

APA Friday August 14, 1992

"Present at the Creation of Division 28"

by Victor G. Laties

3:00-4:50pm; Cabinet Room, Washington Hilton

(followed by Div 28 dinner)

[Jarvik:1st President; Laties:2nd; Weiss:5th; Cook: 6th; Brady:1th; Dews: Distinguished Affiliate]

1. Harley Hanson's role in starting Division 28. Murray Jarvik may have been our George Washington but Harley Hanson was our Sam Adams, the man who stirred the rest of us to action. Without Harley, we would not have been born in 1966. The new division was started because Harley wanted it badly and worked hard to get it going. It was he who talked up the idea of a new division. As he remembers it now (I talked to him by telephone several times over the past few months), he first discussed the idea with Joe Brady and Fred Skinner when they visited Merck as consultants. While Skinner thought it "politically a good idea," at that time Joe Brady labelled it "a dumb idea." To understand such responses, one must understand the context. Division 25 had been founded in 1964, just two years before, and Joe Brady was then serving a three-year term as its president. But Harley persisted, talking to others at the 1965 BPS meeting, which was at SKF in Philadelphia, and at the 1965 APA meeting in Chicago. At least some of those he talked to agreed with him. He found especially strong allies in Carl Scheckel, who was at Hoffman-La Roche, and Murray Jarvik.

Sometime in the winter or spring of 1966, the "Committee for the Establishment of a Division of Behavioral Pharmacology" was established. This consisted of John Boren and Joe Brady, both at Walter Reed, Peter Carlton from Rutgers, Bob Edwards from NIMH, Jack Findley at the Institute for Behavioral Research and the University of Maryland, Irv Geller from New York Medical College, Harley Hanson from Merck, George Heise from Indiana University, Murray Jarvik at Albert Einstein and the only physician in the group (Murray was an MD/PhD). Conan Kornetsky of Boston University, myself at the University of Rochester, Jim Olds, University of Michigan, Carl Scheckel, Hoffmann-La Roche, and Larry Stein from Wyeth. Note that Joe Brady had warmed up to the idea of

another division enough to let his name be listed here.

These are the names listed on the first piece of paper I have been able to find that bears upon the founding of the new division. In this report by Harley, he says that he had sent out 2,080 invitations to support formation of the new division. These went to the members of Divisions 3, 6, and 25, BPS and the subscribers to JEAB. The requirement was that about 200 APA members (1% of the membership) petition that a new division be formed. Each invitation contained a postcard addressed to Harley and he was able to send about 300 such cards to APA headquarters in Washington by May 24th, which was the deadline for consideration at the next Board of Directors meeting. Harley now recalls that this must have been the first time APA had to deal with this strange form for a "petition," hundreds of postcards collected by mail rather than the usual sheets of names collected at meetings. Harley was alerted by Jane Hildreth at APA, the staff person who took care of membership matters, that the application may meet some resistance from other divisions. Murray Jarvik wrote a persuasive letter to the presidents of all the other divisions, laying out in more detail the case for the new division. APA's Board of Directors accepted the unusual "petition" and the new division was voted into life at the Council of Representative meeting in early September.

Harley now says that his main reason for pushing for a new division was political rather than scientific. He thought that the non-experimental psychologists within APA were coming to dominate the organization. One way to combat this was for the experimentalists to form new divisions, which would automatically get them more representation on Council and more time at the convention. Whatever his reasons, they provided the impetus for some very effective action during the summer of 1966 and got us going.

2. How I got to be president. Murray Jarvik had been made president by acclamation, as it were. Like George Washington, he had two terms. Murray's lasted from September 1966 to September 1968.

The division had to supply two names to APA for the summer 1967 ballot, so our members could choose someone who would be President-elect for a year and then succeed Murray at the close of the 1968 APA meeting. A nominations committee of Murray Jarvik, Harley Hanson and Carl Scheckel selected Joe Brady, George Heise, Conan Kornetsky, and myself. These names were sent to the membership in January to be ranked --there was also

~~space left for write-ins-- and the top two were then to appear on the APA ballot.~~

When I was asked to stand, I considered declining because I was the president of Behavioral Pharmacology Society for 1966 and 1967. But I figured there was no problem because Joe Brady would win. I was surprised to find myself on the final APA ballot, running against George Heise, I think. Joe Brady had changed his mind and had finally refused to run, I suspect partly because he was in the third year of a three-year term as the first president of Division 25. When Carl Scheckel wrote me on August 7th that I had been elected, I answered:

"I received your letter concerning my election to the high office of president-elect of division 28 with mixed emotions. Of course I'll serve. I must say that I find this whole thing somewhat ironic since I was less than enthusiastic about the initial formation of the new division; but the more I get into it the more enthusiastic I become."

3. My year as president. When I succeeded Murray at the end of the APA meeting in September 1968, the division was working well. Harley Hanson was running the newsletter, Carl Scheckel was still the Secretary, Peter Carlton still the Treasurer. We had just started to broaden our membership. Conan Kornetsky chaired the membership committee and had just reported at the business meeting that we had doubled our members by gaining 325 new ones. Of these, 275 came from a mailing to the Division of Clinical Psychology (Division 12)!

~~We had real money in the treasury.~~ That was because we had a Corporate Affiliates membership that was growing: In late 1967, we had 4, which jumped to 10 in 1968, and 13 in 1969. This phenomenal growth was largely due to Carl Scheckel's efforts. He organized a concerted effort on everybody's part to sign up members and most of the large companies with significant efforts in behavioral pharmacology came aboard.

There was a continuing time cost involved in getting these funds. For one thing, a certain amount of public relations was involved. One of our corporate affiliates responded to Peter Carlton's request for another year's dues by writing that since "they do not know what the activities of the Division are, there seems little reason to continue [paying dues]." Peter alerted me and I dashed off a two and a half page, single-spaced report to our contact

at the disgruntled company, outlining all that we had done for humanity during the past year. A month later Peter reported that he received the company's dues.

This money allowed us to have some fun giving it away. In 1968, under Murray Jarvik, we gave a \$250 cash prize for the best psychopharmacology paper presented at the APA meeting and cited the two runner-up papers for "Honorable Mention." For 1969, we increased the first prize to \$300, added second and third prizes of \$100 each, and added a research grant of \$500 to each of the three prizes. In that year, the prizes and grants went to excellent scientists at McGill, Princeton and the Rockefeller University. [\$500 in 1969 = about \$2,000 now]

We had two committees dealing with the papers, a regular program committee to schedule the papers, weeding out the weaker ones, and one to decide which papers would be given the prizes and grants. Since each committee had at least three members, all in different locations, a lot of paper moved in the mails. The difficulty of comparing briefly presented research findings in widely disparate areas were great and the reliability of our decisions probably wasn't very high. There were occasional glitches in the process. Time pressure dictated that the program and prize committees work concurrently. One year, the prize committee made its choice and then found that the program committee had not planned to schedule that paper! The problem was solved, the paper's author gave the paper and got the prize. No one was the wiser.

Appendix to APA paper

The Founding of the Division of Psychopharmacology (Division 28)

by

Victor G. Laties

The new division's most interesting time was the summer of 1966, when the division was being put together, mostly by Harley Hanson and Carl Scheckel and Murray Jarvik.

I hadn't been one of those strongly pushing for the founding of a new division. We already had Division 25, (Experimental Analysis of Behavior), BPS (Behavioral Pharmacology Society), and ASPET (American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics)-- these served the needs of the particular group that rather suddenly started the Division of Behavioral Pharmacology. (That was the original name of Division 28; it went through the APA's Council of Representatives as that and was changed to Division of Psychopharmacology shortly thereafter.)

Sometime in the late spring of 1966, the "Committee for the Establishment of a Division of Behavioral Pharmacology" was established, primarily through the efforts of Harley M. Hanson. On May 18, Harley reported to its members that 2,080 invitations to support formation of the new division had been mailed out to prospective members. These were usually in the form of a postcard addressed to Harley, meant to be used by a single person, and was in the form prescribed by APA:

"The undersigned respectfully requests the establishment of the Division of Behavioral Pharmacology and agrees to become a member of such division if it is established."

The accompanying letter was in the form of a memorandum to the APA Council of

Representatives, and included this explanation of why a new division was needed:

"...Since the mid-1950's, there has been an increasing interest in drug-behavior interactions in both academic and industrial laboratories. However, in spite of the increasing number of psychologists involved in pharmacological research and the development of a distinctive body of knowledge and techniques, the number of behavioral pharmacology papers presented at APA-sponsored meetings has remained small, and the number of papers published in APA journals by these investigators negligible. Most psychologists have solved the problem of obtaining an adequate forum by presenting their research under the auspices of other societies, notably at meetings of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology and the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, often becoming members of the latter society. The end result of this trend is the increasing separation of this discipline from the main body of American psychology and decreasing interest in the training of students of this area."

This memorandum included the names of the "organizing committee," which consisted of John Boren and Joe Brady, both at Walter Reed; Peter Carlton, at Rutgers; Bob Edwards from NIMH; Jack Findley at the Institute for Behavioral Research; Irv Geller, New York Medical College; Harley Hanson, Merck; George Heise, Indiana University; Murray Jarvik, Albert Einstein College of Medicine; Conan Kornetsky of Boston University; Victor Laties, University of Rochester; Jim Olds, University of Michigan; Carl Scheckel, Hoffmann-La Roche; and Larry Stein, Wyeth. The more than 2,000 petitions were sent to members of APA Divisions 3 (Experimental Psychology) 6 (Physiological and Comparative Psychology), and 25 (Experimental Analysis of Behavior), and the members of the BPS (Behavioral Pharmacology Society) and to the subscribers of JEAB (Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior).

At least 200 APA members (1% of the membership) had to ask that the new division be formed and Harley was able to deliver the petitions from more than that to APA headquarters in Washington on May 24th, the deadline for consideration at the next Board

of Directors meeting. Harley must have met that requirement with ease because he could write on June 20th that Jane Hildreth, who took care of such matters at APA, had allowed him to add names that came in after the May 24th deadline and he thought that the total charter membership would be about 320 to 330. In the same letter, Harley also reported to the organizing committee that the petition had been "reviewed by the [APA] Board of Directors and found to be in order and transmitted to the other Divisions for consideration."

He went on to say:

"Apparently there was some discussion about the apparent lack of organizing meetings, etc. It became apparent because most other Divisions were established only after much discussion, meetings, soul-searching, etc. However, it was pointed out that nowhere in the bylaws is there any demand that such gatherings be held before a petition can be considered by the Board of Directors and the Board (or at least one member) finally did concede this point."

I think this shows how much an ad hoc operation this all was, with Division 28 organized by a very few people with most of the work done by Harley and Carl Scheckel and Murray Jarvik. Another group was also coming in at the same time for approval of a Division of Community Psychology, which became Division 27. I'll bet they had a more formal structure than the ragtag bunch of psychopharmacologists. Later in the same letter, Harley mentioned that Jane Hildreth had suggested that there might be a good chance of resistance arising when the other divisions received the formal petition for comment, adding, "I suspect that she was responding to the discussion that took place during the Board of Directors meetings." Many years later, Harley recalled that the board may also have been reacting to the unusual postcard petitions, not the usual sheets of paper covered with signatures which had been solicited at meetings.

On July 25th, Murray Jarvik wrote the presidents of all the existing divisions APA Council meeting scheduled for during the APA convention the beginning of September. Murray wrote to the presidents of all the other divisions, asking for support, explaining why we wanted to start the new division, and addressing very directly any concern they may have had about overlapping membership with the existing divisions of the APA:

"To be sure, the greatest number of petitioners presently belong to Divisions 3,6 and 25. However, there were petitioners from every other division except the Consumer Division.... Psychological pharmacology is a very broad field with both basic and applied aspects and this division should attract members from all parts of the American Psychological Association."

That pitch worked and there was no problem; apparently no one objected at the Board of Directors meeting or when the Council met the next day, September 6th.

A week before the meeting, on August 29th, Harley had sent the committee provisional by-laws and described how they have got to get something in, don't try to revise them now, and so on. He then continued:

"I have made up a list of Provisional Officers, for the most part not consulting anyone. The desire of some members of the Organizing Committee to change the name of the Division [change from 'behavioral pharmacology' to 'psychopharmacology'] must wait until after we are established....I hope that it is apparent to everyone that we don't have time for too much discussion at this point and that also nothing irreversible is being decided."

The provisional officers he listed were Murray Jarvik, President and Representative to Council; Carl Scheckel, Secretary; Peter Carlton, Treasurer; Larry Stein and Harley Hanson as further Representatives to Council; Conan Kornetsky, John Boren, George Heise and Vic Laties as members of the Executive Committee.

The first meeting of the new Executive Committee took place on Oct. 14th at Albert Einstein in New York. Seven of the nine members attended: Jarvik, Carlton, Heise, Kornetsky, Laties, Scheckel and Stein; Boren and Hanson were absent. We were then obviously on our way. The name was changed from behavioral pharmacology to psychopharmacology at that meeting. As I recall, two people voted against this change, myself and one other, perhaps George Heise.

The first scientific program, at the 1967 APA meeting, was superb. We had been given 11 hours and we used them all. The symposia at our first divisional meeting were at a

high scientific level. For instance, the first symposium listed here is on brain amines -it was organized by Larry Stein- chaired by Joe Brady, with the participants being Julie Axelrod, Carl Scheckel and Ed Boff, Larry Stein, and Albert Weissman. Seymour Kety and Peter Dews served as discussants. Axelrod was given the Nobel Prize a few years later. And Conan Kornetsky ran a symposium on addiction and drugs as reinforcers. It had papers by Jim Weeks, Bob Schuster, and J.R. Nichols, and had Jerry Jaffe as the discussant.

Harley Hanson was the first editor of The Needle, our newsletter. Vol. 1 No.1 was dated January 1967. Vol. 1 No. 2 was labelled Summer 1967 and contained the program for the September APA meeting. Harley continued to edit The Needle through 1968, putting out issues labelled Vol. 1 No. 3 January and Vol. 1 No. 4 Fall. He continued as its editor into my term but I can't find a copy of any issue labelled 1969 even though he was still editor on May 29, 1969, when I wrote him asking if he could get out an issue containing our program at APA that September. The minutes of the September 1 business meeting state: "Harley Hanson resigned as Newsletter Editor and as Representative to Council. His resignations were accepted with deep regret." He been serving as our representative to the APA Council of Representatives and got more and more annoyed by what he believed was a politicization of the Council. Council voted to cancel a contract that APA had made to hold its own convention in Chicago in 197?. But after Mayor Daley's police rioted at the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Council voted to abrogate the contract.On 10/17/68, early in my term, I made a note to myself: "Called HM Hanson. Needle is mailed to 300 APA list + 600 members. Thinking of resigning as Rep to Council." [cf his ltr of 6/16/67]

Why was Division 28 started when it was? I called Harley Hanson a few months ago and he told me that his reason was purely political. He wanted to increase the influence of the experimentalists within APA and thought that starting new divisions did that, adding members to council, getting more program time at meetings, etc. The issue of program time was critical in driving the operant conditioners to starting Division 25. When Ron Wood interviewed me and asked whether that was important in this case, I at first did not think so. But then I remembered that Bernie Weiss and I once had a paper rejected by Division 3. It was the first paper reporting on the use of the titration procedure with analgesics. We thought it was pretty good and were highly annoyed. Maybe I wasn't as much against the founding of this division as I first remembered. There is much to be said about having more

control over your fate and to some extent drug-behavior people were thought of as being too applied. All it takes is one person with a gripe to start movement toward a new division where they would have control - you then got to run your own program committee.
