

SR 262, 12-30 → 13-50

Phone
Book

DAN BERLYNE

M: This is part of the Oral History of Psychology in Canada. I am talking to Dan Berlyne in his office in Sydney Smith Hall on Saturday October 14th 1971.

And let's start at the beginning. Where were you born?

B: Well, I was born in Fulford, which is a suburb of Manchester in England in 1924.

M: And into what kind of a family? What did your father do?

B: Well, my father had built up a business, a glass business, I think he did. I better explain what that means. He didn't manufacture glass - that of course is a thing that requires enormous capital and a big operation - he had a business in which they made mirrors. And mirrors were commoner in the days when people used them to decorate walls. He did glaziers work. He made lead light windows or stained glass windows in the days, again, when these were quite common in middle class houses. He sold bathroom fittings and things of that nature.

In order to give the family background, I suppose I should go back a generation and explain that my grandparents all came to England from parts of the Russian Empire. They were refugees from the various kinds of persecution the Jews suffered in the Russian Empire in those days. My paternal grandparents came from White Russia and my maternal

BERLYNE:

2.

grandparents from Latvia. But my mother and father were both born in England. My father's father died when my father - who was the oldest in the family, the oldest child - was nine years old so that his mother was left destitute and he himself lived for a time in an orphanage. He didn't go beyond elementary school in his education except for some evening classes in an art college. . .

M: Oh. This happened in Russia or was this after?

B: Oh no, this was in England, yes. . .

M: I see.

B: . . . he was born in England. So his family must have had to struggle to make ends meet and he had to struggle to build up this business. I imagine that he must have been born in some part of London that was classified as a slum. My mother also, I understand, was born in one of the slums of Manchester. Her father was in the jewellers and watchmakers business, but they must have been quite poor. So my parents had both known poverty but by the time I was born, they had got out of it. They were comfortable. I suppose they worked their way up from a, what you might call a lower-middle class standard of living to a middle-middle class standard of living during my childhood.

M: Do you recall what you thought of your family's social status at the earliest time you thought about such things? How did you view your home as compared to other peoples'?

B: Well, it was rather a peculiar situation in that

the house I was born in and the house that I lived in for ten years was in a working class area. My parents went there when they were married and I imagine that they while my father's business was ^{growing} running, he couldn't afford much more than that. After ten years they moved to a rather fancier neighbourhood. But most of the people around us, all our neighbours, were working class and our family was somewhat wealthier than they were. I remember that ours was the only family on the street that had a car, a telephone at one time, and even we were the first family on the street that converted from gas to the electric light. Electric light had of course been invented a long time before but it was not yet common - I'm talking about the 1920's. So I had a feeling of isolation, of being peculiar. We got on quite well with the neighbours. If I remember rightly, I used to play with the children. But I was conscious of certainly being different, being more privileged in some ways, being viewed with some latent hostility as I think the neighbours must have been somewhat jealous. There was also the religious difference that played a part. So my answer to your question is that my view of the family social status was probably confined to a status in the street. But I had the impression of belonging to a family that was different from the people round about, not necessarily.

M: Was this primarily because of economic status or primarily because of Jewish extraction?

B: I think both, both together.

BERLYNE:

4.

M: Well now, brothers and sisters?

B: Well, I have a, one sister five years younger and one brother ten years younger. My sister is a Psychologist.

M: Oh.

B: She, well, imitating my career to a certain extent, she went to Cambridge and specialized first in Modern Languages and then went over to Psychology. She didn't do too well in the final exam - well, she did, I suppose, adequately; she got what was called a ^{II} 2.2, a second division of the second class - not because of a lack of ability but because she was taken up by the gay social world of Cambridge (that the girls, being in a small minority, were pretty often tempted towards). She was, for example, very prominent in the amateur acting circles ^{in the amateur}. Anyhow, she took a degree and then she went to the Maudsley and did the clinical psychology diploma. And, well, she is now the mother of a family but off and on she has done some clinical psychology; still does.

M: Well, let's go back now to the . . . to your earliest recollections of your home. Inside the home, when you were very young (up until five) you had no brothers and sisters.

B: Yes.

M: And what kind of a home would you say it was, particularly in regard to attitude toward education, reading, music, religion, that kind of thing? What are your earliest recollections of that?

B: The family was, actually, a rather un-intellectual home. By that, I don't mean it was anti-intellectual, but my parents for example had had somewhat limited educations although I think they were quite intelligent people. My father had had to leave school at the age of 14, I imagine, had had to work hard in the school of hard-knocks or whatever you call it. . . .

M: Yes.

B: My mother had been a school teacher, an elementary school teacher. . . .

M: Oh, yes.

B: . . . but in those days, that didn't mean too much education. She had actually gone to the secondary school in the days when a minority of people did. But. . . .

M: But in a home like that, often, parents strongly express to young children their desire to see that 'my children are going to have a better chance for an education than I ever got.'

B: Well, we didn't have quite that attitude. You see, in other words, in our family, we didn't have the common attitude - it is quite common in Jewish families but common in other families too - of education as a means to social climbing. . . .

M: Yes.

B: They were anxious for me to do well at school, certainly, but they, well, they didn't want me or expect me to rise in the social scale. My father, from an early age,

wanted me to go into the family business. There was never any idea that I would go into any profession or any intellectual kind of occupation. The tastes of my parents were decidedly 'low-brow.' I don't know if you have this expression over here, but in those days, people used to divide themselves into 'high-brows and low-brows' . . .

M: Yes. Yes.

B: . . . for example, later on, in adolescence, when I became interested in serious music, they didn't like serious music. They would like popular music and musical comedies and things like that and there was some problem about who would have the radio on to which station, you see. They. . . they didn't discourage me, I mean. For example, when I took an interest in symphony concerts, my mother ^{encouraged} would carry me to the extent of paying the admission fee and I would go weekly to the Hall Orchestra in Manchester. So they were not, when I said anti-intellectual before, that might give a false idea that they were. . . They were indifferent to intellectual pursuits as such, not particularly interested in them themselves. Certainly, they were interested in education but they didn't have any plans for me or my brother and sister - at that stage certainly - that would involve using the educational system to rise in the social scale.

M: Did they give you the impression. . . do you have any early recollections of their value system? I have talked to quite a number of people, especially Jewish people, who

BERLYNE:

7.

explained to me that in their families, the highest value was attached to the rabbi-teacher and that the next highest value was attached to the doctor. And then after that, I was surprised at this, lawyers, businessmen; they were at the next level and their chief function was to earn money to enable the community to be able to support the rabbis, teachers and doctors.

B: Oh yes. That is very true, generally very true. It was not true of my family! My family never showed any sign of wanting me to be a doctor or a lawyer.

M: But did they show a high respect for. . . ?

B: Oh, I'd say, moderate respect, nothing in particular. . .

M: Yes. Well then, was it an orthodox Jewish faith you were brought up in, or a. . . ?

B: No. No. It wasn't. It was - how shall I put it? - a sort of. . . They had a moderate degree of observance. They would, for example, go to the Synagogue on the important festivals of the year. They would keep the dietary laws, not with complete strictness but to a large extent. But my father, for example, would go to his business on Saturday morning - which, of course, an orthodox Jew is not supposed to do. . .

M: Yes.

B: And they wouldn't have any compunction about riding in the car or going to the cinema or anything like that on the Saturday, so they were in between. But they were. . .

BERLYNE:

8.

They regarded this as a normal, rational reaction. In other words, they would look with horror - or, if not with horror, with disapproval - on anybody who was notably more religious or less religious than themselves.

M: Yes.

B: You see, for example, you asked a few moments ago about the attitude to the rabbi's profession. . .

M: Yes.

B: My parents certainly didn't want me to be a rabbi, not that I ever had any ambition that way, but they made it clear that they wouldn't like it. Because, for one thing, this would. . . to be a rabbi, I would have to be very religious and orthodox and this would make me peculiar.

* - They had this horror, if you like, of being peculiar, which meant deviating from their idea of what normal rational people do, you see.

M: Yes. Yes. That's very interesting. Now, I gather in general terms then, it wasn't a home in which there was a great deal. . . when you were very young, I'm talking still back. . .

B: Yes. Yes.

M: . . . at the early pre-school if you can remember that. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . it wasn't a home in which there was a great deal to read? A lot of magazines, books, papers, that kind of thing?

B: Well, there were books to read. I'm trying to think. . . I mean, I did a lot of reading. I was encouraged to read, although my mother was alarmed because I would prefer to read rather than go out and play in the street with other children. She didn't mind my reading. But there were books in the house. There were things like, oh, I remember, the complete works of Scott that my father must have picked up cheap somewhere and I doubt if. . . he may have read some in his early days. Maybe I should explain that he had, although he didn't have time to practice it, he had maybe something of a greater respect for intellectual pursuits than my mother. He was definitely a low-brow and disapproved of high-brow music and that kind of thing, but he had read in his youth, I think, and he was certainly not against reading.

M: And there were books, eh, newspapers and magazines?

B: There were certainly newspapers. There were magazines - not very intellectual magazines. There were books. I of course used the libraries. There was never any great shortage of reading material.

M: Were you able to read before you went to school?

B: I learned my alphabet early so that my mother even won a prize for this. What happened was that there was some sort of competition in the newspaper in which you had to write in precocious things that your children did. And she sent, she wrote in some things that I did. And, well, I won the prize, actually. I remember, it consisted of a book

BERLYNE:

11.

of cut-outs. But she mentioned things like, for example, that I could. . . I knew the alphabet. I may have been two or three. I can't remember certainly, quite early. I could tell, I could recognize the records we had in the record collection at home, without being able to read. I mean, I was surprised that this was a feat because I could recognize them by the colour of the royalty labels, the stamps they had on them. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . and a few things like that. I remember I was quite good, I understand, at recognizing makes of cars. A few things like that, so I showed that kind of precocity. . .

M: Yes.

B: I suppose.

M: Yes.

B: Yes, I think I certainly knew the alphabet. If I remember rightly, I could read also before going to school, although of course, you've got to remember that in England, serious schooling began - I think it still does - at the age of five. . . that's when you eventually go in. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . to learn your reading and writing.

M: What about, what about play? As early as you can remember, your play interests?

B: Well, I used to play with the neighbour's children, but I didn't like it very much. I didn't like, well, athletic pursuits, such as they had them, running about and

chasing one another and kicking balls and so on. I did a certain amount of it. I didn't like it, for one reason, was because I wasn't very good at it, from the very beginning, X I found that I had a very low sensory motor co-ordination and still do. I must be in the lowest percentile for sensory motor co-ordination. When I later on went to school I was always getting into trouble for my bad handwriting, things of that nature. So when it came to kicking balls, catching balls, I was always butterfingers. I just couldn't do it and I wasn't particularly interested in it.

M: Were you small for your age, do you recall?

B: Well, I think. . .

M: later?

Certainly,

B: I was thin. My mother was afraid, because I was thin and pale. I mean, I sometimes said that my average weight over my lifetime would be just about right, but. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . but this was it. Another thing was that for some peculiar reason, I refused to eat meat. In fact, I didn't eat any meat until about the age of 17. I ate fish and a few things like that, but I must have had a. . . you know, it must have been very awkward for my mother to find. . .

M: Well, this didn't stem from a family taboo attitude towards certain meats?

B: Oh no, no. The rest of the family ate meat. . .

M: Yes.

BERLYNE:

13.

B: . . . and everything. I don't know why. . .

M: Did it have anything to do with killing animals?

B: No, no, I don't think so. It may have had something to do with being offered meat too early as a baby, when I wasn't ready for it and didn't like it. But I took a dislike to it. In fact, I was very faddy with regard to food. I still am, I suppose, except that much less than then. There were lots of things I wouldn't eat. And so my mother found this inconvenient. But I imagine I must also have had a low-protein diet. My mother did her best, but she had no idea of balancing diet. She would give me extra vegetables instead of meat, but not those things to substitute for meat.

M: Yes. Yes. Was she a. . . you know the caricature of a Jewish mother: always so concerned about feeding her children, that they eat well and so on - was she. . ?

B: Well, to a certain extent but not so much. You see, my family was in many ways not a typical Jewish family. I think, more anglicized than most of their generation. I think maybe because the influence of the grandparents was less. You see, my paternal grandfather had died long ago. And the other grandparents died relatively early; I knew them all, but when I was a child. So that. . .

M: Another factor seems to have been that you didn't, apparently, live in a heavily Jewish community.

B: Yes, well, we lived in an area in which there were Jewish families about, but not in the actual street, you see.

BERLYNE:

14.

M: That's what I mean.

B: Many people would live - and this would certainly be true in North America too. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . in streets were all the people weren't Jewish.

M: Yes.

B: Yes.

M: And that would dilute your sense of. . .

B: Yes. I imagine it would.

M: Yes. Okay, let's go to school. What are your earliest recollections of school life?

B: Oh, I can remember very vividly going to elementary school, being taught letters. I was rather surprised because told that this said 'a' and this said 'b' and I had been taught that they were 'a' (aye) and 'b', (bee). and then being a bit confused by that. But anyhow, I sorted that out. I went to one school for about a term and then my mother got me into a neighbouring school that had a higher reputation. And I stayed there and I think it was a good school - Grecian Street School it was called. And I think that this was, looking back on it, a good elementary school. And. . .

M: Is this what we would call a Public School, what they call. . .

B: Yes, it was, certainly. . .

M: Yes.

B: Yes it was what here would be called a public school that they called a state school.

BERLYNE:

15.

M: It wasn't, in our sense, a "private" school?

B: Oh no. No.

M: But by this time, your father had been reasonably successful in the business, so. . .

B: Yes. Yes, but the idea. . . well, he wasn't of the class that would send children to private schools. This was a thing for real social climbers. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . upper-middle ^{class} ~~(garbled)~~

* M: Yes. And I can kind of get the impression that your parents were not, either for themselves or for you, socially ambitious.

B: Not socially ambitious, no.

M: In terms of social status, I mean.

B: Well, in the sense of preserving social status, they may have been. For example, they had, I think, some sort of identity-group of Joneses that they wanted to keep up with, or at least not fall short of. I mean, they were. . . they had their friends and acquaintances and relatives and they didn't want at any time to do anything that would make them look silly in their eyes.

M: Yes.

B: But they didn't have any idea of improving social status.

M: No.

B: They regarded their own social status as good enough - or maybe it was a matter of as good as they could

expect maybe. . .

M: Yes.

B: Maybe that was it.

M: Yes. Do you remember any particular teachers?

B: Oh yes. I can remember them all very well. The one that had the most influence on me in the elementary school was a Miss Williams. As a matter of fact, I skipped a grade - and this was a strange thing maybe I should mention that my mother came to school for some reason or other when I was in then what was called Standard 2. . . I don't know, I must have been about eight at the time. . . and she happened to overhear that somebody else's little boy had been moved to a higher class. So she asked if this could be done for me, and they said that it could. And so I went from Standard 2 to Standard 3 in the middle of the year - which of course put my whole education a year ahead, which is quite important. It also, of course, made me younger than most of the other people in the class. But this Miss Williams I had in Standard 2 and Standard 4, she was a Welsh woman, a diminutive woman - she must have been under five feet - very formidable person. And she would coach people for the next stage, which was a scholarship at the Manchester Grammar School. The Manchester Grammar School, as you may know, is a very highly regarded secondary school in England, one of the most highly regarded ones, the one that had the greatest success at getting Oxford and Cambridge scholarships other than Eaton, although it is not a boarding school. It is

technically a public school. It's headmaster attends the Headmasters' Conference, but it is not an example of a typical public school. So she coached me and one or two others for these scholarships, which we were successful in. And I think she was probably a very important influence.

M: This would be at what level, 8? 10? age. . .

B: Well, most people would take the scholarship at 11, but of course, I was a year ahead so I took it at 10.

M: Yes.

B: But, my parents for example - we were talking about their attitude toward education - they were certainly very keen on my getting a scholarship. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and were glad when I got it.

M: This allowed you into, not in a social sense but in an educational sense, a selective school, where they selected you?

B: Oh, this was highly selective. In fact, since then it has become even more select. But this is a school, it then had 1,400 boys in it, which is a very large school for Great Britain - where the average secondary school in Great Britain would have been ^{below} four and eight hundred.

M: And all boys? No girls?

B: Oh yes, certainly. All boys. And it would cream off the top of an area of, say, 20 miles radius around Manchester, which is a very densely populated area.

M: Yes.

B: So. . . and, of course, if you got a scholarship, they were paying the fees. Not everybody there had this privilege. Everybody had to pass an entrance examination, which wasn't all that easy to pass, even to pay a fee. So that the school as a whole would represent an elite of this large area. The scholarship boys, I suppose, would be something like an elite of the elite. And it was streamed, you see, so to be in the A-stream was something. And, yes, so that this was a sense of, well, a sense of elitism to use a cogent word. . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . that one received, yes.

M: Well, before that, before you took that exam and got into that school, have you any recollection of preferences?

B: For. . .

M: Some subjects over other subjects.

B: Oh. Well, I certainly didn't have any career plans.

I assumed that I would go into my father's business. This is what he had wanted and there had been no question of anything else. It certainly never occurred to me that I would ever go to university. I assumed, as my parents did I think, that you would go to university if you wanted to be a doctor or a lawyer or something like that. And those weren't the plans that were made for me. As far as subjects are concerned, well, in elementary school I liked everything. When I got to the Manchester Grammar School, I happened to be in a section of the school specializing in Modern Languages. And I took the modern languages which were French, and later on, German, very well. I liked those.

And seemed to manage very well at them. So, yes, they became my favourite subjects. I was never quite so good at Mathematics. This is a thing that has always been a pity - because of carelessness, you see, mathematics at that stage meant arithmetic. And to do arithmetic correctly and get a good mark meant not so much grasping the principles as avoiding careless errors. And I was generally careless which, because of my sensory motor co-ordination problem, perhaps I was careless physically and mentally. ?
I would make a lot of slips so that I didn't get such a good mark for mathematics. Another thing that I remember put me off a part of mathematics was, well, the fact that you have to engage in what we call productive thinking.
For example, if you are trying to prove a theorem in geometry, you have to wait for an idea to come and there is no decision procedure, as they say, there is no rule to apply. And I can manage this, I could manage it all right, proving theor ums and so on. But I was never happy with intuition that. I didn't like the idea of just having to sit there until the right idea came to you, you see. And which, of course, now I recognize is an important part of all productive thinking, and. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . you have got to face that as part and parcel of life. But I remember. . .

M: You were impatient.

E: . . . I didn't like that particularly. I was impatient. I liked something in which there were rules X

ARI

that you applied, which was the case, for example, in learning the grammar of modern languages. . . the case in certain kinds of mathematics, but not in that kind.

M: Was there any art or music at the school now?

B: Oh yes. There wasn't much music except singing, but one thing I was famous for in the school was my poor ~~poor~~ art. I just. . . now this may have been partly the way that art was taught there, you see. There would be a lot of drawing from models, which I believe some art experts are against now, but earlier than that, art consisted, I remember, of drawing outlines and colouring inside. And they used to judge your artist merits by whether you could keep the shading inside the outline.

M: (laughter)

B: And I couldn't! I was physically incapable of doing it, or I was incapable of drawing a straight line or a circle freehand. This was a thing that I got in trouble at school about quite a lot. You see, teachers in those days - and I don't think they have improved very much in this respect - didn't understand sensory motor co-ordination. They didn't understand that with the best will in the world some people aren't capable of writing neatly or keeping the shading in the circle. They thought this was carelessness, which was a moral defect; you would find that you were morally lacking and, of course, as this happened you would find that you did become morally lacking. You hated the thing so much that you drew attention from it, you got over it as quickly

as possible. So although my teachers viewed me favourably because of my performance in other subjects, they would get impatient with my writing and drawing and things of that nature so that I would have sometimes a very strange ambivalent relationship with them.

M: Yes.

B: And even at the Grammar School, I remember one thing. . . when we got to the, what was called the School Certificate Examinations - it has been replaced by several other kinds since then, but this was the big examination that you'd take after four years of high school which you took then - it was hinted to me, and I didn't need the hint, it was obvious to me that I had better not take the art paper, that I had better do something else while the others were studying for this exam. I was pleased at that. I wasn't in any way put off by it.

M: (laughter)

B: So. . .

M: Miss Williams. She seems to have been important at an early stage of your recollection of things. What did she do? How did she coach you? Was she a termagant? Was she. . .

B: She was a bit of a. . .

M: . . . hard task-master?

B: She was, a little. She would impose, she showed strength of character. She was sometimes called the mighty atom. She would, she would not, well, I was going to say

she didn't give me any special separate tuition, but this is completely true. A few of us were, actually, given lessons in algebra during the lunch hour before we went to the Manchester Grammar School, although I doubt if this actually helped us very much. But at least she was trying. She would make it clear that she expected great things of those of us who were currently likely to win scholarships to the Grammar School. She held up this as an ideal. These, of course, are not the values of most of the class. This caused isolation from the rest of the class, even though this was an A-stream that we were in, a school stream.

M: Now, you're speaking of the grammar school?

B: No, I'm not speaking of the Grammar School; this was the elementary school.

M: Oh, I see.

B: Streaming went on in all ways.

M: Well now, I'm not too sure that I understand streaming to this extent. A lot of the people that I have talked to started their schooling in what we call an ungraded school - now they were one teacher or two teachers that had a whole series of grades and the teachers teach one grade while the others do their homework or study or what have you. Did you ever have that kind of experience in your early schooling.

B: Oh, only at the very beginning. You see, elementary school was divided into two parts. There was first of all,

BERLYNE:

23.

what they call "the infants" which went up to about the age of seven, and that, I think, was not streamed. But then you began what we called the "big boys" school, which was a higher elementary school. . .

M: Yes.

B: You began at the age of seven with standard 1 and then it went up through the standards. Those were streamed at this particular school and I think at most schools then.

M: Well, did that mean that in the same room at the same time you had children at different stages?

B: Oh no. In one room, you would have the children selected as belonging to a certain ability level.

M: Oh, I see, yes.

B: Oh yes.

M: So streaming, in the sense that they use it, means segregation of class.

B: Oh yes, isn't it called ^{tracking} packing or something like ability grouping. . .

M: Yes.

B: It's called by those names. Yes, this was it. And even then, this was done at the Manchester Grammar School where the whole population was highly selected to begin with.

M: Yes.

B: There was, once, I remember, in the Modern side, which I was on, the Modern Language side, there were six streams all the way from upper SA to lower three-D, and similar streams

streams on the Science side.

M: You seem to have known, all along, what stream you were in.

B: Well, I was in the A-stream throughout, yes.

M: Yes, but you seem to have known it at the time.

B: Oh, this was. . . there was no question of hiding it.

M: Did the people who were in the E-stream know where they were?

B: Oh, certainly they did, you see, and they didn't well, they didn't show that they felt in any way inferior. You see, their attitude would be that they didn't want to be with those ^{swaps}, they would call them in the A-stream, you see. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . or they looked down on them. I mean, inside they may have felt humiliated, I don't know. I remember, for example, one friend of mine was a member of our group who came from the same elementary school and got to go to some Manchester Grammar School, for reason, went down from the A-stream to the B-stream one year. . . probably just some slight lapse in his performance. And this had a profound effect on his. He didn't mix with our group so much anymore. I heard - and this isn't all that reliable - that later on he got into a little delinquency, stealing cars or something. He certainly seemed rather unsettled. And I can't say that this demotion was the cause of that. . .

M: No.

B: . . . but for somebody who was identified with
the A-stream to go down into the B-stream would
certainly be a blow. But nobody ~~saw~~^{had} to softening the blow
by hiding it or anything like that.

M: Yes.

B: It was part of life. Whereas people who always
had been in the B-stream or a lower stream adopted a
different set of values, you see.

M: Yes.

1(b)

B: Although the Manchester Grammar School was a
highly selective school, you mustn't think that all the
boys there had intellectual values. They didn't. The
vast majority was more interested in ^{frivolous} brawling, fighting
and that sort of thing.

M: Yes. Now, through the grammar school, were you. . .
was the A-stream identified by the staff as all in a
class together, separated from the other streams?

B: Oh yes. Yes.

M: And did you stay in your own class and have the
teachers come, or did you move?

B: No, we moved. In most schools in England, the
teacher moves, but we moved. . .

M: I see. Yes. What about. . . I'm afraid we are losing
track and it will take us back, but I am interested in the music

B: Yes.

M: Your musical

B: Yes.

M:

B: Oh. Well, there are two sides to it. One is that I was given piano lessons from the age of, I don't know, about 10 onwards. This was part of the . . . my mother, well, she actually could play the piano by ear. She could play popular songs and things of that nature. She wasn't interested in classical music. But she gave me piano lessons, she gave all of us piano lessons because it was the thing to do in her circle.

M: It was the culture pattern.

B: Yes. And I hated these piano lessons. I, well I had a teacher who - I suppose I blame too much on the teacher - but she wasn't the right sort of teacher for me. I was unmotivated. I was made to do practice, which I hated rather than something else I would like to do. I didn't do very well at it, in fact, I did very poorly. And I gave it up after a few years, and then later on, I took it up again by myself and actually, as an adult, I had a teacher, two or three teachers at various times - one in Scotland and two in the United States - and to this day I have kept this up. I have not achieved very much but enough to keep it up and to draw enjoyment from it. As regards other, my listeners' interest, that's rather interesting. The person who had the

greatest influence on me and probably to whom I owe a lot, is a cousin of mine now resident in Vancouver. Now, she came to live with us - her mother died - and she came to live with us for a period of a year or two when she was 15 and I was about 10. And she was very interested in popular music. She would sing and tap dance - tap dancing was in fashion then - and she would sing the songs that they had on the radio. And this put me off them. As a matter of fact, I was interested in popular music in those days too. In fact, I remember, the BBC had the Children's Hour at 5:15 p.m. on one station and Henry Hall's dance orchestra on the other. And there was often a conflict; I would have liked to hear both, you see. But, it was a ^{big} ~~country~~ very simple influence and it was likely this cousin. If ^{she} you can imagine, there were difficult relations at times with this cousin. I mean, she was like an older sister for a while, but an older sister who had come in all of a sudden. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and the fact that she liked this music would be a factor in making us dislike it.

M: Yes.

B: And then, in, I suppose the first form as we called it - the first level in the Manchester Grammar School - there was a teacher who was later on killed by a bomb during the ^{War} war, actually. But he, a Mr. Loeb, he encouraged music. He was a teacher of mathematics. He used to hold recorded concerts

during the lunch hour. And I went to one of those. I remember the first one happened to be one where they had Schubert's Unfinished Symphony. And this developed in me a liking for listening to music which I have had ever since. I think I mentioned before, I used to go to the Hallé concerts when they started again during the war, and so on.

M: Did you collect records?

B: No. No, I didn't, because I didn't. . . . the family had a gramaphone - as they called it - and a collection of records, but these were popular records. . . .

M: Yes.

B: I didn't have my own record player. A friend of mine did and I used to help him collect records and listen to his. We would rely on the radio, mostly, for music, you see. . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . so that I would listen to quite a lot on the radio, but since the family had only one radio, sometimes it would lead to problems as to who would. . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . have what to listen to.

M: All right. Let's go back to grammar school and at what point, if you can remember, at what point did you first encounter the word "psychology" to have it have any real meaning?

B: Oh, I can remember that very well. In fact, I can mention two incidents. One was, in elementary school, it may

have been this Miss Williams, it may not. . . she was mentioning one day that sometimes boys don't want to go to school in the morning and they tell their mothers that they have a tummy ache or something like that and very soon they actually have a tummy ache, they have convinced themselves that they have a tummy ache. And she said, 'What do they call people that study that kind of thing?' And we didn't know. And she said, 'They call them Psychologists.' So that was the first time I think I ever heard the word.

M: (Light laugh)

B: The second time was also influential. This was a lot later. At the Manchester Grammar School, we had a history teacher who was talking about Vienna, about the city of Vienna, and the various contributions that it had made to culture. And he pointed out that there were musicians and others who had been associated with Vienna. He said, 'There was one Science that was founded in Vienna. . . what was that?' And anyhow, it had transpired that ^{it} ~~is~~ was Psychology that he was referring to. . .

M: Yes. Yes.

B: . . . Freudian psychoanalysis. So, of course, this was one thing that encouraged the belief I shared with many people (who could still have it) that Psychology is psychoanalysis.

M: Yes. Yes. Well, now, at what point did you begin to shift from the expectation of your joining your father's business to doing something else?

B: Oh, now this would have been in the sixth form. Now, the sixth form is the term given to the last three years of the secondary school, at least, the last three for those who remain there for the whole time. And this is when you study for. . . well, then you study ^{for} the Higher School Certificate, it has now been changed to the ^{old} G.C.E., and the university scholarships. And by then, the numbers had dwindled, we had something like a half a dozen ~~for~~ certain in the sixth form so that we got a lot of individual attention. And we were the ones who were marked out as possible candidates for the university scholarships. And then there was another teacher who had a great influence on me, a Mr. Hyslop, who was, I want to say, a specialist at getting people ready for the Cambridge scholarship exams. He was a French teacher, and, well, he was a very great success at this; he had perfected the art. And part of the art, I suppose, was choosing the people who were likely to succeed.

M: Yes.

B: So he got the idea in our heads and in my head that we ought to try for a scholarship to Cambridge. Now, for the sort of family I came from, Cambridge was a things that was associated mostly with the annual boat races. A lot of people in England. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . literally, quite a lot of people really think that Oxford and Cambridge are boat teams, and they don't realize there is a university attached to them. . .

(A)

M: Yes.

B: . . . and my family. . . well, they knew there was a university, but the university was a thing like, well, it was a thing for the nobs, you see. They would think it was for the upper class people. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . to say you were going to, you had an ambition of going to Cambridge was a bit like saying, you wanted to be presented at court or something. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . rather unrealistic and treated as rather a ~~f~~ joke.

M: Yes.

B: But anyhow, this was. . . up until then, I had never thought that I would go to university at all, let alone go to Cambridge. But he seemed to think this was a possibility. Now, my father didn't like this. I think my mother liked this idea better; she began to see the social cache of going to Cambridge and that appealed to her perhaps. But my father didn't see any point. He still assumed I was going to join his business and he didn't see what Cambridge would add to that.

At the same time, I began to see - it developed gradually - that it would be better for me not to go into the business. I began to see that I wouldn't be much of an asset to the business, for one thing, and that wasn't the kind of life I would find very satisfying. And so it happened gradually.

There was a point when my father said, well, as a compromise, he would agree to my going to Manchester University - rather than Cambridge - and taking a Bachelor of Commerce Degree, which would be teaching me something I could use in the business.

M: Some business value, eh?

B: Yes. Well, I agreed to that, at least at the time, and then I, somehow or other, I remember writing away for the catalogue of Manchester University and thinking about this. And then it occurred to me that if I took this Bachelor of Commerce Degree and learned things like Economics and things like that, maybe I'd rather teach economics than return to business. And then gradually it occurred to me that if I was going to teach [^]economics, why should it be economics? I had no special interest in economics, had never done any, why shouldn't it be something else? So, gradually, myself began to think in terms of doing something other than business.

Now, I put this to my father and he was very resistant for a long time. I can see the way he looked at it. You see, he had struggled hard to build up the business he had and understood how hard it is, or how hard it can be at any rate, to earn a satisfactory living. . .

M: Yes.

B: Now, as a result of all this work, he had this machine operation which would grind out an adequate living and I could have this machine handed to me on a platter.

And I had turned it down; it was the height of insanity to him. . .

M: Yes.

B: If I went to the university - now this seemed very precarious; it was clear that I didn't want to be a doctor or a lawyer; he didn't want me to particularly and I didn't particularly want to - so what on earth would I do? I wasn't clear myself. This was the strange thing. I was very certain that whatever came out of my going to university, I would like it better than going into the business.

M: (laughter)

B: But I still wasn't sure what it was going to be and I was a bit worried about that. And, on the one hand, I had to discuss things with my father and express great conviction that something satisfactory would come out of this - but in my heart of hearts I was positive it would -

M: (laughter)

B: My teacher, this Mr. Hyslop, used to talk in glowing terms about the Civil Service, the Administrative Grade of the civil service which was the highest grade, particularly the foreign service. He explained that there would be a great future for people who did well in Modern Languages at the university in the civil service. In fact, I remember he used to talk about a thousand a year, a thousand pounds a year - this is I think now what most factory workers in England would turn their noses up at. . .

BERLYNE:

34.

M: Yes.

B: But it seemed like a fantastic sum. We laughed when he said this because he seemed to be exaggerating the possibilities. But he would say, 'you might work your way up to a thousand a year in the civil service.' And I wasn't clear what the civil service was, what it's like. I still don't have a very clear idea of what you do all day in the civil service.

M: (laughter)

B: But it sounded, at any rate, anything better than the business. And my father wasn't very much attracted by the idea of the civil service. He thought that was a rather unimaginative kind of career in which the possibilities were limited. Teaching was not looked. . . well, another possibility was that of being a school teacher, a secondary school teacher, which I kind of liked. But my father didn't like that too much; a secondary school teacher didn't earn very much and they didn't have a very high social status. The - what was I going to say? - I didn't have any idea of being a university teacher for a long time because this seemed too lofty, even when I went to Cambridge. To be a university teacher, eventually a professor, this was like wanting to be the Prime Minister or to be ^{j. m.} folk star or something. Somebody might have this as a secret ambition but he wouldn't admit it to anybody. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . but you could make an utter fool of yourself

if you had said that you were aiming at such an eminence you see, so that that was a sort of very remote possibility but not something very serious. But anyhow, gradually, my father began to see that perhaps I wouldn't help the business very much if I came into it, which would be true.

M: Well now, these three years you were in the sixth form must have been a difficult period because a great many of your fellow school pals had already dropped out, left, gone into business, maybe into their fathers' businesses, but you hadn't. And with this pull of your father wanting you to and your not wanting to and your not being very clear what else. But that's a long period for your father to acquiesce and continuing to support you at school when he could have used you in the business.

B: Well, you're right there. You see, as far as my friends were concerned, many of my acquaintances had dropped out; my close friends hadn't, you see, because, well, I suppose the people who did best in the school work used to ~~hang~~ hang together. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . they had different values together. So, there was a group of us that stayed together at this time.

M: So you would get an emotional support. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . from your close pals.

B: Yes. Now, the question of my father's supporting me. He didn't have to pay any school fees, but of course he had

to support me. This was something that he didn't mind doing. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . although my brother paid for that, you see. My brother was taken out of school at the age of 15 - which is the minimum legal age, although he was doing quite well in school - and he was put into the business and he is still there. And he is doing very well at the business. He's quite liking it and he's certainly much more cut out for it than I was. But it's a great pity that he wasn't allowed to finish his education. But my father had the idea, I suppose, that it wasn't safe to leave somebody in. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . school longer.

M: Yes, that's what puzzles me. How he could put up with your going on along the line when he couldn't see any particular future in it.

B: Yes, well, I suppose, you see, he had mixed feelings and although he had these firm views, he had a certain tolerance. You see, many fathers would have been much less tolerant, much more insistent on their. . . but the fact that it became apparent to him that I, you know, at first I would begin by expressing slight doubts about the business. But in the end, it had become clear that I felt this very deeply and that this was very important. And he realized this and it weighed with him and he didn't. . . And, for example, my brother, he was taken out of school early and this, I think, was a disservice to him but he didn't protest.

M: Yes.

B: I mean, I would have protested and I did protest but he didn't protest. He was. . . he is sorry about it now and he was sorry at the time, but he didn't object to it nearly as strongly as I did. And if he had, I think even then, my father would have been affected by that.

M: Well now, under Mr. Hyslop's tutelage, you continued on and wrote the scholarship, or the entrance, examinations. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . for Cambridge. Tell me, if you had gone to Manchester, would you still have had to write this same university entrance exam?

B: Oh, it's a complicated story because there were a number of scholarships involved. I actually got four scholarships. I got a major scholarship in Modern Languages at Trinity College, Cambridge, through writing an exam that was peculiar to a group of colleges at Cambridge. Then I got a state scholarship, which was offered by the Government of Great Britain or the United Kingdom, A Manchester City scholarship and Salford City scholarship, based on performance on this high school certificate exam, plus some additional papers, you see, so the second part would have been common to all university entrance, and the first part not.

M: Yes. You said, four.

B: Yes, there were the state, Manchester, Salford and the open.

M: Oh, I see. Yes.

B: Yes.

M: But could you have gone, apart from the scholarship, as far as entrance is concerned, could you have gone to the University of Manchester at an earlier stage?

B: No. No. I went to the university as early as it is possible to go, you see. I won these scholarships at 16 and then I went to university at 17 and I don't know if there was a minimum legal age, but I never heard of anybody going to university in England. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . before age 17.

M: Now, what was the impression of a 17-year-old? Had you been out of Manchester? Had you travelled much?

B: Only once; that was when we were evacuated to Blackpool at the beginning of the war, at the age of 15. That's the only time, really, that I had been away from home for more than a day or two. . .

M: Oh.

B: . . . I mean, away from my family for more than a day.

M: And did you. . . you were evacuated, but not your family? You were. . .

B: Yes, this was at the very beginning of the war. Yes, what happened was that - I think, if I remember - September the 1st, 1939, Poland was invaded and Great Britain and France declared war on September the 3rd. Now, on

BERLYNE:

39.

September the 2nd, they put into effect a very vast evacuation programme: school children and expectant mothers and a number of other categories were evacuated to what was referred to as safe places. And our school went to Blackpool, a seaside town on the northwest coast. We stayed there for five weeks and then we came back. I think ours was the first school to come back and then there was a movement back, so that when the bombing started in 1940, most of the schools were back in. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . the places of danger, including ours.

M: But you went as a school?

B: Yes. We went as a school, you see, and this was the first time I was ever separated from my family and been away at the age of 15. This is actually - it may be worth mentioning, in connection with this evacuation - something that happened connected with Psychology. You see, the war broke out at the beginning of September in 1939. And in that same month, I think towards the end of the month, Sigmund Freud died in London. Now the newspapers, of course, were full of war news, but they had obituary notices about Freud - the usual thing - potted layman's summaries of what he had done. . .

M: Yes. Right.

B: And we had a lot of idleness during these five weeks in Blackpool. For about the first half of the time, we had no schooling at all; this was the end of the summer

BERLYNE:

40.

vacation. And then, for the last part of the time, we shared a Blackpool school. We went half a day and they went to the school half a day. But this didn't work out satisfactorily; for one reason, this is why the school went back. But there was lots of spare time and some of the boys got into scrapes and so on. But one of the boys in our billet - as we called the boarding house in which we were billeted - got Freud's Introductory Lectures out of the library. And he read those and showed us parts of them and we read them too. And, as I say, at this time, I had learned from this teacher in grammar school that psychology was psychoanalysis. We found this very interesting. There obviously was salacious appeal which was part of it, but apart from that, this was a new world of ideas, interesting ideas, whether they were true or not, we couldn't help finding them interesting. And so we talked about these and when we got back, I read more about it. So this was sort of quite an important introduction to at least one part of psychology that was a result of our evacuation to Blackpool.

M: Yes. Did your teachers go with the school to Blackpool?

B: Yes. They did. Yes.

M: I see. So you had your own teachers even though you shared the physical. . .

R: Yes, we did, but it was very disrupting. I mean,

BERLYNE:

41.

for example, the people who were unfortunate enough to go to Blackpool in their scholarship year to Cambridge didn't do very well. The school had less than it's usual quota. I was fortunate in being ~~in the~~ ^{such a fine for the following year.} ~~exingitakes~~ of the term. I had that crucial part of the education when we went back again.

M: Oh, I see. That was in the next year?

B: Yes.

M: But then, at 17, you had not been to London or. . .

B: Oh yes, with the family. I had been to London occasionally to visit relatives.

M: So you had traveled?

B: Yes. I had even been abroad once.

M: You had? oh!

B: Well, just a weekend in Paris at the age of 13, with my parents.

M: But you had not been to Cambridge?

B: Only for the scholarship examinations. Yes.

M: Oh, you went there for the exams?

B: Yes, in December 1940.

M: Well, what was your impression, as a 17-year-old of Cambridge?

B: Well, it was a very fine place, you see. In fact, certainly, this was some of the most satisfying years I have ever had. First of all, one had the sense of belonging to ~~an~~ elite. About half the people there came from aristocratic

families, or wealthy families. And about half of them came from less wealthy families and had got there by scholarships. Some of them came from quite poor families, although poor families were at a disadvantage. But there was very little snobbery. I mean, we'd mix with aristocrats among others and we got on very well; there was never any. . . I mean, maybe they looked down on us slightly, but we looked down on them slightly for not having scholarships. But on the whole, relations were good. The population wasn't divided into these two groups really very much.

M: Was it something of a discovery to find that these toffs were regular human beings?

B: Yes, it was. I mean, they were all right, although some of them were a bit ludicrous, you know. . .

M: Yes.

B: They would obviously be rather arrogant and. . .

M: They way they talked?

B: The way they talked and the way they would behave, you see, but the whole. . . you see, the manner of treating people at Cambridge - I'm sure it's changed now - but the manner of treating people was derived from the way that these toffs had been treated. You see, for us, it was a completely new experience. For them it wasn't; the ones who had been to Eaton or some other public school found it more a continuation of what they had been used to. For example, there would be people called college servants, which would include the people who cleaned shoes and waited at tables,

and the porters. And they would call you sir. Even when they were telling you off. The porters, actually, were responsible for discipline in the college and they would tell you off in no uncertain terms, but they would call you Sir. And you had the idea that you were important and that these people were ministering to you, which, as I say, these toffs were used to; we weren't. This was quite a thing; I think it went to our heads, but. . . Apart from that, Cambridge was obviously intellectually satisfying.

M: You chose the Trinity Scholarship?

B: My teacher, Mr. Hyslop did this. This was part of his planning. You see, Trinity actually was the highest prestige college and the biggest college of all Cambridge. On the whole, the highest prestige one, especially in Modern Languages, you see, so that he. . .

M: I see.

B: . . . and he had to be very careful. You had to fill in a form giving your order of preference. And he had to be very careful that your order of preference didn't clash with somebody else's; it was quite a complicated job - now it might be done with a computer.

M: (laughter)

B: But he did this and he did it successfully, apparently. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . so that when he judged that I might get the scholarship to Trinity - I might be the type that they would

like at Trinity and somebody else at St. John's and so on - apparently he was right at these things.

M: It's like playing a chess game.

B: Oh yes, yes. This was his life's work and he did it very well.

M: Well now, first of all, on the living side. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . what was it like to live as a Freshman at. . .

B: Well, it was a very intense and a very satisfying social life. Of course, you have got to remember that this was during the war and it was abnormal. I never knew Cambridge in normal times, even after the war it changed. I'm not sure what it's like now. But there was something of a shortage of food and so on. But it was an intense social life. You would invite people in to tea or coffee and you would talk, talk over crumpets till two o'clock in the morning. And this is the sort of thing we learned most. There were all kinds of clubs and societies. There was plenty to do. Every evening there would be meetings of various clubs and societies with prominent speakers down from London or there would be plays or foreign films and concerts. In fact, I didn't work, very much in the evenings. Most people did I suppose, but unless just before the exams, I would not do any work - generally speaking - after five o'clock. I would find something else to do in the evening, something educational but not that contributed to the courses.

M: Yes. Was it difficult to get in to any of these clubs that you were interested in?

B: No, not that kind. There were some very select clubs - which were something like the ^{America} medical fraternities where you had to be proposed and seconded. But very few people did and we would look down on them. On the whole, the clubs I am talking about would be something like. . .

M: Literary? Musical?

B: . . . the political clubs, the religious clubs, the philosophy society, things like that, anyway. . .

M: Yes. Yes.

B: . . . we could, and so on, yes.

M: Yes. They would be competing for members rather than exclusive?

B: Yes. Exactly. That's it. Yes they would.

M: All right, now, on the more formal educational side, who did you encounter and who do you recall with the greatest vividness?

B: Well, to begin with, I did Modern Languages. And I found - as all students find out - that the level of teaching was very variable and that the really good lecturers were rather exceptional. Some of them were very poor and most of them were somewhere in the middle. I'm not sure that there is any teacher in Modern Languages that I was very taken with which may be one reason why I changed later. Things were all ^{very} so unsettled there, you see. This was a time when we knew that we weren't going to finish our time at Cambridge. The war

was on; we had all registered and we were apt to be called up at any time. I think for the first year I was there, it was made clear that the Government would allow every undergraduate one year. I think after that, even that was rescinded. But we knew that before long, we were going to go into the Army. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . even if you weren't sure just when you went. Learning German, particularly, I remember was strange because this was like learning Latin. This was the language of a culture from which we were cut off. There were several German refugees about, but we didn't have a sense of contact with Germany. So that there was nothing that I found very exciting. I was interested in the courses and. . .

M: Had the German professors who were German, had they left?

B: Some had, but some were refugees and were still there. There were certainly native German speakers about. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . quite a good lot among the students too.

M: Was it a highly concentrated programme? Was it all Modern Languages or did you get exposed to Philosophy?

B: Oh, no. This was completely Modern Languages you did. This was the British System. In fact, you see, the last three years at Manchester Grammar School was specialized. I was in the Modern Sixth and we did French and German and History and English. And that's all.

M: Oh.

B: You see, so that the last mathematics I did was
at the age of 14, almost.

M: And it got still more concentrated at Cambridge?

B: Yes. This was the British System then. When you went to the university, you had, not necessarily made up your mind what career you were aiming at, but you had made up your mind what you were going to specialize in. So you had to make very important decisions very early and with a minimum of advice - which is a great contrast with what happens over here.

M: Yes. Well, now, at a more casual level, my impression is that the great philosophers and some of the outstanding English scholars and so on, of the Cambridge community, would know that they were going to give a lecture and you could go if you wanted to. Did you do much of that?

B: Oh, a little. A little. For example, I went to one or two of Bertrand Russell's public lectures which were very polished performances. I went to two or three if
Wittgenstein's very strange classes. At least, they were strange for England; they wouldn't have been strange over here. He held them from five to seven in the evening. They lasted for two hours. And there would be free discussions. Now that is the sort of thing which is quite common over here - in fact, it is regarded as desirable. It is very unusual there. I mean Wittgenstein, who is a bit insane and he admitted that himself, only he would do a thing like that.

M: Yes.

B: And. . .

M: Did you find these very exciting?

B: No. No, I didn't; some people did, because Whitgenstein, as you know. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . had a great influence even on people in North America, but no, they were very odd. They were rambling. I'm not sure what I learned. I found it interesting. I learned a lot from them, but I couldn't say in words what they were because, well, he himself said he was trying to teach a technique, a technique of philosophizing. He was very rude to people. He held them in these rooms which were in a remote part of the college, less desirable part of the college. They were very barely furnished rooms with green deck chairs and very few books about. And he wanted the class to diminish till it formed a small group of really interested people. Now, he couldn't do this legally. He had to admit anybody who was entitled to go in the university. So, he would be rude to people but he would also tell them that he didn't want them coming to odd lectures. He didn't want "tourists" he called them - which was a very good descriptive - so that you would come for as long as you want to and when you don't want to come anymore, you drop out. But you either come all the time or you decide you have dropped out. Which is what I did. I went to three or four of them, and I couldn't spare the time and so I didn't. . . Come to think of it,

this is actually my second spell at Cambridge that I'm talking about now, after the war, 1946-48. Shortly before, ^{W.H.} Wittgenstein surprised everybody by resigning, going to Ireland, marrying, and dying soon afterwards.

M: (laughter) Well now, did this even have the effect on you of stimulating your reading?

B: Well, my reading had been stimulated, you see. To go back ^{somewhat} ~~a ways'~~, I should explain that when I was in the Manchester Grammar School, before the sixth form, I was very much of an auto-didact. I read a lot of stuff on my own. I read Economics and I read Philosophy; I even read some Psychology. And this is one thing maybe, I suppose that makes me less capable of understanding our present students who say, 'We want courses on this that and the other.' And when we wanted to know something, we didn't ask for courses; we read it. But anyhow, maybe that is unfair.

M: Yes.

B: But I did read a lot. And when we went to the sixth form. . .

M: Just let me ask, I'm sorry. . .

B: That's all right.

M: You said that you even read Psychology. What?

B: Can I come back to that please. . .

M: All right.

B: . . . in a moment, because. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . that needs a bit of explaining. I did want

BERLYNE:

48.

to explain that in the sixth form at the Manchester Grammar School, we had by far the toughest part of our education, much tougher than anything I met at Cambridge or Yale Graduate School or anywhere. Because to study for this Cambridge University Scholarship, you had to be prepared, if you were / in Modern Languages, to answer questions on any aspect of French and German literature, history, culture and whatever as well as language papers. So that, for a period of about two years, those of us who were doing this had no leisure. We, every single German or French book we ^{could} should read increased our chances. And obviously, we couldn't read the whole of French and German literature, but we had to read as much of it as possible. So we had not time for. . . well, we would occasionally go out for a walk with our friends or something like that, but certainly no time for any. . .

2(a)

M:

All Modern Languages produce this much more reading matter.

B: Yes

M:

the history and the culture, which means that although you read it in German, you were getting a lot of German history.

B: Oh yes. Yes.

M: Or, if you read it in French, you were getting a lot of French history.

B: Yes.

M: And literature. And customs. And mores. And values. And philosophy.

B: Yes, that's true. Which is one thing that actually put me off Modern Languages in the end. You see, the subject matter changed gradually, and one could even say, insidiously. You see, you began by learning the language.

M: Yes.

B: Now, as you mastered the language, you spent more and more time studying the literature and the history of most of the literature until, at the end, which was for example, the second part of the Cambridge undergraduate course in Modern Languages, you would not be doing any languages at all unless you opted for Old French - which is interesting. You would be doing literature. And I woke up to this - you see, I had liked the linguistic part and I liked learning the language - but to do literary criticism requires a very different kind of aptitude, a very different kind of taste. And although I didn't mind this - I liked the literature and still did and I managed to write critical essays and so on adequately, apparently - this wasn't the sort of thing that I felt I liked to do for the rest of my life.

M: Yes. Well now, when you say it changed insidiously, are you referring to what happened at, say, at Cambridge?

B: Yes, I'm referring to the two occasions when I changed from Modern Languages to Psychology. You were asking,

a little while ago about my reading in Psychology. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . maybe you should take that up. I didn't read anything in Psychology until that time I spoke about when we were evacuated to Cambridge. . . I'm sorry, to Blackpool, evacuated to Blackpool. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and I became acquainted with the work of Freud. But, when I got back to Manchester, now, then I was in the first year of the sixth form at age 15, which wasn't as bad as the next two years - those next two years were the ones without leisure. I thought I had better read some more Psychology and I went to the Manchester Public Library and got a book on the subject. And I was actually very fortunate indeed - I mean, you know the kinds of books that you find in libraries and other places that purport to introduce people to Psychology. . . goodness knows what I might have picked up - but just by chance, I picked up something that was very good for the purpose. This was a book - I don't know if you know it over here - by a man called Sprott. . . I still have it here as a matter of fact. It was a book that was called General Psychology - at least the edition for the ordinary student was called General Psychology and the edition for the general reader was called Psychology for Everyone. You see, it was exactly the same book. . .

M: (laughter)

BERLYNE:

B: . . . with two different covers. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . which is a thing I've never come across before. But, anyhow, this book by Sprott - Sprott is a man who was a professor at Nottingham later, and then died a few years ago. . .

M: Any relation to the Sprott that's over here?

B: Don't think so. No, I don't think so. Now, Sprott's book had a very wide coverage and above all, it gave one the idea that there were different schools of Psychology; in fact, it said that there are three main kinds of Psychology - I think it said: instinct psychology (which includes Freudian and Marxist and so on). . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . behaviourist psychology and the Gestalt psychology. Now that, of course, is an oversimplification and all reading in those days was, but still, it certainly conveyed that psychoanalysis wasn't the only kind. . .

M: What was. . .

B: . . . that there were different kinds.

M: . . . your impression?

B: It went through these. It dealt with a lot of problems that people don't deal with enough I believe and so on. It covered the field pretty well. It didn't give a strict experimental approach; it gave a very eclectic approach, but still, it gave one breadth, which most books wouldn't. So, I think it was fortunate that I picked up this,

and I read this, and I. . . I read more Freud. I read books on hypnotism. I even tried out some hypnotism and so on. That was about all I had read in Psychology. I had read less Psychology than some other subjects. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . by the time I went to Cambridge.

M: Yes. All right now, back to Cambridge and this is your first year. This is pre-Army. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . what else happened to you there that you now think that is important in your subsequent career?

B: One thing was that I had more social interaction that I had had before. I mean, it was of this intellectual nature. I mean, I had been rather isolated. I had had my close friends but on the whole had been isolated. And I didn't mind being isolated. I didn't particular want to go and join in the things that the other boys seemed to be interested in. But at Cambridge, I did mix with people quite a lot. I joined the various clubs and societies. I had tea and coffee with people and so this was certainly one important change.

M: And it was exciting to you.

B: Oh, certainly, yes. Yes it was.

M: Yes. Okay, what happened next?

B: Well, the main thing that happened then was that I first changed from Modern Languages to Psychology. At the end of the first year, I took the, what is called, Part I

of the Modern and Mediaeval Languages Tripos[/] - there were two big exams that you take for the Honours degree.

M: Yes.

B: And we were given separate grades for French and German. I was put in class one for French, but I was ^{I(1)} put in class two, one - that is class two, first division - for German, which was a disappointment and a blow. I mean, it is not an enormous disgrace to get a 2,1. . . it is considered quite creditable, but until then I had done almost as well in Modern Languages as one could in those exams. At any rate, I was very disappointed at this and it made me think. I was already beginning to wonder what this would lead to. By that time, I think I was beginning to think of academic work as a possibility. I had certainly thought that I might go into the civil service, or I might go into school teaching, but I enquired about. And the idea at Cambridge seemed to be that if you got a first class in a subject, you had a chance of this, of an entry into an academic career. But then I was asking myself, Do I really want to spend the rest of my life writing books about Goethe and Schiller or reading books about them? I didn't mind reading the Goethe and Schiller, but literary criticism - nothing against it - didn't seem to be what I wanted to do. And so the question is, What should I do instead.

You do have a very rare thing in the British educational system at Cambridge after Part I of the triposes, and that is,

you can change to another subject. Normally, you have made your decision and you are stuck with it, but you could take Parts I & II of different triposes. And, as a matter of fact, the subject matter in the second part of the tripost was often designed so that you could do it without doing the first part. And there was no Part I in Psychology then - there is now. So we had to do something else.

M: Does "tripost" represent a series of three examinations. . .

B: No, it's a series of two examinations. It's called "tripost" because they used to sit on a three-legged stool in the Middle Ages. . .

M: (laughter) I see.

B: No, there were two parts: one taken at the end and one taken either after the first year or the second year.

M: I see. Now, you were ready to try your first. . .

B: Well, I took the first part of the Modern Languages tripost; I passed it although the performance in German disappointed me. I had passed it and so I was ready to go on to the second part. And this was the golden opportunity because it was now or never that you had to change. You could take part II in something else and you wouldn't have an opportunity later. So, I was wondering what I would like to do, and the thing that I thought I would probably like to do was Philosophy. I had read quite a lot of Philosophy then. I was very much interested in it. But,

there were arguments against this.

The Philosophy School at Cambridge was quite small. It was very analytic - different groups, the ^{left} Wittgenstein group and the group around people like Braithwaite. . . well, Russell wasn't back then; he was still in America then, but later on he was back. But at any rate, there were different groups; it was all analytical philosophy which I wasn't particularly interested in. But it was very risky. You see, if you went into Philosophy, about the only thing you could do was university teaching. And that was a thing you couldn't bank on, at least it seemed to me that you couldn't bank on it. My father would never have understood, for example.

M: No.

B: Whereas, in Psychology there were things you could do if you didn't succeed in being a university teacher. You could do some industrial psychology, or something, you see. So, I didn't do Philosophy because it was risky mainly; and I did psychology, probably in the first place, because it was the nearest thing to philosophy that wasn't so risky, although it was risky enough. So. . .

M: Had you encountered any of the Cambridge Psychologists in that first year.

B: No, not at all. If I had, I'd have a better known what laid ahead of me. No, and I still at this stage - this is very odd though, looking back on it - but at this stage, although I had learned from Stropp that Psychology

NEUROTIC

BERLYNE:

56.

'isn't all psychoanalysis, I remember I suddenly pictured myself as getting a degree in Psychology - a B.A. in Psychology - and setting up an office somewhere and giving psychotherapy to people. It's the sort of idea. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . that many of our students have. I certainly had this.

M: Yes.

B: In fact, I remember distinctly that the first thing I did, was advised to do, was to go to the Psychology Department in Cambridge and ask about the courses. And I did. And Bartlett, the professor, was not in. He was away. But his second in command was there; this is a man called Bannister, who is the man who wrote the chapter ^{on hearing for the Marchessan} Handbook of Experimental Psychology. Well, Bannister was in, but the secretary said, "He's with a subject. Will you wait a few minutes?" And I sat down and I assumed that this was a patient, a neurotic who was being given psychotherapy. And in fact, this Bannister did give psychotherapy, but not ~~in unison~~. And then the door opened and this young fellow walked out and I looked at him. And this was the creature that I had read so much about, the neurotic patient who is being given psychotherapy. Of course, he was nothing of the sort. He must have been some subject for an experiment. But I remember looking at him as the first time I had seen one with my own eyes.

M: (laughter)

B: And anyhow, I thought that was what I was going to do and what people normally did. And so, after the summer vacation of 1940, second year at Cambridge, I changed over to the ^{17, ~} Model Sciences tripost, as it was called, the Psychology section.

M: And did that involve a complete shift?

B: Oh yes, certainly, a complete shift into Psychology and nothing else. Oh yes. I don't know, there may have been some circumstances in which you could take a course in another Department at Cambridge, but it was very exceptional if it ever happened.

M: All right, who did you encounter?

B: Well, two groups of people, because this was during the war - we are talking about 1941, no, '42, 1942 - when some of the London colleges were evacuated to Cambridge. The London School of Economics, the Queen Mary College and so on. And there was an interchange arrangement with regard to lectures and we would go to their lectures and they would go to ours so that I met two groups of people. On the London side, I went to courses by Mace (who gave a very interest course on behaviourism and such like), Julian Blackburn (who gave the only introductory course that was then available - this was a course on Introduction to Psychology given to most of us, 297 women and three men of the London School of Economics). . .

M: Yes.

B: And the people at Cambridge wouldn't give such a thing as an introductory course. And then, as far as Cambridge was concerned, of course, you went to Barlett's ~~own~~
^{the best} lectures by far were given by a man called McCurdy. McCurdy was a psychiatrist who gave a course on psychopathology; he's a man that had actually played a role in the early history of . . .

M: (too faint)

B: . . . psychoanalysis and so on. I mean, he wasn't a psychoanalyst but he was sympathetic and it encouraged interest in that sort of thing in the United States - he was an American, I presume.

M: Canadian.

B: Oh, Canadian, was he?

M: Yes.

B: J. T. McCurdy.

M: If we are talking about the same man, he also had something to do with early days of flying.

B: Yes, I think it very probably is the same man, yes. I didn't know he was a Canadian. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . but that's quite likely.

M: And he was a colourful. . .

B: Oh, he was! An excellent lecturer. He would have a very - there would only be three or four of us at these lectures that were held in his room, in his sitting room at Corpus Christy College, I think. But he would read these out -

I don't know whether he would have them all written out or notes - but his style was excellent, his delivery was excellent. In fact, I'm not even sure that I wouldn't say that he is as near as I've had as a model of a lecturer and I don't think I have come up to his standard or got to ^{certainly} his style, but he was a very fine lecturer.

M: And just three or four of you in the sitting room of his own living quarters?

B: Well, the number of people in the Psychology course would be quite small - there would only be between 10 and 20 people taking Psychology all together and they'd be divided among the various years. Yes, there would be three or four, half a dozen at the most, in his sitting room. Quite a common arrangement with small classes. They would go to the . . . mountain would come to Mohammed or the other way around.

M: Yes. Yes.

B: So he was by far the best. The standard of lecturing, otherwise, was poor.

M: What was Barlett like as a lecturer?

B: Awful, the worst lecturer I've ever heard I think. Not everyone would agree on that, but very poor. He would mutter on and on and on. His were unorganized. And I found the material distinctly uninteresting. I had the kind of reaction that is very like what our students have. I know exactly how they feel; I felt the same way. Which is one reason I find it difficult sometimes to sympathize with them -

BERLYNE:

60.

because I know how they feel and. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . but I had gone there thinking that Psychology was not all psychoanalysis. I had learned from Sprott it wasn't that. At least, it included to a large extent that kind of thing and dealt with things that were, I don't know if we used that word, but nowadays we use the word "relevant" and it wasn't. I was very puzzled. I went to. . . I remember that very first time I went to Bannister after the subject left the room, I said, 'well the vacation is coming up, the summer vacation. If I'm going to take Psychology after the summer vacation, what should I read? He said, 'Read Bartlett's Remembering.' And I did. And I read it four times and literally fell asleep every time.

M: (Laughter)

B: This was a very odd thing to give to somebody as a first book on Psychology. It wasn't actually my first book, but it might well have been.

M: Yes.

B: And I. . . and then later on, we had lab classes as we lifted weights, we looked into cystoscopes and, I remember one thing that puzzled me, we had a test for visual acuity - we had to look at an optician's chart. And I didn't know what that had to do with Psychology - I asked all the usual questions a student does. 'What has this got to do with Psychology? What has this got to do with the unconscious?

(H)

And the super-ego? And so on? And nobody bothered explaining it. I mean, now, I think we, when our students come to us with these questions, we try and answer them. We don't necessarily answer them to their satisfaction, but we ^{try} should try. There, nobody ever bothered. It soon became. . .

M: Was ^{the} there an attitude of, on Bartlett's part, disdain toward that kind of question?

B: Oh, most definitely. There ^{is} no two ways about that. He was. . . we soon learned that we had better not be too much interested in those things or show any interest in those things until ^{we} he had left. But, now, to give you ^{years} an example, a few/later, I happened to visit the Psychology Department in Manchester, then headed by ^{now} Piat. And I saw on the wall a picture of Freud. Now, you might very well think that it is not at all that unusual to find a picture of Freud on the walls of a psychology department, but I couldn't believe my eyes. It was as if I had gone to an Astronomy Department. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . and seen a picture of Nostradamus, or something.

M: (laughter) Yes.

B: you see, this is the kind of indoctrination we had.

M: Yes.

B: So, certainly, we. . .

M: Well, bit by bit, do none of the kinds of things that he did in Thinking as opposed to Remembering, none of the historical, almost philosophizing about Psychology, . . .

about Sciences, did you have none of that at all?

B: Not very much, you see. I'm talking now about my first period at Cambridge. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . because the two were separated by a period in the Army. But he gave a course, I can't remember what it was called, on cognitive things, which included things like psychophysics. And I remember he would ramble on about G.E. Miller and people like that and apparent differences in weights and so on, which I found very puzzling and not very interesting, and he didn't make it interesting. You see, some people became intensely interested in his approach; he certainly had a group of very loyal students around him, [✓]searchers, but he didn't appeal to my tastes at all.

M: Was George Drew with him at that time?

B: No. No. He was away. Another man that was there was Grindley. . .

M: Yes.

B: Now Grindley gave, actually, lectures that weren't bad. His material was not as out-of-date as some of the others; he included some of the American work. He gave a course on Learning, I think, which wasn't bad, at least compared to the others. He had a very slow drawl, but at least his lectures were tolerable. The worst lectures of all, actually, were Bamister's. I remember that people used to say that the best aid to getting a first class in the exam

was the avoid his lectures. And the lectures, of course, were not compulsory, although in a small department like Psychology, if you. . .

M: They knew if you weren't there.

B: Yes, that's right. In fact, it certainly would have been tactless and impolite to miss a lot, but you could, certainly miss sometimes.

M: Did you encounter Craig?

B: No. He was about then, he must have been about, because he died in 1943. But you see, he was one of the people on the other floors. The Psychology lab was a wing of the Physiology lab, which actually was symbolic, if you like, of the close relations there were with physiology. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and all our classes or all the things we ever did were on the ground floor and the upper floors contained people that were doing things to do with Psychology.

M: (garbled)

B: There were various research units that Barlett had the control over: there was a MRC unit on aging, or at least there was later (I'm not sure it was at that time)- there was an industrial psychology unit; there was, at that time, people doing war work, work on skills.

M: I was going to ask you, did you hear much about that?

B: No. . . heard nothing about it, well, next to nothing about it, didn't know anything about it, didn't see it. . . We saw one or two of those people. I never saw Craig; we saw them about and knew who they were. Craig I

don't remember seeing at all but he must have been about.

M: You never saw his Spitfire cockpit with all the string and stuff?

B: No.

M: I suppose the same thing is true now. Our undergraduates don't know what goes on inside.

B: That's right. ^{Let's} People have organized tours. And as a matter of fact, during my second spell at Cambridge which was just after the war, they did take us on a tour of the upper floors, which was quite instructive.

M: Yes.

B: Although we were never quite sure how these people fitted in. You see, there were very few people with a teaching appointment in the Department; there was Bartlett as professor and I think there many have been two or three other people with appointments as lecture. So that. . .

^{as} but some of these supernumerary people would give courses. I mean, it would be paid by the course, I imagine. Otherwise, their income would come from appointments as research assistants or whatever they were called. And we were never quite sure how they fitted in, but we never knew how universities were run in those days.

M: Yes, Well now, you've covered the people you encountered. . .

B: Yes. Yes.

M: . . . in a real sense.

B: In that first period.

M: What happened at the end of that year?

B: Well, I didn't get to the end of the period, you see. I had one term, and then I was called up into the Army. . .

M: Oh.

B: . . . and that was in February of 1943. So, it was an interruption of Psychology. Of course, I hadn't done enough to be eligible for any kind of psychological work.

M: Or any kind of examination. Yes.

B: Yes. That's right. Yes.

M: All right. Now, the war. . .

B: Yes.

M: The Army. . .

B: Yes. Well, I joined. . . I went into the Intelligence Corps. This was considered a desirable thing and a suitable thing for people who had done Modern Languages. Although, as it happened, it didn't work out that way. First of all, I went to - for some primary training - at the largest private house in England, Wentworth Woodhouse, which is in Yorkshire. But we actually lived in the stables, which fortunately had the horses and the straw and so on cleared out. But it was the stables. . .

M: Yes.

B: And I remember, it was very strange because the courtyard contained the Lord Fitzwilliam Stables and bore an ironic resemblance to the famous Great Court of Trinity College Cambridge. I mean, the Trinity College was a large

quadrangle. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . which had openings leading to staircases to undergraduate rooms and this had openings leading to the stables, you see.

M: (laughter)

B: Then there was a famous Renaissance or Tudor style fountain in the middle. There was a similar fountain, I suppose it was some kind of a horse trough. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . in the middle of the Lord Fitzwilliam/Stables. And there was a clock tower at one end of it.

M: Clock Tower?

B: And this sort of, this increased the painfulness of it all, you see. I went in as a private. There was some vague idea of trying to become an officer, but in those days, officers were not chosen from undergraduates. At the beginning of the war, anybody who had been to university became an officer. But then they found this didn't work, and they introduced their Wuzbee system and on the whole. . . I think you have probably had some experience with this. . . the (with some exceptions of course) the old professional soldier was more likely to pass the Wuzbee than the fellow who was an intellectually inclined undergraduate. So that I never took a Wuzbee - I doubt if I could have passed one if I had, but I didn't. I was actually sent abroad within a few months, four or five months. But I was a private,

and treated with the lack of consideration that the privates are. And you can imagine that this was quite a contrast with the Cambridge where the porters called could sir and you had the idea that you were mixing with the cream of . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . intellectual society, and that you always would. So this was quite a change, and needless to say, I didn't like it very much. And then the time came when we were allotted to jobs in the intelligence corps. . .

M: Now, just a minute. . .

B: What?

M: You selected. . . you had the option. . . were you selected for or did you select (garbled)?

B: Oh, this was a complicated business. What happened was that we, they got us as undergraduates, to enlist voluntarily in the Queens Royal Regiment. You see, most people would register and then when their time came, they would be called up and they would be allotted to whatever. . . I think they were probably, at one time, be allotted to ^{Unit} some unin where they would be given psychological tests. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . to find a. . .

M: But that didn't happen?

B: It didn't happen, no, because we were made to bypass all that by joining the Queens Royal REGiment. We joined, and we took the Queens half crown - I think it was then

and were put on leave. And we were given a certificate saying that we had served with the Army for one day and our conduct had been exemplary. So this was the case, you see. Now, by doing that, we were out of the hands of the Ministry of Labour and in the hands of the War Office. . .

M: Yes.

B: That meant that the Minister of Labour could not go through his usual^v procedure with us; we could be allotted to whatever the War Office decided. So, all of the various pieces of machinery there were there, but ^{at} the time I got to the Intelligence Corps, which is what I wanted to be in - whether I would have wanted it if I had known what it was going to be like, I don't know, but it was certainly preferable to most of the jobs in the Army.

M: Yes.

B: Anyhow, I got in^{to} the Intelligence Corps.

M: Yes.

B: So, after some primary training, we. . .

M: Was that mostly marching up and down?

B: Yes. I had done some of it. I had to belong. We all had to belong to the, what they called the Senior Training Corps which also was part of the Home Guard. You had to go twice a week and, in fact, I was let off quite a lot of primary training because of this. And then we were allotted to jobs.

Now, most people in the Intelligence Corps went into

BERLYNE:

(69.)

what was called field security, which involved going around on motor bikes and seeing that people observed security regulations. But I went into a service that involved listening into enemy wireless communications. And this was an ironic thing, because we were chosen for our knowledge of languages but we didn't use them. You see, the nature of the work had changed since the people who were doing the recruiting were in it. As people used higher and higher grade ciphers on both sides of the war, knowledge of German counted for less and less so that, in the end, I found myself not doing any work for which modern languages were required. And it turned out to be very dull clerical work. This was a very good example of something going wrong with the selection procedures. And in our units, we had some people of various intellectual professions - several barristers, teachers, students, and so on - and some post office sorters. And the post office sorters did best by far because this work was closer to what they did. It was very boring, clerical work about sorting papers and marking things on them and things like that. It varied, but at any rate, it was very soul-destroying and boring. Now. . .

M: Why didn't you listen in to the ordinary broadcasts from Germany to Germans?

B: I suppose. . . No, it wasn't that. That was done by some other. . .

M: Oh, I see.

B: No, this was listening in to the actual Army.

M: Oh, oh yes.

BERLYNE:

70.

B: The actual, yes, the actual Army communications. . .

M: Military intelligence.

B: . . . which were in ciphers, so we just. . .

They were all transmitted to London. I don't know whether anybody ever cracked the ciphers or not, we never heard anything about that. But we never saw any results of what we were doing. Now, we were very lucky, you see, because we were safe. I mean, I was in much greater danger in the bombing raids in England than I ever was in the Army. I never. . . the nearest I ever got to the front line was about 10 miles, and that was actually once when I went ahead illegally to ^{VIS} do some town in Italy. So while we didn't appreciate this, we should have appreciated the fact that we were extremely lucky in being safe. Although, of course, in a modern Army most people are safe from day to day.

M: Sure.

B: Then other people. . . for example, people ^{here} pointed out that in Vietnam, 90% of the American Army never came within sight of shot and shell, but the poor people that did had a very high chance of becoming casualties. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and this was so in the Second World War too.

M: Yes.

B: So we were lucky, but no luckier than many other people were.

BERLYNE:

Art
71. Travel
Work

M: Now, you say you were sent abroad. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . where? Italy?

B: First of all, to Tunisia.

M: Oh yes.

B: Then to Italy, where I was for about almost two years. And Corsica, I spent a couple of months in Corsica. And, finally, six months in Malta when the war was over. But this was, this had a certain psychological interest in the sense that later on, when I read books on industrial psychology, I could find on every, almost every page, something that they had done wrong. The unit had low morale and the management was. . . I mean, the work was boring and the people were badly selected for it. We were treated, well, in all the ways that industrial psychology books say you shouldn't.

M: Yes.

B: So, there was a lot of grumbling and, together with grumbling goes social friction. I mean, we got on well together - I had some very good friends there - ^{Sparta} but occasionally people would set off and be in a bad mood with each other. I mean, I enjoyed, as we all did, the opportunities to do tourism. We certainly got to know the Italians very well and got to know the Italian cities which helped to promote an interest in art and so on. But that isn't what we were supposed to be doing, all of us. But at the same time, also, we. . . it was somewhat humiliating

to feel that there was a war going on, and they couldn't find anything better for us to do to help the war effort than this, this miserable boring work, you see. It was not that we were ^{at all} ~~sort of~~, eager to volunteer to build ^{get a} a front line - I mean, maybe we should have done - but perhaps we weren't. But at the same time, we felt that somehow or other our qualifications and training should have been made use of in some other way. But anyway, that's the way it worked at.

M: You spoke of errors, blunders in selection. Do you know the inside story about the . . . I don't know how ^{long} inside it is now. . . about the Wuzbees that you escaped?

B: Oh, I heard lectures about them later. I've heard different accounts of how successful they were. I mean, ^{Semianif} Semian, an author who had something to do with it, gave a lecture on it once at ^{PPS} PPS. I wish I had gone through ^{long} a Wuzbee just to see what it was like. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . because it seemed like an interesting experience.

M: Yes.

B: But many of my friends when through and didn't pass. Some did pass; most of them didn't.

M: I was there during the time that Nigel Vulchin. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . was trying to get the Army to drop the old Officer Selection by birth and education and association and

replace it by what was thought to be a more modern, more effective way of selection. And this was terrifically difficult to do in Britain. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . because, well, culture was against it. And they had great agonizing over how they could change this traditional system of officer selection. So they called in some public relations people and they put on an enormous campaign in the public press in Britain and all the picture magazines were full of these pictures and. . .

B: That's right. Yes. I remember that. Yes.

M: . . . and country estates and these fellows crossing streams and building this and solving problems of all kinds. Tremendous propaganda. All designed to persuade the people that the British Army was now getting hip to its job and going to pick good officers. Well, if you had ^{U.S.A.} gone to a Wuzbee, you would have spent the first morning in a big attic room in this country estate at a table doing pencil and paper tests. From that point on, you would have been out for the next two and a half days, taken out with these observers with the clip boards, observing you and the group trying to solve some silly problems. And assessing your leadership quality, your initiative, your originality and all this stuff. And I was also in on the first returns of it two years later from operational evidence of officer performance as judged in combat, among other places, and the horrifying things emerged

BERLYNE:

74.

from these initial results that the only predictor of performance on the field was that morning on pencil and paper.

B: Really?

M: That's the only thing that had any validity at all in predictiveness were those pencil and paper tests. The rest of the things had had a zero correlation.

B: I see.

M: But they didn't dare let that out; they didn't dare reveal this.

B: Yes.

M: But talk about blunders.

B: Yes, one cause of grievance among my acquaintances was the fact that the ~~members~~^{W.M.S.} tried to judge everybody's suitability as an Infantry officer. You see, so if you wanted to be in the Intelligence Corps, or even the Pay Corps or anything like that, you were certainly. . . we felt that if we were fit to be officers, it was something other than an infantry officer.

M: Yes.

B: But they would reject you.

M: Yes.

B: So that this was another cause of grievance, you know, that we have these people who felt they should have. . .

2(b)

M: How long were you in the Army?

B: Three years.

M: Three years.

B: Of which two and one half years were abroad.

M: (too faint)

B: Yes.

M: Okay. You came back. You were demobbed when?

B: I was demobbed in February, 1946. This was earlier than I would have been otherwise. You see, there was a special scheme. Most people were just let out in the order in which they'd got in. But people who had special occupations, including students, were let out earlier according to the particular scheme. So I was demobilized in February 1946 whereas otherwise, I would have been in until the end of 1947.

M: And you were now what age?

B: Twenty-two.

M: Twenty-two.

B: Yes.

M: And you returned then to Cambridge.

B: I returned to Cambridge. That's right. Yes.

Now, when I got there, I didn't know what to do. Most people were bewildered. Many people had changed their specialities. I wasn't sure if I wanted to go back to Psychology. I hadn't liked, on the whole, my first acquaintance with it. It wasn't the kind of thing I wanted to do.

I wasn't altogether sure what would come of Modern Languages either, or anything else. But by that time, my self-confidence was lower than it had been to begin with. I had gone through this period in the Army in which, although I believed that I was capable of doing better things than I had been doing during that time, I certainly didn't feel quite so confident that I could expect to do anything very great and glorious. So, I went back to Modern Languages because it was the thing that I was used to - ^{the language of} ~~blind~~ British resistance if you like. I wasn't quite sure what I was going to do. I maybe had some vague idea that I might get into academic work, but I probably would have been contented to be a secondary school teacher. But anyhow, I did that.

I did a term - and I suppose it would be one term - of Modern Languages. I got back into it; I even won a prize in fact, a ^{the} ~~old~~ French prize at the end of that term - it was a special prize given for a special examination. So I got back into the stride, but then I began to have doubts again. What was this Modern Languages going to lead to?

M: Was that first term, after coming out of the Army, a disappointment? You are now a veteran in two senses; you were. . .

B: Yes. Yes.

M: A veteran of the Army, but you were also ^{to some degree} a veteran of Cambridge.

B: Yes.

M: Was it a letdown? Do you recall it as a period. . .

B: Oh no. It was, on the whole, it was the same very satisfying life again. . .

M: I see.

B: . . . with a more serious ^{almost} aire. There were fewer aires and graces on the part of everybody and less affectation. People had a sense of lost time and wanted to get down to it. But on the whole, things were relaxed and people moved in the same gay social rounds and the same other activities. Yes, we got back into that very quickly, surprisingly quickly perhaps. But then came the sort of moment of truth when I had to decide whether to keep on with Modern Languages or whether to go back to Psychology or what. As a matter of fact, there didn't seem to be very much else; didn't seem to be another alternative.

So, by then, I certainly understood that going into psychology didn't mean giving people psychotherapy, at least not a Cambridge. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and I had given up that sort of ambition. But I went through, I remember, a very very bad week. I think it was one of the worst weeks I've ever gone through in my life - a week of conflict, because I had to make a decision that was going to affect the rest of my life. It difficult and irrevocable decision and I had very little

guidance. I mean, certainly, in the British educational system, good guidance was very hard to find. I got as much information as I could. I went to see Bartlett who was in at that time. And he was always very pleasant and kind about it, but he. . . I asked him what sort of jobs were available if you took a degree in Psychology and he mentioned jobs in the civil service. I suppose it was the scientific civil service - the PSIR, I think it was called (mumbled) Industrial Research. He gave me the idea that at least there was things to do in psychology. If I got into academic work, I would have liked that. Otherwise, there were other things.

And anyhow, I got through this week - I remember I got through this week - by getting as much information as possible and by taking aspirins. I later found out actually, very few years ago, that somebody had discovered that aspirins have a tranquilizing effect; it's not one of the effects it is supposed to have been a placebo. But at any rate, I felt almost close to a breakdown at times. However, I got through ^{the} week alright, although I wasn't completely sure I was doing the right thing, I was sure enough to take the plunge and go back to Psychology for the second time.

My father had grave doubts about that, but by that time, I was completely financially independent, you see. Ex-servicemen got. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . scholarships that kept them. But at any rate,

I wasn't sure myself it was the right thing, but it seemed to be the best decision to make and I had to do it quickly. So, I went around and told all the people in Modern Languages that I wouldn't be doing their stuff anymore. And I resumed Psychology.

Of course, then the London colleges were away, so we had only people from the Cambridge department. And I did Psychology for, I think, a year plus a term... You see there is an ironic thing that at Cambridge in those days, you could only do part II in Psychology. And you could do it in one year or two years. And people who did it in one year invariably did better than people who did it in two years because they had less time to forget. And strangely enough, this worked for a time. It was only much later that. . . as a matter of fact, it was an incident involving Harry Kay, who is now leaving our department and a friend of mine from New Zealand called Peter McKeller. They were applying for a job somewhere and Harry had a Cambridge degree and had done quite well in the triposts and Peter had had a New Zealand degree, Peter McKeller. And they chose Peter McKeller. And they said, 'Look here,' well, they said to Harry Kay. apparently, I don't know if he still remembers this, 'You've only done two years or maybe one year. . . McKeller has done three years.' And this is the first time when the cache of the Cambridge degree had been outweighed by the consideration of the extra training. Because it is true, what we learned was limited

in that time. After I had done the degree, I and my colleagues found out how little we knew, and we started to learn some psychology. You see?

M: (laughter)

B: But certainly this was. . . I actually ended up doing something like a year and two terms, in other words, a year and two-thirds because of the Army interruption. So we did this, and. . .

M: Now, who did you meet?

B: Well, the same people. Bartlett was then giving his lectures on Skill. He had been very much influenced by Craig. He had got into what later came to be called by the name of things like Human Practice, Human Engineering, Information Processing, Cybernetics even came into it. This had been developed at Cambridge I gather, to some extent independently from similar things that had come from the United States. Craig had been a very important factor; Bartlett was obviously very grieved when Craig was killed in a bicycle accident in the ^{East} ~~East~~. He is still, ^{still} using the present tense but Bartlett died a couple of years ago. . . until the end of his life Bartlett, whenever I heard him, used to speak of Craig with reverence, as if Craig were his master rather than the other way around. Although he was a brilliant man. And there were others there too. . .

M: I can sit back and understand that because I met Craig and I spent a day with him. And he, I think, was

the most brilliant person, the most brilliant mind I have ever come that close to.

B: Yes, people certainly talk about him that way, yes.

M: (too faint)

B: Yes.

M: He just sparkled the whole time with ideas on every conceivable sort of subject. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . and it was impossible to be with him, even for a day, without being excited by all the things that he sighted in on.

B: Yes, I'm sorry I didn't meet him. But this was the impression I get.

M: Yes, it is very interesting that Bartlett felt that way.

B: Oh, Bartlett certainly felt that way. And he certainly took every opportunity to say this; whenever he gave a lecture, he would mention this. And so he got into this skill work, as he called it, which did have some connecting links with his earlier work on perception and memory. For example, the context of the schener still came in. But he gave a course on this which some people were very excited by and many other people who later went in to the applied psychology unit were excited enough to devote the rest of their lives to it. But I didn't find it very exciting at all, and one or two of my friends didn't. The people -

BERLYNE:

82.

Melvin

McCurdy had. . . no, McCurdy was, that's right, McCurdy was back again - but he died while I was still there. I remember, he died very suddenly. Grindly was still giving his course, but one man that made a great influence, I think, was a man called Russell Davis, a psychiatrist who later went to Bristol and may still be in Bristol. He gave a course on motivation and this was a new topic. And he also mentioned a lot fo contemporary American work. Grindly actually did also in his lectures, mention contemporary American work, but Davis moreso. And, now, this was, this became exciting.

Particularly, I remember his mention of the work of Mowra, because this American group - the learning theatre group - the Yale group it was, actually - were doing animal experiments, were sympathetic in a critical way to Freudian psychology. They were doing rat experiments that purported to be about some of the same processes that Freud was talking about in the human being. Mowra had a rat analogue of regression and various things like that. And this seemed very exciting. You see, we began to see the point of some of Bartletts strictures on psychoanalysis, you know: psychoanalysis wasn't very scientific, it was highly questionable. And not only Bartlett's influence but there was the influence of the logical positivist philosophy that was current in those days, analysing the meaning of things. Bartlett, sorry Boitz statements seemed to be unverifiable and so on.

BEPLYNE:

(83.)

M: Yes.

B: So we understood that there were reasons for being wary about Freud, but at the same time, Freud was dealing with important questions,

M: That's right.

B: Which were motivational questions. Now these Americans, you see, were using scientific method - in fact, certainly they were much more scrupulous about their experimental design in their fields of instruction than the Cambridge people were - but they were dealing with ~~the~~ the vital questions. So this is one way in which we differed from our present students. As I said, we have similar attitudes; in fact, it has been amazing to me that a generation of work by the mass media has made so little difference to information and attitudes. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . among students. But in one way, we differed and that is, for our students here, rat work. . . they look on rat work as we looked on, I suppose, Bartlett's work. When I say we, I mean not all the people who were there but people like myself, a few. That rat work is irrelevant; it's dealing with fiddling, pedantic questions and doesn't have anything to do with things we are interested in. But our situations was exactly the opposite. Lab part work was glamorous; this was the gateway to the scientific study of the problems that matter, the problems that Freud was sealing about, was dealing with, you see. So it was very

exciting.

And then I, so I read Mowra and I liked that very much. And then from Mowra, I went on to reading Hull and Neil Miller and this movement at Yale and other places to synthesize psychoanalysis and learning theory. I found it very exciting indeed for this is certainly what I wanted to take up, and then tried to later.

M: But now, who else besides Bartlett . You have just mentioned (muffled)

B: Wilisat. We, you see, one thing that we had in the Cambridge system was what was called supervision. You know, it was a small tutorial group that met every week. Now, Williford, who is now a professor in Australia, Adelaide, was the supervisor of myself and a friend of mine called Albert Chearns who was a close associate in those days. We went to Williford's for supervision, and Williford had just come back from the United States. He had gone to Princeton - this was about 1947 I suppose - he had come back and very few people had been to the United States. We heard a lot about this country in Psychology, but not many people had been there recently. He was a man who had come back from the very beginning of it all. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . Princeton in particular. And he told us about the things going on, Cantroll's work and Cherielle's work, and it seemed it wasn't quite as interesting to us as the work going on at Yale, but still it was interesting stuff

and certainly it was like fresh air. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . compared to the musty stuff we were getting at Cambridge. Also , he helped us. . . an important thing was getting bibliographic information because we had to do a lot of work on our own. Another thing that our students don't experience - there was no relation whatever between the exams and the courses.

The exams were what we would here call comprehensive exams. So that we found, at least those that had enough common sense to look into it, found that at least 50% of the material on the exams was not covered ~~on~~ courses anywhere and vice versa.

M: (laughter)

B: So you had to read on your own.

M: Yes.

B: And we did. We read, of, I think there was a time when we were reading three books a week. And I mean books like Hillgard and Marcus on Conditional Learning, was one. Quite obviously skimming it but getting ~~this~~ stuff out. In fact, that there was a time just before the exam when my head was. . . I could feel my head bursting. I could feel pain in the skull . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . through the stuff I was having to cram in, you see, but you see, what we did on our own. The guidance we got was. . . we got guidance from our supervisors if they were good. Willford was. Otherwise we followed up hints

in lectures. But to a large extent, we were on our own. And this was the way. I think it wasn't too good a system but this was the way we were.

M: This comprehensive style of examination, was that before you did your research, and did a thesis? Or. . .

B: There was no research and no thesis involved at the B.A. This was just a. . .

M: Oh, I'm sorry.

B: Yes.

M: You're just finishing your B.A.

B: That's right. The B.A. And the Honours B.A.

M: Oh yes.

B: Most people were on an Honours B.A. at Cambridge.

M: So the supervisor wasn't supervising you in research.

B: Oh no. A supervisor was what in fact, at Oxford he's called a tutor, amongst other things.

M: Tutor, eh.

B: Yes. Tutor. He would give us an essay to write and he would discuss things. so we were given individual attention and he would also be the only person who was keeping an eye on how we were doing, you see. At times, if you were slackening off, he would do something about it. Because we didn't have term tests or anything like that. We just had these formal exams.. Normally you would have. . . well, you would have the two tripost exams, of which there was only one in Psychology, the end one.

But you would also have a Preliminary Exam that didn't count for very much but was more for your information. This was at the end of the year when you didn't have a tripos/~~f~~ exam. Now I missed that because of the timing due to the war, so that my final examination in Psychology, on which all depended - no chance of taking it again, that was it - was the first examination in Psychology that I ever took, of any sort I had ever had in my life, you see. I mean, the only other kind of test I had had and it wasn't really a test, was writing essays for my supervisors who would judge them and I suppose would have produced negative feedback if they hadn't been good enough, but I we had this very important exam, without any previous experience of doing an examination in Psychology. A bit unusual but certainly not too unusual in the British system for people to have relatively few exams. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . on which a lot depends.

M: Yes. Now, about the tutor. At this stage, you were assigned or you selected him?

B: Oh no, we were assigned to a tutor.

M: Assigned to a tutor. How often did you see him?

B: Once a week.

M: Once a week.

B: Once a week. Right.

M: Was this regular?

B: Oh yes. Yes. And in fact. . .

BERLYNE:

88.

M: It's not something you skipped.

B: Oh no. That would be considered very discourteous and obviously you couldn't hide the fact. I mean, if you couldn't. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . come you would phone him and apologize. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . but you were expected to go there. Yes.

M: And so, in fact, this wasn't so casual?

B: No, no. No, this wasn't casual.

M: You couldn't go off to Italy for a couple of months?

B: No, no. Not unless you had cleared it. And this happened in all subjects, not only in Psychology.

M: Yes.

B: You see.

M: Yes.

B: And it's a very good system. It's expensive of course. That's why universities. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . find it difficult to use it.

M: You met him at his digs, in his. . .

B: You would meet him sometimes at his house or sometimes in his office at the university. . .

M: I see.

B: . . . whichever was convenient for him.

M: Yes. Yes.

B: And the supervision would be done by all sorts of

BERLYNE:

89.

people. There weren't enough lecturers - professors usually wouldn't do it - but there weren't enough lecturers, so it would be done by post graduate students. For example, I supervised the famous Broadbent, as a . . .

M: Oh.

B: . . . when I was just a year ahead of him, I'd had my B.A. and had a post-graduate year there and he came to me for supervision. And people like that would give supervision.

M: I see. Yes. Okay, so this is your first examination in Psychology. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . and how did you do?

✓ B: Well, I came in class one, which was a stroke of luck. And so that was alright. You, of course, get one grade for the whole exam. You take altogether something like eight papers, each lasting three hours with something like four essays to be written out of eight or three out of six, with the exception of one that was a three-hour essay - which, of course, you didn't see before-hand. So it was a tough thing, but there were techniques for dealing with it.

M: Would these be on successive days, or. . . ?

B: Yes. Two a day. . .

M: Two a day?

B: Yes. Well, we may have an afternoon off, but they would be scattered over and certainly, there might very well

two on a day, yes.

M: Now, was the atmosphere under which you wrote this exam a formal one or a casual one?

B: Well, formal to the extent that there were people watching you and you had to go and. . .

M: Oh

B: It was actually formal to the extent that you had ^{one of the} ~~the~~ gown. It was the ~~only~~ occasions that you had to wear a gown at Cambridge.

M: Oh.

B: Yes. And we had a practical exam also, a lab exam, which was, I remember, this lasted for six hours uninterruptedly. And it was a very hot day. And the ^{second} examiner was Stevens, William Stevenson, you remember? who was in charge of the Department at Oxford, later came to the United States and so on. He came round telling us ^{he was at} practice was ~~an~~ exam that had been different from previous exams, this practical exam. And we had thought that Stevenson knew nothing about anything except factor analysis. And, whether this was true or not, he didn't think so. He came around and talked to us about the way we were doing it. He told us we'd all been answering a certain question wrongly. And we told him that the way we were answering it seemed to be justified by the wording. And he said, 'Well, the question was worded badly.' And in the heat and the stress, you can imagine that that didn't do our morale our or tempers any good. But anyhow, we got through

that. And. . .

M: Well, what did the exam consist of? Doing anything?

B: No. No. No, it couldn't have done. It consisted of designing an experiment. You had. . . oh, I remember. One question was: you have to imagine that you are designing a liferaft that will showup on the sea, what will you do? We hadn't had any lectures on anything like that. However, I made up something that sounded like the best I could. And everybody else did the same. But, no ~~else~~ you couldn't do anything I don't think, but you had to state in detail how you would conduct it. Yes, that was it.

M: Practical only in the sense that questions were phrased in practical terms?

B: That's right. I think in later years, they had arranged to get some subjects from a local school or something to enable people conduct some experiments. But the problem was getting the subjects.

M: Yes. Okay, so this. . . the result of this, these examinations must have done a good deal to restore your confidence and self-esteem.

B: Oh yes. Yes. It certainly did. But by then, I sort of. . . I was firmly. . . I didn't think I could bank on a first class; it was a gamble. But at the same time, I felt I was doing all right and although I wasn't one of the people who was favoured by Bartlett. This was clear.

I mean Bartlett was not this unfavourable to me. He was always

very kind to me, but I wasn't one of his disciples. He did have disciples among the undergraduates who were very interested in his work and had this warm student-teacher relation. He didn't have it with me because I just wasn't all that interested. And later on, when I had the degree, of course, the question was: what to do next? So I went to Bartlett for an interview, which was customary, and he told us what the possibilities were. And there were various jobs.

There was a job, I remember, available in the fishponds hospital - I don't know if you've heard of this; this is a hospital near Bristol for retardates. There were some jobs in research there. There was somebody, the government wanted somebody to do some kind of study of the bonus system in the building trades. And various things like that. Although an alternative was to spend some time on research. You see, Bartlett had control, apparently, more or less control of all the research funding in Great Britain. We didn't realize this. It was only afterwards when I found out about the resentment of the people at London, and they were furious about this. But anyhow, he had various funds - Ford money and Rockefeller money which he used for his own research.

M: He had NRC money.

B: NRC too, yes... I mean, he was key figure on all the committees that made the decisions.

M: Yes.

B: So he had some money to dole out. And if you got a first, or even a ^{II.C} 2,1 in Psychology - which was considered quite good - he would take you on as a research student.

Now, what that means is that you could spend up to three years. And, at the end of the three years, you would write a thesis for a Ph.D. and for a fellowship. You see, the same thesis could do for both, a fellowship of a college, except that the fellowship was competitive - there were only a certain number. And if you became the Fellow of a college, then you could stay on. You would get some sort of a teaching appointment. You may eventually get some kind of a university appointment. But at the same time, most people didn't. You see, that's why, in those days, it was considered a bad thing, if anything to have a Ph.D. It was a sign, almost, that you had looked for a job for three years and hadn't found one.

M: Yes.

B: Because, if you found a job in the meantime, a university job, you were well advised to take it. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and get on the ladder while you could.

M: Yes.

B: So, anyhow, the best thing was to take this research studentship and keep a lookout for jobs, of which there were quite a few. This was a period when there hadn't been new people trained during the war, but universities were

expanding, Psychology Departments were expanding. So there was quite a demand for university staff.

M: This would be '48?

B: Yes this would be. I got the degree in '47 so this would be the year '47-48.

M: Yes.

B: I have to keep on mentioning this friend of mine, Albert Chearns, because we did everything together.

He is now Professor of Social Science at the Technical University in Lothbury, in England, now. And he was, for many years, a key figure in the research granting business. He was a top civil servant in the British Social Science Research Council, in England.

M: Oh.

B: Well, ^{now} learning British Psychology. But we were close friends; we had similar interests at the time. And we got our degree together and we took our job interviews together. You see, normally, when you got a B.A. - you didn't need anything higher than a B.A. for any teaching appoint ^{ment} - you could be a professor without anything higher ^{than} a B.A. But it was usual to get an assistant ^{lectureship} ~~lectureship~~. But because of the market, we felt, and were advised by people like Bartlett, that we could very well stand ^{up} ~~up~~ for a full lectureship.

There were several vacant and people with qualifications like ours should get them. But we had little success for a while. Albert and I always seemed to be put on the short list

for most of these jobs. And, they would be given, time after time - I don't know, we must have gone to six or eight interviews, I don't know how many - to people who were older. Age counted for a lot in British academic life. And there were several people about who were somewhat older than we were and maybe not as well qualified, but anyhow, older. And they would get the jobs. In fact, Albert and I used to say to ourselves - and these were people we didn't know about, we had never heard of - and we used to say, 'Look here, this stock of people whom we've never heard of who are more experienced than we are and are in for these jobs ^{can't} ~~must~~ be inexhaustible. The time must come when it comes to an end.' And then, time after time, this would happen. We would be ushered into a waiting room to await our interviews and then the door would open, and another man whom we had never seen would come in. And we'd be introduced and we'd look at each other and nudge each other meaning, 'This is the man who is going to get the job this time.' And it was.

M: (laughter)

B: So, we went on, you see. We weren't in all that much hurry because we did have this Rockefeller money supplied by Bartlett to fall back on. But we were anxious to get established as quickly as possible. And then, finally came the job. . .

M: Are most of these university jobs you are talking about?

B: Oh yes. I'm talking entirely about university jobs. . .

M: Oh.

B: . . . except once we did actually go for a clinical job. I don't know why. We weren't interested in it; we weren't qualified for it; we shouldn't get it. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . but we did.

M: (laughter)

B: At Chichester, ^{well} Graling ^{Well} Hospital. But most of them were university jobs, that's right. And we, oh, we would go and have the interview and the same sort of thing would happen. We got a bit disheartened by this but anyhow we persisted.

M: Well, weren't you interviewed on these occasions, therefore, by Psychologists?

B: You would be interviewed by an interviewing committee which consisted of people from several departments. It would consist of the professor of psychology - and of course, there would generally be only one - and the professors of supposedly neighbouring disciplines: the psychologists would have the lion share of the interviewing and the decision making probably, but it was. . . They were fairly formal. They varied, actually, they varied quite a lot.

M: I'm curious to know what psychologists you met in these interviews?

B: Well, there would be the professors of the . . .

M: ^{New at} Jos Bristol, for instance. Did you meet him?

B: Bristol. No, I remember going to Liverpool and ^{Hannah} ^{for} meeting Hernford. Manchester, Piat. We didn't. . . I can't remember some of the others. Some of them we didn't even get as far as the interview. You know, they would put people on a short list of two or three. Sometimes, they would do this even when they knew whom they were going to appoint. They felt, for form. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . they should invite some poorpeople up. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . to fill out the interview. But at any rate, of course, you see, at that time - maybe I'm talking about the time a little later when I actually had a job - but it was possible to know almost everybody in British university psychology. All the professors would be known by name and we would meet them personally pretty soon. At that particular stage, I didn't know them all personally, but at least I got to know quite a few.

M: You wouldn't, at this stage, be eligible to be a member of EPS and go to their meetings.

B: Oh, one would be eligible, but one didn't do it. It wasn't the "done" thing at Cambridge. Bartlett never went to a EPS meeting until he was elected president one year, I think, and he ^{furniture} yielded to preside at a meeting. Not, it was not the done thing. People looked down on the BPS.

The only reason I joined the BPS, actually - but I'm getting ahead of the story a little - was when I was at St. Andrews. The university was quite generous in paying expenses to go to meetings of the Scottish Branch of the BPS.

M: (laughter)

B: I found St. Andrews rather a dull place and the idea of a day away at Glasgow or anywhere. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . was worth whatever the fee was, you see. Otherwise, I probably never would have joined the BPS.

M: (laughter)

B: I don't know. At least, not till much later.

M: Now, going back a little earlier, my first encounter with the EPS was in 1941 when, of course, most of the psychologists that we would consider to be Psychologists had gone.

B: Yes.

M: And it impressed one. I can see why Bartlett would have marked disdain for it, because it seemed very much like a conference of tea cup readers and little old ladies. But that was wartime and a very severe shortage of. . .

B: Yes, but it was. . .

M: But I did encounter Eier, for example, who - during my experience of the several times I met him, was a very bitter

man, very embittered. He felt he had not been used. . .

B: He was always pretty jovial when I saw him.

M: Is that so?

B: Yes.

M: I got the impression that he was very persecuted man and very aggressively hostile to Bartlett, feeling that Bartlett had not. . .

B: A lot of people ^{were} are hostile to Bartlett. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . which ^{was} is rather a surprise. I mean, when Bartlett was such a revered creature at Cambridge, you would be surprised. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . to find that so many people were quite personally bitter towards him.

M: Well, when you went to see him - of course, it doesn't matter what time of the year it was and so on - but would you go into his office and discover that all the chairs around the outside of the office were covered with correspondence files and papers and so on. And wouldn't he stand up in front of that grate he had in his office and talk to you standing? Or would you sit down?

B: I can't remember. I seem to remember that I would sit down and I think he might very well have been standing. I remember his office very well. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . it was a rather untidy office. Yes, that's

right. But he would speak. . . he was completely cordial. He would smile and. . . but he would talk in his rambling way and. . .

M: Were you ever invited out to his country estate?

B: Not to there. . . But to his house. Once, for example, when I was a post-graduate student, I was invited to one of his tennis parties. He used to. . . he wouldn't play himself, although I gather in his youth he had been very good at sport, cricket too he played. But he would invite some of his students to play tennis and meet Lady Bartlett. I can't remember whether this was just after he was knighted or just before. And his son, who was a medical student then. Yes. This happened to me once. I don't know, I think it happened to some people more often and some people less often - but it happened once.

M: Mentioning his knighthood, Bott and I went to see him in 1941 just when Bartlett had been thrown out of the Air Force. . .

B: Oh.

M: . . . well, thrown out of his job as advisor.
That's why we were invited over.

B: Oh, I see. I remember hearing some vague story about that.

M: Yes. And so we went to pay our respects to the Professor of Cambridge and it was one of the coldest receptions you've ever had. There were actually three of us - Air Force officers. We were ushered into his office and he stood up

but there was no place for us to sit down because all the chairs were covered with papers. . .

B: I see.

M: . . . and he stood, it was a bitterly cold day, and he stood with one leg blocking. . .

B: Yes. Yes.

M: . . . the only source of warmth in the room, you see. And we stood there with our hats and coats on, shivering, for this interview. And he did take us over to St. John's for lunch. . .

B: Excuse me, he must have given you a cold but smiley reception. I couldn't imagine him not smiling.

M: Oh, it was a smile. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . but it was an awfully cold smile.

B: Oh yes. Well, he had an odd smile actually. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . it was an odd character and his appaarnce in many ways. . .

M: Well then, later, we toured the labs and I met Craig. And when we were going, George Drew was there. George Drew was in his office on the occasion when we were saying thanks and good-bye. And George later told us that as we walked away, Bartlett turned to George and said: "There goes my knighthood."

B: Oh. I see. I see.

M: Although I don't think there's any, any. . .

B: People say that he. . .

M: . . . any surprise. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . at his feelings toward us, because he has had this bitter quarrel with the Air Force. . .

B: That's right.

M: . . . you see, and lost. And here were these upstarts who. . .

B: Well, he got his knighthood (^{eventually} garbled) and so on.

M: I know he did. But it's interesting that he would interpret what had happened. . .

3(a)

M: . . . for various interviews you and your pal had for a. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . lectureship.

B: Yes, and then came the final one which was rather ironic, at St. Andrew's in Scotland. For some reason, I was put on the short list and Albert was not. This was the first time this had happened. And it so happened that Albert would have liked this job very much. You see, he was married by then and had a child and I was always one for the big cities. So, he would have liked the job and I didn't like it particularly, but I took it. You see, I went to St. Andrew's and, it is a very picturesque little

town. You see, it is an old university, the third oldest university in Great Britain. Not necessarily the third best but the third oldest one after Oxford and Cambridge. It was an extremely picturesque town with its ruined cathedral and ruined castle by the sea. But it certainly was a nice place to visit, but you wouldn't like to live there.

M: (laughter)

B: And I didn't. One thing I had learned in the Army was how to size up a town very quickly. When you went to a new place in the army, you were ^{called} going to see what it was like as soon as you were there. Where was the nearest big city, how soon can you get there and that kind of stuff. So, I went to St. Andrew's for an interview and the job was a good one - the job was a lecturship rather than an assistant lectureship. It paid 550 pounds a year whereas the normal rate was 500 pounds a year. And the other conditions were quite favourable. And they did a rather unusual thing there: they told me there and then that they would offer me the job and normally they didn't. They wrote you sometime later. And, anyhow, I said I would like to go think about it - which was quite a normal thing to do - and as soon as I got back, it's a funny thing, it's true, but before I wrote them a letter accepting the appointment, I wrote to the secretary of the university to ask how much notice you have to give to resign, because I was sure that it was a place I wouldn't like to spend the rest of my life. . . just because it was too small and isolated.

M: Well, was there any. . . were there any other Psychologists there?

B: Oh, well, there were, but not very many. You see, the Psychology Department had. . .

M: They had a Department?

B: Oh, they had a Department which, well, it had been founded I think in the early 1930's and not many departments in Britain were founded as early as that. It had had Mace there who had ^{done lots} sort of built it up. And it had had a man called Oser, who later went to Australia, and then it had closed down during the war - literally closed down. And it was opening up again under the headship of a man called Henry Fergusson, who was a man who had graduated and spent some time in New Zealand - and is actually just about retiring this year.

And Henry Fergusson was not the professor - there was no professor then although there is one now. But he never became the professor, he was the head, the senior lecturer and head. I think I was the first member of the staff besides him. The only member of the staff besides him at that time, apart from a lab technician a remarkable man called Mr. Sweeney who was a secretary-lab technician-advisor to students and a very fine character, jack-of-all-trades. Then later on, other people were added. Like, for example, this man Peter McKeller I've mentioned worked there. And I think, by the time I left three years ago, the staff had gone up to about. . .

M: Three years ago?

B: Three years later, I mean.

M: (laughter)

B: Well, three years later. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . the staff had gone up to about four or five.

M: Had Betty, what's her name, arrived.

B: No, that's Aberdeen you're thinking about.

M: Oh.

B: That's right. Yes.

M: Yes.

B: Yes. No, St. Andrew's was one of the places where Psychology had had a history, but it had not been viewed favourably. You see, in European universities generally, the Departments traditionally had less autonomy than over here because many of the decisions were made by a Faculty or a group of departments. And there, there was a thing called the Philosophy Board of Studies, which we belonged to. And they were hostile to Psychology. We wanted to expand our course. You see, we gave an honours M.A. - it's called an M.A. in Scotland, the first degree - an honours M.A. in Psychology. But you couldn't do Psychology only; you had to do Psychology plus some other subject, possibly Economics or something. And I think we, our course, lasted two years and we wanted to expand it. And Henry Fergusson produced plans. And we had these peculiar meetings of the Board of Studies of Philosophy in which ~~wanted~~

BERLYNE:

106.

squash it. You see, the professor of Moral Philosophy would object. He was a man who later on became the principal of Knox. He was a Scotch Hegelian. He wasn't actually Scottish; he was English, but he was a Scotch Hegelian. He was bitterly opposed to experimental psychology. He said, 'You've got down on your curriculum here something about behaviour and motivation. That's not Psychology; that's Moral Philosophy.' And the professor of Greek would say - I mean literally; I'm not exaggerating at all - would say, 'I see that you have here something about the psychology of language; and I think that until people have done sufficient Latin and Greek, they shouldn't learn the psychology of language.' And so on. There was another man, a very nice man actually, professor of logical ^{and} metaphysics, Wright, who was against psychology. But he thought psychology was all about sex and everything and it wasn't fit for young girls. They all had their various objections. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . and this was the first university I had ever been at except Cambridge and the first one where I had ever seen things from the ^{a. self manner} Scottish point of view. And I had no way of knowing how peculiar this was; I thought all universities were like this. I didn't realize what an odd place St. Andrew's was, especially with regard to Psychology. So Psychology was not well viewed. It was not allowed to flourish.

M: Well, it wasn't like Cambridge. You found out later, it is very like Oxford in this kind of thing. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . overt. . .

B: Yes.

M: (garbled name) described these same meetings you've mentioned.

B: Yes. I suppose you are right. There were some similarities, although there were differences in that the whole thing was much smaller. You see, the whole university had 1,200 students in St. Andrew's and about 800 at Dundee, which was Glasgow's separate university. And we were just beginning in the ~~honest~~ course with 20 or 30 students in the lower years. . .

M: Yes.

B: Quite a small thing, where, for example in these small Scottish universities - like St. Anne's in Aberdeen - the principal, as he is called, would have, well, would poke his nose into many more things than the president can here. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . just because of the size, you see.

M: Yes.

B: He could keep an eye on absolutely everything and would do so, you see.

M: Sure.

RAT MAZE

BERLYNE:

103.

(H)

B: So psychology was not. . . I mean I. . . it wasn't bad for me. I enjoyed the courses I gave. I was able to start some research. I didn't have any research grant, but you didn't need any funds. There were funds in the budget. I started some rat research, you see. I should mention that the first time I ever saw a rat, I suppose, an experimental rat, was in early 1949 in the middle of my first year in St. Andrew's when I went to visit London. Among other places, I visited the Bethlehem Hospital, where there was an outgrowth of Isaac's Maudsley Department. And Roger Russell was then a visiting Fulbright professor. Of course, he became the professor at the University College, London very soon after that. He was setting up this animal lab and I went to see it. Sorry, I've got the chronology slightly wrong. This is, I know now, after I began my own animal work, but anyhow let me mention this. For the first time in my life I saw a likely jumping stand and a maze, in the flesh, you see. I had read about these things in books. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and as I said before, they had a certain glamour.

M: You had seen pictures.

B: Yes. But here, I saw an actual rat in an actual likely jumping stand. This was very exciting, you see, and this was Roger Russell who was greeting me very warmly. *

He was a man who was an emissary from these parts where all this work went on. Now, actually, I did animal work before him because I was the second person to do animal work in Great Britain after the war. There was quite a bit before the war, done by Drew and Grindley and others. But it had all closed down during the war and most of those people got into applied work afterwards.

The first person to do any animal work was apparently a girl, I can't remember her name; I never knew her and she hasn't been heard of afterwards, who did an M.A. Thesis under Knight at Aberdeen about 1946 with a little rat experiment. But I was the second.

M: Yes, but you know that McDougal did rat experiments at Oxford at the time when the Board of Regents at Oxford had passed a law that no one was allowed to do rat, animal. . . That's in his autobiography.

B: Oh yes, that was much earlier of course.

M: Oh yes.

B: Yes, that's right.

M: Way back. But you mean after the war? Right.

B: Yes. I was the second one after the war. That's right. Yes. Now, it was under peculiar circumstances. I remember, first of all, I wanted to consult people who had had experience with rat work. This was before I had contact with Roger Russell who was in a good position to give good advice, but there were only two people in the country that had had experience with rat work that I knew of, although they weren't doing any then. One was George Humphrey at Oxford. The other one was Drew. And the both gave me, as it

turned out, bad advice, you see. for example, I was doing work in which I wanted to see whether rats would approach a light area rather than a dark area. This was work connected with curiosity and things of that nature. And Drew told me that this wouldn't work because rats were negatively phototropic. Well, as a matter of fact, my experiment didn't work, but other experiments later with other designs showed that rats would press a button or a bar to put a light on. And then Humphreys gave me some very peculiar advice: he said, 'Never handle the rats with gloves.' Which I didn't. And of course, I've still got some scars; I'm quite proud of them, rat bites. But since then, my students who handle rats handle them with gloves and there has never been any evidence that it makes a difference to their experiments, and it certainly makes a difference to their fingers. . .

M: (laughter)

B: But anyhow, I didn't handle them with gloves.

M: Now, did you see George Humphrey and Drew?

B: No.

M: Or you wrote them?

B: I saw Drew at a BPS meeting. I wrote Humphrey.

I did meet him. I think I met him briefly at the 1954 National Congress in Montreal, but at this time, no, this was correspondence. And then another thing I had to do was rather peculiar. The department had no rat facilities, so I had very few rats. I had two cages housing six rats each.

CARRIES
RATS

BERLYNE:

2 cages having 6 rats each. 111.
And I kept them in the animal facilities in the Medical School. And I used to go there. And I would put a cover over the cage and I would carry them through the town to the Psychology Department where I would leave them, usually for a few hours, to settle down. I remember I would go into a newspaper shop and collect my paper and *Put [in] cage* put these on the ground and the dogs would start nosing round and. . . Anyhow, it worked sufficiently.

M: (laughter)

B: Rather crude, but. . .

M: Well, how far away would this. . . ?

B: Oh, not very far. About 10 minutes walk.

M: I see.

B: But I remember, Drew said. . . , no, Humphrey said, 'You can't do this, the maze begins the moment you leave the rats' quarters.' And for one thing, there wasn't a maze involved. But in any case, I never found any evidence that this made any difference to them except. . . they settled down^{and} the experiment seemed to work quite well, which is the first experiment I ever did on *Egyptian* ^{between} rats. So I got this experiment done on a small scale and this got into the laboratory research. This actually grew out of the work I did during my post-graduate year at Cambridge. You see, Bartlett was a strange man. He was very intolerant. He had a disdain for all Psychology outside Cambridge with very few exceptions - like Mishot and Curlew. So that when I told him I wanted to do this work which had nothing to do

BERLYNE:

1121

with his current interests, he didn't mind. He didn't stop me. He made it clear that I didn't think very much of this and didn't think much would come of it. But he certainly didn't stop me. Now this says a lot for him.

M: Yes.

B: I started doing work on, well, it was on the topic of interest. I did some experiments on attention, which were later published and I wrote a review article on the concept of interest - it was the first thing I ever published, in 1949, British Journal of Psychology. And this was the time when I was intensely interested in the learning theory of ^{the} ~~Hall~~ Yale-Hall-Marlowe variety. And I took these problems up because it seemed to me that, and it really seemed to ^{many} ~~make~~ people in those days, that the problems of Psychology were almost solved, you see. There was a synthesis of Hall ~~and~~ such like - and Freud. That seemed to make good sense and it seemed that really, a convincing theoretical system was just about in the finishing stages. . . There were just a few things. And it struck me that problems like attention and interest and curiosity were a few minor things that the present state of that theory hadn't taken care of sufficiently. I thought that just a few finishing touches would take care of it and that was how I got into that particular line of research. And this is what was pursued further when I did these rat experiments in St. Andrews' you see.

M: That's fascinating. Very interesting. Especially

that feeling that. . . this marriage between learning theory and Freudian theory you have just opened. . .

B: Yes.

M: Just a few doors.

B: Well, you see, it became very plausible. And the strange thing is that many years later, some of the pioneers of behaviour therapy - of course, there were many other people besides the Skinnerians, you see - the Hullian people like Isaac and Halpy and C.J. Taylor began to develop a synthesis of Hullian ideas and anti-Freudian ideas. You see, they had a theory of neurosis and especially a ^{Cybernetic} ^{W.L.Y.} ^{J.C.} ~~theoretical~~ ^{empirical} theory of psychotherapy that was ~~damnishly~~ close to Freuds in many respects. And they made the synthesis between this and Hull's theory equally plausible, which of course, is a very instructive thing, that this ~~treatment of~~ ^{empirical} plausibility can be very deceptive. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . it can be more than that.

M: Yes. Oh, yes.

B: But still, that was the exciting thing and it was an exciting thing at Yale later too. And now, obviously, it doesn't seem the same to me at all, but. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . it did in those days.

M: Yes. Okay. And you were there. . ?

B: Well, I was there for three years. Oh, I tried to get out, in the sense that I wanted to know how long is was,

BERLYNE:

114.

"decent" to stay in a place. And people gave me the idea that two or three years was decent. I don't know why I was all that concerned about decency, but at any rate, I wanted to feel decent. There was no. . . well, very few jobs came up. The job market changed. I did apply for a Commonwealth Fund Fellowship to go to the United States after two years, but although I was put on a short list, I didn't succeed. And, yes, by the time I had been at St. Andrew's two years, it became evident to me that I should try to get to the United States. Because the type of Psychology I was interested in was going on in the United States. We very much got the impression, which I think was accurate, that Psychology in the United States was 20 or 30 years ahead of British psychology and I don't just mean that as a value judgement; I mean that they were doing things in Great Britain that they did in the United States 20 or 30 years ago. . .

M: Yes.

B: So I had to go ^{to} the United States and temporarily, and that was my idea, just temporarily to learn what was going on and come back. One or two other people were beginning to do this. Quite a few people I knew had been to the United States for a while, so I felt that this was a thing I should do.

So, I applied for various things and the first time I didn't succeed, but finally, the next time ⁱⁿ that year, I did succeed in getting a fellowship tenable at Yale

BERLYNE:

11.5

University offered by the English Speaking Union - offered jointly, actually, by the English Speaking Union and Yale University. So that gave me a chance to go to Yale. If I had got the Commonwealth Fund Fellowship the year before, I might have gone to Yale, but actually, I got in touch with ^{le} Hull - I indicated ^{le} he was the man I was interested in - and he sent the message to me through them, through the Commonwealth Fund office, that Yale wasn't the best place to go to for Hullian psychology; Iowa was the place. So, if I had got that Commonwealth Fund Fellowship, I might have taken his advice and gone to Iowa. But the. . .

M: ^{le} He passed the mantel onto Spence even then?

B: Oh yes, he felt that, yes. He was rather disappointed at the fact that his work wasn't being pursued as he wanted it to be by his colleagues at Yale, or students for that matter.

M: Yes.

B: Oh yes, this is the. . .

M: But it was being pursued. . .

B: But he was right.

M: . . . in a way he liked to see at Iowa.

B: This was true. This was true. Well, anyhow, the fellowship I got was only tenable at Yale. It was a thing that was just assigned for that purpose, so I had to go to Yale. And this was all right. It was certainly one of the places that I was interested in.

M: Were you married by this time?

B: No. No. So this was 1951. I went over to the United States to take up this Fellowship at Yale. And at Yale, I of course, met some of the great names that I was familiar with. ^{Neil} ^{Hovland} I met Neil Miller and Copeland and I met Hull although Hull was not very active - he was very sick and had ^a coronary thrombosis. He was . . . he knew he didn't have long to live. And as a matter of fact, he died at the end of that year. He was very frail. But I did talk with him three times. In fact, when I first arrived, well, he had been interested in some papers and especially one paper I had written in the Psychological Review - a sort of Hullian theory of perception: "The Rudiments of a Hullian Theory of Perception."

So he invited me to his house and then he came to the Department rarely but on two occasions I had talks with him lasting about an hour. He invited me, actually, to Thanksgiving dinner at his house on Thanksgiving, 1951, but I had already arranged to go to Boston, so I didn't take this up. Which was rather a pity. It would have been a very nice experience. But, anyhow, I had this contact with Hull and I had more contact with Miller. I attended his course and Hovland and Doob. I did a little psychotherapy under Dollard. This was sort of ^{Hull's} below-Freudian psychotherapy.

M: Yes.

B: He took a patient under his supervision and so on. So this was a very profitable. . . I just had one year there. I found, actually, I didn't learn all that much about Hullian learning theory because I had already learned a lot about it, you know. I learned some of the details

but on the whole my knowledge of it was very good because I just read it all very thoroughly. But I did learn a lot of things I hadn't learned before and they were very valuable. Mainly statistics and research design. The training we got in Cambridge was very defective in these fields, so that was one good thing.

M: Now, who did you learn Statistics and research design from, any particular. . . ?

B: Yes. From Sheffield. . .

M: I see.

B: . . . and Hovland, in particular.

M: Yes. Yes.

B: Yes. So we got very. . . And, of course, in general, I found American Psychology worked, so I found out about the American educational system, which was very different from the British in many ways - not only on the university level but on other levels. That this explained the differences in the context of Psychology in many respects. Certain, it was very instructive indeed.

M: You said you were only there one year?

B: I was at Yale only one year, you see. But what happened was this. At the end of the year, the question came up of whether I should take a Ph.D. I didn't go there. . .

M: Oh.

B: . . . with the purpose of taking a Ph.D. because it wasn't necessary to teach in Great Britain.

M: No.

B: As a matter of fact, when I got. . . you see, I left Cambridge before I had completed the time for a Ph.D. That was normal. When I got to St. Andrew's, I looked into the possibility of writing up some research and taking a St. Andrew's Ph.D. And this caused quite a flurry, because nobody had taken a Ph.D. in St. Andrew's at the Faculty of Art since 1928. I mean it was there, it was on the books, you could do it, but they didn't know what they wanted to do about it and in the end they advised me, They said Don't bother, just publish things. And it would be just as good.
And I gave up the idea.

But then, when I went to the United States, I wasn't thinking of taking a Ph.D. because by the time I had gone through that year, I thought I might as well for two reasons: one was, that I wanted to have the experience of going through the American "mill" that American psychologists had. I realized this was good rigorous training. And secondly, it occurred to me that I might possibly want to stay on or come back to the United States one day. I didn't have any definite plans of that sort, but if I did, a Ph.D. would be mandatory. And then it turned out that they would give. . . they gave me credit, you see, you had to, Yale regulations required three years of study for a Ph.D., minimum, plus a two years minimum residence in New Haven. Now, they gave me one year's credit for the post-graduate year I had done at Cambridge. And I suppose I had done other things.

I had published ^{some} papers . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I had more experience than most of the graduate students there. And they were willing to interpret the residence rules liberally. You see, in fact, nobody defined residence. At Cambridge they did; you had to be in residence so many nights each terms, and in residence meant within so many miles of Great St. Mary's Church. At yale, they had no such definitions, you see, so that later on I got a job for a year at ~~Courtland~~ ^{Harkness} College as what was called a substitute. And they agreed that as long as I pursued my research and could come into New Haven for consultations from time to time, they were willing to count that as second year of residence, you see, which was very generous of them. And anyhow, that's what happened.

So, since by staying on an extra year and doing things that way, I could try for a Ph.D., I decided to do so. And Hoveland was my supervisor and I did. I taught ^{lectures} at Courtland College and I submitted a thesis which, well, ^{all} was successful and five revisions as usual and so on. But anyhow, it was successful and I took the Ph.D. degree in 1953.

M: Yes. You've mentioned the staff who were there, but talk about your colleagues. . . .

B: Yes.

M: Who were there?

BERLYNE:

120.

B: Oh yes. Well, a lot of the people ^{who} were there as graduate students are people who have now become quite well known. I don't know if I can remember them all. . .

M: No.

B: . . . but certainly, they included George Mandler (who was here). I remember, when I arrived at Yale in the Psychology Department, I went to introduce myself to some people like Neil Miller and so on, great men on the staff, but they said, 'There is one man you must meet; that's George Mandler.' George Mandler was the uncrowned king of the graduate students. I think, officially, he was the Chairman of the Colloquium Committee. But he was very helpful and very friendly and he helped me get settled in various ways, so he was a good man to get to know. Well, he was there certainly.

Oh, other names would be Ed Murray - I'm not necessarily mentioning them in any. . .

M: No.

B: . . . order, but there was Murray, Berkin, Byron Campbell, Jerry Kagan, Lesser (of Harvard), Kessen, Sheppard was certainly one of them, who was certainly one of the ones who became best known, mostly for his ^{teaching} techniques. Of course, you remember, I took a variety of courses at Yale. Although I was there physically for one year, that belonged to two years. You see, . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I had this peculiar arrangement so I

overlapped. You see, I was with two generations of various students.

M: I see.

B: I don't know, that's not a complete list. . .

M: No. No.

B: . . . or anything.

M: No.

B: But there were a large number of them. And the students had a very high level of aspiration. You see, they had the idea that Yale was the place in the world where important things in Psychology was going on. And they had Hull there and he was not the only one by any means. Another famous people. And they certainly fancied themselves as potentially successors of these great men. They. . .

M: As indeed they became.

B: Some of them, yes they did. . .

M: Some of them.

B: . . . although whether they became quite as towering figures as. . . I don't know, I suppose people take a generation or so to become towering figures.

M: Yes.

B: In fact, I remember that when I took lectures from Grindley at Cambridge, he would write on the board names like Hull and Tiffman, and these names were simply well known human beings who were well known for certain research - they weren't the towering giants that they became later.

M: That's right.

B: And I suppose there always is this time-lag.

M: Yes. Sure.

B: But anyhow, these were some well known. . .

M: You're talking about 20 years back there.

B: Well, I know. . .

M: (mumbled)

B: Yes I am, and so on. But. . .

M: Now, you say, 'They had the feeling. . ."

But you shared that feeling.

B: Oh yes. Certainly. We had a very high level of aspiration. We. . . and the graduate students would, for example, offer improvements on Hull's theory, which in some cases really were improvements. They would aim very high indeed. There was a pressure there, of course. They had the usual insecurity, the danger of being thrown out and economic insecurity, which distinguished them from British students. It distinguished them that while although there was an insecurity, I had never come across that pressure and that level of aspiration anywhere else. For example, I taught for a year later at Berkeley, which ^{one of the} is a, most highly reputed graduate schools in Psychology, but there they had a relaxed time compared to those Yale students. You see, this was the hardest part of their education for them. For me, it wasn't, because the last three years at high school were the hardest. . .

M: Yes.

B: And also, things were easier for me because I had

done some of those things before.

M: Yes.

B: But with these students, who had had a relatively easy time at high and undergraduate school, and then had to master all this stuff very quickly, with a language exam and the minor specific project and the major and goodness knows what besides this, they had a tough time indeed.

M: Was this anxiety or positive fear of failing, of being thrown out, was this a realistic. . .?

B: Oh yes. People were thrown out at the end of the first year. I suppose, looking back on it, I think the people who were thrown out may have been the people who should have been thrown out, I don't know. I think that, you know, at the time, we were a bit puzzled by some of the decisions, but maybe they knew what they were doing, but they. . .

M: It was a justifiable fear in your view?

B: Oh, certainly. Yes.

M: It wasn't just an atmosphere?

B: Well, it was partly the fear of being thrown out, but the fear also of not coming up to expectations. . .

M: Yes.

B: Maybe you might get your ph.D. but you wouldn't cut such a fine figure later. Yes, really, it wasn't so insecure that people were paralyzed. People got a lot of work done; they would work very long hours; they would do their research assistanceship in the evening. And course-work

during the day.

M: Yes.

B: So that they had a ^{shift} big pace of work. And they did relax and have parties and drink and so on. They were a pleasant lot to be with. It took me a few months to feel at ease with them. I mean, mainly because they were ill at ease with me; they didn't know, I came from such a different background, they didn't know how to take me. You see,

M: Yes.

B: . . . they weren't used to people from a ^{culturally} different culture. But, oh, easy enough, I got into a ~~the swing~~ gang very well.

M: Were you the first or were you the only non-American student?

B: Well, there was one exception - I am Waterhouse, an Australian, who is now a prominent figure in Australian psychology. He was there; I think we two were the only ones.

M: Yes.

B: They had had others before and after, but at that time, only. . . And I was probably rather shy, and maybe conformed a bit more than other people might to their ^{standard} stereotype of a sarcastic cold Britisher, . . .

M: Reserved English. . .

B: Something like that. But anyway, I got along very well with them. . . after a while. . .

M: Yes.

B: Yes.

M: What kind of a teacher was . . . did you take
a course with ~~Neil~~ ^{Neil} North?

B: Yes.

M: What kind of a teacher was he?

B: Not very good. He obviously didn't like teaching very much; he regarded it as a chore. But at the same time, we got a lot from his seminars. He would give his readings and there would be a discussion. And I seem to remember that the graduate students there were of a high calibre; that they would discuss quite freely and vociferously. So we would learn quite a lot from it. But he wouldn't pay all that much attention to the techniques of teaching.

M: Well, he didn't need to cater to you at that. He had a name apart from Psychology.

B: Oh yes. After all, he was more interested in his research, as many ~~America~~ psychologists are.

M: Is it your impression now, looking back, that you learned most from fellow graduate students, from staff, from books, or what - as you say, you were already pretty well versed in Hullian. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . psychology - but you learned a lot of other things. Now, is this mostly, or is this just a mixture of them all?

B: Well, the specific things I learned - like research design and ~~statistics~~ from the courses, I remembered

that from the courses. Analysis of variance, you see, was introduced in England. In fact, by Fisher, it was in Cambridge in the 1930's if I am not mistaken. It was introduced in agriculture. Now, at Cambridge, they didn't teach this. Grindley, when he was my supervisor, did mention that there was something new, hot off the press as it were, called analysis of variance coming out. But he didn't talk about it and nobody knew anything about it, which was very late - it had come to the United States by then. So that when these people talked mysteriously about degrees of freedom, I had no idea what they were talking about. I was very puzzled by this until later on, I found out what they meant and how you do allocate degrees of freedom, and so on. so that I learned from the courses, ^{organized} those courses seemed to be in control quite well.

I learned from graduate students a lot about how American psychologists think, how people think when they are. . . Well, from Miller, we learned a lot about how you think, or at least how he thought when planning research. And how, for example, you always have an experiment at the back of your mind when you are talking about any theoretical issue, or you look for an experiment out of the back of your mind.

M: Yes. That was, maybe not as exciting as your undergraduate years at Cambridge, but in its own way, it is perhaps as exciting a time as you've ever had in Psychology?

B: Yes, I think that was. It was a . . . probably,

It was a bit stressful in many ways. I mean, this was a strange thing for me to. . . I mean, it turned out I coped with everything. But I wasn't sure I was coping or could cope.

M: Yes.

B: This was quite a strange environment, not exactly what I was expecting, so I remember it was a somewhat stressful year, but certainly not unpleasant.

M: Did you have anything that you would describe initially on arrival there like culture shock?

B: Well. . .

M: Because it was a shift in culture among other things.

B: Well, not all that. . . I was expecting that. I was expecting that America would be different. I mean, in Great Britain, you learn about America, not always accurately, from the films. I was surprised at some of the things that. . . at some of the ways that they did things in the universities. I mean, I had of course also to suffer a drop in status, you see. At St. Andrew's, I had been a lecturer, which was sort of, you know, an assistant professor. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . but higher than an assistant professor. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I mean, you. . . when you wrote a book, if you wrote a book, you would put your name down and, you know, Lecturer in Psychology at the University of ST. Andrew's. . .

M: Yes.

B: A fine, rolling phrase, you see. Then I was a graduate student. In fact, this was a sort of, not exactly a bone of contention, but a troublesome thing, that they wouldn't, you know, in their North American system. . . anything you do before your Ph.D. is prenatal. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . you see, so the Idea that I was, that I had come from a different system where I had the status that was equivalent to some of the people on the staff, and now I was a humble graduate student, I mean it didn't cause any. . . that didn't cause any great stress, I adjusted to that quite well. But it was a bit of a. . . certainly, a change. It was a thing I had to adjust to.

M: The mere fact they didn't recognize this.

B: Yes, it's not. . . they went out of their way to be polite and. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . courteous, but they didn't. . . for example, I knew that if I wanted a job - in fact, it happened when I later looked for a job in the UNited States at the end of that year. They gave me no credit for these three years I had done in St. Andrew's. I was treated as a fresh Ph.D. and sometimes they' apologize. I tried to explain to them. I even had a little lecture on the differences between the American and the British Systems. . .

M: (laughter)

B: And sometimes they would say that they understood but the Dean wouldn't, or they understood but nothing could be done. And nothing could be done. And anyhow, I just did do that. . .

M: Yes. Yes.

B: . . . but this was a sort of thing that. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . was a little difficult at times

M: Okay, and you taught, what, a full teaching load
British
at Berkeley?

Berkeley
B: At Berkeley, I did a 15-hour teaching load and this was it. In fact, I remember, two days a week, I gave the same lecture three times running between eleven and two o'clock. And so 15-hours. I mean, people who were there permanently had research and other commitments, they *selected* could get a reduction. And I think now it's *(mumbled)*. But 15-hours was the thing. I mean, people are talking. . .

3(b)

B: Yes, 15 hours was rather tough. But anyhow, I liked the teaching there. They were a very very good group of students. They asked embarrassing questions at times and I didn't always answer them all that politely, but they were very practical students. They reminded me much more of the British university population than most other undergraduate populations I had met over here.

They were people who were strongly motivated. They came from relatively poor families, many of the Jewish and coloured, who were anxious to get ahead, but they also had intellectual values you see. It was a college where the sort of man who sounded as if he knew a lot - whether he did or not - had the prestige rather than the football stars. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and this was the case of most of the students I had mixed with in Great Britain.

M: Yes.

B: So I liked that although it was tough. And I had to do a thesis experiment and get the thesis written and so on during that year.

M: And commute to New Haven?

B: Not very often. Maybe two or three times a year I did. I had to go there for an oral exam and so on, yes. And so that was a tough year but it wasn't bad. It was living in New York. I liked that.

M: And then?

B: Then, well, in 1953 in Yale I got the Ph.D. And, of course, the question came up of what to do next. During that summer, or well the end of that summer, I was also married. And that was an additional responsibility. And at that time, I, well I wouldn't have been averse to living in the United States. My ambition always was to get a job in

one of the most desirable places in England - Oxford, Cambridge, or London. But it was very difficult to do that, just because there weren't many. ^{of them} (garbled)

And, I mean, if I had really wanted to stay on at Cambridge by hook or by crook, the thing to do would have been to remain there for the completion of the three-year post-graduate research studentship, get a fellowship and then somehow or other you could always eek out a living. There were times when I regretted not having done that, but I think now I don't. I don't think that would have been a good thing to do. Anyhow, I wasn't. . . I certainly wasn't keen on going back to St. Andrew's - they gave me leave. And they made it. . . Well, as a matter of fact, come to think of it, they gave me leave for one year but when I decided to stay in the United States a second year, they made it clear in a very pleasant way that either I came back or the leave came to an end. They couldn't keep the job open any longer, which was reasonable, and so I told them I wouldn't come back. I wasn't very keen on going back to St. Andrew's. I would have been interested in any desirable job in Great Britain, especially in the three big places, but none were offered.

So, I looked around for opportunities in the United States. And there didn't seem to be very good ones there. This was a time when their market was getting less favourable. So, what happened was that I was offered a job in Aberdeen by Rex Knight. Aberdeen was actually one of the places that

Albert and I had applied to in the early days.

M: (laughter)

B: Fred Smith got that job; he was then the ~~unknown~~^{only experienced} senior person, Fred Smith, who is now the professor at Durham, Australia. Anyhow, REx Knight had known me. I mean, you see, it's actually not all that easy to get a job in Great Britain or a British university from abroad because you can't go through the interview system and so on. But he knew me and he sent me a cablegram and offered me a job at, I think, 1,000 pounds a year, which was not bad for those days. And that seemed to be the best of all the things to do. So, I went there and stayed there for three years.

So, fresh from the United States and full of the way they did things there, I went back to Great Britain, to Aberdeen. And I stayed there three years.

M: What. . . . did you have a counter-culture shock then?

B: Well, I knew Scotland, you see, and Scotland. . . well, frankly, I didn't like Scotland as such very much. I think I'd have liked the big cities of Scotland. I don't like small towns in any case. Small towns in Scotland seemed to me more trying than elsewhere. They are very isolated and the geography of Scotland with its mountains and its glens produces this. It's a very homogeneous culture. It's one that it is difficult to feel comfortable in if you are not brought up in it, or if you've no particular sympathy

for its' values. The people in Scotland. . . I mean, they are kind and pleasant, but aloof to strangers, in small towns at least. So I found St. Andrew's very trying indeed. I was very glad to get out of it. I mean, I was young and unmarried. I had much more in common with the students than the staff. And the students did have a good time at St. Andrew's and I occasionally went to their parties and so on, but the atmosphere was such that they didn't feel too comfortable with me or vice versa. I mean, they did their best and I did my best, but I couldn't really become part of their circle. Cambridge would have been easier because of the tradition.

M: Was a factor in this your development of cosmopolitan tastes in regard to where you'd been abroad for some time in other cultures, you're. . . I'm thinking of your tastes for movies or music or. . .

B: Yes. Yes.

M: . . . a broader spectrum of experiences?

B: Oh yes, this is certainly so. And, one thing I've never. . . I've always disliked has been any kind of narrowness or parochialism, you know. And some people can't help having it in certain. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . circles, but that's not for me, you see. I like to be. . . I like the bright lights. In fact, I used to say that there was. . . what was, an old saying, I think it was an old Roman saying about somebody who would rather be

king of Etruria than the second man in Rome. And I used to say that the last man in Rome for me anytime. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . was my preference. I wanted to be in the centre of things and I wasn't much concerned about my status, it was more the status of the place I was in, if you like.

M: Yes.

B: You see, so. . .

M: Well, was Aberdeen less enjoyable?

B: No Aberdeen was infinitely better than St. Andrew's in this respect. It's a much bigger city. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . much less narrow-minded and more in the centre of things, strangely enough, although it's something like 150 miles further from London, it's on the direct railway line, you see. St. Andrew's was on a branch line. You had ^{to change at a place called Luncaster} ~~you could easily~~ ⁽¹⁷⁾ to change at a place called Luncaster Junction. They didn't get in^to Edinburgh, which was 30 miles away. . .

M: Yes (laughter)

B: Now they have road bridges over the Firth of Forth Firth of Tay, so St. Andrew's is less isolated; but then it was isolated. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . physically and mentally. But Aberdeen less so. And, Psychology was also viewed favourably at Aberdeen. Rex Knight had built up ⁽¹⁷⁾ this reputation so that now, I believe it is still the biggest department - it wasn't then but it is

now - the biggest department in the country. So Psychology didn't have the problems of people in Philosophy and other subjects trying to crush it.

N: Yes.

B: It hadn't had much research going on. Rex Knight didn't do much research, didn't do any research in fact. He was a very good administrator and committeeman, but there was a group of people there who were doing research. For example, there was my old friend, Peter ^{Mc} Keller - who had been a colleague and friend at St. Andrew's - was there. I think he went to Aberdeen. . . at least he was there when I came. He and I were both active in research, as I think were many other people. Betty Fraser was there; she was doing research. In fact, Peter largely converted her to doing experimental research from her educational interests. I don't know, I think maybe she's gone back, but she was an exception. And so on. You see, this was quite a lively place. We had a small group, a very closely knit group of people in the Department. Knight was always a bit aloof, you know, fatherly but aloof. Margaret Knight, his wife, was there. so that, as far as work was concerned, this was a satisfactory place. But it was still too isolated and too small for my tastes, you see, so I still certainly would have preferred to go to the south of England and I looked for every opportunity but none offered itself. One very great disappointment, actually, was this. . . quite a bitter disappointment, was that there was a vacant lectureship at Cambridge.

in 1954, after I had been at Aberdeen a year. And of course, there were very few lectureships at Cambridge; there were only about three lecturers there and there didn't seem to be a vacancy very often. And so I applied for this, and I remember explaining to Knight that 'I'm sorry, I might be leaving after a year, but this was the sort of thing I just couldn't give up.' He was a little peeved, but he understood.

M: Yes.

B: And I didn't get it. I wasn't even on the short list. It was given to a man called Watson who was much less experienced than I was; he had just got his B.A. He hadn't had his Ph.D. or the re-search experience, publishing experience ^{w/ll} I had. But he was an associate of Zangwald who had just gone there. . .

M: Oh.

B: . . . associate at Oxford, you see. And this was not only very disappointing to me, it was a disillusioning thing. I had had an idealistic picture of the academic world which suggested that such a thing couldn't happen. I didn't suppose that personal, [✓] political considerations were completely absent. But I thought there were limits to what people would do. If you had a job open and there aren't many jobs open and people applied and one person seemed clearly to have better capabilities than anyone else, you just couldn't. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . ignore this. But I was wrong, you see, so that this disillusioned me with lots of things. But anyhow,

I stayed on at Aberdeen and . . .

M: Do you suppose that the Yale Ph.D. - the Yale experience in that two years - instead of being an asset (mumbled) from Cambridge's point of view, instead of being an asset, would it be against you, operating against you? In fact, we don't want any of these Americanized psychologists in here.

B: Oh, I see. I don't know. I had never thought of that. It may have been a minor thing. I think it was just that he had come into this department where he was ~~is club~~. But at any rate, the story was that he was the heir-apparent when I was an undergraduate. We assumed Zangwald ^{will} would be Bartlett's successor. He was Bartlett's most eminent and most brilliant student, it is ~~was~~ believed, so it was taken for granted. But then, afterwards, Bartlett fell out with him. Zandwald became interested in some clinical psychology, neurological psychology, he was favourable to psychoanalysis and so on. So Bartlett ^{will} did not want him as his successor; he wanted Macquarie. And he was very bitter when Zangwald ^{will} was appointed. But anyhow, he was appointed.

M: Yes.

B: So, he went there where most of the people would be associates of Bartlett's, a hostile atmosphere, and I can well imagine that he would want to bring in some support.

M: Yes. His friend, which all . . .

B: Which I ^Could understand, but I just thought there

should be limits to this.

M: Yes.

B: So, as I say, that happened, and in fact, it began to be clear to me that my chances of getting to Oxford Cambridge or London were rather slim. There were not very many vacancies, and when there was one I couldn't be sure that I would get one even if I happened to have the best paper qualifications, you see. . .

M: Yes.

B: So this was certainly a thing that made me think a bit more in terms of settling on this continent.

M: Did you attribute this at all to your Jewishness?

B: No, I don't think that played a part at all.

There was no anti-Semitism in it. The only time this came up, actually, this was rather - the two times this came up at Cambridge. . . When Albert and I, Albert Chearns and I were looking for jobs, there were troubles in Palestine. The Jewish terrorists were then throwing bombs and killing British soldiers and so on, and there was naturally ill-feeling about this in great Britain. And Bartlett was talking to Chearns about the fact that we seemed to be having bad luck. We were repeatedly being called and what's this old song about going to the altar as a bride's maid and. . . Anyway. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . we were getting so far and no further.

M: Oh, I see.

B: He said, Bartlett suggested, 'Maybe if you got the

Jewish Agency to change it's policies, this would help.' And Albert Chearns said, quite rightly, he said, 'You probably have more influence with the Jewish Agency than I have.'

M: (laughter)

B: But, anyhow, we had no evidence that anybody. . .

M: Yes.

B: And then there was another time, but at that time I was more orthodox in religion than I became later, and so I used to take off religious holidays. And Grindley once came, after this period when we weren't - Albert was Jewish also - and he said - and more orthodox than I, actually - he said, he wondered whether the fact that we were not succeeding in these interviews was due to the fact that in his letter of recommendation, he felt bound to say that we, being observing Jews, would want to take off a day now and then and this might be an inconvenience and he should point it out, you see. And we said we had never had any evidence that people cared about this. But he said he would agree to leave this out of his letter provided we agreed to mention it to the interviewers. And I remember, when I went to the interview at St. Andrew's, I mentioned this. And they all looked amazed that I would mention it; it was no problem at all, why bother mentioning it? And so I never had any evidence that that. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . played a part. But at Cambridge, there were

at least those two people who thought it might play a part.

M: Is that so?

B: It's strange, isn't it, you see.

M: Yes. I see. Yes.

B: Two of them.

M: I can see that for anybody, no matter what their qualifications, Oxford and Cambridge are sort of special. But the situation at London must have been more to it. There must have been more going and coming and. . . I would have thought.

B: Not enough, you see. There wasn't so much. . .

By the way, to get back to your last question, you realize of course that Zangwill ^{wil} is of Jewish origin.

M: Yes.

B: Yes. I mean, his father was a well known novelist.

M: Yes. I hadn't thought of that.

B: There just weren't many, but when there were. . . oh, for example, I applied for a couple of jobs in London before I came to the United States, at BurkBeck, for example. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . College. And Mace actually raised the question. I would have liked an arrangement that would have been able to let me go to the United States for a year and go back to Burkbeck. But in the end, they decided to appoint Brian Kosa, and I can understand. You know, this was too much to expect. So that, yes, I mean, one reason that I didn't get in in that period, when I had made up my mind that I must go

to the United States, then I didn't, of course, pursue job opportunities and things.

M: Yes. Yes.

B: But in Aberdeen also, there weren't many. . . well, in that time, the market was definitely rather bad. I don't think it's quite as bad as it is now, but there weren't very many jobs available so that although I would have taken any opportunity to go to Oxford, Cambridge or London rather than Aberdeen itself. I remained in Aberdeen except for the summer of 1954 when I ^{and} my wife went to, to the United States. We came to the International Congress. . .

M: In Washington?

B: . . . in Montreal, the 1954 Congress. . .

M: Oh. Yes.

B: And then I taught at the University of Vermont for the summer. I had already taught there for the previous summer in 1952, but we came for two months and then went back. But that was the only. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . time in the United States other than that. So I stayed there until the opportunity for leaving Aberdeen was occasioned by an invitation to go ^{to} the the Centre of Advanced Studies in the *Behavioral* Sciences.

M: Oh yes.

B: This was set up in 1954. And I got a letter quite early, probably because of Hoveland. Hoveland had been my supervisor at Yale. He was a prominent figure on the committee

that ran the Centre and chose Fellows. So, I got an invitation to go there at some unspecified date, soon after it opened. And they gave a description of what went on, which wasn't very informative. I wasn't sure what went on until I got there. But I raised this with Knight and Knight said, well, I could get leave, considering the requirements of the department, from 1956-1957 - not earlier, he couldn't manage it earlier. But that was alright. So I stayed there. And we went over to the United States in 1956 to the Centre for Advanced Studies while I was still on leave at Aberdeen.

M: Now, what was that like?

B: Well, this was a very fine place, in some ways, a Utopian place. A place where people did what they liked. And it is very hard to imagine what that is like. It is very hard to believe it, because we are very rarely in a position where we can literally do what we like. You see, there were no requirements at all. You needn't even attend. There were cases of people who hadn't attended, but just came and collected their paycheck. The administration wasn't too happy, but it was against its policy to demur. It was hard for the first part for me, because of a very strange reason perhaps. I had never met anybody, I had never been able to meet anybody who was there. I had read the literature describing it but I fancied that this was a place where you would go and you would engage in all kinds of co-operative research projects. So, I worked very very hard before I went there to finish various things, particularly to write

several articles, to leave myself with a clean slate. And that was a big mistake, because this was just an ideal place to finish off things like that. And it left me with nothing to do. So I spent the first six months wondering how to spend the second six months. And I found this rather trying. Other people seemed to know what to do.

Another factor was that I was at a stage when I needed to get some experiments done, many times since then, in fact, almost any time since then when I would welcome a year off . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I'd find opportunities to find things to do.

M: Yes.

B: But then, I needed to get into the lab and they didn't have a lab there. I did get the hospitality of the Stanford lab and did a few experiments. But it was all very limited. But, still, I met some very interesting people there. . .

M: Like?

B: Like, ^{Jack} Paul Hillgard who was there. ^{Lvt/lz} Walpy, the behaviour therapy pioneer was there and he became a close friend of mine; I haven't seen him all that much since we're in different places, but I certainly saw a lot of him. Kelly and Thibeault, the social psychologists, were there. Charles Morris, he was a man that I was very glad to meet, the philosopher. Morris had influenced me through his book Signs, Language and Behaviour. This was a book that came out in the heyday of the ambitions of behaviour theory, you see.

as per
The field of Hullian behaviour theory wasn't simply that it seemed capable of being synthesized with Freud. But it seemed to be able to make an integration with everything. You see, Gestalt psychology and everything.

M: Yes.

B: And Morris had shown how it could bring in the theory of symbolic processes. So I had been very interested in Morris's work and was very glad when I found that he was a Fellow at the Centre. And he is certainly a man of . . . a remarkable man, of very broad experience. A man who has composed music and been a professional ballet dancer in his time and studied oriental culture - a very tolerant man. So he became a good friend. I think I was in Florida at his university giving a talk a year and a half ago. I stayed with him. He is about 70 now. But he is a man I have a great veneration for and have been influenced by. So he was there.

We met, of course, anthropologists and sociologists and ^{African} ^{W.I.C.} Attnay was there. The psychologists, I found, didn't have all that much common interest, except ^{W.I.C.} Waipy. Hillgard, of course, but Hillgard was getting interested in hypnotism which was a rather different thing, you see, but I still liked talking to him. And then, at the end of that year. . .

M: Well, wait a minute now. Was there not as much as you had expected of, if not group interdisciplinary research, at least interdisciplinary discussion, talks. . .

B: Oh yes, there were seminars that were continuously

started by the Fellows. And I went to some of those and found those interesting. There was one on biology, by a man called Caspari, who was a distinguished figure in Genetics. And I learned a lot of Genetics from this. And so on.

We had another one on learning theory ^{for} of the psychologists. I don't know what those were about, but. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . a couple of them were very ingenious.

M: As you say, this being suddenly. . . you find yourself in a situation where quite literally you are free of any obligation, any demand. . .

B: Absolutely.

M: . . . is disturbing things.

B: It's very disturbing, it's even. . . I'm told that people found it more than disturbing. For example, one other place where apparently something like that happens is the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton.

M: Oh.

B: And people said, no doubt with a little exaggeration, that they have psychiatrists on hand to pick up people who collapse in the corridors and so on, you see. I don't know anybody in our year that actually had a serious collapse from the stress. No, most of the people there actually seemed to know what they were doing. Some of them were writing books and hardly mixed with anybody. But most of them had met people who had gone there. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . so knew what the opportunities of the facilities were.

M: In what respect?

B: You see, but I wasn't sure. I didn't know what to expect. Some people did acquire new interests there.

M: Another place where this happens is. . . I've watched my son-in-law who is a geologist, he graduated from Queens and went to M.I.T. where it was the pressure kind of graduate programme that you described. And then the first job he got was at the Carnegie Institution in Washington where the place was developed way back for other sciences than ours - geology particularly - as a place where absolutely nobody was looking over his shoulder, he didn't have to do anything, and he began to feel awful. That first year was a very trying one because he felt guilty. He knew he should be. . .

B: That's right.

M: . . . producing, but, you know, he had been so used to having a driver, being driven by obligations of various kinds, so that when that was removed, he was very. . .

B: Yes. I can understand that. Many of the people there, of course, welcomed. . . some of them were very distinguished people who were in much demand for consultation --
committees, and they welcome ^ a year off from committees and from telephones, just. . . I mean, I had never had a. . . it was very difficult to get a departmental meeting together in

BERLYNE:

Writen
by
writer

147.

Aberdeen. So this didn't weigh with me at all, being free of committees. . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . or anything like that, you see.

M: Yes.

B: But at any rate, it was a . . .

M: Well, in the second half, did you get going?

B: Oh, I got some experiments done. I got a theoretical paper written. And I started my first book at the end. I mean, looking back on it, the book. . . . it would have been sensible to start it at the beginning and. . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I had a golden opportunity to work on it. Well, anyhow, I suppose I wasn't ready for it. I had hesitated to write a book because it seemed like a big job just to get so many words on paper. But several people at the center were experienced authors. I remember talking to Morris and talking to Hillgard about their experience as authors. I think it was Morris who said something to me that had a big effect. He pointed out, he said, 'Supposing that you write two pages a day. You can get 700 pages written in the course of a year.' And I thought, come to think it, this is true. And suddenly writing, let's say 300 pages, didn't seem like such a ~~an enormous~~ horrible thing after all. So I started the book Conflict, Arousal and Curiosity in the last few months, after there was an opportunity to think about it

and plan it and go on with it.

M: Yes, it had been incubating quite a bit.

B: Yes, quite, you see. But then of course, the question came, What to do next?

M: You were on leave from Aberdeen?

B: I was on leave from Aberdeen, and once again, they indicated fairly enough that I should tell them if I wanted to come back or not. I warned KNight before I left, actually, that I might possibly want to stay in the United States. By then I had seen that that might be advisable. And he said, alright, let me give him as much notice as possible. So that I investigated possibilities and there weren't all that many attractive possibilities. But I did get an invitation for a visiting job at Berkeley. I visited Berkeley and found it was a very pleasant place, as well as a very interesting place psychologically. It was made clear that this was a visiting job - somebody was away for the year; they have a lot of visiting teachers in that department. I think maybe I kidded myself into the hope that this may become a permanent job. I would have lied a permanent job there. But anyhow, I wanted to take it on.

And, so, I resigned from Aberdeen. And this was a very very bold thing to do. I certainly wouldn't advise anybody to do it. You have no base you can fall back on. It ruined your bargaining position, if ever you needed a bargaining position. But it is also, I overestimated the ease

/ of getting a job. Although the United States ia a big place, there weren't so many jobs in those days and there were many people competing for them. And I was at the level then when I could have expected an associate professorship and might ^{had} have been promoted to senior lectureship at Aberdeen, although they didn't use that title, they called it lecturer grade something or other.

But anyhow, I certainly could have expected an associate professorship but that's the grade at which the fewest appointments are made. People are usually appointed at the top or at the bottom, you see.

M: Yes.

B: So, I didn't realize all this. I didn't realize what a dangerous thing this was to do, I would never have done it otherwise, because I shouldn't have done it. But I did it. I resigned ^{from} Aberdeen and I went off to Berkeley with simply a year's job in front of me and nothing very tangible afterwards.

Now, the year at Berkeley was very satisfying, if anything, more than the centre. I got the book finished. I had a pretty full teaching load. I had got some research done. I had been given a sort of strange grant from the Ford Foundation - they were getting rid of some money - a grant in aid for research of about \$4,000 and no strings attached whatever, as long as you spent it on research. So I was able to use this and I got quite a lot done. I found I was able to do

more work on the book when I had other things to do. I've always found that, that to have nothing to do but one thing isn't the most efficient way. I'm sure a lot of people find this too.

So, doing a full job as well as writing the book was the best thing. And I liked the facilities of Berkeley which, in some ways, were like those of Cambridge. New Haven was a disappointment. It didn't have anything like the extra-curricular activities of Cambridge.

M: Yes.

B: And so on. So this was quite an enjoyable year.

M: Who did you get to know there?

B: Well, I got to know ~~Tellman~~ in the last year of his life, ^{Tell} you see, ~~because~~ ^{just as} I got to know Hull in ^{his} the last year. ~~Tellman~~ I had met during a visit to Berkeley that I made while at the centre. And he was a most very different type from Hull - joyful, relaxed man. He mentioned that he had read some of my things and he mentioned them in his chapter in ~~Koch~~ Copeke's book. And later on, I got to know him and spoke to him several times. Didn't really talk to him very much about his work, but still, he was a very good man.

M: Did he show much evidence of the trauma of the McCarthy. . ?

B: He didn't show any evidence of any traumas at all. And that was the point, you see. Hull was deadly earnest. Hull was very involved with his system. He took the line that these are postulates and all I care. . . I don't care if

I . . . all I care about is that they should be tested, and people should test them. This was the Yale party-line. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . but at the same time, this wasn't completely true. If somebody verified his postulates, he was very pleased. And if they. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . found a flaw, he wasn't. And he was very single-minded. He was very serious. He was reputed to have had a sense of humour, but I didn't see too much of it; it would maybe be some childish. . . laugh at some childish jokes now and then. But he was a very serious character. Very impressive character although frail compared to what he must have been like.

~~Tillman~~ was exactly the opposite. ~~Tillman~~ was very relaxed. He took the. . . well, in fact, he said, "I've had a lot of fun with my theoretical system. If anybody else gets fun from it, good luck to them; if they don't I don't care." No, he didn't show any kind of trauma. He was a much more well adjusted I suppose you would say. . .

M: And saner.

B: Than Hull and most of the other psychologists.

M: And who else at Berkeley?

B: Well, one man I became very friendly with was ^{from the TV} ~~how~~ ~~in that~~ ~~the~~ ~~much~~ ~~close~~ Bendell Ritchie, a man in ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~much~~ ~~close~~ ~~the~~ entourage as you would say. A man who hadn't been in much research, hasn't done much since, but he wrote, for example, that very witty article,

you remember, in the Psychological Review a long time ago about the circumnavigation of cognition, making fun of the Yale Hullians because of their attitude to latent learning, taking the circumnavigation of the globe as the. . . Do you remember this article at all?

M: No, I don't.

B: You know, he talked about. . . he compared Hull with Captain Cook and Magellan and so on. A very very witty article. And there's never been anything like that. And it was done very well, I mean his points were good points.

M: Where is it?

B: Psychological Review sometime in the, about 1950. The point was, there has never been any other article I know of since that in the Psychological Review.

M: Oh.

B: So he was a man that had broad interests, broad cultural interests. In fact he, I don't know if this is an exaggeration, but he gave a course called "Animal Learning" which he devoted to human aesthetics.

M: (laughter)

B: (laughter) So, he's a man that I certainly enjoyed talking to. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . a very bright man. But a man that somehow or other never did too much research, some early papers, that's all. Kelly was there as a visitor. Atney, strangely enough. These were people that I had known at the Centre and talked to.

M: Oh.

B: I talked to them.

M: George Kelly?

B: No, Harold Kelly.

M: Harold, oh yes.

B: Harold. Yes. ^{LCC} Neil Postman, of course, was the Chairman.

M: Yes. Yes. Yes.

B: There was him. So it was a good department, but it wasn't as uniformly. . . It was different from Yale in that at Yale, practically everybody on the staff was either a venerable distinguished figure or somebody who was getting that way. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I mean, because they got rid of them very quickly. They had a double slot system. And many very competent people, like Kimball and Kelly were assistant professors at Yale when I was there. And they were dismissed after their assistant professorship because there wasn't a slot. So that the people who were left were, on the whole, pretty high class, uniformly. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . but at Berkley this was not so, you see. There were several people on the staff at Berkeley - of course, I am not mentioning any names. . .

M: No. No.

B: . . . but they are names that are not well known,

and they were not very competent at all. Something like 50% of the people would be the well known people. . .

M: Yes.

B: *Krech* Grettch, of course, another man that. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I knew there. Rosenweig, ^{they} [^] they were just starting their work on the brain.

M: Was another feature of Berkeley then also the fact that they weren't all together, that they were off pockets by themselves?

B: No, most of them were together. There were some people of in enclaves, like Frankl-Brunswick I once saw in corridor. She was working at a, what they called the Personality Institute. There was an Institute of Child Study or whatever it was called. We saw those people occasionally, but no, no. . .

M: I see.

B: . . . the nucleus was pretty much in the same place.

M: Yes.

B: This was before they moved to their new building.

M: Yes. Now, that was a good experience?

B: Yes. That was good. If anything, that was better than the Centre, even though I had had less to do at the Centre. Somehow or other, I found it - always have found it - better to have several responsibilities at once, as long as they are not too many to. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . to be able to handle. You get more done
that way.

M: Yes. And then, as the year wore on and it began to appear that you might not get a permanent position. . .

B: Well, it became clear about the middle of the year that I wouldn't, you see. . .

M: Yes. Then you must have started being a little anxious.

B: Yes. And with good reason, you see. I had obviously looked for jobs in the. . . I kept an eye on job opportunities in Great Britain, but there weren't very many. And then the disadvantage of being so far off. In the United States, there weren't all that many, and certainly the ones that there were would be assistant professorships, which would mean a come down in status and so on. . .

M: Yes.

B: And I'm not altogether clear what I would have done if the opportunity ^{didn't come} finally came to go to Geneva. You see, Piaget, I had known Piaget, I met him first at the International Congress in Edinburgh in 1948. And I had met him once or twice since them. He invited me to go to his centre, the International Centre for Genetic Epistemology, a year previously, when they were working on learning. That's why he invited me; he thought I could participate in the discussions on learning. I couldn't go; this was when I was due to go to Berkley so I told him that. But then I asked him

whether I could go the next year - partly because I wanted to go there; partly because I didn't have anywhere else to go.

M: Yes. . .

4(a)

B: Oh yes, we were talking about Piaget. Well, Piaget said, actually, later, that he managed to find some extra funds to fit me in, that really, ^{the} it. . . no vacancies. The Centre consisted actually of about three people besides himself. And there were only about two foreign visitors, but he was able to invite me again to go and spend the next year in Geneva. So that's where we went in 1958-59 and as I say, I didn't have anywhere else to go. Of course, I imagine, if this hadn't come up, I'd have found something somewhere. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . sooner or later, but goodness knows where. Probably not anywhere very desirable. So, off we went to Geneva. This is really like having the third sabbatical year in a row. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I mean, looking back on it, it was a very fine opportunity but employment and things were rather insecure. I had finished the book by then and I remember, this was a bit delicate. I mentioned. . . I also didn't know

very much about Piaget's centre. I thought it was something like the Stanford Centre and that I could spend part of the time writing a book. And I mentioned to Piaget that I was looking forward to finishing this book. And he wrote back tactfully and firmly telling me that this wasn't the idea. I could work on my own time in the evenings on the book, but I was supposed to be working on the programme of the Centre.

But anyhow, I went there. As a matter of fact, I did work clandestinely on the book during the working hours because I was able to do the Centre's work sufficiently *during* part of the time.

M: Yes.

B: Anyhow, I went there and this was, of course, very different but interesting and instructive year for me, with Paiget's group in Geneva.

M: Piaget's group. . . Barbeil and who else?

B: Well, Piaget has a number of groups. It is quite a small enterprise, but he had a collection of groups - I'm not quite sure how many. There were people who held a teaching position in the university, which included Berbeil and Helder and one or two others - Bin Bang, the man from Vietnam was in what they called a desson, a libre desson, which was a kind of associate professor and one or two other people with junior appointments. Then there were several people with research appointments. He had this Centre for Genetic Epistemology with Ford money, I think. He had a

longitudinal project with Rockefeller money and in fact, it was rather like Bartlett's situation in that he had a lot of hangers on doing research and we were never quite sure exactly how they fitted in or what their official status was.

M: Yes.

B: Everybody, including the undergraduates, would be made to act as research assistants in these ongoing projects.

M: Well now, were all of these Centres a part of the University of Geneva?

B: Yes, they were part of the University of Geneva, but at the same time, pretty independent.

M: They weren't all involved in teaching?

B: Oh no. The Centre didn't - at least not the ~~permanently~~ research jobs - didn't do any teaching at all, but they. . . some of them would have part-time teaching appointments. For example, I just realized this, but one of the men who was there then was a Swiss called Moif, who is now in Montreal. And he told me that Piaget would divide an assistant's - an ^{assistant} being the lowest ^{second} grade there, un assistant - he'd divide an assistant's salary between two assistants because there wasn't enough to go around. But they would each have to do the work of a whole assistant, and then of course, a full salary wouldn't be princely. And Moif says that at one time he was living off a third of one assistance and three-eighths of another. There was a man there called Nolting - who is now also actually in Canada at ^{laval} Laval Universit

who didn't have a child then and Moſf did. And Piaget put pressure on Nolting to cede a certain percentage of his assistancehip salary to Moſf so that Moſf ended up with a third of one and three-eighths of another, and poor Nolting presumably ended up with less than this. And this was all very awkward. And these people, of course, were completely dependent on Piaget. There was no where else they could go. There weren't many jobs in Switzerland. Some of them emigrated to Canada, I believe. There wasn't much else they could do anywhere so they all had to do this and had to put up with whatever Piaget wanted them to put up with.

M: Now, Piaget himself, as a person, in the same ^{Tel} terms that you've described Hull and Tillman.

B: Yes. He was different from any of them and different, I think, from any North American psychologist. He was a European type. He was an authoritarian kind of chap. He ^{a sort of} ~~as it was~~ ^{directive}, what the French called ~~gerigisme~~. He would direct people but he would do it in a diplomatic way. He was a very polite man, a very pleasant man, a jovial man, a man that's got a good sense of humour, a man who was very likable personally. But he had his ways of making clear to people - especially to people who depended on him - that they were supposed to do it the way that he wanted them to, which is not unusual in the European continental system. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . or, at least, until recently. He tried to

exercise this ~~gerigisme~~ ^{dirigisme} on visitors to his Centre too.

Because he had a programme mapped out, that they were going to go through the various branches of science from the point of view of genetic epistemology. When I was there, they were still on mathematics. They had just left Logic. And he had his idea of what they were supposed to do, what experiments they were supposed to do, what results these experiments should produce. . .

M: (laughter)

B: He had a role for the visitors. He had this odd idea of an Anglo-Saxon empiricist, who apparently denies that the subject is acting, who thinks that knowledge is just a matter of passively receiving impressions. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . something that if you go to the 18th century, to Hume, you might possibly find some approximation to this, but I doubt it. Certainly, nobody since Hume has ever had a position anything like it, his supposed Anglo-Saxon empiricist. So, he expected, I was told, that the Anglo-Saxon empiricist (he always had one there, at least) would voice the objections he expected from their point of view. They would discuss things and end up, he hoped, being converted. And we didn't fulfill this role at all, you see, because we differed from him, first of all we didn't hold his stereotyped view of an Anglo-Saxon empiricist and secondly, we differed from him, not so much on the answers to the questions, but on the kinds of questions he was asking. So, he didn't see this. But, he also

couldn't direct us because he didn't understand us as much as he understood the Swiss people there and the French people. And also, we were only there for a short time. And we weren't under his thumb, you know, we weren't dependent on him and so we could get away with doing what we liked.

So we spent - it's very strange - we spent the first six months discussing at our meeting, discussing what we were going to do for the year, and then there would be a sudden change with the new year when he realized that the symposium was coming. You see, the crowning event of the year was his symposium held in June or July to which visitors would come from most of the European countries and people would give papers. All the members of the Centre would give at least two papers on their work. So then, the question would come: 'How are we going to get things organized so that we can put on a good show for this symposium?' And I think we, foreign visitors, tumbled to this. We realized that the thing to do was to get on with whatever we wanted to do. We would discuss it in the meetings in such a way as to point some relation between it and Piaget's plans for the Centre. But still, we would get what we wanted done and we'd give our papers at the symposium and it worked out quite all right that way.

So, I was able to finish my book on conflict, arousal and curiosity. I was able to also. . . I did a few experiments, although they actually didn't come to very much, with children.

I did do a theoretical paper which came out in French is his Etude (and later was expanded into my second book. So, I suppose I got quite a lot done there and I found it very profitable to talk with Piaget's associates. Maybe more than him. I did go to his house about three times for long talks with him, as well as the talks we all had at the meetings - weekly meetings on Monday mornings. But his associates were very bright, he ^{could} did pick bright people, and they knew not only his work but the American work. So they could understand our questions; he couldn't, he couldn't see really what we were driving at. But they saw exactly what we were talking about and what it ^{wanted} does and they would be capable of discussing instructively. And so this was a very. . .

Another man who was there was ^{Piet} Papper, the South African mathematicis-turned-psychologist, who is now at M.I.T. He was also, became a close friend and he was a good man to talk to.

M: What you say about these bright young people that he picked, was that also true of ^{T-} Himhelder? Or was ^{T,} Himhelder an altar ego?

B: No, ^{T,} Himhelder is very bright and very ingenious at designing experiments. But she had become an altar ego as far as theory was concerned. You see, she never voiced - to my knowledge - a view that different from his.

M: Yes.

B: If you asked her a question. . . for example she has

fulfilled the role very often of going to conferences in the United States and elsewhere to give the piagetan point of view. . .

M: As his voice, almost. . .

B: . . . you see, and when people ask questions, she will answer what he would answer, you see. So she has not a theoretical mind of her own. How she will fare, for example, when Piaget retires - as he is going to do soon, I gather - I don't know. . .

M: Yes.

B: The very. . .

M: Is she the heir-apparent?

B: Well, she has a professorship of her own. And I think that's the only. . . I don't think he is director of the institute anymore, I really don't know. And then there is a second Psychology Department at Geneva, a more conventional psychology, ^{sys} on the floor above, not so well known. Their people teach the more usual kind of psychology. And they are certainly jealous towards Piaget and would like to take over as much as they could of his. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . set-up.

M: Yes.

B: (too faint)

M: Yes. She is a most impressive woman, just to hear her talk.

B: Oh yes. No, she is a very intelligent, very able woman,

no doubt about that.

M: Yes.

B: But, well, this very often happens to people in Europe. ^{IF} she had had the opportunity to develop on her own she may have developed differently. . .

M: Yes. Yes.

B: . . . as some of the other young people did, but she hadn't. She's become Piaget's voice-piece, yes.

M: Is Flabie a later arrival at Geneva? He wasn't there. . .

B: Oh yes, he was there rather later. Of course, several American visitors came there later. But even when I was there, I was rather surprised, they didn't. . . they were getting tired of visitors wanting to come there. In fact I, at one time, even had to translate a letter that ^{T.} Wimholder was sending to somebody - somebody, I can't remember who it was, but somebody relatively senior in American psychology - who wanted to go there. And this letter put to him that if you want to come here, well you had better come on the agreement that you will do certain experiments that we are laying down for you because we've got limited room. And you know, it wasn't impolite. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . .but there was an attitude that if you don't ^{in free way} want to come, we only want people who will do it you see.

M: If you want to come, here's our program.

B: So, lots of people have been there, you know. . .

lots of people have been there since. . . not, some people have been there because of the Centre, I think. Many people came independently of the centre after that.

M: I once understood you to say that. . . trying to account for this tremendous belated wave of Piaget enthusiasm in American development psychology. . . that this was because of a failure on Piaget's part to get himself properly translated.

B: Oh, this may have been. Yes. He did the most peculiar things with regard to translation. He would give them out to English speaking people who happened to be dropping in, regardless of whether they were competent translators, because translation is a very specialized job. With my experience in Modern Languages, I know it is hard to translate. And, to translate technical material is very hard. You have to know the languages, both languages, and even more important, know the material.

M: Yes.

B: But he would just give them out to people, which would not only mean that incompetent translations would be made, but some people wouldn't do them at all. You see, for example, one of his main books, The Introduction to Genetic Epistemology has never come out in English and never will because he gave it to somebody who just never got around to it. And the first contact I had with Piaget arose in this way: two friends and classmates of mine from Cambridge - one of them is Peter Castle, the nephew, incidentally, of C.S. Myers

M: Oh!

B: A man who actually works for the International Labour Organization in Geneva, you see - and Malcom Pearcy who later on worked at Queen's Hospital in London. I don't know what happened later. They went to Geneva and dropped in on Piaget, and he gave them one of his main books, The Psychology of Intelligence, to translate. You see, typical. Well, anyhow, this was published by Kegg and Paul in England and they weren't satisfied by the translation, rightly.

Now, by then, I had met Piaget at the International Congress in Edinburgh - this was 1948 - and so he mentioned my name as somebody who might look at the translation. So, they asked me to do this; they said I could either redo the translation or revise it, as I preferred. Now, in the end, I ended up more or less rewriting it but I didn't want to say I would do a new one, because I knew that these friends of mine would then lose all their labours. But anyhow, I revised it so thoroughly that it was more or less a new translation and that was it.

M: Yes.

B: Yes. And that came out. But that's a pity. That was a very crucial book. . . I mean, it was a pity for him to be so casual about it. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . because it is such a crucial book. It summed up all his work up to that period, you see.

M: Yes.

B: But this is what he still does. And two people that weren't particularly qualified for the job were given books to translate while I was in Geneva. As it happens, both of them have come out and I gather than both of them had somebody to collaborate with who was able to make a competent job out of it. But this was a strange. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . habit of his. Very strange.

M: Yes. But, for a period there, I guess it is dying off now somewhat, but for a period there, it just flooded into the States. . .

B: Yes, well. . .

M: . . . about 20 or 30 years after he had written the stuff.

B: Well, people thought that Piaget was a man who had written five books before 1932 and then died. And they didn't realize that nothing can be further from the truth. He has written about three books a year since then. Of course, now, they realize it.

M: Yes. Yes.

B: And then there was a prejudice also agains Piaget. *Thucchin*
I remember, in the Marchesson Handbook of Child Psychology,
a man called Praat - he's not the well known Carole Pratt -
but anyhow, whatever his name was, he wrote an article in
which he dismissed Piaget's work as purely literary and of
no interest to experimental psychology. . .

M: Yes.

B: And this was very common idea.

M: Was this a failure on Piaget's part to take the trouble to give his detailed methodology, or was it that he didn't have any detail. . .

B: Oh. . . well, he himself has repudiated the methodology of those books. As a matter of fact, he is rather embarrassed that they are so well known. I mean, they put him on the map. He was quite a young man then, about 36 in 1932, and he was invited all over the world to give lectures and so on. He became quite well known. But he did realize that that method, which involved interrogating children, had its faults. And so he went over to his other methods which still involved interrogating children, but interrogating them in front of some concrete apparatus. I mean, that's a method that people still find reason to criticize, but at least it's. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . not as bad as that. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . earlier kind of very uncontrolled method. So this is the reason he was rather sorry that this early work of his was all so well known, that he was judged by it.

M: Yes. Yes. Well, you finished your book, and since - if not at the time so much - but since this Piagetan experience has been a valuable one to you hasn't it?

B: Yes. Oh yes. Quite definitely. I could have stayed

another year. Piaget asked me to. And I think he liked me, if only for the reason that he was - I don't know if I want to say "lazy" but certainly - not very well organized for finding people. In fact, people he invited to this Centre were very often people he met casually, people who were dropping in. He didn't know the English speaking psychological world and its ways sufficiently to find out the best people for the Centre. So that, it would have been a relief for him to have somebody stay there for two years or maybe even indefinitely, rather than look for somebody else.

But anyway, I could see that ^{what} I got a lot out of one year, but from a scientific point of view, I wouldn't get all that much out of a second year. Actually, we were living on very little money. The money that he gave us, you know, was barely enough. It was normal by Swiss standards, but the idea of living on such a pittance for a second year didn't. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . add to the appeal of it and so on.

M: Did you like living in Geneva, apart from the fact that. . . ?

B: Yes. Geneva was an interesting place. It was a place that the French people found deadly dull compared to Paris and the people from Zurich and other parts of Switzerland found very gay and exciting, you see.

M: (laughter)

B: It was all right. It was a cosmopolitan city,

a large number of foreigners. Yes, Geneva was a quite pleasant place. We would be very near. We could go off for the weekends into France - surrounded by France on three sides - into the Alps or ~~in parts of~~ ^{Switzerland}. We could go off skiing for a day in the winter and we could go off on excursions to the interesting villages round about ~~in~~ the summer. . .

M: Yes.

B: We did a car tour into Italy and the south of France. Yes, we had a great year.

M: You had lots of chance to practice your multi-lingual skills.

B: Oh yes, certainly. Yes. Of course, French was needed at the Centre. There was nobody allowed there who couldn't manage to talk in French. Piaget refused to admit that he spoke any English, although I think he knows enough to read and probably could, if necessary, speak a little, but he would never admit to being able to speak any.

M: Yes. And then?

B: Well, then came the question, again, of what to do next. It was good that we had Piaget to fall back on. It was different from the year before, where if we hadn't. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . didn't know where to go. I mean, we could have stayed another year with Piaget. I didn't want to, but I didn't think it was the best thing to do. But there weren't so many opportunities again. I looked out for opportunities in the United States or Great Britain. There

weren't many, or any satisfactory ones. But then, another I suppose God-send came up. An invitation to go to the NIMH - National Institute of Mental Health - in Bethesda, Maryland, to join the ^ligidity, ^{as} ^{like} visiting scientist. This had come, I think this had come because of a man I had met, David Hamburger - a well known psychiatrist now - who was a colleague at the Centre, who took a permanent job at NIMH and I think he may have mentioned me to Dave ^{like} Shatto or whoever it was.

^{the point}
But, at any rate, this was a think that actually Harry Key was there the year before or the year before that. I remember even phoning him at Oxford, from Geneva, to ask him what the place was like and give me any information I could get. But anyway, I got this letter inviting me to go there for a year, which sounded like a good idea - at least, nothing better offered itself. So this was the fourth sabbatical year in a row.

M: Gee!

B: So, I don't know what else we would have done except, possibly, well - either stayed another year, or there were several rather unsatisfactory assistant professor jobs in the United States and I might possibly have landed up in any one of those. Anyhow, it worked out quite well as it happened, so we went back over the ocean again and - just with a new baby, a baby that had just been born a few weeks earlier, and at the age of three weeks, went over the ocean. . .

*Next
was
in
England
with
the
wife
in
1956.*

M: Wow!

M: Born in Aberdeen, actually. And then we went to settle in a suburb of Washington. Now, this was another very different kind of experience from any of the others. I was with people who were ostensibly concerned with mental health. But actually, this was a very very free and easy place, surprisingly so, moreso than it should have been maybe.

Knows
The people in Shatz's - it was called the Psychological Laboratory, I think that was the name of it and it was divided into sections - and the people were given a free hand and many of them were doing work that had only the remotest connection in any way with mental health. Others of course were doing clinical work. I was invited specifically because there was a group in the personality section, headed by Morris Pauloff, that was supposed to be studying creativity. And so I was there mainly for that purpose.

And I did take part in these discussions with Morris Pauloff and another man, Al *Caron*, who is still there, on creativity. And maybe through my influence - I don't know, it was begun by with the intention of studying creativity as an individual difference, point of view, tests of creativity and so on - but we ended up talking more about the experimental psychology of thinking. I think this was my influence. Whether it was good or not, I don't know, but anyhow, this is what happened.

M: Yes.

B: But these were interesting discussions. I did get

some experiments done that had to do with creativity - some rat experiments, if I remember rightly. Oh no. Sorry. They weren't rat experiments either, they were experiments with GSR. NIMH had very very poor experimental facilities considering. . . for lack of space. They had a very very great shortage of space. They had hardly any rooms available for research, considering that that was their main reason for being there. . .

M: Yes.

B: They had, of course, a big hospital wing with patients there. They had animal facilities. But anyhow, I got enough. I got. . . it was hard to get subjects. . . I got nurses as subjects and we did a GSR experiment which came off. I can't remember, I must have done some writing there and took part in these discussions. This was preliminary to the next book I wrote, which I started at the very end - once again - at the very end of that year: Structure and Direction in Thinking, which had partly grown out of the paper I had written while in Geneva and it had been stimulated to a large extent by these discussions, which gave me a chance to work out these some more. As a matter of fact, Al Caron, whom I mentioned, was going to be the co-author of the book at one time. But then he decided he couldn't and he dropped out of it.

M: Was this your first encounter with GSR in anger and directly for experimental, as experimental work?

B: Let me. . . I think it was, actually. I think it

was the first, yes, that's right. At that time, I had been. . . I had become interested in the orientation reaction while I was writing this first book at Berkeley because of some important Russian work that was going on there. And that was obviously very relevant to the theme of curiosity that I was writing on. And, of course, The GSR and the EEG and things like that were the standard ways of measuring the orientation reaction. I don't think. . . I mean, I certainly realized that this was important work, but I didn't do any of this sort until I went to NIMH. But, fortunately, by then, good apparatus was available. Anybody who worked with a GSR in the 1930's would warn you off it. You had to rig up some improvised apparatus that wouldn't work very well. Whereas, by the time I started working, there were several very conveniently arranged pieces of commercial equipment, so working with a GSR wasn't. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . very hard. So this is the first experience I had with that, yes.

M: Who all, besides those you've already mentioned, any other psychologists you got to know there?

B: Well, yes, I got to know some other people. Like, for example, the animal psychology groups and the physiological psychologists like Mishkin and Rossvaldt. . .

M: Oh yes.

B: ^{Final} Rossvaldt, I believe, is a Canadian, if I am not mistaken. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . was a Canadian.

M: Mishken is too.

B: Oh! That I didn't know. But you're right.

Yes. He is Canadian, Montreal, McGill, yes, of course.

Yes, well I got to know them. I got to know Rosenthal,^k, who is now, I think, Shato's successor, who did some very good work on the inheritability of schizophrenia. And, yes, he was there. There were others who were doing work under ^{ker} Shato's direction on psychoanalysis. They had a big project in which they were filming people who were being psycho-analyzed with a view to studying the records later and verifying psychology's hypotheses or something.

M: What was your impression of Dave Shato?

B: Well, he was a nice man, but a man that I didn't have all that much in common with because his interests were so different. He was a man who. . . he was very much taken with psychoanalysis, I think to an excessive extent for anybody in those days. In the sense that in those days, you see, there had been enough criticism of psychoanalysis for people even - it's alright to be interested in psychoanalysis, I mean I'm still interested in it and I think we've begun to ask the right questions. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and many of its hypotheses may be correct - but people have to face psychoanalysis with a very critical and cautious attitude. And he didn't. He belonged to an earlier

generation. . .

M: Oh.

B: I mean, he was a sort of easy-going boss. He let the people there do what they liked.

M: Yes.

B: It worked out quite well I think. I didn't really have all that close a relation with him, but I've seen him from time to time since.

M: He was. . . the reason I asked particularly about him, he was such a dominant influence in the 1948 Boulder Conference. . .

B: Oh! I see. I didn't know that.

M: . . . "Training of Clinical Psychologists." He was the man who prepared the working paper, which laid the groundwork for the Boulder decisions, and he wielded a great deal of influence there at that time.

B: Yes. I think he has been a very influential figure in, well, in circles different from the ones I've had much to do with. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I suppose.

M: Yes.

B: That was it. I mean, I don't think I had heard of him for example, before I'd got this invitation from him. But he is very well known among people in his line of work.

M: Yes. Okay, so then you got - just at the end, got - started on your next book.

B: Yes, just at the end. And also, there was this question of what to do next. Now, the question of my staying, as a matter of fact, I wouldn't have minded staying. I mean it was a place where it was quite enjoyable to work and get enough research done in spite of the shortage of space. It turned out in the end that I could have stayed there; that they were willing to keep me on. In fact, ^{he} Shatz even raised the question of whether I wanted a permanent job there, although it would have been difficult as a non-U.S. citizen to have a permanent job there. But he just raised the question; he didn't make any definite offer.

But I think I had decided that I wanted to get back to teaching. I wanted a teaching appointment. But it wouldn't have been too bad if I had stayed there two years or longer. But an opportunity did come up. This is the first real opportunity I had to get a permanent teaching job, at Boston University. I think I went to one or two interviews during this period. But anyhow, Boston University came up with an offer which was an associate professorship which I decided to take. And then we went off there. So that was in the summer of 1960.

M: And you were there. . ?

B: Well, I was there a year and a half. Now, this was a good year and a half. I did get some research started. I didn't get the second book finished, I don't think I got the second book finished until I came here. But anyhow,

I was able to. . . I got a polygraph, which I am still using, 11 years later, doing GSR work and some other psychological work. And I had a. . . the teaching load wasn't bad. But it was, on the whole, I wasn't satisfied there, mainly because it was a department where, or a university where, the graduate school was run on a shoestring. The graduate school wasn't taken seriously. The undergraduate teaching wasn't bad. They had quite good students. But the graduate school was run on a shoestring. Most of the graduate students had remarkably well paying jobs in the town and they would reluctantly leave these jobs to come and attend a course now and then. They didn't live in the department as they do in good graduate schools. . .

M: Yes.

B: The staff members, often, also had well paying jobs on the side. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . and would come in for their courses reluctantly. So it wasn't a place were people -graduate students and staff members - would live there and get together and discuss psychology together. . .

M: Right.

B: . . . very much, you see. . .

M: Yes. Who was there on staff?

B: Well, the chairman was a man called Austin Berkeley, who actually had been an associate of Shato's, I think, at Clark University at one time. Or was it a hospital where they

worked?

Walter Weiss. The person who was most active in research, I think, was Walter Weiss, who was an old colleague and friend of mine from Yale, now at Hunter College in New York. There was a new man called Leonard ^{Solomon} Sullivan, who was a social psychologist trained by Morton Deutsch, who was also active in research. There were a few people ^{Rayna} active in research. Rayner, a man whom I know and had been friendly with, and Harrison, an Englishman, they were active.

I was in a peculiar position actually. This graduate department was divided into three^r and the three were really quite separate in the sense of students could take a course in another division but the staff were quite separate.

There was ^{the} experimental division, the social and personality division, and ^{the} clinical division. And I had been appointed to the social and personality ^{division} because I was thought of as a specialist in Child Psychology. Now, that was a very strange thing, you see. I had never been a specialist in Child Psychology; I had done a few experiments with children, but it was association, guilt by association with Piaget, you see.

M: Sure.

B: And as a matter of fact, you may remember, when the question first arrived of my coming to Toronto, I was to be jointly in the Institute of Child Study and the Psychology

Department - on the assumption that I was a Child Psychologist. And this was a thing that I felt not too comfortable about because, although I was interested in some aspects of Child Psychology and quite liked the idea of teaching it, this was not really my forte or my speciality. So, at Boston University in particular, I felt rather uncomfortable. The people I would have most sympathy and - well, I don't mean personal sympathy, I liked the people there - but the people I would have most in common with, professionally, would be the people in the experimental group. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and I didn't see too much of them. The people in social and personality had rather different interests.

M: Yes,

B: So, on the whole, I liked living in Boston and this was what weighed with me in accepting the job. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . in fact, I used to think in those days - I suppose due to my experience in places like St. Andrew's - that the most important thing was the place you lived. The department you worked in didn't matter as long as they left you alone and let you do your work, whether they were doing their work adequately or not or how they were doing it didn't matter. I found that that was an exaggerated view, that the department you work in does matter. It doesn't make a difference whether you are in a high quality department,

BERLYNE:

181.

or where things are run worse. ^{well} And that a good city isn't the only thing.

M: Yes.

B: So that, after I had been at Boston for a while - you see, all sorts of other difficulties there. Boston University is overshadowed by prestigious places across the river. . . .

M: Sure.

B: Harvard and M.I.T. and many other universities in the Boston area. So that it was. . . oh, I remember things, for example, I couldn't get any photocopying done, because there wasn't a photocopying machine or any funds to pay for any photocopying. There wasn't a very good library facility. The library was very poor, and I did get permission, special permission, to use the Harvard library. But I actually, I. . . this permission didn't include going into the stacks. . .

4(b)

B: . . . I would clandestinely, without very much ^{past} difficulty, rush up the girl at the entrance and enter the stacks illegally. But I felt this was rather an indignity to have to commit these illegalities, minor though they were, to consult the books I needed. And so little things like that gave me the feeling that this was not a satisfactory situation. And so, you may remember that, actually, rather a short time after I arrived at Boston University, I received

a phone call from you, raising the question of my coming here. I was hesitant about it because, again, although these questions of decency play a lesser part in North America than they do. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . in Great Britain, and certainly there is no idea that you have to stay in a place three years if you have reason for leaving. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . still, I mean, to sort of leave immediately seemed a bit much. But anyhow, you may remember that what happened was that I came here and the question of my taking an appointment, partially in the Psychology Department and partially in the Institute of Child Study was raised, and offered in fact, but I turned that down. And then, I don't know, within six months, I think I myself actually asked whether the opportunity was still open, and took it in the middle of the year. Because, by then, it had become clear that Boston University wasn't a good place to stay indefinitely and Toronto was a much better place. And so that was how the next move occurred.

M: Now, do you recall - because I don't recall - what was the tipoff to me that you might be available?

B: Oh, that was quite simple. I had two good friends in this department, George Mandler and Abe Afsel.

M: Where had you encountered Abe?

B: Oh, Abe I had met once before. . . New Year's Eve,

between 1951 and 1952 in New Orleans. Another English graduate student - not in psychology but in English - and myself, during the Christmas vacation when I was at Yale, went on a hitch hiking trip through the American South. We decided that that was one of the parts of the country that was most unique, in any case. And when we were in New Orleans, I got in touch with Irian, the head of the Psychology Department. I can't remember, somebody at Yale had given me his name. And he invited us both to a party given at his house New Year's Eve. I remember, somebody came from having played tennis and this struck me as odd, in New Orleans and playing tennis on New Year's Eve.

But, anyhow, Abe Ansel was there. I remember him as a youthful looking fellow and met him and Tess and talked to him and, well, that was all. You know, I didn't meet him again until here.

M: All of a sudden they were both. . .

B: Well, I'd know him. George Mandel, I had known him well and been in touch with him.

M: Oh, George, yes.

B: Abe, I had not met apart from that time.

M: Yes.

B: So, I think I just phoned up George or Abe, probably George, and I indicated that I had changed my mind and that I would like to explore whether the option was still open. You see, one thing I had learned from. . . I remember, I learned very quickly when I arrived in the United States,

BERLYNE:

184.

that American universities - I suppose Canadian universities too - are run very differently from British ones. The British ones have changed now. It took me a long long time to find out how they did work. And I made very many mistakes in the way I handled things. I didn't realize, you know, for a long time when I was applying for a job or negotiating for a job, I would think that I could put all my cards on the table, you see. The man who was the Chairman, he's a colleague, you know, I could tell him, ^{example} And I didn't realize that it is part of the Chairman's job to do some negotiating. He has to bear in mind the interests of his department, so it is a bargaining/position, not blatant as in business, but it has to. . . it's a negotiation situation. I didn't know anything about that, didn't realize it. I mean, probably I underestimated the extent to which this happens in Great Britain.

But I had very naive ideas, for which I think I suffered. For example, I think I got the job at Boston University on much less favourable terms than I could if I had been anything like a ^{skilled} schooled negotiator. Although I did have the disadvantage of no firm base to go back on, - except for another year at NIMH. But another thing I learned from Hillgard, I remember, at the Centre. . . I consulted Hillgard about. . . I said, 'I might be interested in a job in the United States if one turns up. How do you go about it.' I wasn't sure. In Great Britain, you look for advertisements in the press and you send in your application in triplicate or occasionally 16 copies and you wait until you're called

BERLYNE:

185.

Job

for an interview and. . .

In the United States, it is very different. He said, and quite rightly, that it is done by something very much like the marriage broker system, you see. You get a third party who knows you - at least, this isn't. . . there are several ways it is done, but this is one of the best ways - somebody who knows both parties and you make known your interest to the third party who will sound out the other party and then, you know, just like a marriage broker system.

M: I had never thought of that.

B: It is very accurate.

M: I never thought of that. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . that way.

B: It's a very unsatisfactory method, especially now that they have computers. You see, they couldn't use the British system of open advertising in North America because of the great mass of applications they would get.

M: Right.

B: But at the same time the American system as it existed, you see, doesn't ensure that if there is a job here in one part of North America, and the ideal man for it over there, who would like it, that they will get together. . .

M: Right.

B: . . . you see. Any more than the marriage system ensures that if there is an ideal person here and an ideal partner there that they will get together.

M: That's right.

B: It's all very irrational.

M: Yes.

B: And, especially nowadays with computers, a better way could be worked out.

M: Yes.

B: Probably will be worked out.

M: Yes.

B: But anyhow, with what Hiligard had told me, I realized that the thing to do was to phone up George, who was a very suitable marriage broker. . .

M: Yes. I should say (laughter)

B: . . . who knew both parties well, and he evidently made enquiries and found that the matter could be re-raised and I did a rather unusual thing in coming in the middle of the year. I did. . . well, I didn't mean it as a. . . I was getting a bit impatient with Boston University, I suppose, then. BUT it was mainly simply a mechanical matter that, for various reasons, we had to change apartments in January. And, our child would have had to change schools. The nature of the lease we had made this necessary. And it struck me that it would be rather pointless in going to a new apartment for six months if we were going to be moving to Toronto afterwards. . .

M: And new school and everything anyway.

B: That's right. So I realized, I mean, as a matter of fact, later on I realized that this was probably a rather inconvenient arrangement for the Department here with

its short teaching year. But anyhow, this arrangement came off and it worked out well.

And so, that was the next and so far the last move.

M: (laughter) Do you recall your first visit to Toronto?

B: Oh yes. Very well, very well indeed.

M: What was your impression of the department?

B: Well, certainly, it compared very favourably indeed with Boston University, which you know, is a pleasant place - the people there were pleasant, I will say that, but it wasn't an ongoing centre of psychological research.

Here, evidently, things were going. People had ambition for the department, people were building it up. I hadn't heard much about the department. I remember when I saw, like so many people, the news that Abe ~~Ausek~~ and George Mandler had accepted appointments in Toronto, and I had never heard of Toronto. I had heard of McGill. I'm not sure I even knew there was a university in Toronto.

And then I remember meeting George at the APA shortly after this and he must have argued this way ^{well} for lots of people. He told me that many people may not realize it, but Toronto is the leading Canadian university. It hasn't been leading in Psychology so far; it has been overshadowed by McGill. But its the best university in Toronto; it's a very fine university; and so on, you see. So anyhow, that was the first I had heard all this, but anyhow, I listened to it. And the. . . I mean, I didn't know any of the people. . .

I knew Bott's name because I had seen it on the front of the British Journal of Psychology. . .

M: Yes.

B: But I didn't know, I think, anybody. . . we-1, Walters I knew. Walters I had met and I knew his work. He is one person, I suppose, I knew, apart from Mandler and ^hAinsel. But still, I could see when I came here that this was a very different place from Boston University and a place where psychology was proceeding, particularly at the graduate level, as it should.

In fact, I remember one thing - one little incident - that struck me. I was walking around the main campus and I heard two undergraduates in front of me. And they were talking about something. (^{psychology} mumbled) or something else, you see. And one was expounding a theory he had and the other one was asking him about his theory. And it struck me that this is the sort of thing. . . in a sense, it is pretentious and absurd for an undergraduate to have a theory. . . but this is what you expect from an undergraduate. This is what we would have as Cambridge undergraduates or Yale graduate students. They would have theories and they would assume that their theories were as important as any other theories in the world. . .

M: (laughter)

B: And that's what. . . this hadn't been the case at Boston University or some of the other places I had been.

M: Yes.

B: And this was a refreshing thing. This was one little incident that later made an impression.

M: Yes. That's very interesting.

B: Certain things like, for example, the library facilities were immeasurably superior to the ones in Boston University, for this certainly, really. . .

M: Were you surprised to find the city as big and as cosmopolitan as it was.

B: No, I enquired about the city, you see, because the city is important. I know that Toronto had had a reputation for being very dull. I had met a few people who had lived in Toronto before. And they didn't like it. They said it was very dull. And, in fact, now I know what it was like. Having lived in a small city, several small cities in Scotland - at least two - and imagining that expanded to a city of a million inhabitants or more, I could imagine what it was like. . .

M: Yes.

B: And I think I would have liked it, you see.

M: But still ^{skeptically} homaging this. . .

B: Yes, this dominant, essentially intolerant culture. . .

Toronto

M: Yes. Yes.

B: Yes. That's right. No, I imagined that I wouldn't have liked Toronto. But I made enough enquiries and certainly understood that things were changing. George Mandler was a very competent salesman, you know. He was with

BERLYNE:

190.

many of the people we tried to recruit.

M: I should say.

B: But anyhow, he. . .

M: Where was the department?

B: Well, when I first arrived, I arrived to give a colloquium in about December 1961, no 1960. . .

M: Oh. The year before.

B: Yes. Something like that. It was very soon after I had arrived at Boston. . .

M: Oh yes.

B: I remember, Sydney Smith Hall had the scaffolding up and Abe, not Abe, George pointed to this and he said, 'That's the building we'll be in, where we'll have 50% more space than anybody could possibly use in the department for the next, for the foreseeable future.'

M: (Laughter)

B: But the department itself was in those two houses on either side of the Faculty Club.

M: Yes.

B: You see. And of course, they also had their rat house. I understood that the facilities that the department had were not what it was going to have, and what it was going to have would be rather good.

M: How long was it. . . how long were you here before we moved in?

B: Oh, the move had already. . .

M: Oh!

B: Oh, when I arrived here, the move had already been made.

M: Oh, I see.

B: Oh yes.

M: Oh, it was that close to. . . ?

B: Oh yes. That's right.

M: Yes. Now, I think we, before I wear you down, that brings us, you know, up to such close history that maybe you want to talk more about psychology, your experience here, or we could stop at that point and let me throw a couple of generals at you.

B: Well, let me say for my own part, I'm willing to go on as long as you are.

M: Oh, so am I.

B: But, so, whichever you like. Do feel free.

M: Well, I prefer to go on, but I. . .

B: At the same time, I can certainly make it briefer if you feel it is taking too much. . .

M: No, I don't feel that at all.

B: Yes.

M: I do think. . . we've done just about four hours. . .

B: Yes.

M: And I just don't want to tire you out. Otherwise, I can take this. . . I would like to hear more about psychology and your. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . experience as a psychologist at Toronto.

B: Yes. Well fine. Well, what would you like to start with?

M: Well, anywhere.

B: Well, it's been a satisfying experience. I've certainly been able to get work done. I've had colleagues who have been congenial. And there have been, of course, two periods. The period when there were a lot of important losses, just about the time I was away on sabbatical produced quite a few changes. I hadn't had a group of people with very close interests to mine - as I say, people that I could really talk about research matters to closely. I could talk to Mandler and ^{In}Aysel to some extent. Their interests had something in common, weren't very close. But I have got that from colloquium visits, you see, and on the whole, I have made a visit almost once a month since I have been here, to some place where I have been invited because of the people there doing similar work. . .

M: Yes.

B: So I haven't missed that. So, and then of course, we had this experience in these heady days, you remember, of building up the department, especially with well known senior staff and in which we had a certain successiveness, although looking back on it, the number of hours we spent certainly produced many more near-successes . .

M: Right.

B: Although those were interesting days. The atmosphere in universities has changed very much since then, so that the question of keeping universities alive at all

is more in the minds of the chairmen and the dean than whether his university can compete with another for prestige you see.

M: That's right.

B: This was an interesting thing. I mean, this was a department that I was able to identify with very well, as we all could. I suppose that is all very vague and general but I think that's the best answer I can give.

M: Yes. Yes. You may not recall it, but one of my earliest interviews - I guess after you had come - I recall very vividly having just gone over your visa and so on and telling you that you had ^{/to an} unusual degree, been rootless for a period of a decade or more, quite a rolling stone.

B: That's right.

M: And we were going to put a stop to that if we possibly could. I must say, we did.

B: Well, this is true. Yousee, I had moved. I had had these four sabbaticals in a row. Well, partly because I had, well I can't say no choice, but I had no satisfactory alternative. I think, during this period, I would have taken a permanent job if I had. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . found one that was satisfactory. For example, if one had come up at Toronto, I might very well have taken it and. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . been here ever since. But nothing did come up.

And also, I saw that these were opportunities to take. You couldn't go on wandering indefinitely, especially when you have a family growing up. . .

M: Yes.

B: So these were very valuable opportunities - very very instructive indeed.

M: Goodness yes.

B: So, I took them, but I know that I got a message from Knight, you see, indirectly, when I told Knight I wasn't coming back, he was disappointed. He was disappointed actually because they were just going to offer a permanent appointment to a girl who was there. And they thought I was coming back and so she took an appointment in a gymnastic college or something like that. But I told him it wasn't my fault. I told him I would let him know as soon as possible and I couldn't let him know sooner than that. So he was a little peeved, I think. But he also got the message to me that I was making a mistake in moving about too much, that I would get a bad reputation, that people in Great Britain didn't like it and it was bad. Now, I think it was exaggerated. People don't move all that much in Great Britain, but at the same time, if you have been in a place three years and you find somewhere that seems to be better. . .

M: Sure.

B: . . . nobody would think any worse of you for it.

M: Right.

B: But in the United States or in Canada, of course,

this was a place where people. . .

M: Sure.

B: . . . people go all over the place. . . people are. . . you see, you know, another thing is that in Great Britain, if ever you became a professor - which you probably didn't because there were so few - . . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . you never thought anything better could come to you. I mean, what. . . people rarely went from one professorship to another. . .

M: Oh yes.

B: . . . you were lucky enough to get one, let alone expect a better one. . .

M: Yes.

B: Many people, if they. . . well, you know, the figure still is that only about a third of the people in British universities ever become senior lecturer or above, so that even if you were senior lecturer, well, you had reached you/re. . .

M: Sure.

B: . . . ambition. Whereas, over here, people - *in Canada or America* ~~at least in the Nedy, Nider, Hicksman people~~. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . received a desirable position, there was always the possibility that they could get a more desirable position elsewhere or make the position where they were more desirable.

M: Yes.

B: This was a thing. . . I remember being very distressed to find how much time people had to waste on this. You know, the time that is spent with people going to meetings. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . getting information about the market, who's moved where and so on. . .

M: Yes.

B: But at the same time, the system demanded it, a certain amount of that.

M: Yes.

B: So, this sort of. . . in North America, this reputation for moving, I suppose, may have been a drawback but not as much as in Great Britain. But it wasn't. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . that I was particularly inclined to move or particularly less inclined to remain permanently in a place if a satisfactory one offered itself.

M: Yes... I can understand that. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . an awful lot more now after hearing what your subjective view of the situation was than I could when you first look at a vitae. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . and you see all these things. In one sense, it was very impressive. But it does convey the impression of

BERLYNE:

197.

a person who is certainly on the move.

B: Yes, well this is a thing that I tried to explain to people. For example, a question came up of a job at Oxford some time when I was at Aberdeen. And I remember, my friend McKeller - who knew somebody there - said the question had come up. And they had said, 'Look here, what does Berlyne really want? Does he want to stay in one place or does he want to wander around?' Although I hadn't yet done some of the wanderings I later did.

M: (laughter)

B: And I remember almost losing my temper and saying to Peter, 'What do those damn fools think? That one stands in front of a big menu, ^{and} why just pick out different jobs for as permanent or as short a time as you want? I mean, don't they realize that you don't have all that much choice?' You see. . .

M: (laughter) Yes. Talk a bit more about some other of your colleagues in Psychology here. ^{Tolling} _{Telby,} for instance.

M: Yes. Well, Tolling was a man, of course, that I got to respect a great deal and I became friendly with him. I didn't, oh, I wasn't unfriendly with him, but I wasn't so friendly with him at first. I don't know why, it just happened, probably because I was friendly to other people. But I've been very friendly with him since. We have certainly been to each others' houses quite a lot since he's been nominally away and I am very glad to see that he is back. He is an

impressive man, although his. . . of course, you see, we have here a verbal learning group, it is very strong, and verbal learning has now split off from, what I call, my kind of psychology, if there is such a thing. And this is an example of how things have changed. When I was a graduate student or a beginner in learning theory, you could be a specialist in learning. We had the idea that learning theory was the key to the whole of psychology and most human behaviour is learned so if you got the laws of learning, ^{Tu} you had everything. Now, learning theory had absorbed, apparently it was on its way to absorbing, abnormal psychology, social psychology and goodness knows what else. And within psychology, all sorts of learning - there was animal learning and classical conditioning and verbal learning and all the rest of them. These all seemed to be amenable to explanation by the same laws so that Hull had something to say about all of them and if you knew Hull's system plus some of the rival systems, you knew what there was to know on this. Well now, this isn't so. You can't be an expert on learning. For the one thing, there is too much and secondly, they've diverged. The sort of questions that the verbal learners take up are different from those that the animal learners take up and Hull-Hulligan intergration seems to have gone by the board and I think it is a pity. I mean, I was a very loyal follower of Hull at one time. It was strange, but I was really convinced that he was on the way to having the answers. Well now, I can see some reasons why he was wrong,

and what he was doing couldn't succeed. But I am still 100% for his aims, you see. His intentions were excellent. His aim of integrating, even though it is hard to do and impossible to do with sixteen postulates, a common language that the whole of psychology can fit into, a common set of concepts, I think, is essential. And this, the pendulum has swung against that altogether. And there are very few people who do this sort of thing. Hebb, I think, is one of the few one can mention.

And I think it is temporary, although it is harder for somebody who ~~has been~~ ^{wants to be} an integrator now. So that there has been this splitting up and of course, it has happened in this department too in the sense that the verbal learners - I mean I don't have all that much to do with ^{him} ~~professionalism~~ ^{but} and I meet them personally - but what I hear of what they're doing I'm sort of generally interested in, but I can't follow the details, don't feel like following the details, and they feel the same about what I'm doing, as too the other groups in the department. . .

M: Yes. Yes.

B: This is very different from the old Yale days which were fairly exceptional, when everybody in the department could talk with everybody else. They were all pursuing variants of Hull's theory and applying it to different fields, looking for new fields to apply it to.

M: Yes.

B: So this department isn't unusual in that respect.

BERLYNE:

200.

In fact, it's been a more harmonious department than many until recently, one could say that we really did get on well, it's just that in the last few years, there have been one or two people who have had grievances against others - ^{Their} ^{Grievances} minor little things, I think, that weren't even reasons, I think, in the old days. . .

M: Yes. Go on, past the present, on that theme, if you will. You've got your crystal ball there. What's going to happen next?

B: Where?

M: In Psychology. I don't mean in this department. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . I just mean in Psychology.

B: Oh. Well, that's difficult to answer, and of course, it's difficult to cut out wishful thinking, you see. . .

M: Sure.

B: . . . it's difficult to think about the things one hopes would happen. My feeling, which is partly wishful, I think, but not entirely, is that there must be some swing of the pendulum back toward integration. People are getting less and less satisfied with the fragmentation of Psychology and the pursuit of specialized aims. Some of the humanistic psychologists are trying to get over this. In fact, they are reacting against that. But I don't think that's the way it's going to be done, because they've got nothing really to offer. They have thrown away the scientific rigour and rigour

of language too, much. I think the integration is likely to come through increased use of neurophysiology. Now, this is a view that many people would dispute. And it is a view that I came to very slowly.

The old Yale party-line - which is similar to the Skinner party-line still - was that you should keep physiology out of it, that you should build up a theory of behaviour in its own terms: what goes on in the brain is irrelevant. You've got to look at intervening variables that relate stimuli to response, you see. Hull didn't believe this at first, but Spence converted him, actually.

M: And Hull did?

B: Oh, he did. But first, he talked about receptor effective connections and then this was a hangover from the old behaviourist tradition of thinking in physiological terms. But Spence pointed out to him that you are not really talking about connections in the nervous system and nobody knows what happens in the brain and why bother, you've lost nothing? And so Hull gave this up. And this was a party-line at Yale, that there were people doing physiological psychology, but behaviour theory didn't need physiology. This field had nothing to offer and even if it did, you could do without it. And this is very much Skinner's line.

M: Yes.

B: Now, Hebb's book The Organization of Behaviour is a protest against this. He pointed out that important things had been happening in physiology that most psychologists didn't

WATCH

202.

PERLYNE:

know about. And that it helped if they knew about it.

I wasn't convinced by it. My ~~real~~ ^{friend} training perhaps ~~produced~~ was in resistance. I became convinced rather later, when I was at Berkeley writing my book on Conflict, Arousal, Curiosity and looking up the Russian literature on the orientation mechanism. And I discovered that some amazing things had been done in physiology, the reticular formation and various brain structures governing motivation. And I thought that this was stuff that you couldn't afford to ignore.

M: Which we couldn't do without.

B: Yes, well especially in my own field.

M: Yes.

B: But in general, I can see that. . . I can understand that theoretically... well, I've given the example of sometimes to the students, of a watch. Supposing someone is trying to figure out how a watch works by just looking at it and moving the crown and examining it. Now, theoretically, you can do this. But, meanwhile, a friend of yours has pried off the back of the watch and is willing to tell you what he can see there. You would be a fool, I mean, you could say, 'I can work this out by myself' but you would be a fool if you didn't take notice of what he was telling you about what he can see on the inside. And, psychology is just like that. So that neurophysiology, I think, . . I think it's really hopeless to try to build up models or theories in Psychology without Neurophysiology. But I am well aware that people disagree with this. And I think I have retained enough

of my Yale training to be able to rehearse the arguments against this position as well as anybody. . .

M: (laughter)

B: . . . who wants to. I know what all the arguments against it are. But this is what I can see happening. As people find out more about the brain, there will be room for more integration and integration will come back with specialists in integration, if you like. Speacialist-generalists. Although it will be a very specialized and difficult job, but. . .

M: It will be much more difficult now than the job that Hull tried to do.

B: Yes. Oh yes. It will, yes. Yes. But done in a different way. You see, for example - let's take one example that I suppose I was influenced by. . . In Hillgards book, Theories of learning - which came out first in 1948 - he took an anti-Hulline[↑] position on the whole and a sort of pro-Tolmanite position. But he said that Hull's principles of behaviour is probably but most textbooks of psychology will look like in 50 or 100 years time. Now, I believed that. . . now I don't, I think they'll probably look like Gray's Anatomy.

M: (laughter) That's interesting. You really do.

B: Yes. I think that's likely. You see, they won't have that kind of tidiness. You see, Hull was able to aim at the kind of tidiness that you can find in Newton. Certainly, Newton's laws of motion were a big influence in reducing all the world of planetary motion and motion on the earth to three law.

What Hull can do with 16 postulates. Well, that can't be done in anything biological I think.

In biology, you've got a different kind of tidiness. You don't have that kind of tidiness. You've got the sort of tidiness you've got in a tree, in organic growth, and that's more what you find in Gray's Anatomy, which is a lot of disparate facts, if you look at it. But there is an underlying rhyme and reason there beneath it, but it is not a nice, simple, mathematical rhyme and reason that you can lay out in 16 postulates.

M: Good, well, now take another strike at the future. What do you think is going to happen in Psychology, not the teaching of psychology, but what is going to happen to psychological research on the issue, on the matter, on the question of what is currently called "relevance"? Are we going to become a discipline that is more and more or less and less interested in practical human affairs?

B: I don't think so, but one thing I think I do believe, and this is one thing that I have kept from those old learning theory days. . . I believe very firmly that you need a basic non-applied psychology - just as, in other fields, you can't get many practical advances unless you've got the basic work done by other people who didn't ever dream of doing anything of practical value. People understand this in other fields, but "people" - that is, government people and public - find it hard to understand in Psychology. So, I think we need a lot of psychology that is not relevant. I think what we need

is something else that is often confused with this. And that is this:

If you take any kind of psychology nowadays - pure or applied - let's take the pure - now, if you consider the distribution of man-hours and money among the various questions that can be taken up, nobody would ever think that this distribution corresponds to the distribution of importance, by any criterion of importance you want to use. I mean, for example, and maybe I'm voicing my own prejudices here except that that's inevitable. But an enormous amount of effort is put nowadays, in this department among others, into verbal learning. . .

M: Right.

B: Now, I have a great respect for this work and some very interesting things are coming out of it. But an enormous amount of - proportion of - the research time of psychology is going to verbal learning nowadays. Now, is this so much more important - by any kind of criteria: practical or purely scientific - than others that are receiving much less. I mean, I have been interested in the last year or two in experimental aesthetics. Now this may be a bias, but this seems to me a sort of problem that is at least as interesting as verbal learning. But much much less has been going into this.

M: Right.

B: So something should be done about this. I am not sure ^{whether} why, to direct people to different area of research,

is not correct policy, not in the way in which people usually understand that.

M: You say you are not sure why it isn't correct policy?

B: No, I'm saying I'm sure that it isn't the correct policy.

M: Oh, I see.

B: You can't just. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . have the government. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . telling people to. . .

M: Or anybody else.

B: Yes, but at the same time, somehow or other, there are important fields in psychology which are not - well, they may not be relevant in the sense in which people use this term who have the most naive view of it. Or, sometimes they are. But there are lots of questions in pure psychology that people aren't getting onto and something, I think, will have to be done about this disproportionate, rather accidental concentration on a few areas. . . which has really, I think, gone too far. I mean, I picked out verbal learning, but. . .

M: Yes. Yes.

B: . . . there are many more serious examples in this you see. Now, I don't know what is going to happen except for feedback processes that come about from one generation to another.

M: Well. . .

5(a) M: What about the . . . I can't quite find my line of though now. . . Oh yes. I've got it back again. Would you agree on this question of disproportion of time effort and money that has, in any given period, gone into area A. compared to area B., not because it's more important, but because it is the style, it's currently "hot" everybody is excited about it - we've always had bandwagons - and, I suppose, in all Science, this happens. . . but, would you agree that some of our bandwagons have continued on long after there is any reasonable probability of any kind of gain, either practical or theorctical?

B: This is a very subjective matter you see. People make judgements like this. For example, I've heard one or two people complain that their research grant proposals were turned down because somebody or other said that this line of research was "mined out."

M: That's the problem, I am sure.

B: Yes. Now, people don't realize. . . psychologists are very very low in ^{inter-}~~re~~-^{ing-}reliability of the value of work. Most of the disputes in psychology - and it has always amazed me how few psychologists realize this - 90% of the disputes are about subjective judgements of "-importance-" not about /whether+somebody's+experiments+are+well-designed/ or /what+the+experiments+imply/; they are about whether this kind of research is "important" or. . .

M: Promising!

B: . . . "worthile". And people don't realize that this is a purely subjective thing on which people disagree. I mean, let's get one example. I've heard people criticize Abe Ansel's work on the grounds that this is "an old-fashioned kind of psychology." As a matter of fact, he himself got very riled at this. . .

M: Oh, very. . .

B: . . . being one of the things that made him leave. But anyhow, I've pointed out to people that the sort of work he is doing is still filling a large part of the journals. And then they say, you see, ^{not} is what they really mean is, "It should be old-fashioned. . ."

M: Yes.

B: . . . in their opinion. And I say, "Well, that's a different question altogether, you see. And, obviously there are some people who don't agree, or they wouldn't be doing it." And psychologists seem to be remarkably stupid on this point. They will make this decisions, they will hold them firmly, they will - I mean, if they just held them firmly, it might not do any harm. But you see, people the people who make decisions about research grants and articles in journals and so on. Make this a decision. . .

M: It can do harm.

B: Yes. It can do harm, you see.

M: Yes.

B: And. . .

M: But, do you really think this is peculiar to Psychology?

BERLYNE:

209.

Don't you think this happens in other sciences?

B: Oh, it probably does. But less so. I still think that Psychology is peculiar in many ways, in ways that are not to the credit of Psychology. I know, quite often, I am taken aback to find that people in other fields have the same problems, when I hear them talking. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I know one can exaggerate it. But no, I still think that psychologists are in some ways, naive; they don't have a sense of proportion. . . Maybe they don't have the time nowadays to stand back and look at what is going on in the field. They don't - the field is breaking up into little circles - now, this happens in physics too, but there, the circles are more or less static, you see. The people are in nuclear physics like low-temperature physics are in areas that have been recognized for a long time. Whereas the boundaries between areas in Psychology are fluctuating all the time and people. . . I mean, they don't have the sense to realize that, whereas they are discrediting the things that were fashionable five years ago, in five years from now, the things they are doing will presumably be discredited. They just don't even have such an elementary sense of history that they can see how quickly fluctuating these trends are.

M: Yes. But then you would not agree that a perspective, a broad perspective. . . if we can get some group of psychologists to stand back and view the scene in

this fashion, not the present scene but the past scene, you wouldn't agree that they could now say, with hindsight, "Look, the amount of time and money and effort put into that area of research was far beyond the proportion which would reasonably go to that particular area. In other words, would you deny that there had been some veins in Psychology that have been "mined out". . . and people go on working. . .

B: Yes, but. . .

M: . . . and people go on working on them after they've gone. . .

B: I think it's only after a long time that this becomes apart, you see. For example, there is an amazingly wide agreement among psychologists nowadays that much of what ~~C. L. T.~~ E. & T. did was a waste of time. It may have been historically important; it may have been a necessary stage to go through. . .

M: Yes.

B: But this sort of introspection really doesn't get you data that will be worth very much. Maybe this may even change, I don't know. So, a lot of people agree on that, but they began to agree on that, I don't know exactly when, but a long time after this thing really fizzled out. Then you get swings, you see. For example, you get a lot of criticism of behaviourism nowadays, including the new behaviourism of Hull's day. Now, it may be that that is because this has had it's day and like the older introspective

psychology, it really was mistaken in some of its approaches. But, it may also be just a swing of the pendulum, I mean, if you look through the history of psychology right through to the Ancient Greeks, you'll see how the number of ideas is limited and they keep on coming up in the same form. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and they are even, well, some of the behaviorist ideas you will find in the Ancient Greeks and in some form or another. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . so it is very difficult to judge. It is very dangerous to think that because a thing is discredited at the moment that that is the end of it.

M: (too faint)

B: If it is still discredited in 20 years, you see, fine, yes. But if it has just been discredited for the last three years, it's just as likely that in five years time, this will be the new fad, with of course some changes to bring it up to date.

M: At some. . .

B: You see, there would be examples of both, I think.

M: Yes. At some meeting that was intended to be a eulogy to Hull. . . this David Ba^ckan, from York, got up and made some outrageous statements. I remember particularly that, "there is no other way of accounting for Hull except to admit that he was a stupid man" and on the platform were Neil Miller, ⁺Tiffigard and a whole series of other Hullian
K.¹

. . . Hullian students. And then the statement was made
that, oh, it was ^{Sigmund Koch} Sydney Gotch. . .

B: Oh, yes. ^{Sigmund Koch} Syd Gotch, yes. . .

M: that "Hull's kind of behaviouristic, or any other kind of behaviourist psychology was as dead as dead as a dodo and we've got to recognize that and that it plays its part all over again." ^{Neil} Neil Miller's response was that to the effect "Every five years for the last 40 years he's heard 'rides hell over behaviourism'. It still hasn't been licked."

B: Yes.

M: Let's take it a different way. You know the ^{D. I. S. Y. L. C. U. M. A. N. T.} stance of the new Illinois P.-Psy. people?

B: I don't know much about it.

M: Well, I heard. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . the man that's in charge of that programme talk about it. And he did so very interestingly. And to put it briefly and very simply, in simplified, oversimplified terms. What he said, in effect, was that 'up until behaviour modification, Psychology had not developed a technology that it could use. And, therefore, we had to go on concentrating on the production of "scientists" not "practitioners". . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . and the justification for this new programme, which is frankly and officially a programme to develop

practitioners, is the emergence in the last decade of a technology which is applicable to a wide variety of practical human problems. It is a technology which can be taught and can be learned. It requires some skill, but it can be learned and it can be applied.

B: This is a kind of behaviour modification technology they are talking about, isn't it?

M: Yes.

B: Yes.

M: But, he meant it not in any narrow sense. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . as a form of psychotherapy. He meant applied in schools. . .

B: Oh yes, that's right.

M: . . . in hospitals. . .

B: All sorts of things.-

M: But what do you think about that thesis?

B: Yes. Well, this of course is Skinner's thesis.

It's an extreme point of view. It may be right, but I think it's a bit too early to say. You see, it is possible. For example, I have a great respect for Skinner, although I think that his disdain for theory is a bit misguided. I met Skinner, quite early. . . once, when I. . . in fact, I said that I was invited for Thanksgiving once in 1951, to Hull's house, and I couldn't go because I went to Boston. Well, I did meet Skinner that time and he treated me very graciously, considering I was just a graduate student then,

but I remember that Skinner's point of view. . . I found it a very important point of view, first of all in that it is a challenge. It believes in cutting out nonsense and talk. And if you don't agree with him, you should at least feel an obligation to say why. Not why in terms that would convince him, nobody can convince him, but to have Skinner standing over your shoulder - or, to imagine him standing over your shoulder - and think to yourself, 'How would I answer Skinner's objection?' I found that a very healthy thing.

Now, you see, Skinner as part of this, has taken the view that this idea of reinforcement will lead to a behavioural engineering, has already led to one. Although, if you read his latest book, you'll see he doesn't talk about this as something about it ^{that has come to me} as per se, he talks about it as in-the-future. It seems to me that this is plausible; it's plausible in theory; it's plausible in the light of the initial apparent successes that people have had in therapy and other applications of his approach; it's too soon to judge exactly what will happen. It seems a bit too simple in that I'm sure that some things that people ignore - like motivational questions - we will have to find out more about ^{individual} attentional questions - but this may be so. It's a bit too early to say now, but one of these days, we will have schools of applied behaviour^{al} science, I'm convinced. . . which will be very different indeed from presentday clinical psychology schools or schools of social work, etc. . .

M: Yes.

B: That's what some people are trying to do already and maybe it is a bit premature but how can they find out without trying it?

M: One of the things that interested me about that stance was that because of what I was teaching, I had to dig pretty hard into the roots of this thing. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . and when you do this, you find an incredibly wide variety of out-of-the-way places and I have often thought, well, if I were a ^{temporary} ^{if M} fellow who worked on neurotic sheep at Cornell. . .

B: Yes. Lidell.

M: Lidell.

B: Yes.

M: Or, Watson and ^{Cave} Mary Culver Jones, that sort of thing, at the time, I could easily have thought that this was pretty trivial, pretty embryonic. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . pretty irrelevant to the immediate problems, and if you look at these, then it seems to me quite clear that what is derrogated as curiosity research, hobby research and all kinds of ways is what we are now getting some fruit for. What appals me also is, how slow has been our ability to see the implications of this for practical work.

B: Yes. I would agree with that thoroughly. And this used to be a thing that I found irritating, particularly when

I was in British Psychology. . . people seemed to spend a lot of their time, not getting on with their own work, but belittling other peoples'. . .

M: Right.

B: And I thought this was a pity and people don't do this so much nowadays, I think, because they don't know much about other peoples' work - they just don't even know it - but they. . .

M: Don't know it well enough to get critical about it.

B: Yes, that's right.

M: Except. . .

B: But it seemed to me. . .

M: Except for this bland, indifference, 'Well, it's not important.'

B: That's right. . .

M: 'I couldn't care less.'

B: Well, I mean, if you criticize something because
it is poorly controlled and not scientific research. . .

M: All right.

B: . . . respectable, that's a different thing. It will mislead people. But if you criticize it by saying, well, 'He's not getting at the important questions.' You see, it seems to me - I once said this years ago and I think it's still true - that not a single psychologist has ever done
any piece of work that the majority of psychologists think
is worthwhile.

M: (laughter)

TOLERANCE

BERLYNE:

217.

B: This is true, there is work that the majority of psychologists will agree, has been historically important and influential. But I think there has not been a single piece of research or writing that most psychologists in the world would not be completely uninterested in and think it was an utter waste of time.

M: Very true.

B: I think this is probably right, you see.

M: Well

B: So these arguments about what is worthwhile, what is going to pay-off, what is going to. . . I mean, bad work isn't going to pay-off because it misleads people, you see. It's worse than telling you nothing. . .

M: Right.

B: But if it is respectable in form, but on some content you can't perceive, you don't know whether it is going to pay-off. So that in an ideal society, everybody should be encouraged to do respectable research in anything he wants. But then, of course, in real societies, you have the problem of allocation of resources. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and this is the great difficulty: that you don't know where the pay-offs will be of practical value. So the best thing is to assume a mixed strategy.

M: But even the more. . . Yes. . . but even the more important issues you're putting it in, that it has got to be good research, even that is debatable, in the sense that

we have had research styles and fashions which, at any given time, these advisors to granting bodies all belonged to a kind of in-house 'clique', they were all supposed to be trained in the same gospel, and so we can't even be sure that what this panel of judges at this particular moment in time regard as good strategy for research is going to be regarded by another panel ten years hence as good strategy.

B: Yes. Well, you're right. Yes. The boundary line between a good researcher and a bad researcher is a vague one. . .

M: At the extremes, you can.

B: At the extremes, yes, but it's just that if the research is so poorly designed that you really don't know what conclusion it implies. . .

M: Yes.

B: That's a different matter. But it isn't always as easy to tell that. So that, but, you see, the best thing is to, from the point of view of somebody who is making an administrative decision is certainly to encourage basic research and not to try to guess which is going to pay-off. To tolerate the stuff that seems least likely to pay-off because it might be what pays-off most.

M: Yes.

B: But, at the same time, to try and distribute it evenly - I don't know exactly what is meant by that - but to try and avoid disproportions. I don't know, but I think this could probably even be deduced from some mathematical model

such as ~~that~~ ^{same} theoretical models that this is the best strategy. But if you don't know which of several. . . well, it goes back to Laplace's principle of indifference. If you don't know which of several courses of action will pay-off, the best strategy is to do them all about equally.

M: Spread your bets.

B: Yes.

M: Yes. The difficulty there is, it seems to me, that no. . . I've lost it. . .

B: We were talking about spreading the risk. . .

M: . . . spreading your risk, games theory. . . just about got it. . . it's got something to do with. . . oh, yes, the problem as I set it is this, that if you say, all right. . . now this is a granting body and how are they going to spend their money or advise it to be spent? If they use as their central criterion the quality of design of the research, then it so happens that at any given time, applications for research studies in verbal learning, let's say, using that illustration, are, if it is popular, if a goodly number of the best available talent are all excited about that and they are going into that area. Then, they will submit, from a quality point of view, the best application and before you know it, your money is all going there, as a consequence of ^{the} your talent. . .

B: That's right, it seems to be. . .

M: of your students.

B: That's right, there seem to be mechanisms that make

it self-perpetuating, so that if a certain area becomes fashionable. . .

M: Yes.

B: But it doesn't work that way, you see. It doesn't work that way. There are, obviously, some other feedback mechanisms in the system that act against this. That, somehow or other, there is a pay-off to somebody for criticizing something and pointing out holes in it or starting something new. I don't know if this feedback system works with perfect efficiency, it probably doesn't, but there is something there. And somehow or other, the time comes when people are rewarded for saying the opposite. It may be a change in generations.

A thing that is especially relevant to the American system in which you have, or the continental system or the British system, in which you have people who have to do a Ph.D. thesis under a professor, ^{in the} through a supervisor. And they have to do something that is going to give good results and there are various reasons why it is likely to be something the professor is interested in and then that is what they know how to do so they do more of it. . .

M: (laughter)

B: So you would think that certain things would become very firmly established and ineradicable. . .

M: Yes.

B: Now, they don't you see. These fads do actually have a remarkably short life.

B: Something that many people will point to as examples of things that they feel haven't had a short enough life. But still, they can't say that things don't change, you see. . .

M: That's right.

B: They can't say that.

M: If it were as self-perpetuating to the extent that we were talking about before. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . it wouldn't change. It would just get worse and worse and worse. . .

B: Yes, that's right. And I'm not altogether clear. . . I'm clear on the forces that will make it self-perpetuating. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . I'm not altogether clear on why.

M: What breaks it up?

B: . . . there are things that break it up. Somebody could and should do a study on this. But that is a very interesting question.

M: Yes. Yes. Dan, are you glad you have been a P_sychologist?

B: Oh, I think so, yes. As I said, I started psychology probably to a large extent because it was the nearest thing that was safe to Philosophy. But I think, oh yes, I think it is a goodthing that I made that choice. Oh, there are one or two odd misgivings, I suppose minor misgivings, the id.

that psychology as a field is misunderstood so often. One does have to come across all sorts of irritating misconceptions and criticisms, ^{the} not that they are not justifiable ones, but some of them are ignorant.

Sometimes, I have had the feeling like, well, it's a feeling of envy for physicists or philosophers who are dealing with basic things that apply to the whole universe, you see, in the sense that if a psychologist knew everything there was to know about Psychology, he would know something about a few small organisms that inhabit one minor heavenly body . . .

M: (laughter)

B: and that's all. And I know that there are obvious answers to that. The fact that the universe can produce organisms like ^{us} this is an important thing about the universe. In a sense, the whole universe is a product of the intellectual processes of these creatures. And I know all those arguments. But there have been times when I felt, sort of, 'should we be spending all our time on human and even animal creatures? Are they as important as all that? And ^{and} that social problems ~~are~~ are important?' That sort of thought has come up. . .

M: Yes. So, have you wondered sometimes that you'd rather be. . . that you'd rather have been a philosopher or a. . .

B: Yes. I can imagine that if I had have been a philosopher, I might very well have ended up like most

HUMANIST

BERLYNE:

223.

philosophers, or many of them, talking nonsense about Psychology and not appreciating the need for vigorous evidence, you see.

M: Yes.

B: And I'm glad I haven't been in that position, you see. . .

M: &Yes. Yes. But not the other way? You haven't wondered so much whether you'd rather be - rather have been - famous for literary production or. . .

B: Oh. No, no. I mean, I have a great respect for literature and so on, but no, as a matter of fact, I. . . this is a thing on which I suppose I changed my whole ideology diametrically. When I first went to Cambridge, I believed in ⁱⁿ very ignorant ways. I was in favour of idealistic philosophy; I was in favour of. . . I was anti-scientific; I believed, as many of our students do today - which, as I say, makes it harder, at least for me, to sympathize with them - I believed that emotions were more important than thinking; that intuition or something called artistic sensitivity was a much more important guide to knowledge than science or logic or something like that. . . I believed all that quite thoroughly, in a very ignorant way - I used to defend this point of view in the kind of undergraduate arguments we got into - but afterward, I became converted to the opposite and I am still pretty well convinced of that. . . I very much believe that science and rational philosophy and logic have really got the answers,

in the end. . . I mean, not that. . . sure, these other things have got their parts to play, but not for arriving at the truth. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and not for solving the practical problems of the world.

M: This may be an impossible question, but I want to try it on anyway. Looking back over all of the books you've read. . .

B: Yes.

M: I'm talking about Psychology books. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . of all the books in Psychology, which ones - looking back - at the time. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . really turned you on?

B: Oh, well, I think I can answer that fairly easily. I mean, certainly, Hull's Principles of Behaviour; well, Mowra hadn't written books, then, but Mowra's articles certainly were the first ones. . . well, he started writing books later but it was the early articles that he did. . .

M: Yes. Yes.

B: Piaget's books. The one I translated or had a hand in translating. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . for example, I was interested in that. Hebb's book was certainly an exciting event when it came along.

M: It was exciting elsewhere, was it to you?

B: Oh, yes, certainly.

M: Yes.

B: Very much. Oh, yes.

M: Do you think that the furor it caused was justified?

B: Well, I think it was. I'm not sure if it would cause a furor if it came out now. . .

M: No. No.

B: . . . you see, in the sense, even brought up to date, in the sense that one man can't have such a powering position as any of these great giants could then because there are just too many people about. . .

M: I guess.

B: No, no, this was an important book. I remember well when it was advertised and they had a very clever copywriter and it said, 'This is the book that tells you what happens between stimulus and response.' I remember that, that's what it said. And, like everybody else, I wanted to know what happened in the brain.

M: Sure.

B: And, well, the advertisement was a bit exaggerated. It didn't clear up the whole question. . .

M: No.

B: . . . but the book, certainly - unlike most books about which claims like that are made - it did help to. . .

M: Well, it was a very whole attempt to tell what goes on

between stimulus and response.

B: As a matter of fact, it is rather interesting. . . there is a man called Madsen, a Danish psychologist who writes books on theories of motivation who, in fact, we were jointly organizing a conference in Denmark this summer, and he had tables in which he had various people who had various theories and he put me down as one of his diagrams as a disciple of Hebb's, you see, as Hebb as the man who influenced me most. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and I told him that that wasn't so, that I should go with an arrow from Hull, if anybody. And I mean, Hebb influenced me, but at the same time, some of the things, some of the new notes that Hebb introduced, I was already onto. . .

M: Yes.

B: Some of them, I'm not saying all of them, but Hebb for example is famous for bringing in the questions of the role of stimulus structure in effecting emotion expectancies oncongruities boredom and so on. . .

M: Yes.

B: Already, I had got onto that, you know, I don't want to measure what I had done or what I've done since. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . against Hebb's. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . but at least I was thinking along those lines

as an outgrowth of Hull. . . where things that I could see were not treated sufficiently/ / .

M: by Hull. . .

B: . . . so that when Hebb came along, he reinforced some of the things that were already there, but I had got them previously, ultimately from Hull and maybe Piaget to some extent. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . maybe, even without realizing it, from Bartlett. I think, looking back on it, that I owe more to Bartlett than I give him credit for.

M: (laughter)

B: Some of ~~this~~ thinking about memory ^{and} in perception, ~~the scheme~~, this scheme, and so on. . .

M: Yes. Turning from books to people, especially teachers, first. . . who, without being invidious at all, but who among your teachers, who had most to do with making you the kind of psychologist you are, after Hull. . . although Hull is more of a book to you. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . than he is as a person.

B: Yes. Well, I think I might have been much more influenced by writers than by teachers. . .

M: Yes.

B: You see, I have learned a lot from teachers, but I didn't rely on them. I mean, people I came across like Miller who gave me a course. . .

M: Yes.

B: I mean, I owe much more to Miller for his writings than for his course. . .

M: Yes. Yes.

B: I don't know if this was the British system in which, oh, there could be pretty influential lecturers. You were left on your own; you didn't rely on courses.

M: Yes.

B: This was it. Bartlett may have had sort of a negative influence. . . my thinking about Bartlett at the moment about Bartlett is not all negative by any means, but Bartlett was, to some extent, a model of the kind of a Psychologist that I didn't want to be - the kind of approach and the kind of subject matter. . .

M: Yes.

B: But otherwise, I don't think the courses, the teachers, in psychology were all that important. I'm not sure they should be important to students. I mean, after all, if you've got a choice between the teachers you happen to have in your department or the writers you can read or all the best people in the world. . .

M: Sure. Sure.

B: It seems more sensible to use the latter.

M: That's right. That's right. Well, turning from your predecessors in psychology to your followers in psychology, and again, without any intention to be invidious or complete, of the many graduate students you've had, which

now in retrospect seem to you to have been the most rewarding from any point of view, either in terms of their subsequent achievement or in working with them or on any criteria, which are the ones you. . . ?

B: Oh.

M: . . . remember with the greatest pleasure. . .

B: Yes.

Oh, well, there are several that I look on, I remember, with great warmth. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and so on. The one who has branched out from the kind of work that he started with me most fruitful, I think, is Hi Day

M: Yes.

B: Hi Day is now of course at York University and he's gone into rather different line of work there. But he is, he was very energetic because he got into studies rather late in life. . . I think he is about one year younger than I am, so that he had this sense of energy. But he got on to some lines of work that branched out from what he was doing with me that I think have been important and fruitful. And another man, I think, if you asked me that in a year's time, I think that the man I've got at the moment, John Crozier, is almost certainly the best graduate student I have ever had. And at the moment, of course, he is doing his PhD. work. But I have great hopes for his doing something very worthwhile on his own, when he is on his own,, in

experimental aesthetics. . .

M: Yes.

B: I am trying to think of others. Dick Nikky, who is now at New Brunswick, has continued research that branched out from the work that he did with me. Before I came to Toronto, I only had two graduate students - both at Boston University. One was a girl, ^{L. Helper} Ester Helper, who worked at McGill for a time. You may have possibly met her; she was quite prominent there. She did the Piagetan kind of thesis with me; she was very bright; and she now has married and gone off to Israel - I don't know what she is doing now. The other one was a man called George Lawrence who I don't know quite what he is doing, and I don't think he will really do too much in the way of research.

In Great Britain, we didn't have this graduate student system, you see. . .

M: Yes. Yes.

B: I mean, there were people who took undergraduate courses from me who have now gone out into the world and done various things, but this graduate student system. . . what I really mean is that in Great Britain, when I was there, Bartlett and ^{Glynne} Isaac were the only people who had anything like that, who had anything like a research centre well that even an assistant professor would expect over here. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . with his assistants. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . and his disciplines^{es} and so on. . . This is a thing that wasn't done in psychology, maybe in other fields. Over here, of course, it is done. But I've really only got into this kind of style in Toronto. . .

M: Yes. Except that there was one student you had in the U.K. who has since become a very eminent Psycholgist, what was he like as a student?

B: This is Broadbent?

M: Yes.

B: Oh yes. I don't think that I had an influence on him, but Broadbent - he was a year behind me, he just happened to get out of the Army or the Air Force or whatever he was in a year later - I think he is about the same age, exactly - he came to me for supervision. And, I remember - in fact, I even said this once when I introduced him when he was ^{there} talking - I found him very hard to supervise because he was very bright. He didn't seem as outstanding then, but he was bright. . . There were lots of bright people about and I certainly had no idea that he'd become the very eminent man he is. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . . although anybody could have been, I suppose. He was very very quiet, and therefore it was difficult to get discussion going with him. I remember this. He did his assignments, he read, and he was pleasant and polite and shy actually, so I wouldn't have predicted that he would reach

the eminence that he has now, because I wouldn't think that of anybody you never knew.

M: That's right.

B: You see, but he. . . I didn't. . . Oh, I suppose I didn't know him all that well apart from his supervision hour, but I saw him once a week for a period of the academic year. . .

M: Yes. One comment you made about Hi Day. It reminds me to ask you about this thing that, at the moment, is concerning you very much. The Department of Manpower and Immigration in Ottawa has issued now their full reports on the supply and demand for fully qualified manpower in Canada. And in all of these reports, psychology is among the so-called social sciences, where we are classified by them as the only one of the social sciences that has now and. . .

5(b)

(very faint). . . supply greatly in excess of the requirements. What. . . I don't believe this for a minute, and it is obvious that they are predictions based on very false assumptions. But the problem that lies behind the problem is still a problem. Where with out North American methods of Ph.D. training - which is a very close apprenticeship kind of relationship - it seems to me no wonder at all, that our Ph.D. or many of our Ph.D. students during the three or four years that they are closely associated with somebody

research, should come out pretty much with the idea - that obviously Hi Day didn't get - that it's a fate worse than death unless they can find a place to be and a way to live their model lives. . .

B: Yes.

M: . . . in other words, that the only thing - and this is the assumption Manpower made - the only thing a Ph.D. in Psychology can do is teach at a university. Now, through the 60's, with expanding universities, that was all right because universities could absorb them all. But that is all over now, well, not all over, but we can clearly absorb only a small proportion of our Ph.D.'s in psychology in academic posts; only a small proportion are going to find those posts. And what puzzles me is this; I think that is a hell of a good thing for the country because they are not going to starve to death, they are bright people and they are going to get out and get other kinds of jobs and this is going to put highly qualified manpower where it is badly needed. But this is very painful. And would you agree that we do tend, in our system, to model our students, to shape them, in the direction of an academic career, to a degree which makes it awfully difficult for them even to conceive of doing anything else?

B: Well, I want to make two comments there. And here I sound like an old man pontificating. We are talking about 'our younger days' and so on. But there are two comments. One is that you do have this modeling on a university teacher

which is encouraged, as you very often mention, as one of the advantages of having an inspiring teacher. I think you have got that in Germany. But this was, I think, this was one of the things that North America got from Germany. We didn't have this in Great Britain. This was a thing that surprised me. We had this attitude to our teachers in high school. We would, well, we were half aware of modeling ourselves after them. We would be intensely interested in them. We would spend hours and hours discussing their foibles and speculating about their private lives. And when we got to the university, we didn't have any of this at all. We wouldn't have cared about the private lives of our lecturers and professors any more than we would have if about the milkman. I mean, the milk man delivers satisfactory milk, all well and good, and otherwise you complain, but you don't care about what he is like as a person. And this was quite an amazing thing to me and one of the many things that made the North American undergraduate part of the university look like a school to me, look like a secondary school, you see. And although even in Great Britain and other parts of Europe there is a movement now in this direction, you see. But this used to be part of it, the modeling, the role of the teacher as a model, and some of the students will even complain if the teacher isn't a skilled psycho-therapist who can solve all their personal problems, you see. So, that's one remark.

But, the second thing is this idea of specializing is also

a thing that was new to me when I came to North America. We know what extremes it has come to, how we have, even in this department, we have occasionally had very junior people negotiating for jobs and being very very particular indeed on the courses they will teach. Now, in Great Britain, in my younger days - to use that phrase. . .

M: Yes. (laughter)

B: . . . we had to be ^{ready}, ~~be~~ to teach everything. I mean, I taught one time and another, I think, every possible course that ~~is now~~ ^{was} in applied psychology. And we were prepared for anything. I mean, when I was at Cambridge, I was hoping I would be a university teacher. But I was prepared and I would have been prepared to go on studying bonuses in the building trade or retardates at fishponds if I had had to. I mean, this very often happened. I mean, this is typical. Take a man like David Schonfield, you know, at Calgary. . .

M: Yes.

B: Now, when he took his degree at Cambridge - I think he went to the Maudsley too - he went to a Child Guidance clinic. And, like most people at Cambridge - as a matter of fact, I think he went to the Child Guidance Clinic before he went to the Maudsley - but at any rate, after Cambridge, many people went into Child Guidance Clinics, and they didn't know the first thing about it, they had been given no courses at all that were relevant,

but they were bright people, they learned, they picked it up. I don't know if they would have been as good as people who were properly trained for the job, but certainly, they may have regretted this. They may well have preferred to do something else. But they were prepared for this, they were prepared for the idea that a psychologist had to be ready to do anything in psychology.

Well now, in North America, until recently, this has not been the idea at all. In fact, you not only have to specialize, you have to have a label attached to you. . .

M: Yes.

B: This, I think, was one of the many things that I found was a disadvantage to me to hop back a little when I was on the market for jobs. That when people are looking for somebody to fill a job in a North American University, the first question is, 'What area do we want him in?' And if you are not, if you don't have a label that is on the currently fashionable list of areas, you are at a great disadvantage. . .

M: Yes.

B: Now, in Europe, this is not so. If you have a job in Psychology, theoretically, you look for the best qualified person in Psychology - with, of course, modifications due to personal preferences and political factors and so on that we were talking about before. So that, over here, I think the students have been, gone a bit too much to the other extreme, they have been a bit spoiled, you see, and

ideally, I don't think that anybody who has had any kind of training in psychology should be considered for any kind of job. There is such a thing as specialized training. But, at the same time, they have to be flexible, I think, in going into new fields of applied psychology. And I suppose we can afford to talk that way, we happened to be at the right time when we got into academic careers and. . .

M: Yes.

B: . . .we can be smug about it. I can understand their resenting this, but still, I think this is bound to happen.

M: So what you were saying, that you were surprised as specialist labeling over here, may have become true here, but your description of the readiness to turn to everything that applies to this department in through the 30's, up through World War II and far beyond. . .

B: Yes.

M: And it is reflected also in our resistance, even after the war, our continued resistance to this business of labeling our Ph.D.'s as being this kind or that kind or the other kind. But that day is, although we don't label them here, we shape them differently. And I think that we go along with the American tendency a long way toward giving them tunnel-vision so that they think that their training is just to become a researcher in verbal learning or in some other area.

B: Yes, that's right. And then, they don't do the integration or the effort at integration.

M: Yes.

B: Yes.

M: I think that is going to create a very difficult human problem for us in the next decade.

B: It is, you know, I know what they're going through at the moment. And their position is an unpleasant one. It can't be help^{ed} in some ways. . .

M: No.

B: . . . socially, it may be a good thing, but I don't know, this is a thing that many generations of students in previous ages have gone through. . .

M: I guess so. . .

B: . . . in many countries.

M: I personally feel optimistic about it because, although it is going to be painful to some of them, I also - out of my own experience - feel sure that when they can't get an academic job, they are going to get another kind of job and they are going to find it damned exciting.

B: Oh, it's happened to several exciting.

M: . . . because they are going to find this training damned useful. . .

B: Yes. That's right. As long as they are willing to go at it with the right attitude.

M: Yes. Hunger will drive them to it.

B: Yes.

BERLYNE:

239.

M: Well, thank you very much.

B: Well, thank you.

M: I've enjoyed this enormously. And I often do.
But particularly in your case. Any post-scripts you want
to add?

B: Not that I can think of at the moment. I find
it amazing how many reminiscences one can dred up. . .

M: Isn't it?

B: I never realize myself. . .

M: Isn't it fascinating?

B: . . . that I can keep on going for so long,
but I suppose that I have had a bit more varied experience
than many people. . .

M: Yes. Yes, and a very interesting one.

B: I've been various places.

M: Well, things will occur to you that you forgot
to mention. I know that. That is inescapable. However,
I'll send you a copy of this (!) - I'll send you two copies
and ask you to return one - the other one that you keep
will be very useful to you when you come to your autobiography.

B: (laughter)

M: The history of Psychology.

B: I see (laughter)