In 2006, all of the Society’s scholarly presentations occurred at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. There was no Midwinter Meeting. At our recent Midwinter Meeting in Phoenix, we scheduled 35% of hours of programming. In contrast, at the 2018 APA annual meeting in San Francisco, there will only be 11 hours of papers and symposia. A dramatic shift has taken place.

To reflect deeply and to plan for more efficient and effective Midwinter Meetings in the future, the Midwinter Meeting Advisory Committee has been working hard to produce a general framework for future Midwinter Meetings. This framework will mean that Planning Committees won’t have to start over each year and make all of the decisions pertaining to a meeting. However, the framework will have sufficient flexibility that Society Presidents can shape meetings to reach the goals they think especially important. I extend my gratitude (and that of future presidents and planning committees) to co-chairs Kate Slaney and David Goodman, and to Committee members Scott Churchill, Jeff Reber, Gregg Henriques, Pavan Brar, and Abigail Collins.

Our publishing relationship with the American Psychological Association has produced another set of changes in our budget. In 2006, 6% ($300) of our income came from the journal (subscriptions), but 65% of our expenses ($7903.86) were journal-related. In 2016, 50% of our income ($17,932.35) comes from journal operations. The net cost of the journal to the Society was $7603.86 in 2006, but the journal produced a net income of $13,682.35 in 2016.

We have also substantially increased our investments in convention social hours and hospitality suites, and student and early career professional travel grants. In 2006, our convention expenses were 4% of our expenses ($541.58), but in 2016 19% ($3866.48). In 2006, we raised $54 for student travel, but, in 2017, the Society committed to spending $5000 a year on travel grants.

One other budget category showing dramatic change is postage. In 2006, we spent 14% of our expenses ($1728.71) on postage, but in 2016, we spent nothing, since we primarily communicate electronically.

Other changes have also occurred. In 2006, 78% of our income ($7557) came from dues paid by Fellows and Members. Ten years later, only 6% of our income ($2185.50) came from Fellow and Member dues. Several factors account for this change. First, our members are aging, and those who reach the age of 65 don’t have to pay dues. Second, many members have left APA, because of the torture issue, or because APA is seen as either insufficiently scientific or excessively scientific. Third, younger psychologists are less likely to join any association. Fourth, those who were members primarily in order to receive our journal now often receive the electronic version of the journal through their employers’ libraries or...
through an APA journal package and so have dropped their memberships.

Another reason that the percentage of our income derived from dues paid by Members and Fellows has decreased is that dues from another category of membership—affiliates—has increased substantially. In 2006, only 7% of our dues income ($531) came from affiliates; by 2016, 56% ($2824.50) came from student, professional, scholarly, and international affiliates.

Given the dramatic increase in affiliate participation in the Society, it is propitious that—effective this year—affiliates will be able to vote in Society elections and hold office (with the exception of APA Council of Representative elections; that position and its elections are restricted to those who are APA Members or Fellows). Affiliates have been playing an important role in the life of the Society for many years, and we welcome them as voters and potential office-holders.

I am pleased to announce that we have a strong set of candidates running for Society offices:

President-Elect: Gregg Henriques and Stephen Yanchar; Treasurer: Samuel Downs; Member-at-Large: Michael Arfken and Robert Bishop

The relationship between this Society and APA will continue to be an important issue meriting our careful reflection in years to come. Although there are certainly advantages to addressing like-minded colleagues at the Midwinter Meeting, the possibility of self-marginalization and speaking in our own echo chamber are risks about which we need to be aware. Interacting with those who think theoretically and philosophically, or who need to, but don’t think of themselves as theoretical and philosophical psychologists, happens at APA annual meetings, but very rarely at our Midwinter Meetings. At APA we can find connections with areas of inquiry, forms of practice, and individual psychologists from whom we will benefit and who would gain from what we have to say. An example: Div. 24 will have a joint social hour with Div. 27, Society for Community Research and Action: Division of Community Psychology, at the APA convention in San Francisco. This is a group of people with whom we have some commonalities, but with whom we haven’t formally interacted. We hope a synergy will emerge that enriches both groups.

As previously announced, Louise Antony (Ph.D., Harvard), Professor of Philosophy at the University of Massachusetts, will be an invited speaker at the APA Convention. One of her areas of interest and expertise is epistemology, including feminist and naturalistic epistemology. Her Department website indicates she “is currently trying to develop a psychologically realistic account of empirical justification.” Of interest to some members, she has also addressed the chilly climate for women in the field of philosophy. Louise is a past president both of the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division) and of the Society for Philosophy and Psychology. She is also a Consulting Editor for the Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology. Her talk will be titled, "What is Naturalized Epistemology? Continuity vs. Reduction."

Consistent with the practices of some other divisions, this year’s convention in San Francisco will also feature an address by the 2018 recipient of the Society’s Award for Distinguished Theoretical and Philosophical Contributions to Psychology, Jill Morawski. Holding the Wilbur Fisk Osborne Chair of Psychology, Jill is Professor of Psychology, of Science in Society, and of Feminist, Gender, & Sexuality Studies, plus Chair of the Science in Society program, at Wesleyan University. A past president of the Society (1996-97), Jill’s address is titled, “Chasing Psychology’s Objects: The Quest for Ontological Certainty.”

The time and location of Jill’s address and my presidential address will be listed in the convention program under Div. 24 Business, in order to permit more Div. 24 presentations in our allotted time. Within the 3-hour Business meeting block we are permitted, the Society’s Annual Business Meeting will be following by Jill’s address, which will be followed by my presidential address, titled, “Professional Ethics Needs Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, and Vice Versa.”

Those and the other programs in San Francisco reflect the breadth and depth of theoretical and philosophical psychologies, the advancement of which is the aim of this Society. These programs are the result, in part, of the excellent work of program chairs Lisa Cosgrove and Justin Karter. Also to be noted is the excellent work of the Midwinter Planning Committee, co-chaired by Sam Downs and Chris Schuck, along with committee members Gary Brill, James Lamiell, Stephen Yanchar, Mary Beth Morrissey, Erin Thrift, and Pavan Brar. Our deepest thanks to them for their leadership and hard work.

Another set of often-unheralded contributors to the Society are the hard-working, talented members of the Executive Committee, who carry on the work of the Society with dedication and thoughtfulness. I am deeply grateful to them.

I look forward to seeing many of you in San Francisco and to the presidency of my successor, Mary Beth Morrissey.

Alan Tjeltveit, President
Midwinter Conference, 2018

By Samuel D. Downs and Chris Schuck, Midwinter Program Co-Chairs

Phoenix, Arizona

We would like to thank all presenters and attendees of the 2018 Midwinter Meeting (MWM), which convened March 2-4 in Phoenix, for helping to make the event a success. A remarkably diverse array of presentations (approximately 100 in all) by the 80 people in attendance focused around this year’s presidential theme Explaining Psychologists’ Ways of Knowing, addressing the ontological, epistemological, ethical, and aesthetic issues that contribute to current and potential ways that psychologists know. Our invited speaker Joshua Knobe touched upon this theme in discussing the burgeoning “experimental philosophy” movement, including his own use of both experimental methods and philosophical conceptual analysis to research lay conceptions of ethics, self, and happiness. All of these talks sparked many wonderful conversations in their own right. And naturally, there were exquisitely timed fire alarms.

To listen to one of the many recorded presentation from the MWM, please click here. We are in the process of adding detailed file names to help people navigate through the various recorded presentations. The full conference program will also be available there as a reference.

Meanwhile, there were both formal and informal meetings related to the recently formed special interest groups (Clinical and Counseling, Critical Theories and Social Practices, Epistemology and Research Methods, and Critical Pedagogy). We encourage division members to continue to support these groups.

Additionally, the day before the conference a group of members organized by Gary Brill took part in our first annual service project at Arizona’s largest homeless shelter, UMOM New Day Center. Mary Beth Morrissey later chaired a symposium on homelessness designed to connect the lived experience of the service project with theoretical work.

As co-chairs, Samuel D. Downs and Chris Schuck would like to thank the members of the Planning Committee—James Lamiell, Gary Brill, Stephen Yanchar, and Mary Beth Morrissey—for their tireless efforts. We would also like to thank the Student Representatives, Erin Thrift and Pavan Brar, for their efforts in supporting the MWM.

See you next year!
APA Conference Update, 2018, San Francisco

By Justin Karter, Program Co-Chair

This year’s program decisions were made to reflect the Presidential theme, “Psychologists’ Ways of Knowing.” We received a large number of proposals and we had to make some very difficult decisions, reducing the length of time for symposiums and turning down some good proposals. We are excited about the final program and we have planned 13 symposia and 8 posters as well as hospitality suite roundtables and social events.

An overview of the full program will be sent out over the summer. We are excited to welcome Louise Antony (Ph.D., Harvard), Professor of Philosophy at the University of Massachusetts, as an invited speaker. One of her areas of interest and expertise is epistemology, including feminist and naturalistic epistemology. Her talk will be titled, “What is Naturalized Epistemology? Continuity vs. Reduction.”

This year’s program will also feature an address by the 2018 recipient of the Society’s Award for Distinguished Theoretical and Philosophical Contributions to Psychology, Jill Morawski, during the Society business meeting and awards ceremony on Saturday. Holding the Wilbur Fisk Osborne Chair of Psychology, Jill is Professor of Psychology, of Science in Society, and of Feminist, Gender, & Sexuality Studies, plus Chair of the Science in Society program, at Wesleyan University. A past president of the Society (1996-97), Jill’s address is titled, “Chasing Psychology’s Objects: The Quest for Ontological Certainty.” Also during the Saturday business meeting society president, Alan Tjelvæit, will give his presidential address, “Professional ethics needs theoretical and philosophical psychology, and vice versa.”

Announcements/Highlights!

- **Invited Speaker:** Invited Address by Philosopher Louise Antony, PhD
- **Invited Address:** Jill G Morawski, PhD, Title: Award for Distinguished Theoretical and Philosophical Contributions to Psychology
- **Socials:**
  - Foundational Divisions Social Hour on Thursday, 5-7 p.m with Divisions 1, 24, 26, and 39
  - Division Journal Social on Friday, 7-9 p.m.
  - Combined Social

Every year the APA asks incoming presidents to develop a presidential initiative. Although limited to 50 words, at first blush, this seemed a daunting task! However, after much reflection and dialogue with our colleagues in the division, I share with you my thoughts about the framing of a central focus for guiding our engagements in dialogue during my presidential year and invite you to join me in such dialogues.

Most philosophical or critical psychologists heartily endorse “social justice.” But there is little agreement as to just what it is or how best to pursue it. One of my goals as president is to encourage us to reflect more deeply about how we might cultivate a psychology that is more attuned to historical, social and cultural contingencies.

Presidential Initiative, 2018-2019

by President Elect, Mary Beth Morrissey

This idea means that we are always already deeply embedded in cultural traditions and historical struggles for meaning and justice. We continue to reshape those ideals through experience and reflection. As a result, all of our constructs, analyses, and principles are shaped by our interests and commitments—commitments not to just ideals of human rights or distributive social justice, but to broader and richer understandings of the good life for human persons, and nonhuman persons as well. This idea applies to all of our quantitative, qualitative, and theoretical endeavors. The familiar idea of “ways of knowing” seemed to work well as a theme for our last annual meeting. Another idea that has been bandied about for many years (since 1983, actually) is the philosopher Richard Bernstein’s idea of going “beyond objectivism and relativism,” neither of which seems acceptable or even possible for historically situated persons. This seems to be very much an unfinished challenge. In light thereof, I suggest that a fruitful theme for the coming year’s meetings might be, What is Social Justice?

Donald Elmer (“Don”) Polkinghorne will be remembered by fellow scholars and students alike as the quintessential theoretical and philosophical psychologist. As easily at home with Continental philosophy as with cognitive science, he developed abiding interests in philosophy of science, research methodology, narrative theory, and theory of practice. He was the author of four books and at least 68 articles and book chapters. At various points in his career, he served as President of the Saybrook Institute, Professor of Counseling Psychology at the University of Southern California, and President of Division 24 (1993-1994).

Professional History

Don’s academic career began as a religious studies major and football star at Washington University in St. Louis. He accrued nearly 2,300 total rushing yards as a running back, a university record that stood for 30 years. From there, his interests in pastoral counseling took him to Yale, where he completed a Bachelor of Divinity, and Hartford Seminary, where he obtained a master’s in psychology and religion. By the late 1960s, his interests expanded to include poststructuralist, phenomenological, pragmatist, and hermeneutic strands within philosophy. His nascent philosophical leanings were a natural fit for both the humanistic movement in psychology and Duquesne’s novel program of phenomenological inquiry. He completed his doctoral studies at Union Graduate School, a progressive and humanistic coalition that was also one of the first distance learning institutions, simultaneously working as a psychology faculty member and Director of Admissions at one of Union’s member colleges, Goddard College in Vermont. His experience in this institutional environment was an impetus for his first book, An Existential-Phenomenological Approach to Education (1976). Following brief stints as Associate Director for Student Services at his alma mater, Washington University, and Director of the Center for Counseling and Special Services at UC Irvine, he was hired as Academic Dean of the Saybrook Institute and shortly thereafter, was asked to be its first President. He served as President of Saybrook for 10 years. During this period, he wrote his landmark methods book, Methodology for the Human Sciences (1983).

In 1985, Don founded the journal, Methods: A Journal for Human Science, which was perhaps the first journal dedicated exclusively to the growing pluralism of human science research methods. He stepped down as Saybrook’s President in 1996 and stayed on as psychology faculty member for one additional year.

In 1987, he moved back to Southern California to become Professor of Counseling and...
In Memoriam: Don Polkinghorne

and Occupational Therapy students. However, several colleagues at Fielding Graduate Institute, including fellow narrative scholar Ruthellen Josselson, convinced him to teach again as a part-time Faculty in the Media Psychology program. He created an innovative course on semiotics and revamped the doctoral psychology research methods offering into a rigorous 3-course sequence combining philosophy of science with training in both qualitative and quantitative methods. He also served as research advisor on many students’ dissertations. He continued at Fielding as Professor Emeritus through the Fall term of 2017 and was scheduled to teach in 2018 before his passing in January.

Theoretical Contributions to the Field

Don was one of the few psychologists who engaged in careful study of the philosophical and psychological works in European phenomenology. He introduced American audiences to the difficult writings of Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, Ricoeur, and the early existential work of Foucault. Don was critical of philosophical and scientific projects that presumed to achieve absolute certainty and that viewed consciousness as disembodied and unextended in space. From the existential-phenomenological tradition Don gleaned and shared the importance of human agency and the centrality of practice in human life and in science itself as a human activity, themes that would continue in many of his writings.

Running through all of Don’s theoretical work is a sense that his mission was primarily pragmatic and educational. That is, he encouraged his readers to draw connections that might prove helpful to them, whether those connections be between ideas, traditions, practices, historical events, or resources. He was not a pure theorist and did not craft a theoretical edifice that was startlingly new. Instead, his skill lay in weaving together a subtle and sensible tapestry of disparate ideas that already existed, and making them accessible enough to provide a practical way forward – while leaving the door open for each of his readers to follow their own inspirations.

Research Methodology

Through the 1970s, education in social science research methodology was remarkably narrow, focused almost entirely on hypothesis, measurement, and statistical analysis. Philosophy of science in the 1960s began to problematize quantitative research methodology and new qualitative methods like phenomenology and grounded theory were gaining ground by the 1970s, but there was a woeful lack of wide-ranging, systematic writings in this area. Don’s Methodology for the Human Sciences: Systems of Inquiry (1983) was the most comprehensive study of the full range of research methods in the human sciences when it was published, and it influenced “the qualitative revolution” of new methods in the 1980s and 1990s.

Don reminded us in Methodology that despite the pervasive and unquestioned assumption that the human sciences should use the research methods developed by the physical sciences, the appropriate way to investigate the human realm had been a source of profound debate at the founding of the human sciences. The book meticulously traces the origins and development of positivism; the anti-positivist responses from Vico, the neo-Kantians, Dilthey, Brentano, Husserl, Weber, and James; and the continuing debate advanced by Gestalt psychology, symbolic interactionism, and humanistic psychology. In his chapter on “the received view,” Don showed that the nature of science was far from settled within the positivist tradition, as he traced the nuanced struggles from the Vienna Circle, which integrated Russel’s logic and Mach’s positivism to the theoretical postulation of unobservables, to the later proposals of Hempel, Nagel, and Popper. Don’s exposition continues with chapters on pragmatic science, systems and structuralist approaches, human action and the practice turn, and existential-phenomenological and hermeneutic systems. This volume provides a veritable roadmap for the flourishing of human science research pluralism in the late 20th century.

In the end, Methodology is a passionate plea for a revitalized science of the human realm that gives up the impossible goal of certainty and instead provides a deepening understanding of human existence. Don argues for the emergence of a science that is well-fitted to the unique realm of the human, including personal experiences, activities, constructs, and artifacts, and extending into values, language, and social, political, and economic systems.

Narrative Theory

Don’s work increasingly turned to the issue of language in the 1980s. His Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences (1988) set the bar for scholarship in narrative psychology and has played a crucial role in the emergence and development of postmodern approaches to psychology that emphasize the sociolinguistic construction of human existence. Drawing on the work of Paul Ricoeur, he emphasized that the achievement of personal identity and self-conceptualization takes place through the use of narrative configurations that bring wholeness to human existence through stories. Don’s articulation of the dynamics of self-as-story called attention to our being in the middle of a plot that is our lives, one whose end is uncertain and in which we will continue to evolve as long as we are alive. What made Don’s account of narrative particularly powerful was the breadth and depth of his scholarship, and the ways he was able to draw from across an array of disciplinary domains—literary studies, semiotics, historiography, analytic philosophy, phenomenology, hermeneutics, structuralism, psychoanalysis—to address not only thorny epistemological matters, but also weighty ontological ones.

Don’s conviction that narrative knowledge could provide a valuable paradigm for psychological inquiry grew from his observation that the work of psychotherapists and other social scientific practitioners consisted largely in the production, interpretation, and revision of clients’ narratives. As a psychotherapist, he used practitioners’ implicit work with narrative to understand how individual life experiences come to be structured both internally and externally in the pursuit of meaning. His distinction between narrative analysis and analysis of narratives provides an important lens for understanding how “narrative reasoning” organizes and makes sense of major life events. Polkinghorne’s emphases on the contexts in which stories are constructed, the embodied nature of narrative, and its historical continuity are particularly relevant to current scholarship in cultural psychology. Don saw narrativity as fundamental to psychological existence, and narrative knowledge as the key to understanding how human action and experience become configured as temporally meaningful episodes. Narratives chronicle how the particularities and vicissitudes of individual human lives are given shape and interwoven in ways that resist explanation by universal theories.
In subsequent narratologies, Don explored other fields and frameworks with which to further his case in establishing narrative as a vital feature of psychological life. Among his research methodologies, and recommended that more research be done on experts’ judgment and reflective processes (Hoshmand & Polkinghorne, 1992). Conversely, he advised practitioners to read research studies in a way that highlighted their local practical value rather than their universal prescriptive claims (Polkinghorne, 1999). However, by the early 2000s, Don was so alarmed by the increasing hegemony of managed care over the discourse and livelihood of clinical practice that he framed the relationship between scientists and practitioners as a war for the soul of human practice. In an early draft of his last book (2003), he made a wholehearted appeal to preserve judgment-based practice; by the final version (2004), he came to argue that it was in fact superior to research-based practice and needed to be reclaimed. In his view, insurance bureaucracies had attempted to technologize research-based practice, mandating specific sequences of manualized techniques for specific presenting problems and thus minimizing the human agency of both practitioner and client. This contrasted with practice seen as a real relationship between two unique human beings, where the task of the practice is often ambiguous, heavy with context, and always evolving. In this humanized view, it is only natural that the experienced practitioner be guided by intuitive-but-reasonable embodied judgments based on their lifetime of experiential knowledge narratives. To bolster his conception of practical judgments, Don wove together the background knowledge of Heidegger and Dewey, the embodied knowing of Gendlin and Damasio, the phronetic reasoning of Aristotle and Dewey, and the reflective understanding of Gadamer and Schön. Left undone in this work, a charge to be perhaps taken up by future theorists and researchers, is the question of how practitioners may best improve the quality and effectiveness of their practical judgments in the face of the sedimentation of habits and the temptations of self-confirmation.

Personal Remembrances

JS: There were many impressive things about Don. He was a wonderful and very skilled teacher. He had an uncanny ability to see into ideas, grasp them with keen perceptibility, and explain them with refreshing clarity. He was generous, patient, and encouraging of students and young scholars. But when he thought directness was needed, he didn’t shy away from the job. And yet, his delivery made one feel he was acting out of genuine concern and kindness, and you knew he was right.

FW: I remember having lunch in a rooftop restaurant with Don and his wife Judith. It must have been the mid-1990s, while we were in Washington DC for an APA convention. I remember talking with Don about psychology—where it was and where it was going—to hear his most current thinking. This memory somehow captures my sense of how Don saw the world—from a high place, looking out over everything. Over the years, I cherished every opportunity I had to check in with him because his knowledge was so critical, his scope so vast, and his conclusions so incisive. Don respected every new development in psychology, and yet he was passionately committed to pointing out what he thought was being missed. I always found Don’s assessment to be fair and his perspective fresh and generative—at the leading edge of what was best for psychology.

JC: I still recall interviewing with Don for the USC Counseling Psychology doctoral program. In that phone conversation, I realized I had found a home. Here was someone who not only understood but encouraged my quest for investigating big, complex problems, for not being satisfied with answers that seemed discrepant with my own experience, and for wanting to disclose rather than extinguish what was truly mysterious about being human. In my first years of my doctoral program at USC, I recall fondly the Sunday morning advise meetings Don held at his house, 5 or 6 of us drinking coffee in his living room listening to Don talk about the theoretical dissertation process, with his springer spaniel Chelsea trying to lay her head in someone’s lap. I joined several of his doctoral students in a lively reading and discussion group on Merleau-Ponty’s Phenomenology of Perception. As a dissertation mentor, Don was kind, helpful, and wise, but he also pushed to get the best out of me (and occasionally, provided me with a much-needed stick to get it done!) He was not a stickler for strictly following a set of data collection and analytic procedures, but instead fostered a pragmatic, intuitive, and yet rigorous approach to methodology. In short, he instilled in me the trust that if I only put in the time and effort, I too could develop unique and important ideas about being human. — John Carter, Jeff Sugarman, & Fred Wertz

with additional contributions from Jenny Pak, Rod Goodyear, and Jerri Lynn Hogg
Critical Theories and Social Practices Special Interest Group
by Erin Thrift

Critical Theories and Social Practices (CTSP) is a Special Interest Group (SIG) composed of Division 24 members who are interested in exploring the relationship between critical theories and social practices. We use a number of critical approaches to inform our scholarly and professional work. While our work focuses on a variety of topics, we share an interest in questions of power, resistance, equity, community, social justice, and diversity as it relates to psychological theorizing, research, and professional practice. Interdisciplinary inquiry is strongly supported and encouraged.

The first year of CTSP has been a busy one! Inspired by the momentum of the #metoo movement, our group has been researching APA internal policies and externally directed statements related to the issues of sexual harassment and violence against women while also exploring some of the various ways that APA could potentially support survivors. We are also pursuing opportunities to collaborate with other APA divisions on this important issue.

Members of our group have also been engaged in addressing a range of issues facing members of immigrant, refugee, and asylum seeking communities. In collaboration with Human Rights First researchers, this has involved visiting migrant detention centers and advocating for increased access to health care for women and children in detention. This work has been instrumental in convincing APA to sign on to the amicus brief in the Charles case supporting the rights of immigration detainees to mental health care through the discharge care planning process.

For more information about our group, please visit our website (https://ctspdiv24.wordpress.com/).

If you are interested in joining the group, please feel free to contact the coordinators through the website.

STPP Candidate Statements
For President:

Stephen Yanchar: I am grateful to be nominated for president of the Society for Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology. I have long found the Society to be a place of scholarly excellence and warm collegiality. I see any opportunity to play a role in its leadership as an honor. I currently serve as secretary and have, in the past, acted as the annual convention program chair and, several times, as a member of the midwinter committee. My qualifications also include serving previously as associate editor for New Ideas in Psychology and currently as associate editor of the Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology and editorial board member of Issues in Religion and Psychotherapy. In my involvement in the Society, and in various leadership roles at my university, I have sought to be open to others and work collaboratively in response to the needs of the organization. This, of course, I would strive to do as president. I would also seek to facilitate the growth of diversity as we plan for a vibrant future. Finally, with others in the division, I have argued that examining underlying assumptions is a key aspect of critical thinking. As president, I would invite members to critically consider

the Society’s future within APA and the field. What assumptions have allowed the Society to thrive? What assumptions should be reconsidered as we prepare to meet the challenges of the future? These questions I would ask Society members to consider as we continue to strive for excellence.

Gregg Henriques: I am honored to be considered for president of the APA Division 24, Society for Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology. Over the past several years my involvement in the division has deepened, and I am happy to consider it my professional home, a place where I have made many lasting friendships and had endless stimulating conversations. During this period, I have worked on the Executive Committee in the role of Membership Chair, represented the Division at APA Conferences, maintained an active presence on the list serve, served as a member of the Division’s Ethics Review of the Hoffman Report, and had a leading role developing the midwinter programs for the past three years.

My background is such that I believe I will make for an effective president. I have broad familiarity with the many facets of the field. I have authored many peer reviewed articles, three special journal issues, and a book, A New Unified Theory of Psychology, and am a regular blogger on Psychology Today. In addition to focusing on deep theoretical issues, in my role as Professor and Director of the Combined-Integrated Doctoral Training Program at James Madison University, I also train emerging professional psychologists who are sophisticated in the ways of theory and philosophy, thus bridging theory and practice. I was recently voted to be an APA Fellow through the Division.

As president of the Society for Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, I will work to continue advancing the society and will emphasize exploring the dialectical tensions between critical theory and constructive solutions and between fostering unity and embracing pluralism. I will be especially focused on how Division 24 can be a place for building effective conceptual bridges between science and practice. Thank you for your consideration.

GO VOTE
STPP Candidate Statements

For Treasurer:

Samuel Downs: As a member of the division for almost a decade, I have served in many capacities and would like to continue to serve as treasurer. I have some experience with the finances of the division as I have sat in many executive committee meetings and helped plan two Midwinter Meetings.

For Member-At-Large:

Michael Arfen is Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Prince Edward Island. His scholarship focuses a range of issues surrounding social, environmental, and economic justice and had been featured in *Handbook of Critical Psychology*, *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, *Handbook of Critical Social Psychology*, *Encyclopedia of Critical Psychology*, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*, and *American Psychologist*. Michael’s theoretical and philosophical work explores a range of issues at the intersection of hermeneutic phenomenology and critical political economy. Against the background of this work, he has recently started to investigate the experience of people trying to carve out an existence beyond the boundaries of a competitive market society.

Michael has had an opportunity to present his work to Division 24 both at the APA Annual Convention and as a guest editor for a special issue of *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology* that explored the philosophical foundations of modern social justice movements. He is also actively involved with members of the Division in planning the 2023 Mid-Winter Meeting.

As a Member-At-Large on the Division 24 Executive Committee, Michael would be interested in connecting a new generation of philosophical and theoretical scholars to established scholars within the Division. Through this outreach, he hopes to encourage our colleagues across the Association to recognize the importance of grappling with the philosophical and theoretical foundations of their various empirical investigations.

Robert Bishop: I have been attending and presenting at Division 24 meetings for that past 20 years and believe that this division is well-positioned to address foundational issues in psychology as well as wider issues affecting society. To enrich our ability to address these two fronts I would like to see the division deepen philosophical and historical analysis not just to sharpen our critical edge, but also to strengthen our ability to present credible alternatives in addressing the problems underlying within and beyond mainstream psychology. I would like to help us find ways to engage with the work of philosophers and historians who care about the same questions Division 24 members do. To me this means finding ways to enable faculty members, practitioners and students to embark on deeper study of philosophical and historical work that is relevant to the concerns and work of the Division. It also means finding ways to increase the participation of philosophers and historians in our meetings whose work addresses issues and concerns relevant to our Division. If I’m elected, I would work to help Division 24 pursue ways to bring about these kinds of philosophical and historical enrichment to our work.