

Dale B. Harris

- Born 6/28/1914 in Northern Indiana; Died in 2007
- B.A. (1935) DePauw University , M.A. (1936) University of Minnesota, Ph.D. (1941) University of Minnesota
- Married to Elizabeth Harris



Major Employment:

- Head of Psychology, 1963-1968, Professor of Psychology, 1968-1969, Professor of Psychology and Human Development, 1969-1979, Professor Emeritus of Psychology and Human Development, 1978-2007, all positions held at The Pennsylvania State University

Major Areas of Work:

- Research on children's drawings, resulting in the Goodenough-Harris Draw-A-Person Test.

SRCD Affiliation:

- Secretary and Governing Council Member

SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Dale B. Harris

Interviewed by David Palermo
May, 1994

Palermo: Okay, I think we are suppose to begin with your general intellectual history. So would you describe your family background along with any childhood and adolescent experiences that may be of interest - where were you born, where did you grow up? What was your schooling like? Do you have any military or early work history you want to talk about?

Harris: Well, I grew up in a town in northern Indiana on the eastern edge of what is now the rust belt. While it suffered pretty severely during the depression the town was hit earlier than the great depression generally because its main industry was musical instruments. There were five band instrument companies.

Palermo: Five companies?

Harris: Five companies and they produced something like 85% of the world's supply. Germany was the only one that came even into the picture and of course radio coming in during the early 20's just knocked home music and the town was badly hit by the depression by 1924/1925.

Palermo: When were you born?

Harris: I was born in 1914. So I was in school you see. I entered school in 1920, Fall of 1920.

Palermo: Were your parents connected with these, one of these music instrument companies?

Harris: Well no, my parents had fairly limited education both of them. My mother derived from plain people of Pennsylvania originally, not to far away from here as a matter of fact. My father had just what was available then, eighth grade or what we call an eighth grade education. They were not particularly oriented toward education but my father's mother, my grandmother was very much oriented to education and I was slated for college from the word go by her. My mother was a little more reluctant. She felt that college would somehow damage my moral fiber. Well, she had a Pennsylvania attitude you see, it was dangerous to your faith- higher education. While she went along with it-all the way along-and I think eventually came to feel somewhat differently about my career. She was never

enthusiastically encouraged as my grandmother who had been a teacher, a public school teacher. In fact, she had taught in the very school where I attended elementary school for six years.

Palermo: What time was this?

Harris: Oh, she was teaching in the 1880's.

Palermo: No, what was the town?

Harris: Elkhart, Indiana.

Palermo: Oh, Elkhart. You never mentioned which town we were talking about.

Harris: Yea, that should be in the records certainly. Beyond that I don't know quite what to say, there was a strong interest in biology, and general features of biology in the family. My younger brother was slanted toward biology by a school teacher early on-bird watching and collecting specimens, butterflies and pressing flowers and things like that-and he went into working for the Department of Interior in the Wildlife Division.

Palermo: He went to college too?

Harris: Oh yes, yes.

Palermo: How many sibs did you have?

Harris: Well, I had a sister then who was eight years younger than I and my brother was a year and a half younger than I. We all have college degrees. My sister finished her Master's and I and my brother finished with a Ph.D. Now let's see where, I can't think of any particular influences there except that I graduated in a very hard time during the depression, just before the banks all closed. They closed when I was a freshman in college.

Palermo: 1929.

Harris: But a teacher and a local minister both urged me to go to DePauw which had pretty generous scholarships for men at that time. They had as many as 400 men in a college of 2,000 on full tuition scholarships for four years. It sounded pretty good and I qualified and attended but was caught short the first year by the banks closing. I didn't lose anything, my dad did. Every penny I earned went into a bank account for college. At times I resented it but at other times it worked out. It paid for one year of schooling and by the time I got down there I got work there, the library and one thing or another. A little later on we had appointments on projects within school, not unlike some of the programs we've had around here in recent years. Paid the magnificent sum of 25 cents an hour, that was basic wage in those days and we went through at that rate. It was quite interesting.

Palermo: Tell me a little more about the minister and the teacher who encouraged you to go.

Harris: Well, the teacher was a history teacher and he took an interest in me as did one or two of the other teachers and he urged me on to college. I could tell you one interesting anecdote. He spent one day a week on current events and news and of course this was the day of the emerging Communist Party so I proposed to him one day and said, "let's just go to one of the meetings." They keep advertising for guests so he said okay so we went up, I don't know whether the FBI have got this or not. But we went up there and joined the local group of about a dozen men, sat around in a circle and read Marx out of leaflets in rotation around the circle much like an old fashioned Sunday School session and neither of us were going back but we were curious because these were not fire eaters as they were sometimes portrayed at all, they were kind of seedy old men!

Palermo: So you never became a card carrying member!

Harris: Oh no, I should say not. But somewhere along the line I got fascinated with kind of a social theme, social service theme. It may have been from my mother's influence who was strongly inclined to the welfare of her fellows.

I was pretty active on campus, anti-war, that sort of thing. This was at the time the Japanese went into Manchuria, we felt sure we were going to be involved before we graduated. Some of us joined various groups that spoke out against this senseless activity going on in China and we were also very much concerned over the growing threat in Europe and I remember my grandmother saying to me once, this was after I had gotten into college, she said, "I'd sure like to live a little longer to see how this works out." She said, "that man Hitler is going to stir things up."

Palermo: How right she was.

Harris: She was so right. I've had much the same feeling recently as I look at events in the world. I won't live to see it, but sure would like to see how it works out! But as I say it was a social motive. It was stronger than the basic science motive although I had a teacher who wanted me to head towards science and my grandmother encouraged that because my father's younger brother was very successful. A metallurgist for the Bell people in New Jersey and thought that he had gone in by way of chemistry and always thought chemistry would be a very suitable field for me but I never took to it. I didn't particularly like it. I took a basic course in high school but I never took to it and I avoided it when I went to college. I was clearly more interested in social phenomenon from very early on.

Palermo: So you went to the Social Science, you didn't go to the Humanities?

Harris: That's right, Social Science, Psychology. One of the influential teachers that I had in college was Fowler Brooks who wrote an early and very influential, Psychology of Adolescents, I don't suppose anybody has every heard of it.

Palermo: I certainly haven't.

Harris: He was always of interest to me, it certainly stimulated me because despite that fact of two adolescent daughters he was using the first longitudinal data, not longitudinal, cross sectional data that gave growth curves and it showed steady growth through adolescents. Of course any parent knows you go through spurts and he wrote the whole book on the smoothness and lack of turmoil which Stanley Hall had stressed, in fact I think he says his book as a kind of correction from Stanley Hall. He was a good man. He was the one who urged me to go to Minnesota for graduate work and he was very influential and very sympathetic to my desire to do something in psychology.

Palermo: Let's backup a little bit here before we get on to graduate school. Were there any particular friends that you had as a youngster in grade school or high school that ...?

Harris: Oh, I was kind of the odd ball out. I was clumsy, no good at sports at all, that is, I was the guy that was always stuck out in the field hoping that no fly balls come my way! I had a good friend and I suppose he sparked my liberal tendency then, he was a Finn. I would say a red Finn. He was much more sympathetic to the communist movement than I and he was an intellectually bright kid and we both got interested in H.G. Wells science fiction and science fiction magazines that were just new. There was a new genre of writing on the horizon in those days and we read the stuff enthusiastically. I was always less interested in the science aspect of it than in what you might call the social science aspect or how these people accommodated to whatever adventures they were in. Well anyway, back to college, I had a course with a professor in religion who had just finished his Ph.D. at Northwestern in what he called "character education." He had contrived a couple of tests, paper-pencil tests on moral knowledge and moral insight for children and he suggested I do a research out of this. In fact I did two but both at his suggestion. One of them was using the Bernreuter which was brand new then with four scales (before it had been reduced to two. With some question about the validity of even two!)

Palermo: We are not going to do an interview for Bob Bernreuter on here, so you can go ahead and say what you want!!

Harris: Well, Bob Bernreuter was very decent to me. I wrote to get permission to mimeograph his tests. We had no money, there were no such things as grants for research and he applauded the idea. We were going to test a bunch of students heading for the ministry and a bunch in math and see if there were personality profiles that were distinctly different. That did occur and we got some differences and we published when I was a junior in School and Society,

in its research section (they had one research paper a week, it was a weekly publication). That was, in a sense, my first publication.

Palermo: What was the senior author's name?

Harris: Bartlett. Edward Bartlett. Then I went on to the second project which Bartlett encouraged to use his tests along with a battery of other tests which I pulled together from the literature and from my own invention, a schedule of play activities where you check off whether you do this a lot, some or never at all and we went over to the Indiana Boys School and got a sample of kids junior high age and then high school age. We used local, of course we were aware that they were not socially equivalent but we used local kids in the small towns around Greencastle Indiana to get a nondelinquent population of boys. We did find major differences in the things that they liked to do. Of course as you guessed the kinds of activities that are shady that are on the border of misbehavior, those were the ones that a kid could be scolded for that sort of thing, those were the ones that separated the groups. On the moral tests, the moral insight and so on the differences were not so sharp and my mentor put in a biblical knowledge test. The delinquent kids won hands down, because they had compulsory Sunday school. The sample of nondelinquency of course took kid out of the community, some were inclined to Sunday school and some were not!

Palermo: Then he wanted to take it out again!

Harris: Well, I wrote that up it gave me a real experience. By that time I was pretty well involved with Elizabeth (now my wife) and she got employment for a while typing manuscript under the Youth Act, so it helped both of us through school.

Palermo: So you met at DePauw?

Harris: Oh, yes. Yes, and I never published from that but I wrote it up as a thesis about so thick. It was quite a job but it was a very, very good experience in how to go about and how to write up and how to set up, and organize a research project. It was all mine. I was permitted to do it all. It was interesting. The instrument that I played with, as I said, was a list of play activities and I expanded this for my Master's paper and Master's dissertation at Minnesota and did a factor analysis of a sample of delinquent boys to find families of activities for my doctoral.

Palermo: When was this?

Harris: Oh, this was 1935, 36. I got my doctorate in 1941. My mentor at graduate school was W. S. Miller of the Miller Analogues test.

Palermo: Oh, yes.

Harris: And he was rather pleased with the background I had although he was not all that sympathetic with any religious sentiments (he was a minister's son).

Palermo: He rejected it all!

Harris: But he brought this bound volume of mine into the prelim and the upshot was my prelim was waved. They just said go right ahead with your dissertation. The final oral they did examine me on some aspects of the study that I had done. The thing that I remember most from that was the contortions you had to go through to do a factor analysis. You use a Hollerith machine to sort the cards and it took sort after sort after sort to get the various categories. Then you entered them into four-fold tables and did the appropriate statistical evaluations of four-fold tables in order to get estimates of correlations. It was a dilly.

Palermo: How old of a technique was that?

Harris: Well, it was fairly new. What's his name down at North Carolina. The early factor man, L. L. Thurstone. Thurstone had just come out with it. Two or three years old but I saw the possibility. It appealed to me as a way of grouping activities and finding families of activities that would tend to clarify a pretty complex situation. Well

anyway this kind of goes on but what I am leading up to is a trend in my thinking that was already apparent I think. By the time I got to graduate school I had been given a thorough doctrination in Watsonian behaviorism. That was our text. That was the approach the undergraduate instructors made. They were confirmed in it, as it were. Yet I was uncomfortable. It seemed to me too limited and too mechanical so I went to Mike Elliott at Minnesota to do a paper and I said I wanted to work on organismic psychology. Well, he'd just heard of it and he said well that would be fine and I told I was a little uncomfortable with Behaviorism and he said well, you've got to understand that's the backbone of psychology. I agreed that it had to be understood. But he saw me through an analysis of some of the writing of the Gestalters and I did a paper and he applauded it. That paper lead me into more biological literature. I had never studied biology formally but I did a lot of reading of basic biology and philosophy of biology at that time, the conflict between the mechanists and the vitalists which was pretty volatile in those days, and out of all that came a conviction that the process of development and growth was really the way, one way at least to go at it, a legitimate way to go at the study of psychology. Now I was working with Miller who was an educational psychologist and I was not over in the Institute where development would be found and...

Palermo: You mean your graduate work was in the Psychology Department not in the Institute?

Harris: It was in Ed Psych and Psych between the two. Ed Psych was in Education and the Dean of Education at that time was.

Palermo: Not Williams?

Harris: No, he was an old line psychologist who had worked with monkeys and cats and so on, oh well, Melvin Haggerty was still Dean and he was pretty respected as a psychologist but then he was succeeded by a curriculum development man or an Administration man and education moved directly into what we call the Educationalist point of view and Miller always regretted that. It had lost its scientific bearings he thought. Well, where was I?

Palermo: You were talking about your development of your ...

Harris: Oh yea, I was getting this point of view of a more fluid, more global, more organismic approach. At this time I took two years out to head up an educational program, a school program down at Red Wing School for Boys. You see I had this background in an Indiana school which I work a summer as a psychologist aide there, as well as conducting all of that research. So this looked good to the Red Wing people and they were looking for someone to head up their program for a couple of years and so I went and tried to loosen up a little of their educational view point to meet the kids at the level at which they actually were instead of the level of how many years they had been in school. A lot of them were retarded, you see, in education. Well, that was an interesting experience and it was very valuable. I've often advised graduate students of going somewhere between four year college and graduate work as indicated because you need sometimes contact with reality and to sharpen up what you really want to do. So I came back to Minnesota but not directly because in the meantime Alvin Eurich had heard about my work, in fact I've had a little work with him, course work. He went out to Stanford to head up a program in Educational Research and he took me out there and that was a bust. That was a real bust. I came very quickly to the conclusion that they were more interested in snaring teachers in their experimental schools around the Southwest into their summer academic program than anything else, because every schedule of tests or evaluations we called them then was pushed aside. They weren't really interested. They wanted to encourage the "best thinking" of teachers, I've heard that expression so often and "measurement really doesn't tell us anything". Well, anyway I had decided this wasn't for me, this happened within a few weeks! So I went over to psychology and loaded up on Psych courses towards the end of that year. I took Terman and I took Hilgard and I took Farnsworth, Paul Farnsworth. Then the ratman, I'm really blocking on his name. Calvin Stone who had gotten his degree at Minnesota years before. He gave me a lot of help, he I remember introduced me to ethology, an ethological approach to behavior, and I ate that up but good. That year was useful to me in another way because I did a project on Meaning. An analysis of the "Meaning of Meaning" that Ogden and Richards had published and got into this whole business of specificity as a meaning and an exactness of words and so on and the futility of it all and so on and so forth. It really, I think, sharpened up things. I went back to Minnesota without an appointment or anything, I just went back on the strength that something would work out and it did right away.

Palermo: So basically, you started when?

Harris: In 1936.

Palermo: Then you took one year, then you took three years out?

Harris: No, two years out. Two years at Red Wing and a year at Stanford. Three. Then I went back to Minnesota because Terman thought so much of Florence Goodenough and was dumfounded that I hadn't worked with Florence Goodenough. I immediately went over and got a course with Anderson and a little later one with Goodenough. She wasn't teaching in the fall term. From then on I was anchored to the Institute pretty much, because Anderson was beginning to look for a person to substitute for his grad students who was going over to the State Board of Health to work and I found myself working with the Parent Education Program as a way in. I had an appropriate reservation regarding parent education but I learned to support it really. The thing that interested me most about the Institute over the long haul was the fact that it was modeled on the Agricultural Experiments Station, quite explicitly. In other words, if you wanted a program of research studies of child growth and development and then you needed a program to feed this back to consumers. So we had an active program of parent study groups all over the state, usually in connection with the PTA's, and I used to go out and lecture one or two times a week. Talks. They weren't formal lectures they were just talks and I always tried to do three things, again on model of the Agricultural Experiment Station. Give them a study. I would illustrate it with a chart, detailed graphs and so on and then we would talk about practical consequences. If I had some anecdotes or some anecdotal material to go along, fine, that went right in. But they always got a study outlined in some detail and a chart of results because a little later when I used to go back to Indiana to visit Elizabeth's parents, her father was a farmer and he took me around to a bunch of the meetings and you'd have a half dozen farmers squatting down and chewing on grass stems and the county agent would be talking to them and he'd have a book and he'd show them some graphs and he'd talk about a study and he'd recommend certain rations for their animals. The pattern was just there so I was dumfounded to see how closely it had been modeled on that. I found out later when I got into the history of the thing that Larry Frank, of the General Education Fund had made that a kind of cornerstone of the whole approach to the five or six major Institutes at that time. The Institutes Rockefeller Fund had supported included the Iowa Fund. Of course the Iowa pattern had been established earlier quite independently of the, as you know, of the Rockefeller Fund.

Palermo: Bess Hilles also got the Legislature to get everybody in. My understanding is that she compared, said we know a lot about the growth of hogs in the state of Iowa but we don't know anything about the growth of children and so you had the parallel right there. She'd say let's give some money to research on children as well as research on hogs.

Harris: She was on the right track. She had a good argument there but I am saying that to some extent I think the Iowa program influenced Frank.

Palermo: Oh, really?

Harris: To look more closely at the Agricultural Experiment Program and he definitely, in fact John Anderson used to say in effect, be though he'd carried it a little too far! But anyway that's the way it went. I would say at Minnesota, my influential people were Miller, Scammon who is the growth man who working in the School of Medicine, Goodenough and Elliott were the ones that were particularly influential I think.

Palermo: Did you have Anderson in the group?

Harris: Oh, yea. I put him in there.

Palermo: He was a strong man.

Harris: Oh, yea and he I think influenced me unwisely in some respects in that he took the view, he was boss. A good Institute was run by one man who had one idea and applied it. I think I had to unlearn some of that a little later! He did another thing that was quite useful, he said look if you are going to go into academic work you've got to cut your teeth. He said you follow me around, I'm a good teacher, you follow me around for one year and be my assistant in my basic courses and I will teach you how to teach. There was no modesty there, never, as you well

know. But he did, he said one thing you have to do is put yourself through the paces. He had me do everything that the Institute offered at one time or another except one course and that was the child care and training course, the practical course, everything else I had to teach at one time. Summer session or night school or somehow, plus all this work out in the field and I sure did, I worked like a devil but I learned. There is something to be said for putting you through the paces.

Palermo: Seeing as you were talking about the PTA meetings I remember Charles Spiker in particular was always poo-pooing the PTA meetings and the staff that were in charge of doing that and went out two or three times a week you know and gave talks to various groups until he finally decided to go to a meeting or two and he said, he couldn't believe how much it was needed. How the parents were so ignorant and how they needed this kind of information and he became a convert just by going to a couple of meetings because he didn't realize how little people knew about raising children and how needy they were in terms of finding and getting some professional advice.

Harris: Well, I finished there in 1941. We had our first child about that time, three months ahead of my degree. From then on I was gradually given more and more responsibility and more independence in thinking, I do have to admit that all along Mike Elliot told me, he said Dale you've got to cut loose from Minnesota. Go somewhere and be yourself so I had that in the back of my head although Minnesota treated me so well and so generously all along that I found it hard to break away and didn't, until you know when, in 1959.

Palermo: So you were hired as soon as you got your degree you were hired in the Institute?

Harris: I was hired in the Institute before I had a degree. I was paid a magnificent sum of \$1200.00 as an instructor for a year. We didn't know what to do with all that money! Well, I was going to say when you were commenting about Charlie Spiker's feeling about practical applications, John Anderson used his program up to the hilt to get support for special grants from the legislature to keep the Institute going when the Rockefeller money ran out. You see the Rockefellers made a second grant but it was about half as much so to keep the program going you had to get new funding in the University, this was still depression days although this was in the middle of the 30's.

Palermo: The Rockefeller money was cut in half in the middle of the 30's?

Harris: How's that?

Palermo: The Rockefeller support was cut in half about 1935 or so?

Harris: Yes, well a little sooner than that, oh it was about 1935. Yes you are right. It was a ten year grant and they started it in '24 or '25. Didn't nearly get rolling until '25 or '26 and so John found that his friends all over the state could put the heat on their legislators and did and he was able to get a separate appropriation for the Institute which was independent of the Universities appropriation. Now the University put a little money in because after all we had an academic tie up. They had to furnish the building and space and that grew and increased so that when the second grant of the Rockefellers which is I think a five year grant ran out toward '39 or '40 or something like that there were some activities that were stopped but on the whole, the program was supported. However there was an angle to that that bothered me when I was director there in the 50's. The financial officers for the University did some fancy work which without ever any consultation. We didn't like that, what happened was that the Institute had been granted a block of stock in Parent's Magazine and this of course accrued in value and as I recall we didn't use the proceeds. We plowed it back in, the financial officer decided to sell the stock and incorporate the money into the University budget and since the University was now theoretically at least supporting us entirely but in fact we were still making a special legislative plea. I had to go over a couple of times to the State legislature and talk to the legislators about the necessity of our support. When we confronted the financial officer about it he said, well of course in time we are going to carry the whole thing and you won't hurt and you won't have to go over and make that presentation, that sort of thing. I think John was annoyed. I certainly was although John was merely a bystander at that time, I was the director but we thought it was just little irregular. Well you know, I don't know whether you've followed Minnesota history since then but they have had some more episodes like that where financial speculations occurred not to the person's own benefit but manipulating things within the University without discussion with interested people, vital people, the last one was this medical school which just about ruined the medical school, this was just this last year.

Palermo: I didn't hear about that.

Harris: Yes, well it was pretty scandalous up there. We were there just two or three days at Thanksgiving time and we heard all about it from people who aren't involved.

Palermo: I do remember the President who was using funds.

Harris: Oh yea, that was another thing. This man is working against odds at the present and he is a Swede, Nils Hasselmo. He's a good man, they like him but they aren't quite sure whether he is equal to the situation, it's kind of gotten out of hand you see. They have had a couple of officers face prison terms for misuse of money over the last couple of years.

Palermo: I'm not clear on how John Anderson stepped down and eventually you were his successor.

Harris: Oh, he had heart problems, high blood pressure really is what it was and he was told he just had to cut back on his activities. He is, you know, a class A personality! So he decided that it was time for him to step back and he did pretty well, he didn't bother me. Oh, I must say there was a kind of a ghost there as far as I was concerned.

Palermo: Yes, I know you told me that before, either after you left or just before you left you said that was part of the reason you were leaving.

Harris: Yes, well you wondering, I felt at the time that the Institute needed a new direction and I couldn't conceive of what it would be. I was so wedded to the older patterns. To see those dissipated just threatened me terribly. But I saw it was necessary. It seemed to be at least necessary because money was beginning to come in during the 50's for training and for research and you had to have a pretty vigorous ongoing program with vision of where you were going in order to attract that kind of money and I just didn't feel equal to it at that time. We had just been through, as you were remembering a transition and were given the choice of going over to the Department of Home Economics or the Department of Education and the Department of Education had more promise but the Dean at that time was an elementary school ex-superintendent you know, Wesley Peiks and he was a nice man but he didn't have any ideas above his ears, he was strictly an Educationalist.

Palermo: Who was the woman?

Harris: Oh, Marcia Edwards, she was number two and she was sharp but she too had been a local person. She had gotten her degree in the college and had stayed on as a good gofer, you know. Some of the things that happened, well, the General Education College back in the late 20's was funded by the General Education Board but was in a large part the product of the associate dean of education at that time, Harold Benjamin who had some ideas about the nature of education which were way out, far out compared to traditional schools. He didn't last but he did first establish that Continuing Education Center there, one of the first in the nation. He had a bent toward the practical, serving needs and yet in novel ways not just old cut and dry educational programs. Well, I think that about covers it.

Palermo: When did you become director of the Institute?

Harris: In 1954 and I had five years, left in 1959.

Palermo: Okay, well we will talk about your primary interests in child development at the beginning of your career.

Harris: Well, I suppose you would say mental development, testing because my background under Miller was largely in testing. I'd gone over and taken J. Arthur Harris's work in biometrics and Palmer Johnson's in Educational Statistic. He was just back from England fresh from Fisher and brought Fisher back to the United States although I got a good deal more out of your man in Iowa. Now where was I...

Palermo: What were your interests in Child Development?

Harris: Oh yea. Mental development and I did some work with some of the old records at the Institute, putting them in shape for study. They were mental test records, they couldn't have had the notion that they could maybe be cleaned up a bit and there were mental measurement scales that we had for young children that could be revised. That never came to anything because the war came on. I was, when was Pearl Harbor-'41, I remember I was still technically a graduate student. I was up in the assistant's office and somebody stuck his head in the door and said, "Pearl Harbors been bombed." You never forget that! From then on it was kind of constriction of the program, of the Institute. John and a couple of us went over the teach statistics to the Specialized Training army group that was brought in, students several of whom went on to prominent psychology careers by the way. At least three, one went to Stanford and one went to the Educational Testing Service in Columbia, not right away, but ultimately. I remember one of them sent back a photograph. They had high hopes that they would be specialists and get into treatment and he was swabbing out the latrine and he says, "Psychologist at work!" Well anyway...

Palermo: When did you go into the Marines?

Harris: I went into the Marines in 1944 for two years. It came about this way, "Dinty" Hahn, had been in personnel over at the General College and I'd been teaching over in the General College. Teaching a course at the Institute, contributing to the General Education Program of Human Growth and Development, a kind of dynamic social psychology.

Palermo: The General College we should explain is the part of the University that anyone could enter. If you had no entrance requirements to get into the University you went into the General College.

Harris: Yes, and if you survived two years, passed your comprehensive with 75% you could transfer to almost any college of choice. Of course the question arose whether the General College really was to prepare for a two year program or to potentate individuals to move into better avenues and actually it did both. They developed a number of two year curricula, gave an Associate in Arts degree but a fair number also moved on as Juniors into other programs. The Institute taught a course, come to think of it, a kind of humanistic social psychology that dealt with attitudes and with personality formation that sort of thing. It included some good developmental material as an approach to it, growth material as an approach to it. I think that had quite a bit of influence on the way I saw the field ultimately. Dinty Hahn was in the personnel area in General College. He got a commission from the Marines to set up a program for demobilization, a counseling program for demobilization and he was ready to retire, got one of his colleagues, Cornelia Williams of the General College into the Marines as a Major I think, ultimately a Lieutenant Colonel, she had something to do with the women Marines and the two of them spotted me as to succeed Dinty. But by the time I got through basic training (they put us through basic training so we knew what the Marines were like) by the time I got through basic training, as near I can figure out, the American Legion got wind of this development and they got in there and changed plans. They got the option on doing the counseling including offices in the various centers and I was left to kind of floating around. I went to Cornelia quietly and said, "what can we do about this." I was slated to go out to the Pacific and sit on what they call a base defense unit which was an island that had been pacified and you sit there and I didn't particularly relish that. She said, "well, there is a category as Educational Officer" and I became an Educational Officer and they assigned me to the hospital, the naval hospital in Philadelphia for a better part of two years, a year and a half at least. I gave weekly summaries of what was happening in the war to various wards to keep the men alert. I did some counseling but with a gingerly eye on the man who represented the American Legion whose office was next to mine and a number of things of that sort but I did learn an awful lot about some of the handicaps and the guys who had suffered from inadequate nutrition in prison camp. We had a bunch of returnees from the Phillipines returned from Japanese prison, and blind, amputation, deaf cases and I learned a good deal about handicaps, of some of the problems involved and psychological problems involved in handicapped patients but then I got out in the spring of '46, got back to Minneapolis. There was nothing particularly significant there except as I say I got a much clearer picture of the handicapped as a result of that work with kids on the wards, some interesting examples. It was a kind of background that I think a clinical psychologist ought to have before they go out and do clinical work.

Palermo: Well, presumably that is what the internship is for, I don't know whether it works or not.

Harris: Yea.

Palermo: When did you get involved in the Draw A Person?

Harris: Oh, when I got back Florence Goodenough had been having difficulties with her vision and it was ascertained finally that she had a pancreatic condition that was creating a kind of premature aging. Her hair had turned white earlier and her vision and hearing and all were beginning to deteriorate and she had to take early retirement, she felt she had to take early retirement. She was missing too much and she said to me, "would you help me revise this test." She put Leona Tyler to revising her basic text book, Child Development text book and Leona did and it went very well. She turned to me for the test because I had, I guess, all this background in measurement.

Palermo: Where was Leona Tyler?

Harris: She was out at Oregon at that time.

Palermo: What was her connection with Leona?

Harris: Oh, she had been at student at Minnesota, graduated and stayed on for a year or two before she took a job on her own out West.

Palermo: She was a graduate of the Institute?

Harris: No, she was in psychology but she'd taken work with Goody and Goody certainly knew her competence. Leona, went on to become Dean of the Graduate School at Oregon and a very well respected person. But Leona had a good sense, apparently. Well, let me take a side excursion for a moment. Goody had a feeling for people, surprising in her because she had a mind like a steel trap. She could cut like a razor right to the heart of issues and sometimes students felt that she was just merciless with them. But on the other had she had a feeling for people, particularly families with children, a warmth about her. It was amazing to see her work with a parent in parent consultations. Well, anyway she sensed that in Leona, Leona had it too, and I think she encouraged the relationship with Leona because she felt a kindred spirit, as it were. Well I went to work on the Draw A Man thing. By this time she was living in New England, and I went out there after I got the data together, I'd send her things and she'd send them back with some brief comment and when I went out to see her it became apparent that she really couldn't see the graphs that I had, she was totally blind. I tried to show her, my finger on her finger and so on. We were selecting items by graphs really to show differentiation and change with age and so on. She said, "you just take it over and you do it, make it yours." That was generous of her, I'd already gotten a couple of years invested in it but the publishers felt in a way this supported her textbook which had been in print for, 20-25 years in her Draw A Man textbook and really half of the royalties ought to go to her. Well, she didn't want them. She had a niece who was coming along, who was named for her so they were paid to the niece. The contract was set up to be paid to the niece so this differentiation was made. I've never regretted it all although I've sometimes wondered why I never heard from the niece! She got a check twice a year and she never responded. Well, anyway despite Goody's feeling for people there was one blind spot she had. She had a nephew who came to live with her the last year she was there while he was doing some graduate study and she would say right in front of him, "well my favorite of all my nieces and nephews is ..." and she'd name this girl, the niece who was named for her! Here was this guy who was doing all kinds of things for her and she just kind of waved him aside. Well, anyway another interest of hers that she told me about it at some length. She said she was very much interested in the life story as might be portrayed in a diary or some kind of personal memoir and she said she had a manuscript from a great uncle, I think she said, of hers. Lived in Pennsylvania and who had gone down through training at the old Camp Curtiso, the training camp for the Civil War. He had kept this detailed diary all his life and he died when he was in his 80's and she said, "I have it all". She said he was married for one week and those pages had been torn out! She wanted to do something with it but she didn't know quite what. She said he was a meticulous recorder of everything. She felt that a literal transcription would be a little too much, but if there was some way of kind of generalizing it or condensing it or something. She kept urging me to think along those lines. Not that I would do anything with the manuscript. I've often wondered what happened to it because historians would just go nuts with it, you know. It followed my contact with Elliott and Elliott had taught a course (which I never took by the way) what he called Human Development which was essentially a biographical course, the study of psychology and biography, but he was no longer teaching it. That may

be one reason why he was willing to let me study Gestalt psychology and organismic psychology when I went in as a first year graduate student to do a paper.

Palermo: These are your two roots of your interest?

Harris: That's it exactly. It goes back to that and when it came to kind of shaping up my final years here, I wanted to teach a course in biographical psychology.

Palermo: You did.

Harris: And I did. It was a fun course. I enjoyed it and the students enjoyed it who took it and I found something which has impressed me a great deal. Occasionally I would get upper classmen who wanted something a little more broad than engaged in just learning theory or something like that, they'd be dutiful students. They were adolescents, late adolescents, you know they'd be dutiful students and they'd get something out of it. But occasionally I had a graduate student who would drift in, mostly women. There was one man and three or four women over the years and they would just take fire. Usually they are students coming back to retread in clinical (this was in the 60's) and this hit them where they were. Change midstream, change in direction when they were in their late 30's or 40's and they would just take fire.

Palermo: Donna Boswell was one of them.

Harris: Yes, she was a little younger when she took hold of it. Well, I've tried to lay out what I think has been a kind of organizing theme in my thinking and I've done it rather crudely I'm sure and awkwardly but it's there. It certainly supplanted the early indoctrination in behaviorism that I had. In other words, it just seemed to me that a growth point of view, a developmental point of view, particularly one that shows change within a complex environment over time is a good way to go, perhaps the only way. I don't mean to dismiss experimentalism but it's a supplemental which I think we ought to recognize a little more as to help put things together. Goody use to emphasize that, she said "we must have analysis, lots of analysis but we've got to have a course somewhere along that puts things back together." I remember she got into a big argument with this man at Antioch, oh what was his name, well anyway she got into a big argument with him at one of the SRCD meetings over just that.

Palermo: Les Sontag?

Harris: Yea, Sontag. He said that is nonsense, analysis is all that you need and she certainly wouldn't accept that.

Palermo: I get the impression that she was a little small in stature but a big fighter.

Harris: Yea, oh that's right.

Palermo: This of course leads to, I'm reminded again because I just gave a little talk on Personalized History of Developmental Psychology at Columbia and we were talking about the Experimental Child Movement as oppose to the Developmental Movement. Succeeding Presidential addresses by Boyd McCandless and Dale Harris, how did you view all of that? I get a better perspective of it because it was brought up in the Experimental Child Psych, you were the major spokesman as it turned out for the Developmental style, how were you viewing what was going on? What was your reaction?

Harris: I was too much involved in it and I didn't have, at that time, I didn't really have my own position clearly enough thought out so that I could make a coherent statement about it, but I was working toward something that was more global. Now let me give you two points that I think would supplement what I have been saying. One is that we Psych students, at least Developmental Psych students ought to have a course in Physical Growth like your man at Iowa used to give.

Palermo: Howard Meredith.

Harris: Howard Meredith. I knew the chap at Penn better than Meredith, Wilton Krogman, I knew him better than I knew Meredith but they both saw the individual growing as a unit as well as a mass of measurements and I certainly got most from a course I took with Scammon on Prenatal Growth from the embryo through the fetus to birth. He made that thing so dynamic and so exciting to see all this coming from within as it were before the individual is launched into the outside world to be further shaped and manipulated why there is a great deal of autonomy involved and I think that's an interesting philosophical point to make. There is an element of autonomy in all of us that has to be recognized and I've often said that I think Developmentalists who don't have that have missed something very important because it gives you a kind of schema for putting your ideas together, that you don't get from the experimental point of view. Now I think a person should be trained in the experimental point of view because it's a good sound scientific point of view and it's contributed tremendously but I've noticed that the experimentalist in psychology, and he's always been strong in psychology, has difficulty with the developmental point of view simply because he has been so schooled in experimentation. One is a limited time frame, you run an experiment for six weeks or three months or whatever. Second, you've defined your variables very precisely and limited them because you haven't any techniques that will manipulate a large number. Third, the time frame, limited time frame gives you access to influence from outside on a very limited basis. John Anderson once said that two kids playing catch in the backyard for twenty minutes engage in more trials than any psychology experiment that he knew of. You see, you are faced with that fact and I think that when you are an experimentalist you are working with variables about which you made some sharp delimitations, you've set the situation up so that you don't look at it broadly. That would destroy what you are trying to do but as a consequence you never get back far enough to see what the whole thing is like and I think that's why psychologists by and large have not done well with developmental point of view, the basic scientific method. He's right, I'm not diminishing it at all, his experimentation.

Palermo: Well, Kurt Levin is the one of the people who has closest in my perspective to being able to combine developmental perspective with the genius research.

Harris: Yea, and he was, of course John Anderson used to think of him as just a mess, sloppy you know and yet his Aristotelian verses Galilian distinction always appealed to me.

Palermo: Yes, me too. Well, when I have given this talk and I have given it many times in various versions, I always play it out that as far as I was concerned you were the devil when I was in graduate school because you were on the developmental side and I was on the experimental side and my career has been one of moving over to your side!

Harris: I would like to see a little more people, a few more people have that kind of transition but on the other hand I wouldn't want them not to have the experimental training just as I had a good measurement training, which I have come to recognize as very limited when applied to human situations.

Palermo: So do you want to talk a little bit about the history of the Institute?

Harris: Well, it has a written history, filed in the Institute files when I left so that's still around somewhere I'm sure, in the Archives. It was based on correspondence that were set up at Minnesota when they were negotiating with the Rockefeller people back in the 20's. I don't know whether it incorporated the later years or not but it certainly the founding of it was well...

Palermo: Documented up to about 1920 you mean?

Harris: No, no to about 1930-35.

Palermo: So that the time from '35 to the present might not be.

Harris: Might not be so full but you see the Institute originally had, I forget whether it was an 8 or a 10 year grant and then they had a subsequent grant, a kind of tapering off grant that covered, oh, about to 1940 or thereabouts.

Palermo: From whom?

Harris: From the Rockefeller people, it was a kind of a closing deal. The University, of course those were depression years and the University wasn't ready to pick up all the tab, so the Institute was on what you might call short funds, it was supporting itself. What was done was to send the director of the Institute over to the Legislature every two years when the University made it's pitch and he made a supplementary pitch for a separate appropriation to the Institute, well to the University for the Institute, but it was separate from the major appropriation.

Palermo: That was still going on when I was there, '58-63.

Harris: Was it that late?

Palermo: Yea, I think so because I think you went over to the legislature.

Harris: Yea, that's right. You came in '53.

Palermo: '58.

Harris: '58. Well that was about to change because one of our conditions of our switch to education was that the University was taking full responsibility for us and we wouldn't make the separate pitch, that was the argument. Well, what it meant was a further reduction in budget and the thing that annoyed me, and it was just a small matter. But we had an endowment, some stock that we were given by the Parent's Magazine and it was worth, oh in those years about \$10,000 a year in income and the business office proceeded to sell the stock without any consultation.

Palermo: Oh, yes I remember you telling me that.

Harris: It just made me sore as the dickens. They had a right to do it, I couldn't challenge that but it seemed to me just common courtesy you discuss the situation. We were trying to keep up a brave front as a growing concern. Well anyway that was one of the points that bothered me. Course what we were getting then was a little bit of sort of thing that's come in full spate in more recent years to all University the running of the University as a business enterprise rather than an educational enterprise. It was inevitable I suppose. Well, from that point on of course, I wasn't there and I don't know what the subsequent history has been.

Palermo: When did you go there as a student?

Harris: I went there in the fall of '40 as an instructor, \$1200.00 a year if I remember right, in those days.

Palermo: Twelve hundred a year in 1940, that's not bad. I got \$90.00 a month as an assistant at Iowa in 1952.

Harris: Is that right?

Palermo: I remember Boyd asked me to teach an extra course one semester for which he would give me a \$2.00 a month raise!

Harris: Well, anyway I don't know what the subsequent history has been except very indirectly. They've managed to keep a fair degree of independence and integrity and keep going.

Palermo: Why don't you talk a little bit about what it was like when you arrived at Minnesota.

Harris: Well, at that time I was hired for parent education. That was the one slot that was open. Bill Griffith who was a graduate student had been filling it and he was offered a job at the State Board of Health and went over, which opened up the slot. Anderson picked me up.

Palermo: Was Bill Griffith a student?

Harris: Yea.

Palermo: Probably got his Ph.D.

Harris: Yea, he got his Ph.D. and went out to California and had quite a career out there in Public Health, that's what it amounted to. Of course this was '40-41 the war was closing in on the society, the economy and there was a heavy emphasis from my point of view on contact with the public, talks. We charged I think ten to fifteen dollars.

Palermo: Oh, you did charge.

Harris: Yea, this went to the Institute as part of the budget and the Institute covered our expenses for travel which were not very great in those days. Marianne Faegre was in Parent Education full time, Anderson I think saw me as coming in to do some teaching as well. Parent Education was the excuse for the opportunity to appoint me and so he had me over in the General College teaching a course that he had set up and in that piece that I wrote about him, his obituary, I pointed out that he was an interesting combination of a guy who made a great push on theory and theoretical presentation and yet was a very practical person in his own right.

Palermo: John Anderson?

Harris: And I believe, he was somewhat of a social Darwinist, you can check this-he believed in testing your mettle, putting you through the fire. So he had me teach literally every course in the Institutes book except "Child care and training" and eventually I had to rewrite the book for that. That's literally the case.

Palermo: Who was on the faculty at that time?

Harris: Well, Josephine Foster was over in the nursery school, Neith Headley was in the kindergarten and Pearl Cummings and Marianne Faegre were in Parent Education as was I. Goodenough and Anderson were the Institute.

Palermo: Just the two of them?

Harris: The two of them with Goodenough being supported by Katherine Maurer-a graduate student of Goody's, who picked up the loose ends you know and got things together.

Palermo: Mildred Templin wasn't there then?

Harris: No, she wasn't there then. That was the staff that I mentioned. Oh, we had a part time pediatrician who got a nominal fee for giving the kids a physical exam and was available for consultation and there was a guy from the Dental School who was doing research on the growth of the jaw. He made measurements of casts at that time and he had a nominal appointment of sorts. Scammon, well not Scammon, he was pretty inactive but Edith Boyd taught a course.

Palermo: On physical growth?

Harris: Yea, on fetal growth and she was using Scammon's material and I took her course as a matter of fact. One of the most interesting things I ever did. She was doing dissections of the fetus and a like and I think I got a concept out of that that has stayed with me ever since. The concept of kind of an impulse to grow, which you couldn't do anything about. You just got out of its way in those early years! I suppose that is one of those metaphysical items that linger in the back of my consciousness. This was reinforced later when I got Scammon to repeat the lectures. He was a much more fascinating lecturer than was Boyd, who is thoroughly competent. But Scammon had a way about him that was unusual. Scammon, he was just a fascinating guy, did you ever meet him or work with him?

Palermo: No, I didn't. I remember you talking about him.

Harris: He was gone when you came. Well, that guy he was about 6'5" and he weighed about 300 pounds. He was just a big gorilla you see and he shambled when he walked, he had something wrong with his knees. He'd stand at the blackboard and draw with colored chalk and when he was done the floor would be covered with trodden chalk, he'd be dusted from head to foot, the blackboard would be immaculate, he'd have a drawing that could pass any

medical art inspection in the country. Just beautiful, he could draw with either hand and did! So he really reinforced that notion of the impulse to grow that we are born with. Of course in addition to that he was a remarkable teacher. He could link abstract concepts to concrete realities in ways like I'd never seen anybody else do and he'd bring Latin and Greek books, old ones out of the library, and read from them, sight translate, somewhat haltingly but literally. He was just a really remarkable guy.

Palermo: I don't understand why you took the course from Boyd initially and then later ...

Harris: He was not active. He'd had an unhappy experience as Dean, and got onto the sauce and he had to be dried out as I understand it. He was no administrator and they got him out of that and gave him a distinguished service appointment in the graduate school, and he'd write his own ticket. Toward the end of his, he retired in '48 or '49, and I got before he retired I got him over to the Institute to give some seminars. He did it without compensation, he was glad to have a few students sit around and listen to him. Well, you know the thing I've discovered since is that when he was an active lecturer in the medical school. He lectured on anatomy. His class was scheduled at 7 in the morning, he packed the amphitheater and they stood in the halls to listen to him. Many people took it two and three times unofficially just because he was such a fascinating lecturer.

Palermo: Amazing.

Harris: I can't say enough for him because he really was a remarkable guy. Anderson was always a little irked by him. Scammon was a showman. But Anderson missed or didn't recognize fully what Scammon could do. He could take as he did just one tiny illustration, he'd say "Captain Cook sailed around the world with a crew of so many men and a ship of X tons burthen," "what does that mean?" He said "that ship with ninety men was about the size of four boxcars put together," you see! Right away you'd know what he was talking about.

Palermo: Yes, you certainly would.

Harris: That's a remarkable achievement, he was just full of that. He was one of those fellows who would ask questions. I remember he once said to us that in the height of the Roman Empire the healthiest place to be was the Roman Army in Spain, because he had made quite a study of Roman Tomb stones, age of death, statistically and he found that the soldiers, the retired soldiers lived longer than any other segment of the population.

Palermo: Especially if they lived in Spain, huh?

Harris: Especially if they served in Spain where there were few clashes with the Germans from across the Rhine.

Palermo: How long had John Anderson been the head of the Institute when you arrived?

Harris: Oh, he was the first director in '26 when it was established. He'd been there for roughly fourteen years when I came. He retired then in '58. We had that conference in the spring to recognize his contribution.

Palermo: As the Concept of Development?

Harris: Yea, right, and I was a little surprised that thing stayed in print for 25 years.

Palermo: Yes.

Harris: And was still being sold.

Palermo: Yes, people still refer to it even today. I was just in on an e-mail discussion group that referred to it this past year.

Harris: Is that right, that's amazing.

Palermo: Well, what kind of a person was John to work with?

Harris: Oh, I'll be very candid here, he was a son of a gun!

Palermo: That's what I thought!

Harris: Yes, I learned one heck of a lot from him but it was just murder. Course this was partly a personal matter. In a way I was suffering from the fact that my own father was not a very capable person. He didn't play much of a role in my life and I was looking for a father substitute in a way, so I knuckled under to a lot of things. That is, Anderson literally blue penciled every paper that went out of the Institute, he insisted on it. He said, "I am the Institute." He said that once to me. Any professional thing that you submitted he went over first, and okayed it. He didn't demand his name on it but it had to be kosher. One of the things I was to do was to write a weekly column to distribute to the newspapers in the State, small weeklies and dailies around and every one of those must be penciled. Everything I wrote he insisted on reading if it went out of the Institute. He didn't ask to see my term papers, except for his courses!

Palermo: Was there any negotiating?

Harris: Well no, he would tell me and I'd learn from it. He knew what he was talking about in many cases. Now some cases it was just a question of whose taste and I would knuckle under, of course.

Palermo: He was a pretty strong guy, didn't give you many openings for arguing.

Harris: No, no. He just laid it on, that was the way it was. I remember once he was challenging something I had agreed to do, serve on a committee or something. I said I thought it would be good for the Institute. He said, "I'm paid to decide what's good for the Institute."

Palermo: Enough said, huh?

Harris: Yea, that was it! While I would say that when we made the transition, he stayed out of the way, out of my way.

Palermo: When you became director?

Harris: Yea, he didn't move in but there was that feeling underneath and you know I'm told that Harold Stevenson had some of the same problems later on. That was in the background, the sense of his dissatisfaction with things, with the status quo or something. But it did seem to me that I had to get back out and particularly since Mike Elliott, you know had said it and he'd been a good friend to me. He always said to me he said, "Dale you gotta get out of here." Now he said that because he had filled his own faculty with his own graduate students and I guess he decided that wasn't so good.

Palermo: When then was John president of APA?

Harris: About '43, I can check it, but roughly it was just before the war. Before we were actively engaged in the war and I know the next year, it was in '41 he was passed over, and it broke his heart. For about a week he was just disconsolate, but he made it the next year. In those days they kind of worked through the chairs you know, something had happened. He played a role in keeping the old American Association of Applied Psychology together, the AAAP. They were ready to secede from the APA, he kept them in, he was one of the ones that maneuvered a compromise and it worked for about 50 years and then the academics split.

Palermo: Then when were the other people hired? When was Mildred Templin and Merrill Roff?

Harris: Oh, Merrill Roff, that came in...

Palermo: After the war when things started easing in.

Harris: Yea, they came in after the war, some years after the war in the early 50's. John took a year off, a sabbatical for six months and kind of left it between me and Goodenough to run the place. He hired Roff himself, no discussion, nothing, he just hired Roff. The year that I was there in the office the six months or whenever Roff was coming up for appointment, the University insisted on a physical and Roff wouldn't take it. What to do! I didn't want to write a letter so, remember we had the old Dictaphones and I dictated my dilemma and mailed it to Anderson. He had a machine he was writing a book and he was very helpful, very kind, very solicitous and somehow it got straightened out. That was after Roff was there, they insisted that his appointment was irregular and they wanted to regularize it by having him complete that requirement. He refused, academic freedom or something. That was the first year he was there which was in the early 50's. Now Mildred Templin came in about that time.

Palermo: Let's finish with Roff first. Was he a productive scholar when he first came in?

Harris: No, he was not. He got himself going finally by using his army contacts to get access to the Veterans Administration records and he was able to do that study of the backgrounds of individuals who had gotten bad conduct discharges and so on. Sal in Texas really got him going on that, got him some money for that, and he did a series of studies which involved some of the Veterans Administration records and some other kinds of records that he was able to get a hold of. He was a very bright guy but eccentric, intellectually eccentric.

Palermo: I even noticed that when I was there. I've never had more than a three sentence interchange with him. It was always, its nice weather or it was lousy weather and no good for golf or it was good for golf and that was about the extent of the change that we exchanged. Otherwise we never had any conversations.

Harris: I can remember Anderson saying in amazement, the guy is a good golfer but he is terrible. He violates all the rules but he could get the ball wherever it ought to go!

Palermo: John played golf?

Harris: Oh yea, he was a great golfer.

Palermo: All right that's Merrill Roff, what about Mildred?

Harris: Well, I can't remember just when she came in. She was a graduate student for a while until she got her degree and he appointed her into the Institute, so it was in the 50's sometime. She'd been around a long time.

Palermo: She was a graduate student then quite late, age wise.

Harris: Oh yea, she'd had a career at Purdue I think it was for some years in Home Economics and came in I'd judge she was in her early 30's when she came in to finish her degree.

Palermo: Did she work with Goodenough?

Harris: Well, no. She was John's student. I'm not sure how it ever played out, but she repeated one of the classic studies of children's information. Remember it was one of the classic Institute studies with the content of children's minds that this former student had done for a Ph.D., repeated with some modification in increased precision-G. Stanley Hall's study with a bunch of kindergartners, getting the scope of their knowledge.

Palermo: By interviews?

Harris: Interview tests, that sort of thing, asking questions, oral you see. Mildred repeated that and it looked interesting and she decided to amplify it, increase her sample and so on and it was going to be extended. I don't really know whether it was really finished in that sense, she got a degree. She did that much of it and she had gone on to extend it and she was making a more extensive publication of it. I don't remember seeing anything in the literature, of course by then my own interests had shifted in somewhat different direction. I remember at that time that there was, I don't know whether it was her study or someone else's study that did a study of the range of children's scientific knowledge. I guess it was someone at Teacher's College, and then gave the same test to a bunch

of elementary school teachers and found that the elementary school teachers and the kindergarten kids overlapped on score.

Palermo: That's a little discouraging isn't it!

Harris: I see it borne out every day when I read the paper!

Palermo: We are talking about Mildred Templin now, how did she get on her language, she got so involved in the study of language development? She did that on her own?

Harris: I think on her own, yes. She came from a speech background and I guess she settled back into that. Maybe that's the reason she never really finished, if I am correct at assuming that that she never really finished the project she planned to extend her thesis into. I still get a Christmas card, we still exchange Christmas cards. She is in a retirement home I think.

Palermo: Where?

Harris: I'm not sure whether it is St. Paul or Wisconsin but she's, you know, at one of those geriatric shelters.

Palermo: So you had then Mildred Templin, Merrill Roff, John Anderson, Dale Harris.

Harris: When, oh what was her name in the nursery school. Jo Foster died the year I went to Iowa. Mary Gutteridge, an Australian woman, old Tasmanian family, she was there for a year but she didn't suit John for some reason and so she moved on and then he got Elizabeth Meckam-Fuller.

Palermo: To run the nursery school?

Harris: Yea, she was the one who came from education and was the primary mover in setting up that NKP certification program, Nursery school, kindergarten, primary. It was a smart move because it gave her students access to jobs they wouldn't get otherwise because nursery schools as such weren't prospering in those years but you could get a job in kindergarten and primary and she nailed the thing some way. She always troubled Anderson, she was a little too aggressive and Anderson wasn't ready to knock her down, he would be a dominating male you see, so he was never really very sure how to deal with that.

Palermo: I can see how it would be a dilemma for John.

Harris: You know John was an interesting guy in many, many ways. He was a conservative, a real conservative politically. Temperamentally, the whole works, he was conservative and yet underneath it all he was, as someone once said, he's just as soft as an old shoe. He could be handled by anybody that would make an emotional appeal.

Palermo: Is that right.

Harris: If a staff or faculty person in the University had trouble with a child-serious conflict has happened a couple times in the families-bring John in and he'd just be sympathetic and as helpful and as clinical as you could ask. He always idolized Leonard Charmichal, he was the conservatives' conservative.

Palermo: Charmichal was?

Harris: Yes, and Anderson just thought the world of him.

Palermo: What was their interaction? I know that the group of psychologists was very small in those days so his knowledge of Charmichal came through meeting him at meetings and that sort of thing.

Harris: Yes, oh yes. You see Anderson traveling in a pretty rare circle because he was one of the Rockefeller units to begin with. That gave him access and he was one of the founders of the SRCD and he just knew everybody in

those days. Yes, the first APA meeting I went to was in Minneapolis, I think it was '36 or '37 I'd have to check the date, there were 600 people!

Palermo: It's only about 100 times that size now!

Harris: If you were a graduate student and got a paper accepted you didn't have a poster session, you had to address the crowd. There would be maybe two sessions running simultaneously and you had to face a crowd and read your paper.

Palermo: Then so you had Roff, Harris, Anderson and who else, oh this nursery school person. The only institutions you worked at were University of Minnesota and Penn State?

Harris: That's right, except for summer appointments here and there.

Palermo: I'm not sure if we covered this question here, it says, describe your experiences in so called applied child development research, please comment on your role in putting theory into practice.

Harris: Oh boy. Well, I've always had an applied streak. An interest, very definitely. I want to see knowledge used but I would say you can trace the things several ways. One is the tradition that John established at the Institute which laid a heavy hand on me. That was the image of the agricultural research station. You see, he modeled the Institute on that. You have a clientele, which are the parents, not farmers but parents. You have a research unit doing research on development and then you have a parent education unit translating that development into practice and he took that very seriously and that concept which he got partly from the land grant college concept, Land Grant University Concept, that has played a very determining role in my own thinking all the way along. The course he developed for the General College, the General College you know was set up the General Education Board as an experiment in University Education of non-degree, made an associate degree sort of thing, but for the better students it was an easy access into the four year program by a series of examinations, a comprehensive exam in general, a practical applied concept. Well, John wrote his Human Development and Personal Adjustment book out of his lectures for that course and it is essentially an applied adolescent psychology for adolescents. Social psychology, or growth and development during the adolescent years, is what it amounted to and I taught that course for a while and it too laid a hand on me. In terms of research, of course the big project on the drawing study has a direct utilization, getting at a crude estimate of a kid's level of ability from a drawing which Goodenough passed along to me.

Palermo: How did that developed between you and Goodenough?

Harris: Oh, she was retiring on disability back in around '48.

Palermo: It was her eyes?

Harris: Yes, that was involved. There were some other things too. I understood it was kind of a pancreatic problem of some sort, accelerated aging all the way down the line and it hit her eyes and she got Leona Tyler to redo her Child Development book, a basic text on developmental psychology and she asked me to redo her test, her drawing study. It had been in print since '25 I think and the publishing company said this is too interesting and useful an item. They didn't sell a lot of them but they wanted to keep it in print, so they reprinted it in 1954 with the proviso that she would see to it to get a revision of it and that's what I was to do. So we planned it. We laid out the outline of what we wanted to accomplish and so on and this was fine. So I went to work on it and I got a lot of data together and of course graphed the age measures. On each item you want to see whether you are getting a discrimination with age and I took all that stuff East to her and she tried to visualize what I would describe and she would use her finger and we would trace on a map on a table and so on. She finally said, "well, I am not managing this." She said, "I can't translate these into mental pictures." So she said, "you take it and it's your book." I talked to the publishers and they said that it would be all right but they felt and I felt, I agreed that she should have benefit of the royalties so half the royalties went to her. She left those in her will to her niece, the one that she had had around as a graduate student, she was a chemist. I always felt it was a little inappropriate because she was really a snotty person but Goody had a nephew who lived with her for a year or two and helped take care of her toward the end. He was just as fine a guy as you could ask for and she would just, right in front of him, now my favorite and she'd name this

namesake niece, Florence. That was Goody, she was kind of indifferent to the effect of what she said, but she was a wonderful person and I owe her a lot too. In my little biography I think I have an extended paragraph in which I spell that out what I got from her.

Palermo: Well, you have talked about your applied interest in your research, what about the theory side of it?

Harris: Well, I have been interested in theory because I always felt that the Clark Hull approach was suited to experimentation but when you got into social experiments when you are dealing with social forces it was pretty dubious to try to apply narrow experimental concepts and methods.

Well, I supply the name for this problem person Elizabeth Metchem-Fuller, she was hired as Elizabeth Metchem, later she married an ex-Naval officer by the name of Fuller.

Palermo: She was the nursery school teacher?

Harris: She was the nursery, well she was the head of the nursery school and the kindergarten although Neith Headley was pretty independent too.

Palermo: Neith Headley was?

Harris: Technically part of the Nursery school/kindergarten but she was pretty much her own person, too, although very quiet about it.

I was talking about applied and theoretical research. Well, I got interested in theory as I said and I couldn't quite see a hypothetical deductive model working very well in the social area where you had social forces of such complex character. Well, I taught a seminar for some years on Developmental Theory which we reviewed systematically. Theoreticians or writers in the developmental field took a systematic view point and tried to analyze their various positions, I never really translated it into a personal theory except later on when I taught here at Penn State and got into the biographical psychology, I treated the personal life story as a kind of a developmental phenomenon.

Palermo: That fits with your old notion of growth from the fetus.

Harris: Yes, I always pointed out to students that you had to live with a dilemma really because you had forces of change and forces of conservation. You had growth in bringing constant change and yet you were aware of continuity, not change, and that this was a paradox and you had to live with it. There was no way of resolving it at the present time. Science likes to resolve all paradoxes but I claimed that you really could not do this one with our present insights and understandings.

Palermo: This relates the notions of assimilation and accommodation.

Harris: Yea, it would. In this chapter that I am going to send you (I've entitled it a Metaphysical Odyssey) later published in Thomson, Dennis and Hogan, John D. A History of Developmental Psychology in Autobiography Westview Press, 1996 in which I have tried to trace-you see, I started out as a rigorous behaviorist and found very early that it didn't work. I was looking for a growth model and that was as growth I came to an integrating theory I think. It was a shaping thing, it wasn't really a theoretical statement. It was a way of shaping your thinking and it's been interesting to me to see the number of books coming out in the last decade on the life story and the life approach. James Birren has had some input in that and he is, by the way, one of the twelve who is also in the forth coming book.

Palermo: Oh, really.

Harris: So I can't say that I have really resolved a theory but I've got a theoretical direction.

Palermo: I was interested when you wrote and asked me for a copy of a chapter that was in the book that Lou and I did. You said that you hadn't allowed yourself to do much theorizing and that was one paper that you had done some in, that surprised me a little bit.

Harris: Well, I did one other job which I never published and I have been wondering what to do with it. It was the year after I retired here I gave an invited address to Division 12, no 36 I think at APA and I called it the Proper Study of Human Kind and started out with a poem. You know the old classical poem, "The proper study of mankind is a man", and I developed what I thought was an approach that would be useful to all those students, not so much to the scientists in the field but to all those students who take the courses in psychology looking for understanding of themselves. I hear so many students say, "I wanted to learn something about myself and I have all this stuff to learn." I always sympathize a little with them because as I kept saying we treat our undergraduates just like they were graduates students, all having to earn a Ph.D. and that's all right if you are going to be a scholar in the field but there's a lot of people who are going to have one or two courses and that's it. Well, anyway, you have to see what I, because I do talk up around the problem if not directly solving it. I talk around it in this paper.

Palermo: Well, I look forward to seeing it. When did you join SRCD?

Harris: Back in 1941 I think. Right away, John got me into the APA. I had joined the AAAS by myself when I was in the Minnesota State School for Boys. I submitted a paper and got it accepted and read it at the meeting-a little study I had done on the delinquent boys. I was greatly set up because Percy Symonds was in the audience. He made some nice statements about it. That was very encouraging to a neophyte that didn't even have a Master's Degree at that time. I got into the SRCD in '40 or '41 and stayed right along with it. Course it was not very active during the mid forties but in 1950 it began to really be an intellectual power in the field.

Palermo: Who were the people that were, I know John was very active, who were some of the others?

Harris: Tom Jerslid had been active, and the business manager, Protem and kind of unofficial was Tom Richards. Your man at Iowa, what was his name?

Palermo: Boyd McCandless?

Harris: No, the growth man?

Palermo: Art Meredith.

Harris: Meredith was active and Wilton Krogman from Penn they were all big names and Pauline Mack.

Palermo: Beth Wellman.

Harris: Yea, well yea, although I don't remember her name quite so much for some reason. She was more active in the APA, the child division of the APA. You kind of got the impression, I did at least that the SRCD was a kind of an old boys venture for a while.

Palermo: Oh really.

Harris: Yea, the original founders in the 30's pulled it together and they were kind of still in charge in the 40's although with the influx that came with Boyd McCandless and some of the others the younger group that came along in the 50's, that changed very quickly.

Palermo: Who were the "boys" beside John and Jerslid?

Harris: I was trying to think, I would have to look as a roster to recover a lot the names because they were the ones I had some contact with, oh, Gesell was around. He was kind of remote, and throned! Pauline Beary-Mack was in nutrition. Harold Jones, Krogman of course. In those days the interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary character was more pronounced definitely. Oh yes, there was the guy in education, progressive educator, Dan Prescott, he was one of that group. Willard Olson was another from Education.

Palermo: What was the first meeting you ever attended?

Harris: Well, it was biennially in those days and I can't remember whether it was '41 or '42, every two years. Then of course I went to one meeting in Ohio State, now whether that was right after the war or just before the hiatus-there was about a four year period where nothing much happened. They didn't have meetings during the war years.

Palermo: Did you present then?

Harris: Probably, I was pretty busy in those days, the heat was on.

Palermo: Did you ever hold office in SRCD?

Harris: In SRCD I was the secretary for a while and served on the Governing Council and that was it.

Palermo: You were president of Division 7.

Harris: President of...?

Palermo: Division 7 in APA.

Harris: Yea, and chair for one term in the Section I of the AAAS. You know, just as a confession, I always enjoyed the AAAS more than the APA. Possibly because I wasn't so much at risk professionally in the AAAS and I was engaged by the breadth of view of the principle speakers. Always you had first rate scientists and they always took a broad view of social responsibility and the like. Whereas you get some of the hot shots, real good guys coming along that were concentrated on their own discipline, they were pretty narrow in their outlook. The top knights were never engaged in the AAAS but the top notch guys were well engaged. I had an argument with one whom I won't name, a psychologist when I was on the Council for the AAAS, a psychologist who took issue with the recognition of the AAAS that one of its principle functions was to educate the public in science. He said, "we have no business talking to the public, we talk to each other, to individuals, the intellectuals, you see, that know our language." My argument was that, "look if you don't watch out you are going to paint yourself into a corner, because its the public who gives these grants." And that's happening, that's happening.

Palermo: That's true. I remember the Golden Fleece Awards.

Harris: I often think, you know this is important. Well, this is by the by but it tells something about me. Once when I went home to Elizabeth's family, her father who was a wheel in the agriculture of the county he lived in. Took me out to go around with the county agents to a group of informal training sessions. A group of six or eight farmers would gather and chew straw and he'd tell them about an experiment, he'd show them pictures, before and after, talk about he treatments that they gave this group and the treatment they gave this group and so on and I came away with the feeling at that time, which was right after the war, that perhaps the farm group was the best educated laymen scientifically in the country for farm methods of science and how you go about running experiments and knowing. My father-in-law also took me to the dairymen's association at Purdue University, the state meeting, and my gosh you could sit there and these guys had charts, they talked about experimental and control groups, you could follow. You didn't know their chemistry always but you knew what was happening, it was amazing to me and that reinforced the notion you know, John Anderson's notion, that the agricultural experimentation was a good model to follow.

Palermo: Were all of the Institutes around the country set up that way? I know at Iowa I they have a parent education wing.

Harris: Well, yea. Iowa had a three day conference every year for parents, remember?

Palermo: Yes.

Harris: They concentrated their effort that way. John distributed it into study groups around the state, hired a staff to travel around. It was a different way of doing it. Now at Columbia, Jerslid didn't have much of a public. His public were teachers-to-be so he emphasized that and up in Canada at Toronto University where, William Blatz organized a school for gifted children and brought in the parents of the gifted and worked with them, so it took different emphasis at different places. John for some reason got the notion of the experimental model from, the Experiment Station model, and it certainly laid a heavy hand on me. I saw it as a really important social mechanism.

Palermo: Well, Ralph Ojeman did some of that.

Harris: Yes, he did.

Palermo: I know, what was the fellow from Iowa or Minnesota in Parent Education.

Harris: I can almost say it. I know, Koppe? Bill Koppe, he was there.

Palermo: No, this guy went from Minnesota to Merrill Palmer.

Harris: I don't remember.

Palermo: Anyway, they used to go and give talks. I remember the experimentalists always poo-pooed the parent education until Charlie Spiker one day went to one of those meetings and discovered how little the parents knew and how much they welcomed the information that was being presented. He was flabbergasted and became a supporter of parent education. What do you think are the most important changes to occur in SRCD in its activities during your association with them?

Harris: Well, I have always regretted the fact that it has largely lost its multidisciplinary character. It has become pretty much a psychological group. The thing that always excited me about the early meetings I attended was that while you couldn't always follow the chemistry of somebody, you could follow what he was saying. You could get some of the implications and you saw how this could be used. This was kind of a broadening experience, a kind of a liberating experience. I have always felt that, well as I've said, maybe I've said to you that I think one problem with psychologists in developmental psychology is they never had a course in physical growth or fetal growth that gives them a kind of intellectual model to think about. The SRCD in those days gave you a variety, you'd hear different people talking from different view points and yet it wasn't utterly nonsense. You'd see the general pattern and you could certainly understand the importance of what was being address. The thing that amazed me when the SRCD had its 50th celebration I helped prepare a program. I went back to the tapes that, what's his name from Yale had made when he went around interviewing the surviving members. He was the medical man there.

Palermo: Milton Senn.

Harris: Yea, Senn went around and interviewed. Anderson and Goodenough were both dead so he interviewed me for them as near as I could present their point of view. Well, I went back to those old tapes and the thing that was overwhelming to me was the fact that these people were idealistic as could be. You know the Rockefeller people had discovered the horrible state, mentally and physically, of the recruits in the World War I and they decided to do something about this. The thing to do was to address it scientifically with a series of Institutes around the country and get a child study movement going and they did. Then the Society came along to project that forward and you could see these people thinking. We were going to have a body of research over a period of years and we were going to grow a wonderful generation of children. We'd have the answers, scientific data. They really believed it and they were idealistic as could be. Some of them were a little amused by what had happened back in the mid 50's or 60's when Senn made the tapes. It was in the 60's I think, yet I tried to convey some of that to the group with a kind of wry remark that after 50 years of this kind of work we had more children in worse trouble than ever before and I said, now what's the answer and the answer you got invariably was more research! In fact Senn did a supplemental series of interviews where he went around to legislators and Congressmen and others and asked what ought to be done about this situation and they all would say, more research, just more of the same. Build some more agencies, more programs the sort of things the Democrats get cursed for, I think properly so, lots of times! Just throw money at the problem and it will solve itself!

Palermo: Interesting.

Harris: Yea, it really is. You take a long look at some of this stuff and you kind of wonder where we are.

Palermo: Well, the world has also changed.

Harris: Yes, for sure. The basic problems are still there.

Palermo: Well, before we doing anything else and while it is still on my mind, there are two other people who where members of the Institute, Gene Gollin and Harry Beilin, where do they fit in.

Harris: Well, Gene Gollin was brought in and was slated for a full appointment, a full tenure appointment but there were questions about how stable he was. People were not very willing, course I may not have handled it well because this was the first time we ever had a discussion about retention of a person. John-it was always just unilateral with him, he made up his mind. This was the first time I was involved and monitoring the process and Gollin just didn't get any support. I don't know whether it was the Eastern manner or what, he moved on. Beilin was hired on Anderson's research project. He was never on a tenure track. I've run into him a couple times since and he seems to have done a number of rather interesting theoretical things, but just what he is doing now I don't know. The one that I have had most contact with is, oh the gal who is out at Berkley-the German girl, Emme Werner.

Palermo: Oh, Emme Werner.

Harris: Yes. She has done a series of what I think are really remarkable books. Do you know her work?

Palermo: A little bit about her, not a lot.

Harris: She got the Hawaiian island which is virtually off limits to outsiders and its a self-contained community of natives and she's followed all the children. The ones who made it and the ones who didn't make it. She has a lot of data over about a fifteen year period. She could really see what the antecedents of this behavior were really like. There are some fascinating things and some puzzling things that have come out. This was I think her last book, High Risk Children from Birth to Adulthood.

Palermo: Is this the same Emme Werner who was at Minnesota?

Harris: Yea, she was there with Beilin.

Palermo: It seems to me I overlapped with her.

Harris: Oh, I think you probably did. She was a very able gal, she was German and she was committed to her professional life and Harry Beilin made a play for her and she rejected him and he took it to heart. She was German and he was Jew, he was really miffed. She married finally, but very late, about the time of her retirement.

Palermo: Harry very much involved with Piagetian Theory, of course he belonged to the Piaget Society. His version of Piagetian Theory which is a functionalism.

Harris: Well, I haven't followed that except to know that he was busy in a responsible way.

Palermo: He is over 70 and he is still active. He is in the Graduate Center where I now have a visiting scholar appointment and so I see him on a fairly frequent basis.

Harris: Well, tell him hello for me.

Palermo: I'll do that. So then Harry left and went to New York and I was the next one in line. As I understood it I was the experimental, well you hired me basically as a representative of the Experimental Child Psychology.

Harris: Yes, I wanted a representation, a variety of view points.

Palermo: It reflects your general breadth of scholarship.

Harris: Yes, I hope so.

Palermo: I always felt I was the token Experimental Child Psychologist in the department.

Harris: Well, we didn't have too big a department.

Palermo: Yes, I know but it always struck me, I mean I entered with some fear and trepidation.

Harris: Oh, I see.

Palermo: Going into the den of lions, from my own perspective but I always felt very comfortable there. Very nice part of that. Well, do you have any other comments you would like to make about the history of Developmental Psychology or your part in it.

Harris: Well, I'll refer you again to the last three or four pages of my chapter which may never see the light of day. That's why you are going to have a copy right away.

Palermo: Well, I will certainly send it with these tapes. You should send me two copies so I can keep one for myself and send one with the tapes.

Harris: I'd be glad to do that. I think we've touched on a number of things. First writing that darn thing, I wrote it at top speed for a while and a lot of things came back and I had to go back and piece in a lot but you get to thinking back and get a perspective on things. There is an interesting book that I found, I guess I don't have it here but William Zinsser edited a volume for the Book of the Month club. For a period of time they and the New York Times sponsored a series of annual lectures by five people on writing, in particular genres. The genre that I had was the memoir, and he subtitled his memoir The Invention of Truth, you see. That's what you do in a memoir in a way that you couldn't possibly when it happened because you don't have any outcomes. An autobiographer does the same thing and a biographer does somewhat the same thing. He may come out very differently from an autobiographer but puts together the way that he sees it, so it's legitimate. When I got into the literature on the personal document, there wasn't early literature except that which the Social Science Research Council brought out years and years ago in the 30's. When I got into that literature, Allport contributed a lot of it, he recognized this. He said, "both are constructions and so who's to say."

Palermo: That's right.

Harris: You see, who's to say. Both, and Zinsser and Allport recognized it, both have a legitimate place, a person's view of himself, the outsider's perspective on the situation. Both are constructions and both have distortions in them and both have truth in them. That's a fascinating concept to play with and I struggled with that a lot when I wrote this chapter because what I wanted to do was to try to show the forces that influenced my thinking over a period of years. The people and the forces-I think I treated the people a little better than the forces. That was a little easier to recognize and pin point.

Palermo: Well, it is interesting your commenting about not being able to see the bigger picture when you are actually involved in it. It seems to me that is what people refer to as wisdom. That people who get older have this notion of being able to see things in a broader context and I was putting that together with the notion of there is a point in your life when you stop thinking about how many years you've lived and begin to think

about how many years you have left to live. Now that at some point after that it seems to me you begin to get this notion of looking at things in perspective.

Harris: That's a good point.

Palermo: I wonder when roughly developmentally you might think that would occur.

Harris: Well, I've come at it very obliquely. I was in the field when most of our students were women, I was impressed with the fact that girl after girl would come it along when she was 27, 28 and say, "gee is it worth it. Should I stay with it? I want your advice." Well, I'd always as I usually could, evaluate their abilities and their opportunities but I said whether it's worth it is up to you. I can't advise you on that, that is your choice. About the same time I read a German study that was trying to find out when you crossed the line from the sort of thing you were talking about, between the past and the future, and when you suddenly discover that next year is not infinitely away it is just around the corner and of course this is on German graduate students, but he placed it around 28 years! I thought my God, this fit my experience so well! So I don't know in a different culture whether that would be the same thing or not but in the kind of society we've had and the kind of tests that we give people and the trials, the occupational trials, that we subject, the family trials that we put them to, that yes somewhere in the third decade of life toward the later part of it that you wake up to the fact that tomorrow it just around the corner. Time is speeding up. Boy, the older you get the faster it goes! You will discover that!

Palermo: I think I'm already noticing.

Harris: It's true. Well, of course, I can't think of his name-he is a biologist in the East somewhere here who made quite a bit of that. He traced it down to a metabolic function. Changing metabolism, that is your subjective awareness of time is related to that and he tried experimentation with it because he had noticed that his wife was ill with a high temperature. He'd go out for medicine and she'd be very fretful, why did you take so long, you know he began to wonder about that. So he had people, he chilled people in ice and had them report subjective units of time. He gave people injections which raised body temperature, these were volunteers of course, and had them give subjective responses and he found it worked exactly. He began to relate it then to what has happened metabolically in the human system as you grow older. He Finds this thing happening that he thinks is generic to this sense of accelerating time.

Palermo: Well, I think we may have covered everything.

Harris: One of the points I make in that paper is that our whole scientific approach has been that old age is a disease to be cured. The average doctor approaches you as a patient to be cured and social policy the same way that old age is a problem to be solved. Did I ever tell you the time I heard Margaret Mead on this?

Palermo: No.

Harris: She said the same thing. It was back in the 50's, there was a big conference, two day- three day conference on old age, aging and research needed and the place was full of young psychologists looking for jobs, you know, opportunities. At the end of the scene she got up with her thumb stick, said "you young people talk as if old age is a problem to be solved," she said, "it's not a problem to be solved, it's a condition of life, it's progressive and there is only one conclusion." That is what's wrong right now, we don't recognize that aspect of it. We think of it was somehow solvable. I brought that out or tried to bring it out and indicate that I thought one contribution that developmental approach might make to borrow some of the concepts from humanities and address this problem since we look on aging now in concert with growth, as part and partial of the life cycle. Now how do you handle it? How do you deal with it, personally or collectively? Maybe we could go back to humanities and get some ideas.

Palermo: That's probably a good idea, yes.

Harris: I don't know.

Palermo: Then there's your breadth of scope coming into play again.

Harris: Yea, I suppose.