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Edie Greene earned her BA in psychology from Stanford University, her MA from the University of Colorado–Boulder, and her PhD in psychology and law from the University of Washington. Additionally, she completed a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Washington from 1983 to 1986, and she served as Fellow in Law and Psychology at Harvard Law School from 1994 to 1995. Edie is currently Professor of Psychology at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs where she conducts research on jury trials, eyewitness memory, and other topics in psychology and law. Her work has been funded by number of federal agencies, and she has earned extensive research recognition including an award from her college for Outstanding Research and Creative Works. Edie is a coauthor of the textbook Psychology and the Legal System (5th ed.), published by Wadsworth (2002), and she coauthored Determining Damages: The Psychology of Jury Awards, published by the American Psychological Association (2002). She has published more than 70 articles and book chapters as well as an annotated bibliography on the adversarial system (Strier & Greene, 1990). In addition to conducting research, she has served as a trial consultant, and she has testified extensively as an expert witness on eyewitness memory and jury decision making. Edie has been active in the American Psychology–Law Society in numerous roles including membership on the executive committee. She serves on the editorial boards of Law and Human Behavior and Psychology, Public Policy and Law.

Woody: How did your interest in psychology and law develop?
Greene: I was in graduate school in CU Boulder in cognitive psychology in the late 1970s, where my training was very theoretical. At some point I felt frustrated that there might be only two people in the world who were interested in what I was doing. I completed a master’s thesis entitled “Memory for Evidence in Text.” I was working with Walter Kintsch, who studied text memory and how people remember long passages of prose. His work, and that of other cognitive psychologists who studied text memory, was somewhat revolutionary. Prior to that time people had been studying memory using word lists, but people don’t remember word lists in life; they read texts. Kintsch’s method was more ecologically valid. For example, Kintsch was interested in questions such as, “How does having a theme and a schema affect text memory?”

In my thesis work I had people read detective stories and decide which of two suspects was the perpetrator of the crime. I wanted to know how their memory of the information in the text would vary as a function of who they thought the perpetrator was. That research started my interest in crime and evidence. It was much more interesting to me than the capacity of short-term memory in a college sophomore. I wondered how people remember actual crime-related information and how their
schemata affect memory. That was my first foray into this area.

Shortly after I finished my thesis, I quit school.

Woody: Wow! I had no idea.

Greene: I had gone straight from undergraduate to graduate school, and I was asking myself a lot of questions about the professional choices I had made. I took 3 years off. I sold flowers, worked as a community planner, read books, played the piano, traveled, and worked in a travel agency for a while. By then, I was ready to go back to school.

All through this process there was the opportunity to go back to Boulder to finish my PhD, but I just couldn't bring myself to do that. The focus of the program was too theoretical for me, and by that point I had moved to Seattle. I knew that Elizabeth Loftus was there, and I asked her to read my master's thesis on memory for evidence in text. That started our friendship as well as our collaboration that lasted for well over a decade.

Woody: What was it like to work with Elizabeth Loftus at that time?

Greene: I knocked on Beth’s door just when she was leaving to go on sabbatical. She was going to the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford to write a book. I guess she must have been impressed (or maybe she was desperate) because she asked me if I would run her lab and keep her studies going while she was away. She had some studies that were ongoing, so even though I wasn't in graduate school at the time, I was running her research projects. The studies were exploring the idea that after people had seen a specific stimulus, they could be exposed to some kind of misinformation that could affect their memories for the original scene that they watched. Those were my first experiences working with Beth—and they occurred in her absence! Actually, my experience with her was great. If I had to name the three most influential people in my life, Beth would be on that list. She was a terrific mentor for me. She taught me a lot, both directly and indirectly, about how to be successful as an academic.

Woody: How did these experiences and collaboration with Elizabeth Loftus shape your eventual career choices and destinations?

Greene: Working with Beth made me realize that I really could get excited about psychology as long as it is connected to the real world and wasn’t purely theoretical. I need to do work that is meaningful to people beyond the two or three folks who understand the particular theory that was motivating my work. She taught me how to write papers. She taught me how to get funding. She works exceedingly hard and is really brilliant. But, watching her made me realize that I didn’t really want to live my life in the “fast lane” as she does. I guess I’ve opted for a slower, simpler life, both personally and professionally. So, she indirectly helped me to clarify my professional goals. I respect her enormously, and I respect her choices, but they are not the choices I have made about how to spend my time.

Woody: A mentor once pulled me aside and suggested that I consider my happiness holistically. This was extremely important to me.

Greene: I really resonate with the idea that you can be important to other people without being renowned or esteemed in the eyes of the academic world. There are just too many things that I want to do.

Woody: Some friends of mine are facing similar decisions about the type of academic lives they want to lead and about the amount of time and energy they want to dedicate to their professional lives.

Greene: Coming to the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs was a good move for me personally in that it has allowed me to have a broader and more interesting life. That’s what I wanted for myself. For example, I'm able to do good professional work, and I have excellent students, yet I'm also able to spend time with my family, play the piano, and do a lot of outdoor recreation.

Woody: Excellent! Let’s change direction and talk about the field of psychology and law. There is an increasing interest in psychology and the law. What are the major areas of psychology and law, and what are the most important factors driving this increase?

Greene: There are several factors driving the growth of the field. I think the practice side of the field has grown more than the research side of the field, but the research side has grown too. Part of the research growth is because there are more graduate programs now, certainly far more programs than there were 20 years ago. The idea of a joint PhD/JD program was revolutionary in 1975 but is well accepted now. The programs established in the 1970s and 1980s have been around long enough to be perceived as highly successful. The vitality of the PhD/JD programs and the MA/JD programs, along with an increase in the number of clinicians working in the field, has been a large part of why the field has prospered.

The field has grown as more practitioners—clinicians with an interest in legal issues—have come on board. Some of this growth has to do with the fact that managed care has reduced or curtailed other practice opportunities, so a fair number of people who used to have more general clinical practices have started doing forensic evaluations and assessments, competency evaluations, custody evaluations, and risk assessments.

Woody: Are there enough people trained to be forensic psychologists to fill the need in the court system? What are the potential issues if individuals, who are not specifically trained as forensic psychologists, fill this gap?

Greene: A lot of clinicians without formal forensic training are stepping into that gap, and I know that some formally trained forensic psychologists have concerns about this development.

Woody: Are the differences between clinical and nonclinical psychologists well understood by the general public?

Greene: No, I don’t think so. Each time I testify as an expert witness I have to explain that I am not the kind of psychologist who sees clients in her office. Many people think that if you are a psychologist you are like Frasier Crane. The idea that someone could do research on how normal people behave or how normal people think and make decisions is a new concept to many people.
Woody: How can we, as educators, address these misconceptions?
Greene: I think it is a long, slow process of re-educating, but I don't want to spend a lot of time worrying about this. I would rather just do what I do, which is to try to understand how people think, and, when appropriate, share my understanding with the general public.

Woody: How is the interaction of psychology and the law portrayed in the media?
Greene: One thought that comes quickly to mind is that many people assume that we all work as profilers. Obviously, they have watched The Profiler. Over the years, I've received dozens of questions from students here and elsewhere about different careers in psychology and law. A lot of people have told me that they wanted to be profilers. Because I don't watch TV, it took me a little while to figure out where that was coming from. The FBI has, apparently, a small number of psychologists who do criminal profiling work. We heard about that work in the context of the DC sniper case. I don't know if any police department has its own full-time profiler, but I suspect that few, if any, do. Hordes of students want to be profilers, and the fact is that few will make it. So, over the years, I've had to disabuse a lot of people of the idea that they were going to be profilers. I've tried to do this in a nice way by directing students to other interesting aspects of psychology and law.

Woody: The media may perpetuate the belief that if you work in psychology and law you spend your time getting insane people off the hook.
Greene: You're right. But, in fact, the insanity defense is used in a very small fraction of cases, and it is successful even less often. The media overrepresent use of the insanity defense. Clearly, there is a correspondence between mental illness and criminality, but reliance on the insanity defense is a rare thing in real life.

Other aspects of forensic psychology are misrepresented in the media also. The concern about competence to stand trial is a rare thing. The concern about competence to be executed is almost nonexistent. These are the kinds of issues that might interest the media because they are controversial, but they are not the routine kinds of issues that get adjudicated every day.

Woody: How should instructors deconstruct the myths that the media portray?
Greene: You really have to be aware of what media students see. I've never been interested in watching television, so I feel sometimes adrift when students tell me what they see on TV. I'm not advocating that faculty watch television, but I am advocating that they poke their heads out of the tower more than I have to become more aware of the things that students pay attention to. Popular culture is a powerful influence on students' minds, and it's not something that we should summarily dismiss or disregard.

Woody: What historical effects have psychologists had on the law?
Greene: At the beginning of my Psychology and Law class we discuss the Brandeis Brief, the first foray of psychologists into the legal system. Louis Brandeis was an attorney who was later appointed to the Supreme Court. He argued the case of Muller v. Oregon (1908) before the Supreme Court. The case dealt with oppressive labor laws, especially those affecting women and children. Brandeis was the first attorney to reach out to social scientists who examined the social implications of extended work regimes. He included results of these studies in his brief to the court.

Also in 1908, Hugo Münsterburg wrote On the Witness Stand in which he proposed ideas that we now know to be true about misremembering and misidentification. These were the early glimmerings of correspondence between the two fields, but not much materialized for years after these initial linkages.

The field really came into its own during the 1970s. The first edition of Law and Human Behavior was published in 1977, and some of the joint degree programs in law and psychology started at this time. Psychologists and lawyers started working together in a variety of settings during the 1970s. Some psychologists offered their expertise to assist the defense in trials of antinomy protestors. Other psychologists began to testify about factors that affect the reliability of eyewitness identifications. Social psychologists became interested in the jury as a group of decision makers. Cognitive psychologists were interested in the juror as an individual information processor, and this approach fits the cognitive model in the 1970s and 1980s. Developmental psychologists began to study the reliability of children's memory for legally relevant events. This is a very brief overview of the history of the field.

Woody: What major changes has the field undergone in the last 20 years of growth?
Greene: The field continues to grow rapidly. Courses in psychology and law are offered in hundreds of colleges and universities around the world. Many hospitals and mental health institutes offer opportunities for predoctoral internships and postdoctoral fellowships in clinical forensic psychology. Membership in the main professional organization, the American Psychology–Law Society (AP–LS or Division 41 of the APA), has grown considerably, and a separate student section has been formed. Whereas the group met only biennially in the past, future meetings will occur every year to accommodate an increase in submissions and attendance.

A number of journals, in addition to Law and Human Behavior, publish work that is related to psychology and law. Among these are Psychology, Public Policy, and the Law; published by APA; Behavioral Sciences and the Law; Criminal Justice and Behavior; Psychology, Crime, and Law; and Law and Psychology Review. There are at least three book series of which I am aware: APA has published books in a series on Law and Mental Health Professionals and another on Law and Public Policy. AP–LS has published books on a variety of topics in psychology and law. Each month, the Judicial Notebook column appears in the APA Monitor. This feature, which is written by prominent scholars in the field, alerts psychologists to issues of imminent importance to the law that have arisen in recent cases.

Woody: Are there funding opportunities in these areas?
Greene: Yes, and funding opportunities have increased. The National Science Foundation has a program in social sciences and the law that has funded the work of many psycholegal researchers. Psychologists and lawyers have worked together in recent years to prepare amicus (friend of the court) briefs that provide judges with up-to-date research findings and policy implications on a variety of topics including psychological aspects of abortion, sexual harassment, psychological testing, the right to refuse medication, civil commitment, the death penalty, and many others. So, we've been busy, and the field has certainly prospered.

Woody: What are the biggest gains from the field as a whole for psychology and for the law?

Greene: Psychology has pushed the bounds of the ivory tower and we have begun to give psychology away as George Miller (1969) advocated that we do. We have learned a lot in psychology that the law has benefited from hearing. In terms of the benefits to the law, ideally judges and attorneys would come to understand that the assumptions they make about the way people behave are not necessarily accurate.

Let's take the small example of my recent research. The law assumes that jurors in civil tort cases will use certain evidence to make one required decision (namely, who is responsible for an accident) and then use different evidence to reach a second decision (namely, how much should the injured party receive as damages). Yet, our research shows that jurors blend these sources of evidence and reach verdicts based on more holistic reasoning. If lawyers understood this principle, they might present their arguments differently. If judges understood, they might instruct jurors differently and structure the trial differently. I suspect that if the law was receptive to what we are learning and communicating to them, there could be more fairness in the procedures and in the outcomes of these disputes.

Woody: This is a frustration shared by many students in my Psychology and the Law class. Why are lawyers and judges so seemingly unaware of psychological work?

Greene: Frankly, part of it involves an "old boys" network in the law. There is a sense that we psychologists are so different from them that we have little to offer or that our research simply doesn't speak to their needs. This is part of the value of having a joint degree. You can speak the language of the law, and, more than that, you have the correct letters after your name. People will sit up and listen to you. In my view, the law is just not very welcoming of outsiders.

The law also is a conservative system based largely on precedent. In other words, things are done now as they were done in the past. Unfortunately, neither judges nor lawyers tend to be very forward thinking, revolutionary, or willing to take risks because that is not how decisions get made in the law. Decisions get made in the law based on what comparable decisions were made in the past. There are exceptions, of course.

Woody: What are relevant challenges or research problems that have been successfully approached?

Greene: The research conducted by psychologists on eyewitness identification has resulted in some success because this work has led to changes in procedures that police officers use when they interview witnesses. However, as prominent eyewitness testimony researcher Gary Wells is the first to say, other things were happening besides our research. For example, we've learned about many instances of wrongful convictions based on mistaken eyewitness identifications. How can we be so sure that the eyewitnesses were wrong? DNA analyses of evidence have cleared dozens of individuals who were convicted largely on the basis of an eyewitness's mistaken identification. These exoneration happened at the same time that these scientific studies began to document the kinds of errors that eyewitnesses are likely to make, and the media picked up on this convergence. There have been several news programs that alerted the public to the fact that people can have inaccurate memories and that this can lead to wrongful convictions.

So, in 1999, a committee of prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, and academics devised various policies that federal agencies must follow in terms of how line-ups can be conducted. Federal law enforcement officials now have to do some things in a new way. For example, at the time a witness makes an identification, authorities must also ask the witness how confident he or she is. What tends to happen is that people are less confident in their initial identifications than they are when they testify about their identifications in court. By the time of the trial, they are often absolutely certain that they are right. So, if a juror knew that an eyewitness was wishy-washy at the time that he or she made the initial identification, this may have an impact on the juror's thinking. That situation is very different from one in which a witness testifies on the stand and is 150% confident.

In general, the federal guidelines are going to change the way that police do some things and in turn change the way that jurors think about identification accuracy. This is one area where there has been some success. I think the APA recognizes that change as one of the feathers in their cap, and they have featured stories about this work in numerous publications.

Woody: What are some other successes?

Greene: I suspect that not many custody evaluations happen these days without input from a therapist or clinician who has evaluated the family and made some recommendations to the judge. One of the changes that will take place in the next few decades is that there will be more psychologists involved in issues around aging, medical decision making, and legal decision-making competence. With increasing frequency, psychologists will speak to the court regarding whether older adults need someone to help them make financial and medical decisions and whether a guardian or conservator should be appointed to help them make those decisions. I expect that psychology will have an impact on the law in this area.

Woody: Are there examples of the law borrowing paradigms or values from psychology?

Greene: Restorative justice can provide one example. The goal of these restorative justice programs is not simply...
to resolve disputes between people but to attempt to enhance the lives of people who are disputing. For example, if you can get victims and offenders to come together so that the victims can describe how the experience of being a victim has affected their lives and if you can get offenders to be able to take responsibility for what they have done, then there could be something mutually beneficial in the interchange. It can be therapeutic for both sides. I know that there has been some empirical work on the benefits of the victim of being able to confront an offender and explain the kind of harm that the event has caused him or her. My understanding, from films and from talking to friends who are defense attorneys, is that this process is every bit as powerful for the offender as it is for the victim. But, I don’t know that psychology has had much of a role in illuminating or evaluating those benefits.

Woody: What are other examples?
Greene: Drug court is another good example. In Colorado’s drug courts, drug offenders get a chance at rehabilitation instead of punishment. The message that this practice conveys is that the system will try to help them rather than punish them. If they can meet the conditions imposed by the court, namely attending therapy, keeping clean, and meeting other requirements, then, after a certain period of time, their criminal records are wiped clean.

Woody: Exciting! What accurate assumptions does the law make regarding human behavior?
Greene: Unfortunately, I don’t think the law is very understanding of how people really think or make decisions. Let’s consider jury trials. In simple terms, we select jurors to think hard and to make important decisions, but we don’t let them talk, and we don’t let them ask questions (this is beginning to change in some places, though). If you conducted your class like that you could be fired. How can people learn, make good decisions, and exercise rational judgment when we essentially muzzle them?

I like to use this example with my students: Being a juror is like taking a class where the professor provides two versions of the facts (like having two guest lecturers) and then asks students to decide which guest lecturer is right. Unfortunately, students in this hypothetical class can’t talk to either guest lecturer, can’t ask questions, and can’t do research about the guest lecturers’ topic. At the end of all this, the hypothetical students have to agree with 11 other students as to which version of the facts was correct. We make it just this difficult for jurors. Procedures used in jury trials are really antiquated; not much has changed to improve that.

Woody: That description makes this process sound rather bleak.
Greene: There are some glimmerings of hope, though. Arizona and some other states now allow jurors to ask questions in selected cases. In Arizona, jurors can sometimes talk about the evidence while the trial is ongoing. In many jurisdictions, jurors are now allowed to take notes. We’re finding that these reforms help jurors to process the evidence and do not make them likely to reach premature judgments or to ignore the evidence. I’m quite convinced that these reforms will empower jurors to be more careful, thoughtful, and rational.

Woody: What are the biggest immediate challenges for the field?
Greene: The biggest immediate challenges are to be relevant and to have more of an impact on the law. How does one do that? It’s important to connect with lawyers and judges in their world. You go to their meetings, you write in their journals, you speak their language, you train yourself in what they do and might need to know, and you find out from them what they consider to be the important issues on which they need help. You infiltrate that realm rather than staying in the ivory tower.

Woody: What are exciting current directions of research within the various areas of the field, and what are future problems emerging on the horizon?
Greene: There is a growing awareness that the field has to move beyond the traditional focus on dangerousness assessments, eyewitness testimony, and jury decision making. There are other interesting questions to be studied. Slowly, people are beginning to look at new topics. Among the innovative ideas are these questions: How do you evaluate psychological distress that is experienced by someone who was involved in an accident? How do people feel about the way they were treated by the law? What happens in situations where there has been some sort of a criminal act but the intent to harm was missing, for example in mercy killings or euthanasia?

Woody: What options are available for careers in psychology and law?
Greene: Several possible careers are available in psychology and law. I wrote an article available on the AP–LS Web site (Greene, 2002) in which I detail legal careers in psychological subfields. For example, clinical-forensic psychologists often perform assessments to evaluate such factors as competency to stand trial, insanity, dangerousness, or degree of emotional harm in civil cases. Additionally, developmental psychologists, social psychologists, and cognitive psychologists often conduct research within legal settings. The possible career options are extensive.

Woody: How could psychology and law remain an option for folks with various goals in their psychology majors, for people who want to be counselors, social psychologists, cognitive psychologists, and so on?
Greene: I think the field of psychology and law connects to all those areas. One of the really exciting features about psychology and law is that you can do it as a clinician, a developmental psychologist, an organizational psychologist, a social psychologist, a cognitive psychologist, or a neuropsychologist. I don’t know that you can study animal behavior and psychology and the law, but that is about the only realm of psychology that doesn’t connect well with the institution of law. No matter what area of psychology you study, there are interesting legal questions that arise.

Woody: What are some possible teaching demonstrations for instructors of general psychology courses?
Greene: It is easy to demonstrate many of the basic concepts in psychology and law such as misremembering...
events or creating memories of events that did not occur and to expand these demonstrations to discuss false memory or eyewitness testimony. An instructor could demonstrate and discuss the pressures that may influence someone to confess to something that he or she has never done. What benefits may accrue to him or her by doing so? What might be the costs? Why, in some circumstances, might the benefits of confessing outweigh the costs? In my class, this conversation always begins with students saying “I would never, ever, ever, under any circumstances confess to something that I hadn’t done.” If I can push students hard enough they can sometimes see why it might make sense for them to confess, especially if not confessing would make things worse.

Woody: Do you have other examples?
Greene: Other topics related to confessions include social influence, voluntariness, and free will. For another example, juries are such social psychological beasts. An instructor could expose students to some kind of complex, conflicting information and then arrange them in small groups to come to some resolution about the issue. Students will quickly realize that it is not as easy as they might have thought. There is an immediate and powerful awareness of the fact that intelligent, well-meaning people often have radically different interpretations of the same facts. Students learn that they will have to compromise, listen to each other, and clarify their own beliefs. There are several other issues in psychology and law that can be powerfully demonstrated in a general psychology class.

Woody: What basic resources are available in psychology and law for instructors of general psychology classes?
Greene: Several years ago, I wrote an article about teaching materials for use in undergraduate classrooms. I described several classroom demonstrations in that article, which is available on the AP–LS Web site (Greene, 1997). Wendy Heath (2002) has written an excellent instructor’s manual to accompany our textbook (Wrightsman, Greene, Nietzel, & Fortune, 2002). In addition to interesting discussion topics, she has provided numerous suggestions for demonstrations and projects. An instructor of general psychology would find an abundance of great ideas in this manual. The APS journal Current Directions in Psychological Science features articles that overview a particular field of research and a few articles have been on issues in psychology and law (Darley, 2001; Greene & Loftus, 1998; Wells, Olson, & Charman, 2002). Finally, articles relevant to these topics have been published in numerous past issues of Top (Anderson, 1992; Greene, 1987; Perry, Huss, McAuliff, & Galas, 1996; Swenson, 1983; Werth et al., 2002).

Woody: How common is the psychology and law course and in what ways is the course typically taught?
Greene: The psychology and law class is a class that instructors like to teach and that students like to take. It is taught at several hundred colleges and universities around the country at several different levels and class sizes. I think the course is taught most often as an undergraduate survey class that students take after they have completed some introductory psychology coursework. The class connects to our world and raises a lot of intriguing and controversial issues. Curricular materials, sources for teaching aids, and possible approaches to teaching the undergraduate course can be found in Fulero et al. (1999).

Sometimes the class is more narrowly focused. For example, Livia Gilstrap, a colleague of mine at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, is teaching a class on the suggestibility of the child witness as an advanced undergraduate seminar. Sometimes the psychology and law class is taught at the graduate level, and then faculty tend not to use a textbook. They are more likely to use a case law book or readings from primary sources. Sometimes the course is taught in a criminal justice program or a law school.

Woody: Where is your research taking you now?
Greene: I’m starting to look at teen court jurors. Teen court is an alternative to the juvenile justice system for kids who have committed a minor offense, not a felony. If they are willing to plead guilty, a jury of their peers sentences them. The process is quite formal and involves a “minitrial” in which the defendant is “represented” by a trained teenage district attorney. A real judge presides over the whole process. The jurors are other kids who have been in trouble, have pled guilty, and, as part of their sentence, have to serve as teen court jurors. The defendants admit that they are guilty, and the question for the jury is how the defendant should be sentenced. This is a question that few real juries are ever asked (judges make sentencing decisions), but this is what teen jurors are asked to do. They can require that the defendant pay restitution, provide community service, take drug and alcohol classes or antitheft classes, and so on. Defendants also have to serve a certain number of nights on jury duty. If the young defendant meets all the conditions of sentencing, his or her record is expunged.

My students and I are watching these teenage jurors deliberate on the appropriate sentences. It’s a fascinating experience because jury deliberations typically happen behind closed doors, but we’re allowed to watch this process unfold. It is really interesting to see how these kids think, what evidence they pay attention to, and what evidence they ignore. That’s my new project.
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Theophile S. Krawiec, 1913 to 1995

A Belated Obituary

Theophile S. Krawiec received a 1971 American Psychological Foundation award for distinguished contributions to education. He was editor of the Newsletter of Division Two from 1967 to 1970. In addition to announcements, the Newsletter contained Presidential addresses, brief articles, and information on the Division program at the annual convention. It was the predecessor of Teaching of Psychology (ToP), the current Division Two journal. No obituary has been published for Krawiec in any psychology journal, so we present this to remember and honor his contributions.

Krawiec was born May 14, 1913 in Central Falls, Rhode Island soon after his parents immigrated from Poland. One of his teachers, Louise Alma Ross, was impressed with his potential and offered to pay his tuition at Colby College in Waterville, Maine, which he attended while earning his room and board tending a boiler. He received his bachelor’s degree from Colby College in 1935 with majors in philosophy and mathematics. His master’s was from Brown University (1937) and his PhD from New York University in 1945.

Krawiec taught at Oregon State College (1940 to 1944). He wanted to contribute to the war effort, but he was colorblind, so could not enlist. In 1945 he accepted a position as an Associate Professor at Skidmore College, which was his primary position for the remainder of his career. For 23 of these years (1947 to 1970) he served as Chair of the Skidmore Psychology Department. He also taught summer school at the University of Vermont, 1957 to 1972, and was a Fulbright lecturer at Ibrahim University, Cairo, Egypt, 1953 to 1954.

Krawiec’s major scholarly interest was the history of psychology. He published a textbook, Systems and Theories of Psychology (Chaplin & Krawiec, 1979), and edited three volumes of autobiographies of American psychologists. He also was the author of an introductory book, Beginning Psychology (1950).

He told his students that his name, Theophile, meant “the love of wisdom.” His son, Steven, said that “if there was any tension in him, it was that concerning the humanistic tradition versus analytic approaches to understanding.” Is psychology a science? He asked that question of a number of his well-known contemporaries and published a summary of their varied responses (1981). This question presented a dilemma for Krawiec, who drew on Dostoyevsky for his conclusion that, “It is a mystery and we cannot understand it.” Our discipline of psychology and the effort and work has been founded upon a miracle, mystery, and authority. So psychology is/is not a science.

He was fond, too, of telling his students that “you are the choices that you make.” He made a wonderful choice by sharing his love of ideas with his students and with our discipline. T. S. Krawiec died in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, February 9, 1995.

James H. Korn
Saint Louis University

Dana S. Dunn
Moravian College