

Dr. Howard Parad  
Interviewed by Dr. Carl Shafer  
at Dr. Parad's home in Pacific Palisades, CA  
on April 5, 1999

SHAFER: Dr. Parad, could we begin by your telling us a little bit about how you got into social work and your early experience as a social worker.

PARAD: Well, Carl, it's a pleasure to see you again after all these years. You and I used to have offices adjacent to each other. We had many conversations about social work, life, our families, USC, and lots of other things. It's very good to see you.

It's always hard to tease out just one factor that made me want to become a social worker. There were several. As I think back over the years, going back now over 50 years, I would say that an experience I had while I was in high school, and later in perhaps my first year or two of college, was a major factor in my choosing social work as a career. I worked as a rent collector for some property that my father managed in a very poor part of Boston, Roxbury, and near the south end of Boston, some of it blighted, and I'm sure much of it now totally rehabilitated through urban renewal. In my capacity in visiting families -- in those days, a lot of people paid their rent week-by-week -- I got to know the families not just as a rent collector, but as people who were dealing with many personal family and social problems. I became very interested in problems of poverty, alcoholism, prostitution, spousal abuse, without knowing very much about social work. That was one factor. Another factor that influenced me was the encouragement I received from a tutor at Harvard University named Clyde Cleckhone, an anthropologist who wrote a wonderful book called *Mirror for Man*. Although he encouraged me to pursue my

studies in social science at Harvard – and he was a wonderful teacher and friend, really – he also suggested that I consider social work, because he sensed that I was interested in doing more than the life of academe. He, himself, had done a lot of research with the Navajos at a time when learning about and studying the culture of native Americans was not at all popular. He wrote a number of books about the Navajos and really was an expert about Indian culture. So I learned from him in classes on social anthropology and cultural anthropology about participant observation. I began to listen carefully to people with whom I was working in these tenement houses, and did my undergraduate on this thesis on the social structure of tenement groups. That was very informative to me. Then I began reading a lot about social welfare. I remember vividly there was a library in Emerson Hall on the Harvard campus which had a complete collection of the various proceedings on what used to be called the National Conference on Charities and Corrections. So I started with something big as a kind of an eager student. It had nothing to do with any courses I was taking. I started to read, and I was fascinated by social welfare history. I guess that became the National Conference of Social Welfare in later years. That got me further interested in becoming a social worker.

My wife, Libby, then my girlfriend when I was in college, was also very interested in social work, and her sister dated a number of very intelligent social workers. They discouraged me from entering social work, saying that it was a low status, poorly paid profession. This was, of course, during the recession in 19 - let's say, '40, '41. It was only World War II that pulled us out of the recession of 1937, if you remember your history. So somehow or other, even though they discouraged me, they were very enthusiastic about what they were doing. Most of them were working in family agencies. I was imbued with their sense of idealism. That was a factor.

During the War, I had an opportunity to be assigned - even though I didn't have a master's degree - as a military psychiatric social worker, which carried, as did everything in the Army, an MOS - a Military Occupation Specialty, Number 263. In that capacity, I took social histories of soldiers who had been in World War II, and who suffered from combat fatigue. I was in the United States Army Medical Corp as a Corporal, Technician 5<sup>th</sup> Grade. I had the good fortune to be supervised by a person named Walt Pippert, who had a prized master's degree, and also, to have consultation from a psycho-analyst named David Flicker, Dr. David Flicker. I had read Freud as a student at Harvard and a lot of books on social science, and I began to read and almost memorize a book by Abraham Mazlow called *Principles of Abnormal Psychology*, read and re-read Freud. The third book I read, which was of no use at that time, was Carl Roger's *Clients Sent to Therapy*, which didn't exactly help too much with psychotic individuals, but I learned a lot about interviewing style. I was self-taught, but the Army gave me some in-service training. Then I had the good fortune to be sent by the United States Army Medical Corp to take a few courses at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill. I was stationed at a hospital near Durham, North Carolina, not far from Chapel Hill, and there, unbeknownst to me, I was exposed to Rontien (?) and Functionalist theory - not knowing that this was considered shameful (laughter), which I learned later on. I never felt ashamed of it. I always felt informed. I had a marvelous teacher named Muriel McLaughlin for this course, who, of course, gave me a lot of readings based on - well, including the writings of Jessie Taft, Virginia Robinson, and Ruth Smalley, I think, and others of the Functionalist persuasion.

I realized that I was very interested in learning more about social work practice. As the War started to wind down, I applied to, and was accepted to two graduate schools: the University

of Chicago and Boston University. Having been away from home for so long, I decided to go back to Boston. In my graduate work, I had a wonderful experience at Boston University, majoring in what was then called Psychiatric Social Work. Now it would be called Clinical Social Work. I had excellent supervisors and a combination which was quite innovative at that time. The first year was on the concurrent plan; two or three of class and two or three days of field work. I've forgotten exactly which - or half and half. The second year was on the block plan. That got me very interested in intensive clinical work. My second-year internship was at the Massachusetts Mental Health Center, where I had excellent supervision and training, a lot of psychiatric consultation. I learned how to work with children, adolescents, adults, neurotic and psychotic. That's how I got into social work, and it's been a long road since then. It's been a very, very wonderful adventure. Okay?

SHAFER: I know that in your early experience – you worked in agencies, I take it, for a while – then you decided to go back and get a doctorate at some point at Columbia. That exposed you – that and your later employment after graduation from your doctoral studies – exposed you to a number of outstanding social workers who have a real historic interest. I wonder if you could tell us a little bit about that experience, following your doctoral studies.

PARAD: Well, yes. I was encouraged to do a doctorate by Florence Hollis, who was a graduate of Smith College and was on the part-time faculty at Smith College as a visiting professor. She had been a very close, personal friend of Florence Day. I don't know if that name rings a bell for you. Florence Day had been the Dean or the Director of the Smith College School of Social Work prior to my being appointed as Dean and Professor at Smith College. Florence Day and Florence Hollis, the two Florences, were very dear friends, so you could see that Florence

Hollis, after Florence Day's death in about 1958, would be interested in keeping up some tie with Smith College and with me. She'd gone to Smith College. She was one of the pre-eminent social workers, and I was much influenced by her writing and by my association with her, in general. She wrote a book called, *Casework: A Psychosocial Therapy*, and I remember encouraging her and helping her to get a publisher and participated in some of the research that she was doing on a typology of social casework, which I was very, very interested in and so were others, including William Reed. Unfortunately, although I use that material in teaching, it seemed to not attract people, because although a lot of social workers talk about the need to study practice and build up a practice theory that really is based on practice as actually conducted, when push came to shove, and it was time to do the research, including (Frances, I could hear him, but didn't understand what he said here, but it sounds like this "a times teaches cot and analysis") tests of reliability and validity and all sorts of statistical tests of co-efficiency of correlation and all that sort of thing. A lot of social work gets carried away from that. (Laughter) But I stuck with it, and I use that material a lot in my teaching, especially at USC, in the Ph.D. Program.

Well, so Florence Hollis was very important, and she encouraged me to pursue a doctorate at Columbia, and I did that, and I'm glad I did. I wanted to broaden myself, so I had a combination of concentrations which was quite possible in those days, including community organization, social policy, which I studied with Eveline Guerins, also a very famous person. I believe an economist by discipline. Extremely demanding, intelligent, challenging, provocative (laughter). I also took courses with Lucille Austin – no, no I didn't take courses with her. She was my advisor for a while. Lucille Austin, who had also taught at Smith, so it was a very close

relationship between many of the faculty members at Columbia and Smith, including Alfred Kahn, who had taught research, Herman Stein, who had also taught at Smith, but at that time was not at Columbia. Let's see, who else? There were a lot of psychiatrists who were very sympathetic toward Columbia and Smith, both being schools that emphasized the psychodynamic approach to the teaching of social casework theory practice.

My doctoral study was rich for me. I took many courses outside of the School of Social Work. I had the good fortune to attend many lectures by Robert Mentor, a very famous sociologist. Another one with whom I was very impressed wrote the book in the academic marketplace – I forget his name at the moment. I'm embarrassed to do that, but he was excellent. Also, a course that helped me – two courses I took very much in my research were taught by Herbert Heiman(?), who wrote the classic definitive book at the time on survey research, and he was a very stimulating teacher. I appreciated him more than perhaps some of the younger students did at the time. There was a student rebellion on the Columbia campus at the time, and many of the students, unfortunately, would read newspapers during his lectures. I felt like strangling them. I listened attentively and got to know him quite well and learned a great deal from him, which helped me in my research activities.

That gives you a kind of a sampling of the people at Columbia.

SHAFER: Howard, could you comment about what was going on in the profession, itself, during those early years following the War and the early '50s. What was the nature of social work practice at that time?

PARAD: Carl, you do ask some good questions. You and I graduated and got our MSWs at

approximately the same time. I actually finished in December, 1947, got my degree awarded in May or June, 1948. My first job was in a district office of the Family Service Association of Greater Boston in what is called the South End of Boston, which was then a skid row area. I remember being assigned to a cubicle in a basement office of the Public Health Building, and all I could see when I looked up were the feet of the pedestrians who were walking by in the street. There was a little window up there. So these were, shall we say, not very elegant surroundings. I had a kind of an old fashioned, rigorous supervisor named Dorothy G. Burpee - B u r p e e, who shared with me the dilemmas she was going through as Director of this District Office in making the transition from giving relief, which family agencies used to do, and moving toward casework counseling. There were many debates going on in many heated staff meetings. Public assistance at that time was extremely inadequate and inconsistent and unreliable, and the Family Society of Greater Boston had been called Family Welfare Society and had a rather large endowment with numerous funds for the giving of relief to the worthy or deserving poor. But the agency did not wish to do as a private or a social service, what public welfare was mandated to do by statute – namely provide maintenance and support for people who were unable to work and who were poor. There were many debates about, “Shall we continue to give relief? shall we only do counseling, or shall we combine the two? “ It was a kind of enactment of the old Fagalian dialectic thesis, antithesis, synthesis. I guess the thesis was, “Let’s continue to give relief.” The antithesis was, “Let’s only do counseling.” The synthesis was, “Let us give financial aid, but only when we have – and I remember this vividly - what they then called – a casework plan.” In other words, if someone wanted help with a problem in marital relationships, or a parent-child relationship, or in their adjustment to the workplace, and also was

poor, as long as we had a plan, we could give them some money to supplement public welfare. As time went on, within a few years, the giving of supplementary assistance waned, and the major function of the Family Agency was personal and family counseling, and in this case, family life education. So that was a big argument. There was a big argument at that time.

Grace Martin had written an article on the use of relief as a tool. There was much controversy. Do you happen to recall this yourself? Now it may have been different on the West Coast, but in New England there were many private charities which were outgrowths of the COS, the Charity Organizations Society movement, which, as you know, was a forerunner of the Modern Family Agency. Right? Am I remembering my history? God knows, I've taught this for a number of years.

Just on a personal reminiscence, there were times in my work with families, mostly poor and working-class people, when I knew they didn't have enough money. For example, I was working with a family – I remember this so vividly. A woman came for help with her daughter who was a teenager. She was very bright, but underachieving in school and promiscuous. We later learned that she had been molested, really raped, by an uncle, and was acting out in typical adolescent fashion, suffering from a lot of inner turmoil. She was doing very poorly in public school, and showed a lot of strength. I was supervising - what we then called a caseworker - we were now called clinical social worker - or in fancy language, a psychotherapist - I was supervising a young woman who happened to be a graduate of Smith College. She was extremely intelligent, and she said, "You know, Howard, this girl - we'll just call her Nancy - should be in a private school. She's extremely bright, and she's pretty much at risk in this toxic environment. Her uncle is a predator." This was before molestation was reported to the

authorities, and no one did very much about it in those days. Let's say this was around 1949, 1950. I took advantage of one of these little charity funds that I learned about for which the agency served as trustee, and it was called, interestingly, the Burnham - B u r n h a m - Fuel Fund, for deserving families who did not have enough wood, coal, or other fuel to heat their homes during the harsh New England winter. So I wanted to send, to help my staff member - I was then a District Director, myself. I got promoted quickly. (Laughter) I wanted to help the caseworker who was assigned to Nancy to be able to send this girl to private school, where we thought she would do well, but we didn't have the money. So I applied to the coal fund. I asked the mother how she heated her house, and she said, "By coal." So I said, "Well, we're going to try to get the money for you so you can pay for the coal." I had to give her a wink, which would now be considered very unprofessional, and I told the mother that she can then use the money she would have used for coal, toward tuition for her daughter to go to a private school. This was not exactly kosher, but that's how we survived in those days. I was a great believer in action. If a kid needed something, a family needed something, I would sort of knock myself out to do it. So that's how I dealt with the relief problem, at times. Not in every case, obviously. Okay? That's one example.

Perhaps you have another question.

SHAFER: You sort of slighted over the idea of the fact that you had been appointed Dean of the Smith School of Social Work, which is a very prestigious school, then and now, and I wondered if you could say a little bit more about the academic experience that you began at that time. Also, it has occurred to me that during that period, at least, and maybe even to this day, the social work in the East was practiced with a little different emphasis than here in the West.

What eventually developed in the West, started in the East. You were in a place where leadership in the profession actually resided. I'd like to hear a little bit more about that whole experience as the Dean of the School.

PARAD: Again, you ask a question that's dear to my heart. I invested a great deal of time and energy, blood, sweat, and a few tears into my former incarnation as Dean of the Smith College School of Social Work. I felt lucky to have that job. It was like a dream come true for me. I had a chance to work for a brief period with Annette Garrett, who was the Associate Dean when I was there. I was there from 1956 to 1971, before I came to USC. I want to point, though, that the longest tenure I had throughout my career of well over 50 years, was at USC. I don't want to minimize that for a minute, because I had 17 good, and I mean really good years at USC, the memory of which I also cherish.

Back to Smith. As most everybody knows, Smith College School of Social Work is one of the leading schools, perhaps even distinguished – I can say that because I inherited the job, I didn't create it – for the teaching of a kind of psychodynamic approach to clinical social work, based largely on a combination of psychoanalytic and psychosocial theories of behavior and intervention. Smith College was very influential in educating and training, initially, only young women, and later, because of my stubborn and persistent efforts, we were able to accept men as degree candidates in what was then called social casework. We would now call it clinical social work or psychotherapy. I had an opportunity to be really intimately engaged in planning curriculum; in recruiting faculty; not so happily engaged in fundraising and getting NIMH training and research grants in order to keep the program going. But I saw the program at Smith continue to evolve, and keeping its psychodynamic base very much intact, we were able to add a

lot of sociocultural theory to the curriculum. If you will recall, there was a period of when the Russell Sage Foundation was encouraging the incorporation of social science theory into the social work curriculum. Herman Stein, with Richard Clouward at Columbia, had edited an excellent book called something like *Socioculture Theory and Social Work Practice*. At the University of Michigan there was a lot of integration of social science and social work. I was able to introduce course content in that area. One of the teachers, who was Dr. Jerome, or J. Cohen, whom I 'm sure you know, who went on – was at Smith for a few years – he helped us develop social science content, because he had a doctorate in sociology or social science as well as a master's in social work. That was an exciting development. During most of my tenure at Smith, the theoretical inspiration came from ego-psychology. Annette Garrett had done a series of lectures and had done some writing on ego-psychology and its contribution to what she called dynamic casework. I collected a number of her papers and other papers, and I guess the first book I did was called, *Ego-Psychology and Dynamic Casework*, which I think had some impact on the field. Then, I did a follow-up volume with Roger Miller called. *Ego-Oriented Casework*. Those two books were very much in the Smith tradition, drawing, as they did, on the use of psychoanalytic theory in helping people with personal family and other inter-personal problems.

One of the common criticisms of Smith was that we were training junior psychoanalysts. I never appreciated that comment, because I was very much oriented toward the person in the environment. While Smith had many excellent psychoanalytic teachers on its faculty, we were not training the students to become psychoanalysts, but rather to become informed and skilled social workers. I think one of the important aspects of the Smith program was the block plan, which allowed three summers of ten weeks each of very intensive academic preparation, with

two intervening winter internships. Because of its location as well as for reasons of ideology, the School was able, and had to, even if it wasn't able, pick affiliated training centers for fieldwork internship all over the country. So we were able to pick the best training centers, mostly interdisciplinary, all over the country. In those days, it was all the way from Boston to Denver, Colorado, and from Milwaukee to Falls Church, Virginia, outside of Washington, D.C. The block plan was a prominent feature of the Smith program. To summarize briefly, the emphasis on ego-psychology, especially the work of Erik Erickson, Hartmann, Chris Lowenstein, among others; the continued emphasis on keeping the social and social work through a psychosocial approach; the high quality of the students and the faculty; all made my 15 years of experience at Smith very rich and memorable.

SHAFER: Let me just see....

(Editor's Note: An interruption in the taping occurred at this point. However, the context is included in a later part of the recording)

PARAD: We're still reminiscing, the retrospect of you down memory lane. So I mentioned child therapy being done directly by social workers with proper training and consultation. I mentioned my interest in liberal scholarship aid for students as a way of attracting promising students into social work. For a while, I was chairman of a group which I helped start called the Massachusetts Social Work Recruitment Committee. I was very proud of that. At a time in the 50s, when we had a shortage of applicants in schools of social work -- although we had a great need of services after the War-- I recall that in an effort to bring social work to the attention of college students, a group of colleagues and I developed summer internship programs for juniors in college in an attempt to interest them in the possibility of pursuing graduate study in social

work. Since Massachusetts has so many colleges and universities, we had access to many bright young men and women, and many agencies were willing to provide even small stipends for the students to work as case aids. That was a very successful program. We had two or three meetings during the summer: we gave them lectures and had discussion groups. I must say I was impressed with the zeal and the intuitive wisdom of many of these young men and women who had never studied social work, and certainly, many of them had not studied sociology or psychology. Quite a few went on to graduate schools in social work. That was a wonderful, positive experience.

A couple of anecdotal reminiscence that are sobering in their implication – in some of these busy – especially in these public agencies which had certain families on their caseloads which were called, for lack of a better term – I think it’s a horrible term – chronic, crisis-ridden, multi-problem families. Do you remember, Carl, the interest in the multi-problem families? So many of the supervisors who participated in this special summer recruitment program figured these families were so mixed up, so disturbed, they might as well assign some of them to the case aid students from places like Harvard and obviously, Boston University, and the University of Massachusetts, and other colleges and universities in the Greater Boston Area. What harm can they do, since the staff didn’t know what to do with them? Well, many of these student volunteers or case aids, because of their enthusiasm and lack of stereotypes, lack of bias, lack of prejudice, just their love of humanity and their warmth, were able to relate to many of these families much more effectively, because they looked at the world with a kind of an idealistic, wide-open, optimistic-eyed, whereas the seasoned professionals, who were beaten down, low in morale, and burnt out, often viewed these same families with a jaundiced eye, always

volunteering that the prognosis was very guarded. The deal we made was that the supervisor wouldn't say anything like that to the students, but just say, "Why don't you do what you can? Here's a little summary we have of the family. See how you can help them." Well the students did unorthodox things: for example, visiting an ADC mother who, let's say, had three or four kids out of wedlock and maybe drank a lot and had a lot of boyfriends and wasn't too skilled as a parent, somewhat neglectful, if not abusive. So students would tell stories like this – and I remember some of them quite vividly. A student would say, "I made a home visit-" – I'm making this up – "Monday afternoon, and although it was 2:00 or 3:00 p.m., the dishes were piled in the sink, the kids hadn't eaten, the baby's diaper was loaded, the mother was watching tv and sipping wine and smoking cigarettes." Instead of saying, "Gosh, this is terrible," the student would say something like this to the woman. Let's say it was a woman student. I remember one in particular, very bright. She would say, "Wow! No wonder your depressed, with all these kids and all this pressure and not much money. Let me pitch in." And bright-eyed and bushy-tailed, the student would roll up her sleeves, as it were, and clear up the dishes, wash the dishes, help diaper the baby, ask the mother if she could make her a bowl of hot soup, open a can of soup for her (laughter), maybe bring some food for her. In that way, she formed kind of a woman-to-woman relationship. Then they would sit down and have a cup of coffee or a bowl of soup, and the ADC mother would volunteer information about her problems, and the student would counsel her in her own best way. At the end of the eight- or ten-week period, many of these clients missed their case aids. (Laughter) They had, in other words, a relationship. So that was so exciting to me, and of course, now we know how there's a sort of trained incapacity on the part of many professionals to bring such biases to the therapeutic endeavor that they are

unable to help people. That was a tremendous learning period for me and for the supervisors. Not that it happened each and every time, but it happened frequently enough for me to remember it about 40 years later. Okay?

I want to go on to something else that also left me with a feeling of great satisfaction and excitement. Long before the Civil Rights Act passed, when I was at Smith College, my wife, Libby, and I wanted to recruit more Hispanic and Black students at Smith College, which was in those days, a kind of Waspy center; White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant Women. Many of them came to the undergraduate college rich enough to bring their own horses with them, so we used to call them – not too graciously – the horsey set. You didn't see many faces of people with color. It was very difficult to get grants at that time because Richard Nixon was President of the United States and had impounded most of the money we were getting from training grants NIMH. But I happened to meet a member of the French Department of Smith College who struck up an acquaintance with me at the Faculty Club where we were having lunch one day. Because I had offered some informal counseling to a student majoring in French – it had nothing to do with French or my lack of knowledge of it – but she had personal and family problems, and the student went back to her French teacher and said, “Howard Parad was helpful. He's at the School of Social Work. I didn't know we had a School of Social Work.” Here we were, and nobody knew about us. So this woman, whose name was Mademoiselle Sturm, S t u r m, became very interested in our program and said that she a Smith College alumnae who was a benefactress and wanted to do a good deed. She was getting on in years and wanted to do

something very useful, and did I have a special project for which there was no government money. Of course, I embraced Mademoiselle Sturm. (Laughter) I had about 15 such projects, and I didn't know which one to pick. So my wife, Libby – Libby was then on the faculty of Smith College, teaching social policy – and I developed a program whereby we, again, reached out to college juniors. This time we had as our target, college juniors from what were then called Negro colleges, Black colleges in the South, who would usually not aspire to go to graduate school, A, and B, if they did, they would not aspire to go to a graduate school such as the one offered by Smith College. They didn't have the money, and it just was not part of their world. So we developed a program whereby we would offer Black college students in their junior year – between their junior and senior year – and Hispanic students, that would be Puerto Rican students, largely from the Greater New York area or New Haven or Hartford or Boston – who might be interested in social work, a chance to take two courses: one was in social science theory, and the other was in communication. We made the mistake of first entitling these as remedial courses. That was a mistake, because that tended to assault or threaten the student's self-esteem. My wife had a brother, who unfortunately died a few years later, named Leonard, who was a professor of English at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. He was very interested in the Black experience, and he even wrote a book on Black English. He was very interested in what we now call ethnic or cultural sensitivity. He had friends at Tuscaloosa. He told us first, do not use the word, remediation. Use the word enrichment. I thought that helpful, because it wasn't enrichment. Secondly, he said, when you send out the leaflets, -- and we were shocked because nobody was responding. He said that's because no one believes you, no one trusts you. Why would a White, women's college offer Blacks a free summer of

education at Smith, and a complete scholarship to the Smith College Graduate School if they're accepted and qualified, and also, they're poor. They can't come, even if it's free. So, I went back to Mademoiselle Sturm and explained my dilemma to her, and we developed a "learn while you earn" or "earn while you learn" program. We'd pay the student's transportation expenses, whether bus fare, train or air fare, and we gave them board and room, free tuition, and \$50 a week, which, let's say, in the year 1960 or 1961, was pretty good. They could afford to come. Then my brother-in-law took these leaflets to Tuscaloosa and told his Black colleagues in the Black colleges about the program; that it was for real, it was not a fake, not any sort of deception, and we had plenty of applicants: Black and Hispanic students. That was very, very exciting. Jay Cohen taught them a course on social science theory, which was really a course on how to conceptualize, and we had a person who was very interested in teaching students from other cultures, who taught a course basically on communication, teaching them how to write more effectively. The students actually enjoyed the courses. We had a recreational coordinator so it wasn't all work. They had plenty of chance to play. Quite a few of them went on to graduate school. A few got scholarships to Smith. One, named Joyce Everett, is now on the Smith College faculty and got her Ph.D. from Smith, as well as her MSW.

That was before the Civil Rights Act was passed in 1964, and I'm proud of that. I wish we had enough money to have it continue. We had some government help, but it was very limited. It was very hard to sustain the financial support.

Now I want to say a couple of words about some things that weren't so good. I want to go on record as saying that I was disappointed in only one major thing that happened at USC while I was there, and that is when Dr. Carl Shafer and I were on a subcommittee to explore the

possibility of developing and implementing a clinical social work doctorate. Our efforts were not very successful. We had the rudiments of such a program. We had all the ingredients we needed, but we did not have the support of the then Dean. I feel badly about that, because Carl is an imminent clinician. He had been President of the Society of Clinical Social Workers; had years of experience working with children, adults, families, absolute 100% integrity. He and I had developed clinical internships; we were going to have clinical research opportunities so the students could do their doctoral dissertation in some area of interest. A few of them did that. We had a pilot program of maybe three or four students. I hope you remember, Carl, and they were placed at Cedar Sinai, Didi Hirsch, Foothill Family Service, among other places, and they loved the experience. They had supervision, and they did dissertations. They did extremely well. USC missed out on a great opportunity to attract those students who otherwise might go to the Ph.D. program run by the Society of Clinical Social Workers or the non-university affiliated programs such as CSPP -- whatever it's called -- Los Angeles School of Professional Psychology -- that does not operate within the University framework.

Another source of regret I have is that at one time, I was, in an ill-advised way, enthusiastic about the possibilities of managed care. Thinking naively -- I'm going back probably 15 years -- that managed care, as it originally promised, would provide services to people who ordinarily couldn't afford them in the mental health field. As it turned out, I consider managed care largely a disaster, a way for insurance companies and entrepreneurs to make a lot of money, to give less service, violating client privacy and confidentiality, creating layers of bureaucracy between the client and the therapist. It's not that I gave any speeches in support of it, but I thought it was a promising development. It has turned out, from my point of

view, to be capitalism at its worst. I feel very badly about that.

While I'm reminiscing – one thing that I think clinical social workers aren't doing enough of – that is in providing group therapy. I think group therapy is a powerful medium for helping people, not always instead of, but often as a supplement to individual or couple therapy. For some reason it has not caught on as much as it deserves to. I know for a while, I volunteered at Didi Hirsch Community Mental Health Center, and myself led a few groups, crisis groups, and I found that to be a valuable experience. The therapy was very effective, and I can't quite figure out why group therapy is such an underutilized resource.

One final comment – whereas we used to draw our clinical wisdom from ego-psychology and psychosocial theories, it seems to me that today's social work students have not heard of Florence Hollis, Gordon Hamilton, Annette Garrett, some of these really great women in social work who offered us profound insights, not only into social work, but into human conditions. Instead of drawing more on our social work roots, a lot of people develop theoretical orientation, primarily from object relations and self-psychological theories, which have their own value, but these theories could be integrated into the social work fund of knowledge. After all, social workers are great borrowers and adaptors of social science and behavioral science knowledge, generally. I regret that they're missing out on this great heritage and wish they knew more about the history of social work in general and the history of social work's contribution to mental health services in the last 100 years.

Let's see if there's anything else. Well, that's probably more than enough. Okay? I appreciate this opportunity, Carl.

SHAFER: Thank you, Howard, for your extensive comments and your valuable insights into

understanding a little bit more about where we came from as a profession and where we are now.