

**Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project**

**Interview with Ethel Tobach**

*Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford and Wade Pickren  
New York, NY  
November 13, 2006*

**When citing this interview, please use the following citation:**

Tobach, E. (2006, November 16). Interview by A. Rutherford and W. Pickren [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. New York, NY.

**For permission to use this interview in published work, please contact:**

Alexandra Rutherford, PhD  
Project Director, Psychology's Feminist Voices  
[alexr@yorku.ca](mailto:alexr@yorku.ca)

**©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010**

**Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project**  
**Interview with Ethel Tobach**  
**Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford and Wade Pickren**  
**American Museum of Natural History**  
**New York, NY**  
**November 13, 2006**

ET: Ethel Tobach, Interview participant

AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer

WP: Wade Pickren, Interviewer

---

AR- We both are curious about your training. We're going to go way back to the beginning: your training at Hunter College in the 1940s.

ET- Well, I was just telling people yesterday that I had five majors, because I couldn't make up my mind about what I wanted to do. When I came to Hunter in 1937, before your parents were born, I was an English major. I was an English major for one year because I had a big fight with the poetry people. But, that's beside the point. Then I got married, so I decided that I would go into something that was more practical. First I was an Economics major, then I was a Business Economics major, then I was Pre-Med, and then I was an Educational Psychology major. But when I was in Educational Psychology it didn't matter, because Hunter just had Psychology, they didn't care what specialty you were.

So at that point, I decided that I didn't want to do Educational Psych because it was pretty bad, and so I took three courses with someone- he taught all three courses- who was a real leader in Psychology and in Hunter College. He had gotten his PhD from Columbia when he was twenty seven. His name was Bernard Reiss, and people don't know about him now, but something should be written up for the archive because he's a wonderful, wonderful man. I took Abnormal, Experimental and Comparative with him. At that point, he was doing research here at the museum [The American Museum of Natural History]. He was a very strong materialist, almost a dialectical materialist, maybe he was but I'm not sure. He was involved with the museum, and at the museum T. C. Schneirla was the psychologist here, and he had a brilliant student named Daniel Lehrman, you know that name, right. And Danny was working on his famous paper which got published in 1953 on exposing Konrad Lorenz for his whole history, everything about him.

So at that point, I was taking Comparative Psychology in the fall of, I don't know what year it was, forty-something with Ted Reiss, and I heard all about Konrad Lorenz and Ethology, and the museum, and Danny, and also Jay Rosenblatt who was here at that

time. One of my fellow classmates was a woman who was the sister-in-law of Danny Lehrman. So when I said I was thinking of going into Comparative, well “You should go and talk to Danny and Jay because they really know everything about the museum and everything about Comparative, and see what they say.” And they were both teaching assistants for their PhDs at City College. They were staying in- I have to tell you because I loved it- they were staying in the attic of City College.

AR- Oh my gosh. (3:21)

ET- Two little rooms with a window, you know. And I said to them “What do you think about my going into Comparative?” So they said “Oh, it’s a great subject, etc.” And they told me all about it. I think at that time somebody said, but I don’t remember which one of them said, “Well you know, there are no women in Comparative Psych.” So I said, you know, “I don’t care about that”.

So I came, and they said you should meet with Schneirla to see if he’ll take you on as a student. So I met with him, and he said “Well,” he said, “I think you should at least take a course with me first to see if...”, you know. I was graduating in, I guess, January or February from Hunter, so I went into NYU in the second term of Comparative Psychology on the advanced level. In that course were some very good people: it was Danny, and Jay and Sid Levine and Harold Moltz, and I don’t know how many other people [who] became very famous later on. And there I was, you know, I had just this one course. I got an A- in the course. So, I thought “Well.” And he said, “Okay, you can come work at the museum.

AR- Wow.

ET- So that was my training actually, because then I took my PhD at NYU. Oh, and I’ll have to tell you something that you should know. Now, what the hell was his name? Who was the famous social psychologist at NYU?

WP- Stuart Cook?

ET- Stuart Cook, right. Stuart Cook; he interviewed me to see if I should be accepted into the program. He said “Well, you know, we don’t take married women usually, because they get their PhD and then they never come back and work in the field because they have kids and a family.” You know I was so innocent at that time, so I started to argue with him, I said “No, my husband understands that perfectly, we’re very happy for me to take the courses, and I want to continue in the field,” and so on. So I got in.

AR- Wow.

ET- But, I’m so ashamed of the fact that I didn’t fight him on that, because I just, you know. I thought, well, you know, he’s telling me the truth.

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ET- Then I came to work in the museum as a volunteer, and at the same time I was able to get a little bit of a job with a man who was working on TB, through Schneirla, again. And that's it. I mean, I really got my training here with him, and Lester Ahranson was very important in that. And actually from Jay and Danny we only had theoretical discussions; we never talked about real research because they were both very busy with their PhDs.

WP- They were a few years ahead of you then. (5:56)

ET- Oh yeah. Because Danny was already working on his wing doves upstairs, in a place that was a hallway. By the way, historically, I don't think that was ever recorded. What happened was this Department of Animal Behavior had this whole floor plus the entire sixth, seventh floor and it was a department that was started by a very, very brilliant man named...it'll come to me in a minute. No, I'm just very embarrassed because I know him so well, and I'm talking about other things, all the other thoughts...see, it's not because my memory loses it, but because I have too many other things confusing it.

AR- Right, right. It'll come back.

ET- So, anyway, Nobel, G. K. Nobel. Okay, so when he founded this department, he had the brilliant idea that you could not understand systematics and evolution if you did not understand the ecology, the hormones, the genes, the behavior, everything. You had to work with a lot of species to know what was really going on. So, when he opened this department on the seventh floor, he had dogs, and fish, and roosters, and rats, and that was about all- and cats, he might have had some cats, but I don't remember. This was in the 20s, way before I came here, but I remember the stories. The only problem that they had was that the roosters used to wake up the people across the street, and they were very upper-class people. But, he had most of his problems with the people in the museum because they didn't like having live animals in the museum. He was a very forthright person who didn't hesitate to tell you what he thought of you, you know. He was a very, very smart man and very good. So, he founded this department.

The reason I'm telling you this is that when I came here there was no room for Danny to have his birds any place because so much else was going on. And Aaronson had fish, and they had to grow their own daphny and stuff like that. You know, it was a very big place and a lot of things were going on. So they put him in the hallway between the elevator and the stairs. He had two walls on which he would have fluorescent lights that went on at different times so he'd get the different day-night cycles. He had a room at the end of the hall in which he was supposed to be doing his analysis of the glands and everything else. And it was a mess, it was horrible, but that's alright.

Jay, at that point was doing something, I think, with Schneirla...yes, he was working with Schneirla on cats and they had a big room in the back with cages of cats. So then when I came and had to do my dissertation, I got Danny's old room up on top, but I had to run my animals in the closet down on the sixth floor. So I was going up down; I was doing twenty animals a day, so I had to go up and down twenty times a day.

AR- Wow.

ET- And do my observation in the closet, then have my colony upstairs. But Danny had his birds in there and we had those lamps up and those cages up until the 1980s, I think, late 1970s. Because nobody cared about what was going on here. (9:37)

But Danny and Jay...and then Jay did his famous work on the cats and so on. First he did the wonderful work on the relationship between females and their infants, their young. At the same time I was doing research in the rooms across the hall, with cats and parturition. So, we had a lot of cats. Then Aaronson was doing cats with Jay in here later on with the sex behavior. So all of that was going on here; it was really very, very active and very good.

AR- Tell us a little bit about your dissertation research and what you did. It was Schneirla who basically supervised you, or?

ET- No, Schneirla was my sponsor.

AR- Okay.

ET- The thing that was so remarkable about Schneirla is that he never, never forced his students to do things that only he was interested in. He was always very interested in things that people thought they were doing. That was very good because he didn't particularly like mice, I was doing it with mice. He liked rats very much, because he used to have a pet rat that sat on his shoulder when he was at NYU, not when he was here, but when he was at NYU. He also liked cats very much, so he used to go in and pet the cats a lot that were in the cages here. So the cats in our cages were really very well suited for the life that they led. They had a lot of interaction with people and with each other that kept them very healthy and very good so that when people said we were doing bad things with the cats it was very bad. Because Aaronson actually invented a cage in which the cats had a shelf to sit on, and they were let out of the cage when the cages were being cleaned and stuff like that. It was a very, very different approach to cats because they both loved cats very much. Schneirla had- no he was in an apartment where he couldn't have animals, he didn't have any cats at home. But Aaronson had cats at home. So it was a very, very different kind of lab in many ways.

But, when I spoke to Schneirla about what I wanted to do, the reason he was interested in what I was going to do was because I was talking about emotion and the evolution of emotional behaviors. So, that was fine. But, he never said a word about my dissertation. I mean, at the end I typed my dissertation up in four days, that's ninety six hours, in the seminar were, and there were so many typos in it that one of the people on the committee said "I never saw a dissertation with so many typos in it," because I went all the way through without sleeping just to get the thing done on time, and so on and so forth. But we had a lot of discussion about Comparative Psychology, because while I was doing my dissertation, and I think a year or two after that, Zinyan Quo was writing his famous

book on development and evolution and he would send us his chapters. Well, he would send them to Schneirla for Schneirla to look at and comment on them. And Schneirla was very busy with his own work so he said “Why don’t you do it.” And I said, “I’m not going to do it alone, I’ll do it with you.” So we did it together. So we spent a lot of time on that and I’m very ashamed to say I can’t find those papers now. They’re in there someplace; I don’t know where they are, but anyway. (13:15)

But, we did a lot of work on that, and a lot of the things that Zinyan Quo changed in his paper were a result of our conversation, what we wrote back to him. You see, that’s the correspondence I’d like to find because it was from him and to him. He was writing to us on that very thin air-postal paper and then we would send them back. Anyway. So, I had a lot to do with him and Jay and Danny on Comparative Psychology and with people in the lab who were not so keen on what we were saying so we had a lot of arguments and discussion. So that was very good. And Aaronson was part of that too because he was busy with his thing...everybody was busy, you know, but we did get to talk a lot about that.

My dissertation was supposedly on emotional behavior in mice. At that time the big thing was open-field behavior. I was very skeptical about what they thought was open-field behavior, so I was looking at my mice in terms of what their early experience was before they got put into an open-field behavior type of thing. Do you want a copy of that paper, or do you have it?

AR- I would love a copy, sure.

ET- Okay, so I’ll give you a copy of that. Because it finally got published in a book on emotional behavior, no on social behavior, I think. I don’t remember what it got published in. And on that paper Schneirla and I were co-authors so he went over it before it got published and so on. What I tried to show in that paper was that open-field behavior was, to call it emotional behavior is crazy. Then I wrote a paper on emotional behavior and evolution which also explains why I don’t think that’s really the term to use for behavior that you see in many species including human beings that is called emotional; but it’s a very different kind of behavior for different animals so you can’t really call it emotion. What I really based it on was that most people were actually talking about response to stress. That that was what they thought was emotional behavior. I said humans have all kinds of emotions that animals don’t have, you know. Anyway, I’m saying it now which is so many years later, so who knows what I said then.

That was what the dissertation was on, and while I was going to school at NYU I decided I should get a Masters in case I didn’t do well on my dissertation. So I did a Masters on behavior in rabbits. I got the masters, and I had to give a presentation of my research at NYU. I think it was Kendel was at NYU then. Wasn’t he at NYU then? Not Kendel, it was another Skinnerian who was there.

WP- Howard Kendler?

ET- Kendler, Kendler that was his name, not Kendel, right. So I gave my presentation and he stood up at the end and he said “Another one of Schneirla’s ideas”, and walked out. He was so mad at what I said. And that’s the kind of thing I remember, you know, because that was, wow, you know. But I ignored it. Then I published that paper because I found a relationship between the organization of space for the animals that changed during their pregnancy and parturition and so on. That was what I remember about NYU. (16:43)

AR- Okay.

WP- Let me ask another question about NYU. Now you were doing your work up here while a doctoral student at NYU.

ET- That’s right.

WP- How aware were you of the atmosphere at NYU; you had Stuart Cook there, Isidor Chein, I think Marie Jahoda was there.

ET- She was the only one I responded to, I’ll tell you how that happened too.

WP-Okay.

ET- You see, I’m a very- maybe it’s not very nice of me- but I sat in those classes and I thought “Well, I’ll give them back what they’re giving me so I can get the hell out of here fast.” You know, I didn’t care what they were talking about. But Jahoda was very interesting, so I did take this Social Psych class with her. We had a very good class; the people that were in it were very good. So we had a lot of good discussions. But, in the end I also felt that I didn’t quite go along with all that she was saying, so I didn’t...

WP- Talk about that a little bit, do you remember? Where you disagreed with her about things or...

ET- I’m sure that anything I say now will be colored by what I know now that I didn’t know then. So I don’t really know. Except that I felt that she didn’t deal sufficiently with issues of race, and gender, and class. I mean, she was a very good analytical, theoretical person. So I could get a lot of stuff from her. She was doing interesting work at the time, I don’t even remember any more. But we had good discussions in the class because of the fact that we didn’t all agree with her. And so I never persisted in any kind of relationship with her because of that. And, I think she was also having problems with her husband at that time...something was going on, I don’t remember what it was. But anyhow, so I didn’t have much to do with her.

I didn’t know Chein at all because he was mostly in the Clinical program. And I didn’t have much to do with Stuart Cook. Oh, that’s not quite true. I just remember now that I did have something to do with Stuart Cook because we formed an organization called Psychologists...you remember that this was at the time of the beginning of the Vietnam

War. So that was very, very important in my life at that time. And Eleanor Leacock, who was an anthropologist, and I became friendly about that time. And then we formed an organization which had a lot of very big names in it, like Stuart Cook and Margaret Mead, and Brodjinski, and the guy who invented RADAR, whose name I've forgotten right now, you know, they were all there. And Eleanor and I were doing all the work and they were very pontifical, everything that they said and did. We organized a few conferences at which these people spoke. And then Eleanor and I decided that it was a waste of our time and we just left, and it died. (19:41) But it was the result of the action of a very active man named Harry Lerner, who should also be in the Psychological ...you know his name?

WP- No, I...

ET- You know, Harry Lerner is a very interesting man. I don't know if he's still alive, he might still be alive. Because he formed an organization of Psychologists for...I would say Social Response, but it wasn't Social Response, it was something else. I have all the records. And he organized a lot of very good symposia for the psychologists of the New York area. And it was a very active organization, and there were some very wonderful people in there, and I have all their names someplace. But he...you know, it's unfortunate but there's always a lot of conflict and tension among the people who are in an organization so the thing didn't last much longer. So by the time we formed this other organization we decided that we wouldn't involve Harry Lerner because he was having all these fights with all these people, so we didn't want to be involved with that. But we did have some very good conferences. And I have all that material someplace. And it should go into the archives.

WP- It should.

ET- Yeah. So one of the things I want to do is I want to go through all those filing cabinets and send this stuff to the archives, but we'll get to doing that soon. Maybe this summer, I don't know.

But the main thing is that I really didn't have anything to do with NYU at that time, except for the fact that Stuart Cook was in that organization. We choose him because he was a social psychologist, he had a peace interest, so that was good. And Schneirla would have nothing to do with anything like that at the NYU because...do you have the history of Schneirla as a union organizer?

WP - No, I don't.

ET- That's right, you see. What happened was that when he came to NYU, he came to NYU after having been at Carmichael, no, Lashley's lab. And he and his wife were both liberal people. And so when he came to NYU the condition among the teachers was pretty bad. So they organized a teachers' union. He was very, very active in the teachers' union. As a matter of fact, when I came home and told Charlie, my husband, that I was going to have an interview with Schneirla, he said "Schneirla", he says, "I



know that name, there aren't many people with that name." He says, "I know, he was in the Psychologists League that defended the Spanish Civil War people against Franco." And he was a member of that so he knew his name from that.

WP- Psychologists League, that was a group in the 1930s.

ET- That's right. (22:21)

WP- Yeah

ET- And he was in that, and he wrote a piece for that which I have in his collected papers.

WP- Oh, I'd love to read that.

ET- Yeah. So, the problem was that the way it always goes with organizations is that they didn't fulfill what they were supposedly committed to. So, he ended up out by himself fighting for something that he believed in. So he would have nothing to do with them. But he did do some very good things while he was at NYU. Do you know the books that he did there?

WP- I do know some of his work.

ET- Do you know about the stuff that he did with other faculty people on experiments in psychology?

WP- Yes, Kraffs or Krauffs and Schneirla on Recent Experiments in Psychology, yes.

ET- Right, yeah yeah. He tried very hard to get his ideas into that, but they were very good. Elsa Robinson was in that. Oh, Elsa was another person that I did continue being friendly with because she was in Developmental. I was interested in development at that time. So, I did get to see her. In fact, I had a date with her when she was almost dying and so when I came to the apartment, I think it was her son who said to me "You know, she really shouldn't be bothered now", and stuff like that. So, I never got to talk to her again. But, I was in communication with her all through the years. I mean, not a lot, but, from time to time we would talk to each other.

So those were the only people I had anything to do with there. Oh, the other man that I did have something to do with who was one person who stuck with Schneirla on the union business and that was Kraft, is that the name you said?

WP- I think Krauffs, or...

ET- Kraft. Kraft.

WP-Okay.

ET- Kraft. Because he was always very sympathetic to all that Schneirla believed and he was a very sweet man. And he lived, he and his wife lived...his family and Schneirla's family at that time lived in the same place in Queens and it was near where I used to live, so I knew that whole area. And I did go to visit him at one time. We were doing the book on Schneirla, the two books on Schneirla, and he wasn't dead yet. He was a very sweet man, but I don't remember too much about him in terms of anything else. But, he did do stuff there that was along Schneirla's line which was good. (24:36)

So that was the only thing that I really had to do at NYU that I can remember now.

AR- Okay, okay.

WP- Yeah, your career sounds like it developed kind of independently of NYU even though your degree is from NYU.

ET- Right, yeah. It was really the museum.

AR- Right.

ET- And of course now, you know, the museum gives masters and PhDs.

WP- Oh, I didn't know that.

AR- I didn't know...wow.

ET- They just got it like, last month sometime.

WP- Wow.

ET- They've been working on it for a while. But, it's a very funny program. Let's not go into that.

WP- Okay, alright.

AR- Do you want to tell us a little bit about how you first got involved with SPSSI?

ET- With SPSSI, yes. Now, but you see, when I was a graduate student, I knew about SPSSI and SISSI. At that time the impression I had about SPSSI and SISSI was that they were the outcome of the Psychologist's League, and I think it may have been a Sociologist's League, I don't know; and that they were supposed to be the people who kept Psychology's conscience clear in some way, I'm not sure how. That was something I was very interested in because I was feeling very strongly about Lorenz and the way he had been accepted by everybody in the United States and England and Europe, he was a bastard but, anyway. So, I always wanted to be part of SPSSI, you see. And I think I wasn't able to join SPSSI until I got my PhD.

AR- Okay, so you had tried to, but they had...

ET- No, I don't know if I tried even, but I think that that's why I knew I was going to be an APA member and a SPSSI member. So I joined SPSSI. But I was never very active with them because I wasn't really the kind of social psychologist that they were, you know, and so it was not quite the same thing. And I was too busy doing research and I just had to get my career organized. (26:40)

But at one point, I guess it was during the Vietnam War, I did become sufficiently active with them because I was concerned about psychologists not doing enough about the war. And so I became sufficiently active to be on their board, I think or something like that. Wasn't I on it? I don't remember exactly what it was. And then I was actually a candidate for Council of Representatives where I thought I could really have something to say. And I was the SPSSI representative. All I remember about that period was the fight I had with them.

AR- Okay, well tell us about that.

ET- Because I was the Council Rep, right? And I was elected, right? And so some issue came up in the APA Council, I don't remember what the issue was, and I voted the way I felt it should be voted. So it was a big argument on the board as to whether I was representing SPSSI's view or my view. I said, "But SPSSI has to have more than one view, and the people who elected me knew that I would have a different view or I would have a view that they had to know about". And I said, "And I didn't hide what I was doing." So we had a big fight about this; I never got elected again. That was the story from SPSSI. But that's all that I remember, because you know what happened at that time. We were meeting in Ann Arbor, and my sister-in-law was dying and I got a telephone call that I had to come to the hospital because the family wanted her not to be kept on life-support, and the doctor wouldn't let them do that. So I had to go back to Massachusetts to find a doctor who would agree to let them do what they wanted to do with the body and everything. So, I left even before the Council meeting was over, or whatever they call that meeting, was over. So that's why I don't remember very much about SPSSI. I remember the fight I had before I left, that was the thing that counted, yeah.

AR- Well, can you tell us a little bit more generally about this...you've mentioned, you know, obviously you've made a career for yourself in Comparative Psychology, but you also, it seems, from very early on had a deep interest in issues of race, gender, class. And so how did those kind of co-exist?

ET- You know, I've said this story so many times, I don't know why people don't know it because I don't hide it. See, my mother and father were Socialist Zionists, they were Labor Zionists. And so when my father died and my mother had to take care of me and I grew up with her, she was very...she was a woman who never became organizationally involved with anything, she would never join an organization or anything, but she was

very clear about the fact that as a woman I could do anything I wanted to do and that there was nothing to hold me back. And that was partly because of her own father and family, where she was living in a little village in the Ukraine, and her father was supporting her to become a Botanist in Odessa, you know. So, that was alright. He was a very interesting man. I wish I had known more about him, I never thought to ask her all the things I should have known, but anyway. (29:47)

My mother raised me in a very left orientation. Very early I went to a Yiddish school which was not religious, it was a secular school and it was called the "Umpatayishe Shula", which means it's a non-partisan school. You see, so that we were not partisan to any...but we were very labor organized and left organized. And so I always grew up with things that my mother acted and said that meant that you, first of all, were very concerned about people who were poor and who didn't have the same possibilities that you had to do what you wanted to do. And that there were all kinds of different people that you should be friendly with. And that Labor was an important thing; that you had to support labor. So she was the kind of woman who, when we came to New York she worked in a factory. And the workers there saw that she was the real leader of the finishers- that's not the people who sewed the garments, but who finished the garments. So I had the feeling right away that I should be more involved with organizations than she was because I could see that she was supporting her union and she was doing things for the union but she really wasn't going to be a leader in the union, or anything like that. And I didn't think of myself as a leader either. But I grew up with that. I mean, that was what everything was about.

So when I came to New York, I also sought out people who thought the way that we thought. It was hard until I got to high school. See, in high school, they were very active in the peace movement. And so I became very active in the peace movement at that time. And that was in '36 to '37. And we also had at that time an organization called the American Student Union, you've probably never even heard of that. The American Student Union was a very interesting organization, because what they did was that they were able to unite the Socialists and the Communists into one organization. Now, that was really very hard to do at that time. So we were very active in all kinds of labor issues, and race issues, and school issues in terms of freedom of expression and studies and things like that. And we had a very good group of teachers and students. The school that I went to was Thomas Jefferson High School, which also had a very interesting history. But I won't tell you about that now. Anyway, so that was part of the way I always thought.

But, you notice what's missing? Gender. You see, the women were very different at that time. We were very active in an organization, but we never really fought against the fact that all the leaders were men, mostly. Occasionally there was a woman who was a leader too, but most of the time it was the men. And so that was that. But, then when I got here- I guess the beginning of the Women's Movement you would say was around when, 1960-something, 70-something?

AR- Yeah, the 60s.

ET- And so when I got here...who was it here...oh I guess it was my friendship with Eleanor Leacock that did this then, because Eleanor was a very good feminist and she and I got to be very close and friendly. And so at that time I became very interested in the women's issue. And I also became interested in the New York Academy of Sciences during the Vietnam War. There was a very good couple that edited the magazine that the New York Academy of Sciences did. They organized a session outside of the Academy on the sidewalk to talk about the Vietnam War. (33:51) They asked me to come and talk on that. I don't know what I was doing that they knew my name. But, anyhow I got invited to do that. So I got there and I met them and I realized that the Academy was a really, very closed organization. So I became active in the Academy too. There we also began to talk about Women's roles in science.

At that time the Association for Women in Science got founded. so I became active in the New York Association for Women in Science. And the person who brought me into that was a woman name Betty Rosoff with whom I edited the Genes and Gender series after that. She was a biologist. She was a very militant woman who was very, very...she was very nice. She never got into confrontations like I did, she was very diplomatic. But she was very strong about what she thought about women in science. And we had a very big fight with the New York Association for Women in Science and the two of us left it. Because, this was a story that I don't think is ever written any place, but it was awful. I won't mention the names of the people because one of them has now become very friendly, I don't know why. Anyway- you see, 'women in science' meant that they might get to the masters degree and they might work as scientific assistants in somebody's lab. But they very rarely could get any further, and most of those women were women of color. You know, so it was a very important aspect. So Betty and I felt that we should have an organizing campaign for the Association for Women in Science, for masters students and for scientific assistants; not PhD people only, but we should have everybody in that organization.

We had a very big fight with the leadership of the New York Association for Women in Science. And one of them even said to us, "I can't stand all this post-menopausal anger," because Betty and I were older than any of the others...so, you know. That really did it for us. We said to hell with them, we got out of there fast.

AR- What did they object to about you advocating for masters level people, what was their objection to that?

ET- They said we should be PhD, we should be the highest level, we should [be representing] people who are recognized, we want to organize the women, you know. We won't go into that now but that was...

AR- Okay. I noticed that you've been a member of the Association for Women in Psychology, AWP, which started in the late 60s, 69-ish. Can you tell me about that?

ET- In the meantime, during the Vietnam War and earlier, we had formed an organization called Psychologist for Social Action. I don't know if you have that in your archives?

WP- A little bit, we have a little bit.

ET- You know who you should get in touch with? Doris K. Miller. She was a very important person in that. (36:48)

And unfortunately Howie Gruber is dead now, but he and Doris and I and a few other people. It's a history that should be in Psychology because it was a very, very important thing. At that time, when Psychologists for Social Action was formed, we were talking for all the marginalized people in psychology: blacks, women, gays, everybody. And we had very good meetings, we had a good newsletter and everything else. But what was happening, which is very important and very great, is that while we had started this at the very beginning of the war and really had become active in speaking for all these people and getting them to do things, they decided to go out on their own; so that the blacks formed their own organization. I don't think the gays had an organization at that point.

WP- Not yet.

ET- No. But, the women had an organization. And so I joined. In fact I was a founder of that organization, and we had a lot of discussions. And when they decided to become Division 35, I and a few other people were very opposed to that, because we knew that once you get into the APA, you become formalized into their way of doing things, you only can be a gadfly.

AR- Can you tell me about those discussions, who was involved?

ET- Oh, don't tell me about names. You know, I don't want to...I mean, there was a woman Joan, I don't remember Joan's second name, I have it someplace. She and I, and there was another woman who was a very troubled woman about what was happening to women in psychology. She was very articulate and spoke a lot, but she was so obviously stressed that people didn't respond to her. So...

AR- This wasn't Joanne Gardner?

ET- Well, Joanne Gardner was the one that I remember. Joanne. See, Joanne dropped out of all that- have you talked with her?

AR- I haven't yet. I'm trying to track her down, though.

ET- You should talk with her. I think I still, I might have it.

WP- She's in Pittsburgh, I think.

AR- We think she's in Pittsburgh.

ET- No, no, that's Irene...

AR- Well, Irene Frieze is there in Pittsburgh.

ET- Yeah, she's in Pittsburgh. But Joanne was in Texas.

WP- Really? Okay. (39:06)

ET- Yeah, she was in Texas the last time I heard from her.

AR- Oh, really? Okay.

ET- I have something.

AR- Rhoda Unger's been trying to get me in touch with her, but...

ET- Yeah. Well, Rhoda would know, I mean she's a good historian so she would know where people are. But, it was Joanne Gardner and this other woman Joan, I think- those are the only two that I remember very clearly, because everybody else was very eager to get into the APA. We were very much opposed to that.

WP- We have people like Nancy Henley who were involved with AWP.

ET- Who?

AR- Nancy Henley. Also Martha...

ET- No, Henley was the historian from the new school? Mary?

WP- Not Mary [Henle]. No, Nancy Henley.

AR- She did a book on Touch.

ET- I don't remember her particularly. Maybe she came in late. Oh, and Carolyn Sherif was very active in AWP. She was a leader of AWP. But I don't remember that she took the stand that I took on the APA. I don't remember that. I think she gave in on that. See and Muzafer and Schneirla were very good friends. And I don't know if Carolyn was part of that. She probably was because Muzafer did everything with her. So, I don't know, but anyway. We had that big discussion. AWP was very good at the beginning. I mean, we really got a lot of things done at APA, as an outside organization that was going to be fighting for a particular program we could do things in APA. But once you're in APA...anyways.

WP- They co-opt the energy that you have, right.

ET- And to get anything done you have to go through hell.

WP - Right. But, I want to go back to the Psychologists for Social Action, and ask you to talk more about that. Because at APA, you know, we have some, a very small little bit of materials on that. And it was clear that there were programs put forward for the convention and...

ET-And I have some of it, and Doris has some of it, and other people may have some of it. And, do you know Sylvia Scribner? (41:11)

WP- Know her name, and that's all.

ET- She has to be in the archives, God damn it. I'm so angry about this because there's so many good...Sylvia and I and Eleanor were very close friends at one point during the Vietnam period because that was the thing everybody was very active in. And Sylvia was a brilliant psychologist who came from a labor background, she had been educational director of a labor union, I think the Electrical Workers' Union, and she decided to go into psychology. And she did brilliant work with Mike Cole on illiteracy in Africa, and on the number concept. She was really...we did two books on her- you don't have those books do you?

WP-No.

ET- That's terrible. I really have to give you all that information. And Sylvia was very active in Psychologists for Social Action in the beginning, because the way Psychologists for Social Action became formed was in San Francisco during 1968 when the police were so brutal to the protestors against the Vietnam War in Chicago. And she and Howie Gruber and Jack Sawyer and a lot of other people became very active in forcing the APA not to have their next meeting in Chicago, but they had it in Washington. They not only got that passed, but they also got passed the idea that the APA had to examine its behavior in socially responsible activity, and that the meeting in Washington would be on the social responsibility of Psychology, which quickly became part of the official APA thing. So they did not recognize the role of Psychologists for Social Action. And Sylvia gave one of the most wonderful papers there, and organized a session with Howie Gruber and other people which got lost. I have it all written out, you'll have to look at the books and then you'll get the picture of what happened really.

How did we get onto this topic? Because you were asking me about Psychologists for Social Action; and so after San Francisco and after Washington with what happened there, we decided to keep the organization going, and we tried very hard to organize all the people. But, you see, what was happening was that people were forming their own organizations. So that, for example, originally we had educators and physicians and all kinds of computer people, everybody was in it. But then they each decided that they wanted to do their own thing. And so, Doris and Howie Gruber tried to develop something called the Dolphin Center- you've got to get in touch with Doris Miller and get her story because she not only has material but she has a wonderful memory, she's



not like me. She's close to my age, but not quite, but she's really very, very good. And so they started the Dolphin Center which was supposed to be a place where all the different groups could be together and do things. That didn't work. And so Rosamin Geonousos and John Geonousos and I decided to keep the New York Psychologists for Social Action going. We put some newsletters out. And then finally we realized that everybody was so busy with their own agendas that we couldn't do it anymore, so we gave it up.

WP- Do you still have those materials from the New York group? (44:50)

ET- There's some... I mean, I come across things every one in a while when I'm looking for something else. What I have to do is I have to go through all of my stuff and organize it. But I have so many other things going on now that are even more important that I don't get to do them, you know. But, I really do want to do it. You have to talk to Doris Miller, I'm sorry that Gruber is dead now. Jack Sawyer is still alive and in San Francisco, and he'll tell you things that were very good. The other people I think are gone. So that's very serious. And we've got to do that early. So, I don't know if the archives have the personnel to do all this, that's the problem.

WP- We can make a good effort. Do you know where Doris Miller is?

ET- Yes. She's- let me get my book so I can get- you want the address now?

WP- No, no, we can get it later.

ET- I'll give it to you later, because she's still around. And Jack Sawyer always sends me very nice little cards and things like that for all the things that we remember together. He's very good, but he's not as active as he used to be in Psychology. And who else that you should...oh, you know who else is also around that if you really want to know something about Psychology in New York School, no, what's the school down on 12<sup>th</sup> Street?

WP- New School?

ET- New School. Mary Henle.

WP- Is she still around?

ET- Let me tell you about her. This is very interesting. Mary Henle is living in the same residence that Doris Miller is living in. That place is filled with psychologists and academics of all kinds. It was founded by the people from the four schools that are around, you know Haverford, and Villanova and you know, all those, Swarthmore. So they're a group of Quakers there who founded this residence. And it's a very, very nice residence. It's expensive, but it's very nice. So, Mary Henle is still alive. She lives there with her sister. But, of course her vision is bad and her hearing is bad, but her memory is still good. And I had a visit from a young – you sent me to him, no not you- Dave Baker

sent him to me: a German psychologist who is doing a history of psychology. He wanted to talk with Mary Henle. So I was able to get Doris to talk to Mary about his calling her. And he called her, but she couldn't hear what he was saying, and he has a thick German accent so it was very bad. But, I've been in touch with him since because he's still working around here. And he said he's going to go down there, because it's not very far to go to, and he's going to try to interview her directly.

WP- That would be good. (47:24)

ET- That will be very good. I can give you all that information. And I hope that before I die I'll get all that stuff done, because that really has to be done, and I will do it. Even though my memory's bad, I'll do it- I promise you. What else do you want to ask me?

AR- Okay. Well, let me ask a little more about the Women's Movement. This is a particular interest of mine. So, you mentioned being active in the New York Academy vis a vis women in science issues, women in psychology, and in AWP. Were you involved outside psychology in terms of...what was your experience of the Second Wave of the Women's Movement?

ET- Well, I knew that at the museum, we never had more than five women on the curatorial staff at any one time. At one point we were as low down as three, I think.

AR- Wow.

ET- Now, this department was very, very remarkable. Aaronson and Schneirla would never have called themselves feminists, but they were always very sensitive about women and blacks and things like that because this department had a history with blacks- I'll tell you about that sometime. When I got my degree I went to work at NYU. I was promised there that I'd be able to set up an animal lab and do research in psychiatry and things like that. Well, that was a lot of baloney. Things were very bad there for me. So, eventually...well, I'll give you one little example of that, okay? The head of psychiatry, when he heard I was leaving there to come to the museum, he said, "Why are you going?", he said "Oh, I know, you were having fights with Arnie." I said, "Yeah", he said "Aren't you married?" I said, "Yeah", and he said "Hasn't your husband beaten that out of you yet?" This was the head of Psychiatry talking to me, so that was an example of what was going on there and I got out of there as fast as I could and I came back here.

At that time the NIH [National Institutes of Health] had a program for post-docs who were going to be career development people, or something like that. So I had that for ten years, and I was here at the museum at that time. I knew that the museum was very, very non-feminist organized, and they certainly, until World War Two they didn't have any Jews that were known as Jews on the curatorial staff. The one Jew that they had on the curatorial staff discovered that when he had come down for his interview, the man who was in charge of the committee that had interviewed him wrote to the man at Harvard who had sent him down saying: "How dare you send us a Jew." So he said, "You asked me for the best student, I send you the best student." Years later I talked to him about this

and he said, “Well, I didn’t realized what had happened,” he said, “when I came down for my interview they said I had to have dinner with Osborne.” Is that the...Fairfield Osborne. “And I said to him, you know, I can’t have dinner with you Thursday night because I’m teaching a seminar, you know, as a teaching assistant.” He didn’t realize the reason they had him go to dinner with him was to see if he knew how to use knives and forks, or something, you know; that this was because he was a Jew who was being suggested for the Anthropology department. About six months after he was hired, he had to go to the files to look for something, he found the folder marked Harry Shapiro, his name. And in there was this whole correspondence about why they wouldn’t hire him. (51:08). So he said “At first I was going to quit because I was so angry,” he said, “but then I decided I’m going to stay and stick their noses into it.” Well, this man was anything but what you would call a militant, anti-Semitic fighter, or anything like that. He then became an expert in identifying people according to their race because as an anthropologist, as a physical anthropologist he could talk about whether they had the right hair and...that was his career, really. It was a very...it showed you how people are very contradictory, you have to understand them. He was a very, very, a very rigid man in many ways. But that’s beside the point.

At that time, when this happened in 1968, we formed Psychologists for Social Action. And then, dear old E.O. Wilson wrote his book. And we were all very reactive to that.

WP- *Sociobiology*.

ET- Right. And what people don’t know and I’m going to tell you- do you know about where sociobiology really came from, where that term came from?

WP- No.

ET- It came from...it’ll come to me in a minute, from the man who did the genetics of the dog with...up in Bar Harbor. J. P. Scott.

WP- Okay.

ET- Scott was very active in the Ecological Association of America. In fact, we would go there and give papers on behavior and he was active in trying to get the ecologists to recognize that behavior was an important part of anything to do with evolution and ecology. He had sessions on that. At one of his sessions, he said that what we have to study is the biology of the social behavior and we have to have sociobiology. That was in 1950. Wilson never gave him credit for that term, or anybody else. And I had a lot of discussions; I mean I got to know J. P. Scott. Even though he worked with genetics, he never really understood what Schneirla was saying but he thought he understood it, so that was nice.

At that time the book came out. I had had that experience with the Association for Women in Science. Betty and I decided that what we should do is hold a women’s meeting at the museum to talk about *Sociobiology* and what it was saying. This was in

January, 1976, I guess, because the book came out in '75. So in January 1976, we had here a man named...who was the director of the museum, Nicholson, who was a good Catholic, and not at all interested in social, political issues at all. But at that time the women were beginning to really be active, so he said he couldn't say no to us. So we had a meeting here on a day when the temperature was close to zero, and it was in January. Four hundred women showed up.

AR- Wow. (54:29)

WP- Wow.

ET- We had a wonderful meeting. We represented the Association for Women in Science, because we had to have them there. We represented, I think AWP was already started at that time, so we had them in there. And we had a group of women at the museum who were going to talk about what happened to women in science here. And I don't know what the fourth organization...there were four organizations that formed to do it. And we had this wonderful meeting. And Betty, who was a very clever woman, said "We can't let this die, we have to continue with this." So we decided to do the first issue of *Genes and Gender*. And then we decided to go on with it. So that was what happened here. That was the last time the museum ever let us have an official meeting here. You know, it was really something, it was really great.

AR- Yeah.

ET- But, the *Genes and Gender* group still met here all the time, we always had...our meetings were here. So, about the AWP, is that what you were asking... women in general?

AR- Yeah, I was just asking kind of in general what your involvement was.

ET- Well, you know, I would be connected with CLUE, you know what CLUE was?

AR- No.

ET- You don't know what CLUE was? CLUE was a group of women in trade unions. And there was a...there were several women's organizations around at that time that I identified with. I wasn't really active with them because I was mostly active with Psychology. I felt that psychologists had to be really pushed to do the [inaudible] things. It's 11:20 is it?

AR- Yeah. What was your impression, I know you had this kind of brief foray into SPSSI. But at the same time, you know, you're forming Psychologists for Social Action. So, what was your impression then of SPSSI, like what they were doing and how they were dealing with things?

ET- They had...see, when the psychologists decided to form SPSSI, they were very concerned [inaudible] the gadflies to make psychologists be the kind of group that they should be. But, you know, once you get into being Division 9 of APA, life changes. I mean, you know, they all had to deal with things that take up a lot of time. And they did some very good things. They had some very good issues in the journal, and they did, I mean, they did a lot of things. But I just felt I couldn't be bothered with that, and I just dropped out of it after that foray because there was really nothing... I mean, then, you see, that's what happened, the reason that I stopped being with SPSSI was that when I was a graduate student in Division 6 of APA, which has been Comparative Physiological Psychology, they decided to drop Comparative. And I was very upset about that. (57:21). At that time...God, I'll remember his name in a minute, Sid Weinstein was working in the lab of Tauber. Tauber was on my committee, and he hated what I was doing but he did it anyway. I went to Sid and to Tauber, because Tauber was very nice about peace and about women- he would invite us all to his lab, to his home and stuff like that. He was a very nice person, but psychologically and scientifically...anyway. I fought with them to fight with Division 6 to get Comparative Psychology back in there. So of course they did that and left me out completely. I mean, like I had nothing to do with it. Okay. But I did get onto the Executive Committee, or whatever they had there, I don't remember what it was. And so there I was able to fight for the following, which was a very great story. And, you know whose doing something on this now? Gee, I just gave them material on that. On what happens to women- oh, what's her name...it'll come to me soon- what happens to women when they enter a field which is dominated by men and then they have to leave that field. And an outstanding example of that is Rhoda Unger. And so I wrote to her and I said...who the hell is doing it, some woman is doing it, and she is doing it...oh: Nancy Dess.

AR- Nancy Dess.

ET- Nancy Dess, you know Nancy Dess?

AR- I don't know Nancy Dess.

ET- Now, Nancy Dess is a very interesting person. I just got to know her the last two years or so.

AR- D-E-S-S, Dess?

ET- D-E-S-S.

AR- Okay.

ET- She was the scientific...she was the liaison between APA and the Scientific Board, or something like that. And I never thought highly of her because she was that [at APA], I mean how could she be anything? But she turns out to be a very interesting person who has understood- I don't know how recently this has all happened because I haven't really investigated that too much with her but- she became very concerned with the role of

women and minorities and things like that. So, she's doing a lot of nice things with Division 6 now. One of the things she's doing is what happens to women when they start out in one field and because it's dominated by men they go into something completely different. So there are a lot of women like that and I'm giving her names as I go along. Two of the women who are like that were Mary Parlee and who was the - was the other person Rhoda? It wasn't Rhoda, maybe it was Mary Lou Cheal? I don't remember now which one it was there at that time. They wanted to get into Division 6 because they were physiological psychologists and they wouldn't take them in. So we had a big fight about that. And both of them went on in the field but they always had trouble as women, I mean (1:00:23), and that went on forever. And they kept in the field but I don't think...you have to talk with them really. Mary Lou Cheal is very active in Division 6 and in APA and although she's a very conservative person, she and I are still friendly because she's really a good person. I think she's a good person anyways. And then Mary Parlee became an expert on transgender and all the other kind of stuff that happens with people. She's a part-time lecturer at Harvard where she also is not recognized for what she should be doing, what they should have recognized her for. And she's happily married so she's very busy with the family and all that kind of stuff, you know. This is what happens to women.

At that time I became very [SWITCH TO DVD #2]...what happened was...you know, I usually get involved in things because somebody calls on me to do something. I don't usually initiate these things because I have too many other things to think about. But, somebody said to me...see, I also joined Psychologists for Social Responsibility- you know about that, you both know about them. And Doris was very active in Psychologists for Social Responsibility. And when they formed Division 48, and I want this on tape, I want this recorded because this was really a very...it's the same thing that's happened to the women. God. So, when they decided to form Division 48, I said "No", I said "they're going to go into APA, it's going to be the same story with them as what happened to the women."

I was very opposed to their forming Division 48, and so were a couple of other people. Let them tell you, I don't want to tell you, let them tell you. So I didn't have anything to do with Division 48 because I was so angry with the fact that they had formed. But then somebody said to me that I really should accept the nomination for president, or something like that, I don't remember what it was but it was something I had never even thought about. So I said okay because at that time...oh, you see what also happened was that that was the first Gulf War. And Sylvia, just before she died, and I had been active in the organization of a session against the war in CUNY, because we were both in CUNY at that time. So, I thought, well this is a good time for me to get some peace because there was a lot going on. If I had known how bad it was going to be...but anyway. So I said, okay I'll run for president. I was surprised, I didn't expect to be elected, but I was elected, so anyway, I was elected. So that's how I got active in the peace thing.

There is something that happened then that I'm not going to talk about because that's part of what I'm going to send to the archives. But, what happened to me was that I think I

suddenly thought, I had good reason to believe, that Division 48 was not dealing with racism in the way they should have dealt with it. So, I won't go into it any more than that. So, I am no longer active with them. Although I am going to attend their Executive Committee meeting because we had a big struggle to get the Executive...see, what happened was that, and I mean so much has happened. Suinn became the president of APA, he was the first Chinese-American president that we had. And he did something very, very brilliant: he formed something called the Multicultural Summit Conference. So what happened was that Division 48 at that time was very with it, and so then we started to have our Executive Committee meetings at the time that the Multicultural Summit Conference was being held. So this time they're not meeting in that expensive place called Hollywood, but they're meeting in Seattle, Washington. So, the Executive Committee didn't want to meet there. So we had a big struggle in the Executive Committee to have the meeting there anyway because we should be there where the Multicultural Summit Conference was being held. (3:36) And Division 48 then became very conscious of the racism issue, so they elected a Secretary who was African-American, they put on the [inaudible] a Spanish-America, Hispanic woman, and they then elected Debbie Reagan, who's an African-American woman as the president. So anyway, so we had enough votes to get them moved to Seattle, Washington.

So, that's an example of what's happening in Division 48. Now, in the meantime Linda Woolf. Oh- so, as a result of the Multicultural Summit Conference a group was formed by Judy Van Horn and a couple of other people- Joe Trimble was in it, a whole bunch of people- Divisions for Social Justice. And now Brad Olsen in the head of that because they elect a new person every year. And they're very, very good, because they've been really very active in doing things to make social justice an issue in the APA. And so when that was formed...I have so many things to tell you, I don't even...so how did we get started on this?

AR- I guess your work in peace Psychology.

ET- Working in peace Psychology...So that's when Division 48 continued to be active in peace Psychology, in that way anyway. And then what happened was that while I was working away here at the museum, besides the women, I became very conscious of all the things that the museum had done in terms of genetic determinism and racism and so on. They had done some very awful things. One of the things that I remembered from school was that everybody was taught in school that there were no horses until the Spaniards brought them here. Now, knowing something about the evolution of horses, I didn't believe that. I just could not believe that that was true. So I became very fortunate in having a very good volunteer working with me, who is a guy who really wanted to be a paleontologist but ended up being a counselor for children in schools, a social worker. So he is a paleontologist and he's retired. He's been doing a search of the literature for every place in which the fossils of humans and horses are found together, going back to forty thousand BC. Some of them are after the Indians agreed that they came here and before the Spaniards came. So that there's a long history of the relationship between horses and Indians that we're going to eventually write up because we have a lot of work to do on it yet. So as a result of that, I joined the Society for Indian Psychologists and

Graduate Students, because I had this stupid idea that I could win their confidence enough for them to talk to me about horses, which they still haven't done. But they've done some very nice things and I really love them. And Joe was very good because I gave him the Division 48 award for his work and then he gave me a very beautiful ceremony in which they gave me a beautiful robe and they said prayers over me and everything. It was very, very nice. And that was Joe's doing. And so I remained with them. Joe is very busy doing a lot of other good things so...

But one of the things that I've been fighting for is the following. You see, the Indians of the United States have had a long tradition in their legacy of, although they fought with each other, they always had ways of reconciling their conflicts and peace was a very important thing. Peace and harmony was very...harmony, especially with the environment and among themselves. So there's a very famous Chief whose name I don't remember at the moment (7:45), who has been preaching peace. He spoke to the UN on this, and he has an organization that goes around the country talking about peace. I wanted very much for us to invite him to our meeting to give a thing on peace, but it was too late. But we're trying to organize one for this coming session on peace. So I felt that there were many aspects to peace that Division 48 was not as active with as they should have been.

One of the other things that I did that I have to tell you about which is very important, is that when we met in Honolulu I organized sessions of indigenous psychologists talking about what happened to them in the transition from colonialism to independence and how they functioned as psychologists. And that issue is coming out I hope before the end of this year with all the papers that were given at those sessions. And I have been working with the two editors of the South Pacific Journal of Psychology.

WP- Is that where it's going to appear?

ET- That's where is going to appear...

WP- I need to get that

ET- ...all those papers are going to appear

WP- South Pacific Journal of Psychology?

ET- South Pacific Journal, yeah, S-P-J-P. And the two editors of that journal are Stuart Carr, who is an Industrial Organizational psychologists, but he's very interesting, in the University of New Zealand, at the, I think it's called Massey, but I'm not sure they have a lot of campuses- and Leo Murrei who is a Papa New Guinea man. And he gave a paper there too. As a result of that, he invited me to Papa New Guinea.

AR- Wonderful.



ET- So I spent five days there, and we're going to have a course in Comparative Psychology, I hope, and he's going to come and talk at City University of New York. And he's the head of Psychology, he may be hiring some psychologists, I mean anyway, I'm very excited about that.

AR- Wow, that's great.

WP- Wow.

ET- And in New Zealand I met all the Maori people. Because one of the Maori is going to get his doctorate at the State University of Utah which has a fabulous program on Indigenous Psychology. He went there to get his degree, to apply there, and now he's been accepted, and he's going to get his degree. He told them that- they thought he would be a clinical psychologist, it's what most of the psychologists are, because there's so many problems on the reservation with Indian people that that's what they need (10:16). So he said, "No, I'm not going to be a clinical psychologist, I want to go back and learn enough psychology so I can go back and help the Maori people in what their fighting for." So they said, you know, "Well, what are you going to do?" So he said, "Well, I guess you can call me a Community Psychologist." They said, "Well, what do you mean by 'community'?" He said, "Well, the Maori concept of community is everything from the sky down to underneath the ground. That's the community."

WP- That's great.

ET- Which is beautiful, I love him for that, that's really great. So I got to know the Maori and I'm hoping to do a lot with them too, because they have...see, they are very different. They're a very organized people and they have won a lot of things that are great. So the universities are in two languages, it's really great. Anyway. So let's go on now.

AR- Yeah.

ET- What else?

AR- Do you have something else you'd like...?

WP- I'd like to... I know that in the early 1970s you were part of the board for Social Responsibility in Psychology.

ET- That's right.

WP- So, in that, I think that's the same time Ken Clark was the Chair of...

ET- Oh, I knew about Ken, yeah, but I knew about Ken not from Psychologists for Social Responsibility but because of another wonderful woman who should be in the archives: Clara Rabinowitz, it's a name you don't know at all.

WP- No.

ET- Now, Clara and I became friendly from the Psychologists from Social Responsibility, I think in the late 1950s, early 1960s. I knew her a very long time, I knew her until she died. She was the first psychologist, white, to go to Ken and Mamie Clark's clinic on 110<sup>th</sup> Street for African- American children in the Harlem area.

AR- She's, yeah, she's in the book, the Markowitz and Rosner book.

ET- In which book?

AR- There's a book called *Children, Race, and Power* written by a couple of historians. I think she features in there. (12:01)

ET- Yeah, oh yeah. Now, she started out as a social psychologist, but she also had a very strong social responsibility sense. She was actually a social worker in St. Louis, or someplace down South, I don't know where she was. But she was always involved with race as an issue. As a Jewish woman, she felt very strongly. She got her training at William Hanson White at Columbia. She never got her doctorate, but she was one of the best clinicians I have ever known. She was really a wonderful clinician, I sent a lot of people to her because she was very good.

So she knew Ken and Mamie Clark very, very well because she was the first white woman psychologists to be a psychologist there. So that's how I knew about Ken and Mamie. I met them through her a couple of times. We never really became friendly in any way because they were very, very busy with their clinic and other things that they were doing. Although I did interview him for something at some...I don't remember what it is but I never got to know Mamie as well because Clara knew Mamie better. But, she knew Ken very well. Then I tried to get in touch with Ken because of something I was...oh, I know. I was on...Ed Gordon. You know the name Ed Gordon? He's a guy who should be in the archives too.

WP- Right, yes. Didn't he just recently retire?

ET- Yeah.

WP- I think so.

ET- Well, his retirement is that he's still as busy as he ever was before, you know.

WP- Yeah, yeah.

ET- But Ed was, now that's another part of psychology that you should, I don't know if it's in the archives at all. See, there was a man names Joseph Wortis, does that name mean anything to you?

WP- W-O-R-T-I-S, right.

ET- Right, yeah. Incidentally, the man who told me that at NYU about my husband, that was his cousin, or his brother, or something. Anyway, they were very different. I became very friendly with Joe because his son was an undergraduate assistant in the museum here. We became very friendly. He married a woman who was Danny Lehrman's student, but she started out here and she worked with me and she worked with Danny. I knew them both very well. But what also was happening was very interesting. Joe was a very strict, materialist, mechanical clinician, who believed in conditioning. I didn't agree with a lot of what he said, but that was okay. So anyhow, Ted Reiss, Gundlach-Ralph Gundlach, Danny Lehrman, Jay Rosenblatt, and Ed Gordon were all psychologists working with Joe Wortis because he was the only one who was willing to let psychologists into the medical-psychiatric setting and do things there. So they could get their training and they were all able to be practicing therapists as a result of that. Ed Gordon went on to get his degree at Columbia, (15:14) with, I think, was Mort Deutsch still...? I mean, he got his degree at Columbia, I think he knew Mort very well, but I don't remember exactly how they knew each other. And Ed married a woman named Sue Gordon who was an MD who was active in *Genes and Gender*. So, you see we were all...

AR- All connected...

ET- Yeah, connected in that way. I knew Ed very well. Then Ed was put in charge of a panel that was investigating the Educational Testing Service, what their testing was like and what was good or bad about it. He was very kind and he invited me to be there; I belonged there like I belonged in a...anyway. But it was a very interesting session. We tried to talk to the Educational Testing Service about genetic determinism and how it featured in what they were doing, that they had to really...And some of the people were with me and Ed and some of the people weren't, you know. It was a very mixed thing, but it was very good.

There was another very interesting thing about psychologists and women that you should know about. And that was that- who the hell organized it, I don't know who organized it- but we had a weekend with Arthur Jensen, in which we tried to teach him about genetics.

AR- Really.

ET- And Lee Ehrmann was very active in that. You know who she is?

AR- No.

ET- You don't know who she is? She is a very well-known genetic behaviorist, behavioral-genetics person. She and a friend of mine now who's in Chile discovered that the rare male, you know about that? That's a beautiful discovery; that if you have fruit flies, they have different color eyes. So if you put females in with two groups of males

that have different color eyes, let's say red and green, the females will mate with the color that is less represented. They will not mate with the one- like, if you have forty-sixty, they'll mate with the forty ones. It's called the Rare Male Effect. There's been a lot of research on it. But this was discovered by two people: Susie who was working in France and Lee Ehrmann who was working here in the United States. So it was very, very... And at that time what happened was, this was during that weekend, it was really quite a weekend. And Bjonski was there, and Jensen of course was there, and a whole bunch of geneticists including that awful man from California who wouldn't let me become a- they have an institute for behavioral sciences or something, some place in California- and he wrote against me coming there because he said "She's not really a biologist." I never said I was a biologist, but you know. So, Gardner was his name? No, I don't remember what his name is.

We had that weekend there, and we were supposedly trying to teach Jensen what he didn't know about genetics so he wouldn't say the things that he was saying. We were very unsuccessful because he was such a racist, he said and did things that were absolutely unbelievable. So, at that time there were three or four women there. (18:32) And Susie was one of the people that came because that was when Pinochet took over the Chilean government. Lee Ehrmann invited her to the United States to be part of the seminar so that Pinochet would let her out of the country. Otherwise she couldn't get out of the country. It was very interesting. But, those women were treated so badly with all those men there that one woman was crying. I came out, and I said "Why are you crying?" She said "Oh, I don't want to talk about it." I don't know what the hell happened, but that's the kind that happened there all the time. So that was a story there about women and Jensen and genetics and everything else.

AR- Well, I know you were on a Task Force on Sociobiology and Women in the early 90s.

ET- That's right; in Division 35.

AR- That's right. How did that come about? There must have been a president at the time who was interested...

ET- Well, there was a president who was willing to let me do it, but she couldn't fight against those women. So, nothing ever happened. We were trying, I was trying to get them to do an issue on it, you know, and to do a meeting on it and stuff like that...

AR- It didn't...

ET- They didn't want to fight against the establishment in any way. [inaudible] So nothing happened. That was awful, I hated it.

WP- Let me ask a question. I'm working on this project about Psychology in New York City.

ET- Oh yeah, right.

WP- And that's what I'm talking about tonight.

ET- Right, yeah.

WP- Do you think, you've been here a long time, do you think that there are things that are particular about the city that have shaped the psychology that has developed here: the way it's been applied, maybe even the research threads that have been followed. Any thoughts about that?

ET- Absolutely. You see, I think that the main issue of Psychology in New York is that it was in New York. Because here we have Columbia and we have NYU, we have a lot of other colleges, and all of them were very involved in having some kind of credentials that would make them the leading institution in the country and nationally and internationally. So psychology was taught with that in mind, primarily. And, for example, the fact that I had that argument with The New York Academy of Sciences, that they didn't recognize Psychology (20:56), and the way it finally got accepted was that the psychologists became very traditional, mainstream kind of psychologists. At Columbia, you had Mort Deutsch who was a very forward-thinking kind of man, and then you had the story of Barnard. For example, Ray Silver, who was one of the most brilliant people we ever had in Comparative Psychology, who started out with Danny Lehrman in New Jersey, went to teach at Barnard. Lila Braine went to teach at Barnard. Of course the big struggle there was Barnard as a women's school as opposed to college of Columbia, which was all men, and so they had a big thing about that. Guess who became the president of the American Museum of Natural History? President of Barnard. Now the one good thing about that woman was that she really fought to get Barnard accepted as a regular part of Columbia so that men and women can both go to either school. Here her role hasn't been quite the same, but we won't talk about that now.

The thing that I think, beside the fact that it was the schools and how they had to train psychology, and the history of the American Psychological Association was very tied in first with New York and Columbia as the main things. Then you had what's his name up in Rhode Island, the social psychologist. Gardner, not Gardner...it'll come to me. And, so there was always a struggle between Washington, New York, and Philadelphia, and that other school up there.

The second big thing that happened to psychology in New York was World War Two. Now, with World War Two for the first time we had the government supporting the training of psychologists to do psychological work. And almost all the PhDs from the 1950s were psychologists who had been in the war and could get their degrees by being veterans. That's how I got my degree because I didn't have to pay for my schooling at all. I got my PhD because I was a veteran. So that's the kind of thing that was really dominant. So at that time, because of World War Two and what happened to the men in the army, the need for clinical psychologists became very, very prominent. And although you would have to do research and the V.A. supported the research, I mean, the V.A. was

very, very good- this present administration does not treat veterans well at all, but we won't go into that now- so that you had all these psychologists who had to get their PhDs who were being supported by the government. So Psychology in New York became clinical Psychology primarily. That's why we had the problems with the Academy because Clinical Psychology was not considered a science, so how could we be in the New York Academy of Sciences, you know it didn't make any sense to them. So that was the main thing here, you see. Comparative was just here [at the museum], primarily.

Then there was Skinner, and he had his effect on Columbia and NYU and all the other schools. So that became the dominant...Clinical or Skinnerian. And it was ridiculous. That was what was so brilliant about Schneirla, he said, you know, this dichotomy was stupid because you really have to know how things develop and how they evolve to understand. So that was what I think psychology in New York was. All my friends were clinical psychologists.

WP- Yeah. It also strikes me- there's been an incredibly high rate of involvement among New York psychologists in social issues.

ET- Oh, of course (25:26)

WP- That seems to me very distinctive about New York.

ET- I'm so happy to hear you say that because you know why? Because that's what New York is in the United States. I have family in Minneapolis who always say to me, you know "New York is not the United States." Things happen in other places that are just as good or just as bad, or anything else, but New York has always...I mean, New York and Chicago and San Francisco were the three main places of labor and left thinking. So the psychologists, remember these are veterans from World War Two where the concept of racism was a very important issue, they were very active in that and in peace because that was supposed to be the war that stopped all further wars, right? The United Nations was born. So, there were a lot of reasons for that to happen. The Trade Union movement was very strong in New York at that time, as it was in the rest of the country. So that's why that was true. But I'm glad you noticed that because almost all the people that I knew- see that's why I never had any real biases against clinical psychologists because I knew that they were also very socially responsible and that was very good. And Doris is a very good person for that, you should talk to her.

WP-Yeah, follow up with her.

ET- She'll have a much more scholarly approach to her answers than mine are. She's done some wonderful papers- you know her papers? You don't know them?

WP- No, but I need to be informed, so it's good that...

ET- You know, for example, she was also involved in the New York Academy of Science because I brought her in and a couple of other people in. She did beautiful

papers on the responsibility of scientists because we were talking to New York scientists. She was very, very good. She's excellent. What?

AR- Well, do you want to wrap up at this point. Let me ask one more question then that will help us wrap up. Do you care to make any...

ET- Predictions?

AR- ...reflections...

ET- Oh.

AR- ...reflections on the current state of Psychology, perhaps specifically with respect to Psychology and social issues and social responsibility. (27:39)

ET- Well, I think that we are very, very fortunate today because, and this is true all the time in history that you always have more than one thread, as you said, that is having different ideas. It is the Divisions for Social Justice that are really doing the right thing now. The people that I think of most in regard to that are Bernice Lott, who is really a wonderful leader. She and I- you know how long I have known Bernice?

AR- No. How long?

ET- Since she was in her mother's belly.

AR- Wow.

WP-Wow.

ET- So I know her and her whole family very well. Bernice is really a remarkable person. Her husband is equally remarkable. They're two very remarkable...I'm very, very- I feel very lucky that they're here and they're doing what they do because they're really great. And the other person that I've gotten to know only recently is Brad Olson who I think is also...do you know him at all?

AR- No, no.

ET- He is also a very interesting man. I don't really know very much about him, I don't know where he comes from, how he got politicized. But he's doing very good things in the Divisions for Social Justice. So the way I feel about Psychology today is, first of all, that there are a number of Divisions that are doing these kind of things. For example, I belong to Division 35 and 45. I'm very lucky because they accepted me onto Division 45's Task Force on Research. I am working with them and we are presenting a session at the Multicultural Conference which is very good. And the young woman who' - and they're all young which is so great- and the young woman who is heading that Noweda, what's Noweda's second name? I keep forgetting her second name. You know her?

AR- No.

WP- I do know her, but I can't remember her second name.

ET- You know who she is right? Okay. And Joe Trimble is especially wonderful with the Native American [group]. I mean there are people who are doing things that are really very, very great. I am concerned about women because we are being so attacked in society with all this crap that's going on about what women are really like and so on and so forth, that I really feel that...I'm trying to think of who...except for Bernice, I'm sure there are other names... Mary Lou Cheal is good on this too. I really can't think of anybody specifically that I can count on as much as I can count on Bernice and Brad. There's another woman who is very good that I have hopes for that maybe things will happen. Now it's coming back to me, okay. So, for example, Maram Hallak (30:45), H-A-L-L-A-K, you know her?

AR- I do, yes.

ET- Yeah. And Maram is a very, she's a very strong woman. She did something so remarkable. She came here with three children from an arranged marriage as an Arab. She's a Christian Arab. She came here and she worked to support those children and to get her PhD. I mean, she is really a remarkable person. She and I were both very active in Division 48 at one point.

AR- Okay. And she's an AWP-er too, right?

ET- She's a very strong [woman]. She decided that's the place [AWP]. And so Maram Hallak is another person that I can think of. And then...who else is it...oh, another woman who I'm going to tell you about who is also very, very good, who I also got to know only recently because there's another group of people that I should mention. I forgot all about them. At one point when I was very, after my husband died, I didn't know whether I wanted to stay here or what I wanted to do. My family in San Francisco was after me to come to San Francisco. So I said, well, I won't go unless I can get tied up with some university or something like this; I wanted to continue working. So I got to know Saybrook, do you know Saybrook? Okay. And I got to know Mark Pilisuk.

WP- Yeah, I think that's right.

ET- Right, that's his name. And Stan.

WP- Krepner, isn't it?

ET- Kripner.

AR-Kripner



WP- Kripner.

ET- Kripner, right. And they were starting a program at Saybrook on Social Transformation I think it's called. I don't know what the exact name is- you'll probably get it from your records some place. They're very remarkable people. I'm very, very pleased that they're around because they are what I count on, along with Divisions for Social Justice, as people who are really trying to keep social justice as a primary consideration in Psychology. They're very, very good at it. They're very different from me, they're more diplomatic, they know how to work with people- it's great. And they're very remarkable people in a lot of ways, and I'm very, very grateful that they're there. So that's Saybrook. (33:20).

The other person at Saybrook who I think is going to do remarkable things because she is a remarkable person is a woman named Donna Nassor, who is also a Christian Arab person. She's Egyptian, her family has been here for two or three generations, so she's been here a long time. But they're Christian and they are from an Egyptian background, and she is a very articulate active person for the Palestinians. She is at Saybrook, because she got her degree in law, she was a practicing lawyer who only wanted to work with people who couldn't get legal help unless they, because they didn't have enough money. So she thought she would make a career out of that, but she had to give it up because she was not eating.

AR- Could not make any money...yeah, yeah.

ET- So she went to work with her father but she decided to go back and get a PhD in Social Transformation with Mark and Stan and the people at Saybrook. She and I have been very, very active in the APA on the Palestinian issue.

AR- Okay, okay.

ET- That is another story, I don't know if we have time for that, but...we don't.

AR- Yeah...

ET- But, it's a story that should go into the archives.

WP- It should.

ET- Because we started out, Maram and I started out at the Multicultural Summit Conference after I had attended the first meeting there where we were having all this anti-Muslim stuff going on in the United States and there wasn't one session or one speaker on the Muslims as a multicultural organization. I got up and spoke about it and I got a very good response. So the next session, the next meeting that we had, Maram and I organized a difficult dialogue session between Jews and Arabs; Jews and Muslims, not Arabs, Jews and Muslims. From that we then organized a session at the APA at which we- this was Division 48 - had to sponsor it as one of their sessions- at which we had a

Palestinian man who is the head of a non-violent international organization of the American University, very, very well-respected man and his graduate student who is also a non-violent. He did his work on how you promote conflict resolution and non-violence who was leading the session that we had to go to Afghanistan, which is where we were then at that time, to talk about non-violent reconciliation and things like that. Then we had a Jewish woman who had lived in Israel and had lived with both Palestinians and Israelis and she had to leave there because it was so tense and she didn't like what was going on so she came back to the States. Then we had Donna Nassor talking who had just been on a fellowship of reconciliation trip to Palestine and she had taken pictures of what happened to the Palestinians because of the Israelis. She had also been to the townships of South Africa, so she was comparing how the two things were with Apartheid and what was going on there.

At that session we had the most violent attack (36:54) by the pro-Israeli psychologists where they really were vicious. They wrote to the president of the APA about us. I mean, it was really a whole story. And the only time that I had anything like that happen, I've got to tell you this....I've got to do this, this has to be...after the book on Sociobiology by Wilson, a group of us organized a session at the EPA, the Eastern Psychological Association, because Thornhill and the other guy, Palmers? No, I forgot the other guy's name. They had written two books on why rape is evolutionarily adaptive.

AR- Oh yeah.

ET- So we had a session on that which was so well attended, they were out in the hall. I mean, it was a fabulous session. And *Genes and Gender* published that book. And one of the psychologists wrote a letter to Nicholson, the president of the museum saying "How dare you employ that woman who was such a non-scientist as to have a session like that," and stuff like that. Nicholson wrote a very nice letter back to him saying "We do what we think is best," you know and "she's a scientist, she's here." But that's in the book.

AR- Yeah, okay. I saw that on your list.

ET- You know that book.

AR-Yeah, yeah, yeah.

ET- Okay, so anyway. So then they wrote to the APA about us and then finally the assistant to the president wrote me a letter asking me to explain what happened. We just sent them a letter "thank you for your letter, we'll let you know", we never answered because there's no point in answering. So, we're still trying very hard to do something about that, that's a whole other story.

WP- How do you spell Nassor?

ET-Who?

WP- Donna Nassor.

ET- Donna, and N-A-S-S-O-R.

WP- S-S-O-R

AR- O-R...okay, we'll look her up.

ET- Yeah. And she's getting her...oh, now listen to...why is she remarkable? She's been very active with the Palestinians. So, when the whole immigrant story arose here, she decided to reactivate her lawyer-ship and to start working with immigrants as a lawyer to help them in the things that they were suffering from. So that's what she's been doing. She's been getting her PhD (38:59) and acting as a lawyer at the same time.

AR- Wow.

ET- So, she's a very remarkable woman, she really is.

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ET- And when she becomes a psychologist, we'll have to remember her. Yeah. Okay?

AR- Yes, Okay.

WP- Thank you.