

DR. JOSEPH SPEISMAN  
November 7, 1977

JS I don't think I really ever had a genuine sense of the operations of the Institute to external politics which were very important and obviously all of us got some sense of that. Let me give you some impressions first of all, those that remain vivid because I remember when I first joined the Institute I was coming off a disappointment - academically, and was angry in many respects about what I felt a particular academic Institution was doing that didn't enable psychology to really put together what was possible and I found at the Institute, I think at almost every level where I had contact in those days, the willingness to think and a willingness to approach issues, first of all from the specifics of my particular set of interest, psychology as such, but also in terms of an integration. I used to say this all the time - it was a first-class outfit. The people there were and they were from all disciplines and research focus or training focus didn't matter a hell of a lot, but there was always the conception that we had a very broad mission and that we could do it and it seemed to me that characterized the place for many years while I was there and it was only toward the latter part of my stent there - I came here in 1968 - that I had the sense that we were headed for difficult times and it wasn't always the Institute's problems by any means but the political changes.

EAR You got there in 1961 or 1962?

JS In 1962. Just the Psychology Section alone at that time - who was the Chief of the Branch? You were the

EAR Ray Feldman

JS Yes, Ray Feldman was Chief at that point and you were the Assistant Chief and even the Psychology Section itself not too long before that for example had made a strong pitch apparently to broaden its scope and to include what the field could possibly contribute to the mental health area and that turned out to be to my mind at least, what one could see the most effortful kinds of things and

JS(continued) still not achieve all the possibilities that existed so in that impressionistic sense the Institute was a place to dig in and do what was needed to be done. It is not as though there wasn't critical exchange there always was and I am speaking now quite outside of the internal politics those were there and they had to be dealt with but rather in terms of ideas and exchanges and competition. The various branches were competing and they competed on the business of ideas and potential and program rather than on the business of politics alone by any means. So that kind of thing, I think one of the strongest kinds of atmospheric conditions that enabled most people to do a very good job.

EAR What persuaded you to come to the Institute? You alluded to the fact that there was a disappointment in prior professional relationships,

JS Partly, it was the people - that is the people I spoke to were top-level professionals as far as I was concerned - Irv and Hal and Ken was just leaving at that point and they were filled with the notions of what was possible and this broader scope to include research training and to try to provide that in the field so partly it was just the fact that these were people who were directly in the field of psychology itself. I could feel a genuine collegueship with and learn something from and perhaps contribute something very real. People in other areas similarly, Stan Yolles, for example, was

EAR He had not yet become Director, he was Assistant Director

JS In fact, Felix left I guess at the end of my first year or second year. He was there for some time.

EAR Early in 1964

JS So it was about a year and a half or two years, something like that and Yolles obviously was filled then with the ideas of what community mental health might be like, that again was on an issue that was programmatic in

JS(continued) nature and indeed, one of the very first things I did in talking for example to Hal and Irv - they suggested you know is there a piece of this that you feel you would really like to dig into, what's possible and I said "why don't we tie into this, these ideas of community mental health" - there is no such thing as community psychology or there wasn't a few people thinking and talking maybe there is something there and within six months or so we had a couple of people in. I think Eliot Rodnick we asked in as a consultant and - I can't remember, there were three people all together.

EAR Harold Rouch was still in the Intermural program, he hadn't gotten into community, yet.

JS It wasn't Harold - there were three outside people. Anyway, that was one of the kinds of things that were easily done, you bring in some people who have a critical view of what a potential program might be and you started to put it together and we had that \_\_\_\_\_ Conference as a result of those beginnings and the people in the Institute - I don't want to make this sound as though it was all a bed of roses, it wasn't, but there was always a genuinely critical approach rather than any, that I felt, an overlay of politics, internal politics that you simply had to wade through and for whatever that was worth, it was an effort then to put something together on a program basis, it was simply done. I am not so sure what the ultimate outcome of that conference and what followed from it, some good things happened and it was never a highly successful thing in Psychology but there were some programs that were put together from it. The relationship with the other areas in the Institute, there were the kinds of tensions, Eli, that I always felt were productive, even when I might have been at my feeling most wrong about something that was going on, there was always the clear sense that nursing had a piece of what was going on

JS(continued) and could make a good case for what they were doing, social work could make an excellent case for some of the things that they were doing and psychiatry and so forth and this was even before the Special Branches were opened - that is before Ralph and I guess Ray Ballister started in the Special programs or the experimental area, it was just about at that time that it was beginning in service. Psychiatry always was the fall guy in those days, they had the biggest chunk of cash, the biggest program and possibly least able to attract top-level people through that period at least so you always had those tensions, we don't have enough and they have too much but in the exchanges I never had the sense that there was simply such a dominant theme that one couldn't get done what one needed, even on the level of internal politics, I guess I am saying, you could make your way and that simply lends itself to something you can say that this is a place for me to work and think.

EAR You had no feelings then of profession or scholarly distress in having moved from \_\_\_\_\_

JS In fact, the choice I made, I had two job offers that I had sought out, one was the Institute and one was at the University of Michigan, which after all is probably one of the best departments in the country and I made a choice for the Institute partly on kind of personal grounds, that is, I wanted to regroup my own thinking and rethink where I was and the Institute was probably the best place to learn what was going on in psychology throughout the \_\_\_\_\_, no question about that, so my choice was on that level as much as it was on the basis of, if I felt that the Institute was a place where we were simply a bunch of bureaucrats, I don't think I would have made the choice, but it was clear that given that kind of opportunity with a professional level of people, I had no problems with the choice, and it was the right one as far as I am concerned. I think I went in and out good, healthy in all respects.

EAR Well, it is interesting to put a little bit more of a descriptive comment on the four branches, I think you are right, I think that for a variety of reasons the scholarly level and the national prestige of the people in psychiatry were not equivalent to that in psychology and by the same token, what you have just commented on, was almost the given in psychology, people came in, knowing full well that they were going to be there for three, four or five years at most and then go on back into the academic community, in social work and in nursing work it was not true. And, in psychiatry it was a mixed bag, really, it was not as clearly a place for someone to take not an interim position but a position in the sequence of their professional growth and development that would be very useful in the subsequent responsibilities that they took on, which is exactly what's happened with our \_\_\_\_\_.

What can you, I am kind of refreshing your memory on some things. Can you think of anything either early on or later on that you could recall as kind of being illustrative of an activity or an event, or an incident illustrative of some of the unique qualities of NIMH, its responsibility nationally, its involvement in the growth and development of psychology, something that you remember as a vividly as being a good example of the manner in which the program operated and revealed the kind of quality you just described? Any one?

JS Well, one of them was that Swamska, for example which was a development where all staff work was available where the necessity to bring in people and get their critical responses was easily done. Any kind of option that was necessary in order to bring the best possible group together, the Institute simply supported it. Once the idea was accepted that this would be a good thing to pursue, in other words good for mission of the Institute, then everything was done and all I had to do or we had to do at that point was put it together and to find the best people and bring them together. I think is a good illustration, whether ultimately we consider its outcome to have been what we all wanted, it was the kind of thing

JS(continued) the Institute did exceptionally well.

EAR Program development.

JS Yes, program development and even Program Development where up to that point there was no program in the field, in other words, we would genuinely develop in the field as much as we were trying to put something together that existed and make it better or make it more available. It was genuine development, almost from the ground floor. Now, on the other side of that, another kind of illustration, psychology has always been a field that, especially clinical psychology and the other areas of psychology always been somewhat publically self-reflective. The Institute was probably the major organizing force for allowing the field to have its several conferences to bring these people together and enable it to have that kind of probe pattern. Now, that wasn't organized from the ground floor so to speak or foundation level but rather to enable a continued reflective development on the part of the field. We still don't know the ultimate benefits or lack of them on those purposes. So are things I would think of without any hesitation.

EAR That's a very critical point, I think, not only in psychology but perhaps most clearly and most vividly in psychology the series of professional conferences which took place.

JS It was always the Institute that enabled them.

EAR From the Bolder conference on. That's very good. Years ago George Sazlow - did you ever interact with him?

JS Yes

EAR That's Joe Moderotso's better half. George Sazlow told me. He said, "Eli, some day you are going to have to write an novel about the way the various committee's worked - review committee's, and I think in many respects that whole story has not been effectively told. I think of all the single phenomena within the operation of the Institute, the one which probably had the most beneficial side effects of various kinds was the operation of the various Review groups

EAR(continued) Training Committee and of course, Study sections. Now you were very intimately involved obviously with one of the most effective of the Training Committee's because of - well, in some respects the unique quality of some of those people on those Committee's I think just as the Staff was extraordinarily competent so we were able to draw on. Would you want to talk a little bit about that,

JS I am glad you reminded me because if I could think of anything that gave professional pleasure, growth and a sense of really being able to accomplish something, it was through and with those Committee's and it was - I don't know how to say this to make my meaning clear but when he said write a novel he had a sense of what I think I am trying to be responsive to because it was at the highest levels of of professional exchange always. Each of the Staff as they in turn took on the responsibility for the meetings of the Psychology Training Committee for example, we would always go out of our way to provide those Committee members with the proper - that's probably the wrong word - the kind of setting that enabled them to do the work that we felt was most critical and I think they did, we did it obviously in the professional sense that is with the best kind of Staff support. I mean the women for example and they were women who worked in the records group and in the contracts management group and so forth were for the most part superb. The secretarial staff, now all of those things occurred not only because there maybe was a large labor force in Washington or things like that, but because they were attracted to the quality of the work that was being done, so on one level the Staff was being responsive, that is the Psychology Staff at least I don't know the others as intimately, to the real potential of bringing such a group together and enabling them to work and to participate fully in the work as we went on and as I said even on a social level the kinds of evening dinners

JS(continued) that we had were of the highest order that I can recall in any area of the level of exchange, the kind of conversation, the quality of interaction among all concerned simply was superb.

EAR Can you think of such specific incidents, individual circumstances, even talk about people, I will give you one of my own prejudices - Emory Cowan for me was one of the hardest working guys you ever had.

JS He probably still is.

EAR But, he was by no means unique.

JS Now you know Seymour Saracen is a guy who comes to mind for example. Seymour is a kind of \_\_\_\_\_ in many ways, he's almost always critical of everything and yet when Seymour was operating with that Committee I can't even remember just who was on the Committee with him at all times, he had a particular perspective and a point of view about psychology and what it should provide and it was broader than the perspective of most for that time. And, as critical as he was, he was always able to get his ideas put forward and do so in context where he knew he was going to get honest responses and critical responses in that sense. A quite different kind of guy, but his name is eluding me for the moment was the Chairman at Duke, who was the Chairman of the Committee the first two years I was there. I think he is dead now. Very different from Seymour that - they are almost entirely opposites - and yet his impact was quiet but terribly effective at the same time. A single incident, I don't know whether I can really you know with a dramatic flavor I am not sure I can raise, but

EAR Well, let it lie a minute. I think my feeling about the Committee and her Committee was especially even as the membership rotated as it inevitably did each year or so

JS Carl, the name is still bugging me.

EAR As the membership rotated somehow the Committee remained a very integrated whole, everyone in a sense played a slightly different role within the Committee,



EAR(continued) but it wasn't a group of disparate people working together, just as Seymour for example played a particular role or Emory played a particular role or Dave MacClelland or I guess Herb Kelman was there after you had left, but there were a number of people who were there at various times and the Committee changed its personality so to speak but it always had a kind of personality.

JS It remained as I described it earlier all through, never had an instance that I can remember at least where the Committee didn't take on its own character and personality but always Task oriented and effective group.

EAR You might want to talk a moment or two about - I know it was a complete pleasure for everybody to work in that kind of atmosphere because it was so intellectually stimulating and so professionally rewarding but what do you recall if anyone even shared with you the thought, what do you recall that may have motivated the various individuals to be members of the Committee. True, the most obvious was it was a national point of prestige to be a member of that Committee but there was more than that, what were some of the comments if any that people shared with you about why they served on the Committee?

JS They had the same sense that is the Committee members felt that this was a place where their careers as scientists or as professionals was going to be enhanced intellectually in all other ways. That's not something I'm inferring that was said any number of times. The kind of reluctance with which people left the Committee was a clear instance of that. Joe, the Developmentalist at Illinois, I am still as bad with names as I ever was, Eli, his name will have to come back, but I can remember his last session on the Committee and he made a little speech when we had dinner to the effect that he had felt that he had grown more over that period of years, three years or so, in relationship to the Committee members than at any other given period of his life, professional life and I don't think that there is any question about the fact that

JS(continued) they felt that there was real service to be performed that is they had a clear an important function to play with the Institute but what they were getting in return was equally clear and equally effective.

EAR Well, all the parts interacted so well because I think that you had to have reasonably good applications to begin with, to spark this sort of thing, the site visits had to be meaningful and a circumstance which the give and take between the potential grantee and the Staff and the site visitors had to be illuminating not only of that one particular program but what it would mean or could mean to the total effort on a national effort so all these things interacted in a very positive way.

JS Right. You know it wasn't as though the Committee couldn't be tough, even with very well-known people and programs, and so forth. They were quite willing to be to apply a critical view to a program, I guess I am trying to talk to a sense of integrity and honesty now, that is the Committee never felt a political pressure for example that was external to its own work. There was not even although obviously we spent hours taling about the relationship with the Council and what their policy function might be and the other staff of the Institute and what their positions might be and we would spend literally hours trying to think through the role of this particular Committee with the larger sense of the Institute and jealousies - the same kind - they have more money than we do to distribute but even within that there was never any sense that I had that the Committee felt it was being pressured in any direction other than its scientific or professional merit. So, as a quality of what the level of exchange, the level of honesty and integrity was singularly excellent.

EAR Again, with the Committee situation, can you recall any particular meetings

EAR(continued) that may have focused for some significant part of the meeting on a particular program development, whether it was either in the extension of Community Psychology or in any other facet in the extension of program operation that would be useful to comment upon?

JS One thing that continued for a while even after it had been established as part of Institute policy that went through several meetings and several Committee's, was the degree to which the broadest conception of psychology could or should or might be engaged in the funding program and again it reflected the level of the field's discomforts with its own parts. I can remember clearly for example, Saracen for one and Ed Borden for another, well any number of people, there is another name that is trying to come through and I can't remember now, Vassar

EAR The one who died, a child psychologist, Joe Stone.

JS Joe Stone, that's right. These were people who felt that psychology had been too tradition-bound that the scientism of psychology rather than the science was too overpowering and were always terribly more critical perhaps of traditional research training programs than they were of programs that were attempting to get started in a relatively newer direction and yet there were many people on the Committee's always who were in traditional research areas, they too, never felt that they were simply being overpowered and overwhelmed so that that was a theme that I remember through those Committee meetings that served an enormously useful function. Ultimately, what we turned to was if our site visits have any impact to have on the field directly as site visits with Committee members, with consultants and with Staff, it wasn't discussing these very issues and I think an awful lot of what was possibly accomplished at the Chicago Conference for example, or even the later Conferences, was initiated in those meetings and those groups to provide a consensual validity.

JS(continued) for the newer issues of psychology and it didn't even have to be something the Institute was trying to organize and form like the community mental health area, but other things as well came forward there, all within the context of never believing we had a big enough budget so things couldn't be funded or experiments couldn't be tried that perhaps should have been, even within those tensions it was enabled.

EAR Do you think there is any one part of psychology that may feel or may have felt that it got somewhat short-shrift from the Institute. Obviously it is a leading question, I am thinking of counseling psychology where somehow it seems to me if my recollection is correct we never really seemed able to expand it always seemed to be courted some kind of bind as being the poor stepchild of clinical.

JS You may be right about the sensibilities of the people in the field, you didn't ask me whether I thought it was correct.

EAR I want you to.

JS I think so, I would include also industrial psychology because both were not large but relatively vigorous. Now we had programs in both of those areas, counseling and industrial, but we never found the means, any of the staff for example nor for even that matter to any large extent the Committee members and we had counseling psychologists on the Committee's ever felt that we had a conceptual means of approaching those areas for growth patterns, for modification, for forward looking programs, so if I had to say with that good program or bad, I would say it was good and indeed, they compare to other areas they didn't get as much attention or money.

EAR Alright, fine, now one other variation on this same theme, I think the Committee members certainly and the staff with equal vigor, would support the point that you are making about no appreciable internal politics or no appreciable influence on the part of any members of the Committee or Staff

EAR(continued) in one direction or another except for the purpose of you know the total program are good, but what about the very small departments here and there, who may have felt that they needed even more of a boost to get off from the bottom and by the time you left I guess there was an increased sensitivity to the difference between the have's and the have not's and the need perhaps to think about the have not's as needing even extra help beyond what their confidence revealed was worthy of. Would you want to talk a little bit about that?

JS There was always a minor key or minor theme, we do have an obligation to try to get the best better but shouldn't we be worrying about those that are struggling to establish. I think it was I left or at least after I left the psychology program per se that at least we the program went to option for example of supporting non-accredited programs that were in development which I always had felt was a good idea and a way to do that kind of thing. I guess if there were anything that was seen as a kind of a imposition at times it was the notion, which may have been a correct notion, that geographically and in all other ways we should be more sensitive to what was not in Nebraska rather than whether there was another great program in Boston and in that sense we didn't have good coverage at times in the committee or in the staff, so that I think may have been kind of a weakness in the group and there was no serious effort that I can think of at least to try to work through those problems or at least to conceive how they might be enabled. There was a time that I think we all fell back on we don't have enough to do with now that we could really support well if we had enough funds.

EAR How about, I am really moving around in various different directions here, but how about now thinking back over the six years you were there approximately six years, in the six years you were there can you see in the perspective

EAR(continued) from the present vantage point anything over those six years that markedly changed or anything that represented beyond the program growth per se a kind of evolutionary or a kind of change over time that comes to mind, you have eluded to one, of course, by the time you left things weren't as good as they were when you first came.

JS You know when I - Don't know whether this really speaks to what you are asking me - but when I left the Institute we had a party, as we always used to do for people that were leaving, and I said to the group and I mean't it that I could foresee nothing but real problems on the horizon, that it was obvious if we could maintain the kind of quality that I had felt we had maintained up to that point, we would be very lucky, but it didn't look to me as though - that was already after many of the massive problems started to appear on the horizon, I wasn't being any kind of a prognosticator, I was simply saying what my feelings were - in an evolutionary sense?- in some ways the mental health, the community mental health program was almost indigestible, it was too big a chunk that we got into, maybe that's the way those things have to happen but it seemed to me that at that point some of what had always been healthy tensions became problems between psychology and psychiatry, between social work and another area. The administrative functioning of the Institute it seemed to me at least, started to creak under the strain - that kind of programming, yet without it, I don't know how well we would have gotten into many of the things that had to be gotten into, the minority issues had not surfaced really well prior to that time, if we hadn't been opened up that much, I don't know whether they would have gotten in at all or how well. It may have even been worse, but that as an instance of the kinds of problems that are now compounded, it seems to me was around that set of issues, maybe it was only the time.

EAR Let me ask you because we haven't deal't with it at any great length and maybe it is not worth a long discussion, but there were obviously tensions, some healthy and perhaps some not so healthy between psychiatry and psychology. I think psychology of the three other disciplines beyond psychiatry was the most competent to be articulate about its concerns in the competition for funds and in the competition for program development, etc. and there continues to be, as you well know, stresses and strains between psychology and psychiatry. Now you have been relatively gentle in saying that much of it was healthy but there were instances in which there were some serious points of difference and I know in my case, for example, I always had the feeling rightly or wrongly that I was being seen partly as an apologist for psychiatry when I would say people like Irv and Hal, I think I had less of that kind of interchange with you, but with Irv and Hal, in a sense I would say you know you really have to be sensitive to the point of view on the outside, which in effect says that mental health really is primarily a medical specialty and all the other programs that were supporting or benefiting partly because the Congress and the people are willing to give a significant amount of money to psychiatry. Now that was partly a politician point of view but there was also a thread of truth to it. What in terms of your interaction with people in the Branch in terms of your leadership in the psychology program, what other things can you think of where psychiatry, because it was the medical specialty, was treated somewhat differently than the other three and perhaps to their advantage above and beyond program.

JS It is hard for me to respond to that, that is, there were two things about psychiatry that were problematic from the perspective of psychology. There wasn't a sufficient awareness at that time, that they were trying to be both their own basic science and their own medical specialty and the viewpoint that

JS(continued) most of us had in psychology, most of the time, was that it was such a mixed bag that was accomplishing nothing - that is one set of issues - the other set of issues was I suppose simply based on economics that we were training a lot of people to become private practitioners rather than what we felt was a much more long-term or enduring contribution, which is either in research or in training new people but I always had to look at the Institute as a kind of a totality and the kinds of support that psychology was getting in research for example in many ways off-balanced for me any particular emphasis in the training division in psychiatry. That's what I mean by healthy, it's much easier for me to say it now many years later but even at that stage I could never get terribly upset with the notion that they simply had too much money. How well they used it was another set of issues and there was very little ability that we ever felt - we never felt, I think, effective in trying to achieve modification of that program - there was too much strength outside of it supporting it, not just you or anyone in the Institute but outside of it. On the other hand, it always seemed to me that politically psychiatry was doing better than psychology or anybody else in terms of general support for the Institute so maybe they had to get their due in that sense. This may sound all rationalized, Eli, but in fact I think that's why I thought about it.

EAR That is interesting because, incidentally, I, Hal Vasowitz wrote me a note saying he was going to send me a long statement and he never got around to it, I still have to talk to him if he is willing to and I may see Irv. I am going to North Carolina next month to see some people. I may see Irv at that time but I think Irv and Hal, Irv more than Hal even, and Irv maybe even more than Ken because if Irv's personality, had the feeling that psychiatry was in a sense getting an undue share of the pot and you probably aren't as sensitive to the old 40-20-20 formula but that was the betonwar of psychology's life at that time because



EAR(continued) it seemed like such an artificial, such a completely irrational way of dividing the pot and, of course, when the general practitioner program came along, which was also slightly before your time, it became such that psychology was getting about 16 or 17% and psychiatry, when you added it all up, was getting about 45% and nursing and social work were getting even less than the 16%, so there was an imbalance in every way and again, I was forced to say, well, look you can't count the general practitioner program because that is a special pot of funds and if it hadn't been for Mike Gorman it wouldn't even exist so that's not part of the pot, you know, which was kind of a subterfuge but nonetheless, those were some of the discussions and I guess almost because of the differences in personalities you were less vocal about that problem than Irv in the beginning, Irv would go into Ray Feldman's office and almost pound on the table at times and the same with other discussions with me but but it is interesting part of the whole picture. Let's shift for a moment I don't want to take too much of your time, but let's shift for a moment now after the fact, you said that most recently you probably haven't had a great deal of interaction with the Institute, but knowing it as well as you did from being involved with it and perhaps I am not sure how much contact you had with other Federal agencies that supports. Can you think of any other ways to identify the unique or individual quality of NIMH as contrasted with, let's say NSF or any of the other Federal agencies, does anything come to mind?

JS I am not sure whether I am talking after the fact or during the fact, let me just get a cigarette, the kind of thing that occurs to me only in terms of more extended experience with NSF and some other agencies. They didn't have any of the venturousness that we did, none, that is NSF has done a superb job in some areas, not the social sciences by any means, and there they may be, I don't know with nuclear physics they may do some things that I simply don't know

JS(continued) about that are genuinely exploratory and as I say venturesome but not in the areas of social issue, not in the area of social science at all, whereas the NIMH, as far as I am concerned, and that includes all the other Institute's in NIH, was the one who was willing to poke out into the areas that were of greatest difficulty most complex, and willing occasionally to make a mistake and pull back. Now if anything characterizes the difference, and still does by the way, if I had to compare on the most critical grounds, I would say NSF is high-bound where NIMH had at least always tried to get into the issues, we had our own high-boundness, but we were always willing to try, get into these things. For example, to compare NIMH with ~~something~~ like the Education Group, you can't compare them. That group was going to stay with its past history as long as it possibly could.

EAR Not in the training program but nonetheless, I think a beautiful example of what you are talking about was the small Grants Program, which was a denovo thing. Harry Harlow once mentioned, of course, I have talked to Phil Sapir, incidentally, and Phil said you know Harry really stole that from me, that was originally my idea, but if you want credit for it you can have it, but that is immaterial, the point is that in fact someone mentioned it was a totally new idea.

JS You listened, people in the Institute listened and made mistakes occasionally but more often than not came up with something that was a real gem as that small Grants Program was in to some extent, still is I think. That was always the case.

EAR I want to ask you, what is going to sound like a very personal question, but you can answer it any way you like. From your own involvement per se, what would you say you are proudest of or what do you recall most pleasantly in terms of your responsibilities, what would you say, Ok, Joe, you were there for six years, what would you like to be best remembered for in terms of what you did there? This is a Dick Cavett type question.

JS I don't know that I can justify this but I have some sense that the potential when we created the behavioral sciences training branch, the potential of that unit as much as anything, I think I would like to be remembered in that sense, not because I organized it or it was my thought or anything like that but the idea of bringing together the behavioral sciences so called rather than the four units that we had worked with up to that point.

Part 2

JS simply exists and some of the programs he did was magnificent, both in the training division when he was independent in that sense and in the Branch

EAR No question about it.

JS In his efforts, for example to instruct others and to inform others about the potential of the biological was superb. I think it occasioned itself really within that context when psychology had to talk directly to Fred directly, and the social sciences group, whatever else that kind of mix was. If the Institute were still growing and still in its old sense powerful, I think that mix would have come through with something that we don't really even envision at this point. So, if anything I think that's is the kind of thing I was most satisfied with

EAR It is so interesting to me to see how every time you talk about the organizational innovation or development such as that, but it really comes down then to people. Fred \_\_\_\_\_ is just a unique guy, who now and all the time he has been there has done something that is so much an outgrowth of Fred Elmajian in one sense but so much taking advantage of the opportunities that were made available and development.

JS And, in his own way, trying to make them available to others. Often by standing on there toes, but saying we have opportunity to think here, we can do things that are different than we were doing and obviously, everyone, at one point or

JS(continued) another got his toes stepped on by Fred, sometimes very heavily,  
but always there was that element.

EAR Once you got beyond time space and location you were alright.

JS You were okay then. I will tell you though just as a personal instance of a lingering relationship with the Institute and with Fred, he passed through here a couple of years ago and he had another one of these things buzzing in his head and he called me up and he said, "Joe, I don't know what you are doing, come to lunch with me. Fine, delighted. We didn't talk about the Institute except in passing. He started talking to me about adolescence - he was on the adolescence kick. He had spoken to other people about similar kinds of things and he had a set of ideas that settled in with me a bit and indeed, it is not much, but it is a little text book statement that includes some of Fred Elmajian's ideas and they didn't come from anywhere else except from Fred Elmajian. The last little chapter in that book is at least a flyer toward what is the function of adolescence in cultural and social process. It is a made up thing in many respects, that Fred Elmajian but that was also the INstitute. It is whatever relationship we established at that point and were enabled to during the years that I was there, that set of ideas could be passed along.

EAR Well, that's it, I think, there are the Fred Elmajian's and there are the Bert Booth's and the Phil Sapir's and every name that you mentioned.

JS You mention Bert, I thought of his name earlier. I had more later contact with that group than I did with any other because I was on the Committee after I left the Institute. Now I began to appreciate that probably, I don't know what percentage, but some healthy percentage of the fine work that is done by psychiatry in research is the result of that program and no other.

EAR Absolutely.

JS And it wouldn't have happened without that program. That was the kind of thing that NSF could never do or any of the other Institute's could never do in a

JS(continued) million years except for the. I can only ascribe it to the atmosphere and the people, the quality of the people that were attracted to.

EAR That is really what I would like to somehow get to come alive because you begin to sound corny, as a matter of fact, by the time I finish the three days with Bob Felix, I said to him, "You are the most sincerely corny guy that I know" and that is exactly what he is.

JS Well, Eli, I am being corny with you today, too. It is mush, but it is just damn difficult. I could be just as harsh and critical as anyone, in fact, if we talked about Bert Booth, who was essentially a gentle spirit, he was enraged 48% of the time and he was enraged about program things, but when I take perspective on that, that is why I say tension, healthy tension - it was because every rage that he had ultimately turned out into some kind of productive thing and if he were held down a little bit, the vitality that was being held down would come out in another way and ultimately would get put together. You can't do those things when you are in a setting, an organizational setting, where the repression or suppression of things is ultimate and it wasn't in the Institute and if anything, to me that is what characterized it. It was there, when I say tension I mean real tension but that kind of vitality then was able to be expressed. Somehow we were able to do the things we needed to do, even under the worst circumstances. Now that is corn, but I prefer to say that's more important at least it is to me than anything that I could say which said psychiatry was a bunch of dumb bellies. At this stage it makes no sense. Indeed, psychiatry trained a bunch of guys who were are making a lot of money now and not making any other contribution, so who is to say it should have been better in an other way, I don't know that. Maybe 16% was better than 20% if we had to do more with it - corny as hell, but there was an awful lot of hard

JS(continued) thought about what we did.

EAR Can you think of anything else, we really covered the whole field,

JS Only that - there are two things, I guess, and I can't say very much about them. One I think we would have been even more successful or better had the Research and Training Branches been able to come together in the older days and later when the great push with, this is when the Institute really took off and just spread all over the map, the newer Divisions somehow were always the training branch was never, division, was never then able to get off track sufficiently. There were just too many pressures and too many points of difficulty, but I couldn't detail that, you know those stories better than I do anyway, but those two things I would look at wistfully. We could have done better with those.

EAR Okay, well listen I thank you very much, it is very helpful.

JS For whatever it is worth.

EAR As I said to Herb Kellman this morning, from each individual it must feel like a part of a jig-saw puzzle, but it is, and I think it will fit together very nicely, if I can really do my job well, and that remains to be seen.

JS It overwhelms me, what the hell you are going to do with this information.

EAR Well, I should tell you when, what happened, Stan and I when we came to Stony Brook and we would sit down every once in a while and kind of reminisce and I would say somebody should really write the story about NIMH and he kind of agreed that that should be and I don't remember the specific incident that occurred but I finally decided that I was going to do it and so I wrote a little prospectus which we discussed and went over and I modified it somewhat and then I called Bert Brown and I said "Do you think that NIMH would have some money for this" because at that time I thought without money how could I do it. He said Eli, tell me why you want to write this book and I thought what in the

EAR(continued) hell is he talking about, you know and I still am not sure but I answered him on the level that I thought he was asking but somehow this was going to be ego-gratifying to me, which of course, it would be or that I had an unfinished part of me that had to be finished and I said Bert, I just think that it is a story that needs to be told and I have been thinking about it so much, now that I have left that I want to do it. He said okay and then as I said, I went to see him and it was unfortunate, a very disappointing hour because just nine other things were happening at the same time. Then he even dropped an amusing little one shoe on me, he said "you know, I have three days of oral history that the Kennedy people took, when the Kennedy assassination took place because I had been at the White House through those years early on and they were putting together a whole volume of materials which some day will be published as a book and I said "Oh, really, is any of that available, he said, no, that is all locked up in the Kennedy library, so whatever it is that he has got there about his own original involvement with NIMH, literally, almost immediately after he came to NIMH he went to the White House and spent about a year there working on mental retardation program and that's why we got so heavily involved into the whole White House business with community mental health, and I suspect that Bert may secretly believe that he was the instigator into the community mental health program and it may be partially true, I don't know and I think what he ignores is that Bob Felix had his own feelers out, so did Stan and so did Mike Gorman, there were a lot of people working in many different avenues for the growth and development of NIMH. The Mike Gorman story is the most original. I have a problem with Mike Gorman

NLM NOTE: Interview tape ends abruptly here