
A History of the New York Branch of the American Psychological Association, 1903–1935

Ludy T. Benjamin, Jr. *Texas A&M University*

The Eastern Psychological Association (EPA) held its 62nd annual meeting in 1991. The numbering of those meetings began with a meeting of the New York Branch of the American Psychological Association in 1930, but the roots of EPA are much deeper, originating with the formation of the New York Branch in 1903. The branch began as a forum for the exchange of scientific information in psychology in the New York City area. It was initially successful, meeting three times per year for a one-day program, and featured a Who's Who of speakers delivering some of the most important papers in the history of American psychology. After World War I its character, like that of psychology, began to change as the program reflected the growth in applied psychology and the membership began to be dominated by nonpsychologists. Its reorganization in 1930 restored control of the branch to university-based psychologists and reestablished the scientific goals that characterize EPA today.

As the ninth president of the American Psychological Association (APA), Midwesterner Joseph Jastrow chaired the meeting of the APA Council of Directors in Baltimore in December 1900. A principal subject of debate was the location of the APA meetings. Since its organization in 1892, APA had held its annual meetings in Philadelphia (twice), New York (twice), Princeton, Boston, Ithaca, New Haven, and Baltimore, clearly favoring the strong northeastern base of psychology. Complaints about that regional bias came primarily from psychologists from the Midwest who argued that it was difficult for them to attend the meetings on a regular basis.

Two decisions were made at that 1900 meeting to benefit psychologists outside of the Northeast. The first was to hold the next meeting of the APA in Chicago. The second was to propose a bylaw change that would permit the establishment of regional APA groups. At the Chicago meeting in 1901, the following bylaw change was formally adopted by APA: "Local Sections. Members and Associates of the Association living in any center may, with the authorization of the Council of Directors, organize themselves into a local section for the holding of meetings" (Fernberger, 1932, p. 34). Approval was given at that meeting for the founding of local sections in New York, Cambridge, and Chicago ("Proceedings of the Tenth," 1902). The Chicago Branch of the APA was the first to be established, holding its organizational meeting on the campus of Northwestern University on April 19,

1902 ("Notes and News," 1902); it is considered the predecessor of the Midwestern Psychological Association (Benjamin, 1979).

The New York section, the forerunner of the Eastern Psychological Association (EPA), held its first meeting as the New York Branch of the APA on February 23, 1903, chaired by Edward L. Thorndike. A brief announcement of the meeting appeared in the *Psychological Review* ("Notes and News," 1903), and a full description of the program, written by the secretary, James E. Lough (1903a), was published in *Science*.

New York Academy of Sciences

Some psychologists in the New York area had been meeting regularly in a local group since 1896. At the urging of James McKeen Cattell, arrangements were made "for the more formal recognition of the mental and social sciences" ("Notes," 1896, p. 356) by the formation of a section of the New York Academy of Sciences for Anthropology, Psychology, and Philology, divided into anthropology–psychology and philology subsections. Although technically subsections, these new groups were referred to as sections. They met on the fourth Monday of each month, with the initial meeting of the section on anthropology and psychology on April 27, 1896. Sociologist Franklin H. Giddings was chair of the section and psychologist–anthropologist Livingston Farrand was secretary. Cattell, Giddings, Farrand, and Franz Boas read papers at the first meeting ("Notes," 1896; "Scientific Notes and News," 1896).

The anthropology–psychology section met six times a year, alternating months with the philology section, and combined papers in psychology and anthropology at each meeting. Dues for academy membership were high (\$10.00 per year) and few psychologists actually belonged. Psychologists in the academy, concerned about recruiting more members, agreed to hold separate meetings for psychology and anthropology (three each per year), beginning in 1902. This allowed psychologists more control over their program, but the advent of local sections of the APA offered New York area psychologists even greater advantages of lower dues (50¢) and more involvement of younger psychologists and graduate students (Cattell, 1940).

A version of this article was presented as the annual historian's address at the 1986 meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ludy T. Benjamin, Jr., Department of Psychology, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843.

Until around 1920, meetings of the New York Branch were held in conjunction with the psychology group meetings of the New York Academy of Sciences. Following an academic calendar, the branch typically met in November, February, and April. All meetings were one-day events, except for a special two-day memorial meeting for William James in 1911.

The branch used dues primarily for printing and mailing postcard programs announcing the time and place of the meeting, the presenters, and the titles of their papers. Academy section meetings were usually held at the American Museum of Natural History, but when the psychology group began to meet separately from the anthropology group, its meetings were normally held on the campus of Columbia University, and sometimes at the Washington Square campus of New York University. These meetings were always labeled as joint meetings of the academy section and the New York Branch (Woodworth, 1941).

The chair and secretary of the academy section were always either psychologists or anthropologists. When the officers were psychologists, they also held the same positions as officers of the psychology branch; when officers were anthropologists, the psychology branch elected its own officers. The secretary performed virtually all of the duties of the branch, including collection of dues, arrangement of the program, and preparation and mailing of the postcard meeting announcements. Robert Woodworth (1941) described the form of the branch-section meetings:

The typical meeting in the old days (say 1905–1915) consisted of afternoon and evening sessions, with dinner between. At other times, when only an evening session was held at the Museum, the group adjourned to a near-by cafe for free discussion after the formal meeting. (p. 2)

There were five meetings of the academy section between the December 1901 APA meeting that permitted the establishment of sections and the initial meeting of the New York Branch in 1903. It is possible that the branch was planned at one of those meetings, although there is no indication of that in the published minutes. During that time Farrand and Thorndike served as chairs of the section and Woodworth and Lough served as secretaries; thus the branch had strong support in the leadership of the section.

Initial Meeting of the New York Branch

Lough's (1903a) account of that first meeting summarized eight papers, two of which were read by title only. Whether Cattell had any direct involvement in planning that program is not known; however, his influence is obvious throughout. The first speaker was Yale University's Edward W. Scripture, whose "Phonetic Surveys" described the latest technologies for voice recording: phonographs, graphophones, and gramophones.

Scripture was followed by two New York University psychologists: Lough described an illusion of movement in the background of stereoscopic pictures when they were

moved from side to side, and Robert MacDougall reported his research on facial vision, arguing that auditory cues played no role in performance.

Cattell led the Columbia University contingent with a paper that discussed the accuracy with which grades could be assigned in college classes and several methods for grade assignment. Two papers were given by psychologists-anthropologists Clark Wissler and Joseph Hershey Bair of Columbia, both of whom described correlational studies of anthropometric measures in children. The lone graduate student presenter was William Harper Davis, Cattell's student, whose paper, "A Preliminary Report on Tests of One Hundred Men of Science," was read by title only. However, he was able to deliver this paper at the second meeting of the branch two months later (Lough, 1903b).

The other non-New Yorker on the program was Scripture's colleague at Yale, philosopher E. Hershey Sneath. He presented an analysis of psychology over the previous 25 years, calling attention to changes in the nature of training, the differentiation of subfields, and the development of new methods. He also commented on the growing status of psychology among the more established sciences.

Structure and Content of the Meetings

The meeting schedule for the branch changed very little over the next 20 years. The branch kept to its three-meetings-per-year schedule through 1925, even during World War I. The branch's secretaries wrote summaries of the meetings, which were usually published in *Science* or in the *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Method*, and occasionally in *Psychological Bulletin*. All of those journals had some connection to Cattell as either publisher, editor, or founder. It is interesting that no mention of the New York Branch meetings was ever made in the *American Journal of Psychology*. Many societies, including the Chicago branch of the APA, the Western Psychological Association, the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology, and the American Psychological Association regularly published their reports in that journal. Yet the New York Branch was absent, both in terms of a meeting report or even a short meeting announcement. Perhaps that omission was due to the hard feelings between G. Stanley Hall and Cattell that began when the latter was a graduate student with Hall at Johns Hopkins University in the 1880s.

Published accounts have been found for 42 meetings from 1903 through 1925. If the branch met three times as scheduled during each of those years there would have been a total of 69 meetings, which leaves possibly 27 meetings for which there are no published accounts. Eight of those meetings can be confirmed by unpublished documents, but the existence of the others is a mystery. However, it seems likely that they were held and not reported. Only two published accounts of the meetings appear after 1917 (in 1918 and 1921), yet meetings can be confirmed from unpublished sources for every year from 1918 through 1925 except for 1922. Perhaps the secretaries felt

too burdened with other duties to prepare the meeting summaries for publication three times a year.

Table 1 is a frequency analysis of the programs by topic for the first 15 years of the branch (1903–1917), summarized in 5-year intervals. The number of papers in most categories is so small as to make any trend analyses suspect. Still, the declines in philosophy and sensation–perception and the increases in learning and the applied areas reflect broader trends in American psychology during that period. Published summaries or unpublished programs are rare after 1917, making frequency tables for those years difficult to compile.

According to the published and unpublished accounts of the meetings from 1903 through 1925, the format of the meetings remained essentially unchanged from the initial meeting until 1915. The one-day meeting usually involved the presentation of four papers before dinner and another four after. By 1915, the afternoon sessions were no longer held; meetings usually began with a dinner, followed by a session involving two to four papers. The reduction in meeting time may have been due to waning interest in the meetings, or the result of growing concern about the war in Europe. The meetings were in New York City, except in 1903 and 1907, when they were in New Haven, and in 1906 and 1914, when they were in Princeton.

The programs were not arranged around a single theme or even several themes. Instead, the norm was diversity, similar to that exhibited in the program of the first meeting. The two exceptions were a 1911 meeting that featured a number of papers on William James and a 1915 meeting that consisted of five papers dealing with

the conditions affecting efficiency (Poffenberger, 1915; Woodworth, 1911).

One or two graduate students were usually among the presenters at most meetings of the branch, whereas they were not permitted to present at the academy meetings. Among these students was Naomi Norsworthy, who presented her research on mentally deficient children at the March 1904 meeting. Her address, which described the results of the testing of 150 children in state institutions for the “feeble minded” as well as special classes in the New York City schools, was the first presentation by a woman at a branch meeting (Lough, 1904).

The bulk of the program was made up of university faculty members, with the heaviest representation from Columbia University and New York University. Columbia’s Cattell, Thorndike, and Woodworth were frequent presenters. It was at these meetings that Cattell described his research on the measurement of scientific merit, Thorndike described his work on the variability of mental traits, and Woodworth described his work on mental testing, based on the testing program he conducted at the 1904 St. Louis Exposition.

Some programs, such as the third meeting of 1903, held at Yale University in conjunction with the Philosophical Club of Yale, were particularly star-studded. Presenters included Lightner Witmer and seven past or future APA presidents: Cattell, Woodworth, Henry Rutgers Marshall, Charles H. Judd, Raymond Dodge, Robert Yerkes, and Shepherd Ivory Franz. This meeting was also unusual in the number of universities represented in the program: Dartmouth, Yale, Harvard, Wesleyan, University of Pennsylvania, and Columbia.

Table 1
Papers Presented to the New York Branch of the American Psychological Association by Topic (1903–1917)

Topic	1903–1907		1908–1912		1913–1917	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Sensation–Perception	27	31.4	16	18.0	5	7.2
Philosophy	21	24.4	15	16.9	3	4.3
Mental Testing	16	18.6	10	11.2	14	20.3
Educational Psychology	4	4.6	1	1.1	4	5.8
Apparatus–Methodology	3	3.5	1	1.1	2	2.9
Language–Thought	3	3.5	2	2.2	1	1.4
Physiological Psychology	3	3.5	3	3.5	3	4.3
Clinical Psychology	2	2.3	7	7.9	7	10.1
Learning	2	2.3	12	13.5	9	13.0
Memory	2	2.3	5	5.6	10	14.5
Comparative Psychology	1	1.2	2	2.2	1	1.4
Developmental Psychology	1	1.2	1	1.1	2	2.9
Social Psychology	1	1.2	1	1.1	1	1.4
Fatigue	—	—	5	5.6	—	—
Industrial Psychology	—	—	5	5.6	3	4.3
Motor Processes	—	—	3	3.4	4	5.8
Motivation–Emotion	—	—	—	—	2	2.9

The New York City meetings frequently included out-of-town guests on the program. Sometimes these guests were scheduled as part of the branch's program; examples include John Watson's talk on vision and Henry Herbert Goddard's address on the heritability of mental traits, both in 1911. At other times these speakers were part of a university-sponsored program in the city, and their addresses were incorporated into the branch's program; these included Edward Bradford Titchener's lecture at Columbia University in 1908 on the laws of attention.

The early published program summaries included brief abstracts of the talks. Over the years the length of those abstracts increased until they averaged one to one and a half printed pages, yet they contained little more than a description of the addresses presented. Occasionally some of the discussion following the address would be included, even identifying by name participants who raised particular points, but that was the exception. Sometimes the remarks were quite cryptic: The description of Goddard's 1911 address concluded with the sentence, "Considerable discussion followed" (Hollingworth, 1912). One is left to wonder what was said in reaction to his presentation of the data that would form the basis of his book on the Kallikaks, published the following year.

If discussions other than those involving the program occurred, they were never reported in the published reports. Apparently such business activities as the election of officers took place at these meetings, but the secretaries reported only the program. Such a focus was typical of the reports of other academic societies appearing in the scientific journals; however, several of these other groups also reported their business news. Whether the branch was involved in other activities is mostly unknown. Robert Woodworth addressed this issue in a 1925 letter:

Only once, I think, has the branch taken any action aside from its scientific program and the election of its own officers. One time it adopted a resolution in support of some movement or other—something, I believe, in the direction of promoting clinical psychology. The resolution was introduced at one of the regular scientific meetings and passed, and was then used in support of the movement in question. (p. 1)

No trace of that resolution has been found. It is possible that it was a resolution to support the formation of the American Association of Clinical Psychologists in 1917 or its subsequent inclusion within the formal structure of APA. Columbia University's Leta Stetter Hollingworth and several other New Yorkers were prominently involved in that organization and may have encouraged the branch to support that effort (Napoli, 1981). Another possibility is that the resolution supported the New York State Association of Consulting Psychologists, which was founded in 1921 for the purposes of "the promotion of high standards of professional qualifications for consulting psychologists [and] stimulating research work in the field of psychological analysis and evaluation" ("Notes and News," 1921, p. 439). Both Leta Stetter Hollingworth and Robert Woodworth were members of the executive committee of this group. However, if the resolution had been about

this group, surely Woodworth would have remembered it, both because of his direct involvement and because of its recency.

Arguably the most important address presented at the branch (perhaps the most important address ever presented at any psychological meeting) was John B. Watson's "Psychology as the Behaviorist Views It," which was delivered on February 24, 1913. The summary of that meeting did not include an abstract of the paper because by the time the summary appeared, Watson's address was already in print as part of the March 1913 issue of *Psychological Review*. Nor is there any indication of reaction to the paper (Hollingworth, 1913). Apparently people were not lining up to react to Watson, as no related papers were presented in later branch meetings. This lack of published reaction supports Franz Samelson's (1981) conclusions that support for and criticisms of Watsonian behaviorism were slow in materializing. However, Watson's address was not the first discussion of behaviorism at the branch. Columbia's William P. Montague presented a paper on April 24, 1911, entitled "Has Psychology Lost Its Mind?" The meeting summary described that paper as follows:

The movement to dispense with the concept of mind or consciousness and to substitute the concept of behavior as the sufficient object of psychological study was criticized (1) on the ground of ambiguity, (2) on the ground of inadequacy. (Hollingworth, 1911, p. 494)

Montague attacked a psychology that sought to describe consciousness solely in terms of a one-to-one correspondence between stimulus events and motor responses. As in the case of Watson's later presentation, no reactions to this address are indicated, and subsequent programs did not follow up on the theme.

Reorganization of the New York Branch

After World War I, psychology's popularity rose dramatically, leading Canadian humorist Stephen Leacock (1924) to declare that America was suffering from an "outbreak of psychology" (p. 471). Popular magazines sprang up in the early 1920s to sell psychology to the public, and daily newspaper columnists declared that everyone needed the services of psychologists to achieve the greatest happiness and success (Benjamin, 1986). Public demand for psychological services was great and there were simply not enough psychologists available to meet that demand. Consequently, many individuals with little or no psychological training began to advertise their services as psychologists, which led APA to establish a certification program for psychologists in the 1920s. The program certified only about 25 psychologists and was abandoned after a few years. The New York State Association of Consulting Psychologists, mentioned earlier, also attempted to identify qualified psychological practitioners for the public. However, in the absence of any state statutes, this organization, like the APA, was powerless to stop the practice of psychology by individuals with dubious credentials. Not surprisingly, these societal changes affected the New York Branch.

Three Columbia University psychologists served as secretaries of the branch during the 1920s. However, they did not submit any program summaries for publication in the journals, and no unpublished accounts have been found. The only verification of the meetings in the 1920s are some program postcards and occasional references in the correspondence of psychologists of that time. When compared with earlier programs, those of the 1920s show an increase in the presentation of applied research, such as evaluation of military troops, selection of salespeople, and study of human factors in automobile accidents. This shift was to be expected given the activities of psychologists during the war. In fact, applied papers had been increasing in the programs before the war, but that increase accelerated after 1918. This change, coupled with the growth of educational, clinical, and industrial psychology in applied settings, alarmed some members of the branch who felt that the association was in danger of abandoning its original purpose as a forum for scientific exchange.

The most significant change in the New York Branch during the 1920s was in the membership of the organization. Because the branch had no bylaws or membership requirements (other than the payment of dues), virtually anyone could belong to the branch. According to the 1901 APA bylaw change that established the branches, they were supposed to be made up of members and associates of the APA. However, the New York Branch did not conform to that requirement. A membership roll of the branch in 1925 lists 150 members, only 40 of whom also belonged to APA; most of the others were probably ineligible to join APA (see Figure 1). These other branch members were psychiatrists, educators, ministers, sociologists, graduate students, and a large number who cannot be identified. Undoubtedly some of them were laypersons practicing psychology and using their branch membership as a credential.

By the end of the 1920s there was considerable concern among legitimate psychologists over the viability of the branch. Indeed, some of the most visible psychologists in the area had stopped attending the meetings, perhaps because of the changes in membership, but also because of the growing applied and consulting emphases of the program. For several years, Henry Garrett, secretary of the branch in 1929, had difficulty in arranging the program because of growing dissatisfaction among the psychologist members. His frustration was shared by Douglas Fryer (1940a) of New York University, who described the situation as follows:

Those with serious interests in the science of psychology felt that the New York Branch as it was conceived during the previous decade had served all too inadequately the professional interests of psychologists in the area centering around New York City. (p. 1)

In an effort to change this situation, Elaine Kinder (the membership chair) and Fryer (the incoming secretary-treasurer) identified 360 psychologists living within 100 miles of New York City. They mailed invitations as far north as Albany, as far east as New Haven, and as far

south as Philadelphia, for a one-day meeting of an interim organization to be held April 12, 1930, on the Heights campus of New York University. An overwhelming 240 of the 360 who were invited actually attended.

The program for the 1930 meeting consisted of 31 papers presented successively in six sessions. One of the sessions was on applied and industrial psychology and consisted of 5 papers, 4 of them from university professors and 1 from a psychologist with the Personnel Research Federation of New York City. There was also a session of 6 papers on consulting psychology. Of the presenters, three were psychologists, and the professional identity of the others cannot be determined; only one of the six worked at a university. The other sessions were on general psychology, experimental psychology, animal psychology, and child and genetic psychology. All of the presenters in those sessions held university positions (*Spring Meeting, 1930*).

The eight-person program committee for the 1930 meeting was chaired by Garrett and included Clark Hull and Ernest Wever. The program listed the New York State Association of Consulting Psychologists as a participating organization, and that organization was undoubtedly responsible for the session on consulting psychology. Woodworth was named honorary president and addressed the more than 100 psychologists who attended the dinner that evening. It is from this meeting that the current Eastern Psychological Association numbers its meetings.

At the business meeting, Fryer asked the group to decide whether it wanted a scientific organization. A motion to that effect was introduced from the floor and was approved unanimously. It was decided that the organization would be called the New York Branch of the APA and that the group would ask the APA council of directors to confirm its existence, which APA did at its December 1930 meeting.

The group decided to hold annual meetings in the spring. Howard C. Warren was elected president for the 1931 meeting at Columbia University, and an executive committee, consisting of Warren, Fryer, Kinder, Garrett, Hull, and Albert T. Poffenberger, Jr., was appointed to serve until bylaws could be drafted and approved (Fryer, 1940b).

No report of the 1930 meeting was published, but a 21-page report of the 1931 meeting appeared in the *Psychological Bulletin*, marking the first published report of the branch in 10 years ("Proceedings of the New York Branch," 1931). The bylaws of the reorganized branch were unanimously adopted at that meeting, defining much of the contemporary structure of the Eastern Psychological Association. Membership was restricted to members and associates of the APA in good standing who were located within a 100-mile radius of New York City. Nonmembers could attend the meetings but could not present papers unless they were sponsored by a member. Psychology graduate students were encouraged to participate and to become APA associates and branch members.

There was concern among the branch's leadership about the content of the program. It was agreed that in

Figure 1
Program of a 1925 Meeting of the New York Branch of the American Psychological Association

NEW YORK BRANCH

OF

The American Psychological Association

1924-1925

THE NEW YORK BRANCH
of the American Psychological Association will meet on Monday,
April 27th, at 8 P. M., in Room 305,
Schermerhorn Hall, Columbia University.



- DR. LILLIAN M. GILBRETH,**
"Motion Study and Psychology."
- DR. BESS V. CUNNINGHAM,**
"A Report of Studies of Pre-school Children"
- DR. HENRY C. LINK,**
"An Experiment in the Selection of Salesmen."
- PROFESSOR ANATHON AALL,**
"The Problem of Animal Mind."
(Illustrated with lantern slides).
- PROF. W. B. PILLSBURY** will preside.

H. K. NIXON, Secretary-Treasurer,
Columbia University.

MEMBERSHIP ROLL, 1925

The New York Branch of the American Psychological Association

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Harold H. Abelson | B. Goldberg |
| Theodora Mead Able | Edward B. Green |
| *Edith Mulhail Achilles | Henry J. Gross |
| Paul Achilles | Harold M. Grossman |
| Mary G. Allerton | Ruth Lewy Guinzburg |
| Katherine Alston | *J. Victor Haberman |
| Clairette P. Armstrong | *Thomas H. Haines |
| Thaddeus H. Ames | *Frederick Hansen |
| Ann Anthony | George W. Hartmann |
| *Ada H. Arlitt | *†Samuel B. Heckman |
| Harriet S. B. Babcock | Georgene Hoffman |
| Bernice E. Barrows | *H. L. Hollingworth |
| A. G. Batten | Smith Ely Jelliffe |
| *J. Carleton Bell | Thomas Jenkins |
| C. E. Benson | A. M. Johanson |
| *W. V. Bingham | Jane S. Joliffe |
| *†Grace E. Bird | K. S. Kao |
| *Phyllis Blanchard | Harriet H. Keith |
| Frances Blumenthal | C. M. Kelly |
| *Frederick G. Bonser | William H. Kilpatrick |
| Eleanor E. Boyakin | W. B. Kittredge |
| L. S. Brady | Paul Klapper |
| E. M. Burdich | Natalie Kneeland |
| Emily T. Burr | *Christine Ladd-Franklin |
| Leda B. Cady | *Herbert S. Langfeld |
| Fred Caiola | George A. Layng |
| †Edith Carothers | Agnes B. Leahy |
| *†James McKeen Cattell | Kate Lewis |
| *George A. Coe | *Henry C. Link |
| Sidney A. Cook | *†James E. Lough |
| Katharine S. Day | *Howard D. Marsh |
| *Geo. VanNess Dearborn | *Henry Rutgers Marshall |
| Constance Dowd | Dorothea M. Marston |
| Fannie W. Dunn | Warren S. McCulloch |
| Edna J. Fox | Helen Meyer |
| Richard B. Franken | George M. Michaels |
| Max Freyd | *David Mitchell |
| Herbert M. Garn | *Gardner Murphy |
| *Georgina S. Gates | *Sante Naccarati |
| *Arthur I. Gates | †Margaret E. Noonan |
| *Franklin Henry Giddings | G. F. Orphal |
| *Lillian M. Gilbreth | Joseph Millard Osman |
| Charles M. Gill | *Arthur S. Otis |
| Irene L. Glenn | Margaret Otis |
| Bernard Glueck | Alice E. Paulsen |

- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| *John Pickett Turner | *Rudolph Pintner |
| E. H. Tyndale | *A. T. Poffenberger |
| Mary B. M. Uxem | *Louise E. Poull |
| Elizabeth F. Vilkomerson | Dorothy Rennie |
| Elizabeth A. Walsh | *David Edgar Rice |
| *Carl J. Warden | Dorothy C. Rowell |
| *Howard C. Warren | Louise L. Schriever |
| James Weinland | Harry M. Schulman |
| *F. I. Wells | L. Shepherd |
| R. Wells | Myra E. Shimberg |
| *Mary T. Whitley | H. B. Silsbee |
| A. E. Wiggam | P. D. Stout |
| Mrs. A. E. Wiggam | S. A. Tannenbaum |
| *F. J. Woodbridge | Frederick Tilney |
| *R. S. Woodworth | Katherine Treat |

* Member of the American Psychological Association.
† Dues paid 1924-1926.

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers. This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

arranging the annual program, there should be no discrimination between "pure and applied research, but it was to be understood that scientific papers meant experimental results" (Fryer, 1940b, p. 7). That concern was formalized in a resolution unanimously approved at the 1931 meeting:

That no distinction be made in the scientific programs of the New York Branch between pure and applied psychology; that the Association emphasize the presentation of experimental (including mental measurement) research whether performed with pure or applied intent; that research performed with either intent be included in sections arranged according to *scientific* fields of research. To avoid duplication of the activities of the Association of Consulting Psychologists it is recommended that papers dealing with consulting practice be presented at the meetings of that Association or some similar body. ("Proceedings of the New York Branch," 1931, p. 615)

The annual program was placed in the hands of a three-person program committee established by the bylaws and appointed by the board of directors. The bylaws called for the committee to "conduct and supervise the scientific programs of the Branch" ("Proceedings of the New York Branch," 1931, p. 619).

The new bylaws solved the membership problems by excluding nonpsychologists, but they also excluded the consulting psychologists. The New York State Association of Consulting Psychologists was not listed in the 1931 program; there was no session on consulting psychology, nor was there a single presentation by a psychologist not affiliated with a university. The members of the branch had voted to narrow its program domain—psychologists who were not presenting the results of experimental investigations were not welcome. Consulting psychologists withdrew to their own organization.

The reorganized New York Branch of the APA continued to meet once a year in the pattern of the 1930 meeting and to publish reports annually in the *Psychological Bulletin*. The branch began numbering its meetings with the 1932 meeting at the University of Pennsylvania, designating it the "Third Spring Meeting" of the branch. The "metropolitans" (those members residing in New York City) and the "outlanders" agreed that meetings should be held outside the city in alternate years. Accordingly, the group met in New Haven in 1933 and in Princeton in 1935, and in New York City in 1934 and 1936.

The Question of Affiliation with APA

While the branch was in the midst of reorganizing itself to preserve its identity as a scientific association for psychologists, some members were concerned about how best to accomplish that in terms of the branch's relationship to APA. Members who favored identity as a branch of the APA felt that the APA should organize branches throughout the United States, allocating territory to each branch. Psychologists beyond the 100-mile radius of New York City were already complaining about their exclusion from the New York branch when they had no other regional association to which they could belong. Those op-

posing continuation as a branch cited the membership restrictions imposed by APA and the lack of a separate identity for the organization. They noted the decision in 1928 of the former Chicago Branch of the APA to establish itself as the Midwestern Psychological Association, independent of APA and its membership requirements. Other regional groups, such as the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology, had remained independent of APA, and new groups were being established in the 1930s as independent organizations, such as the Psychometric Society, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, and the American Association for Applied Psychology.

The New York Branch acted on the territory issue at its 1936 meeting at Fordham University, changing the name of the organization to the Eastern Branch of the APA. Its territory was to include all of the Atlantic seaboard. The 1936 annual report interpreted the territory as follows: "It may draw its membership from Florida to Canada, and westward to contiguous territory of whatever branch of the American Psychological Association may exist or may be formed" (Rogers, 1936, p. 467). As an immediate result, membership increased from 268 in 1937 to 393 in 1938.

Disagreement about branches of APA led the APA council of directors to discontinue them in 1936. Concurrently, the APA bylaws were changed to allow for the affiliation of regional associations. These regional affiliates were permitted to define their own memberships, but they were not allowed to seek affiliate status unless a majority of their members were also APA members (*By-laws*, 1937).

As a result of the changes, the Midwestern Psychological Association requested affiliation with APA in 1937, which was granted in September 1938 (Olson, 1938). Also in 1938, the Eastern Branch voted to change its name to Eastern Psychological Association, thus establishing an identity independent of APA, although it retained the APA affiliate status it had held since 1930 and continued to require membership in APA for its own members. Thus the New York Branch, in existence for approximately 35 years, was subsumed in the new Eastern Psychological Association, which celebrated its 62nd annual meeting in 1991. That numerical designation begins with the annual spring meetings in 1930 and thus includes six meetings under the title of the New York Branch and two meetings as the Eastern Branch of the APA, yet it completely ignores the 50 earlier meetings that can be documented between 1903 and 1925. Officers of the branch from 1903 to 1935 are shown in Table 2.

Legacy of the New York Branch

Although the New York Branch has been officially extinct for more than 50 years, the philosophy of its founders is very much embodied in the contemporary philosophy of the Eastern Psychological Association. The EPA exists exclusively to conduct annual meetings for the exchange of scientific information. That was the commitment of the branch, and it has been reaffirmed in a number of

Table 2
Officers of the New York Branch of the APA

Year	Chair ^a	Secretary-treasurer
1903-1904	Edward L. Thorndike	James E. Lough
1905	Frederick J. E. Woodbridge	James E. Lough
1906-1907	Robert MacDougall	Robert S. Woodworth
1908-1910	Adolf Meyer	Robert S. Woodworth
1911-1912	Robert S. Woodworth	Harry L. Hollingworth
1913-1914	Wendell T. Bush	Harry L. Hollingworth ^c
1915-1918 ^b	—	Albert Poffenberger, Jr.
1919-1920 ^b	—	F. Edith Carothers
1921-1922 ^b	—	Edith M. Achilles
1923-1925 ^b	—	Howard K. Nixon
1926-1929 ^b	—	Henry E. Garrett
1930	Robert S. Woodworth	Douglas Fryer
1931	Howard C. Warren	Douglas Fryer
1932	Margaret Floy Washburn	Paul S. Achilles
1933	Raymond Dodge	Paul S. Achilles
1934	James McKean Cattell	Paul S. Achilles
1935	Joseph Jastrow	Herbert W. Rogers

^a Title was changed to Honorary President in 1930. ^b Chairs are unknown from 1915 to 1929, however the following were listed as "presiding" at a meeting during that time: Robert MacDougall (1924), Robert S. Woodworth (1925), Walter B. Pillsbury (1925). ^c Served as acting secretary-treasurer during part of 1918.

decisions throughout the history of the branch and EPA (Lane, 1961). Furthermore, both the branch and EPA have fostered the scientific development of graduate students in psychology by encouraging them to present papers at the meetings.

Although other organizations in psychology may have multiple purposes, EPA has adhered to a rather rigid interpretation of its mission in the dissemination of the science of psychology. Like the branch, which defined that mission, EPA has eschewed activities that would carry it beyond its original purposes, with the possible exception of the development of a job placement service. Its adoption of resolutions has been minimal, and most of those approved have had to do with the freedom of scientific inquiry and expression. Like its predecessor, EPA has not seen itself as an organization to engage in social or political activism.

Gorham Lane (1961) understood that the history of EPA included the history of the earliest years of the New York Branch, although his article included only a single page on the branch's history. That brief attention to the branch and the practice of numbering the EPA meetings from 1930 may make us forget the continuity of purpose and setting. The purpose of this article is to expand the historical record and make accessible the history of the New York Branch of the APA.

REFERENCES

- Benjamin, L. T., Jr. (1979). The Midwestern Psychological Association: A history of the organization and its antecedents, 1902-1978. *American Psychologist*, 34, 201-213.
- Benjamin, L. T., Jr. (1986). Why don't they understand us? A history of psychology's public image. *American Psychologist*, 41, 941-946.
- By-laws of the American Psychological Association (revision). (1937). In Willard C. Olson Papers, American Psychological Association Archives, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Cattell, J. M. (1940, February 6). *Letter to Douglas Fryer*. In Eastern Psychological Association Archives, Archives of the History of American Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, OH.
- Fernberger, S. W. (1932). The American Psychological Association: A historical summary, 1892-1930. *Psychological Bulletin*, 29, 1-89.
- Fryer, D. (1940a). *Decade 1930-1939*. In Eastern Psychological Association Archives, Archives of the History of American Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, OH.
- Fryer, D. (1940b). *The social behavior of eastern psychologists: Historical sketch of the Eastern Psychological Association: Decade 1929-1939*. In Eastern Psychological Association Archives, Archives of the History of American Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, OH.
- Hollingworth, H. L. (1911). New York Branch of the American Psychological Association. *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Method*, 8, 491-496.
- Hollingworth, H. L. (1912). The New York Branch of the American Psychological Association. *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Method*, 9, 234-238.
- Hollingworth, H. L. (1913). The New York Branch of the American Psychological Association. *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Method*, 10, 270-274.
- Lane, G. (1961). The Eastern Psychological Association: 1896-1960. *American Psychologist*, 16, 249-255.
- Leacock, S. (1924, March). A manual for the new mentality. *Harpers*, pp. 471-480.
- Lough, J. E. (1903a). New York Academy of Sciences. *Science*, 17, 588-590.
- Lough, J. E. (1903b). New York Academy of Sciences Section on Anthropology and Psychology. *Science*, 18, 81-82.
- Lough, J. E. (1904). The New York Academy of Sciences Section on Anthropology and Psychology. *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Method*, 1, 325-328.
- Napoli, D. S. (1981). *Architects of adjustment: The history of the psychological profession in the United States*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press.
- Notes. (1896). *Psychological Review*, 3, 356.
- Notes and News. (1902). *Psychological Review*, 9, 432.
- Notes and News. (1903). *Psychological Review*, 10, 224.
- Notes and News. (1921). *Psychological Bulletin*, 18, 439, 568.

- Olson, W. C. (1938, October 4). *Letter to J. P. Guilford*. In Midwestern Psychological Association Archives, Archives of the History of American Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, OH.
- Poffenberger, A. T., Jr. (1915). The New York Branch of the American Psychological Association. *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Method*, 12, 243-247.
- Proceedings of the New York Branch of the American Psychological Association, Inc., New York City, April, 1931. (1931). *Psychological Bulletin*, 28, 613-633.
- Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association. (1902). *Psychological Review*, 9, 134-155.
- Rogers, H. W. (1936). The Eastern Branch of the American Psychological Association. *Science*, 83, 467-468.
- Samelson, F. (1981). Struggle for scientific authority: The reception of Watson's behaviorism. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 17, 399-425.
- Scientific Notes and News. (1896). *Science*, 3, 402-403.
- Spring meeting. (Program). (1930). New York Branch of the American Psychological Association. In Eastern Psychological Association Archives, Archives of the History of American Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, OH.
- Watson, J. B. (1913). Psychology as the behaviorist views it. *Psychological Review*, 20, 158-177.
- Woodworth, R. S. (1911). New York Branch of the American Psychological Association. *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Method*, 8, 460-467.
- Woodworth, R. S. (1925, May 8). *Letter to F. Lyman Wells*. In Eastern Psychological Association Archives, Archives of the History of American Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, OH.
- Woodworth, R. S. (1941). *Eastern Psychological Association: Notes on its early history (or prehistory)*. In Eastern Psychological Association Archives, Archives of the History of American Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, OH.

Instructions to Authors

Authors should prepare manuscripts according to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (3rd ed.). All manuscripts must include an abstract containing a maximum of 960 characters and spaces (which is approximately 120 words) typed on a separate sheet of paper. Typing instructions (all copy must be double-spaced) and instructions on preparing tables, figures, references, metrics, and abstracts appear in the *Manual*. All manuscripts are subject to editing for sexist language. Comments should be submitted no later than two months from the date of the issue containing an article on which comment is made. Comments should be double-spaced, limited to five pages, and should contain no more than nine references. As in all manuscripts, authors should include page numbers and references for quotes. Authors should also be certain that their address and phone number appear with their comment.

APA policy prohibits an author from submitting the same manuscript for concurrent consideration by two or more journals. Authors submitting a manuscript previously considered for publication in another APA journal should inform the Editor, who will then seek to obtain independent reviews, thus avoiding the possibility of repeated reviewing by the same consultant. APA policy also prohibits duplicate publication, that is, publication of a manuscript that has already been published in whole or substantial part elsewhere. Prior and duplicate publication constitute unethical behavior, and authors have an obligation to consult journal editors if there is any chance or question that the paper might not be suitable for publication in an APA journal.

All manuscripts submitted for consideration as regular articles are anonymously reviewed. Each copy of a manuscript should include a separate title page with authors' names and affiliations, and these should not appear anywhere else on the manuscript. Footnotes that identify the authors should be typed on a separate page. Authors should make every effort to see that the manuscript itself contains no clue to their identity. Manuscripts for other types of commentary or reporting are reviewed as appropriate to their style and content.

Five copies of each manuscript should be submitted, and all copies should be clear, readable, and on paper of good quality. A dot matrix or unusual typeface is acceptable only if it is clear and legible. Authors should keep a copy of the manuscript to guard against loss. Mail manuscripts to Raymond D. Fowler, Editor, *American Psychologist*, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036. Statements contained in the *American Psychologist* are the personal views of the authors and do not constitute APA policy unless so indicated.

Authors will be required to state in writing that they have complied with APA ethical standards in the treatment of their sample, human or animal, or to describe the details of treatment. (A copy of the APA Ethical Principles may be obtained from the APA Ethics Office, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.)