

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Special Issue on the History of Psychology in Canada

Adrian C. Brock
University College Dublin

This article begins by pointing out that history and theory of psychology is much stronger in Canada than it is elsewhere. However, the history of psychology in Canada itself tends to be neglected. This situation is linked to the dominance of American psychology and the movement to establish a distinctively Canadian psychology that differs from psychology in the United States. It is argued that this movement can help to encourage more interest in the history of psychology in Canada and vice versa. It is also suggested that addressing the neglect of the history of psychology in Canada will lead to more internationalization, not less.

Keywords: history of psychology, Canada, indigenous psychology, internationalization

A special issue of *Canadian Psychology* on the history of psychology in Canada guest edited by someone based in Dublin might raise a few eyebrows. I am not an expatriate Canadian. I am British and my connection with Canada began exactly 25 years ago in 1988 when I was awarded a Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship to do a PhD in history and theory of psychology at York University under the supervision of Kurt Danziger. I lived very happily in Toronto for 5 years and was reluctant to leave, but I was obliged to do so under the terms of my scholarship. However, the bonds made during those 5 years have been difficult to break. I have spent a part of every summer in Canada for the last 7 years and my visit in 2013 is already planned. As a result of my former residence and my regular visits, I have come to know the position of history and theory of psychology in Canada well.

Perhaps the most striking thing about this position is that Canada punches above its weight on the international, and especially the North American, scene. The graduate program in history and theory of psychology at York University is the only one of its kind in North America, and it has attracted many students from Europe and the United States. The influence of its former and current students, and its emeritus and current faculty, on the field is such that the term “York Mafia” is frequently used. No less than four of the last five presidents of American Psychological Association (APA) Division 26 (History of Psychology) were or are based in Canada. One of the most important organisations in North America that include history of psychology in its mandate is Cheiron

(International Society for History of the Behavioral and Social Sciences). The relative percentage of its members based in Canada and the United States is completely out of proportion to their respective populations and the influence of its Canadian members can be seen from the location of its conferences. The 2008 conference was in Toronto, the 2011 conference was in Calgary, and the 2012 conference was in Montreal. Journals provide another source of evidence. The journal that is associated with Cheiron is the *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*. It is edited by Ian Nicholson of St. Thomas University in New Brunswick. The journal of APA Division 26, *History of Psychology*, is edited by Wade Pickren, who was, until recently, based at Ryerson University in Toronto. In the closely related field of theoretical psychology, the journal of APA Division 24 (Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology), the *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, is edited by Thomas Teo of York University, and its international counterpart, *Theory & Psychology*, is edited by Henderikus Stam of the University of Calgary. The inescapable conclusion is that history and theory of psychology in North America would not have anything like the profile it has without the involvement of psychologists based in Canada.

Why this should be the case is an interesting question. In Europe, the Dutch exert an influence on the field of history and theory of psychology that is similarly out of proportion to the size of the country. What the two countries have in common is that they are smaller than their immediate neighbours and subject to a variety of influences. The Dutch are famously multilingual and generally aware of what is happening in Britain, France, and Germany. Similarly, Canada has to cope with the influence of the United States and the lingering influence of its British and French heritage. It seems that larger countries can develop a distinct tradition of psychology without being too concerned about what is happening elsewhere, whereas smaller countries at the crossroads between them are subject to a variety of influences, and this leads them to examine the basic assumptions of the field. It is a speculative explanation, to be sure, but I am not aware of a better one.

I acknowledge the support of the International Council of Canadian Studies in conducting the research on which this article is based. I would also like to thank John Berry for providing the correspondence discussed in the article and for graciously offering to devote his article to other topics when we accidentally discovered, during an informal meeting, that we were both preparing articles for the special issue on the same topic.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Adrian C. Brock, School of Psychology, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland. E-mail: adrian.c.brock@ucd.ie

Although history and theory of psychology is much stronger in Canada than it is elsewhere, it is particularly striking how little research is devoted to the history of psychology in Canada. There is certainly research of that kind, but it is dwarfed in comparison with the amount of research that is done on the history of psychology in the United States. Textbooks on the history of psychology, even those written by citizens and residents of Canada, rarely, if ever, contain any information on the history of psychology in Canada. Although the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) has an active Section for History and Philosophy of Psychology, only a small proportion of the articles presented at its conferences are on Canadian topics. I recall an incident during my student days at York when one of my fellow students was advised by a well-meaning professor that a PhD dissertation on a Canadian topic would have negative implications for her career. It would be safer to write a dissertation on an American topic.

This situation dovetailed with another interest of mine: the rise of indigenous psychology as a global phenomenon. The term is used internationally in two distinct ways: It is often used to describe the psychology of an indigenous people, such as the Native Americans (e.g., Jordan, 2011), but it is more commonly used to describe the attempts of psychologists to avoid pursuing a psychology that is a carbon copy of psychology in the United States in order to pursue a psychology that is more appropriate to the national context. In the international literature on indigenous psychology, the two meanings of the term exist side by side (e.g., Allwood & Berry, 2006). In the account that follows, I am using the term in the sense of establishing a psychology that is more appropriate to the national context.

A great deal of literature on indigenous psychology has appeared in recent years, and some of it has been devoted to the topic of establishing an indigenous psychology in Canada. Two books are particularly notable in this regard. The first appeared in 1993 and was edited by Uichol Kim and John Berry. Kim is a Korean who studied with John Berry at Queens' University and is now a prominent figure in the international movement for indigenous psychology. The book is titled *Indigenous Psychologies* (Kim & Berry, 1993), and it contains a chapter by John Berry, "Psychology in and of Canada," in which the movement to establish a distinctively Canadian psychology is outlined and discussed (Berry, 1993). The other book was edited by Kim and two colleagues from Taiwan. It is titled *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology* and appeared in 2006 (Kim, Yang, & Hwang, 2006). The penultimate chapter of this book is authored by John Adair of the University of Manitoba. Although the chapter is not specifically on the movement for an indigenous psychology in Canada, it covers this topic in some detail (Adair, 2006).

Among the special issues of journals devoted to indigenous psychology is a special issue of *Applied Psychology*, the organ of the International Association of Applied Psychology. It was coedited by Adair and appeared in 1999 (Adair & Diaz-Loving, 1999). Adair has also contributed an article to this special issue in which the movement for an indigenous psychology in Canada is discussed (Adair, 1999). There is also a special issue of the *International Journal of Psychology* that John Berry coedited in 2006 (Allwood & Berry, 2006). It contains entries on the movement for an indigenous psychology in several countries, and one of these entries is by Berry on Canada (Berry, 2006). This literature covers the movement in Canada in some detail, and so there is not much

point in repeating the information here, especially because some readers may already be familiar with it. I will simply summarise its main points.

Canadian psychology was slow to develop in comparison with its American counterpart, and Canadian psychologists relied heavily on American institutions in the early part of the 20th century. The CPA was not founded until the start of the Second World War, and thus many Canadian psychologists became involved in the affairs of the APA. The tradition of the APA holding its meetings in Canada began quite early, with the annual meeting in Toronto in 1931. Funding for psychological research was also hard to come by in Canada, and so some Canadian psychologists applied for and successfully obtained funding in the United States. This state of affairs undoubtedly helped psychology to become established in Canada, but it also led to a situation where there was little, if anything, that was distinctive about psychology in Canada. This situation continued after the Second World War, when many psychology departments in Canada sought to have their professional programs accredited by the APA.

Matters seem to have come to a head with the massive expansion of higher education that took place in the 1960s and 1970s. There were not enough psychologists in Canada to fill all the university positions that were being created, and so psychologists from other countries were brought in. Some of these were from Europe and other parts of the world but, for simple reasons of geography, the vast majority were from the United States. There must have been some exceptions to the rule, but the rule was that these professors did not change their approach to psychology as a result of moving to Canada, but taught and researched the kind of psychology that they were already familiar with from the United States. This practice was no doubt encouraged by the common view that psychology is the same all over the world and does not vary from place to place. It was also exacerbated by the fact that there were no Canadian textbooks on psychology, so American textbooks were widely used.

In the early 1970s, dissatisfaction with this situation was openly expressed and one of the central figures in expressing this dissatisfaction was none other than John Berry. Together with his colleague, Gerry Wilde, who was originally from the Netherlands, Berry compiled an annotated bibliography of social psychology in Canada (Berry & Wilde, 1971). The bibliography was funded by the Canada Council and distributed free of charge to colleagues and libraries. They followed this up with an edited textbook, *Social Psychology: The Canadian Context* (Berry & Wilde, 1972).

Berry justified the need for a distinctively Canadian approach to psychology in several publications (e.g., Berry, 1974, 1993, 2006). He argued that Canada differed from the United States in important respects and it therefore needed a psychology that examined topics of Canadian interest. The differences included the fact that Canada is a vast country with a small population, and this brings with it special problems like transport and communication. The composition of the Canadian population is also different from that of the United States, one of the most striking differences being that a large percentage of the population of Canada speaks French. Canada also has a larger aboriginal population than the United States and a higher percentage of immigrants. It also has a lower percentage of African origin and does not share the obsession with "race" that has historically been a feature of the United States.

All this has led to official policies of bilingualism and multiculturalism, in contrast to the United States, where English is the sole official language and a policy of assimilating immigrants exists. Berry suggested that there was a need for a separate Canadian approach to the study of basic psychological processes, pointing out that some psychologists do not consider them independent of culture. However, he chose to direct his arguments to the areas of psychology that were more directly related to Canadian society, such as social psychology and the applied areas of organisational, educational, and clinical psychology.

Berry has kindly shared with me some correspondence that he conducted with the CPA and the APA around this time. The starting point was a letter from the President of CPA, Raymond G. Berry, to Prime Minister Trudeau, concerning a new policy of the American Internal Revenue Service with regard to “foreign conventions.” Berry expressed concern that it would affect the ability of APA to hold its meetings in Canada and asked for the Canadian government to intervene. The letter, and the replies to it, were published in the June 1977 issue of the *CPA Bulletin*.

John Berry (1977) wrote to Raymond Berry to complain about this letter. He was particularly offended by the words, “I think it is fair to say that we in Canada have considered . . . that the American Psychological Association is a continental association, servicing the needs of North American psychology.” John Berry wrote that he was appalled by the statement and wanted to know if this was now the official policy of the CPA and, if so, whether it had been confirmed by the board. Raymond Berry (1977) sent a reply in which he said that it did not represent a change in policy on the part of the CPA and defended his words. John Berry had copied his original letter to the executive officer of the CPA, Roger Myers, who sent a similar critical response (Myers, 1977). He said that Raymond Berry had been merely expressing his opinion, as CPA presidents often have to do, and he—Myers—agreed with this opinion. CPA had no formal policy on the issue and he hoped it never would. He added that he had been a member of the APA since 1932 and had never been treated as a foreigner. He also saw no reason why Canadians should now consider Americans to be foreigners.

Berry, Kalin, and Wilde (1973) had previously submitted a brief on the need for a distinctively Canadian psychology to the Commission on Canadian Studies, and Berry received a more sympathetic response from its chair, Tom Symons (1978):

The way in which some American learned societies toss off their meetings—this year Utah, next year Hawaii, the year after in Toronto, and then on to Puerto Rico—does convey the impression that, in their mind, Canada is just another state of the Union or, at best, an off-shore island in the American empire. This continentalist view which some U.S. learned societies take of their role can also impede the proper development of Canadian learned societies and, beyond that, retard the development of Canadian learned societies and of scholarly interest in Canadian problems and circumstances. For all these reasons, I share the reservations you express about national learned societies meeting in countries other than their own.

Berry (1979) subsequently tried a different approach: He wrote to the APA Office of Minority Affairs to suggest that if APA insisted on continuing to hold its meetings in Canada, it should recognise Canadians as an ethnic minority within the organisation. The suggestion was meant to be tongue-in-cheek (John Berry,

personal communication). The letter was passed on to the Committee on International Relations of APA, and one of its members, Mary J. Wright (1979), herself a past president of CPA, sent a reply:

I am a member of the Committee on International Relations of the American Psychological Association and, at our last meeting in Washington, your correspondence with Esteban Olmedo, regarding your views on the relationships between APA and psychology in Canada, was brought to our attention. A considerable amount of time was spent discussing your letter of March 8, 1979 and much concern was expressed lest your views represent those of the majority of psychologists in Canada. I expressed the opinion that they did not.

She continued,

I am a nationalist too, in that I am exceedingly proud of our Canadian culture and heritage which I consider to be distinct from that of the U.S.A., but this does not deter me from liking our neighbours to the south or from working with them on enterprises that are to the mutual benefit of both our associations.

The differences between Symons and the various officials of CPA may reflect the point made by Adair, Paivio, and Ritchie (1996) that psychologists tended to be less vocal about these matters than members of other academic disciplines.

Berry was undoubtedly one of the more radical critics of the relationship between Canadian and U.S. psychology, but he was far from alone in wanting Canadian psychology to pursue an independent course. Several publications by Canadian authors appeared in the 1980s in which they attempted to establish a distinctively Canadian approach to the subject. One of them was a textbook titled *A Canadian Social Psychology of Ethnic Relations*, which was edited by Robert C. Gardner and Rudolf Kalin (Gardner & Kalin, 1981). The editors make the nationalistic aims behind the volume clear in the preface:

To provide a Canadian contribution, we contacted social psychologists and sociologists with clear research programs on Canadian problems to invite them to contribute a chapter to this book. The major criterion for selecting authors was that they be active contributors to the research literature. Furthermore, it was not sufficient that the research be conducted in Canada—it had to be distinctively Canadian. (p. vii)

Indeed, the very topic of the book had been chosen on this basis: “Distinctively Canadian research does exist in subareas other than ethnic relations, but it could not be easily integrated into a common theme which could serve as the nucleus for a course in social psychology” (Gardner & Kalin, 1981, pp. vii–viii).

In 1988, the first comprehensive Canadian textbook on social psychology appeared, with revised editions of it subsequently appearing every 3 or 4 years (Alcock, Carment, & Sadava, 2005). Again, the nationalistic aims of the authors are clear:

As in the earlier editions of *A Textbook of Social Psychology*, we have tried to provide Canadian students of social psychology with an introduction to this exciting field that encourages them to think about the psychology of social behaviour in the context of Canadian society and culture. (p. xv)

The authors state that they have tried to cover all the material that is usually presented in U.S. social psychology texts, but they

illustrate it using examples drawn from Canadian social experience. They include a chapter on language and bilingualism, topics which have become important in Canada but are generally neglected in the United States. They also include a chapter on collective behaviour, a topic that is usually associated with European social psychology rather than its American counterpart (Smith, 2005).

As these events were taking place, European social psychologists like Henri Tajfel and Serge Moscovici were issuing their own declaration of independence from the United States (Moghaddam, 1987). American social psychology, they argued, was not just American in the sense that it was produced in the United States. It reflected American interests and values. The solution, in their view, was for European social psychologists to establish their own distinctive approach and their efforts resulted in a European association, a European journal, a European handbook, and a European textbook. As far as I am aware, there was no mutual influence between the movements in Canada and Europe. They seem to have arisen independently and can perhaps be best explained in terms of that much-abused word, the *Zeitgeist*. A contributing factor was the rapid growth of psychology outside the United States and the increase in self-confidence that it brought.

The movement to establish a European social psychology is generally seen as a historical event. It predates the rise of the indigenization movement in psychology and may have contributed to its growth. Nowadays, this movement is usually associated with countries in Asia and Africa whose cultures are very different from that of the United States, and the psychology they are reacting against is usually described as “Western” rather than American. The Wikipedia entry on indigenous psychology provides a good example of this view.

The aims of the movement in Canada have been modest compared with the movement in other parts of the world. When the *International Journal of Psychology* devoted a special issue to the topic of indigenous psychology, Kurt Danziger was asked to comment on the papers. In his comment, he makes a distinction between what he calls “technical” and “structural” changes that are made when psychology moves from one place to another (Danziger, 2006). Technical changes should not surprise us. They are made with material objects; for example, machinery that is modified so that it can function in extreme climates. An equivalent technical change in psychology would occur when a psychological test is standardized on the local population. Structural changes are more wide-ranging and affect the concepts, theories, and methods of psychology. According to this classification, the movement in Canada has been largely concerned with technical changes because it has focused on the topics that psychology investigates rather than how it investigates them. Adair (1999) has even proposed a hierarchy of indigenization, according to which the countries of Asia and Africa have the greatest need for indigenous psychology and Canada the least, with the countries of Latin America and Europe somewhere between the two.

Perhaps the most surprising thing about the movement for an indigenous psychology in Canada is not that it has been modest in its aims but that it exists at all. In order to show how unusual Canada is in this regard, we might compare it with another developed English-speaking country like the United Kingdom. There is nothing in the literature that I referred to earlier about a movement for indigenous psychology in the United Kingdom. To the best of

my knowledge, no such movement exists. There are also no contributions to this literature from authors based in the United Kingdom. The situation is similar in Australia. The only well-known author on this topic in Australia is originally from the Philippines and writes exclusively on the indigenous psychology of that country (Pe-Pua, 2006). There are some contributions from New Zealand, but these are concerned with the indigenous people of New Zealand, the Maoris, and not with the establishment of a distinctive national psychology.

The situation in Canada is interesting in that it shows that, although cultural difference is the most common way of justifying the need for an indigenous psychology, it is not the only factor in explaining why a movement exists. If cultural differences were the only factor, it is probably the last place on earth where we would expect to find such a movement. Like Adair (1999), I am speaking here in purely relative terms. Some advocates of indigenous psychology tend to exaggerate the importance of the movement worldwide. In reality, it is a significant force in only a few countries and is not the majority view in any of them. The countries that are usually mentioned in this connection are South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, India, and Mexico. What is particularly striking about them is that they are not the traditional enemies of the United States but some of its closest allies and friends. South Korea and Taiwan would not exist as independent countries without the help and support of the United States. The Philippines is a former American colony and continues to have close ties with the former colonial power. India is a former British colony and a longstanding ally of the United States. Mexico, like Canada, shares a long border with the United States, with which it has close economic ties. It is widely recognised that the indigenous psychology movement is fuelled by nationalism and anti-colonialism, and it tends to appear in countries where people feel that their national identity and culture is under threat. This would explain why there is such a movement in Canada but not in many of the countries of Asia and Africa.

How successful has the movement to establish a distinctively Canadian approach to psychology been? Here there is a notable difference between Berry and Adair. According to Adair (1999, 2006), the movement for an indigenous Canadian psychology has been a success. He points to the policy of giving preference to Canadian citizens and permanent residents in hiring decisions that was introduced in the Immigration Act of 1978 (Immigration Act, 1978). He also points to the growth of research on topics that are of specific interest to Canadians, such as bilingualism, and sees the appearance of Canadian textbooks on psychology as the culmination of this trend. Although he acknowledges that some progress has been made, Berry (1993) is much more critical. In response to the question, “What has been accomplished?” he answers, “Not very much!” (p. 268). He says that although the European declaration of independence was generally successful, he and his colleagues were accused of anti-Americanism and extreme nationalism. It is certainly true that there is not a great deal of difference between psychology in Canada and psychology in the United States. Many Canadian psychologists continue to go to the APA meetings and seek to publish in American journals, while the APA has continued the practice of holding its meetings in Canada. It is difficult to see how the situation could be different, given the proximity of the two countries and the fact that they have a similar standard of living and a common language.

If the movement for an indigenous psychology in Canada has had limited success on the domestic front, the same cannot be said of the situation elsewhere. It is surely no coincidence that psychologists from Canada have played such a prominent role in producing literature on indigenous psychology for an international audience. The connection between their views on the importance of indigenization and their views on the situation in Canada is there for all to see. As psychologists based in North America, they have access to publishers and journals that psychologists in developing countries might not have and they have used this situation to the advantage of the movement as a whole. They have also contributed to the movement by training some of its most prominent figures, such as Uichol Kim. In this respect, the movement for an indigenous psychology in Canada has been a success.

The history of psychology can make an important contribution to this movement. The neglect of the history of psychology in Canada goes hand in hand with the American domination of the field. Conversely, a greater interest in this topic can help to encourage a greater interest in the current situation in Canada, just as a greater interest in the current situation in Canada can lead to a greater interest in its past. One of the reasons why history matters is that there is an intimate relationship between our views of the present and the past.

Some might see this move as a retreat into insularity, but I beg to differ. A major problem with our current view of the history of psychology is that it is based on a few dominant countries to the neglect of everywhere else. I made an attempt to change this situation in an edited book titled, *Internationalizing the History of Psychology* (Brock, 2006). As I pointed out in the introduction, internationalization in this field lies in recovering the largely unknown history of psychology in countries that have been left out of the traditional accounts. Although that volume was focused on developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, we can learn a great deal from the history of psychology in the smaller countries of what has been traditionally called “the West” (Brock, 2012). Thus, addressing the neglect of the history of psychology in Canada will lead to more internationalization, not less.

The articles in this special issue are extremely diverse. The first article (Gül et al., this issue, pp. 94–104) is an account of the first generation of women psychologists in Canada, and it compares their experiences with those of the first and second generations of women psychologists in the United States, a topic on which a great deal of literature already exists. They show quite clearly that the experiences of women psychologists in Canada were different from those of their counterparts in the United States, due to the different social conditions that prevailed in Canada. For example, women in Canada had more job and educational opportunities during the Second World War.

The article is authored by Pelin Gül, Anastasia Korosteliiov, Lori Caplan, Laura C. Ball, Jennifer L. Bazar, Elissa N. Rodkey, Kate Sheese, Jacy L. Young, and Alexandra Rutherford. They are all based at York University and associated with the project “Psychology’s Feminist Voices.” This project is directed by Alexandra Rutherford of York University and Wade Pickren of Ithaca College, and its members are a diverse group of undergraduate and graduate students, most of who are based at York University (see <http://www.feministvoices.com/>). As mentioned earlier, York University has the only graduate program in history and theory of

psychology in North America. It is therefore no surprise that two of the four papers in this special issue emanate from there.

The second article by Erin L. Moss, Henderikus J. Stam, and Diane Kattevilder (Moss, Stam, & Kattevilder, this issue, pp. 105–114) of the University of Calgary looks at the relationship between eugenics and first-wave feminism in Alberta. Eugenics is basically concerned with selective breeding to improve the human race. It was well known to the Victorians that selective breeding had been used to produce desirable characteristics in dogs, racehorses, and farm animals, and it did not take a huge leap of imagination to suggest that it could be used to produce desirable characteristics in human beings as well. Although eugenics and psychology are not the same, the close historical relationship between them has led to the history of eugenics becoming a *de facto* part of the history of psychology. It was established by Charles Darwin’s cousin, Francis Galton, who is also a major figure in the history of psychology. Among other things, he bequeathed to psychology the intelligence test, the self-report questionnaire, and the correlation coefficient. He also bequeathed a lot of controversial baggage, including the “nature–nurture” debate (a term which he coined) and eugenics. Other prominent psychologists, such as Charles Davenport and Henry Herbert Goddard in the United States, were involved with the eugenics movement, as was the only Canadian who did his doctorate with Wilhelm Wundt, John M. MacEachran. MacEachran is an important figure in the history of psychology in Canada, having been the first head of the Department of Psychology and Philosophy at the University of Alberta and a cofounder of the CPA, as well as its first honorary president. He also served as the Chairman of the Alberta Eugenics Board from 1928 to 1965. The board recommended the compulsory sterilization of thousands of Albertans, a policy that continued until 1972, when the relevant act was repealed and the board dismantled.

The focus of the article is the role of first-wave feminists in the eugenics movement. Far from elevating them to the status of heroines, it shows how they were influenced by the racist and ethnocentric prejudices of the time and seeks to offer a more balanced view of their role. It also shows that some male eugenicists were sympathetic to the aims of the first-wave feminists. These points are important because they show that social critics do not stand outside society, as is often supposed. With the benefit of historical hindsight, we can see that they were as much a product of their time and place as those who endorsed the status quo.

In view of the fact that the first two articles have a feminist theme, a few words about the relationship between feminism and the history of psychology might be in order. Prior to the 1960s, history of psychology was an exclusively pedagogical field. It was during this decade that it became an area of specialization and research. Some of the important developments connected with this change were the establishment of APA Division 26 (History of Psychology), the Cheiron Society, and the *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*. The 1960s also marked the start of a worldwide trend that is often characterised as the “feminization” of psychology. Prior to the 1960s, the composition of the discipline was overwhelmingly male, and it became overwhelmingly female in the 1970s and beyond. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the two developments came together and feminism has been an important aspect of the history of psychology ever since. History is as much about

the present as the past in that the present determines the topics that historians select (Brock, 2011).

This point can also be seen in the third article (Bhatt, Tonks, & Berry, this issue, pp. 115–123) on culture in psychology by Gira Bhatt (Kwantlen Polytechnic University), Randal Tonks (Camosun College), and John Berry (Queen's University). Psychology has traditionally been based on naturalistic assumptions and has consequently neglected the influence of culture. In 1984, Smedslund called it “the invisible obvious” in psychology (Smedslund, 1984). This situation began to change in the 1980s and 1990s as culture became an important area of research, the most likely explanation being the worldwide trend toward globalization and the increasing amount of intercultural contact that it brought (Kashima & Gelfand, 2012). The authors divide the Canadian research on culture and psychology into three different areas: culture–comparative psychology, which involves comparing the different cultural groups in Canada; intercultural psychology, which involves examining the relationships between them; and indigenous psychology, which involves the creation of a distinctively Canadian psychology.

As with history and theory of psychology, Canada is unusually prominent in this field. The reasons for this situation are more obvious in that the country is a meeting point of different cultures, including those of its indigenous peoples, the original British and French settlers, and more recent immigrants. It should be noted, however, that this situation applies to other countries of European settlement, including the United States. The crucial difference appears to be that Canada was settled by two European powers rather than one. It consequently had to contend with two dominant languages and cultures, and this opened the door to the recognition of the languages and cultures of less influential members of society.

The fourth article by Daniel Lahham and Christopher Green of York University (Lahham & Green, this issue, pp. 124–132) is a biographical sketch of John Wallace Baird. Although it is not strictly speaking on the history of psychology in Canada, it concerns an important Canadian psychologist who has been largely forgotten. Baird grew up in the rural community of Motherwell, Ontario, and did his undergraduate degree at the University of Toronto. He then studied with several important figures in the history of psychology, including Wilhelm Wundt, Joseph Jastrow, and Edward B. Titchener, with whom he completed his PhD. After holding faculty positions at Johns Hopkins University and the University of Illinois, he settled at Clark University in Massachusetts, where he was a colleague of G. Stanley Hall. Perhaps most significantly, he served as the president of the APA at an important time in its history when the United States was involved in the First World War. The intelligence tests that were administered to U.S. army recruits at this time represent the first case of mass psychological testing anywhere in the world. Why Baird has been forgotten is an interesting question. The authors suggest that it is due to his close association with Titchener, whose introspective approach to psychology fell out of favour in subsequent years.

The final contribution is a book review by John B. Connors of Canadian University College (Connors, this issue, pp. 133–134). It underlines much of the content of this editorial in pointing out that textbooks on the history of psychology rarely mention Canada and that, although CPA has an active branch devoted to history and philosophy of psychology, few of the papers at its conferences are

on this topic. Like the special issue, the review seeks to go beyond a critique of this situation, but instead of providing new material, it provides information on some of the literature that already exists. The literature includes a “special section” that appeared in *Canadian Psychology* in 1992 (English, 1992; Hoff, 1992; Wright, 1992a; 1992b) and other articles that have been published in this journal and elsewhere during the intervening years (e.g., Dzinis, 2000; Green, 2004; Pols, 2002). It seems appropriate to end this editorial by acknowledging the work that has gone before us. The special issue should be seen as a continuation of this work and not something radically new.

Résumé

L'article commence en soulignant que l'histoire et la théorie de la psychologie occupent une place beaucoup plus grande au Canada qu'ailleurs. Toutefois, l'histoire de la psychologie au pays tend à être négligée. Cette situation est attribuable à la prépondérance de la psychologie américaine et au mouvement visant à établir une psychologie qui soit propre au Canada, différente de la discipline aux États-Unis. On fait valoir que ce mouvement peut contribuer à susciter plus d'intérêt à l'égard de l'histoire de la psychologie au Canada, et vice versa. Il est aussi suggéré que la discussion sur le peu d'importance accordée à l'histoire de la psychologie au Canada mènera à une plus grande internationalisation, et non le contraire.

Mots-clés : histoire de la psychologie, Canada, psychologie indigène, internationalisation.

References

- Adair, J. G. (1999). Indigenisation of psychology: The concept and its practical implementation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48, 403–418. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1999.tb00062.x
- Adair, J. G. (2006). Creating indigenous psychologies: Insights from empirical social studies of the science of psychology. In U. Kim, K.-S. Yang, & K.-K. Hwang (Eds.), *Indigenous and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context* (pp. 467–485). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/0-387-28662-4_21
- Adair, J. G., & Diaz-Loving, R. (1999). Indigenous psychologies: The meaning of the concept and its assessment: Introduction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48, 397–402. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1999.tb00061.x
- Adair, J. G., Paivio, A., & Ritchie, P. (1996). Psychology in Canada. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, 341–370. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.341
- Alcock, J. E., Carment, D. W., & Sadava, S. W. (2005). *A textbook of social psychology* (6th ed.). Toronto, ON: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Allwood, C. M., & Berry, J. W. (Eds.). (2006). Origins and development of indigenous psychologies: An international analysis. *International Journal of Psychology*, 41, 243–268. doi:10.1080/00207590544000013
- Berry, J. W. (1974). Canadian psychology: Some social and applied emphases. *Canadian Psychology*, 15, 132–139. doi:10.1037/h0081745
- Berry, J. W. (1977, June 24). [Letter to Raymond G. Berry]. Copy in possession of the author.
- Berry, J. W. (1979, March 8). [Letter to Esteban L. Olmedo]. Copy in possession of the author.
- Berry, J. W. (1993). Psychology in and of Canada: One small step toward a universal psychology. In U. Kim & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context* (pp. 260–276). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Berry, J. W. (2006). Global development and characteristics. In C. M. Allwood & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Origins and development of indigenous psychologies: An international analysis*. *International Journal of Psychology*, *41*, 260–261.
- Berry, J. W., Kalin, R., & Wilde, G. J. S. (1973). *Brief to Commission on Canadian Studies*. Subcommittee of Canadian Psychological Association. Copy in possession of the author.
- Berry, J. W., & Wilde, G. J. S. (Eds.). (1971). *Social psychology in Canada: An annotated bibliography*. Kingston, ON: Canada Council.
- Berry, J. W., & Wilde, G. J. S. (Eds.). (1972). *Social psychology: The Canadian context*. Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart.
- Berry, R. G. (1977, July 19). [Letter to John W. Berry]. Copy in possession of the author.
- Bhatt, G., Tonks, R. G., & Berry, J. W. (2013). Culture in the history of psychology in Canada. *Canadian Psychology*, *54*, 115–123.
- Brock, A. C. (2006). Introduction. In A. C. Brock (Ed.), *Internationalizing the history of psychology* (pp. 1–15). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Brock, A. C. (2011). Why history of psychology is going global. *The Psychologist*, *24*, 150–151.
- Brock, A. C. (2012). Ireland. In D. B. Baker (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of the history of psychology* (pp. 289–306). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Connors, B. C. (2013). A Chronicle of the Work of the CPA 1938-2010, by J. B. Conway. *Canadian Psychology*, *54*, 133–134.
- Danziger, K. (2006). Comment. In C. M. Allwood & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Origins and development of indigenous psychologies: An international analysis*. *International Journal of Psychology*, *41*, 269–275.
- Dzinas, K. (2000). Founding the Canadian Psychological Association: The perils of historiography. *Canadian Psychology*, *41*, 205–212. doi: 10.1037/h0086869
- English, A. (1992). Canadian psychologists and the aerodrome of democracy. *Canadian Psychology*, *33*, 663–674.
- Gardner, R. C., & Kalin, R. (Eds.). (1981). *A Canadian social psychology of ethnic relations*. Toronto, ON: Methuen.
- Green, C. D. (2004). The hiring of James Mark Baldwin and James Gibson Hume at Toronto in 1889. *History of Psychology*, *7*, 130–153. doi: 10.1037/1093-4510.7.2.130
- Gül, P., Korosteliiov, A., Caplan, L., Ball, L. C., Bazar, J. L., Rodkey, E. N., . . . Rutherford, A. (2013). Reconstructing the experiences of first generation women in Canadian Psychology. *Canadian Psychology*, *54*, 94–104.
- Hoff, T. L. (1992). Psychology in Canada one hundred years ago: James Mark Baldwin at the University of Toronto. *Canadian Psychology*, *33*, 683–694.
- Immigration Act, 1976–77, c. 52, s. 1 (1978).
- Jordan, J. B. (2011). Indigenous psychology in North America: Lessons learned from a neo-colonialism. Retrieved from <http://www.iaia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Jordan-2011-Indigenous-Psychology-in-North-America-Lessons-Learned-from-Neo-Colonialism.pdf>
- Kashima, Y. B., & Gelfand, M. J. (2012). A history of culture in psychology. In A. W. Kruglanski & W. Stroebe (Eds.), *Handbook of the history of social psychology* (pp. 499–520). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Kim, U., & Berry, J. W. (Eds.). (1993). *Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kim, U., Yang, K.-S., & Hwang, K.-K. (Eds.). (2006). *Indigenous and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context*. New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/0-387-28662-4
- Lahham, D., & Green, C. D. (2013). John Wallace Baird: The first Canadian president of the *American Psychological Association*. *Canadian Psychology*, *54*, 124–132.
- Moghaddam, F. (1987). Psychology in the three worlds: As reflected by the crisis in social psychology and the move towards indigenous third-world psychology. *American Psychologist*, *42*, 912–920. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.42.10.912
- Moss, E. L., Stam, H. J., & Kattevilder, D. (2013). From suffrage to sterilization: Eugenics and the women's movement in 20th Century Alberta. *Canadian Psychology*, *54*, 105–114.
- Myers, C. R. (1977, July 15). [Letter to John W. Berry]. Copy in possession of the author.
- Pe-Pua, R. (2006). From decolonizing psychology to the development of a cross-indigenous perspective in methodology: The Philippine experience. In U. Kim, K.-S. Yang, & K.-K. Hwang (Eds.), *Indigenous and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context* (pp. 109–137). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/0-387-28662-4_5
- Pols, H. (2002). Between the laboratory and life: Child development research in Toronto, 1919–1956. *History of Psychology*, *5*, 135–162. doi:10.1037/1093-4510.5.2.135
- Smedslund, J. (1984). The invisible obvious: Culture in psychology. *Advances in Psychology*, *18*, 443–452. doi:10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62641-2
- Smith, P. (2005). Is there an indigenous European social psychology? *International Journal of Psychology*, *40*, 254–262. doi:10.1080/00207590444000195
- Symons, T. H. B. (1978, September 11). [Letter to John W. Berry]. Copy in possession of the author.
- Wright, M. J. (1979, August 16). [Letter to John W. Berry]. Copy in possession of the author.
- Wright, M. J. (1992a). Women ground-breakers in Canadian psychology: World War II and its aftermath. *Canadian Psychology*, *33*, 675–682.
- Wright, M. J. (1992b). The golden anniversary symposium: CPA's first 50 years. *Canadian Psychology*, *33*, 695–696.

Received October 20, 2012

Revision received March 8, 2013

Accepted March 8, 2013 ■

Copyright of Canadian Psychology is the property of Canadian Psychological Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.