

Thick Description and Fine Texture

Also of Interest

John A. Popplestone and Marion White McPherson,
An Illustrated History of American Psychology

J. R. Kantor

Psychology and Logic

The Logic of Modern Science

The Scientific Evolution of Psychology

The Aim and Progress by Psychology and Other Sciences

The Science of Psychology: An Interbehavioral Survey

Cultural Psychology

Tragedy and the Event Continuum

Psychological Comments and Queries

Principles of Psychology

The University of Akron Press

Akron, Ohio



Thick Description and Fine Texture:

Studies in the History of Psychology

Edited by David B. Baker

Copyright © 2003 David Baker

All rights reserved

All inquiries and permissions requests should be addressed to the publisher,

The University of Akron Press, Akron, OH 44325-1703.

Manufactured in the United States of America

First edition 2003

07 06 05 04 03 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Thick description and fine texture : studies in the history of
psychology / edited by David B. Baker. — 1st ed.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-931968-02-0 (alk. paper)

1. Psychology—Historiography. I. Baker, David B. II. Title.

BF81.T47 2003

150'.7'22—dc22

2003021622

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American
National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed
Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48—1984.∞

Contents

Preface

Thirty-five Years of Archival Achievement:

Essays in Honor of John A. Popplestone and
Marion White McPherson / vii

David B. Baker

Introduction

Looking Backward / xi

John A. Popplestone and Marion White McPherson

1. **“Microhistory” and the History of Psychology:**
“Thick Description” and “The Fine Texture of the Past” / 1
Michael M. Sokal
2. **Interviewing as a Tool of the Trade:**
A Not-Very-Satisfactory Bottom Line / 19
John C. Burnham
3. **Harry Hollingworth and the Shame of Applied Psychology / 38**
Ludy T. Benjamin Jr.
4. **An Insider’s Look at Experimental Psychology in America:**
The Diaries of Walter Miles / 57
C. James Goodwin
5. **Contextualizing Documents, Data, and Controversies:**
Working with the Henry Herbert Goddard Papers / 76
Leila Zenderland
6. **Three Decades of Historical and Archival Research on Psychology
and Religion / 108**
Hendrika Vande Kemp

vi Contents

7. Whatever Happened to the Brass and Glass?

The Rise of Statistical “Instruments” in Psychology, 1900–1950 / 123

Ryan D. Tweney

8. Archival Adventures in the History of Comparative Psychology / 143

Donald A. Dewsbury

9. A Tale of Two Institutions:

York University’s History of Psychology Program and the Archives of the
History of American Psychology / 162

Raymond E. Fancher

Contributors / 175

Notes / 181

Bibliography / 217

Index / 241

PREFACE

Thirty-five Years of Archival Achievement:

Essays in Honor of John A. Popplestone and
Marion White McPherson

David B. Baker

TO HONOR THE CONTRIBUTIONS of significant persons, the academic world has at its disposal any number of award mechanisms. Most ubiquitous are items that become the private property of the recipient, including honorary degrees, all manner of chronometers, and countless variations of engraved decorative icons. Once bestowed, the gift and recipient are often relinquished to a restive setting, removed from the currents they once occupied.

In the hierarchy of academic acknowledgment, being honored with a collection of essays generally indicates that a person's legacy is lasting and relevant. Unlike acknowledgments that inhabit personal spaces, these works reside in the public domain and serve as a perpetual reminder of past accomplishment and contribution. And so it is with this volume that pays tribute to two pioneers in the history of psychology, John A. Popplestone and Marion White McPherson.

Their founding of the Archives of the History of American Psychology at the University of Akron in 1965 was a watershed event in the history of psychology in the twentieth century. In bringing together the primary sources in the history of psychology, they brought a new legitimacy to the study of the subject. Historians of psychology had a place to hang their hat, historiography gained muscle, and scholarship broadened.

To honor their legacy a festschrift conference was convened at

the University of Akron on April 7, 2000.¹ A vestige of nineteenth-century German academic life, the *festschrift* was conceived as an expression of esteem from students who had profited from the mentorship of a beloved and accomplished professor. For Popplestone and McPherson, the archives were their university office and historians of psychology their students. Indeed their reach was far and wide, touching not only the lives of individual scholars but also shaping the corpus of the new history of psychology that was emerging in the 1960s. Shepherding this new movement from its infancy through the century's end, they created, challenged, provoked, and persevered to leave a record that has no equal.

Who better then to begin this volume than the founders themselves, answering several questions demanded by the historical record. Following the introduction, nine distinguished scholars in the history of psychology share in the reflected glory of the good works of Popplestone and McPherson. The composition of the authors reflects much of the contemporary scene in the history of psychology. Some are historians and some psychologists, all keenly aware of the primacy of original source material in historical scholarship. Each was invited to reflect upon the process of archival research.

As with any selected work the reader is free to read at will, the essays offering insights into a myriad of issues familiar to anyone who has reached for an archival folder or considered the provenance of an artifact. As one considers these diverse and informing essays, what emerges is a sense of the journey available through archival research. The panoply of available methods reminds us that historiography is dynamic and continually open to new interpretation and knowledge. The ways in which individual writers collate archival elements to produce a coherent narrative also reminds us that such undertakings are a human endeavor, capable of inducing a range of affect and experience. It seems fair to say that the journey is a satisfying one.

The opening essays, offered by two established editors in the history of psychology, Professor Michael Sokal and Professor John Burnham, provide a focused and personal examination of some of the tools and techniques of historical analysis. Sokal's discussion of microhistory offers a range of possibilities for considering the data of individual lives, whereas Burnham

brings the reader along in his search for meaning in the use of oral history.

The genre of historical biography is well represented in the papers of Professors Ludy T. Benjamin Jr., C. James Goodwin, and Leila Zenderland. Interestingly, each of the biographical subjects is part of a cohort whose careers reached full stride in the second and third decades of the twentieth century. Benjamin shows in detail how a seeming paradox of identity can be unfolded through an examination of personal and professional personas. Goodwin offers a perspective on the use of personal diaries, illustrating that the vagaries of autobiographical note taking can offer valuable insights into the interaction of person and place. Expanding the scope, Zenderland carefully walks the reader through the steps involved in deconstructing social policy to reveal the influence of the personal, professional, and political.

Just as biography provides rich historical narrative, so too do the tensions in the culture at large. The essay offered by Professor Hendrika Vande Kemp illustrates how one can take on a topic of massive proportions and in the process distill some essential facts and provide credence to areas of neglected historical analysis.

Professor Ryan D. Tweney treats object as subject in a fascinating piece in which the instruments and apparatus of psychology provide the raw data for considering transformations in the ways in which knowledge is generated, analyzed, and interpreted.

Completing the volume are two essays that reflect the essential nature of the archival adventure. Above all else, the Archives of the History of American Psychology serve an educational function. The holdings are there not only to preserve the historical record but also to see that it is always available to those who come in search of answers to questions about the often ethereal past. Archival work connects the past with the present and offers possibilities for the future. In it are contained patterns and interconnections. Archives can mentor and can reveal the influence of mentors on succeeding generations. Such is the case for Professor Donald A. Dewsbury, whose archival adventures reveal much about the nature of finding an intellectual family and home. Bringing us into the present, Professor Raymond Fancher offers the perspective of a teacher of the history

of psychology whose graduate students participate in an archival rite of passage that affirms the importance of the archival record.

Taken together, these collected works honor two important people and the institution they created. In doing so, they celebrate the expression of creative and careful scholarship made possible by the efforts of John Popplestone and Marion White McPherson, who in founding the Archives of the History of American Psychology not only gave us an institution for today and tomorrow, but also gave us permission to see the possibilities of the past.

INTRODUCTION

Looking Backward

John A. Popplestone and Marion White McPherson

IN 1965, THREE BEGINNINGS took place that mark the end of one developmental phase of the field of the history of psychology and the beginning of the next: Division 26, the Division of the History of Psychology, of the American Psychological Association (APA), the *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, and the Archives of the History of American Psychology (AHAP) all came into existence in the same short time period, all nurtured by Robert I. Watson, and all three have flourished in the years since.

Here, we would like to boast a little about what has happened in the archives. Quantifying growth is easily done: from nothing to more than twenty-seven hundred linear feet of documents ready for use, more than fifteen thousand photographic records, over six thousand test records, and so forth. But these statistics, like so many numbers, tell a story only in one language without a contextual, interpretative setting.

In these years since the beginning we have become a different institution, existing in different times, serving a different population and reflecting a different psychology. For openers, the collection policy announced in 1965 was embedded in the social and intellectual unrest of those times. For example, the 1970 Kent State shootings were only twelve miles away from the Akron campus and closed it down while the second annual meeting of Cheiron was being held with the AHAP as host.

We specified at the beginning that we would be interested only in North American psychologists, not European or other nation-

alities and not in psychiatry, psychoanalysis, or anything else, and that this restriction was not a narrow nationalism but only a means of limiting our focus. We also said that our interest was in the whole field of psychology and in all psychologists. That is, we are not going to be elitist in terms of people and not hierarchical in terms of kinds of psychological activity.

One of the considerations here was that, traditionally, most archival programs were in academic settings, which meant that academic psychologists were more likely to have a place that would be interested in their papers (the program at Harvard was the exemplary example). But those psychologists who were employed in nonacademic settings, particularly those in the independent practice of psychology, were quite unlikely to have someplace where their papers would be welcomed and protected.

We assume that Columbia University and Barnard College did not have an archive program in 1956, and for this reason Harry Hollingworth *did* deposit copies of his unpublished autobiography with the Nebraska Historical Society. But other copies of the autobiography, along with the rest of his papers and those of his wife, Leta Hollingworth, were still in his possession at death. We obtained them from his daughter, by his second marriage, and they are now in Akron, safe.

This policy of inclusion by AHAP was in contrast to many older historical and archival interests that tended to be restricted to “important” people, places, and events. In the spirit of the 1960s we were to be egalitarian, reflecting a psychology that was pluralistic in content and diverse in membership. By and large we have stayed with this definition, but we are now a little less interested in typical people—although they are still represented—and we are a little more sophisticated, we hope, in predicting what historians in the future are going to find of interest. What is called “important” today will be of interest tomorrow. And the obscure tends to remain so.

One special collecting project that reflects this attitude began in the earliest days and was only terminated in 1997. We had selected six people, neither stellar nor obscure, as typical faculty members, and asked them to save whatever came across their desks; everything that a typical faculty member had to deal with in our times. Gradually, most lost interest and

dropped out, but one conscientious person lasted from the start of the project until his retirement. This is a unique record, which we hope some historians in the future will find immensely interesting.

At Mystic Seaport in Connecticut is a pavilion devoted to an exhibit called "Neptune's Attic." The seaport administration explains that although its collecting policy is now very specific and focused, it was not always thus, and all sorts of interesting, but irrelevant, things have washed ashore—as it were—and ended up there. This exotica is "Neptune's Attic." We could almost do the same thing, "Psychology's Attic," from some of the surplus things we have found embedded in the papers of psychologists. For example, we could include a large collection of items related to Edward Muybridge, the early photographer of movement, a collection of California wine bottle labels, a lock of Rosalie Rayner's hair, the altimeter of Wolfgang Köhler, and an eight-ball which a speaker liked to place on the podium before beginning his remarks. We were almost offered Einstein's brain, but wiser counsel prevailed. (Actually we would have declined since he was not an American psychologist.) We do have the complete records of obtaining a degree from a Florida diploma mill, from application through dissertation to the final conferring of the Ph.D. in counseling psychology with subsequent membership in APA.

We are still trying to represent the whole of psychology and the diversity of the people who do psychology, but we also recognize that the task is different today from what it was when we began. For openers, there are simply many more psychologists in whom we have to be interested than there were extant then. To underline this, and using APA as the example, in 1965 there were twenty-three interest divisions, and by 1999 there were fifty-two. The field has grown and diversified. The 23,500 APA members of 1965 are overwhelmed by the more than 155,000 who belong today. In a relatively short time, the American Psychological Society (APS) has formed and grown to include some 15,000 members.

Many more archival programs exist today than in 1965. Then it was a rare university, hospital, or clinic that had an archival program. Now many institutions do, and they stand ready to help preserve records that would have perished, except for our efforts. Today many records can receive excellent care at home. We still feel that we can give a psychologist special

treatment and understanding, but we also are happy to learn that a collection is well housed elsewhere when we do not receive it.

J. E. Wallace Wallin, who was ninety-three years old at the time of his death in 1969, left his papers to the University of Delaware, his alma mater—an appropriate bequest. However, we had a call from the archivist at Delaware one day asking us if we might be interested in accessioning the Wallin papers. His reason was that they simply could not make any sense out of them; they seemed to be in no order with which they could deal. What he was really saying was that the papers of this psychologist did not fit the usual archival expectation, partly because they were psychological and partly because of Wallin's career and personality. My answer was that we would take on Wallin if the family agreed with the transfer. Wallin's daughter did agree, and the transfer was made. Later when she came to visit Akron, and saw the inventory and the gray boxes that held her father's papers, she was pleased.

Another anecdote indicates the special quality of care that we can give. One of our student workers came to one of us one day with a typescript and the question of just what it was and how should the inventory describe it? She said, "It seems to be the start of a novel or perhaps a short story." And then I read, "This little boy seems to be sitting at a table. There is a violin on it and the little boy is thinking about. . . ." Only a rare psychologist would not recognize a story stimulated by Card 1 of the Thematic Apperception Test.

From the beginning, the mission of the archives was providing protection and service where it would otherwise be missing. There was never an intention to dominate the field, to corner the market of manuscript materials in psychology. But in those early days fewer resources were available to psychologists, and we had to do more for the field simply because no one else was helping us. In the first years in particular, we heard repeated horror stories when one of us arrived too late. "Dad burned everything," or, "I just could not keep all that stuff so it was thrown out," and, "when Mother went into the nursing home we closed the house down and those things must have gone then." We hope that today we have forestalled some of that sort of destruction.

In 1965 we were novices and Akron was an obscure midwestern uni-

versity that housed an archive that was an unknown. Most psychologists did not understand that the writing of history requires the preservation and use of primary sources, the unpublished documents that are produced by a career in psychology.

A common misunderstanding in those early days was to hear us talk about “papers” and have the listener respond with the collected reprints of published research articles. That sort of thing does not happen anymore, although psychologists are still amazed and somewhat apprehensive when they consider that the historian is dependent upon what has survived, by chance, as data. All that has changed. The Archives of the History of American Psychology at the University of Akron are well known, internationally, which is, of course, why the university has supported this very special, rather elitist enterprise all these years.

Very early, one of our archival consultants explained, “In the 1920s a university that wanted prestige built a bell-tower; in the ‘60s they founded an archive.” And he added, somewhat sinisterly, “The cost is about the same.” At one point Akron’s then vice president for academic affairs told me, “It used to be that when I went to meetings of academic vice presidents people would look at my badge and say, ‘Oh, Akron, where the rubber comes from.’ But now they look at my badge and they say, ‘Oh, Akron, where the psychology archives are.’” I knew then that my budget was safe.

Of course not all academic administrators have been supportive. The dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Robert Oetjen, once said to me, “You know John, when I encounter a scientist who is knowledgeable about the history of his discipline I know that I am dealing with an incompetent.” He later presided over my demotion as department head.

More than a thousand people have actually donated things to us. But many more have received brochures and other mailings as we have tried to be visible. Activities such as chairing the Task Force on Centennial Celebrations help to keep the archives at Akron conspicuous.

The changes in the field of psychology and the changes in the salience of the archives have been accompanied by a third set of changes in the field of the history of psychology. In 1965 Division 26 had 234 charter members; today that number exceeds eight hundred, nearly a four-

fold increase, just about proportional to the growth of the membership of APA.

In 1969 a second forum for history research (and fellowship) came when the Cheiron Society was organized, originally around the core of the alumni of a workshop in the history of psychology. Cheiron was created as an interdisciplinary society with the original name International Society for the History of the Behavioral and Social Sciences, which forms the acronym ISHOBS and required the shift to Cheiron. There is now also the European Society for the History of the Human Sciences, and members of both societies attend both meetings. Cheiron is dominated by psychologists with an interest in the history of the field, both in North America and Europe. The Forum for the History of Human Science (FHHS) was founded in December 1988 as an interdisciplinary group with a stated purpose "to promote scholarship in the history of the social and behavioral sciences." The organizational meeting took place at the 1988 History of Science Society (HSS) annual meeting, and the group sought affiliation status with HSS as an interest group. We expect that FHHS will prove to have a membership with a dominant component of trained professional historians with an interest in the history of psychology, while Division 26 will be professional psychologists with an interest in the history of the field. Cheiron seems to be mostly psychologists acting like historians.

The arrival of the historians is changing the field. Psychologists writing about psychology are generally friendly and tolerant of their field and its problems, but the outsider looking in is sometimes hostile, negative, and even seems to see psychology as an enemy. These people take Foucault seriously. However, they are a highly sophisticated group and bring new points of view to the field. One of these people describes himself as a member of the loyal opposition. Perhaps that says it as well as anything else.

Thirty-five years ago the members of Division 26 and most of the members of Cheiron, but not all, were self-taught historians coming to the field with only a rough and ready knowledge of historiographic techniques and skills. Many of them wrote very good history, did use primary sources, and managed to create a discipline that was very different from the history of psychology that had been too frequent prior to 1965.

Over the years, some of the questions we are asked have been repeated, but sometimes the answers change.

What kind of permanence do the archives have? Will they outlast your enthusiasm and interest? Will the archives go on? How can we be sure that the administration at Akron will continue to support the archives? The answer to this good, reasonable question has remained the same over the years. How can anyone guarantee that anything will be permanent? Who would have thought that the Merrill-Palmer institution would close its doors? Who could have predicted that the Vineland Training School could end so ignominiously? And, on a larger field, who would ever have predicted the collapse of Marxist-Leninism on such a vast scale? When the University of Akron administration and Board of Directors established the psychology archives it was, of course, with the intention that it was permanent. Archivists like the term "perpetuity." A project of this sort, with its national and international attention needs to be done well. If it were to be abandoned national and international opprobrium would replace praise and regard. They know this. Currently, the University of Akron continues to be generous. We have been supported for thirty-five years. In 1994 we moved into new quarters, and the succession has been assured with the appointment of David Baker as the new director in 1999.

"Is the collection on microfilm?" and *"Are you on the web?"* are two similar questions still being asked. Microfilm is not really seen as a solution to any of our problems. It fades, gets a disease, and generally does not have the kind of permanence that paper and ink possess. Also, a confidential item in a file can be pulled from a box before the box is given to a patron and returned when it goes back on the shelf, regaining its position in the collection.

We are especially careful about confidential material. The donor may stipulate that certain items are to be closed under various conditions and may also specify the level, or time, when they may be inspected, copied, or quoted. Or we may decide that some material is simply too sensitive, for the present, to be made public. We maintain that one does not lose one's privacy simply by being dead. And one's associates and family have the same rights. Because we are not a governmental agency, like the Library of Congress, we may restrict access, and our legal department is even touchier about these things than we are.

Lastly there is an aesthetic side to all this. People like to hold in their hand the real document, the thing itself, and staring at a ground glass screen is not the same thing. So we have no expectation, at the present, to go to microfilm. The saving in space would be the compelling reason to use it, and we do not feel that this has come yet.

We are in the process of computerizing the inventory and other finding aids. It is a significant undertaking and one that will meet the needs of our donors and patrons.

Popplestone's favorite question still being asked is "*How did you ever get an idea like this?*" said with an inflection that says "how come a dork like you is able to come up with something so splendid?" He has answered this question so frequently that it seems redundant to answer it again but perhaps we should.

In 1965, we were both identifiable as clinical psychologists; our teaching and research were concerned with personality, mental retardation, and psychometrics. Teaching was in the clinical area. But the head of the department asked one of us to teach the history of psychology course, which was far from our main interests and not an area of special expertise. But, on the other hand, we are not afraid of history, or of the past either. In 1965, after about four years of teaching a course in history, one of us complained that there was a very low standard of what passed for research in the field and predicted that unless the historians began to use primary sources and had archival material available, a field of respectable historical writing would never exist.

A mutual friend had been involved in the recent establishment of the Archives of American Art, and that interesting project probably helped to suggest a psychology archives. Also we were reminded many years later of an article in the *American Psychologist* signed "Historiophile" (actually Saul Rosenzweig) which urged a psychological museum. But that was not in consciousness at the time, and neither the earlier Rafi Khan nor the David Boder "museum" attempts were known to us.

In any case, the dean, who was an historian, authorized pursuit of the possibility. Visits to the Archives of Labor History at Wayne State University and the Archives of American Art at the Institute of Arts in Detroit were helpful, and the influential support of Robert I. Watson sped things

along. In October 1965, the University of Akron Board of Trustees authorized the Archives of the History of American Psychology and at the same time created the University of Akron Archives.

AHAP at that time was without released time, without a budget, and with space limited to a desk in a library office, with a part-time student assistant and some handsome letterhead. We had the good wishes of many, but not all, of the university administrators.

“Why in Akron?” This suggests that the American midwest is as remote from civilization as is Baffin Land or the upcountry of Belize. West Coast people feel it should be on the West Coast, and East Coast residents think it should be in either Washington or New York. In fact, with modern methods of travel and communication, it can be anyplace. In this case our willingness to do the work and the university’s willingness to provide housing and money settled the issue.

Journalists—and some others—ask, *“What is the most interesting request you have had?”* We have several favorites. One is our participation in the Ellis Island restoration project. The concept was to allow the modern visitor to experience vicariously what the arriving immigrant experienced, to evoke the physical and psychological examinations. But the staff were not able to find the tests that had been given. Manuals and descriptions abound, but the actual objects did not. Then a friend of the Ellis Island exhibit staff suggested they try Akron. We had the tests—in fact we had enough extras that we could lend Ellis Island what was needed. We have not been out to see the restored station but an article in *LIFE* magazine did illustrate the “Ship Test” we loaned them, although it did not give us credit. So we are awaiting the chance to see it. Neither of us has an Ellis Island experience in our families—we came in by another route—but this *does* mean that we now can share some of this part of the history of America with so many others.

In another, not particularly psychological experience, we were asked to make available some of the genealogical charts that had been prepared by the staff of the Vineland Training School and known as “The Jackson-Whites.” The genealogies of the Jukes family and the Kallikak family were once “evidence” of the familial occurrence of social inadequacy. The Jackson-Whites are another such family, although not as well-known as

the Kallikaks and the Jukes. We received an inquiry from a professional genealogist hired by the Ramapough Mountain Indians who were trying to achieve acknowledgment by the federal government as an Indian tribe. The genealogist asked to be allowed to examine the charts since they were believed to provide important information on the ancestry of their tribal members. A letter urging us to allow the genealogist to have access came from Ronald Redbone Van Dunk, chief, Ramapough Mountain Indian Tribe. We were happy to give access, once our legal department gave us clearance, and we wrote to Chief Van Dunk to assure him of our cooperation. We had never before written to an Indian chief and none of the manuals we consulted told us what the correct salutation was. They do prescribe the appropriate form for the Queen of England and the Pope, but not for an American Indian tribal chief. We have no idea how valid the claims of the Ramapough Indians are, but it was nice to do something for the Indians more concrete than just have the usual white, European-origin, liberal, guilt feelings.

A similar inquiry is, "*What is your favorite or most valuable or most important collection?*" Well, the Papers of Henry Herbert Goddard are very large—he was an important figure—and we have a lot of traffic in them. The Donald K. Adams Papers reflect the Gestalt movement and did receive a lot of use. The Papers of Barbara Strudler Walston will reflect many of the current, cutting-edge things happening in psychology now. She was involved in many activities. In fact the extent of her involvement and the recency of events has decided us on the indefinite postponement of preparing her papers for use. They are just too new and involve too many people on the contemporary scene.

As we have examined this question of what collection seems most important, the real answer is, "Whatever one is most recent." We acquired the papers and films of Rene Spitz on July 24–27, 1990. This is a very large collection—1,320 pounds of paper and 2,080 pounds of film. (We have these figures since the collection was released by The University of Colorado in Denver and came to Akron via air freight, in two shipments for security. And, since we shared the cost of shipment with the people in Colorado, we know the exact poundage.) Spitz is probably most easily identified as a psychoanalyst and psychiatrist of European background,

and the work usually identified with his name is the anaclitic depression and hospitalism. But he was a member of APA from 1956 to his death in 1974, and was, at one time, frequently cited by psychologists. The collection begins in Europe before 1938 and includes psychoanalytic materials from the pre-Hitler era, a period in which historians of psychoanalysis say the records are very sparse. He seems to have had a wide correspondence with many workers in personality, child development, and early studies of psychopathology in children. The films, particularly *Grief*, are still in demand, mostly by people in television production.

We are frequently approached by the producers of television programs, particularly educational television, for help with visuals, photographs, and film clips. They are delightful people to work with, and it is something of a thrill to give things to them because of the potentially huge impact. If a scholar uses our materials and they are seen by a few hundred other scholars that is just fine—that is our main reason for existence, after all. But when a single film clip is going to be seen by millions and have the potential for influencing them for the better, it is really having impact.

What financial support do the archives receive?

Strangely, the question about “the bottom line” which dominates the thinking of the staff of the archives is rarely of concern to the inquiring consumer-donor. Perhaps the worth of the project seems so self-evident that the question does not seem salient. However, to those of us who are intimately concerned with operation and execution, money is important and rare.

Through the years the University of Akron has generously provided our salaries, supplies and services, travel, and space, heat, maintenance, and auxiliary services (like audio visual support), just as for an academic department. We have never been overwhelmed by surplus abundances but, on the other hand, the university has allowed us the basic subsistence budget without which nothing would have taken place. However, the amount of work does increase every year, intake is sometimes a little overwhelming, and there is a gap between what the university can provide and what AHAP needs to carry out its goals.

Except for a very few grants, we have not been able to generate any significant extramural support. For example, in 1966 a National Science

Foundation official, Murray Aborn, a psychologist, in the course of saying no told us, "There is no need for a psychology archive since there are no competent historians of psychology." He was invited to the festschrift conference of 2000 but did not attend.

We generate funds by selling photographs to book publishers and others. Some publication royalties are assigned to us. One of these is an AHAP-based publication, *An Illustrated History of American Psychology*. It has gone through two English language printings, as well as an abridgement in Japanese. And over the years we have had spontaneous gifts from organizations and individuals who have felt that we deserve help. Some psychologists have included the archives in their wills, and one has even made the archives his heir.

In order to structure these spontaneous gifts, an organization, "The Friends of the Psychology Archives," was initiated in 1995. The friends have sent a mail solicitation every year since, and the annual gifts are now a major support of the work, particularly in providing the salaries of our student workers who prepare the finding aids.

In 1965 when the field of the history of psychology took a great leap forward with the creation of the journal, the division, and the opening of a special subject matter archive, we all felt that maturity, if not here *now*, was soon to be obtained. At the archives we were sure that the directed preservation of primary materials was a necessary and perhaps even sufficient condition for the writing of good history. The field is certainly much better now than it was in 1965, and we think that most of us would allow a prediction that it will be even better in the future. But we must also entertain the proposition that an ideal history may never exist. Perhaps our goals and aspirations can never be fully experienced. This is not a statement of pessimism but simply one of looking at our record with some pride—the idealism of 1965 may have been less mature than a present-day realization that perfection may be pursued but may not be apprehended.