History of women in Psychology

This Newsletter is dedicated to women in the history of psychology. I would like to talk about Women in the presidency of the IAAP. I begin by quoting an excerpt dedicated to the presidents of this important association.

Among the 16 first Presidents of IAAP […] Only two were women, both from France - Claude Lévy-Leboyer became President in 1982, after 62 years of male leadership. Christine Roland-Lévy became President of IAAP, as the second woman President, some 28 years later (Presidents of IAAP).

Claude Lévy-Leboyer (born June 10, 1928 and died August 3, 2015). She was elected as the first woman president of the IAAP at the Edinburgh Congress in July 1982.

Her term as president was from 1982 to 1990. Lévy-Leboyer (1983), in his Letter from the President [Lettre du Président], affirms: "I will strive to" [me esforzará por]:

- To develop actions to clarify the status of applied psychology in the world.
- A project on the role of women psychologists is under study.
- To carry out actions aimed at strengthening international links (a project that was decisive for the internationalization of psychology in Spain).

Christine Roland-Lévy is the current President of the IAAP (2018-2022). In 2014 she was the President of the 28th International Congress of Applied Psychology. Roland-Lévy in 2019 during the proclamation at the International Summit on Psychology and Global Health stated three priority issues on her agenda:

Source: @AntoineLeboyer
**Gender equality and quality education**
For this purpose, a series of Special Projects involving our 18 Divisions are actively developing innovative ideas that will need to be enacted as soon as possible.

**Peaceful and inclusive societies and justice for all**
For this goal, we have created the Prevention of Terrorism and Peace Building Task Force.

**Climate change and sustainable ecosystems**
For this key topic, we have a Special Project [...] Studies in applied psychology have already shown how to contribute to changing behaviors to reduce climate change and develop sustainable ecosystems.

We thank Claude and Christine, who in addition to having in common their French origin and their surname Lévy, have notably represented Women in the History of the IAAP.

**Referencias**

Julio César Ossa Ph. D.  
Editor in chief

---

**President’s Corner**

**Dear colleague,**

It is a pleasure to send you this issue of the Division 18 Newsletter (History of Applied Psychology) which is dedicated to women in the history of psychology. Around the world, many people (women and men) have contributed to the development of psychology as a scientific discipline. However, the role of women in the history of psychology has been silenced throughout time despite their relevant contributions in advancing our discipline as we know it today.

One of the main reasons is that they were subjected to discrimination and prejudice because of their status as women, without considering the quality of their ideas and work.

There have been many systems of exclusion that women have had to face. For example, the fact that they were admitted late to universities and the obstacles to accessing scientific academies and professional circles. Sometimes, many women were forced to hide behind the male figures of their husbands or teachers.

Some occasions, the most outstanding psychologists in the history of psychology have had women working with them in their laboratories as collaborators, doctoral students, or students. Frequently, their contributions have been ignored by historians. During many years, there has been a silence (or lack of visibility) in the contributions of women in Psychology in general.

One of the pioneers to make visible women's work had been James McKeen Cattel who created his yearbook of 'American Men of Science (AMS)', which was renamed "American Men and Women of Science" in 2014 that continues to be a work biographical reference book on leading scientists from the United States and Canada.

In 1906, in his American Men of Science (AMS), James McKeen Cattel already published the names of some women such as Christine Ladd-Franklin (1847 – 1930), Mary Whiton Calkins (1863 – 1930) or Margaret Washburn (1871 – 1939) with the recognition...
of "eminent psychologists" for their contributions to psychology.

Besides, we have to add other names of pioneers who emerged in North America and in the rest of the world; some of them are:

- Elizabeth Fry (1780 – 1845)
- Dorothea Dix (1802 – 1887)
- Christine Ladd-Franklin (1847 – 1930)
- María Montessori (1870 – 1952)
- Clotilde Guíllén (1880 – 1951)
- María de Maeztu (1881 – 1948)
- Melanie Klein (1882 – 1960)
- Karen Horney (1885 – 1952)
- Mercedes Rodrigo (1891 – 1982)
- Hélène Antipoff (1892 – 1974)
- Anna Freud (1895 – 1982)
- Leta Stetter Hollingworth (1886 – 1939)
- Margaret Mead (1901 – 1978)
- Laura Perls (1905 – 1990)
- Mary Ainsworth (1913 – 1999)
- Bärbel Inhelder (1913 – 1997)
- Mary Ainsworth (1913 – 1999)
- Virginia Satiér (1916 – 1988)
- Mamie Phipps Clark (1917 – 1983)
- Eleanor Maccoby (1917 – 2018)
- Elisabeth Kubler-Ross (1926 – 2004)
- Claude Levy-Leboyer (1928 – 2015), etc.

As it can be appreciated the list of women with relevant contributions in psychology is very extensive.

For this reason, in the issue of this Newsletter we wish to pay tribute to all those women of the past who have gone unrecognized for their contributions to psychology. Besides, this Newsletter also serves as recognition of all those women at the same time who are working tirelessly making relevant contributions to the advancement of psychology. Some colleagues bring relevant contributions on women in psychology history.

Dr. Heather Gridley shares with us a brief history of women in psychology in Australia. She underlines that in a discipline and profession that psychology is now numerically dominated by women who are leading the development of application of psychology in different fields.

From York University (Toronto, Canada), our colleagues Danielle Christie, Zoé Martin, and Desirée Salis stress on the Psychology and Feminist: Supporting Critical Historical Work on Women, Gender, and Feminism.

They underline those women contributions seemed to be of little interest to historians until the latter half of the 20th century. They are working together with different associations and professionals to build the resources to ensure that histories of psychology will always include women, gender, and feminism as essential forces in the field.

On her side, Dr. Mari Carmen Giménez makes an analysis on why most of the historical narratives about science or artistic creativity ignore the role of women. She exposes those different narratives that make invisible the contribution of women to the construction of knowledge which are not only unfair, but also convey a falsified version of history.

We take this opportunity to pay tribute to Professor Herbert C. Kelman (1927 – 2022) who passed away in March 2022. He was one of the pioneers in the Psychology of Peace, both for his contributions as theorist and his active involvement in promoting peace. He taught psychology and Social Ethics at the Baltimore College of Commerce and at Harvard. Kelman was president of some relevant academic societies such as the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (1964 – 1965), the Peace Science Society (1975 – 1976), the Psychologists for Social Responsibility (1990 – 1992), etc. He will always remain in our hearts and memory.

We profit this occasion to invite all of you to look for and then send us information and news related to those historical issues related to psychology from your country or region. You might also suggest new topics for the coming issues. Our newsletter tries to be our common work, and an important piece for our common memory.
A brief history of women in psychology in Australia

Heather Gridley OAM*  
* Order of Australia medal, awarded in 2019  
Victoria University, Australia

PSYCHOLOGY IN AUSTRALIA

Taking its cue from the Ancient Greeks’ emphasis on order, measurement and control, the 17th Century Western scientific revolution emphasised a methodology of quantification, prediction and verification to uncover truth – to torture the secrets out of nature should she prove resistant, as Francis Bacon so delicately suggested (Eisenberg, 1992). Nature was of course assumed to be feminine and passive, awaiting the gaze and penetration of the male scientist-adventurer.

Women took virtually no part in the cultural and scientific Renaissance, except as its artists’ models - and so the healing knowledges of midwives and others fell outside ‘the academy’ of the emerging male medical profession that psychology aspired to emulate. Despite being rendered motherless, when modern Western psychology was ‘born’ in Wundt’s Liepzig laboratory in 1879, it claimed two ‘parent’ disciplines: philosophy and science. With the new sciences of biology, physics and medicine kicking so many goals, it paid to line up in science’s corner.

The formal history of psychology in Australia has clear links with its parallel history in the world of its colonisers, but with the important difference that the discipline emerged here in tandem with the establishment of the first universities themselves in the latter half of the nineteenth century. In most Australian states, psychology was initially located within philosophy departments led by Scottish chairs, unsurprisingly all male. Only two chairs of psychology were established in their own right prior to World War II.

The emergence of psychology as a science was linked with practical applications in education, industry and medicine in the early twentieth century, and tied in particular to the introduction of compulsory schooling. The profession of psychology becomes an interesting case study, since it comprises both a feminised service branch and a classically male-dominated academic branch. (Furumoto, 1987).

It was in this latter area that women began to take leading roles, developing intelligence tests and setting up special classes for ‘mentally defective’ children (Turtle & Orr, 1988). Similarly in the USA, Furumoto (1987) reported that in 1910 only 9.8% of psychology academics were female, yet there were three times as many women as men in school psychology, with more men in industrial psychology and equal numbers in clinical psychology. Applied psychology came further into the spotlight during World War II, with many psychologists recruited into the armed forces in areas such as personnel selection, aptitude testing, task analysis and rehabilitation.

GENDER REPRESENTATION IN PSYCHOLOGY

There has been very little documentation of gender representation in Australian psychology over the years, apart from the membership numbers within the Australian Psychological Society (APS) since its formation in 1966. The Society had existed since 1945 as a branch of the British Psychological Society (BPS) that became affiliated in its own right with the International Union of Psychological Science in 1957.

Much of the following discussion is therefore focussed on activity (and activism) within the APS over the last fifty-five years.

The foundation members of the Australian Branch of the BPS numbered forty-four men and ten women. By the time the branch closed twenty years later ahead of the formation of the APS, there were close to one thousand members, of whom 284 were female, a proportional increase of about ten percent.
Twenty years later again, female membership of the APS was rapidly approaching parity, and overall membership had increased to more than five thousand. By that time a rapid post-war expansion in tertiary education, together with the second wave of feminism, had enabled thousands of ‘baby boomer’ generation women to access psychology courses.

Examinations of gender trends in human services professions in Australia in the 1980s (Cross, 1984; Taft, 1990), the USA (Cohen & Gutek, 1991), and Britain (Kagan & Lewis, 1990) revealed the predominance and greater visibility of men in research, publishing, training and leadership positions, while the practitioners, students and clients were predominantly female. These trends continued into the 21st century, according to APS membership statistics in 2001 showing that 31% of Fellows were women, compared with 68% of full Members and 83% of Student, Affiliate and Associate Members; 61% employed in tertiary settings were women compared with 71% in practice settings, with the figure higher again in the public sector (APS, 2001). Taft (1990) wondered whether the feminisation of the APS might lead to a loss in status for psychology in general. As shocking as such speculation sounds, he was probably right – it was and still is commonly acknowledged that feminised work, especially in the care economy, attracts consistently lower remuneration than do male-dominated jobs and professions.

The most recent APS Annual Report (2021) noted that 79.77% of the 27,657 APS members were female, but only 20% (3/15) of Honorary Fellows were women. The APS has had thirty-nine presidents to date, seven of whom have been women, including the last two. The current President-elect who will assume the role in October 2022 is also female, which will bring the proportion of female leaders to 20% since 1966, and 40% this century.

This trend in the Society’s membership and leadership has emerged in parallel with a major shift over time from the APS identifying itself primarily as a ‘learned society’ of scholars and academics to that of a professional association where the majority of members are practitioners, predominantly in mental health service delivery, and increasingly in the private sector.

The Psychology Board of Australia, established in 2010, reports that a total of 42,657 psychologists were listed on its register in December 2021. Of these, 80.3% were female. By 2021, the most common work setting for psychologists was private practice.

THE APS WOMEN AND PSYCHOLOGY INTEREST GROUP

In the early 1970s Australia elected a reformist, progressive Labor Government and matters such as social responsibility, Indigenous issues, and the treatment of those with mental illness were being increasingly debated within psychology (Cooke, 2000). Two feminist psychologists were active in the formation in 1972 of the Women’s Electoral Lobby, contributing their research expertise to the development of a survey of Federal Election candidates on their attitudes to equal pay, equal opportunity, childcare, abortion and family planning.

One of those women was Dr Carmen Lawrence, who went on to become the first female Premier of any Australian State (Western Australia) and later a Federal Minister.

The other was the late Patricia Strong, a prominent and much-loved counselling psychologist who conducted research and delivered classes on women in management in the 1980s and 90s. Both women appear in the recent documentary of the Australian Women’s Liberation Movement, Brazen Hussies.

Within the APS, Sydney academic Dr Una Gault was among a number of members urging the Society to contribute to public debate on issues as diverse as discrimination against homosexuals, Aboriginal land rights, and the Vietnam War (Cooke, 2000).

In 1974 the APS formed the Committee on Social Issues, following a successful motion by Gault at the 1973 AGM and a preceding ballot of members in which 86% of members endorsed the general principle that the APS should “be prepared to take a public stand on social issues” (Cooke 2000, p. 168). The Committee lasted only
five years before its functions were absorbed into the National Director’s role and faded from view until a 1994 governance restructure saw the establishment of a Board instead of a larger Council, with a Directorate of Social Issues among the portfolios of the ten directors. Una Gault and I were both appointed to the inaugural Social Issues Advisory Group. As Cooke (2000) noted, The landscape of ‘social issues’ proved too vast for a volunteer society like the APS to traverse, but as experience in the 1980s was to show, laying claim to small parts of that territory allowed the Society to hold ground (p. 170).

The rapid increase in membership numbers in the 1970s and 80s, along with the long-standing tensions between ‘academic’ and ‘professional’ arms of the Society, led to the establishment in 1981 of Scientific and Professional Divisions, with the latter hosting the then five Boards representing increasingly diverse areas of professional practice, soon to be expanded to seven and finally nine in the early 1990s. But when moves were made to establish groups for members organising around social issues such as feminism and the prevention of war, it proved difficult to determine whether these were primarily ‘scientific’ or ‘professional domains – and of course they were both.

There was also resistance to the political nature of such groups, which some members viewed as antithetical to the notion of professional and scientific objectivity. A 1990 article by Sue Wilkinson, co-founder of Feminism and Psychology, examined some of the strategies employed by academic-professional societies to contain women’s attempts to organise within their national psychological societies in five countries, with particular attention to comparisons between the UK and Australia. Una Gault herself recalled how the women discussing the proposed group at the 1981 APS Conference were heckled and mocked by a number of male ‘heavies and nuisances’ (Cooke, 2000, p. 171).

Amongst the women advocating for a group along the lines of the American Psychological Associations Division 35 on the Psychology of Women that had been in existence since 1973, there was also discussion on several questions: whether such a group should be open to women only; whether it could include non-APS members; what structures (if any) it should incorporate; and whether it should focus on women’s studies in psychology or psychological practice with women. Founding members Kaye Bussey and Una Gault were passionate in the mission to ensure women’s issues remained visible within the discipline and profession of psychology.

The motion to form a Special Interest Group on Women and Psychology was finally passed by the APS Council in 1984, along with that for an interest group for psychologists concerned with the nuclear threat, later named Psychologists for the Prevention of War (now Psychologists for Peace). The name Women and Psychology (W & P) rather than Women in Psychology reflected the insistence of the APS that its constituent groups be open to all members, despite the fact that professional boards such as the long-established Division/Board (now College) of Clinical Psychologists stipulated higher qualifications for its members than those required for general APS membership.

Women and Psychology sub-groups soon became active in three states, based in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. Activities ranged from monthly dinners with a guest speaker, lectures, organizing presentations at the annual APS conferences, and making representations to Council on matters relating to women within psychology and in the wider community. W & P became a place to find women mentors, a learning, training network/ground for early career women psychologists – a function it continues to serve.

The redoubtable Una Gault had previously co-organised a Women and Psychology Hearing in November 1974, in the lead-up to the first International Women’s Year. She also edited a special issue of the Australian Psychologist (Vol 10: 3) in 1975, and did the same fifteen years later (Vol. 25: 3), reflecting on possible future directions for ‘women’s work in psychology’ – mainstream or separatist? positivist or social constructionist? women venerated or problematised? feminist or apolitical? It was generally agreed that psychology was an ideal site for enactment of the feminist mantra ‘the personal is political’. Gault also launched the Women and Psychology Newsletter which was mailed to members several times a year. Known as ‘the Blue Newsletter’ for the colour of its paper, and carrying a sketch of a white ant as its subversive logo, the newsletter was members’ main link with the group prior to the digital age. Published online from 2005, it ran for 25 volumes with a series of editors before ceasing publication in 2013 with an obituary for Una Gault. Somehow reading it online just wasn’t the same experience as receiving it in the mail.

THE ELAINE DIGNAN AWARD

In 1991 the Queensland W & P group established an award to honour the contribution to psychology and to the wider community made by Elaine Dignan, a feminist activist and public sector psychologist who died of cancer in 1990. In a famous feminist event in 1965 when two women had chained themselves to a bar to protest against restrictions on women, it was Elaine Dignan who threw the key to the bolt for the chains in the Brisbane River. The chains had to be sawn off. Long-standing Queensland group coordinator Ann Aboud recalls that Elaine was at many protest marches for Aboriginal Rights and saw the police brutality meted out to protesters. She campaigned strongly against domestic
violence in the 1980s and following her untimely death, the Elaine Dignan/Jan Stephens annual oration was established at the Royal Brisbane Hospital.

The Elaine Dignan Award “encourages research about women; women’s studies in psychology; or professional work of a psychological nature involving women, which addresses gender and other social attributes (e.g., race, class, sexuality) and considers their psychological effects”. It has been awarded to thirty-five women for contributions spanning research, teaching and practice, ranging from student theses through community projects to lifetime achievements.

The inaugural recipient was Una Gault, and the most recent was Dr Susie Allanson (2021) for sustained contribution to psychological practice and research with and about women in Australia for more than thirty years, with a particular focus on women’s reproductive health and advocacy for women’s reproductive rights and safety. Susie worked for many years as psychologist at the Melbourne Fertility Control Clinic, where a security guard was murdered by an anti-abortion fanatic twenty years ago. Susie documented the events and impacts of that murder at the time, and is also co-author of the recently released book on how the murder catalysed the abortion-providing clinic’s fight to protect women from religious extremists. She was also active in the successful 2008 campaign to have abortion decriminalised in Victoria, and her work underpinned a series of APS submissions and presentations to government inquiries in other states considering similar legislation. Like her feminist psychologist predecessors, Susie has been an inspirational advocate and agent for change both within and beyond her profession.

WOMEN AND PSYCHOLOGY CONFERENCES 1990-2016

In 1990 the New South Wales group hosted a Residential Weekend Conference which attracted women from several other states as well as Aotearoa New Zealand. The conferences became an annual event at the end of November through to 2011, mostly in NSW or Victoria, with two in Queensland and one in Adelaide, South Australia. A number of similar conferences were held in New Zealand between 1992-2013, with plenty of trans-Tasman visitors in both directions over those years.

Since then, the Victorian W & P group has hosted three non-residential conferences, the first showcasing the work of Elaine Dignan Award recipients as a memorial tribute to Una Gault (2013), the second taking the theme of Motherhood Matters (in 2015), and the third co-hosted with the APS Child, Adolescent and Family Psychology Interest Group, on Sex, Gender and the Future of Relationships (2016). There was also a one-day conference in 2004 (2004) on Feminist Research in Psychology, but overall, the focus of the group has tended to be more on counselling/clinical/therapeutic and community-based practice than on theory and research. In contrast, the New Zealand conferences carried a stronger research base. In both cases however, the values underpinning these gatherings were explicitly feminist, and the links between theory and practice were also emphasized, along with the importance of providing and supportive, nurturing and safe spaces for women in psychology to come together. The residential weekends often incorporated entertainment from local artists and women’s groups like the memorable Drummers of Illawarra OWN (Older Women’s Network) (2011).

THE POLITICS OF ETHICS: APPLYING FEMINIST ETHICS TO PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

The development, eventual adoption and subsequent periodic review by the APS of a set of ethical guidelines for psychological practice with women provide another instructive example of Wilkinson’s analysis of how the strategies typically deployed by such organisations to resist member activism ‘can illuminate the processes of disciplinary stasis and change’ (Wilkinson, 1990, p. 256). First suggested by the Victorian-based Feminist Therapy Collective in 1990 following similar developments in Canada and the USA a decade earlier, the proposed guidelines drafted by W & P were not approved until six years later. Extensive consultation processes as well as institutional obstacles formed a subtext to their evolution and subsequent revisions. Three of the tactics identified by Wilkinson (1990) are particularly applicable:

- Control by definition: what is a Guideline? Who should be consulted? ‘These Guidelines are not consistent with the rest of the Code’.
- Use of informal tactics to control deviance: apathy/incompetence vs urgency/authority
- Deployment of ‘equality’ rhetoric: ‘The principles addressed apply equally to male and female clients. Focusing on female clients only is discriminatory on itself’ (feedback from 6 APS Branches during the consultation process)

In contrast to the slow, drawn-out processes involved in having ‘the women guidelines’ accepted, in 1994 the then APS President, whose research expertise was in eye-witness memory, oversaw the near instant approval of a set of guidelines he had drafted in relation to the ‘Reporting of Recovered Memories’, in the context of international and local controversies around the veracity and reliability of memories of sexual and ritual abuse reported for the first time in therapy.

Regardless of the merits of arguments on both sides of the false memory/recovered memory debates and their
legal implications, it was clear that the sense of urgency for the rapid acceptance of these guidelines was underpinned by the power of presidential authority, scientific justification, and legal threats in defence of alleged perpetrators of abuse (all predominantly male domains) vis-à-vis the efforts of (mostly female) therapists/practitioner psychologists who were actively discouraged by the new guidelines from believing, supporting or advocating for (mostly female) clients whom they believed had survived sexual abuse and who might be considering taking legal action.

Ironically, it was the undeniably stark contrast between the development processes for these two sets of ethical guidelines that embarrassed the Board of Directors into adopting the informally named Women and Therapy Guidelines in May 1996, along with at an equally ground-breaking set of Guidelines for the provision of psychological services for, and the conduct of psychological research with, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people of Australia that had also been ‘in the pipeline’ for several years. The unifying saga was also the catalyst for the establishment in 1998 of an APS Ethical Guidelines Committee (EGC) to oversee a more orderly protocol and process for the development and periodic review of the Society’s ethical guidelines. (Having been a key proponent of the now official APS Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Female Clients, I was appointed to the inaugural EGC and remained a member for the next twenty years).

The history of ‘the women guidelines’ provides a fascinating narrative of power and gender dynamics suffusing the structures and discourses of our profession. And it was played out again in more recent years in another initiative by W & P to assist the APS to develop a set of practice guidelines for psychologists responding to the issue of family violence. After preliminary discussions, a wide consultancy group was formed in 2013 and two years later an initial draft was provided to the APS National Office. Around this time, W & P National Convener Carmel O’Brien was informed that the APS had received a letter from the Victorian Coroner’s Office and that as part of the response to this letter, it was mentioned that the APS was indeed putting family violence, has made the Guidelines publicly available on her own website.

WHAT NOW, WHAT NEXT FOR WOMEN IN PSYCHOLOGY IN AUSTRALIA?

There is much more that could be written on the history of women in Australian psychology, but no more time or space here. It is fair to say that there are very few Australian feminist psychologists whose research has had an international reach (although there are some, and naming those would risk omitting others). Australian contributions to journals like Feminism and Psychology have been sporadic, with the most substantial probably being Joan Beckwith’s editing of a special issue on Power between Women in 1999. The individual and collective impacts of the many women who have been involved in the activities and undertakings of the APS Women and Psychology Interest Group have more often coalesced around the implications for (and of) psychological practice of issues such as gendered violence and sexual assault, women in organisations, mothering, body image, women’s mental health and reproductive rights.

The group’s original aims encompassed both research and practice, in keeping with the founders’ resistance to separating these domains. The W & P aims were recently revised to reflect a more explicit feminist stance that takes account of gender inequities and intersectionalities, and seeks to promote dialogue within a gendered framework across all areas of psychological theory and practice.

Current challenges confronting the latest generation of women in Australian psychology include the increasing medicalisation and privatisation of psychological services that works against collegiality and collective action and masks any gendered patterns in the social determinants of health and wellbeing. Similarly, the neoliberal turn in Australian universities and the politics of publication both demand a focus on ‘high impact’ journals and preclude acceptance of local, community-based, politically contextualised research in those same journals.
As Michelle Fine (2012) put it a decade ago:

We seem to have forgotten to ask critical questions like ‘What kinds of evidence are being privileged? What are we not seeing?’ in our rush to accept ever-narrowing notions of evidence-based practice in the face of irrefutable indicators of the gendered, raced, classed and sexualized collateral damage of economic and political crisis (p.3).

Australian psychology is currently riven with debates over a ‘two-tier system’ that sees mental health services delivered by clinical psychologists attracting a 50% higher Medicare rebates than do arguably similar or identical services provided by any other registered psychologist, whether or not they have an Area of Practice Endorsement in domains such as counselling, health educational or community psychology. Since many active W & P members over the years have been counselling, community, educational or ‘just’ generally registered psychologists, and a number of such women have resigned from the APS and/or joined an alternative association that seems to better represent their professional needs.

In a discipline and profession that is now numerically dominated by women, it is paradoxically more difficult to make the case for women as a special interest group. New APS members tend to (pay to) join interest groups that most closely match their interests and identities, such that groups like Christianity and Psychology or on Acceptance and Commitment Therapy are now larger than W & P, which perhaps sounds too diffuse. W & P is also alphabetically last on the list of choices.

There are now more than fifty APS interest groups, loosely clustered around meta-themes such as organisational systems, health issues, culture and spirituality, practice approaches and public interest, which is where W & P fits best, along with its old sibling, Psychologists for Peace, and the rebranded Diverse Bodies, Genders & Sexualities (formerly Gay and Lesbian Issues in Psychology, or GLIP). The latter change raises another key question. What does ‘women’ signify in the context of contested gender identities, queer politics and non-binary spaces?

From trailblazing women like Elaine Dignan and Una Gault though to Susie Allanson and Carmel O’Brien, many feminist scholars and practitioners in Australian psychology have also been active in public debates and campaigns in the wider community. Today, movements like #MeToo and the School Strikes for Climate are attracting widespread support in the Australian community, but most of the action is taking place outside psychology. What can psychologists contribute, and how?

Are professional associations the best site for activism ‘in our own backyard’, or do they provide us with a useful power and evidence base from which to direct our efforts outwards towards influencing gender-infused policies and initiatives that matter to people and planet? As we say in Australia, I’m going to handball that one to the next generation of women in psychology to tackle.
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Despite their longstanding presence in psychology’s disciplinary past, women and their contributions seemed to be of little interest to historians until the latter half of the 20th century. This (incomplete) shift away from purely male-stream histories occurred in tandem with the emergence of women’s movements and feminist psychology in many parts of the world in the 1970s (see Rutherford, Capdevila, Undurti, & Palmary, 2011). In response to the need for critical historical work on women, gender, and feminism in psychology, Psychology’s Feminist Voices (PFV) was formed.

PFV is a research team and multimedia digital archive project based out of York University in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Our team engages critical, historical, feminist, and intersectional perspectives to analyze the relationships among gender, race, class, and psychology. In 2020 we launched our newly redeveloped website which houses an extensive collection of oral histories, profiles, and teaching resources that highlight the diverse contributions of women and feminists in the field. The collection includes over 320 short biographies in the Women Past and Feminist Presence sections of the site. The Women Past collection focuses on profiling and bringing recognition to women who, while not necessarily self-identified as feminists or endorsing feminist views, made important contributions in many areas, from research to policy to practice.

The Feminist Presence collection focuses on psychologists who shaped the development of feminist psychology in the 1970s, as well as those who continue to elaborate feminist psychologies through diverse praxes and theoretical modes.

While U.S. and Canada-based psychologists are heavily represented, our ongoing aim is to make this an international resource.

The PFV team also conducts, transcribes, archives, and makes available oral history interviews to amplify the voices of individuals and groups who bring feminist values into their work as psychologists. The ongoing oral history project, which includes over 100 video-recorded interviews with contemporary feminist psychologists, provides firsthand accounts that explore the dynamic intersection of feminism and psychology, professional and personal narratives, and feminist identity formation. Interview participants come from Austria, India, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Canada, Sweden, Australia, and the United States. Documenting and preserving these accounts can lend critical insights into the multifaceted relationship between feminism and psychology, for both today’s psychologists and future historians. They can be used for research as well as for teaching purposes, and indeed, historians are beginning to draw on them to reconstruct histories of LGBT psychology (Hegarty, 2018), histories of sexual harassment and exploitation in psychology (e.g., Kim & Rutherford, 2015; Young & Hegarty, 2019), and even women in science for a popular audience (Ignotofsky, 2016).

PFV also includes a number of projects and exhibits that tackle historical and contemporary issues related to gender, feminism, and psychology. For instance, our Standpoints blog encourages short entries that reflect and share insights on psychology and its history from a feminist perspective. Our other projects and exhibits are typically student-led, or in collaboration with research groups at both local and international levels.
A fruitful collaboration with the American Psychological Association (APA) and Cummings Center for the History of Psychology in the United States, for example, has given rise to the I Am Psyched! multimedia exhibit, which attends specifically to the history and contemporary contributions of women of colour in U.S. psychology. A PFV student-led digital exhibit called “Takin’ It To the Streets” explores how a number of feminist psychologists featured on the site have engaged in social justice movements, bridging the often artificially siloed worlds of academia and political activism. And “Queer(ing) Psychology” uses a ‘choose-your-own-adventure’ structure to frame video interviews with three feminist scholars – in Canada, the U.S. and Britain - who are asked, “What does queer(ing) psychology mean to you?” Visitors are invited to engage with this question by exploring interview excerpts, a glossary of terms, and recommendations for reading and video resources.

Although feminist psychologies continue to develop and grow today, many aspiring and established feminist researchers are exiting the field to psychology-adjacent disciplines due to psychology’s enduring association with oppressive practices and racial and gender-based injustices in many parts of the world (see, for example, APA’s recent apology to people of color for its role in perpetrating racism; Teo, 2010). Part of addressing this exodus is listening to and learning from the experiences and strategies of those who have encountered these injustices first-hand. For example, in her interview and profile, Native American social psychologist Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa describes feeling isolated as the only Native American in her psychology graduate program. When asked how marginalized groups and their allies can dislodge or weaken structural barriers, Sekaquaptewa underscores the importance of mentorship and representation. As a faculty member at the University of Michigan, she disrupts typical power structures by actively seeking out students who may not feel included or confident in academe, inviting them into her mentorship.

Transnational histories and perspectives are also crucial in widening space for feminism within the field of psychology. We collaborate with the feminist research group led by Dr. Nora Ruck at the Sigmund Freud University in Vienna, Austria, to develop resources on the history of feminist psychology in Vienna from 1972 to 2000. Ruck and her team do archival research and conduct oral history interviews to analyze the production and mobilization of feminist psychological knowledge in political groups, women’s counseling and information centers, community colleges, and at the University of Vienna (see Ruck et al., 2020; Ruck et al., 2022).

We are also partnering with Rose Capdevila, Katherine Hubbard, and Lois Donnelly in the UK to gather oral history interviews with feminist psychology pioneers there. Finally, we continue our partnership with Ana Jacó-Vilela and other colleagues in Brazil to document and celebrate Latin American women psychologists and feminists. Together, we are building the resources to ensure that histories of psychology will always include women, gender, and feminism as essential forces in the field.
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As you know, with a few exceptions, most of the historical narrative about science or artistic creativity ignores the role of women. The few times it deals with it, it seems almost anecdotal, insignificant, banal, or non-existent. These kinds of narratives that make invisible the contribution of women to the construction of knowledge are not only unfair, but also convey a falsified version of history.

The most common answers to the question of why this happens are usually two: first, is that history is written by men and secondly, that we have lived and live in a patriarchal society in which, to a large extent, still today, are rooted in the culture and many subjectivities, arguments and mechanisms of exclusion of women in the public sphere typical of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries.

The following image illustrates the arguments generally used to justify the exclusion of women from scientific circles.

**ARGUMENTS AGAINST WOMEN’S ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION**

Patriarchal societies have simultaneously or successively, openly or subtly, argued different arguments to prevent women from accessing to higher education.

Arguments:

I. Women’s intellectual capacity is insufficient for higher education.
II. Female nature is not suitable for intellectual tasks.
III. Studying makes women sick.
IV. It’s unnatural for women to study because they’re destined to be wives and mothers.
V. Women who study abandon their duties as submissive daughters, wives and mothers.
VI. Women who study represents that they imitate or compete with men.

VII. Studying loses femininity.
VIII. Men and women can’t study together in college because men get distracted and can’t concentrate. Also, men’s attitudes and conversations can offend women.
IX. Graduated women become rebellious.
X. If after graduating they want to work, they will take jobs away from men being the ones who must support the family.

Of course, the world has changed a lot and nowadays almost no one thinks of expressing themselves in these terms, but in fact, over time, a stereotype of woman has been set up that often works automatically as a cliché that distorts perception of reality and eludes specific data.

Obviously, there are many other factors that influence invisibility. Factors that have to do with cultural, scientific, economic, political and sociological background and also, let’s not forget, with the needs, circumstances and feelings of each woman. But in spite of this, both answers: history written by men and patriarchal society are arguments that, although they contain part of the truth, do not explain or solve anything. In my opinion, they remain on the surface of the problem and instead of giving solutions tend to obfuscate curiosity.

I think that in order to understand and change things, we need to go deeper and deeper. Since the ‘70’s of last century, this eagerness motivated, according to the feminist thinking of the time, to generate in the universities, specially in the US, various research groups dedicated to discovering and proving the true women’s contributions to the construction of the different sciences. Logically, as the number of university professors interested in the subject increased, the movement spread throughout other countries.

Well, Psychology is no stranger to this process. One of the first women to stand out as a historian of Psychology was Edna Heibreder (1890-1985), who taught at the University of Wisconsin and Columbia. Her teaching was the source of inspiration for those who, I think, was the starting point for the matter in hand. I am
referring to Laurel Furumoto, who in 1979 began to rescue Mary Whiton Calkins’ essence and work from oblivion, and a few years later, in 1987, with Elizabeth Scarborough, they published Untold lives.

The First Generation of American Women Psychologists. From there, publications on women in psychology proliferated in different countries and universities. There are currently different research groups in Spain dedicated to this task, but in my opinion the number of people working on it is small.

Nevertheless, these efforts have paid off. A good example of this is the recovery of the three characters that I will talk about next. The first two are Mary Calkins, perhaps the most well-known, and Christine Ladd, both pioneers of Experimental Psychology. The third one is Spanish, Mercedes Rodrigo Bellido.

CHRISTINE LADD FRANKLIN (1847-1930)
AND MARY WHITON CALKINS (1863-1930)

Although these two pioneers of Psychology are very different from each other, their trajectory, difficulties and some of the obstacles they had to overcome have some similarities. I will compare them to illustrate what the spirit of that time was and how her perseverance and hard work helped to change it. In first place, gaining access to the community of psychologists and secondly, bringing new theories to their theoretical foundations.

Both were born in the United States but in very different places, when Psychology was still part of Philosophy, Physiology, Medicine and Physics. Remember that Psychology was not instituted as an independent science until 1879 and do not forget that it was then believed that the nature of women was not made for study. Not only it was presumed that they had no intellectual capacity but also that it was against nature.

Well, both of them belonged to middle-class families who were quietly overcoming these prejudices and proud of seeing the girls studying. The problem was that women were not allowed in universities. But as there were many young people who wanted to study, some institutions founded the so-called “Colleges”, which were private university centers, exclusively for girls, which awarded degrees but with no official validation. Christine Ladd began her studies in Logic, Mathematics, and Physics at Vassar College (Poughkeepsie, NY), while Mary Calkins studied Philosophy at Smith College, Massachusetts.

For very different reasons, the two temporarily stopped studying.

Christine because she needed to work for financial reasons. She got a very singular job. She presented mathematical problems that were published as entertainment in various popular magazines such as Times Education. Ironically, her luck changed when the renowned Professor of Mathematics, James Jones Sylbester became interested in her and encouraged her to try to enter Johns Hopkins University where he was a professor. Christine was clever enough to sign the application as C. Ladd, so they took her for a man and accepted her. But as expected, when they saw she was a woman, she was rejected. Finally, after many attempts and protests, and probably to silence her, she was allowed to attend class as a listener, without the right of obtaining a degree, and at the same time given the possibility of teaching mathematics at different high schools.

She did so for ten or twelve years. While in the university, she worked secretly and for free with some of the patums of the time, including Ch.S. Pearce, founder of the Pragmatic Philosophy that influenced American Functionalism. Despite all the official and unofficial barriers, she encountered, she met all the requirements to obtain a degree and a doctorate, but because she was a woman, she was denied of such degree. On the other hand, she decided to marry another
mathematician, Fabian Franklin, but since married women were not allowed to pursue a profession, she was unable to continue teaching.

Since her husband could enjoy a sabbatical year, they both embarked on a long study-tour around Europe. She held to her interests in Mathematics and Pragmatic Philosophy and experimentation. A background that led her to work for a few months in the laboratory of Experimental Physiology of Müller in Göttingen and then in the famous Helmholtz in Berlin. As you know, Helmholtz dealt with issues halfway between pure and simple Physiology and Psychology, specially the nerve conduction involved in perception. So, Christine Ladd began to apply her mathematics to his research, specifically to retinal reactions to color stimuli. Being the daughter of one of the first suffragette fighters, she must have been a very persistent woman. On her return to the US, still working on her research, she got a part-time teaching contract (always for free) at the Columbia and Clark Universities in 1912 and 1913, and at Harvard and Chicago in 1914.

Finally, in 1924, forty-two years after reading her dissertation, John Hopkins awarded her a doctorate. She was 77 years old. In addition to her numerous publications in various scientific journals, in 1929 (at the age of 82) she published a book entitled Colour and Colour Theories, in which she set out a new theory on the subject that partly complemented and partly contradicted existing ones. Her ideas are still valid. She was the first woman admitted at the APA. As I said before, much of Mary Whiton Calkins’ journey was similar to that of C. Ladd-Franklin.

As you can imagine, despite her insistence and the constant recommendations of both professors and later also of Müstemberg who wanted her as a student, the academic authorities did not consent. She tried throughout other universities but with the same result. Finally, Harvard accepted her to continue her studies, in an annex that the university had just created so that women could follow the same program and with the same teachers as men, but with no official recognition. She accepted it, but under the condition that she could only use the laboratories outside school hours so that she would not meet with other students. This is how she completed her university degree and her doctorate, but obviously she was not awarded with a degree.

In the meantime, she set up her own Experimental Psychology lab, developed the Vallesley College Psychology program, and published her numerous research papers. The most important, or at least the best-known contribution of all, was the Psychology of the Self.

It was a new conception of Psychology as an alternative to Wundt's atomism and the functionalist version of consciousness (so important at the time) of James and Titchener. For her, the human being is a unit that interacts with the environment. The experience of this is unique, personal and constantly modifiable by the relationships of the physical and social environment.

This unit, partly conscious and partly unconscious, which she calls Self, manifests itself in movement, word, emotion, and action, is for her the true goal of the study of Psychology either theoretically and professionally. When Harvard annex became Rackliff College she was offered the doctorate official degree but since she presented her thesis at Harvard, she refused it. In 1905 she was elected the first President of the APA (consisting of 400 members). In 1960, thirty years after her death, under pressure from students, specially women, Harvard University named her Doctor posthumously.

Mary Whiton Calkins
Mary Clakins, after completing her studies at Smith College, she also interrupted her academic activity, in this case, to take care of her sick mother and siblings. She was so bored that she ended up contacting a Greek teacher who taught her at home. From this she got hired at Wellesley College to teach Greek in the department of Philosophy. It was a time when Psychology was gaining ground thanks to the advances of Wundt in Germany and of W. James in the United States. As a result, the demand on Psychology studies for both men and women were growing exponentially. So Wellesley College decided to include a specific program. In order to do so, they needed a teacher trained in this discipline and decided to subsidize Calkins to get it done. The idea excited her. She then applied for a place at Harvard University where W. James and J. Royce taught.

As you can imagine, despite her insistence and the constant recommendations of both professors and later also of Müstemberg who wanted her as a student, the academic authorities did not consent. She tried throughout other universities but with the same result. Finally, Harvard accepted her to continue her studies, in an annex that the university had just created so that women could follow the same program and with the same teachers as men, but with no official recognition. She accepted it, but under the condition that she could only use the laboratories outside school hours so that she would not meet with other students. This is how she completed her university degree and her doctorate, but obviously she was not awarded with a degree.

In the meantime, she set up her own Experimental Psychology lab, developed the Vallesley College Psychology program, and published her numerous research papers. The most important, or at least the best-known contribution of all, was the Psychology of the Self.

It was a new conception of Psychology as an alternative to Wundt's atomism and the functionalist version of consciousness (so important at the time) of James and Titchener. For her, the human being is a unit that interacts with the environment. The experience of this is unique, personal and constantly modifiable by the relationships of the physical and social environment.

This unit, partly conscious and partly unconscious, which she calls Self, manifests itself in movement, word, emotion, and action, is for her the true goal of the study of Psychology either theoretically and professionally. When Harvard annex became Rackliff College she was offered the doctorate official degree but since she presented her thesis at Harvard, she refused it. In 1905 she was elected the first President of the APA (consisting of 400 members). In 1960, thirty years after her death, under pressure from students, specially women, Harvard University named her Doctor posthumously.

MERCEDES RODRIGO BELLIDO
(1891-1982)
Among other merits, of which I will give a brief summary, there’s the fact that Mercedes Rodrigo was the first Spanish psychologist.

To situate ourselves, we have to go back in time to the Spain of the 20th century. A political, social, cultural and scientific situation far from the North American one and characterized by political turmoil and a considerable social disruption. A predominantly agricultural country, not at all industrialized, living in between the traditional world of the imperial spirit and modernity. A tension that on one hand was reinforced by the loss of the colonies (1898) and the corresponding mourning and, on the other hand, it saw the intellectual birth, progressive and critical, questioning the immobility of the State and fighting for the new Europe and the new scientific advancements. It is the Spain of Clara Campoamor, Victoria Kent and so many other women who fought for equal rights, women's suffrage, legal reforms, and of course, for the intellectual formation of women. (The Spanish University opened its doors to women in 1910).

Mercedes was also born into a middle-class educated family. Her father was well-connected in the intellectual world as a professional musician. I don't know what her mother did, but I imagine she was a housewife. After high school, Mercedes studied Education (which at that time was neither a degree nor was it studied at the university), and she specialized in deaf and blind education.

A few years ago, The Institución Libre de enseñanza (ILE) was founded in Madrid. It was a private foundation made up of professors who had given up working at the university because the government, claiming that it did not promote fidelity to tradition and the religious spirit, had prohibited academic freedom. The purpose of ILE, which followed Krausist ideas, was to freely teach the quality learning of men and women, and mainly to introduce in Spain the most cutting-edge scientific ideas in the world. Along with this institution, the Junta de Ampliación de Estudios (JAE) was also created, which, among other things, awarded scholarships to outstanding students to do internships abroad. Well, Rodrigo received one of these scholarships to study Psychology in Geneva. There she was a student of Claparède and student partner of Piaget. She graduated in 1923 and during six months she worked with her teacher in the application of psychological concepts to Pedagogy. She returned to Spain at the end of that year and launched a didactic project for teacher training. Using the most modern techniques of the moment, she introduced the application of psychotechnical and selection tests, training in the systematic observation of each student and the study of learning.

In 1929 she entered the National Institute of Psychotechnics in Madrid, under the direction of José Germain, to introduce selection and career guidance to education. At the same time, she began collaborating as a psychotherapist in a children's clinic.

In 1936, she was the Director of the National Institute of Psychotechnics and worked also as a Clinical Psychologist at the National Juvenile Court. At the end of the Civil War, like many of the few professionals in Psychology that practiced in Spain, she had to go into exile. Her destination was Colombia where she went with her sister and a collaborator who followed her ‘till the end.

The choice of Colombia was not accidental. In fact, the National University of that country, aware of her work, had invited her to set up a psychotechnical center belonging to the University. Not only she did so, but a few years later she set up the First Faculty of Psychology in Colombia. She stayed there for eleven years.

But again, the political turmoil cut short her career, forcing her into exile again. In this case, she ended up in Puerto Rico because her sister, who, like her father, was a musician and a good friend of Pau Casals. He was the one who suggested it to them. There, she created and organized the program of what was the first Faculty of Psychology in San Juan, Puerto Rico, where she remained for the rest of her life. She never returned to Spain.

As a final note, I remind you that the First Faculty of Psychology in Spain was inaugurated in Madrid in 1982 and in Barcelona in 1983.
psychologists who, together with men, have built the current Psychology but which the historical narrative tends to ignore. I'm sure the only effective way to get them back to their place is to keep researching the subject, and the university is the place to do so. So you know, protest if necessary, but above all insist, work and never give up.
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HERBERT C. KELMAN
18 March 1927 – 1 March 2022

Herbert C. Kelman, the Richard Clarke Cabot Professor of Social Ethics emeritus at Harvard and the director of the Program on International Conflict Analysis and Resolution at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs (1993-2003), died March 1 in his Cambridge, Massachusetts, home (The Harvard Gazette, 2022).

Herbert C. Kelman is one of the leading names in the Psychology of Peace, both for his contributions as theorist and his active involvement in promoting peace (Mínguez Alcaide et al., 2009).

Psicologia, ciência e tecnologia
Edward B. Titchener

In Brazil, psychology programs offer mandatory courses on the history of psychology. This means that Brazilian psychologists must read and know something about the past of their own professional practices. The problem, however, lies in the quality of the available sources, both in graduate and undergraduate courses. Usually, most of the information about psychology’s past comes from secondary sources (textbooks, handbooks, etc.) that usually misrepresent or distort primary sources. As a result, psychology students have no direct contact with important ideas that helped shape its present context.

In 2018, Professor Saulo de Freitas Araujo at Federal University of Juiz de Fora (Brazil) and Hogrefe Publishing House created a new book series called Clássicos da Psicologia (Classics of Psychology), the goal of which is to translate into Portuguese crucial texts of the psychological tradition that have never been available before (Araujo, 2019). All translations come from the original texts (German, English, Russian, French, Latin, etc.). Thus, authors such as Wundt and Watson are now available for the first time in Brazil and other Portuguese-speaking countries (Araujo, 2018; Strapasson & Araujo, 2020).

The third volume has just been published. It is an anthology of Edward Titchener’s (1867-1927) most relevant papers on the subject matter and status of psychology as a science (Araujo & Marcellos, 2022). The translated texts are representative of Titchener’s long career and cover the period between 1895 and 1925. The volume begins with two overlooked papers on the scientific spirit and the idea of scientific psychology by Titchener (1895, 1897), before he created his structural psychology. The two papers that helped define the idea of Structuralism in the United States come next—The postulates of structural psychology (1898) and Structural and functional psychology (1899). In the following, there is a paper on the nature of introspection (Titchener, 1912), Titchener’s distinction between science and technology (Titchener, 1914a), and his review of Watson’s behaviorism (Titchener, 1914b). The last essay is a retrospect of experimental psychology as a whole, which represents Titchener’s mature views on the subject (Titchener, 1925).

At the end of each translated paper there are dozens of explanatory notes, which contextualize original passages that would otherwise be difficult for the contemporary reader to understand. For example, Titchener refers to authors whom every psychologist knew at that time, but who are practically unknown today. Besides, he often uses phrases in foreign languages, the context of which is far from ours. Finally,
his references do not follow our contemporary standards, so they need to be updated.

Apart from those notes, the reader will find an introductory chapter with biographical information, indication of the translated texts, and a chronology with the most relevant dates in Titchener’s life. After the translations, there is an index to facilitate the location of authors and topics throughout the text.

As we are approaching the centenary of Titchener’s death, the present volume offers a good occasion to reappraise his contributions to psychology and maybe draw lessons therefrom. After all, his work revolves on the perennial questions that haunt every psychologist, be it in theory or in professional practice.
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Para Além da Psicofísica: 
Fechner e as visões diurna e noturna

Gustav Fechner (1801-1887) é um pensador que desempenha um papel singular nas narrativas em história da psicologia: em um número grande de trabalhos ele é descrito como uma espécie de gênio científico que teria aberto as portas para a matematização dos fenômenos psicológicos, mas tendo produzido também um grande conjunto de textos satíricos, metafísicos e religiosos. Nessas narrativas históricas, esses textos muitas vezes são apresentados como curiosidades metafísicas (source Editora Nau).

Neste livro apresentamos pela primeira vez em língua portuguesa um desses textos, “O Pequeno Livro da Vida Após a Morte” – escrito por Fechner na década de 1830 e aqui acompanhado da introdução escrita por William James para a edição em inglês (1904) –, além de um conjunto de artigos de diversos pesquisadores estrangeiros, que se reúnem aos pesquisadores brasileiros para dar uma dimensão única à vida e à obra desse singular pensador alemão. Num mesmo gesto recusamos a operação de fragmentação feita pelos historiadores da psicologia e propomos uma retomada das principais questões de Fechner, buscando um formato do texto acadêmico que não exclua o estético e o poético. Tomamos Fechner como autoria a ser reconstruída pela voz de seus textos, de seus comentadores mundo afora e nas expressões do trabalho artístico, permitindo uma perspectiva muito além daquela esboçada pelos manuais de história da psicologia (source Editora Nau).

Na escolha dos textos aqui presentes, na interlocução com os comentadores e com os trabalhos de poesia literária e visual que compõem esta edição, acreditamos nos afastar daquilo que o autor chamou de “visão noturna”, incluindo aí todas as perspectivas reducionistas e mecanicistas no tocante ao entendimento da nossa existência no cosmos (source Editora Nau).
**XV Encontro Clio-Psyché**

This year we will have our XV Encontro Clio-Psyché. It will be from August 24 to 27, because on the 27th we will commemorate the 60th anniversary of the regulation of the profession of psychologist in Brazil, so our meeting will have this focus and also that of modernity, because we will also commemorate the 100th anniversary of the modernist movement.

XV Encontro Clio-Psyché will have this focus and that of modernity, because we also commemorate the 100 years of the modernist movement.

That is why the poster is inspired by the painting Abaporu, by Tarsila do Amaral, which is exhibited at Malba, in Buenos Aires.

We hope to count on you!

[https://encontrocliopsyche.wixsite.com/xvcliopsyche](https://encontrocliopsyche.wixsite.com/xvcliopsyche)

---

**VIII Congreso Regional de la Sociedad Interamericana de Psicología (CR-SIP)**

This time the Regional Congress (CIR) is organized by a Consortium of eight regional universities.

The Congress will be held in the city of Concepción, Chile, an eminently university city.

SIP hopes that the development of this congress will be a relevant experience not only for professional psychologists, but also for those in training.

More information [https://sipchile2022.cl/](https://sipchile2022.cl/)
International Society of Political Psychology
Call for Papers ISPP Annual Conference
14-17 July, 2022 Athenas
Democracy as an Achievement: Recognizing Tensions, Challenges, and Aspirations through Political Psychology

More information: https://ispp.org/meetings/

ECP 2022, 17th European Congress of Psychology

The 17th European Congress of Psychology is organized by Slovenian Psychologists’ Association under auspices of the European Federation of Psychologists’ Associations (EFPA) and with support from three mayor Slovenian universities, the Ministry of Education, the Mayor and the City Council of Ljubljana, Slovenian Tourist Board and other prominent organizations.

“You’ve probably already heard of Slovenia’s natural beauties and cultural monuments, many of them on UNESCO World Heritage list. Maybe you have visited our beautiful small country before. In any case, we are sure you’ll be glad you have come (back). There is so much more to discover!” (Marko Vrtovec, President Slovenian Psychologists’ Association, 2022).

https://www.ecp2022.eu/
International Union of History and Philosophy of Science and Technology
IUHPST
https://iuhpst.org/

World Digital Library
http://www.wdl.org/en/

International Association of Applied Psychology
http://www.iaapsy.org/

The National Archives
Records of the UK government from Domesday to the present
http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/

The British Society for the History of Science
www.bshs.org.uk

Laboratório de Historia e Memória da Psicologia – Clio-Psyché
www.cliopsyche.uerj.br
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