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At the time of its inception every scientific journal is a new journal, and its future course is in doubt. Does it have a functional niche in the scientific community, and will it survive? Later, when the new journal is taken for granted by the younger generation of scientists, the question of what conditions led to the establishment and maintenance of the publication arise. This historical review addresses these issues for the first five volumes of The Psychological Record. The Record was founded to decrease publication lag at a time when American psychology was expanding rapidly just before the onset of World War II. Although the Record was immediately successful, the wartime diversion of psychological energies to war-connected activities greatly diminished the submission of manuscripts, and concomitant wartime paper rationing led to suspension of publication with Volume V. The careers of those persons who participated as editors for the first five volumes are evaluated, and it is concluded that they were of extremely high quality. Indeed, many became exceptionally well
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known both within and outside of the field of psychology. The contents of those volumes are evaluated in a summary fashion. Certain of the papers are seminal in specific psychological traditions, and the authors of these must be regarded as significant representatives of scientific developments within psychology. After World War II ended, a new, younger, generation of psychologists resumed publication of *The Psychological Record*, and it has become a prominent feature of scientific American psychology in the second half of the twentieth century.

American psychology has grown at a prodigious rate since the latter half of the 19th century when it began to become an independent academic discipline. The first journal devoted to psychology (the *American Journal of Psychology*) was founded by G. Stanley Hall in 1887; however, by 1990 well over 1400 publications were being covered by *The Psychological Abstracts* (Popplestone & McPherson, 1994). In 1997, the 60th year of publication of *The Psychological Record* (Record), it is appropriate to pause, document the origins, and state the past and present purposes of this journal as well as to evaluate its success in fulfilling those stated purposes. The Record began publication in 1937 and ceased with the completion of its fifth volume in October 1945. Conceived and inaugurated to “help in reducing the long publication lag and the cost accruing to authors” (Volume I, p. 2), it was suspended because “war conditions” had “enormously curtailed the work of psychologists” and “the original motive for establishing the RECORD no longer exists” (Volume V, p. 354).

The approximate position of the Record within the historical continuum of journal proliferation may be represented by the ordinal number 26. At any rate, that is the chronological position assigned to the Record by the unknown author of “The Growth of Psychological Journals in America” (Anonymous, 1943). And, the Record was then the new journal, since that unknown author’s enumeration ceased with it.

Now, with the broad historical background in place it is appropriate to examine the founding of the Record in some detail.

The Principia Press

On Friday evening, October 21, 1932 four Indiana University faculty and a philosopher of science (who then held no academic position) unanimously adapted a set of nine by-laws which formally established a corporation entitled “The Principia Press, Inc.” (Press). Each of them was then elected to an office as here listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Arthur F. Bentley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Jacob R. Kantor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Harold T. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>Fernandus Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Bernard C. Gavit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Later brochures claimed the Press had been in existence since 1931, but the rough draft and the polished copy of the minutes of this meeting in 1932 are the earliest documents we have been able to locate.

The establishment of the Press is germane to a history of the early years of the Record because the first five volumes were published under the logo of the Press. Hence, each of these men is worthy of some notice. We shall discuss each in terms of their professional achievements, stressing their importance in the history of what may be loosely termed “psychology,” (including science in general and the philosophy of science), and do this in the order of their appearance on the list of officers.

**Principia Press Officers**

Arthur F. Bentley (1870-1957) received his BA and PhD from Johns Hopkins University. The PhD is worthy of note because it is one of (if not actually the first) PhD in sociology granted by that, or any other, university. However, except for one year as a Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Chicago (1895-96) and a visiting lectureship in Columbia University’s Philosophy Department (1941-42) he held no academic positions. Since 1911 he had lived the life of a gentleman farmer and independent scholar at Paoli, Indiana. However during the 41 years between the publication of his PhD dissertation under the title of *The Process of Government* (widely regarded as a classic in the field of political science) in 1908 and his coauthorship with John Dewey of *Knowing and the Known* in 1949, he published three scholarly books and numerous papers in philosophy. In these papers he praised Kantor for his departure from conventional psychological doctrines. Of the books, *Linguistic Analysis of Mathematics* (1932) is most worthy of note because in it he criticized the Whitehead and Russell (1910-12) position that there was a rigid hierarchy of sciences ranging from the basic, independent, mathematics and physics to the dependent ones of psychology and sociology. Bentley and Kantor both held firmly to the position that there were a number of independent sciences. It should also be noted that Bentley stated very early on that the only actual thing the word mind could refer to was behavior (Bentley, 1908). (See Lavine, 1995 for a brief overview of Bentley’s career.)

Jacob Robert Kantor (1888-1984) may seem to need no introduction; he is the founding Editor of the Record. However, the purpose of this paper is to record historical events and thus to provide orientation for future scholars. After earning both his PhB and PhD at the University of Chicago (Mountjoy & Cone, 1995; Mountjoy & Hansor, 1986; Wolf, 1984) Kantor accepted a faculty appointment at Indiana University, where he remained until retirement. He then returned to Chicago and continued to be an active and productive scholar until his death. Kantor called the organizational meeting of the Press to order, and by the time of his death he was, in effect, its sole proprietor. By 1932 Kantor had already published his two volume *Principles of Psychology* (1924, 1926) and his *An Outline of Social Psychology* (1929) as well as 44 articles and book chapters.

The early behavioral revolutionaries were a small and closely knit
group. Indeed, in 1925 Weiss expressed his appreciation to K. S. Lashley, J. R. Kantor, and W. S. Hunter. (See p. viii of the second edition, 1929, where this preface to the first edition is reprinted.) It was widely believed at that time that Lashley was the preeminent living psychologist. Weiss' *A Theoretical Basis of Human Behavior* has many similarities to Kantor's *Principles*. For purposes of this paper the fact that Weiss did not attempt to explain behavior solely by means of neural mechanisms must suffice. However, in Volume II of his *The Scientific Evolution of Psychology*, Kantor (1969) quotes Weiss' "One Set of Postulates For Psychology" (pp. 362-364). These had been presented on pages 427-433 in the final chapter of Weiss (1929), and it should be noted carefully that Weiss is the only behavioristic psychologist whom Kantor discussed in a detailed positive fashion in his historical analysis of behaviorism in his 1969 treatise. (See Bloomfield, 1931; Elliott, 1931; and Renshaw, 1932 for obituaries of Weiss.)

Harold T. Davis (1892-1974) received his MA from Harvard and his PhD at the University of Wisconsin. Professor of Mathematics at Indiana University, he had been a successful author of books in his field since 1926 and was associate editor of several mathematical journals. Later he wrote in history and philosophy. He left Indiana for Northwestern University and was chair of the department of mathematics there for many years. He was the author of the first book published by the Press (Davis, 1932).

Fernandus Payne (1881-1977) had received his PhD from Columbia in 1909 and, after arrival at Indiana, was successively Head of the Zoology Department, Dean of the Graduate School, and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. While at Columbia he was in the forefront of pioneering genetic research, and he began publishing papers in biological journals in 1906 (before his PhD was granted). He is most well known outside of biological circles for his *An Open Letter to College Teachers* (published by the Press in 1935).

Bernard C. Gavit (1893-1954) was Dean of the Indiana University College of Law from 1933 to 1951. He served as General Counsel for the War Manpower Commission in Washington, DC from July 1, 1942 to July 1, 1943. Thus, his career was distinguished both in academia and in the actual practice of law.

These, then, were the founders of the Press in 1932, which was to publish the Record some five years later. Kantor was the only psychologist, although Bentley had published philosophical papers with some comments about psychology. All were active scholars at the time that the Press was established.

*Principia Press Activities*

The Press was established to allow scholars to publish books at very low cost. In the depths of the depression, which developed following the stock market crash of 1929, established publishers were loath to venture capital upon works with scant probability of financial success. Surviving
documents of the Press indicate that even prior to the meeting of incorporation there was negotiation underway upon a contract with the geologist J. J. Galloway (1882-1962) and the Kemp Memorial Fund at Columbia University to publish his *A Manual of Foraminifera* (1933) which was to become a classic in modern stratigraphy. Indeed, Galloway was the first to expand Mantell's early nineteenth century invention of stratigraphy with its basis in multicellular organisms to the unicellular kingdom by his work with the foraminifera. This had enormous utility in the exploitation of petroleum deposits.

Shortly after the formal incorporation meeting (February 22, 1933) the Press signed a contract with The American Association for the Advancement of Science to publish *The Stabilization of Employment*, edited by C. F. Roos. These examples indicate the important role of the Press during its early years. Many other works by individuals not members of the corporation were also published so that it was truly a cooperative press which served a wide community of scholars during difficult financial times. By January, 1933 the Press had published a total of five books.

The following summary of the career of the Press has been abstracted from the surviving documents on file at the Akron and Indiana Archives. The "Balance Sheet" dated March 13, 1933 (about six months after formal incorporation) lists 12 books by 11 authors, and 7 of these authors were not members of the Press. A brochure dated November, 1935 (the Press was about three years old) lists 23 books and also agents in New York, Tokyo, London, Shanghai, The Hague, and Colorado Springs. The books themselves are varied in topic, but they tend to be technical in nature (for example, the first listed is *The Calculation of the Orbits of Asteroids and Comets* (Williams, 1934). Hardly destined to become a best seller, its merit is indicated by the appearance of a second edition in 1943. Another brochure, which is called a "Supplementary List of Publications," is dated 1945 and lists 13 books. A final, undated brochure probably dates from 1947 and lists 37 titles (if two volume works are counted as two books, there are 41 volumes). The subject matters range from archaeology to statistics. It is obvious that the Press was not operated simply to serve as a publication outlet for its membership, but was intended to serve as a cooperative publisher for competent scholars in any field of human intellectual endeavor. And, we add, for books which could hope for only limited sales, not the sort of thing which would earn piles of money for the author and publisher.

Indeed, the officers of the corporation received no remuneration. The financial arrangements were essentially straightforward: The author (or as in the cases of Galloway and Roos, an organization) provided the amount required to print a given number of volumes (usually $1,000.00), and the Press recovered costs from sales. Once the cost had been recovered, the author and the Press split additional income over and above costs from the sales of any further copies.
In about 1951 Davis and Kantor divided the Press between them (documentation on this is sparse and that action is presumably largely irrelevant to the current report, because the Record suspended publication in 1945).

*The Psychological Record*

No documentation relevant to the first five volumes survive in Kantor’s personal papers in the Archives at the University of Akron or at Indiana University. Therefore we rely upon the published issues. Page 2 of Volume I contains the following statement of purpose:

The Principia Press, Inc., has undertaken the publication of this cooperative journal to afford authors the opportunity of immediate publication at the least possible expense. The present low cost of publication, and possible future reductions, depend entirely upon the number of subscriptions. The subscription price has been made low to induce individuals to subscribe. Under the Articles of Incorporation of the Principia Press no profit can be made on any of its publications. Therefore an increase in the number of subscribers will be reflected in reduced costs to authors and in increase in the number of pages published annually.

*Editorial Staff*

The same page lists the staff of the new journal as here reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>J. R. Kantor</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Editor</td>
<td>C. M. Louttit</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Editors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal</td>
<td>Edmund S. Conklin</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Helen Koch</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>B. M. Castner</td>
<td>Yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>E. A. Culler</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>J. G. Peatman</td>
<td>C. C. N. Y.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editorial Assistant, J. W. Carter Jr., Indiana
It is stated that: "The above named board of associate editors have agreed to serve in an active capacity for a period of three years, and all manuscripts will be submitted to them." For Volume II the only change was that Carter became Assistant Editor. The next changes occurred in the fourth volume with the notation that Carter was now at Wichita; of the loss of Koch who was replaced by Martin Reymert at the Mooseheart Laboratory; and of Castner who was replaced by G. A. Kelly at Fort Hays K. S. C.; and, the replacement of the department of Medical (and thus of Norman Cameron) by the department of Industrial, with Joseph Tiffin of Purdue as the associate editor. These changes were announced in paper #5, dated June, 1940.

These names were all familiar to us during our graduate training. Examination of various sources allows the following characterizations. Order of discussion follows the order of appearance on the Record masthead and date of announced appointment.

J. R. Kantor has already been briefly characterized and will be further discussed at the end of this paper. However, it is obvious that he conceptualized and founded the Record.

Chauncey M. Louttit (1901-1956) worked largely as a clinical psychologist, although his training was in experimental, and he devoted a large part of his professional effort to solving the myriad problems encountered in the retrieval of psychological documents. A student of Dodge and Yerkes he earned a PhD at Yale in 1928. He was director of the Psychological Clinic at Indiana from 1931 until his departure. From 1940 to 1945 he was with the U. S Navy, attaining the rank of Captain by the time of his discharge. President of the American Association for Applied Psychology, he also chaired the APA committee which developed the "Publication Manual" which has gone through many revisions and editions and which dictates the precise form of all psychological publications (APA, 1957). Indeed, it seems to be the sole competitor to The Chicago Manual of Style which dominates the humanities (University of Chicago, 1906). His devotion to the retrieval of psychological documents may be judged from his Editorship of Volumes 21-29 of Psychological Abstracts. At the time of his death he was professor and chairman of the Department of Psychology at Wayne University, (now Wayne State University) in Detroit (Dallenbach, 1956). His importance beyond psychology itself is indicated by an obituary in Science (Carter, 1956); and a discussion of his career in Hearst and Capshew (1988). His Handbook of Psychological Literature was published by the Press in 1932, and thus was one of the total of five published in that first year of operation.

Edmund S. Conklin (1884-1942) was professor and head of the Department of Psychology at Indiana University at his death. Following his PhD (Clark, 1911), he published two successful text books (in 1927 and 1929) (see, e.g., Conklin, 1927) and came to Indiana as professor and head of the department of psychology in 1934. He published two additional books and served as president of the Mid-Western
Psychological Association in 1938-39 (Hearst & Capshew, 1988; Seashore, Davis, & Kantor, 1943; Weld, 1943).

B. F. Skinner (1904-1990) may seem not to require comment, but his status in 1937 should be indicated in order to place him and the Record in proper historical context. *The Behavior of Organisms* would not be published until the next year, however he was already recognized as an experimental psychologist of great ability on the basis of seven publications in the *Journal of General Psychology*. In these he had already established the distinction between operant and respondent behaviors. He was at Minnesota and would come to Indiana as chair from 1945 to 1948. Indeed, Kantor wrote him in 1935, both sending and requesting a reprint. Skinner went from Indiana to Harvard and his career is attested to by many commentaries (e.g., Holland, 1992; Keller, 1990; Vaughan, 1990).

Helen Koch (1895-1977) was a younger contemporary of Kantor at Chicago, obtaining her PhB in 1918 and PhD in 1921, the year after Kantor left Chicago for Indiana. She taught at Texas for seven years, then returned to Chicago, becoming Professor Emeritus in 1960. She was a Fellow of the APA and AAAS, as well as President of the Division of Developmental Psychology of the APA for 1960-61. In addition to her many offices in professional societies she was associate editor on the boards of three other journals as well as that of the Record. She published about 50 monographs and papers as well as book chapters and articles for the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. She remained an active scholar until her death.

Norman Cameron (1896-1975) received his PhD at Michigan in 1927, followed by the MD under Adolph Meyer at Johns Hopkins in 1933. He was the Resident Psychiatrist at the Johns Hopkins Hospital and the Dispensary Psychiatrist of the Phipps Psychiatric Clinic of Baltimore, Maryland in 1937. He became Head of the psychology department at the University of Wisconsin, and later taught at Yale. His *The Psychology of Behavior Disorders* (1949) and *Behavior Pathology* (Cameron & Magaret, 1951) were important contributions to the expansion of behavioral theory into clinical psychology.

Burton M. Castner (????-????) earned a BA in 1927 at Johns Hopkins and a PhD at Yale in 1931. In 1937 he was Clinical Research Assistant at the Clinic of Child Development at Yale. He contributed 25% of the biographies in Gesell's *Biographies of Child Development* (1939). We have been unable to discover any other information and assume that an exceptionally early death truncated his career.

Carleton F. Scofield (1900-1990) received a BA at Wesleyan in 1921 and the PhD from Yale in 1928. In 1937 he was Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Buffalo. During WWII he served with the OSS, and later in psychological warfare with HumRRo, and as chief of cultural affairs USIS Pakistan. Still later, in 1963, he became Chancellor of The University of Missouri at Kansas City. In 1970 he became Emeritus Professor of Psychology.
Elmer A. K. Culler (1889-1961) was a contemporary of Kantor's at Chicago, but because he was an instructor at Ohio State (1916-20) and Wisconsin (1920-23) he attended only summer quarters for those years so that he and Kantor could have had little opportunity for contact. Receipt of a PhD in 1922, and another year at Wisconsin, was followed by appointment as an Associate at Illinois. By 1927 he had published seven major papers in psychophysics and was promoted to assistant professor. He shortly embarked upon a series of classical studies of audition in cats and dogs using Bechterev's technique of motor conditioning, the new electronics, surgical preparations, and histological evaluations. By 1938 his work was so highly regarded that he received the Warren Medal of the Society of Experimental Psychologists. While Professor and Chairman at Rochester he developed Parkinson's, which terminated his career. He had published some 70 papers from his laboratories, and approximately 20 individuals earned their PhD under his guidance (Brogden, 1962).

Joy P. Guilford (1897-1987) was awarded a PhD by Cornell in 1927. He taught briefly at Illinois and Kansas and became Associate Professor at Nebraska in 1928. His *Psychometric Methods* (1936) became the standard text, treating as it did scaling, correlation, and factor analysis. He was at the University of Southern California from 1940 until his retirement in 1962. Between 1942 and 1946 he was in the U. S. Army Air Corps, attaining the rank of Colonel. Author of more than 400 books and articles he was awarded the Gold Medal for Distinguished Teaching of the American Psychological Foundation in 1983. He opposed the concept of general, innate, intelligence—arguing instead that intelligence consisted of many traits, that IQ was not inheritable, and that children could be trained to be intelligent (Comrey et al., 1988; Hunt, 1992).

John G. Peatman (b. 1904) after receiving a PhD from Columbia in 1931 essentially spent his entire academic career at the City College of New York except for a visiting professorship at Columbia in 1948. He became Professor of Psychology in 1947, was an Associate Dean from 1944 to 1953, and Chairman of the Department of Psychology from 1952 to 1963. President of the New York State Psychological Association 1946-47, he was a Fellow of the APA and active in other professional organizations. Author of three textbooks on statistics, he was also coeditor of the *Festschrift for Gardner Murphy*. A letter dated April 17, 1996 to Paul Mountjoy stated that Professor Peatman had enjoyed his work on the Record, and that Kantor had approved of his efforts.

Norman C. Meier (1897-1967) earned the PhB in 1921 and the MA in 1922 at Chicago, so he was a near contemporary of Kantor there. The PhD was granted by Iowa in 1926, and in 1937 he was Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Iowa. He taught widely in European universities while remaining affiliated with the University of Iowa. He published extensively in aesthetics and public opinion polling. Perhaps his most original and important contribution was the application of experimental (psychophysical) methodology to the study of aesthetics in the well known Meier Art Tests (Meier, 1940).
Jerry W. Carter, Jr. (b. 1908) earned his BA at Florida in 1932. Both his MA (1934) and PhD (1938) were in experimental psychology, were directed by Kantor, and were based upon Kantor's theoretical view of psychology. In 1937 he was Senior Clinical Psychologist in the Psychology Clinic of the Department of Nervous and Mental Diseases, Riley Hospital, Indiana University Medical Center in Indianapolis, as well as a Consulting Clinical Psychologist for the Indianapolis Public Schools. By 1940 he was at Wichita, and later moved to the National Institutes of Mental Health in Washington, DC (1941). From 1949 to 1955 he was senior scientist and after 1955 scientific director of the United States Public Health Service. Fellow of the APA and AAAS, his publications included a book on community mental health (Carter, 1968).

Martin L. Reymert (1883-1953) was educated through the MA (1906) in his native Norway, and received a PhD in 1917 from Clark under G. Stanley Hall. After teaching in Norway and at Iowa, including an appointment at the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, he went to Wittenberg College where he organized The First International Symposium on Feelings and Emotions in 1928. As Director of The Mooseheart Laboratory for Child Research in 1948 he organized The Second International Symposium on Feelings and Emotions held at The University of Chicago (Reymert, 1928; 1950). He was involved editorially with three journals in addition to the Record and participated in varied activities with APA, AAAS, MPA, and other professional groups (Langfeld, 1953).

G. A. Kelly (1905-1967) received the PhD in 1931 from The State University of Iowa. He was on the faculty at Fort Hayes Kansas State College from then until 1945 when he moved to the University of Maryland. He then taught at Ohio State University and became Professor of Psychology at Brandeis University in 1965. His reputation rests upon his stance in personality theory (Kelly, 1955), and he still receives considerable discussion in standard works on this topic (e.g., Maddi, 1968). (See Thompson, 1968).

Joseph Tiffin (1905-1989) received his PhD in experimental psychology from the University of Iowa in 1930. He became Professor of Industrial Psychology at Purdue University and was a Fellow of the APA. He is widely regarded as the founder of industrial psychology (Popplestone & McPherson, 1994).

Although we lack information concerning some of these individuals sufficient to satisfy us for the purposes of this paper, we still believe that we can state this was a remarkable assembly of talent for a new journal. Note that if we include Kantor there were 8 out of the total of 16 editors (50%) who merited obituaries in journals of substance. In fact, five of them rated multiple obituaries, which even a casual examination of obituaries will reveal is an unusual occurrence. Clearly an unusual group. Hardly your simple random sample, even among competent and well known psychologists!

The information that we have been able to gather concerning these
16 editors indicates that they were workaholics who continued their professional activities well into their retirement years unless, as was the case with Culler, debilitating disease prevented it, or as in the cases of Conklin and Kelly, an early death intervened. It is also worthy of note that all were trained as experimental psychologists no matter what specialization they pursued during their later careers. We take this to indicate not merely that training options were limited solely to experimental psychology but also that experimental training produces individuals who are skilled so as to be generally competent in many potential areas of action. Indeed, so many were Fellows of the APA that we mention that distinction only rarely as it does not appear to differentiate among them.

The Record devoted one issue (Fall, 1984, 34, #4, pp. 447-634) to a commemorative issue consisting of papers by Kantor's former students or others who had been influenced by him. Skinner was similarly honored by a special issue of the American Psychologist (1992, 47, #11, pp. 1265-1560). Both Kantor and Skinner were honored by Festchrifts (Dews, 1970; Smith, Mountjoy, & Ruben, 1983). Guilford received an American Psychological Foundation Gold Medal. It is evident that Kantor must have been highly thought of by at least these contemporaries in order for him to obtain agreement from such busy and productive people to serve on the board of the Record. The members of this board, as a group, were well established already, and some were destined for notable distinction within the field, as well as in academic and government administrative positions.

Although the absolute number of psychologists was much smaller then than it is now, we are impressed with Kantor's knowledge of the field and of the personnel within that field which enabled him to select and organize such a powerful board. It is also evident to us that Kantor had administrative abilities beyond the ordinary (note the various specializations, geographical spread, and PhD granting institutions of the board members), at least in terms of his vision for a journal which would meet a need within his profession. As proof of his administrative ability we cite the fact that he served as acting Chair of the Department of Psychology at Indiana University three times in later years. However, his ambitions did not extend to academic administration; rather he chose to devote his energies to the promotion of the general field of psychology as a science. Further evidence of Kantor's administrative skills is his central role in the formation of the Press (he called the meeting to order, and thus obviously was an initiator and organizer).

The First Five Volumes

The major appeal of the Record may well have been the "immediate" publication of each paper, which made reprints available to the authors virtually at once. Then the articles were assembled into an issue and mailed to subscribers. Of course, the attempt to control costs must have also been attractive in that period of tight money. The Record certainly
did not come into being to serve as an outlet for the editors alone; they were authors of very few papers as the following tally indicates. (Indeed, Kelly published in Volume I before he became an editor, and he is included in this tally.) Here, in descending order of numbers of papers published in the Record with an editor as either senior or junior author, with percentage of the total of 112 papers in the first five volumes.

Skinner 7 (6%); Kantor 5 (5%); Louttit 3 (3%); Carter 3 (3%); Meier 2 (2%); Castner 2 (2%); Peatman 1 (1%); Cameron 1 (1%); Kelly 1 (1%). That is, members of the editorial staff were authors of only 25 papers (or only 22%) out of the total of 112 papers published.

The papers tended to be rather short in these first five volumes. About 36% were under 10 pages, roughly 66% were less than 20 pages, and nearly 90% were under 30 pages in length.

For 83 of the 112 papers a footnote indicates which editor accepted it for publication. Of these 75% of the published papers for which editorial responsibility may be assigned, Kantor led with 35%, followed by Skinner and Louttit with 10% each, and Conklin with 6%. Castner, Guilford, and Peatman each accepted 3%, while Cameron, Culler, Koch, Scofield, and Tiffin each accepted 1%. For 29 (25%) of the papers there is no indication of who was responsible for recommending publication.

Thus, we can argue that Kantor was the workhorse of the Record, but Skinner, Louttit, and Conklin certainly did their fair share. We assume that the actual papers submitted for publication did not fall often into the specialty areas of the other editors (although the 25% of papers for which no editorial responsibility is assigned may have been accepted by these other editors).

We have now covered the staff of the new journal and would be remiss if we did not discuss the content and significance of the papers published in these first five volumes. Thus we turn to that analysis.

As is clear from the membership of the editorial board the Record was conceived to serve the entire field of psychology as it then existed. When it became evident that medical psychology did not require service at that time (possibly it was subsumed under abnormal) it was dropped and the "new" area of industrial psychology was added.

The first five volumes may be summarized in this manner:

Volume I contained 502 pages, 25 papers, and was published during 1937.

Volume II consisted of 459 pages, 20 papers, and was completed during 1938.

Volume III contained 422 pages, 23 papers, and was published during 1939.

Volume IV consisted of 468 pages, 27 papers, and was published over a period of the last nine months of 1940 (13 papers) and the first nine months of 1941 (14 papers).

Volume V comprised 394 pages, 13 papers, and the first paper is dated November, 1941 (although Volume V is conventionally dated as
having begun publication in 1942), and the second is dated February, 1942. Paper #8 is dated December, 1942, and ends on page 275. Paper #9 did not appear until August, 1943, while #10 is October and #11 appeared in December of 1943 and ended on page 339. Number 12, is dated March, 1945 and #13 (dated October, 1945) ends the volume on page 394.

Thus, the diversion of effort from scientific matters to the war effort may be seen to appear with Volume IV, since its publication required about 18 months rather than the 12 which had sufficed for each of the preceding three volumes. Obviously the number of manuscripts decreased drastically, although the real effect of the war appears even more strongly in Volume V, which required four full years to be completed. Kantor, in response to Mountjoy’s query as to why the Record had ceased publication, commented in the early 1950s about the difficulty of obtaining paper on which to print it caused by wartime restrictions.

The desperate nature of the situation may be judged from the increase of the rate of publication in the Record by Kantor himself, who wrote four of the last eight papers in Volume V. Clearly this was an attempt to retain the viability of the journal rather than some place to publish papers which had been rejected elsewhere. Indeed, during the eight calendar years the Record was in existence Kantor published nine substantive papers in reputable journals both in the USA (6) and in Europe (3), as well as one chapter for an edited book, coauthored an obituary in *Science* (Seashore, Davis, & Kantor, 1943), and published the first volume of his two volume *Psychology and Logic* (Kantor, 1945). As was the case for the other editorial staff, the Record was merely another outlet for extremely productive people.

To summarize: The Record was founded to provide rapid publication at a reasonable cost. Volumes I through IV successfully functioned to fulfill this need for psychology in general. As World War II attenuated those psychological activities not directly related to the war effort the rate of manuscript submission declined to the point at which Kantor contributed four papers (50%) of the last eight papers of Volume V. In fact, Volume V began in November of 1941 and the last paper was not published until October of 1945. Of the 13 papers included in this volume Kantor provided the just mentioned four (31%). Thus, Volume V extended over three years and eleven months while the first four volumes had each occupied only about one year each.

Some eleven years later, in 1956, the Record resumed publication under the editorship of Paul Swartz, with J. Robert Kantor, Paul T. Mountjoy, and Norman H. Pronko as associate editors, and it has been a continual feature of American psychology ever since. Although Volume 6, and subsequent issues, proclaimed that the Record was devoted to theoretical and experimental psychology it has always been a Journal which was open to papers of interest to scientific psychologists in general. In adhering to this general approach to the science during the tenure of several editors the Record appears to us to have remained true to Kantor’s original conception at its founding. Kantor himself was
committed wholeheartedly to the field of scientific psychology as a whole rather than to a limited aspect of that field.

It is difficult, if not actually impossible, to succinctly summarize and describe the 112 papers published in the first five volumes. We have decided, therefore, to selectively discuss a very small sample.

The topics covered by these papers represent the broad spectrum of the psychology of those years. For example, the Dionne quintuplets, public opinion polling, industrial psychology, human psychophysics, clinical classification and treatment of abnormal behavior, free operant behavior in nonhuman animals, the effects of drugs upon the test behavior of human beings, the effects of drugs upon the free operant behavior of nonhuman animals, and so forth. In an attempt to reduce this variety to some sort of order the senior author simply recorded the names of all authors (whether senior or junior) whom he recognized. This resulted in 20 names, of whom 10 were found to have been mentioned in Popplestone and McPherson (1994). A similar check in Zusne (1984) revealed that nine of these authors received brief biographies, and Hilgard (1987) mentioned 15 of them. This means that at least this sample of psychologists who are interested in, and knowledgeable about, the history of American Psychology agree to some extent concerning the important role certain of those psychologists who published in the Record played in that period.

One empirical report is singled out for citation because it is the point of origin for the large investigative area called behavioral pharmacology. This appears to have been the first evaluation of the effects of drugs upon free operant behavior in nonhuman animals to have appeared in print. The title is “Effects of caffeine and benzedrine upon conditioning and extinction” (Skinner & Heron, 1937). It is reported (Pickens, 1977) that between 1955 and 1963 operant methodology became the dominant technique in behavioral pharmacology.

One theoretical paper is singled out for citation because it is an initiating point for the development of an adequate scientific orientation toward a large number of psychological events, including those contained within the rubric of behavioral pharmacology. The title is “Problems and paradoxes of physiological psychology” (Kantor, 1945). This, of course, was to develop into Problems of Physiological Psychology (Kantor, 1947).

In his 1945 essay Kantor began to develop his detailed argument for the treatment of the brain as one setting factor in a unified field rather than as the basic cause of behavior (a position it had occupied since before the publication of James' Principles of Psychology in 1890). This theoretical position may be regarded as a fruition of Kantor's attack upon both mentalisms in general and Watsonian behaviorism in particular which he had launched in 1918. Of course, this specific topic was exhaustively treated in the 1947 book. The true fruitions of his scientific career are the 1957 Interbehavioral Psychology and the 1981 Interbehavioral Philosophy. Taken together these two works indicated the validity of his interbehavioral
alternative to all mentalisms and that failed monism which all too frequently passes for a scientific approach to the myriad things and events which all scientists study and attempt to understand.

We conclude that the Record was conceived of as a journal to serve the entire field of scientific psychology as it existed in 1937, and that it remained true to that conception until inimicable social conditions forced it to suspend publication in 1945.

Reference Notes

We consulted standard reference works such as various editions of the *APA Directory*, *Who's Who*, biographical directories, and so forth. We have taken on trust the accuracy of these entries, but in the interests of economical use of space we do not cite each such source specifically. Similarly, we have not specified those folders of The Archives of the History of American Psychology or of the Indiana University Archives which contained the materials we drew from.

Phone calls and letters to Alumni Offices of both undergraduate and graduate institutions which granted degrees to members of the Editorial Board sometimes produced vital information, although sometimes it did not. We regret our inability to obtain complete data for some individuals and would welcome information from our reading audience.
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