

Dr. John Adams December 2, 1977

J.A. do you have in mind sort of centering it around any particular decision points, I mean, do you, and I guess what I am doing now is reflecting the way I perceive , and that is from a particular issue and then a number around that, because it is a little harder, I guess I can say, some things in general about the general decision making , ;you know, sort of style, if you will....

EAR Yeah, that would be helpful, but why don't you also do it in terms of some of the things that you were intimately involved with , the Homosexual one is certainly an example. Also, I think what would be helpful since Stan did something with the sequence of special assistants that I think was extraordinarily useful, to him, certainly and to the people involved. His style, I think, was probably, if not best illustrated in that interaction, certainly well illustrated in the way he used people who came in as special assistants, all of whom have since gone on to very productive, very active careers beyond that so it was a tremendous learning experience for everyone who was involved, but he certainly did it without using the word selfish. He did it for reasons that served his purpose extraordinarily well. So, I wish you would keep that in mind because I think that is important. Stan's relationship to people is dramatically different from Bob's relationship to people. And I want to make that point without, in any way, making envidious comparisons but I think it is an important issue, so maybe the thing to do, and it will come to you as you go ahead, is to begin with how you first got started with him. I'll try to cue you a couple of ~~things~~ times if something I think I'd like to know more about but you go ahead. Incidentally, if there is anything you'd rather I not use, either don't tell me or tell me and I'll exclude it. I will be discreet. This is not an effort to talk about personalities.

JA Well, then, maybe just to begin with a little bit of kind of background as to how I got into the whole thing in the first place, My being in that position at NIMH was in a major way engineered as was certainly much of my earlier career by Dave Hamburg, as mentor of Stanford. And when I first went into the PHS and ~~may be~~ maybe this will be some comments that apply to other parts of the NIMH as well, my initial interests when I went into the PHS was to get involved as a clinical researcher in the intramural program, and so I, at an appropriate time, which I recall was certainly very early in the first year of residency , was one of these very long lead times kinds of things, was invited in for the round of interviews.

EAR8 What year was that?

JA It would have been '65, the early fall of '65 . Then I had indicated my interest in various of the programmatic areas and was duly interviewed by the people who were involved there. But, as that day went along, it turned out to be an increasingly frustrating interview series for both myself, and I think, also for those involved, Because, I had, I think, probably come there with pretty high recommendations, again from Dave. But, it was clear that the kind of commitment wanted of me, in terms of a specific interest in a specific research area, and I have subsequently jokingly said that if I had presented myself as being interested in the uncles of schizophrenics , that I would have been snapped up very quickly, but at that stage of the game, when my research interests were really quite unformed and I had some general notion of what I might be interested in, and saw myself as generally interested in some of the activities , particularly of the psychiatry group. But it was quite clear that what they wanted were people who would plug ~~in~~ in, in a very

well defined way to studies that were ongoing at that ~~time~~ point, and were presumably going to be ongoing three years hence and that short of that, they really weren't interested. So, at the end of the day, we came to a sort of mutual parting of the ways, and sort of mutually decided that I wasn't prepared to make the kind of commitment that they wanted, and they weren't prepared to take a chance on me.

EAR Who were some of the "theys" here involved?

ja Well, Biff Bunny was involved in that, and Lyman Wynne. Those were the principal people involved. So, I went back to Stanford then, somewhat bewildered by this, and rather at sea in terms of what I really wanted to do. So the next step was again some machinations on the part of Dave, involving this time, Joe English, who had become the chief psychiatrist of the Peace Corps which preceded the OEO thing, and on one of his travels around the country, he landed at Stanford, and I ended up having an hour with him and it went well and, I am sure, there were again some behind the ~~scen~~ scenes inputs and the next thing I knew there was a formal invitation that when my tour of duty came up I would be assigned as a Public Health officer with the Peace Corps to head up a Regional Area with the very strong notion that some of the research interests that I was then developing in the whole area of coping and modeling and adaptive kinds of things, again following Dave's lead, could actually be implemented in those kinds of settings. and a research opportunity lay in that area. So things coasted along that way pretty well until, I guess, third year residency would have been early '68, probably late '67 when two things happened. First, I guess, the PHS regs were changed so that it was no longer possible to detail people to non PHS organizations and that, secondly, Joe English moved over to OEO. So I was suddenly, rather late in the game, kind of floating free in terms of where I was actually going to spend the next two years. And, again, I think, Dave's hand entered into it and the next thing I knew I was set up for a trip to NIMH and a series of interviews had been set up with the various Division Directors of that place, and at that time it was Don Oken and Dirke, and did I see you there, (I think that perhaps we did), and Mort Miller was just on board, just getting started with that one. And then some of the people within those units, the psychopharm group, those that regularly and traditionally use the Corps of officers. One of the people that I saw was Dick Zaluck,

who was Stan/s special assistant. I had had met Stan briefly that morning, the first time I had ever seen him I think, although I may possibly have shaken his hand on one of his trips to Stanford, and the message I had received that morning was that I was to go around and look at all these various things and that I had an appointment with Stan at the end of the day to see what would be appropriate, if possible. So I went through the whole day of interviews and one of the people who I particularly enjoyed talking to was Dick Zaluck, who indicated, first, his sort of fascination for the job, and then also his intention of leaving at that point. I had some subsequent discussions with him, I think he may have been sugar-coating it a bit, in terms of the way he really felt about it at that point, but that aside, so at the end of the day I met with Stan again and I vividly remember the conversation, because Stan's office was one of the more elegant and opulent I had ever seen and because I had a certain awe of all this.

EAR This was in the Barlow Bldg?

ja Barlow Bldg. On the Fourteenth floor. And walked ⁱⁿ ~~in~~ and sat down, and I remember that when I had seen him in the morning, and had been rather hurried and stiff, and he was behind the desk and was sort of "hello, here is your schedule, and I'll see you at the end of the day" At the end of the day he was very much more relaxed and unwound, and we sat down in a little conference area, and he looked at me and he said " Well, Hohn, you come very highly recommended, and essentially, he said, you can do whatever you want. Well, the things that had specifically been mentioned were various kinds of regular Corps assignments around the other parts of the Institute and did something that was perhaps a little uncharacteristic of me , I proceeded to go through and evaluate all the various ones that I had seen and express interest in a number of them. And then I was more assertive than I sometimes am and then I said, Well, there is one other position that we really haven't talked about but I did particularly enjoy speaking with Dr. Zaluck and I wonder if there would be any chance

of my working directly with you. And, he didn't give me an immediate answer. He said that he would take that under advisement and that certainly that was not beyond the realm of possibility, so for me to go back to Stanford, and he would be in touch, and I think it was a week later that I got a letter formally assigning me to . So I was very much excited about the prospect and spent a good deal of time talking about it with David and of course, I think, there may well have been some motivation on Dave's part in terms of having one of his boys close to the seat of things and, so, that was how I got there. I remember that when I first arrived I was greeted in highly differing ways by different people. And I think that this does say something about the administrative style and the kinds of relationships that went on. I was greeted, first, I guess, by my office-mate Dave Mustow, who was also special assistant and he and I spent, he had already had one year on board, so we were overlapping by one year. And he and I spent sometime that afternoon and a great deal of time later on talking about what it was like and I still remember Dave's comment. I said, "What is this job like" and he grinned and he laughed. He said, "Well, it's interesting." You have to know Dave Mustow well. I can see his face saying "It's interesting". And interesting it was. I talked at some length. I don't remember whether it was that first day, but early on with Goldstein, who at that point was extremely bitter, angry, thought he'd been undermined, short-changed or sold out, or whatever, His feeling was that he had broken his ass for Stan and that Stan had sold him down the river in some way that I didn't quite understand. I also talked to Steve Goldston early on, who felt that way in spades, that that he was at that point in the midst of the whole Public Health Mental Health thing which unfolded over the course of that next year, and I was in significant ways involved in that, and his bitterness became greater as that went on. I also talked to Mort Miller

there early on who told me first off that he had been a special assistant and he said, you know, of course, what the acronym is for your position, don't you? I said "no". He said, Special Assistant to the Director, SAD, sad, which also had some meaning that .And then I had a considerable experience down the road with the other folks that I got to know. There was one other particular relationship that had a complicated history to it, and that is that virtually at the same time that I came on, as Special Assistant to Stan, a very old and very complex friend of mine, George Hamm, came on board as Director of Mental Training (?) and a small digression there. I had known George very well when I was a kid back in Chapel Hill. In fact, I first met him through his daughter and had had all of the complex relationships that go with being the boyfriend of the oldest daughter of a very powerful and self-assured man. It has not always been a smooth relationship with George . The daughter had subsequently died and I ~~we~~ had become, in sort of a funny way, almost the adopted son almost in that family , it was very much a father-son relationship. When I was back in Chapel Hill I would visit with the Hamms. I had also ~~ix~~ acquired a wife in the interim whom the Hamms had met only very briefly on a quick trip to the West Coast, so that it was knowing George in a whole new thing, and I think maybe as we go along the whole thing of what happened with George and Stan might be something that would be worth going into in some detail . I think I have a real sense of where that didn't work and why. So I guess I finally began to get acclimated to the thing. One other very key person in the system was Esther Kohn, and if there is something that I had learned through internship and in the Medical School, I think that I already had some orientation to being cautious in dealing with people in the kind of position that she was in. I relatively quickly, and I must confess, somewhat by

design, came to be quite close to Esther. As I said, I had learned from my internship, for example, that the intern is a fool if he alienates the head nurse. She can either make his life infinitely easier, or she can kill him. And actually I had practiced this with some skill in terms of Dave Hamburg's secretaries at Stanford. They are the keepers of the gate. And if you expect to have a smooth access, let alone a smooth relationship you had damn well better pay attention to that and not lord it over them, and act uppity and all this kind of business. And I think frankly, that a number of my predecessors/^Isubsequently learned, largely from Esther, and from others, had really run very much afoul of that, that they had seen themselves as rank kind of thing, and she killed every one of them. Because it was very clear, early on, that if it came to be a question of who was more important to Stan, between Esther and a special assistant, Esther hands down and won, and out of this/~~a~~ whole bunch of other encounters, I sort of developed a notion about power. There are three, what/~~soever~~, levels of power in a system, any system, maybe, and that one, perhaps in particular, there is power and that's the guy who's got it, there is delegated power, that is specific task responsibilities that is handed to somebody else, to deal with, and there is borrowed power, which is really influence or effectiveness that is, not capriciously, but temporarily given around a specific issue and can be just as quickly pulled back, and one of the key things about the Special Assistant role, is that that individual always operates with borrowed power, and never with delegated power, and again, I think, some other folks who have been in that position got the notion actually that they had the mandate to do something and that never never happens in that system and you can run quickly afoul of all sorts of stuff. There were a couple of occasions in which I inadvertently blundered into that. I remember one occasion specifically when Stan had had some political contact with an alcoholic patient and so he told me to call Jack Mendelson out at St. E's and to admit this guy. So I called yup. I had never met Mendelson, mind

you and I called him up and I said, well this man has come in, and I didn't mention Stan's name, this man has come in and we would appreciate it if you would admit him. Well, I thought the phone was going to melt in my hand, and he said. Well, who the fucking hell are you to tell me who we are to admit down here, and I quickly realized what I had done, and I said, well, I am only bearing the message here for Dr. Yolles, who asked me. He said, Stan wants me to admit this guy, Stan can call me, and you can tell Stan in the meantime that the minute he thinks he has admitting privileges down here, he can have this God damn job and shove it down his ass. So, occasionally, I blundered into those things, but in general, I think, and I'll be very immodest about it, I do think that I function generally very well and very smoothly in that Special Assistant role, and I think that I had had a lot of tutelage in doing that at Stanford, it was not a new role for me. Well, I also for a lot of psychological reasons, tend to be tuned in to working with older senior people. I admit I have, my career has been heavily that of being an effective mentee and I have always had a strong mentor. And part of that is learning how to keep the Mentors happy with you, and so on, and I think I did pretty well with that and didn't run afoul too much of some of these things.

What else can I sort of say in general about this.

EAR. Let me just prompt you on this point because I think you're touching on just exactly the sorts of things I wanted to get at. I think the issue of how people like yourself in that kind of position worked effectively as, in contrast to some others, who you mentioned earlier on, didn't realize that they were playing ^{is}, part of that kind of total process of what went on in the Institute. So, that's wonderful. Why don't you, if you would, turn to a couple of more substantive issues, unless there is more that you want to give me about the background.

JA Let ~~me~~ give you a little more about the background, because I think that does become relevant. Stan was in many ways a different kind of person from those that I had encountered before, and he could be a vastly different kind of person from one setting to another or one time to another. And you were never quite sure what you were going to encounter in working with him. One of the things that struck me relatively early on was the degree to which Stan maintained an element of distance in everybody that he dealt with. And I think this does have something to do with the way in which decisions and so on got made around more substantive issues. He tended to use ~~up~~ different people for specific kinds of different functions but with quite strong compartmentalization between them. For example, small staff was no more a decision making body than the man in the moon. It was purely and simply, I think, largely a form or a mechanism to make people feel as though they were part of the overall decision making. It was a matter of going around the table and round robin and and a few sort of sometimes politically sensitive, but more often, just ~~kinds of public~~ generally public kinds of announcements. That was not how decisions were made. They were tended to be made much more, on a one-to-one setting with Stan and so on. One of the things that this produced was a certain element of jealousy or lack of communication in the circle of those who were responsible, because nobody ever quite knew what was going on. I did sometimes get caught in the middle of that and I would sometimes be sent as message bearer from one faction to another, and those were the ticklish kinds of things. Just to sum it up, I felt very much as if I was in all of that but I was not really of it. With the exception of a few things, like the homosexuality thing, I really wasn't in a major substantive role with my job. I think that's both the strength ~~or~~ ^{and} the weakness of the position, or at least, the way Stan handled it, but and I don't know quite what it says, at least with respect to me, he really didn't delegate specific kinds of responsibilities very much to me.

He tended very much more, to Mort, to you, Phil Sorotkin was clearly a very broadly involved person in all of this. Stan, had very much, those who he leaned on, particularly , although, again, with some separateness, you, Mort and Phil being clearly the ones , and Sherm of course, being clearly the ones that he related most closely to, much less closely to Lou , and I'll get to Bert. And very little at all, really, to Bert. That for a couple of reasons....

EAR And when you came this was after a very serious strain had taken place between Stan and Bert over the St. E's situation. Were you privy to that after the fact?

ja Only in a kind of indirect way. The strain was immediately evident and became more evident as time went on, particularly and frankly in terms of Bert's very active efforts on many occasions to seduce me into his camp to use me either as information source, or whatever to Stan. I remember, one day, certain uncharacteristic of Bert. He came into my office , obviously very steamed up about something. He said, you know, "Is Stan crazy? Is he clinically crazy" Obviously, I didn't give him any answer on the subject. Something had happened. Those kinds of things I often didn't know about, interestingly enough, despite the fact of being very much in the middle of things. It had come from other sources, usually. Stan didn't share a great deal with me at that level . He shared a great deal with me in a more relaxed and personal way when we traveled and one of the other roles in which I functioned was that of companion and part of the entourage when Stan traveled, and that I enjoyed immensely, but one of the things that I very clearly learned was that the very open relaxed relationship that existed on trips did not carry over in the office. It was pretty much strictly business. The only exception was that one of the sorts of rituals, was that at the end of every day I appeared in the office to go over the mail and that involved reviewing, I

this also, by the way, says something about Stan's administrative style about the way that Institute was run in those days, and that was that every single solitary letter that went out of that Institute, anyplace, that went out over Stan's name, was personally read, very often corrected, and signed by him. He would pick up the finest kinds of wording, things that made him uncomfortable. One of the more difficult tasks I had, was the next morning to take all these letters that he had written all over in black pen back to whoever had drafted them, and say, well, you know, this has got to be changed, and in this and this way.

EAR Even I got letters back.

JA So that there was an element of sort of real central control over everything. He was very concerned over what went out over his name.

EAR That's a terribly important issue.. It sounds very small, but, but I know, both you and I know, that it is not. I think that Stan's style of administration was, just as you said a few moments ago, about your relationships to the gatekeepers, and the realization that they were very important. Stan, obviously, also has a number of aspects of administration that he feels are inhibital (?) to good administration, and he has long recognized that his letters with his signature are a mode of communication about which he feels very strongly and couple that with the fact that he has an absolutely incredible facility to see these nuances. Interestingly enough, he doesn't like to write himself, he is not literary,

JA.* He actually wrote very very little. The only letters that I was ever involved in, that he had himself dictated, were letters to personal friends. Not business, but letters that had to deal with people that he knew in Brooklyn, or whomever. Those he dictated himself, but everything else was farmed out for draft preparation but when it came back, he would massage it down to the last comma.

EAR That's right, and literally to the last comma, and with an incredible capacity, skill, because I pride myself on writing good letters, and when he made a

he was invariably right.

JA. I remember one that had to do with training and social work at the Post Master's degree level and someone had typed up a letter that had Postmasters. And he simply came through the roof on that. We are not training people for the Postal Service here. It is Post-Master's. But at those times, late afternoon, I vividly remember the darkening Washington sky, as we would be sitting there, just going through the phenomenal correspondence, load of stuff, There was a single drawer in his desk into which everything, with the exception of the Congressionals and the Blue Folder ones and the executive mail went and all of that would be gone through at the end of every single day that he was in the office.

EAR How long did it take you to realize that he had an incredible capacity for work/

JA That became evident within the first week. Because his ability to not only handle, but get through and retain and remember the masses of stuff that he had to deal with was really phenomenal. Stan was very much a person, who, not only in letters but in terms of, he is greatly concerned with details of things. It is not the other administrative model, which is to paint the broad brush strokes and then let someone else fill in the colors. For him it was a matter of really all the responsibility. The other thing that I think did preoccupy Stan and I think the whole Institute during this time and for obvious reasons was the political process. ~~Was~~ We are talking about the capital P Political Process. There was a tremendous amount of politics ~~both~~ internally but the just phenomenal sensitivity to the subtle attitudes or shifting attitudes of Senators, Congressmen and the Congressional Staffs and I guess, I would have to say, across the board much of the success of at least as I saw it, of the Institute during that period in its warfare with various Surgeons-General and various NIH people and ADAMHA people and so on, had to do with the fact that those channels were kept very well

lubricated by very skillful people. Stan, himself, was very good at it, Phil Sirotkin, was of course a master of doing that. One of things that certainly caused an awful lot of friction, as I saw it, between Stan and Bert was that Bert thought he was awfully good at it, but Stan had a very low opinion of his ability to work in those areas.

EAR Was it clear then....."I want to raise one more point, because there is a curious sequence between Bob Felix's use of Stan and then subsequent disaffection and Stan's initial use and development of Bert and then subsequent disaffection different in many ways and yet fundamentally similar, was there anything else that you sensed, and let me just tell you, I think one of Stan's real concerns about Bert, aside from the fact that Bert was not as politically skillful as he himself thought, was that Frankly Stan thought that Bert's sense of integrity about^{some} things was not that strong and Stan's, whatever people think of him, Stan's sense of integrity is very very high. Was that clear at that time? Was that part of the problem?

JA I think I only saw that around the edges, here and there. Bert would, on occasion, suggest, at one point I almost got sucked in on that. It was fairly early on, I believe what had happened was that Stan was out of town and I didn't go along, Bert was Acting Director and some policy question came up and somehow I got involved in that. Because Bert was going to be away and he didn't want to handle it and he said well why don't you hold that till Stan gets back but I would suggest we do thus and such. And so I made the mistake of going to Stan and saying, "Well, thus and so, and thus and so and Dr. Brown suggests that we do thus and such. " And I got a long lecture. That pretty much said that, that Bert was slippery and that the...
There's one other^{little} piece of this and I don't know whether

EAR Do you want me to turn it off?

JA No, I trust you to....Bert thought, and I think let Stan know that he, Bert,

EAB Some of us did.

JA I'm sure a number of you did. I'm sure that Stan went ahead anyway, for what he thought, I am sure, were very good, largely, I think, political reasons. Stan was in a lot of trouble then and later, some of it justified, some of it not justified with the Academic community and psychiatry and I think he felt, well, you know, I'll just take one of their boys and they can't argue about it. That's I guess, maybe a ~~very~~^{poor} basis on which to decide ultimately but it was worth the effort. Stan had to have known that George was ^{very much} over the hill at that point. George should have known that two, in a way, more similar yet more different people would be hard to imagine both of them very powerful people basically with very strong egos, sometimes fragile egos, but strong ones, both of them very used to being Numero Uno, Number One in charge, being looked up to. There was an additional very strong factor in George Hamm that was what really dommed him, and that is for all of his bravura and bluster George had to be loved in a very special way by those whom he worked for. A funny way, you would hardly expect that in someone with as much breasbeating as George, but he ran afoul of the Dean at Chapel Hill in exactly the same way, exactly the same way. And George came there with, I think, a much overblown view of his own worth to the Institute, or at least his place in the system and he genuinely expected to be Stan's #1 friend, on a social basis, confidante, major policy advisor. He expected to be, pardon the, the analogy is limited to the relationship, and not to anything else, he expected to be to Stan as Kissinger was to Nixon. General purpose, most intimate kind of And Stan didn't have that in mind at all. For a variety of reasons, I think, he simply did not respect George's judgment in a whole range of different areas and he was already well placed with confidantes whose judgment he did very much admire and respect so one of the more complicated things that I got into was being in some sense party to, very much in the middle of this strain on that. Now it's an

incredible compliment to both of those people , and I think particularly to George . In a way it would have been much easier for George to lean on me to be an intermediary and he really did not do that at all, despite the fact that Anne and I became very close to George and Sally on a much more peerlike, it was a friendship rather than a business thing. But that was doomed to start with. I also remember terribly vividly that another component of the disaffection with George was the drinking problem, and I remember so vividly that small staff retreat down at Airlee House and the just horrible show that George and Don Greaves put on and Stan's an incredibly moral person as well as the high ethical standards , I've never seen Stan either remotely drunk or out of control, in any ways he'd control himself and I think he found that simply disgusting as well as anything else. He lost any respect he might have had for him. At least, George had the good sense to know when enough was enough and to get out.

EAR At that same time had Don Oken left, before you left? There was a partial variation on the same theme, totally different in one sense, because Don's expectation were not George's expectations but, let me just tell you, since you don't know all of the details of some of these things that one of Stan's problems really was an amazing ability to assess people almost immediately. By the time you walk in the door, he can tell you how good you are or not. That's a slight exaggeration, but very quickly on to be able to assess people and I think that when he decides that someone doesn't fit, then, whatever he may have told them before, no longer holds. Now, interestingly enough h, you were talking about his being very conservative and a high order of integrity, which I completely agree with, sometimes he conveniently forgets things that he may have told someone, or he interprets what he says differently than people interpret it, or a combination of both.

And I know three specific instances. That of Don Oken is one, Bob Weiss is another, then George Hamm is the third, in which each individual thought they heard something in their interaction with Stan that he didn't think he said. Now Don has a stronger case than perhaps anybody else, because he has something in writing which almost discounts something that Stan said, but be that as it may, it's an interesting problem, and I think it speaks to a lot of complicated things. One, when people ~~are~~ like Stan, whose mind works at three levels, at least, simultaneously, say something to someone else, and they only hear one level, he reacts then, and afterwards, in terms of all three levels, you see, and it becomes a problem. Now, do you sense any other examples of this where, unfortunately, his interaction with some people, literally what he may have promised them, or what he may have told them, turned out later to be different from what they actually understood? Do I make myself clear?

JA I don't come to a specific and clear example of that.

EAR Now, I want to say something though, and frankly, get it on the record, too, because there is another interesting comparison. Something I did not know earlier, I am learning so many things in this effort. Apparently, early on, Bob Felix was known as "Promising Bob" because when people came in, whatever they wanted, he promised them. And, of course, you know, very sincerely clearly, glad-handing, out-going, hypomanic character who, in many respects, was exactly the opposite of Stan in his interaction with people. Whereas Stan could not tolerate the third minute in a sequence of Council meetings, and was ready to leave by the time five minutes were over, Bob Felix absolutely revelled in sitting up at the front of that room. You, unfortunately, never had a chance to see him do that but it was like the conductor of an orchestra leading the entire symphony orchestra, whereas Stan, by the time the Council meeting came along, he was on to something else and really didn't want to be

EAR cont. involved and yet, in some respects, this capacity to be

AJ It was on a one-to-one relationship with people, you know, trying to get them to join the Institute, or whatever, which you made early on, on how at the end of the day that he was relaxed, and very very open, and very very engaging, because he can be a very engaging guy, he also tended, in a sense, to promise people things which they took. I have yet to see somebody go into a meeting with him and not come out feeling, both impressed, enthusiastic, willing to go in. He has real charm in those circumstances, although in a formal meeting, he can be stiff and formal and not very verbal, which is totally the opposite from Bob.

AJ. I had had some exposure in a very different mode, expressed in different ways, but the same type of thing with Dave Hamburg. And I really watched that awfully closely. I really think that I had had a superb tutelage for the time with Stan by and within the Institute by having worked in a somewhat similar kind of role, not quite, but a similar role with Dave. And Dave had a whopping reputation for promising in usually, rather vague and general ways, the moon and the stars, and there was a number of people who felt betrayed thereafter in not getting it. I guess I was tuned into that kind of thing. But, of course, as I say, I stress again, that I think so much of the inner workings of Stan's thing were on a one-to-one basis and I wasn't in on those. I was, as I say, in it, but not of it. Well, I didn't stay around long enough if you will, to become a Division Director and have the delegated kind of relationship or whatever, something grandiose.

EAR. I understand, but that's exactly what ^{Mort Miller} took...the grandiose...

Jim Istbister was there?

AJ Jim was there, and it is interesting that I haven't mentioned Jim yet. Jim was a very different character from most of the others. Jim, at that point at least, was very very much the loyal soldier and the one one ...Jim didn't

Jim didn't become involved in the substantive issues at that stage of the game. Now obviously, later on with Bert, he became very much involved, but, I think, there again he was bright enough to know what his relationship was vis-a-vis Stan. He was an expediter, a doer, one who took what Stan told him to do and got it done, not one who suggested what Stan ought to be doing or got heavily involved in policy. Now, at that point, I don't know whether that squares with....

EAR No, no, not....

AJ Because one of the ways in which I think he was.....I had certainly at this stage of the game, held Jim in very high regard, one of the sharpest and most effective and minimally screwed up people I had ever run into, really very effective. I think he may have gotten caught in the Peter Principle later but..... One of the problems though, with, what was I saying. You mentioned Stan's ability to size people up and I would agree with that. I also think that Stan operated, at least, on the covert assumption that he was brighter than everybody he dealt with, everybody, and the thing that made it work was that at least 95% of the time he was right. Now in 5% of the cases he wasn't right and then/^{he}got into some severe difficulties, particularly up the ladder, but, in general, that was his modus operandi. I think there were also some problems. One other thing, just a little bit of an aside here, that has to do with the transition, even though I didn't know Bob Felix, I've heard a lot about him, and from what you said, just corroborated it for me. I am very much impressed with the role that the style of the leader plays in the way in which an organization functions and the way in which decisions are made within an organization, and the impact that a change in style can have on an organization, Did I ever talk to you about the Micky Steinfeld-Hamburg thing, maybe this evening... There's a very strong parallel in terms of a massive style shift, people continue to respond in terms of what a given message meant in the old style and it means something totally different in

AJ cont. the new style and it leads to a lot of confusion. Now, if there was in my view, a strong kind of problem with Stan's style and with ~~his~~ business of consulting in a rather limited way with people and going ahead, it was that I think at some times, it led down paths, that had broader consultation been sought, you know, things might have gone differently. Stan is, and was, and I think maybe is in the best sense of the word, I think, an empire builder and he was very desirous of having the NIMH grow and get bigger and I remember his incredible , just, plea, and there is no other word for it, when it, for a brief period, attained full bureau status parallel with NIH, and I remember his fury when the ADAMHA thing got created over the Poverty, and of course, the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institutes spinning off. It made him furious.

EAR I wish I could talk to you a little more fully about some of those conversations.....

JA

AJ So, but the problem is, and I think one that obviously is still very much an issue had to do with the whole community mental health center business. I was there at the time when that was really felt....when the groundwork had all been laid, when it was very much a time when the push was to get those things out, to get them rolling and to get the budget up so that more and more and more and more could be funded. And at that point a tremendous amount of the congressional mail that we were getting had to do with people writing having already negotiated it with NIMH , but then going the congressional route, making arguments that this or that aspect of the regulations for establishing community mental health centers , didn't apply to their places and essentially asking for exemptions or why in the hell does it have to be between \$50,000 and \$200,000 and our place doesn't break up that way, or we got this, why can't we do that, and all of these various and Stan saw all of those as subterfuge, and as attempts to destroy what he was really convinced, or at least, put up a good show of being convinced, was absolutely the way to go. I remember also, that fairly early on, ^{one} kn the midst, we'd had six or seven congressionals from this/very active

place , so I said to Stan when we were going through all this, and he was explaining to me how these bastards were just trying to, you know, and I said, Well, gee, you know, incredible naivety, why instead of pushing this one model , why doesn't the Institute set up six different pilot models around the country using different mixes, different models, whatever and see which one works best and then, you know, implement those or maybe have a range of different possibilities and he really gave me a tough lecture. He said, John, that and a dime will get you a cup of coffee. He said, that's not the way it works. He said you have to decide what you want to do and then push every button to get it done. And that approach, I think hasled us into some difficulties. Because it obviously hasn't worked in every setting. I remember so vividly a sub-set of that which I think again was a problem with it. I recall being in his office and , in fact, when he read a little blurb, I forget whether it was in the Blue Sheet or what, reporting some of Alan Kraft's first findings out at Ft. Logan that chronic patients were cluttering up the community mental health center and that more and more and more of the energy and activity was going to simply maintaining chronic patients rather than the kind of outreach and social, Stan, had, of course, a very broad definition of what mental health concerned. He genuinely believed in a kind of public health model of what mental health was. And he was absolutely furious at that. And one of the most incredible assignments that I ever had. Stan read this thing and he said, John, I want you on a plane tomorrow and go out to Denver and find out what they are doing wrong. Not, why is it happening, not , you know, is there something peculiar about that place, what they are doing wrong, in terms of that. And I think some of that came, frankly, from Stan's not really being willing to listen to a broad range of different advisories and consultants. Stan talked to those who agreed with him in a major way, who, at least, in a way were willing to go with it and then zingo, anybody who objected to that had ulterior motives.

of

Coming back to Bert, one/the needles that Bert stuck, and you probably remember this one, Bert came back from one of his sojourns, I guess, out to Boston, or some place with this big button which said "Even paranoids have real enemies". And he gave it to Stan. And I think in one sense, not meaning anything clinical, in one sense he was kind of paranoid. He did really see enemies around a lot and those whoas a general principle of the way in which, and I know, I am still being awfully general, I think as a general principle, the way in which decisions were made in the Institute about a whole range of issues, you know, health centers, whatever, had a great deal to do with sort of limited consultation , usually with a rather close group, largely in-house group, and then followed by a sort of a massive highly political strategy to bring that about and damn the torpedoes.

EAR Now, you see, again, to get it on the record, someone in one of these interchanges said , knowing both Stan and Bob, that, in a sense, Bob asked someone to do something, gave them the responsibility and gave them their head, and assumed that it would get done, in a trusting kind of way. And that Stan was always expecting something to go wrong, so to speak, and always worked against that kind of contingency by all kinds of preparations. He was, and is, somewhat paranoid about that, but it's also important to realize that, as you said before, he really starts with the premise that over the years his experience, abilities and his general competence lead him 95% of the time, and in his mind, it is probably 100% of the time, to be right, so once he makes up his mind, everyone, almost inevitably, has to go along with him, otherwise they are wrong. And that also carries with it something else. I think, maybe, Dave Hamburg would exemplify, and I would say, more at the present moment than even that he did before, you get to the point in terms of power, responsibility, people working for you and reinforcing whatever feelings you have about your competence and omnipotence, you get to be somewhat imperial. You can't help yourself. That's an impossible thing to avoid. I think, you just get seduced

EAR cont into it without realizing. I don't know anyone who could avoid it.

Stan has the same thing, and he has had it for a long time. Now, I would love to see Dave Hamburg now, because I don't see, whatever he may have felt when he was back in Stanford he's got it in spades now. There's no question about it.

JA. You aren't kidding. In some ways, he's a different person. Dave, to spin of the top, he's so funny. Anything that Dave was guarded about, it was negative statements about people. The biggest robber, and Dave would balance his negative assessment with some positive points about the person, and whis got Dave a long way. One could argue, as people have, that this had a very pernicious design to it. You never can tell when your enemies will be in a position where you need to...Dave's changed, and I have heard him just recently in some of the most unbelievable, what I can only call, character assassinations that I have ever heard. It's just ZZamm...writing somebody off and he didn't do that before.

EAR Ya, I think it's a side effect of the same....OK, you want to talk about St. E's?

JA. Ya, I think that's an example, if you will, of one of these things that maybe some, I don't pretend to know all of the true intricacies of that business, but I may actually be dead wrong about some of the circumstances, that led to it, but I think maybe it could be an example where Stan sort of didn't realize, or at least, didn't make as much effort to find out as he might have, where the mines lay on that. Because I think Stan's motivation for wanting, and here's where I'm not sure where the first impetus came from, but I, even though somebody else may have suggested that the way to solve the St. E's problem was to have NIMH take it over. It's very clear that Stan thought that very quickly, very quickly indeed, and saw it as a real opportunity to do a variety of things. First of all, one other thing that Stan absolutely is, and it's sort of funny, because he has had himself, certainly in recent years, relatively little kind of direct patient contact on a one-to-one basis. In fact, as an aside, I ended up seeing a lot

has an absolutely unalterable commitment to the welfare of the mentally ill. Whatever else one can say about his motivations, that is unquestionable. One of the few times that I have ever heard Stan really raise his voice and scream, the maddest I think I had ever seen Stan, was once he had taken some higher functionary down to St. E's on a tour, shortly after the NIMH had taken over, you may even have been along on this, as they went on to one of the wards, there was a patient chained to a bed. When Stan got back, he didn't even go into his own office, he stood out in Esther's area there, and had her get, what was that guy's name, (EAR -Robinson) no, preceded Robinson, career PHS...

EAR I've forgotten his name

JA That's significant, that we don't....Anyway, he got him on the phone and he screamed in that telephone . He said, "as long as I am director of this Institute no patient, in any way, is evergoing to be in chains. Now you get that man out of that thing this instant and I want to report you... just screaming at this guy, and slammed down the phone, so that I think there were several motivations involved in the St. E's thing. I think, one of them was genuinely a concern for the patients there and the fact that the care was just God awful. The second thing, I think, was that he really wanted to be able to show all these people in the field who were saying, Well, we really can't do anything with these old state hospitals or the state hospitals are here, and the community mental health centers here, and they can't work together and I think he genuinely believed that by doing it right which meant the way he thought it ought to be done, and sort of by sheer force of will, he could set that up as a model. And I think the third thing was that here was a very large expansion of the empire...

EAR 4,000 more employees

JA 4,000 more employees with three new divisions, a national center for mental health training services and research. One of the bigger jokes, at least to me, I never laughed in Stan's presence, but to call that place the

Anacostia Campus, I thought was incredible. And I think some of that had also to do with the NIH business, you know, they love to call that the NIH campus and they were going to have their campus and he was going to have his campus, the Anacostia campus. But that was certainly a case, in which I would think a little bit more careful, advanced planning really seemed that unbelievable quagmires that were gonna be got into there would really have led to some more caution, in terms of marching into that. Because that I think had probably a fair amount to do, that it certainly led to some horrible confrontations with Bazelon, and I was around during all of that time. Bazelon, is certainly, whatever else one may think of Dave Bazelon, he is certainly someone, who I would think, it is better not to have angry with. And he certainly got that going in a very heavy way. Another problem with the St. E's thing, specifically was that it was all done so sort of hastily that the key people weren't in place' and, well, you know, Don Greaves was stuck in, he was on sabbatical, and the next thing you know, pooff, he's a Division Director at St. E's.. Henry Lederer, who was inbetween jobs and floating around, and the only one, you know, that really had any competence was Sherm. Sherm is someone that I'm phenomenally fond of and admire and how Sherm has caught up with doing Stan's dirty work over all these years, I don't know. But he's a phenomenally competent guy and great guy. But again, the one other thing, and this belies what I've said about Stan's attention to detail, but I think that on a number of decisions like the St. E's one, for instance, Stan has some tendency to, or the Institute at that time, and in a major way I think it did reflect Stan and his style. I do believe that men make institutions often enough the other way around, Stan really felt that if he could only get sort of control of something and get, you know, the political thing, that then somehow the programmatic things could be worked out and I don't think that always works. You can get control of something and it may still be a hell of a problem to do something with it. And I think the St. E's thing

was very very good example of that. And I think in a significant way, that the amount of time, well, one other point, the amount of time and energy and effort that was devoted by Stan and all of the senior people to the St. E's problem, you know, clearly pulled him away from a lot of other kinds of activities, that, you know, hindsight is perfect, that might have had better pay-off down the road.

8: EAR But you see, you've touched on an important issue which is like a moth to a flame with Stan, and that is give him either a new empire to build or give him a new problem to solve and everything else would go by the wayside, so that what you're saying about this seeming paradox, that he's inordinately concerned with details, witness what he does with letters, and yet with the actual operation of St. E's, once it was part of NIMH, he didn't seem that much involved. His perspective is different. To get St. E's was a problem. Once having gotten St. E's the rest of it was, well, that's routine stuff he doesn't get involved with. Letters, by themselves, each letter is another little problem to deal with, see, so there's a continuous problem, but running St. E's was not something that he wanted to do, if a problem comes up, fine, but he was off and running on something else, whether it was Columbia or whatever else was coming along at the time, every new problem. And talking about Sherm, just to give you some further insight, I don't know what keeps Sherm doing what he's doing either, but without Sherm, I don't think Stan would be where he is right now., in many respects, but Sherm provides that kind of balance for him and Sherm constantly feels that Stan takes on all these problems prior to having solved the previous problems, which, of course, is exactly the point you're making with St. E's, but Stan is incapable of avoiding what seems to be an insurmountable obstacle as a challenge. It doesn't make any difference what he did yesterday, today is another day for jumping another hurdle and for solving a new problem. Without a problem he is lost and he has such a tremendous capacity for solving these problems.

EAR cont. OK, What was your interaction with Sherm on the St. E's thing? Do you recall any particular incidents?

JA Only by the time that all this came along I think I was on sort of quite good terms with Sherm and in a way, very different from the way in which Bert, for instance would try to undermine me versus Stan. Sherm and I could sit down and just sort of talk about, and what the hell do you do with this one, and I think in some ways I was just sort of kind of a sounding board for Sherm because he obviously got very intensely frustrated many times when he felt he had been sent off to do...I'm sure, Sherm, with his very much more clinical and management kind of, he knew what the hell he was getting into and another example, of course, is Lexington and Ft. Worth. There was another case where Stan was going to turn something around, and I think particularly Lexington he had very vivid memories of what it had been like when he was there and, by God, now that he could do something about it, he was going to. And again, you know, that didn't just quite work out quite that way. One of the proudest possessions that he had in his office were some of the bars from Lexington, the last of the bars that were there, cut out. I remember, in fact I think that one of the early trips I made with Stan, the earliest one, interestingly enough, was out to MacKinsey(?) Institute, One or the other was the first one, the other was down to Lexington, and I think it was very shortly after Lexington had been transferred to NIMH, I think it was at about that time, that I remember going on a tour of the place and Stan's feeling, again, of a sort of outrage at this, and that, by God, it was going to be changed. And I think he said to me, he said, "In one year there will be no bars in this place". Now that again, I think, is an example, you know, take down the bars, but then what do you do? And I remember then a whole series getting very angry, you know, about patient management problems at Lexington and there was a lot of vitrol, sort of poured on those who were down there trying to run it, because they were incompetent and why the hell can't they manage it, now that it's different. Stan had

in some ways, an almost revolutionary view on changing things. For all his conservatism, he was also a revolutionary, in the following sense. A revolutionary's basis notion is that if you take something that is, and if you blow it up into the air, somehow, as the pieces fall, they will be better than it was. Just perforce. And I think Stan had some of that view, that if he would just change something, then it would be better. And that sometimes works, but sometimes doesn't.

EAR Well, that's what we all gossiped about at NIMH, you know, all about.... How about a few words about the Homosexuality because I think that's illustrative

(AJ) Of a lot of things about him, as well as probably the one case in which I almost did get caught out in left field with it. Let me give you the whole chronology. First of all, I didn't start that. That had actually been started before I came and Dick Saduck had been the executive director of that. But I think that is a good example of again, Stan's really very courageous willingness to take on what he saw as a real problem and to try to use his own personal, and the Institute's leadership to do something about it, because certainly that wasn't in the days of Gay Lib, it wasn't something he was forced to do. It was something that he did because he thought it was a problem that ought to be addressed and I know about this only second hand from talking with Saduck. But, for example, Stan personally picked the membership of that Task Force, it wasn't delegated to somebody else to put together a group to do this. He personally did this. That was run out of his office and I was formally designated to be the executive sec of that, but the way in which he put that thing together was in itself sort of interesting, because he really did try to draw from a wide range of different disciplines. There were clinicians, there were psychiatrists and psychologists, there were sociology contingent, theologic contingent and legal contingent. We were all sort of patched together there. There were

terrible problems , of course, with Evelyn Hooker's illness right at the, in fact, when I came on board, she WAS hospitalized and Judd Marmor , I remember, ran the first of the sessions that I attended. And Stan had given sort of a complicated charge to the group, he had asked them to review the state of knowledge in the whole area and then to come up with recommendations both for a research and scholarship program, but also to look at matters in social policy and to see what recommendations the group would have. Well, we sort of went along with that, and once, that's one instance in which once Stan set it up then he really did sort of pull back from that one, and made me kind of the go-between or the doer on that. And he really didn't check on it day to day, after we had had a meeting, well, he would say, how did it go, and what happened, but he was on to something else. Well, this gets away a little bit from the narrative but I think if does, the way that thing evolved I found absolutely fascinating and a certainly valuable lesson to me on commissionmanship and so on. It was a very diverse group, not a scholarly group, and so with a few exceptions, the basic task of deciding what areas ought to be looked at and the preparing of the White Papers and you know, talking about the meetings and collecting...all that went sort of according to Hoyle and I was able to draft, with a lot of input from the committee the first section of the report, which had to do with what we do know, what we don't know and a lot of it, of course, we don't know and also where more research was needed. That was fairly easy to do. What became a lot tougher, with ⁱⁿthe group, was deciding on the social policy business, and this gave me a very vivid lesson in what I think is almost the inevitable dichotomy between the clinician and the researcher and why I think there are so very few people who really and truly bridge those two planes, because I think it's almost a philosophical difference at the premise level, a clinician is trained from day one to be willing to act on less than complete information. Otherwise, you do not, no matter what area of clinical medicine or anything else, you just can't move. The scientist, if he is a good one, is trained to

do nothing, either publish, or anything else, until he is damn sure. So what quickly came out of the early part of the discussion in the general policy one was the split. And on the one hand, the clinicians led particularly by Judd Marmor were saying, Well, OK, we don't have all the answers, that's clear, but we know enough to be able to say that this and this and this and this is inequitable and probably damaging and therefore....The scientists, led on the other hand by Henry Reicken (?) said loud and clear, "This is a complete non sequitur of that. The first half of our report talks about all we don't know and all we need to learn and then we turn around and suggest doing something. Crazy. We should reject, or at least be very guarded in what we say. We had a series of, I guess, at least ten, fifteen meetings, no.. three or four meetings, I guess. And Stan, I'd feed this back to Stan, and he had some sort of pithy things to say about the god damn scientists and researchers, you know, if they want to play it safe, they'd better not get out of bed in the morning. But, through a lot of verbiage and waffle words all through it, we finally had put together a compromise report that everybody, could, more or less, live with. This also gave me a real insight into at least some segments of the legal profession because clearly the dominant legal force on that commission was none other than Bazelon. Bazelon, I guess, had attended a couple of meetings at the very beginning and then he didn't come any more and he sent, what was his name... the social worker who was sort of his special assistant and aide.....

EAR Yes, I don't remember his name but I know who you mean.

JA difficult, to be his ear in an obvious way. This guy had said nothing in all of this and finally we come to the last round-up meeting, one that's going to finally ratify this heavily worked on draft, and I had spent a tremendous amount of time, writing all of this thing out and passing drafts around and getting feedback, and waffling here and adjusting there and on the phone... Who should show up, but Bazelon. He walks in, and listens to the first five

minutes of the discussion, cuts right in and says, "Ladies and Gentlemen, this first whole section on research and on what we know, that is trivial. Absolutely trivial. We could have written that without meeting once, any one of you could have written all of this. There's nothing new. What's really important about this report is the section of social policy. That's what really counts. That's where we really got to put our energy. But let me warn you about one thing. Don't you dare base your social policy recommendations on some kind of, you know, good guy humanitarian kind of ground;. It's got to be based on facts. Now, I'm a layman, I don't know what the facts are in this field. You experts come up with them. And he walked out. He was there for a total of, maybe 45 minutes at an all day meeting, and he absolutely and completely and totally destroyed the whole fabric that had been put together. Scared Reicken and company to death and they immediately pulled back from everything they had agreed to and we ended up, as you know, with a watered down report, with a minority report and all this kind of stuff. And that was one of the more frustrating things. There were two occasions when Stan really got angry with me, in a very forceful zapp way. One of them had to do with that report, because after all of this, you know, I was frankly discouraged with the whole thing and I got awfully involved with other things and it just sat on my desk for months, and I didn't get it published and I didn't get all of it cranked out, and so on. And for some reason, I guess, some query came to Stan about it, or whatever, he called me in and he said, "Where's the report on the Task Force"? I think the question was, you know, "When's it coming out" When's it going to be published? And I kind of went(gulped) and he gave me a very steely look and he said, "You go get that God damn thing published now and he threw me out of the office. The other time, again, was the same kind of thing, this procrastination. I think this must have been near the end of his tenure and he was applying for medical licensure in a number of other states and he had delegated to me the

job of getting himself and Tam licensed in New York and elsewhere. I'd worked on it same, and I'd ask my secretary to collect all of the stuff, and then we'd go at it. And he called me up one day and said, "Where do you stand on that license...and I Said, we've been working at at...and he said, I want that done now. Zapp. Again, really harsh, sort of...he didn't tolerate dawdling around. That whole homosexuality thing was really a phenomenal lesson, but I think it also says something about the way Stan...I don't know whether that thing ever had any impact to speak of, it comes up certainly, every once in a while...Another area, quite similar, that I also had a fair hand in was the business about sex education in medical schools there. And in fact, was fairly heavily involved in working with Paul Gebhardt, in setting up the first, and then, I guess, I was involved in two of the summer training sessions out at the Kinsey place for medical school,,,,,,psychiatric education and again that was an area where Stan clearly saw a need, well ahead of the world, the rest of the world, and where he really pushed it. And I think it had a major kind of impact.

EAR Stan and I went out there, early on started working, and they clearly saw him as their guardian angel. They felt that he had saved them from total destruction at the time, that he had provided the necessary funds, that he had given them all kinds of financial, moral and professional support and Gebhardt, who is a very delightful man, really, if anyone massaged Stan's ego well, it was Gebhardt in his interactions, and that was very pleasant. I'm trying to recall....

JA There were some other incidences of this same general sort, where it didn't work out so well. I was the first NIMH person for some four years who had set foot in Master's place and that had had a very stormy previous history

EAR Oh, yes, that's a story in of itself...

JA. And I got ears full of that

EAR That's another story. It went through Council...with some disaster...About

JA cont

EAR this point, I was about to come up to Council, How many of the Council meetings did you attend? Did you have a feel for the Council meetings at all?

JA Ya. I went to all of them during the two and a half, three years that I was there.

EAR Was that at the time that he turned the Grants part of the program over to me, or that was already

JA Well, I think that was done during that time because he clearly didn't like to meddle with it.

EAR No, you see that's just pure routine, that's detail that he doesn't feel he wants to do. In addition, he just doesn't like to officiate in that kind of meeting ...behind the scenes, beforehand....

JA There was one other issue that I think was also at the of it, and that is that there was a very very different point of view between, at least some of the people on Council and Stan as to what their role was. I remember a number of settings in which he said quite directly, "You are advisory with respect to policy. You are mandated to approve the grants, but what we do is up to us". And that did not set well, at all, with the likes of Josh Lederburg and others, Jolly West, and I think, Stan wasn't particularly interested in sitting up there and taking the flack on that there either. He said, that's the way its' going to be, and screw you. And the Councils again were clearly not policy making, or really even policy discussing for him. Important issues came up there, no question, about that, and I think they were very skillfully handled but in terms of one role that the Council could have served, which was a major input role, it didn't.

EAR Ya. It's very interesting because the problem of the strain, so to speak, between Council and the Director existed with Bob Felix too, but in different ways. Bob's style was to be there, and in a sense, to turn the discussion or the tone around somewhat, and in a very corny kind of way, his style was on many occasions, I saw him do this, they'd get into a big discussion about

EAR cont. something . Instead of responding to the discussion, instead of saying, this is really what we would not do, he would say, Now this is,,you people are now earning your keep. This is exactly what we need the Council for. Well, lovely, lovely, but what about the answer to the question that they are raising. And he would just go on.

JA Reinforce the process...

EAR Exactly, exactly, and he would just go on (Whereas Stan, this was the case where Stan somehow, turned tails on his feet, and didn't want to sit up there because he didn't know how to deal with it verbally. But I think it's also true that part of the other phenomenon that we talked about was operational there even with the people of the caliber of Josh Lederburg, Stan felt that his thought process around these issues was superior to theirs. He didn't want to waste his time with this, and go through this. It was an interesting paradox ~~that there were~~ ^{or} at least a kind of contradiction in equality, because with people coming up, he can be inordinately patient, which is what he did with his special assistants and he loves to bring people along, he loves to have people learn from him, so to speak, and while he can be harsh, in terms of getting things done, as you mentioned, with people in that kind of learning situation he really can be very warm and very permissive in a sense, but when it's a matter of interaction with peers , or superiors, right, then there's another problem. One other part of this that's very important, and that is, and you alluded to it fairly on, Stan was really not a charter member of the psychiatry community the way Bob Felix was. Stan, I think, will never be , whereas Bob Felix obviously came up with all of those people, Frank Braceland, John Romano, they started together, they worked things through together. He was a member of that community, an intimate member of that community. Stan, was in a sense, and still is, to some extent,..... a kind of an outsider to those people, so that when they came out of Council, whether it

8

EAR was Jack Ewald, or whoever it was, I think most of them were bright enough and honest enough to admire his competence, even a Josh Lederburg, but they didn't feel the sense of camaraderie.

JA It wasn't an Old Boys Club, with him as a member of it.

EAR Exactly, of course,

JA To some degree, you see, that's another piece of it. To some degree, you see, I think there was and is an incredible arrogance on the part of the field, because I think, in one sense or another a lot of those people would have felt that Stan worked for them, and the Institute should be an agent of the interests of psychiatry, specifically, and the fact that Stan had some very different views about that, that he genuinely believed in interdisciplinary kinds of things. I remember his great pride in speaking of the first community mental health center with a lay director and of what a great step forward he felt this was. He didn't have to have a damned MD to be the director of a community mental health center and how proud he was of that. And that wrangled. And there was another shift there too and that had to do with this I think. You may even have gotten caught in some of this one. The way in which the field was treated by financially, by the training branch and the fact that with, I guess, Bob Felix's total blessing Vertermark, I didn't know him, but he was a Johnny Appleseed and he simple went around the country helping set up departments. He was a collaborator, he was a friend, helper, you could call Vesty and get what you needed. If you needed another grant, he would taake care of if. It was very significant to me that the psychiatry training branch, at least up to and including the time that I was in that division, as a sort of director, so I think that this whole business of Stan's relationship with the field of psychiatry was often a less than smooth one, though having to do with I think things on both sides. I think Stan, at is core, is , I'm being interpretive here, but I think he has some questions. He would have liked to have trained in the main line

and they felt they ought to own him and run him and if he weren't part of the club, then at least he ought to work for us, and Stan doesn't work for anybody. That's another characteristic of Stan. He does not work for anybody. But I don't think I ever heard Stan say a sort of unqualifiedly good thing about any other people, sort of up the ladder from where he was. He certainly had friction with Shannon of NIH and he certainly didn't care much for, it was strange, because I guess he'd had a previous good relationship with Irv, (EAR oh yes) what's his name?

EAR I don't remember. Obviously that secretary has got

AJ who then became

EAR He works at NYU. I know who you mean.

JA NotPhillips...

EAR Oh, no, it's a Jewish name, Mike Lazarno?, I don't know

JA Wasn't he involved in the Adamha thing early on? Then he was director of Adamha, wasn't he?

EAR Ya, and also, well, it really all began with Wilbur Cohen, who eventually may be the compromise fact in the title. But that was another...~~Whether~~
~~whether~~

JA Whether or not Stan was going to be made associate administrator of ADAMHA for Mental Health,(which is the

EAR Which is the model Bob Felix had had for NIH, you see, Bob Felix had been Associate Director for Mental Health within ~~NIMH~~ NIH, that had happened long ago with Jim Shannon. Well, it's very interesting. You never saw him in interaction with Jim Shannon. Now, you see, Jim Shannon, of course, had long since made his relationship to NIMH through his relationship with Bob Felix. There too, the problems were, relationships, not problems, they were, I think, between two peers, and while they went at it cats and dogs quite often they had mutual respect for each other. When Stan came in, I think that the lack of cordiality and the lack of regard was mutual. I think that Stan admired Shannon's ability, but I think he had no

EAR CONT personal regard for him at all and that was recipricated in spades by Shannon. He really thought that Stan was Johnny come lately to begin with and He, Shannon, shouldn't have to tolerate him, and yet there was no way to get around that.

JA I think there were some very basic philosophical differences too. Because Stan was absolutely committed in part I think because of the empire thing, but I think for other reasons too, to having , again, a case where the grand scheme made very good sense but where in practice it just didn't work out quite that way, in terms of having service, research and training all within one establishment setting

EAR Absolutely, well we had fought that fight, you see, long before you came and after it was separated from NIH in a different department..but you touched on something that I really want to get on the record a little earlier on because one of the ways in which Stan has not been given his just due is precisely in his willingness to go beyond the psychiatric community for leadership , and there's another part of that, which has to do with the Intramural program, which we haven't talked about at all, and that is that, you see, there was a long standing enmity on the part of the key people in the Intramural program, because of their own early dispute with Bob Felix, and so Bohn Eberhardg, Loren, and Bob Cohen, not very much because he just doesn't have a jealous bone in his body, but some of the other people at the Intramural program really felt, epitomized by Eberhardt, that Stan was selling the Intramural program down the river because it was then
in the Intramural program, never realized how many times he went to bad for them, how much he feels, and he still expresses it to this very day, that a great part of his career has been devoted to protection of the scientist and the support of the scientist. He sees himself as the administrator par excellence who has done a tremendous amount to nurture and protect these scientists, who are very bright but have no sense

EAR cont about politics and really need to be led like children for their own protection , so that his willingness to put me in, for example, as the first non psychiatric *head* for the training branch, and then the Division, and his willingness to do other things that incurred the wrath of the psychiatric community because he was willing to go beyond that, and even ironically, and I'm not sure that this happened before you came, either, but the psychologists were up in arms because they thought the original regulations for the community mental health centers did not permit non MD directors and he said, that's wrong, but the regulations were none the less changed a little bit to pacify, and to make it ;more clear that there could be non-psychiatric *heads*. Psychologists never believed , never have really accepted the fact, that Stan was willing to go beyond the so called medical model.

JA Nor for that matter, I'm sad to say, have a large number of the research community every appreciated the degree to which he did in fact fight for their interests.

EAR Danny Friedman is the classic example.

JA He is still pushing like hell to get it broken up and send the research back NIMH, and that may well happen, that may well happen now.

EAR Well, I talked to Bud Bussey not to long ago, who you know is on the Biomedical *Panel* , recently, and Bud Bussey, I don't know how well you know, is an interesting man. I had not known him that well (JA he's not easy to know) I'm sure he's not easy, but he plays his cards very close to his chest. And incidentally, this little procedure is, in it's own way an interesting clinical tool, if you will, and so you get to know people, much better than you thought you did, after you get finished with all this. But, Bussey, I think is in the same camp as Dan Friedman in that NIMH somehow didn't do do right by..research...

JA Even Dave Hamburg ...

EAR Oh yes, now, now...

JA I think he had his questions before, but he knew which side his bread was buttered on and he liked very much being part of Stan's extramural consultative apparatus. It's very clear that they did consult.

EAR Well, you know, more than that. You know, Dave played a very peculiar unusual role with Stan. Stan went out to Stanford every once in a while to consult on whatever was going on with Dave because he had a lot of respect for him and I think Dave, very uniquely, played that role with Stan in a way that almost nobody else did. I think Stan respects Dave's ability. To Stan's everlasting credit, when he does see someone who is competent, he's willing to give him credit for it and well, he respects good people, and of course, Dave's a very extraordinary man

JA Dave also had a real talent though in knowing when to keep his mouth shut. with Stan, which someone like Danny Friedman obviously didn't. He would pop off about everything.

EAR Well, I hope I can get to see Dave. I know he is so damn busy. I was going to interview him early on, and then he got involved in a lot of things, the Africa thing came along, and then this thing came along. Incidentally, I saw Betty in Boston not too long ago. The other thing about Dave, and this is not as incidental as it may sound, because I think he's played a role at NIMH that's important now, I think, to some extent, probably still ~~is~~ will, but Dave is playing, very clearly, the Kingmaker in Washington.

JA You're telling me."

EAR And behind the scenes, every once in a while, it surfaces, but those of us who have been around, can tell the signs.

ja Here and there, and this is another real change for Dave, at least, in some settings. He's not at all candid about that. He said to me, I talked to him the day before yesterday, and he said to me over the phone. He said, of course, I either suggest it or approve of every single health person who's been appointed in this/^{entire}administration beginning with Califano, right straight on down. He means it In the way that he played with Terry

EAR Well, that goes back quite a bit. That's another story.

JA That's another story. I'll tell you one thing right now, Eli, absolutely right now, that I would be willing to predict, and this is no reflection on you or on the project, but I will be willing to predict, he will be too busy to talk to you, if he does, he will not be candid. No way will he be candid now. Five years from now, wherever he is, maybe.

EAR It's too bad. Well, he's cut some people off, including Alberta for other more complicated reasons.

JA Much more complicated reasons. He's cut me off too,

EAR It's a sad part of what happens in a person's life cycle and sometimes, some either/or situation and we can't..... Well, let's get back to NIMH. Is there anything, as we were talking, any large issue that comes to mind, that I've left out or that you've left out, which is more important than what I've left out?

ja Well, in terms of the substantive things that were going on while I was there. The various moves either, to increase the domain and how those came about and we talked about that. The intense amount of energy that got devoted to internal, by internal I mean within the government political struggles and an awful lot of Stan's time went to doing battle with those up the ladder, really, a tremendous amount..

ear I want to ask you a slightly different question, before it gets away from me. You came here early on in your career, so you didn't, although it is true that you had seen comparable things and I think you very nicely pointed out that you had comparable kinds of responsibilities with the...

JA Oh, but not really.

EAR Well, in a sense, I mean process-wise. So that having that early on in your career you don't quite have the opportunity to see your NIMH stint in a perspective as it might compare and contrast with other agencies, but I don't think that's a serious problem. What I really want to ask you is "What was your

EAR general evaluation of the people there and the manner in which they worked. You talked a little bit about the rivalries, some of the internal politics, the way Stan tended to compartmentalize people, but you interacted with a lot of people. What was your overall evaluation of the operation as such, in terms of competence of the people, ways of working together, or whatever? Was it a series of fiefdoms?

JA Yes, to some degree, it clearly was a series of fiefdoms and some of that was Stan's doing. That's the way he set it up, that's one of the things that comes of that kind of multiple unilateral relationship, namely, in the decision of whether or not to develop a special mental health division it was not discussed in Small Staff and decided there, it was decided quite otherwise. In general, certainly, the people who were in the leadership positions, see, one of the funny things about my position there was that I had vastly more to do at that stage of the game with the dozen people in the top of the scheme than I did with those well down in the system. At the next step, when I became Associate Director of Mental Health training, I had a very different kind of experience down in the bowels of the thing, which was a fascinating shift of gears for me. But, in general, a superbly competent bunch of people, none I think without flaws, if you will, all of them very much captive to the Zeitgeist that was . Those who couldn't function within that system be it Don Oken, or George Hamm, got out. They were not tolerated. Interestingly enough, the one person amongst that group whom I never, ever, could get close to, and I'm sure you can guess who that is, (EAR-Phil, Mort) Oh, Mort, Oh, I actually got quite close to Phil, never intimate with him, but I could talk with Phil. With Mort, Never. And I think there may have been a number of things that related to that, I think,

EAR But the most obvious is the most important. He didn't want to feed back to Stan.

JA Because he knew , he was the only one who really knew what the role was.

JA The second thing was, that I think in some ways, I mean, this is purely speculative, I think Mort was a little jealous. You know, he had supplanted in one part of the role. The second thing was, that by God, he wanted to work directly with Stan. Some people whom I have just incredible respect for, Phil certainly did an amazing job in a very quiet, but super effective way in the congressional affair. I think Sherm, what a phenomenal guy, just incredibly solid, hard-working, would take on the tough ones kind of a guy ..Certainly your role as being, in a very effective way, the kind of gad-fly in the system and you were the one person who could sort of get away with saying, Yeah, but what about this way of looking at it, and I don't altogether understand of how and why Stan tolerated that, Stan and the others tolerated that, but it was a terribly important role that you played there. I did have, and still have, the most incredible respect for Lou, who was able in the face of all sorts of onslaughts, I mean, the easiest thing in the world would have been for Lou to stir up the research community against Stan, to be an undermining, never, he may have disagreed with Stan, and Lou is certainly very conservative, for Lou it is research uber alles, he certainly was not supportive of setting up that special division, he saw it as a rape, he saw it as a perversion of the things that, no question about it, but by God he worked at it, he worked hard at it, and I think he deserves a hell of a lot of credit for actually keeping a very high standard within NIMH. Betty Pickett was another unsung sort of hero for a long time who did an awful lot of the hard work. I also was very close to, for all of his rigidity, to Bert Boothe. He and Stan certainly disagreed violently on many things. Bert was certainly one who hued to the old line, but again he gets an awful lot of credit. Stan would probably not value Bert's contribution in all that hiring (?) I may be wrong.

EAR In one sense he would, but he sees, he would see Bert as being a somewhat more pedestrian kind of guy than he really was. He wasn't that all pedestrian.

EAR And Bert Boothe's dislike of Stan was a personal dislike based on a very emotional attribute. He just didn't feel, that Stan, and this is where he was wrong, that Stan valued human dignity and that he was willing to tolerate the human condition in the way one needed to. Bert was an absolutely thorough-going gentleman and he didn't think Stan was, and I think, as simple as that and as complicated as that, let alone the fact that he couldn't tolerate what Stan did to what he thought was his program. So, it's all very complicated, and yet it's terribly important to understand. Someone has already told me, and I hope they're wrong, that this may be very interesting to those of us who were involved in this but it really isn't very interesting to anybody on the outside. I really hope to be able to do it in such a way that it's illustrative of the way an organization often works and very important because this was one of the most successful national federal health programs with a creativity, with inventiveness, with a cadre of people, with an impact on its own field that I think in some respects is almost unequalled. So I think it's a very important story and I think the story is essentially the people, and as I've said to individuals, My God. If a story about the National Institute of Mental Health can't talk about behavior and dynamic processes, which one can?

JA Now, as particularly as I shifted over into the Manpower and Training and sort of got more down into the bowels of it, that was a stormy time for me too, because, in a way, you see, the training area was one in many ways I think it was the area that Stan had the least impact on for a variety of reasons. Maybe he calculated that he didn't want to attack that one head on it would have required a head on assault, he approached the research issue in terms of trying to have at least a component of research that was more targeted than the..he did it by sidestepping the dirt. He simply set up another one and went that way. There wasn't any convenient way to do that with respect to training, it would have taken a head-on assault, and he clearly

JA intended that Tom Plaut and I do that

Well, it's very strange, I remain on very close personal terms with Tom, but there is no one with whom I disagree more totally in terms of many of the issues that Tom stands for. I think Tom is absolutely irresponsible in terms of some of the things that he proposes to do, and more importantly, the way that he proposes to go about doing them. Tom

taunts himself on being such an egalitarian, in fact Tom is the most dangerously dictatorial person that I think I've ever run into, and he will sidestep anything to get done what he thinks he, he really doesn't listen, and goes about it as he damn well pleases. His latest white paper on that five year plan, is a sort of ultimate example of that, so I very soon had my falling out with Tom and I found myself in a very awkward position down there because I was Tom's, in some ways, in a little different version of the Bert-Stan thing, in that everybody, particularly people like Bert, Bert Boothe and Stan Shneider and Milt Witman and everybody, you know, were coming to me to protect them against this thing. I hope I never undermined Tom on that but what became clear after a year at it was that I could not, in conscience, stay on and do that.

EAR Was Jerry Osterwild at the time there?

JA Jerry was there, and Jerry is a classic example of one of the sort of tragedies of the system. Jerry and Steve Goldstein is another one and several people like that. And that was what I was going to say. At the
9 working level within the Institute there were, well, it was obviously a gradation, but the level of quality was much less uniform than at the top. And what you had there, in my view, was some very very good people, maybe a bit narrow, maybe a bit captive with things, but first class people. Bert Boothe, Elmagen, and I know he again has lovers and detractors, but man, did he do a job. Milt Witman, in terms of what he did with respect to social work, Ralph Simon in terms of fighting terrible odds in terms
going
of getting some things ~~done~~ and started

EAR By that time, I didnt even know the nurses very well

JA Yeah, they werre all in transit when I was there and well, I always liked, but was not impressed with the wisdom and vision of Stan and some of the people in psychology. They did a job. On the other hand, there were within the lower echelons of the some of the saddest people I've ever seen, people who developed what I, for want of a better term, sort of call institutional paranoia, and they were professionals who were de facto ex-some-things. They had been psychologists or psychiatrists, or social workers or something else. They had let themselves get terribly far from the roots of, where they had become bureaucrats, and there were still terribly concerned with and proud of being Dr. this and Dr. that. They had lost the ties with where they were and what came of that. I think, was a rigidity and a protectionism. Now, I have to sort this out. You see, I guess, and maybe I'm captive of some of this. I really think that Bert Boothe was being protective because he had something pretty good, and not perfect by any means. There were certainly some abuses of that. It was something that really needed to be protected. But there was another whole area where it was a matter of "my program" to be defended against anything, whether it was good, bad, or indifferent, and people who genuinely became more interested in and rewarded by the accolades of the field and everything else. Now I think if there was a problem with Stan's style , not just Stan, but the ambiance, it was that it was not particularly supportive of the troops in the trenches, and much more often the message would come down from the 14th floor "You're not doing it right. Why the hell don't you do this? rather than a supportive, nurturing kind of ...that might have produced some identification with the tasks of the Institute, so the result was that those who had any gumption at all sought their ego rewards from the field/^{and they}became really captives of the field rather than leaders of it and developed this kinds of very rigid, and tended to be, and Osterwild's a sad classic/^{al}example , that they tended to be unhappy depressed, discouraged, bitter, nitpicking , some of them pompous, you know,

JA overblown sense of their own worth and importance and discouraged because they weren't being offered chairmanships of major departments everywhere, and so on. Those were sad people, and I must say that it was partly seeing that that the forty year old depressed bureaucrat who was also so locked into the federal retirement system and their salaries had often gotten up to the point where they were not going to get the same thing outside, who one of the things that made me decide that I didn't want to, at that stage, of the game at least, that I wanted to get out, back into academic, so one sort of final pitch may be the best of all worlds it would have been awfully nice I think if some scheme could have been worked out to allow more real kind of interchange between those not necessarily in the top leadership positions, but sort of at the exec. sec. level within the various units, some interchange between academia and the Institute, so that there could have been more sharing of the . I guess one sort of last thing. If I had to categorize the times of my life that had been most clearly important, when the sort of learning density has been highest, it would be clearly my last two years at Swarthmore, in the honor's program there, the first year and a half at Stanford and absolutely those years at NIMH. It was the most phenomenal, and that was particularly unusual because it was not in the ordered sequence of things to have had the chance, at that really terribly green stage, to be part of all of that, to watch it work, to learn from the likes of Stan and you and Sherm and Mort, and all of that crowd, simply unparalleled, just unparalleled, in terms of that kind of experience and it has stood me in phenomenally good stead at, that many many times since, there are literally times when faced with a decision, usually when it has a political component to it, which now more and more mine do, would say, you know, "How would Stan handle this? and I also think, how would Dave Hamburg handle this, and they were two, in some ways very similar, in other ways vastly different people, so I had two strikingly different models and I, you know, incorporate pieces and things. There was a ^{able} valueless experience, I made one professional career error in my life.

I go for grandiose statements, like the man who said , I ain't made one grammatical mistake in my life and I took that back as soon as I seen it. When I left NIMH, I should not have gone directly back to, well, a) I Probably should not have gone back to Stanford, though that's hard to sort out, but I certainly should not have gone directly back to a faculty position at least not to one that got me again so quickly embroiled in administrative things. I should have, maybe, used my contacts that I made in, by the way, that's one other terribly important component of that , is that it let me meet and get to know at a very early age an awful lot of people who otherwise I still might not know. People like Dan Friedman and others, that I am really now on a very good relationship with, not all the time, but, you know, I met them. Otherwise, I wouldn't have met all this sort. What I should have done was to go and get the very very best research post-doc for two or three years that I could possible have found, because the one flaw, for me right now, is that I really don't have the background, the real full background. I know what good research is , I can dabble in it, I can probably facilitate it in somewhat the way that Stan did, but I feel a little uncomfortable about not not having got it yet. In that respect, had I in some way or other gone the clinical associate route, I would have got that, but I would not have got the other, so you pay your money and take...I should have done both, that's what I should have done. I should have delayed gratification a little bit longer and spent two years with that, although that probably wouldn't have had much impact on (what) where I am now.

EAR I would suspect that , I remember when you left, and we chatted for a while as you were leaving, I suspect it's easier to say now that what would have been then. I think you would have found it very difficult to go back to well, a research post'doc after having been in that...

JA I think so too. But you see I had the illusion , don't delusion, that that's what was going to happen at Stanford, but through a variety of

things that were partly out of either Dave's or my control, partly within our control, too, I mean, I could have said no to Dave, I suppose, but I went back to, I really in a sense went more back to administrative things than I had come from them, so it was really a

But, I just , you know, summing it up, I just view myself as having been phenomenally fortunate , just plain lucky, to have had that chance and particularly at that time, it would be very different now. I don't think I'd want any part of it. I've in fact had a couple of feelers about, you know, in no way am I interested.

EAR Though, you did ^{come} ~~xxxx~~ exactly ~~whatx~~ at the right time. Had it been somewhat earlier it might not have been quite as good. Had it been any later it certainly wouldn't have been as good. You had the best of both worlds, so to speak. When Mort came along there wasn't quite as much going on. Stan hadn't rally set himself up as extensively, so that Mort had a different responsibility, although he too sees it as an important part of his experience.

JA Have you interviewed Mort?

EAR No, I've carefully stayed away from the people that I , well, except for Stan, and I've already done some work with Stan, but I haven't talked to Sherm, I haven't talked to Mort and I've also stayed away from the people who are still at NIMH, except for one hour with Bert, which was very unsatisfactory. The phone kept on ringing, and Bert, as I am sure you are aware, is very difficult to pin down. I think it was as dd difficult for him to talk to me as I'm sure Dave Hamburg, if he would even allow me to come and see him, so that's too bad because Dave's input in many ways is terribly important and while I know a lot about it, by inference and by interaction myself with Dave, I really would have liked to have gotten in to him. But, listen, let me stop at this point and let me thank you again so much for this . You know, with everybody, it's so interesting to hear .

NLM NOTE: Interview tape ends abruptly here