Celebrating 70 years

In this issue, we celebrate our 70th anniversary with exuberance and jubilation against the backdrop of the reverberations of the Hoffman Report. Thank you to all those who made submissions to this issue. One major addition to this issue is that we provide you readers with the opportunity to respond to articles. In our spring issue 2016, we will feature some of these responses as ‘Readers’ Comments/Contributions.’
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Psychology in the news: Crisis or opportunity?

When I read the morning paper, I am accustomed to reading about issues to which Division One’s overarching and integrative approach to the field of psychology could contribute in a meaningful way. There are the long standing problems of racism and sexism, along with serious issues raised by both the rise of religious fundamentalism with violence generated in the name of religion and the impact of catastrophic climate change (often referred to as global warming) sustained by the lack of political will to combat it. But recently, I have been distressed to find myself reading about issues in psychology. First it was the Hoffman Report and the reopening of the critique of psychology’s role in the so-called “harsh interrogations” (aka torture) of detainees at Guantanamo. More recently it has been about the failures of replication for psychological research identified by the replication project of the Open Science Collaboration. But once again, there are contributions that the perspective of Division One can bring. For this column, I want to focus primarily on the most recent issue that faces us specifically as psychologists — the concerns about the nature of our science.

To some extent this choice is due to the fact that most of what I would say about the organizational challenges revealed by the Hoffman Report were covered in the Division One Executive Committee’s statement released prior to the August APA Convention. At this point, perhaps the most important thing that can be said about the issues raised were summarized in the following lines from the statement:

“The structural and philosophical issues that led to this situation must be addressed. In particular, we urge APA to consider these fundamental questions: 1) How does a membership organization with volunteer elected leaders operate in a way that ensures that the paid staff on which the volunteer leaders rely do not usurp the control of the organization — whether for good or bad?; 2) How does a profession dedicated to the good of humanity develop and maintain its ethics and ethical standards independent of the press of guild or self-interest motives? In this process and all activities going forward, real transparency will be critical.

“The state of our science is both our concern and our territory.”

Whether or not those issues are addressed in a transparent manner is not under the direct control of Division One or our individual members.

The same can’t be said about the issues raised by the replication project. We are, after all, a science division and most of us engage in and teach about psychological research. The state of our science is both our concern and our territory.

As most of us are probably only too aware, the Replication Project was a joint effort by a number of individuals in psychological science to replicate results published in three leading psychology journals. They went to great lengths to attempt to replicate the methods used by the original study authors, including inviting those authors to provide materials and review planned replications. The results of that project, that 60% of the studies failed to replicate, were publicly released in August, published on-line in Science (Open Science Collaboration, 2015). It is an interesting and important article to read. Furthermore, the authors provided as open source material substantial data about their efforts that will, I suspect, be the subject of many secondary analyses over the coming months or even years.

There are standard issues raised about failure to replicate. There is the critique of the practices of only publishing new results rather than replications. There is also the issue of privileging novel or unusual results. Finally, there is the charge that we worship significance levels rather than looking at effect sizes. These concerns were supported by the project’s findings. Obviously if many studies don’t replicate, we should demand a literature replete with replications before accepting the findings as something approaching received wisdom. Further, the experiments most likely to replicate were those with large effect sizes.

Today, my morning paper had an opinion piece by another psychologist, Lisa Barrett (2015), arguing that this failure to replicate is nothing to be upset about — it is merely the nature of science. She noted that failures to replicate clue us into additional factors about when an effect occurs and when it doesn’t. She further notes that while “much of science still assumes that phenomenon can be explained by universal laws,” psychologists understand that context matters. Here I think that Dr. Barrett is both correct and incorrect at the same time. Context does matter.
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It matters because, as her examples about rats and learned fear demonstrate, distinguishing between the situations where we do get a particular result and the situations where we don’t, provide important information and scientific clues to a better understanding of the phenomenon under study. Hazel Markus and her colleagues previously demonstrated that not only are contexts and materials important, but the people participating are as well. Her work has outlined a number of areas where “classic” psychological findings are different in Japan compared to the US (Shweder, et al., 2006). One author of a study that is reported to have asserted this issue saying that the reason her study on women’s hormonal levels influencing ratings of male attractiveness failed to replicate was because she studied Italian women while the replication used American college students.

My concern is that, as a profession, we are more imbued with a belief in universal laws and less sensitive to the importance of context than Dr. Barrett admits. I fear this is particularly true when it comes to the importance of recognizing that the participants in our studies are not widgets but humans who come to us with individual, community, cultural, and historical experiences that shape how they understand and react to anything we do. While we may have begun to talk about the importance of understanding people in their intersectional complexity, our research designs and reports don’t seem to reflect that appreciation. Furthermore, in many (most) psychological experiments, we don’t get an effect in 100% of the participants, nor do we generally get a uniform effect of the variable of interest on each participant. Currently my students and I are looking at the frequency with which our studies of psychological interventions are reported in ways that allow us to address intersectional issues. The preliminary impressions are not encouraging. I certainly hope that as the field engages in discussion about the results of the Replication Project, we begin to discuss the importance of addressing human diversity rather than looking for universal decontextualized humans following universal context free laws. That conversation will be reflected in my Presidential theme – Roots and Branches: Envisioning a psychology free of racism and sexism.

References


If you have any comments or questions for this column, please click this link to submit: https://division1apa.wufoo.com/forms/z4yijqfogkeqc3/
There will also be an option if you choose to allow us to publish your feedback in the Spring newsletter 2016.
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Why should I become a Member of Division 1?

Because we are number 1!!! (literally…)

Contact Kasey Powers if you are a student - (kpowers1@gradcenter.cuny.edu)
Contact Emily Dow if you are an Early Career Psychologist (ECP) - (emilydow@gmail.com)
Otherwise if you have any questions, check out our membership brochure on page 6 designed by our Membership Chair, Mark Sciutto!
70th Anniversary Greetings to the Society for General Psychology

FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

“I am pleased to join you in celebrating your 70th anniversary.

In America, history is not only made by presidents and generals. Change often comes when caring and engaged individuals join together to build a brighter, stronger future for themselves and for the generations to come.

For years, you have carried forward a proud tradition. By daring to imagine the world as it could be and working tirelessly to realize that vision, you are helping America to build a better tomorrow.

Congratulations on your anniversary. As you reflect on your years of service to your community, I hope you take pride in what you have achieved. I wish you all the best for the years ahead.

Barack Obama”

FROM THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF TORONTO

“It is my esteemed pleasure to extend greetings and congratulations to The Society for General Psychology (APA Division 1) on the occasion of its 70th anniversary.

A non-profit, professional organization, The Society for General Psychology is made up of academic scientists, professional practitioners, and psychologists who are dedicated to creating a common link between psychology’s many different specialties.

This milestone anniversary is a cause for celebration, a time to reflect on The Society for General Psychology’s many accomplishments, and an opportunity to look with hope to a future of new possibilities.

On behalf of Toronto City Council, please accept my best wishes for a memorable anniversary celebration and continued success.

Mayor John Tory
City of Toronto”
70th Anniversary Greetings to the Society for General Psychology

From the President-Elect of the American Psychological Association

“On behalf of the American Psychological Association, it is my great pleasure to attend this reception on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the establishment of the Society for General Psychology. Let me congratulate the Society on reaching this milestone in its history and in particular all those whose work and dedication have ensured its place as a successful and well-respected society.

Over the past seven decades, the Society has enjoyed a rich history with an amazing array of illustrious fore-bearers – names recognizable to psychology students everywhere – Dashill, Munn, Tolman, Seashore, Anastasi, Lindzey, Wertheimer, Kimble, Denmark, Brewer – the list goes on.

According to Division 1 historians Michael Wertheimer and Brett King, Ernest Hilgard spoke of the creation of Division 1 in 1945 as the “default” division. Anne Anastasi said that she recalled that those APA members who felt strongly that the division structure would encourage ‘fractionation’ found a home in Division 1 as the ‘non-divisive’ division. Hilgard said that organizers were united in their opposition to fragmentation and a desire to see the whole discipline integrated or at least reunited. Division 1 is therefore a micro-cosm of the entire earlier APA.

The Society for General Psychology now has a long history with many accomplishments. It has a well-respected journal, Review of General Psychology, which began in 1997 and has published over 450 cross-disciplinary psychological articles. Its Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology book series goes back to the mid-1970s and is a testament in its own right, paying tribute to scholars in the history of psychology. The Society, through its programs, publications, and member interactions around scholarly pursuits and social exchanges, has engaged APA members and supported professional collaborations over the past 70 years.

On behalf of APA, I congratulate the Society on its 70th anniversary and express my appreciation to all those who have dedicated their time and effort and contributed to the success of this achievement, and sincerely wish the Society another seven decades and more of bringing psychology together.

Susan McDaniel
President-elect
American Psychological Association”
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FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
ONARIO PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

“Thank you, Joan, for inviting me to say a few words. I would like first to extend a warm welcome to Toronto to all Division 1 members from the Board and membership of the Ontario Psychological Association. I hope you have the opportunity to explore this beautiful city and enjoy yourself so much that you’ll want to come back. The weather has been really nice this week... had you been here last week you would have experienced our northern heat and humidity... not quite Arizona heat or Carolina humidity, but it still packs a whollop.

I am also very pleased to congratulate you on your 70th anniversary! We are celebrating OPA’s 68th anniversary this year, so we are aware of the dedication and commitment required to stay relevant and to attract and keep members. In every successful organization or society, there are those who go above and beyond, volunteering their time to ensure that members receive value for their dues. So, in addition to recognizing the members of Division 1 who keep the society strong and vital, I would like to acknowledge the executive, chairs, committee members, and others who after 70 years ensure that the Society for General Psychology remains a division that APA members want to belong to.

Congratulations, and I wish you many more years of success.

Jane Storrie
President
Ontario Psychological Association”
Call for Nominations for President Elect for Division 1

If there is someone you would like to see serve as President of the Society for General Psychology, please send your nominations (preferably with an email address for the potential candidate) to Joan C. Chrisler, Nominations and Elections Chair, at jcchr@conncoll.edu.

The election will take place in the spring. The person who is elected will serve as President-elect (and Chair of the William James Book Award Committee) 2016-2017, as President (and Chair of the George A. Miller Award Committee) 2017-2018, as Past President (and Nominations & Elections Chair and Chair of the Ernest R. Hilgard Award Committee) 2018-2019, and Chair of the Arthur W. Staats Lecture Committee 2019-2020. Division officers change roles in August, after convention.

The division’s executive committee generally meets only once per year, during the APA convention. It is a small, friendly, and dedicated group, which makes being the division’s president a pleasure.

Message from our Membership Chair ~ Mark Sciutto

It has been a pleasure to continue my service as membership chair for Div. 1. The past year has brought a lot of exciting developments in the division. Div. 1’s aim has always been to support coherence among psychology’s diverse sub-specialties. This year, we have more clearly articulated our specific goals, which are reflected in the Division’s newly adopted mission statement. These goals have served as a foundation for a thoughtful examination of the value of a Division 1 membership. As membership chair (and Member-At large), I want to see Division 1 become a "go-to" resource for psychologists who value the integration of theory, research, and practice. Moreover, I would like to see the Division better support psychologists at all levels of their career and in a wide range of work settings. There are many professional "homes" for specialization, but Division 1 provides a unique opportunity to keep psychology connected. The next few years are going to be an exciting time for Division 1. We have also seen an infusion of new members and new ideas on our Executive Committee, which has translated into an increase in memberships this past year (despite general declining memberships across APA divisions). The challenge for us moving forward is to maximize the value we provide to our members. To aid in these efforts, please take a few minutes to share your ideas about the direction of Division 1. Please go to (http://www.surveymethods.com/EndUser.aspx?A682EEF6A6EDF6F5AD) and complete a brief survey. Or please feel free to email me with ideas for improving the ways in which Division 1 can support its members.

Best regards,

Mark J. Sciutto, Ph.D.,
Membership Chair, Member At-Large
The Society of General Psychology, Division 1 of the APA, encourages students, academicians, and professionals in psychology to be educated and trained across the broad areas of the discipline and to promote unity and coherence in psychology.

To this end, we would like to offer you a free 1-year membership to Division 1.

By accepting this free offer you will:

- Receive our biannual newsletter, The General Psychologist;
- Be added to our email list to receive announcements about the society;
- Be cordially invited to involve yourself in all of the activities of the division, such as serving on committees of the society, presenting your research and scholarship at the annual APA convention, and enjoying the congenial fellowship of like-minded colleagues.

Benefits of Ongoing Membership:

- The General Psychologist, the Division 1 newsletter — the best newsletter in psychology
- A subscription to the Review of General Psychology, Division 1’s outstanding journal (this can be added to the free membership for an additional $22.00)
- Discounts on Division 1 books, which includes six volumes of Pioneers in Psychology
- Exciting programs at APA that present distinguished award winners
- Great people who support coherence among psychology’s many subfields
- Low dues

Please visit www.apadivisions.org/division-1/membership for more information on this exciting offer.
Congratulations to the New Fellow of Division 1

The Fellows Committee of the Society for General Psychology (APA Division 1) is proud to announce that eight (8) psychologists were elected as Fellows of the Division, based on their “outstanding and unusual” contributions to general psychology.” All of them are current APA fellows. According to APA, "Fellow status is an honor bestowed upon APA Members who have shown evidence of unusual and outstanding contributions or performance in the field of psychology. Fellow status requires that a person's work has had a national impact on the field of psychology beyond a local, state, or regional level. A high level of competence or steady and continuing contribution are not sufficient to warrant Fellow status. National impact must be demonstrated."

Jerome Bruner, Ph.D.
Mindy J. Erchull, Ph.D.
Harris L. Friedman, Ph.D., ABPP
Kurt F. Geisinger, Ph.D.
Verlin B. Hinsz, Ph.D.
Maureen C. McHugh, Ph.D.
Charlotte J. Patterson, Ph.D.
Senel Poyrazli, Ph.D.

Congratulations and best wishes to our new Fellows!

I also wish to mention that it has been an honor and a pleasure for having served as the Division’s Fellows Chair for the past 3 years. I am pleased to announce that an outstandingly competent colleague in our Division - Dr. Mindy Erchull – is our new incoming Division 1 Fellows Chair. My sincerest thanks to Drs. Florence Denmark, Janet Sigal, and Harold Takooshian who served as members of the Committee this past year.

For those who may be interested in applying for Fellow status in Division 1, please contact Mindy Erchull, Ph.D. (incoming Fellows Chair of Division 1) by email at merchull@umw.edu. Criteria for qualifications as Division 1 Fellow may be found at http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/membership/fellows/index.aspx

Sincerely,

Richard S. Velayo, Ph.D.
Outgoing Chair, Fellows Committee
APA Division 1 (Society for General Psychology)
Become a Fellow of Division 1

The Division 1 Fellows Committee is seeking nominations and applications for Fellow status in the Division.

Self-nominations are welcome and encouraged.

**There are two paths to Fellow status in the Division:**

*First,* members of Division 5 who are APA members but are not yet Fellows of APA may apply for Fellow status in Division 1. These are known as “New Fellow” applications, and applicants must meet both APA criteria and Division 1 criteria for fellow status.

*Second,* any member of Division 5 who is already a Fellow of APA may apply to become a Fellow of the division. These applicants are known as “Current Fellows.” Applications from current fellows are only evaluated by the Division 1 Fellows Committee.

Current Fellows are good resources for information about being and becoming a Fellow. Letters from current Fellows are also required for those applying for New Fellow status.

**APA Fellow Criteria include:**

⇒ Five (5) years of acceptable professional experience beyond receipt of the doctoral degree
⇒ Membership in APA for at least one year
⇒ Unusual and outstanding contributions that have had a national or international impact

You can find details about the APA criteria at [http://www.apa.org/membership/fellows/index.aspx](http://www.apa.org/membership/fellows/index.aspx)

**Division 1 Fellow Criteria include:**

⇒ Unusual and outstanding contributions within general psychology
⇒ Contributions can be include textbooks, published research, books and book chapters, outstanding teaching, and leadership in and/or extensive service to Division 1

Specific details about the Div 1 criteria are at [http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/membership/fellows/index.aspx](http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/membership/fellows/index.aspx)

**Process for New Fellows:**

Applications to be a new APA Fellow are submitted online through the APA Fellows Online Application Platform. This system will allow nominees, endorsers, and Division Fellows Chairs to submit all required documents online. Applications will not be considered unless they are submitted through this system.

Applications for New Fellow status require letters of endorsement from three current Division 1 Fellows in addition to a detailed statement indicating how, specifically, the applicant meets both the APA and Div 1 Fellow criteria and completion of other information as required in the application platform. Please visit the APA Fellows webpage for more information and to the online system: [http://www.apa.org/membership/fellows/index.aspx](http://www.apa.org/membership/fellows/index.aspx)

All materials, including letters of reference, must be submitted through the online platform by **December 1, 2015.** Applicants will have to enter the names and contact information of their endorsers in advance of that date so that endorsers can submit their letters of recommendation by this date.

The candidates’ applications are reviewed by the Division 1 Fellows Committee. Those receiving a positive recommendation will be forwarded to the APA Fellows Committee for their review. Fellow status is granted by the APA Fellows Committee. Please remember that there can only be one nominating division.

**Process for Current Fellows:**

Current Fellows of APA may apply for Division 1 Fellow status by sending a current CV and a letter detailing the ways in which the applicant meets the criteria for fellow status in Division 1. These materials must be emailed to Mindy Erchull (merchull@umw.edu). The due date for Current Fellows applications is **April 15, 2016.** Current Fellows applications are evaluated only by the Division 1 Fellows Committee.
The Hoffman Report: Statement from Division 1

The Executive Committee of Division 1 is disappointed and dismayed by the revelations about APA in the Hoffman Report. We realize that there may be multiple opinions among the division’s membership about how to move forward. However, we wish to go on record with our views.

We are deeply distressed by the evidence that the PENS Taskforce was manipulated from the beginning to endorse the goals of the psychologists representing the Department of Defense rather than to explore ethical issues regarding psychologists’ participation in interrogations and other national security activities. We are appalled that during the following 10 years, public relations and the concerns of the DoD appear to have taken precedence over ethics and the will of the membership. We were outraged to learn that the evidence indicates a conspiracy by some staff leaders and some elected officials to hide the truth from the membership and their elected Council of Representatives; these leaders claimed that the PENS Report clearly prohibited psychologists from participating in torture (as defined by the Geneva Conventions and other recognized international standards), but actually used general and abstract language that provided neither limits on the activities of DoD psychologists nor any guidance to them. The duplicity in statements to the membership on the part of a combination of elected leaders and paid staff is completely unacceptable. We are ashamed that the result of APA’s failure of leadership may have contributed to the torture of those held in detention by the U.S. government.

If the trust of the membership and the public is to be regained, we believe that it is essential to hold those responsible accountable. This includes both staff and elected leaders. We believe that this accountability must occur in the context of appropriate due process, but calls for “due process” should not be allowed to obfuscate accountability or unreasonably delay action. We call upon those mentioned in the report as having significantly contributed to this untenable situation to step down from any leadership positions they currently occupy.

The structural and philosophical issues that led to this situation must be addressed. In particular, we urge APA to consider these fundamental questions: a) How does a membership organization with volunteer elected leaders operate in a way that ensures that the paid staff on which the volunteer leaders rely do not usurp the control of the organization? whether for good or bad?; b) How does a profession dedicated to the good of all humanity develop and maintain its ethical and standards independent of the press of guilt or self-interest motives? In this process and all activities going forward, real transparency will be critical.

We urge the Council of Representatives to demand that the organization hold those involved accountable and address the issues we have raised. The legitimacy and future of the American Psychological Association (and its divisions) is at stake.

Responses to Division One’s Statement

Like other Divisions, and various individuals, this response reminds me of Lewis Carroll: Sentence first, verdict afterward, and our own appendix: trial with a chance to defend oneself and for an impartial judge and jury to evaluate the evidence: Never. Off with their heads! ~ Peter Suedenfeld

Hurrah, well-said. ~ Peter Killeen

Thanks for posting this good statement. ~ Charles Brewer

Thank you for that statement! It is one of the better ones I have seen from any of the divisions. Now if only some others could find their voices with the same clarity and strength. Best wishes for the coming days, ~ Kelli Vaughn-Johnson

I appreciated reading the Div 1 statement. The deception, unethical behavior and duplicity involved in this entire affair has left me with a growing sense of betrayal and the damage done to members of the APA who in no way would ever have supported this sub rosa maneuver both personally and professionally is shameful. Whatever form of accountability for those immersed in this travesty must be must be accomplished without favor and in such a way that the public can grasp how an organization like the APA can clean the house in a responsible and mature way.

Marilyn Lainey
I just saw the draft statement that was circulated to the Div 1 listserv. As a longstanding member of Division 1, I disagree strongly with the overall tone and specific assertions in the statement, notably:

"We are appalled that during the following 10 years, public relations and the concerns of the DoD appear to have taken precedence over ethics and the will of the membership. We were outraged to learn that the evidence indicates a conspiracy by some staff leaders and some elected officials to hide the truth from the membership and their elected Council of Representatives; these leaders claimed that the PENS Report clearly prohibited psychologists from participating in torture (as defined by the Geneva Conventions and other recognized international standards), but actually used general and abstract language that provided neither limits on the activities of DoD psychologists nor any guidance to them."

This statement indicates that the Div 1 EXCOM has accepted the nefarious motivations which Hoffman et al impute to APA and DoD psychologists. In fact, it is military psychologists who requested help and guidance from APA, and all of the evidence shows that (with the notable exceptions of Mitchell and Jessen, whose unacceptable activities took place under the CIA) military psychologists have worked tirelessly to prevent torture and coercive interrogation methods from occurring.

I worry that the Div 1 statement represents a rush to judgment, and risks doing serious damage to innocent people. Please reconsider.

I ask you also to read and consider the attached statement from Dick Kilburg of Division 13 and the Maryland Psychological Association, who has given permission to share.

~ Paul T. Bartone

I would like to take the opportunity you offered for comment on what the APA ‘Hoffman Report’ uncovered and what APA should do. I have read the Hoffman report, and must say that I am surprised but not amazed. APA officials in Washington DC eagerly embrace the role of lobbyist for Psychology, to both the legislative and executive branches. In doing so they essentially act like courtiers (the 16th century term for lobbyist); their stock in trade with their clients (the APA membership) is their ability to get the ear of influential people—which includes congressional staffers and government officers in NIH, NSF, CIA, DOD, etc. at well below the Secretary level. To maintain this access to the ears of the government officers, they must maintain good relationships with those officers. Everything else falls out from this. It is a difficult problem, because lobbyists (and courtiers) do perform a useful function for the membership. But the situation in inherently vulnerable to conuision and favor currying of exactly the type described by the Hoffman report. The problem is to find the right balance, and lurching back and forth from ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ to sweeping prohibitions, which I fear APA is doing, won’t help. Let me make two specific suggestions.

1) The APA proposal to proscribe ANY participation by psychologists in interrogation programs led by military, intelligence, or police authorities. This is far too broad, and in fact is not in the interests of either the profession or the country. There are many situations in which military, intelligence, and public safety organizations have a legitimate interest in acquiring information from, to use the legal term, hostile witnesses. How to achieve this goal (without torture) is a legitimate need, and psychology should help. It also raises interesting scientific questions about the form of person to person communication. If psychologists do not work to provide legitimate methods for such interrogations, then the agencies will make them up. See, for instance, the NRC report on the use of polygraphs in various agencies, which shows that the agencies place far more reliance on this sort of evidence than is warranted by research findings. (You can’t be convicted in court on the basis of polygraph evidence, but you can lose a government job.) This is only one example.

I suggest that the right proscription is to forbid participation by psychologists in ‘Any interrogation program if they have reason to suspect that the program involves torture (emphasis here) as defined by the Geneva Convention and related international protocols.’

2) The APA ethics committee and investigation procedures. One of the less published findings of the Hoffman report is that the APA ethics committee’s investigatory procedures were heavily biased toward whitewashing any claim that an APA member had performed inappropriately. Again, this can be understood in context; it is a traditional response of professional communities when they try to police themselves. Medical and Legal associations have been accused to the same sort of bias. Nevertheless, APA’s procedures seem to be particularly egregious. This should not be forgotten during the more publicized discussion of torture.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I hope some of these ideas will be considered in changing APA procedures

Earl Hunt

I, as a Division 1 member, like to strongly concur with Dr. Bartone’s message. Like you, I would also be appalled if the conclusions of the Hoffman report were true. However, they are based on a selective and highly prejudicial presentation of facts and highly questionable interpretations of these facts. I find it credible that APA officials would try to provide helpful guidance to military psychologists seeking a basis for pushing back against abuse of prisoners; I do not find it credible that APA officials would attempt to "curry favor" with DoD by condoning abuse of prisoners or by sacrificing the interests of other members of APA. Nor do I feel that the information presented in the report establishes pushing back against abuse of prisoners; I do not find it credible that APA officials would attempt to "curry favor" with DoD by condoning these facts. I find it credible that APA officials would try to provide helpful guidance to military psychologists seeking a basis for Hoffman report were true. However, they are based on a selective and highly prejudicial presentation of facts and highly questionable interpretations of these facts. I find it credible that APA officials would try to provide helpful guidance to military psychologists seeking a basis for pushing back against abuse of prisoners; I do not find it credible that APA officials would attempt to "curry favor" with DoD by condoning abuse of prisoners or by sacrificing the interests of other members of APA. Nor do I feel that the information presented in the report establishes pushing back against abuse of prisoners; I do not find it credible that APA officials would attempt to "curry favor" with DoD by condoning these facts. I find it credible that APA officials would try to provide helpful guidance to military psychologists seeking a basis for this highly questionable conclusion. Also, knowing several of the individuals stigmatized by the Hoffman report, I agree with Dr. Bartone’s observation that they have "worked tirelessly to prevent torture and coercive interrogation methods from occurring.” Unfortunately, these individuals were not given the opportunity to review the report before it was leaked to the press, and the report as it appears now presents an unfairly negative view of the motives of those involved. Attributing motives is always a risky venture and it is my belief that the Hoffman report authors have made costly and inaccurate judgments in reaching their conclusions.

I suggest that we should not move in haste to accept this report’s conclusions at face value. Let those who have had their reputations unfairly and preemptively damaged have an opportunity to present their perspectives and additional information that will lead to a more complete picture before we rush to judgment.

~ Michael G. Rumsey, PhD
The APA State Leadership Conference (SLC): One of the highlights of my year has always been the annual Practice Directorate/Practice Organization State Leadership Conference (SLC), where Katherine Nordal exposes approximately 550+ state association leaders from around the country to the changes evolving within the nation’s health care system, as well as the world of national politics. One of her subtle reoccurring themes is the importance of the attendees getting to know their local media on a personal basis, in order to educate them about the field of psychology and our collective potential for having a positive impact upon society’s most pressing needs. Dan Ullman, for example, recently shared with us an article from the Star-Herald graphically describing the compelling need for quality mental health care throughout the rural areas of Nebraska. This will undoubtedly be used by the Nebraska Psychological Association in furtherance of their contemplated RxP legislation. Earlier this year, I was invited by President Lori Butts to participate in the Florida Psychological Association annual meeting where their ongoing efforts to collaborate with the media were highlighted. And, I am well aware that the Hawaii Psychological Association hosts an annual media award. There can be no question that the media has a major impact upon society’s appreciation of psychology. During our Toronto convention, the impact of the New York Times coverage (as well as that of other major news organizations) of the Hoffman Report was quite evident.

The Hoffman Report: I have had the extremely good fortune to have been involved in the APA governance for approximately a quarter of a century. It was a wonderful experience – addressing important agendas; working with fantastic colleagues; and a real chance to “make a difference.” Having been interviewed for the Hoffman Report at the invitation of Past President Nadine Kaslow, I read it carefully several times. As the Report indicated, the specific question the APA Board of Directors asked the authors to address was: “whether APA officials colluded with DoD, CIA, or other government officials ‘to support torture’,” (Hoffman et al., 2015, p. 1).

In my judgment, the discussion regarding the Department of Defense (DoD) psychopharmacology (RxP) training program was very accurate. As stated in the Hoffman Report, “The demonstration project thus served a crucial unlocking function for psychology and APA, since it established the legitimacy of a prescription-training program outside of traditional medical school, thus providing a strong answer to the traditional critique from psychiatrists that the only way to be trained in prescribing psychiatric medication was to graduate from a traditional four-year medical school. We do not believe that by 2005, APA officials were realistically seeking or expecting anything further from DoD on the topic of prescription privileges. Nor do we believe that APA officials actually worried that a failure to curry favor with DoD would cause DoD to reverse course on prescription privileges by, for instance, disallowing previously-certified psychologists from continuing to prescribe medication when they treated DoD personnel,” (Hoffman et al., 2015, p. 69). The convention Town Hall meeting focusing upon the Report, chaired by Nadine and President-Elect Susan McDaniel, was most impressive. More colleagues passionately participated than I had anticipated and they were definitely engaged. My sincerest appreciation and congratulations to Steven Reiner and his colleagues Stephen Soldz and Jean Maria Arrigo for their personal commitment to having APA address this important issue. And yet, as I listened to the audience and reviewed the comments being made on various list-serves, I must conclude that if I had been President in 2015, rather than 2000, there is little question that the same individuals would be demanding my resignation. That realization fosters an entirely different perspective.

Over the years, I have served in various capacities within the APA governance. As an elected (or appointed) member of various boards and committees, including three terms on the APA Board of Directors and President in 2000, I relied heavily upon the good judgment of staff and volunteers. I worked closely with a number of the individuals mentioned in the Hoffman Report and have the highest respect for them and their professional integrity. For example, during my Presidential year APA CEO Ray Fowler unfortunately suffered serious health problems and Mike Honaker did an outstanding job in his absence. Similarly, no one has contributed more to APA’s smooth functioning than Judy Strassburger during her 40 years of service. I will never forget how helpful Rhea Farberman was to then-President Norine Johnson during the chaos surrounding 9/11 and her efforts to address the psychological needs of our nation’s children and their families. Similarly, I will remember Norman Anderson as the CEO who succeeded in having our Association named by the national media as a wonderful place to work. To see these individuals being sharply criticized today for doing their jobs is simply unfair and not right!
Having worked on the staff of the U.S. Senate for 38+ years, I have come to appreciate the unique (and at times delicate) role that senior staff must play in order to keep an organization functioning smoothly and goal oriented. Psychology’s elected officials (on Council and Boards and Committees) set overall policy. Within that framework, senior staff work tirelessly to implement mutually agreed upon goals and objectives, often consulting extensively with their committee chairperson. It is frequently the responsibility of staff to draft correspondence, formal statements such as language for proposed resolutions, and even speeches for the elected ones to cogently present. One should never forget that staff, no matter how senior or knowledgeable about a given content area, do not vote. That is solely the responsibility of those elected to office. During the process there are any questions about documents presented to the committee, it is the obligation of the elected members to raise questions and respond to the proffered answers. On the PENS report, for example, I understand that multiple governance groups had the opportunity to respond at different times during the process.

The Hoffman Report was to address the issue of whether APA officials (including staff) “colluded with” the Department of Defense. The Report stated: “The collusion here was, at the least, to adopt and maintain APA ethics policies that were not more restrictive than the guidelines that key DoD officials wanted, and that were as closely aligned as possible with DoD policies, guidelines, practices, or preferences, as articulated to APA by these DoD officials.” From my perspective, more appropriate terminology might be the less value-drive term “collaborated with.” APA is fundamentally a membership organization and whenever its policies could potentially have a direct impact upon any segment of the membership, the organization has a long history of reaching out to those who might be affected to explore how to most effectively accomplish mutually agreed upon objectives. For example, during the early discussions surrounding the CHAPUS peer review efforts, the voice of independent practitioners were affirmatively solicited and responded to. Certainly, in working on the specialty forensic guidelines, staff worked closely with forensic psychologists. These collaborations seem most reasonable to me. During my years working for the legislative arm of the federal government, I learned that almost all levels of executive staff within every federal agency were extraordinarily hesitant to be identified as having worked with outside entities (such as Congressional staff), especially outside of their formal “chain of command.” This orientation might provide an alternative explanation for the Hoffman Report’s finding that many of the APA staff-agency discussions (e-mails or phone) were labeled “confidential.” Perhaps this approach was intended not to keep governance members uninformed; but instead, to provide a level of protection to colleagues working within the federal agencies. I will not pretend to know the answer; however, I would suggest that there are many possible alternative explanations for the behaviors that were the focus of the Toronto Town Hall meeting.

Personally, I have never heard any of my colleagues or APA staff expressing support for torture and I seriously doubt that I ever will, notwithstanding impressions that may have been conveyed by the media. This reflects a fundamental personal value system which, growing up as an altar boy in a Russian Orthodox church, I am very proud of. It seems to me that much of the ongoing discussion has wondered away from the fundamental question of whether APA policy has had the effect of facilitating torture on any detainee and instead addresses other agendas, which although they may be meritorious are, in my judgment, tangential. For example, some have called for increasing the voice of early career and ethnic minority psychologists within the APA governance. These are objectives which I would strongly support and reflect one of the underlying reasons why I have not run for any APA elected office since the end of my Presidential term. However, I do not feel that this directly addresses the underlying issue of whether APA has acted in a manner which condones torture.
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General Psychology Trivia Quiz #3
By John D. Hogan, PhD

The brief descriptions below all refer to esteemed psychologists or members of the APA. How many can you identify? (Correct answers can be found on p. xx. Don’t peek! :)

1. He was Harry Harlow’s first doctoral student and was trained as a behaviorist. Eventually, he radically changed the direction of his approach to psychology.
2. In 1968, a filmed encounter group led by this past-president of APA won an Academy Award.
3. Henry R. Marshall, APA President in 1907, was not trained in psychology and spent his life practicing another profession.
4. One of the first I/O psychologists, she appeared on a U.S. postage stamp to honor her work designing a home for the disabled.
5. He was the only APA president to die in office.
6. One of his most famous books bears the publication date 1900. The book was actually published the year before but the publisher didn’t want to use the earlier year arguing it would date the book.
7. The brain of this psychologist is on display in a cabinet outside the Psychology Department at Cornell University.
8. These two researchers, investigating very different phenomenon, each made use of animals named “Sultan” in their studies.
9. She once said that she and psychoanalysis were born in the same year.
10. On Oct. 1, 2015, this past APA president celebrated his 100th birthday, the longest lived APA president so far.

**Bonus Question:** List the academic degrees earned by Erik H. Erikson and the areas he earned them in.

Answers on page 35
SIGMUND KOCH
Psychology’s Anti-Hero
by Andrew J. Schwehm and John D. Hogan - St. John’s University

Every profession needs someone to keep it humble, especially when it is a young profession. For psychology, Sigmund Koch (1917-1996) was that someone. An earnest promoter of psychology’s scientific method and procedures early in his career, he spent the latter part of his career questioning them. In his maturity, he tried to re-direct the discipline’s questions from behaviorist practices to areas of human mentality and functioning. Through the use of scathing and passionate critiques and wit, Koch became one of psychology’s “most trenchant critics and most skeptical, yet ultimately hopeful, prophets” (Leary, Kessel, & Bevan, 1998, p. 316).

Early life and education

Koch was born on April 18, 1917, to Desider and Helen Koch. He was raised in New York City, along with his two sisters, Adrienne and Vivienne, both of whom became highly regarded in their respective fields of history and literature. Koch himself had a great love of literature. As a teenager, he hoped to be a poet; in fact, he won a national poetry competition. He also served as editor of the literary section of his high school newspaper and founder of an independent magazine (Leary et al., 1998).

He began his undergraduate career at New York University (NYU) as a philosophy major. Eventually, he added a second major in psychology because he felt the field could use logical-empiricist cleansing. Although his love of literature and poetry would not turn into his career, he would return to the arts later in his life.

Koch graduated from NYU in 1938 with a bachelor’s degree followed by a master’s degree from the University of Iowa in 1939 under the direction of Herbert Feigl, the Austrian philosopher and a member of the Vienna Circle. During his time at Iowa, he worked with Kurt Lewin and Kenneth Spence. After receiving his master’s degree, he left for Duke University under the belief that he would be working with Wolfgang Köhler. This never happened, but Koch stayed at the University to receive his Ph.D. degree in 1942, under the mentorship of Karl E. Zener. He remained in Durham for the next 22 years, eventually becoming a full professor.

Theory, scholarship and professional accomplishments

Koch’s magnum opus came in 1952 during his tenure at Duke. He was approached by the American Psychological Association (APA) to compile and edit a work that would be a mid-century status report on the discipline. This work, entitled “Psychology: A Study of a Science” (Koch, 1959-1963), was a six-volume series that brought together the best minds in the field. Each author contributed a chapter to the volume. Koch hoped to write a seventh volume in the series titled “Psychology and the Human Agent,” but this never materialized. Koch became known worldwide for “The Study,” as it was nicknamed, giving him credentials to continue to challenge the field.

Koch spent the remainder of his career using “brisk analyses and a biting wit to critique those who sought insight into the human condition by, as he described it, watching rats negotiate mazes” (Freeman, 1996). Koch’s goal was to turn the mainstream, behaviorist psychological theories of his time into a more humanistic approach -- even though he was once a strong proponent of behaviorist ideas. Koch saw psychology as the missing link between the natural sciences and the humanities. Much of his criticism can be summed up in a few sentences: “The hope of a psychological science became indistinguishable from the fact of psychological science. The entire subsequent history of psychology can be seen as a ritualistic endeavor to emulate the forms of science in order to sustain the delusion that it already is a science” (Koch, 1973).

Continued on next page...
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Sigmund Koch

Psychology’s Anti-Hero
by Andrew J. Schwehm and John D. Hogan - St. John’s University

Continued from previous page...

Although his own theory was constantly evolving and he was prone to taking one argument only to debunk it years later, Koch was never one to bite his tongue when it came to criticism of his own profession (or himself). In his 1977 invited address at the APA Convention in San Francisco, Koch stated, “Psychology is populated by a vast hyper-sufficiency of heroes but as yet not a single anti-hero... It is important that someone step in to fill the anti-heroic void in psychology. I here-with submit my credentials” (Koch, 1977). This term “anti-hero” is one that appears frequently in Koch’s writings. He desired, in his own self-deprecating way, to play the role of the villain who came to the rescue of a field that was in many ways stuck in a quagmire of its own theory and inability to define itself. He proposed that explanations of human activity should shift from the exterior state (behaviorism) to the dynamics of organism-environment interaction (Franklin, 2001).

While Koch was undoubtedly best known as a critic of the field, his affinity toward the arts from high school and college never left him. In the last part of his career, he turned his focus to psychology as it relates to humanities. From 1964 to 1967, he served as the director of the Program in the Humanities and the Arts for the Ford Foundation in New York City. In this capacity, he directed funding to support a variety of arts, including orchestras, conventions, and public and private lectures, many of which followed Koch’s own viewpoint of an interdisciplinary approach to the arts and sciences. During this time, he found an urge to understand the creative mind. In 1986, under the guidance of the Boston University Aesthetics Research Project (funded in part by Boston University and the Ford Foundation), Koch undertook arguably his most in-depth work (Franklin, 2001).

This project centered on research conversations with distinguished creative minds—including Arthur Miller, Toni Morrison, and Richard Wilbur, among others—and ran over a two-year period with 8-hour long conversations with 16 artists. In the conversations, he explored aesthetics and the creative impulse/process as a method for understanding how the mind worked, something that Koch long-admired. These questions were part of Koch’s attempt to bring psychology one step closer from a science to a humanity as part of his search for a “deeper human context” (Koch, 1985). In these conversations, he found that creativity had a number of common characteristics across all fields such that the self disappears when creating art. Koch concluded that anyone is capable of reaching such a state but “few have learned to husband them for creative purposes, and some do not even note the difference between this condition and their more usual goal-oriented daily striving” (Koch, 1999, p. 47).

Although this would be Koch’s last great undertaking, his work of advancing psychology did not stop. Koch returned to work as a full professor at the University of Texas (Austin) in 1967 before moving to his final destination at Boston University from 1971 until his death in 1996. He was the president of APA’s Division 10 (Division of Psychology and the Arts) from 1968–69. In 1978, Koch was elected president of two divisions of the APA: Division 1 (now The Society for General Psychology) and Division 24 (now the Society for Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology), the latter for a second time. Koch was influential in an assessment of the state of psychology in 1979 on the 100th anniversary of Wundt’s lab, organizing lectures that included over 40 individuals to assess developments in their divisions and what the future would bring. During this time, he also continued his anti-heroic work of critiquing the idea that psychology was a singular science, including a well-known article in Psychology Today (Koch, 1969) entitled “Psychology cannot be a coherent science” and other articles and presentations that argued for the pluralistic nature of psychological studies previously discussed (Leary et al., 1998).
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by Andrew J. Schwehm and John D. Hogan - St. John’s University

Koch died on August 10, 1996, at the age of 79. The word of his death began spreading just at the start of the annual APA convention in Toronto, and a memorial service took place with speeches from a number of individuals in a variety of fields expressing gratitude for Koch’s contributions to the arts and sciences.

In summary

Koch will forever be remembered as a maverick who helped move psychology out from being dominated by behaviorists to a discipline that looked at human mentality and functioning from a multitude of viewpoints. His name will likely be remembered in psychology as a hero rather than the anti-hero he saw himself. In 2006, Division 24 of the APA created the Sigmund Koch Award for Early Career Contribution to Psychology. This award is given annually to recognize the scientific contributions of an early career psychologist in theoretical or philosophical psychology.
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Award Coordinator’s Report

The Society for General Psychology awards program recognizes excellence in research, scholarship, and service that contribute to the integration of knowledge across the subfields of psychology. The Society awards books, research articles, career contributions, student research, and service to Division 1. The Society also provides nominations to the American Psychological Foundation (APF) for the Arthur W. Staats Lecture award. Winners are announced at the annual APA convention the year of the award submission.

During the 2015 award year, we received many stellar nominations. The winners were announced at the awards reception held in the Division 1 hospitality suite on Saturday August 8th. We were joined by our 2015 and 2016 award winners and celebrated their achievements. During the celebration we reflected on the 70 year history of Division 1 as well as the history of the awards program.

Special thanks to Nancy Baker (Chair, William James Award), Joan Chrioler (Chair, George Miller Award), Janet Sigal (Chair, Ernest Hilgard Award), Wade Pickren (Chair, Arthur Staats Award and liaison with APF), Carrol Perrino (Chair, Anne Anastasi Award), and Terece Bell and Nick Noviello (Chairs, Corsini Student Poster Award) and their committee members for their hard work and dedication. Thanks are also extended to Harold Takooshian and Josephine Tan for their support during my first year as Division 1 Awards Coordinator.

Details about the award program are available from http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/awards/index.aspx.

Division One The Society for General Psychology
2015 Awards Announcement

Division One is pleased to announce its 2015 award recipients who were recognized at the 2015 APA meeting that was held in Toronto, Canada. For more details on awards, please go to http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/awards/index.aspx

William James
Book Award

Division One is pleased to announce its 2015 award recipients who were recognized at the 2015 APA meeting that was held in Toronto, Canada. For more details on awards, please go to http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/awards/index.aspx.

George A. Miller Award for the Outstanding Journal Article in General Psychology

Gregory E. Miller, PhD (Northwestern University), Edith Chen, PhD (Northwestern University), and Karen J. Parker, PhD (Stanford University) for Psychological stress in childhood and susceptibility to the chronic diseases of aging: Moving toward a model of behavioral and biological mechanisms published in Psychological Bulletin (2011), Volume 137 (6), 959-997.

Ernest R. Hilgard Lifetime Achievement Award for Career Contributions to General Psychology

Richard M. Lerner, Ph.D. Tufts University
2015 Arthur W. Staats Lecture for Unifying Psychology (from the American Psychological Foundation)  
(Staats Lecture presented at 2015 APA)

Judith Torney-Purta, PhD  
University of Maryland, College Park

2016 Arthur W. Staats Lecture for Unifying Psychology (from the American Psychological Foundation)  
(Staats Lecture to be presented at 2016 APA)

Lisa M. Osbeck, PhD  
University of West Georgia

Anne Anastasi  
General Psychology  
Graduate Student Research Awards

2 or more years of graduate work  
Jessica L. Hamilton, MA  
Temple University

Under 2 years of graduate work  
Aliza A. Panjwani, BA  
The Graduate Center, City University of New York (CUNY)
Christy K. Thai, Jinhong Guo, M.Ed, Janet Turan, PhD, and Bulent Turan, PhD (University of Alabama at Birmingham). *HIV medication adherence: the importance of stigma and treatment self-efficacy.*

2 Honorable Mentions (in alphabetical order)

Leslie Munoz, MPH (Emory University). *Comparing the effectiveness of project UPLIFT among younger and older adults with epilepsy.*

Janelle Rowe, MA & Craig Rush, PhD (University of Alabama). *Preschoolers and mindfulness practice: A meta-synthesis and extrapolation of the literature.*

Other 2015 Division One Awards

C. Alan Boneau Award for Outstanding Contributions to Division One

Douglas K. Candland
Donald A. Dewsbury

Presidential Citations for Outstanding Service/Achievement

Emily A. A. Dow (Student Representative)
Maria del Pilar Grazioso (Program Chair)
Richard Velayo (Fellows Chair)
2015 Division One Conference Highlights

Award Recipients

Raymond Corsini
Student Poster Award
Terece Bell and Christy Thai

Anne Anastasi
Graduate Student Award
Carrol Perrino and Jessica L. Hamilton

Anne Anastasi
Graduate Student Award
Carrol Perrino and Aliza Z. Panjwani

George A. Miller Award for Outstanding Journal Article in General Psychology
David H. Uttal and Janet Sigal
2015 Division One Conference Highlights

Award Recipients

2015 Ernest R. Hilgard Award for Career Contributions to General Psychology
Richard M. Lerner and Jocelyn Turner-Musa

2015 William James Book Award
Nancy Baker and Darcia Narvaez

2015 Arthur W. Staats Lecture Award for Unifying Psychology
Judith Torney-Purta and John Hogan

2014 William James Book Award
Sendhil Mullainathan

2014 William James Book Award
Michael Lewis
Program Chair
*Maria del Pilar Grazioso*
from Universidad del Valle de Guatemala (UVG) hosted the D1 suite with her three Psi Chi students from Guatemala: María Ximena Flores, María José España & Ana Lucía Urrea

In the D1 suite, five authors discuss the new APA book on "Pathfinders in International Psychology" (Rich & Gielen, 2015).
In the D1 suite, historian James Pate watches as incoming Fellows Chair Mindy Erchull receives a Certificate from outgoing Fellows Chair Richard Velayo.

In the D1 suite, the annual breakfast for APA Division 1 Fellows.
Celebratory Moments at Division One’s Suite for APA 2015 Convention

Compliments of Division 1 Suite Hostesses

Maria Ximena Flores, Maria José España & Ana Lucia Urrea standing with 2014-2015 Division One President Joan Chrisler

Maria Ximena Flores, Maria José España & Ana Lucia Urrea standing with Division One’s Treasurer Deborah Johnson and Program Chair Maria del Pilar Grazioso
Celebratory Moments at Division One’s Suite for APA 2015 Convention

Compliments of Division One Suite Hostesses

Maria Ximena Flores, Maria José España & Ana Lucia Urrea standing with past Division One President Florence Denmark

Maria Ximena Flores, Maria José España & Ana Lucia Urrea standing with past Division One President Florence Denmark, Mercedes McCormick and another Division One member
This masterful and comprehensive book slowly unfolds before our very eyes, the biography of a brilliant, innovative trend-setter, enterprising visionary, bold and controversial psychology presence, that of Dr. Nicholas Cummings (1924-), "psychology’s true provocateur." It is an inspiring biography about an extraordinary human being and committed professional, an ingenious Ulysses of professional psychology and practice.

The book is inspirational and moving by showing that Dr. Cummings, despite his early losses, familial challenges, and hurdles on his life path and way to immense success, through his dynamism, uncanny abilities and unwavering resolve, made immeasurable contributions and transformed the field of professional psychology and practice.

Although this does not do justice to his life and contributions, after reading this stimulating biography, the main highlights about Dr. Cummings’ life and professional accomplishments can be summarized as follows:

1. The book introduces his Greek heritage and talks about his early life and impact his father’s death had on young Nicholas' emotional life; his medical illness (polio) and subsequent physical hurdles; his maternal grandmother’s unwavering belief in his spirit and abilities to overcome anything; the numerous family changes and adaptations affect his mother’s second marriage.

2. It examines the interpersonal conflicts and emotional cut-offs between the two most important, astute and strong minded Greek American women he felt loyal to, his mother and maternal grandmother, and the impact of their own psychology on his personality development and life decisions. It also recounts his mother’s religious conversion and zealotry and the imposing effect that had on him.

3. It recounts his military service and post war education in psychology and psychoanalysis, that served as the foundation of his psychology career.

4. It presents the courtship, marriage and strong, loving relationship and family life with his charming wife Dorothy of 60 years. It highlights the mutual respect and significant positive influence that she had on him. It recounts his own effort to balance family and work life and time.

5. It spotlights his vision and innovative spirit, undying zeal and commitment, service and immeasurable professional accomplishments that advanced the practice of professional psychology.

6. Highlights of his accomplishments mentioned include: His career as chief of mental health at Kaiser Permanente where he moved psychotherapy into the health care system; leadership, advocacy and activism within the American Psychological Association (APA); launching the professional school movement by founding the California School of Professional Psychology (CSPP); being the primary architect of the American Biodynamic model of Psychotherapy, the nation’s first psychology driven managed behavioral health organization (MBHO); numerous awards, including psychology’s highest, the APF Gold Medal for Lifetime Achievement in Practice; cofounding many professional associations; countless prolific writings; serving as Distinguished Professor at the University of Nevada; and his philanthropic pursuits through the Cummings Foundation for Behavioral Health.

Continued on next page..
7. Finally the book offers testimonials by those that crossed paths with Dr. Cummings and presents his own impressions and accounts of his interactions and relationships with ‘the greats’ in the field of professional psychology.

What a privilege to all of us to be gifted with this exhilarating masterpiece of a book.

This stimulating detailed biography is written by a very astute and thoughtful author who took the time to intimately know psychology’s provocateur, through a number of sources, such as personal interviews with Dr. Cummings, his family, friends and acquaintances and by looking at his own publications (49 books and 400 refereed articles).

Page after page, Dr. Austad presents the unfolding of the life and work of a psychology warrior. It is evident that she has put forth painstaking effort and time to obtain intimate knowledge of all the players in his life, in order to put together a thrilling, informative, and highly specific human account of the development of Dr. Cummings.

This is a book about a psychological lighthouse of Greek ancestry that lit up, fired up and transformed the field and practice of professional psychology. Dr. Cummings’ contributions to the practice of professional psychology can be seen as powerful as Pericles’ gift of democracy to the Greeks and to the entire world.

Being of Greek descent myself, I felt tremendous pride and privilege to read about this extraordinary mover and shaker, with the wisdom of Aristotle, Plato and Socrates combined, and the strength, spirit and courage of Alexander the Great.

Despite his early losses, familial, emotional, educational, religious, cultural and health challenges, Dr. Cummings, has stood and fought bravely at the frontlines of the psychological Thermopiles. A true developer of the Practitioner movement of Psychology, who was not only able to foresee the future of professional psychology, but helped to create it.

This book documents not only the history of a visionary and uncompromising truth-sayer. In a powerful parallel way it also documents and presents to all of us, the transformations in the field of professional psychology from the 1950s till now. Wow, this is a priceless, inspirational gift. His biography, struggles, spirit, resilience and deep personal work is the biography of each one of us, tireless psychological warriors.

I would support the idea that this book that chronicles the history of a psychological leader and visionary be included as a seminal and informative reading in the history of psychology so that future generations of practitioners can be inspired, mobilized and deeply moved by the human accounts of psychology’s true provocateurs, such as Dr. Nicholas Cummings.

Note: Elizabeth Marmaras, PhD, ABPP, is a Greek-American, and a board-certified clinical psychologist. She practices psychology and psychoanalysis in New York City, and is passionate about empowering others to find their true calling.
In Memoriam
Ethel Tobach, PhD
(November 7, 1921 to August 15, 2015)

Figure 1. Attendees at the 1st meeting of the International Society for Comparative Psychology in Toronto, Canada (1983). Back row: ?, Charles Tolman (Canada), ?, ? Everett Wyers (USA). Front Row: Gary Greenberg (USA); Jack Demarest (USA), Nancy Innis (Canada), Joe Erwin (USA); Ethel Tobach (USA); Tom Cadwallader (USA), Kiyoko Murofushi (Japan); Graziano Fiorito (Italy); ? (cut).

Ethel Tobach was born in Ukraine and moved to the United States. She grew up in Philadelphia and as a young adult, she became a champion of unions, peace and social activism in New York City. As one who believed that war and violence had no justification, she still joined the Women’s Army Corp during WWII worked at a Long Island Psychiatric facility. She was educated at Hunter College (BA 1949, Phi Beta Kappa) and received her PhD at New York University in 1957 under the tutelage of T. C. Schneirla. She later joined the Department of Animal Behavior at New York’s American Museum of Natural History to work with Schneirla. She had academic appointments at New York University, Hunter College of City University of New York, and Yeshiva University. She worked with many post-doctoral students abroad, including Gary Greenberg, in laboratories with animal species. Her important publications are books she co-edited which are The Genes and Gender series (Gordian Press, 1978-1980); The T. C. Schneirla Conference series (Erlbaum Press, 1984-1997); Selected Writings of T. C. Schneirla (W. H. Freeman, 1972); Development and Evolution of Behavior: Essays in Memory of T. C. Schneirla (W. H. Freeman, 1970); The Biopsychology of Development (Academic Press, 1971).

In Memoriam
Ethel Tobach, PhD
(November 7, 1921 to August 15, 2015)

Even though Ethel Tobach can be described as a scientist and scholar, her role as social activist was clearly demonstrated in providing resources to those who could not participate. She and Michele Wittig organized the International Union of Psychologists for Women (IUPW) whose goal was to include feminist researchers behind the “Iron Curtain” that separated communist from non-communist Europe. Michele Wittig fondly remembers Ethel Tobach as having a prodigious presence but their work together signaled the inception of feminist psychological research at the international level. In addition, she founded the International Society for Comparative Psychology (ISCP) and held the first meeting in Toronto along with the Cheiron Society. (A photo of those in attendance accompanies this obituary on the left page.)

She was the Society’s first president and subsequently its president emerita. She launched the International Journal of Comparative Psychology (IJCP) and she sagaciously decided to host the biennial meetings in countries other than the USA, thus making the society truly inclusive and international.

Ethel Tobach has been honored and recognized for her work several times by APA divisions and the APA itself and she served as President of Divisions 6 and 48. Although she retired from the American Museum of Natural History in 1991 as curator emerita, she remained working almost to the day she died. She was renowned in the scientific community, locally and internationally, and recognized as a steadfast warrior in building authentic collaborations among researchers and a strong advocate for human rights and dignity.

In the obituary by Gary Greenberg (2015), he provides several biographies of Ethel Tobach and a full obituary for a forthcoming issue of the American Psychologist.
**New Member Profiles**

**Barry Klein** is working on his dissertation in General Psychology (Walden University), "Objective Criteria in Assessing States of Consciousness," under Dr. Harris Friedman. Barry is a student affiliate (at 70 years old) of Divisions 1 and 24, and of APA itself. A life-long mystic with a master's degree in Computer Science (USC), Barry has been teaching self-development techniques to individuals and performing as a shaman-priest in mystical rituals. Barry has had many years in meditation training (SRF and Shivananda), a year of NLP training with one of its founders, three years of lucid-dreaming training, another three years of Chuluquai medicine apprenticeship, 12 years of Gurdjieffian work, 15 years of mediumship with Teachings of the inner Christ, and 20 years of work in the Santo Daime syncretic religion of Brazil. Barry has his 20-chapter manuscript online, along with a dozen of his student papers and previously published essays, transcripts, and spiritual talks at Whole Life Expo's (http://paibeiramar.org/SiteMap.htm).

Barry Klein’s Book: *Our Other Mind*

**Dr. Kimberlee Bethany Bonura** is a fitness and wellness educator. Dr. Bonura promotes health and exercise behaviors within a framework of evidence-based recommendations and realistic changes that are fun and manageable to implement. As an exercise scientist and faculty mentor, Dr. Bonura’s primary research areas include the psychological benefits of mindfulness practices, exercise for special populations, and strategies that facilitate health behaviors. As a practitioner, Dr. Bonura has two decades of applied experience as a yoga and mindfulness instructor, personal trainer, and group fitness instructor. She earned her Ph.D. in Educational Psychology, with a research emphasis in sport and exercise psychology, from Florida State University. Her doctoral dissertation won national awards from the American Psychological Association (Division 47) and the Association for Applied Sport Psychology in 2008.

Dr. Bonura is a triple-certified yoga instructor, registered with the Yoga Alliance and a member of the International Association of Yoga Therapists. Dr. Bonura currently serves on the editorial board of the International Journal of Yoga Therapy and the Journal of Social Change. She is a contributing faculty member in the Walden University School of Psychology, where she serves as a mentor for doctoral student research. She previously served as the Executive Director of the Walden University Center for Faculty Excellence, and has been a faculty member at the US Military Academy – West Point, the State University of New York – New Paltz, and Florida Southern College.

Dr. Bonura is a professor with The Great Courses. How to Stay Fit as You Age was released by The Great Courses in 2013. Her newest course, How to Boost Your Physical and Mental Energy (http://www.thegreatcourses.com/courses/how-to-boost-your-physical-and-mental-energy.html), was released by The Great Courses in August 2015. "How to Boost Your Physical and Mental Energy" includes twelve 30-minute lectures, and provides a balance of scientific theory, current research, and practical exercise for hands-on learning. The framework of the course is that we can improve our energy for life through appropriate self-care, making deliberate choices about how to allocate our energy, and by focusing on relationships, work, and activities which we find personally meaningful.
**New Signatories for our Online Newsletter**

1. Dr. Danny Wedding
2. Mrs. Olivia Szlachta
3. Mrs. Zohreh Molaee
4. Mark Mattson
5. Dr. Gary Brill
6. Alan Feldman
7. Dr. Cloyd Colby
8. Dr. Grant Rich
9. Prof. Monroe Friedman
10. Dr. Diane Grych
11. Dr. Chin-Siang Ang
12. Carolyn Cowl-Witherspoon
13. Dr. Joan Chrisler
14. Prof. Satish Kumar Kushwaha
15. Dr. Mary Lou Zanich
16. Dr. Luis Felipe Garcia
17. Dr. Carrol Perrino
18. Jonn Hagen
19. Dr. Irene Frieze
20. Dr. Alice Healy
21. Dr. Peter Suedfeld
22. Dr. Linda Solomon

---

**News from the APA 2015 Convention**

Elisabeth (Lisa) Straus, Executive Director of the American Psychological Foundation, came to Division 1’s business meeting on Saturday, August 8th, to present us with a certificate of appreciation of our partnership with APF in regard to the Arthur Staats Lecture, which is delivered annually during the APA convention. This year’s lecturer was Judith Torney-Purta. APF funds travel for the lecturer, who is selected by a committee chaired by Division 1’s Past-Past President. Joan Chrisler accepted the certificate on behalf of our division; she has passed it on to our historian, John Hogan, who will see that it is preserved in our archives.

---

**Reflection from the APA 2015 Convention**

**Barry Klein:** Both the 2014 and 2015 conventions were very enriching for me as a grad student (at 70 years old!) in Research Psychology (Walden) who had completed all course requirements. However, as a disabled person, I have to say that disability facilities were a sketchy after-thought which made my participation a nightmare. The distances between presentation rooms and neighboring hotels may seem trivial to a normally-able person, but were a real challenge for a disabled person without an electric wheelchair, and none were provided, only push-type chairs with no volunteers to push. It was actually harder to self-propel one of these than to simply limp around. Vans were provided, but were inaccessible to me until I happened to come across them at the rear entrance. They assured me that they would always be cruising around, but I had to give up and take a cab to a neighboring hotel. So, as much as I would love to attend the Denver convention, I would not dare to put myself through that kind of suffering unless some real improvements were made in disability facilities.

---

**Division One Announcement**

**From Awards Chairperson: Joycelyn Turner-Musa, PhD**

The Society for General Psychology, Division One of the American Psychological Association is conducting its Year 2016 awards competition, including the William James Book Award for a recent book that serves to integrate material across psychological subfields or to provide coherence to the diverse subject matter of psychology, the Ernest R. Hilgard Award for a Lifetime Career Contribution to General Psychology, the George A. Miller Award for an Outstanding Recent Article on General Psychology, and the Arthur W. Staats Lecture for Unifying Psychology, which is an American Psychological Foundation Award managed by the Society for General Psychology.

In addition, there are two student awards: The Raymond Corsini Student Poster Award for the best student poster presented in the Division One poster session, and The Anne Anastasi General Psychology Graduate Student Award, based on the student’s past performance and proposed research.

All nominations and supporting materials for each award must be received on or before February 15, 2016. Self-nominations are welcomed. Please see the attached document and visit our website for more information [http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/awards/index.aspx](http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/awards/index.aspx) Thanks for your consideration.
Based on the popular vote in our Spring 2015 newsletter, we announced the winning theme for this issue of our newsletter. The Golden Years are apparently becoming a myth for many older adults. The subtle cynicism and rising doubts are said to arise from increased financial and medical challenges, changing family structures, and low accountability and clemency in positions of great power. We encourage submissions that speak to these issues, or alternatively illustrate that the golden years are alive and well.

We were fortunate to receive one response from Ellen Langer, PhD (http://www.ellenlanger.com/about):

The meaning of the Counterclockwise study
The counterclockwise study found that by priming our younger selves we become more like the ways we were at that earlier time. It was never meant to suggest that we should value youth over our more experienced older selves. It was meant to suggest that we can reclaim the vitality and some of the abilities we had when we were younger that we mindlessly let slip away. Wrinkles should be worn as badges attesting to lives well lived. No one wishes they were 3yrs old when they cried after simply scrapping their leg. No one wishes they were in elementary school fretting about whether Johnny or Susie will be sending them a valentine. If mindful, with each decade we grow more experienced. Few if any, if really given the choice, would give up this hard earned experience, especially when offered the chance to now regain some of their strengths as their older selves.

From my perspective, the best of all possible worlds is to retain/regain our youthful vitality as we continue to gain experience as we age.

Thank you and we will continue the theme for our Spring 2016 newsletter. There were two themes that tied for first place. They both are Parenting/Fatherhood/Single Families and Acceptance/Rejection of Alternative Care Therapy. We are already receiving submissions for these two themes so the deadline for the Spring will be firmly March 5th, 2016.

Thank you for your cooperation and I am looking forward to your submissions! If you have any questions/concerns, you can directly email me at ali.trot@gmail.com
"The right way is not always the popular and easy way. Standing for right when it is unpopular is a true test of moral character."
- Margaret Chase Smith
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