

Oral History of Dr. Murray E. Jarvik
Taken by Jack E. Henningfield
On
Friday, December 13, 1991 @ 11:05 a.m.

JEH: You were not only the first President but the only one with a two-year term. How did you come to find yourself APA Division 28 President?

MEJ: Well, I don't remember the details of it to tell you the truth but I know that it came out of a conversation with Carl Sheckel. I had been in touch with him for a couple of years before that on a variety of things and did some work with him. It could have been Valium work that we were discussing when I had visited him. We were friends when it started out; it was his idea to start a new division.

JEH: How did Division 25, The Experimental Analysis Behavior, affect the founding of Division 28?

MEJ: Well, a lot of the members of Division 25 became members of Division 28. At the time many of the members of the Division 25, were involved in drug work. In fact, at the time I would say that many of the people working in psychopharmacology in drug firms were members of Division 25. It just seemed like a good idea, to start a new division although I must say I went back and forth a little bit of whether we really needed another division. We had so many already in the American Psychological Association.

JEH: You have an M.D. with psychiatry as your specialty area and a Ph.D. in psychology; you have been active in both APA'S?

MEJ: Oh yes. Actually, I am not a member of the other APA [American Psychiatric Association]. Only this one; the big one. I guess I am one of the oldest Division 28 members now. It is hard for me to believe. But that is true, I never joined the other APA. I never joined any of the medical associations but the AMA.

JEH: Which psychological divisions had you been active in before Division 28 was established?

MEJ: I was in Division 3, Experimental Psychology and Division 6 - Physiological Psychology, but I never belonged to Division 25.

JEH: What led you and others to conclude that a new Division (of Psychopharmacology) was needed?

MEJ: It was the result of discussion among several of us in the APA. Most psychologists in those days belonged to APA. That was all there was. I shouldn't say that. There were some other organizations, but they were much smaller.

JEH: Yes, there was the Behavioral Pharmacology Society that was formed in 1957. That organization also had some drug industry involvement. Then, the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology (ACNP) was established in 1960. You have been active in a number of these organizations.

MEJ: I was active in the ACNP but I never belonged to the Behavioral Pharmacology Society, although I may have attended a meeting or two. There was some concern among people about whether another organization dealing with drugs and behavior was needed. We had Division 25, but Division 25 wasn't devoted solely to drug behavior interactions. Behavioral pharmacology is a broad category, and experimental analysis of behavior even more broad. Of course, there was the ACNP. I guess the argument was that this organization was a very broad organization, which, at

that time, had a very strong clinical affiliation or interest. Since then it (ACNP) has gone absolutely in the other direction- to molecular biology.

JEH: Where was the Division born?

MEJ: Columbia University, Psychology Department, seems to have been the real birth place of this division.

JEH: Who at Columbia was involved?

MEJ. I am trying to think. I know I had been doing some work around that time or maybe it was earlier. There is Bob Berryman and with the names that are vaguely floating through my mind, Cummings, Schoenfeld, Keller. These were contemporaries of mine, I don't know where they are or what became of them to tell you the truth.

JEH: Were they psychologists or psychiatrists?

MEJ: They were psychologists who worked with drugs and they were sort of proteges of Keller and Schoenfeld.

JEH: So the real beginnings weren't in drug abuse but rather were to study behaviorally active therapeutic drugs?

MEJ: Yes, I would say so. There were certainly therapeutic drugs and then they were people from the drug industry too. It seemed that every drug firm had at least one behavioral scientist working there. At some places they were even called psychologists.

JEH: How, by the way, did you conclude that "Psychopharmacology" would be the best name for the new division? Was there much debate over the name?

MEJ: There was no debate in the beginning. Carl suggested it first to tell you the truth. I don't remember if Joe Brady was involved. But I do remember about a year later there was talk of changing the name to Behavioral Pharmacology and there was a whole bunch of people there with a lot of debate. There must have been about 12 or 15 people debating back and forth the pros and cons. The ultimate result was that it stayed the same.

JEH: How many drug companies were involved earlier on?

MEJ: I think there were just two or three. How many are involved now?

JEH: Well there are nearly 30 that are on a list that have occasionally supported us and probably about 10-15 that regularly provide some support. At this point, the major source of financial support is membership dues. The drug industry funding is a small but very important component because it is the component that provides money to enhance our convention activities such as publication of abstracts; and provide travel awards, and activities such as the hospitality suite which provides an important opportunity for people to discuss the state of the: science and recruit new scientists to the Division.

MEJ: Earlier, it was a much more informal organization. We didn't even have a newspaper. There was some concern at that time about competing organizations, such as the ACNP. But a group of us thought that something within the APA was needed.

JEH: Let's go back; how did you actually find yourself President?

NIEJ: I am like Gerald Ford, I guess. I never was elected. I cannot tell a lie. I was a founding member. I think Carl Scheckel selected me. We were the first members and we actively recruited

other people. I am not sure how many we actually got the first year. A dozen maybe and then it grew pretty fast.

JEH: Was Travis Thompson active at that time?

MEJ: I believe so. I certainly remember talking to him.

JEH: The Presidential roster is as fascinating as it is impressive. John Boren must have been active in the founding because he was to be the third President (1969).

MEJ: He was the third one. Who was the second president?

JEH: Vic Laties, who was also very active in the Behavioral Pharmacology Society.

MEJ: Yes, I remember that. He even took a picture of me. He had a camera. I remember that so clearly. It was a nice picture. I have it somewhere. I had a mustache. I remember that.

JEH: What were your main reasons for founding the Division?

MEJ: Because I thought that the APA was the primary organization for nearly all psychologists and in those days psychopharmacology was getting to be important; it was a major branch of psychology, not to mention pharmacology. I guess there always were small organizations but that wasn't the real mutiny that occurred some years ago. No, not in those days and I think everybody who considered themselves a behavioral scientist called themselves psychologists. I am sure that even Joe Brady did.

JEH: I believe he did right up until about six years ago, when he told us this onion joke which B.F. Skinner apparently reprimanded him for.

MEJ: What was the joke?

JEH. Joe will have to tell it to you. But it involved a discussion of the certain absence of green onion and that until "psycho" became similarly absent from the American Psychological Association he would cease to be a member.

MEJ: Oh really, and he would not eat onions?

JEH: Something like that. But I would guess that even in those days, he would probably have been arguing against the name "Psychopharmacology" -

MEJ: He has a point, I must admit, that is very sound, but the name has been around for so long that people know the name, they kind of know what the name means.

JEH: Similarly, terms like "addiction", 'cognitive' and "abuse", seem to serve nominal umbrella functions even though they can also be problematic.

MEJ: Yeah, I guess it is good to be conscious of the fact that these terms have extra meanings to some people.

MEJ: Many of these pharmaceutical companies were very much in high demand, with big money that could profit organizations. I remember that. Some of the early members really thought that we were selling ourselves. I argued that we really weren't representing them directly, that the money was a freely given gift with no strings attached. I think that is the way it was. They [the company] wanted a tax write-off and I guess it added a little to their prestige.

JEH: That continues to be pretty much the model. So it would seem that model that you folks set up was an effective way of minimizing conflicts of interest.

MEJ: You know sometimes it is a little hard to draw the line. There is the example of the public broadcasting system, which some people used to call the Petroleum Broadcasting System because of the support of a petroleum company. But at that time, there was a very small membership; there was no other sizable source of funds. That money enabled the Division to set up awards, travel awards for young people and build the Division and the field.

JEI-I: Do you remember who argued against the involvement of industry in the Division?

MI-li: I don't remember. But I remember that there were some strong feelings.

JEH: How did the collaboration with the pharmaceutical companies come about? Was there a practical kind of drug screening kind of aspect to it such as provided by the International Study Group Investigating Drugs as Reinforcers or the College ("Committee") on Problems of Drug Dependence?

MEJ: Not really.

JEH: It seems that nearly all the research of interest to the Division involved animal models and not human testing or clinical trials.

MEJ: Yes, and I too was working primarily with monkeys. I really didn't get into human work until a few years later.

JEH: Were there any human testing or human researchers involved in the early days of Division 28?

MEJ: There might have been. But, I think that research belonged to the Committee on Problems of Drug Dependence.

JEH: At that time there may not have been that much cross-talk between the APA psychologists and the CPDD, which was primarily comprised of pharmacologists and clinicians. Was Abe Wikler ever involved in the APA?

MEJ. No. At least not in the Division 28. Although he was working on behavioral conditioning. There was George Heise, too. He is the guy who discovered Valium. He was at Roche at that time.

JEH: So in the first 7 years, two Presidents were from industry. Len Cook was another.

MEJ: He was very much involved with antipsychotics in the early days. That was big stuff.

JEH: Were the companies worried that they might lose proprietary information by participating in the Division?

MEJ: How do you mean? They lost their money but not their secrets. That is an interesting question though. I wonder about the key scientists, and how much were they sworn to secrecy?

Of course because these big pharmaceutical companies are so secretive about some things, other things they are not.

JEH: There must have been some concern.

MEJ: Yes, well I am sure they were, probably the same as today when chemicals are under the review process, going through the FDA steps. They couldn't talk about it very much because there is always the question of another company stealing their ideas and patent privileges. Even today, I am kind of amused about what is happening in the nicotine patch area.

JEH: By the way nicotine replacement therapy has to be one of the areas of contribution by the Division. You can trace a lot of the early development of the rationale for nicotine replacement therapy through the Division 28 meetings. In fact, for a number of years the nicotine replacement symposia were a standard feature of the Division 28. You participated in a number of those.

MEJ: Yes. That is true.

JEH: What other areas did Division 28 help provide a home for?

MEJ: Well, I imagine all of behavioral pharmacology. It is hard for me to put my finger on when that was. You know I don't recall if we have any archivally published documents. For example, the Newsletter, which is a marvelous thing, would have been helpful. But it certainly didn't exist in the beginning.

JEH: Were clinical psychologists involved in the Division at its founding?

MEJ: I don't remember whether we excluded them or tried to invite them in. We were almost purely scientific. What is the situation today?

JEH: Today most, but not all of the activity of the organization is focused on basic drug abuse research. Much of this has clinical implications, though. You started the APA before Nixon's war on drugs, what was that like?

MEJ: Well there was the Haight Ashbury scene. The psychedelic scene was an important factor. I think that people were quite interested in psychedelics. I was. That is how I started out, by working on LSD.

JEH: Did the CIA or Army fund much of the psychedelic research by members at the founding of the Division?

MEJ: Yes, and actually a little earlier than that even.

JEH: Was the Division of Psychopharmacology formally approached by the Army?

MEJ: We were not overtly approached not that I recall. I think by the late 60's the Army and CIA had gotten out of the LSD business. Although the Army supported many scientists and psychologists. And the Air Force and the Navy too.

JEH: Let's come back to the involvement, or lack thereof, of clinical psychologists in the Division. Were they opposed to its founding, or did they simply find it irrelevant to what they were doing?

MEJ: I never encountered any opposition. I don't know any clinical psychologists who felt comfortable in the Division though. Although there might have been some. I remember a clinical psychologist, Conan Kornetsky, but he became a basic scientist and even today he works on brain stimulation in rats.

JEH: He was Division President in 1983-86; he was also at the Addiction Research Center in the 1950's involved in human research. Was Conan involved in the formation of Division 28?

MEJ: I think so. This first big war on drugs, in this half of the twentieth century, was in the early 1970's, under President Nixon. That gave birth to the first Presidential Drug Czar, Jerry Jaffe, in 1971 and then to the establishment of NIDA in 1973 [(by a 1971 Congressional act)]. Of course before NIDA, much of our research was funded by NIMH.

JEH- The Division was established only a few years after Travis Thompson and Bob Schuster, and others were developing animal self-administration procedures; the notion of drugs as reinforcers and applying the technology to drug screening was being considered to identify drugs with abuse potential.

MEJ: Self-administration research made a big impact on the field. But I never liked that term 'abuse'. It had such a derogatory meaning. Although "abuse" and "addiction" are both kind of everyday terms.

JEH: What is your reaction to the expansion of the title recently adopted by the Division ["Psychopharmacology" became "Psychopharmacology and Substance Abuse" in 1992]. This is the sort of issue that might have been discussed 25 years ago.

MEJ: I wasn't sure I understood the recent name change because I never discussed it with anyone. I guess it is a good idea. This is an important area. It happens to be the area that I am interested in, substance abuse. Yes, except for the fact that I object to the term 'abuse'. I prefer the term 'dependence' to abuse. Although people argue that they need both terms. It is tricky to come up with a good term. No one term does it all. People will say don't use this term because it has excess baggage but every term has baggage. Every term in English does.

JEH: I wonder, if you had formed Division 28 in the early 1970's, would you have named it differently?-that is, Would the same group of people have come up with a different term or have included "abuse", "addiction", or "dependence" in the title?

MEJ: I wonder too. Those years were very different from today. Those were the 60's, the psychedelic decade. The era when the Beatles were big, when they had the love-ins in Golden Gate Park. People were taking psychedelic drugs. Marijuana was used everywhere, and so was LSD. Look at pictures of people, particularly young people. What a difference; their hair styles were different. It was very long hair for men in particular; shoulder length hair, side burns. The dress and attire was associated with drugs.

JEH: You mentioned the term dependence, but the drugs of a societal concern and even of scientific concern at that time were used mainly for their psychedelic effects. The assumption of the time was generally that they were not dependence producing, at least not physiologically. So if you were interested in those drugs, you probably wouldn't have used the term dependence in the name of the Division either.

MEJ: You are quite right. You are absolutely right. They certainly weren't producing strong physical dependence, if they were at all. With drugs like marijuana and LSD, although people would use them repetitively, it wasn't because of an obvious withdrawal syndrome.

JEH: You are bringing me to a renewed appreciation of the term "psychopharmacology". In retrospect it still makes sense that was the right term for the time - with all due respect to Joe Brady.

MEJ: I think so, although I can understand Joe's objection. He doesn't like the 'psycho' prefix. What does "psycho" mean anyway? It means something referring to the soul or spirit or even the mind. Even the term 'mind' is a little abstract too. Basically, the experiments that people do as psychologists are on behavior. I come from a different background than Joe Brady of course. And I never dropped out of APA.

JEH: One recent concern about adding the term "substance abuse" was that we still have an important industry constituency that is not necessarily interested in an association with drug addiction research. I wonder if that was an issue 25 years ago.

MEJ: There certainly is something to that. The industry doesn't like to be associated with drug abuse.

JEH: But was it a concern in the early days?

MEJ: Well it never came up because we hadn't even considered using drug abuse in the name. In the early days, the Division was focused on therapeutic drugs like antipsychotics and benzodiazepines. There was so much research going on and of course the drug companies were looking for therapeutic drugs in the 60's. Every one of them was looking for a new antipsychotic or antidepressant drug. I guess today the interest would be in cognitive enhancers. Now there are drugs for treating Alzheimer's Disease that are of interest too.

JEH: It would be interesting to look at a history of papers presented at the annual meeting with respect to the percentage that dealt with drugs like morphine and cocaine as opposed to antipsychotics and minor tranquilizers; similarly to the ratio of animal to human studies. There would seem to have been a reversal in APA program time over the years.

MEJ: Oh yes, I am sure you are right. You could look at the programs and get an historical view of how interests change.

End Dec 13,1991 interview.

Oral History APA Div 28
January 9,1992

JEH. What are you working on these days?

MEJ: Well, I'm working on applications for several different grants with different people. There seems to be more grant writing than actual grant research going on these days.

JEH: It seems like the work demand has outpaced the researcher availability.

MEJ: I think so. I think it has something to do with the money. Less money seemed to be available for a while. But now there is more and not enough young people to do the work.

JEH: It seems like just about everybody I know is so over-committed as a result.

MEJ: That's a favorite word these days "overcommitted". You know, I feel like Diogenes. I'd like to find somebody who is not really over-committed, who just doesn't have enough to do.

JEH: I'd like to get your thoughts on some of the other early Division 28 influentials.

MEJ: Well, you'll have to jog my memory for events that occurred a long, long time ago.

JEH: First, what were some of the important forces that shaped your work and the Division?

MEJ: My first work in psychopharmacology involved LSD, but that was in the '50's that was before the 'drug culture of the 60 s. I published a paper with Frank Barron, a personality psychologist on LSD. Frank Barron was, and is, today, a close friend of Timothy Leary.

Timothy Leary was a very bright graduate student, who also was working on personality at the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research (IPAR) in Berkeley.

He went to Harvard and got a faculty position, I'm sure that was where he and Frank met. Frank then discussed the LSD work that I was doing

He picked up on LSD, that way. So I'm kind of responsible for Timothy Leary's interest in LSD.

JEH: What were your observations that got them interested?

MEJ: It really surprised me how this drug affected how people felt and thought. LSD became very popular, but there was nothing to lead me believe that it was reinforcing or dependence producing.

JEH: Wasn't it being used in psychiatry at that time?

MEJ: Yes, it was being used in psychiatry. Several people had tried to work with it. They used it in psychotherapy; so did Abramson. But these were totally uncontrolled studies. There was no evidence that it was really a useful thing for that matter, I'm not sure that there is even evidence today. But one thing was for sure, it changed people's perceptions. The stories began to be circulated about its effects on perception. Several very famous people got involved with it. The Beatles wrote "Lucy in the Sky with Diamond" – that was their LSD song.

JEH: Was your interest initially from a psychiatric perspective or more basic science?

MEJ: My work was just, a general investigation of a very peculiar drug. It was the effect that interested me back in the '50's. I continued to work on it from 1952 to 1955.

That's when I got a grant, that studied the effect on monkeys. I remember, my first NIH grant. I was so pleased! Ah, fifteen thousand dollars, that was the whole grant. I funded a whole laboratory, a monkey colony, and with a staff of something like four or five people. Salaries were very low then.

Well, for that matter, I remember when I got my first job after I got my Ph.D. I worked for Karl Lashley. I got thirty-five hundred dollars a year. That was a good salary then. Remember that this was in 1951.

JEH: From what you have been saying there seem to be two really important contexts from which the Division emerged. One was the drug development by corporations with their realization that behaviorally active medications could be very helpful in the treatment of mental illness and profitable too. That made basic psychopharmacology research worth supporting.

MEJ: Right.

JEH: The second context is a very different one; that's the experimental drug culture and the associated activities of the 1960's.

MEJ: That's right, I think those two things interacted though, at least, they came together. You're quite right. There were tremendous economic forces at work. It started first with the anti-psychotic drugs, and then in the late '50's, probably throughout the 60's, there was development of anti-psychotic drugs. The first big one was chlorpromazine.

That was succeeded by Librium then Valium. In fact, Valium is partially responsible for some of the money paid to support the Division. That was through Carl Scheckel, who was working on

Valium at Roche. That company then produced the biggest selling psychotropic drug in the world, Valium. I don't know if it is any more. But led to support of our Division.

JEH: So you and Carl Scheckel thought a Division of the APA could be useful to further such medicinal development?

MEJ: It was his idea to begin with. He came to me and we discussed it, we went back and forth and I agreed.

MEJ: There was another figure who was very prominent in the developmental drug field, and that's Joe Brady. He was responsible for setting up a lot of the behavioral drug testing laboratories.

JEH: What about Bernard Beer?

MEJ: I believe he worked for a drug firm. A lot of the people who were in our Division worked for drug firms. He became a President of the Division.

JEH: What about Jonathan Cole?

MEJ: Oh Jonathan Cole, I knew him. He was a psychiatrist. He was surely a big influence. At that time, he was head of the Psychopharmacology Service Branch of NIMH. Jonathan was responsible for one of the first, big co-operative studies on neuroleptic drugs. It was launched by NIMH. I think it was one of the first studies to show that these drugs were actually effective, that they really did have anti-psychotic actions.

JEH: How about Robert Edwards?

MEJ: He was a secretary of the psychopharmacology study section. He had a lot of influence on the development of the field. Interestingly, study section secretaries vary a lot on how much influence they exert. Some of them really take over. I guess Edwards was in the middle ground. He was a psychologist, I know that. As I recall, he died very suddenly at a fairly young age. So did Carl Scheckel die fairly young, I don't remember how either of them died.

JEH: How about Howard Hunt?

MEJ: Howard Hunt, yes. He must be tremendously old now, considerably older than me. He was professor of psychology at Columbia University. I don't remember exactly what he did, but I know he was very well known and highly respected.

JEH: How about Roger Kelleher?

MEJ: Oh yes. A very important figure. I guess he's still around. In fact, he worked with Bill Morse.

JEH: Were he and Bill Morse involved in the formation of the Division?

MEJ: You know, I don't remember now. I must admit, things are a little vague in my mind on those points.

JEH: How about B.F. Skinner? Was he actively involved in the Division?

MEJ: No, I don't think he was but I remember talking to him. I remember visiting his laboratory in 1952. Well, this is a bit of a digression, but I remember he encouraged me to go around the country and visit laboratories. Skinner was really very hospitable. He spent the whole morning showing me his laboratory and the work he was doing. He took a pigeon, a naive pigeon and he demonstrated how he could train, to peck a key in a few minutes. I was very impressed.

JEH: How about Earl Usdin.

MEJ: He had a different style. He was a very forceful, aggressive kind of study section secretary. There was a lot of money to be gotten out there, in fact, he went around and got to know all of the grant people. He visited them quite often then, there was a lot more traveling in those days. There was more social involvement in setting up APA meetings.

MEJ: There were some others at that time in Columbia. Of course there was Schoenfield. He was very prominent at Columbia at that time. He was a very colorful professor at Columbia.

MEJ: When Division 28 started, I would say almost all psychologists were in APA at that time, whatever their orientation. But of course it isn't so true today.

JEH: No, not at all.

MEJ: There are many organizations and meetings now. I don't think this is necessarily good. One of the problems is that it dilutes the impact of each. It also costs a lot of money for all these memberships.

JEH: Well, it's really been great talking to you again Murray. I'll talk to you later!

(End of Interview)