

Received 8 Jun 92

June 2, 1992

To: Herbert A. Barry III

Subject: Division 28 Oral History Project
Interview by Ronald Wood of Victor G. Laties
Nov. 1, 1991 at University of Rochester

From: Victor G. Laties

[If you also want this in ASC I, yell.]

Herb, here it is, finally!

Bob regards,
Vic

Wood: I am looking forward to this enormously because most of the events that you are going to talk about are events that occurred just after I came to the University of Rochester.

Laties: When did you get here?

Wood: I discovered Rochester in 1966 when Bernie Weiss gave a paper on theories of reinforcement schedules at the American Psychological Association meeting in New York City. I came the following summer and spent 90 days here and returned as a student in June of 1968. So that really overlaps the chronology of all of this. While I was in the laboratory with the monkeys and the raccoons and the iguanas and the crows and the opossums and dogs, all this stuff was going on, and my only glimpse of it really was the appearance of these personalities in the courses you guys mounted. There was a magnificent course of instruction here in behavioral pharmacology and as I looked over the notes that you prepared in advance of this interview, I realized that all the names that popped up were of people I was reading about back then.

Laties: Being somewhat conservative in these matters, I really wasn't one of those strongly

(EAB)

pushing for the founding of a new division. We already had Division 25, the Division of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior, that I thought served the needs of the particular group that suddenly wanted to start a Division of Behavioral Pharmacology. That was the original name of Division 28; it went through the American Psychological Association's Council of Representatives as that and was changed to Division of Psychopharmacology shortly thereafter.

Wood: You thought that EAB would do it all?

Laties: I thought our needs were being met by Division 25 and, of course, there was ASPET, the pharmacology society. Bernie Weiss and I had both become members of the pharmacology society in 1961 while at Johns Hopkins and had been going to its meetings and so that was the venue for our papers. It was a perfectly acceptable venue, with no problem giving papers on behavioral pharmacology, and they were well received. So between the Pharmacology Society and APA's Division 25, we had no big problem. I guess others saw more of a problem, and I think the others who found the problem and pushed for the formation of a society were primarily Harley Hanson and Carl Scheckel -- Harley was at Merck already, Carl was at Hoffmann-La Roche -- and Murray Jarvik, who was at Albert Einstein, and Peter Carlton, who had been at Squibb and was then at Rutgers. Carl became the first secretary.

Being a pack rat, I still have most of the written material that came out at the time. Let's look through it and maybe it will give this interview some structure.

In my folder for 1966, the first thing I have is a letter from Harley Hanson, addressed to the "Committee for the Establishment of a Division of Behavioral Pharmacology" and it reports on the 2,080 petitions that had been mailed as of Friday, May 13, 1966. Each was meant to be used by a single person and was in the form of a memorandum to the Council of Representatives of the APA, describing the establishment of a Division of Behavioral Pharmacology and giving some reasons and including the names of the organizing committee, which consisted of John Boren and Joe Brady, both at Walter Reed, Peter Carlton, already at Rutgers after being at Squibb, Bob Edwards from NIMH, who had previously been at some drug house in the mid-west, Jack Findley at the Institute for Behavioral Research and closely associated with the Walter Reed group, Irv Geller from New York Medical College, Harley Hansen from Merck, George Heise from Indiana

Feeling in Rochester, NY?

University, who had been with Hoffmann-La Roche, 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. This piece of paper was something that someone could sign and return and sending out more than 2,000 of them means that you are serious.

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

Laties: That was the format that APA dictated. I think we had to get 1% or half of 1% of the membership of APA ^{512^} to [^] you had to have a serious number of people and so that's the first thing that I have in this folder, dated May 18, 1966 and then I have a piece of paper right here with the names of the APA fellows who signed the petition and then there's a letter from Harley to me [June 20, 1966], which I presume went out to all the members of that organizing board, saying that the petition had been reviewed by the APA Board of Directors and was found to be in order and transmitted to the other divisions for consideration. He goes 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 points out that Division 28 was organized by a very few people who put together this board of names, but most of the work was done by Harley and Carl Scheckel and Murray Jarvik. Later Harley mentions that Jane Hildreth had suggested that there might be a good chance of resistance arising when the other divisions consider the petition.

Wood: Why, for heavens sake?

Laties: Well, at the time APA was still at the point where it hadn't exploded in its number

of divisions. New divisions were being added very, very slowly, and each division would always think it could serve the needs of those coming together to start a new one. For instance, Division 3, experimental psychology, or Division 6, physiological psychology, could rightly feel that behavioral pharmacology is something that is done by them and that they were perfectly willing to schedule papers reporting on drugs with behavioral effects, etc., that's part of their job. So your proposed division is competing with the other divisions. There was always that problem. There were I think 25 divisions at the time - I think there were two empty numbers, no divisions 4 or 5, for instance. But apparently Jane Hildreth, who wrote to Harley from APA, was reflecting the conversation at the Board of Directors meeting. There was another division, the Division of Community Psychology, also coming in for approval at the next meeting of the Council of Representatives. I think she was recommending that we lobby the other divisions. The next piece of paper I have is dated July 25th - this is all happening in the late spring and summer of 1966, with the APA Council meeting scheduled for September 5th. 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 the concern about overlapping with the interests of 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; no one objected apparently on the floor of the Council of Representatives and Harley sent another letter on August 29th to me and the others, now including some provisional by-laws and talking about how they have got to get something in, don't try to revise them now, and so on.

"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 were Murray Jarvik as President and Representative to Council; Carl Scheckel, Secretary; Peter Carlton, Treasurer; Larry Stein and Harley Hansen

as further Representatives to Council; Conan Kornetsky, John Boren, George Heise and myself as members of the Executive Committee.

Here is a copy of the original bylaws, which talks about the "Division of Behavioral Pharmacology."

Wood: I think those by-laws stood until Don Overton did a job on them a few years ago.

Laties: To give you a feeling about how naive the whole group was, in one of the first letters [June 20th], Harley talked about by-laws and reported that Carl Scheckel had suggested:

"One way of handling the writing of the by-laws problem would be to let each person be responsible for the preparation of a small section using as a model copies of the by-laws of other Divisions."

This was a wild idea, each of 10 people producing 1/10 of the by-laws. I do remember at least one long meeting discussing by-laws but think that took place after we had been accepted by APA.

Wood: Were these hotel room meetings with six-packs of beer?

Laties: I don't remember the beer. The first executive meeting took place on Oct. 14th at Albert Einstein. In the minutes of the meeting: Jarvik, Carlton, Heise, Kornetsky, Laties, Scheckel and Stein. Boren and Hanson both missed the meeting. We were then obviously on our way. The name was changed from behavioral pharmacology to psychopharmacology. As I recall, two people voted against change, myself and one other. I don't recall who the other was; my guess now is that it was George Heise.

Wood: And you argued?

Laties: I just liked to have the emphasis put on behavior.

Wood: And who argued against this?

Laties: I don't recall the content of the argument.

Wood: Not a heated discussion.

Laties: It was not a knockdown dragout battle. This was a group that really did get along quite well. I don't think that there were "sides" with emotional investment in any part of this thing - in fact, because this was a very homogeneous group. I hope someone is interviewing Harley. Do you know if this is happening? He, I think, was the key person, he was the contact person with APA and he was the final common path to APA. As the secretary - he was essentially the acting secretary from the start - he really did more than anyone else to get it started.

Wood: Was there some press on program time or were people - in the early history of the field was there was a problem in people getting papers published like in the evolution of the Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior - was there a comparable meeting problem here?

Laties: In the founding of JEAB, the important thing was that Charlie Ferster felt great pressure - he was annoyed at requests for revision of his papers by people he thought were idiots and therefore he pressed for the founding of a journal - so that he could essentially publish his own papers and not have to take anything from anyone. This was an attempt to find a better venue for the papers. I'm not sure that anyone had any trouble with say Division 6 or Division 3 getting a paper accepted for presentation at APA but it may be that Harley Hanson or someone else did have that problem ~~and it would only take~~

Wood: Why? Bias against industrial employees?

Laties: I don't know. Remember, APA has always refereed papers given at annual meetings. ~~so~~ in fact, now that I think about it, I remember once that ^{Wells} Bernie and I had a paper rejected by Division 3 for an APA meeting. It reported on the titration procedure with analgesics and we were highly annoyed. We thought it was pretty good. 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 run your own program

committee. However, in the beginning there wasn't a big press of papers. We had trouble filling up the program time that we were given, the twelve or twenty hours or so.

Drug-behavior stuff continued to be reported at pharmacology society and at EPA --the Eastern Psychological Association--I remember hearing of many good papers there, but I think the new division fulfilled an important function. And very quickly we had a large number of members; when people get in the mail a notice that a new division is being founded, with no dues involved, all they had to do was sign the petition and they would automatically be members of the new division, and most people, just to do a favor to the people who asked them to sign the petition, so I think we had 1,500 members very quickly.

Wood: Who were the original members?

Laties: I think the petitions were sent mainly to members of Divisions 3, 6 and 25. In fact, that's what Harley says in his first letter - he sent out 2,080 petitions, getting the mailing tapes from APA. He also got preaddressed envelopes for all JEAB subscribers through Kay Dinsmoor and also solicited the membership of the Behavioral Pharmacology Society. However, in picking up members in APA - remember in APA you can be a member of Division 3 and also be in 12, the clinical division, and there were quite a few members like that. That's why Murray could say in his letter to APA's Council that we had members of all divisions - even if originally only the experimental divisions were solicited.

Wood: We were surprised - you know two years ago Bob Balster looked at who's in the division and there is a significant clinical representation.

Laties: The fact that the division has changed its name to the Division of Psychopharmacology and Substance Abuse certainly reflects that.

Wood: Well, there were several reasons which are very similar to the ones you just alluded to -

Laties: You don't want a "Division of Clinical Psychopharmacology" to form and cut the field in half.

Wood: Well, that was our feeling - there's a lot of emphasis now on technology transfer. Was there a focus on this concept early on? There must have been. A lot of the drug house employees were developing new drugs...

Laties: Some, perhaps most of the employees of drug houses really thought of themselves as research psychologists and tried to pursue a research career and not bend much to the immediate needs of their employers. This probably hurt their careers because most drug houses were acutely aware of whether they were coming up with something that they could sell. Anyway, let's go on past the very beginning. I've exhausted my letters from 1966.

Wood: Who is responsible for suggesting such an inflammatory name for a newsletter as "The Needle"? I don't think we could use that today.

Laties: I think it was Harley, who was the first newsletter editor.

Wood: Look at that! It's a large vertical hypodermic needle - it must be 9 inches long. Down the left hand margin - "Division 28 Newsletter, APA Division of Behavioral Pharmacology. Volume 1, Number 1." I'm going to have to add this to my collection.

Laties: The first one is dated January 1967 and the editor is Harley Hanson of Merck Institute.

Wood: This is Harley's sketch?

Laties: I don't know who he got to do it. The second issue is labelled Summer 1967. It contained the program for the September APA meeting. 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.

Incidentally the road to such an impressive program was a bit rocky. Carl Scheckel, the Secretary, wrote all members of the executive committee on February 20th a frantic letter:

"Subject: PANIC. Our new division had hoped to make a notable presentation at the next APA convention - the deadline for papers and organized symposia to be given at this meeting is March 1st, 1967, to date, Conan Kornetsky and Larry Stein have made good progress toward organizing symposia on drug addiction and brain amines but other projects are failing. Peter has discovered that people really don't care about RNA and this topic may have to be abandoned at this later date. Also, the fact that I have not even received a single submitted paper (election returns have been rather good though). The result, APA gave us 11 hours, but we can only use about 5 hours - this is embarrassing and disappointing. If any of you have any suggestions, please call me.)

4rs/ Then there was another paragraph about some other possibilities. I wrote a note on his letter saying that as of February 27 Division 25 had received only seven papers. So it didn't sound to me like we were in such bad shape.

On January 4th, Carl had written to all members of the Executive Committee about the convention program, by-laws, nominations, et cetera. Interestingly, we had decided that there was to be no presidential address. This was going to be a working presidency here, not an honorary post, and the model I think was Division 25, which had broken with tradition and made its presidency a working job. Division 25's president served a three year term, which was supposed to produce more continuity.

Another important point that Carl reported on in his January 4th letter was nominations for president-elect. Murray Jarvik had been provisional president in the application sent to APA and he then became President when we were made a division, and served for two years, for the years 1967 and 1968. So we now had to elect someone who would come on board as president-elect for the year 1968, which would be Murray Jarvik's second year in office, and then president for the year 1969. Carl says in his letter that nominated for president-elect, are Joe Brady, George Heise, Vic Laties, and Conan Kornetsky, these names to be sent to the membership to be ranked, with the top two then to appear on the APA ballot as our candidates for president-elect. When I asked to stand for that I considered not doing it because I was the president of Behavioral Pharmacology Society for 1966 and 1967 and I didn't want to continue spending that much time on organizational stuff. But I figured that Joe Brady would win because he was obviously the

really senior person of the group, with quite a large reputation, much larger than Conan's or George's or mine, and so there would be no problem. However, I was surprised to find myself on the final ballot, running against George Heise, I think. Joe Brady had himself refused to run. And so that's how I became the first elected president of the division.

Wood: And then Joe Brady didn't become president as I recall until 1979-1980.

Laties: Was that when he was president?

Wood: In 1979-80; that was when I started to become active. That was when the Neurotoxicity Test Standards Committee was formed. Joe resigned from the American Psychological Association immediately after that his Division 28 presidential address that year.

Laties: I remember I was already president of Division 25 when Joe resigned. So anyway a letter on August 7th informed me that I had been elected.

Wood: Let's pursue that a little bit.

Laties: What?

Wood: You were president of ~~the~~ Division 25.

Laties: Right, I was at the time that Joe Brady resigned from APA. He was highly annoyed at the great influence that the clinical people had. He resigned in a huff really and was very unhappy.

Wood: That was over those issues, not really over the mentalism. The mentalism was a cover for other...

Laties: Oh, I don't think so, he told a joke about the mentalism, but he was unhappy with the APA being as clinical, as cognitive and so on as it was. But, I don't know, you'll have to ask Joe about why did ^{he} resign~~ed~~.

Remember that APA during the 80s was rent with strife because the experimental areas were not growing rapidly whereas the clinical and applied and especially the practice areas were growing rapidly. Whereas at one time the presidency of APA was a something of a capstone recognition of a career in science, gradually the presidency had become much more political, people would be campaigning for it, obviously people who ~~were~~ had not made much contribution to the science of psychology. The experimentalists wanted desperately to reorganize APA into some sort of federation where they would be more in control of their own meeting and where the council would not be devoting most of its time to professional matters. That's another story. One by-product was that even Division 28 eventually wound up losing most of its council seats until today it has only one member, as does Division 25. Right now though there has been somewhat of a de facto reorganization of APA - there are different interest groups that do tend to keep their business separate.

Wood: I interrupted you - you were going to look at a letter.

Laties: This was the letter informing me that I was elected president-elect - this is from Carl Scheckel and, interestingly, the second paragraph says:

"What do you think about the division taking over Psychopharmacologia?"

That was what is now Psychopharmacology. We are just going through this again now - APA actually finally founding a journal devoted to the area of psychopharmacology.

Miczak
Wood: Klaus ^{Miczak} has just assumed an editorship of Psychopharmacology (Berlin).

Laties: OK. I'm a member of a committee that Bruce Overmier chairs. It is writing an editorial coverage statement and he asked about who would be a good editor about 2 weeks ago.

Wood: This is clearly an object under intense discussion right now. If I were to bet today on a title I'd say that an appropriate one would be "Journal of Psychopharmacology and Substance Abuse." This has been emerging as a hot topic of discussion over the E-mail wires of the executive board list for the past few weeks.

Laties: I suggested "Behavioral Psychopharmacology." It has good parallelism to another

APA journal, "Behavioral Neuroscience."

Wood: We're right back to the old - let's just call it the Journal of Behavioral Pharmacology, of course, we have too many of those already.

Laties: Unfortunately, we already have one with that title - OK - we're getting off the topic here. OK - but anyway Murray Jarvik thought that ^{it} may be a good idea to take over Psychopharmacologia.

Wood: That must have been voted down.

Laties: I answered that I figured that it would be an interesting idea to look at Psychopharmacologia as a possible acquisition but I would be in favor of it only if it were in trouble. So long as the present publisher does a good job I can't see why we should interfere. In some ways it is much better to have journals published by independent organizations. However, let's talk about other things.

Wood: That was in 1967.

Laties: I answered Carl's [August 7] letter informing me that I had been elected:

"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."

Let's continue to go through the 1967 letters. This is another from me to Conan saying:

"One thing that should be on Division 28 agenda is a report about the reorganization of APA - how does that plan now stand? I can't think of anything else that is not obvious".

So APA was reorganizing even in 1967. Once we were in the club, once we were in APA as a division, we now had the interesting prospect of having to talk about whether other people should form divisions, and there's a letter in June of '67 from Murray Jarvik about the formation of two new divisions - saying that he had been requested to solicit opinions of the membership about new divisions, the Division of Psychotherapy, and the

Division of Professional and Public Affairs, and we had to give opinions. He writes:

"As you may know both of these divisions have strong clinical interests and I'd like to find out whether their formation is desirable."

I then wrote him a note saying:

"I've checked with a few friends here about their reactions to the formation of the two new divisions and was met with bemused indifference. A clinician I talked to saw no reason for opposing the formation of the new division of psychotherapy and I can't either. He himself felt he would rather see less splintering but did not feel that he should impose his will upon those who would like to form a new division. I feel the same way - I suspect as members of one of the newer divisions we are in a rather poor position to speak out against the formation of other interest groups. The second new division, I take it, will be the one that will eventually reflect the interests now be represented through the state organizations. As such, I think it a great idea and hope that it leads to a speedy reduction of the influence of the state organizations."

Of course, that didn't happen. Ron, you would be interested in the next sentence:

"May I have a copy of the paper you presented at New York Academy of Sciences on the cigarette-smoking monkeys, if it is relatively available?"

This was written in June 1967, your first summer here.

Wood: Well, we just trained animals to puff - it was about an hour and a half exercise - a world record. Puffing away!

Laties: I also have a copy of a letter that Harley Hanson sent out - it was addressed to Murray and says:

"With reference to formation of the two new Divisions, I think that we should vote "yes" in spite of my own reluctance to encourage the clinical types. The main reason for this is the rather surprising acceptance Division 28 received, at least at the Council level. I will probably abstain from voting at the Council meeting on this particular issue. I haven't contacted anyone else about this problem."

That's an interesting letter because I don't think it was that issue but at this point Harley resigned from the council of representatives, apparently feeling strongly about something and feeling that he didn't represent the Division's viewpoint. No, I'm not sure of that. Maybe he resigned a year later. I remember that I was the one who accepted his

resignation, but I can't remember the issues now --

Wood: There was not correspondence about that --

Laties: There's correspondence later but it doesn't refer to what the actual issue was. It sort of dances around it - you'd have to ask John Boren maybe, or Harley, who's now retired. Anyway, what else is here? Corporate affiliate money. That was an interesting question that came up. We included in the by-laws the category of corporate affiliates. At that time, I don't think any other division had corporate affiliate members. We were following the pharmacology society example. The American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics has always had corporate affiliates who, of course, paid much higher membership dues, hundreds of dollars rather than tens. They were very handy to have and so we decided that we should have some. I think Murray must have pushed for it but many of us were members and it was adopted without much discussion and put into the by-laws.

Laties: Let me react to this list of names that Herb Barry compiled of folk who may have been important in the early history of the division. Bob Edwards: was a psychologist out at California State University in Fullerton - died early - I don't think he was particularly active in the division. Howard Hunt: I don't recall him being active at all. Roger Kelleher: wasn't active in division 28 as I recall and he may - I forget now when he dropped out of APA - probably after that - maybe in 1970. Maybe 1975 - he bonded very strongly with the pharmacology - he and Bill Morse were in the Department of Pharmacology first and then in the Laboratory of Psychobiology at Harvard and Peter Dews leaned much more toward pharmacology meeting. Francis Mechner: Francis was a Columbia Ph.D. of Fred Keller and Nat Schoenfeld who went to work at Schering and worked there for perhaps 4 or 5 years and then started a programmed learning company called Basic Systems and not many years later sold it to the Xerox Corporation for \$5.2 million dollars. I don't know if he had the lion's share of that but he disappeared from psychology except for that aspect of it, certainly disappeared from psychopharmacology, and just reappeared in the last 2 or 3 years, coming to meetings of ABA [Association for Behavior Analysis] and has been writing some theoretical stuff on what he calls revealed operants and likes to deal with the fixed consecutive number schedule and such. He thinks there are great advantages to using it as the operant in studying complex behavior -- a very bright fellow. It was a real loss in a

sense - a loss to science that he went into commerce - the Wall Street Journal once had a rather snotty article about how he could raise money but never quite make the products. Very nice fellow, but he had nothing to do with Division 28 so far as I know.

Wood: Of course, he had some impact on you.

Laties: Oh, of course, he devised schedules that I've worked on a lot - the fixed consecutive number schedule. I guess that I have been somewhat instrumental in keeping his name before the scientific public. Nancy Mello: a bright psychologist who used to be at NIMH - she and her husband, Jack Mendelsohn, went together to McLean Hospital just outside of Boston, Belmont, Mass. Did nice work on alcohol - they orient toward ACNP and tend not to come to APA but very bright people, do good work.

Wood: They spoke at APA in Boston this August.

5/ 9
3
A
of manuscript
Laties: Nothing much to do with Division 28 really. Nancy served as Council Representative for a time but missed several meetings because, I think, she had conflicts with ACNP meetings. Neal Miller: also had nothing to do with Division 28, directly. I don't think he ever was on the executive board or anything like that. He was active in psychopharmacology for years - he was a very, very bright person certainly and also in later life got to be very interested in combatting the animal rights people and putting the case for animal research - he was a skilled speaker and a skilled writer. Bill Morse: the same as Roger Kelleher - Bill has been one of my closest friends in science. He is one of the best reviewers in the history of our group. A very strong psychologist. Very to the point and very, very skilled - has been on the editorial board of the Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics I think since - maybe continuously since 1960 - I'll bet he's been serving for 30 years. He's also one of the greatest contributors to JEAB - has never been editor of it but he could have if he had wanted to. He has been on the editorial board almost continuously and he's just been asked by Marc Branch, the new editor of JEAB, to be the field editor for Behavioral Pharmacology. He's been president of the Society of Experimental Analysis of Behavior at least once. Very conscientious person. Carl Scheckel: was very important in the history of this organization and he died in 1971. Big fellow. Psychologist at Hofmann-La Roche. B.F. Skinner: No direct involvement in

Division 28's organization or life - lots of indirect involvement - provided capital off of which many of us having been living for years. He was at the planning conference for NIMH Psychopharmacology Service Center, though. He did in fact do a few seminal drug studies. At that conference he presented a strong paper, strongly in favor of doing basic research on mechanisms of drug action and behavioral methods and so in that sense he was in the field certainly. Earl Usdin: was the executive secretary of the NIMH Preclinical Psychopharmacology Research Review Committee for many years. Then I guess then he was somewhat higher than that at NIMH - but always involved in extramural research - a very bright biochemist who tried to be as proactive as possible in pushing for what he thought was important. He died a couple of years ago. Tom Verhave: a delightful Dutchman. The first person of the group of psychologists from Columbia that went into the drug houses. He was hired by Lilly and was there maybe five years and then went off to the west coast and worked for NASA or someone like that near San Francisco and then went back to Queens in New York City. But he had nothing to do with the organization of the division. CINP: is the Collegium Internationale Neuropsychopharmacologicum. I was a little bit involved with that organization, going to I think two meetings and gave a paper at the Washington meeting. ACNP: I don't believe I ever went to one of their meetings. Presidents listed on separate sheet (Jarvik, Latics, Boren, Stein, Weiss, Carlton, etc.): a fine group of people.

Wood: Victor, what is this claim you make that you were not legally elected president?

Latics: I have a letter in there somewhere congratulating me on being made a Fellow of Division 28 and the letter is dated [September 17, 1968] after I had already become president [a few weeks earlier, after the APA meeting] and so I couldn't have been a legal president. It says in the by-laws that you have to be a Fellow, is that still in there?

Wood: You do have to be a Fellow.

Latics: So I certainly wasn't a Fellow when I was elected to be president-elect in 1967. So maybe they looked at it and said we've got to make him a fellow quick - I don't recall whether I was a Fellow in APA through Division 25 at the time. I don't think so. [Note: I was also nominated for Fellow of Division 25 in 1967.]

Wood: So you think that someone should ask John Boren about Harley's resignation?

Laties: Ask Harley. Harley will reply. We could call him up right now and ask him.

Wood: I think you've done a good job. You're a good candidate for an oral history project that's not constrained to your interaction with the Division of Psychopharmacology. A lot of reminiscence has been inhibited here because of the scope.

Laties: I suppose.

Wood: There are many things to mind here in this career. It's interaction with the Hopkins group, you spent several years there. There are lots of interactions and reminiscences that ought to be pursued.

Laties: I am surprised at how many places many of these people have interacted with these different organizations. I think I was the only one who was at that 1956 conference starting the effort in psychopharmacology at NIMH. That was an accident because I was working with Lou Lasagna at Hopkins and he got an invitation to give a talk there. He asked me to help him write the paper he promised and so I came along with him to the Conference. I was just two years out of graduate school at the time. It was an introduction to the power structure of the field, the aging power structure. The people at that conference were usually chosen for their eminence and with very few exceptions quickly disappeared. They had done something in science close to psychopharmacology and many of them were not heard from again.

Wood: How about a reflection on the Board of Scientific Affairs and the oral history project? You were present at some meeting when the centennial was discussed, what should we do at the centennial of the American Psychological Association.

Laties: For that you have good records, agenda books, etc.

Wood: There was a suggestion that an oral history project should be undertaken at a BSA meeting?

Laties: Oh yes. I couldn't swear that I was the first to suggest it but I know that I championed it. I had gotten to be keenly aware of histories and I suspect that one of these things was doomed to happen.

Wood: The 1992 APA meetings will be great.

Laties: One just full of history. I've written 2 or 3 papers now on history. Comes with aging.

#####