

The Interview

Part One: Becoming a Social Worker

Josua Miller: Ann, when you reflect back to your childhood and to your family life, can you recognize the seeds of your career?

Ann Hartman: Oh, absolutely, you know how that is. You are the son of a social worker, I am the daughter of a social worker. And it really goes back before my mother. My grandmother was an active volunteer social worker. At the turn of the century she was head of the Methodist Home Missionary Society of her church, helping the poor in Chicago. She did not approve of Jane Addams, her contemporary, however, because she felt all charitable activities should be under the auspices of the church. Jane Addams was my mother's ego ideal and when she was a little girl she said, when she grew up, she wanted to be like Jane Addams. So this was an interest always in her life and her mother's life. And interestingly enough, when I found my great-grandmother's obituary it said if anybody had any troubles, they knew they could go talk to "Sister Beca." She was a farm woman down in southern Illinois and she was my grandmother's mother. So I think I come by it honestly.

When I was a child my mother worked in a family agency in Rochester, New York. There were some interesting connections there. During the depression, I used to ride around with her on Saturdays, because I didn't go to school and I needed sitting. And she would deliver checks and money and emergency relief to the families, and I would sit in the car. So I had a lot of exposure, although I did not want to be a social worker. I remember in my teenage years, I was very critical of mother's work because I said that individual work with families was just smoothing over the real social problems and the only thing that really mattered, really, was so-

cial change. So I was very critical of this retail method. I was not going to be a social worker.

J: When you say you were critical of it, it sounds like you were saying it wasn't changing society. How did you come to that position at such an early age?

A: My family was always politically very progressive. My grandmother's first cousin was William Jennings Bryan, so they were old mid-western populists. My grandfather was an attorney, and he was always on the side of the underdog, in Chicago. It just was a family that came from that tradition. Nobody was in business, they all were in service professions. They were teachers, dentists, lawyers, journalists.

J: What did your father do?

A: My father was a chemist. That's the other side of the family that I was less influenced by. I was much more influenced by my mother's side.

J: Why do you think it is that you were more influenced by her side?

A: My parents separated when I was eighteen months old. I had some ongoing contact with my father, and in many ways I am a lot like him; he ended up an administrator of a large scientific program. He was the head of the organic synthesis laboratory of the Eastman Kodak Company. But I had more exposure to and was much more identified and influenced by the values on my mother's side.

J: Were there certain values that your mother or grandmother conveyed to you?

A: My grandmother died when she was quite young, but my mother certainly conveyed

values and a political perspective. The patron saints of our household were people like Bertha Reynolds and Franklin Roosevelt and Eleanor Roosevelt. And there were other social attitudes and values. One of the major things I remember her saying so often was "There but for the grace of God go I." That there is really no difference between us and her clients in trouble...we are just luckier. The other value was the obligation to use your abilities and talents for a social purpose. There was no question about that. If you were privileged by having abilities and talents and opportunities, you were obligated to make use of those for social purposes. She wouldn't have probably said quite that, in that language, but that's exactly the message that was always communicated.

J: So you were influenced by your mother basically, but had on-going contact with your father. You were saying that when you were a teenager, you were sure you were not going to be a social worker, and yet now as you look back, it is very clear that there were at least two generations ahead of you, before you, that led to this. So what did lead you to social work?

A: Well, I suppose that's what led me to it, but I struggled for a long time. My older sister became a social worker. She went to Case Western Reserve.

J: What kind of career did she have?

A: She worked at a family agency all her life until she retired. At one point all three of us were working in family agencies. Mother was in Akron, I was in New York, and my sister was in Montgomery County Family Services near Philadelphia.

J: How did your academic studies influence your choice of career?

A: I was interested in painting and sculpture and perhaps in medicine but when I went to Wellesley College, I fell in love with philosophy. I took every course they had.

I took 48 hours of it. Then I started graduate school at the University of Chicago in philosophy but after one year it became apparent to me (this was 1948) that nobody was getting jobs teaching philosophy. So, I decided this wasn't what I was going to do. And a friend of mine and I went out to Oregon and we built a cabin on the beach out there and taught school. I was out there for a couple of years. Then I came back home.

By then, mother had gotten a job in Akron, Ohio, as the head of professional services in a family agency. I was unsure about what I was going to do. I had been accepted at Berkeley to continue my degree in philosophy. There was also a temporary part time job open at the Akron public child welfare agency placing children for Christmas. I took the job and ended up working there in foster care for three years. I lived at home for these years and it was then that I decided to go into social work, or when I finally ceased resisting the pull to go into social work. But I continued to be interested in teaching. I had been planning to be a philosophy teacher and I think always, somewhere in the back of my mind when I went into social work, was the notion that someday I would teach social work.

J: What led you to Smith College School for Social Work?

A: My mother had gone to Smith in social work. I turned out to be the first second generation graduate of the school. The other thing is that Smith had an advanced standing program, which meant I would be out in two summers and a winter. And it was a top notch program. It was a logical choice.

J: Was it as clinical a program then as it turned out to be in the long run?

A: Probably it was, although Smith goes through its periods. When my mother was there, Bertha Reynolds was the leading

faculty person and mother was devoted to her. During my period it was Annette Garrett who, although clinical in her perspective, also had a strong conviction about the social. In her own biographical article, she tells about her professional development, going back and forth between emphasizing the psychological and emphasizing the social. She was really quite socially oriented.

I still was strong on a social perspective. The reason I know that is just before I graduated, both the Community Service Society (CSS) and the Jewish Board of Guardians (JBG) tried to recruit me. That was back in the day when there was a shortage of social workers. I had interviews scheduled with both agencies and on my way down on the train, I read an article by somebody from JBG in *The Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. It was very clinical, very psychodynamic. I thought, "this isn't social work, this isn't what I want to do," and I called up JBG and canceled the interview and went to work at CSS. My mother was very much a social worker, and I think my perspective from the very beginning was to emphasize the importance of the social surroundings. I have been pretty consistent in this, but I think that we have become more sophisticated about the nature of that social surrounding and its influence.

J: So when you first went to Smith, did you have a clear idea in your mind about what kind of work you wanted to do?

A: I don't know, just work with people. I wanted to be a case worker.

J: But you still maintained this feeling of wanting to change society?

A: Well, but primarily to think about the social aspects of working with individuals and families too.

J: Back to your growing up. I recall once you and I had a conversation and you told me that when you were in school, as a child,

you used to be very bored. Can you tell me more about that and what happened and how?

A: One of the things that happened was that my sister would come home from school and teach me everything she learned in school. She would play school with me. So she taught me to read and she taught me all the things that were going on in school. I couldn't wait to get to school. And when I went, I was so tall they put me ahead. I mean they let me in when I was four and they put me in first grade when I was five. But, I already knew the work they were doing. I was so disappointed, so miserable and bored. I remember watching the clock and seeing how long I could hold my breath while the second hand ticked around. By about second or third grade, I really had had it and I began to act up. I stopped paying attention and began to fool around and began to get into trouble.

J: So what happened?

A: I went to the "visiting teacher," which is what they called school social workers in those days. Visiting teachers started in Rochester. I went to the school social worker, whose name was Helen Cohen, who was a friend of my mother's and happened to be a Smith graduate. They gave me psychological tests and found out that I was smart enough and I don't think they did anything else. So, back I went to school and finally when I was in sixth grade, my mother went to Smith to get her MSW. The writing was on the wall; people were not going to be able to continue to work in family agencies without a Master's. So, she went to Smith and Annette Garrett didn't think that she should be placed in Rochester, because she should have a new experience. She placed her in Chicago and of course we lived in Rochester. A young social worker and her husband came to live with us for that year in our house. But I did not take well to that separation.

- J: So your mother was away for the nine month internship.
- A: Garrett felt that social work education comes first, ahead of family, ahead of marriage, ahead of everything. Mother lived at Hull House in Chicago and was placed in the Institute for Juvenile Research. I went to visit over Christmas and stayed one night at Hull House, which I will always cherish. It was the year after Jane Addams had died, so she was not there, but the whole atmosphere was there. To continue with my school problems, that year I flunked out of school. I got all E's. I had had separations before, being away from my father, and then when I was three and a half, my mother developed tuberculosis and she was hospitalized for six months. So, I had had my share and I did not react at all well to that separation. My mother took me out to Harley School which was a very progressive private day school in Rochester, and they let me in on a scholarship. And I went there for six years and graduated. They saved my life. I don't know where I was headed in terms of education and the future. I guess that's another reason why I think the social environment is so important. I had these "terrible problems" and they disappeared in one day. As soon as I was in that school my problem was over. I never had another school problem.
- J: So actually it sounds like that did shape your thinking and your values.
- A: It could very well have. It changed the environment and I became a different person.
- J: So you stayed there for six years and then went to Wellesley from there?
- A: Which was a mistake probably.
- J: Why do you say that?
- A: You know, Wellesley at that time was quite rigid and a very different social world than the one I was used to. I came out of a progressive, liberal background—Harley School, my family, my friends and their families—and into the Wellesley environment. I had a very tough time because of the political and social differences that I felt from many of the other students. Eventually, I did find people with whom I felt comfortable, but it took a long time.
- J: Were there any particular professors that had an influence over you?
- A: Oh, yes, the whole philosophy department was very important for me. Virginia Onderdonk, Ellen Haring, and T. Hayes Proctor, mainly those three people. I had a wonderful education, but in many ways a miserable time [laughter].
- J: A wonderful education and a miserable time.
- A: In some ways a miserable time, but a wonderful education. I was taking all these advanced philosophy and social theory and biblical history courses. I would talk myself into advanced levels. During the last couple of years almost all my classes were senior seminars with five or six people. I took symbolic logic with four or five other students and we spent the whole semester on *Principia Mathematica*. I had an unbelievable education.
- J: Do you think this was a good background for becoming a social worker or professor?
- A: I think it was like exercising on the Cardio-glide. It was fantastic mental exercise and I think it developed my thinking ability to think. It has absolutely no use in terms of specific occupation. But I think it was tremendous training to then take on anything else.
- J: I can imagine. Just backing up again, I imagine that growing up in a single parent family was certainly not as common as it is today.

- A: There was only one other family I knew in that situation, one friend who was from a single parent family. Even so, I wasn't particularly aware of being stigmatized about it, partly because of Harley. When I got to the age where one would be stigmatized, by then I was in a place that was accepting of differences of all kinds, so it was no problem. But I've thought a lot about what it means to grow up in a single parent, female-headed household, and I think as with any family form it has its special strengths as well as its weaknesses. The weaknesses were that it's a puny work system, that one adult has to do all the work. But, in a way, that's also an advantage because my sister and I very early became quite independent doing work and becoming very competent. Marianne Walters talks about this occurring in single parent families. I was really quite independent. When I was eight years old, I went by train all by myself out to Michigan with my dog to spend a summer on a farm. The other thing was that it was a very democratic household. There was no male authority, no "wait 'till your father comes home!" The three of us would vote on things. Literally. I've compared notes with other people who have been raised in female headed, single-parent households — much less authoritarian, a very different way of dealing with authority.
- J: Do you feel that this influenced you as an adult and in your career?
- A: I would guess that it influenced my leadership style.
- J: Do you think it contributed to your feminism?
- A: Well... I was just talking to Joan Laird about that the other day. I came very late to feminism. Because, you see, I was raised that I could do anything. It never occurred to me that being a woman would limit what I was able to be or do. I had a working mother and she always told me that I could do anything. Did I want to be a lawyer, a doctor, whatever? It was very late when I noticed that women were oppressed. Because I did not experience it, you see, in my family, at Harley, or in my sense of where I could go.
- J: Well, it sounds like you were already a feminist, in a sense, or had been thinking about it.
- A: Yes, I suppose. Women could do anything. My mother had a story that she used to tell us, and I think the message was loud and clear. When she was a girl, she was the only girl that belonged to the boys' club, because she was the only girl that was able to climb up the tree into the boys' tree house. The other part of the story was that she fell out of the tree house and broke her arm. To me the message is you can do anything, but you pay a price. That was, as I think back, the message in that story.
- J: What do you think the impact was of the historical conditions under which you grew up, like the depression.
- A: Oh, well of course, the depression had a tremendous impact. We survived it, I think, better than many, many families did, partly because in Rochester the Eastman Kodak Company instead of laying off workers, reduced everybody's salaries and kept almost everybody on. That made a very big difference for the whole community. My father never lost his job and he continued to pay child support and my mother never lost her job. So, although we lived very simply and things were tough, I never felt poor.
- That was partly due to my mother. She was raised in a comfortable family. My grandparents were raised on poor, poor farms, but my grandfather was a successful attorney in Chicago and they were raised comfortably. Our family was in a less comfortable situation, but she always made it as if we had everything. Like she would take us to New York to the theater

or for Easter. People at our income level didn't do things like that, but we did, because those were the things we spent money on. We would go to the Automat and we thought it was the most important restaurant in New York because my mother would always make things that way. Or we would go to Childs and we thought that was terribly fancy. And then we would go to the theater and we would stay in a cheap, cheap hotel, but we thought it was the greatest thing in the world, because my mother always had a way of making things into a lark. On Friday nights we always went out to dinner and the movies. We would go to the Manhattan Restaurant in downtown Rochester. My mother would say "look at the right side of the menu first" and we would get pancakes, or something like that, and go to the movies. So although we certainly lived very modestly, I never had the feeling of being deprived.

J: It sounds like you were a very tightly knit family. The three of you did a lot of things together.

A: Yes.

J: So you are saying you were not directly affected by the depression as much as other people.

A: Well, I would say we did not suffer material hardship in any way that was damaging, I don't think, although I do think my mother carried a lot of anxiety about money. But also, she had a fail-safe because my grandfather would have bailed her out before we got into serious trouble, although I don't think she ever called on him. But she knew that he was there, which made a big difference. But, I was very aware of the depression because of mother's work and because of what she came home with and what she talked about. So I knew that people were having a terrible time. Then of course the war — those were two enormously dominating

events. I think, whether you lived through World War II or you didn't makes the biggest difference in the generations.

J: Yes, I am sure that's true. How do you think it manifests itself? Or what was it that people of your generation have that's different?

A: I don't know exactly. It's just that it was such a major life experience, for everybody. Of course, I was in college during the last part of the war. One of my very best friends from Harley was killed. I almost joined up at that point. But there was a very strong message to stay in college and finish from my family. It wasn't like today when it is more acceptable to take time out and go back and finish.

J: You mentioned that your parents admired the Roosevelts.

A: My mother did; my father was non-political.

J: How big a deal was the New Deal for you and your family?

A: Well, I remember it all very well. We talked about it. You know political things were important in the family. We talked about what was going on. And we went and visited a CCC [Civilian Conservation Corps] camp to see things they were doing, building. I mean I remember the newsreels on the WPA [Works Progress Administration] I went to the WPA parade in Rochester. It was just very much a part of life. And my mother met Mrs. Roosevelt at a conference and she was absolutely thrilled.

J: So there was something significant in having a historian who is an expert on Eleanor Roosevelt on the program at your retirement.

A: Absolutely. Eleanor Roosevelt is my favorite historical woman. My second favorite is Rachel Carson, but my favorite is Eleanor.

or Roosevelt.

J: Why is that?

A: Eleanor? She was a fabulous person. I've read everything about her. She was just such an unusual woman in every way. Her energy, her joie de vivre, her flexibility. She had such a tough time and it was remarkable what she was able to do with her life with all the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune that she had to go through. I don't think there have been many like her.

J: Would you describe her as a role model for you?

A: Oh no, she's too far away [laughing].

J: She's an Olympian?

A: She's an Olympian, right, and I'm just a person.

J: An inspiration?

A: An inspiration. Absolutely. And Rachel Carson, in another way, although she is a new heroine of mine. I really just got to know more about her with the publication of her correspondence, then a wonderful biography. In such a totally different kind of way, they both changed the world. Rachel is this very quiet, very self-effacing person. She just did it with a pen, very quietly. And Eleanor did it with her powerful personality. I think *Silent Spring* is like *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. It's one of the few books that really changed the world. And it's a remarkable achievement for this woman who was a woman, was ill, was relatively unknown, and didn't have all the credentials. It's remarkable.

J: How much of a factor do you think your gender and sexual orientation were in leading you into social work, if at all?

A: I don't know that they led me to social work. It might have strengthened my

identification with the underdog, being a member of an oppressed population when I was young, an unbelievably oppressed population. So, I think probably the identification with the underdog, which I got from my family, was accentuated by that. Also social work was a somewhat friendly, less oppressive profession and place to be.

J: Right.

A: Although not very friendly until fairly recently [laughing].

J: Well, what was it like? I mean, how did the profession respond to women or people who were gay or lesbian?

A: It didn't respond to people who were gay or lesbian at all. It was absolutely, "don't ask, don't tell" until really quite recently.

J: Like how recently?

A: Well, it's hard for me to know, because you see I moved to Northampton. I think the world has changed [laughing] but, I've moved to a different place, it's like Harley School. As I got into the profession, I knew that many of the leaders in social work were women-oriented women — that is, they lived their lives with other women. I began to realize that.

J: Was it like manifest or was it just something that you intuitively grasped?

A: No, no. You pick it up. I knew for instance about Florence Hollis and Rosemary Reynolds, and Gordon Hamilton, Charlotte Towle and Mary Rall, and Jessie Taft and Virginia Robinson, and of course Jane Addams. That was a good feeling when I began to learn about these women, but I was already well into the field by then, so I can't say that it led me in.

J: You were saying that it did give you a consciousness of what it felt like to be an underdog. Had you had some really bad experiences?

- A: Sure. Not very many, because I kept such a low profile. I mean, I was extremely closeted, always. I always played the "don't ask don't tell" game. Probably, really until Joan stood up at Smith and gave a Monday Night Lecture on gay-lesbian issues about seven years ago.
- J: Is that something you feel comfortable talking about now?
- A: Well, you know, I want to talk about it now, but that doesn't mean I do it with comfort. I lived too many years before gay liberation and was too traumatized by all those years. Joan is much more comfortable than I am. I still find it very discomfoting, but I think it is important, so I do it. If I can't, who can? I have nothing to lose. I think of all the people in leadership positions when I was younger, who could have helped younger people out as role models. I also believe that it changes people's attitudes towards gays and lesbians if successful people that don't look any different than anybody else are "out."
- J: And did you eventually meet a lot of these people?
- A: Yes and no. I never met Taft and Robinson. My sister knew Charlotte Towle quite well because my sister was on the staff at the agency there in Chicago. In fact, Mary Rall was an agency director at United Charities, and my sister knew them. I knew Florence Hollis quite well from my Columbia University experience and through Smith, as she was an alum.
- And my mother had known her for years. I knew Rosemary Reynolds and I interviewed them. As a matter of fact, I did an oral history, just like you are doing today [laughing] with [Reynolds and Hollis] together. I didn't know what I was doing, but at least I got them on tape.
- J: So, you were saying, that this obviously is part of who you are and yet it was something that was not an easy thing to manage throughout your career.
- A: It has been different at different periods of my life. When Joan and I went to Michigan, which was twenty-three years ago, I was invited to a party my first month there by Henry Meyer, the famous researcher who wrote *Girls at Vocational High*. He was the head of the doctoral program there, and his wife invited me to a party, and I said I had come to Michigan with this friend, Joan Laird, and could she be included. Mrs. Meyer said, "of course." Such a gracious lady, and that was it. I made it clear that I didn't go out to a social party or on Friday or Saturday night without Joan and so we were always included. But there was never any conversation. But we were always included as a couple in the social life at Michigan.
- J: So was that a turning point?
- A: Well, you see it was a different type of social world, a small town in Michigan. I had been working in New York, living way out on Long Island, so that my social life and my professional life weren't as intimately connected. Although I did have good friends on the Fordham faculty. But we knew that this was going to be a new experience in a town where the University was going to be the major social connection. So, I just made the statement: I wasn't going to act as if I were a single person.
- J: I am jumping ahead also, but while we are on this: Do you feel that this affected your career one way or the other, as you think back?
- A: Well, I don't know. You don't know whether you have hit the glass ceiling; you don't know what choices people make. I don't know how my career could have been much better.
- I did everything I wanted to do and in fact more than I ever would have dreamed I was going to do. I do think when I was interviewed at Smith, when they discovered that I had a partner, there were probably some concerns.

J: This is when you went to become Dean of Smith?

A: When I was interviewed in the dean search. It was really very funny. They sent three members of the search committee out to Ann Arbor and they went all around talking to everybody. They sat down to talk with the staff at Ann Arbor Center for the Family (which I had co-founded and where I practiced). One of the things they were worried about was at sixty was I going to have the energy to be a dean? They asked the Ann Arbor staff about this. Ken Silk, our psychiatrist, says, "Well, she takes Duncan to his job at 7:00 in the morning and then she comes in here and has a 7:30 appointment, she goes over to the school and works all day, then she's here seeing clients until 10:00 at night." They said, "who's Duncan?" And Ken answered, "Joan's son." And so, they began to get the idea. I later heard that when the president of Smith, Mary [Dunn], brought this news to her staff, there was silence. And then the treasurer said, "I don't care, I think she's great — I think she ought to come." He was probably the most conservative person on the staff. They hired me and Mary [Dunn] became a very close friend. She is wonderful and one of the most non-heterosexist people I've ever known. So, I don't know if it has influenced my career

I remember one of my friends overheard several of the male deans at the social work Dean's meeting communicating with each other saying, "The lesbians are taking over the field." I am sure there is still plenty going on underground, as you can imagine. For instance five or six years ago there was a concerted, but rather quiet, effort led by some of the deans to keep homosexuality out of the Council on Social Work Education guidelines.

J: I guess why I was asking these questions, not only to learn how it affected your life, but also, I am thinking there are so many

people today who probably don't have an understanding of what it was like thirty, forty years ago.

A: Oh, no, they don't. Thank goodness they have a very different experience.

I was very unsophisticated about all this and very isolated and silent, which was probably typical. When I was a kid, I read *The Well of Loneliness* and after that I didn't want to read anything on the subject.

J: What was the *Well of Loneliness*? I never read that.

A: That was the first well-known lesbian novel, written by Radcliffe Hall. It was the classic and, of course, it was a tragedy. They always had to end that way. But that was the famous book. The classic. Horrible book. Horrible, because of the 19th century vision [of lesbianism] — it was [written in the] early 20th century. And any lesbian in the world that's over 50 probably sneaked the book into a corner in the library and read it, and that was their education. The message is terrible. It's written by a lesbian, but a homophobic lesbian in a homophobic world. The text is full of pain and struggle and conflict and ends in tragedy. Because that's the way they all ended. Just like the *Children's Hour*. And homophobic and heterosexism culture.

We live in this wonderful place [the Greater Northampton community]. I had no idea when I moved here, that this was a lesbian-friendly town.

J: That's interesting.

A: [Laughing]. It was so funny. I remembered Northampton from 1954. It was a down-at-the-heels mill town that had lost its mills. There were two restaurants downtown. I was very surprised as how the community has changed. It's been a wonderful community for me.

J: Getting back to your beginnings in social work, when you entered the profession, what were some of the key debates or issues that were occurring at that time?

A: Well, when I first entered the profession, it was in child welfare. I think the debates were around the placement of children, the nature of adoption. I was involved in the debates of what child welfare ought to look like. It was very child centered. Which troubled me, always. I think it troubled me always, although it's hard to remember. You re-write your life story with your current ideas, thinking you thought those ideas then. When I entered Smith and began professional training, I think that probably, intellectually, the major issue was that the social sciences were just beginning to come in and challenge the hegemony of the psychodynamic perspective. Herman Stein, who taught at Smith, and Richard Cloward had just published their ground-breaking book on social theory for social workers. Annette Garrett had just read *Childhood and Society* and was very excited about that. Of course, this is what I paid attention to, because it's my life interest.

Also there were a lot of arguments about Smith because they were teaching purely clinical social work. It wasn't called that then. They were teaching psychiatric casework and the other schools were branching out into all kinds of things. Smith was taking the position that this was the base and you could go on to anything from this base. That was the big argument in social work education then, which I was just on the very edge of.

J: So what books were they using at Smith when you went there?

A: I don't remember using any text on practice. We read cases and we read psychodynamic theory. We read Annette Garrett's work on transference. I don't remember much of what we read. I just remember the cases and talking about the

cases. It was such a case method. Grace Nichols was my casework teacher my first year, and Annette Garrett was my second year. They were both wonderful.

J: You've brought up Annette Garrett a few times. Was she really one of the key influential people on you when you went to Smith?

A: She and Grace Nichols, the two of them.

J: And what was Annette Garrett like? In what way did she influence you?

A: She was a character. I would say she was one of the shyest people in the world and so she acted very gruff and cross because she was so shy. She was very uncomfortable with students, except in the classroom, so every year she would grab one student to be her sort of liaison and....

J: ...intermediary?

A: ...and intermediary and security blanket. And I was it, my year, and I ate with her almost every meal. She'd look up and look at me with an expression that said "you aren't going to abandon me," and I would go and sit with her. And she would hold forth. She knew my mother both as a student and later when my mother supervised Smith students and I think felt a special sort of kinship with me. Florence Day, who was the Dean, asked me to drive her to Boston to a medical appointment. That's not the kind of thing that Smith faculty in those days ever did. They were very dedicated and involved but strictly professional.

J: So, this was unusual?

A: Very unusual. I didn't know it, but she had cancer and didn't feel well enough to drive. She died two years later. I drove her to Boston to the medical appointment. Both Day and Garrett died within three months of each other. They were the

school. Day was the Dean and Garrett was the Associate Dean and the head of field work. I believe there were only three full-time faculty members, Day and Garrett and Ester Clemence who lived in Chicago and she took care of all the field placements in the mid-west, and came to Smith for the summer. Grace Nichols was half-time, and lived in Boston, and Garrett lived in Boston and only Day lived in Northampton. There were probably forty-five students in my class. Something like that.

The part-time faculty was also wonderful. I had Herman Stein for research, Al Kahn for social policy, Norman Polansky for group, Irving Kaufman for psychodynamics, James Mann for psychopathology. The students were also wonderful. We had a such a good time. I was organizing all sorts of activities and one day Garrett said to me. "Miss Hartman, this is not a summer camp."

J: Where was your field placement?

A: At Mass. Memorial Hospital in Boston. Which I think is Boston University's (BU) training hospital. There were two of us from Smith, five from BU, and one from Simmons. We were all placed in the psychosomatic clinic down in the basement. My supervisor was Evelyn Styles. The best supervision I have ever had in my professional life, at least since I left child welfare. I had good supervision there, too.

I learned a lot from Evelyn Styles. She told Nancy Staver, my research advisor, that she used to have to go to bed very early in the night before her conference with me [laughing].

J: What were you like then, when you were a student?

A: I don't know, but I guess I wasn't easy. I guess I was demanding.

J: You told me that you still thought that it was important to be involved in policy and to have an influence on society.

A: No, I didn't say it was important to be involved in policy. I said that I didn't want to go to [JGB] because I didn't think it was social work because they were doing psychotherapy and they were not attending to the environmental issues within the social context. I never wanted to be a social policy person. Although now I find that most of my writing happens to be in social policy. But I didn't want to be a practitioner of social policy.

J: So you knew you wanted to work with people as you were leaving Smith but you didn't want to work in a place that only did psychotherapy.

A: I didn't want to work in a place that had that image of what you do as a social worker. So, I was a little out of step with Smith probably, even back then. I mean they didn't feel I was, but psychodynamic psychotherapy was not what I was going to do for a living.

J: Right. You knew that much.

A: I was going to do social work. □

[To be completed in the next issue:
Reflections Volume 4, #4 (Fall, 1998).]

Copyright of Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping is the property of Cleveland State University 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.