, where I was studying psychology, and he of course took it for granted that I was there in English -- G. B. Harrison was his name -- and I said no, I was there taking psychology, and he said "Psychology?" and I said "Yes," and he said "Tut tut. Well, don't let it get you down."

(Laughter and brief exchange of unintelligible remarks.) But the people were characters. They stood for something. Even eccentric characters -- people you remember.

Q. You started in Honours English and History.

A. Mm hm.

Q. Did you stay through Queens in that?

A. No. In the second year I took the introductory course in Psychology and the introductory course in Philosophy and they were together.

Q. Who did you take Philosophy from?

A. I don't remember. (Q. Right.) Jack Houck (Haupt?) was one of my first Psychology teachers, and uh . . . I'm having trouble with names today -- a very famous psychologist at Queens who went off and took a chair in England.

Q. Humphrey.

A. Humphrey.

Q. George Humphrey.

A. Yes. I had him for a few lectures before he left.

Q. Did he leave shortly after you went to Queens?

A. Yes. I remember that's what happened, I'm quite sure.

Q. Was Don Hebb (?) on the staff there?

A. No, but I got my times wrong (Q and A speak simultaneously - unintelligible) .

Q. In what year did you go?

A. I went there in '45.

Q. Oh no; Don had left then.

A. No, I know Don wasn't there, but I'm not certain about when Humphrey left.

Q. I think '46.

A. Mm hm, then I am right.

Q. And now, in your first year, what did you take that you remember turned you on?

A. Strangely enough, it was really the experimental psychology that caught me. (Q. Oh.) Ah . . .

Q. But that wasn't until your second year.

A. No. I think, though, that even in the introductory course the more experimental material within it, and then later Brother Philip. In my last year Brother Philip came and I had a tremendous amount of respect for him. He was a great teacher and he loved his work. And the books I remember are things like Boring, Langseth (?) and Wells and Woodworth, which is sort of surprising. I remember taking Child Psychology and not finding it terribly interesting. It seemed soft to me.

Q. The hard stuff appealed to you. (A. Yes.) Well, that's perhaps because it was strange.

A. Well, I think in a sense there's a good part of me that still goes that way, and I liked good experimental design and I liked (end of Side 1 of tape) .

Q. (unintelligible - beginning of Side 2) . . . he was a grand . . .

A. He was a delightful old man. He stood for so many things that you could admire and yet he was so subtle and so gentle. (Q. Yes.) He was just a very lovely person.

Q. But he was especially good with individual students (A. Yes.) because he took such an interest in what they were doing and so concerned about making what they were doing good. (A. Yes.) Did you know that Don had virtually created the lab at Queens? In the late thirties?

A. No. I think at that time I didn't know who Donald Hebb (?) was. Isn't that awful? I think that's true. I really . .

Q. I don't think anybody . . .

A. . . . had no great awareness.

Q. But he, in the late thirties, had persuaded (?) that they . . .

A. That they needed a lab.

Q. They needed a lab. Now in your second year you elected to take Psychology, and that plus Philosophy decided you to shift?

A. Yes. I remember getting an "A" in the Logic path of Philosophy and somehow or another that had a great appeal, and of course Philosophy and Psychology were together then, (Q. Yes.) and I knew from that minute on, practically, that that was what I wanted to do.

Q. Who was the philosopher with the Russian-sounding name? I've lost it.

A. I have too.

Q. But did you take any courses from him?

A. I did take a course from him. Yes, I did, but I can't come up with it.

Q. Was he good?

A. I think so. I didn't like the Ethics that much, that part of it, but the Logic somehow or other had a great appeal for me.

Q. That too would be hard and Ethics would be soft.

A. Yes, I suppose.

Q. Then in your third -- who was Wallace's daughter? What was her name?

A. Elspeth.

Q. Elspeth. Very lovely girl. Was she a contemporary . . .

A. She was a contemporary. We took lab courses together, yes. We tested each other's pain threshold, as a matter of fact. Our two-point and two-point threshold, I mean. Yes, she was a very, very lovely person.

Q. Well now, she quickly got into clinical work. You didn't.

A. I didn't. That's right. I didn't even -- I ended up not with the four-year degree but with the three-year degree because I got married, (Q. Ah yes.) and I had not even worked in a single clinical or abnormal course at the time I left Queens. I did take one by extension from Julian Blackburn.

Q. What about George Humphrey as a teacher?

A. He was a very dynamic teacher. I remember the very first lecture him telling us that there was a pink elephant up on the ceiling or something like that and running up and down the centre aisle saying "Don't you see it? There it is! Don't you see it?"

Q. Gesticulating?

A. Gesticulating away, and of course trying to get us to think about consensual validation -- how do you know that something is.

Q. He was a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge in Classics. Didn't get any philosophy or psychology until he came to North America. Like a lot of people in those days, his background was something other than academic, something other than Psychology, but he was a most entertaining fellow to meet and drink with, as I did in the late thirties or early forties. Once at a party at the University of Montreal, I think it was, he and Roy Levy -- Roy was a very -- do you remember Levy?

A. No.

Q. No, you wouldn't have encountered him. He was a very stiff and proper type of person, and George Humphrey was anything but prim and stiff and proper, especially at a party. George could enjoy himself, and I remember at this party Roy, who didn't drink at all and George, who'd had one or two too many, waved to me across the room and beckoned to me to come over, and I remember very vividly as soon as I arrived within earshot he looked at me and he said, "Do you know what the trouble with you, Meyers, is?" and I said "No," and he said "You're too God damned sardonic." My recollections of George are very vivid.

Glassbaum (?) -- something like that.

A. That sounds familiar. It's something -- you may be right on.

Q. Now you got married. Therefore you settled for a three-year . . .

A. That's right.

Q. . . . general degree, and what happened then?

A. Then we sent to Sarnia, Ontario, and I became an instant social worker. I worked for the Children's Aid Society of the City of Sarnia and the County of Lambton.

Q. Did you go there because your husband had a . . .?

A. That's right. He was a chemical engineer working at Polymer Corporation.

Q. I see. And how long did that last?

A. We were there for three and a half years, and actually I quite enjoyed being a social worker and for the last several months I was Acting Superintendent of this agency. It's amazing; in those days -- I don't what it's like so much now, but they didn't have that many fully trained social workers around, and this was one that was dreadfully understaffed and people were always having nervous breakdowns, including the Superintendent, and I suddenly found myself running this thing.

Q. Did they have a shelter with a lot of children?

A. We had -- not a shelter, we used foster homes.

Q. Oh, did you?

A. Some foster homes took as many as ten children, so in a sense they were shelters, but I remember the first day I was there being handed, I think it was three hundred and twenty something cases for which I was responsible, and they were very active cases, a good proportion of them. You know, child protection cases and adoption and unmarried mothers -- the whole bit.

Q. Yes. Well that would certainly give you a kind of clinical experience.

A. It certainly did. It was a very valuable experience.

Q. What then?

A. Then again, follow the husband. He decided to go back to graduate school. We had always planned this, and like a dutiful wife I went where he went, and it turned out by sheer luck that he chose the University of Michigan, (Q. Oh?) and it had one of the best clinical programs in the States.

Q. So that's how you got to Michigan.

A. That's how I got to Michigan.

Q. Following your husband.

A. That's right. That's how I got back to McGill, too.

Q. Oh, really? (A. Oh yes.) All right. Now what -- was it this Children's Aid experience in Sarnia that interested you in graduate work in psychology?

A. Well no, I had always intended, ever since I became interested in psychology I intended to go back in psychology. Actually what happened was that since Murray was going back for a Master's degree at the time when I applied to Michigan I also said I wanted a Master's degree. Besides, that seemed like the humble thing to do -- you didn't say you wanted a Ph.D. -- and they wrote me back and rejected me, saying they didn't take terminal Master's people. By that time it was too late to do anything about it, so I went into social work in Michigan and got the M.S.W. and then shifted over to psychology.

Q. I see, yes. Ah, what was Michigan at the graduate -- oh, by the way, Elspeth chose to do graduate work at Michigan.

A. Yes. She I guess went down directly, did she?

Q. Yes, she did. She was one of the first cases by means of which we broke the parochial Ottawa view that mental health bursaries could only go to Canadian students who did their graduate work in Canada, . . .

A. Canadian schools.

Q. . . . and we went to bat for Elspeth because she wanted to go to Michigan. I remember writing and getting other people to write heavy letters of support, and she broke the barrier.

A. I don't think I knew -- I think we lost contact completely with each other.

Q. That's what I wondered -- whether you'd heard . . .

A. No, I didn't know. She wasn't at Michigan when I got there.

Q. No, I think she went directly and she'd be out by the time you got there.

A. Or probably because I went into social work first, because we would have overlapped at Ann Arbor.

Q. Yes, maybe for a year. Now you got your M.S.W. What was that experience like?

A. It was excellent. The School of Social Work at Michigan -- my impression is that it was not like most schools of social work. There were some very good minds, very interesting people there, and very reality-oriented.

Q. But not hard.

A. Not hard.

Q. In a methodological . . .

A. Methodologically speaking, no, but hard in the sense of looking for results, and . . .

Q. Tough-minded.

A. Tough-minded; yes, tough-minded I think would be a good way to describe them, and very exciting, bald? people, so that I never had any -- you know first I was most disappointed when this confusion about the psychology happened, but I -- once I got into social work I quite respected the people there and I had a lot of very good training and good experience.

Q. And then when you decided to go further, did your husband decide to go beyond the Master's?

A. Yes, and I began -- I got permission to take a couple of courses in psychology while I was in social work, I-get-the foot-in-the-door sort of thing. Actually, my social work research project I did with Lowell Kelly in psychology. (Q. Really?) Yes. He was predicting success in the School of Social Work and it was parallel to his predicting success in clinical psychology, and by that time it became evident that Murray was going to be there longer and I got good grades in the courses I had taken, and so I simply shifted over.

Q. So they had some confidence that you . . .

A. That's right, although I must say the fact that I was in social work made them dreadfully suspicious. Why would a do-gooder want to study the science of psychology?

Q. Well now, you switched over at the post-Master's level.

A. Yes. Actually I think I may have even officially got the Master's in psychology before I got the Master's in social work.

(A - continued)

I was actually by that time really integrating the two.

Q. I see; and then you went on. Who else did you have? Did you have Max Hutt (?) ?

A. Yes, I surely did -- a source of great ambivalence to all who knew him.

Q. Oh, why?

A. Well, because he confused his teaching and his psychotherapeutic interests and was constantly interpreting to the class why they were sitting where they were, or whatever.

Q. Which made you, at least, feel uncomfortable?

A. Well, I felt the man had a certain amount of hostility and that he used these interpretations in ways that were not particularly . . .

Q. Objective.

A. Constructive, yes.

Q. Who else did you have?

A. Dan Miller; I've mentioned Lowell Kelly.

Q. I knew Lowell Kelly very well before and during the war, but I never heard him as a teacher. What was he like as a teacher?

A. Well, he was the person who introduced me, really, to psychoanalytic theory, and that he did extremely well. Yes, he did. He taught the course in Psychopathology.

Q. What year was this?

A. Fifty-two, . . .

Q. Oh well, that was after . . .

A. . . . fifty-three . . .

Q. . . . his experience in predicting success in . . .

A. Oh I'm sorry. I thought you said Dan Miller.

Q. No. Lowell Kelly.

A. Oh, Lowell Kelly. I liked Lowell Kelly as a teacher. He always got dreadful ratings from the students, though. But . . .

Q. Now he'd be hard-nosed.

A. Yes. He tried to be hard-nosed, anyhow. He wasn't always dealing with material he could be hard-nosed about. I liked him.

Q. Now, let's clarify. It wasn't Lowell . . . (rest obscured by A's reply).

A. It wasn't Lowell who taught Psychopathology. I must have misheard you. No, it was Dan Miller, and Lowell was on my thesis committee and I found him a very valuable person to have there.

Q. Who was the -- was Clyde Koonz . . . ?

A. Clyde Koonz was one of the more popular, strangely enough, speakers in our introductory course. He again was a man who was completely committed to what he was doing, and you appreciated and respected that. Then there was Ed Walker. He was another good teacher. And Bill, who was President of A.P.A. just . . .

Q. McKeachie?

A. Bill McKeachie.

Q. And was Haveringhurst? there?

A. No. Swanson was and Newcomb was.

Q. Oh yes.

A. Ted Newcomb. I don't remember Haveringhurst.

Q. Did you take any work from Newcomb?

A. Yes, I took Social Psychology from him.

Q. Was that when the survey team moved to Michigan from wherever they had been -- or someplace?

A. Are you talking about the one that Swanson worked on, the survey in Detroit of lower-class and middle-class families and childbearing practices?

Q. No. An institute was established at Michigan to do nationwide surveys of (rest obscured by A) .

A. Oh I see. Yes. This was there by that time and . . .

Q. Let's bracket the time.

A. Fifty- . . . by the time I was over in Psych it was pretty much fifty-three to fifty-eight.

Q. You went there in fifty-one?

A. Went there in fifty-one.

Q. And you were in Psych from fifty-three to fifty-eight. (A. Mm hm.) Right. And then you followed your husband to McGill. (A. Right.) And how did you -- did you just apply for a job at McGill and were accepted?

A. Yes. He applied and was accepted, or it looked like he was going to be, and so I applied, and -- actually, if it hadn't been for coming with him I would never, never have come to McGill. It would have been probably one of my last choices. I was invited to stay on and teach at Michigan. I had been teaching in the Psychological Clinic there. I have a way of getting terribly committed to wherever I am and unless somebody moves me I'd probably stay forever.

Q. But if you had decided to come back on your own, it probably would have been either to Western or to Queens.

A. Yes, or Toronto if there had been anything there,

(A - continued)

although there probably wouldn't have been, since it was clinical I was looking for.

Q. In those days we had a clinical (obscured by A).

A. You did have in '58? But the salary was fiendishly low, the morale of the clinical program here was very low -- they were seriously considering shutting it down at the time I came. I was told I couldn't use the word "psychotherapy" in talking to students. I mean, it was dreadful. It really was awful. It seemed to me to have a completely outmoded attitude toward anything clinical. And of course it was a terminal Master's program and so within the department it almost had to have lower standards.

Q. This was after Hebb? and during Ed Webster's . . .

A. Yes. Ed Webster became chairman the year I came here.

Q. I remember George once asking me whether I became paranoid after I had given up the chairmanship, and I asked him why he should ask such a question, and he said, "Well, when Ed Webster replaced Don Hebb as chairman, Don considered that Ed had done everything he could to undermine what Don had tried to establish, and when I became chairman after , he became convinced that I was doing nothing but undermining everything that he had stood for."

A. It's funny, you know, the rest of us would be somewhat aware, perhaps, of the differences between Hebb and Ferguson, but as for the rest of it, it didn't show that much. There were

(A - continued)

three men with just completely different styles -- just completely. But I caught on fairly early in the game that this was a very solid department and who was chairman didn't seem to matter that much. You know, an industrial psychologist, Ed Webster, being chairman of a department that had made its name in physiological seems quite ridiculous, and he certainly didn't understand at all what went on in that wing, and didn't pretend to; but in his own way he was a good chairman.

Q. I'm sure that's true.

A. And the same goes for George. He had a style that he brought to it, and I think the department has been stronger perhaps for shifting between these different men.

Q. Well, certainly it's become broader as a result of these tangles.

A. Yes, it has.

Q. Now, is there anything up to your arrival at McGill that we should add to this?

A. No, I don't think so. I enjoyed Michigan very, very much.

Q. It was -- even at the time you got there, it was a very big department.

A. It was absolutely unbelievably huge.

Q. Monstrous. (Rest obscured by A)

A. From Queens to Michigan -- you know, it was just a different world, and I had a son two months after I arrived on that campus, but somehow or other you adapt and you make friends with a small group within the big one and I enjoyed it. I even got to enjoy their crazy football games and the dumb marching band, which -- you know, I was used to the dignity of the pipe band at Queens and here were these high-stepping, drum-beating types, but I actually got to enjoy it.

Q. Who were some of your colleagues that you remember -- fellow graduate students at Michigan?

A. Well, Bob and Lee Hafner were among my closest friends, partly because they were raising a family at the same time as my son was growing up, and also Bob took on the job of teaching Lee and me statistics, since we weren't going to get it without him. I had no introductory statistics whatsoever, and as I just said a while ago, I didn't have any fifth year -- I had no calculus or anything. The crazy part of it was that on the final exam Lee and I got a higher grade than Bob did because he refused to write all this nonsense down about developing things. We did it all painstakingly. That was the second half of Stat. The first half I was no great on, but we came through finally.

Q. Well, Stat could be pretty big -- an important part of . .

A. Oh yes, it was important and it was being taught at that time by Dave Birch, who was a purist. If anybody asked him,

(A - continued)

you know, where would you use this or what is this for, he sort of scratched his head.

Q. Who cares?

A. Yes, exactly. So it took me a while to get into the swing of that because it was completely foreign to any training I'd ever had before.

Q. Was there an atmosphere at Michigan generated by graduate students rapping with each other (rest obscured by A) .

A. Yes, we spent a lot of time together and in the early days there was, you know, lots of struggles between the clinical types and the experimental types. Bob Isaacson was one of my classmates in experimental. Yes, there were some good friendships, good lively -- we hung around the lounge a great deal.

Q. Dan Berlion told me when I was taping him that when he came from St. Andrews to Yale and was in that group -- the Neal Miller group -- that he had the feeling -- they, he and his fellow graduate students had the feeling that they were at the very centre of the cutting edge of psychology and that any day they were going to make a significant break-through. At any rate, they had the feeling that they were the very centre of the volcano of psychology. Did you have that feeling, you and your friends?

A. No, I don't think there was ever that kind of self-consciousness. I know what you're talking about. I think that

(A - continued)

it was much more just a very solid business of doing what you were doing well and not having grandiose dreams about it but making sure that it added up to something that you could back up and that would hold water. I don't think there were these -- at least it certainly wasn't part of my make-up at the time to think of becoming one of the great psychologists.

Q. This may be partly a function of size. The Michigan department was so big that you'd have to form groups within . . .

A. I think too there was a mood about the place. I remember Don Marquis, who was the chairman when I first went there, giving a prize -- a bottle of good Canadian rye -- that part I remember -- for the shortest thesis, and in a way that kind of typifies it: don't put on a big show about what you're doing; do the absolute, you know, minimum to do it well, but don't garnish it.

Q. Don't elaborate. Stick with the guts of it, . . .

A. That's it.

Q. . . . the essentials.

A. I think that's a different style, perhaps, from what you're describing.

Q. Did you take any courses from Don?

A. Yes. I took Research Design from him and very much enjoyed it. There again, it was part of my thing and I got an "A", I remember, in that course, probably one of the higher grades.

(A - continued)

I always enjoyed Research Design. He taught it well. I would never teach a course in research design -- that's probably the Hebbian influence that hit me since, but uh . . .

Q. Why? Because you don't believe in it?

A. I don't believe in teaching it as a mechanical thing. I think that Don is quite right -- that if you get a student interested in a real problem and then talk about the design you need to answer that question, you're doing a better educational job.

Q. Don's contribution to that, Estes Park, is fascinating, but people don't -- eminent scientists don't do what the cookbook says.

A. Right. As a matter of fact, I find myself so identifying with him that I'm sometimes out of tune with some of the bureaucracy. We're finding right now that we're in disagreement with ATA on the clinical training, (Q. Oh yes.) and some of it I'm pretty sure is the Hebbian style versus the U.S. put-it-on-paper, make-a-course-out-of-it, make-it-look-good bureaucratic kind of value system.

Q. Currently there's considerable pressure in C.P.A. and ACAP? to launch a national accreditation in Canada.

A. That's been going on for years, hasn't it? Certainly when I was president it's something we talked about, and I gathered that Webster talked about it.

Q. Quite recently I was down at A.P.A. headquarters talking

(Q - continued)

to the accreditation people, the people involved with it there, and I told them there was this move afoot, and they both said, in a chorus, the two men I was talking to said . . .

(End of Side 2, Tape 1)

(Side 1, Tape 2):

A. But I think the nice thing about McGill is, as soon as people began to know you as an individual and what you were interested in and what you could do, the old ideas washed away very, very quickly.

Q. But if there was prejudice, it was not impregnable.

A. No, and it may be that some of the prejudice was deserved; I don't know. I think that Canada went through a period when all of its clinical psychologists -- and that probably wasn't very many -- were very much wedded to the Rorschach and some pretty unrealistic ideas about what they could do, and . . .

Q. Why do you say Canada? That surely is true of North America.

A. Yes, it's just that Canada, I think, was dragging a few years behind, and I had been spoiled by being in a different setting, so I was very aware of it when I came back, and I really, you know, would never want to see a department let some brands of clinical psychology take over.

Q. So you -- fairly quickly or slowly? -- recovered from this initial, ah, somewhat chilly atmosphere?

A. It was kind of slow but sure. I think I realized fairly quickly that progress could be made and Don Hebb I think was one of the most generous and kind people to me when I came. I had been getting into some pretty hot arguments. But I never felt that he was an enemy. I always felt that he was a friend and my first graduate -- my second graduate student -- where I needed money to support the student. I took her in a rush because of some special circumstances. He offered to help me support her and it's been like that ever since. Whenever there was a pinch or I needed help -- or I needed advice or sound judgment, I've always found Hebb a very good person to go to.

Q. Well, Don is a self confessed soft touch for women.

A. I don't know whether being a woman had much to do with it. I think he does this with most people. If he feels that they have something going, he'll do anything he can to help.

Q. Who else was here Ginny when you arrived?

A. Dr. Webster was the Chairman. George Ferguson was here. D.B. Dr. ....Ron Nesbitt came later. Peter Mellany was here.

Q. Brenda?

A. Brenda has been here but her contact with the department is not very close so I didn't get to know her

Q. And it hasn't been since you've been here?

A. No.

Q. I see.

A. I now know her quite well and she sometimes lectures to my students but at that time I didn't ...

Q. She wasn't sort of central in the deparment?

A. No.

Q. Poser came later eh?

A. No, Poser of course was here in one of the first departments. He was here when I got here in '58 and I think had been here for quite a little while because he started the Applied programming thing.

Q. I think that was when Don gave up the Chairmanship.

A. And of course Wally Lambert was here. It's always hard to pop up with names.

Q. Yes, isn't it.

A. But Ernest and I were the only two when ..

Q. Was Bud Rutyens here?

A. No, Rutyens I heard about but he had just left I think.

Q. Did you come in initially into a full time academic post as Assistant Professor?

A. Yes. At $5000.

Q. These salary figures just make fun - reminiscing. Wally was telling me he arrived just as you arrived just after the worm had turned - and things were getting better. But he arrived just before the worm turned and when things were at there worst. Oh geez. I'm telling you that our Sid Smith against every other president including yours - in Canada - just went ahead and proposed a raise - to raise salaries substantially. And they said, don't do that. You'll ruin us all. And he said the only chance for anyone was for someone to step out and do something. And by golly, everybody else had to follow.

A. Of course these were the days of Duplessis in Quebec and McGill didn't have any degree of freedom.

Q. No. That's right.

A. No. I remember we could have made $3000 or $4000 more just about anywhere else at that time.

Q. Yes. Right.

A. That was really atrocious.

Q. And I guess they stayed bad here longer than most places?

A. Well, as soon as Duplessis died, things started picking up in Quebec almost immediately.

Q. Like what heppened in Russia after the death of Stalin?

A. It really was the same sort of thing. Well, they started taking federal grants, of course...

Q. Since your ten or eleven years at McGill, what are the mountain peaks for you? In your own experience as a psychologist in this department?

A. Well, I suppose finally getting rid of the M.Sc. applied programme and heading to a Ph.D. programme in Clinical Psychology - having it accredited by A.P.A. But I think most of all keeping it a very integral part of this department. To me that's the biggest ...

Q. And you from the start were unhappy with the M.Sc. applied, were you?

A. Yes.

Q. And worked for ..or felt that the department should move toward a higher level ...

A. Yes. It isn't that I don't think there's a place in practice for people with much lower training than a Ph.D. As a matter of fact, we're now turning out Psychology Technicians.

A. (cont'd.)

But I did feel that Canada was just desperately lacking and needing in the clinical field.

Q. But you were going to get those out of a Master's programme.

A. We weren't going to get them out of a Master's programme.

Q. Now, my impression is that what you've moved to ...well, you tell me what you've moved to. Maybe that's better. What is this new scheme now?

A. Well, what I'd like to think it is is an extremely well balanced programme that takes the best from the service tradition and the best from McGill brand of the research tradition...

Q. And puts them together in one programme.

A. ..and puts them together in one programme.

Q. How does it differ from the Montreal?

A. Very very much.

Q. Well in what specific way?

A. Well, in the first place, the research orientation in our programme is very heavy and we take great pride in turning out theses that are as good as a typical McGill

A. (cont'd.)

thesis and the work that our students and we are doing is very much integrated into general psychology. Our colleagues work with us and help us and come to our Orals and know what we are talking about. So I think we draw very heavily on the method and theory of general psychology. We aren't cut off from our own roots.

Q. Well, the Montreal scheme as described to me -- and mind you -- what's intended to be or said to be is always different from what it really is -- but what is described to me is a two pronged programme leading to differently named doctorates -- which by the way, they're afraid they're going to be forced out of. This Quebec Universities' agreement now is that their cannot be and will not be any of these funny doctorates. There'll be a Ph.D. or an M.D. and those will be the only doctors there are. And this sorts of knocks their programme on the head, or is apt to in a way. But anyway, the way it stands at the moment is that there's is an M.A., Ph.D. programme leading to a Ph.D. in Psychology which is their research -- or their hard science research degree. And the M.P.S. and D.P.S. is a programme which instead of being eighty percent research and twenty percent applied is eighty percent applied and twenty percent research. Now, are you saying that there is as much emphasis on research in your doctoral programme as there would be for students with or anybody else.

A. I think so, pretty much. Or something pretty much approaching that. We have a four year programme. Most of the straight experimental students get out in about three and they take Hebb's seminar, statistics and the human experimental seminar along with the experimental people - which is all of the courses they take pretty well.

Q. I see. And now the pay-off is on research that they actually do for their thesis.

A. Right.

Q. You explain the greater ingredient of ... practical skills, clinical experience and so on by this extra year, I suppose.

A. Yes. Now I think that the U. of M. people were criticising our programme -- and they might say it's weaker on the service side than theirs. And I think that this is so if you want to count man hours or student hours and courses and we've always as you know. Courses are things that we try to keep to a minimum but..

Q. But you can't on this side surely get them to such a small minimum that they can on the other side.

A. No. We have some applied courses. We have courses in measurement of intelligence and personality. We have a course in psychopathology and we have a seminar in behavior assessment, behavior change. The Rorschach we teach in a short

A. (cont'd.)

workshop of a series of half a dozen meetings and that's all the formal time that's put on the Rorschach. We also have a special workshop on learning disabilities..

Q. Workshop, now...

A. By workshop we simply mean that rather than giving a whole year course, we find a professor that's really strong in this area and meet with the students repeatedly in a short block of time.

Q. I see, In a concentrated period of time.

A. In a concentrated period of time.

Q. How much of this - two or three weeks or whatever it is is devoted to this and other courses...

A. No, we try to put those workshops in when the other courses are - when course work is at a minimum.

Q. What about apprenticeship?

A. They have their first summer, the second summer out in the field and then in their final year, they have two days a week over one entire academic area with the hope that they will be able to work more intelligently with cases and follow through a case.

Q. Is this an assessment? Or is it...

A. Two days in one setting. That's their specialized internship and we're hoping that by that time they know in terms of clinical service which area they're most interested in - Behavior Therapy, Psychotherapy, Learning Disabilities ..

Q. So it helps to build up some longitudinal experience in that particular setting.

A. Right.

Q. Is this the year in which they're supposed to be completing their thesis?

A. Yes.

Q. Searching for ways in which this may differ from the bolder, if not patter - bolder goal or you know, essentially it is the semantics practitioner...

A. I think -- I of course went through the bolder kind of training programme myself. I think the difference is really only the difference that is McGill's Department of Psychology and that the number of courses is many fewer. And the integration with the rest of the department I think is much better - probably because we're small, and I hope we'll stay fairly small. And the research is really valued. It's a way of life that you either catch on to and bask in or hate. We lose a few along the way who....

Q. ...really don't want that.

A. ...Who really don't want that. But if it's to their liking, I find they thrive on it.

Q. Are you sure that -- is it quite evident that you have among students got rid of the arrogant scientist looking down his nose at the second rate practitioner?

A. Yes. I think so.

Q. Is this a function of selection?

A. Perhaps. But I think that if you try to do research on clinical problems you don't stay arrogant any more.

Q. I think the ones that aren't doing research are the ones who stay arrogant.

A. Oh, you're talking about the rest of the department and how it looks..

Q. No. I'm talking about the situation that I think did exist when there was one set of graduate students who were the elite working with Malnol and Hebb and such types and then there was another group who were regarded as second rate people working chiefly with Ed Webster in the applied programme. I'm just asking, are these attitudes between graduate students -- have they changed.

A. Yes. I think they've changed tremendously.

Q. One thing that I would think would change it quite a bit would be to have them all in the same pool -- in the same seminars where they're in straight competition and if in fact they don't do any worse in those than the hi-fi science types, then they gain the self esteem which doesn't...

A. No. I think the clinical students -- we've been able to select of course ...

Q. Yes. You have a bigger pool to start from now.

A. Yes. That's right. And I think they're more than holding their own in the joint seminars and since their interests are of an experimental clinical sort, the other students are interested in what they're doing.

Q. Yes.

A. So that ....

Q. ..they've got common ground to start. Let's go back to you Ginny. I mean more personal, eh. This is the big mountain -- the big hurdle if you like, that you feel most pleased about? And are you pleased at having A.P.A. accreditation?

A. Yes, but only for very practical reasons because I think -- in that we're able to draw on a bigger pool of students -- if a student has any intention of working in the United States, having an A.P.A. accredited programme is very

A. (cont'd.)

important to us. I would like to think that sooner or later Canada will get around to looking at its own programme -- and we were criticized for letting foreigners evaluate us -- but we felt that we had to start somewhere and there were certain objectives there that looked sound to us. We found that we didn't have to lose our identity or fit any mold that was too constricting.

Q. This was the thing that discouraged most of us from wanting to have anything to do with it. At one time it was thought that the A.P.A. accreditation was of a kind which would lock you into a straitjacket and you'd have to do it their way or else you would be accredited.

A. We found no sign of this. I think they've changed..

Q. No, I don't think actually that ever existed but it was .....it was one of those situations in which it was just as bad to think it was bad because there were departments - for instance Iowa - wanting to be accredited at that time and still they were determined not to use the third year for the internship and so they bootlegged and kept highly secret for several years, the fact that the student was required to continue and complete his thesis before he had his internship. And this came out at Miami and it came out very surreptitiously and there were snide remarks about some people not

Q. (cont'd.)

conforming and to their amazement, the A.P.A. accreditation board got right up on their hind legs and said, we've been telling you people to straighten out. It was awfully funny to see culprits guiltily admit something that everybody knew was going on. It couldn't possibly be kept secret anyway.

A. No, well we found -- we sort of set about it over the years and decided what we wanted to do. We had a lot of time to think about it because since I came here I think we must have turned out -- well at least 80 of these M.Sc. applied types - and many of them were very bright young people who were Ph.D. material. And we started squeezing them -- actually I think some of them - the Master's projects that they did came pretty close to being Ph.D. theses -- because of our own ambition and the fact that they were obviously competent to do this. So over those years we kind of developed our own model which fit in this particular setting. And when we looked into the A.P.A. thing we found we didn't have to sacrifice anything and we seemed to have quite a bit to gain so we went ahead with it.

Q. For you, what else now has happened that is a source of gratification?

A. I think the biggest gratification is from my colleagues here. This is one of the loveliest departments I've ever had anything to do with in the sense that the

A. (cont'd.)

relationships between the staff are a very genuine sort. There is a great deal of sharing and interest and pride in each other's achievements. And yet a minimum of meddling. You just sort of know that the people around you are friends.

Q. This is good. And there's not the cliques and divisions that characterise so many larger departments.

A. No. And you know, people with quite different interests like Dalber Benga have just been such a tremendous source of help and ideas. And they're bright people and you've always got something to learn from talking to your own colleagues.

Q. You were at both Penticton and Couchiching weren't you?

A. Yes.

Q. What did these things do to you?

A. Well, I enjoyed both of those conferences. I know a lot of people were dissatisfied with Couchiching. But Couchiching for us helped us win a battle really. There was some inclination among some people at McGill, and I think Ed Webster was one of these and he has probably told you this himself - he would have liked to have gone for a different model for Clinical Psychology - a much more applied one.

Q. A more Montreal one?

A. A more Montreal one and I think that he and Don Hebb had talked quite a lot and Don had talked Adrian in P.R. and they were rather convinced that this was the thing to be done. I think they were convinced for very different reasons -- almost opposing reasons. And to be able to go and air this whole thing in a less personal way with psychologists from clean across the country -- somehow shaped up for us the goals that we could agree on and it was very shortly after that that we began to actively work toward this. So from a very selfish point of view, I think it helped us.

Q. It probably relieved what might otherwise have continued to be tensions in the department.

A. Yes. I think Ed got convinced at that point that that was what we should do.

Q. Ginny, let's switch now to another tack unless there's something else you want to add to this phse.

A. No. At Penticton you asked about - I was just fresh back in Canada then and it was just a very wonderful opportunity for me to get a cross view of psychology from, you know, all of the departments in Canada and I made a lot of friends and got a very good picture of what was going on.

Q. Are you conscious of it having done anything to your ideas about how to organize graduate training for psychologists?

A. Well, yes. I think there again I was able to see Don Hebb's ideas and ideals for graduate training argued out against other kinds of models and you know, I had already sort of heard him but again, it was around the home table, and things became much more explicit. And over the years, I've become very much convinced that this man -- if you've got first rate graduate students to work with -- then he knows how to get the most out of them.

Q. It's quite clear that he does. Of all the teachers you've had in Psychology, and you've had a great many, which would you list among the more influential in making you the kind of psychologist you are?

A. He hasn't been my teacher in the formal sense, but I'd say Don Hebb.

Q. Now he wasn't a teacher but he's been a close enough colleague and sufficiently dominant in the setting in which you worked that I could see that that would be true. But out of your teachers, which...

A. I guess I'd go back to Lowell Kelly.

Q. By the way, you didn't mention McKeachie in your...

A. Well, I didn't have that much direct teaching from Bill although it was funny, when I heard him give his paper, I realized that he...talking about .... and interpreting it - was obviously something I had picked up. It sounded exactly

A. (cont'd.)
like the way I would go about thinking about data.

Q. Unintentional learning.

A. Right. Something got communicated there. The cautiousness and yet a - you know - a joy in doing research. Fred Wyatt from the clinical point of view, I think would be a very important person. But I do think in many ways that I've done a lot of my growing since I left graduate school and people like Hebb and Bindroff ..

Q. The same question now in terms of books. You've read a lot of books in psychology. Looking back now in that respect, which ones at the time really struck fire in you? Fenichel?

A. Fenichel, yes.

Q. Not initially but the second time...

A. Not initially but I think there are some ideas in there that are going to hold up for a long time to come. There's an awful lot of nonsense but I think some of it is pretty solid. I think I got a great deal out of Woodroffe. I got a kind of perspective on experimental methods that I expect is still with me. There is a graphic core. You've got to read gobs, but there are insights in there.

Q. Did you ever meet him?

A. No.

Q. You missed an experience.

A. Yeah?

Q. To most people it could be a traumatic experience but oh, he's the prototype of a Hungarian.

A. Was he really?

Q. Oh. Gee. He didn't bottle up anything. He got mad.

A. He didn't let you out either.

Q. I had the temerity at Menninger's in talking with him to make, I thought, a very innocuous but perhaps somewhat sceptical remark about something -- I haven't the faintest idea what it was -- and I got him so -- my colleagues thought that he was going to come right across the table and hit me. He just went white. He was so angry. He cooled off after a while and he was jovial and friendly. But he was just up and down and around the corner and you couldn't tell He was so fiery and so erratic in his temperament, I suppose but..

A. Hebb's 'Organization of Behavior' I think would be one of them. I studied this at Michigan and was very..

Q. This was before you knew Hebb?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Now, apart from the psychologists at McGill, talk a bit about other Canadian psychologists that you have known, wild ones in particular.

A. When you talk about wild ones, I guess I think of the first C.P.A. I came to. The boys from out west were all involved with the other research. It was quite a shock. Dunc Fruett was telling us all the magic that it was going to work. But the wild ones ...

Q. Oh, I just meant the funny ones or the good ones, if there are any or..

A. Well, I remember at Penticton I was very much impressed with Lynn Newbigging and the McMaster group for what they seemed at that time to be accomplishing. I came to realize that it is not at all easy to start a department of psychology and really put down roots that are going to hold firm.

Q. He performed a virtual miracle at McMaster in a very short time.

A. He seemed to have started with virtually nothing and he really built something that was going to last. I can remember thinking, you know, McMaster - when I first came back - the idea that anything good could happen there was sort of a surprise. He seemed to me to be a pretty solid person.

Q. Dick Walters?

A. Oh, Dick, of course, was there and wild and woolly. There was no doubt that he was a man with ideas. I was always frightened for him. Somehow, I suppose everybody did sense that he could be his own worst enemy.

Q. Yes.

A. As his Chairman I can tell you that there were some pretty worried... (End of tape)

(First part of Tape 2 Side 2 not audible)

A...........and I suspect that this was his way of conceptualizing some of those problems...... But it was good for us to be spoiled...to think of some of things that psychoanalysts had mucked over...

.....I found him much too, he flows too fast for me.

Q. In conversation, you mean.

A. In conversation. If he had just given a paper and you got excited about something, he would say something like, "Oh well, you don't want to hear about that. I'm doing something new now".

Q. Yes. He talked very fast.

A. Yes.

Q. I guess you probably didn't know very many of the real old veterans in Canadian psychology, did you?

A. Probably not.

Q. Did you ever encounter or hear or see people like Roy Liddy. George Humphreys is a veteran but I guess he's the only one.

A. Yes. And I didn't really get to know him that well. What's his name from Sir George Williams, I met? Wynne Bridges.

Q. Wynne Bridges, oh yes.

A. I've talked with him on many occasions.

Q. What do you think of Wynne?

A. Well, of course by the time I knew Wynne, he was quite an old man but his interest in psychology and the fact that he must have inspired students to get interested in this subject -- still comes through pretty strong, I think.

Q. He's an old man of the sea at meetings, or was until recently. I don't think I've seen him at the last few, but he used to be the ancient mariner, remember. You'd get buttonholed by Wynne in some corner at every meeting.

A. Yeah. And when the Association gave him an Honorary Presidency, it really pleased him so much.

Q. No man deserved it more. Now let me see, what else should we get to go on the record.

A. Well, you were talking about the high points. I suppose my own research on hyperactivity -- just that this is something I've been working in for five or six years and have a feeling that I'm beginning to understand this syndrome and to be able to use techniques from general psychology and to tease out the cognitive and attentional and variables with these kids. That's been a real source of joy and interest.

Q. All right. Now, let's polish up the crystal ball and tell me where Psychology's going. I don't mean Canadian psychology. I mean the discipline and application and if you like, where clinical psychology is going.

A. Well, I'm worried still that we're the step between the laboratory psychologist and what the world out there needs and expects of us, and that we haven't given enough thought to this. I think that we are wasting some of our energy in training students in rigorous psychology, some of which may be kind of a dead end.

Q. Such as?

A. Well, I think a lot of the animal work done in learning may be getting worn a little thin. And I'm not sure

A. (oont'd.)

Canada or the States needs that many students coming up in that tradition. I get the feeling from various conferences that I have been at lately - both one of Canadian scientists and one on Health Manpower Needs that society it is not going to let us get away with this too much longer, and that we're going to have to try somehow to see whether what we know or what we can learn can be of a little bit more direct applicability. I think it's a mistake to try to go out and solve the world's problems and set ourselves up as people who can do that. I think the first wave of Clinical Psychology made this mistake and got its fingers burned to and deserved to. But I have a feeling we may have retreated a little too far now into only measuring out things that we can measure absolutely, also accurately and that some of it may not matter very much. I suspect that we're going to be forced out and I hope that this time we go out with a little more caution and common sense and that we try to tackle somewhat more meaningful, if you like...

Q. Relevant..

A. Relevant problems.

Q. Well the pressures toward relevance are certainly obvious to us all.

A. I don't mean relevance in the empty way that the kids mean it..

A. ...but I think they have the grain of an idea there that we're going to have to listen to.

Q. All right, now. If we are forced or even if not external pressure but a conviction some veins have been worked hard enough and are no longer likely to yield anything very productive. Well, I think what you were saying is a mixture of these things. There are pressures to do this but also there is inside psychology some scepticism about how much...

A. I think some of our own people are getting very worried ..

Q. Well, whichever it is or if it's both or a number of things, then where are we going to go? More specifically than just vaguely to try and make what we know perhaps a little bit useful in the real world...

A. I suspect the educational area is one place we're going to go.

Q. Do you?

A. I gather from our history that was one of the places where we started and were interested in and then somehow or other at least during my years of training, that was the low place on the totem pole.

Q. Yeah. Yeah.

A. All the dumb people were supposed to go into educational psychology.

Q. Well, they last a long while you know, and how is this going to change?

A. Well, I think that brighter people - my students, I find some of the kids that really care about what's happening out in the world, particularly the whole problem of learning and education and the disadvantaged. But some of the brightest young people are willing and ready to get into that field and are bound and determined that they are going to do something about it. And they're not the woolly wild-eyed ones.

Q. You think there's new blood in that area?

A. Yes, I think there is if we give them a chance.

Q. Or if they're given a chance by the educational system which is notoriously a difficult one to move.

A. I think it's going....

Q. Of course, it's moving in Quebec anyway for other reasons.

A. Yeah.

Q. But ...

A. We find that sending undergraduates out into the schools now. Five years ago, you know, if they went out with black stockings on, we'd be told, "Don't send us that hippie again". But not anymore. One of the boys with a beard and peace symbol and the works came back to me and said, "You know, you had me scared". But they accepted him and I think things are opening up out there.

Q. But the French speaking educational system hasn't got enough psychologists to do much here or am I wrong? They did have of course, at one time, but they were vocational guiders.

A. Yeah.

Q. And you're talking about basic changes in the system of education, aren't you?

A. My understanding is that on the French side one thing that's happening is that a great proportion of clinical psychologists are not sure this is a good thing.

Q. Are actually getting jobs in the school...

A. Getting into the school system. Now what worries me is that they just go about giving their routine battery of tests there instead of in the hospital and if they don't try to innovate, they're not going to be much more use than they were in the hospital. But the whole business -- the learning clinic at our hospital with Sam Rabinovich has been

A. (cont'd.)
moving out into the schools and talking about learning disabilities and how to diagnose them and how to tease out exactly where the child is having trouble and what kinds -- and breaking down the learning task and teaching what is needed. And this is something that the educators seem to be very very ready to listen to. Now, we've got undergraduates doing this.

Q. Has this any relevance to that awful cliche -- has what these people are doing in the school system got any relationship at all to learning theory?

A. That's a good question. You know, the whole notion of reinforcement etc. etc. -- it's amazing how far that goes, certainly both in the schools and working with disturbed children. I am always appalled at how unaware people are of the learning contingencies in a situation and what they're teaching the kid when they think they're teaching him something else.

Q. Yeah. But what we're talking about on our side is as old as the hills.

A. That's right.

Q. When you dress in a mini skirt and so on, but it's the same old stuff. And yet you're absolutely right. Maybe dressing it up in a different attire and different jargon and terminology may make it more impressive to the people who've

Q. (cont'd.)

ignored it and who are unaware of it. It's not a question of ignoring it. They're just not aware of what they're doing.

A. You know, when I'm sort of humble about how little we know, I think, you know, we've got to train researchers. There's no point in training applied people because we haven't got anything worth applying yet. And then I go out and see what's happening and it's so bad and we've got so much more than that..

Q. Yes. That's right.

A. ..that maybe there is room to find people who can at least apply and test the application of what we already do know.

Q. Let's put the question this way. If for the last twenty years the big bandwagon in psychology had been learning theory - not learning theory -- learning theories -- and if as some people claim that vein had been worked to death and overworked, and if the most obvious current bandwagons are on the one hand Behavior Modification which can be directly rationalized out of Learning Theory - and on the other hand Computer Cybernetics' attack on cognition, for instance - are rather obvious popular areas for current studies, what's going to happen to them? Are they transient? Are they going to disappear. Are they going to be replaced by something else. In

Q. (cont'd.)

other words, if you wanted to place a big sweepstakes bet on the bandwagon of the 1970's what would it be?

A. I think that Behavior Theory or Behavior Therapy is already realizing that it's too over simplified and that we're coming back to an awareness of the cognitive kinds of variables that have to do with attitude and set and what Dalerton Miller called 'cue producing responses'. I think that in a way Piaget's thinking...

Q. Now, talk about bandwagons. There's one that already rolling ....

A. Yeah, it's rolling very very wildly I think..

Q. I should have said that that was the most currently obvious one ...

A. But an attempt to get it more complex cognitive functioning in humans -- I think that's where we have to hit.

Q. But more than that, you think that's where we will go.

A. I think so. Cognitive style complex, problem solving... I think that both the Behavior Therapy and the Learning Theory in education has been just too much

A. (cont'd.)

oversimplified. We need some sort of higher order variable.

Q. Are they going to ...Are the difficulties posed by them going to hold us up on it?

A. Not if we can shift out of our kind of constipated state.

Q. Well, how will we do that? By becoming more European or Piaget-an, doing our work the way he did his?

A. You see, I think you could learn a tremendous lot by using American empiricism to look at more complicated kinds of problems - how young children learn, how they think about problems, how children learn to talk, how they generalize labels. We did a little study with very tiny infants and we became so intrigued with how they would learn a label and then generalize it in the most fascinating and ingenious ways. What's going on inside, you know? This isn't straight S.R. stuff you're talking about. If you show a baby a, you know, barely talking a domino for the first time and she says "grandma's piano". You know, the conceptualization that's going on in there is absolutely fascinating. And I just don't think enough people have spent enough time trying to tease out what's going on in human reasoning.

Q. Well, what I'm getting at is how are you going to do that? Are we going to do that intuitively? Are we going to do that by natural observation? By being satisfied

Q. (cont'd.)
to sit down and observe or are we going to do it some other way?

A. I think it's going to be a cross -- there's going to be some sort of a -- it's going to be more like in the natural setting and it's going to be more like natural problems but we're going to use our know-how about designing experiments to ask questions that are somewhat standardized and where we'll have data that can be analysed. Well you know, with ingenuity you can set up normal-like situations and you can apply it to many subjects - the same situation. But something much closer to what would be a real life kind of problem than that having to get through a maze or push a lever to get a pellet.

Q. Yes, but the technology is bound to follow us into this situation, isn't it? And to that degree you have to make it artificial and certainly this stuff is going to be -- whatever comes out is going to be -- to wind up in the computer.

A. Okay. But technology could be used to observe very carefully. You can record. You can use film to set up a semi-natural kind of experiment and then look ruddy carefully at what happens.

Q. What do you think of the thesis that Bob McLeod and others are so fond of throwing up to the

Q. It was more of an exciting and fruitful technique to open up an area and to add very significantly to our knowledge but it was primarily a technique of observation.

A. Yeah, but I think that the whole kind of thinking behind it was almost armchair psychology.

Q. Yes. Your right. One last question Ginny. Switching around now trying to get samples of your attitudes. The French problem we have in Canada - what's your present feeling?

A. Well, I'm concerned. I would like to think that as French Canada becomes more secure, I'm sure that it will be able to brodden out again and keep its windows to the rest of world open. I can easily understand why at the moment -- this sudden rush of insecurity and need to establish their own identity -- and in the process of doing it they pretty well have to hate everybody else and close them out. I think if it continues it's going to be a very self defeating thing.

Q. For them?

A. For them. I mean, the rest of us, you know, I think we'll lose too and I would certainly hate to leave Quebec. I love it and I think of it as my home now. I think our only hope is that as they work away and become sure of their own identity and they're running a much bigger

A. (cont'd.)

part of their own show - that they'll then be able to afford to open up again. But this may take some time.

Q. Yes. And then it may be too late to do what they want to do. I was very puzzled yesterday with Adrian as to why there is -- I didn't feel I should intrude to that extent but I would have loved to ask him why he felt so strongly that it was impossible to retain the language and the cultural values that they value so highly. The way Wally does it with his children -- the way Endel Tolbing does it with his children -- his values. They are both Estonian and they highly value the Estonian language and culture. They preserve it but they don't impose it on their children. Why can't it be preserved this way? This isn't good enough. So many feel they've got to shut the door - they've got to establish their supremacy. Now this was reassuring, this last Bill that was just passed in a sense, but who knows how the entrenched politicians -- how fully they represent French Canada.

A. No. I think -- just going to the theatre even I was asked -- Lysistrata, a French production -- the other day and at the end of the production I suddenly became aware that the applause was more than just applause for a play well done and one of the actors came out and said that he was going to make a statement about Bill 63 and that anyone who wanted to leave could leave. And this was in the Place des Arts. You've just

A. (cont.d)
all of a sudden this nationalism was staring at you and you had to sort of either get up and walk out or stay and declare yourself. I stayed. And he went on and proclaimed, you know. This Bill, you know, was going to destroy the French language. It was very interesting being a good actor and having a dramatic way about him, he presented this thing in a very -- the tension in that room was just fantastic. Every time he came to the Bill he called it Bill 63 in English which I thought was very lovely dramatic touch. But when the people filed out of that hall it was a desperate feeling. Perhaps I felt more threatened but it was almost as if they were girding themselves for war and I couldn't shake off this horrible feeling, a premonition of something bad - for hours afterwards.

Q. If that were likely really to accomplish the purpose thay think they have, if you believe that apart from personal considerations, it wouldn't be so tragic. But if you believe that's ruinous to what they want ..

A. I believe it would be ruinous. But they don't, you see.

Q. I know.

A. They think that there are many countries in Europe that are as small as Quebec. Quebec has lots of natural resources. Why shouldn't it be able to cope as a separate ...

Q. How could they cope with the geographical fact that they are a small enclave on the North American continent?

A. Well, I suppose the argument there is that in a sense France is a small enclave among countries that speak other languages too.

Q. France is not ....

A. Well but Europe, you know, has all sorts of languages.

Q. I know. That's what I mean. That's fine. That's seems to me to give some future to it. But they're just one little country surrounded by a tremendous ocean of English.

A. Well, I guess their argument is if the English, you know, want to do business with us, just as if they wanted to do business with Belgium or France, they would do business in that country's language and they'll darned well do business in our language.

Q. Yep. Yep.

A. And we will make our own life here so rich that our people will have all the advantages of living in a small country.

Q. That is of course attributing the submergence,

Q. (cont'd.)
the erosion of French to these god dammed English Canadians which I think erroneous.

A. I think it is too. I think it's attributable to people like Duplessis and frankly to the Catholic Church.

Q. Yeah. Yeah.

A. But that's past history now. The fact is they think they can change that.

Q. Well, it's worse somehow. Anything else we should record now?

A. I don't think so. We seem to have been going for quite a while.

Q. Yes, that time was very good Ginny.

(Tape 3 Side 1)

Q. This is Tape 3 and starts with your presidency of C.P.A. What do you remember about your early days with C.P.A.?

A. Well, ever since I came back to Canada I have always been active in C.P.A. I went to the meetings and very much identified with...

Q. Who all did you get to know in Canadian Psychology through C.P.A.?

A. I think that my first warm kind of introduction to personalities was at Appinikan. I was taken there as a new young professor to be one of the recorders and well, Roger Myers was certainly one of them.

Q. Yes, that was a very interesting collection..

A. It was a fantastic experience for somebody coming back who was out of touch with the Canadian scene -- to spend all those days up there in the woods with those people. I very much enjoyed it.

Q. Did you get to know Bock for instance?

A. No, I didn't.

Q. We were veterans with the mostly

A. That's right.

Q. ..who was besides Roger Myers and George Brookes?

A. Well, all of the -- well, of course there were some of the clinical people there - Wes Coombs, I remember being very angry -- I guess he was a young man then ..

Q. A very young Turk was Morgan Wright.

A. Right. And then there was Lin Newbigging from McMaster and I began to be aware of their programme and how hard they were working to make it "respectable and scientific".

Q. Yeah.

A. And the poles were already showing up there, very much, between the clinical and experimental. I remember being struck and troubled by the fact that most of the clinical people were bitter people and I thought, insecure people. It was as if history hadn't made a place for them when they were developing and they had sort of always felt on the outside of things. I can remember one of the first C.P.A. meetings I went to where there was terrible bitterness about the fact that Appinikan was really handed over to the experimentalists when it was the clinicians who had thought of the idea. Couchiching of course was an attempt to...

Q. Repair that.

A. Finally catch up with that situation. And I remember finding it hard to identify with the Canadian clinicians that were there in a way because perhaps I had been protected somehow at Michigan but I certainly had not felt there like a second class citizen. I felt that these people definitely did feel that way.

Q. And perhaps aware.

A. Yes. It's very hard after somebody goes through

A. (cont'd.)

those kind of experiences to know what caused what.

Q. Yup. Yup.

A. And certainly I was in no position to really make any judgment.

Q. I certainly felt that they had been shabbily treated and not given credit for what they thought they were doing.

A. That's right.

Q. How did you -- when did you get involved with the operation of C.P.A.?

A. I guess when I went on the board of directors.

Q. When was that?

A. Roger, I haven't the slightest notion. I don't know what year it was.

Q. It would have been some time in the '60's.

A. I can't even tell you what year I was president. Isn't that awful.

Q. No. I don't think that's awful at all. I similarly couldn't tell you what year but that's easily obtained from documents.

A. Sure. Sure.

Q. Did you get interested in the board business?

A. Very much. I certainly went through a period a few years back with C.P.S. and the Social Science Research Council and then Psy. when I was very interested in sort of the politics of science. I have a vague feeling I've lived through that period now and moved on to other things. But at the time, yes, I felt that having an active solid organization in Canada was very very important.

Q. Who was president when you went on the board? Have you any idea?

A. Hm.

Q. I can find out...

A. I remember Dan Burloyne was president one year when I was on the board. I think Wes Coombs was president one year wasn't he?

Q. Yes. Yes. I think so. Just before -- no, two before you, wasn't it Wes Coombs, Mary Wright and Ginny Douglas. Was that the order?

A. No. Wally Lambert was just before me.

Q. Oh yes. Wally ..That's right.

A. Two McGill types in a row there.

Q. Oh yes.

A. No, I guess Mary was while I was ... certainly I remember her being a very active board member and probably she was -- yes, sure she was. She was president while I was on the board.

Q. What was prominent?

A. Well, I of course became very aware of the small membership. It seemed to me that one of the things we had to do was get a larger proportion of the psychologists involved in the C.P.A. and that was one thing which you remember we worked on very hard.

Q. Yes. There were times like '68 and '69 when our membership sank to 600 or something.

A. I remember the year I was president we rounded up about 25 percent and as I watched, I think it kept up there didn't it?

Q. Yeah.

A. And then of course we were getting into -- well the year I was president the financial problems that you caught in the nick of time, I think, with the journal. We would have been bankrupt in no time at all if you hadn't taken hold there.

Q. Yes. Were you involved with Psy Tech - or did that come later?

A. Yes, I think I was. I was secretary of Psy. Tech for a while and I think that there was some overlap there. Certainly I had been going to the Psy. Tech meetings at the time I was ..

Q. Representing C.P.A.?

A. No, I don't think so. I think I was just there. As an individual first.

Q. And were you appointed secretary or elected secretary or what?

A. I think ... I was one of the founding members of Psy Tech and I think I was simply appointed secretary at first.

Q. Yeah. I think initially you must have been representing C.P.A.

A. Quite possibly.

Q. What was that experience like - that whole Psy Tech period during which you were secretary and then president and you were trying so hard to extend Psy Tech's membership?

A. It was an extremely interesting period. I felt that the cause was good. I think personally one of the greatest joys was getting to work so closely with some of Canada's liveliest scientists in all the other fields.

Q. That must have been very heavy stuff because it wasn't just prominent scientists in other fields. It was prominent politicians and senators and others..

A. Frankly I was much less impressed by the politicians. And there if anything I think I've become far more cynical and jaundiced. I think it's extremely difficult for scientists to move things political because always there are hidden agendas and always economic and political concern will override the scientific ones.

Q. They're now on an extended kick trying to blitz the politicians. They have tried before often. You see, the M.R.C. is the only research council that had the freeze lifted because...

A. They blitzed hardest.

Q. Well, they were able to blitz because when you can go on T.V. and say, "This team of researchers is going to break up unless you do something for sick children." then you've really got your finger on the pulse of the public. And that's politically a very strong stance. But what of the social scientists or the M.R.C. - what have they got that's comparable? They've got nothing that has the public appealof a sick child.

A. Well, I think that's only partially true. I think the medics have always been far better organized and far more willing to talk to the public.

Q. Well, haven't they got more to talk to the public about?

A. They may have more but they certainly don't have -- there are all sorts of things that could be explained to the public and could get -- certainly, you know, pollution and environmental problems, the native people, poverty -- I think we simply lack -- first of all, I think that people who've gone into the social sciences until recently have not been the wisest, smartest students in the university. And they don't -- I think they just don't know how to talk directly to the people. They get bogged down in all sorts of high sounding philosophical hoohah. On the other hand, the hard scientists are very often people who retreat from this kind of dialogue.

Q. Well, our officers are very reluctant to...

A. Get involved.

Q. ...get involved. Why is that? I have tried for five years to get them to use the media for their annual meetings, to volunteer for talk shows - they're hungry for people - and I get no takers.

A. Well I suppose it's partly because the media does often misuse what ..

Q. What they might be asked.

A. Yeah. And how it'll be interpreted and how it'll be put across. But I think that we simply give a lot more thought

A. (cont'd.)

to telling the public about what we are doing in terms that they can understand and if we really know what we're doing, I don't think that's so difficult. It's -- I've decided now actually -- one of the things I'm involved in is trying to write a book for lay people about Child psychology and the publisher is highly committed to getting good scientists who want to communicate to intelligent lay people. And I think that this is something that we simply failed to do. And if we do our homework there, I think over the years it will build and we will not be at the mercy of politicians as we are today.

Q. We certainly are.

A. Our principal a while ago, when Drury was Minister of Science and Technology, had a dinner and, you know, all of the scientists in the university and a lot of the administrators were there and I was invited because I had been president of Psy Tech. And after a few drinks Drury simply said to us, "But you people have to understand, science is like diamonds. It's a luxury." If you can afford it, fine but if you can't, that's the first thing that goes.

Q. Sure.

A. So I think that in a much more kind of less hectic way, we simply have to devote a certain amount of our time - those of us who are good at it anyway - to telling the public what we are up to in terms that they can understand.

A. (cont'd.)

Not so much as build.

Q. What puzzles me is why we have such difficulty in doing that.

A. Well, I think our training -- we seem to have in psychology either blabber mouths who are more than willing to do it and give a very half baked...

Q. Perhaps doing more harm than good.

A. Yeah. Or the scientifically trained ones who is hedging every statement he makes ...

Q. Trying to be correct.

A. Yes. And there must be some happy medium in between there.

Q. One of the difficulties seems to me that we are trained to use technical terms technically. We're also trained to pull apart every bit of research that we read. Now this is one of the things that troubles me sometimes about the Honours students. They are so much better at criticizing somebody else's work than they are at having an imaginative idea of their own.

Q. Yeh. I was talking to one of the media people in Calgary and she said, "Look, you've got to find psychologists who can talk in ordinary language that ordinary

Q. (cont'd.)
people will understand and then you've got to coach them. They must be coached about where to look - looking at the camera and so on".

A. That's right, It's an art.

Q. It's an unfamiliar form of communication for most of our people. I was quite struck by -- she went on to detail the kind of coaching that she thought our -- she said the first thing is to select only people who can talk without jargon and secondly give them specific coaching on how to use the medium, whatever it is, effectively.

A. Well I think that all makes sense.

Q. I'm trying to get Bart to find somebody in Vancouver who is familiar with the media people. Bob Wilson was telling me they've heard about some psychologists who spent ten years in television.

A. Really?

Q. And he's going to try and get him. Whether that will work or not -- I've got some notes here. Anything else about Psy Tech?

A. No. It was a good experience for me. I don't that Canada is going to be able to support it in a way that will keep it really dynamic. I must admit I had a dreadful feeling

A. (cont'd.)

of deja vu the other night when I read an article about how the executive went to see the Senators on the Senate Committee on science policy and the same old stupid nonsense about the engineers not being in Psy Tech came up and this was something we live through years ago. It's such petty stupid stuff compared with what Psy Tech has been trying to do.

Q. Did you get and read -- I don't suppose you would -- Grant McDonald's report on this recent blitz in Ottawa on M.P.'s. Well, it was very interesting. He was one of a team of three who went to see a series of M.P.'s and the last one was very frank in saying, "You scientists are a bunch of amateurs. You don't know how to bring pressure on politicians.".

A. Were you there the day we had the debate with the parliamentarians, three of us and three of them?

Q. Yes. Sols -- what was his name the N.D.P...

A. From ..

Q. He was a very lively character. I want next to hear about Cuba.

A. Cuba? Oh, that's a long time ago. That was a very valuable personal experience for me.

Q. How long were you there?

A. Just about six weeks and I loved it. The people were warm and welcoming and questioning. It's a long time since I've seen students who worked so hard and hung around so long.

Q. Where did you teach?

A. The University of Havana.

Q. And is it still a university because I was told years ago that the problem is not university education - it's at lower levels and that the universities have become really technical highschools.

A. That's only partly true. They had,that Department of Psychology had literally lost all of its senior people with the exception of, I think, two. And so the staff was extremely - very young and a little naive I suppose but very idealistic and very committed and trying extremely hard to keep up with the literature although the journals were of course not coming in there.

Q. Home grown - most of the young people?

A. Yes. Home grown with some training from Russians who had been brought over but almost completely home grown.

Q. One of the reasons I'm interested in the Cuban situation is that as a member of A.P.A.'s committee on international relations about two or three years ago at the time

Q. (cont'd.)

when it looked as though U.S.-Cuban relations were going to warm up..

A. Warm up.

Q. ...and the freeze was going to melt. We had Cuban psychologists from Johns Hopkins or some place - some U.S. university - come to us and plead with the committee to get A.P.A. to help psychologists from Cuba. Well then, shortly after that everything got frozen again.

A. Right.

Q. And so nothing has been done and nothing can be done as long as their...

A. They waiver back and forth. They were extremely welcoming to me. I, you know - it was just an emotional thing. And yet, when I got back I sent down -- I decided I really didn't use my journals that much - so I packed all of my journals and sent them down there and I have never had a word of thanks from them. And apparently it was because just at that time a move went through to cut themselves off more from the -- the Americans and the Canadians were tainted with the same -- apparently the Russian thing was getting stronger again. When I was there I didn't feel that. They were able to talk quite freely about the pros and cons of what the Russians had been teaching them - and even make little jokes about

A. (cont'd.)

it on occasion. But ...

Q. Well since we don't have the same diplomatic obstacles, I wonder whether this wasn't an area in which Canadian psychology could be...

A. I would certainly think so and I've bee -- you know, life goes on and you do different things at different times. I had thoroughly intended to go back. Now one problem was that I got bronchitis, apparently as a result of being down there, and pleurisy right after I got back. It was dreadfully humid. I went at the worst time of the year. So I've been a little frightened to approach the thing again and other things caught me up.

Q. Was it the Canadian government that sent you?

A. No. I have a funny independent streak in me. I don't like going sponsored by something if I can help it and here it was the Cuban government who invited me and actually paid my fare down and put me up in their hotel and fed me.

Q. And you taught what?

A. Oh, I taught everything. I taught in the university Psychology Department and then the Education people started showing up and some psychiatry people and them we started giving some night lectures in the Department of Health.

A. (cont'd.)

They took me to the hospitals and then we went to the middle province and the university there and a hospital there. You just sort of adapted to the group that you were talking to. And they were trying to get some research going. I had been doing some work with disadvantaged children here in Montreal and we also had some interesting training children in our control -- impulsive kids -- and they were interested in this because -- here again they were very frank. There are families in Havana where, in spite of all the inducements, the parents really don't want to go to work and the children have not internalized the kinds of values that they had hoped would be general and they are getting into difficulty in school, just like our kids -- and they had hoped to put in some training programme for these children because they weren't going to get it at home and so it was necessary to try to do it at school. And we were going to try to set up control groups and this sort of thing and see if we could prove that the kind of training programme worked out and was helpful.Now, they -- and here they caught on very quickly to what the programme was all about and how you do it and how you would design study and it is quite conceivable to me that they went ahead and did that without me. The idea was we would stay in closer touch but as I say, that seems to have got cut off.

Q. Was language a problem?

A. I expected it to be but it wasn't. They had three or four different translators who were very very good and I learned very quickly to talk nice and slowly and you get a chance to pause and get ready for the next...

Q. What you're going to say while...

A. Yeah, and I didn't mind it at all and I found that they obviously got what I was saying because I could tell from their questions and I very soon forgot that I was being translated.

Q. But you were being translated?

A. Absolutely. I didn't know hardly any Spanish. I know I used to have to get help with the menu.

Q. But they in turn are Spanish speaking and not English speaking?

A. Well, yes. A lot of them are that but their translators were very good.

Q. Yes. Opposed to your audience.

A. And some of them were psychologists. Yes, a lot of the audience did not understand English.

Q. What if anything could C.P.A. do to help psychology in Cuba?

A. Get them up to date journals and books. And

A. (cont'd.)

send some people down if they want them.

Q. If they want them.

A. And, you have to sort of mark -- bide your time. You've got to go when they, you know - I negotiated with them for, I think it was over a year and then all of a sudden they want you tomorrow. So you have to be pretty flexible and ready to fit in with their plans but certainly they took extremely good care of me and I felt their students were more than ready to absorb what I had to give.

Q. Would it be proper for example for us to offer to send them our journals on a complimentary basis if they want it?

A. Sure, it would be proper. Just don't be hurt if they say 'no'. Because these phases come and they go, I gather and you just have to sort of stand ready to help when they want you to. But they also need -- I went through their library and it's just unbelievably out of date - I think worse than China.

Q. Really?

A. Yeah. I think it's the poverty and how much the Russian influence had to do with it I don't know.

Q. Well, the Russians -- we exchange journals with them and they obviously read our journals and very few of us

Q. (cont'd.)
can read theirs.

A. Yes. Well, I don't know what it was but I certainly was in -- I spent many hours in the library at the University of Havana and it was just pathetic how out of date. I mean, when the revolution started, that was when the library stopped.

Q. Yeah.

A. So anything of that sort to bring them up to date. Again -- you know, this could have changed since I was there.

Q. Are there other universities in addition to the one in Havana?

A. Yes. I visited one other in this middle province. I don't remember the name. It was perhaps more of what you're describing -- kind of a technical...

Q. High school?

A. Well, more than a highschool, I think, but of course, it's like any Communist country -- and I found that in China too ....

(Side 2)

A. ....I went to the public.... and that was a

A. (cont'd.)
wonderful sight -- side benefits from the presidency. The fellow who took over (tape very poor here)

A. He said he only got to Ottawa. But it was interesting actually in both those countries looking at what they did for the institutionalized mental patients. And I must admit that if I were frankly psychotic, I probably would prefer to be in a Havana or the one I visited in China.

Q. Well now, that's new to me because a manic depressive by the name of Dave Cohen at Whitby told me years ago that he had been in seventeen different hospitals in a dozen different countries and he said , "if you ever become mentally ill, be sure you're in Ireland at the time".

A. That might work too.

Q. Now, what did you find so appealing about the Communist...

A. Well, there was a -- the staff's job was to be with those people and to treat them well and the patient's job was to do whatever he could do and so nobody was lying around the wards. If they were capable of cutting wood or sanding wood or putting paper flowers or plastic flowers together or whatever, they were there doing it. And there was this good feeling. I remember going into one of the wards where a woman

A. (cont'd.)
was obviously in a panic attack and one of the ladies or attendants had her wrapped in a blanket and was sort of half lying on the bed with her hugging her and talking to her. Much less use of heavy drug dosages. They do have the drugs in both places but the patients are much less heavily drugged and their work - their labours are needed for the state and of value whereas our people are discards from the state. We don't need them. They are just a burden. That's not so much the ideal of their system as the realities of the economy of the two places I suppose.

Q. Is there also a tendency for even mentally sick people to view themselves as part of the national resource?

A. Yes. This is exactly what I am saying and they are part of it. They raise chickens. They do things. And they're done for. In Havana the patients were getting manicures and pedicures and there was an attempt to treat them as real people.

Q. As human beings and as worthwhile people.

A. Now, you know, they are also being brain-washed. I remember in China a ladies' group there all had the little red book out and each of them was expounding on how Mao had something to say about her personal problem. But that may not be so much worse than group therapy. I don't know.

Q. The primal scream sort of thing.

A. Yes. I'm not at all sure that....

Q. I remember being very impressed when in Moscow visiting one of the pre-school day nurseries kind of place and a group of us were ushered up to the music room which was on I think the fourth floor -- third or fourth -- with those wide open windows characteristic of Russian style with about a three foot sill -- but wide open and this was before the children arrived. And our guide said to us, "This is a music room and a group of children will be coming here". One of the American women said to the guide, "There are no screens, no protection on these windows?" and the guide said, "But you don't seem to understand. This is a music room." And none of us understood until the children arrived and then they went in an orderly little group and they got their instruments out and they -- this was a music room. It was not a room in which you played near the windows.

A. Well you found this in China too. Now, it was too much there I thought. They were singing only political songs -- many of them filled with hatred. And they were screaming at the top of their lungs and they were playing at the time -- you know, there was no sort of appreciation of the music for the music's own sake but was being used as another political tool. But certainly the discipline is tremendous. Less so in Cuba. As a matteer of fact I think that the people of Cuba are so warm and so kind of fresh and human that it's very hard for the Russians to regiment them. It may be the best

A. (cont'd.)
combination. The Russians sometimes talked about them as if they were children. They really were very paternalistic towards them. But I couldn't help but enjoy the fact that the Cubans hadn't really knuckled under. They were still alive and although they had taken on the ideals of sharing and working together, they still were doing all sorts of playful and lively things.

Q. This is what you mean by warmth?

A. Yep. You know, the men still flirt with you when you walk down the street. They don't bother you but they flirt with you. And the kids are spontaneous, whereas the Chinese children were thoroughly regimented. They looked like little mechanical dolls.

Q. Yes. Let's switch to your research. Since this involvement with politics and so on you have been able to concentrate on your hyperactive research.

A. That's what it is. Hyperactive research.

Q. No. No. Research about...

A. Research on hyperactive children.

Q. Okay. Where is it at?

A. Its' going, I think, very well. We've

A. (cont'd.)
doctoral theses in this area and certainly I've had a lot of invitations in the last few years from the States and I also was at a N.A.T.O. meeting giving a paper. To talk about what we're doing, it's being picked up and developed. Other people have followed through on our work. I was asked a while ago to edit a special issue of the Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology on hyperactivity in children. It's been -- it's funny because when we started in this area, there was virtually nobody interested in them and it just happened that that was the time when the interest was beginning. Now it's almost a fad but there are now some good researchers and it's fun to go -- to be invited to small meetings where we can talk and learn what each other is doing. And I've been able lately to combine some interest in some more basic processes - at the moment attention, memory and problem solving with our more applied interests and so it's sort of fun being able to draw on the basic research from these areas and give it some meaning in the applied context.

Q. Not being close to the area at all, you mentioned it having become a fad. I've been concerned about whether or not there's any control of the faddishness -- to be in the swim these days you have to have either a hyperactive child or an emotionally disturbed child ...

A. Well, emotionally disturbed -- that was what was the fad when I started. I remember when I first went into

A. (cont.d.)

the Montreal Childrens' Hospital, for some reason they'd got hooked on childhood depression and it seemed like half the children who went through turned out to be depressed and now it's hyperactivity. Yeah, I think you're quite right. The children are being mis-diagnosed. They are also being given drugs supposedly to treat hyperactivity and things have got out of hand. But I think it's beginning to level off somewhat and I'm pretty sure another fad is bound to hit some time soon.

Q. Is it true that some parents label a child hyperactive who is not really?

A. Yes. I think that sometimes it's easier to think of a child as being hyperactive than to admit that he is really perhaps severely emotionally disturbed, perhaps responding to a home situation or something more serious - possibly brain damage or whatever.

Q. Watching my, as far as I know, perfectly normal grandchildren, I think they're all hyperactive sometimes.

A. Yeah.

Q. The youngest at four - I was told this, I wasn't there - was playing dominoes with his grandmother when his mother arrived and his grandmother and his mother started to have a conversation and this four year old's nose was suddenly

Q. (cont.d)

completely out of joint. He took over the next hour to raise as much hell as he could to disturb their conversation..

A. Get even.

Q. ...well, that's entirely...

A. That's child behavior.

Q. Sure.

A. And did somebody call him hyperactive?

Q. No. No. Not in my presence.

A. I think though that actually this is one of the benefits of the research we've been doing. I think we're getting some pretty good diagnostic techniques now..

Q. That's what I was interested in..

A. ..for picking up what we consider the "true hyperactivity" and by the time we've done some -- had some rating scales done on the children by both the parents and the teachers and given them three or four tests, we begin to get a pretty good feel as to whether we're dealing with a true hyperactive. One of the areas that we know most about now is the problem of attention, sustaining attention, in these children. And impulsivity, which seems to go together. As a matter of fact, Dan Burloyne - he and I were both writing chapters for the

A. (cont'd.)

same book. It was a book on attention and I'm writing a chapter on attention in hyperactive children. And if you give them some vigilance measures and some impulsivity measures, it doesn't take too long to get a pretty good idea as to whether you're dealing with a true hyperactive. Now, these tests have not been properly standardized yet. There's a long way to go but I think we have pretty much all the raw data we need now to make that diagnosis accurately.

Q. Now, speaking just of what you would call the "true hyperactive child", what is your belief about the basis of this?

A. Oh, I think it's physiological. There are about as many theories as there are theorists as to what the process is.

Q. You don't think it's just behavioral?

A. Absolutely not. No. I think that..

Q. Would you go further than physiological and say neurological?

A. Neurological -- possibly biochemical. We're gone searching over and over again for evidence of minimal brain damage in these children. We've looked at birth histories, neurologicals, E.E.G.'s and if it's there, it's very very very subtle. But that doesn't mean it's not there.

Q. But it's not evident?

A. No. One thing that we were able to replicate is a study done in Washington which demonstrated that a larger proportion of them than of a normal sample had physical anomalies -- which suggests either something genetic or intrauterine kind of factors at play. And they do have more of these subtle anomalies. So I'm quite convinced that -- and there do seem to be some studies that at least hint strongly at a genetic picture -- so I'm quite convinced that it's on that level that the etiology comes.

Q. Could the symptomatology not be simulated on a behavioral basis?

A. I think so. As a matter of fact in writing this book that I was talking about for lay people, I feel quite strongly that a lot of the training techniques that we are using for the hyperactive are just about as valuable for a child who has not been taught inner control because of environmental kind of factors or simply because of poor child raising. And, you know, I do think there's an overlap there but I'm fairly convinced that our diagnostic tests can pull these two kinds of children apart. We haven't -- as a matter of fact, I was trying to get some cases recently of cases where a psychiatrist might call a child hyperactive but say that he thought the cause was environmental. But apparently our psychiatrists now are so brainwashed in our way of thinking --

A. (cont'd.)

they used to say that all the time but now they won't say it. They'll say, "Well, there must be something neurological and then this behavioral thing or this environmental thing is on top of it. So I can't seem to test my ability to make this differential diagnosis. But that's certainly one of the goals I have in mind.

Q. Don't some parents volunteer false positives?

A. Oh, absolutely. But you've got checks on that. Most of the children are in school and you can find out from the teacher how the child behaves. You can also go and observe in the classroom. Gaby Reiss who has worked a lot with a psychiatrist of the children, set up a little nursery school and she found in the younger group more false positives. Children whose mothers described them as dreadfully hyperactive who settled down within a day or two when they were given a good consistent environment to live in.

Q. You several times mentioned 'impulsivity' and Mary was telling me that some recent work has suggested that the impulsive child, that is to say the child who scores impulsive

A. Matching familiar figures.

Q. What was it? Somebody has studied eye

Q. (cont'd.)

movements in such children and has demonstrated that - well, this is probably familiar to you..

A. Well, they are less strategic and careful in their way of scanning.

Right. They look everywhere and don't look at some of the possibilities at all. We've done quite a lot of work actually. We've moved in some or at least part of our researches, we've moved from the clinical hyperactive to the impulsive child and one of my students is just completing a thesis on -- we tried to develop alternative forms of the matching familiar figures but in other modalities -- we have an auditory modality and a tactual one -- and they are correlating with one another rather well and they also are correlating with many of the tests that differentiate hyperactives from normals. Attentional measures, the Porteus mazes which again have an impulsivity factor, so that I think we are talking about a constellation there of disabilities that where the impulsivity is a fairly strong part of the picture...

Q. It extends beyond single modality.

A. Yes, definitely.

Q. It's a generalized characteristic.

A. It's certainly generalized through those three and generalized into how they go at reaction time tasks, how they go at the Porteus mazes; vigilance measures are also correlating with these things.

Q. Do you remember the psychologist who decided to use the Porteus maze in Africa with such disastrous results?

A. No.

Q. Because he found that in most African tribes no child and no adult for that matter is prepared to try any task like that alone.

A. They have to do it together.

Q. They've got to do it together and they insist on having a conclave.

A. How are you going to find the best solution if you don't work it out together.

Q. I was very amused by that. Ruth Lewis -- did you ever know Ruth?

A. No, I don't think so.

Q. A speech therapist in Toronto. She has a sister who's married to some high official in Rhodesia, whom she visits and she's got very interested in using or comparing native

Q. (cont.d).

children there with native Indian and Inuit children here and she was going to use the Raven progressive and I urged her to use something further down the age scale because it seems to me that to hit the level of 14 to 16 year olds is not as crucial as to get down to the 3 and 4 level.

A. The Raven does go lower than that, doesn't it.

Q. Well, she was planning to concentrate on the 12 and 14 year olds and 14 to 16 and by that time, who could tell whether the differences are the product of poor schooling and all kinds of cultural factors. In fact, what I think it is we're curious about is whether they start at all at comparable levels.

A. Kegan, by the way, claims that they do. He's been talking much more recently about the universalities that run through childrens' problem solving.

Q. That they do start even or they do not.

A. Well, certainly that the order of development is the same and that the starting point, as you put it, is not all that different in different cultures - that the age at which they reach the points are not all that different.

Q. Ginny, I thank you for being willing to do this again and add this postscript but I mustn't impose unduly

Q. (cont.d)

on your time. Before we turn the tape recorder off, is there anything we should add?

A. No, I don't think so. I think you've covered the waterfront.

Q. Fine.