

Practically human: The pragmatist project of the interdisciplinary journal *Psychiatry*¹

Charles Bazerman

Abstract

The interdisciplinary journal Psychiatry, founded in 1938 by the psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan, provided a remarkable interdisciplinary forum for such outstanding social scientists as Edward Sapir, Harold Lasswell, Ruth Benedict, Gregory Bateson, Ashley Montague, Lev Vygotsky, Erich Fromm, Erving Goffman, A. H. Maslow, and Robert Merton. The journal sought an interdisciplinary synthesis concerning personality, problems of living, and community mental health. Almost all of the major contributors to the early years of the journal drew strongly on the pragmatic tradition. In that tradition, Sullivan saw language shaping the development of personality and the interactions that constitute social life. Major themes of articles in the journal included the relation of personality of culture, the relation of the political order to the psychic order, propaganda and the creation of public and private meaning, racial and gender issues, and social arrangements influencing mental health. While pursuing the many dimensions of being human revealed by the different social sciences, the journal never developed an integrative theory to create a coherence among the many thematic strands and disciplinary perspectives on its pages. The journal also never developed an adequate account of how language served a central role in mediating personality development and social interactions. With the added theoretical and methodological tools now at our disposal we may be in a position to advance the unfinished project proposed by this journal.

KEYWORDS: PRAGMATISM, INTERPERSONAL PSYCHIATRY, INTERDISCIPLINARITY,
RHETORIC OF SCIENCE, LANGUAGE AND PERSONALITY,
SOCIAL FORMATION OF SELF, HARRY STACK SULLIVAN

Affiliation

Charles Bazerman, Chair and Professor, Department of Education, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education,
University of California, Santa Barbara.
email: bazerman@education.ucsb.edu

Introduction

The founding of a new interdisciplinary journal *Linguistics and the Human Sciences* provides the occasion to remember another interdisciplinary journal founded over 65 years ago, in which the founder of linguistic anthropology Edward Sapir and the founder of modern propaganda studies Harold Lasswell took major roles alongside the founding editor, psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan. *Psychiatry: Journal of the Biology and Pathology of Interpersonal Relations* (now *Psychiatry: Interpersonal and Biological Processes*) was directed toward the psychiatric concerns of personality, problems of living, and community mental health, and was grounded in an interdisciplinary inquiry into what it meant to be human. In the pragmatic tradition, Sullivan saw language shaping the development of personality and the interactions that constitute social life. Reviewing the formation and content of that journal may advance the vision of the project of this new journal and suggest the opportunities and challenges of creating an integrated social science. This study will focus primarily on articles in the first dozen volumes of this journal – the first eleven under Sullivan's direct editorship and the next volume before new editorial directions were set – that pursue an integrative social science. Some peripheral attention is given to related editorials and reviews as well as thematic continuities in articles in later volumes.

While the story of *Psychiatry* and its interdisciplinary project is well known and documented within scholarship on Sullivan they are little recognized or discussed more broadly. Even Sullivan's close friendships with Sapir and Lasswell are recognized asymmetrically: well known in the scholarship on Sullivan (see for examples Perry, 1982 and Evans, 1996), but barely mentioned in works on Sapir or Lasswell.² Even within the wider psychiatric world, this interdisciplinary nexus remains well hidden, as Sullivan and interpersonal psychiatry are currently seen as out of the mainstream (see Cushman, 1995: Chapter 7). However, the obscurity of this story is surprising, given the prominence of the authors published in the early years of the journal: Ernest Beaglehole, Ruth Benedict, Abe Fortas, Erich Fromm, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, Erving Goffman, A. H. Maslow, Robert Merton, Talcott Parsons, Lev Vygotsky, and of course Sapir, Lasswell, and Sullivan. This remarkable interdisciplinary nexus expresses an underlying affinity of projects that come out of the American pragmatist tradition as it became translated into academic disciplines and professions, an affinity that flew in the face of the increasing disciplinary isolation of the social sciences.

The differentiation of the social sciences

The history of the social sciences has been primarily one of disciplinary differentiation, definition, and proliferation. Until late in the nineteenth century inquiry into all domains of human life was encompassed by philosophy and its sister philology. Within the last century, however, psychology, economics, sociology, political science, linguistics, communications, education, management and other social science fields have formed their own disciplines, departments, professional organizations, even schools. Much of the work of this separation has been to define boundaries between fields – to distinguish between a psychological and a sociological approach to a problem, to distinguish the data and procedures of political science from that of economics. Most germanely for the readers of this new journal, modern linguistics is often said to begin with Saussure's *langue/parole* and diachronic/synchronic distinctions and his selection of synchronic *langue* as the proper object of linguistic study. This was not because a pure language could be found separate from its uses or from its mutating history (except in the works of linguists, grammarians, and language teachers), but only because Saussure's (1983) moves enabled linguistics to become an autonomous field of study. The imperative of disciplinary autonomy justified the simplification of the object of study.

While there has been in recent decades a renewal of interest in interdisciplinarity (see, for example, the website <http://www.interdisciplines.org/interdisciplinarity>), the strength of disciplines remain strong – with faculty hired into and evaluated by disciplinary departments even though they may participate in some interdisciplinary activity and funding. Historically the moves toward interdisciplinarity have been few and far between. The recently released Volume 7 of the *Cambridge History of the Sciences* (Porter & Ross, 2003) writes the history of social sciences primarily as one of separate disciplines, although they note attempts to overcome disciplinary boundaries between the two world wars, including the interdisciplinary project I recount here (see particularly Ross, 2003: 224–8 and Lunbeck, 2003: 673–5). Other chapters also note that some perceived social projects attract the interests and expertise of several disciplines. However, these problem-based cooperations typically treat the wisdoms of the separate disciplines as distinct resources rather than attempt encompassing visions synthesizing the perspectives and knowledges of several disciplines.

The fate of one of those interwar projects is instructive. In 1933 during the final days of his administration, Herbert Hoover received a report of the President's 'Research committee on social trends', which has come to be known as the Ogburn report. The interdisciplinary committee – an economist, a political scientist, a social worker, a public health expert, and two sociologists – was

charged with providing a 'national survey of social trends' aimed at identifying the stresses of the depression ridden society and providing directions for solutions. This broad, sweeping study (working largely from quantitative, statistical data from each of the disciplinary perspectives) was to be a model of the social sciences working together to address fundamental problems of society. While the impulse to apply social science to national problems has remained with us, the effort has ever increasingly fallen to separate disciplines acting in their separate domain. A volume marking the 50th anniversary of the Ogburn report recounts the developments of social indicators and application of social scientific knowledge, but each within distinct disciplinary traditions with little indication of cross disciplinary cooperation or communication (Smelser & Gerstein, 1986). Even the force of great, complex, multi-dimensional social problems could not hold the disciplines together. The problems were decomposed and distributed to separate disciplines.

The pragmatist origin of American social sciences

Despite the early and persistent balkanization as areas of philosophic inquiry adopted empirical programs to become social sciences, significant strands within several US social sciences had common philosophic roots in pragmatism. The founding pragmatists Charles S. Peirce, William James, George H. Mead, and John Dewey were initially philosophers and their affinity is obvious when considered in their philosophic mode (See for example Menand, 1997). Their related accounts drew a picture of human life constituted through social interactions mediated largely by language use. These creative interactions were motivated by the perceived needs of living and in the process constituted our social relations, socially-embedded personalities and identities, our ways of thought, our understanding and use of language, our political and economic orders.

Yet each of them are now also seen as founding figures within separate social science disciplines: Peirce in semiotics, James in psychology, Mead in sociology, and Dewey in education. As each area of inquiry attended to its separate disciplinary sphere the connection with the others got lost. Further, each of these pragmatist lines of inquiry came to represent only a minority (and therefore weak) tradition within their separate fields. Pierce, overshadowed by Saussure, survives only as an incomplete gesture to recoup a more user-sensitive semiotics. James' psychology was reinterpreted through the behaviorist hegemony that dominated experimental psychology for much of the twentieth century. Mead's sociological influence has come to be seen as limited to the specialized tradition of symbolic interactionism. Yet ethnographic examination of urban life, widely recognized as developing within the influential University of Chicago sociology department, can also be seen within the pragmatist tradition and clearly stands

behind much of modern sociology. And Dewey, though highly influential in educational practice, has little standing in educational research dominated by Thorndike's experimental and testing tradition. (Lagemann, 2000).

Sullivan's pragmatist vision

The project of *Psychiatry* and the interdisciplinary group who gathered around Sullivan draws on this pragmatist tradition. Almost all of them can be traced back to Chicago (where both Dewey and Mead had taught) or founding pragmatists with few degrees of intellectual separation. Lasswell, for example, was an undergraduate and graduate student at Chicago and taught there until 1938. Edward Sapir taught in the Chicago Sociology Department in the late 1920s when he met Sullivan.

Sullivan's initial psychiatric affiliation with the biographical approach of Adolf Meyer already placed him within a pragmatist genealogy (See Leys, 1990 for Meyer's pragmatist influences, especially James), but after he met Sapir the interdisciplinary pragmatist reasoning became more explicitly pronounced. The most developed account of that synthesis is in Sullivan's *Theory of Interpersonal Psychiatry* (1953), compiled from course lectures in his final years. The theory presents psychiatric phenomena as having roots in interpersonal experiences and relationships throughout life which in turn impose difficulties in forging new relationships and shape one's sense of self that informs social behavior. One's ability to interact with others is most fundamentally shaped by relationships with primary caregivers. One's anxiety system, which affects one's ability to participate in and process information from various domains of life, is formed in those early relationships in response to the discomforts and resistances the primary caregiver brings to child-caring interactions. Many of those discomforts of caregivers are in direct response to cultural patterns, expectations, and belief – such as a cultural beliefs in the wilfulness of infants or taboos surrounding certain body parts and functions – which lead adults to be very concerned lest their child develop into a socially unacceptable person. Both anxiety and unfortunate disciplining may result.

One protects this early shaped anxiety system through security operations that defuse anxiety-provoking situations at the expense of limiting one's ability to participate in them. Development, nonetheless, can continue through the social and economic opportunities of one's cultural time and space. Later interactions, moreover, open the door to reformulation of the self, as one finds ways to experience (often in collaboration with a trusted partner who does not share the same pattern of anxieties) those things that were initially anxiety laden. Language provides a major tool in expanding social interaction as well as one's reflexive understanding of the self. Even further, through internalization processes, much

like those described by Vygotsky, language forms the material and medium of reverie processes (similar to Vygotsky's inner speech), which formulate much of the symbolic, interpretive, and evaluative characterizations of self, others, and situations that are typically considered psychiatric material.

Biographical events – both cultural and biological – provide the opportunity for new relationships to form, life horizons to expand, and characterizations of self, others and situations to change. These events also pose challenges to be addressed, for which one may or may not have adequate personal resources. These events include transition through levels of school (themselves culturally shaped institutions with culturally patterned interactions and expectations), the onset of puberty and the pursuit of sexual urges (in part biological, but pursued through culturally shaped activities saturated with cultural expectations, proprieties, and taboos), finding a satisfying and economically viable way of living (shaped by economic and social factors, including one's history within school and community). All such events may lead to greater satisfaction and psychological ease or increasing dissatisfaction, misery, and psychic distress.

This approach to meeting life problems—as they arise in different times, places and cultures and are reached through different life trajectories—opens the door to social, cultural, economic and political analyses of life conditions and problems, as well as of their effect on the formation of personality and individual life competence;³ nonetheless, it does not yet spell out the mechanisms and patterns that concretely play out in life. It does not tell us concretely how personality and culture interact to co-construct each other, how politics and institutions frame life struggles, or how personalities and psyches shape the socio-political order. It does not tell us how economic orders shape life projects nor does it draw a psychiatrically rounded picture of humans as economic actors to replace the reductionist *homo economicus*. These are issues that need their own theories and investigations, carried out by people versed in different disciplines, to develop a rounded picture of human life and provide a balanced guide for our individual and communal practices. Sullivan, though he drew inspiration from other disciplines and his dialogues with social scientists in those other fields, still pursued psychiatric questions to aid the professional practice of providing help to individuals housed in psychiatric institutions or seeking counseling in private practice.

The journal *Psychiatry* was founded to create a public forum that would advance an interdisciplinary public dialogue.⁴ An editorial statement in the opening issue states ambitiously that

Originally a specialization with the medical arts somewhat related to psychology (and thus to philosophy), the psychiatry of today is a growing integration of the biological and the social sciences. (1938, 1: 1, 141)

Further

Psychiatry.... is enriched by and contributes to social science. Medicine, hygiene, philanthropy, education, criminology, penology, religion as a normative influence in life; all of these turn more and more towards a 'rediscovery of the individual,' in the end the study of interpersonal relations in the psychiatric sense. Psychiatry, which finds something useful in each of these activities, has also something to offer, and fair promise of increasing usefulness. (1938, 1: 1, 141)

While it places psychiatry at the center of social science inquiry, it redefines psychiatric inquiry broadly to encompass all inquiry into the nature of human life and relations. This includes biological sciences as well as social sciences.⁵

Personality and culture: psychiatry and anthropology

In this initial issue a related editorial statements concerning the sponsoring institutions of the William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation and the Washington School of Psychiatry elaborate the interdisciplinary agenda. One part of the agenda addresses the interaction of culture and personality:

The inhibitions and facilitations more or less universally effective in any elaborated culture complex tend to minimize the range of persons' differentiation and to stereotype both personal goals and performances for their achievement. The special need of psychiatry is the comparison of life courses that have been studied in this culture with intensive studies of personalities in culture areas widely divergent from ours. (1938, 1: 1, 136)

This concern for studying the relationship of personality and culture is spelled out in the lead article in this first issue by Edward Sapir 'Why cultural anthropology needs the psychiatrist' (1938, 1: 1, 7-12). Sapir observes that the data of anthropology is transmitted through individuals, who despite nominally sharing the same culture have different perspectives on what that culture consists of. Sapir argues that cultures themselves are built on the perceptions and understanding of the varied individuals producing the culture through their actions. Cultural patterns then only arise out of the personalities of the people who carry that culture forward:

We cannot thoroughly understand the dynamics of culture of society, of history, without sooner or later taking account of the actual interrelationships of human beings. We can postpone this psychiatric analysis indefinitely, but we cannot theoretically eliminate it. (1938, 1: 1, 11)

In the second issue anthropologist Morris Opler in 'Personality and culture: a methodological suggestion for the study of their interrelations' (1938, 1: 2, 217–20) points to the epistemological problem of data filtered through persons, who are idiosyncratic, evasive, and contradictory in their actions. Methodologically, he proposes that anthropologists be aware of the psychiatric literature on personality and to move toward a more personalized, individualized mode of inquiry. Dr Opler had been one of the four recipients of a special training grant from the National Research Council to cross train anthropologists in psychiatry, according to minutes of a December 21 1935 meeting of an NRC committee on training fellowships. This meeting was chaired by Sullivan and included such luminaries as Ruth Benedict, Erich Fromm, Kurt Lewin, Adolf Meyer and Sapir. The existence of the grant and NRC sponsorship indicates the depth of this project and that at this time the NRC was interested in advancing an interdisciplinary social science agenda of the sort advanced by Sullivan.⁶

The comparative project of trying to understand the formation of personalities within cultures and the formation of culture through the interaction of personalities defined a major string of articles in the early years of the journal. In the first volume Ruth Benedict reviews the prior literature on the subject in 'Continuities and discontinuities in cultural conditioning' (1938, 1: 2, 161–7). In the second volume political scientist Mousheng Hsitién Lin in 'Confucius on interpersonal relations' (1939, 2: 4, 475–81) provides a thematic exposition of Confucius' teachings. Later anthropologist Weston La Barre presents a contemporary set of 'Some observations on character structure in the orient'. Over three articles (1945, 8: 3, 319–42; 1946, 9: 2, 215–37; 1946, 9: 4, 375–95) he lays out major aspects of Japanese and Chinese culture that impact on personality formation and attitudes toward personality. Sociologist Dinko Tomasic presents two further cases from the Baltic regions: 'Personality development in the Zadruga society' (1942, 5: 2, 229–61) and in 'Personality development of the Dinaric warriors' (1945, 8: 4, 449–93). Psychiatrist Kurt R. Eissler comments on 'Balinese character' (1944, 7: 2, 139–144) through a discussion of material found in Mead and Bateson's (1942) book of that name. Psychiatrist James Clark Moloney provides 'Psychiatric observations in Okinawa Shima' (1945, 8: 4, 391–9) inquiring into the rarity of psychoses on the island despite even the trauma of World War II. Anthropologist John Honigsmann in 'Cultural dynamics of sex' (1947, 10: 1, 37–47) looks at how the sexual impulse is culturally shaped and directed in the Kaske tribe of Athapaskan Indians. To understand the cultural adjustments immigrants need make, sociologist Norman Daymond Humphrey provides an analysis 'On assimilation and acculturation' (1943, 6: 4, 343–5).

The articles recognize not only cultural patterns of personality, but also different meanings and practices concerning problem behaviors or conditions. Anthropologist Ruth Bunzel provides a comparative study of 'The role

of alcoholism in two Central American cultures' (1940, 3: 3, 361–87) based on historically-grounded ethnographic work in Indian villages in Chiapas and Guatemala. In the same issue anthropologist A. Irving Hallowell examines 'Aggression in the Salteux society' (1940, 3: 3, 395–407). This Native North American tribe, long reputed as mild-mannered, has a vigorous aggressive undercurrent played out through gossips, dreams, and sorcery. Another 'Study of a psychopathic personality in Guatemala' (1947, 10: 1, 31–6) by psychiatrist Miguel Molina brings into question Western assumptions about sexual repression. Anthropologist Victor Barnouw interprets 'The phantasy world of a Chippewa woman' (1949, 12: 1, 67–76) in relation to cultural meanings, practices, stresses and problems. Psychologists John and Jean Arsenian examine the different degrees of stress induced by the problems of living in what they call 'Tough and easy cultures' (1948, 11: 4, 377–85). Anthropologist Margaret Mead in 'The concept of culture and the psychosomatic approach' (1947, 10: 1, 57–76) considers the way culture influences the occurrence, organization, and meanings of psychosomatic manifestations. Art historian Ananda Coomaraswamy in "'Spiritual paternity" and the "puppet-complex"' (1945, 8: 3, 287–97) argues even more fundamentally that the interpretation and evaluation of behavior needs to be considered through cultural frameworks, such that behaviors and perspectives considered problematic in one society may be viewed as highly exemplary in others. In one of the few articles reprinted from another journal, psychiatrist J.C. Carothers examines the culturally bound profile of mental illness that occurs under Kenyan cultural conditions in 'A study of mental derangement in Africans, and an attempt to explain its peculiarities, more especially in relation to the African attitude to life' (1948, 11: 1, 47–86). Psychologist Ernest Beaglehole in 'Cultural complexity and psychological problems' (1940, 3: 3, 329–39) argues that cultures are so complex and particular that an external analyst would have a hard time engaging in a therapeutic dialogue with someone from a substantially different culture.

Also of interest to the journal's editors and readership are the means other cultures and societies use to understand and provide for psychological difficulties. Issue 4: 4 contains an examination of 'Elements of psychotherapy in Navaho religion' (1941, 4: 4, 515–23) by psychiatrists H. Alexander and Dorothea C. Leighton as well as 'A study of mental disorder in ancient Greek culture' (1941, 4: 4, 535–45) by psychologist George Kisker. Archeologist Donovan Senter writes a comparative essay showing appreciation for the two professions 'Witches and psychiatrists' (1947, 10: 1, 49–56). In 'Obeah. Magic and social structure in the Lesser Antilles' (1948, 11: 1, 15–31) lawyer, interdisciplinary social scientist, and social affairs administrator Renzo Sereno argues that among poor Caribbean Negroes the magical practices of Obeah draw their effectiveness from standing in opposition to the forms of discrimination

and domination which attempt to suppress it. In its African and slave roots, it provides the strength of personal affiliation and identity.

This interest in alternative views of mental treatment included the Soviet experiment in 'Individualized therapy and socialized living in the Soviet Union' (1939, 2: 4, 525–32) and 'The making of Soviet citizens' (1945: 8: 1, 35–48) both by social worker Nathan Berman. It also included the ways religion addressed mental and social distress. Classicist Robert Casey examines how 'Transient cults' (1941, 4: 4, 525–34) speak to deep asocial impulses without the 'sublimated expressions ... slow assimilation of multiple needs, [and] then integration of desire and knowledge' which characterize more stable religions. (534). Psychiatrist Robert A. Clark examines the attraction and functions of other sects in 'Theosophical occultism and mental hygiene' (1944: 7: 3, 237–43). Priest and psychiatrist Thomas Verner Moore presents the case for religion as a force in healthy psychic development in 'Religion, psychiatry and mental hygiene' (1944: 7: 4, 321–25). Finally, psychologist Eliot Dole Hutchinson considers 'The phenomenon of insight in relation to religion' (1943: 6: 4, 347–57).

Social conditions, social division and social tensions

Editorial statements in the initial issue also link mental health to political unrest and political symbols:

Every established order throughout the world is constantly threatened by collective discontents which may discharge in hostile political action. At any given time, the stresses of the community are potently attracted by certain symbols of protest against things as they are. (1938: 1: 1, 136)

Further social and political conditions are recognized as affecting personalities, just as personalities are seen to influence social and political processes:

Intensive personality study exposes the more subtle, profound, and long range accumulations of stress; but the results of intensive research must be supplemented by extensive research into the short run sources of conflict, such as reductions in employment, reductions in the standard of living, and damage to the prestige of collective national, racial, regional, and class symbols. The study of the personalities who agitate and organize to lead challengers or the defenders of an existing order is one aspect of this research program, linking it tightly with the general course of personality development and deviation. (1938, 1: 1, 137)

This formulation of a research program brings together work of several disciplines, as reflected in the authorship of articles discussed below. However,

the pragmatic concern for addressing social problems brings them together in order to improve our communal existence.⁷

Many articles starting in 1941 address the challenges of World War II and the return to peace—including establishing wartime psychiatric services, selective service screening, healing the psychic wounds of war, and reintegrating returned soldiers into civilian life. By the journal's own count (1947, 10: 4, 433) over 20 percent of the substantive articles in the first ten years were devoted to the war experience. Most were written by psychiatrists providing services or consulting with the military. Particularly intriguing are two lectures on 'The reestablishment of peacetime society' (1946: 9–20; 29–34) by General G. B. Chisolm, psychiatrist and Canadian Deputy Minister of National Health and Welfare. He argues that the future peace relies on developing mature, thoughtful rational human beings who are freed from authoritarian forms of relationships, institutions, and ideologies and are therefore free to enter into the communal solving of problems of living together. Published comments include those by mental health professionals along with such political and governmental leaders as US Under Secretary of the Interior Abe Fortas, Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace, Federal Security Administrator Watson B. Miller; and Anthony Hyde of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

The political order and psychic order

More fundamental questions of politics and personality are within the journal's scope from the first issue, where Harold Lasswell discusses 'What psychiatrists and political scientists can learn from one another' (1938, 1: 1, 33–9). He begins with what every politician knows – that politics is personal, but governance also requires a degree of submission to generalized authority embodied in the law. Consequently political scientists need the wisdom of psychiatrists to examine the psychically potent symbols or propaganda by which individuals are drawn into cooperation with the state and study of the personalities that make for political and administrative leadership. He also notes that psychiatrists gain by understanding the context of the patient's condition including 'insecurity crises of the community as a whole' (1938, 1: 1, 39). Psychiatrists have an interest in advising political leaders on the public conditions that advance mental health; these conditions at the same time advance public order and political stability.

To begin to study the impulses behind political movements that undermine political order, the journal publishes over three issues the dissertation of political scientist Moushen Hsitién Lin on 'Antistatism: an essay on its psychiatric and cultural analysis' (1938 1: 3, 391–417; 1938, 1: 4, 535–59; 1939, 2: 1, 63–97). Lin compares the philosophic traditions that argue for the abolition of the state: Daoism, The Greek Cynics and Stoics, Rousseauianism, Communism, and

anarchism. He then considers the social and psychological conditions that give rise to anti-statist orientations.

Also in the first volume is a study in the pathology of personality and political leadership, 'A case study of a political boss' (1938, 1: 4, 527–33) by political scientist Harold Zink. On the symbolic meanings citizens grant to a leader in contemporary politics, political scientist Sebastian de Grazia collected data from two analysts on the response of thirty analysts to the death of Franklin Roosevelt reported in 'A note on the psychological position of the Chief Executive' (1945, 8: 3, 267–72).

Propaganda, public symbols and personal meanings

The most robust and significant line of political inquiry that appears in *Psychiatry*, however, examines the power of symbols and propaganda in aligning personality and polity, and mobilizing both in war and peace. Lasswell pursues that inquiry in an essay with Dorothy Blumenstock: 'The technique of slogans in communist propaganda' (1938, 1: 4, 505–520). In 'The propaganda technique of the pamphlet on national security' (1938, 1: 3, 421–47) he composes and then analyzes a pamphlet to advance national cohesion, economic independence, anti-monopolism, and democracy in the face of developments in Europe. In the analysis, Lasswell explains the public symbols he deployed in the pamphlet, and how these symbols are embedded in American culture. He also analyzes 'The propaganda technique of recent proposals for the foreign policy of the U.S.A.' (1939, 2: 2, 281–87). In a different kind of application he develops 'A provisional classification of symbol data' (1938, 1: 2, 197–204) for use in analyzing psychiatric interviews. He also makes a more general statement on the role of symbols in bringing together 'Person, personality, group, culture' (1939, 2: 4, 533–61). A decade later, as the Cold War was taking shape, he returned to consider 'Propaganda and mass insecurity' (1950, 13: 3., 283–99).

The sociologist Talcott Parsons also theorized the role of propaganda and public symbols in fostering war and peace. In 'Propaganda and social control' (1942, 5: 4, 551–72) Parsons considers how propaganda influences peoples' definitions of situations, passions, and expectations in response to perceived events, particularly through reinforcement of predispositions. He sees this form of socialization as a way to increase mature commitment to the social order. As the war approaches an end Parsons considers 'The problem of controlled institutional change' (1945, 8: 1, 79–101) particularly to reframe the symbols and propaganda that might make for a more peaceful and stable Germany. In 'Certain primary sources and patterns of aggression in the social structure of the Western world' (1947, 10: 2, 167–81), however, he finds the sources of

aggression in local interactions of family and work, which are suppressed and channeled outward into political aggression.

Other authors examine the power of symbols in both person and culture a variety of contexts. Linguist Stanley S. Newman examines 'Personal symbolism in language patterns' (1939, 2: 2, 177–84). Psychiatrist I. Roxon-Ropschitz looks at disturbed use of symbols in 'The act of deleting and other findings in writings of neurotics' (1946, 9: 2, 117–22), but the communal sharing of personal symbols is found to be therapeutic by psychiatrist Jerome M. Schneck in 'Bibliotherapy and hospital library activities for neuropsychiatric patients' (1945, 8: 2, 207–228) and adult educator John Walker Powell in 'The dynamics of group formation' (1948, 11: 2, 117–24) and 'Group reading in mental hospitals' (150, 13: 2, 213–26).

Cultural practices of symbol use get the attention of anthropologist M. F. Ashley Montague who considers the use of 'Swearing' (1942, 5: 2, 189–201) and the history of 'Bloody' (1943, 6: 2, 175–190) while La Barre documents 'The psychopathology of drinking songs' (1939, 2: 2, 203–12) and sociologist James Barnett looks at the complex meanings enacted by 'Christmas in American culture' (1946, 9: 1, 51–65). The symbols of the Third Reich are examined by psychiatrist Erik Erikson in 'Hitler's imagery and German youth' (1942, 5: 4, 475–493), sociologist Isidor Thorner in 'German words, German personality and Protestantism,' (1945, 4: 4, 403–17), and by philologists Arno Schirokauer and Leo Spitzer in response to Thorner (1949, 12: 2, 185–87).

In a more general spirit, sociologist Alfred McClung Lee 'Public opinion in relation to culture' (8: 1) attempts to come to a more realistic understanding of public opinion as something beyond a technical construct of survey research. As well, sociologist Paul Meadows provides an overview of 'An age of mass communication' (10: 3) and its effect on society. The most thoroughgoing study of the interaction of politics, personality, life problems and language, however, is polymath Sereno's sociopolitical study of the Spanish variant used in Puerto Rico, 'Boricua' (1949, 12: 2, 167–84), particularly in relation to the colonial history under the Spain and then the US. He concludes, 'Language formations directly result from specific political structure and have unforeseen and unplanned consequences, directly affecting the personal adjustment of all the individuals involved in the power process' (1949, 12: 2, 184).

Race and gender in America

Racial, ethnic, and gender divisions in America gain the journal's attention, with a focus on understanding what causes and reinforces the divisions and on the consequences for those discriminated against. Psychiatrist Loretta Bender in examining the relatively greater incidence of 'Behavior problems

in Negro children' (1939, 2: 2, 213–28) finds their causes in social and economic conditions rather than in biological differences proposed by others. Psychologist Margaret Brenman's participant observation study of 'Urban lower-class Negro girls' (1943, 6: 3, 307–24) examines how the young women cope with the dual burdens of class and race. Sociologist Norman Daymond Humphrey in 'American race and caste' (1941 4: 2, 159–64) and 'American race relations and the caste system' (1945, 8: 4, 379–81) applies the concept of caste to understand the character, forms, and consequences of discrimination endured by American Negroes, an idea further endorsed by Montague in 'Race, caste and scientific method' (1941, 4: 3, 337–8). Psychologist John Arsenian considers 'The paradoxical effects of the "quota system"' (1945, 8: 3, 261–5) in producing personality differences that further increase stigmatization. Sereno examines the racism behind hiding one's racial origins in 'CryptoMelanism: a study of color relations and personal insecurity in Puerto Rico' (1947, 10: 3, 261–9). Interestingly, he finds it more of a practice among the middle class than the working class. Psychiatrists Henry Myers and Leon Yochelson in 'Color denial in the Negro' (1948, 11: 1, 39–46) explore the racial prejudice and anxiety that stand behind the great affiliation with white culture of Negro patients hospitalized as psychotic.

Anthropologist Montague over numerous articles looks particularly deeply into the construction of race as a social category, with the consequent social problems and interpersonal difficulties. His first articles in the journal 'Problems and methods relating to the study of race' (1940, 3.4, 493–506) clearly identifies racial division and discrimination as social rather than biological. He further looks into the history of cultural beliefs about 'The myth of blood' (1943, 6: 1, 15–19) with reference to both stigmatization of American Negroes and Nazi claims of Aryan supremacy. In 'The physical anthropology of the American Negro' (1944, 7: 1, 31–44) he examines physical characteristics not as a sign of racial purity, but rather as a mixing of African, European, and native American genetic lines to produce characteristics significant only because they make individuals visible as members of a stigmatized group. In 'Origins of the American Negro' (1944, 7: 2, 163–74) he further elaborates on the complexity of the multiple genetic lines that went into the formation of this new ethnic group of American Negroes. In a related article 'The physical characters of African and other non-American Negroids' (1945, 8: 3, 275–89) Montague surveys the greatly varying physical characteristics of people considered Negro. He further argues in 'On the phrase ethnic group in anthropology' (1945, 8: 1, 27–33) that the term race ought to be banned and replaced by 'ethnic group.' The changes would not only dissolve myths of racial purity and essence but would bring both culture and mutability of cultural affiliations to the center of our discussion of human groupings. In 'The creative power of ethnic mixture,' (1942, 5: 2, 523–36)

he further argues on the basis of review of numerous studies, that for humans, hybridization tends to increase biological fitness and 'ethnic group mixture constitutes one of the greatest powers in the history of [hu]mankind.' (1942, 5: 2, 536). His critique of race presented in these articles six decades ago sounds remarkably modern, particularly as he links 'Anti-feminism and race prejudice' (9: 1, 69–71) and in 'racism and social action' (1946, 9: 2, 143–50) advocates political efforts to bring about legal and educational change to counter racism and its consequences.

While essays on sex differences and sexual mythology in volume one begin from a Freudian perspective, the analysis of women's issues soon also becomes cultural and social. In 'The role of women in this culture' (1941, 4: 1, 1–8) psychiatrist Clara Thompson takes the cultural critique of her women clients seriously, and understands their political action as an attempt to resolve the insults and traumas they receive as being in a subordinated social role. In a subsequent article 'Cultural pressures on the psychology of women' (1942, 5: 3, 331–9) she analyzes how character traits perceived as typically feminine are responses to the cultural situation, subordination, and economic dependence of women. In 'Penis envy' in women' (1943, 6: 2, 123–5) she further argues that the Freudian construct of women's envy of men is caused by cultural subordination rather than biology; the envy is of men's position in society and not their sexual organs. Erich Fromm in 'Sex and character' (1943, 6: 1, 21–31) and Ruth Hershberger in 'Sexual differences and character trends' (1943, 6: 3, 301–5) make similar arguments that perceived differences between men and women had more to do with culture and inequality than biology. Psychiatrist Kate Frankenthal in 'The role of sex in modern society' (1945, 8: 1, 19–25) recounts the particular economic conditions of women in recent centuries. Weigert-Vowinckel examines how the changed conditions of 'Woman in war-time' (1943, 6: 4, 375–9) create challenges and opportunities for women. For some the war is the means to the power and freedom that relieves their prior psychic tensions, while for others it creates difficult to resolve conflicts with their earlier accommodations.

Sociological studies of stress and personality

From early on some studies of social problems were overtly sociological. In the initial issue sociologist Kingsley Davis examined 'Mental hygiene and class structure.' (1: 1), considering the role of normativity and dominant class ideology in forming the criteria for mental disorder, as well as the stresses engendered by class domination and social mobility. Sociologist Morris Gilmore Caldwell provides and annotated bibliography of sociological studies that bear on mental health in 'The sociological tract: the spatial distribution of social data'

(1938, 1: 3, 379–85). Psychologist Nathan Isreali provides a social demographic account of ‘Population trends and the family’ (1941, 4: 3, 349–59). In the same issue sociologist Robert Merton analyzes structural and functional factors influencing Negro-White marriage in ‘Intermarriage and the social structure’ (1941, 4: 3, 361–74). Sociologist Thorner examines the troubled emotional dynamics of one family in ‘Sociological aspects of affectional frustration’ (1943, 6: 2, 157–71) to analyze the role of mainstream Protestant beliefs in creating tensions within the family. Ashley Montague also comments on how cultural beliefs and class issues affect family life in ‘Some factors in family cohesion’ (1944, 7: 4, 349–52).

Anticipating work of decades later, the journal published articles that considered the mental health professions and institutions as themselves social phenomena. In the first volume sociologist Howard Rowland observes ‘Interaction processes in the state mental hospital’ (1938, 1: 3, 323–37) noting that, whatever psychiatric condition patients had on entry, behaviors and attitudes respond to the local social organization and interactions of the institution. The following year he extends the analysis to ‘Friendship patterns in state mental institutions’ (1939, 2: 3, 363–73). Just after Sullivan’s death, but with his posthumous commentary, co-authors psychiatrist Alfred H. Stanton and sociologist Morris S. Schwartz in three articles point to the social shortcomings of the institution that complicate the clinical behavior of patients, lead to misdiagnoses and mistreatment of patients, and initiate further dissociation. ‘The management of a type of institutional participation in mental illness’ (1949, 12: 1, 13–26) studies a repeated pattern of two nurses having conflicting views about a patient, which leads them to interact differently with the patient. The inability to manage the conflict leads to hostility between staff members and excitation of the patient, along with further upsetting behavior from on-looking patients. Unfortunately, confronting the difficulty leads the supportive nurse to withdraw the beneficial attention given to the patient. ‘Observations on dissociation as social participation’ (1949, 12: 4, 339–54) further notes that the patient in the middle of the conflict may suffer dissociation because of the conflicting relations and self views developed within differing interactions with the two care-givers who cast the patient in such different roles. ‘Medical opinion and the social context in the mental hospital’ (1949, 12: 3, 243–9) examines the social conditions in the hospital dynamics and social competences of the doctors that lead to inappropriate decisions, frustration, guilt, production of rationalizations, and further decreased attention to the details of the patients’ actual needs and behaviors. These outcomes all increase cynicism and decrease patient trust and confidence needed for recovery.

The institutions and conditions of American economic life make available particular forms of personal development as well as frame contemporary

stresses and challenges. The initial issue contains psychiatrist Ernest Hadley's analysis of 'Unrecognized antagonisms complicating business enterprise,' (1938, 1: 1, 13–31) and the next contains tax lawyer Randolph E. Paul's exposition of 'Motive and intent in tax law' (1938, 1: 2, 169–79). Psychologist William Line in 'Mental hygiene in industry' (1948, 11: 4, 367–70) examines the organization of work affecting quality of life and mental health as well as providing means for personal development, in ways that rise above immediate corporate interests. Shortly thereafter he writes of 'Anxiety and guilt in the modern community' (1949, 12: 1, 27–35) arising from an exaggerated role granted authority and obedience to it. Sociologist Arnold Green writes of the increased pervasiveness and effects of 'Duplicity' (1942, 6: 4) in contemporary society, driven by the culture of success and heightened by the depersonalization of organizational life. In another analysis of the psychic toll of modern life, 'The "cult of personality" and sexual relations' (1941, 4: 3, 343–8) Green considers the mating practices in an industrial working class community in New England. The effect of economic conditions on community mental health is also examined in theologian Anton T. Boisen's 'Economic distress and religious experience' (2: 2) which looks at the emergence of Holy Roller sects.

Sullivan's editorship: what does it add up to?

Sullivan edited the first 11 volumes of *Psychiatry*, and the 12th remains under his posthumous leadership during the acting editorship of Sarah Tower. On the face the tables of contents of the issues offer, mixed with more typical psychiatric fare, a random collection on all aspects of life. Sullivan's editorial commentary on 'Ten years of psychiatry' (1947, 10: 4, 433–5) reports that about half of the authors were from non-psychiatric professions, including 25 psychologists, 19 sociologists, 13 anthropologists, 7 political scientists, 6 educators, 3 lawyers, 3 social workers, 2 philosophers, and 2 historians. The underlying theoretical justification for this eclecticism is that to understand personality and distress one must examine the conditions, events, and organizations within which people lead their lives. The coherence of the journal is based in a vision of personality and difficulties in living arising within interpersonal relations, which in turn are in the social, cultural, and material conditions of life. Further the journal adopts a pragmatist view that human arrangements are emergent, diverse, and mutable and a pragmatist interest in proposing transformative interventions for social problems to create more satisfactory ways of living.

While Sullivan notes that almost half of the articles of the first ten volumes are directly assimilable into a 'theory of interpersonal relations' (1947, 10: 4, 435) even more are loosely assimilable through the larger agenda reflected in the selection of articles. Nonetheless, there remain questions as to what

theoretical integration would make sense of this diversity of articles. Sullivan's own framing of interpersonal theory remains clearly focused on psychiatric issues of anxiety and self-system. Though we can extrapolate from this theory the interest in culture, economy, politics, society, and social problems, it does not yet integrate those concerns in a coherent interdisciplinary view of life apart from the practical interests of the psychiatric profession.

The challenge of integrative interdisciplinarity

One of the difficulties in framing such a synthesis is giving due attention to both the commonality of human experience and the particularity of each person's experience. Sullivan vigorously opposed psychiatry's attachment to the myth of individuality and an indissoluble, inarticulate personal core. Not only did he see such a core of individuality not capable of being publicly studied and transformed, he saw it operating as a desperate security mechanism to keep the person from anxiety-provoking experiences which might lead to growth and dissolving of ineffective parts of the self-system (see 'The illusion of personal individuality' 1950, 13: 3, 317–32). On the other hand, if the self and personality are formed within interaction, each person's competences, satisfactions, and opportunity are caught up within a historically evolving situation and each person's unique path through life experiences. An integrative theory must provide a rich account of how the commonly human emerges into varied individuals through the complexity of life organization and trajectory of experiences. This tension in saying something usefully general about the particularity of situated experiences currently haunts a number of fields in the social sciences and provides a challenge to effective theory.

This need to forge some integrative theoretical account that encompassed the interdisciplinarity of the journal's early vision is evident in psychologist J. F. Brown's essay in the second issue, 'Freud vs. Marx: real and pseudo problems distinguished' (138, 1: 2, 249–55). It also is evident in Beaglehole's 'Interpersonal theory and social psychology' (1941, 4: 1), which attempts to integrate psychiatry, psychology, and sociology, and in his 'Character structure' (1944, 7: 2) which offers an approach to personality that is equally individual and social. In volumes 12 and 13 others take up the attempt to synthesize an interdisciplinary theory. Philosopher Benjamin Wolstein looks back to the founding pragmatist vision in an examination of 'Dewey's theory of human nature' (1949, 12: 1, 77–85). Wolstein emphasizes Dewey's functional understanding of habits, on both the individual and social level, as well as the role of values, acculturation, education, and reflective intelligence in changing habits and thus the organization of life. While the focus here is primarily psychological, the analysis does

open up to more social and cultural forms of organization operating on the same level as the organization as the individual. Psychologist John Money, still a graduate student, ambitiously takes on 'Unanimity in the social sciences with reference to epistemology, ontology, and scientific method' (1949, 12: 3, 211–21). He focuses on interpersonal feedback systems operating in six dimensions, from social aggregation to bodily metabolism.

Juergen Ruesch and Gregory Bateson provide a more thoroughly interdisciplinary synthesis in 'Act, structure and process in social relations' (1949, 12: 2, 105–24). They frame an account of the human interacting within a total societal system (which they parse into eleven components from geography to acculturation to degree and information about cultural change). The individual actor is also systematically organized (again parsed into seven components from biological state patterned behaviors and perception to flexibility). Further, interaction itself is organized (parsed into eleven components from rules to signs to interaction processes). Each of these three major systems incorporates both change and reflexive understanding about change.

Despite these attempts, no robust shared interdisciplinary vision emerged to inform the coherence of the journal. Without such an integrative standpoint from which to frame the coherence of the journal and without the guiding hand of Sullivan, the next permanent editor Mabel Blake Cohen in Volume 13 began narrowing the focus out of a concern about a 'kaleidoscopic loss of form and definition' that arose from unchecked eclecticism. The journal nonetheless remained open to occasional interdisciplinary contributions. Most notably, the journal published four of Erving Goffman's major early papers: 'On cooling the mark out' (1952, 15: 4, 451–63); 'On face-work' (1955, 18: 2, 213–31); 'On some convergences of sociology and psychiatry' (1957, 20: 2, 201–3); and 'The moral career of the mental patient' (1959, 22: 2, 123–42). Nonetheless Mabel Cohen's editorial comment on 'Psychiatry's twentieth anniversary' (1957, 20: 4, 399–400) gives scant mention to interdisciplinarity, commenting only on the revival of humanistic approaches to behavior, particularly represented by Martin Buber's recently published three lectures – 'Distance and relation' (1957, 20: 2, 97–104); 'Elements of the interhuman' (1957, 20: 2, 105–13); and 'Guilt and guilt feelings' (1957, 20: 2, 114–29). There was a similar waning of attention to social problems as the journal became, in the words of the editor at the fortieth anniversary Gloria Parloff 'much less sanguine now than it was 30 or 40 years ago about the magnitude of effects that psychiatric insights and techniques are likely to have on the social and political ills of mankind' (1977, 40: 1, 99). Parloff also provides a sample of the varying editorial choices in each decade of the journal, confirming the residual, but clearly decreasing interdisciplinarity.

One major attempt to keep the interdisciplinary project alive is Leonard Cottrell's essay on 'George Herbert Mead and Harry Stack Sullivan: An unfinished synthesis' (1978, 41: 2, 151–63). Cottrell emphasizes the concept and formation of the self within social interaction, as articulated by both authors, as well as their approaches to the underspecified issue of empathy in interaction. He appends essays by Mead and Josiah Royce (one of Mead's teachers) on self-formation and self-consciousness (1978, 41: 2, 164–83).⁸

Recently the interdisciplinary project has another attempt at renewal with the republication of three integrative essays of Sullivan, Sapir, and Lasswell from Volume 1 Number 1: 'Psychiatry: introduction to the study of interpersonal relations' (republished 2000, 63: 2, 113–26); 'Why cultural anthropology needs the psychiatrist' (republished 2001, 64: 1, 2–10); and 'What psychiatrists and political scientists can learn from one another' (republished 2001, 64: 2, 184–91). Each is accompanied by an interdisciplinary cluster of comments examining the current value of the articles and state of the issues they raise. In recent years, articles in the journal from outside psychiatric specialties are also often accompanied by psychiatrists' comments to identify the interest and validity of the work from the perspective of psychiatry, and to identify areas of common concern. For example sociologist Thomas Scheff's 'Shame and community: social components in depression' (2001, 64: 3, 212–24) is followed by four psychiatric commentaries (2001, 64: 3, 225–47).

And where does language fit?

With language taking a key role in the work of Sullivan and his two closest interdisciplinary collaborators, Sapir and Lasswell, and with language so central to social formation and thought in the underlying pragmatist theories of Mead and Dewey (although, Sullivan and his group appear not to pay any attention to Peirce) it is appropriate to ask what attention the journal plays to language. One might think it played a central role, especially since the journal published the first translation from Vygotsky's *Thought and Speech* into English, in the form of the final chapter (1939, 2: 1, 29–52) with a brief comment by Alexander Luria (1939, 2: 1, 53–4).⁹

Although language does appear, most frequently as the medium of propaganda and public symbols, it does not take a central role. The concreteness of language and linguistic analysis fades quickly into the symbols, meanings, and thoughts it is taken to represent. That mentalization of language and the meanings it carries is a weak point in the attempt to stay focused on the public and interpersonal. The inability to hold language concretely in focus may have several causes. First the mechanical, intellectual and analytic tools we now have available to support microanalysis of real language in use were not available at

that time; we start to see a microanalytic approach with Goffman's articles in the second decade of the journal. Secondly, the available approaches to language and semiotics were broadly Saussurean in looking for systems of expression and meaning rather than looking for the unfolding of meaning in interaction. Almost every one of the articles that touches on language either assumes or looks for stable sets of meanings embodied in a symbolic system rather than looking toward the utterance as a fundamental unit. Thus in the difficult yoking of understanding human interaction without myths of irreducible individuality with the particularities of situations and the mutable local congeries of social system, the approach to language only offered, on the one hand, models of the acculturating of people into systems of language and meaning, and, on the other, the recognition of idiosyncrasy of language of those who because of troubled self-systems and anxiety are insufficiently integrated into common use and publicly shared language.

Finally, while Vygotsky's work clearly was of interest to Sullivan and his colleagues, the chapter from *Thought and Speech* appears as an unassimilated outlier, truly a report from another country. Even if Sullivan and his colleagues had access to and understood the whole Vygotsky corpus and not just the fragment of a chapter, they still could not have gotten close to the kind of account of language they needed. While Vygotsky opens up a richer account of the development of interpersonal and intrapersonal mind through language interaction, with full awareness of both the commonness of our processes and the particularity of our social experiences (especially evident in his work on defectology), his linguistics is also not developed and uses conventional assumptions about the structure and stability of language. It is only with the admixture of Volosinov's and Bakhtin's views about utterance and emergent language understanding, do we start to get a view of language that has the possibility of being deeply consistent with the pragmatists' vision of emergent life forms in a world of constant human experiment.

Now, over half a century later, as we have new tools to examine flexible and creative language within emergent human activities and we have concepts to match, we also have begun gathering enough data to start seeing the unfolding of interactions, events, relations, socially organized complexes, and systems through language. We also are starting to collect enough data about individuals' development of language resources and practices over the course of their lives to understand the development of the personality dynamically in relation to participation in language situations people find themselves in. In writing studies, with which I am most familiar, we are developing both longitudinal studies that reveal language development as socialization and historical studies that trace the emergence of writing-mediated social systems, so that we can begin to see the life possibilities that people can pursue through available forms of

literate interaction. The time might finally be ripe to explore the nexus of human social life, as parsed by the social sciences, but as held together in the evanescent interaction mediated by language. Language, that filmy, dissolvable glue of interaction, may be a key place to look to understand how life seems to all hold together in the moving wave front of the moment, which leaves behind it only what we take away in artifacts, experience, memory, and changed practice.

Notes

- 1 I appreciate the able assistance of Nicole Merino in gathering and organizing materials for this study.
- 2 The primary exception is the attention Sullivan's project gets within mid-century social psychology as indicated by citations in the textbooks of Shibutani (1961) and Lindesmith and Strauss (1949). The recognition here, however, is only for specific findings and ideas instead of being at an interdisciplinary nexus.
- 3 For Sullivan's essays that most explicit address interdisciplinarity see the collection *The Fusion of Psychiatry and Social Science* (1964).
- 4 For the business and administrative side of the journal's history and the sponsoring Washington School of Psychiatry, see Prince, 1972; Rioch, 1986; Bever, 1993; Saxton, 2002; and Frederickson 2002. For snapshots of the interdisciplinary thinking of the group gathering around Sullivan a decade before the founding of the journal in relation to psychiatry see American Psychiatric Association (1929; 1930), and in relation to sociology, see Young (1927).
- 5 Naoko Wake is examining Sullivan's relations to the physical and biological sciences in her dissertation in progress in History at Indiana University. I also acknowledge her generous suggestions.
- 6 See also the agenda of the 8 February 1936, meeting of the Board of Trustees of the William Alanson White Foundation, at the Shoreham Hotel Washington DC, to which is attached the curriculum and NSF proposal to establish a three-year post doctoral curriculum for four fellows (Archives of the Washington School of Psychiatry). In these archives is also another undated proposal signed by Sapir, Lasswell, and Sullivan, for an Institute on Ethnic Psychiatry which would focus on comparative culture studies of disorders of adolescence, political discontent and field studies of culture, using the methods of psychoanalysis, bioanalysis and sociopolitical analysis.
- 7 See also Horace G. Miller 'Psychiatry and social change' (1943, 6: 1, 33–5).
- 8 See also Cottrell and Foote (1952) for a related consideration of Sullivan's contributions to social psychology. In the same volume Johnson (1952) spells out Sullivan's contributions to sociology. A book length sociological perspective on Sullivan is provided by Blitstein (1953).
- 9 One of the three translators of this chapter, Eugenia Hanfmann was later co-translator for the first full English edition of the book published in 1962. Luria's note also mentions that Jacob Kasanin, another of the translators had the opportunity to meet Vygotsky. For further discussion of Sullivan's contact with Vygotsky's ideas see Bazerman (2001).

References

- American Psychiatric Association (1929) *Proceedings: first colloquium on personality investigation*. Lord Baltimore Press.
- American Psychiatric Association (1930) *Proceedings: second colloquium on personality investigation*. Johns Hopkins Press.
- Bateson, G. and Mead, M. (1942) *Balinese Character: a photographic analysis*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Bazerman, C. (2001) Anxiety in action. *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 8: 174–86.
- Bever, C. T. (1993) Collaboration and conflict: Ernest Hadley and Harry Stack Sullivan, 1930–1945. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis* 21: 387–404.
- Blitstein, D. R. (1953) *The Social Theories of Harry Stack Sullivan*. New York: William Frederick Press.
- Cottrell, L. S. and Foote, N. F. (1952) Sullivan's contribution to social psychology. In P. Mullahy (ed.) *The Contributions of Harry Stack Sullivan* 181–205. New York Hermitage House.
- Cushman, P. (1995) *Constructing the Self, Constructing America*. Reading MA: Addison Wesley.
- Evans, F. B. (1996) *Harry Stack Sullivan: interpersonal theory and psychotherapy*. London: Routledge.
- Frederickson, J. (2002) An interview with Gloria and Morris Parloff. *Psychiatry* 65: 103–9.
- Johnson, C. F. (1952) Harry Stack Sullivan's contribution to sociology. In P. Mullahy (ed.) *The Contributions of Harry Stack Sullivan* 207–14. New York: Hermitage House.
- Lagemann, E. C. (2000) *An Elusive Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leys, R. (1990) A biographical note. In R. Leys and R. Evans (eds) *Defining American Psychology* 39–57. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lindesmith, A. and Straus, A. (1949) *Social Psychology*. New York: Dryden Press.
- Lunbeck, E. (2003) Psychiatry. In T. Porter and M. Ross, D. (eds) *The Modern Social Sciences. The Cambridge History of Science*. Vol. 7 663–77. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Menand, L. (ed.) (1997) *Pragmatism: a reader*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Perry, H. S. (1982) *Psychiatrist of America: the life of Harry Stack Sullivan*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Porter, T. M. and Ross, D. (eds) (2003) *The Modern Social Sciences. The Cambridge History of Science*. Vol. 7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prince, W. G. (1972) *The Washington School of Psychiatry: history 1936–1956*. Typescript. Archives of the Washington School of Psychiatry.
- Ross, D. (2003) Changing contours of the social science disciplines. In T. Porter & M. Ross, D. (eds) *The Modern Social Sciences. The Cambridge History of Science*. Vol. 7 205–37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rioch, M. (1986) Fifty years at the Washington School of Psychiatry. *Psychiatry* 49: 33–44.
- de Saussure, F. (1983) *Course in General Linguistics*. Trans. Roy Harris. LaSalle, IL: Open Court.
- Saxton, C. (2002) Helen Swick Perry. *Psychiatry* 65: 58–9.
- Shibutani, T. (1961) *Society and Personality*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Smelser, N. J. and Gerstein, D. R. (eds) (1986). *Behavioral and Social Science: 50 years of discovery*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.
- Sullivan H. S. (1953) *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry*. New York: Norton.
- Sullivan H. S. (1964) *The Fusion of Psychiatry and Social Science*. New York: Norton.
- Young, K. (1927) Topical summaries of current literature: Personality studies. *American Journal of Sociology* 32: 953–71.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962) *Thought and Language*. Trans. E. Hanfmann and G. Vakar. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

The interdisciplinary journal *Psychiatry*, founded in 1938 by the psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan, provided a remarkable interdisciplinary forum for such outstanding social scientists as Edward Sapir, Harold Lasswell, Ruth Benedict, Gregory Bateson, Ashley Montague, Lev Vygotsky, Erich Fromm, Erving Goffman, A. H. Maslow, and Robert Merton. The journal sought an interdisciplinary synthesis concerning personality, problems of living, and community mental health.Â @article{Bazerman2007PracticallyHT, title={Practically human: The pragmatist project of the interdisciplinary journal *Psychiatry*}, author={C. Bazerman}, journal={*Linguistics and The Human Sciences*}, year={2007}, volume={1}, pages={15-38} }. C. Bazerman. Published 2007. *Sociology*. What if Discipline Is Not Interdisciplinary? The Case of Social Psychology in India. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, Vol. 53, Issue. 3, p. 504.Â *Journal of Educational Thought* 29: 121â€“28. Nissani, Moti (1997) â€œTen cheers for interdisciplinarity: The case for interdisciplinary knowledge and research.â€ *Social Science Journal* 34: 201â€“16. Peters, Julie Stone (2005) â€œLaw, literature, and the vanishing real: On the future of an interdisciplinary illusion.â€ *PMLA* 120: 442â€“53. Pfirman, Stephanie L., Collins, James P., Lowes, Susan, and Michaels, Anthony (2005) â€œCollaborative efforts: Promoting interdisciplinary scholars.â€