

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

INTERVIEW

MAGDA ARNOLD

APRIL 2, 1976

QUESTION: Magda Arnold who has come up from Mobile and I'm interviewing her at 267 Rosedale Heights Drive on April 2, 1976. So let's begin with where you came from and what you did as a child.

ANSWER: Oh, are we going that far back?

QUESTION: It's a preliminary.

ANSWER: Well, I came from Marishtreba which is now called Moristawtrebohar -- it's now in Czechoslovakia but was in Austria when I was born. I only went to commercial school there, two years after elementary school, and then went into the local bank as a bank clerk, stayed there until I got married in 1926 when I went to Prague with my husband, stayed in Prague for two years, was working as a bookkeeper and foreign language correspondent in various places and then finally in 1927 when my husband went to Canada -- he insisted that there was going to be another war and he was not going to be caught in it. So he went over in 1927 and I stayed on still working in Prague and followed him in January 1928. And then we went to Toronto, probably because it seemed better than Montreal which was half-French and neither of us knew very much French, and it seemed better than spending an awful lot of money going further west, so we went to Toronto and stayed there for a good long time.

QUESTION: What dates would these be?

ANSWER: January 1928 I came to Toronto.

QUESTION: And you were born?

ANSWER: I was born in December 1903, so I was 24 when I came over. And at first I was again working in a mail order house -- my English was still very bad but at least I could type. I typed envelopes for half a year and then I got so tired, my back was giving out.

QUESTION: Did you speak English at all?

ANSWER: I learned English in commercial school and while I was still over there, I read Galsworthy's Forsyte Saga. I could understand English but it was the speaking that was so difficult because English is a difficult language.

QUESTION: But in your home, where you were brought up, what did you speak?

ANSWER: German and Sudeten German. I was born in a small town, about 5,000 inhabitants then, which was German at the time. There were four German towns and a few German villages and they were surrounded by solidly Czech territory so that children came into this little language island to learn German and children from our town would go into the Czech area to learn Czech, but I wasn't one of those. We had some Czech children at home so I learned a bit of Czech and we learned it in school but again I really didn't speak it very well until I got to Prague. The two years in Prague I learned Czech quite well.

QUESTION: And who were in the home when you were a child?

ANSWER: I was brought up -- my mother was an opera singer

QUESTION: I think I heard that, eh?

ANSWER: Yes, I think you did. I never knew my father -- I was an illegitimate child. My mother three years later had another child, a boy, from another father -- I suppose today it wouldn't be particularly astonishing but at that time it really was pretty bad because, well, my home town was a very small town and they knew everything that went on and so I was under a cloud, you know, from the time I was born.

QUESTION: Is this the brother you're going to see?

ANSWER: Yes, that's the brother I'm going to see. And he was brought up in a family in Danschstadt so that he only got acquainted when I finally at age 18 decided, after I had worked in the bank for a couple of years, then I decided I was going to visit my mother and see how she was living because I was brought up by two spinster ladies in this small town -- one of them was a semi-invalid, the other one had a little sort of boutique, you would call it today, and because she didn't believe in keeping books, she finally went bankrupt. By that time, fortunately, I was finished with the commercial school training and at 15-1/2 I started at the bank and made a good enough salary so the two of us could live on it. The other maiden lady, her sister, had died in the meantime so there were then just the two of us.

QUESTION: So you must have gone through what we call public school in that time?

ANSWER: Well, it was eight years of public school and two years of commercial school -- that's all I had before I came to Canada.

QUESTION: They must have thought of you as a pretty bright pupil?

ANSWER: I was bright and my teachers were trying to convince my aunt -- that's what I called her -- that I really should go to university and she just laughed. She said, "What on?" Because my mother was supposed to send money monthly, you know, to my aunt but she just didn't have it either so we really just didn't have any money to spare. It was very, very difficult to make ends meet until I got this job at the bank and from then on we did all right.

QUESTION: They were educated people?

ANSWER: No, not my aunts. The one that really was the brighter one and had the boutique, she was in service in Vienna when she was young and then came back to my home town -- this was her home town actually -- and her sister was a factory worker in a silk factory, so at home there was no education, no stimulation, no nothing.

QUESTION: But some admiration for education?

ANSWER: No, no.

QUESTION: No?

ANSWER: No, because they felt instead of me having my nose in books from morning till night, you know, they always threatened they'd tear up the books and throw them in the fire and, of course, I got frightened at that because the books were not mine -- they were library books or books from France, so I had a difficult time at home because my aunt just didn't -- she was really helpless as far as I was concerned. She didn't know what to do with me -- I had such odd ideas, you know. I wanted to go to university, of course. However, fortunately, I joined the Youth Movement when I was about 12 years old and there, you know, it was not like the Scouts or Girl Guides or anything like that -- it was a movement that grew up from the young people themselves -- they didn't have any older people you know, to guide us, because as soon as some of the young people became 18 years old, they became leaders in this Youth Movement and so it was always the older ones, or at 17 they might become leaders but then guided the little ones and we had all kinds of cultural educational evenings and that was the only intellectual stimulation I had apart from school and school wasn't too much. And books, books, of course -- I practically read everything in the local library.

QUESTION: Did the Youth Movement have political . . . ?

ANSWER: None whatsoever. There was a slight anti-Semitic bias in the sense that they didn't admit Jews. It wasn't very

ANSWER: strong -- there was at one point some -- because nobody knew my father, you see, there was at some point some rumour that my father was one of the local very well-to-do Jews and when I heard it I said, "I wish he were because then we would have a little more money at home." Of course, it wasn't true. Anyway. . .

QUESTION: Did you hear anything about psychology before you came to Canada?

ANSWER: When I was 16, I got hold of Freud's Psychopathology in Everyday Life and at this point I was absolutely fascinated and at this point I decided if ever I had a chance to become a psychologist, I would.

QUESTION: And did you just get hold of this by chance?

ANSWER: From the library, you know, by that time I had a card of my own and went to the library every other day and took home as many books as I could and devoured them.

QUESTION: So it was really over there you got the first glimmer of psychology. What about the church?

ANSWER: This was Austria, don't forget, and everybody was Catholic, of course, and we had religion classes in school but it was a very narrow-minded kind of religion, very old-fashioned. Nobody ever answered my questions. I had all kinds of questions -- nobody answered them -- and so I just simply drifted away from it, and when I married my husband, who was a Lutheran, I was

ANSWER: perfectly willing to switch. I did try -- as a matter of fact, I did try. I went to the parish priest and I told him that I would like to marry a Lutheran and as a matter of fact, at that time my husband was really interested in religion -- he had some connection with the Y.M.C.A. -- and I had drifted away, I was completely indifferent, I had lost my faith when I was about 18 -- and Freud incidentally had nothing to do with it. It was just a matter of nobody giving me any kind of reasonable answers as to why I should believe this rather than that and so forth and so on. Well, when I went to the parish priest, he said to me that I could be married not in the church but in the rectory if my husband would sign a paper to say that the children would be brought up Catholic. And I said to him, "Well, if they are brought up in the same kind of benighted religion that I was brought up in, I'd just as soon they wouldn't." "Well, then," he said, "You know what will happen." I said, "No." He said, "Hell and eternal damnation." So I said, "Well, if that's your last word, then, I've had enough." And I walked out.

QUESTION: But there wasn't any intellectual stimulation from the church?

ANSWER: No, none whatsoever.

QUESTION: It was really was your school, your reading, and your Youth Movement.

ANSWER: One difficulty was that the priests were usually from the back woods, the Czech small villages -- they were



ANSWER: badly educated, they murdered the German language, of course, they had to preach in German, and so there was this feeling that everything that stood for the Catholic religion was uneducated, poorly thought out, absolutely no rhyme or reason, just tradition, and I wasn't going to have any of that.

QUESTION: So you left for Canada.

ANSWER: So we left for Canada.

QUESTION: But you were married over there.

ANSWER: We were married in Prague.

QUESTION: And then your husband thought war was coming?

ANSWER: That's right.

QUESTION: Did you have trouble getting to Canada?

ANSWER: No. This was, we originally, of course, were thinking of the United States but the quota was such an obstacle -- we would have had to wait about eight years before we could have come in and in Canada for a very short time, just a few years, they were willing to let in people of German descent who were neither domestic workers nor were they farm labourers and it was during these few years that we managed to come into Canada.

QUESTION: No trouble with the Immigration?

ANSWER: No, no trouble.

QUESTION: So you went to Toronto?

ANSWER: We went to Toronto, started working again, and my husband at the time, he got a job at the Massey-Harris Company and stayed there for a while. I got a job eventually as a bookkeeper and French correspondent because this was an amusement-novelty company and they sold their toys and things mainly to bazaars in Catholic parishes in Quebec and so they needed somebody who had at least a little French so that much French I could manage, and eventually they found out that I could actually keep books. Up till then they had had a firm of accountants come in and so when they found out I could keep books, they made me bookkeeper and I stayed there until about three or four months before the first baby was born, and at that time there didn't seem to be any particular chance for promotion for my husband at Massey-Harris and so I suggested to the owners of this amusement-novelty company that they might take him -- I was going to stay home -- and, of course, when they heard that this was a man, they immediately gave him more money than they gave me but, of course, I had to teach him the necessary bookkeeping knowledge and helped out for a few weeks until he managed to do it. And then we got acquainted with a Scotch Presbyterian minister, Dr. Slater, in Toronto . . .

QUESTION: Oh, yes.

ANSWER: Do you know him?

QUESTION: Um-hmm.

ANSWER: And when he heard that there was a baby coming and that my husband had a Ph.D.

QUESTION: And where did he get his Ph.D.?

ANSWER: He got his Ph.D. at the Charles University in Prague and it was a Ph.D. in Slav languages but, of course, he had enough courses in German language as well, so Dr. Slater thought that maybe he could teach German at Victoria College, so it was through Dr. Slater that he actually got this job at Victoria College.

QUESTION: Where were you living? We were talking about houses a little while ago.

ANSWER: Oh, we started out in a furnished room on Seaton Street which was pretty rundown by then but it was all we could afford and then went from one furnished room to the other and then finally we found a small apartment somewhere in the east end -- it was quite nice -- and the baby was born -- it was quite satisfactory. The only trouble was in the summer it would get frightfully hot because it was an upstairs apartment and it had dormer windows, you know, and no insulation.

QUESTION: Were there other Europeans living in that area?

ANSWER: No.

QUESTION: So you weren't part of what we now call an ethnic group?

ANSWER: Not at all. The only other Europeans I knew at that time was Professor Beshenstein and his wife -- they were Swiss and we were Austrian but still we talked German to get together and those were really the only German friends I ever had in Toronto.

QUESTION: There wasn't a German group or a German Club?

ANSWER: Well, there was a German Club but it took many years before we went there and got acquainted -- and I never did -- it was really after our marriage broke up that my husband got -- and this was really during the war that he got better acquainted at the German Club simply because he went there dancing, that's all.

QUESTION: So what did you think of Toronto and Torontonians -- I mean, you'd be running into mostly people of British descent at that time.

ANSWER: Yes, mostly British descent -- mostly Scotch, as a matter of fact. One of the people I got to know was the group around Dr. Slater -- there was a group of very nice young women, some married, some not married, it was a Bible study group -- and several of them then became my friends. There was one, Agnes Swinnerton, she was in the United Church Publishing House for a great many years and she became really my best friend here in Toronto. The only trouble was when I came back into the church and she found out about it, she didn't like it.

QUESTION: Well, now the baby's born -- that would be Joan?

ANSWER: Joan, the oldest, was born in 1929.

QUESTION: And when did you begin thinking of going into Psychology? Or am I getting ahead of you?

ANSWER: Well, Margaret was born in 1932 and Kay was born in 1935 and it was at that point that I went through a very rough time. I came home from the hospital and my husband told me the same evening that he didn't feel like a married man and he didn't intend to act like a married man -- so the same evening I necessarily moved out of the common bedroom and from that time on, there was just no -- well, we lived in the same house but . . .

QUESTION: He was teaching German at this time.

ANSWER: He was teaching German at Victoria by this time and we simply made the best of it -- at least I made the best of it because he had friends of his own -- as I say that was the time when he began to find all kinds of women friends to go dancing with so I decided I had to do something -- I couldn't just stay home, you know, and wait until -- we didn't have any money for even a separation let alone . . .

QUESTION: And this would be the Depression?

ANSWER: Yes, this was still the Depression -- 1935 -- and there wasn't any way. You see, divorce was only possible by parliamentary decree way back when, and I just couldn't see

ANSWER:        myself even going back to become a secretary or bookkeeper again -- I simply said to him, "Well, if this is the end of our married life, at least I want to have some life for myself." Two years before that, in 1933, we had talked about me going to university and he had encouraged me then but when I applied, the University of Toronto had really very, very lenient admission standards for adult students. They said that in spite of the fact that I only had eight years of elementary school and two years of commercial high school, if I would make up either a foreign language, either Latin or mathematics, and I could do that either by taking an exam -- the matriculation exam -- or by taking the first year of either Latin or math, and if I passed, then they would admit me as a regular student to the University of Toronto. Well, I was good in languages -- I had never had algebra in my life, only commercial arithmetic -- and, of course, there were three small children, one just a baby, so I decided -- oh, well, I'm getting ahead of myself -- this was actually two years before 1935, in 1933, I was admitted then, but when it came to going to university, my husband sort of said, well, it's a terrible thing for a married woman with three children to want to leave home and go to university and this is just absolutely incredible that any young woman, any young mother with three children should want to do that. So, I said, "If you feel like that, obviously I can't go." So I didn't go, but I still was admitted to the University of Toronto so in 1935 after the last baby was born and after our marriage was

ANSWER: definitely on the skids, I said to him then, "All right, you go your own way if you have to -- I don't like it, but what can I do? But at the very least, I want to go to university and see how far I can get." And he was perfectly willing -- at least it would keep me quiet, you know, keep me from making a fuss, so this was what happened finally. We got a housekeeper -- since it was depression time, we found it fairly easy to get a housekeeper who was quite competent -- we paid \$18.00 a month, my heavens! So I did go to university, only at Victoria College they were terribly concerned, you know, again not only that I have a young baby but I had a kidney operation -- I had one kidney out just about four weeks before university started -- and so they told me I shouldn't go into the Honours course which I wanted to do -- I should take the Pass course. So I said, "All right, I'll go into the Pass course and if I do all right, I can switch in the second year."

QUESTION: What year was that? 1937?

ANSWER: This was 1935. September 1935 I started my University.

QUESTION: At Vic?

ANSWER: At Victoria. And I did all right in the Pass course.

QUESTION: And what did you take?

ANSWER: I took Psychology and English.

QUESTION: Who was teaching Psychology?

ANSWER: I really don't know who was teaching. I know that we had tutorials with Carl Williams and Mrs. King, I think . . .

QUESTION: They couldn't be much ahead of you.

ANSWER: No, well, I mean, for heaven's sake, I was just taking my first year, you know, and they were graduate students.

QUESTION: Yes, yes.

ANSWER: I was older than they were, but even so -- Carl Williams gave me my first failing mark -- the only one I ever had.

QUESTION: That sounds like a young graduate student.

ANSWER: It was an essay that he assigned and he admitted it was a good essay but it just wasn't what he wanted and so he gave me an F. I got terribly upset about it because I said to myself, "My heavens, this is what it's going to be like -- I'll never get anywhere -- what will I do? So I went to see him, and he explained that he wanted a particular type of essay, much shorter than I had written, and he didn't want to discourage me, he was sure I was going to be all right later on, so I was.

QUESTION: You were too good for him. You probably knew and had read more than he had, eh? Broadly.



ANSWER: I don't know about that, but anyway I realized that it wasn't what he had wanted but I didn't think that people at the university would be that narrow-minded, you know, but as you say, it's rather typical for a first year graduate student and I think it was his first year. So I ended up with all A's in my Pass course and then nobody objected any more when I wanted to switch and I did remember in the second year I had to take this one hour a week course which was designed to make the poor Pass students, you know, catch up with the Honour students and I thought this was the most ridiculous thing I ever had done because at that time in second year we had Experimental Psychology and, of course, we did the ordinary Honours course Experimental reports and everything<sup>and</sup>/with Dr. Bernhart in his one hour tutorial there were the silliest little demonstrations that he gave us, you know . . .

QUESTION: This was Honour Psych?

ANSWER: This was Honour Psych and, you see, in addition to the Honour Psych courses that we had to take, we also, anybody who came from the Pass course, also had to take this one hour tutorial -- I'll never know why they did it because at the same time that we took this course we took the regular second year Honours courses which were much more advanced than this poor little tutorial so from that time on, I'm afraid I never got along with Dr. Bernhart because I made no secret out of my detestation of his one hour tutorial course.

QUESTION: Who were the other teachers in that second year?

ANSWER: In the second year I think Professor Ketchum was one of them and, of course, I liked him very much. And then there was the Experimental which I liked too and I think -- oh, I forget his name, he was a tall, heavy graduate student who ran it.

QUESTION: Chant didn't run it?

ANSWER: No, Chant didn't run it. I forget his name -- he dropped out very soon after that . . .

TAPE 1, SIDE A ENDS HERE

TAPE 1, SIDE B STARTS HERE

ANSWER: . . . he started with 12 and ended up with 9. Charlie Walker was one of the brightest in the group and it was really quite a close-knit group, but of all the people in this group, there were very few, I think there was only Ed and myself and possibly Helen Porter who went on into Graduate School -- yes, I think Helen went as far as the Master's, and Ed and I went -- well, Ed, of course, pretty soon joined the Navy so he didn't finish -- I don't think he finished even his Master's -- I think he finished it later on. You see, we graduated in 1939 and that's when the war started in Canada and England, so at that point everybody sort of disappeared -- Dr. Lyon to England, Bott to England, Chant -- where did Chant go, did he go to Ottawa or England -- and so

ANSWER: all that was left was Dr. Bernhart and Dr. Cosgrave and Dr. Myers had left too, I think, I'm sure, and then they took you on, remember and me . . .

QUESTION: That's right.

ANSWER: Well, you had had your Ph.D. for some time and I got it in 1942.

QUESTION: Well, going back to the undergraduate course after the second year you'd have run into the other people in the department.

ANSWER: Yes, Dr. Cosgrave gave us a course in Industrials some term or other, and of course, Dr. Lyon -- I know I had a course from him in second year and then again a course from him in fourth year -- so in second year, I think it must have been History of either Learning or the History of Psychology in second year and as I say either Learning or the History of Psychology in fourth year.

QUESTION: But you'd read all this Freud and you'd read a great deal so what was your impression of Toronto Psychology?

ANSWER: Well, I was terribly disappointed when I found out that nobody wanted to have anything to do with Freud or any other depth school of psychology and so, as a matter of fact, I still remember that Dr. Bernhart told me once that people got well not because of psychoanalysis but despite psychoanalysis, and I took it quite seriously and decided

ANSWER:       for myself that I'd better do some more reading which I did, and so I read up on Adler and Jung and yes, we must have had this History of Psychology course with Dr. Lyon in the second year because that's what started me reading these other branches of depth psychology and I got particularly interested in Jung and read everything that I could lay hands on of both Jung and Adler and Freud. And for the rest of it, I began to see that really Dr. Bernhart had had a point, that is, I began to see that it was Freud's type of psychoanalysis was a highly one-sided kind of psychology, that there was such a thing as scientific psychology, and I'd better get acquainted with that, and if the department in Toronto didn't like depth psychology, well, O.K., I could read up on it on my own and I didn't have to protest too much because what they were offering was the scientific brand of psychology and I got very interested in it because, as I say, I liked Experimental Psychology and it occurred to me at that point that probably research was as well worthwhile as clinical Psychology, so I got sort of a conversion experience -- I mean, I was perfectly willing to go along provided only that people didn't insist on too narrow an interpretation of what they wanted.

QUESTION:     Well, did you think they were a good bunch of psychologists? I mean. . .

ANSWER:       Well, there was only one brilliant man in the department and that was Bill Lyon.

QUESTION: Yes.

ANSWER: I considered Blatz competent in his own brand of psychology. Cosgrave -- I just couldn't see at all -- I didn't think he had any business in the university as a university teacher. Carl Bernhart, I think, was a plodder -- we used to call him Brother Rat because Jean Langman, she had quite a talent for caricature and I still remember she drew a profile of him on the blackboard one fine day -- this was when we took our course in Comparative Psychology with Carl Bernhart -- and he really made us toe the line -- actually, he demanded so much work that I got to the point where I just realized I couldn't run both the house and look after the children and be in the rat lab as long as he wanted us to, so at this point I went to Chant and told him just how many hours a week -- it really amounted to pretty close to 40 hours a week that we were supposed to spend, but I just couldn't afford that much time and he saw the point and he immediately cut down on the hours, for which I've always been grateful to him because I just couldn't have done it under those circumstances.

QUESTION: Well, then there was Myers around and Blatz.

ANSWER: There was Myers around and Blatz. I enjoyed Blatz's course but I did think -- I mean, I appreciated the fact that it was his own theory and I appreciated the fact that he had founded the Child Institute and certainly did a beautiful job of running it, but I also felt that it was a

ANSWER:           rather simple kind of psychology -- it was all right in its way but let me not get stuck with this. Myers -- I'm trying to think whether I had any course with Myers -- I must have had a course with Myers in the undergraduate program but I just -- I remember him in graduate school very well because eventually I went to intern during the summer in Hamilton and, of course, he was running all the internships and I remember the graduate course that he ran because I liked it very much -- we were all giving papers and criticizing each other's papers -- it was a well-run and a very stimulating course, but I just can't remember him in the undergraduate years.

QUESTION:       How did you manage with the three children to do all this work?

ANSWER:           Well, I'm a very fast reader in the first place. In the second place, I did have a good housekeeper. Of course, it was always a little more difficult if one of the kids got flu or a cold or something like that but then I usually negotiated that very well. It was a near disaster if I had to change housekeepers and, unfortunately, my husband didn't get on very well with some of the housekeepers so there were changes and whenever that happened, well, then I had to miss a few classes.

QUESTION:       What were the university fees then -- that must have been a bit of a problem.

ANSWER:           University fees were no problem because my husband

ANSWER:           was a professor at Victoria College and so I could attend any courses -- I mean I could attend the university without fees, without having to pay fees, so that was lucky. And, of course, Victoria, I didn't really have very much to do except in the first year I took a course in English from Dr. Robbins which I enjoyed very much.

QUESTION:        Do you remember any of the other people outside Psychology that you took undergraduate courses from?

ANSWER:           Yes, Professor McCallum in Philosophy and Professor Grant in Philosophy.

QUESTION:        I remember them so well too.

ANSWER:           And these were some of my very best courses.

QUESTION:        Yes. Agreed.

ANSWER:           They really were wonderful. And then I took a course Professor Hart in Anthropology -- do you remember him? He was an Australian, and actually I got so interested in Anthropology that I contemplated maybe doing some graduate work in Anthropology but finally decided that I wasn't that interested in it after all. Then I took a course with Professor Diamond in Biology which I liked very much, although I had difficulties drawing the fish and the various organs and things until somebody told me, "For goodness' sake, don't draw what you think should be there, draw what is really there." And from that time on, I did all right.

QUESTION: So you graduated in 1939.

ANSWER: In 1939 with a gold medal in Psychology.

QUESTION: Was that the Dunlop?

ANSWER: Dunlop gold medal.

QUESTION: So then you had to decide.

ANSWER: Well, there wasn't any decision because obviously I couldn't go anywhere else for graduate work and I did want to get my Ph.D., so I went right on.

QUESTION: Did you go straight to a Ph.D. or did you do an M.A.?

ANSWER: No, I did an M.A. too. I got my M.A. in 1940. And my problem was -- there was a problem on tension -- muscular tension.

QUESTION: With the dynamometer thing?

ANSWER: Yes. I designed my own instrument and I decided that I would see how much stress people could suffer when they were forced to work faster and faster, and what I did was I had a teacher of shorthand do a dictation and it was students from her class in shorthand that I used as guinea pigs or subjects, and she speeded up more and more until it got to the point where the students just couldn't keep up and it was a fairly clear breakdown point for every one of them where the shorthand just didn't become legible any more or they just stopped altogether. And I had an awful run-in with Professor Bott on that too



ANSWER: because he wanted me to do a kymographic study on muscular tension with one subject and I said, "But I want to find out about tension and breakdown with several students and find out what the individual differences are -- I'm not interested in one subject -- I'm interested in individual differences."

QUESTION: Were there other people doing M.A.? This would be 1939-40, wouldn't it? The first year of the war.

ANSWER: This was 1939-40 and I think Ed Belyea was already in -- as a matter of fact, I think he immediately went into the Navy, I don't think he went into graduate school at all, come to think of it, because he certainly didn't do his Master's thesis when I did. And I don't think Helen Porter did. I think I was the only one that did their Master's thesis that year, and considering Professor Bott's insistence on doing it way, I finally ran the subjects during the Christmas vacation when he wasn't around. It was all finished by the end of the Christmas vacation and then Bill Lyon and Chant, they acted as my supervisors, and we got it enough in shape, you know, that the problem was accepted by the Committee and Professor Bott never said anything about it any more, since it was already done and it looked all right.

QUESTION: How did you come to choose that topic? I mean, did somebody on the staff interest you, or were they interested in it? So many students followed a lead that some staff member was investigating, or in his general area.

■

ANSWER: No, I couldn't say that. I was interested in, actually in schizophrenia. It started that, you know, we took Abnormal Psychology and I can't figure out with whom I took it.

QUESTION: Well, it was Blatz who used to give it.

ANSWER: No.

QUESTION: Bill Lyon was interested in schizophrenia -- because that's where I got on to those withdrawn kids.

ANSWER: That's right. I think maybe he gave that course -- it's quite possible. Anyway, I was interested in schizophrenia and wanted sort of hard-heartedly to do something with it, and then began to realize that it's too big an area and then I said to myself -- and I was still an undergraduate -- I said to myself, "Well, maybe if I can't do something with schizophrenics, maybe I could do something with affective disorders."

QUESTION: But you thought this up out of your own.

ANSWER: Oh, yes, I thought it up myself.

QUESTION: It wasn't a local interest in Toronto Department?

ANSWER: No, no.

QUESTION: Was it in the literature at the time?

ANSWER: No, it wasn't. It was just something that interested me in reading about it. And so affective disorders, well, it was a little easier and then I said to myself, "Well, for heaven's sake, before you do something about affective disorders, why not

ANSWER: do something about just ordinary normal emotions?"

QUESTION: Um-hmm, and that's where you got into emotions.

ANSWER: And that's where I got into emotions and the easiest one seemed to be emotional tension.

QUESTION: So that's the area that you really continued in and made your name and fame.

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: And it came out of . . .

ANSWER: It came out of my interest in schizophrenia. Narrowing it down and narrowing it down -- general reading and thinking.

QUESTION: But not really pushed by anybody on the staff.

ANSWER: Except that I found Bill Lyon always willing to talk about it, discuss things, and it was really he who sort of said, "Well, you know, that's just too big a field." And pushed me and pushed me until it was of some reasonable dimensions. And I also read at the time experimental reports on muscular tension and learning and you know that Bill Lyon was interested in learning, so he was mildly interested in that, and from then on I simply said to myself, "Well, why couldn't I try individual differences in muscular tension and emotional tension?" And, of course, everybody I talked to about emotional tension said to me, "Well, what is emotional tension?" And so finally I was willing to narrow it down to muscular tension because that was

ANSWER: something that could at least be experimentally investigated, and then I designed my own stylus with a tambour attached to it and a kymograph because at that time the kymograph was all -- I wanted a photographic record of the stylus movements.

QUESTION: I'll bet it was the old smoke kymograph.

ANSWER: It was the old smoke kymograph that Professor Bott wished on me. I had to learn to run it. However, it worked all right so who was I protest.

QUESTION: Now did other people, I mean college students, other staff get interested in the topic you were pursuing?

ANSWER: No, no, I'm afraid I was always a lone wolf. I still remember -- you see, I took readings of the working hand, that is, the stylus with a tambour on it and the pressure that the student exerted while he was taking down stenographically the dictation of the teacher, and then I also had them hold a tambour in the left hand so that I'd get a sort of general muscular tension, and I still remember when I had it all done, all measured, and inserted on a great big sheet -- scores for the left hand, scores for the right hand, and I went over to Bill Lyon and said, "For goodness' sake, here I have all these numbers -- what do I do now?" I had absolutely no idea. He looked at me and he said, "Well, you know, I always believe that if people do something with the right hand, something's going to happen to the left hand too. Why not run a simple correlation between right and left hand?" And from then on in, I was all right

ANSWER: because I began to think about it, there was a correlation between right and left hand but not high enough really to amount to very much, and then I began to figure out what else it could be connected with, and came up with quite a decent Master's thesis.

QUESTION: For which you got your M.A. in 1940. And that was when you began your Ph.D.

ANSWER: Yes. As soon as I had my M.A., I went to Hamilton interning in the Psychiatric Hospital there for the summer and then while I was there I figured out what I was going to do for the Ph.D. and I had it all worked out. I wanted to use the same little gizmo, the tambour in the left hand, the tambour in the right hand, and this time I did want to work with schizophrenics and had the idea that I could do something similar with schizophrenics, that is, put a little pressure on them in some way -- I wasn't quite clear about that -- and see how their performance compared with the performance of normal people. But when I came back, Professor Bott told me that he needed somebody to run the lab -- the animal lab --

QUESTION: Which you hadn't liked.

ANSWER: No, not particularly. And he told me if I would run it, he would give me an assistant who was Edore Signori and he would give me a decent assistantship, which was \$1,500.00 . . .

QUESTION: Boy, that was good -- it really was for those days.

ANSWER: Oh, yes, for those days.

QUESTION: Because I remember them.

ANSWER: Of course, mind you, he wasn't immediately willing to do that, but I said I really have to make enough money to live on because by that time I was on my own -- my husband had bought a farm in Scarborough and moved out there and made it quite clear that he didn't want me around so I really had to be on my own. So, however, he gave me the \$1,500.00 and I decided I could run both -- I could run what I wanted with the schizophrenics and I could run rats with the sound-produced seizures, and I was willing to try and see what happened with adrenalin injections working on Cannon's notion that adrenalin or fear prepared the organism for fight or flight.

QUESTION: So that was the beginning of your Ph.D.

TAPE 1, SIDE B ENDS HERE

TAPE 2, SIDE A STARTS HERE

ANSWER: I suppose I talked about the fact that I started to work with the rats and at the same time started a bit of my own problem with the patients down in the Psychiatric, and I found out very soon that the adrenalin that I used to give the rats bigger and better sound-produced seizures worked just the opposite -- that is, the adrenalin stopped all the seizures and so I began to realize that perhaps I had hit on something and began to read up on the effects of adrenalin -- it didn't give

ANSWER:           me any particular satisfaction but at this point I decided I'd better stop my work with the psychotics and concentrate on this because it would take me really all my time to find out what the reason for this particular effect was. Well, to make a long story short, I had quite a bit of difficulty, not with the adrenalin but with the people in Pharmacy -- in Pharmacology. The Chairman of the Pharmacology Department told me that I just didn't know how to give the injections and I didn't know how to preserve the adrenalin -- it was probably contaminated and deteriorated -- so I asked him to prepare a solution of adrenalin for me and I went to Physiology and asked Dr. Solandt to instruct me personally in how to give the injections and I went through the whole sequence all over again. So I ran the rats all over again and there was absolutely no doubt about it that adrenalin stopped not only the original sound-produced seizures but also stopped the seizures that had been produced with strychnine injections. So at this point I was quite sure that whatever the effect of adrenalin, it did not prepare the organism for fight or flight, and at this point I had to go back to all the literature on Physiology, the physiology of adrenalin, to find some reason why it didn't do that, and I found all the reasons and that was finally all incorporated in the doctoral dissertation, only I got into more trouble when it came the time to defend my dissertation. The Department was very nice about it but the general university defence in Simcoe Hall -- I still remember that -- Dr. Henderson was there and Dr. Solandt from Physiology and Dr. Farrar -- no, it wasn't Dr. Farrar, it was somebody else from Psychiatry -- and they finally had to ask

ANSWER: Dr. Henderson from Pharmacology to withdraw because he insisted he was going to vote against me getting the Ph.D. so he withdrew and I did get my Ph.D.

QUESTION: Yes, I was there. I was at that. I didn't say much but I remember.

ANSWER: It was an interesting . . .

QUESTION: And I remember Bailey and Henderson walking out just livid.

ANSWER: I know, I know. And Dr. Blatz told me afterwards that what saved me was that Henderson really got terribly aggressive and I kept my cool. Well, you know, I had to because I was just shivering inside with fright and when you're afraid like that you just can't get aggressive.

QUESTION: So what happened -- now that was 1942.

ANSWER: That was 1942.

QUESTION: And then you stayed in Toronto till 1947.

ANSWER: That's right. By that time, you know, all the senior members of the Department had gone -- you and I were immediately taken on, remember, and when Bill Lyon came back -- it was in 1945, wasn't it -- then he asked me whether I'd work with him on this psychological work with the young psychologists that the psychiatrists had taken on after the war and those poor girls, they had a B.A., some not even with Honours in Psychology,



ANSWER:           they had just had one or two Psychology courses, so we had to try and bring them up to scratch to the point where they would be of some use to the psychiatrists because obviously just the B.A. wasn't going to be very helpful. So at that point we brought them back to Toronto for the summer -- I think for two weeks in the summer -- the brightest of them we sent to Rochester, New York, to get some familiarity with the Rorschach, and the rest of them came to Toronto -- actually all of them came to Toronto to take a course in a little more theory which Bill looked after and also the TAT, and I had by then done a bit with the TAT, only now I was faced with the urgent necessity of working it into some kind of system that could be easily taught and could give them some insight in what was going on and that was the beginning of my system of TAT into mutation story sequence analysis.

QUESTION:       Did you publish your Ph.D.?

ANSWER:       Yes, I published my Ph.D. in two articles in, I think one was in the Journal of Experimental and the other one was in the Psych Review.

QUESTION:       But on the whole -- I'm going back to Ph.D. -- the Psych Department was quite favourable to it?

ANSWER:       Oh, yes, yes, they were quite impressed, as a matter of fact.

QUESTION:       It was the Professor of Pharmacology . . .

ANSWER: It was Pharmacology and, as a matter of fact, the Psychiatrist was very favourably inclined -- it was only the Professor of Pharmacology. And the funny thing about it was that a year later I met him in front of the Medical Library and he stopped me and he talked and he was as friendly as you please, asked me what I was doing, and so forth and so on. Because, really, maybe he found out in the meantime that I was right and very soon afterwards a couple of people at Harvard picked it up, that is, the fact that adrenalin does not energize the organism, and also picked up the notion that I published at that time, namely that fear and anger had different physiological states, and that was Al Axe and Dr. Funkenstein. Funkenstein did quite a bit, he was a physiologist, and he did quite a bit of research. Al Axe did, I think it was his doctoral or post-doctoral research, I forget, but it's pretty well accepted by now.

QUESTION: Then you left Toronto in 1947.

ANSWER: I left Toronto to go to Wellesley College to substitute for Edna Heibrader which I thought was really something.

QUESTION: Yes. But that was a temporary thing, was it?

ANSWER: That was a temporary -- yes, she had a year's leave of absence but actually she didn't particularly want to come back -- she had, I think, Parkinson's disease by then and so they asked me to stay another year but in the meantime, I was offered a job as Acting Head of the Department at Bryn Mawr College

ANSWER:           and since Bryn Mawr College sounded permanent and I knew that Wellesley was not, I went to Bryn Mawr College. Actually, I enjoyed Wellesley much more than Bryn Mawr College. Bryn Mawr had a bit of a -- well, the President there was Miss McBride -- she had published a book, I forget the title now but it's a very well-known book -- but she was quite psychoanalytically oriented and I ran up against that orientation everywhere. She taught the course in Abnormal and they were -- well, I liked the situation there -- it was a College but it was much more a sort of university atmosphere there -- they had a very good graduate school and they were very intellectually oriented. So I liked it except for this malaise that I felt with the President -- she was a peculiarly cold woman -- probably so reserved, but to me she was just a cold fish. I just couldn't help it.

QUESTION:       Now looking back on your Toronto years, who was the most influential of your teachers?

ANSWER:       Oh, Bill Lyon -- there wasn't any doubt about it. I mean, my whole orientation stems from Bill Lyon -- the fact that the human being is more than a sort of combination of reflexes -- that he has dignity, that he has self-determination -- that was one of the most important points that I got from him -- although I must say that there was still a little bit of difficulty. I remember it must have been my first graduate year at the point where I felt I really had read about every important book in Psychology which was easy at that time because

ANSWER:           there weren't so very many, and I had been dissatisfied and I felt that somehow or other the human being had to be an agent -- that is, somebody who acted out of himself and not just reaction to stimulus -- and so one fine day when I talked to Bill Lyon, I said to him, "You know, the more I know about Psychology, the more sure I am that there has to be in the human being something like a soul." And he looked at me and he said, "For goodness' sake, keep that under your hat."

QUESTION:        Around here.

ANSWER:           Yes. So I realized then that I'd better be careful, even though Toronto at that time was much more humanistically oriented than it is today -- still probably it would be better for my reputation.

QUESTION:        In your opinion he was head and shoulders above anybody.

ANSWER:           Oh, absolutely. And I would say the second was Blatz only he was so wrapped up in the Child Institute and most of us just never had a chance to talk to him, you know. I always looked at him as, you know, the big authority but I looked at him from afar. I was his assistant for three years, goodness knows.

QUESTION:        But then you were called in on some of the children, as we were saying last night.

ANSWER:           Yes, that's right.

QUESTION: So you had some connection.

ANSWER: I had some connection -- I was always interested in the Child Institute -- and because they knew by that time that I was interested in emotion, I got called in when there was a particularly difficult case.

QUESTION: Well, did you find with Bill Blatz your common German European background had any . . .

ANSWER: No, not really but, of course, personally I owe him a great deal of gratitude because when my marriage broke up, he really -- well, both my husband and I went to him and he was really very good about it. He made it possible for the separation to be at least feasible from my point of view. He got my husband to go down to the Domestic Relations Court and insisted on a settlement and anybody else, I'm sure, couldn't have done it because it really was an almost hopeless case. So I really have always felt very grateful to him about that.

QUESTION: Did you get into theoretical arguments with him?

ANSWER: No, no I never did. I didn't see him enough.

QUESTION: You were too bright, maybe. He loved to pick on somebody and get an argument going.

ANSWER: No, I was his assistant but I never saw him. I mean, afterwards he told me that he picked me as his assistant because he knew I'd run the show on my own. The only time when

ANSWER: I really got into trouble was when I had to substitute for him. This was his lectures to the medical students and, of course, I had a very great respect for the medical students -- they were fourth year students and quite blase about things and I had always admired Dr. Blatz because he spoke so easily and always with a smile and he was so completely on top of his subject and I still remember sitting there and saying to myself, "Well, I'll never, never, never be able to do that." And then quite unexpectedly, I think he went to the States for three weeks and for three weeks I had to take his lectures, and I just shook in my shoes and I still remember the first lecture I gave, I prepared enough for what I thought would be four weeks but I used it all up in the first half-hour and after that I just stuttered around and the medical students kept looking at their watches and finally I let them go, ten minutes before the time. That was really the most dramatic experience I had.

QUESTION: So you really put Lyon top and Blatz second in, what will we call it, intellectual influence.

ANSWER: Well, I wouldn't say influence because Blatz, I mean, of course, his system . . .

QUESTION: Lyon influence.

ANSWER: Lyon influence, Blatz just sheer intellectual prominence. I just didn't get enough of him, I suppose.

QUESTION: And personal prominence -- getting into the newspapers which was at that time.

ANSWER: Well, I suppose so, I never felt like that but, I mean, it was professional prominence; after all, at that time he was lecturing all over the United States and so forth and so on.

QUESTION: Well, now, did any of your colleagues in Toronto have an influence on your psychology and your . . .

ANSWER: Well, I think you and to a much less degree, Mary Salter, but I still remember, I mean it always seemed to me, you came from England, you had known Bartlett and so forth and so on, and it always seemed to me that you really were closest to my own developing point of view.

QUESTION: Yes, and at that time I was interested in Bartlett and memory before I got detracted to sociometry which remained a permanent detraction. Well, it was something to do with it -- you could publish it -- nobody was interested in Bartlett. What about the other graduate students?

ANSWER: Well, Ed Belyea who was from my own class in Honours Psychology -- I never had much in common with -- anyway, he was so big and bouncy, we just didn't talk the same language at all. Charlie Walker was gone -- he was the one that I liked best of my classmates and he was probably also the brightest of them but he had left -- he had gone to Ottawa to

ANSWER:           the Civil Service, and so really -- Carl Williams I liked very much but he was too far ahead of me.

QUESTION:       And besides, he failed your first essay.

ANSWER:       Yes, well, I didn't hold that against him. Afterwards he often joked about it. He had the singular distinction of giving me the only failing mark in my career. But it was a nice group. I got to know Mary Salter pretty well and then Julien James was an interesting person -- I met him later on in the States -- he is at Princeton now -- I don't think he ever got his Ph.D. or did he finally -- he always said he didn't want his Ph.D. -- it was too much like getting a union card -- he didn't want that -- but maybe he finally did. But I think he's still teaching at Princeton.

QUESTION:       Did you ever want to stay on at Toronto?

ANSWER:       Yes and no. I would have liked it in one way but on the other hand, I knew too well that I wouldn't have ever got anywhere in Toronto, and also the fact that my husband was in the same city and actually teaching at the same university, even if it was Victoria College and I never got there, still it was sort of an uneasy situation,<sup>but</sup>/particularly professionally speaking, I knew I'd just never get beyond an instructorship and so what was the use.

QUESTION:       And you probably wouldn't have liked the change in 1952.



ANSWER: Oh, heavens, no.

QUESTION: You'd have been on Bill Lyons' side and that would have been -- I don't know if it would have been as distressing to you, but I don't think you'd have felt very happy, and actually it was a long time before women got appointed, wasn't it?

ANSWER: Oh, yes.

QUESTION: Mary Lawrence.

ANSWER: I didn't know her.

QUESTION: Did you not know her? She did her Ph.D. around 1950-51.

ANSWER: Did she actually get on the faculty? You were on the faculty.

QUESTION: Oh, yes. She is now Associate Professor.

ANSWER: At the Psychology Department?

QUESTION: Yes. And there are two or three other women.

ANSWER: Oh? Isn't that interesting.

QUESTION: There was a woman Head of the Department for a while who is now Vice-President of the University but this is many years later.

ANSWER: Of course, Dr. Ford was then, I think she was Associate Professor in Biology. I liked her very much.

ANSWER: I never had really a class with her but I knew her because I was interested in Biology.

QUESTION: Let's go on to what you did after Toronto. You said about Wellesley and Bryn Mawr.

ANSWER: I was at Bryn Mawr for a couple of years.

QUESTION: Those were supposedly temporary.

ANSWER: No, Bryn Mawr was permanent because Harry Helson had just left at Bryn Mawr when I got there so that's why I immediately moved into the Acting Chairmanship of the Department and it was pleasant in one way because really the administration moved so smoothly, I began to appreciate that later as soon as I got into Catholic colleges -- but, you know, the wheels turned without any noise and everything was very pleasant except for my difficulty with the orientation that the President represented. And then again it was really a personal problem that took me away from Bryn Mawr. I was teaching summer school at Harvard for two years running and I liked it very much there and all that. Also at that time, I think my first year at Bryn Mawr, I had come back into the Catholic Church and Joan had moved down to stay with me and I think she was in her second year -- she took her second and her third year at Bryn Mawr -- she was in the Philosophy Department -- and at that point she also came into the Church and as so often happens with new converts, she immediately wanted to go into a convent and she picked the Trappistines in French Quebec --

ANSWER:           oh, I don't know, I think they had a chocolate factory or something like that -- and I just couldn't for the life of me, I just couldn't see Joan who is a vivacious, lively, intelligent girl -- I just couldn't see her with the Trappistines who have perpetual silence in French Quebec and she didn't know French -- it seemed just so outrageous to me, I decided I'd have to do something to prevent that. So at that point I was offered a Professorship at a small mid-Western Catholic College, Barat College in Lake Forest and I went there to interview the President there -- I didn't like the situation much because it was such a small college and I was very doubtful about the intellectual calibre of the students, but, oh, somehow she promised me the sky and the heavens behind it and she, of course, told me quite frankly that now that I was a Catholic it was my duty to do something to further Catholic education so I couldn't resist that appeal and the combination with my idea that at least I should show Joan some more intellectually active women's orders so that she might forget about the Trappistines, so I took that job. It was a little less money than at Bryn Mawr and, of course, there was just no comparison. As soon as I got there, I realized that I had made a very big mistake. The students were more like first year high school students -- it was just an incredible comedown -- it was just a very, very bad situation. Joan, however, didn't see that. She thought I was overcritical, you know, and she was in the first flush of a convert's enthusiasm so she promptly after a year or so decided she

ANSWER:            would enter the convent of the Madams of the Sacred Heart which she did in 1951. By that time I had realized that this was just not for me and I had had a letter from Dr. Allport who told me that he was on the Committee selecting the post-doctoral Fellow for Radcliffe. I had applied for that before and I had been turned down. Apparently with some regret they told me I was the runner-up but they had picked a medical woman as post-doctoral Fellow. Well, this time since Allport himself invited me, I thought I'd try it again and I got the Fellowship -- in 1952-53 went to Cambridge and was given an office at the Harvard Department of Psychology.

QUESTION:          Is that where you wrote your book?

ANSWER:            That's where I started my book Emotion and Personality, but the first year I also had to get ready for publication -- we had a conference at Barat College the first year I was there, a conference of Catholic Psychologists because I began to feel at that time that the profession was veering so far towards behaviourism that maybe it would be a good idea for the many Catholic institutions that had no use for behaviourism to have something that they could use as a text book or at least a book of readings in personality. So we had this conference -- Father Myhew was there from University of Montreal and Dr. Colebrook from Loyola University and several other people, some quite interesting people, and we got this symposium volume together only then we found out that

ANSWER: it would have been too thin so Father Gasson from Springhill College and myself, we edited it but added about half of the contents so that eventually it was picked up by Ronald and it was finally published in 1954 which meant that my first year at Harvard, I had to proofread and so forth and so on. And then at the end of 1952-53

TAPE 2, SIDE A ENDS HERE

TAPE 2, SIDE B STARTS HERE

ANSWER: the book that came out of it which really has had a great deal of use. My two advisers at Harvard for this book on Emotion and Personality WERE Dr. Alcott and Dr. Vidisenta.

QUESTION: But this was a book after The Human Person?

ANSWER: After The Human Person. This was a book that I was going to write on Emotion and it was on that basis that I had asked for the Fellowship because any other foundation, they gave a lot of money for experimental research. Well, I knew that I didn't want to do experimental research which I was going to incorporate, of course, my stuff on adrenalin and fear and anger, the content of my Ph.D. dissertation but what I really wanted to do was to go into this whole field, look at what other people had done, review their theories and their research and if possible at all, come up with a theory of emotion that would fit in with a theory of personality that would fit in with a theory of learning, a theory of motivation

ANSWER:           and so forth and so on -- it was sort of ambitious but it turned out that the plans really weren't even ambitious enough because I found out that to do what I really wanted to do -- that is, to find out what was happening in emotion, not only psychologically but physiologically, I had to work out a theory of brain function as well. So after I got the grant extended for another year, which pleased me very much because they must have been satisfied with what I was doing, I spent really the second year finishing the first draft but I only went into the really the first attempt at figuring out what goes on in the brain and this second year really was a year of great excitement because I began to see all kinds of connections nobody else had worked out -- I had a real experience of this sudden insight through a dream where I had been trying to work out how memory was revived, that is, what happens in the brain when memory is revived.

QUESTION:       That's where you're at now.

ANSWER:       That's what I'm at now, and I had got to the point where I began to see in a dream that memory wasn't just sensory memory, that is, visual, auditory and so forth and so on, but there was also something you could call affective memory which is really a reliving of old emotions and that it actually had a circuit in the brain that served to revive these emotional impressions, just as there are circuits in the brain to revive sensory impressions. And so this second year I really had a whale of a time because, you know, new insights came up

ANSWER:           practically every other week in between a lot of hard work, but when I left Harvard to go to Loyola University, I had the first draft of this book ready. I had no idea that it would take me five more years to finish the book. The first year at Loyola, they had promised me that I would only teach one course one semester and they'd give me the rest of the time off so I could work on my book, finish it, they thought, but I worked like a fiend but I didn't finish it. This was then 1954-55. In 1956 I got to know Dr. Bailey, a Neurosurgeon and Neuropsychiatrist in Chicago and he was on the Selection Committee of the Guggenheim Fellowship and I talked to him about this book that I was working on and he was very, very interested, and one fine day he called me up and he said he had just found out that the Guggenheim people had some money left. Would I like to apply for a Guggenheim? So I said, "Well, I certainly would." So I got the Guggenheim Fellowship in 1957-58. The same year I went over to Europe to Brussels for a symposium on emotion in connection with the International Congress there in 1957, but I came back -- now I could have stayed in England -- I would have very much liked to -- after all, with a Guggenheim you can go anywhere -- but I considered that by now I really knew the libraries in Chicago and knew my way around -- it would be much faster if I stayed there, although I surely didn't like Chicago -- it would be much faster, I could get much more work done if I just stuck around home and just put all my time into writing, which I did finally. And by 1959, the very next year, the book was at the printers. I had all kinds

ANSWER:           of difficulties, of course. I submitted it to Ronald and they refused it -- I found out later because one of their older authors, P. T. Young who had written a book on Motivation and Emotion before, he brought out another book, quite a good book, as a matter of fact, but apparently it was already there and they didn't want two books of the same kind, but they told me that one of their editors was now at Columbia University Press and Bob Tilley, this very same editor, actually wrote to me and asked me to submit the manuscript to Columbia University Press which I did and it was eventually accepted. It was a very happy year to see it through the press because they were not only very nice people there in the editorial office but they were bright -- they really knew what I was trying to do and they gave me all the help that I could possibly have expected, so it was really a very . . .

QUESTION:       Well, your theory and your book were highly controversial -- I don't mean in the Bill Blatz sense -- of public controversy in the front pages of the newspaper -- but professionally.

ANSWER:        Oh, no, professionally -- yes, very much so.

QUESTION:       There were ~~some~~ people who wouldn't accept it at all.

ANSWER:        Yes, but I think -- I mean they certainly don't accept the theory but at the same time . . .

QUESTION:       They read the book.



ANSWER: They read the book and they will admit even today that it is the standard book on emotion. It got as far as Czechoslovakia and Russia, translated, of course, in pirated editions. But I was so amazed because the people in Russia that came to a conference in New York where a lot of people from all over the world came -- they told me, Oh, yes, they knew the book, they used it all the time.

QUESTION: And is it translated into French? German?

ANSWER: It's been translated into Spanish and is used in South America. Well, the people who wanted to translate it into Spanish got a big advance from a publisher in Munich and I think I'm going to go to that publisher while I'm there this summer and find out what happened to it because as far as I know, it's never been published -- the German translation -- although they at it for a couple of years and I stipulated that I wanted to see the German translation because while I'm not sufficiently fluent, particularly in German physiological terminology, even psychological terminology, to do it myself, I certainly am sufficiently acquainted with the professional literature to know whether they've done it right or not.

QUESTION: Well, you'd consider that your magnum opus?

ANSWER: My magnum opus, certainly.

QUESTION: And that's the book you're known widely for?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION:       Whereas The Human Person . . .

ANSWER:         No, that was the first attempt and it's uneven, The Human Person -- some articles in it are good -- I don't particularly like my own articles today any more either because I was still at the time writing pretty much in jargon and I have really made a very determined attempt to get off from the psychological jargon and write just good English. And, incidentally, most reviewers have made a point of saying that, that it's a well-written book.

QUESTION:       Well, this was 1960.

ANSWER:         This was 1960.

QUESTION:       So, in the last 15 years what have you been up to?

ANSWER:         In 1954 I went to Loyola. Actually, I had got the job at Loyola in 1952 but when I had the offer of the post-doctoral fellowship from Radcliffe, they immediately gave me a leave of absence, paid me a retainer even, which was funny, but it helped because the Fellowship was pretty meager, I think it was something like \$3,000.00 and my friends in Chicago told me I couldn't possibly live on it but I did. So in 1954 finally I got back to Chicago.

QUESTION:       Or 1964?

ANSWER:         No, in 1954, but you see then I worked at Loyola University, mainly working on the book and, of course, teaching as much as I had to on the side, and while I was on the

ANSWER:           Guggenheim I was in Chicago, although I wasn't teaching, of course -- the year of 1957-58. Well, then, in 1960 the book was published and I had a bit of a run-in the next year with Loyola because my salary was very low -- about at the level of the Harvard assistant professor although I was a full professor at Loyola. I finally pointed out that it really was the custom when somebody wrote an important book that one did get a bit of a promotion so I got it eventually and after that never any problem any more because gradually they did realize that the book was important and I was acquiring some kind of professional reputation and they don't have so many people with an international reputation there so from then on everything worked out very well -- I was quite happy there until the winters began getting too hard for me -- as one gets older somehow the winters get more and more difficult to bear so when the chance came to go down South, I took it. What happened actually was that I had been visiting at Spring Hill College in Mobile off and on for 20 years -- Father Gasson was my co-editor in editing The Human Person. I had met him because he came to Harvard to study anthropology. They told him he would have to give a course in anthropology -- when was it, 1947 -- in the summer he was there and he decided he was also going to take a course in psychology to see what the high muckamucks were teaching at this point and so he drifted into my class -- of course, I was only a temporary teacher, but from that time on we worked together, wrote a couple of articles together and so forth and so on, and then edited The Human Person

ANSWER:           together, so often and on, I was invited down to Spring Hill to give a lecture so I knew the place -- it has a beautiful campus, I certainly liked the climate. So eventually I told them that they really should do something about their Social Science Department -- they had told me that there was a decided switch in student interest from the physical sciences to the social sciences and they didn't have any facilities -- they had wonderful facilities in the physical sciences. And I said to them casually, "Well, why don't you apply to some of the federal agencies, get a grant and do something about the social sciences." So the next thing I heard was that their foundations man asked me would I help them write the application to the National Science Foundation and if they got it, would I act as Project Director, so I thought for a while and then decided -- well, this was in 1971, I knew that I would have to retire, I think it was in 1972 I would have to retire from Loyola anyway -- in 1973 -- and this way I could probably teach another year in a much more congenial climate than in Chicago, so I said, all right, I'll help them write the grant and I will act as Project Director. It took us a couple of years actually before we got the grant because it was refused the first time, not for any other reason except that we used an old set of guidelines so apparently they just weren't up to the minute but eventually we got the grant and I moved down to Mobile, bought a little house even before we got the grant because it looked as if we were going to get it, and rented the house for a little over a year and then finally they asked me to come down.

ANSWER: One semester I had a sabbatical coming from Loyola so the first semester in Chicago I worked on this new book that I'm still working at now and really got ahead very fast because it was the first part of the book -- this is a book on memory and the brain and what I want to do is to review various theories of memory by psychologists in the first part and in the second part I want to review the physiological research and theories because it seems to me that the psychologists and the neuro-physiologists work in the same area and they don't even speak the same language -- they don't know what the other part of the world is really doing or saying even -- so what I thought I would do was to write a book that would review both the psychological and the physiological research -- the theory in the area, and try and somehow reconcile the two. So I got the first draft of the psychological part done in that first semester. In the second semester I went down to Spring Hill College as a visiting professor and again got quite a bit of work done. Of course, there was the moving and so forth and so on which took a bit of time, but by May 1972 we had got the grant and the next three years were really a complete loss as far as I can see as far as working on this book is concerned -- I worked harder those three years than I've ever worked in my life, mainly testing this story sequence analysis which was meant to see whether this three year grant for updating the social sciences, whether it had any effect on the motivation of the students. We thought we would have three people working on this -- Father Gasson, myself, and Father Fagot who had been a

ANSWER:           a student of mine at Loyola University, but he left -- no, it wasn't Father Fagot, it was Father Meehan -- he left the very year that we got the grant so there were only two of us and since I had worked much longer in that area than Father Gasson, I realized that I would have to do most of the testing myself, so between the testing and administrative work as Project Director, Chairman of the Department, and Chairman of the Social Sciences Division, I just worked my head off and, unfortunately, the attitude of the students made it practically impossible to get valid tests because the students were supported by the administration in their idea that psychological tests are just silly -- the administration wouldn't really inform the students that this was part and parcel of that grant project and that it was important for the college. I tried to, but I was a newcomer, they had no idea who I was or what I had done, nobody told them about it -- oh, yes, they found out finally that I had written a couple of books but that didn't make any difference to their attitude to personality tests, so they tried their best to be as uninformative but that wouldn't have been bad but they just didn't obey instructions -- they just didn't give outcounts and without outcounts the test just can't be scored reliably and so the upshot of it all was that after three years of very hard work, testing hundreds and hundreds of students, retesting them again in the third year, I just had to give in because more than half the tests were unreliable and the upshot was the only real failure of my life and I felt very badly about it.

QUESTION: I was going to say that -- that's the only time I've heard of your not going through . . .

ANSWER: Well, I went through with it but nothing came of it.

QUESTION: Well, we all have to have at least one and many people have more.

ANSWER: We all have to have one but it was very sad that it was the last sort of effort, you know, of my professional life.

QUESTION: But your new book, your Brain and Memory will be . . .

ANSWER: Now I have time to work on it again. I retired officially last May and unofficially the end of July because there were a lot of things that had to be wound up -- the grant was finished on the 31st of May but there was still some money left so we got an extension of time for another year which meant that I had to write the final report but also had to see that my successor got all the information and could carry on for the next year.

QUESTION: But your main effort is going to be complete in this book.

ANSWER: Yes, that's right.

QUESTION: And working in your garden and house at a more leisurely pace.

ANSWER: At a much more leisurely pace and really I find that probably it was just as well that the three last years were so hard and so unrewarding, because I have absolutely no regrets. If I had stayed on at Loyola and had had to retire in 1973, I would probably have missed teaching but the switch from graduate teaching to undergraduate teaching, from teaching in an intellectually live environment in Chicago to the deep South where students are bound and determined to have a good time -- they're bright enough students but they are having a good time -- they're really not intellectually interested very much.

QUESTION: Tell me this -- do you think being brought up as a Canadian psychologist has had any assets or liabilities or any influence at all. Did it make a difference?

ANSWER: Yes, I think it did make a difference, particularly having had these years in Toronto. I think it gave me a courage that otherwise I mightn't have had, because in Toronto with Bill Lyon and with a group of graduate students like yourself, and Mary Salter and others, I felt that there was something to my point of view -- it simply wasn't true that either psychoanalysts on the one hand or behaviourists on the other had all the good ideas to offer. I mean, there was something to be said for a humanistic point of view that at the same time could use scientific methods. What made me unhappy in the States in later years was the humanistic movement that went so completely overboard into ascientific encounter groups -- you know, they



ANSWER:            had absolutely no use for psychology as a science any more, and so you had on the one side the humanistic psychologists who didn't want to hear of any kind of scientific investigation, and then you had the behaviourists who not only dominated the whole experimental field in all the areas, personality as well as anywhere else, but they've also pushed into clinical psychology with their behaviour modification. And so really there was no support anywhere, and if I hadn't had the years in Toronto, I think I just might not have had the courage to go on in this very unpopular direction of wanting to have a truly scientific and yet humanistic kind of psychology.

QUESTION:        Well, we were on a very unpopular tangent too, you know, when behaviourism in rats came into the foreground but it seems to have balanced out. What's going to happen to psychology next?

ANSWER:            Despite everything, I think behaviourism is on the way out.

QUESTION:        Out?

ANSWER:            Yes, I really think so. The very fact that behaviourists belatedly got interested in quite unbehaviouristic areas, for instance, they are working in emotion now and memory and so forth and so on. Who would have thought when Watson first appeared that they would break into these mentalistic fields? Unfortunately, they've all been brainwashed so that even if they talk about emotion and memory, they still do it in these atomistic terms, and I think it'll take us quite a few years

ANSWER:        before we've got over this unfortunate atomistic point of view. We will eventually, I'm sure.

QUESTION:      We will too, and that's the end of the tape.

TAPE 2, SIDE B ENDS HERE.