

Norman Garmezy

- Born 6/18/1918 in New York, NY; Died 11/21/2009
- Spouse - Edith Linick Garmezy
- Ph.D. from University of Iowa (1950); M.A. from Columbia University (1940); B.A. from City College of New York (1939)

Major Employment:


- Duke University -1950-1961, Psychology
- University of Minnesota - 1961-1989, Psychology
- Institute of Child Development at University of Minnesota - 1961-1989, Psychology

Major Areas of Work:

- Clinical Psychology, Risk and Resilience, Schizophrenia

SRCD Affiliation:

- Member



SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Norman Garmezy

Interviewed by Ann Masten
1995

Masten: Why don't you begin by talking about where you were born and your family and any experiences growing up that you think had an influence on you?

Garmezy: Well, I was born on June 18, 1918, in a small apartment on the ground floor of a Bronx, New York tenement. My elementary school days were lived in this Bronx enclave and by enclave I mean it was an entirely Jewish community. It's now very much a black neighborhood. At that time it was all tenement houses, and all the children I knew there were kids in these tenements whose parents had either come over to the U.S. at a very early age and had gone to a certain degree in elementary school or others who had come over later. I remember it as entirely Jewish; if a gentile showed up everybody paused and looked around. That's the way the Bronx was to a very great extent. I just remember that ours was a very small apartment. It had a "dumb" waiter in it, which was used to send garbage up or down. We lived there with neighbors who were very much like the rest of us. Everybody was fixed on seeing to it that their children were going to get an education and climb upward. I remember, I think, I skipped upward three times in elementary school. There was another skip that I made, so I was rushing ahead much too frequently. Every time I skipped my mother went around the neighborhood to inform everybody that I had another promotion. One day and in one skip, I went into this schoolroom of my new grade and there were no seats available, so I was told to double up on a seat. Two kids on one small seat at one desk. The principal came in, saw this and sent me back to my original grade class. In the meantime, my mother had spread through the neighborhood that I had been promoted. When I came home and told her that they had put me back to my grade, she immediately assumed that I had misbehaved in some way. She had the job of going about the neighborhood to report that hadn't happened, and she always insisted that I must have done something wrong. Well, the story is really reflective of the great pressure that was on me for education. In many ways it was very unfair because

my sister, who was five years older, had also gone through high school. She took a commercial course rather than the regular course, but despite that she was admitted to Hunter College with a fellowship. It was a scholarship for one hundred dollars a year, which was clearly a lot of money from a free institution. So I think that was sort of an image of the time and very much a pattern of lower middle class Jewish families. You placed your bets on the sons; the daughters, you just wanted to ensure that they got married to a nice person and so on. Very, very unfair!

Masten: Where had your parents grown up?

Garmezy: Both of them came over in that great migration from the eastern area of Europe, which is now the Soviet Union, Russia then. They must have made their way to a German or Polish port along with a great exodus that happened at the turn of the century. Two different Jewish groups came to the United States. In the mid-19th century the German Jews arrived. In the early 20th century the Russian Jews came. The Germany Jews wanted little to do with the Russian Jews, yet they wanted to see that they got settled in the United States. They played a superior role, but it was a helpful role too. My parents came from what would have been a hard working community in a small place in Russia. They never really told me and I wasn't smart enough to ask, "How did you do it?" They were only three or four years-old, so they didn't remember how their parents did it. It was likely that they came from varied places in Russia going to the port of Danzig or other ports in order to get on a ship in steerage and to live in steerage for something like three weeks before crossing the ocean. It was the second great migration. The first great migration was the German Jews who came over in the mid-19th century and settled in various parts of the country; they didn't stay on the East Coast. At the beginning of the 20th century or late 19th century, the Russian Jews came and they settled to a very great extent, not in the Midwest, but right on the East side of New York where they stayed. The German Jews looked down upon them, but in keeping with Jewish behavior they supported the Jews who had to escape from Russia. I heard stories as a child about what it was like in Russia where the Pogroms actually took place and Cossack soldiers would ride down on these Jewish villagers to loot and burn and so on, and that was the stimulant for the great exodus of the Jews from Eastern Europe.

Masten: Would you say that you came from resilient stock?

Garmezy: Well, I would guess that I came from resilient stock and that was evident in the Great Depression. My father worked to learn how to be a millinery designer and was a good one, well-respected. When the crash came, he had opened up his own factory. That was a dream of his life and it did very well, but my mother's brother and he were partners and the brother had a ne'er-do-well son who emptied the bank and fled; so they went into bankruptcy. Thus began a dreadful time for our family.

Masten: How old were you at that time?

Garmezy: I must have been nine or ten when we ran into this very rough period. I can remember my father's sisters bringing food into the house in plentiful amounts. I can remember my dad; he was very well-liked in the millinery industry. People knew he was out of work, so they would give him some money. He kept a little book with the name of the person and the amount given; he paid it all back before he died. I think it was a kind of quality that's hard for me to describe; I get very tearful when I think of my father because he could never go back to being a millinery designer again. He ended up being a millinery operator and the designer was at top of the heap in these factories, the operators not so.

Masten: So how far had he gone to school?

Garmezy: Oh, I think he probably left school in the third or fourth grade.

Masten: And then he went to work in the factory?

Garmezy: Yes, he went to work in the factory and so did my mother. They lived on the East Side in New York City. My father taught himself to play the piano, and he was the life of the party as a pianist. He was a very gentle man, my mother very strong and very firm. It was a very typical kind of Jewish union with the mother being the powerful force in the family, but also instrumental in holding the family together.

Masten: And both of them were very interested in your education?

Garmezy: Oh yes, it was foreordained. My sister was born first, and she was five years older than I was. She had the talents to go on and was admitted to Hunter College, but it was the Great Depression and she couldn't. So she taught herself bookkeeping and became a bookkeeper in a hat factory, but that was very unfair. I mean when you really stop to think of it, it was the role of women at that point, but on the other hand, the preparation was made for me to go the City College. When I was accepted at City College and said, "No! I am going to go to work and I will go to school at night," they manned the troops and the troops in the family were my Uncle Lou, who was an insurance agent and thus a higher up in the hierarchy and his son, who had gone to Columbia University for two years. Both came over and told me that my responsibility to the family was to go to college. So I went to college, and in the evening I worked as an usher at a movie house called Paradise. Loew's chain was a big one. The Paradise was the major movie house of the Loew's chain in the Bronx. It had a floating sky overhead and all of the ushers were either, and this is fascinating, from City College who were Jewish or from Fordham University who were Catholic. Although these two groups were normally adversaries, they came together as ushers and were united commonly against the customers because many customers were always trying to sneak up in the crowd from the back and so on. We were a united group, Catholics and Jews against those patrons who came in and tried to sneak ahead of the line. Ushers worked approximately 40 hours a week for \$10 weekly.

Masten: So you worked there while you went to college?

Garmezy: Yes, I went into work at 7:00 every night and finished at 12:00. If you were lucky and you got assigned to the lounge where the more expensive seats were, you could do your college work under small light on the wall off to the side once the last show began, so that's what I did. I used to study cards.

Masten: You could study?

Garmezy: You could study!

Masten: What did you, what course of study did you follow?

Garmezy: I followed one that was very typical in those days too. I was to be in the world of business, so I went to the Business Administration School of City College of New York. But I took a number of courses in psychology because there was a professor there named Milton Blum, and he took a liking to me in his first class. While at City College in its business school, I read the alumni magazine and it was evident that they have moved into the world of business and rose to the highest ranks. They became CEO's of major Jewish corporations and so on; they all shared brightness and drive. It was City College downtown as opposed to City College uptown, which was Arts and Sciences, but the thought of Arts and Sciences never even entered my mind. I thought I would go into the world of business and this was the way to do it except for one thing, which was a Psychology I course from Professor Milton Blum and that began to capture me much more, but still my major was in Economics. When I look at the successes of the people I knew at City College, it's clear that so many of them really rose to the top of the business world in New York despite the initial amount of anti-Semitism they encountered. Nobody ever thought

that they would end up working for a company whose head was a Christian because City College graduates couldn't get those jobs. The College had a reputation of being an inflammatory, left wing center so that businesses didn't want its graduates. There was manifest prejudice against City College graduates, but the whole thing was dissolved by the war. When war began, everybody that I knew at City College went into the service; I never knew anybody who tried to escape the war. I, like millions of others, went off to war.

Masten: What year did you go to war?

Garmezy: It was January of 1943 I think. I was called up earlier and they discovered that I had a diaphragmatic hernia, so they rejected me. I was told that if I had the operation six months later they would take me. So I had the surgery, and six months later I went off to infantry training. I have a marvelous story to tell you about infantry training because we were a bunch of boys from the Bronx and Brooklyn. We went down to Fort McClellan, Alabama, which was our first time in the south. We had a southern Lt. Colonel who was in charge of taking this group of hybrids and making soldiers of them via infantry training. My favorite memory was of the Lt. Colonel pointing out to us, "this is a rifle," and everybody looked at it and it was the first time they had looked at a rifle in their lives. I remember he pointed out that what you have to do is raise that rifle up and here was the sight and you are to get that sight focused right on the person that you are going to shoot and then you fire. "Are there any questions," he asked. And so this hand goes up in the group and a soldier says, "Sir, do you mean that you should get the person's feet sitting right on the rifle tip?" There followed a long pause in the company and the colonel asked, "What's your name soldier," and the soldier replied, "Garmezy, sir." Said the colonel, "Garmezy you worry the shit out of me!" So you can imagine basic infantry training with a bunch of these guys from New York City, but this remains my favorite war story!

Masten: Where did you leave off with your education when you left to go for training?

Garmezy: Oh, I had finished at City College in 1939 and then in 1940 I got my Master's degree in Counseling at Columbia. I went off to my first job with the Jewish Vocational Service in Cleveland. It was very hard to get jobs other than this.

Masten: So your interest in psychology had obviously intensified while you were at City College?

Garmezy: Yes, but it was a narrow image. It was really to be in a Vocational Counseling Agency. I had some experience. I had very good grades at Columbia so my name was sent to Darien in Connecticut where the school system was searching for a school counselor. I received a letter back saying that the committee had decided that I was the one they wanted to have as their school counselor. I packed my bags ready to go and on the day that I was to leave I received a telegram from the new superintendent at Darien. The telegram said, "Letter follows, please do not come to Darien." The letter came and it was one of these letters that you could never witness now. It said, "Darien is a community in which there are no Jews, therefore we don't feel that we can have a school counselor who is Jewish and we are revoking the appointment that we made." You know, I just read that letter and I didn't even think in terms of challenging the Board. I simply accepted this as a common event and ended up going to the Jewish Vocational Service in Cleveland, Ohio. But nobody at Columbia professed Darien's misbehavior. No one at Columbia said, "Well, in that case we are not going to send you anybody." They just accepted that this too was a reality.

Masten: So anti-Semitism was that pervasive?

Garmezy: Anti-Semitism was that pervasive in Darien, Connecticut, which probably banned Jews from living there. This seemed a total anomaly to the new school superintendent; that was interesting. I was appointed by a superintendent months earlier and then the new superintendent wrote, "I am the new superintendent of the school. Because we have no Jewish population here it seems unacceptable to have a Jewish counselor." There was no one you could turn to, nothing you could say, and so I went

back to Columbia to ask what other jobs there were and they were probably alerted to Darien's letter. So I ended up being placed at the Jewish Vocational Service in Cleveland, which was a very good one. It served two purposes: it got me out of New York, which was all to the good and it started me on a road to counseling, which is where I would have ended up had the war not intervened. But the war came along, and I was called up by the army. To my surprise and distress, I was rejected by the army due to a diaphragmatic hernia that I had since birth. They told me the only way I could get into the army was to have surgery, so I had surgery and six months later I was drafted into the army. Now when I view that action against the Vietnam War it gives a picture of the marked differences between the two wars. World War II was a--

Masten: Very different war.

Garmezy: Very different war and everybody wanted to be in it. My surgery was considered dangerous at that time, but I had it and then six months later they said we'll draft you and draft me they did.

Masten: So after you had your basic training, where did you serve in the war and what was your role?

Garmezy: Well, then something else happened because with the end of basic training I wanted to get out of the infantry. I thought I didn't want to be in that. So I would go over to the Headquarters and look up at what was available, anything in the air force, anything in anything else and so on. At the end of my basic infantry training I went back to the office to ask one last time, and this is one of those critical moments in a lifetime. The officer said, "The only thing we have here is engineering training and obviously your background doesn't fit that so that won't do," so I saluted and turned to leave. As I got to the door the tickertape began clicking and this lieutenant called, "Hold it soldier, let's see what this says." And he said to me, "How would you like to go to psychology training at the University of Iowa?" If I had gone out that door that would have been it; he would have asked the next person to come in. "How would you like to go to the University of Iowa for six months training in personnel, army personnel work?" That brief moment changed my whole lifetime.

Masten: Who was at Iowa at that time?

Garmezy: Professor Kenneth Spence was Chairman of the department, and most of the distinguished faculty was there. I recall how he took the test scores of people from his own intelligence test that he gave to all, irrespective of the army view. Spence was the king of the hill, and he divided the whole core of 120 soldiers into four platoons. Platoon one had the "brains" and platoon four was at the lowest point so when he assigned me to platoon one I went in to see Professor Spence, knowing little about the big man. And so I went to the office and said that I wanted to talk with Professor Spence and the secretary said, "What about?" and I said, "About my placement in this group," and there was Spence seated behind the desk and he said, "Well, what do you want?" I said, "Sir I don't think that I'm really the person to be in group one and so I wonder if I could just be moved to one of the other groups." He looked at me and he said, "You are in group one," and I said, "Yes, sir," and went out. I think I ended up about third in the class in terms of scores and so forth. But it was both a recognition about my total uncertainty about myself and about Spence's' certainty about himself, so when the war began to end in Germany I wrote Kenneth Spence a letter asking whether I could come back to take my doctorate.

Masten: So after you left your training at Iowa, how long a period was it that you were overseas?

Garmezy: Oh, I was in a replacement company for a time, and I was given very minor personnel work to do. With the Battle of the Bulge I was sent up to the 28th Infantry division. There was chaos at that point because the 28th Infantry had fought across France, a prime division, and it badly needed refurbishing and so they sent the 28th Division out of the battle line and up north and then they refilled it with new troops. I was among that group. But the rest place that they chose was alongside another

division; I think it was called the 110th made up completely of ASTP College students and sent up there because no one thought there would be an attack at that point. The battle was now moving into Germany. When the German's launched their last offense of the war, they knew where to hit; they hit the 110th division, and they hit the 28th division. The 28th division, battle-hardened, retreated in good fashion; the 110th was massacred. Finally, the Germans were stopped with a marvelous effort by Patton's Third Army, which came up from France to stop the German drive. After that we were sent to France refurbished with many new soldiers and then we left with the first division to come home for 30 days leave before going to the Pacific. What happened, of course, was the atom bomb dropped on August the 6th; on August 8th the second bomb was dropped, and the division was simply demobilized and sent back home. I mean that was it, but later the army indicated that the 28th was to be the assault division on Honshu Island where Tokyo is located; that was to be the final drive. We received 30 days leave, and Edith and I were married on the third day that I was home and we had our honeymoon and so on.

Masten: Thinking you were going?

Garmezy: The interesting thing was, and this is just very personal, that I had received a letter in Europe asking whether I would be interested in going to Paris to begin to work on a counseling program that they were going to set up to prepare soldiers for the subsequent discharge of those who were in Europe at the war's end. I had to answer whether I'd be interested or not and I wrote a letter saying, "Yes, I'd be interested." I walked across the grounds to mail it, and my only vision was of Edie. So I tore up the letter when I got to the post box, went home with my division, married Edie, and went on a honeymoon. The two atom bombs were dropped that week, and the war came to a rapid end.

Masten: Do you think that the years you spent involved in this war influenced your later work in any way?

Garmezy: In the war?

Masten: Yes, the experience of war itself.

Garmezy: I don't think it influenced it, but I always had the sense that it was one of the most important moments of my life to be a part of that. And I think it must have been awful for people who had been declared 4F to live in the country and people not knowing they were 4F and so on. I really felt very proud particularly being with the 28th Infantry Division because it was a battle-hardened division. And if the atom bomb had not been dropped, you and I would not be talking today because ours was to be the assault division on Honshu Island. You know what the probabilities would be as revealed later by MacArthur's battle plans; ours was to be one of the first to invade Japan. And I think all of us would have been going on into Japan at the same time, the first divisions that would have been so shot up and so forth. What can you do when you think of life and these incidents?

Masten: Well, one thing that happened through the military was the connection to Iowa.

Garmezy: Yes, indeed.

Masten: And so you wrote again?

Garmezy: I wrote to Kenneth Spence. I wrote to Spence actually sitting on my helmet in Germany saying that I had been thinking about returning to get a doctorate and would he be willing to admit me to the department. I got a very curt letter back saying, "Yes, when you are ready come." I mean it was just one of those things. Kenneth Spence was a very tough person, and he had no appreciation for clinical psychology unless you were an Iowa clinical psychologist; then you were accepted. When he made a declaration, it was a declaration you didn't seek to modify in anyway. Incidentally and while I

was serving in the army in Iowa, my happiest moment was doing a musical review for the soldiers to raise money for athletic equipment the group lacked. While I was at Iowa, I met a soldier who had been on Broadway and he and I developed a good friendship. Together we wrote a musical revue, which played in Iowa City to two packed houses two nights in a row. We went to the Colonel and said, "Sir, would it be possible for the two of us to ship out together?" The Colonel said, "No." The thing was as quick as that. Larry Paulus, my musical comedy colleague, went to Japan (where he opened up a theater for the soldiers) and I went to Germany. But I think of that now in retrospect and think of that Colonel sitting behind the desk wondering, "Who are these two guys, and what's this business of staying together?" All we wanted to do was write shows and that's all.

Masten: So you returned to Iowa for your Ph.D. work.

Garmezy: Immediately, within two weeks of my discharge.

Masten: How long were you there?

Garmezy: I stayed a little less than two years and then went to my placement at the Worcester State Hospital in Massachusetts. It was a famous hospital to work in, and I never went back to Iowa except for six weeks to write my dissertation. Spence felt that was inappropriate behavior because I stayed another year at Worcester. I was learning so much there, and Elliott Rodnick was there as the head of Psychology. David Shakow had preceded Elliott Rodnick, so I didn't want to go back to Iowa. I wrote my dissertation really under Rodnick more than I did under my advisor at Iowa. Spence then passed a rule that you have to come back from your internship, but he didn't demand it of me. So I came back briefly where I.E. Farber served as my doctoral Chairman. It was he who taught me how to write and I stayed six weeks in Iowa, leaving my bride behind in New York while I wrote my doctoral dissertation on process-reactive schizophrenia.

Masten: What was the focus of your dissertation study?

Garmezy: I think it represented the very beginnings of the process-reactive dichotomy in schizophrenia, but it had to be in the Iowa tradition meaning some type of learning study. It was something that passed muster very easily, but Elliott Rodnick was really my mentor. He was the person who opened up the gates and his mentor had been David Shakow.

Masten: At the time you were at Worcester was it still the heart of experimental psychopathology?

Garmezy: Yes, it was. In the Psychology Department it was that. And then I think things fell away because just look who it had. It had David and then Elliott Rodnick to do this and then David of course went to the NIMH. Elliott Rodnick went to become the clinical director at Duke and so I stayed on until I finished my dissertation and then Rodnick wrote and asked would I be interested in taking the Assistant Professor Chair in Clinical Psychology at Duke, so I jumped at that opportunity and I went down there.

Masten: Have you always thought in terms of an academic career?

Garmezy: I don't think so.

Masten: Was it just the circumstance of being invited to this position or somewhere along the line did your direction change?

Garmezy: Well, first I think perhaps the major factor was that Kenneth Spence could accept his clinical people, that was his group but he didn't think very much of being a practitioner. He would see to it that if you went through his program you were to go out and teach somewhere, but the second

great factor in my career was Eliot Rodnick who was head of Clinical Psychology at Duke. He was really a father to me in terms of getting me out of an exclusive Iowa mold and allowing a much broader vista at Duke University, to which he invited me. He and I became co-authors of an NIMH Research Grant that we created once we had settled in at Duke. From that point on, the grants came to us because we first took a look at process and reactive schizophrenia in families and their offspring, and that I think provided the longitudinal view that I began to perceive and ask the question, "Here you have two groups of people labeled schizophrenics and one is called process and one is called reactive, why are they called schizophrenics when they are so very different?" I think it was then that I wrote the Process-Reactive Schizophrenia Review for the Schizophrenia Bulletin. It was one of the first major reviews on the subject, and the Editor informed me that they had to run 25,000 copies in a world distribution as it was the first real review of process versus reactive schizophrenia from an experimental stand point.

Masten: So your earliest work focused on the etiology of schizophrenia, but you quickly began to have a developmental perspective in the sense that you were interested in the different pattern of development of these two types of disorder.

Garmezy: Yes, how could you end up with people who had been labeled schizophrenic with two such different factors in terms of marital status, work effort, schooling, and the like and how such a fulminating disorder in one case and recovery, if one stayed out of their way, compared to 13.1 years if you were the other type of schizophrenic and, in which case, little could help the patient.

Masten: Seems like you were also interested from very early on in normal development in the sense that you were interested in how well these people were functioning in the reactive group.

Garmezy: Yes, and in the intensity of the psychotic episode that brought them in and my early awareness that if you don't do anything and just have the hospital serve as a rest home, they will leave. There were all kinds of experiments going on with drugs and so on, but I must say where I was at that time (at famed Worcester State Hospital), some of those good psychiatrists also perceived this and suggested to keep drugs away from them and let rest be the treatment of choice. You know, it's almost like the early rehabilitation work done with people who had psychotic breaks in the early 20th century; there would be some who would remain in the hospital for decades and there would be some who could leave the hospital after x number of weeks. Such differences became fascinating because it called for a longitudinal look. These two groups of patients were so different. If you begin to look backwards more and more, first, they were often married, they had jobs and job stability, and they had gone to school and finished high school. I mean you would look backward and it was so different from what you would call "schizophrenia".

Masten: Is that the origin of your interests in child development?

Garmezy: I think so. You could get a developmental picture going at Worcester State Hospital where Elliott Rodnick had a sense of the developmental thing. I think Elliott Rodnick is one of the underrated major figures in clinical psychology. All you had to do was spend a year with him and you realized what a first-rate mind he had and why he was so well regarded at Yale. Then he received his doctorate. I think he was uncomfortable writing, but he was a powerful mentor. I mean you have mentors all along the way, but he is my mentor and I think my special note in the front of my doctoral dissertation pays tribute to Elliott Rodnick. He invited me to Duke, as an Assistant Professor, where he held a professorship and served as the Director of the Program's clinical program. If I gradually grew restive it was simply because I was always the, you know there's the mentor and here's the product and I grew more and more restive. Even to the extent of one point considering if I should go into social psychology. Duke was fairly open, but I was wise enough or lucky enough that I didn't do anything like that. And that was it, but it was probably also a mistake to go to Duke.

Masten: Because of the closeness of the relationship?

Garmezy: Because of the closeness, yes. And Elliott left to go to UCLA, and I left to go to Minnesota just about a half a year apart.

Masten: After about ten years?

Garmezy: Ten years, yes. Elliott Rodnick, I think, was one of the most able, noteworthy clinical psychologists we have in this country. I and his thinking played a tremendous role in what was written by me.

Masten: What other figures have had a profound influence on your intellectual development in addition to Elliott Rodnick?

Garmezy: Well, he stands out in my mind. I mean I took all the Spence courses and so on and so forth, but the Hullian position went into decline. I think what Iowa gave me, and that was very important, was that you have to be a researcher. You know, other places can train clinical people but if you are going to be an Iowan you had to be a researcher and so you know parental figures come up at any and all places and I think that I am very grateful for the Iowa training. Now you know that's dead, Hullian psychology is gone, but the whole influence of research and awareness of the significance of research came out of my Iowa background, not from Worcester State Hospital. But Elliott Rodnick, as I said, was Hull's principal grad student. But if you ask me who are among the great clinical psychologists of America, I'd name Elliott Rodnick and most universities knew it. So Duke made the right choice and shortly after coming there he became chairman of the department.

Masten: Instead of mentors, who were colleagues that have had an important influence on your intellectual development?

Garmezy: One of the persons I'd name was Leslie Phillips. He's not known to many people, but Leslie Phillips was a magnificent clinician. He was at Worcester, and I remember the first case write-up I wrote. He took it over with a red pen. I was to deliver it in Grand Rounds and he slashed that thing to pieces and I looked up at him and said, "Les, this isn't mine anymore," and he said, "Yes, but this is good now!" This too was a moment of growth.

Masten: When you worked with Phillips was he already interested in competence, premorbid competence?

Garmezy: Yes, I think that Leslie Phillips was one of America's most significant clinical research talents as well as a magnificent clinical psychologist, the very best I have ever known. He was insightful and knowledgeable. He wrote a significant clinical volume, but it failed to gain the recognition it deserved and as a result he did one book; I think it is an important book. Furthermore, he was the best clinician I ever knew.

Masten: And he collaborated with Ed Zigler in developing the measure that--

Garmezy: Well, Ed Ziegler was also at Worcester State Hospital as an intern.

Masten: At that same time?

Garmezy: No, Ed came a little after me, but Leslie Phillips had this impact on both of us. I started to say that when I think of the mentors I've had, I really place Elliott Rodnick at the top of the list, but I grew restive and that's a healthy thing, but not a nice thing in the sense that he invited me to come to Duke after he went there. It was at Duke that I grew restive because, you know, we were co-authors of a major grant, but I felt that I wasn't getting the regard I should and so forth. That was absolutely wrong, poor thinking on my part. Rodnick was all a mentor should be, and he must have seen my

restiveness and was probably discomforted by it. He was a total gentleman in every way about this, but he had difficulty writing. A major paper we co-authored on Process-Reactive Schizophrenia got a worldwide distribution of some 25,000 copies, I mentioned that I think. It was Rodnick and Garmezy and I grew restive, but it should have been Rodnick and Garmezy. If he was slow in writing, he was not slow in thinking and the richness of the dissertation that I did was entirely his so that I owe him an enormous deal of gratitude for what he did. But it took me a long time to recognize that, and if any young investigator is thinking in this mode too I would say it pays to very carefully look backward and give credit where credit is due.

Masten: I think that sounds like a natural evolution of a strong mentoring relationship.

Garmezy: Yes, but you never quite say your thanks the way you should, you know. I've gone back to Elliott Rodnick now to say any number of times how much I owe to him whenever I see him, but you should be able to say it earlier in your career.

Masten: You moved on to Minnesota and afterwards there was a dramatic shift in the nature of your research. How did that happen?

Garmezy: Well, I don't know. But I think that it was part of breaking away and appropriately so. Had I continued along in the same vein, I would have run dry. I think that the couple of reviews I wrote played a significant role for the field and so on. My first two major papers were on schizophrenia with researchers who worked in schizophrenia, but I wanted freedom from it. My good fortune was that at a conference I met Mike Rutter and sat down with him. It was on Bled, an island in Yugoslavia, and I was invited to this conference but how I don't know. I sat down next to this young man and there it was. The meeting changed my direction and so I began to think, "Now you better get some good background in this." Michael Rutter was always so impressive, but I too was highly-regarded as a result of having a Lifetime Research Career Award. Imagine an award of \$30,000 a year toward salary and it lasted until I retired. The NIMH stopped doing that after the first eight people, but it was so very special that it enabled me to go to London to study with Rutter and staff of the magnificent Department of Psychiatry. We had a marvelous time, and I sat in at the great Institute of Psychiatry, on case conferences, and in the various research programs that Mike was conducting. That was the big moment of change. I had gone to the right place. I just acted as if I was an intern on a postdoctoral, so I showed up at meetings, sat in and listened, and spent the year in Michael Rutter's division. Subsequently, we were re-united in the Center at Stanford a couple of years later and joined the wonderful group that we helped to bring together.

Masten: The result was the volume on Stress, Coping and Development, which--

Garmezy: I think really helped to launch the area.

Masten: That in my mind seems like the third phase of your career. The first phase being the study of schizophrenia and its' etiology and then there was a transition phase, studying the offspring of schizophrenia during which time you were part of the high risk consortium group worldwide and that group really had to begin to think about child development and try to come to grips with what are we going to measure and what we are looking for in these young children.

Garmezy: You know, I had almost forgotten that critical formation. That's so unusual because we had no money, and yet it didn't seem important as everybody had a research grant that the Grant Foundation offered us. It resulted in nine thousand dollars with which we brought people together several times a year, and it's almost impossible to really weigh how much we all secured from those investigators who were all at their peak.

Masten: Which included Mednick?

Garmezy: Mednick, Goldstein, my memory for names is fading. I think I could dig it out, but it was about six or seven people.

Masten: Arnold Sameroff at Rochester?

Garmezy: Arnold came in later, but he was a very important force because Arnold really brought with him a superb background in child development. Few of us had this knowledge base. Most of us were working with children at risk, but we didn't have the needed child development background. But the joyousness of that group remains with me. What we tried to do was to formulate and this was Grant Foundation supported. The emphasis was on evaluating our group to study our other laboratory. It was a rotation that produced a coordinated database. It was a wonderful idea with a group of people, none of whom chose to be "on top". It was nothing like that in the consortium. I think that consortia can only live a certain amount of time, and I think we lived our time. I don't remember how many years but it was all a very great learning experience. We traded around, we had doctoral students who would go and spend two or three days with other labs to get a feel for it, the work. It was a great idea, and the William Grant Foundation supported the effort.

Masten: So there was a period of some years where you had experimental psychopathology studies of the children, offspring of parents with mental disorders, schizophrenia, affective disorders, and then normal controls and so forth and then you had this experience interacting with Michael Rutter and went out to the Center to study--

Garmezy: We went to the Center, but before we went to the Center I went to London.

Masten: Okay so you spent your year in London.

Garmezy: Spent my year right in that lab, going in every day. You know some people who went there took a lot of vacations, I took none. I sat in on all the case conferences, which were at a very high level. In this crowded room on my first case conference, I went in, sat in the back, and then after the room had emptied the professor came up and wanted to know what was I doing there. I thought, my God that's really quite incredible. You have a packed room of people and he wants to know what you are doing there and I told him and then it was open gateway. I was invited to speak often in the labs of the United Kingdom. Whenever I think why would that happen, I never really, quite frankly, saw it as something that I had done previously and I had a lot of these invitations. These institutions gave honoraria and my last contribution to the department of psychiatry was to give them all of the honorary funds I had received. I think it was about nine hundred dollars to their great surprise, but it was just a thank you for that extraordinary opportunity and it was most welcome. Mike Rutter, of course, is an absolute giant and I perceived it on Bled in Yugoslavia at this meeting. I sat down next to him at breakfast, my first meeting with Mike, and he was just a young man, you know, but he had it, he just had it.

Masten: Those experiences in England and with Michael, how did they emerge in your work back in Minnesota?

Garmezy: Well, it helped in the transition that was very important.

Masten: From children at risk to a broader examination of competence and stress?

Garmezy: But also to leave schizophrenia behind.

Masten: To let go of that.

Garmezy: That is a kind of break that rarely happens in a career, except that it had the Process-Reactive Dichotomy as the grandfather. That is how you can have disorder when you have two groups so different in background.

Masten: So there is both discontinuity and continuity.

Garmezy: Yes and the continuity was noting the competence of reactive schizophrenics. That, I think, was the key and it was just great to be a part of all that.

Masten: So those series of several events culminating perhaps in the experience in Palo Alto where you spent a year?

Garmezy: Yes, together with all those people who are part of the authorship of the book.

Masten: You put out this book and from that time forward do you feel that you are best known for your work in the area of competence and resilience?

Garmezy: I don't know. I don't know what you are well-known for. That's to be asked somewhere else. I think the interesting thing were these transition points based upon unique experiences. I mean you start with schizophrenia and you look for some controls, which was what our first focus was -- in looking at children who are acting out versus children who are internalizing. That way you are looking backward and then you are not looking backward, but you are now right in the clinic looking at two groups with differential outcomes. That, I think is one of the most important aspects of the transitions, not the schizophrenia thing. What schizophrenia gave us was the Process-Reactive discrimination. What I started to try to look for in the Child Guidance Clinic were those early attributes of the reactive schizophrenic present in children who might profit by being in the clinic and go on from there. That was a linkage that I had in mind, but I don't think I ever really wrote and joined the two together. But it was always a search for the "haves" versus the "have-nots". The "haves" being people capable of moving out of some distress situation relatively unimpaired. I think for people working in schizophrenia, that may seem a little extreme to even compare that with the Process-Reactive discriminators, but yet it was the edge of a model that suggested that people may have the same symptomatology, but at the same time greater strengths that provide survival. In the cases of children, if you had very marked "acting out" behavior there wasn't going to be a maxim for success at later points in development. I think that still remains a very critical element in research. Who are the children who are really susceptible to acting out behavior and what outcomes are produced. I'm not sure; you would know better than I whether that has progressed in any way in terms of a search into the positive factors that might explain the relinquishment of pathology.

Masten: I think that is happening, but it's still in a young stage. One of the things that people focus on now that has roots in the Process/Reactive examination of schizophrenia is simply the general notion of developmental pathways -- that there are different branches, that there are multiple influences on the pathway a child will take and not simply a small number. What is happening now is the study of anti-social behavior is becoming more and more differentiated. People are looking at different life course patterns like Terry Moffett when she came here and recently talked about life course persistent pattern versus the pattern where adolescents are acting out, but it is limited, time limited. There is a lot of interest in why these different life course patterns are occurring and how we explain the recovery to a normative developmental trajectory of a large number of young people who have anti-social behaviors in adolescence and so the same questions are being addressed now in many different areas.

Garmezy: Yes, and I wonder if there is anything to be gained by investigators in the second area from investigations of the first area. It would be interesting because the reactive cases for a disorder like schizophrenia had such different histories. My table in that book, the big article the NIMH put out, just

gives you the differentiating signs of the time. Can such an effort be made with children who succeed despite deprivation when compared with others of similar background who do not.

Masten: Well, I certainly think that there is considerable interest now as part of developmental psychopathology in the antecedents and patterning after an episode of disorder and the different pathways children are following.

Garmezy: Developmental psychopathology now is firmly established isn't it?

Masten: I would say so.

Garmezy: And that is, I guess, a function of the broadening of child development to allow the incorporation of disturbance in trying to provide formulations because for a considerable time it didn't seem to be appropriate to do so. The use of clinical child development may help to complete the bridge.

Masten: But it's simultaneously the result of experimental psychopathology and the study of disorder broadening to include normative child development, both had to occur for this field to be born.

Garmezy: Yes and child development had to accept it. Who are the major figures in child development who accepted it readily?

Masten: I think it was very important that developmental psychopathology became an early part of training at the University of Minnesota because you had strong experimental psychopathology represented in psychology by people such as yourself, Paul Meehl and so forth and you had mainstream child development represented by the Institute of Child Development and when people like you and Allen Sroufe began turning out students like Dante Cicchetti and so forth, the study and acceptance of developmental psychopathology began to take hold.

Garmezy: Its time had come.

Masten: There are many people who had an influence. I certainly think Arnold Sameroff had a profound influence because he was involved with all of you psychopathologists and the Risk Consortium and yet he was strongly attached to mainstream child development as well. There were all these bridging figures.

Garmezy: Yes, I think Arnold was a beautiful example because I saw it in action at Rochester University, and I have a great affection for that guy. But he is so jocular when you meet him that one has to watch out for not taking him too seriously. He exemplifies the nature of a major contributor and he is. He was at Rochester at the time I was going down to Rochester and that's when I met Arnold. I think he is now and will continue to be a great contributor to the field in the years ahead.

Masten: You have indicated that one of the papers that significantly reflect your thinking is the Process-Reactive paper. What other pieces of work do you think most importantly represent what your work is all about? In your own mind, what papers would you point to?

Garmezy: I'd have to look in my papers. I don't remember things very well now. I just don't know what other review papers I did.

Masten: Well, *Children at Risk* was certainly and *Schizophrenia Bulletin* was a major review paper.

Garmezy: Yes and the Process-Reactive paper was a big one, but those are schizophrenia. I don't know what some of the other things might have been influencing forces in reviews.

Masten: Your review of the literature on resilience and stress resistant children is certainly where you identify three major--

Garmezy: You know I am prone to forgetting now so that if you ask me, well name five articles you've written, I'd have a very hard time. But that's what comes with being 80. I remain aware that number one is the good fortune that one has with graduate students. You know so much of the work that was done at Minnesota was collaborative work with students. That seems to me to be one of the most important things that I can imagine and students helped in the bridging away from schizophrenia to childhood stress and adaptation, which brings me to the Institute of Child Development. I don't know what my colleagues in psychology thought when I decided to go over to sit in on courses in the Institute of Child Development, but the Institute was a blessed place and when I sought permission to become a student, it was opened to me. Allen Sroufe and I taught a seminar together at one point. Alan's back was hurting him terribly. He was in somewhat bad shape and if anyone had walked past the door they would have seen Alan lying on a desk with a pillow and I walking around the room.

Masten: What was the seminar about?

Garmezy: I can't even remember what we titled it, but it was some linkage between the terms of "development" and "psychopathology". I learned a lot from Allen Sroufe, and I also sat in on courses at the Institute. Never for a moment did I ever think, "my goodness what are you doing here sitting with graduate students." That wasn't part of it, so I am not sure if we did have an Institute of Child Development at that time whether this transition in my own career could have taken place with the absence of models to emulate. And so I can't help but make the point that I owe an enormous amount to the Institute for allowing me to come in and take courses. It was there and I will forever owe my appreciation to the Institute and its staff.

Masten: Have there been any times where you felt like you're thinking or work went down an alley, a blind alley or that you were off on the wrong track?

Garmezy: Well, I think that there was a point where I said, "No more schizophrenia," and determined on a different path and chose it by sitting in on courses at the Institute and going to Mike Rutter's Institute in London. Both were great breaks for me so that when I came I think I supervised several dissertations on schizophrenia, but then that opportunity arose. I cannot understand quite how the presence of these things fitted in with the wise judgment on my part to go that way and to have these resources. I really can't capture the moment.

Masten: And yet from that time your work focused strongly and more broadly on children including both normative and deviant development.

Garmezy: Well, it began with deviant children and it began with my going to the Child Guidance Clinic and sitting in on cases and looking through one of my former students who is so well-known in terms of classification.

Masten: Tom Achenbach.

Garmezy: Tom Achenbach came into our Child Guidance Clinic in the city to take a look at what were the counter parts to process and reactive schizophrenia, but really seeing in terms of markedly manifest disorders versus inhibitory disorders. So that was the linkage to try to search for outcomes where there existed a discriminable difference between two groups of children who came to Child Guidance clinics. The internalizing is the externalizing behaviors, and if one looks back to my process-

reactive paper I think you find an internalizing/externalizing dichotomy cited in that too, and served as the bridging element of “taking a look”. At that point Tom Achenbach carried that work on and did it in his usual striking way with complete autonomy. He is a very autonomous person. He just went in and did the article for the Bulletin. It was a search for parallels, and the Process-Reactive differentiation gave somebody who was on a new island, you know, some harbor to look at it in a search for the similarities that were not Process-Reactive, but adaptive/non-adaptive over long periods of time. Also, there’s recovery versus non-recovery and I think that lead me into the Child Guidance Clinic looking at externalizing/internalizing children. You know, there’s never a great vacuum. There is always a cue that moves you.

Masten: I am also struck by the number of students who have interacted with you and gone on to autonomous careers and new directions, but in some way that interaction with you played an important role in their lives. Not just students who you did doctoral studies with, but you are mentioning Tom Achenbach. There’s also been Dante Cicchetti and a number of other students.

Garmezy: Do you know the entire outfit was built on student’s work, the entire thing with just some review publications to sort of bring things together, but I think I’ve been extraordinarily lucky in the students and the grad students with whom I have worked.

Masten: I have a feeling they would say the same thing.

Garmezy: That would be very nice if they did! But I once had a seminar. Were you in that seminar with Dante and Lacono?

Masten: They were fifth year students when I started so I think I probably wasn’t in that seminar.

Garmezy: But I could look around that room now and talk about the tense students that were in that room! Incidentally, my fondest memory was at one moment where Dante was sitting and he went out for something and he came back and he looked down at his place where he was sitting and he had a paper there and the paper had apparently been lifted by someone else. So he reached over and took the paper from another student and the student said, “What are you doing, that’s my paper,” and he said, “yes, but they took my paper.” I always thought of this as very Dante, you know, but he has been something. Dante has really been something that we can be very, very proud of, and I wish him so much happiness.

Masten: You have talked about having a Lifetime Career Award from the National Institute of Mental Health. Could you say more about your connections to funding over the years? How did you participate in federal research funding over the years? I know you had an influence on clinical training grants that was very significant.

Garmezy: I was in my fourth or fifth year at Duke when the visiting person who looked at clinical programs came through. His name escapes me now and he’s long since retired and lives in California, but we hit it off very well and he asked me if I would be willing to come to NIMH to go into the field and evaluate clinical programs. I think it was very nice of my chairman to give me 18 months at the NIMH because I was only in my fourth year in academia. I think it was both decent and wise to do so. I went to the NIMH, and my task was to visit clinical programs. Some programs worried because I had come out of a Spence tradition and an “iron-hearted” Iowa kind of psychology. I know that when I headed for Clark University to evaluate it there was great fear in the department that this was a Spencian coming. I walked into that department and was absolutely captured by its quality. It was small and it was just superb and it took a while for the field to realize that I was coming in as a neutralist because Clark got its biggest grant on the evaluation I wrote about that extraordinary department. I think I never was an Iowan to begin with, you know, but on the other hand I wasn’t an anti-Iowan so that I could get through and get my degree. I’m grateful for what Iowa gave me in terms of a kind of tough mindedness in research. But I must have scared about half the departments in the

country when I took those 18 months as an evaluator for the NIMH as I was going out where they didn't anticipate. The fear was "if this is an Iowa coming we are going to have trouble." Actually I got a lot from just watching as Clark was magnificent. I came away with a four-star report for Clark University from that small department, what it was doing, and its intimacy of students with faculty and so on. But that was a great turning point to have that freedom of visiting and writing up an evaluation for a prime committee. The committee was made up of great names and they simply took the report and then discussed the thing. People outside saw this report as infinitely more critical as what could happen to them rather than the fact that we had a magnificent committee of very distinguished people in clinical and out of clinical, professors of the highest rank.

Masten: What was the long-term impact of that process?

Garnezy: It was tremendous because I saw so many good programs that weren't Hullian. I saw Ann Clark was one of the best. They were worried, but they never should have worried. I came back and wrote a report for the committee. I was writing for the committee and not for the NIMH, but I was an NIMH representative. I saw things going on in departments that really took me so far beyond Hullian psychology in the University of Iowa and somehow or another I think I just had an openness of mind when I went in and interviewed and asked questions. It was a tremendous experience, but I remember Clark mostly because it was so very different.

Masten: What was the result of that committee and your work?

Garnezy: Well, it was, I mean I just saw so much. I saw so many variations of what people were doing. I saw a potential vision of clinical that was far beyond what clinical was when it started and what you saw were theoretical variations in which these variants were turning out superb students. I think it simply made me more human about our field. More open.

Masten: That was in the mid 50's.

Garnezy: Yes.

Masten: And that was a time of great expansion or training grounds.

Garnezy: Yes and I had only had five years of academic experience. I think I wasn't more than an associate professor, if anything. And here the image was of an Iowa coming, but they didn't know how much I had changed under Elliott Rodnick's mentoring.

Masten: So you had the opportunity to have an influence on really the funding available to train graduate students.

Garnezy: Yes, yes.

Masten: Which expanded greatly through that committee.

Garnezy: Absolutely, and more and more I think it was the critical development of clinical in its broadest way and you went to departments that were so far away from what you had been reared on, but they were quality programs. And I was delighted to surprise Clark with my review because it was a splendid small department.

Masten: What kind of changes did you see over the decades you were at the University of Minnesota in the Department of Psychology and what roles did you play in that department?

Garmezy: That department had a fixity to it that I don't think I really changed. I mean the influence of Neil Hathaway remained the powerful influencing figure. On one hand, there was in the psychopathology course that people came and took the course, but I never really found myself embattled by what was the presiding influence in that department. On the other hand, I never thought that I was really going to make any great indentation in a department that had so much of its core for clinical psychology.

Masten: Was it a frustration to you, the rigidity of that core?

Garmezy: Well, no I went my own way. I had enormous freedom because I had the Lifetime Research Career Award. The first \$30,000.00 of my income came from the government.

Masten: What was the impact of that award, since there aren't many people who are going to ever have that in this day and age, on the nature of your daily work? Did you have to do any teaching? Was it up to you what teaching you did?

Garmezy: The department was superb about recognizing freedom, so I got out of Abnormal Psychology. I used to teach Abnormal Psychology to a tremendous number of students. So much so that one of the economics professors, a very distinguished economist, had his wife sit in on the course. It was in this huge auditorium, and I had magnifying glasses as a joke. Once, she came in and sat in the balcony and I looked up through my magnifying glasses and greeted her. She was the wife of a very distinguished economist. But it was large, very large so once I got my award I was finished with doing that kind of teaching. I don't think I enjoyed it particularly.

Masten: What kind of courses did you enjoy when it was up to you what to teach?

Garmezy: Well, I would guess I did very little teaching once I got the award and there was just the seminar.

Masten: On psychopathology.

Garmezy: On psychopathology and maybe one other seminar and research.

Masten: And your time was free to mentor student research assistants.

Garmezy: That's right and they did away with those things. They were glorious, but they changed them to five year appointments and so on. But it narrowed the amount of teaching I did. I enjoyed teaching Abnormal Psych in a whopping big class, but it was quite impossible to do that, you know. You'd have three or four hundred people. One was in the auditorium, if you can imagine, and you had a walkway that reminded me of a burlesque show. You know, you had this big plank going out for more intimacy, if you can imagine. But the intimacy was that...well, it occupied the first four rows so the fifth row was the intimacy, it was terrible. I mean, it really was terrible, but I had a lot of fun teaching even though I didn't teach for very long once I came here and escaped it. But while I was doing it I enjoyed it; I had a lot of fun in Abnormal Psych.

Masten: It seems to me that during the years before your retirement, your official retirement from that department, that you played an extremely important role in launching the joint collaborative program to formally train developmental psychopathologists in a way that for years you had facilitated the training of clinical psychologists in child development. Could you say a little bit more about that?

Garmezy: Well, I think the initiator of that move in coming over to visit me was, if I remember correctly, and now I am going to forget a name of someone I have great respect for of your colleagues right on the second floor.

Masten: Allen Sroufe.

Garmezy: Al Sroufe and I co-taught once, but I think the opportunity to sit in on our course was extraordinary. I don't know how the graduate students felt about it, but I chose and enjoyed the seminars and the like. I don't know if I could have made the transition if the Institute of Child Development wasn't there. How would you go about making the transition? Certainly my department wasn't helpful in any way, shape or form but they couldn't do much about it because I had this Research Career Award and I did my teaching.

Masten: So you were free to get together with Alan and he was very interested in formalizing the connection between the two programs?

Garmezy: I don't know if it was that or if it was just that we enjoyed each other and thought we'd teach some developmental psychopathology from our different viewpoints. I enjoyed it thoroughly and learned a great deal from Alan and I think the students must have enjoyed it. I don't know how long it went on...maybe only two times or something like that and we had students from both departments. That was a very good thing. I think the Institute has had a great deal of effect on me. I don't know if I had gone to a school where there wasn't any early child development center whether I could have or would have made the transition into children.

Masten: Turning that around a little bit, what do you think has been the impact that you've had on the field of Child Development? What impact did you have on the Institute of Child Development and also more broadly on the field?

Garmezy: Well, I can tell you a story that sort of sums up what might have been the thing and maybe I've told you the story before. When I was beginning to make this turn into developmental psychopathology, I was asked to give an invited address and I think it was at the Society for Research on Child Development oh, maybe fifteen years ago or more. And this was an invited address. I came off the platform. The room had been quite crowded. The applause was reasonable and I came off the platform and was greeted by someone from a Midwestern university whose name I have forgotten and he said this to me, he said, "I want to tell you how much I enjoyed your talk, but I hope that we won't have many of them because it will weaken the base and quality of child development research!" I remember that well! And I don't remember what my answer was, but I thought, now that is without a doubt the most gratuitous compliment I have ever received on giving a presentation. I think that was my first SRCD presentation with this fellow waiting at the stairs to congratulate me.

Masten: And what have you seen in the fifteen years since then?

Garmezy: That has changed very, very radically. It is so clear to me that SRCD is a critically important component of psychology today. We've witnessed an enormous growth in development and normative and psychopathological development and it could not have been done without the world of childhood and the quality and talents of the people who have come into places such as SRCD. It provides that superb balance between exactly what this guy was trying to tell me down below, but he didn't realize that namely the formal nature of developmental psychology is a critical aspect of what we can then bring in with developmental psychopathology. He had the first part right about the critical importance of development and knowledge about it. He had the second part wrong, which was that it would in some way spoil instead of gain from knowing the base and now applying it to critical groups that developmental psychology hadn't spent its time on.

Masten: Do you remember your earliest contacts with SRCD? Was that your first visit to a meeting? Was that the first time you think that you had been to a meeting?

Garmezy: It probably was or came very close to it indeed. I don't know if I can even find the presentations somewhere, but I was very new to SRCD at that point and it was an invited address.

Masten: And yet a dozen years later or maybe a decade later your festschrift was celebrated at SRCD.

Garmezy: Yes, but of course that turning was occurring. It was occurring and I give a great deal of thanks to the Institute. You know, I remember going over to Harold Stevenson, he was the director then, and asked if I could sit in on courses. I don't know what went through his mind, but I just took my place in the classroom and sat in on courses.

Masten: How much involvement have you had over the years in SRCD since that first connection?

Garmezy: I think that what we have, what I have with SRCD is a friendship. There was some co-teaching with Allen Sroufe, but I think it has just been a friendship.

Masten: With the Institute of Child Development.

Garmezy: Yes, an appreciation of what it has given me in making a transition that few people make. Imagine just trying to move over from adult psychopathology and schizophrenia to precursors, that's a sort of intermediate step and then to a sense of wanting to see children who adapt despite, and the Institute had to provide that.

Masten: What about the organization of Child Development, SRCD. Once you gave that invited address at SRCD, how extensive has your contact and involvement been with that organization?

Garmezy: You know, I don't remember things about it. I mean, I joined it.

Masten: You and your students presented numerous times.

Garmezy: Yes, numerous times and so on. I feel a part of it in a way much more than I feel with APA.

Masten: And yet you were much more extensively involved in the governments and committees and so forth of APA.

Garmezy: Yes, but I haven't seen those as competitive and I think I am less centered on APA now that I am on the development group. I'm turning now, of course, to moving off the stage and coming back behind the curtain and I think I was extraordinarily lucky to be at a University that had an Institute in Child Development.

Masten: What do you think have been the most important changes that have occurred in the SRCD during the time you've had some association with it?

Garmezy: Well, certainly this chap waiting at the bottom of the stairs to greet me on my first exposure to SRCD, it didn't really faze me. I know that my reaction to this was laughter. He was very serious, but I don't know if it would be possible to, for example, let's take a place like Iowa, the university I came from. We had a Child Development Institute at Iowa and when I went to Kenneth Spence early in my career as a grad student to ask whether in my program I might take courses in the Institute, he said "no". He forbade it. Bob Sears asked if I could be a research assistant for him and

Spence said no to that too. I think he said no to that more than he did about taking a course. But it was a negative view.

Masten: You were interested though.

Garmezy: I was interested, yes.

Masten: Where did that interest come from?

Garmezy: I don't know, maybe that I enjoyed Sears so very much and sat in on his course and I think that was probably, he was more human than Kenneth Spence was.

Masten: Was Spence aware that you sat in on Sears's course or did you just sneak off and do it?

Garmezy: No, no he probably knew that. But it is very hard to try to describe Iowa in those days as I don't even know what it would be like to be a faculty member at Iowa with this kind of dominant figure and so forth. He had contempt for clinical psychology, except his own clinical psychology. But on the other hand, it provided a basic training in psychology itself.

Masten: And experimental design.

Garmezy: Experimental design and statistics and so forth. I often regretted that I didn't apply to Yale, which would have been a more open place after getting out of the service; you know, the war had ended and I was discharged very early. I could have gone to any number of places, but I had been at Iowa so I went back to Iowa. Not a very daring, pioneering fellow.

Masten: Like the familiarity?

Garmezy: Yes, I think I probably needed that. I was very uncertain of myself. It was an uncertainty that had lingered over many decades. Some people are surprised with it, but I find it a surprise the things that I had done. I find it surprising that I am being interviewed for the files somewhere! I was never one who had a real sense of, yes, I will succeed and I will do this. A lot of uncertainty was built into me.

Masten: I also wonder if wartime brings a wish for continuity to resume.

Garmezy: Well, I think if I had just served in the infantry and didn't go into anything I might never have gone to graduate school. You know, it was just one of these lucky things, nor did it ever occur to me to apply to Yale. For example, with the GI bill I didn't have to go back to Iowa. So I guess it represented a safety zone for me in this transition from the military back into real life.

Masten: Either that or this larger than life figure that Spence would want his own to come back!

Garmezy: Well, he didn't think much of clinical psychology as I said, except his program. He was very Teutonic in his behavior.

Masten: Let's step back a little more even broadly into the field of psychology as a whole. What changes have you witnessed over the decades of your career in the field of psychology or clinical psychology, but speaking very broadly?

Garmezy: Well, you know the Iowa experience was not an optimal experience for people in clinical psychology. And the reason for that is there wasn't an openness about going into clinical psychology at

Iowa. Kenneth Spence was a brilliant contributor to Hullian psychology. This was a freebie for him because he received money and opportunity for various kinds of support for students and so on so that I think I might have, well I don't know. I think I might have gone to another place where there wasn't that kind of submissiveness to the chairman. You see, in 1945 all departments had decided they were going to have clinical psychology programs. There were clinical psychology programs.

Masten: Partly as a result of the war?

Garnezy: Partly as a result of the war or the fact that people trained for personnel and things like that and so on. So I never was someone with a great deal of self-confidence. I'm not that way now and I was not that way in high school or in college or in grad school. There was always an uncertainty about myself and just that surprise at some of the things that have happened to me, but a feeling that I was lucky. So I've never intellectually had a feeling of real strength to stand up to anybody and so on and so forth. So that's been part of the life battle and sometimes I think, gee you have been a lucky guy with all of these feelings and the achievements that have still come along. So I think it's just been a happy time, but it hasn't been a time of great confidence in self.

Masten: What do you see for the future in child development or developmental psychopathology? What do you think is coming, what do you see?

Garnezy: Well, I think that's a good question. But I think that developmental psychopathology is absolutely critical for the entire area of child development because there is very little help coming from child psychiatry. Child psychiatry has always been subordinate to adult psychiatry and it's always been a smaller part of a department and the visions of research in psychiatry have come over to child psychiatry, but I think under rather detrimental conditions. So the retreat for many child psychiatrists has been into biological issues and related sciences, which is not a great freedom. And certainly psychoanalytic contributions have not really been striking in this new environment and this broader view of science, etc. So my feeling is that developmental psychopathology and developmental psychology first are critically important to the well-being of psychology and developmental psychopathology really opens up a whole new avenue for people interested in research with children. What would worry me is a program in child clinical that didn't take a scan of the whole developmental range of normality. It's just very much like clinical psychology with adults, you have to know enough about adult growth, normative growth, and development, but we don't focus that way often in clinical psychology except when we are doing studies and we need a control group. As a clinical thing we don't, we don't ask the question, "Well is this really disorder?" "What about the positive attributes?" You know, they are the things that we have often talked about here at Minnesota, the positive strengths of persons and so forth. I think it is doubly necessary in the world of children. I think here with children who show disordered behavior, it's very important not to lean toward the adult database as we have often done. I think it is very, very necessary for developmental psychologists and development psychopathologists to work together both with normative children and children being seen in clinics and such an exchange would be extremely important. It's the kind of thing that Allen Sroufe and I tried to do once in a joint seminar because I could not see a child clinical program without a major developmental program. I don't know what it is like in departments elsewhere, where there isn't an Institute of Child Development or there are only one or two representatives of child development in a department. I think that the danger there would be in a psychologizing of children's disorders that really lean more to the disorder than toward the positive sides. That's the great quality of having an Institute as we have at Minnesota.

Masten: Do you think that the times we face now and the plight of children in the United States is influencing the directions of Child Psychology and Developmental Psychopathology...social problems?

Garnezy: Well, I think the one problem that I would very much focus on is poverty and I think the Institute, for example, ought to now give serious consideration to those children in poverty. This is the

nut of the future growth of studies of disordered behavior in children. This is one of the critical things and I think if child psychopathology follows the path of adult psychopathology, it would not make the great potential contribution that it ought to make. I think we need to know something about poverty. We should introduce courses in poverty and its consequences via the Institute. I think that we should have students working in centers that are in the midst of ghettos and so on because we know that a large proportion of disordered behavior will come out of those backgrounds. But a larger proportion will not be disordered and I think that poverty is going to worsen in the United States and it's going to worsen because the faint hearted Democratic Party and a very strong Republican Party is going to ordain that and will neglect this kind of thing. Do we have a course on the impact of poverty on children in our department?

Masten: We've had visiting speakers on that and have courses offered like every other year focusing on children at risk where a large portion of the course addresses poverty. So I think there has been a response.

Garmezy: That's great. Who teaches it?

Masten: Well, I taught it the last time.

Garmezy: Did you? Well, I think the other thing that should happen is that the Institute ought to go out into the community.

Masten: I see movement in that direction and much more of an effort to go out to do research rather than inviting people into laboratories.

What we have been talking about reminds me of the red kimono. I wonder if you could explain what that means.

Garmezy: Well first of all, two of my dearest students, you included, presented me with a red kimono because I had been talking about the Japanese year that at age 71 is free to speak about any topic that they wish to see or to have discussed and that silences are not appropriate to somebody at that age and I think I have added to it. The view that silence is when there is irrationality or where there is distress in the community is something that we all ought to sound our voices about. So at the age of 70 in Japan, one has earned the right to put on the red kimono and that gives you the freedom to speak. Two of my finest students gave me a red kimono, you are one of the two, and what it really means is that instead of one going into retirement, this is the time not to return to writing articles and so on and so forth, but to really thinking about how you can play a more vital role in the community on behalf of children.

Masten: Do you think that the time has come for the Institute of Child Development and organizations like SRCD to speak out on behalf of children or do they need to stick with their role in building research, building a knowledge base which can be applied?

Garmezy: Well, for SRCD the answer is immediately of course they can and should. For the Institute the answer should be of course it can and should, but on the other side the Institute has to wrestle with budgets, etc. and corporate and governmental structures that might even come down on the Institute negatively. I would not view that as dishonorable if the Institute on that basis held its voice somewhat, but from the standpoint of SRCD there is absolutely no reason not to, or for the APA to speak out on this.

Masten: Do you think that will happen? Do you think it is happening?

Garmezy: Yes, I hope it's happening, but I'm out of the mainstream and structure of those two places. I don't know if SRCDC is extending its views in terms of becoming more political on behalf of children and families.

Masten: Well, there is a lot of discussion about, you know speaking up advocacy for children and the Social Policy committee has become much more salient in that organization.

Garmezy: I can see one of the dangers for professional research-oriented groups would be that one might be accused of losing their research fineness in terms of moving into an area and being open about you might find and so forth. I think it is easier for a collective to do it than for a research group to do it. I mean, it is perfectly fine for the Institute to say, "We are going to try to concern ourselves with poverty and its effects on children in the next five years." I think that is separate from advocacy and it might be that there is a two-part sequence here. One is that we're concerned with children. Fine, let's go and find out what's happening to children and what might be done in terms of providing some help and assistance. The second point would be to now become people who really have a stake in trying to advance the cause of children. I think it is more important to do the first initially so you have a sound database and then do the second, which means showing up before the legislature. Edie once appeared before a legislative committee to talk about pregnant, unmarried women. So there are always openings to be advocates, but it's very important if one's going to be an advocate to be able to clearly separate it from research; can that be done? My guess is it probably can be done if one is a good researcher. But will it evoke suspicion? It might indeed because the things that we stand for are the things that others are extremely ready to jump on. On the other hand, I think just as they are ready to jump on us, we ought to be ready to jump on them. The status of poor children in this country is very discouraging and there is not just a political thing at stake here, there is a philosophical and historical responsibility at stake here. If we are going to have pride in the nature of this country, then this country has to take care of its children in poverty. I think I'd be ready to speak now at this point, but nobody has asked me. But I think that that's what retirees might indeed be able to do and to speak out on behalf of children more easily than people who have to get research papers out and so on and so forth.

Masten: It is probably quite a sizable number of retirees nationwide.

Garmezy: Yes, but of course one of the problems for retirees is that their major political group wants to be sure that the aged get before the children get.

Masten: But that's why I think the increasing numbers of retired child development researchers perhaps could take a role.

Garmezy: I think it would be a wonderful thing to do, and at SRCDC perhaps, to have a meeting about political necessities on behalf of children and what can be done to initiate those programs. If a program is developed appearing before a committee of State Senate or a National Committee, it could stress the similarity in what is said and reported with consistency, and that could be worked out with people who are going to take up the fight on behalf of children.

Masten: Well, speaking of children and families, you have mentioned Edie a number of times. I know she is the central part of your life. Tell us something about your family, your interests, and how they've influenced your career or vice versa.

Garmezy: Well, Edie is Edie. You know people hesitate about getting married and so on and so forth, but the good thing that came out of the war was that I only had 30 days after coming home by ship from the European War before our division was to go to the West Coast for the invasion of Japan. So with 30 days, Edie did all the preparation for us getting married within two days. Now I say that because from that day onward my life has been blessed with her, with her presence and I just wish that everybody had an Edie. Regarding family, you worry about your kids first of all and you never stop

worrying. I want to announce that genuinely for all people in child development. You never stop worrying about your kids, but we have three and they are widely different in the things they do. Our daughter Kathy is a political person in the Hollywood Women's Political Forum and our son Larry is a geologist. Our son Andy is an advertising specialist. They are widely scattered all over the country, but I think that there is a kind of integrity about the family that is very much in evidence and Edie is, I think, the central figure in our family. She is the one who does the traveling around and does the visiting and the grandparent thing and so on. To a very great extent I think career is one thing, but if you are lucky in marriage you have it all. I mean that's really it. We were married within two days of my return from Europe. Now you know people walk on eggs and they try to think, now should we get married, have we known each other well enough and so on and so forth. But with a 30-day leave you don't have time to contemplate your decision to marry in wartime.

Masten: So how many years have you been married now?

Garmezy: We will have our 50th anniversary on August 8th and I came home on August 6th fifty years ago for 30 days leave and Edie had, you know there was much more openness about getting all the license things and so on and so we were married on the 8th. We went up to Maine for our honeymoon and in the middle of the next week the bombs were dropped. My first meeting of Edie in the hotel Astor after coming back was to see the New York Times laid out saying that Nagasaki had been bombed. It was the second atomic bombing. Hiroshima being the first and so you know it was a very interesting kind of thing because I was in the 28th Infantry division. They knew the war in Europe had come to an end and the army now, and this is a great tribute to our country, they wanted to set up a counseling center for soldiers who would be remaining in Europe. Well, what are they going to do in the future and how could they use the GI bill that was being formulated, so they needed counselors in Paris. Just think of that, counseling in Paris while the other Pacific war went on. I was asked, "Would you be interested in going to Paris and working in a counseling program for GI's who were just sitting in Europe and waiting." I wrote this letter saying, "Yes, I would be willing to do that." It would mean two years separation more from Edie. So I walked across the field to the army post office thinking, and all I could see was Edie. As I kept walking and when I got to the postal box I tore up the letter and came home with my division even though it meant facing the war in Japan. But 30 days with Edie won out and we were married two days after I came home on 30-day leave.

Masten: And then the war ended before--

Garmezy: The war ended during our honeymoon. We two met in the Hotel Astor and they put down the newspapers and it related the bombing of Nagasaki. We had a very small wedding with just our parents, my best man, Edie's maid of honor, and her folks. That was it. Now so many people think, "Are we ready or should we be ready," or "Do I know this person well enough," and so on. But in the war when you have only 30 days you make the leap and there isn't any time to begin to worry about these things. It has been a great marriage. August 8th is our 50th Anniversary.

Masten: Norm, we're about to close here and I'm wondering when you think about those students in the future who hear about you, your work, and so forth what would you most like to be remembered for?

Garmezy: Well, that has a broad sweep to it. I think that for the most part people don't get remembered for things. I mean it's fleeting, it may cover a ten year span or a fifteen year span and then it disappears. I think that more than what I am remembered for would be the memory of my students. The professor/student relationship is a very curious one, you know, because it isn't like you are undergraduates, you're a graduate and this is the future generation that you are working with and so on. I don't have any thoughts. I think of my students often and what they are doing and have pride in what they are doing and so forth, but I don't anticipate that I will be remembered for anything or if I am it will be mainly via a brief obituary and that will disappear. But I think the memory of students and the party that they gave that time at one of the APAs, that's the memory I will always carry with me.

Incidentally, just for other people who might read or hear this, this is very difficult time in one's life when you know that this is, not that the end is near and death, but that the end is present in what you are going to do or say. You are not going to say anything much anymore and that's kind of a curious thing and I think that, in part, aging is a critical factor because it isn't with ease that you try to come down to try to write something. I don't come down here very often anymore and yet this is the place where I have lived for a long time. So I don't...you know, you don't have any thoughts to pass on and so on. If you have any thought, it ought to be to give your students that are intimate with you a lot of space. Give them space and don't—

Masten: So they can go their own way?

Garmezy: So they can go their own way and be thankful that you were lucky to get into a field where you could be a tutor. I mean it is just incredible. We must keep silent the nature of academia from the rest of the world or they may do something to disturb it. But I think our choice of careers has been just a wonderful choice, and you know, it's just been great. That's really about it.

Masten: So it's your students that you think of yourself when you think of your proud moments?

Garmezy: Yes, absolutely and I sometimes go in the other room because all the dissertations are up there on the top shelf and occasionally you call or a former student calls and you speak. I think that is the tie that remains. You always talk about your mentor. I talk about Elliott Rodnick. I mean, he wasn't a man who wrote very much, but he was a first-rate mind and he knew it. He should be regarded more than he is because he didn't publish much for the amount he did for psychopathology research. His students and his thinking were absolutely first-rate. David Shakow was his mentor and there's this lovely chain, you know, that is part of the whole development of our field picture, and you will be one.

Masten: I'm link from you to your new descendants. The students who are beginning to come out are trained by both of us actually.

Garmezy: It's very interesting. It's family if it's a good relationship that has continuities and so on, and I would really say to you it's not easy to leave the field. It's not really so. There are people who say, "Well, I'm off and I'm having a great time," or "we are going here and we are going there." I don't have that feeling. I'm more nostalgic about my years in it and so on.

Masten: Well, as your student it always seemed to me that you were having a wonderful time.

Garmezy: Well, I think it is a great job and we have to keep it very secret from the rest of the world! There is nothing like it and particularly with a Lifetime Research Career Award, you know, it was just total freedom. I don't know of anybody who had that or that kind of thing. I think it is marvelous to be a professor, but we have to keep it from the outside world. We must not tell them this; we must keep our secret!

Those who inspired and were influenced by Norman Garmezy:

Mentors

Milton Blum
Kenneth Spence
Eliot Rodnick
David Shakow
I. E. Farber
Mednick

Kurt Goldstein

Colleagues

Leslie Phillips

Michael Rutter

Alan Sroufe

Arnold Sameroff

Tom Achenbach

Robert Sears