



SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Patricia Minuchin

Interviewed by Paula Menyuk
In Brookline, MA
August 4, 2004

Menyuk: August 4, 2004. This is an interview with Patricia Minuchin; the interviewer is Paula Menyuk. This is going to be part of the SRCD Oral History Interviews, and I've said everything else that should be said including that it's being done in my home in Brookline, Massachusetts. And now let us—you say what you want to say, Patricia.

Minuchin: I'm officially Patricia Minuchin, otherwise known as Pat Minuchin, and we are now trying my voice, and I assume that we're going to be ready to go any moment.

Menyuk: Start recording. So I'll say, "Describe your family background, along with any childhood and adolescent experiences that might be of interest."

Minuchin: Okay, I'll do that in a general—I'll do that in a general way. I was born in New York, in Brooklyn, to be exact. My family: we were a family of four. I had an older sister, four and a half, five years older, and it was just the two of us. My parents—my father was born in Poland and came over when he was a small child. His father had come first, and then his mother took the other children and came over. My mother was born in New York, and her mother was born here, which was unusual for Jewish families at that time. They were, I think, for those times, relatively modern, in some sense. They--their social group was really a group of, of families; couples associated with the local temple, which was a reform temple, and the men were lawyers or businessmen, or whatever. My father was an accountant and had come--he'd grown up in western Pennsylvania. He came to New York--he studied at night--he became a CPA. Not educated beyond that, but a bright man, with a profession.

My mother who I think had a--she had a better sense of humor than my father--was a--she came from a lighter family, in some way, and she had gone to a "normal school", which I think was the term for teacher training, and she had taught a couple of years in the lower east side of New York. Then she married, and she never worked again. And she and her friends were not working women, but all the people in that group of maybe twenty or so couples--families who were in the neighborhood and were my parents' social group--they all expected their children to go to college and to go beyond that, and to be a credit as American citizens settled here. We grew up really, in terms of family, with my mother's family. That was where we spent our Sundays--with my grandmother and with the cousins. My father's family was living in the Bronx--scattered around New York. We saw them very infrequently. Maybe twice a year we went to the Bronx. It wasn't until much later, when I knew something about families, when I thought, "wasn't that interesting." It just seemed the way that things--that's the way things were. But, I really think it's often true that in families, they are closer, more integrated into one spouse's family than the other. I don't know if that's always true but that was true for us.

The only other thing I think I'd like to say about that is that, in that family, I was the younger and the more--I got away with more, if that's a good way to put it. My sister was over-protected. She, she was skinny and my parents were concerned about her. They fussed over her, and they--and I think she paid a price for that. I was all--I was the "tomboy", which was the expression at that time. And I think it was important for them that I should be the one who was not so vulnerable and not so sickly and not so

whatever, and so in some ways I had a better childhood. I was--we fought a lot as kids, my sister and I. We became very close many years later when we were adults. I think I might come back to some of that, but that's the general sketch of my family.

Menyuk: Yeah, as I was sitting here and shaking the head, shaking the head, shaking the head. The only difference is I'm an only child. So that was a very different experience. But, boy was I spoiled by the system. What was your schooling like?

Minuchin: Well, I went to, of course, the grade school and then to the local high school, which was very large. We had a graduating class of over 900 kids. That's in New York—a Brooklyn high school, in which there was some variety but mostly there were a lot of white middle class kids. We were a generally middle class neighborhood. Middle-middle to thereabouts, and it was a successful experience for me. There were a lot of bright kids and the teaching was very traditional, but it was good quality within a traditional framework.

Menyuk: The New York City schools were terrific during that time.

Minuchin: They were certainly better, and they were different. Because I remember reading many years later about that particular high school--James Madison High School--which became integrated. I mean there were hardly--if there were any black children I didn't know that--or Puerto Rican or Oriental, or Asian, or anything. We were--there were--there were sort of social class differences but not, not ethnic variety at the time. And that was a neighborhood that many years later was trying to develop a, a really good integrated school, and they had their troubles. But that was long after my time. My sister had gone to Cornell and I did the same. I think I'm going to be talking about the fact that in some way I have become, I think, a challenger to our field. A challenger in a positive sense, trying to sort of extend boundaries within the field and ask people to think about different things. That came from my experiences later in life. I think through all of college, and maybe even graduate school, it was a more conventional way of being a very good student and learning a lot and not being a big questioner. The, the kind of education that we got at that time was to know a lot--which we did--and, and not to raise an awful lot of questions. That was not, not--was not a challenging kind of background.

Menyuk: Did you know what you were going to do after you graduated--

Minuchin: No.

Menyuk: --when you were at Cornell?

Minuchin: No.

Menyuk: No.

Minuchin: Oh, well, I had decided that I wanted to go--I wanted to go to graduate school. I mean, one of the things that happened--and this becomes relevant, I guess, in a question that comes up pretty soon--that is, that my first, first year--in fact my first semester at Cornell--the Second World War broke out. I went there in September, and December 7th came along, and that was the beginning of the Second World War. And the campus became a center for--they were teaching languages and--languages, literature, politics, whatever--of a variety of places in, in Europe and Asia, where Army, Navy and Marine personnel would be going. So there was a Russian group and there was a Polish group, and an Italian and a French and a German and a Japanese and so forth. And so the, the campus was filled with Army, Navy and Marine personnel who were studying, and they were studying cultures really. And that was interesting--that was a complicated time.

When I graduated, I had decided I really wanted to go on with my education, and I wanted to go on in psychology. I would like to say I had a vision, but I'm not sure that was true. I liked it. I found it interesting. I found it interesting about people--the social psychology, the personality theories and so

forth. So that was going to be my direction, and I--why I picked Yale I can hardly remember. I had one professor whom I liked a lot and who advised me to go to Yale. Maybe that was a good choice and maybe it wasn't. But at any rate, I actually graduated from college in three and a half years--came out in January and was going to enter Yale in September. And that's important, because I spent that time working as an assistant to--at a nursery school in Brooklyn. And it was downtown Brooklyn, near the, near the water and there were--it was the families of men that were in the Army, Navy and so forth. So there were these little kids and their moms. And in a way it was my, it was my first taste of how much I liked being around small children. I just had a good time. And at that point, my sister and her oldest daughter were living with us. My brother-in-law was overseas and I was living with my parents and my niece was about the same age--three, four years old. So I was getting a dose of something that I realized I enjoyed. Okay?

I went to Yale, and that--how do I do that fast? Yale was important and interesting but I think, over time, I took from it -- I took from it the research training. That was the place that gave me the basic ideas of how you do research, and how you estimate whether you're getting results that are better than chance, and things like that. It was a learning theory center and it was running rats--I mean people were running rats, and it didn't grab me. There were a very bright group of professors and they were interesting, but Yale was not a big intellectual experience for me. I made good friends. My closest friend now is somebody named Edna Shapiro. We were at, at Yale together. And for over 50 years we have been very close friends and colleagues. And there were other people--many of them, some of them, well known in the field, who were my colleagues at the time--Johnny Conger, Paul Mussen, Jerry Kagan came a little bit later. A small group. We were never more than 15 graduate students there, so that it was--that part was stimulating and interesting. I don't think my basic ideas about people, about children, about the part of psychology that became very important to me--I'm not sure that was shaped at Yale. But, the part of me that knows something about evidence, finding out, and so forth--I got quite a lot of that at Yale, even while I criticize it.

Menyuk: Were there any particular people that you feel were your mentors and led you into the aspect of psychology that you got involved with?

Minuchin: Well, actually it came just a little bit later, with names that are not so well known. The people, the people at Yale who were interesting--Seymour Sarason; then, the group of, of people from whom I learned things: Carl Hovland, Irwin Child, Leonard Doob, and a woman whose name I keep blocking though she was the clinical person and I was a clinical specialist. While I was at Yale I was working as a clinical intern at a hospital in Framingham, Massachusetts, which was a VA hospital. And the years we're now talking about--I got my doctorate in '50 so I was--this was between the end of '45 and 1950 were the Yale years. And there were a small group of us who were the VA interns, and that was Johnny Conger, Paul Mussen, Fran Moriarty, and myself, and the four of us spent a lot of time at Cushing Hospital. And I did what you did in those days as a clinical psychologist: I did a lot of testing.

And the people who were brought to that hospital were veterans from--fresh from the war--immediate, immediate post-war. I think, along with some other things that happened, some of the questioning about what we do, how we do things in our profession which you always have to get to at some point with small questions, large questions, came then, because it was very psychoanalytically oriented. Cushing was a general hospital, but the psychiatry part was very connected to the, the Boston Psychoanalytic Group, which was a very traditional group.

Menyuk: Very Freudian.

Minuchin: Very Freudian, and you probably can supply me with some names that should be at the front of my head but are at the back. At any rate--they (the psychoanalysts) came sometimes, and they did some sitting in on case conferences. And I had difficulty there, because the men who came to Cushing Hospital--it was all men coming from the wars. They'd been through hell, you know, and they came anxious, and they came with physical damage, and anxiety and depression and psychotic things and neurotic things. And, and the case conferences and the diagnoses and the discussions were all about

oral, anal and oedipal things. It probably sounds crazy now, but it—

Menyuk: No

Minuchin: --was very familiar then, and it was considered to be a way of getting at the deep roots of this, and I knew that that really was limited. That that did not respect what people had been through, to put together with what they had brought with them when they joined the Army. Whatever. So that was, in some ways, an important experience. And, and then I got my degree in 1950. Should I just say where I went from there? Do you want a sort of a—

Menyuk: Well, did we talk about all the individuals that were important to your intellectual development? The research mentors, colleagues—

Minuchin: Well, the research mentors—

Menyuk: Well, some of them were at Yale because they taught research—

Minuchin: They were certainly at Yale, and they taught research courses. And when we took--we looked at the research in all the fields, like personality and social--the things that I was most interested in--and in learning theory, and the works; statistics, and research and so forth.

Probably my most important mentor came just after I came out of Yale. I went from Yale, really--Irving Janis was at Yale, and he was important and interesting. And his wife, Marjorie Janis, was a--she was an educator, and she was lovely, and she was working at the Yale Child Study Center, or whatever—

Menyuk: Yeah that sounds right, yeah.

Minuchin: --and she had also been trained at Bank Street College in New York, if that's a familiar--is that? Okay--as a teacher, and she had said to me, "There's a wonderful person. There's a very tiny research department, and there's a wonderful person named Barbara Biber who runs that. Why don't you go? Why don't you go, and I think they're looking to take on more people in that department." She had been working a little, part-time, with Barbara. I had not wanted to go into a clinical job. I had found that disappointing. It's very different now. Anybody who goes into clinical is preparing to do less testing, maybe research, but also therapy in some form. But no psychologists did therapy at that point and—

Menyuk: Always left to the psychiatrists.

Minuchin: --huh?

Menyuk: That was left to the psychiatrists.

Minuchin: Yeah, absolutely—

Menyuk: Psychologists were not supposed to do that.

Minuchin: So, my experience: I had worked in a small type of psychiatric service in the community, in New Haven, and had done some things in a--but anyway, it was testing. And my experience was that I would give a whole battery of things--projective tests, whatever--and I would use my brain, and I would pull together something and I would hand it over, and it just didn't feel very fulfilling. I thought, "I don't want a job in the VA", or something, and I knew that this was an educational center--Bank Street--and I didn't know much more about it. But I knew Marjorie Janis, and I liked her, and I went to talk with Barbara, and I will make that very fast. She hired me. She became very much a mentor and an ego ideal. I don't know that anybody in the field of child--well, some people in the field of child development probably know her. But in SRCD she would not be a known name. But she was a major

educator. Bank Street, as you probably know, had a school for children, from preschool through the 13 year olds, by then. It had a teacher training—a very developed teacher training program for master teachers. Not at the basic level. People who came already had a college degree. And this was master teaching in, what I will not call “progressive education”, because that has associations where you let the kids do what they want and you make sure that their souls are okay. And it wasn’t like that. This was a very--what developed later was a term for the approach, which was “cognitive-affective.” And it was quite psychodynamic, but it had a very--the overall philosophy--both the teacher training and the school and the research department--had to do with the idea that you made an environment for children. In that environment, they were learning how to think, how to raise questions, pursue evidence, and pull it together. Kind of John Dewey’s way of problem solving. They had a very strong idea about interpersonal relationships; the child group as a peer situation in the classroom, and the teacher/child relationship as an example of the way in which authority comes through to the children, and that interchange. And it was very, very aware of psycho dynamic growth and development, and so forth. It was very--and it was not new to me, but as way of looking at the environment in which children grow, rather than testing children for what’s wrong here, I found it fascinating, and I--

Menyuk: Let’s look at what they can do and not just look at what they can’t do.

Minuchin: --and, and also what they can do, and also how do you stimulate. How do you set up an environment in which children are developing a cooperative way of problem solving? Whether it is about an intellectual problem, you know, about “what is an island, and how is it formed?” or about “how do things come in and out of New York City?” They did--it was a progressive education curriculum, in many ways, that integrated the reading, the writing, the exploring, and so forth. But also, how do you help kids negotiate quarrels and fights and possession of objects, and all those things, and what is acceptable in the way of behavior, and where is the authority important there and where the children? It was a very interesting mix of things for me, and Barbara was wonderful. She was a writer. She did a lot of writing, and I think it came more into the educational field. And she was a thinker, and we had wonderful discussions. A year later, my very close friend, Edna Shapiro, got her doctorate at Yale, and came and became part of that department. We were small, and the very first thing that we did as a research project had to do with a test that had been developed at Bank Street, a Cartoon Situations Test for assessing teachers, but especially people who were applying to the teacher training program. And we, we analyzed that, and we published a small article, my first. But then we got a grant for a large project, called the Psychological Impact of School Experience, which went on for a number of years. We published a book in 1969 with that title and it was--

Menyuk: Who were you supported by in IMH?

Minuchin: --NIMH, and we went into--I will not spend a lot of time on this, but we, we selected four elementary schools in the New York general area where the kids were of the same middle class background but the philosophy of the schools were different. We were calling it at the time “modern” and “traditional”, which is not a very good way, our “modern” keeps changing. But, the traditional were very good students, very good teachers, and a traditional way of having a curriculum and leading the children through it, and so forth, and the rules for behavior. And they were on a continuum towards one of the progressive schools, a very good progressive school in Manhattan, which had a philosophy like Bank Street. We didn’t want to use Bank Street.

And we spent several years gathering data. Studied each school as a society, interviewed parents, observed in classrooms. And we had six sessions in that--with each child, and analyzed them for the type of thinking. There were projective things—a play session, and we analyzed the play session, and incomplete sentences, and all that kind of thing. And, and I did some publishing from that, before the book on sexual stuff, because we had material about boys and girls and their conceptions of males and females, in which you saw a freer kind of attitude in the children who were growing up in a freer, less traditional kind of school. And we integrated that with the parent data, so that you had an interaction between parents and school. Of course, parents choose the schools that are freer. And so forth.

One of the interesting things, of course, is that the world has changed enormously. So that sex-appropriate behavior was the terminology when I published in 1965. It was the first, I think. That was in *Child Development*. It goes way back--and that's 1965 in *Child Development*. It was called "Sex concepts and sex-typing in childhood as a function of school and home environments." That came from this big project, and the theory in child development was that it--boys and girls needed to develop appropriate sex typing, which they learned from the way in which they were treated by their mothers, and they needed to identify with the parent of the same sex. Well, look how the world has changed. We don't need to spend time on that, but we don't talk so much about "appropriate" anymore, and I think the world has moved in its way of raising boys and girls towards what the more--at that time what we were calling the more "modern", the more liberal schools were doing. That was an interesting kind of thing. Okay. Instead of--I think maybe--

Menyuk: I have to ask you the question. I think you've answered the question of what are the origins of your interests in child development? Your preschool experience very early on--

Minuchin: That's it, yeah.

Menyuk: --and significant colleagues. Are there any political and social events that have influenced your research and writing?

Minuchin: Yeah, yeah. I do want to talk about that a little bit, and just at least name them. World War II, I think I said, I was, you know, had grown up in a rather traditional environment and was a very good student, but not a--I think a number of things shook me up personally, and in the way I thought about the world. And the Second World War--the things that it did, with everybody going, it was--do we need to explain? Do you remember the Second World War? Not well?

Menyuk: Are you kidding? Of course I remember the Second World War.

Minuchin: I don't know how--

Menyuk: I remember being a student in high school, and singing the Marseillaise when Paris fell--that kind of thing. So I was very cognizant.

Minuchin: Yeah, yeah. And I told you that it broke out when I was a freshman. So there's something about the way it hit everybody that we knew--relatives, friends, classmates, families; the disruption of life as you had expected it to be. And then, what began to come out about concentration camps, and so forth, the understanding of what human beings do to each other. I think it's hard to understand how people--what wars are about anyway. How people can face each other and kill each other off. That's hard, and continues to be. But there was all of the Holocaust kind of thing. So that's very major in--the way I think about, in some way, how there are people who are relatively safe and people who are living in circumstances that can hardly be imagined. And that has followed me, and it follows me to much later times that I will tell you about, in which I'm working with the poverty stricken in New York, and so forth. And I carry that awareness, I think, starting from the Second World War, of people who were relatively safe here at home, or whatever, and people who were living in the middle of all of the bombing and the mess.

The other kind of thing that came a little bit after that, skipping a bit, is that when Sal and I married, he had been--I'll go fast on this, but he comes from Argentina. He had been a Zionist all his life. When the Israeli War broke out, he went to Israel and was in the army, and when it finished he went back to Argentina to his family, and then came to the States. He already had had an internship in psychiatry. He was a physician already. And he came presumably to work with Bruno Bettelheim, but did not. He stayed in New York. I met him, we married and we went to Israel, presumably forever. And it's important to say presumably forever, because you approach a different country very differently if you think you're coming back in a couple of years than if you think this is it. And that experience of being an immigrant--I was a privileged immigrant. I had my Yale PhD by then, and I had been working at Bank

Street. This was 1951. We married in 1951. So I'd been working at Bank Street, and a little bit at a place called the Council Child Development Center doing testing, which was part of the Jewish Board of Guardians. And we went. What was it that was special about going? I will, I will skip all the reasons, and so forth, but that's what we did. I had not been a Zionist, particularly. My family was Jewish, the people in the temple were Jewish, and everybody was friendly to Israel, but the, the image there was that all of the kids, we would grow up and be very successful and competent and educated young Jewish-Americans. Okay? So this was a bit of a shock. But it was the man, and it was--it seemed to me like a wonderful thing to be doing. An adventure, and a new country, and so forth.

But going as an immigrant, just to encapsulate, we actually stayed three years and then came back. But going there told me a lot about the experience of being in a place that was totally unfamiliar. Language, language! I mean, I had picked up in one year. I did need to pick up the rudiments of two new languages, because when we--we went by boat everywhere in 1951. We went first to Argentina, and spent three months to meet my family and be there, and I picked up quite a bit of Spanish, which I've had ever since. I had had college French and that was not difficult, and then we went to Israel, crossing by boat. And Hebrew is a very difficult language, and for people like us the home language is important. The experience of not being able to communicate at any level, to begin with, and then I studied. And at that time they had what they called "Ulpanim." These were language courses. You spent five hours every day, six days a week, and I learned quite a bit. But--

Menyuk: Do you speak Hebrew still, or do you speak Spanish?

Minuchin: I can, I can--oh, Spanish yes, quite a lot--

Menyuk: Yes, a lot.

Minuchin: --a lot. Sal's family and I--

Menyuk: Yeah, but it's also a much easier language.

Minuchin: It's much easier, and my in-laws and I--yeah, right--it's just a language that's--but the Hebrew--when we go there, I can travel, I can go to the local shops and buy the food, and I have some, but you lose it over 50 years or so. At any rate, Israel was also the experience of an enormous variety of people who had come, many of them, out of terrible European circumstances. I was from my privileged Yale PhD background, and I was now a person sort of finding my way in a new, totally different kind of society, knowing nobody, except my husband, and some of his friends. He had been there and come back, and some of the Argentine people he knew were there, and that became our friendship group.

I did some work there. There was a clinic in Jerusalem called the Lasker Clinic, and it was a psychological center and a treatment clinic. And the person who was the psychologist there was living permanently in Israel, but she was going home (to America) for a period of time, and somebody asked me would I come and fill in and do the testing--which you did, ridiculously, through interpreters. But, I went there, and it was a children's clinic. It was interesting. I went two days a week and I did testing. But I had the same experience that I told you about that I had at Cushing Hospital in Framingham, although I was more aware at this time of what I really thought about it. I will just tell very fast that there was one case conference on a child and a mother. The child was unmanageable. She was six years old. They had come from Morocco, I believe, and many of the people from the Middle Eastern countries had eye problems: cataracts, and whatever. And this child had been blind from birth. She came with--the family came, a poor family--and the Israeli doctors operated, and she was given sight. Not regained sight, but given sight, and this child was frantic, out of control. And I had the same feeling that I've described to you, because the analysts, their way of discussing at the case conference was in terms of the oral and anal problems, and the relationship of this uneducated mother to the way she handled her daughter. And I kept thinking about what we would all feel if we were suddenly given a sixth sense that was the rule of the world, and we were supposed to be grateful, and we had no idea.

And this child had no way of managing, and nobody thought that was the important part, and so they--

Menyuk: They had saved her and that was that.

Minuchin: They had given her an incomparable gift, and they had.

Menyuk: Sure.

Minuchin: But that's a process, and so forth. You know, I was shaping my ideas about what I think about people and psychology and development, and so forth, at the same time as my husband, who was a very important part of the picture. When we came, he had a job. He came--and I will try to be fast on this, but it was important to me. Anyway, his job, when he came, was as director of a part of Youth Aliyah, the immigration--

Menyuk: Movement, yeah.

Minuchin: --yeah, okay. When children came from Europe, often or mostly without their parents, they were placed in the Kibbutzim, which absorbed them, and they became members of the Kibbutz. (note: cooperative settlement). And if you think about it, you would realize that some small percentage of the children could not make it in that environment. They were just not doing well--aggressive, acting out, withdrawn, whatever. And so there were five institutions, that were called Educational Healing Institutions, around Israel for the children who had come out of the youth movement and had not made it in the Kibbutzim. So they were living there, and they had sort of an educational program, with counselors and so forth, and a director in each one. And Sal became--a psychiatrist had been there and had been asked to survey the situation. When he went back to America, where he lived, he told them, "You need a psychiatrist there. You can't do this all with education." And Sal became that psychiatrist.

We learned a lot together. We learned a lot about different cultures. We learned about internal dynamics vis-à-vis experience, and how those come together for children, and that the child who is seeing visions is sometimes seeing things that were part of his culture, and so forth. At the same time, of course, if there's a lot of knowledge that one has about internal dynamics, that's also real.

Anyway, a very important experience: to be an immigrant, and to know a lot of different cultures and a lot of different ways of looking at the world and the chaos. When I talk about Israel, I mean, I am very aware of the fact that the Israel of today is very different and much more complicated, with pros and cons about its behavior, and I feel a loyalty to it and a lot of criticism. It was very different then. We were there from 1951 to 1954. It was the underdog. It had come through a very difficult war, by some miracle it had won or at least was able to maintain itself as an independent entity, and there wasn't much food, and there wasn't much--but it was very interesting, and so I learned a lot from that. When we came back, we thought we would be returning. Sal wanted to finish his psychoanalytic training, something which he did, but then we thought we would go back, and we didn't.

That brings us to--so, the third thing that I would say is the political and social event that influenced me was the war on poverty, and Head Start, and all of those programs that developed in the '60s and '70s. I was at Bank Street. When I came back I went back to work. Came back in 1954. We had a child, a son, who was a baby, but I went back part time, and then full time, to Bank Street. At that time, we were doing--aside from the big project that we did--we were doing work in Head Start, and I was, at some point, doing some research on curiosity and exploratory behavior in the small children in Head Start; the variation in that, and what that seemed to be due to, in terms of parents and--

Menyuk: Are you talking about infants or toddlers or--

Minuchin: --no, no--my --

Menyuk: --high school kids--

Minuchin: What?

Menyuk: --mostly preschool kids?

Minuchin: The children in Head Start were three and four year olds. Then they'd go into the kindergartens, and then came Follow-Through, when they were first graders. So that all of that feel for what to do about poverty and disadvantage, and so forth, was a very important kind of thing.

I think we've maybe taken ourselves very much through number four.

Menyuk: Okay.

Minuchin: Or--do you agree?

Menyuk: Yes--

Minuchin: I think--

Menyuk: What kind of question is this? Would you characterize the development of your ideas in the field of child development as evolving in a straight forward fashion or in a way that involves sharps turns in theory or research style? Why do you think one or the other?

Minuchin: That's an important one for me. I think it's probably core for the way I would describe--I think that I moved--

Menyuk: I don't know how much time has passed, so I want to know where we are on the tape. We should--but I'll say that we stopped for a moment to see where we were on the tape. Okay, carry on George. (Both laugh)

Minuchin: Oh okay. I, I think I have sort of three phases, in a general way, in my development. The first went from adults to children. Even though I talked about the nursery school as being an interesting base for me, when I was at Yale and working in the VA, it was adults that I was working with, and I did my dissertation with adults, and so forth. But, when I went to, to Bank Street, that shifted to be--well, it certainly was focused on children. The big project, which was about children's development in different kinds of environments, was very child focused and school focused. That was a new element--

Menyuk: That was another thing as well--education focused.

Minuchin: Yes, yes and that was big. I think if one looks through what I've published over the years you can see things moving--

Menyuk: In that direction.

Minuchin: --moving in that direction. And there's quite a lot of school stuff and child stuff, and I've talked about the project. So there was a focus on children. But I think I would say that the second phase was a move from individuals to systems. And the third phase is going to be from sort of a general interest in children and families and systems to a particular interest in multi-problem families and social problems. Okay. The first phase--I don't think I need to say more about. The second phase, individuals to systems: there were two very major--there were three major influences. One of them was Israel; seeing the environment in which people grow, it just became--there was just such a sense that people are in interaction between who they are internally and what kind of large environment they have come from and are in now, and so forth. But the second one was Bank Street College itself, where the focus was on the children but the whole enterprise of Bank Street was to be thinking about and creating a, a human and intellectual environment which would be as positive as possible for the

growth of children as secure--as related to other people--

Okay. Well, just to continue to say about Bank Street, that it was also--it was focused on the development of the self, of relationships, and of an inquiring mind that--

Menyuk: Independence?

Minuchin: --independence, and interdependence. I really think that was a value; to be in a collaborative, cooperative relationship. And then a way of thinking that is Dewey-like, John Dewey-like, that raises questions and goes after finding out more. Okay. So the classroom was an interactive system, and I think I absorbed that, and we were studying that.

But the other part of that, aside from the Israeli experience and the Bank Street experience, was that-- and I don't know how familiar you are with that, but from about the end of the 1950s on, or thereabouts, the field of family therapy, based on a theory about family systems, was developing. And I was living with a husband who was a pioneer, and who has continued to be a major figure, and since time has gone by and a number of the other pioneer figures have already died, he is, at this point, one of the most important and influential family therapists of the times. It began back then, and his stuff is all in--published in books, and so forth. But those were the discussions between us. What was happening was that they were seeing families and, uh, working on the theories of the interaction of people within the family: children with adults, adults with each other, the effect of that. And, of course, the other thing, that's much more important in the therapy field than in the research field of child development, is that they were change agents. So then the question comes, how do you help people to change in a positive direction, when they come in in pain, in conflict, in whatever, or a child is damaged, or too aggressive, or whatever? But in order to do that, a lot was being developed in terms of how do we understand how this family is functioning, and what that means for all its members.

I will not do a whole thing on that. I will just say that that's been going on in my household, as well as the field of family therapy, for 50 years. And so, as an influence on me it's been enormous, and I think that I, as an influence on my husband and his work, has been quite enormous in ways you can't even track for either--in either direction. But, it came to a point some time ago when it was--it has been hard for me to think about any child without thinking in terms of what is the human context around this child, and what's the interaction, and how does that function? how does that work? what is that circle like? And one thing you do with children is to try to go deep and find out what's going on inside, but the other thing you need to know is what's going on in the lateral, horizontal way, and how is that. So that's been my guiding philosophy for a lot of years. I have some feeling that one reason that--aside from my age and survival--that I'm asked to come here and talk about my life and work is that I published an article in 1985 in *Child Development* which has been--sometimes there's the one thing that everybody knows about you--and that's still in the references. That's 20 years. And it was called, "Individual and"--I'll have to look--"Individual and family development: Provocations from the field of family therapy." And that was the place where I was dealing with the kinds of things that are there all the time in the way that family therapists work, and that are absolutely part of what child development people have to be involved in. And it's very difficult to approach that in research terms, because as soon as you go beyond one or two people you've got enormous--

Menyuk: Differences--

Minuchin: --design problems. In spite of which, the experience of anybody--the experience from my background--I was one of two children and there were two parents, and anybody who knows--so I've dealt and thought a lot about the meaning of co-parenting. That the two parents have got to, in some way, interleave their relationships to the children. They need to negotiate the ways in which they think differently, and have different impulses about when you stop a fight among the kids, or when you are helpful and when you let the child work it out for him or herself. All kinds of things that are part of what's right in front of family therapists all the time, sometimes as a problem, sometimes as a resource or a strength in the family. And that's important for us to look at in the child development

field. So that's been a great influence on what I've written, published, thought about.

Menyuk: And that particular article you would say has had the greatest impact--

Minuchin: I think so.

Menyuk: --on the field of child development?

Minuchin: I think so, because I keep seeing it. When I pick up other things, I keep seeing it referred to, or I get asked to come to--

Menyuk: Give a talk.

Minuchin: --I've actually--I've brought you just for fun--reading a book published from a conference in 2002 about family systems by psychologists at Clark University. There is somebody there named Jamie McHale, who's doing very interesting work on co-parenting. How two parents--

Menyuk: Interact--

Minuchin: --relate to their child, or their children, and so--and that's still part of his references. So I think this has been influential. I've done other writing like that since, trying to develop the ideas, and the implications of the ideas.

Menyuk: And you think that really took a sharp turn in what child developmental persons were thinking about--

Minuchin: I think--

Menyuk: --development?

Minuchin: --I think that you only have an impact if a field is kind of ready. I got a lot of response to that article, as well as later on. So I think some things don't make sense to people, even if they seem true, because they're not ready. I think the field was ready for that, and so a lot of work has gone on since then, in which people are doing things that I don't feel able to do. Which is to work out some of the technical ways in which you can deal with--beyond the dyad, when you've got three people, or a group of people, or whatever. It's still a very knotty problem. And so sometimes you're asking the statistics to get at something when you know that it's not in the statistics, but the experience of the child is interactional, right there and then, and it's not sequential. But I think whatever part I've had in that, the field was certainly ready to open up, and has, and still stumbles. Because it's correct that the field of research and child development should not be giving up the idea about how you go out to find--to get more information. So you don't want to be limited by your design, and you don't want to give up your design. I mean you don't want to give up the idea that there are ways of finding out whether something is a valid idea, or is disproven, or whether you can't prove it. The research equipment is terribly important, and that's a big--we come to that a little bit later, whether the tensions between theory and research have something to do with what's the experience in the real world and families and for children vis-à-vis what the research enterprise is able to handle in a way that feels disciplined and comfortable, and leading towards an ability to say this has been validated, or no it hasn't, and that's a very strong tension. I have personally moved more into the applied field, and so I'm very aware of the fact that there are lots of kinds of things that I feel--

Menyuk: Versus theory?

Minuchin: Huh?

Menyuk: Versus theory, I don't think so--

Minuchin: I think--

Menyuk: --listening to you.

Minuchin: --I think not versus theory, versus the ability--I think I've moved more into training people to work with troubled families, and training them towards ways of doing that in ways I don't think anybody--and I don't feel able to demonstrate its demonstrably better than leaving it alone, or not doing it at all, or doing it a different way.

Menyuk: Okay, alright.

Minuchin: You need to move with what you think is important for the child, for the families, and that you know that the welfare system is not doing, and that you know the foster care system is not doing. Okay?

Menyuk: Yes. Yes, yes.

Minuchin: And so, I don't know whether this is the moment but we should do it at some point. So, for instance, I've been working a lot since the New York time on working--we were doing a lot of work with the foster care system, in which, as you know, children are taken from the biological family and placed in a foster home. Okay. It is a theory, and the family therapists among us, as well as myself, have the feeling that it's not good for children. I mean, after all, attachment is such an important--it's not good for the children to be abruptly moved from one place to another, without contact back and forth. It's not true that the parents they've been taken from have always abused them physically or are dangerous. They're often neglectful, or drugged, or whatever, which doesn't mean that the kids don't have some attachment to them at the same time they're building attachments to the new family. And a lot of the work we were doing was to help the agencies and the employees, the social workers who are in charge of the work in foster care, in charge of monitoring the families, and so forth, to be able to bring together in meetings the foster parents, or the foster mother, and the biological parents, even if the biological parent or mother cannot be in charge of this child now; to bring them together so they become collaborative. We talked about an ecological triangle, consisting of the agency that monitors, the biological family, and the foster family, with the child at the center as everybody's concern.

And we've worked like crazy on that, and produced manuals for training, and so forth. Now, to prove that it's better for the child; that you cannot do so well. One of the things you can do, which has been helpful in a way, is to work by analogy. There are a lot of analogies between the foster care situation and the divorce situation, where the child is then attached to both mother and father, who don't live together anymore. And one of the things that we know, that Heatherington and a lot of other people have done research on, is the fact that when the two parents who are no longer spouses, don't love each other but care about their children when they come together, when they communicate information, when they work out something that works for them and for the child, it's better for the child. And so you carry that by analogy to the foster care situation, and say, "If you get the two sets of parents together and they're keeping some kind of contact, it's better for the child."

Menyuk: Now you do case study histories, do you not? Case study histories where essentially you're doing a comparison of situations in which you do bring --

Minuchin: And when you don't, yeah. Now not a lot of that, believe me, goes on when you're dealing with the poor, the welfare system, the foster care system. We were in New York City, and there were fifty thousand children in foster care, okay? So--

Menyuk: Yes ma'am.

Minuchin: --I, I don't--I think it would be good if you could have some research base, and it's helpful in

terms of getting people to pay attention and having money directed towards that. But, I know now you can't always wait for that, and you have to go with your theories about what's good for the children and what is a possible thing to do.

Menyuk: Absolutely, absolutely.

Minuchin: Okay, so—alright, where are we?

Menyuk: I think we've done continuities in your work that are most significant, what shifts occurred, what events were responsible. You have notes on what you want to say--

Minuchin: Well—no, we can go down--I think we have been talking just now about the strengths and weaknesses of my research and theoretical contributions, the impact of the work and its current status.

Menyuk: I think so too.

Minuchin: I have moved--I have moved towards this kind of thing, which is about working with families in foster care, substance abuse in pregnant women--

Menyuk: That's what you're calling applied?

Minuchin: I'm calling that applied.

Menyuk: Right.

Minuchin: And I'm bringing whatever I know about children and families to that, and I basically did the writing on this. My husband has been very important in all the work and so has--but, in terms of the impact, you don't know--I mean the strengths and weaknesses, I don't bring a research base to that. I'm not doing research on that. It seems to me very important, it is theory based. And there is an impact. This book, *Working with Families of the Poor*, which is 1998, is now in six other languages. Which means that these issues--I mean this must not be--

Menyuk: It's not national, it's international.

Minuchin: It's--what you do about these problems for children and families is—it's applicable in French, German and--

Menyuk: International.

Minuchin: --Portuguese, and yeah--and Korean and Chinese, and pirated into Hungarian. So what I'm doing right now--I am retired and--but I have been asked to make a second edition, and I'm working on that, bringing some stuff up to date. So I think that's been important, but I've wandered some from the field, I have to say, in a way .

Menyuk: I'm shrugging because to me you--your field has been children and families and, and you have not deviated from that. You really have not. How you look at, what you do with it has changed over time--

Minuchin: Yeah, yes, yup.

Menyuk: --but not your focus of attention. Because your feeling has always been that the child is in a family and is--

Minuchin: That probably has grown more so, I think. The early work--

Menyuk: --of late.

Minuchin: --was more--no--not even of late, but certainly--for instance I'm looking at the "wrong headed" (term). That's not a great question: "Which contributions are the most wrongheaded?" because I think--I don't know--I think it always--everything you do teaches you something, so there you are.

Menyuk: Absolutely.

Minuchin: But I think, for instance the book, *The Psychological Impact of School Experience*, was at the same time very focused on the individual children, but I learned something from that about context and about the, the--

Menyuk: Wider context.

Minuchin: --the, the educational environment they were in. So, I would probably do it in a different way now, but so what? I don't think I can say much about the research funding. I've had, I've had some funding, particularly in past years but it has, in the recent years--the kind of support and the work that I've been doing, more with my husband, and more with the disadvantaged and more with poverty, and, and these issues of teenage pregnancy, and foster care, and mental health for children, poor children, and so forth, funding for any of that work has come more from places like the Casey Foundation, or New York City something or other. So it's, it's not a research funding--

Menyuk: Like National Institutes of Child Health, or Mental Health, or whatever, you have--

Minuchin: Some of them have been more local, or the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health. We have been working together with them and they have supported some of that work, and some of its been pro bono--

Menyuk: Why do you think that's the case? I, I'm just interested in your comment that might be of interest of to others. Why do you think much of what you're doing currently is not funded by national agencies, federal agencies, but by local agencies?

Minuchin: Did you say, "But by local agencies?"

Menyuk: Yes.

Minuchin: Well, because that's the way the social problems are, that's the way they hit the ground. I mean, for instance, the Department of Mental Health in Massachusetts is a state--they may get some of their money federally but they--it's the state bureaucracy that runs the way of handling the families and the children that come in, whether it's the institutions or outpatient or whatever. So, so when you've got--when you're trying to work with--I call it training or consultation--you're working with, often, social workers and administrators who work for the state or for the city and not--they're not federal--

Menyuk: Right, right. But that's an important thing to say.

Minuchin: Maybe.

Menyuk: It is the case that you wonder sometimes why it's not federal, but on the other hand you say to yourself that a particular environment, like a family or a particular issue that a state is involved in that other states may not be involved in.

Minuchin: I think that's absolutely true. I think it's also true that it's a matter of political environment,

and we don't want to talk about political things, but I think one can fairly say that there was a period years ago--and it's 30 years ago by now--when the whole country was involved, for instance, in the war on poverty. And people went to national groups, people like Ed Ziegler and Barbara Biber were in the same thing, talking about getting Head Start going, and thinking, what do we need for children, and what do we need for families. So there was federal thinking and federal funding, and then you applied federally to do some work related to that, and that could be research, or could be--

Menyuk: Application, right.

Minuchin: --application, or could be applied work. I don't think you find it so easy at this point. You don't have an atmosphere that says--you can talk about "no child left behind," but it really doesn't have this. So you need some administrators at more local levels who have some funds, who are interested in what we would call more sophisticated, or more caring, or more something--more knowledgeable investigations and applications of change for the families and for the children, and I think one has to look locally for that.

Menyuk: I think that's important to say.

Minuchin: I think we can turn the page now.

Menyuk: Okay, no institutional contributions?

Minuchin: What, where are we?

Menyuk: The bottom of page one.

Minuchin: Oh, well, I was a professor--I was a professor who--at Temple University from 1965, I guess--yeah, from 1968 until 1983--and went through--I was teaching child development and education, having come from Bank Street at that point, and doing some research on children, and I've done some guest teaching at Tufts, here, in recent years.

Menyuk: Child development?

Minuchin: Yeah. The Elliot Pearson Department of Child Development. They asked me to do a graduate course, Research on the Family, which I enjoyed enormously, and I've taught that three times. Very bright students. A seminar, and useful to me. And I guess, if we come to the point pretty soon of talking about teaching and research and child development, coming up on the next page--

Menyuk: Right.

Minuchin: ---I really think about my experience teaching there. Should I talk about that?

Menyuk: Sure.

Minuchin: I'm just going to talk about that, which was a seminar on research on the family, and I was allowed to do whatever I wanted--

Menyuk: Carry on. I'm just going to open up a window in my office because there --

Minuchin: --it was good for me. I went back to the literature, and so I found some interesting things that I might not have known about otherwise. I really had three areas in that course. The first part was about individuals and systems. So I had my students reading and talking about attachment, and then talking also about the family as a system, and what's the relationship between those things, and so forth. And there is some research and some theory and a lot of discussion.

And the second area was about those things that are social issues in modern society, as they affect children and families. And one of them is the whole divorce and remarriage kind of issue, which has a lot of research attached to it and also raises a lot of things; in a sense, even about attachment. It raises a lot of interesting theoretical questions about the attachments of children who live in these complex--who have these complex human maps around them. If their parents are divorced, if there are remarriages, they have attachments in all, in all directions. And they always are--and the idea brings a lot of discussion about infants and the attachment to one person, and lots of kinds of things about the meaning of social bonds in complex living situations, complex family situations. So there was that, and then things about varied families. We have so much more varied an ethnic mix now. It's been black and white for a long time, but we have an enormous Hispanic population, divided--not all of the Latin American and South American countries are the same. So we have that. We have Asian-American, and others, okay? So there's that kind of variety and diversity, in terms of families and individual children, and what that means. And then, the changes in values. So that we have same-sex--we have very active lesbian and gay movements. We have same-sex parenting. And all of that's very different from 50 years ago--raising questions about the individual child. It's an enormous research field, and it's also an enormous field for having quite a broad mind about the theories of what is a safe and secure environment for children, in terms--forgetting the larger world we live in, which is a whole other question--but in terms of the family world. And I think it's leading to open up questions about what we've always assumed as the security of the intact two parent family. You know, we're way beyond that, I think, and needing to say--

Menyuk: That's very--

Minuchin: --we need ways of defining security and development--

Menyuk: Attachment.

Minuchin: --attachment, and then the possibilities of growth beyond attachment. The meaning of autonomy and interdependence, and how that looks in different kinds of families, and, and how we're going to talk about a good enough environment for children to grow in, without being anchored in what have been the previous definitions of an adequate family. So all of that is opened up for grabs, and very interesting.

Menyuk: Do you see a tension between your teaching and your research?

Minuchin: Well I'm going to say one more thing about the third area in the teaching--

Menyuk: Yeah, go ahead, absolutely.

Minuchin: --and that had to do with what I've been so involved with here. The disadvantage of poverty, ethnicity, and the changes in the meaning of living: language, migration, intergenerational issues, with people living longer, and middle generations--all kinds of things. That's the tension between teaching and research. I think what's important--the tension between teaching and research has something to do, for me, with the relationship between what is the received wisdom, all the things that we have found out and know--and frontiers. And I think you never want to throw the baby out with the bath--and that's literally, in our field, okay? But never--I mean, there are things--everything needs to be examined and reexamined, so that you're teaching some things--for instance, we keep saying "attachment" but when you're teaching the importance of attachment, letting your seminar group--and if they don't, you do it--raise the question of, and what does that mean, in these different situations that children are growing up in? Okay, alright, I don't need to repeat myself there. But you'd have the things that we know and have found out and the things that are the areas that we know are important to investigate and to keep changing, if they need to be changed. And then there are the frontiers, which are ways in which I think I have needed to teach things about--well, the people at Tufts, many of the people taking the graduate seminars, will be in an applied field, so it's not hard to say, "You need to know about social policy. You need to think about social policy. You need to know

and think about how do you take the ideas that come from our field and use them when you are teaching small children, or when you are working with new mothers,” or whatever.

Menyuk: Whatever.

Minuchin: Yeah, so in my personal professional life, I have moved with the frontiers into situations in which I know there isn't any research, or maybe there is no good research there, and I think there may need to be more, but I know that you cannot really apply a tight research design to the issues that arise, for instance, in foster care, and wait for the answers before you take what you think the theory and the information and the experience teaches you.

Menyuk: Well, what do you think about all this discussion about quantitative versus qualitative research?

Minuchin: I think--well, I think both--

Menyuk: Sure.

Minuchin: --I think both--

Menyuk: Sure.

Minuchin: --and I think--oh, one thing that I think is very important, that I believe about the research, is that I have seen observational research come back into favor. It used to be, many, many, many years ago. It disappeared. It's back, and I think it's absolutely essential, because I think you need to see children in context. I think you need to see them interacting with their families. I think you need to see them in their peer groups. I think you need to do that, and I think when you go into the world--it's less tight, in many ways, than questionnaire research, which has seemed limited to me. It gives you something, and you can get large numbers, but I think you're left with as many questions as you can solve from it. So--

Menyuk: I think in general the field of child development is with you and--change in that direction.

Minuchin: Yeah, yeah. And, it becomes more and more possible to apply a certain amount of discipline, which we have been doing, to observational research. We know how to put it within its boundaries, and we know how to analyze it and take a look at whether it's giving us new information or not. So I think that's a very important part.

I think that my experiences with SRCD--I am embarrassed to say that I've not been a very active member, in terms of government, or whatever. I think my earliest contacts were in the '60s. I've published in *Child Development*, and I went to meetings more in the '70s and--'60s and '70s--than I did later. After all, I retired from academic life in 1983. I would have to say one other thing about impact, and it's about crossing boundaries in the other direction. I think I have brought quite a lot of what is my knowledge of child development to the people in the family therapy field. I have for years and years. My husband was doing workshops, and we would do two-day workshops together. They were very prevalent when that field was growing, in the '60s, '70s, and '80s, and they were around the world and around the country. And he was--there would be two mornings and two afternoons, in a two-day thing, and for quite a long time I was doing the second morning. In the second morning, I would be presenting what a normal family looks like, and what child development--I would be taking sessions in which there were children, and talking about the inter-relationships. I was trying to bring some knowledge about child development, of the stages of development, of the interaction between siblings, of the way in which parents and children were interacting from a point of view that we know more about. I was not lecturing about research, but I was bringing child development stuff to the field, and I think that was important.

At this point I am--I do a lot of reviewing of articles, and I'm not asked to do them so much in the child development field. Occasionally I am, but I'm part of the editorial board of *Family Process*, which is a family therapy journal, and the *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*. They send me stuff that is-- that has research, because they don't--because I have more of that, and when it's presenting research I have a better eye for whether this makes sense and is following some rules and so forth. And because I know a lot about children, I think, compared--because family therapists often have a grasp for the interaction in the family but know less about children and the way they grow and what changes as they grow, and stuff. So I think some impact has been from our field into another field, which is useful.

Menyuk: Very, very useful and also not only family therapy but also education, because you've been communicating with educate--

Minuchin: Yes, I did. I did more of that earlier on. I did a fair amount of writing. But for instance there was a--Paul Mussen was editing the *Handbook of Child Development*, in the '80s, and my friend Edna and I did the article in the--there was a socialization section, and we did the article on the schools, as a context for development. You know, one of those big--I mean, it was based on the research in various areas, so that--yeah--that was it.

Menyuk: You crossed fields.

Minuchin: I have, yes, and it just happened.

Menyuk: It's called a multi-disciplinary approach or whatever.

Minuchin: When I was in graduate school--John Dollard--is that a familiar name to you?

Menyuk: Oh yes, oh yes.

Minuchin: John Dollard?

Menyuk: Verbal behavior stuff I'm very, very familiar with.

Minuchin: Oh yes. I know. And he said, "It's a very useful thing to have your feet in two fields. You can contribute in a particular way." And that just happens. But it has happened to me, and I have kind of enjoyed that. I think we're near the end.

Menyuk: Well, do you--I mean, you're not that familiar with the--in a close way, with SRCD and its activities?

Minuchin: No.

Menyuk: So you don't have to comment on that?

Minuchin: What about the future field?

Menyuk: Yeah.

Minuchin: Well, I think I would just--I will repeat what I hope, what I think. First of all I think observational work has come back, and that it should. Because you see people in action with each other, and that's very important. I think there's an effort to look at interactional systems involving kids beyond the dyad. It's very hard to keep that disciplined but it's essential, because that's the reality of experience for people growing up. You grow up with more than yourself and more than one other person, and you are not in a series of dyads but in larger groups. I think--I know that there's an interest in social policy, child care policy, welfare policy, mothers and "welfare to work," and the implications of that. And I think that has been growing in the field. And I think there's a concern with what are--

with what are the--I'll talk louder while they mow the lawn next door--

Menyuk: Let me just pull the window down for a second. You just keep on talking.

Minuchin: Well, I think we need, as a field, to keep--how can we not keep our minds and our brains and our eyes open to the world around us? It's a chaotic world, in some ways, and some things are just the result of change. We have different views about society and about families and about adolescence and about sex, and we have a lot of social problems, with differences in the social levels of people. We have an enormous diversity. We used to talk about America as an immigrant society, when my parents were coming over, and your parents. And for a while it was not so true. And now, again, it is a very diverse kind of society. And I think we need to be trying to keep up and understand, do research, and have some influence in terms of the diverse kinds of families, ethnically, or in terms of their organization. And there's the three-generational family--the fact that people are living longer, and you have families in which there's a middle generation caring for people up, and caring for people down, and trying to take care of their own needs. And all that, I think, is part of the field of development. It's not only child development. If you want to stay focused on the child, you need anyway to pay attention to the fact that grandparents are so important, and--so I think it's a pushing of frontiers. It's a holding on to what the field is good at, in terms of gathering evidence and looking at children from beginning to end, but that there's a pushing of boundaries that's also important, and revisiting the concepts that we've always known were important.

And I think that's it. The personal notes you've heard a lot about. I will just say that it matters who you marry, always, for many, many reasons. And in my case, I married a person who was very major in a very allied field, and we have been very helpful to each other in the way we understand human beings, and so he's been an enormous influence on me. And I think I've been able to integrate what I've learned from his work, and from his world of many people and many conferences. I've seen probably thousands of families in treatment, watching--I did a little of that, but that's not my field really.

Menyuk: What about your kids?

Minuchin: What?

Menyuk: What about your children?

Minuchin: My children. How could I forget them!

Menyuk: Say something about your children.

Minuchin: I should say something about my children. Two children, in their 40s verging on 50. A son, the one who was born in Israel, he's a psychologist with a lot of social interest, so that at this point he's going back to school because he's interested in international conflict resolution. And he's had so much experience, actually, doing training, doing family therapy, training people, working with the poor and with all these things that we've been talking about. Very social-political interests. He's not married, and he's now returning to New York from elsewhere, where he will be doing probably another master's in that, and trying to support himself working in this field. A great guy with a great sense of humor, and I love him dearly. And a daughter, who's--she's the one who's different. She's an artist, like your daughter, and she started as a sculptor. She does a variety of kinds of things. She was living up here, and got a master's at Emerson (College) in the performing arts. Now she's divorced and has a wonderful ten-and-a-half-year-old daughter, and I adore both of them. She's teaching in Florida. She's teaching in a middle school, at a place where she went to interview for a job, and when she said her field was drama teaching--

End of Interview

