Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Rachel Hare-Mustin

Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Amherst, MA
November 16, 2007

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Hare-Mustin, R. (2007, November 16). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording].

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Amherst, MA.

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

Alexandra Rutherford, PhD
Project Director, Psychology's Feminist Voices
alexr@yorku.ca

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Rachel Hare-Mustin
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Amherst, MA
November 16, 2007

AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer

RHM: Rachel Hare-Mustin, Interview Participant

RHM – I grew up in Scarsdale, New York, went to Swarthmore College, and was always concerned with social justice issues. When I was in high school, it might be a topic about racial justice, and people would always make jokes about my name when they met Rachel, because I was always talking about racial justice, which sounded like Rachel justice. And in my family, after I was married, we were very active in the peace movement and then the civil rights movement.

AR – Okay.

RHM – And then when, I guess it was Eldridge Cleaver, or someone in Black Power, said "The only place for women in this movement is on their backs", I decided it was time for a feminist movement and I wanted to be part of it. So it happened somewhat separately from psychology, but I was already active in psychology, so it kind of fit together with other people showing this interest.

AR – Right. And so your family had been activist in orientation?

RHM – Well my mother particularly, the family I grew up in, but as I mentioned earlier, I was married quite early, when I was 19, and had the children within five years, I had four children. So with my children and husband, we were Quaker and we were all going to peace demonstrations together and other things like that.

AR – Wow. I didn't realize your children came so fast and so quickly.

RHM – Yes, so by the time I was 27 I already had four children. And then by the time I was 32 they were all in school. So I was casting about for worthy causes.

AR – Yeah. Well what form did that early feminism take then?

RHM – Well as a student I think it was - I wasn't as aware of job issues, although there were job issues, discrimination against women - in the activities I was involved in where I questioned why did the professors in class call on the men more than the women students, things like that. And when you had a chance to make an oral report on something, I would pick a topic related to issues of women's equality.

AR – And you mentioned earlier, in retrospect, one of your experiences at Swarthmore after you got married was kind of telling in terms of the status of women, even at Swarthmore.

{4:10}

RHM – Oh yes, when I got married at the end of my sophomore year, they took away the scholarship I had. I had a very good scholarship, it covered just about everything, one of the top scholarships, and I guess the assumption was that if you get married you won't make a contribution, your mind turns to mush if you're a woman.

AR – And do you remember what your reaction was at the time to that?

RHM – I was kind of angry and discouraged. But...it worked out. [Laughter]

AR – I guess so! Well tell me a little bit then about those immediate post undergraduate years, in terms of what you were up to at that point. Raising kids?

RHM – Yes. My first child was born when my first husband, who was a sociologist, was getting his doctorate at the University of Chicago. We had met at Swarthmore. And I worked part-time, so the first child was born there. And then we were at Princeton, he was involved with a study of education at Princeton, [it was] a research project under Carnegie, and now I had two children. And then he had a position at Wellesley. So my experience in general had been that academics are migrant labor - you know, you're always moving. Then, I decided while we were at Wellesley I'd get a Master's in psychology. Actually when I graduated from Swarthmore, my idea was maybe I'd start on graduate work and we'd start trying to have a baby and see which came first. The baby came first.

AR – Right.

RHM – Oh and at Wellesley, it was a time when a study was done about colleges that prepare women for advanced study and scholarly contributions. And the indices used were things like grants that doctoral people got, and publications, and such. So this was - I guess it would have been the mid-50s. And of all the top women's colleges, of which there were about 25 that were rated, Wellesley was about 19. So Wellesley was saying never mind, we're educating wives and mothers instead.

AR – Oh gosh.

RHM – Which wasn't, I mean it was nice, I was a wife and mother, but that wasn't only what I wanted. Although my children are more important to me than my life as a psychologist.

AR – How did that compare with... I was interviewing someone recently who went to a fairly well known women's college in the Philadelphia area, and she was saying that their slogan there was that they were training women for careers, and if they got married that was nice, but the career came first.

{7:32}

RHM – But this was different. So at Wellesley we had these jokes about WAMs - wives and mothers. But in point of fact, as I live here now, near Smith College, which has a very loyal following in this area, many people don't know that Wellesley was much more innovative in supporting women; for example, that Wellesley had women presidents whereas Smith for many, many years had men presidents.

AR – Yeah. So how was your experience then at Wellesley?

RHM – It was okay, busy. When I first went they said to pursue a Master's you have to go full-time. I had two small children, but I thought I could manage that. At my first interview with the dean she said "I don't know why you're going full time, I don't think you should go full time". And I said "Well, what do you suggest?" And she said "Why don't you go half-time for two years?" And I said "All right, if you think that's best". And of course that is what I preferred.

AR – Right. Well how did your husband react to your desire to continue your education while you began your family?

RHM – We were in an academic setting, and he was very agreeable to that. Everything was fine until I got the PhD.

AR – Okay. And how about your family of origin?

RHM – Oh they were very proud of me.

AR – I'm trying to get my head back into the 1950s, this was the mid-50s?

RHM – Yeah, well I finished Swarthmore in '49, so the first child was born in 1950.

AR – It wasn't all that common for women to pursue higher education, especially if they were in the middle of, in fact, being wives and mothers.

RHM – Yes, I didn't know anyone else, any other women who had children, who were doing that.

AR – Well tell me what attracted you then, at that point, to psychology, having had your undergraduate experiences at Swarthmore, and you did an MA in social psychology. What attracted you to psychology at that point?

{9:45}

RHM – I guess I was really interested in motivation, you know what motivates people, why they behave the way they do. So I think that was it, although subsequently I never became focused on motivation per se. And it just seemed, from the time I went to Swarthmore, the most interesting

people were in psychology. Professors, you know in Gestalt Perceptual Psychology (not Gestalt Therapy, which is basically Freudian, quite different) like Hans Wallach and Wolfgang Kohler. I worked there as a research assistant to Hans Wallach for a while, and also published some research with another professor on Tolman's Sign-Gestalt learning theory, one of my first publications was while I was at Swarthmore.

AR – So that had an influence on -

RHM – Yes, it was new and exciting.

AR – Yeah. Well tell me then about your Master's work. Was there a thesis involved?

RHM – Yes. I developed a test, sort of an assessment device. At the time there had been these Draw-a-Person tests and other kinds of drawing tests as assessments, and I was interested in seeing if you could learn something about the way children saw themselves and others in groups by having a Draw-a-Group test. So the Master's essentially was asking teachers to rate kids in participation, leadership, and some other group dimensions like that, and independently having the kids draw a picture of themselves on a playground doing what they like to do, and seeing if there was any relationship between these.

AR – Okay. And when did you finish up then with your Master's?

RHM – That would have been in '54.

AR – Okay, and this was right around the time, of course, that the Brown v. Board decision was coming down, the civil rights movement was really heating up. Did that play a role at all in your life at this point?

RHM – Not at that point. Actually, when I was at Swarthmore, one of the early issues in civil rights was the Fair Employment Practices Commission, and we used to do sit-ins in Philadelphia and things like that as undergraduates at Swarthmore. But when I was at Wellesley in '54, well about a month after I got the degree, my third child was born, so I was pregnant the last part of that too.

AR – Wow. You had a lot going on.

RHM – I had a lot going on.

AR – Well tell me about what happened to influence your decision to go back and get a PhD, and what happened in-between those times. There's a bit of a lag there.

{12:40}

RHM – Well, my husband had been working with Eric Lindemann at Harvard School of Public Health, and also Freed Bales in sociology, social relations at Harvard. And then he had gotten a position at Haverford College in Pennsylvania, and we moved down there, and I didn't like the

move. I had been very involved in community activities in Massachusetts and had some professional part-time jobs and friends. So when we moved I was sort of casting around for other things to do. But, we were only at Haverford College a year and then we went with the Peace Corps staff to the Philippines.

AR – Okay.

RHM – And we were there for awhile. And when we came back I happened to visit University Museum at the University of Pennsylvania, the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, and it was just wonderful. So I just sort of walked in and asked for a job, got a part-time job there, and found it a very interesting and exciting place. I remember asking the director there if you really needed a PhD if you were serious about this, and he said that you did, even though some people on the staff at that time didn't have them, but for the future, you would need a PhD. So I realized that I already had a Master's in psych, so maybe I should see if I still liked psychology as much as I had previously because I was closer to getting an advanced degree and wondered whether to go into psychology for a doctorate. So that's when I got the job at Norristown State Hospital in psychology.

AR – Okay. And was that the first time you worked in that kind of setting, in a hospital setting?

RHM – Yeah. I had done some work at Wellesley in the Phoebe Thorne School, as a psychologist, with assessments and other things with the kids. But that was the first time in a real clinical setting, a hospital setting.

AR – How was that? To me, from my eyes, it looks like a pretty intrepid thing to do, just to kind of go - how was that?

RHM – Well occasionally it was scary. I was doing assessments, but also was a co-leader of some groups of patients, and some rather disturbed patients. And I think it influenced me later, what my standards were in training students. When I became the director of the clinical program at the University of Delaware, their PhD clinical psych program, I really felt that at least one practicum or internship placement should be in a setting like a state hospital, that everybody should know what the end of the line looks like in mental disorders. I felt that very strongly.

AR – Yeah. Can you describe the kinds of patients you worked with at Norristown?

{15:47}

RHM – Well there were some that were sort of catatonic. They were just beginning to use psychotropic medications in the 50s, so people had to stay out of the sun, and had problems with obesity that we've now become more aware of, but not at the time. And so some people were kind of zonked out, and others were a little frightening, and as staff we sometimes talked about how , if you're meeting with a patient in your office with the door closed, you should always be the closest to the door in case the patient became uncontrollable.

AR – Were most of the patients men?

RHM – No, and I was more likely to be assigned women patients.

AR – Okay. And what kind of group work did you do? You mentioned groups.

RHM – Well sort of discussion groups, you know group therapy.

AR – And that appealed to you, I take it?

RHM – Yes I found that interesting, I enjoyed it. I felt I learned a lot there too. And that's when I asked the director "Do you think I need a doctorate in clinical psychology?" And he was the one who said "As a woman, you need every degree you can get". So that was when I decided to go back and get the doctorate.

AR – Okay, before we get into that, I wanted to ask a little bit more about the Philippines because I noticed in your C.V. that it looks like you did some research while you were there too.

RHM – Yes.

AR – So can you tell me about that experience?

RHM - Well the first experience in the Philippines in 1961 when we were with the Peace Corps, I didn't do much formal research. We were shifted around. We first lived outside of Manila, and then we were down in the provinces, in Albay in the Bichol region of Luzon, {17:50}, but I liked it. And one thing I did there was I learned Chinese brush painting, so you can see all my paintings around the house -

AR – They're yours?

RHM – Yes, I took up Chinese brush painting. And I love the discipline of it, and I like it very much.

AR – Oh amazing.

{18:13}

RHM – And then I went back again, let's see how many years later? We were there in '61 and '62 the first time, so about '67, and that's when I did research. The question I found interesting was looking at children's learning processes in what is a dependency-oriented society. You know when America took over the Philippines at the end of the 19th century, they introduced an American educational model which has a lot of emphasis on individual achievement and competitiveness, whereas the Philippines have this sort of cooperative, sharing, helping ethos to some extent.

AR – Okay.

RHM – And what I found that was quite interesting was that the kids in school would be expected to follow this American educational model, but at home and in the villages, it wasn't that way. And in fact, in America where a mother would say to a child "Well you're a big boy you can do it yourself", when a child asked for help in the Philippines, a mother would feel gratified if a kid asked for help and would encourage that asking.

AR – Right, more of a dependency relationship.

RHM – Yes, so it was a study about dependency orientation.

AR – Oh gosh. Now at that point did you just know that since you were pursuing graduate training that you would do research wherever you were? Or how did that kind of come about?

RHM – Yes, I guess so. Actually I think it was largely due to my undergraduate training in psychology at Swarthmore that I became research-oriented, that this is the way you find the answers to questions.

AR – Okay. Well tell me then about your doctoral training in clinical psychology at Temple, and how that unfolded.

RHM – I had mentioned that I had started the doctorate at Bryn Mawr College. They had a small doctoral program in personality and social psych, but that sort of fell apart when Don Brown went to Michigan and his successor left. The professors who remained were predominately animal psychologists led by Jeff Bitterman. It became apparent that that was not where I was going to get the kind of training I was interested in. So I transferred to Temple University in Philadelphia, and Temple had an accredited program and I think at the time, a very good program. They had good placements, courses were sufficiently rigorous, and there were different orientations.

AR – What were the orientations that were being taught at that point?

{21:30}

RHM – Well it depended who the professor was, but it wasn't like the whole school was psychoanalytic or behaviorist, or something for the whole department - there was some variety, which I liked. And I had some therapy and analysis myself, and yet I've always been a bit of a sceptic about, well actually about Freudian ideas. I think Freud made some great contributions but I think his major contribution was that you can help people by listening to them, without all the other structures.

AR – Right, creating talking therapy basically.

RHM – Yes.

AR – So you were sceptical of that. What made more sense to you in terms of an orientation at that point?

RHM – Well my approach gradually evolved. In one of my internships at St. Christopher's Hospital, which was a children's hospital associated with Temple Medical School, I had a very good supervisor, Jules Spotts. And he perhaps was influenced by Rogerian ideas, but it was a little more innovative than that. I don't know how I would characterize it exactly. It was funny about St. Christopher's name because at the time, and this has nothing to do with psychology, the Catholic Church came out with a list of who were real saints and who were not real saints. And St. Christopher was one of the ones that was not on the approved list. So I suggested to the hospital that they should rename the hospital the "Mister Christopher Hospital".

AR – I'm sure that didn't go over that well!

RHM – No, they didn't like that idea, but it was truth in advertising. When I finished there, the first position I took with my PhD was at Philadelphia Children's Guidance Clinic, in the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania. I had had good training in child work and Philadelphia Children's Guidance Clinic was very innovative at the time in family systems theory, so that influenced me quite a bit.

AR – Okay, so was that where you first got trained in family?

RHM – Yes.

AR – Well tell me what was going on then in terms of family systems therapy.

RHM – Well it was sort of looking at the influence of the whole family context. And recognizing that that family was a system made up of different subsystems. There was the adult subsystem, the child subsystem. And a parental subsystem, and a marital subsystem, and although they involved the same two people often, they had different functions.

AR – Oh neat.

{24:29}

RHM – Yes, it was interesting. And it related to my background in psychology at Swarthmore focusing on the whole gestalt. And then I think another thing that was very dynamic and innovative in family systems was the use of the one-way mirror and videotaping, so that when you were supervising or training people, you weren't just listening to their account of what they thought they had done in a session, but you were actually looking at live sessions. We looked at each others' sessions with families or children or parents or individuals. So I think that just opened things up so much in terms of actually seeing the interactions that are going on in families. And there was just a lot of energy and innovation.

AR – Now your work of course, I mean you've written a lot about family therapy, but specifically about feminist family therapy. So I know we may be skipping around a little bit here, but can you tell me about your work in *feminist* family therapy and how you brought *feminist* principles to bear on family therapy?

RHM – I had become involved in APA [American Psychological Association] to some extent, and when we get off on that I can tell you a little bit about that. There were women who were active feminists there, with a lot of good feminist ideas, which were not present in family therapy. However, the focus in psychology was on the individual, not the family system. Feminist ideas were absent in family systems. The view was that there was the traditional distant father, and the over-involved mother, which became exaggerated into the schizophrenogenic mother, you know blaming mothers for most problems. But on the other hand, family systems theory, was looking at the influence of the social context much more than just the individual. So I felt that I could combine these two aspects, and I wrote an article that came out in 1978, "A Feminist Approach to Family Therapy", and it just blew the field open.

AR – Yeah.

RHM – It's still cited as the seminal, innovative contribution that led to changes. What followed in family therapy was a flowering of ideas and opportunities, and women in the field began supporting one another and changing the way we worked in family therapy.

AR – Yeah. So I'm trying to get more of a sense then, was this the first time in your professional career that you brought feminism to bear on your work as a psychologist in a direct way?

RHM – Well it may have had less impact, but earlier in the 70s I had been interested in ethical issues, and at the time APA didn't have an ethical standard saying that therapists shouldn't have sex with their clients or patients. And I was troubled by this, and I remember going to one session at APA, sponsored by Division 29, the Division of Psychotherapy, in the Division suite, where they were having a debate, two sides of notable psychologists. I remember one was Albert Ellis

AR – Albert Ellis?

{28:05}

RHM – Yes, and there was one of these guys from California who did scream therapy, I can't remember his name. But anyway, some notable Division 29 psychologists, and they were having a debate as to whether it was beneficial or not beneficial to have sex with your patients. Beneficial for the patients, that is. You know, right out there, right there. So I wrote this article based on the then ethical principles called "Ethical Considerations and the Use of Sexual Contact in Therapy", and I sent it to the *American Psychologist*. And it was rejected and returned with only one review which said this article treats this subject too lightly. So I wrote to the editor and I said "Well, could I have a second review?" So he sent it out for another review and this time it came back essentially saying this article treats this subject too seriously. So here you have two opposite reviews and he still rejects it. So I got it published in *Psychotherapy*, and that was one of the first ethical articles dealing with the question and the then existing criteria - about having sex with clients. And the existing criteria were certain mundane kinds of things like community standards and like what training and supervision have you had in this modality that qualifies you to give sex to your patients.

AR – Yeah, yeah. Well tell me about, because I know there was more follow-up to this story, can you tell me about how that then all evolved, because there was work done to change that?

RHM – Some of the other women in APA were also working to change the ethical principles, and one who worked really hard was Hannah Lerman. And about that time because of my activities in APA I had been nominated to be on the Board of Professional affairs. But they didn't want me and so they shuffled me onto the slate for the Ethics Committee, thinking I would do less harm there. Surprise! So we made a lot of changes and eventually APA made sex with a patient unethical.

But there were also procedures in ethics that I felt were unethical with the way the committee functioned. For example, if someone brought a complaint, the person bringing in the complaint was never informed about the action taken on the complaint. I thought someone had the right to know, and so that changed.

AR – Yeah. Well going back to the sex with clients issue, can you recapture for us some of the arguments for and against. I mean in 2007 it seems almost bizarre that anyone would argue for it, but obviously is was an issue that was -

RHM – Well it's one of those kind of power issues, "droit de seigneur" {31:33}, the right of the dominant male to inaugurate or teach some woman who's presumably just uptight in her sexuality how to do it, and how to enjoy it, that sort of thing. The argument before Masters and Johnson's research on sexual response was that these were women were frigid and here was a qualified, responsible, therapist who could teach her how to do it. And you hear little echoes of some of these earlier arguments in more recent things about ethics, like how soon – APA Council has debated this and paid more [attention] recently – how soon after you've ended therapy can you start having sex between a therapist and a client. Patty Keith Spiegel used to say it's the "You're cured, let's fuck" approach.

{32:20}

AR – Yeah. I remember having this conversation in my ethics class when I was I training, and our professor basically was of the opinion that you should never, ever consider that, it's always a violation of the - Were there any women who were arguing "for" at that point?

RHM – I don't remember any, but some women weren't arguing very much. I can remember in Division 29, Stanley Graham once saying to me that he regarded Annette Brodsky, who had worked with me on a lot these issues, as a lady. And so he was saying "Well Annette was invited on-board, Rachel. You just climbed on board". Actually Annette was someone who worked as hard as I did, but I guess I was more challenging. We chaired a pivotal interdisciplinary conference on Women and Psychotherapy: Research and Practice with an NIMH grant in 1978. But many other women didn't speak up.

AR – Wow. Well tell me, let's go to the APA scene at this point. What was your first involvement then with the American Psychological Association? How did you get involved in the beginning?

RHM – Well I had gone to a meeting and I didn't really know anybody. I didn't have a professor or mentor to lead me around and introduce me, invite me to go to dinner with the group, so I didn't know anybody.

AR – And this was in part because you were an older student?

RHM – Yes, and a woman. So I was nobody's favourite student. I got my Doctorate in '69, so that was 20 years after I got my Bachelor's. And when I went to a meeting at Division 29 there was a women's caucus group, and I was just very delighted and excited. I remember it was in New Orleans, so we can figure out the year from that I guess, and here were these people that I didn't know: Hannah Lerman, Joy Kenworthy, Annette Brodsky, Jackie Resnick, and others. And I thought to myself, "I'm going to make my home in APA in 29".

AR – Okay.

RHM – And as it evolved and I learned more things about it, I discovered that 29 was run by what was called the "Jersey Mafia". It was Stan Moldowski, Marvin Metski, Jules Barron, Jack Krasner, Eugene Shapiro, Stanley Graham, and others. When the women began to be active, the men were very upset. They said "Well you can't have a women's caucus, it's too confrontational". So we had to call ourselves the Committee for Women. And I can remember one time when the women came early in the day, the guys were having a board meeting, and we saw what they were having for lunch, that we were paying for as members. There was this lavish buffet that just looked so wonderful, and we were all poor women, so we just went in and joined them, sat at the tables, introduced ourselves.

AR – Needless to say the entire board was male at this point?

{35:45}

RHM – Oh, the wife of one of the "Jersey Mafia" was Gloria Gottsegen and she was the one acceptable woman, the boys' girl.

AR – Okay.

RHM – Now later in 29's history, some other women became feminist and supportive, but they weren't at the time. People like Dorothy Cantor and Mattie Cantor, those folks weren't involved in the early struggles. And there were some interesting issues, such as, in those days the divisions counted their own ballots and they had their own nominating committees and so you never knew whether someone had really won an election or not. Somehow I got elected to the board of 29.

AR – This was around when now?

RHM – I guess in the late 70s. I got put on as Associate Editor for the psychotherapy newsletter that 29 put out, not a journal, but a newsletter. Bill Herron was the editor. So I had a column, and since then there have been many that followed it. I called it "Dear Rachel". Now 35 has one, "Dear -

AR – Aunt Academe.

RHM – Yes, but this was much earlier, in the 1970's. And I made up most of the questions. So a typical question would be one that women were concerned about like "Why are the same people always on the program?" - because women couldn't get on the programs. So I would have a nice answer like "Well, there are some people that audiences like to hear and see, like Carl Rogers and people like that. They always get a good crowd but, of course, they always sort of say the same thing because somebody only has one great idea in a lifetime". Somebody wrote in to me and complained and said Albert Ellis had two great ideas. [Laughter] But then the mafia got annoyed at this kind of thing and I was fired from the newsletter as associate editor. And then Jack Krasner, who had been a very active Division 29 executive officer, died, and so the leaders felt they should have a Jack Krasner Memorial Fund and they were going to raise some money and give a prize. And Stan Graham had this great idea that we're going to give a prize to Young Turks.

AR – Oh.

{38:22}

RHM – Well Young Turks was a way of giving it to someone who had been out with a doctorate no more than 10 years. Since all these old guys already had all of their prizes they wouldn't have to give prizes to the women who would have been their peers, of the generation like myself. So instead we're going to skip over to the young. So the first nominees were nominated The women nominated Annette Brodsky, and Gerry Koocher was the other one who was nominated. And as I looked around the board I could just see these guys, you know this is not what Jack Krasner would have wanted at all. So they said "How can we decide between the two of them?" And I said "Well these are both very highly qualified people, so I think we should give it to both of them". So they did. The next year the women nominated Jackie Resnick. And the one the guys chose was Gary Vandenbos, and again we gave two awards.

AR – So it was very much along gender lines.

RHM – At that point, yeah. But the interesting thing is if you look what happened to the women over the years who got the awards, and what happened to the men, obviously Gerry Koocher and Gary Vandenbos became big stars in APA. And the opportunities just weren't there {39:53}for comparable women to advance.

AR – Yeah, yeah.

RHM – And then I was asked at one point if I would be on the slate for president of 29 against Ron Fox. And I said "Why should I do this? Ron's going to win, he's got the support of all you guys". And they talked to me and Ron talked to me and said, "Well Rachel, you're a credible candidate and we'll support you next time." So I ran. So next time who else appeared on the slate but Jack Chwast, who was someone who had done nothing in 29, but he was from New York State. So I talked to people and I said "I hope you'll work for me as you said you would" and the reply was, "Oh Rachel, I couldn't vote against Jack".

AR – The old boys network.

RHM – Yeah. So that's kind of when I began to feel - I don't want to be in APA politics. I'm not a political animal. I mean I don't wheel and deal, and if someone tells me something I believe them. Rather naïve. So that kind of did it.

AR – Did it for you?

RHM – Certainly, in 29, although many years later they gave me an award for contributions to theory and practice in psychotherapy.

AR – Tell me then about how you got involved in being parliamentarian, and also about what that role is.

RHM – Oh okay. Well I was at an APA convention in San Francisco and I went to a membership meeting of Division 12, the Division of Clinical Psychology, of which I was a member. There was some overlap with the members in 29, but I didn't really know most of the people.

{41:50}

AR – For the tape, can you tell us about them

RHM –Historically, 29 had broken away from 12 because there was a subset of people who wanted a focus just on psychotherapy, as did many others. So I went to the membership meeting of Division 12 and they were having a discussion of allocating some extra monies for the board to have an extra meeting. Well I remembered the board meetings in 29 and the junkets of these guys -

AR – Yeah.

RHM – And so forth and so on. So I was kind of sceptical about this. And somebody in the room said "Do we have a quorum?" And the meeting went on and there was some discussion and then the division president who was chairing the meeting, Max Siegel, went to take the vote. And I was sitting there and I sort of raised my hand kind of shyly and said "What happened about the quorum?" And he said "Nobody called a quorum". And I said "Oh. Well I'll call a quorum". I knew nothing about this. So he said "Oh she called a quorum, I'll have to take the count". They didn't have a quorum. So he had a temper tantrum, and people in the room were

very angry: "Oh! We can't have the meeting, she called a quorum. We were going to give the Gordon Derner Award, now we can't do that!" You know, we can't do this, we can't do that. We don't have the money. And I just left there shaking, and I thought to myself, this is powerful stuff. I'm going to learn this. I'm going to learn this. And that's what led me to my interest in parliamentary procedures.

AR – Okay. Had there been a Parliamentarian at APA?

RHM – Oh yes, and for many years it was Eddie Newman. And then after I learned Robert's {44:00} Rules, I was Parliamentarian one year for Division 35, and then when Jack Wiggins was president of 29, I said, "I have some experience as Parliamentarian, would you like me to be Parliamentarian?" And they didn't really have a Parliamentarian very often in 29, but I persuaded him. So Nick Cummings was the incoming APA President and apparently he wanted to have a woman as APA Parliamentarian for the first time. So he came to the meeting and kind of looked me over in effect and how I functioned, and then asked me if I would be APA Parliamentarian. The APA President appoints the Parliamentarian.

AR – Wow.

{44:38}

RHM – I heard that when he told Chuck Kiesler, who was APA CEO, Chuck said "We can't have that. We can't have Rachel Hare-Mustin. What about Eddie Newman?" who had been Parliamentarian for many years. And apparently, according to what I heard, Nick said "We'll give him a certificate and thank him". Nick persisted, and Chuck wasn't for it at all.

AR – Okay.

RHM – So what I had observed about APA Council and Robert's Rules was that very few people knew Robert's Rules, and they ran circles around everybody else because they knew the rules and they could make motions and nobody else knew what was involved, and so on. And also Robert's has this very arcane and confusing language, so it was inherently undemocratic. When I had been doing all this studying about parliamentary procedures I became aware that there were other parliamentary systems.

AR – Okay.

RHM – So when I was Parliamentarian I recommended that we adopt a different system by Ray Keesey. And Suzanne Sobel, who was a Council Rep for 12, a friend of mine and Nick's, and a feminist, made a proposal on Council to this effect. And it was referred to the Board of Directors and then the Board asked me to make a presentation about it, which I did. And they said they thought they wanted me to do a little bit more in the presentation. Well I was nearing the end of my year as Parliamentarian and the incoming president was Florence Denmark.

AR – Okay.

RHM – And Florence had said to me "Oh Rachel, I would love to have you as Parliamentarian, but I don't think it would be right to have two women on the platform". So she had picked John Lacey as Parliamentarian. Well I figured politically, if John Lacey proposed it, it probably had a much better chance of going through than if I proposed it because he was part of the old guard. So I said that I think the incoming Parliamentarian should be the one to advise the board. And so he looked it over and advised them favorably, and it was adopted.

AR – Okay.

RHM – And it's interesting that several years later, when APA bought the publication rights from Keesey's heirs, and Gary Vandenbos wrote the introduction to it, since we now publish Keesey, he never mentioned that I had been the one who proposed it. But I came to understand the role of Parliamentarian as a facilitator, and I learned a lot because I also became a member of the American Institute of Parliamentarians -

AR – I saw that on your C.V.

{47:40}

RHM – Yes, and I published an article about preferential voting systems, which systems APA came to use, in their journal. The major function of the APA Parliamentarian is during Council. The Parliamentarian doesn't rule - the Parliamentarian advises the Chair and the Chair makes rulings. And if the members feel that the ruling is inappropriate, they can appeal the decision of the Chair, and there's an easy procedure to do that. And I see being Parliamentarian as a major feminist contribution, because it is making a level playing field so that everybody has an opportunity to participate on a more equal basis. And whereas Robert's has 80 different kinds of motions, Keesey has 11. It is simpler to use. They're based on the same principles: you have to have a quorum, majority rules, you have to follow the agenda in the order, things like that.

AR – Well I was going to ask, what did you then see as the change that was brought by this switch to the different system, in terms of how the meetings were run? Did it become more democratic in a way? What were some of the effects of that switch?

RHM – Right, it did. People couldn't sort of pull "fast ones". And there was less rancor and arguing on the floor, about can you do this, you can't do this, no you're supposed to be able to do this. When I first became Parliamentarian, there were a few people, maybe only three or four who were interested in parliamentary issues in Council. One was Eugene Levitt, another was Linus Belliouskis, who prefers Robert's Rules because he knows them very well, and another was Bill McKeachie. People who were interested in parliamentary procedure in Council would speak up if they felt a process was out of order. Gerry Koocher fully understands parliamentary procedures. One time when I wasn't there they were taking the vote on something and Gerry called a point of order because there was Stan Graham voting. Stan Graham wasn't on Council at the time, he was just in the room.

AR - Yeah. Well I couldn't detect in your C.V. the years that you served as Parliamentarian. Obviously you got started and then there was a hiatus when John Lacey was around.

RHM – Actually, John Lacey was only Parliamentarian that one time. I made a list which is over there in that pile of stuff, that I can give you, and I got a very nice APA Presidential Citation about being the most frequent Parliamentarian. I was Parliamentarian for 15 APA Presidents. But after the first time for several years they weren't quite ready to have me be Parliamentarian again. The assumption was still that anyone on Council would know how to be Parliamentarian. Two other women served a year each. In that interval Max Siegel named a woman. He named Nan Anderson, who served that once.

AR – I've talked to Nan actually.

{51:10}

RHM – And actually I had suggested her to him. And Bonnie Strickland named a friend, Kathy Grady, who was Parliamentarian that once. But of the people in the interval, some of them knew parliamentary procedure and some of them didn't, but over the years nobody other than myself did it more than a couple of times. Sometimes I have been asked and had other commitments so have declined. I think my approach as Parliamentarian was very influential. It helped Council conduct business in a fair manner, it gave the Presidents confidence and made them look good, too. It makes a big difference.

AR – If the person is really professional?

RHM – Yes. And as Parliamentarian, you're not making pronouncements, you're not interrupting the process. It's whispering and passing notes to the Chair, but you help members, too. And some of it is anticipatory. Like if you see that Council is going down a route that is improper, you would certainly alert the Chair and quietly say wait a minute, you can't proceed in this way. You need to clarify that this is the motion we're dealing with, that amendment is not acceptable at this point, or something like that.

AR – Okay. Well tell me, what were some of the standout issues that you were witness to in this office over the years that you were Parliamentarian, in terms of APA Council. I mean it's an important decision-making body. What were some of the standouts?

RHM – Well it's interesting. What stands out to me more are the times when I was Council Representative than when I was Parliamentarian. I was a Council Representative for two terms for Division 12, and one term for Division 24, which is Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology. A term is three years. There were two issues that stand out. And one of the issues was the purchase of *Psychology Today*.

AR – Okay, tell us about that.

RHM – Well the proposal came as a surprise to a lot of people, and there was a great time pressure - we have to make this decision by the end of the weekend, or something like that. So people couldn't really study the issue.

AR – And who presented it?

RHM – Well the people who developed it were the Executive Officer, Mike Pallak, and one of his Senior Staff Colleagues, Virginia O'Leary. And so the two of them had worked this out with publisher Ziff Davis who had lots of magazines, like *Modern Bride*, about our buying *Psychology Today*. And of the Board, Ray Fowler, who was Treasurer, was not a strong supporter. He didn't argue against it, but he presented a point of view that showed many, many financial problems and unpredictable things. And then there were people on the Board who were gung-ho. Ron Fox gave a very moving speech about lost opportunity in the Depression, and you have to take risks occasionally and then you win big. And I think a lot of people objected on Council because we felt we were being rushed. It was going too fast, we didn't know enough about it. The idea was that if we didn't buy it, the psychiatrists would buy it.

{54:32}

AR – Alarmist tactics were used.

RHM – Yes, exactly. So of Council, and I forget the size of Council then but about a third of us were opposed to it. Gerry Koocher, myself, Doris Miller, who did a lot of calling about it from New York, trying to get more information. Peter Nathan, you know there were some very responsible people who were opposed to this. And then APA went ahead and bought it and we lost a lot of money and we lost the APA building.

AR – How many years did APA actually own *Psych Today*? It wasn't that long.

RHM – It wasn't that long. And the problem was, there was the assumption that because we could run journals we knew how to run a magazine. And another thing was the nature of advertising that supports magazines, some didn't appreciate it enough. And so when we got it, Council didn't want tobacco ads. We were told that we would go under unless we continued with the tobacco ads for awhile. And I guess I told you that's when I got up and said "We're getting rid of the personals so poor lonely people can't meet each other, and the Jews for Jesus ads, and yet we're supporting tobacco". And I said that I thought Greg Kimball had a conflict of interest because he came from a tobacco state in the South. So that was one issue. Subsequently the Council Rules were changed so decisions couldn't be so rushed.

Another major issue I remember was the debate for several years about the reorganization of APA.

AR – Right.

RHM – And when this came up on Council, there were various caucuses, and it was a time when there was something going on that I never really understood, which was sort of, objections to the National Register - "Let's *get* the National Register". And two of the people on the Board at the time, Carl Zimet and Sam Osipow, who were friends of mine, were also on the Board of the National Register. I had met Sam on the APA Committee on Women in Psychology, of which I

was chair. And among other things these two were told that they had to get off the Board of APA by the other Board members.

AR – A conflict of interest?

RHM – It was more than that. I never clearly understood what the issues were. But eventually two groups coalesced in Council with totally different agendas. One group wanted to reorganize APA so that there were more semi-autonomous groups of scientists and clinicians, more of a federated system.

AR – Okay.

{57:25}

RHM – And the other group wanted to get after National Register in some way. And the two groups kind of cut a deal to trade votes and support each other's issue. And I remember in the debate when Bonnie Strickland was President, Rogers Wright got up to speak and he was kind of making slurs about Sam Osipow and Carl Zimet. And so I raised a point of order, and this is when it helps to know parliamentary procedures. So I raised a point of order and I said "Bonnie, I feel these personal remarks are not acceptable." She said, "Well I don't know what you want me to do Rachel". And I said "Just tell him to stop talking and sit down".

AR – Pretty easy, pretty clear.

RHM – And she said "Well Rogers, would you please do that?" So then Council voted both for reorganization and for going after the National Register. But I guess it was Milt Hakel, a guy from Texas, who said after the vote, in a sort of summing up during Council "Now remember, you agreed to support APA reorganization. You should go out and work for it". Because a vote was needed from the membership. And I pointed out to him and his group, "People agreed only to trade votes here, you didn't persuade them to support reorganization". So that issue was very divisive, and it kind of propelled Stan Graham into the APA presidency because he came out so strongly against APA reorganization in his campaign.

AR – Okay.

RHM – And that also changed some of the staff procedures about how the Council ran, one of which was to give the President a script now, because Stan needed a script.

AR – He wasn't comfortable speaking, or people didn't want him to speak off the cuff?

RHM – Well as Chair he couldn't seem to follow the agenda book. And then he had his friend, Art Kovacs, for his Parliamentarian. Art tends to make pronouncements, he doesn't employ parliamentarian procedures. So the meeting apparently was quite chaotic, I wasn't there. But it used to be the President would say "The next item before us on the agenda is item number three, it's on page such and such in your book, will you turn to that, duh duh da, the floor is now open for debate". The President had to know enough to say that.

AR – Yeah.

RHM – There was a concern of staff and others that Stan wouldn't know enough to say that clearly. So since then the whole thing is written down, so all the President has to do is read the script as he or she chairs the meeting.

AR – Now tell me a little bit about the training. You mentioned training earlier, that part of your role as Parliamentarian was to help train Council members?

{1:00:21}

RHM – Council members. It's not a big training, but at the February meeting, there is always some time devoted to orienting the new Council members to some of the issues and procedures. Usually Legal Council speaks a little bit, maybe the Treasurer speaks a little bit about budgetary things, and the Parliamentarian outlines a little bit about parliamentary procedure and speaks about some of the basic issues and asks if people have questions, and things like that. So it's not a big training thing, but it's a -

AR – An orientation.

RHM – Yes, it's an orientation and it's an opening of a door, so that if people have questions between Council sessions, or once they get their agendas, I often will get emails or phone calls from people who have questions about things or want to try and do things - "How do I do this?" So I make myself available between Council sessions, too.

[End of DVD 1. DVD 2 Starts]

AR – Can you tell me some of your observations over the years, having been involved in Council as Parliamentarian and Council Rep for various divisions, on the composition of Council, and I'm thinking both gender and just in terms of the science-practice kind of question?

RHM – Well one of the things that I think has happened over the years is there is more staff work, and Council meetings are more cut and dried. Now I can remember early on one time at Council during a recess, Nancy Russo, Florence Denmark, and I were just standing and chatting. And Mike Pallak, who was the CEO, walks by and stops and says "What is this, a conspiracy?" Three women talking is a conspiracy? You wouldn't hear that nowadays.

AR – Yeah, but there was a sense at the time that women coming together represented some kind of a threat.

RHM – Threat, yes, absolutely. Now Council has more women and more diversity. The only feminists on Council originally were from Divisions 35 and 17 (Counseling Psych). And I think another thing that has made Council more cut and dried is so many things are decided outside of Council. First the caucuses are better organized, as are the Boards, and so many more Boards

and Committees making decisions, with recommendations that come – pretty well everybody knows how people are going to line up so there's not much to debate really.

AR – Yeah.

{1:47}

RHM – It's not as spontaneous in that sense. There always are people on Council who never say anything, the majority probably. More things are decided outside Council meetings. And then I think APA has become more aware of legal issues and public relations issues, so there are more cautions around what things mean and how the world at large might regard things. The Legal Department now does more. In my early days as Parliamentarian, I used to advise on a lot more decisions for the Board of Directors as well as Council that the Legal Department now does or advises on.

AR – So they've become much more aware of the potential for litigation, that kind of thing.

RHM – Right, right.

AR – Public image relations.

RHM – Yes, yes.

AR – Do you have any pronouncement on that, or judgment on that, if that's been a good thing, a bad thing, an inevitable thing?

RHM – Well I like things a little more participatory, spontaneous and lively. In fact if they aren't lively, I try and make them lively. I remember talking to Janet Spence once and she was saying "You know Rachel, the only thing I was worried about during my Presidency relative to Council was about your being on Council. And when I got there that year, you weren't on Council". For example, there was one occasion about divisions. APA has never sunset a division for being too small, but there was a time, before we got into our war mode as a nation, that the Division of Military Psych was pretty small.

AR – Yeah.

RHM – And it was about the same time that a group of peace psychologists first proposed their division. So we're having this debate, and the military people weren't sure they wanted the peace people, and others too you know. It almost sounds womanly to be peaceful, right? So I got up and said "Well I have a solution to this problem. We could have these groups combined and we could have a Division of War and Peace". [Laughter]

AR – That's good.

RHM – So I would tend to do things like that.

AR – Keeps everyone from falling asleep.

RHM – Yeah, exactly. You have an obligation.

AR – Well is there anything I haven't asked about the Parliamentarian issue, the sort of APA governance kind of issue, that you would like to add to the record before perhaps I move back to your career?

{4:30}

RHM – Well there was one thing I noticed on ethics, I recall, that really troubled me a lot. The Ethics Committee is supposed to be somewhat independent, or used to be. And when I was on the Ethics Committee, the case came up about Edward Taub for the mistreatment of animals. It is not confidential because it was in the press, it came to us through the press, it was in the public domain, and he talked about it publicly too.

AR – Okay.

RHM – And when the case came up to the APA Ethics Committee, it was this sort of thing where the Board of Directors is operating at a different level. For example, we can have a situation where the Board or another group in APA is giving a media psychologist an award, and at the same time the Ethics Committee is finding this person unethical, but because Ethics is confidential, it is not known.

AR – Right. And just to fill us in, what were the kind of allegations?

RHM – Well with Taub it was that he was mistreating his monkeys. And he had been taken to court in Maryland where his NIH [National Institute of Health] labs were. And although his research caused pain and so forth to the monkeys, the issue was animal care, it was neglect of cleaning the cages, nobody there over the weekend, and that's what came to us. And so the Committee had some discussion. We always had a Board Rep sitting in with the Committee and we took a straw poll vote and it was a close majority to give Taub a minor discipline, a sort of a rap on the knuckles of some kind. This was the same time that the Board of Directors was awarding him a large sum of money for his defence in the legal system.

AR – Okay.

RHM –So when we actually get to have a formal vote, in comes Mike Pallak, the CEO of APA. Mike refuses to leave. And when Mike Pallak was there, one of the members, Len Goodstein changed his vote so we no longer had a majority. So Mike Pallak's presence changed the voting of the Ethics Committee.

AR – Wow.

RHM – And that kind of thing really bothered me a lot. I had been chair of the Ethics Committee earlier. And then the animal psychologists, who were feeling very threatened, because there were

groups attacking labs and things like this, formed this committee called CARE, to imply that they're caring about animals, when the purpose of the committee is to protect psychologists, not animals. And I felt that's the kind of double talk, double speak, "1984," that I didn't like.

{7:53}

AR – Well before we leave this, I'm curious if you have anything that you would like to say about the more recent developments about APA's role in rendering its judgment about the interrogation issue, and Abu Ghraib, and so on, and psychologists' involvement in interrogation? I mean this is over the last couple of years, I don't know if you have any opinions, insight into that, given your history in the Ethics Committee, sort of seeing how APA works.

RHM – You know APA Council has a lot of resolutions, and some of them are very good resolutions, and they all get filed, they don't make much of a splash, whether it's on gun control or treatment of patients or treatment of children or women. There are a lot of good ones. On this issue, I wasn't part of the politics of who gets appointed to be on what review committee and there was some criticism of the committee that led to the minority report. I feel I want APA to be against water boarding even though the Attorney General isn't. Actually, the ethics thing is not the appropriate mechanism in a way, as it is currently structured. I mean APA is good at investigating and adjudicating, but has limited powers of enforcement. The most serious decision is to expel a member. Well, when I was on the Ethics Committee, one of the biggest problems was if you throw somebody out of the organization, then what control do you have over them, as opposed to keeping them in and having them be supervised or trained or something? You know they'll just go off and feel entitled to do what they're doing again. So it's very distressing, what happened. APA's position had been the same as the American Medical Association, but then the American Psychiatric Association came out with a stronger position, so APA could have, too. But I don't quite see that anybody was wilfully obstructing or doing something wrong, it's just the way it happened.

AR – And in fact there wasn't any formal ethical complaint made to the committees.

RHM – Not then, although there may have been later.

AR – Well tell me a little bit about, before we leave APA, I just thought of another thing, you've been involved it looks like, or you've received an award from, and you've been Council Member for the Division of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology. How did you get involved with that group?

RHM – Well my interest gradually shifted from research to theory and I became very interested in post-modern theories and began writing in that area.

AR – What was that transition? Was it something that you were reading about and getting more interested in?

{11:30}

RHM – Yes, I was reading about theory and again it sort of segued over the course of my educational and scholarly life from this early interest in the good Gestalt and the perceptual principles into systems thinking, and then I was very interested in paradoxical interventions. And some of – I brought a few magazine articles to show you – some of the things got picked up, like I was mentioned in *Hustler*, or something like that, and in an article in *Parade* magazine about "Don't eat your peas", when you give a paradoxical injunction.

AR – Yeah.

RHM – And so looking at language and the social construction of meaning to me was sort of a natural kind of flow of what I had been interested in. I also became more sceptical about research methodology.

AR – Was there anything that you were reading in particular that influenced you?

RHM – Well in the whole paradoxical thing, I had liked the book *Change* very much {12:35}, by people at the Mental Research Institute out in Palo Alto [California]. And it's very like Gestalt perceptual principles, how the reorganization of the field, seeing something you hadn't seen before, was very interesting to me. And then in looking at gender issues, and Jeanne Marecek and I worked together on some of these ideas, I recognized that constructing gender as binary difference, just sort of created and reinforced the stereotypes about gender opposites that we already are into, and that we have to begin to think in other ways. Jeanne and I organized several APA programs and published a book with Yale, *Making a Difference: Psychology and the Construction of Gender*. And so I was looking at more theoretical ideas.

AR – Okay. And so that kind of led to being organizationally involved with Division 24?

RHM – Yes. And submitting something to their program instead of to Division 35. And I was on their Board for a term. They're mainly a boys Division, but they're not very organizationally sophisticated at all. They just want to have some meetings and talk to each other. The award they gave me was for feminist post-modern contributions to theoretical psychology.

AR – Yeah, I've never really been involved with them organizationally but I certainly have colleagues who are, and that was sort of my impression too, they just kind of want to hang out and talk theory or philosophy.

RHM – And some of the people I really liked in that division. I really liked and admired Phil Cushman and Ed Sampson, and when Jeanne Marecek and I were publishing this kind of innovative series with Westview Press, now Perseus, that we were editors of, we re-issued Sampson's book, *Celebrating the Other* .

AR – Okay. Well tell me about that series. You mentioned having published something like 115-

{14:40}

RHM – No, no, no. That's Jeanne's other series, that's the NYU [New York University] series she does with Michelle Fine. No, this was much more "select" you might say - another way to say "small". It was about innovative ideas and new ways of constructing experience. So we published a book by Janis Bohan on gender, we published Leonore Tiefer's book *Sex is Not a Natural Act.*

AR – Oh yeah.

RHM – We published another by Oliva Espin, *Hispanic Realities*. We published one by this wonderful Michael White narrative group in Australia, *Men's Ways of Being*, and also *Through the Looking Glass,* by Dana Becker. So we had a very nice series reflecting innovative theory.

AR – Well I noticed from your C.V. that some of your more recent work has to do with discourses of masculinity.

RHM – Yes.

AR – How did that come about?

RHM – It's just a twist so you are not preaching to the choir. That came about because men will listen when you talk about discourses of masculinity, and they don't show up when you talk about discourses of femininity. And I was quite taken with these ideas that some of the British people developed, like the male sex drive discourse that Wendy Holloway and those people worked on. That men have this drive that has to be satisfied and women are supposed to satisfy it and so forth, and how this constructs experiences and expectations without people even recognizing it. I was actually talking about the same ideas from the other masculinity side.

AR – Right.

RHM – So the article I had written, I've written several starting in the 1990s, but the one "Discourses in the Mirrored Room", is one in which I give case examples and then talk about the fact that subordinate discourses don't even enter the room. The mirrored room of course is a room with a one-way reflecting mirror but it also reflects back what is spoken in it. People aren't even aware that they're only talking in dominant discourses. I used that as sort of a graphic way of representing what's going on.

AR – Well tell me, we've talked a bit about the sort of development of your work from the ideas perspective, but getting back to kind of where you were and where you were doing this. It was hard for me to get a sense from your C.V., you've moved several times [gruffled noise in background].

RHM – Muffy! This is my dog here.

AR – Oh let's get a good shot of him [Zooms in to capture shot of Muffy].

AR – So you've moved around a fair amount, and it looks like you've taken a post where you've been Director of Clinical Training upon occasion, you were at Villanova for awhile. Can you give me a sense of that movement, sort of how you moved around, why you moved around, the kinds of experiences you had, that kind of thing?

RHM – Yes. Some of the moving was family related of course, as I've talked about my own training, educational process, you know back and forth, now we're overseas and now back here, now we're doing this PhD, now we're not.

AR – Yeah.

RHM – When I took the job at the Philadelphia Child and Guidance Clinic, it was a very exciting place, wonderful thinkers, and making video films and training and all this kind of stuff, but it was a lot of work. And I once said to Sal Minuchin who was the Director, I said "The trouble with this place is that you don't have time to think" and Sal said "We don't pay you to think".

AR – Wow. Minuchin said that?

RHM – Yeah. I once reminded him some years later and he said "Did I say that? Yeah, I probably did". And so I wanted to get back in academia and I was living in the Philadelphia area and newly remarried, my husband worked in Philly, so I was recruited to the University of Delaware as Director of their Clinical Psychology Program.

AR – Right.

RHM – And why they were looking for a woman - they were looking for two women in their clinical program, which was the most popular in the psych department there - was they didn't get their APA accreditation because they didn't have any clinical women faculty.

AR – Oh interesting.

RHM – So this was an example of where the APA accreditation structure really helped. And by the way, I had been on this standards setting group, sponsored by the APA Board of Professional Affairs and the Board of Educational Affairs and the State Licensing Boards. There was a big conference and they invited divisions and states to send reps to set up criteria for accreditation and licensing and so forth. I was a rep for Division 35, the Psychology of Women. And I remember then at that meeting trying to get gender into the standards. The only concession was to include "individual differences," but it changed over time.

AR – Oh yeah.

{20:20}

RHM – And I again was new and young and didn't know too much. But one way I had some influence, they were saying at the end of this several day meeting "Well now we ought to have a Steering Committee". So it was going to be Asher Pacht, Carl Zimet, and some of the old boys,

there were about five of them, so I raised my hand and said I would like to be on that Committee. So they let me on the Committee, and I must say that when those guys have meetings, they really know good food.

AR – Yeah, yeah.

RHM – And one of them would be out calling his broker in the middle of the meal. Anyway, a whole different world.

AR – Yeah, it really is.

RHM – So where were we? Why I was moving. So then I get sick of driving back and forth to Delaware from the Philadelphia suburbs. And there was this opportunity at Villanova, starting a new program in Community Counselling, it was called, Master's level. And I was hired to head that. And then at one point I applied for an opening at Temple University in the Doctoral Program in Clinical Psych. I thought I would rather have some doctoral students, too. And I was surprised that I didn't get the position, because I had a lot of publications and a very good record. And I remember asking my former dissertation adviser at Temple what happened, and he said "Well you know, we gathered around for the meeting and Jim Framo" – who was a notable family therapist on their faculty that I knew – "when your name came up Jim said 'Oh you don't want her, she's a feminist'". That was the kiss of death.

AR – And when was this?

RHM – In the late '70s. Subsequently, there were two different positions in Massachusetts I was offered. One was at BU [Boston University], as Director of the Clinical Psych Program, and the other was at Harvard in their Counseling and Consulting Psych Program. And I took the Harvard one. My husband Gill was still working in Philly but thought he might be able to shift location, and we got a little house in Cambridge. We would go back and forth weekends, every other weekend. But it was just too much, the back and forthness, and he wasn't able to shift location, and after five years it just wasn't worth it any more

AR – Yeah.

RHM – When I left to go to Harvard, Villanova gave me a long leave, and they kept renewing the leave because they really would have liked me back. So I returned to Villanova for a few years and I also had a very productive sabbatical at the East-West Center in Hawaii doing cross-cultural research. I had also had a semester away at a Chengdu university in China when I was at Harvard.

AR – Okay. And in your training of students, you were Director of Clinical Training in a couple of places. To what extent did you incorporate feminist principles into your training?

{23:20}

RHM – Very much so. I remember one student at Villanova who went on and got a Doctorate at Columbia University. She was thrilled when at Villanova I passed out materials for a course, including guidelines for non-sexist language. I said sexist language will not be accepted including the generic masculine, and papers will be turned back. And she said "Wow!" That was new to her. So it was very apparent, it was very much a part of things.

AR – Yeah.

RHM – And at Villanova I had a research program on attitudes toward motherhood, because I was very interested in women's right to reproductive choice. I knew that people often advocated adoption instead of abortion. So I was interested in what were the views about kids from adopted households, and things like that, because I knew the adopted kids were over-represented in the clinical population, about 10 to 1.

AR – Oh gosh.

RHM – And what it is, well there are a lot of theories about it, but I did some research, and there's sort of an alien or strange unsureness You're never sure that the child is all right because it's not your child in an odd way. And so then I got into research that revealed the idealization and the denigration of motherhood, and how these two different factors are very strong.

AR – Interesting. Well let me ask you some kind of bigger picture questions at this point. Having been involved then with feminist theory in psychology over the course of almost your entire career, what inroads do you think feminist theory has made into mainstream psychology, and where is there still work to be done?

RHM – Well in a way it's sort of like ho-hum, and "we all know that kind of thing." I think conditions are better, there are more women doing some of these things, and more ways open, but gender is such a strong marker. It's discouraging it hasn't changed more. I think we're self-consciously trying, but when you look at a textbook you can go all the way through the book and there's nothing in the index, and there's nothing in the book, that talks about sex differences or gender or women.

AR – Yeah. I think one of the things that astonishes me is how afeminist, if that's a word, psychology of women can be. And one of the great kind of contributions of, in psychology, has been the creation of psych of women as part of the curriculum, at least in most places. But that of course, can be taught in a way that is completely not feminist or doesn't mention feminism.

RHM – Yes indeed.

{26:48}

AR – So I'm getting kind of curious about asking people about their impressions of how feminist theory has or has not changed the theoretical bases or epistemological assumptions that underlie most of mainstream psychology. And as someone who has written a lot about that, and this is tied to post-modernism and social constructionism -

RHM – Yes.

AR – And how that's attempted to change the way we see psychology. Do you have any observations about that?

RHM – I'm sort of with you, Social constructionism seems stronger in Britain. You could say, there really hasn't been the change that was hoped for here in the kind of basic assumptions. It's just that the dominant discourses prevail, and the subordinate discourses are invisible. That's why I try, either using paradox or these subversive techniques, to talk sometimes about masculinity discourses because they'll listen to you, but they don't realize that you're giving the other side of the same message.

AR – Right.

RHM – Or you use humour so people don't walk out of your talk. So I don't know if there'll be another burst further along. I think one problem is, in terms of the world's situation that filters down to where everybody is, that there's a very high level of free-falling anxiety, and that's why we allow authoritarianism to take over in our own country and our disciplines and elsewhere, because we want someone to make us feel safe. We don't want to deal with complexity.

AR – Yeah. And what are your views on feminist therapy and the state of feminist therapy, feminist family therapy, now?

RHM – Well I think feminist family therapy is still vigorous and very active in a lot of strongly committed feminists, many of whom are psychologists. And for the first time, one of the leading family therapy training institutes, the Ackerman Institute in New York, has as director, Lois Braverman, a woman and a feminist. Just marvellous, and she's doing so much there, and there are good people there that continue to write and train. I don't know how much it's happening in psych training programs, but I know feminist psychologists who are active in clinics and independent practice. It seems much harder in the academy.

AR – Yeah.

RHM – I remember one of my colleagues at Delaware, Marvin Zuckerman, saying even in the 1970's that students come wanting a cookbook approach. They didn't want theory, they wanted to know what's going to work, that they can just sort of pick and choose and hang on to.

{29:53}

AR – And in some ways, cognitive behavioural therapy has provided that.

RHM – Yes, exactly. That's what people are comfortable with. Structure.

AR – And for training purposes it is, it's like a recipe, and that's what insecure students kind of want to have.

RHM – Yes, exactly. In Division 24 they complain about the lack of interest in theory. Theory is difficult.

AR – We didn't talk very much about mentoring. It's kind of a hot, maybe it's been hot for awhile now, but everybody talks about mentoring, and feminist mentoring, and the importance of mentoring. You had mentioned that you really, as a doctoral student and then early professional, really didn't have anyone that mentored you. What role has mentoring played in your career, in terms of how you work with students and so on?

RHM – Well I always try to involve students early on in publications with me, on their own or, presentations at meetings, taking them to meetings. Maybe partly because I missed that but also recognizing how hard it was if you didn't have someone to kind of give you a leg up and let your work be known. In Division 29 I had this idea, which the women got the division to support, of having a women's breakfast early in a conference, so women could get acquainted with others and not feel alone at meetings. And I do find it very gratifying to have people come up to me and say "Oh your book made such a difference to me, your ideas helped me so much!" Or "Do you remember me?" And I do have some former students who have become good friends and we get together and support each other's projects.

AR – Yeah, that's neat. Would you have any advice for feminist psychologists who are just entering the field?

RHM – Well you need allies, you need a group. I mean that was what was so great with 29 or 12, it made things worthwhile because we were all working together and sharing ups and downs. And actually, I haven't talked much about Division 35. Why don't I talk about 35? Well again, I always felt an outsider in 35, in the early days particularly. Clinicians were not really the organizing group.

AR – Right.

RHM – But after they set up a division Committee on Research, early on, somebody said "Why don't we have one on practice?" And so they asked me to chair it. And that's how Jeanne Marecek and I, and Nechama Liss-Levinson, and Alexandra Kaplan got together. We ran some workshops at APA in San Francisco and then we came out with this article "Rights of Clients, Responsibilities of Therapists".

AR – Right.

{32:55}

RHM –It came out of that 35 Task Force. And then later, I was division parliamentarian at one point, and then later I was nominated for President and I ran against Rhoda [Unger]. And I lost by about 43 votes, or something like that. But again, I felt politically, I didn't like the process. I didn't like that some people said "Oh you want to vote for Rhoda because she's a member of

AWP (Association for Women in Psychology". Well I was a member of AWP, what do they mean? But it was just politics.

AR – Yeah.

RHM – And that's one thing I think that by being Parliamentarian, I could make a contribution without being political that benefited everyone, not just those in power. And I felt more comfortable doing that.

AR – And in terms of the science-practice relationship in 35, that's changed of late it appears. There are more practitioners now.

RHM – Yes. Maybe not all feminists. There are more practitioners in all of APA, and it really bothers me because I would like to have a more integrated scientific and professional society with more presence of science. And I would rather have the Board of Directors have more balance, not mainly practitioners, as well as Council. I feel that the reapportionment that changed Council to incorporate the states really was a device to tip it toward practice. And some of my best friends are practitioners, but I would just like to have a more balanced organization.

AR – Yeah. Were you involved in APA at the time that APS [Association for Psychological Science] split off?

RHM – Yes. That was after that reorganization attempt I mentioned failed.

AR – Right. Any observations on the process of that event?

RHM – No, other than they made this deal to swap votes and passed something at Council, but they didn't change everybody's minds. I went to a couple of APS meetings and I think some people will say that they don't match APA when it comes to interest in minorities or women, the kind of structures that are more socially-responsive structures. APA still has those and APS doesn't.

AR – Right. In some ways they're starting from scratch and it might take awhile. I mean APA has a long history, over 100 years, and it was only in the late 60s that they became more responsive.

RHM – Yeah, really not until the 70s. Quite a struggle!

{36:05}

AR – Yeah. Okay, well I guess we need to kind of wrap up a bit. I have a couple of sort of general questions. What would you say, in terms of looking back on your career, what would you say have been the accomplishments or the contributions you feel most proud of?

RHM – I am really proud that I have been recognized for challenging ideas and practices that have too often gone unquestioned. This includes theory and research as well as ethics and

therapy and organizational structures. Such challenges are probably why social constructionism suits me, the ability to see what is not obvious. Also, I think as APA Parliamentarian I raised the standards for a new dignity and fairness in Council and APA governance in general.

AR – And what about your publications? Do any of them stand out?

RHM – Well this one, "A Feminist Approach to Family Therapy", was acclaimed as a major influence on the field of family therapy. And then "Discourses in the Mirrored Room" has been reprinted a lot, and is still assigned a lot. People tell me even now, and it came out in 1994, that they still use it for teaching. And students can get it because it's so clear, and I think that's helpful. I may write about advanced theory but I try to avoid jargon and make the ideas clear. Many of my publications in therapy also have been translated into other languages. And I think Jeanne's and my book was a little gem.

AR – And is there anything that I haven't asked you about, about your life, about your career, about organizational involvement, that you would like to have on the tape?

RHM – No, I think you've covered a lot of things.

[Discussion around Chinese paintings begins]

AR – Tell us a little bit about this piece of art here.

RM – Well I learned Chinese brush painting when I lived in the Philippines. I lived in the Philippines on two different occasions. And I was surprised how I took to the painting because I thought I was kind of into modern art because I do some painting and portraits and oils and things. But what I really liked about brush painting was the discipline, and in any picture there really is one right stroke at any point, and that was what you were seeking to achieve in a sense. And this one of the birds and the snow is one of my favourites.

AR – It's beautiful. Well show us some others.

RHM – At the entrance here is one I did, it's a classic figure that many people do different versions of. And this is the guardian of entrances. So when you come in my front door and you see it here, you should feel reassured because he will be protecting you. I didn't do the calligraphy, although these are my chop (seal) marks. My master did the calligraphy, which describes what the painting is and says painted by, my Chinese name is "child of the sea".

AR – Amazing.

RHM – That was sort of fun. I enjoyed doing that.

{39:02}

AR – Now is this something you have done over the course of many years or was there a period when you were more actively painting?

RHM – I was more actively doing it in the 1960s, 70s, and then I got busy with other things, you know, moving around and all that

AR – You know we talked just a little bit about your travels, but obviously you've been in the Philippines, Nigeria, China. What role has that played in your life, travel?

RHM – Well it certainly makes you aware of the social context and people's striving. When you see life overseas, you kind of get concerned about the privilege of the Americans there, who may live overseas because they can be treated in a more privileged way than they would by their plumber at home.

AR – Yeah.

RHM – And it just gives you a different perspective on looking back at your own country and what's going on there. And just the quality of people's lives and what it takes to keep going.

AR – I'm amazed when I look at the literature on social constructionism in psychology. A lot of the people who embrace that point of view and write about it are people who have travelled a lot, and I often wonder if that has an impact on your ability to kind of be aware of those processes.

RHM – I think so. You know when you talk about dominant discourses, but then you see the discourses in other cultures which are just oblivious in your own culture.

AR – That's right. Even words and terms that exist in one language and not another, and how that influences experience. Well is there another one that you would like to show us?

RHM – Here's one here, this little man here.

AR – So tell us about this.

RHM - Well this is one of an old man, squatting down, drinking a little bit. He has the long finger nails of the Chinese who is not a laborer. I once asked, when I was in China, what the word coolie means. You know we talk about coolie labor; coolie means "hard labor". And he obviously is not of that class.

AR – Great.