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A History of the Rorschach Ink Blot Test in Britain:

An interdisciplinary, queer feminist approach to one bleeding test

Abstract

The Rorschach ink blot test was first developed by Hermann Rorschach in 1921. This thesis explains the history of the test in Britain throughout the 20th century. This is a history of a test which has power, is able to do things, and has become embedded into popular culture like no other. My approach to this history in this thesis is critical and interdisciplinary: I borrow from Psychology, History, Sociology, Gender Studies and Comic Studies. I use a particular queer feminist lens through which to approach this research and in doing so I aim to tell a more hidden history. I pay particular attention to the marginal, invisible and ‘white spaces’ of the history of the Rorschach. In regards to these ‘white spaces’ I specifically consider where the ink from the blots has metaphorically ‘bled’ in and out of Psychology. Chapter 1 introduces the thesis as a whole and based on this, Chapter 2 provides the theoretical underpinnings of the thesis and situates it within the history of Psychology more generally. Chapter 3 provides the core British history of the Rorschach. This is developed further in Chapter 4, where I pay closer attention to queer women and develop my own form of analysis for the history of Psychology. Chapter 5 provides a specific analysis of the graphic novel Watchmen which I argue exemplifies a significant ‘loop’ of Psychology into popular culture, and Chapter 6 concludes the thesis. In all, I provide an account of the Rorschach in Britain which allows for those who used the Rorschach; those who were tested with it; and the public; to be included. I argue that this interdisciplinary study of the history of the Rorschach test in Britain exemplifies what is possible when the marginal aspects of history are included. Consequentially, this has the power to allow historians of Psychology to re-imagine more normative histories. After all the Rorschach is all about imagination.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

On the 16th October 2015 I apprehensively travelled to the Tavistock clinic, 20 Belsize Lane, London, to meet a psychologist. Once there, I did a Rorschach ink blot test. As soon as I sat down I altered the chair to face the psychologist and was swiftly informed that the chairs should stay next to each other and not angled. I was warned that there would not be much talking throughout. She asked me only once ‘What does this remind you of? What could this be?’ when she handed over the first ink blot. I saw a mask, that looked like a rabbit, and some crab pincers. She wrote down, almost word for word, what I said. After what felt like an age, I put the card down - or ‘plate’ as they are technically called- and said I could not see anything else. She handed me card number two. This process was repeated for all ten cards.4

Quite regularly, I was asked to repeat certain bits. Perhaps I had said two answers in one sentence. The pressure to respond plentifully was greater than I had expected. But ‘seeing’ things in the blots got easier. At one point when I put the plate down, she simply picked it back up and handed it to me again, indicating that I should say more. After each response, I tried to outline where I saw it, or why, how, but this apparently was not necessary just yet. I felt this incredible urge to explain myself, to have a conversation and to try to get the psychologist to ‘see’ it too. There were a few things I felt rather more embarrassed to say that I saw than others. But I decided to be honest and uttered ‘vulva’, ‘fleshy legs’ and ‘bloody’, and afterwards I was applauded for being so open-minded.

Following this initial stage each ink blot was repeated again, in what is called the ‘inquiry’. Here, it seemed was the place to elaborate and explain where and how I saw each thing in each ink blot. Once I explained where and how I saw what I did the psychologist made a note on mini versions of the blots on the inquiry form. But still the

4 To see all ten cards see Appendix A. To see a list of the things I saw in the ink blots see Appendix B.
psychologist gave no suggestion that she could also ‘see’ the things I reported; or even that she was going to attempt to ‘see’ them. Instead I was asked where I saw each thing, how, what reminded me of it. Open-ended questions meant I gave greater explanations for some things. Though, on other occasions it was hard to not just say simply ‘because it looks like a bat’. Each small thing I referred to was questioned which created a slight sense of fear for me that I might say something highly suggestive and be under immediate analysis, even though I knew that is not how the test works. The whole testing procedure took just over an hour. I was surprised how long it took considering the test is only made up of ten cards; or in my case, several animals, a few people, an underwater world and two pink lizards climbing a Christmas tree.

Throughout the whole procedure, I relaxed more and am certain this was because I knew I was only a participant in a study. I found myself considering what it would be like to be tested as someone in therapy, or in a psychiatric unit. How would this experience be different if I was in prison, or undergoing testing for psychiatrists and psychologists to decide if my sexuality was having a detrimental effect on my mental health? How might my experience have been different in the 1960s when homosexuality was still considered a mental illness? I wondered how comfortable I would feel then explaining how plate number nine looked like a skull peering through some bushes, how the ink blot that looked like a rug reminded me of my mum and why the two women facing one another looked so serene. I encourage you now, to have a quick look at each plate (in Appendix A). This test is not just a common psychological questionnaire but one that somehow entangles the imagination, requires thoughtfulness and has an inherent intrigue. What do you see?

1.1 A brief history of the Rorschach (in Britain)

I came to do the Rorschach test in 2015 thanks to the work of Dr Hermann Rorschach (1884-1922) almost a century before. Rorschach was born November 8th 1884 and spent his youth in Schaffhausen, Switzerland (see Figure 1, Akavia, 2013;
Morgenthaler, 1932). After the death of his father, who was an art teacher, he changed his plans to study natural science and decided on medicine instead (Akavia, 2013; Morgenthaler, 1932). He studied at University of Zurich Medical School between 1904 and 1909, travelling to study at Neuenburg, Zurich, Berne and Berlin and qualified in 1910 (Schwarz, 1996). The last few years of his studies were spent at the Burghölzli cantonal hospital in Switzerland where he was supervised by Eugen Bleuler who also was also supervising Carl Jung (Akavia, 2013; Ellenberger, 1954).

The same year he graduated he married fellow medical student Olga Stempelin who was Russian. A year after working as an assistant physician in Switzerland the couple moved to Moscow. However, they only stayed a year and returned to Switzerland in 1914. From June 1914 to November 1915 he worked as a resident physician in the psychiatric clinic and asylum at Bern (Morgenthaler, 1932), after which he became associate director at the mental asylum in Herisau (Akavia, 2013). He maintained this position until his death.
caused by appendicitis complicated by peritonitis, aged 37, on April 2nd 1922 (Akavia, 2013; Ellenberger, 1954; Klopfer & Kelley, 1942; Morgenthaler, 1932).

Klopfer and Kelley (1942), in their very influential textbook on the Rorschach, describe Rorschach as having been interested in ink blots from 1911, having been inspired by the work of Justinus Kerner. Kerner was interested in people’s associations with ink blots and created the game ‘Blotto’ (Erdberg, 1990). Rorschach was highly aware of such games including ‘Blotto’ and ‘klexographie’, which all require interpretation of ambiguous ink shapes, and was even nick-named ‘Klex’ meaning ‘blot’ at school (Akavia, 2013; Ellenberger, 1954). The nick-name is thought to have derived either from his love of such games, or his drawing ability. In her work on Rorschach’s life and work, historian Naamah Akavia (2013) highlighted the development of the Word Association Test (WAT) by Jung at the Burghölzli cantonal hospital where both Rorschach and Jung did their training supervised by Bleuler, as inspiration on his developing the ink blot test (see Jung, 1910).

The conceptual foundation to the ink blot test was established in Rorschach’s dissertation from 1910 (Schwarz, 1996). The idea that people ‘project’ their own psychology, whether that be childhood experiences, perceptions or evidence of mental illness, onto ambiguous stimuli is at the heart of projective methods. Rorschach was not only interested in projections on to stimuli. He was overall concerned with people’s reactions to new situations: he is reported to have occasionally set a monkey loose on the wards in which he worked to see patients’ reactions (Akavia, 2013).

Rorschach was described as being ‘flexible of character’ by those who knew him (e.g. Morgenthaler, 1932). Those who continued the Rorschach tradition described him as having both the ‘empirical realism of a clinician with the speculative acumen of an intuitive thinker’ (Klopfer & Kelley, 1942, p.3). His critical nature was directed at both

---

5 Some of Rorschach’s drawings, as well as the collection of his written work, are available to view at the Rorschach archives at Bern University. Akavia (2013) extensively draws on this this collection in her book.
his work and himself, though he was kind and had a ‘warmth of feeling’ (Morgenthaler, 1932). Such discourses around Rorschach’s attributes meant proponents of the Rorschach test were able to manage later questions about the test’s scientific status by drawing on Rorschach’s own empiricism and critical nature. Posthumously, Rorschach was considered a genius (Akavia, 2013; Friedemann, 1968) and his supervisor Bleuler said ‘Hermann Rorschach was the hope of an entire generation of Swiss Psychiatry’ (Morgenthaler, 1932). His interests in theatre, art and drawing are especially revealing considering he himself created the ten ink blots. Perhaps inspired by his artist father (who died of lead poisoning as a result of being a painter), Rorschach was known for his sketches of people, including his patients, which are reported by Schwarz (1996) to have been so accurate that patients were recognisable from them decades later. Art and theatre played a key role in Rorschach’s life, pre-empting an interest in his own test almost a century later in popular culture.

Rorschach’s ink blot test was published in 1921 in his only book *Psychodiagnostik*. The book was initially intended as a preliminary report of the use of the ink blots and their application. In fact, Rorschach was clear that it was an experiment, and not a test per se (Akavia, 2013; Schwarz, 1996). Rorschach used the term ‘experiment’ when writing about his underlying theory and used ‘test’ only when considering the ink blots and analysis (Akavia, 2013). Nonetheless, because of Rorschach’s unexpected and early death, the book remained, along with a few additional papers, the only source of information for future Rorschach workers. The test consists of 10 ink blot ‘plates’ upon which the person ‘projects’ what they can ‘see’. In the same way that one can look up at the sky and ‘see’ a dinosaur in the clouds, one can look at the ambiguous ink blot stimuli and say what they ‘see’, just as I did (see Appendix B). Though ink blots had been used before for artistic purposes and had been previously used in Psychology (e.g. Binet & Henri, 1895), Rorschach was the first to shift emphasis from imaginative content to formalised analysis of people’s responses. Rorschach was also the first person to develop the idea into a test of apperception. Apperception, as understood in
Psychology from the writing of Wundt, is the ability to assimilate new experiences with past ones, or simply to perceive. Unlike looking at clouds, Rorschach argued it was not what you saw which was most informative, rather it was how you saw it. He also supervised Hans Behn-Eschenburg’s doctoral thesis in which they developed a parallel set of ink blot plates (Schwarz, 1996). However the Behn-Rorschach plates, as they came to be called, have been nowhere near as popular as Rorschach’s original ones.

Despite their later vast popularity across the world, Rorschach initially had serious difficulties in publishing of his book and the original corresponding ink blots (Schwarz, 1996). After Rorschach’s death, Emil Oberholzer became more responsible for the test. He organised the publication of *Psychodiagnostik* in the United States (US) and the training of American psychologists, including David Levy and Samuel Beck, who would later promote the test there (Exner, 1969; 2003; Klopfer & Kelley, 1942). Klopfer and Kelley (1942) reported that, fifteen years after the publication of *Psychodiagnostik*, Rorschach’s work was evident in fourteen countries and was being used by both psychiatrists and academic psychologists, including psychometricians.

Histories of the uses of the Rorschach in these different countries have been produced. The US projective test movement has received most attention (see Buchanan, 1997; Brunner, 2001; Hegarty, 2003a; Lemov, 2011) whereas the histories of other countries have only been accounted for by Rorschach users themselves. This is true for Japan (Sorai & Ohnuki, 2008); Finland (Mattlar & Fried, 1993); Turkey (İkiz, 2011) and India (Manickam & Dubey, 2006) as well as the United Kingdom (Friedemann, 1968; McCarthy Woods, 2008).

It is the British history that is the central focus of this thesis. In comparison, the British projective test movement was smaller than that of the US or France where the Rorschach and other projective tests continue to be popular (e.g. Exner, 2003). Yet there was a British Rorschach Forum and a British journal devoted to projective methods from 1952 to 1997, indicating a small but significant projective test movement in Britain.
Interest in projective techniques began there soon after the British publication of *Psychodiagnostik* in 1921. A small amount of literature from the Cambridge Psychological Laboratory appeared in the early 1930s, including a three part paper by Philip Vernon in *The British Journal of Medical Psychology*. McCarthy Woods (2008) reported that the Rorschach gained in popularity from 1933 when Theodora Alcock ‘discovered’ the test. It was Alcock who continued to work on the Rorschach, unlike the previously enthusiastic Vernon who later became more critical of its use. Theodora Alcock was one of the founding members of the British Rorschach Forum established in 1948. The other members were C.J. Earl, a psychiatrist who tried to popularise the Rorschach within medical circles, and Eric Trist, a clinical psychologist. At the point at which the group was formed, all of the founding members were working at the Tavistock, which acted as the institutional centre for the Rorschach, in its decades of relative popularity in Britain.

In 1952, the group of founding members of The Rorschach Forum launched *The Rorschach Newsletter* (later renamed *British Journal of Projective Psychology and Personality Study* from 1968 and *British Journal of Projective Psychology* from 1986). Rorschach interest in Britain expanded and, by the 1960s, summer schools, biannual conferences and Rorschach courses were all popular. One oral history participant in my research reported their experience of the British Rorschach society as follows:

‘It’s funny I have a sort of general feeling of having been appreciated, well-treated, amused, intrigued, interested ah, but also the feeling that there was, that it was a very small group’.

The Rorschach had already come under some critique but was enjoying popularity within institutions such as the Tavistock and Child Guidance Clinics. However, 1968 was a very important year for the projective test moment in Britain. The British Rorschach Forum was renamed the British Rorschach Forum and Society for Projective Techniques (and changed again in 1970 to the British Society for Projective Psychology and
Personality Study). It was also in 1968 that, arguably, the most important event in British Rorschach history occurred – the International Rorschach Congress in London. The congress was attended by Rorschach enthusiasts from all over the world and, in many ways, put Britain on the map of the international Rorschach scene (see McCarthy Woods, 2008).

However, following the conference, criticisms of the Rorschach and projective methods began to take a stronger hold. Criticism had emerged early in the British Rorschach history. For example, Audrey Lewis, who was Chair of Psychiatry at the Maudsley, described the Rorschach as of ‘limited or doubtful value’ in 1934. It was at the Maudsley that most of the criticisms of the Rorschach emerged and then abounded. This was in contrast to the support provided by the Tavistock. Hans J Eysenck, working from the Maudsley, was one of the most influential critics of the Rorschach. Eysenck cited the work of Lee Cronbach, who had used statistical analysis to illustrate the Rorschach’s lack of reliability. In fact, the more statistical and experimental approach adopted by the Maudsley became the predominant way to ‘do’ Psychology from the 1950s, and the use of the Rorschach and other projective tests decreased accordingly (Buchanan, 1997).

There have been efforts to revive the Rorschach since the early 1970s. For example, the work of John Exner (1969) has proven to be revolutionary for Rorschach workers in some places such as the US (though the work of Exner continues to be criticised, see Wood, Nezworski, Lilenfeld & Garb, 2003). Such a revival has not occurred to the same extent in Britain. However, this has not been true for all projective tests: Lowenfeld’s World Technique is still in use in the form of Sand Play. The British Society for Projective Psychology and Personality Study and their British Journal of Projective Psychology both ended in 1997, much later than many would have predicted. Nowadays, unlike in France, trainee clinical psychologists in Britain are not taught the Rorschach.
The Rorschach remains, despite its lack of attention in clinical Psychology, an inherently interesting and appealing test. As a psychological object, it behaves in ways that, throughout history, have been simultaneously controversial and alluring. After all, we still look up at the clouds to see what we can ‘see’. The Rorschach may be long gone from professional British clinical Psychology, but because of the appealing nature of the test and its presence in popular culture, it may still come to mind in the public’s imaginings about clinical Psychology.

1.2 My approach

In this thesis I aim to rectify the lack of historical attention on the Rorschach in Britain. My approach encompasses elements of History, Psychology, Sociology, Gender Studies and Comic Studies. This thesis is multifaceted and inter-disciplinary, fitting for a test that has captured the imaginations of so many, from psychologists to writers of graphic novels. Importantly, in my use of Psychology, I adopt Richards’ (2010) distinction between Psychology the discipline, and psychology the subject matter. Throughout the thesis, when discussing psychology as a studied subject, or somebody’s psychology, I deliberately use the ‘little p’ version, and when discussing the discipline that studies it, I use ‘big P’. These distinctions are important for the clarification of the reflexive quality of p/Psychology, and becomes especially important when considering how psychology influences Psychology and vice versa. It is also useful when considering the relationship the public has with Psychology, through psychology. The Rorschach has bled from popular culture into Psychology, and out again back into the public sphere. It has done so more than any other psychological test, though others, for example IQ tests, have done so to a certain extent. For this reason alone, the Rorschach is unique. I argue that a history that does not incorporate a range of areas, including for example, feminist theory, literature and public uses of the test, does not do justice to the Rorschach’s
history. One of the oral history participants in my research also considered an interdisciplinary approach important:

‘And this is why I think the whole interdisciplinary intersectional stuff has to be taken seriously because from a historical perspective, just to pick one and to colonise everything now or then, or to say just from one discipline that’s the only possible reading of it, that’s just no.’

The same participant also said:

‘How do you write a report on a projective test and write a report and say “well it could be this, it could be this, or if you take a feminist perspective it could be this, actually traditionally you might have said that…” Somebody has got to choose the lens that gets elevated.’

The inclusion of feminist and queer reading within this thesis on the history of the Rorschach in Britain is central. As explained by the oral history participant above, ‘someone has got to choose the lens that gets elevated’ – and this is true for all historicism. Despite such interpretation being common to all historicism, it is less common that the choice of lens is made explicit. Morawski (1994) argued that more honest and reflexive accounts are needed for the history of Psychology and that such feminist lenses were especially important. In this thesis, I view the history of the Rorschach in Britain through a particular queer feminist lens, and this is for two reasons. First, because I unearthed evidence of a large proportion of women involved in the projective test movement in Britain and, as a part of the project to re-place women back into the history of Psychology (Bohan, 1990), I concentrated on their activities and lives. The Rorschach also has a particularly queer history already uncovered by Hegarty (2003a) in the US, and so an understanding of the ways in which the Rorschach has been involved with the study of homosexuality is also essential to gain an understanding of its history in Britain. Second, a queer feminist approach is adopted in my thesis because I am
a queer feminist. No historian is able to detach from their own lives in order to conduct scholarly research, and the questions we pose, the archives we seek, and the documents we find most interesting, as well as the interpretations we make, are all influenced by our own identities and privileges. This thesis provides one small wave in the ocean of effort by feminist scholars attempting to flip the traditional historical emphasis on straight, cisgender, white men. By accounting for the history of the Rorschach in Britain through this lens, I write a no less ‘biased’ history than the histories of Psychology available about the ‘great (straight, cisgender, white) men’ of Psychology that are abundant. I also contribute to the rejection of heteronormativity that can be especially difficult to deal with when working historically (discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4). In doing so, I confront the intersection of gender, sexuality and class in the history of the Rorschach. In using such an approach, I have provided an account of queer women in the history of Psychology that would otherwise be unaccounted for in histories of queer men and the Rorschach (e.g. Hegarty, 2003a) and of women’s history in British Psychology (e.g. Valentine, 2008b; 2010).

Some of the methods used in this thesis reflect my attempt to account for invisible or less accessible histories. Both women’s histories and queer histories have been hidden, denied or not deemed important. In order to try to rectify this situation in relation to my own project, I have used different methods to try to uncover the untold history of the Rorschach in Britain. The first method I have used is archival research and systematic review, the bread and butter of historical research. Specifically, I have visited the British Library’s collection of The Rorschach Newsletter (later renamed British Journal of Projective Psychology and Personality Study and the British Journal of Projective Psychology). I conducted a systematic review of the research being published from 1952 to 1997 (the dates in which the journal was published). I also sourced Rorschach publications that were in more popular (and well known) journals in Britain and searched for references to the Rorschach, ink blots and projective techniques in more mainstream publications, including The Times. In addition to the document archives at the British
Library, I also conducted research in the sound archives, specifically the Mental Health Testimony archive and the Hall-Carpenter archive. In order to gain a greater understanding of the lives of individuals, I conducted research at the Wellcome Library, namely in the Margaret Lowenfeld archive (and that of her sister, Helena Wright), and in the British Psychological Society (BPS) archive. Within the BPS archive, I paid particular attention to the collections from Philip Vernon, Magdelen Vernon, Charlotte Wolff, John Raven and Boris Semeonoff.

In order to gain a greater ‘bottom up’ perspective in my research, I also conducted oral history interviews. Oral histories are different from other forms of interviewing and from other forms of historical research. They have particular worth in developing histories from individuals who experienced significant events without imposing the interviewer or researcher’s expectations and interpretation. Oral histories have been said to be ‘the first kind of history’ (Thompson, 2000). Throughout millennia, history has been told through word-of-mouth, story-telling and nostalgic conversations between people and yet this form of history making has fallen out of favour. Many of the histories that have been recorded have been told by scholars who had little contact with their subject matter. However, in the 1970s oral history began to develop into a key area of social history. And, in contrast to previous notions of how to write, research and discover history, oral histories told by individuals with unique understandings have become more prevalent. Not only have oral histories changed the way in which histories can be recorded, but they have also changed who it is telling the history. Instead of elitist historical story-tellers, oral histories have instead promoted the stories of those ‘from below’, that is the otherwise forgotten and untold story-tellers from the past. This technique has allowed histories to be told from rare and individual perspectives, thus revealing ‘hidden histories’ (Portelli 1997; Thompson, 2000). For this reason, they have been especially useful in the telling of feminist histories (Gluck & Patai, 1991). Though not commonly used in Psychology, oral histories have proven to be valuable especially around more hidden narratives. Jennings (2007a), for example, drew on the oral histories
stored in the Hall-Carpenter sound archive at the British Library to provide the stories of lesbian women in post war Britain from 1945-1971.

The approach I have taken in the use of oral history in my thesis has been one of acceptance. I have not queried or debated whether the oral history participants described what ‘really’ happened despite concerns that some researchers may have about long-term memories being unreliable. There are two main reasons for this. First, oral history participants have ownership of their own experiences and perceptions and I, as someone without such experiences, am in no position to question these. Second, all historical documents from which historians derive their narrative are written within context, with motives and objectives, and the narratives developed by oral history are no different. Just as an event might be miss-remembered or re-framed considering present understandings when using oral history, so too can historical documents be miss-interpreted by historians and framed by present understandings. Oral history was described by Thompson (2000) as ‘the first kind of history’ and I strive to consider oral history as equally legitimate as other kinds of historical methodology. I am not the first to use oral history in regards to the history of Psychology, especially in relation to gender and sexuality. Dickinson (2015) recently published Curing Queers in which he used the oral histories of both gay men and trans women who received aversion therapy, and nurses who administered such therapy, in Britain in the middle of the 20th century. I use a similar approach to oral history as Dickinson (2015) as he is aware of potential motives behind participant’s narratives yet allows these to construct the history. After all, who are we to inform those ‘from below’ who experienced history, what ‘actually’ happened? Feminist scholars have been less concerned about the reliability of oral history but rather the appropriation that is possible when people’s narratives come under analysis and are presented by others (Gluck & Patai, 1991). Therefore, I have not conducted traditional analysis on the interviews as might be standard for some methods in Psychology (eg. Discourse Analysis), but rather I have used oral history to inform my understanding of the history, and taken these to be as equally ‘true’ as other forms of historical data. I have included
quotes throughout the thesis in order to allow the voices of the participants themselves to be heard, rather than my own interpretation of what they described. Such an approach is in line with the training I received from the Oral History Society in 2013 as well as others, such as Dickinson (2015) who have used oral history to similar ends.

In all, I conducted four oral history interviews. See Appendix C for all the relevant documents for the first oral history interview and Appendix D for the relevant documents for the three other oral history interviews. They were organised under two separate ethics applications as they were completed at different times, as an opportunity arose to interview the first participant earlier in the PhD process. Appendix E provides the confirmation for both studies from the University of Surrey Ethics Board and Appendix F is the guideline interview schedules.

All of the oral history participants were psychologists or psychotherapists. In order to provide descriptive details without compromising anonymity, I do not specify which participant provided each quote throughout the thesis. However, to provide some context, one participant was actively involved in the British Rorschach Society (initially called the British Rorschach Forum and its later titles) and was tested with the Rorschach prior to being interested in Psychology. Another was a member of this group who also published in their journal but was not as interested in the Rorschach; instead they were more concerned with the projective tests developed by Margaret Lowenfeld. The third oral history participant was trained in the Rorschach as a clinical trainee in the late 1960s. The final participant was tested with the Rorschach in the 1980s prior to becoming a psychologist but, unlike the first oral history participants, has had no involvement with projective testing since. Two of the participants were women and two of the participants were men. These histories revealed the more personal and anecdotal evidence that would otherwise not be included in formal career based archives.

The third method I have used within the thesis is borrowed from Comic Studies. In Chapter 5, I conduct an analysis on the graphic novel *Watchmen*. This is because one
of the central ways in which the Rorschach has been adopted by popular culture is through the character Rorschach (an ink blot masked vigilante superhero) in *Watchmen* by Alan Moore and Dave Gibbons (1987). For many, the character Rorschach is better known than Dr Hermann Rorschach. This analysis, which adopts a queer feminist and psychological lens, considers the ways in which Psychology, via the Rorschach, is represented within its narrative. Lepore (2014) has a similar approach in her historical investigation into the (secret) history of Wonder Woman. In her historical monograph, she not only accounts for the history of Wonder Woman in the 20th century but also unites the links between Psychology, psychology, feminism and comics. This approach is rather rare in the history of Psychology, though I argue it is necessary to understand the Rorschach’s role in popular culture, which is central to its historical trajectory.

Considering the graphic novel element to this thesis, in some ways I consider the kind of history I have produced as a ‘gutter history’. The ‘gutter’ is a term used in the analysis of comics and graphic novels that describes the space between panels. McCloud (1994), in his comic that explains the art of comics, describes the gutter as the place where two separate images are transformed to one idea. See Figure 2.
But the gutter is not just the gap, the invisible space, the edge of the panel. It is where the action is. See Figure 3.
The gutter is therefore where the reader, or the historian in my case, infers what has happened considering a lack of information provided. The reader interprets according to their own identities, privileges and motives, and projects upon the gutter in order to understand the narrative. Historians similarly have pieces of the puzzle, like panels of the comic book, and through the gutter, create the narrative of the history. It is apt, then, to consider comics alongside projective psychology as both require interpretation of ambiguous and blank spaces. The history of the Rorschach I have produced here is like the gutter because it draws together what appear to be separate ideas to one common thread. It also considers the marginal blank spaces that appear invisible in comics, history and Psychology together. The interdisciplinary approach, as well as the inclusions of alternative documents such as Watchmen, are drawn together by the Rorschach ink blot test, and the arguments I produce here create the narrative by which this story is told. The gutter is also a useful metaphor because of the emphasis in this thesis on the forgotten, denied and difficult to reach histories, namely feminist and queer histories. My interdisciplinary approach is also relevant, as the gaps between disciplines act as a gutter and throughout this thesis, I reveal what this space can look like and what such study can do.

The gutter is perceived to be where unimportant objects are discarded, they fall into the gutter, go by the wayside. But, despite being a blank white space, it is the location of action, it is where the reader can infer and be involved in the narrative, it is not merely the edge of the panel. In this thesis, I aim to draw out what is in the gutter of Rorschach history in order to make it more prominent, and to be clear in my own motives as a historian, therefore making the gutter more visible.

As explained by McCloud (1994), a comic can be read in a number of different ways. The panels do not provide a strict route through the narrative. Just like an ink blot, numerous interpretations are possible. In many ways, this is also like history. Historians, along with their own interpretations, also create the structure by which the history is told. For this reason, I titled this thesis a history, not the history, of the Rorschach ink blot test.
in Britain. What I have produced here is just one of the many interpretations and approaches that could be used in order to explore the history of the Rorschach in Britain. This thesis is also a history, not an evaluation. There is no conclusion as to whether the Rorschach ink blot test actually works or not. The tests validity is not a key question of this research. Instead, I position myself one step back from that question and consider beliefs in the test’s ability and arguments about the tests validity as a part of the history.

1.3 Outline of the structure of the thesis

So what does this history of the Rorschach ink blot test in Britain look like? In the thesis, I cover four main topics, each discussed in detail in individual chapters. One of the main themes that is threaded throughout each chapter is power, whether that be the power of the Rorschach test, the power of groups or institutions, the power of the majorities, or the power of superheroes. The structure of the thesis is as follows. Chapter 2 provides the theoretical background and underpinnings of the thesis as a whole. It is here that I go into depth as to why my approach has been taken. To begin, I outline the history of the history of Psychology and key individuals within that history whose philosophy of science has impacted my own research. Then I develop the argument that the Rorschach is historically and contextually situated; not only that but also that the test is powerful as it can do things, it enacts upon people. I also describe the pattern of psychological testing in Britain, in order to frame the deeper historical analysis provided in Chapter 3. Then, having outlined what has, and has not, been done on the history of the Rorschach, I provide my own epistemological positon.

Chapter 3 narrates the history of the Rorschach in Britain, considering the wider socio-historical, economic and cultural contexts in which Rorschach use emerged and declined. Using a comparative approach, I consider the histories of Britain and the US alongside each other in order to draw meaningful comparisons. Such an international
scope begins to decentralise the US within the history of Psychology broadly, and by comparing the US history to Britain particularises the US history rather than considering it the norm. Within this chapter, I consider the institutional influences on the history of the Rorschach as well as the subjects who were tested. For the US history, Hegarty (2003a) described the use of the Rorschach on gay men, Lemov (2011) described the use of projective methods in a postcolonial context and Brunner (2001) considered the Rorschach’s role in testing Nazis. Buchanan (1997) also considered the rise and fall of the Rorschach compared to other psychological tests. In this chapter, I respond to each of these points in relation to the history in Britain and also pay close attention to who was doing the testing.

In Chapter 4, I develop this point as I discovered a high proportion of women in the British projective test moment. Chapter 4 is what I have called a ‘queer feminist herstory’. It focuses on the lives of the women in the projective test movement, some of whom lived potentially feminist and queer lives. To begin, the difficulties of conducting such a history are outlined in detail, and I produce a solution to some of these issues. The solution is to use the work of June Hopkins as an analytical lens through which to view the lives of the four women I discuss in detail. Those women are Theodora Alcock (1888-1980); Margaret Lowenfeld (1890-1973); Ann Kaldegg (1899-1995) and Effie Lilian Hutton (1904-1956). In explaining the analytic lens, I make my own interpretations explicit and accept the subjectivity of historicism as recommended by Morawski (1994). I also compare and contrast June Hopkins with Evelyn Hooker as, through their research, both of them moved against the tide of opinion that homosexuality was a mental illness in the 1950s and 1960s. Finally, in this chapter, I provide evidence of what it was like for those sexual minorities who were tested with the Rorschach, and consider the implications of this in light of the gay liberation movement from the 1970s onwards.

Chapter 5 of the thesis considers an important point that runs throughout the thesis, that is, the public’s awareness and uses of ink blots. The Rorschach, I argue, has bled from popular culture to Psychology and back again to popular culture. The public’s
adoption of the test, as a representation of p/Psychology, is significant and tells us about perceptions of Psychology more broadly. Yet, historians have been slow, if not, reluctant to consider the public within histories of the Rorschach. I frame perceptions of the public as the ‘abyss’ and compare this to the idea of ‘looping effects’ (Hacking, 1995), which positions the public as active in the constructions of psychology. Moving towards comics, I describe how comics act as an interesting example of such loops, and provide evidence of the public being active in the history of Psychology. Turning to Watchmen specifically, I consider how the history of Psychology itself is narrated within the graphic novel and how the character, or psychology, of Rorschach mirrors the Rorschach ink blot test. I also conduct a further queer analysis on Watchmen and consider the position of queer women characters in light of some of the discoveries presented in Chapter 4.

Overall, I provide a history which uses the Rorschach as an excellent example of several key aspects of Psychology. First, Psychology is powerful and the tools that psychologists use do things and enact upon people in different, and sometimes unethical and/or unexpected, ways. Second, the work that psychologists, and historians for that matter, produce are not separate from their individual identities, privileges and motives. These are all evidenced both in the history of the Rorschach and in my own telling of a history of the Rorschach in Britain. The third way that the Rorschach provides a compelling example is in the way the public have responded to the test. The public are not mere receptors of psychological theories; they are not the abyss into which scientific evidence is thrown. The abyss gazes back and Watchmen is just one example of how the public have used the test and, in doing so, ‘looped’ psychology back to Psychology.

1.4 Aims and research questions

In this thesis, there are a number of aims. First, as already discussed, I broadly aim to rectify the lack of historical inquiry into the Rorschach ink blot test in Britain.
Specifically, I aim to do this via exploring how the Rorschach has been active as an object with power (Chapter 2); comparing the tests history in Britain with that of the US (Chapter 3); exploring the further hidden histories of queer women in the projective test movement (Chapter 4); and examining how the test has looped into popular culture via Watchmen (Chapter 5). In producing a thesis that fulfils these aims I have explored the power of the Rorschach in Britain. As a result certain themes run through the thesis as a whole, including: power, feminist thinking, the use of a queer lens and a critical perspective.

This thesis builds on the existing conceptual and historical research on the Rorschach in several ways. Galison (2004) also argued the Rorschach is active and does things, however his approach was not historical in the same way as this. Buchanan (1997) compared the Rorschach with another psychological test, the MMPI, yet my thesis represents the only research that adopts a comparative approach on a national level. At present, there is no attention paid to women specifically in the projective test movement of any country in the literature and my research goes some way to re-place these women back into the history of Psychology. My research also actively avoids heteronormativity and aims to produce a more queer affirmative history of the Rorschach (as also done by Hegarty, 2003a for the US). However, Hegarty (2003a) did not consider women in his history of the Rorschach. I therefore consider the marginal intersection of gender and sexuality in relation to the Rorschach in a way that has not been done before. I also adopt analysis of a graphic novel as a key point of enquiry, which is novel for the history of the Rorschach despite the test being so relevant in popular culture, although research in the history of Psychology has been completed on Wonder Woman to similar ends (Bunn, 1997; 2007; Lepore, 2014).

The broad research questions that I aim to answer in this thesis are:

- What does the history of the Rorschach in Britain look like?
- How does research with homosexuality using the Rorschach compare with the research conducted in the US?
- What role do women play in the history of the Rorschach in Britain?
- How have the public responded to the Rorschach and in what ways has it been adopted in popular culture?

The shape of this thesis is like an hourglass which seems quite appropriate for such a historical topic. I begin with the broader questions about the patterns of testing in Britain and how the Rorschach has been constructed, does things and has power. Having provided my epistemological position and justified my queer feminist critical perspective, I then narrow in focus and provide a history of the Rorschach ink blot test in Britain as compared to the US. Being more specific, at the waist of the hourglass, I specifically consider the lives and work of some of the women in the projective test movement.

Widening focus out again, I consider the ways in which the Rorschach has been adopted by popular culture, the active role of the public in this process, and provide an analysis of Watchmen. Each chapter provides an account of the Rorschach with chronology in mind; however a wide view of the history is necessary in each. The philosophy of the Rorschach is in Chapter 2. This includes the history of testing broadly in the beginning of the 20th century. The British history is presented in Chapter 3 which covers the 1920s-1990s, and this time-frame is similar to that of Chapter 4. However the lives of the women is focused mainly in the 1950s-1970s. Chapter 5 and its focus on Watchmen, which was first published in 1987, is somewhat more contemporary and is about the late 20th century. This thesis therefore focuses predominantly on the history of the Rorschach in 20th century Britain, though references to the 19th and 21st centuries for contextual purposes are included.

As discussed above, this thesis represents a history of the Rorschach in Britain. It is an interdisciplinary, critical and distinctly feminist history that uses a queer lens. It is a history that considers not only the test itself to be active but also the public on whom the test has been used. It is a gutter history, one which draws the white space, the gutter, the
invisible, to the foreground. The interdisciplinary approach and the focus on marginal
‘gutters’ are suited to the history of a test that has transcended disciplines, ‘bled’ from and
into popular culture, and moved from psychologist’s offices to museums and to the pages
of a graphic novel.
A man in his 50s reported seeing an owl, and a grey Eiffel tower, much like I did in Card 10 (see Appendix A and B) in the Rorschach ink blots (Wood et al, 2003). Also, like my responses he saw a skull and a rug, or to be more specific, ‘a Georgia O’Keefe painting of a cow skull’ and ‘a blue rug with course fibres that’s being pulled apart’. He also regularly reported seeing pairs of people such as ‘two medieval guys with hats on’ and ‘two laughing gargoyles’. Blind analysis, meaning the person analysing the responses was not the same as the person who ran the test, was conducted on his responses and was found to be indicative of interpersonal problems, impaired thought processes and depression. The man who was tested was none other than Jim Wood, the first author of *What’s wrong with the Rorschach? Science confronts the controversial inkblot test* (2003), a major text in the body of criticism of the Rorschach. The other authors state how, because they know Wood, they can ‘say with considerable confidence’ that the test analysis does not reflect his personality (2003, p. 5).

Like the Rorschach ink blots themselves, there are some things in the history of Psychology that are obvious and reported by many people. Both myself and Wood reported seeing bats, which is considered a ‘popular’ response. The large black bats of history have become even clearer after scholars discuss them at greater lengths. There are the grey areas, the peripheral inky smears on the edges of the main blot that are sometimes referred to in the history of Psychology. In the realities of the testing situation, these are perhaps the grey Eiffel towers. And then there are white negative spaces that are rarely referred to, and when they are, it is considered rather unusual and potentially worrying. Wood, for example, recognised some white space to be ‘a jet’ (Wood, et al, 2003, p. 4) and, in my own response, I reported seeing a lampshade in the white space of
Rorschach (1921) considered the use of white space, coded as ‘S’, to ‘always indicate some sort of oppositional trend’ (p. 199). In those who were more outgoing, this resulted in outward defiance and aggressive stubbornness. In others, the ‘oppositional tendency’ was directed towards the self and resulted in doubt, indecisiveness and obsessional thoughts. The history of Psychology often refers to the obvious events in history and can reinforce what has been previously said. Sometimes attention is paid to the peripheral grey areas, but rarely are the marginal white spaces fully recognised. As outlined in Chapter, 1 it is these white spaces, the marginal and invisible to which I wish to pay close attention in this thesis.

In this chapter, I first outline what is the history of the history of Psychology. That is not to say that I will provide a history of Psychology generally, but rather that I will briefly consider the history of studying the history of Psychology. This, in some ways, represents the obvious blots – what has been said in the history of Psychology already. I then consider what are the grey areas, the smears and the smudges. Here I focus more specifically on psychological tests. Tests in themselves are well-known in the history of Psychology. However, the actions of tests, their mobility and their power are not so often recognised by psychologists. Finally, I consider the white space, what is not known about the history of the Rorschach and how this thesis goes some way to rectify the lack of acknowledgment of the white space (through, rather appropriately, stubborn and obsessive PhD research).

Three strands of thought – the history of the history of Psychology, the constructed nature of tests, and the literature on the Rorschach specifically – are all necessary to explain the theoretical underpinnings of the thesis as a whole. To provide a clearer structure of this chapter I first outline what is the history of the history of Psychology. In doing so, I present methods of doing history and stake claim to those which I find particularly useful, that is, constructionist reflexive and relative approaches that attribute action to inanimate objects. Second, I consider the constructed qualities of psychological tests. In doing so, I argue that tests, and the Rorschach in particular, are not
stationery objects but are tools wielded by psychologists that enact upon people and do things. Having explored the power of tests such as the Rorschach, I then apply this to the beliefs psychologists hold about the Rorschach, that is, the beliefs of both proponents and critics of the test such as Wood (Wood et al, 2003). Using the literature on extraordinary beliefs from Lamont (2007a; 2010; 2012; 2013), I untangle how supporters and critics of the Rorschach are not all that different. I then outline what history has, and has not, been done on the Rorschach. In light of this I outline exactly what my own historical perspectives are, and consider where this thesis as a contribution to the field sits within the literature. In all, the curious nature of the Rorschach, its history and the beliefs about it, are presented in order to situate the thesis as a whole in the history of Psychology.

2.1 History of the history of Psychology

Psychologists began to account for their disciplines’ history mere decades after its organisation. The first major influential history of Psychology was published by Edwin Boring in 1929. His book focused primarily on experimental Psychology in Germany and explains how this approach was adopted in the US as the ‘proper’ way to do Psychology. Whilst focusing on the period 1880-1910, Boring emphasised Ebbinghaus’s point that ‘psychology has a long past but only a short history’ and stated that despite this the majority of histories written about Psychology neglected its short scientific history. Boring was also highly aware of the applications of Psychology and the works of Stanley Hall and Lewis Terman. In 1923, after the massive use of IQ testing in the US military during the First World War orchestrated by Robert Yerkes, Boring claimed: ‘Intelligence is what the test tests’ (1923, p. 35). Boring was confident in the use of psychological testing yet appears also aware of the nature of psychological tests constructing attributes in individuals.
In Britain, Hearnshaw’s (1964) book on the ‘short history’ of British Psychology between the years 1840-1940 represents one of the most cited early histories of British Psychology. Hearnshaw aimed to provide an outline of the history of British Psychology for both students and the general reader, which he argued was especially important as Psychology was becoming increasingly influential and in the ‘public eye’ (1964, p. v-vii). Yet these early comprehensive histories illustrate the early trend in the history of Psychology to document the people, dates and places of events. These histories map the structured institutions, the retirements, the appointments and the most cited studies of famous psychologists. These styles of history are also usually written by Psychologists and, I argue, for Psychologists as they are essentially the internalist celebratory accounts of ‘great men’ (Young, 1966). Indeed, the women involved in Psychology from its earliest days have only in the last few decades of the 20th century began to be ‘re-placed’ back into the history of Psychology (Bohan, 1990; Morawski & Agronick, 1991; Furumoto, & Scarborough, 1986; Rutherford, Vaughn-Johnson & Rodkey, 2015; Scarborough, & Furumoto, 1989). The venture to write women’s history in Psychology is ongoing and one of the major contemporary projects is Psychology’s Feminist Voices. This particular issue is dealt with in greater depth in Chapter 4, however it is important to note that the early histories of Psychology were written by men psychologists, largely for men psychologists, about men psychologists. Gender, therefore, provides just one lens through which to illustrate the partial telling of the history of Psychology.

The approaches to the history of Psychology have changed, and in the 1960s, the scope of historical perspective became broader (Vaughn-Blount, Rutherford, Baker & Johnson, 2009). Instead of merely accounting for the events in the history of Psychology, historians of Psychology began to ask more epistemological questions. This approach, Pepitone (1981) argued, was much more informative than the mere biographical accounts of psychologists. Several theorists who considered the history of Psychology from this
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6 See http://www.feministvoices.com/
point onwards influenced my own thinking about historicism and so, throughout I explain how I have applied some of their ideas to my own history of the Rorschach.

Popper (1957) critiqued the notion that history had the same scientific empiricism that other disciplines are able to claim. Though Popper was anti-historicist, unlike Kuhn (1962), Kuhn recognised Popper’s step away from realism. Kuhn (1962) argued that science was not a slow accumulation of knowledge which developed in a linear fashion, but rather developed in terms of ‘paradigm shifts’. A science can only be considered as such once a paradigm, that is a shared understanding of the discipline, is reached. Psychology has experienced a number of shifts in thought throughout the 20th century from psychoanalytic to behavioural to cognitive perspectives, but no shared theory has yet (or perhaps will ever be) settled upon (see Driver-Linn, 2003). A paradigm also requires researchers to be in agreement - objective study alone is not enough. The scientific community must share the commitment to the evidence of the paradigm, agree on definitions and ‘model problems’ for hypothesis testing. Hypothesis testing was also considered earlier by Popper (1935), who argued that it is not possible to use observation methods to get to the truth in science, and proposed that instead a hypothesis should be falsifiable, meaning researchers should aim to prove a hypothesis wrong. Yet, no singular approach in Psychology has been agreed upon, meaning a paradigm has not yet been reached in Psychology so, according to Kuhn, Psychology is not a mature science.

The 1960s was a period of growth for the history of Psychology. The *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* was established in 1965 and the International Society for the History of Behavioral and Social Sciences in 1968. One important piece of thinking to emerge from the 1960s was the concept of ‘presentism’. Stocking (1965) argued against the use of presentism in history; that is, the application of current present day understandings onto the past. Presentism distorts our understandings of the past as we view it through the lens of the present. Yet, as Stocking (1965) also points out, understandings of the past are necessary to provide ‘critical leverage’ for problems in the present. Young (1966) believed the 1960s to be a time to develop the history of the
behavioural sciences, to gain greater status as a sub-discipline and establish it more firmly within academia. In order to achieve this, he argued that practitioners needed to become more self-critical, and cited Stocking’s (1965) work on presentism as the one ‘hope for the historiographical sophistication of historians of the behavioural sciences’ (p. 19). Young’s hope for greater critique and the establishment of the history of behavioural sciences, including Psychology, was fruitful. Hegarty (2013) argued that such a shift in understanding from the works of Kuhn, Popper and Stocking in Psychology’s history caused a move ‘away from past as accumulation of fact about the timeless individual subject’ (p. 7). The past had to be viewed as more ‘locked in time’ and context based, which echoed growing social constructionist approaches in Psychology from the 1960s onwards.

In the 1970s, the questioning of seemingly objective disciplines continued, forming what has been since described as a ‘crisis’ of (social) Psychology (Gergen, 1973). Constructionism and the association between the social and historical was particularly explored by Gergen (1973) who argued that social psychology was in effect a ‘historical inquiry’. Such thinking was instrumental in the introduction of using history to critique core aspects of disciplines. For example, Gergen (1973) stated that often people behave in opposition to known psychological theories and thus prove them invalid.

Such critique was in many ways reflective of wider societal changes afoot, such as the gay liberation movement and anti-psychiatric attitudes, including the critique of psychological testing (Thomson, 2006). Other social movements at the time also indicate a changing scene in both Psychology and society; wider effects of de-colonisation began to be felt, the sexual revolution occurred as did an increase in recreational drug use and student protest movements, especially against the Vietnam War (see Zaroulis & Sullivan, 1984). Second wave feminism also began to influence the workings of Psychology, and the work of Naomi Weisstein (1968, reprinted and expanded in 1971) became better known. In Psychology Constructs the Female (1971) Weisstein argued that women were characterised by Psychology as emotionally unstable, weaker than men, nurturing and
intuitive rather than intelligent. This, she argued, was because of the lack understanding of the social contexts in which women live. Social context, therefore, became not only something historians of Psychology began to study about the past, but was also shown to be influential on the practises of Psychology in the present.

Following from Kuhn’s more constructionist grounding, greater relativist approaches gained popularity. There was a shift from biographic histories to more philosophical and epistemological concerns in the history of Psychology. Foucault’s descriptions of the developments of certain things coming into realms of study included ‘the human’ in the 17th and 18th centuries, and later ‘the insane’ and ‘the homosexual’ in the 19th century (1961; 1975; see Hegarty, Bartos & Hubbard, 2015). Foucault developed his ideas around how organisations, such as the scientific academy, create governable ideals that can be observed, monitored and punished (1975, 1961; also see Downing, 2008; Hegarty, 2013; Rose, 1999). Foucault’s writings have been especially influential upon British psychologists, compared to those in the US, in regards to history (Hegarty, 2013), for example in the uptake of Discourse Analysis (Bunn, 2012; also see Lamont, 2007b; 2015). Whilst widely influential in the social sciences, Foucault was not massively influential upon historians of Psychology, however his work has been important for the use of queer theory in Psychology (Minton, 1997). For my own history, I borrow Foucault’s ideas of the power of institutions (Foucault, 1975), as well the constructions of groups such as ‘the homosexual’ (Foucault, 1976), and what constitutes as madness (Foucault, 1961).

Relativist approaches to history were originally considered rather radical. Robin Collingwood, whose major work, The Idea of History (1946), which was published posthumously, argued that history was a recollection of thinking, and that two people could not have identical understandings of the same event, even if the content was the same. Though more influential after his death, his thinking influenced none other than Margaret Lowenfeld to whom he taught philosophy. She cited his thinking in her first book Play in Childhood (1935). In line with such relativism, the rejection of proven
‘facts’ in history has been expanded by thinkers such as Popper (1957) and White (1973). Relativism became more popular after Kuhn, and was developed by people such as Bloor (1976). Bloor, whilst at Edinburgh, developed the ‘strong program’, based on the sociology of scientific knowledge. He argued that study must include the: examination of the conditions (including psychological, social and cultural factors) that bring about knowledges; study of both accepted and not accepted knowledges; acceptance that the same types of explanations can be about both these accepted and not accepted knowledges; and a reflexive awareness of the study’s own sociology (1976; 1991).

Bloor’s use of symmetry in his analysis is particularly useful for my own work as people often have polarised beliefs about the Rorschach (I expand on this later in section 2.2.2). Thinking more historically, Bloor (1976) also argued that current scientific knowledge should not be used to explain ‘correct’ scientific beliefs of the past. In effect, Bloor was arguing against presentism in the practises of Psychology, just as Stocking (1965) argued against it in the history of Psychology. Such historical relativist perspectives were therefore not only to prove influential upon Bloor and others at Edinburgh, but also in developing more constructionist approaches to history and Psychology. I use Bloor’s thinking about symmetry in a more practical sense also, throughout the thesis, in that I maintain a symmetrical view on the Rorschach and consider both the proponents and the critics within the history evenly, as Lamont (e.g. 2013) does with extraordinary beliefs.

White (1973) argued that historians have not accepted that the ‘facts’ they uncover are constructed by the types of questions they posed in the first place. Historians create the historical narrative and so history does not accurately reflect what actually happened. He therefore recommended that historians could even learn from writers of fiction, and should accept that the past is confusing and uncontrollable (Hughes-Warrington, 2007). In creating narratives, White argues that a number of tropes are available. He categorised

---

7 This in some ways is similar to what I do in Chapter 5 in my analysis of the history of the Rorschach through Moore and Gibbons’ Watchmen (1987).
historical writing into romances, tragedies, satires and ironies, with writers themselves being anarchist, conservative, radical or liberal.\(^8\)

In different ways my own historical endeavour in this thesis can be considered to include all four of White’s (1973) tropes in different places. In many ways the romance has already been written by proponents of the Rorschach (e.g. for Britain, Friedemann, 1968; McCarthy Woods, 2008) and the tragedies have been written by critics of the test (e.g. Wood et al, 2003). However, overall, I believe this thesis comes from my own radical perspective. The history I present here does adopt thinking from a range of disciplines and so it is not anarchist – I do not propose starting from scratch. However, I do use ideas and methods in a new setting and present research that highlights what Popper would describe as the ‘poverty’ of present understanding of the Rorschach. In turn, I propose a new approach to the history of Psychology, namely, by seriously considering the hidden histories and the advantages in using queer theory in history as well as paying far more attention to the looping effects between Psychology and the public (see Minton, 1997). The history of Psychology is incomplete without the recognition of how the public use and further produce p/Psychology. This thesis, then, arguably represents a radical romantic, ironic, satirical and tragic history of the Rorschach.

Following the crisis of (social) Psychology, history was viewed as a possible solution (Gergen, 1973; Morawski, 2012). Pepitone (1981) reflected upon this time of crisis in his account of the history of social Psychology, and he argued that it was most useful to consider sociological understandings of scientific knowledge. The study of the sociology of scientific knowledge continued from the work of Kuhn, and Latour contributed to this discussion with *Laboratory Life* (Latour & Woolgar, 1979) and later developed Actor-Network Theory (ANT). ANT takes a relativist constructivist approach

---

\(^8\) Such narratives can be especially seen in the history of the Rorschach. Psychologists and the public alike are divided into two polarised positions as to the tests validity and ethical impact in Psychology. Turner (2011) described discourses about the Rorschach used by psychologists in the US, France and Australia as either romantic or empiricist reflecting these polarised positions.
and takes into account the effects of a number of actors, including objects, in sociological explanations (Latour, 2005; Law & Hassard, 1999).

In the 1990s, more constructivist accounts of Psychology emerged and it is these that Gergen (1996) argued were the future for Psychology. Danziger (1994) played a particularly key role in the development of constructivist approaches to the history of Psychology. He argued that there was a lack of recognition of the socially constructed nature of psychological knowledge, particularly with psychological methods. This included an unawareness of the constructed nature of the psychological test. In historicising a number of themes in the history of Psychology, including the increase of the use and trust in statistics and group data, and the development of personality as a topic of study, Danziger (1994) helped reveal power relations in Psychology. By legitimising and creating scientific methods to study constructed topics such as personality, which he argued was founded in the mental hygiene movement, psychologists had managed to manoeuvre themselves into the position of being the experts in these niche areas of study.

Bloor (1991) expanded the arguments of Kuhn and claimed that no science can claim true independence from social factors: ‘If knowledge does depend on a vantage point outside society, and if truth does depend on stepping above the causal nexus of social relations, then we may give them up as lost.’ (p. 18). Such narrative strategies have also been explored by Leary (1990) who explored the use of metaphors in the history of Psychology. 9 Thinkers from the past decades were expanded upon and developed. Hacking (1995) adopted some of Gergen’s (1973) ideas when he proposed that Psychology experiences ‘looping effects’ due to its reflexive nature. By categorising a group, information about that group becomes known both both psychologist and the group. There are, therefore, different kinds of ‘knowers’, the specialist and the experiencer. The psychology of the group can therefore change with the knowledge of

---

9 The Rorschach however is a key example where instead of metaphors being used to explain psychology (as argued by Leary, 1990); Psychology, in the form of the Rorschach, is sometimes used as a metaphor.
what Psychology has produced about the group, in turn changing what Psychology knows about their psychology. Psychology is therefore looped between the discipline and wider culture. Psychological theories are also developed in such specific cultural circumstances that their application to other contexts and situations is impossible. Historical analysis is therefore essential when investigating (social) psychology (see Gergen, 1973; 1996; 2012; Pepitone, 1981).

During the 1990s, there was also an increase in the reclaiming of forgotten aspects of history. Cherry (1995) used this framework to consider the forgotten, or what she calls ‘the stubborn particulars’, in Psychology. Such attention to the forgotten aspects of the history of Psychology, or the simplified and falsified textbook stories, are often those dismantled in courses on the history of Psychology (see Brush, 1974). The work of Morawski (1994) was particularly important here in her focus on gender and feminism in Psychology. Describing such work as ‘liminal’, Morawski aimed to highlight the importance of reflexivity in doing the history of Psychology. The presence of women in Psychology in the past was central to this work (Morawski & Agronick, 1991). Feminist approaches in Psychology therefore moved from a re-placing project to a reflexive one which included women’s history as central. Young (1966) had certainly commented that the history of Psychology was, according to the history books, one of ‘great men’ but offered little in the way of rectification. It was during the 1990s that feminist scholars such as Morawski began the project to highlight the gendered nature of the history of Psychology. This can even be seen in the above review of the history of the history of Psychology. The majority of theorists from this period in this subject area were men and so a feminist framework for the history of Psychology is also required. In this thesis, I draw from not only these theorists, but also the feminists who have highlighted the need for both the re-placement of women, and reflexivity, in the history of Psychology (Bohan, 1990; Morawski, 1994).

In the 21st century, historians of Psychology have continued to broaden the theoretical scope in which they consider Psychology. As with feminist approaches, a
focus on the public extended the possibilities of historical research in Psychology. Hacking (2000) developed ideas about social constructionism in relation to what he calls ‘human kinds’ which include the categories by which psychologists have organised mental illness (see Grob, 1991). This corresponded to his previous work on ‘looping effects’ (1995). Hacking (2000) argued that mental illness is a good example of where ‘human kinds’ are constructed, that is, negotiated classifications of people. Hacking references the historically situated examples of hysteria, anorexia, the ‘feeble-minded’ and schizophrenia to argue, not that these illnesses are not ‘real’ *per se* (although some have argued that to be the case, see Boyle, 2002), but that they are situated and constructed in specific contexts.

From the turn of the present century, historians of Psychology had a greater scope due to the establishment of the field from the 1960s. A number of different approaches were taken in the new century. Thomson (2006) highlighted the notion of ‘high and low psychological cultures’. Historians had thus far not paid a great deal of attention to popular cultures and how wider society adopted Psychology. Although Foucault (1975) recognised the power of disciplines such as Psychology in their governance and surveillance (also see Rose, 1999), the implication was that the public were passive, unconscious receivers of such surveillance. Thomson (2006) identified such work on technologies of power as some of the most important work in the history of Psychology, however he broadened this and considered the ways in which people in 20th century Britain viewed themselves in psychological terms in a more active way. Hayward (2014) also does this to some extent though he concentrated on primary care providers rather than Psychology *per se*.

Some historians borrowed from other disciplines. Whilst ANT as a sociological approach has not had a major impact on the history of Psychology, it was particularly useful for Galison (2004), who used it to argue that the Rorschach is an object that ‘talks’. Lamont similarly (2012; 2013) applied the thinking of Bloor onto extraordinary beliefs as did Hegarty (2007) in regards to the history of Psychology and power. A range of
approaches from decades of work have therefore continued to be influential and developed in the history of Psychology.

One of the other ways in which the history of psychology has been documented has been through teaching. There is even literature on the teaching of the history of Psychology within the history of Psychology, though it is noteworthy that the emphasis on teaching has been greater in the US than in Britain. The majority of those who do teach the history of Psychology do so out of a personal interest rather than as experts per se (Fuchs & Viney, 2002; Sokal, 1998). The main ways in which the history of psychology is praised within this literature is its interdisciplinary nature and how it relates to wider cultural topics such as ethics, the arts and politics (Apfelbaum, 1992; Kemp, 2002; Matthews, 1994) as well as its critical nature (Beins, 2010; Sokal, 1998). There is also some literature on the applicability of the history of Psychology to more clinical practitioner courses (Buchanan, 2002; Kemp, 2002). The history of Psychology, as a taught course, is therefore not only concerned with informing students about the who, when, what and hows of the figures in the history of Psychology, but has become an arena for critical inquiry and engagement with Psychology.  

Having considered the history of the history of Psychology, I now briefly outline who does the history of Psychology. The first thing to note is that many, though not all, historians of Psychology are psychologists themselves (see Vaughn-Blount et al, 2009). Psychology is a particularly important discipline for historians because, as originally argued by Danziger (1994) ‘the history of psychology, and the history of human subjectivity are not independent of one another’ (p. 475). He argued that historical inquiry in Psychology should therefore be prioritised over the natural sciences. Zenderland
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10 The uses of teaching Conceptual and Historical Issues in Psychology (CHIP) in Britain has recently been explored in a special issue of History and Philosophy in Psychology guest edited by Peter Hegarty, myself and Lovemore Nyatanga, see Hegarty, Hubbard & Nyatanga (2015).
11 Rhodi Hayward (2014) for example is a historian interested in the history of medicine. However, Jacy Young, Alexandra Rutherford, Geoff Bunn, John Hall, Mike Pettit, and Peter Hegarty whose work I draw upon in this thesis are all academic psychologists. That however, is not to say that they produce internalist histories of psychology (like, for example McCarthy Woods, 2008 as a clinical psychologist). Rather they come from a perspective of history which I develop further in the next section of this chapter.
(1997), much like Gergen (1973), argued that history of Psychology has become an ‘exceptionally potent weapon’ as a method to illustrate that science is not value-free; it has highlighted to psychologists and the public alike the importance of a critical perspective. Smith (2007) also argued that the history of Psychology was of particular importance, without which Psychology itself would be incomplete. This he based on the reflexive nature of Psychology (Gergen, 1973; Morawski, 2005; Richards, 2002). Smith (2007) argued that through historical methods the reflexive processes of Psychology (and psychology) are able to be analysed. Lamont (2010) applied consideration of the reflexive nature of Psychology to his analysis of mesmerism in the Victorian era. Having described the works of Smith (2007), Richards (2002) and Hacking (1986) he argued how mesmerism provides one example in the history of Psychology where the reflexive nature is especially clear in the decisions as to what counts as psychological knowledge and how people are understood as psychological beings.

Vaughn-Blount et al (2009) developed the argument that because the history of Psychology is so important, psychologists should be encouraged to become psychologist-historians. They argued that having an awareness of the internal processes and methods of psychology mean that psychologist-historians have an advantage over historians who study Psychology. This is somewhat in contrast to the views of historians of Psychology some decades before. Young (1966) was very cautious about psychologists doing their own history. He thought that because many psychologists recorded history from writing textbooks they had the potential to work backwards from the present to the past increasing the chances of committing the sins suggested by Stocking (1965). Young argued that for psychologist-historians to tell the history of Psychology successfully and avoid presentist insider, they needed to accept that ‘the standards of historical scholarship are no less rigorous than the standards of experimental science’ (p. 18). Yet, Pettit and Davidson (2014) raised some concerns about the historian in Psychology adopting the professional norms of the professional historian. Altering Danzinger’s (1994) original question ‘Does the history of psychology have a future?’ Pettit and Davidson proposed
‘Can the history of psychology have an impact?’ They particularly acknowledged Stocking’s (1965) list of ‘sins’, which those who practise history in their own field may commit, including anachronism, misinterpretation, context neglect and oversimplification. In doing so, Pettit and Davidson (2014) argued that instead of recording the history of Psychology, perhaps historical methods could be better used to answer psychological questions.

Throughout this thesis, I draw on a number of the ideas presented in the above history of the history of Psychology. How I use and apply these ideas to the Rorschach is elaborated on in the next section of this chapter, and of course in the next three chapters. However, to clarify now how such ideas are adopted by myself: I support social constructionist approaches to history (Danziger, 1994; Hacking, 1995; 2000) and agree that history as a method can do a great deal for Psychology (Gergen, 1973; Morawski, 1994). I believe that hidden and marginal histories are some of the most important ones to tell (Morawski, 1994) and wish to contribute to the rectification of the history of Psychology being one about ‘great men’ (Morawski & Agronick, 1991; Young, 1966). Borrowing from relativist historians and those who study the sociology of scientific knowledge, I do not consider history to be one of linear progress (Bloor, 1976; Kuhn, 1957). I also think it is essential to consider how Psychology is used by both psychologists (Foucault, 1975; Rose 1999) as a means of control and governance, and by the public (Hacking, 1995; Thomson, 2006). Based on some of the work of Latour (2005) and Galison (2004) I loosely use ANT to explain the doings of the Rorschach. This thesis is, therefore, very much a history of Psychology but one that has an interdisciplinary approach which borrows from Psychology, History, Sociology, Gender Studies and Comic Studies. In order to develop these explanations further, I now present evidence for the social construction of psychological tests and political motives behind Psychology historically.
2.2 The historically situated and constructed psychological test

‘...if you are not like everybody else, then you are abnormal, if you are abnormal, then you are sick. These three categories, not being like everybody else, not being normal and being sick are in fact very different but have been reduced to the same thing’

Michel Foucault in interview, 1975

The ways in which psychologists have deduced if people are ‘normal’ or not have changed dramatically throughout the last century. One tool that psychologists use to do this is the psychological test. Yet psychological tests themselves have also changed historically. Tests like the World Association Test (WAT) and the Rorschach, which were developed in Switzerland in first decades of the 20th century, are very different to the cognitive tests of today and self-report methods such as the Beck Depression Inventory. The changes in test preference and use illustrate the socio-historical shifts and cultural understandings of psychological tests throughout Psychology’s past. In this section, I argue that psychological tests, with particular focus on the Rorschach, are constructed and historically situated. I do this first by illustrating that testing is not objective and value free. The work of Galton and Burt not only presents the early history of psychological testing in Britain but also illustrates this point well. I then outline the patterns of projective testing in Britain and provide detail about how testing practises began to be criticised. It is here that I relate the constructed nature of tests to the work of Hacking (1995, 2000) and Rose (1999). Finally, to further evidence the subjectivity of testing I provide analysis around Lamont’s (2010; 2012) work on belief in relation to the Rorschach. In all, I argue that the test itself is powerful, and it is able to (in the right hands) enact great forms of violence, kindness, comfort or diagnosis onto individuals.

Tests are evidently constructed in the sense that they are developed and created by psychologists. They do not grow on trees nor can they be hunted down. Just like the

games that the Rorschach was based on, such as ‘Blotto’ and ‘Klexographie’, the test itself is made. However, unlike the games, they are also statistically analysed to ensure they have ‘construct validity’. As a side note, this validity which claims to ensure tests are studying the constructs that they claim to effectively was first considered by Cronbach and Meehl (1955) and was later used to criticise the Rorschach. Construct validity has been analysed by Cherryholmes (1988), who argues that it is discursive, persuasive and from a Foucauldian perspective, powerful. Therefore arguing tests have a socially constructed nature may appear obvious. However, to expand on this, tests are developed and, in turn, often also contribute to the construction of mental disorder. For example, intellectual disabilities are often defined by a person’s score on an IQ test. The test, therefore, constructs what it means to have an intellectual disability, despite the tests own constructed nature (Hacking, 2000). One reason tests are so convincing in this manner are the statistics used to demonstrate that they can validly do what they claim to do. By extension, tests also exercise their power. For this reason, I begin this section by discussing the work of Francis Galton, and provide a distinctly British history of the use of testing and the politics of Psychology at the beginning of the 20th century. Galton’s development of statistical approaches to intelligence illustrates how context can influence even the most concrete-looking constructs in Psychology. By providing a British history of IQ testing in the next section, I aim not only to provide a brief comparative history with that of the Rorschach and introduce some figures who are further discussed in Chapter 3, but also aim to illustrate how bias and politics are embedded in the history of even the most well-known and commonly used test.

Galton (1822-1911) is one of the central figures in the early history of psychological testing and psychometrics. He was influenced by the work of his cousin Charles Darwin and developed a similar evolutionary approach. Galton established what is now understood as the basis for statistical work in Psychology, including the idea of normal distribution. He a priori argued that traits and human characteristics were hereditary and promoted statistical and experimental approaches to investigate this. In his
book *Hereditary Genius* (1869) he argued that genius was inherited and that intelligence was structured according to race (white men being the most intelligent). Later, he coined the term ‘eugenics’ and believed marriages between more desirable people should be promoted to better society (see Richards, 2012). Blind to the irony, he stated in his book presenting visual data of hereditary characteristics that: ‘We must free our minds of a great deal of prejudice before we can rightly judge of the direction in which different races need to be improved’ (1883, p. 2). Galton’s work on eugenics is evidence for his sexist and racist views, and the eugenics movement provides us with a clear example of scientific elitism and racism in psychology’s history (see Richards, 2010; 2012).

Though Galton experienced significant support of his theories in his time, some major figures did critique his theories, some of which were also involved in the history of the Rorschach. Karl Pearson, the statistician whose work was later influential upon Cyril Burt, and Henry Maudsley, who funded the Maudsley hospital, the main site of Rorschach criticism in Britain, queried elements of Galton ideas. Maudsley drew upon the example of Shakespeare to indicate how genius can appear in families without such expected excellence, and drew upon his own medical experience as a doctor to suggest the variation in families. To this Galton replied that they both ‘really seemed to… be living forty years ago; they displayed so little knowledge of what has been done since’ (p. 24). Galton also dismissed the opinion of H.G. Wells, who also offered a response to his 1904 paper presented at the Sociological Society. Galton’s work on testing is just one example of testing being used to support highly problematic societal beliefs about the world.

Influenced by Galton, some psychologists were keen to develop psychometrics using statistical approaches. Hearnshaw (1964) identified Cyril Burt (1883-1971), Hans Eysenck (1916-1997) and Philip Vernon (1905-1987) as particularly central to the use of statistical methods in psychological testing. In his review of the development of British Psychology, Hearnshaw also argued that the widespread use and faith in psychometrics was especially characteristic of British Psychology, possibly due to the work of these
three men. Burt’s father had been the doctor for the Galton family and so Burt was influenced by Galton’s thinking and also had interests in hereditary mental measurement (Jensen, 1972). Burt’s work as a school psychologist gave him major influence upon policy and so he successfully spread his ideas that intelligence was hereditary. He argued that intelligent children, i.e. those from the upper classes, should be given special attention in schooling in order to maximise their achievements, whereas additional effort to those who were ‘dull’ was a waste of resources (Tucker, 1997). Burt published *Handbook of Tests* in 1923 and a number of studies which supported his ideas that intelligence was hereditary, including a number of twin studies with his two research assistants Margaret Howard and J. Conway (Tucker, 1997). Burt was also the PhD supervisor of Hans Eysenck, who developed a keen interest in statistical methods and psychological testing. Later, Eysenck greatly influenced the workings at the Maudsley hospital where such statistical approaches were used with vigour. Hearnshaw (1964) believed that the emphasis on psychometric types of tests had declined since the retirement of Cyril Burt in 1951, but was later resurrected and maintained by Eysenck and Vernon, who was employed by Eysenck in 1934. Vernon was also interested in using statistical methods to measure human abilities (Vernon, 1950). Eysenck was particularly preoccupied with statistical, experimental and psychometric forms of Psychology and developed his own test, the Eysenck Personality Inventory, in 1975.

However, after the death of Burt in 1971, some of his research was questioned and Burt was outed as a fraud. It was the work of Leon Kamin (1974) who first exposed Burt. Burt was accused of making up data, especially the twin research, and the existence of his
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13 The activities of women psychologists in this period and the sexist culture of Psychology in the first half of the 20th century is developed further in Chapter 4. However, it should be noted here how the description of Psychology by Hearnshaw (1964) here is a good example of one of the ‘great men’ histories discussed in section 2.1.

14 The specific context of early British Psychology was influenced by post-Darwinian ideas about gender, race and culture (Shields & Bhatia, 2009). It was also greatly influenced by spiritualism in the inter-war period and Burt was particularly interested in ‘psychical research’ even from his undergraduate days (Valentine, 2012).

15 Burt’s memories of visiting the Galton family with his father are mentioned in the very first paragraph of Galton’s obituary written by Burt in 1962.
research assistants could not be verified (Tucker, 1997). Hearnshaw, though a former supporter of Burt, concluded in his biography that Burt had indeed constructed correlations and data on twins to confirm his own theories about ‘innate’ hereditary intelligence. (Hearnshaw, 1979). Hearnshaw (1979) also suggested that the two research assistants were not the only aliases that Burt used in publications and in his work as an editor. Initially, Eysenck rejected the claims, attributing them to ‘left-wing environmentalists’ (meaning those who opposed hereditary theories of intelligence); however, after Hearnshaw’s (1979) biography was published, he recalled a number of examples where he had witnessed Burt acting unprofessionally as a scientist (Tucker, 1997). Eysenck himself was not afraid of controversy and also has a history of problematic and unethical scientific practises (Buchanan, 2010). The case of Burt in light of IQ testing, political consequences and racist science is explored in great detail by Gould (1996). Zenderland, (1997) similarly discussed the implications of Burt’s controversial career on the teaching of the history of Psychology.

This history of IQ testing and statistical approaches at the Maudsley is not just in contrast with that of the Rorschach, which is described in greater detail in Chapter 3, but also intersects in meaningful ways. Therefore psychological testing and statistical approaches, despite their objective appearance, are still influenced by contexts, political motive and the perspective of the researcher. The sometimes hegemonic use of tests in research and clinical work gives the impression that this use is unbiased. Such methods are trusted as they are viewed as empirical and scientific. However, as the above description of Galton and Burt’s work shows, science is not strictly without motive or influence. In fact, tests are not mere objects but embody ideals which can be powerful and dangerous. They may be inanimate but that is not to say that they cannot be used to ‘do’ things (Daston, 2004).

In fact, in doing things, tests can construct categories, including human kinds, such as groups of mental illnesses (Hacking, 1995, 2000). Hacking (2000) specifically uses the examples of the historically situated hysteria, anorexia, the ‘feeble-minded’ and
schizophrenia. The use of tests on symptoms or experiences can lead to the construction of them as permanent and ubiquitous ‘human kinds’, meaning the tests themselves are important contributors to such constructions. In this way, mental illnesses (and the concept of mental illness itself) become reified according to specific social and historical contexts in which they are meaningful. For example, the experience of hearing voices has been understood very differently both historically and culturally. For those following the guidelines of the DSM,\

16 hearing voices may be viewed as a symptom of schizophrenia, for others it may be a comforting experience during bereavement (Ritsher, Lucksted, Otilingam & Grajales, 2004). The voices themselves may also be perceived differently according to culture (Luhrmann, Padmavati, Tharoor & Osei, 2015). Thus, the same experience can be constructed in different ways and one of the ways is symptomatic of schizophrenia. That is not to say that because it is constructed the experience is any less meaningful, rather that it is one understanding of its meaning within a certain context.

Drawing on the work of Foucault (1975, 1961), the use of tests can be seen as an exercise of power, used in surveillance, control and the classification of people. Tests act as a method of further legitimising the dichotomy of the ‘mad’ and the ‘sane’. Psychology has grown in influence and is a force within Western society with significant power especially via diagnosis, in which testing has played a central role. Psychological knowledge has power and constructs just as it is itself constructed (see Lamont, 2010). A range of factors including historical events, institutional bodies, changing scientific standards of testing and societal beliefs have influenced how tests are used and why, and what kinds of tests are popular. Yet, despite these influences, tests are often viewed as unbiased measures of innate characteristics. This attitude, along with the unrecognised power of tests, has historically led to the application of tests in discriminatory ways to marginalised groups (see Hegarty, 2003a).

---

16 The Diagnostic Statistical Manual (DSM) is the text most referred to by psychologists (especially in North America) for the diagnostic classification of mental illness. It is now in its 5th edition, see Grob (1991) for its early history.
The altering contexts of the 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} centuries have shaped the discipline of Psychology, and the tests psychologists adopt. British people, including non-psychologists also began to see themselves framed within psychological language (Thomson, 2006). Of course, some tests are considered nowadays as relics from the past, which are only suited to the cabinets of museums. For example, the Rorschach plates were located in two separate displays at the Science Museum in 2014. Critical analysis, which remains symmetrical, is therefore required to interrogate the thinking about psychological tests.

2.2.1. Patterns of (projective) testing

The pattern of tests which are used, forgotten and displayed as historical objects is revealing of the contexts and perspectives by which we are currently influenced in Psychology. Perhaps surprising to some, projective tests used to be relatively popular in Britain. The \textit{Mental Measurements Yearbook} (Buros, 1959), an important text for test evaluation, was sectioned according to a projective-objective dichotomy. In fact, despite their differences, projective and objective tests were sometimes used in conjunction (see Buchanan, 1997). In this section, I describe the general pattern of psychological testing practises in Britain in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. This provides shape for the Rorschach specific history in Chapter 3.

From the 1930s onwards, projective tests were very popular. The WAT had been developed by Jung, as had the Rorschach by Hermann Rorschach in Switzerland. The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) was published by Morgan and Murray in 1935 in the US and some tests were being developed by British psychologists. For example, Herbert Phillipson developed the Object Relations Tests (1955) and Margaret Lowenfeld developed the Mosaic test and the World Technique (1954, see Urwin & Hood-Williams, 2013). Both tests were praised by my own oral history participants, and it was suggested they were especially good when used in conjunction with the Rorschach. One Rorschach
user I interviewed, however, maintained that the Rorschach was better in some ways because:

‘Rorschach goes to the bottom of things. And if the structure is not too healthy, even if clinically the person is doing much better. You, you see what’s underneath.’

The popularity of projective methods throughout this period corresponds with the additional adoption of psychoanalysis in British Psychology. The Tavistock clinic was a psychoanalytic and psychodynamic institution, and so the use of projective methods particularly appealed to the psychologists working there.

Overall, the use of projective methods declined from around the mid-20th century. In contrast, more ‘objective’ standardised tests (named according to the Mental Measurements Yearbook projective/objective dichotomy), such as cognitive and IQ tests increased in use (Buchanan, 1997). This switch of testing preference can be somewhat attributed to increasing concerns surrounding validity, reliability and the statistical nature of tests from the 1950s (e.g. Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). The development of the Diagnostic Statistical Manual from 1952 (DSM, Grob, 1991), and North American attempts in 1954 to standardise tests such as the Rorschach (APA, Technical Recommendations for Psychological Tests and Diagnostic Techniques) indicate the increased emphasis on validity and statistical approaches. Papers such as Meehl’s ‘Clinical verses statistical prediction’ (1954) are further evidence of this cultural shift in Psychology towards more ‘testable’ tests. Also, from the 1950s, there was an additional concern regarding the ethics of testing and the appropriateness of psychologists’ reliance on psychological tests (Hetherington, 1981). In Britain, the Maudsley approach, which was more experimental and where Eysenck and Vernon worked, became more dominant, though the Tavistock continued to support projective testing.
Despite some rejection of the use of projective tests in the 1960s in Britain, most clinical psychology training did include use of projective techniques as well as training methods that are now viewed as unethical. Below is an excerpt from an oral history of someone who did their undergraduate degree in Psychology in Britain then went on to be trained as a clinical psychologist in the late 1960s:

‘I do remember us going to ... hospital in Sunderland so thirty of us students sat in this room and a patient was bought in and quote ‘demonstrated’ to us. I mean, we weren’t even trainee psychologists, when I look back at it I mean it was a grossly humiliating and demeaning experience but that was standard. So when I started my clinical training course in 1966, I had no real understanding of the range of assessment methods that- so when I started I didn’t have doubt about it, I didn’t know anything about psychological assessments at all anyway… So as a trainee we would routinely give patients projective tests in particular, the Rorschach and the TAT, um, I hesitate to say whether they needed to be assessed but actually to give us clinical practise using that… So I can remember the first few times using the Rorschach and I have to say being somewhat sceptically about but it but then becoming fascinated by the fact that essentially you’re showing people these random series of, of meaningless ink blots and how then the ten narratives of the patients hung together. And you could see that certain themes were emerging from them.’

Testing was clearly viewed as important for clinical psychologists. All trainees on this particular course were expected to be knowledgeable of intelligence scales, cognitive abilities, attainment tests and personality tests. In all, there were 31 psychological tests they were required to learn. One of the exam questions that was posed to this oral history participant whilst training in the late 1960s was: ‘Describe briefly any diagnostic problem where one might use a projective technique and why.’ However, despite such standardisation of testing procedures in the descriptions of the roles of clinical psychologists, testing began to fall out of favour.
The rising social movements, including the anti-psychiatry movement, in the late 1960s and 1970s indicate major shifts in cultural understandings of testing and its relation to diagnosis (Richards, 2010). These movements, as discussed earlier, also corresponded with the crisis in (social) Psychology. Debates surrounding the use of IQ tests abounded, particularly around their usefulness and the ethical implications of testing practises (see Gould, 1996; Zenderland, 1997). Testing was also criticised for reliability issues, misapplications, privacy issues and for use in discriminatory research regarding race and culture (see Richards, 2012). These, of course, especially rebounded around Burt and his IQ test research after it was revealed by Kamin and confirmed by Hearnshaw that he was fraudulent. The reliance psychologists had on testing also had repercussions as to what the role of the psychologist was perceived to be. In 1964 Hearnshaw noted:

‘The psychological test, a standardized measure of human performance, has been an indispensable tool of applied psychology in all its main branches, educational, occupational and clinical, so much so that psychologists working in applied fields have sometimes erroneously been regarded simply as testers’ (1964 p. 249)

Hetherington (1981) later echoed this point, and said the use of tests in clinical psychology led to the belief that psychologists were mere assessors of people’s strengths and weaknesses. Porteous (1986) reflected that the previous over-reliance on testing gave the impression that Psychology was an underdeveloped profession. One oral history participant reported a similar sense that psychologists were mere testers in the late 1960s:

‘So behaviour therapy was really just still a twinkle in people’s eyes and so the core role of of the psychologists was very seen as an assessor and a researcher. And if you were going to be an assessor then you were seen to need to know something about projective tests, not least because a psychiatrist whose own training in psychology would have been lamentable, would have expected it. You know it was entirely on the cards that when you were on a ward rounds that a
psychiatrists would say ‘should we try a projective test?’ and so we, as a young psychologists said ‘oh yes yes let’s try that’.

In 1980, the Standing Committee on Test Standards was established by the British Psychological Society (BPS). This group instigated a survey of BPS members regarding their attitudes towards tests, how frequently they were used and which ones were utilised. According to Poortinga et al (1982), this was done in reaction to the anti-test attitudes from the 1950s and ‘societal discontent about psychological assessment’. An initial questionnaire was circulated with the BPS Bulletin in May 1980. 1425 psychologists returned the first questionnaire and 567 respondents returned the second questionnaire. Most respondents were clinical and educational psychologists. 60% of respondents said the purposes of test use was ‘selecting assessment’ or diagnosis for more than half the time, or for ‘selecting treatment goals’. Cognitive/intelligence tests were the most commonly used, followed by achievement/attainment tests (unsurprisingly most popular among educational psychologists). In third place were personality tests (which were more popular among clinical psychologists) and finally developmental tests. For personality, questionnaires were the most popular measure, with attitudes measures and personal construct measures following a close second. Projective tests came in third place.

The tests that were used most were the WAIS, WISC,\(^{17}\) and the Stanford-Binet. Clinical psychologists often used Cattell’s 16 ‘Personality Factor’ for personality but researchers tended to use Eysenck’s Personality Inventory. For those clinical psychologists who did use projective methods, the Bene-Anthony, the Rorschach and the TAT were the most commonly used. However, the Rorschach and the MMPI were criticised more often by respondents than they were supported. The BPS members also echoed some of the growing concerns around testing. For example, 84% had reservations about the norms for testing and others commented about doubtful reliability and validity.

The final Report was published by BPS Professional Affairs Board in 1986 (Tyler & Miller, 1986).

Despite an overwhelming sense that projective tests were becoming much less popular in favour of other more cognitive tests, some Rorschach users maintained their support. An oral history participant who used the Rorschach reported:

‘Well I’m of course a defender of the Rorschach but having also worked with the MMPI and the WAIS and things like that… they all function on cortex level, conscious, the Rorschach does not function on that level, so it tells you many things that you don’t even find out when you do a psychoanalytic interview. Because it depends on what the person wants to tell you. Consciously or unconsciously’

However, the use of projective tests were undoubtedly decreasing. Another oral history participant explained how, in 1980 when they became a Head Clinical Psychologist, they also became responsible for:

‘…a number of shelves full of beautiful psychological tests, all made out of hard wood lithography and one thing or another. But I also became the guardian of the set of Rorschach cards for the adult mental health department. I remained in that post for 22 years, I remained guardian of the Rorschach cards and I don’t think that in those 22 years I was ever asked by anyone to use the Rorschach cards.’

This scene in Britain is in contrast to several other countries. For example, the Rorschach is still taught to every clinical psychologist in France and the spread of psychoanalysis has continued. The removal of projective tests from the training of clinical psychologists in the 1970s and 1980s was therefore distinctly strict in Britain.

From the 1990s there was a greater emphasis in assessing the test users as well as the tests themselves. Bartram (1996) identified that:
‘Underlying the problem of test abuse and misuse [there] are two issues: inadequate tests and incompetent tests users’ (1996, p. 62)

He also argued that the BPS had concerns regarding the problems of testing especially within industry and commerce. Focusing mainly on occupational Psychology, Bertram describes the implementation by the BPS of a certification procedure. This was done to ensure testing was up to standard and to protect people from the misuse of tests. This was especially important, Bertram argued, because:

‘Psychometric testing has probably had more impact on society than any other single development in Psychology.’ (1996, p. 70)

Moving now from the history of testing in Britain, which in the metaphor introduced at the beginning of the chapter, was represented by the obvious blots, I now move towards the more smudged and smeary aspects of the history. That is the constructed quality, affect and power of tests. Rose (1999) considered the precise British military context in which many psychological tests arose. Drawing heavily on the work of Foucault he described the developments of institutions and the documentation of information for classifications, which Hacking (2000) later echoed in several of the points he raised: that is, the creation of human kinds beginning with the measurement and scaling of something (or someone) upon which ‘normal’ is ascribed to some components and non-normal is applied to others. By counting, generalising and potentially pathologising, a human kind is created. Rose (1999) argued that such documentation and classification led to the transformation of ‘the human soul into material form – pictures, charts, diagrams, measurements’ (p134). In particular, he used the example of eugenics to explore the consequences and context of such thinking in the early 20th century by those such as Galton and Terman (Galton, 1904; Terman, 1916; see Gould, 1996). In the examination of IQ tests, Rose (1999) explains how the use of psychological tests turns people into a ‘cumulative record’ that is governable. What becomes specially judged,
controlled and accountable is not what a person does but rather what a person is: In other words, the human kinds that people embody.

As discussed above, psychological tests are constructed, but they also construct people in meaningful ways. Such constructions mirror social and hierarchal powers at play. Those who are constructed into human kinds are more often than not the marginalised, the non-normal, the effect to be explained (Hegarty & Pratto, 2001). They are the ‘other’. Adopting Foucauldian thinking, they are controlled, observed and powerless (Foucault, 1977, see Downing, 2008). Psychological testing is therefore intrinsically linked to power. The psychologist embodies power and the test is wielded by the powerful in order to enact upon the powerless. The test itself, through the idea that it is objective, scientific and unbiased, also avoids critique of its subjectivity and so gains further power. The social–historical contexts and the subjective nature of its origins are all but forgotten.

Zenderland (1997) warned against polarisation in the history of Psychology, especially in regards to the IQ testing debates. She argued historians must find ‘middle ground that retains the moral intensity of this debate without reducing the characters involved to be one-dimensional villains and caricatures’ (p. 138), which mirrors the literature previously reviewed regarding ‘symmetry’. Applying such thinking to the history of the Rorschach, it is invaluable to retain contextualised understandings of individuals and the beliefs people hold about the Rorschach. The Rorschach has been used for both good and evil. It was used to pathologise and diagnose men as gay in the Second World War in the US. It has also been used to defend gay men and lesbians in reaction to homosexuality being considered a mental illness. I disagree with Zenderland (1997) to some extent, in that as historians it is sometimes important to make moral judgements, and not stay in ‘the middle ground’. It is incredibly important to identify the scientific practises of racism (e.g. Gould, 1996); sexism (Bohan, 1990; Morawski &

---

18 The Rorschach in relation to the study of homosexuality and its use on (and by) lesbians and gay men is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.
Agronick, 1991; Furumoto, & Scarborough, 1986; Sheilids, 2007) and homophobia (e.g. Hegarty, 2003a; King & Bartlett, 1999) in Psychology. By doing so, the forms of social power are made evident meaning a queer feminist approach is very appropriate for a history of testing. It is through such recognition that psychologists in the present are held more accountable for their actions. In addition, by conducting analysis on the ‘goodies’ and ‘baddies’ of history, with the motivation of doing anti-racist, anti-sexist and anti-homophobic work, it is sometimes possible to complicate who the ‘goodies’ and ‘baddies’ were. I do this in Chapter 4 regarding the work of June Hopkins who was thought to be homophobic when her research was first received in the US (Morin, 1977). It may, therefore, be perceived by some to be too strong a position to argue that the Rorschach has been used for good and evil. However, I think to stand in this ‘middle ground’ leads to a lack of recognition of the lives of those who were treated terribly by those wielding the Rorschach. The Rorschach, like all psychological tests, is not a mere passive object.

In the next three chapters, I explore in depth what the Rorschach has done and what meaningful ways it has been active in different contexts over the 20th century. To begin to understand what the Rorschach does, it is worth considering what the test is like. First, the Rorschach has a rather naturally engaging quality to it, certainly that is in the context of the 20th century. People are interested in seeing what they can see in ambiguous images, and importantly what that might mean about them. This natural engagement can be seen in the common game to see what you can see in clouds and indeed this idea has been expanded out to actual games using Rorschach-like blots (e.g. the Redstone Inkblot Test by Psychogames). Interestingly the origins of the Rorschach begin in such games (Erdberg, 1990; Lemov, 2011; Tulohin, 1940) and ambiguous stimuli are said to have influenced artists from centuries ago as well as those in the 20th and 21st centuries, such as Andy Warhol. The appealing affect of the Rorschach has more to tell us about the ways in which it has been constructed and goes some way to

---

19 This point is developed in Chapter 3 regarding the origins of the Rorschach ink blot test in popular culture and this is expanded much further in Chapter 5 with the consideration of the Rorschach in Watchmen.
explain how and why the public have adopted it to the extent it has via advertising. One oral history participant described this natural engagement with the Rorschach thus:

‘I mean, I think there’s something about fantasy, I think there’s something about um, what’s the right word, not exotic, arcane, mystical ways of accessing our unconscious thinking which in popular thought have always been very attractive.’

Perhaps for these reasons, the power that the Rorschach has apparently to reveal our inner selves, explains why the test came into being during the popularity of psychoanalysis. Thomson (2006) relates cultural context and the increase of the public’s use of Psychology to understand their own individual psychology. He argued that the popularisation of Freud and Psychology generally was, in part, due to the interests in spiritualism, the occult and psychical research in the early 20th century. The interest in spiritualism, the unconscious and personal analysis therefore created a fertile ground from which the Rorschach could grow.

‘And Freud was very anxious that his views should be propagated there’s no doubt there was a propaganda exercise by the analysts and the Tavistock, as you know was not a pure psychoanalytic venture, it was actually more nuanced than that um, and for writers at the time, again it’s an exercise of getting back into intellectual thought in the 1920s and 1930s post the First World War and I think these idea, these interests in phrenology, spiritualism, the idea of the mystical, the subconscious the unconscious, to many this idea was still quite new. So I think the interesting, the Rorschach was received from that, as a part of that package, a part of that mystique.’ (oral history participant)

The mysteriousness of the Rorschach lends itself to provoking respondents to elaborate on responses and project onto the ambiguous ink blots. One oral history participant recalled first being tested with the Rorschach:
‘So when I was about 17 … I met I think it was a French girl who was studying Psychology and the Rorschach and she administered the test to me. Poor she because I gave her around 300 responses! Which is completely crazy but I was fascinated in seeing so many things in the plates and that’s probably why a few years later I started to learn the test’  

The Rorschach therefore does enact upon people its mysterious and mystic impression, and thus creates a sense of trust and/or distrust depending on perspective. Galison (2004) described how the Rorschach is both constructed but also constructs:

‘In the world of Rorschach’s inkblots, subjects make objects, of course “I see a woman,” “I see a wolf’s head.” But objects also make subjects: “depressive,” “schizophrenic”.’ (Galison, 2004, p. 258-259)

The Rorschach does something because we are either asked to, or instinctively do, engage with it.

The second way which evidences the Rorschach’s peculiar nature is its inclusion into popular culture. This is developed further in chapter 5, but here I would like to point out the spread of the Rorschach into popular culture again provides evidence of its engaging nature. No other test has been included into popular culture in the same way as the Rorschach. As far as I am aware, there are no Levi’s jeans adverts with the MMPI, nor does the Eysenck Personality Inventory appear in an Audi car advert – both of which do feature Rorschach imagery. Whilst some superheroes do include important components of the history of Psychology, for example, Wonder Woman (Lepore, 2014), none embody a psychological test like ‘Rorschach’ in Watchmen (Moore & Gibbons, 1987). Such inclusion into popular culture becomes rather political considering the support and criticisms of the Rorschach. The inclusion of Psychology into popular culture

---

20 Later, upon being tested for the second time the oral history participant gave 70 responses, a significant reduction but still a number considered to be very high.
(in, then back to, Psychology again) was named ‘looping effects’ by Hacking (1995).

Though exceptionally significant in the history of Psychology, very little attention has been paid to the processes of looping effects (Teo, 2012). The conceptualisation of the self through psychological theories was explored by Thomson (2006), but the ways in which psychology becomes integrated into popular culture, and included in Museums as objects of curiosity, has been underexplored.

One oral history participant who uses the Rorschach said that, although they were not worried about the original plates being shown on objects such as the coasters and the napkins they showed me, they did still express their own criticisms of such imagery being available:

‘[I] think it’s very nasty and I think, it’s a bit paranoid but I wouldn’t be surprised if that kind of thing was done on purpose by the people who don’t like the Rorschach.’

The bleeding of the Rorschach from popular culture, to Psychology and back out again, is therefore a contentious issue and illustrates the power the Rorschach has.

In manipulating what the Rorschach does a number of factors need to be accounted for. As described above, context is important, as are the individuals involved. The human kinds and the psychologists, whether they be proponents or criticisers, all have key roles to play in the history of the Rorschach and have shaped what that history looks like. In many ways, here I draw upon ANT to explain these manoeuvres and manipulations in the history of the Rorschach (Law & Hassard, 1999). ANT allows almost everything to be active in one way or another, and passivity is almost non-existent in such examples. As to be shown in Chapters 3 and 4 especially, many ‘actors’ have come to influence the history of the Rorschach, and these actors differ dramatically in different national contexts. Although such a comprehensive analysis of all actors involved is nearly impossible, I attempt to consider a wide range in my history of the test.
The thesis overall aims to provide a compelling account of the Rorschach to match its compelling nature. I argue the Rorschach is a naturally compelling, powerful and active test that, like all psychological tests, has the ability to construct human kinds. In order to provide an example of how psychologists have used tests and how that testing has been perceived, as well as the power that such practises have, I present the anecdotes included in the book chapter upon which this thesis chapter is based. The second author, Dougal Hare, provided the following anecdote:

‘I was asked a few years ago by a senior registrar in psychiatry whether he, the registrar, could see “it being done”. When questioned further, the registrar replied somewhat tetchily that he wanted to see what clinical psychologists did, which seemed an odd request as all parties had been part of an autism assessment clinic that very morning. The exasperated registrar finally demanded to see an IQ test as that was what psychologists do (for psychiatrists to interpret).’

This inter-professional ‘misunderstanding’ seems to encapsulate the relationship of clinical psychologists to what is essentially obsolete technology. The conceptualisation therefore, that clinical psychologists continue to be mere testers, remains in some areas. However, it is not only important to recognise how psychologists are viewed by other professionals, but also how the relationship between psychologists and tests are perceived by those individuals undergoing therapy and intervention. In slight contrast to the first anecdote, I as the first author supplied this example:

‘During my time working at a Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service I distinctly remember a young adolescent boy look with terror at the clinical psychologist approaching him down a corridor with the large briefcase of IQ tests. The young boy simply ran and absconded from the building.’

The perceptions of psychologists utilising tests have resonances for both professionals and for those who are undergoing (or are threatened with) tests. Whether from the
perspective of the registrar in the first anecdote, or the adolescent in the second, psychological tests continue to be perceived as powerful, either as the main ‘tool’ of psychologists, or as a terrifying thing from which to run. This is also historically true in that tests are powerful, they are used to ‘do’ things and are not necessarily the passive objects they appear to be in psychologist’s cabinets, or in the case of the Rorschach, in museum displays. It is therefore important that those who continue to wield the test, namely clinical psychologists, recognise both the inherent power and the constructed nature of such tests in order to avoid further misuses of testing.21

2.2.2 Belief in the Rorschach

The use of the Rorschach is fraught with consequences and controversy. Seemingly polar opposite views of proponents and critiques about the Rorschach have led to legal debates (Grove & Barden, 1999; Wood et al, 2003); major concern over the public distribution of the original plates (Schultz & Loving, 2012); and an awareness of such disagreement within the public (Teo, 2012). What is at the centre of these debates is belief. The group of Rorschach workers in Britain clearly held beliefs in and about the Rorschach. They believed the test worked and that it did reliably reveal the personality of the subject. They believed that it could be applied to case-studies as well as group methods and to a range of research topics. In short, they believed it was valid, scientific and an essential tool in the psychologist’s tool box. However their strongly held beliefs in the Rorschach were countered by equally strong beliefs opposing the Rorschach. Such opinions were not the mere absence of belief but rather full arguments against the Rorschach. In short, criticisers argued that the Rorschach was not a valid measurement of personality.

Whilst there were early signs of Rorschach criticism, for example Aubrey Lewis described the Rorschach as ‘limited or doubtful’ in 1934, the critique reached a head in

21 See Hubbard & Hare (2015) for the book chapter in its entirety.
the 1970s. Beliefs that the Rorschach was not a valid psychological test first gained strength in the 1950s from the APA Technical Recommendations for Psychological Tests and Diagnostic Techniques, which attempted to standardise the Rorschach in the US. Such ideas about reliability and validity were rife at this point, and it was in 1954 that Meehl published Clinical verses statistical prediction (Meehl, 1954). In Britain, Phillip Vernon also wrote that the Rorschach was quantitatively unreliable and invalid because the scoring was subjective and the interpretation was uncertain. He argued these problems had been ‘amply demonstrated’ but recognised the tests’ usefulness qualitatively (Hearnshaw, 1964). Such critique from Vernon may have been a significant blow to the proponents of the Rorschach. Vernon had originally been quite a Rorschach supporter. Eysenck became a well-known critic of the Rorschach and, in 1959, wrote a scathing review in Buro’s influential Mental Measurements Yearbook. Eysenck argued that the Rorschach was not scientific, and it is essentially on this basis that the two types of beliefs about the Rorschach differ. Proponents believe it does fulfil scientific requirements, and critics do not.

Using the framework outlined by Lamont (2012; 2013) about paranormal or extraordinary beliefs, it is possible to view the disagreement in a different way. In using this comparison of the Rorschach to extraordinary beliefs I am not intending to liken beliefs in the paranormal with belief in the Rorschach. This is a risky manoeuvre on my part and may suggest an inclination towards my being a sceptic or proponent of the Rorschach. Instead, I would like to reiterate that I am concerned with beliefs about the Rorschach and not about whether the Rorschach actually works. I intend to highlight the similarities of beliefs about the Rorschach (both proponents and critics) with those of extraordinary beliefs (again both proponents and critics). There are interesting parallels between the two that I believe reveal a new angle of thinking about the Rorschach.

Firstly, much like paranormal beliefs, there is an element of the Rorschach that is viewed as extraordinary. When first introduced, the Rorschach was described as an ‘X-Ray of the mind’ (Lemov, 2011). It was likened to the dream analysis as a ‘royal road to
the unconscious’ (Hegarty, 2003a). Key figures were described in mythical ways, for example, Rorschach himself as a ‘fortune-teller’ (Barkas, 1925) and Klopfer was described as a ‘fable’ with ‘uncanny wizardry’ (Hooker, 1960). Dos Santos (2013) in their argument that the Rorschach has great value as a research tool questioned initially whether the test was ‘A meaningful psychometric tool or a deceptive Ouija board?’ Amazing examples were often referenced of times when the Rorschach test had been most impressive or curious incidents had occurred (Hooker, 1960; Kaldegg, 1969). In his critique of the test in 1959, Eysenck considered such occurrences:

‘One of the abuses of the test originates in the use of cues from nontest sources to produce some of the ‘amazing’ diagnoses which have been excitedly reported’ (in Buros, 1959, p.154)

Interestingly, blind analysis was often used to illustrate the test’s validity, or invalidity, as in the case of Wood’s responses described at the beginning of the chapter (Wood et al, 2003). Such analysis was evident from the beginning as Hermann Rorschach gave his results of doing this in Psychodiagnostik (1921). Such results often emphasised the mysteriousness of the Rorschach. Further comparisons can be made here with extraordinary beliefs. Often a person was required to demonstrate their paranormal abilities whilst blindfolded (see Lamont, 2010). Also much like extraordinary beliefs, the emphasis in research is on explaining the belief rather than the disbelief in the phenomena (Lamont, 2012). That is not my intention in this history, rather I explain both belief and critique of the test and contextualise both whilst retaining a symmetrical approach.

Secondly, whilst emphasis on clinical expertise and statistical methods were emphasised to different extents by both supporters and critics of the Rorschach, much of the evidence used is strikingly similar. Lamont (2012; 2013) argues that evidence presented by both believers and sceptics is usually the same. Similarly, much of the evidence drawn upon by both believers and sceptics about the Rorschach is identical. For example, the literature that Eysenck used to base his heavy critique of the Rorschach in
Buros’s 1959 Yearbook is the same literature that the British Rorschach Forum would be using to base their own research. Both proponents and critics of the Rorschach also used the same scientifically ‘approved’ methods in order to argue their side of the argument. To give another example, Exner (1969, 2003) agreed with critics that the Rorschach was made less valid by the range of different Rorschach schools that had been developed in the US. To counter this, he compared all of them and systematically developed *The Comprehensive System* thus creating a single Rorschach method. The method was praised in the US and in Britain and he was described as a ‘second Rorschach mentor’ after Bruno Klopfer (oral history participant). Exner (1969) attempted to bridge Rorschach proponents and criticisers by directly accepting the shortcomings of the Rorschach and creating a new scoring system. Yet, whilst this was praised by Rorschach users, most Rorschach critics remained unconvinced (see Wood et al, 2003). Distance between proponents and critics also remained. A Rorschach user I interviewed maintained a level of distance between themselves and critiques:

‘I don’t know about England but the fact that people who don’t like the Rorschach, are criticisers of it, or don’t use, or say it’s no good so on and so forth belong to a level, an educational level and a scientific level that are not close to me.’

Issues remained and some proponents maintained that the Rorschach went beyond other kinds of psychological test. The same oral history participant also said:

‘You have to have both things to be able to understand another person. Not only statistics and numbers.’

Despite some viewing the Comprehensive System as evidence of the Rorschach’s inherent scientific nature, others believed the methods used by Exner were themselves still not reliable and thus still rejected the Rorschach as a scientific test.
In relation to the thinking of Foucault (1975) and Rose (1999), different discourses about the Rorschach represent two ‘regimes of truth’, the clinical depth of psychological intervention versus statistical objectivity. Turner (2011) described these different discourses about the Rorschach as ‘empiricist’ and ‘romantic’. Both proponents and critics of the test use ‘facts’ but what we can really see happening is the ‘manifestations of beliefs’ (Lamont, 2012). It is essentially the rejection of explanation. In the face of the same evidence, supporters accept that the Rorschach is working, but critics would argue it is not and there is an alternative explanation to the evidence; like in a séance, a knocking sound to a believer may be a sign of the paranormal, but to a non-believer it could be evidence of foul play. Lamont (2012) argues history shows that beliefs (both for and against) are constructed and maintained in similar ways and they are compatible with agreed upon facts even when both sides have agreed upon such facts. There is evidence here of both sides agreeing on what can constitute as a fact. Disciplinary constraints of Psychology, and the criteria the discipline has outlined, mean that both sides use of evidence can be viewed as acceptable, it just depends on perspective. Lamont’s approach is reflective of that of Bloor’s (1976; 1991) thinking about symmetry; the same facts can always be framed in ways to support either side of the argument.

Finally, similar to the disciplines criteria for good research, both proponents and criticisers appeal to scientific expertise. Lamont (2012) argues that someone swapping from being an advocate to a critic, or vice-versa, draws more attention to the idea of narrow-mindedness, thus illustrating further that it is a matter of belief, not fact. Experts on both sides meant that the Rorschach was made quite high profile. Eysenck has been viewed as possibly the most prolific psychologist to come out of Britain (Buchanan, 2010) and people like Boris Semeonoff have been celebrated for their vast contributions to Psychology (MacKay, 1999). As with extraordinary beliefs, some experts have confused matters even more by being converted to either supporter or critic. Lamont (2007a) also discussed discourses used by both proponents and sceptics that claimed
previous belief or disbelief only to be persuaded otherwise. These ‘avowals of prior scepticism’ or ‘I used to believe but now I don’t’ discourses work to remove ideas that the individual is either narrow-minded or gullible and so legitimise their present belief. Vernon for example, though never fundamentally coming down on one side of the qualitative/quantitative debate about personality, began as a keen writer on the Rorschach (see Hearnshaw, 1964). Though being very evaluative he was generally supportive of the test’s potential, but later argued that it was problematic. Experts therefore provide further evidence for both sides by having academic credibility, but can also draw more attention to the argument being about belief rather than being strictly factual. The Rorschach can therefore be compared to extraordinary beliefs as it is treated by some supporters as rather mysterious and criticised for this by others who argue it must be explained. By standing back from belief and studying it within the history of the Rorschach, not only is it possible to symmetrically consider both the thinking of proponents and critics, but it is also possible to further consider the affect the Rorschach has on both.

I argue that the similarities between beliefs about the Rorschach and extraordinary beliefs add to the explanation as to why the test is so compelling. Extraordinary beliefs require some awareness of what is scientifically deemed extraordinary. Academia is usually the place where such distinctions are made. However, as shown in the opposing beliefs about the Rorschach in Psychology, academia as a whole has failed to provide a final answer on the Rorschach. Academia informs society of what can be viewed as legitimate or illegitimate knowledge, and the Rorschach continues to sit in a position where some argue it is one and some the other, and of course these positions have altered historically. Using Richards’ (2002) distinction, Psychology has failed to confirm if the Rorschach is a legitimate or illegitimate test of psychology. The lack of ambivalence about the Rorschach and the beliefs surrounding it which liken it to extraordinary beliefs mean it has become fascinating, intriguing and exciting. Because of this, I argue it has developed a compelling status within popular culture.
2.3 The gaps in the history of the Rorschach

A small literature within the history of Psychology has been specifically around psychological tests. Yet significant gaps remain, and these ‘gaps’, or white spaces as I described them initially in the introduction of this chapter, are similar to the ‘gutter’ I described in Chapter 1. These areas are often difficult to ‘see’ because they are invisible, ignored or marginalised, despite being informative and active. In this section, I highlight where the gaps are and how, using the literature described above, I rectify the lack of literature about these gaps in this thesis.

There has been some attention paid to the use of projective tests in particular in the history of Psychology. Miller (2015) provided an extensive history of the TAT, which explained the test’s theoretical links to psychoanalysis, how the lives of Murray and Morgan influenced the production of the test, and considered the narrative of the TAT today. Agreeing with Galison (2004), Miller argues how, like the Rorschach, the TAT reveals a 19th century understanding of self, which involves both an inner and outer life that are revealed through the testing procedure. Derksen (2001b) conducted an analysis of four psychological test manuals, one of which was the TAT. The test manuals themselves were especially important after the APA attempted to standardise psychological tests in 1954: the first recommendation was that each test should have a manual. When describing the testing procedure of the TAT, Derksen was especially critical of the deception used to lure testees into thinking the test was a test of imagination and not personality. Murray was especially keen that those being tested were unaware of the true intentions of the test (Pettit, 2013). 22 23 In the conclusion Derksen, again like Galison, argued that the test is more than a machine operated by a psychologist. Although not a projective test, the
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22 See Pettit, (2013) for a greater discussion on the use of deception in the history of psychology.
23 The history of deception in psychology, for example, the creation of lie-detectors has a particularly interesting history drawing in some significant figures. Starke Hathaway the creator of the MMPI was also behind the lie-detector still used in legal contexts in the US (Schilling & Casper, 2015). However, he was not the first to develop such a test. William Moulton Marston created one in the 1930s having worked with Hugo Münsterberg at Harvard University and developed an interest in deception. His test failed to be popularised (unlike Hathaway’s later invention) and instead he moved towards a totally different kind of work – he wrote comics. Specifically he was the writer of Wonder Woman (see Lepore, 2014).
MMPI has also been given some attention by historians of Psychology. Buchanan (1997) gives a particularly interesting comparative history of the MMPI compared to the Rorschach. Schilling and Casper (2015) also consider the MMPI and argue that ‘psychometrics were technologies of power’ (p.79).

Of those who have considered the history of the Rorschach specifically, there has been more attention paid to projective test use in the US. Historians of psychology have also been more focused on the ‘othered’ groups who were tested with the Rorschach. In the aftermath of the Second World War there was a great interest in the psychology of Nazis and given the Rorschach was the most popular test in the US at the time (Sundberg 1961), the Rorschach was regularly used to access those being trialled at Nuremburg. Brunner (2001) records this history of psychologists attempting to assess if the Nazis were mad or bad, and quotes Hermann Göring stating in 1946:

‘Oh those crazy cards again… you know one of the old gents said you showed him a lot of vulgar pictures’ (emphasis original, Brunner, 2001, p. 233).

Dimsdale (2015) also accounts for the use of the Rorschach with Nazis. Though he described the Rorschach as being a ‘musty… relic’ he nonetheless describes the responses of those being trialled and considered the Rorschach testing as ‘an enormous and unusual effort in the history of medicine. Never before have we studied so closely leaders who had steered a country into such an abyss’ (p. 4). The Rorschach’s actual presence in museums such as the Science Museum confirms in some ways the perception of the Rorschach as a relic. Yet the juxtaposition remains that the Rorschach is in psychological medicine, museums, and also in popular culture. The history of the Rorschach contains a sort of sense of wonder, whether that be of what the test is capable of, or that it was used at all.

The sense that projective tests act as unexplainable ‘X-Rays’ of the mind was explored in greater detail by Lemov (2011). Lemov (2011) studied the use of projective
tests as tools used by anthropologists with ‘other’ cultural groups in the period of post-colonialization. Ruth Benedict, who worked with Margaret Mead, specifically used the Rorschach to test Japanese-Americans to gain an understanding of Japanese culture during the Second World War. In fact, the Second World War was an especially prolific time for the Rorschach in the US. Following on from Bérubé, (1990) Hegarty (2003a) uncovered the history of Rorschach use in the US military during the Second World War in attempts to diagnose and detect homosexuality. The Rorschach was not only used to remove homosexuals from the military (and prevent their entering) but was also used to detect men who may have been malingering as gay. Historians of Psychology have therefore paid particular attention to the US uses of the Rorschach and ‘othered’ groups who have been categorised, pathologised and studied using the Rorschach as a tool.

In spite of such attention, however there are several areas that have not been covered in the Rorschach’s history. First and foremost, the attention paid to the US mirrors overall predominance of North American history in the history of Psychology generally. This imbalance requires adjusting. The Rorschach was also used in Britain, yet there has been no attention whatsoever paid to the projective test movement in Britain. This is possibly because of the smaller size of the projective scene in Britain as well as the American-centric histories told about the history of Psychology. Second, there is a surprising lack of women involved in these histories, despite the presence of women in testing practises in Britain and the US (Bohan, 1990). Third, there is a considerable lack of attention being paid to how the public have responded to the Rorschach despite it being such a prolific piece of psychology in popular culture. These ignored ‘white spaces’ of history, or ‘gutters’, require attention in order to provide a more comprehensive international history of the Rorschach. The attention paid so far to marginalised, ‘othered’ groups by the literature so far is impressive and this effort should be celebrated. That is
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24 Mead later met Margaret Lowenfeld in the 1940s and was very keen to use her projective methods her anthropological cross-cultural research (Mead, 1974).
not to say however, that no more effort should be made, the continuation of considering the ‘liminal’ in psychology is highly necessary (Morawski, 1994).

2.4 Rationale and conclusion

With the previous sections in mind below I present my own perspective and approach in studying the history of Psychology. To begin, there is a clear need for scholarly attention to be paid to the history of the Rorschach in Britain. However, I do not intend to produce a history that mirrors the ‘classic’ histories of Psychology. I aim to produce a more interdisciplinary study, borrowing from disciplines such as History, Psychology, Sociology, Gender Studies and Comic Studies in order to explore the ‘gutter’ history of the Rorschach. I aim to counter the androcentric and heteronormative histories that have been so common in the history of Psychology.

As evidenced in the descriptions of approaches to history above, I support sociocultural constructionist approaches such as those proposed by Danzinger (1994) and Hacking (1995) and firmly believe that all history must be understood within context. That, however, is not to say constructions are not meaningful, constructions can be highly significant. Constructions are meaningful, powerful and enforced by powerful objects such as psychological tests. This thesis is in effect a history of what the Rorschach has done as a powerful object in Britain (in both Psychology and popular culture) in the 20th century. In providing a highly contextualized account of the Rorschach I navigate some of the issues of presentism, and throughout have considered my position as a psychologist-historian as opposed to a strict historian.

One way in which historical methods have contributed to Psychology has been through feminist efforts to re-place women in the history (Morawski, 2005). The relationship between Psychology and feminism has been complex throughout the 20th century and as Rutherford, Vaughn-Blount and Ball (2010) state, are bound with the
concepts of gender, gendered roles and gender relations. Despite ideas that feminist approaches opposed empirical Psychology, Morawski and other feminist thinkers, namely Harding (1986; 1987), argued feminist methods and reflexivity are necessary in scientific endeavours. Such feminist thinking has been instrumental to moves towards more bottom-up approaches in scientific methodology (Harding, 2008). Indeed, efforts to include the voices of those being studied has also been evidenced in Psychology more broadly (e.g. Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 1996). Attempts to gain the voices ‘from below’ go some way to dismantle the power relations involved in scientific research. Oral histories are a particularly useful method by which to gain such voices (Portelli 1997; Thompson, 2000). The use of oral history can also be especially helpful when telling more marginalised history, including women’s experiences and feminist approaches (Gluck & Patai, 1991).

Such a feminist approach is not only adopted because of the importance to ‘re-place’ women in the history of Psychology. Feminist Psychology has also shown the reflexive nature of Psychology in relation to feminism (Rutherford, et al, 2010). It has also assisted in the removal of heteronormative approaches in Psychology. These are some reasons why I take a queer feminist approach, but also simply because I come from a queer women’s perspective. As discussed in Chapter 1, no historian is able to fully detach from their own interests, lives and perspectives to provide an objective or unbiased history. Archives and materials are both written and read through the lens of people’s own lives, people who have intentions, aims, and beliefs; to fail to openly recognise that is hugely problematic. Koaureas (2014) argues that when using queer theory to do history, one should ‘read between the straight lines’ of the archive, and this is precisely what I do.

The Rorschach is an excellent object upon which to base my queer, feminist, interdisciplinary history. It has been ‘looped’ into popular culture more than most components of psychology, divides the beliefs of psychologists, has hidden and unexplored histories, and has a compelling and engaging nature. The Rorschach is undoubtedly an object of curiosity. One of my oral history participants reported:
'But I mean, one thing I remember of a number of these tests, was that as objects some of them were just beautifully made, they were objects of curiosity in themselves.'

The Rorschach is enticing and goes beyond what many psychometric tests represent. It is visual, playful and somehow becomes very personal. Another oral history participant reported that the reasons she has worked with the Rorschach for decades is because ‘por amor al arte’ or ‘for the love of the art’:

‘That’s something I, its, its I think it’s a personal expression but it was to explain to (name removed) who once asked me how come I, I could write so much and investigate so much, who paid for it. It was a typical questions of admission, because you don’t publish, if you don’t investigate you lose your appointment. And I said nobody pays for what I do! I do it because it I love the Rorschach.’

‘In other words I think that the Rorschach is just interesting! It’s an interesting combination of signs and art.’

Unlike other psychological tests, the Rorschach has been viewed as art, used in advertising, presented in museums and in each of these locations at different times the test does something different. It is likely that it is exactly because of the actions of the test, and its compelling quantities, which make it so appealing to advertisers and others in creating popular culture. In fact, the Rorschach can be distinctly personal, the same oral history participant commented that:

‘The Rorschach is my best friend….And a faithful friend and one who doesn’t fail.’

The actions of the Rorschach in different settings make it essential to understand the context in which different practises are embedded at any given time; that includes the contexts in which they were developed, and the contexts they are used in at present. It is
therefore important to also retain an understanding of one’s present socio-historical context as well as that of the past to understand the Rorschach’s history.

Tests continue to be powerful and, as indicated in the anecdotes in this paper, tests can be perceived as either the main ‘tool’ of psychologists, or as a terrifying thing from which to run. This is also historically true and tests are not necessarily the passive objects they appear to be in psychologist’s cabinets and museum displays. It is therefore important that those who continue to wield the test, namely clinical psychologists, recognise both the inherent power and the constructed nature of such in order to avoid further misuses of testing.

This thesis fills a significant gap in the literature about the Rorschach. It is the first externalist history of the Rorschach in Britain. It aims to provide this history with particular emphasis on voices from below and provide a queer and feminist perspective. It is also the first of its kind to seriously consider how the public have adopted the Rorschach test.
CHAPTER 3: Blots and all: Britain and the Rorschach

Mrs Fox travelled for some hours on the train to meet psychologist Theodora Alcock and arrived at the Tavistock Institute in London looking tired, thin and tense. Mrs Fox then completed a Rorschach test and reported seeing a human pelvis, rather grotesque human faces, horrible little spacemen, a vulva, jewellery of some sort, a skin rug and heraldic dogs, amongst other things. Alcock diagnosed her as having severe hysteria. On the back of the diagnosis Mrs Fox received psychotherapy and two and a half years later was reported to have made excellent adjustment with no fear or anxiety (Alcock, 1963). Mrs Fox’s experience was not a singular event but a common standardised psychological procedure in some institutions in Britain in the 1950s. In the US the Rorschach was the most used psychological test until 1961 and was adopted with vigour (Buchanan, 1997; Sundberg, 1961). The Rorschach’s uptake in Britain was more limited. The Rorschach has such a reputation that it has transcended Psychology in ways that no other test has. It is well known both inside and outside of psychology and is present in representations of Psychology in popular culture. The original ink blots have even been made available on Wikipedia causing serious controversy.\(^\text{25}\) Yet, despite such notoriety, debate and dispute, very little is known about the history of the Rorschach in Britain.

Hermann Rorschach was not the first to be fascinated by the playful affordances of symmetrical ink blots for the human imagination. Ink blots inspired artists such as Leonardo di Vinci in the 15\textsuperscript{th} century and Victor Hugo in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century (Lemov, 2011, Tulohin, 1940). In 1857, Justinius Kerner published a game called ‘Blotto’ which prompted players to make poetic associations to ink blots (Erdberg, 1990). Hermann Rorschach was not alone in recognizing ink blots’ relevance to the new sciences of the
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\(^{25}\) The ink blots were published in 2009 on Wikipedia and sparked what is referred to as the Rorschach-Wikipedia debate, see Schultz & Loving (2012).
psyche; psychologist Alfred Binet had earlier suggested using ink blots to study visual imagination (Binet & Henri, 1895). Rorschach was aware of previous uses of ink blots for perceptual and artistic purposes, and was influenced by the work of Bleuler and Jung on word association (Akavia, 2013; Ellenberger, 1954). In 1921 Rorschach published his only book, *Psychodiagnostik*, which described his experiment involving the ten symmetrical, now highly iconic, ink blots:26

‘The subject is given one plate after the other and asked, ‘What might this be’? He holds the plate in his hand and may turn it about as much as he likes. The subject is free to hold the plate near his eyes or far away as he chooses… An attempt is made to get at least one answer to every plate, though suggestion in any form is, of course, avoided.’ (Rorschach, 1921 p. 16)

Rorschach imagined that this test allowed an understanding of personality via analysis of how people projected meaning on the blots. He paid less attention to what was ‘seen’ per se (Rorschach, 1921, p. 19). For example, responses were to be coded according to whether the person used the whole blot (W) ‘it all looks like a big monster’ or smaller details (d) ‘this bit here looks like a bird’ (1941, p. 40); whether the person saw movement (M) ‘a woman dancing’ (1921, p. 25) or were concerned with colour (C) ‘a beautiful colourful garden’ (1921, p.29). For Rorschach, many ‘movement’ responses indicated ‘introversion’ whilst, many ‘colour’ responses indicated ‘extratension’ (Rorschach, 1921, p. 88). Low numbers of responses were also illuminating to personality. For example, a lack of movement (M) responses would suggest a reduced number of positive qualities of introversion such as imagination (Rorschach, 1921, p. 86, see Akavia, 2013, for a full discussion). Rorschach died of appendicitis and peritonitis in 1922 just after the publication of *Psychodiagnostik* (Hughes, 1950; Morgenthaler, 1932). After his death, his test received little positive attention in the German-speaking world.

26 Rorschach used the terms ‘experiment’ or the German ‘Versuch’ for the most part, especially when discussing the underlying theoretical ideas of the procedure. He referred to it as a ‘test’ only when referring to the technical aspects and the ink blot plates themselves (Akavia, 2013). Considering the popularity and subsequent understandings of the term ‘Rorschach test’ I will continue to use this terminology.
(Ellenberger, 1954) and some speculated that Rorschach died of heart break due to the failure of his test (Lemov, 2011).

As discussed in Chapter 2, several historians have noted how the Rorschach became peculiarly popular in mid-20th century Psychology and psychiatry in the US. In addition to accounts by ‘insiders’ to the Rorschach testing movement in the US, Buchanan (1997) has carefully narrated the rise and fall of faith in the Rorschach with respect to the American Psychological Association’s (APA) attempt to define test validity in the decades after the Second World War. More recent critical essays have focused on faith in the Rorschach test’s ability to reveal the minds of ‘othered’ groups in post-war American society. Such groups include: the defeated Nazi enemy (Brunner, 2001); colonized and de-colonizing societies (Lemov, 2011); and gay men (Hegarty, 2003a). There is also considerable overlap between history and critique; the test’s harshest critics have also written histories of the tests usage in the US (see Wood, et al, 2003). In various ways, these histories flesh out Galison’s (2004) conceptual point that the Rorschach is not a passive object, but a means of ‘making up’ people and power relationships between people.

The history of the Rorschach’s use outside the US has largely only attracted the attention of Rorschach users themselves and several national histories are available (see Sorai & Ohnuki, 2008; Mattlar & Fried, 1993; İkiz, 2011; Manickam & Dubey, 2006). Indeed, histories outside of the US do begin to illuminate indigenous histories of other nations and ‘internationalise’ the history of psychology (Brock, 2006). Whilst informative, such national histories of the Rorschach barely consider the history of critique of projective testing in psychological science, or the political and ethical stakes involved in extending the ‘projective hypothesis’ to whole societies, political ideologies,
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27 For example Jung later described Hermann Rorschach’s method as merely a ‘klexographic method’ and likened it to debunked sciences including graphology and phrenology (Akavia, 2013).
28 For example, Ellenberger (1954).
29 See for example, Turner’s (2011) unpublished dissertation on Rorschach debates using modern Romanticist/ Empiricist approaches across France, the UK and Australia.
or marginalized social groups. Indeed, such ‘insider’ histories are often celebratory narratives attempting to explain the ‘origin’ of their chosen fields. In Britain, there are two histories written by Rorschach users (Friedemann, 1968; McCarthy Woods, 2008). Both focus on the development of the British Rorschach Forum (1948-1997) around London’s Tavistock Institute and their publication *The Rorschach Newsletter* (1952-1997).

The ways in which the Rorschach was employed, and to what end, were different in Britain to those in the US, as were the purposes of Rorschach work and the social historical contexts in which such work developed. Whilst the Rorschach became the most popular test in clinical Psychology in the US after the Second World War, clinical Psychology was first taught in Britain under the leadership of one of the test’s most formidable critics - Hans Eysenck. British clinical psychology was also established in the context of a distinct National Health Service unlike the privatised system in the US.

In this chapter, I describe the history of Rorschach testing in Britain, throwing into relief the differences between British and American faith in the test’s power. I draw on my reading of all available issues of the primary British publication for Rorschach work, initially named *The Rorschach Newsletter* (1952-1968), and later renamed the *British Journal of Projective Psychology and Personality Study* (1968-1986), and the *British Journal of Projective Psychology* (1987-1997). I also draw on Rorschach research in better-known British journals throughout the 20th century, oral histories and further materials one oral history participant provided.

First, I explore the psychoanalytic context of psychology and psychiatry in which the Rorschach emerged. Second, I contrast the engagement of Rorschach psychologists during the Second World War in both countries and the impact of this on clinical psychology after the war. Next, I consider the institutional influences on the history of the Rorschach. Then I describe the specific interests of British Rorschach users from the Second World War to 1968 in detail, noting differences from the US literature of the
same period, for example, comparing the presence of women in the projective test movements and examining the similarities and differences in psychological subjects. Finally, I consider transformations in projective testing in Britain after this point, namely the decline of the use of the Rorschach and contrast this with the uptake of the ‘comprehensive system’ of John Exner in the US from the 1970s. I conclude that contextualised and comparative histories of the Rorschach’s use beyond the US have much to tell us about the particular reasons for the Rorschach’s power in the US. By conducting such a history not only do I account for the Rorschach in Britain but I also provide a rich comparison to the US decentralising and particularising that history.

3. 1 The Introduction of the Rorschach

The advent of psychoanalysis into Britain and the US provided a fertile ground for projective testing. In 1913, Ernest Jones developed the London Psycho-Analytical Society. In the same year physician Jessie Murray and teacher Julia Turner opened the Medico-Psychological Clinic and the Maudsley Hospital opened, also in London. Social upheaval during the First World War meant that Psychology was desperate for new ways of thinking about madness, sanity, normality and deviance (Richards, 2000). Due to the greater economic and social disorder caused by the War those in Britain were especially susceptible to the appeal of psychoanalysis (see Bogacz, 1989). Psychological thinking was also not yet influenced by behaviourist approaches which were becoming popular in the US (Richards, 2000). Psychiatrist W.H.R. Rivers began adopting Freud’s ideas to treat shell-shock whilst at Craiglockhart War hospital in Edinburgh. Those at the Medico-Psychological Clinic also rehabilitated soldiers but the clinic was disbanded in 1922 due to the death of Murray in 1920 and the subsequent debt of the clinic (Hayward, 2014; Hinshelwood, 1999). In 1920 the Tavistock clinic was opened by psychiatrist Hugh Crighton-Miller and here psychodynamic and ‘applied psychoanalytic’ approaches were adopted with vigour (Dicks, 1970; Hall, 2007a; 2007b). In 1925 the London Psycho-
Analytical Society attracted more members including members from the Society for Psychical Research and others from Cambridge, those involved with military psychiatry, those who had been involved with the Medico-Psychological Clinic, general practitioners, and of course, members of the Bloomsbury group (Hayward, 2014; Hinshelwood, 1999).

Following the First World War many women were looking for education, training and careers, and the specific context of feminist thinking and an emerging ‘new psychology’ meant more women were involved with psychology. The focus on sex in psychoanalytic theory was not as well received in Britain as it was in the US. However, a consensus began to emerge about the need for sexual reform especially around women’s rights and sex education (Richards, 2000). The suffragette movement, which Murray and Turner were deeply involved with, evidences this (Hinshelwood, 1999), as does the influential work of British sexologist Havelock Ellis who declined Jones’ invitation to join the London Psycho-Analytical Society (Hinshelwood, 1999). Thought to be a legacy of Murray and Turner, 17 of 54 members (31%) of the London Psycho-Analytical Society were women in 1924 (Hinshelwood, 1999). However, despite women’s presence within psychoanalytic circles (Sayers, 1991), gender issues remained. Alice Woods, one of the founding members of the BPS described how in 1913 all of the women attending the very first reading of Freud’s work were asked to leave the room (Valentine, 2008a). A number of women psychoanalysts began specifically working with children (Sayers, 1991). In fact, child psychology was not only deemed of high importance after the War, especially in Britain (Richards, 2000), but was also considered more appropriate for women. Such attitudes were evident in Britain and in the US (Furumoto, & Scarborough, 1986; Rutherford, et al, 2015; Scarborough, & Furumoto, 1989).

By the end of the 1930s psychoanalysis was somewhat embedded in Psychology in Britain but it did not develop to the same extent it did in the US where it gained greater
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30 Jennings (2007) specifically outlines this history in regards to lesbian women and their careers after 1945. 
31 This was in contrast to the International Psycho-Analytical Society where women only made up 12-15% of members (Hinshelwood, 1999).
popularity up until the 1950s (Richards, 2000). In contrast to the US, British psychoanalysts remained situated within smaller clinics and the offices of self-employed analysts and there was a reluctance to use psychoanalysis widely in practise (Hinshelwood, 1999), though the Tavistock did develop a psychoanalytically sympathetic approach (Hall, 2007a; 2007b). Befittingly, the Rorschach was adopted according to the differing levels of psychoanalytic acceptance. It was from this context of ‘new psychology’ and a zeitgeist of a concern about the unconscious in the US and in Britain that the Rorschach emerged.

Psychiatrist David Levy (1892-1977) brought the Rorschach from Switzerland to the Institute of Child Guidance in New York in 1924 (Million, Grossman, & Meagher, 2004). Levy taught the test to Samuel Beck (1896-1980), a University of Columbia student studying on a fellowship at the Institute (Million, et al., 2004). Beck in turn inspired Marguerite Hertz, and both Beck and Hertz completed dissertations using the Rorschach at Columbia (Buchanan, 1997). Bruno Klopfer picked up the test in Switzerland where he briefly studied with Carl Jung whilst escaping Nazi Germany (Million et al., 2004; Skadeland, 1986). In 1934 Klopfer arrived in the US, and also began work at the University of Columbia assisting the anthropologist Franz Boas. Klopfer began teaching Rorschach interpretation to students (Buchanan, 1997; Handler & Acklin, 1994; Klopfer & Kelley, 1942; Lemov, 2011; Million et al., 2004; Skadeland, 1986). One of Klopfer’s original students was Zygmunt Piotrowski, a European psychologist who had also escaped Nazi occupied Europe. Each of these individuals were to develop their own schools of thinking around the Rorschach in the US.

Interest in the Rorschach test in Britain is evident not long after Rorschach’s untimely death. In 1925 psychiatrist Mary Rushton Barkas, who at the time was practising at the Maudsley, published a detailed review of Psychodiagnostik in the British Journal of Psychiatry, describing Rorschach’s data, the test’s use in Swiss Psychology, and offering the prediction that the test ‘may well prove worth introduction into those of this country’ (p. 330). A year later in the British Journal of Psychiatry W.D Chambers
published his psychiatric notes from a trip to Zurich that described Rorschach’s test as a ‘novel method of testing apperception’ (Chambers, 1926, p. 277). Barkas thought that Rorschach’s test, like Jung’s Word Association Test, was ‘most useful if applied in a more general way, less for the object of rigid diagnosis than as a means of approach to the patient's complexes’ (Barkas, 1925, p. 330). Barkas also expressed disbelief in Rorschach’s powers of insight that foreshadowed the idea that the test had to be used by experts to be effective which became increasingly common in both Britain and the US from the 1930s:

‘Yet in reading the data on which Rorschach's conclusions were based one cannot but feel that he either made lucky guesses, rather in the mode of the fortune-teller, or else that his extensive experience of the test combined with great intuition gave him a skill in interpreting the data which few could attain.’ (Barkas, 1925, p.331)

From 1925, Margaret Lowenfeld developed a technique in which children used small toys and sand to make what became known as ‘worlds’ (Bowyer, 1970; Lowenfeld, 1979). Like the Rorschach and the TAT\(^\text{32}\), Lowenfeld’s World Technique was inspired by popular culture, specifically H.G. Wells’ 1911 book *Floor Games*. From 1929 Lowenfeld formally developed the World Technique and later developed the Mosaic test, and used them in her clinic the Institute of Child Psychiatry (ICP) in London. Though Lowenfeld commonly rejected the description of her methods as ‘projective’ (see her obituary by Margaret Mead, 1974), the tests were regularly described as such. In 1937 Carl Jung interpreted one of her ‘worlds’ at an internal congress in Paris (Bowyer, 1970) and the test remains in use today (Mitchell & Friedman, 1994).

By the early 1930s, reports of clinical practise with the Rorschach were already evident in British journals. In 1931 Gordon and Norman reported using the Rorschach to

---

\(^{32}\) Thematic Appreciation Test or ‘TAT’ (Morgan & Murray, 1935). Morgan developed the images used in the test from images in books and magazines. For example, card 1 shows the image of a boy contemplating a violin which was based on a photograph printed in *Parents Magazine* of famous violinist Yehudi Menuhin (Morgan, 1995).
test different types of ‘mental defectives’ in the *British Medical Journal* (also see 1932). In 1932, Oscar Oeser (1932a; 1932b) of the Cambridge Psychological Laboratory published two studies on form and colour in the Rorschach. Oeser described the Rorschach as an item that had ‘so often been found useful in experiments on perceiving and imaging, for here the subject is absolutely free to react in whatever way suits him most’ (1932a, p. 19). His Rorschach work was cited by his mentor Frederic Bartlett in his magnum opus *Remembering* (1932). In 1932 the *British Journal of Psychology* received a review of Samuel Beck’s *The Rorschach Test and Personality Diagnosis* (1930). In 1933 and 1934 *The British Journal of Psychiatry* published summaries of research which included Rorschach publications. However, criticisms of the Rorschach’s potential soon followed (see Lewis, 1934).

Oeser was not alone among Cambridge students in taking an interest in the Rorschach. In 1933, Philip E Vernon, a recent Cambridge graduate, published four papers on the Rorschach (Vernon, 1933a, 1933b, 1933c, 1933d, also see Vernon, 1935a, 1935b). Vernon described how to use the test, expressed enthusiasm for its use and considered the development of new blots. Whilst aware of criticisms, Vernon remained optimistic about the development of the Rorschach test:

‘…the deficiencies of the Rorschach ink-blots method as a psychometric test have been amply demonstrated, in particular the uncertainties and subjectivity of its scoring, the lack of adequate norms, poor reliability, and almost complete lack of scientifically controlled validation. Yet I cannot agree that these deficiencies should lead to its rejection by investigators in the field of personality… I am unable to call to mind any other test of personality… which tells me as much

33 Both Oeser and Bartlett influenced Eric Trist who was later one of the founding members of the British Rorschach Forum. For more information on this group at Cambridge see Kennedy (2014) for his autobiographical biography of Oeser and Trist’s own autobiography Trist (1993).
about my subjects in so short a time as does the Rorschach test.’ (Vernon, 1993c, p. 291, also see Hearnshaw, 1964)\(^{34}\)

These papers appeared after Vernon spent a year at Harvard collaborating with Gordon Allport on the measurement of personality-related values (Vernon & Allport, 1931). In the same year, Vernon joined the Maudsley Hospital. In addition, Oliver Zangwill of the Cambridge Psychological Laboratory also published on the Rorschach (Zangwill, 1945). Vernon’s sister, Magdalen Vernon, also later published projective work whilst studying under Bartlett at Cambridge (see Vernon, M.D., 1940). Her work however, whilst projective, was more concerned with phantasy, play and projection through cognitive processes. She was also influenced by the work of Margaret Lowenfeld, with whom she later had regular correspondence.

Therefore, despite the idea that the Rorschach was introduced in Britain by Alcock in 1933 (McCarthy Woods, 2008), there was ample consideration of the Rorschach and projective techniques prior to Alcock’s discovery. There was especially an uptake of projective techniques among women clinicians in London working with children despite an early apprehensive attitude towards the Rorschach.

### 3.2 The Second World War: Blitz and Blots

The Second World War acted as a catalyst for the development of Psychology in both the US and Britain. Psychologically healthy recruits were required for war, and so mental testing was not only used to test the ‘feeble-minded’ but also the healthy recruit (Capshew, 1999; Rose, 1999). In the US the Rorschach was relied upon to a great extent for military purposes. From 1920 to 1946 the APA membership grew from 393 to 4427 (Herman, 1995). Key psychologists became involved, for example, B.F. Skinner helped

---

\(^{34}\) The Rorschach Forum made Philip Vernon an Honorary Fellow in 1966 and later published a complimentary obituary (Semeonoff, 1987) despite his later distance from projective methods.
behaviourally train missile guiding pigeons; Murray began work for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) at Station ‘S’\textsuperscript{35} and David Levy organised a ‘personality screening centre’ (Herman, 1995; Rose, 1999). Dr William C Menninger organised most of the general military recruit screening as Chief Psychiatric Consultant to the Surgeon General of the Army (Menninger, 2004). In total 3000 psychologists assisted in the war effort in the US compared to 700 in the First World War (Herman, 1995) and Rorschach workers were no exception. In 1936 Klopfer began editing the *Rorschach Research Exchange* with the Menninger Clinic in Kansas, drawing upon his informal seminars at Columbia University (Ellenberger, 1954; Lemov, 2011; Million et al., 2004). In 1939 the *Society for Projective Techniques and the Rorschach Institute* was established by Klopfer.\textsuperscript{36} In addition David Rapaport and Roy Shafer, who both worked at the Menninger Clinic, developed the Rapaport-Schafer Rorschach scoring system in the early 1940s (Rapaport, 1942, see Buchanan, 1997). Klopfer even organised a ‘Volunteer Rorschach Unit’ in 1942 for those who worked with the Rorschach and were in active service (Hegarty, 2003a). In all, the engagement of psychiatry and Psychology with the military effort in the US outstripped that in any other country at war.

The development of clinical Psychology throughout the 1930s was slower in Britain than in the US (Hall, 2007a; 2007b; Hearnshaw, 1964). There were no collaborations between Rorschach users and military personnel in Britain. Though the Rorschach was not used for initial screening in either country, it was not used for assessment after battle, nor officer selection in Britain as it was in the US (Hegarty, 2003a). Rather, the British military were more wary of testing in general and projective testing in particular. When the Rorschach was initially suggested for officer selection it was swiftly rejected in part because it was believed to be ‘middle European absurdity on

\textsuperscript{35} The screening involved 3 and-a-half days of assessment including the newly developed group Rorschach method (Harrower-Erickson & Steiner, 1941; Herman, 1995). By 1948 Murray was a Captain and had helped publish the *Assessment of men* which outlined how ‘Station S’ ranked each individual recruit on a 1-6 aptitude scale for their application (Rose, 1999). In total 12% of men who enlisted were deemed unfit for service for psychiatric reasons, a higher rate than any other country (Herman, 1995).

\textsuperscript{36} Prominent figures in this group included: Marguerite Hertz, David Rapaport, Zygmunt Piotrowski, Margaret Mead and Mortimer Myers (Hertz, 1992).
par with Kindergartens, Rudolf Steiner, Herbal tea and foreign plumbing’ (Shephard, 2002, p 193). Psychiatrists J.R. Rees and Ronald Hargreaves became consultants to the Army in 1939 and Rees initially unsuccessfully attempted to show the military the benefits of intelligence testing recruits (Shephard, 2002). In 1941, Rees was formally appointed as a Consultant Psychiatrist to the British Army and he assembled a group of psychologists and psychiatrists to deal with such military issues as the screening of recruits, the selection of officers and the rehabilitation of soldiers after battle (Bourke, 2001). War Officer Selection Boards (WOSBs) were set up in 1942 which combined the work of both psychologists conducting testing and psychiatrists conducting interviews to serve these ends. Those psychologists involved in the war effort included John Raven and Eric Trist from the Maudsley, as well as Tavistock psychiatrists such as John Bowlby, Rees and Hargreaves (Murphy, 2008, Shephard, 1999). At the beginning of the Second World War, the Maudsley was re-located further out of London, to Mill Hill School and Belmont Hospital due to threat of bombing in central London (Hall, 2007b).

However, some projective tests were adapted as group tests for officer selection in Britain. From 1942 onwards potential officers were tested with: self-description questionnaires; intelligence tests; the WAT; the TAT; and physical military tests (Murphy, 2008; Shephard, 2002). Simeon Gillman’s (1947) Methods of Officer Selection in the Army described the methods used for officer selection in Britain in the Second World War. These included failed tests of a modified Rorschach in Edinburgh for use in WOSBs. The intelligence tests and the modified group versions of the TAT and WAT in contrast, were deemed useful in providing ‘personality pointers’ which psychiatrists in WOSBs could expand upon in interviews with each officer (Gillman, 1947). In fact

---

37 Trist began work at the Maudsley after being recommended by Philip Vernon but joined the WOSBs in order to leave the Maudsley and become involved in the ‘Tavistock group’ (Trist, 1993).
38 The Maudsley Hospital staff worked in Emergency Medical Services (Hall, 2007b).
39 At Mill Hill specialist neuropsychiatric units were developed which provided aptitude tests, occupational therapy and vocational training (Jones, Fear & Wessely, 2007).
Murphy (2008) recalled that it was his dislike of the Rorschach that led him to be invited to become a sergeant tester/psychological assistant.

‘I joined the Royal Armoured Corps in 1941 and after two years as a regimental instructor with armoured vehicles and a short period in hospital, where it was noted that I had argued with a visiting psychologist on the merits of her Rorschach test, it was decided that I might be better employed with WOSBs where there was a shortage of psychologists to carry out testing, and the category of sergeant tester/psychological assistant was invented.’ (Murphy, 2008; p. 20)

Although there was some experimentation with projective testing for military ends in Britain, the Rorschach was never adopted as it was in the US.

The experience of the Second World War differed between the two countries. The war was not only fought overseas for the British, like it was for Americans, and the heavy bombing of London, often referred to as ‘the Blitz’, deeply impacted the lives of British people (see Roper, 2005). The same wartime context that occasioned Bowlby’s theory of attachment – the evacuation of children from London – also sparked the interest of Alcock. Alcock’s first published paper, *The bombed child and the Rorschach test*, was a brief note published in the *British Medical Journal* in 1941. Alcock reported that 70% of her evacuee sample had ‘fire or explosive K responses’ to the ink blots, but cautioned that these children’s responses might not necessarily be due to a ‘bomb-induced neurosis.’

The history of the Rorschach in Britain was therefore less about military strength as in the US, but more about the effects of war-related trauma, especially on children.

### 3.3 Institutional influences and the British Rorschach Forum

As several authors have noted, the Rorschach quickly became the most popular test in clinical practice in the US after the Second World War (e.g. Sundberg, 1961).
Projective tests were also taken up enthusiastically by heavily-funded social scientists who often carried them to remote locations to make sense of unfamiliar societies (Lemov, 2011). New schemes of interpretation included ‘content analysis’ which allowed for direct Freudian interpretations of responses to the ink blots (Phillips & Smith; 1953). But projective tests were troubling objects for psychologists in this period, who developed the language of ‘test validity’ and ‘construct validity’ to manage the investment of trust in psychological science and the application of projective tests in clinical contexts (Cronbach, 1949; Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Meehl, 1954; Wood et al., 2003; see Buchanan, 1997). The publication of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) in 1952 illustrates the want for statistical classification in the US especially (Grob, 1991).

In contrast, in Britain the uptake of the Rorschach was much more curtailed.40 Psychologists Theodora Alcock and Eric Trist and Psychiatrist C.J.C. Earl formed the British Rorschach Forum at the Tavistock Institute in 1942, ten years before the founding of the International Rorschach Society, having discussed the Rorschach via letters throughout the war. Earl was one of the first in Britain to use the Rorschach, and his work at Caterham Hospital in South London had influenced Theodora Alcock’s paper on evacuated children. Dr Walter Ernst Richard Mons - a Swiss Psychiatrist who had had also informed Alcock’s early work - was Honorary Chairman. Alcock was the first Honorary Vice Chairman. Herbert Phillipson, who had worked on WOSBs and began to work at the Tavistock from 1945 was Honorary Secretary. All of the society’s technical meetings, summer conferences, workshops, seminars and courses took place at the Tavistock from the late 1940s to the late 1990s.

40 The fact that psychologists in Britain had much less enthusiasm for projective testing than those in the US was supported by an oral history interview I conducted with a psychotherapist who worked in the US and had experience with projective tests prior to training in Britain. He said: ‘…at the time we used a lot of projective tests, I say “we did” in the place I was working with, they did. I don’t think, my experience of working in the NHS, you know afterwards was that we don’t have anywhere like that kind of interest or confidence in them’… ‘Then I ended up coming back… to the UK… and it’s like, nobody mentions them. So it was kind of several months it was a big thing and then not so much to do with it since.’
In 1952 the society began its bi-annual publication *The Rorschach Newsletter*, which ran until 1997. In the first issue, it was announced that Earl had resigned as Chairman due to ill health, but would remain the Honorary Vice-President of the Forum. The society was initially exclusive in its membership, its object being to ‘safe-guard professional standards in the use of the Rorschach and restrict membership to society selection’ (Editorial, Williams, 1952). Membership was to be decided by a sub-committee and required the candidate to be ‘experienced and proficient’. However, the society also expressed an aim to widen its interests to projective tests other than the Rorschach early on. Methodologically, the focus was on the discussion of case-studies, and the aim of *The Rorschach Newsletter* was to ‘enable all members of the Rorschach Forum to keep in touch with work that is being done’ (Editorial, Williams, 1952).

To understand why Rorschach testing might have remained confined to this small Tavistock based group, it is necessary to consider other major institutional changes in Britain around this time. The first major change was the introduction of the National Health Service (NHS) in 1948. The NHS was founded on socialist principles that health care should be free and available to all irrespective of the capacity to pay. The introduction of the NHS altered the ways in which mental health services were provided (Hall, 2007a; Hayward, 2014). General practitioners were expected to have greater psychiatric knowledge than before (Hayward, 2014) and the role of clinical psychologists became more clearly defined (Derksen, 2001a). Lowenfeld shared a common view among clinical practitioners that a national service would increase uniformity and interfere with personal contacts between patient and doctor (Urwin & Hood-Wiliams, 2013). Her Institute, the ICP, became a non-profit limited company in reaction to the NHS, but through an arrangement with the North West Regional Health Authority it continued to work with children of poorer families (Traill & Hood-Williams, 1973; Urwin & Hood-Wiliams, 2013). In this context, and perhaps as a consequence of the positioning of

41 The exact qualification was not specified in the early issues of the journal but later attendance to Alcock’s training courses were presumably sufficient. In addition to summer schools there was also a three year postgraduate course provided by the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations (Alcock, 1963).
psychologists and psychiatrists in the military, some psychologists had to convince psychiatrists that they were best positioned to determine which tests were best to use (Buchanan, 2010), yet attitudes towards the Rorschach varied dramatically.

In contrast, psychiatrists and psychologists in the US were undergoing a battle over psychotherapy (Buchanan, 2003). This was highly linked to psychoanalytic thinking in psychotherapy which was originally under the domain of psychiatrists (Mosher, 2008), though after the war psychiatrists began to move further into private practice and clinical psychologists began to stake claims once the field began to get more established in the 1950s (Leveille, 2002; Scull, 2015). Psychologists at the time were subordinate to psychiatrists in both Britain and the US; psychologists were able to analyse tests but not diagnose (Buchanan, 2003; Derksen, 2001a). The scientist-practitioner model also took hold in the 1950s and recommended trainee clinical psychologists complete training in therapy as well as research (Pilgrim & Treacher, 1992). This played out in different institutions and across the Atlantic in different ways. Those at the Maudsley, and Eysenck especially, were staunchly against the model, maintaining their critique of psychotherapy and psychoanalysis (see Buchanan, 2003; Derksen, 2001a; Pilgrim & Treacher, 1992). Those at the Tavistock however, had less psychiatric/psychological rivalry due to their shared psychodynamic thinking (Derksen, 2001a).

The tension between the more psychodynamic Tavistock and the more statistically oriented Maudsley shaped the landscape of post war training and the uptake of the Rorschach among practitioners. The first program in clinical psychology in Britain was taught at the Institute of Psychiatry, which was positioned at the Maudsley in 1946. Aubrey Lewis, who had described the test as of ‘limited or doubtful value’ as early as 1934 was Chair of Psychiatry at the Institute from 1946 until his retirement in 1966. In 1942, Lewis employed Eysenck, following a recommendation from Philip Vernon (Buchanan, 2010; Jensen, 1989; Hall, 2007b). Eysenck took over the role of Senior Research Officer previously held by Eric Trist who went to work at the Tavistock after the Second World War (Buchanan, 2010; Trist, 1993). Eysenck oversaw the training of
the first British clinical psychologists at the Institute of Psychiatry from 1947 onward, but
the training itself was mainly the responsibility of psychologist Monte Shapiro
(Buchanan, 2010). Shapiro however, did not wish to teach the Rorschach himself and
instead employed Swiss expert Maryse Israel to provide Rorschach training in the late
1940s (Buchanan, 2010). By 1955 those at the Maudsley had decided to discontinue using
the Rorschach. In fact a ‘critical discussion’ meeting was held on Saturday 21st May 1955
and all members of the Committee of Professional Psychologists were invited to give
their comments on this decision. The discussion appears to have done nothing but
confirm the anti-Rorschach position of many at the Maudsley.

The history of the Rorschach in Britain was shaped by the institutional attitudes
towards the test and its popularity was detrimentally effected by the rejection of the test
by the Maudsley. In particular Eysenck’s 1959 scathing review in Buro’s influential
*Mental Measurements Yearbook* described no less than ten damning criticisms of the
Rorschach’s validity, likened the test to phrenology, and concluded that ‘the Rorschach
has failed to establish its scientific or practical value’ (Buros, 1959, p. 277). The
Maudsley training programme dominated clinical teaching in Britain producing twice as
many graduates as the Tavistock, whose courses declined further in the 1970s (Buchanan,
2010). However, in contrast, training in the US during this period typically addressed
projective tests and the Rorschach in particular (see Buchanan, 1997; Wood et al, 2003).

After the Second World War, the Rorschach was in clinical use in Britain in some
sites beyond the Tavistock, such as Tooting Bec Hospital in London (e.g. Barker, 1970;
Scott, 1965), and in Child Guidance Clinics (e.g. O’Kelly, 1972). Many vocational
centres also adopted projective methods for assessment in the following decades (see
Kaldegg, 1966; Orford, 1965). Some large companies even employed the Rorschach in

---

42 The Committee of Professional Psychologists (Mental Health), sometimes abbreviated to CPP(MH), was
a part of the British Psychological Society (See Hall 2007a; 2007b). The invitation to the critical discussion
was provided by Hubert ‘Jack’ Wright the Honorary Secretary in 1955. One of the members who did attend
and was active in the discussion was John Raven whose invite is stored at the Wellcome Library archive
London.
recruitment. A year before the ink blot appeared in the television show ‘Dr Who’, JWT Advertising stated in their advert in The Times:

‘You may have heard strange travellers’ tales of our recruiting system: of intelligence tests and writing tests and ink blot tests and autobiographies and sessions with psychologists and many interviews with many people. And the tales are true- we have them all. We have them because it matters more than to most companies that when we choose, we choose well.’ (October 18 1962, The Times, p. vi; Issue 55525)

The majority of Rorschach testers in Britain were psychologists. Earl had attempted to popularise the test among psychiatrists but with little success, possibly due to the military’s rejection of it. In response to the ‘Maudsley-Tavistock schism’ Raven described the three year clinical psychologist training course provided by the Crichton Royal in Scotland in 1956 which required experience of a whole range of tests, including the Rorschach. Yet, Eysenck’s influential criticisms of the test achieved international readership and remain historically important (see Wood et al., 2003, p.183).

Relatedly, the British scene was far more concentrated on psychotherapeutic uses of projective tests, unlike the US where the Rorschach was a frequent object of academic research. Few members of the Forum achieved academic posts – a notable exception being Boris Semeonoff, who taught Rorschach techniques from his position on the faculty at the University of Edinburgh. The use of projective tests in Scotland was supported by Ralph and Ruth Pickford at the University of Glasgow.43 Given the growing interest in the Rorschach, and the lack of uptake in universities, especially in England, it is not surprising that Alcock successfully ran training courses at the Tavistock in response to high demand from 1954 until her retirement in 1968 (McCarthy Woods, 2008; McCully,

43 In fact, there was a significant number of psychologists and psychiatrists in Scotland, possibly due to the WASB headquarters being located in Edinburgh, or as Psychologist who was on the WOSBs J.S. Sutherland commented it could be because ‘we [Scots] have given up being ministers of religion to search for souls in another way’ Murphy (2008 p. 24).
1981). Such academic marginalisation in Britain goes some way to explain why the Rorschach was less established in clinical Psychology compared to the US where it was embedded within academia.

3.4 The subjects of the Rorschach: who tested whom in Britain and the US?

During the heyday of Rorschach testing in Britain and the US some psychological subjects were more pertinent than others reflecting each national context of the late 1950s and 1960s. Here I consider who was testing whom and how these were similar and different in Britain and the US. Of the available articles of *The Rorschach Newsletter*, one quarter reported empirical studies focused on children or adolescents. These included studies of children with brain damage (Williams, 1958); deprived children (Wilkinson, 1964); deaf children (Bowyer, Gillies & Scott, 1966) and others. This focus contrasts the research conducted on adults in the US and shows continuity with the early use of projective tests in Child Guidance Clinics.

Relatedly, another striking difference between US and British Rorschach psychologist’s concerned gender. The British group tended to be overwhelmingly made up of women in the decades after the Second World War in contrast to the gendered nature of British Psychology in general (dominated by men). Individual women such as Beatrice Engel made pioneering contributions to British psychology (see Valentine, 2006; 2008b; 2010) but acceptance of women into British psychology was generally slower due to reluctance of Oxford and Cambridge to accept women students (Shields, 2007). Many military positions for psychologists were closed to women (Bohan, 1990). For many women psychologists, the pressure to have *either* a career or marriage was common (Milar, 2000).44 This was also true for early clinical psychology in the US to some extent,

---

44 Lowenfeld for example, along with her sister Dr Helena Wright, fought against their fathers’ idea that they marry as opposed to gain careers, though Helena did go on to marry and continue her pioneering work.
the majority of work was done by women yet the ‘nursing image’ which prevailed at the
time and clinical psychology’s position outside of mainstream psychiatry meant such
work went unrecognised (Buchanan, 2013; Myers, 2012).

Women were well-represented among British clinical psychologists until the
1950s, when the emphasis on educational and child psychology ended due to the growth
of adult clinical psychology (Hall, 2007b). The original Committee of Professional
Psychologists established in 1943 within the British Psychological Society was
overwhelmingly made up of women. In fact, the early meetings of this group included no
men at all. The presence of women can be somewhat explained by the social concerns
surrounding children. Working with children was considered more suited to women in the
middle of the 20th century. As discussed there was both a need for research and therapy
for children after the Second World War, just as there had been after the First World War
(Richards, 2000). The evacuation of children created particular historical needs, and
inspired influential British developmental work. Women were therefore persuaded into
such areas as they were more receptive and offered more opportunity than other male
dominated fields (Rutherford, et al., 2015).

However, from the 1950s onward new members of the Committee of Professional
Psychologists were increasingly likely to be men (Hall, 2007b). In both Britain and in the
US, the influx of men into clinical psychology in the 1950s was precipitated by deliberate
attempts to articulate a vision of a mentally healthy relationship between family and work
around male breadwinners and female homemakers (Herman, 1995; Jennings, 2007;

Yet, in the small British projective community, women remained well-represented
in the 1950s and 1960s even as clinical Psychology in Britain became increasingly male-

---

45 In the US the ‘Servicemen’s Readjustment Act’ of 1944 and the ‘Vocational Rehabilitation Act’,
commonly known as the ‘G.I. Bill’ prioritised veterans who wished to train in Psychology making the
influx of men into clinical psychology even greater.
dominated. Bohan (1990) suggests that women psychologists often found work in testing because it was sometimes believed to require less technical knowledge than other forms of Psychology, and was viewed as lower status. This argument applies to the British Rorschach Forum, in 1958 there were eight women and five men on the committee, and women occupied 62-71% of committee positions until 1969. In December 1966 a register showed that 48% of all society fellows, members and associates were women. Among the first authors of publications in *The Rorschach Newsletter* from 1952 to 1968, 41% were women, 58% were men, and 1% could not be identified. In contrast there were few women among notable US Rorschach researchers, excluding Marguerite Hertz, Molly Harrower-Erickson, and Evelyn Hooker (who was a critic of the test).

British Rorschach research also shows a very different history of ‘over-reach’ of the projective hypothesis into matters of social concerns, contrasting with its use in the US in regards to Nazis, gay men, and colonised and post-colonial societies in the decades after the Second World War. There were no studies in *The Rorschach Newsletter* from these years on political types at all, which is in contrast to the long fascination in the US with the Rorschach tests conducted in the Nuremberg jail by David Kelley (Brunner, 2001;Dimsdale, 2015).

Nor are there any there any direct studies of gay men in the *Rorschach Newsletter* in these years, in contrast to the interest in ‘homosexual signs’ in the US literature (see Hegarty, 2003a). The Second World War was the first occurrence of psychiatric exclusion based on homosexuality (Bérubé, 1990) and the Rorschach was used to detect straight men malingering as gay (e.g. Due & Wright, 1945; Lindner, 1946; Wheeler, 1949). In America there was a wealth of research on the topic, which was somewhat emphasised by the cold-war (Lemov, 2011), and the concerns surrounding masculinity (Nicholson, 2011; see Hegarty, 2003a; also Roper, 2005 for a consideration of masculinity in Britain 1914-1950). British psychologists however, did not conduct

---

46 Again, in the 1971 published list of members the same was true, 48% were women which did not include Theodora Alcock as Honorary Vice President as she had retired in 1968 (McCarroll Woods, 2008)
research to the same extent on the detection of homosexuality. In fact from the First World War there was some suggestion that gay men might be useful in war. It was proposed that ‘active inverts’, as opposed to ‘passive inverts’, were more likely to turn their aggressive natures towards the enemy and heroically defend their fellow soldiers (Bourke, 2001). These rare but affirmative attitudes were in complete contrast to the singularly homophobic views of Psychology and psychiatry in the US (Bérubé, 1989; 1990; see Jennings, 2008).

The history of ‘affirmative’ research on homosexuality using the Rorschach shows different logics at play in the two countries and is worthy of further comment. As explored in Chapter 1 and 2 a queer feminist perspective is required for the history of the Rorschach, as is an understanding of the intersection of gender and sexuality. In Los Angeles in the 1950s, psychologist Evelyn Hooker secured National Institute of Mental Health funding, collaborated with the homophile Mattachine Society, and published influential studies showing that leading Rorschach experts, including Klopfer, could not discern gay men from straight men from their responses to the Rorschach alone (Hooker, 1957; 1958; see Hooker, 1992). In contrast, in Britain during the 1960s, psychologist June Hopkins collaborated with the lesbian group the Minorities Research Group and argued that there are lesbian signs on the Rorschach (Hopkins, 1969; 1970; Jennings, 2007a). In the US, Hooker’s Rorschach work has been often described as pivotal to the development of affirmative lesbian and gay psychology. In contrast, Hopkins’ work was quickly written off as homophobic after the depathologizing of homosexuality by the APA. Specifically, Morin (1977) considered Hopkins’ attempts to find lesbian signs on the Rorschach indicative of her attempting to diagnose homosexuality. Only in the 21st century, after a more social constructionist form of lesbian and gay psychology had developed in Britain (see Coyle & Kitzinger, 2002) did Hopkins’ work begin to be reclaimed as an early sign of progressive thought (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002). Hopkins had in fact conducted her research in order to defend lesbian women whom she had known had been dismissed from the US Air Force. She had concluded in her papers that lesbian
women were more independent, resilient, reserved, dominant, self-sufficient and composed than heterosexual women (Hopkins, 1969), and later came out as a lesbian herself (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002; see Chapter 4, section 4.3 and 4.3.1, where I go into greater detail about the work of Hopkins).

The difference between the receptions of Hopkins’ and Hooker’s somewhat similar studies demonstrates how national and institutional contexts determine what Rorschach results can mean. In the US, where the Rorschach was used to detect homosexuality ‘difference’ implied ‘pathology’ (Hegarty, 2003a), but Hopkins’ work has had a different response in Britain where the Rorschach was not used for this purpose. The differential influence of psychoanalysis in clinical Psychology in the two countries also helps to explain why their work was perceived so differently. Psychoanalysis had continued to grow in popularity in the US until the 1950s whereas in Britain its popularity began to wane at the end of the 1930s (Richards, 2000). Indeed, psychoanalytic principles were incorporated into ‘content analysis’ in the US and applied for detecting homosexuality (Hegarty, 2003a), which Hooker later critiqued. British clinical Psychology, by contrast, being dominated by the Maudsley approach, was more influenced by the thinking of Eysenck who rejected psychoanalysis (Buchanan, 2010). As a result, Hopkins had greater freedom to generate positive interpretations in her presentation of lesbian signs on the Rorschach.

Despite such differences in logic there were some areas of overlap in the social concerns addressed by British and US Rorschach testers. The consumption of drugs and alcohol was a concern for psychologists in the US (see Bertrand & Masling, 1969; Buhler & Lefever; 1947; Rabin, Papania & McMichael, 1954) and in Britain. From the 1960s especially, the Rorschach was used to test the personality of alcoholics and drug users, and testing was carried out in hospitals (Scott, 1965), as well as in therapeutic groups (Luzzatto, 1987). This concern continued for decades and was particularly focused on adolescents (e.g. Mahmood, 1985). In keeping with the British society’s aim to ‘not lose
sight of the case-study presentation’ most of the drug use studies were case-study reports, whilst a few drew upon larger samples.\footnote{For example V.B. Kanter and Celia Williams (1958) published a case-study of a 60 year old male alcoholic and a year later GC Bathurst (1959) published a study comparing one hundred alcoholics.}

Finally, the British history also throws into relief the uptake of the Rorschach in the social sciences in the US to make sense of culture (Lemov, 2011). Hermann Rorschach himself expressed a desire to test the Congolese using the Rorschach, exclaiming that ‘The test itself is technically so simple- it can be done through an interpreter- that it may be done with the most primitive Negro as easily as with a cultured European.’ (Rorschach, 1921, p. 97). In Britain, Rorschach users began to raise questions about the use of the test with those from Britain’s former empire. Jones and Jones’ (1964) article ‘Projective materials from a few West Indian subjects – The problem of assessment’ and Herzberg’s (1964) ‘Can we Test Africans?’ framed such questions directly. In the 1960s Rorschach researchers attempted to develop new norms for ethnic groups such as Greek children (Routsoni, 1965) and Bengalis (Zakia, 1964).\footnote{The quest for national norms continued into the latter end of the 20th Century for some, for example, the study of Finnish norms (Mattlar, Forsander & Mäki,1997) and efforts are being made to understand norm responses for British people, which is the study I participated in when I was tested with the Rorschach (see Chapter 1, Appendix A).} Colonial thinking and racist stereotypes are clearly evident in this work. Herzberg likened Rorschach responses of British children to African adults and laid particular importance on breastfeeding practices in the formation of ‘African personality’. Rorschach research on culture in both the US and Britain is characterized by an epistemological dilemma; the Rorschach is often imagined to be both a ‘culture-fair’ test that can access unconscious material \textit{irrespective} of culture, and one that accesses unconscious material that is understood to be distinctly ‘cultural.’ The test both looks through, and at, ‘culture’ and in both the US and in Britain it allowed researchers to opine about cultures with the authority of experts, irrespective of the level of their cultural understanding.

On \textit{4}th August of 1968, the work amassed on the Rorschach in Britain climaxed at the \textit{7}th International Rorschach Congress which was held in London under the title ‘The
Projective Approach to the Study of Personality’. The six-day congress was opened by Bowlby, and has been viewed by Rorschach users as the high point of the British Rorschach history (Campo, 1993; McCarthy Woods, 2008). It was criticised by some international visitors who reported that it was ‘very British’ and had lost the ‘international element’ (McCully & Palmquist, 1968). Despite this the conference was deemed successful and drew in a large crowd of projective workers.

3.5 The decline of the Rorschach

By the late 1960s scientific criticisms of the Rorschach’s validity such as those by Hooker, Meehl, and Eysenck became increasingly inescapable (see Buchanan, 1997; Wood et al., 2003; see also Meehl, 1954; Suinn & Oskamp, 1969). In 1961 the MMPI had become more popular than the Rorschach as a diagnostic test in the US for the first time (Buchanan, 1997). The anti-psychiatry movement also gave vocal critique to the power that is inherent in testing and diagnosing without consent or transparency (Crossley, 1998). Critique had progressed beyond demonstrations of projective tests’ lack of validity to cognitive explanations of the illusory diagnostic power of the Rorschach test (Chapman & Chapman, 1969). Rorschach testers reported seeing ‘signs’ in a person’s responses that correlated with their diagnosis, even when such signs were not actually present.

In this context John Exner breathed new life into the Rorschach by reviewing the US history in terms of the five major systems of Rorschach interpretation, and acknowledging that those systems all fell short of psychologists’ standards of test validity (Exner, 1969). Exner proposed a new ‘comprehensive’ system of interpretation which held out the promise of addressing those criticisms (Exner, 1969; 1993; 2003). In the US, Exner’s work was taken up enthusiastically in the new Schools of Professional Psychology that developed in the 1970s, whose graduates with ‘Psy.D.’ training increasingly competed with those with doctorates in clinical psychology trained in the
scientist-practitioner model (Wood et al., 2003). Exner’s work, though encouraging for many Rorschach testers in Britain, did not revive the tests’ reputation there as it did in the US. In Britain, the late 1960s was also a period of historical review, and an inflection point in the trajectory of the British Rorschach Forum. In June 1968, the first history of Rorschach testing in Britain was published by Alfred Friedemann, then Secretary General of the International Rorschach Society (Friedemann, 1968) who celebrated the developments of the Rorschach in Europe, its associations with psychoanalysis and the achievements of the British society led by the teaching of Alcock.

Whilst some participants in the British Rorschach Forum recall the global influence of Exner’s work at this time, they adopted the strategy of broadening the group’s focus from the Rorschach to a wider range of projective techniques. In June 1968 the title of the journal was changed to the *British Journal of Projective Psychology and Personality Study*. Simultaneously, the *British Rorschach Forum* changed its name to the *British Rorschach Forum and Society for Projective Techniques*. These changes were made to ‘reflect development in the scope of the society’s interests, which now include a range of projective techniques in addition to the Rorschach.’ (Editorial, Williams, 1968). In 1970 the name of the society was changed again to the *British Society for Projective Psychology and Personality Study* omitting the word ‘Rorschach’ altogether. Other attempts to widen membership led the society away from its earlier strategy of making membership exclusive to experts. Mirroring the uptake of Exner’s system in the US, more attempts were made to include psychotherapists in the group by loosening membership restrictions (Mahmood, 1986). In addition to these changes, the representation of men in the society also rose after 1968. At the December 1968 Annual General Meeting, just months after the International Rorschach Congress, one woman and seven men were elected onto the committee of the new *British Rorschach Forum and*
Society for Projective Techniques. Women never again made up a majority of the committee.⁴⁹

These changes were not successful in their attempt to revive the Rorschach or even to stem the tide of opinion shifting away from Rorschach testing. Criticisms of the Rorschach continued to gain strength. Writing in the British Medical Journal, Rollin (1970) predicted that the Rorschach would soon be no more in British Psychology, and posited in the event of a ‘psychologist of the year (or decade) award’ then it ‘must go to Professor H. J. Eysenck, the most famed and the most controversial psychologist on the English, perhaps the world, stage.... And if a toast were to be drunk to absent friends then it would be to poor Dr. Rorschach and his ink blots’ (p. 543).

Several changes in the journal’s contents are evident in the 1970s. Reflecting the broader focus, fewer Rorschach papers appeared, and more journal space was devoted to studies using the TAT and the ORT.⁵⁰ Speaking to the inescapable concerns about the validity of projective tests, studies with an experimental design became more common, quite in contrast to the society’s original commitment to case studies.⁵¹ From 1968 a greater proportion of articles were contributed from overseas countries including India, the US, Canada and Spain. This pattern continued for decades and in his 1989 editorial Mahmood, who edited the British Journal of Projective Techniques after 1985 suggested the British readers should try to match the interest shown by their international colleagues.

By the 1980s surveys began to show psychologists firmly moving away from projective techniques in Britain, as they had begun to do in the US. As discussed in Chapter 2, the 1980 BPS survey of members’ attitudes towards psychological tests

---

⁴⁹ However individual women did occupy important roles after this point. Notably psychologist Liz Gleed was Chair of the forum 1982 and Editor of the journal from 1995.

⁵⁰ This preference for alternative projective tests continued, as evidenced by special issues dedicated to the ORT (Phillipson, 1955) in 1988 and the Zulliger test (Zulliger, 1969) in 1990.

⁵¹ They did however remain very celebratory of Hermann Rorschach, and in 1971 devoted an issue to the development of the Rorschach test in commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the publication of Psychodiagnostik.
revealed personality tests were the third most popular kinds of tests. Within those, projective tests were, again, the third most popular and the Rorschach was criticised by responders more than it was supported (Poortinga et al., 1982). In 1987 Dr L.F. Lowenstein published a literature review under the title ‘Are Projective Techniques Dead?’ in the *British Journal of Projective Psychology*. Referencing the survey of US psychologists reported by Pruitt, Smith, Thelen and Lubin (1985), Lowenstein argued that projective techniques were far from dead, but undeniably used much less frequently than in previous decades. Similarly, Mahmood (1984) described the Rorschach as more popular in several other countries – including the US – than in Britain. Also in the *British Journal of Projective Psychology*, Elias (1989) published a paper reviewing the projective scene in the US. Elias (1989) certainly referenced a ‘lessening of fervent interest in projective techniques’ (p. 33) in the US but maintained that projective tests remained very much in use in psychodynamic psychiatric and psychological centres. In relation to Rorschach criticism from Cronbach (1949) and Meehl (1954) Elias rightly predicted Exner’s work to be pivotal in the continuation of the Rorschach in the US.

The tests that were used most were the WAIS, WISC, 52 and the Stanford-Binet. Clinical psychologists often used Cattell’s 16 ‘Personality Factor’ for personality. For those clinical psychologists who did use projective methods, the Bene-Anthony, the Rorschach and the TAT were the most commonly used. The BPS members also echoed some of the growing concerns around testing. For example, 84% had reservations about the norms for testing and others commented about doubtful reliability and validity. The final Report was published by BPS Professional Affairs Board in 1986 (Tyler & Miller, 1986).

In 1988, Mahmood published research on the attitudes and opinions of society members (of which there were 48 in total). Of the 33 members who replied to his survey, only about one quarter of members frequently used projective tests and half used

---

projective tests ‘occasionally.’ 90% of members surveyed agreed that the use of projective tests had declined, and only 56% believed the tests had a future. Mahmood echoed this belief, describing one participant who believed that the use of projective tests had not declined as ‘an incurable optimist’. Of the reasons for this decline, 83% reported that it was because of the changes in clinical Psychology practise and in the roles of psychologists. They cited a focus away from assessment towards a focus on therapy, especially behavioural therapies with outpatient populations meaning that ‘the types of patients and problems referred to them…do not require a traditional diagnostic assessment.’ (Mahmood, 1988). Only 23% of respondents reported that the decline of the use of projective tests was due to their non-scientific status. Specifically Mahmood argued that the Rorschach and the TAT had fared the worst from this decline, but that the Lowenfeld World Technique (Lowenfeld, 1979), Lowenfeld Mosaic Test (Lowenfeld, 1954) and the ORT (Phillipson, 1955) continued to be used.

In the same year, the title of the journal was changed to British Journal of Projective Psychology under which it continued until 1997, with Mahmood as editor until 1995. Mahmood (1988) stated that contributors needed to demonstrate projective tests’ usefulness in modern psychology so that projective techniques did not become ‘nothing but a blot on the landscape of psychology’.53 However, there were few successes in convincing others of the utility of the Rorschach test in Britain after 1988. Again, this situation contrasts with the boost to projective testing that occurred in forensic psychology in the late 1980s and early 1990s in the US (Wood, et al., 2003). Peterson, Johanson and Waller (1993) reported survey findings showing that members of the US based Society of Personality Assessment viewed the Rorschach and the MMPI as equal in psychometric status. In contrast to the US, there was little revival of the Rorschach after

---

53 In the editorial of the December 1989 issue Mahmood also attempted to encourage more contributions from British colleagues and noted that the sources of papers from the Society conferences were ‘drying up’ and that some papers submitted lacked in the conventions of scientific writing.
this point in Britain, however a small amount of Rorschach work continued at the Tavistock into the 21st century (McCarthy-Woods, 2008).54

3.6 Conclusion

When Mrs Fox left the Tavistock in the 1950s after her Rorschach test, she is reported to have said ‘I feel better for coming. You’ve done me lot of good’ (Alcock, 1963). Having presented the history of the Rorschach it is now possible to further understand Mrs Fox’s experience. Some elements of her Rorschach test speak to the contexts explored in this paper, the fact that she was tested by a woman, at the Tavistock, diagnosed with hysteria and received psychotherapy all reflect the history of the Rorschach in Britain.

In contrast to the Rorschach’s popularity in the US, in Britain the Rorschach was confined to a relatively small group. Clinical Psychology was first taught in Britain under the leadership of one of the test’s most formidable critics and established in a National Health Service that was oriented towards standardized care. The Rorschach was also not embedded in academia to the extent it was in the US and it was rejected for military purposes early on. Within this national context, the fascination that Rorschach’s ink blots engendered were not sufficient to stabilise belief in its legitimacy, nor its widespread use. Nonetheless, British Rorschach research does reflect some of Psychology’s normalising projects of the 20th century, that is, the cultural ‘other’, children and issues around drugs and alcohol. However, British psychologists did not engage with Cold War fears surrounding homosexuality in the same ways as those in the US, in fact there is evidence 54Rorschach training was held at the Tavistock on Exner’s Comprehensive System 2004 and 2005. See McCarthy Woods (2008) who describes a resurgence of Rorschach interest from 2000.
for early progressive thought. The Rorschach in Britain, much like the women whose work is so important to its history, remained marginalised but significant.

National interest in the ‘projective hypothesis’ can be explained by specific socio-historical contexts and events as shown in this comparative history. For the US in particular, the use of projective tests in the military during the Second World War was extensive as was the adoption of psychoanalytic thinking and the impact of the Cold War on fears of difference (Lutz, 1997). These led to the Rorschach’s use in homophobic research; the use of content analysis; the greater proportion of men; and its inclusion in clinical training. All of these are distinctly American themes in the history of the Rorschach. In this context the revival from the work of Exner was made possible, enduring the tests popularity. There is also the notable size of the US compared to Britain. Greater numbers of practitioners in the US protected the Rorschach to some extent against critics, whereas in Britain the critics dominated.

By studying this British history it is possible to throw into relief the reasons why the Rorschach might or might not have achieved success in a given national context. By troubling the norms of the US history I have gone some way to explain British and US history in relation to one another and shown individual and nuanced contexts in which the Rorschach developed, declined, and in some places continues to survive. In conducting such a history I have managed the notorious Rorschach test without embodying particular ‘insider’ or ‘critic’ status and thus provide a history of faith and doubt in the test. Such a comparative approach also goes some way to begin to internationalise the history of psychology and remove the ‘norm’ discourse that surrounds American-centric histories.
CHAPTER 4: A Queer Feminist Herstory of the Projective Test movement

Fig 4: Rorschach plate number three

1. An old Victorian oil lamp. The shape of the lamp
2. Two girls - at each side going to kiss each other. Big breasts, very slim, high heads, only one leg
3. Red lipstick

These responses to the above Rorschach ink blot were provided by a young woman ‘who was deeply involved in a homosexual relationship’ while at her stay in Tooting Bec psychiatric hospital in London (Barker, 1970). Her responses were argued to be illustrative of her sado-masochism which she fulfilled by escaping her lesbian relationship to ‘seek the most debased sexual experiences she could find’. Deeply entrenched in psychoanalytic ideas of sexuality, Dr Geoffrey Barker (1970) who tested the young woman, attempted to clarify that homosexuality itself is not pathological. Nonetheless criteria for participation in his study included patients’ willingness to accept their lesbianism had played a part in their illness.55

55 Their illness included: Acute Neurotic Breakdown or Anxiety/ Depression (8 women); Personality Problems (3 women) and Psychotic Breakdown/Early Schizophrenia (1 woman) (Barker, 1970)
Whilst there are a number of differences between myself and the young woman described above, there are also some similarities; I too can see the lamp, the girls and the lipstick. The transhistorical nature of the Rorschach therefore links us, as two queer women, in unexpected ways approximately 50 years apart. It is possible that shared experiences of women, and those who desire women, from different periods can find common ground in the Rorschach.

In the following chapter I delve into the queer and more women-focused aspects of the history of the Rorschach. As outlined in the previous chapter there were a significant number of women involved in the British projective test moment, and my research suggests they led feminist, and potentially queer, lives. This is true for both definitions of the word ‘queer’, both sexually non-heterosexual and also unusual and idiosyncratic. Minton (1997) describes the value of using queer theory and approaches in the history of Psychology and this thesis contributes further to that effort of combining the two. Therefore this chapter aims to contribute to the project to re-place women in the history of British Psychology, as well as provide a queer perspective to account for the intertwined histories of sexuality and the Rorschach.

It can be argued that historians construct history according to their own perspective and what is available to them. This is evidenced by the lack of women’s history within Psychology and the difficulties in doing women’s history because of reduced historical information on women compared to men (see Bohan, 1990; Brown, 1989; Furumoto & Scarborough, 1986; Valentine, 2010). There are certainly limits to archives and this is especially true for queer history (Donoghue, 1993; Jennings, 2007a; 2007b; Weeks, 1997). Such bias in history telling is not inconsequential, nor is it accidental. Instead the availability and readings of the archive are reflective of social order. What is and what is not investigated reveals social power, hierarchies and what is considered marginal (Foucault, 1976; Morawski, 1994; Sedgwick, 1985). This is especially true in the history of Psychology which includes additional intersections of power of the psychologists and psychological testing.
Psychology’s history with sexuality, especially in relation to the Rorschach, (see Hegarty, 2003a), illustrates how important a queer perspective is given Psychology’s pathologising past. Hegarty (2003a) suggests rather ironically that the analysis of implicit homophobia in research (and research with the Rorschach in particular) has queer potential to question the objectivity of Psychology and to reveal new understandings of figures of the past. These figures of the past can also be from a range of positions, whether they be psychologists or those who were tested. Indeed, the Rorschach has a unique historical position, it was used to detect and pathologise homosexuality but it was also used to defend lesbians and gay men. This chapter therefore considers this complex history with particular focus on the figures of the past.

One of the people who used the Rorschach to defend lesbians against the arguments in Psychology that they were psychotic and neurotic individuals was June Hopkins who was introduced in Chapter 3. Hopkins is absolutely central in my analysis of this history in this chapter and I use her research to frame my feminist reading of the lives of the women involved in the British projective test movement. This approach I am adopting is ironic considering the history of the Rorschach as a tool of diagnosis in a period where homosexuality was considered a mental illness. However I use that irony to illustrate how psychological knowledge can do different things for different purposes. In conducting a queer reading of the archive I contribute to what Hegarty (2003a) called for: a greater consideration of heteronormativity in order to reconsider research from affirmative positions of the present. In using this irony I avoid telling another romantic or tragic history of the Rorschach according to White’s (1973) tropes of history. I therefore propose a historical queer feminist reading of the women involved in the projective test movement that is framed around the Hopkins (1969; 1970) study of The Lesbian Personality and Lesbian Signs on the Rorschach. This history is the first of its kind to consider queer women in the projective test movement. For example, though considering
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56 Hegarty (2003a) especially refers to Evelyn Hooker who is discussed later on in this chapter in relation to June Hopkins, who I argue is her counterpart in Britain.
the history of the Rorschach with a queer lens, Hegarty (2003a) focused on men in the US. This history is certainly one about the marginal; it reveals a triple hidden history, one of Britain, one of women and one of queerness.

Before considering the individual lives of women involved in the projective test movement it is important to contextualise those lives and explain why such a queer feminist history is necessary. To explore this, there is a definitive need to contextualise and understand the difficulties in producing such a history. In the first section, I justify why a queer feminist approach is necessary for the projective test movement. In the second section of the chapter I consider the problems involved in conducting lesbian history especially in the 20th century and discuss several solutions and advantages of such a queer endeavour. In the third section I outline my approach regarding the lives of several women involved in the projective test movement. This section is focused on the work of June Hopkins and I use her 1969 *The Lesbian Personality* paper to frame the lives of the women in the projective test movement and produce a comparative analysis of her alongside Evelyn Hooker. Next, the oral histories of lesbians and gay men who were tested with the Rorschach are presented providing the bottom up approach to this research. Finally, the testing of lesbians and gay men with the Rorschach is presented in light of institutional and organisational influences. In all, I present the projective test movement in Britain as important for queer and/or feminist historians and psychologists. In doing so I construct an analysis around ideas of difference and produce an original approach of doing queer history in Psychology.

4.1 Why feminist, why queer, why the projective test movement?

Medico-scientific conceptualisations of women as inferior, infantile and emotional meant women scientists had their ability questioned both professionally and socially. At the turn of the 20th century, during the emergence of projective tests, many gendered
ideals from the 19th Century were still paramount. ‘True’ women were said to have virtues such as piety, purity, submissiveness and domesticity (Bohen, 1990). Scientific theory, influenced by evolutionary notions, proposed men were more variable in their abilities and intellect than women (Milar, 2000). In fact, it was thought an over-stimulation of education could detract from women’s more natural abilities and cause them harm. Because of this, femininity and science were often viewed as incompatible and the ‘women scientist’ was considered a contradiction in terms (Bohen, 1990; Rossiter, 1982).

These sexist frameworks also managed the entry of women into Psychology (Bohen, 1990) in the early 20th century. In the US those women who attained assistant professor positions or higher were unmarried and each experienced significant discrimination (Furumoto & Scarborough, 1986). Such dilemmas were also prevalent within the development of British Psychology. However, in Britain, women were not as easily accepted into Psychology as in the US, and so early British women psychologists did not question the sexist foundations of Psychology as early as those in the US (Shields, 2007). It is likely this was due to the higher reluctance of Oxford and Cambridge, the main and most prestigious Universities, to accept women students at all compared to selective US colleges.

Following from post-Darwinian ideas, the majority of gender differences were explained as having a ‘natural basis’ (Weeks, 1977). Shields (2007) argued that women’s emotional traits were perceived as complimentary to men, justifying the social hierarchy, women’s submissive nature, and consequential inferior status. Ideas of women as inferior, more susceptible to influence, and easily damaged by education continued to be prominent even among those highly influential upon early British Psychology. For example, Henry Maudsley, the main funder of the Maudsley hospital, said:
‘the affective life is more developed in proportion to the intellect in the female than in the male, and the influence of the reproductive organs upon mind more powerful’ (1879, as cited in Shields, 2007)

In the US there has been a number of feminist scholars accounting for the history of women in Psychology. Furumoto and Scarborough (1986) studied the lives of the first 22 women psychologists in the US joining soon after the profession was formed in 1892, achieving doctorates around the turn of the century. All of those who attained assistant professor or higher were unmarried and each experienced discrimination. Milar (2000) found that in the first group of women psychologists, only 50% had a professional rank compared to 65% of psychologists who were men. All of those professional women were single and worked predominantly in women’s colleges; many also had to work for free or for very little pay. Most women colleges only employed unmarried women. Ladd-Franklin, an unpaid lecturer at Columbia University wrote in 1917 that she had no other option but to lecture for nothing. She also said that women ‘ought to be taught that she cannot serve two masters, that if she chooses the higher path of learning and wants to do herself and her sex justice, she must forgo matrimony’ (Milar 2000, p. 618).

Similarly, in Britain, Valentine (2008b; 2010) considered the positions of women in early British Psychology, and in particular provided an account of Beatrice Engle (2006), one of the first women in the BPS. Despite the overarching sexist culture of early Psychology, women psychologists were major contributors to Psychology as soon as the profession was born in the late 19th Century (Bernstein & Russo, 1974; Furumoto & Scarborough, 1986; Milar, 2000; Rutherford, Vaughn-Blount & Ball, 2010). Valentine (2008) explored this with particular emphasis on the women in the early days of the BPS. Her analysis and comparative work with that of Perrone (1993) suggested that women found Psychology as a discipline more accessible than other sciences, especially Physiology, in Britain in the first half of the 20th century. This was perhaps, Valentine (2008) suggests, because of the wish to ‘swell the numbers’ of the recently developed BPS, particularly after the First World War, or because Psychology was such a new
science that men’s dominance had yet to gain a foothold. The proportion of women involved in the early BPS, which included Beatrice Engle, Alice Woods, Jessie Murray, Julia Turner and Susan Isaacs, also reflect the numbers of women involved in the British Rorschach Forum and the projective test movement. In both groups, the majority were middle-class, worked in teaching roles and were unmarried.\textsuperscript{57} Similarly, both this chapter and Chapter 3 show how prominent women psychologists were in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} Century in Britain in the projective test movement, however the efforts of these women have often been untold within the history of Psychology (Bernstein & Russo, 1974; Furumoto, 2003). Because of the misogynistic positioning of women throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, and androcentric history-telling, Bohan (1990) called for a re-placing of the women in the history of psychology. This re-placing project has continued to gain support in both the US/Canada\textsuperscript{58} and Britain (e.g. Valentine, 2008b; 2010).

When considering the gendered nature of Psychology one participant in the oral histories I conducted noted:

‘I think the nurturing and caring professions are mainly done by women but I wouldn’t want to make it a totally gendered thing if you think about the world in terms of culture all the time, I mean you know, men actually tend to be you know, not in the culture, not in the caring professionals, they tend to be seen as effeminate if they do. I don’t know why because they are not.’

The way ‘caring’ professions were gendered therefore highlights the need for feminist history (also see Valentine, 2010). Because women were also less likely to be accepted within academic areas of Psychology, their work remained largely invisible and was less

\textsuperscript{57} Two-thirds (11/16) of the first women members of the BPS remained unmarried. This is despite the fact that the marriage ban only effected school teachers from the 1920s and so did not impact the college and University level teaching these women were doing. However, as Valentine (2008) points out, Liverpool University did try very hard to enforce such a ban. The unmarried status of the early women involved in Psychology has also been explored by Furumoto and Scarborough (1986) and Milar (2000).

\textsuperscript{58} One of the main projects underway at the moment which aims to assist in the re-placing of women in the history of Psychology is Psychology’s Feminist Voices http://www.feministvoices.com. Also for web based feminist resources in Britain, see the Open University CHIP resource under the Women in Psychology narrative http://www2.open.ac.uk/openlearn/CHIPS/index.html
often cited (Stevens & Gardners, 1982). Even in death women psychologists are portrayed differently, as the image of Psychology continues to be represented by the ‘male scientist’ (Radtke, Hunter & Stam, 2000). Radtke et al (2000) argued, based on their discourse analysis of obituaries published in *American Psychologist* 1979-1997, women psychologists were remembered in relation to other people yet when relationships were mentioned for men it was to represent their humanity.

More specifically, Rutherford and Pettit (2015) in their recent discussion of feminism and/in/as Psychology discuss how there is a need for a growth in recent moves to include lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans (LGBT) and intersex history within feminist histories of psychology. This chapter goes some way to contribute to that effort. Indeed, Rutherford and Pettit (2015) also criticised the historians’ conception that the middle of the 20th century was a ‘silent’ period of feminist action. This chapter’s focus on the middle of the 20th century also contributes to remove this silence. However it does continue to focus on the middle-class white women with significant privileges and the rectification of this should be a central focus for intersectional feminist scholarship.

There is therefore not only a need to continue to re-place women in this history of Psychology generally, but this is especially important for the projective test movement in particular as women were so prominent within the scene. In the post-war years Psychology began to grow at an unprecedented rate. Furumoto (2003) argues that these testing practises had a large impact on the overall development of Psychology. However, what is interesting about these testing practises is that it was usually women psychologists doing the work. Testing was viewed, despite its importance and impact upon Psychology, as lower status and was thought to require less technical knowledge. It was therefore deemed suitable for women and so provided them with opportunities in lower salaried jobs than their male counterparts (Bohan, 1990). Testing boomed in areas such as employment, educational and developmental Psychology where it was believed women were better suited due to their natural nurturing abilities (Bohan, 1990; Furumoto, 2003).
Under the control of mainly women psychologists, applied psychology and testing practises greatly advanced the profession of Psychology.

Whilst a directly feminist history of the projective test movement has not been done, there have been elements of the projective test scene within more women centred histories of Psychology. For example, Bernstein and Russo (1974) used the TAT author Christiana Morgan as an example of a prominent woman author in their engaging quiz to introduce their paper *The History of Psychology Revisited Or, up with our Foremothers*. In their conclusion they state how far women have come in Psychology considering the bias and adverse circumstances they faced and question how much women could have done given equal chance. Additionally, both Weisstein, Blaisdell and Lemisch (1975) and Rutherford, et al (2010) in their discussion of Weisstein drawn upon work with the Rorschach. They use Hooker’s (1957) research on the gay men being tested with the Rorschach to show the impact women have had on Psychology. Both examples illustrate how projective testing has been used within feminist histories, yet we still lack a feminist history of the projective test movement itself. Indeed, these examples are also US based and considering the presence of women in British projective Psychology a British focus is also necessary.

A queer perspective or reading of this history is also necessary. As discussed in the previous chapter the Second World War acted as a catalyst for Rorschach testing in Britain and the US, though the British military engaged with projective testing much less. In the US specifically, one reason for this was that the officer screening included Rorschach testing in order to identify those who were gay (and those who were malingering as gay, see Bérubé, 1989; 1990; Hegarty, 2003a). Specifically, Due & Wright, (1945) and Fein (1950) conducted research on what they believed were clear
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59 In Psychology’s Feminist Voices http://www.feministvoices.com there are nine women in total included within the biographies who directly relate to Rorschach research. Those are: Theodora Mead Abel, Louise Bates Ames, Eugenia Hanfmann, Molly Harrower, Evelyn Gentry Hooker, Lois Barclay Murphy, Maria Rickers-Ovsiankina and Marion MacDonald Wright.
diagnostic signs of homosexuality. These included seeing feminine clothing; ambiguously sexed figures, sexual content and castration/phallic symbols in the ink blot (Due & Wright, 1945; Lindner, 1946). Similarly, having an artistic interpretation or one which could be viewed as paranoid (e.g. seeing masks or eyes) was also indicative of homosexuality (Due & Wright, 1945). Wheeler, (1949) disagreed with the methods of Linder and the interpretations of Due and Wright and so developed his 20 signs of homosexuality using the Rorschach. His conclusions were that a gay man could be identified when he presented as a somewhat paranoid person with derogatory attitudes towards women despite a feminine identification (Wheeler, 1949). He also reported that gay men had sexual fixations, especially anal ones, and paid attention to relationships between ‘similar beings’ (i.e. those of the same gender).

As discussed in Chapter 3, the British projective test movement however did not engage with research about homosexuality in the same way. There was much less focus on homosexuality, and attitudes towards it appear to be somewhat more affirmative. In fact there was some suggestion earlier in 1922 that ‘tougher’ soldiers coped better by 'resorting openly to perverted practises’ (p. 109 as cited in Bourke, 2001). These ideas that in some ways same-sex attraction would benefit soldiers was repeated in 1937 by R.E. Money-Kyrle who argued that ‘unconscious inverts’ were likely to turn their aggressive natures towards the enemy and defend their fellow soldiers (Bourke, 2001). In 1942 Berg further distinguished the kinds of men which could be potentially desirable and those which were not. He separated homosexuals into two types: the ‘active invert’ and the ‘passive invert’. The ‘active invert’ is the type which, presumably, Money-Kyrle was describing. These ‘active inverts’ were said to be aggressive in battle and good soldiers, their only danger being long periods of inactivity. The ‘passive invert’ however was continually dangerous, and was said to be liable to psychological collapse, likely to panic and surrender and to lack aggression. Berg also describes how, unfortunately, such men are incurable as the ‘inverts’ argued that it was in their nature to be homosexual (Anderson, 1956 as cited in Bourke, 2001).
Interest in homosexuality continued in Psychology and psychiatry but with a rather more homophobic and pathologising tone from the middle of the 20th century (see Jennings, 2008). King and Bartlett (1999) reviewed British psychiatry and homosexuality paying particular attention to treatments offered for homosexuality. These included behavioural treatments first developed at the Maudsley such as electro-shock treatments and aversion therapy. Having reviewed the history, King and Bartlett then worked with Smith and conducted oral histories of both the professionals involved in such treatment (King, Smith & Bartlett, 2004) and the patients of such treatment (Smith, Bartlett & King, 2004) from the 1950s. The studies revealed the shocking impact treatments had on patients and a worrying trend that some professionals continued to support homophobic and abusive treatments. As well as behavioural treatments, psychoanalysis also continued to have a presence in the treatment of homosexuality and psychoanalytic thinking continued to prevail as a theoretical understanding of the genesis of homosexuality (O’Connor & Ryan, 1993). Bene (1965a; 1965b) countered some psychoanalytic claims that domineering and smothering mothers were to blame for homosexuality, but continued to use psychoanalysis to suggest fathers were more responsible for the production of gay men and lesbians. In fact she argued:

‘It seems that much could be done toward the prevention of homosexuality if more attention were paid to the relationships young boys have with their fathers; and if those who are in need of father figures would be given opportunities for finding them’ (1965a, p. 813)

Psychoanalytic thinking which positioned homosexuality as something that should be prevented, avoided and treated was common in Britain (O’Connor & Ryan, 1993). King (2003) concluded that despite the DSM removing homosexuality as a mental illness in 1973 it had very little effect for lesbians and gay men in Britain.60 Lowenstein and

---

60 King (2003) cites the introduction of Section 28 and the continuation of homosexuality as a mental illness in the International Classification of diseases (ICD) until the 1990s as indications that the DSM removal was not the end point of psychiatric and governmental control of homosexuality.
Lowenstein (1984) in their review of research on homosexuality after 1978 indicated a mixed bag of research. Some researchers still promoted the use of treatments including ‘exceptional methods’ such as exorcism, religious conversion and castration; whereas others began to allude to social prejudice impacting the lives of gay men rather than their sexuality directly. In all, they argued since the early 1980s there had been a move away from attempting to ‘cure’ homosexuality. In this light, Hopkins’ (1969, 1970) research can be viewed as highly affirmative (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002).

Therefore, there is a need to not only re-place women back into the history of Psychology, but also begin to remove the lesbian erasure which is apparent. Such critique is able to raise questions about historical injustice around the normalising projects of Psychiatry and Psychology regarding gender and sexuality. Indeed, Duggan (2006) argued that the history of sexuality was not often considered a serious historical inquiry and discussed the need for greater conciliation between queer theory and lesbian and gay history. This endeavour was also supported by Milton (1997). Such a queer history has several benefits, and so to conclude on why this history is so important I quote King and Bartlett (1999):

‘History is always written from a perspective, our perspective was as gay and lesbian psychiatrists. Mental health professionals in Britain should be aware of the mistakes of the past. Only in that way can we prevent future excesses and heal the gulf between gay and lesbian patients and their psychiatrists’ (p. 111).

Perhaps ironically, the history of the Rorschach has potential to contribute to the healing of this gulf when looked at through a queer affirmative lens.

4.2 The problems of doing queer herstory

There are a number of difficulties in conducting feminist and/or lesbian histories which need to be addressed in order to begin this history. First, to begin the histories of
women have been recorded less reliably than those of men (Bohan, 1990). This is especially true for lesbian women. Cook (1979a) described this as the ‘historical denial of lesbian women’. Such historical denial of lesbian women has been particularly true for those in Britain where the experiences of women, and those women who desire women especially, have been undervalued and unreported (Jennings, 2007b). This is perhaps because Britain, unlike several other European countries, from the medieval era and early modern times onwards avoided legal prohibitions of lesbian behaviour (Brown, 1989). A number of historians identify such a lack of legal documentation about lesbian behaviour as an obstacle to lesbian history (see e.g. Brown, 1989; Donoghue, 1993; Weeks, 1997).

Second, of the reports in newspapers that were about women desiring women, there was a level of sensationalism. In the US, the trials of Alice Mitchell (who murdered her lesbian lover) in 1892 for example, became the benchmark by which other women who desired women were compared (Duggan, 1993). However, overall lesbian history has regularly been considered one of silence, invisibility and denial (Jennings, 2007a; 2007b).

Lesbian erasure is especially prevalent in the history of Psychology. June Hopkins remains a rare exception where a figure of the past has been reframed in an affirmative and distinctly lesbian manner. The life of Charlotte Wolff has potential to be drawn in here, however she was not a psychologist, but rather a psychotherapist and independent scholar (see Brennan, 2010; Brennan & Hegarty, 2010; Brennan & Hegarty, 2012). Conducting lesbian history, especially in a disciplinary context where homosexuality was considered a mental illness is difficult. Using Hopkins as an example, it is unlikely she would have been identified as a lesbian by historians prior to her coming out (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002). Without such clear self-identification lesbian erasure is very possible due to heteronormativity and so historians must ‘read between the straight lines’ of the archive to prevent historical erasure (Koaureas, 2014).

---

61 See Gallo, (2014) for a particularly compelling example of lesbian erasure in the history of Psychology which will be expanded upon in Chapter 4 and 5.
In order to challenge such invisibility a number of histories of the lives of women desiring women have been produced (see Donoghue, 1993; Duberman, Vicinus & Chauncey, 1989; Giffney, Sauer & Watt, 2011; Weeks, 1997). Conducting lesbian history in the 20th and 21st centuries is particularly difficult as terms like ‘lesbian’ ‘invert’ and ‘homosexual’ became known, yet shrouded by medico-scientific pathologic meaning few women directly identified with them and many rejected such labels.62 Turn of the century sexologists had a major impact upon this, for example the work of Havelock Ellis including his introduction of the term ‘sexual invert’ (Ellis & Symonds, 1897). In fact the 1920s and 1930s, the time in which the projective test movement began, saw a pivotal change in the way sexuality was seen, as illustrated by the 1928 ban of the lesbian novel The Well of Loneliness by self-identified ‘invert’ Radclyffe Hall (Hall, 1928, see Jennings, 2007a; 2007b; 2007c). In fact Ellis wrote the original preface of the book, giving it some form of psychological legitimacy. Psychology began to develop constructs of homosexuality around illness and sickness instead of it being framed as a problem of morality as it was in the previous century (Jennings, 2007a). Following from the work of Ellis, psychological theories suggested homosexuality was indicative of sexual ‘inversion’ – though Ellis argued that gay men were not necessarily effeminate, he did believe lesbian women were masculine (Weeks, 1977). Medico-scientific texts informed readers that lesbians were promiscuous, predatory and psychopathic (Jennings, 2007a). The category lesbian and the presentation of ‘inverts’ gained greater cultural significance after the Second World War, but it was still treated as a neurotic sickness (Hopkins, 1969, 62). It is likely only middle and upper class women would have had access to medico-scientific texts and thus been able to identify themselves within the literature in order to reject (or perhaps accept) such labels. Radclyffe Hall is a particularly famous example of someone who self-identified as an ‘invert’ in the 1920s, as too does her protagonist Stephen in The Well of Loneliness in which such identification was a direct association of reading medico-scientific texts on homosexuality. However as discussed in Duggan (1993) newspapers would have run sensationalist stories about women transgressing gender and sexual norms and many stories, terms and ideas would still have been accessible through word of mouth meaning working class women who desired women would not have been unaware of the scientific/social understandings connotations of their desires. For example, the ‘female husband’ is viewed by lesbian historians as a distinctly working class component of lesbian history (see Donogue, 1993; Faderman, 1981; Jennings 2007a; 2007b). 63 See Crozier (2008) for a history of earlier psychiatric writings about homosexuality in Britain prior to Ellis.
1970, Jennings, 2007c). These cultural shifts in understanding about gender and sexuality mean the early 20th Century is a particularly challenging period for historians conducting lesbian history.

By the end of the Second World War fears of the middle and upper class ‘New Woman’ abounded – that is the more independent, masculine and feminist woman (Jennings, 2007a). Women enjoyed more freedoms and political rights, they experienced employment in higher numbers than ever before. However, despite these changes marriage was still deemed to be in opposition to the career and many believed that once the war effort was over women would return to their ‘natural roles’ as care-givers and home-makers. Weeks (1977) identifies the post Second World War era as a particularly hostile time for lesbian women in the US (also see Bérubé 1989). Having experienced, in some cases, relative tolerance in the military, the enforcement to maintain pre-war social order meant many lesbian women were immediately discharged and trialled for having relationships with other women; whereas during the war only those ‘addicted to the practise’ were formally dealt with (Faderman, 1991; Weeks, 1977). Attention to the early 20th century has been fruitful for historians interested in gender and sexuality. The associations with the women’s’ movements and first wave feminism influenced shifting attitudes about women’s social role as well as the slowly growing lesbian community (Jennings, 2006). Specifically Jennings (2007b) identified middle to upper class women gaining careers (especially in education and the professions), choosing not to marry and living more independent lives, some of whom lived their lives with their women lovers, as central to the telling of lesbian histories of this period.64

Despite the fact that terms such as ‘homosexual’, ‘invert’ and even ‘lesbian’ were known in the early 20th century, issues of inappropriate presentism remain. Perhaps the most widespread issue in the history of sexuality is the essential/constructionist debate. The essentialist position is that lesbians and gay men have been present in all historical

64 The life of Charlotte Wolff is a good example of such a middle to upper class white woman living independently working in British Psychology and loving other women (Brennan & Hegarty, 2010).
time, and the constructionist position is that, because the identities ‘lesbian’ and ‘gay’ are recent constructions, it is improper to make this claim. As Foucault (1976) succinctly argued, sexuality is historical and the ‘homosexual’ has come into being only recently. Yet as historians and activists have highlighted, same-sex sexual behaviours, desires, relationships and loves have occurred throughout history (Plummer, 1981; Weeks, 1981). Rupp (1989) explained:

‘In the simplest terms, we are faced with a choice between labelling women lesbians who might have violently rejected the notion or glossing over the significance of women’s relationships by considering them asexual and Victorian’ (p. 398).

In conducting lesbian histories there is the continual problem of ‘projecting’ identities onto people of the past who would not have conceptualised their lives in such a way. However, the contextualisation of love between women throughout history is most likely more nuanced than this, as is the understanding of sexuality in Psychology historically (see Pettit and Hegarty, 2014 for a discussion of the relationships between sexuality and time in Psychology). Several historians have successfully managed to conduct such lesbian history without reducing women to one or two unsuitable categories (e.g. see Donohue, 1993; Faderman, 1981; Giffney, et al, 2011; Jennings, 2007b). Dealing with presentism is especially difficult when conducting histories that are hidden, especially in psychology where ‘deviant’ sexualities were symptomatic and considered evidence of mental illness. Donogue (1993) was realistic about the essentialist/constructionist debate and argues most historians are somewhere in the middle. Jennings (2007b) provided a short account of the historical changes in emphasis on both positions and clarifies the motives behind each position. Presentism is a major concern for historians and its recognition signified a shift towards more sophisticated histories of Psychology (Stocking, 1966). The application of current or present understandings upon a historical period is anachronistic and appears to be of particular concern when discussing sexuality, presentism is therefore of particular concern within this thesis.
Yet sexuality is not the only identity that historians should be wary of projecting onto individuals of the past. One of the participants in my own oral histories informed me in the oral history interview that she does not identify herself as a feminist:

‘That’s my, my thinking so you can go on with – I am, I am not a feminist. And I’m not the, err, the other either. I just think you know, that kind of definition of people, is all sort of feeble really. Sorry.’

Definitions and perspectives are therefore complicated when doing history, and it remains important to consider different intersections in experience. It seems that gender is clearly an important feature within this history of the Rorschach, and indeed, there are differences between lesbian and gay history too. Such understandings of sexuality historically is complicated by beliefs about gender. Premodern women who desired women were not called ‘lesbians’, a word which only came into existence at the end of the 19th century and has only gained greater popularity in the last century. Instead these women would have been understood as attempting to emulate men. For these reasons alone gender is an important intersection.

Other intersections are also important to consider. Some lesbian historians have already investigated class (e.g. Faderman, 2011; Newton, 1989; Rupp, 1989; Smith-Rosenberg, 1989). It seems class is particularly important, as there are vast differences in the experiences of working class and middle to upper class lesbian women in the 20th century and earlier. In fact, most of the attention has been paid to the relationships between middle and upper-class women, for example, Radclyffe Hall, Anne Lister and Virginia Woolf. Race is also an important factor, of the lesbian histories I have outlined above are all about white women. Yet as revealed in my oral history interview, one participant described the racism she experienced whilst in training and working as a psychotherapist in London as ‘dreadful’, ‘very shocking’ and ‘really very very widespread’. Similarly, Charlotte Wolff experienced anti-Semitism in both Germany and in Britain before, during and post the Second World War (Brennan & Hegarty, 2010).
There have been vastly different perspectives about the problems of lesbian history. Cook (1979a) for example states that:

‘women who love women, who choose women to nurture and support and to form a living environment in which to work creatively and independently are lesbians. Genital “proofs” to confirm lesbianism are never required to confirm the heterosexuality of men and women who live together for 20, or 50, years. Such proofs are not demanded even when discussing ephemeral love relations between adult women and men.’

(p. 64, see also Cook, 1979b)

Similarly, Faderman (1981) investigated a range of relationships between women, all were passionate but not necessarily sexual. Focusing on Britain, Donoghue (1993) equally argues that sex is not necessary for a lesbian history, and how it is possible to broaden the meaning of lesbian history to include variety whilst avoiding reducing lesbian history to mere sisterly affection. Such historical perspectives echo Rich’s (1980) assertion that women are coerced into heterosexuality via heteropatriarchy. Rich responded by creating a lesbian continuum upon which all women’s relationship with other women sit. This continuum allowed all women, whether lesbian or not, to recognise their moving relationships with other woman. By recognising lesbian existence and lesbian continuum she argued it was possible to remove lesbian erasure from feminist scholarly work, the existence of which was (and continues to be) both anti-lesbian and anti-feminist (Rich, 1993). Relatedly, Wittig (1981) argued that lesbian women are not women according to patriarchal ideas of womanhood and that lesbian women are outside of such phallocentric conceptualisations. Different ideas about relationships and intimacy, for example, ‘romantic friendships’ (Donogue, 1993, Faderman, 1981; 1991; Jennings, 2007b) and school crushes (Jennings, 2007a; 2007b; Vicinus, 1989), initially suggest that such relationships were not necessarily sexual. Yet the diaries of Anne Lister revealed the occurrences of sexual relationships between women in the early 19th Century and it appeared that lack of evidence of sexual activity was a symptom of documentation more than a lack of sex between women (Whitbread, 1988).
Other lesbian historians have developed different methods to confront these issues with presentism. Bennett (2000) uses the phrase ‘lesbian-like’ to describe the lives of those she views as lesbian prior to the sexual identity. Doan (2006) clearly argues that because understandings of sexuality, gender and thus inversions of both were not understood as they are today such projections of the present onto the past cannot, and should not be done. Using the example of women dressing in a more masculine manner in the post war years, she argues that masculine dress was not at the time indicative of lesbian identity/behaviour, such dress was viewed as a reaction to the war, not as a sign of sexual deviance. Doan (2006; 2013) argues, following from the work of Foucault (1976) how sexuality should be considered historical and that there was not a panic over the increase of ‘masculine’ women per se; their appearance was more humorous and a novelty (Doan, 2006). Whether viewed as threatening or not, the increased independence of women and the shifting expectations means that navigating this period can be tricky. In contrast, a number of lesbian historians have identified such ‘cross-dressing’ as distinctly queer. For example, working class women ‘passing’ as men in to gain work; to marry their lovers and to gain other privileges given only to men (Duberman, et al, 1989; Jennings, 2007a; 2007b; Newton, 1989)

While the presence of homosexuality historically has been debated, little attention has been paid to the presence of ‘heterosexuality’ (see Katz, 1996). While some argue that sexuality as we understand it today does not map onto how it was understood in the early 20th century (Doan, 2013), barely any attention has been paid to how heterosexuality may have been understood. Heterosexuality is regularly conceptualised as historically essential and this is often taken for granted (see Hubbard & Hegarty, 2014 for a social psychological perspective on essentialist beliefs about sexuality). Lochrie (2011) called for a heterosexual history because of the perceptions that heterosexuality has been constant, which of course it has not.65 No other topic appears to have such fraught

---

65 The emergence of heterosexuality came after that of ‘homosexuality’ due to the describing of deviance and illness in contrast to ‘normal’ which of course alludes to the presence of the powers at play in such distinctions. See Katz (1996).
negotiations concerning anachronism. A fear of anachronism surrounds the history of sexuality as if there is something inherently offensive in miss-identifying a person of the past as gay or as a lesbian. As Giffney et al (2011) point out anachronism is present in all historicism, it is inevitable to some extent. Indeed, it can be used for good, for example, Giffney et al (2011) describe their use of ‘lesbian’ in their edited text *The Lesbian Premodern* as deliberately provocative. Similarly, Donohue (1993) too uses ‘lesbian’ as shorthand for all of the terms used to mean women loving women throughout centuries and accepts the connotations of each under this terminological umbrella. Faderman (1981) states how it is impossible to account for ‘what really happened’ and lesbian historians must move forward with the project to protect lesbian history from further erasure. In some ways then, using what might be perceived as presentist language is in fact a conscious act of reflexivity about historical questions pertinent to the present. This effort is of course, political (Traub, 2011) and deliberate, as is all historicism.

A number of methods to deal with presentism around sexuality are available. As outlined above one can use ‘lesbian-like’, or ‘heterosexual-not’ (Lochrie, 2011). From the 1990s increasingly historians and writers have used queer theory. Jennings (2007b) used the work of Judith Butler’s, stating one is not born queer but is named queer by the wider community. Hegarty (2013) applies this thinking specifically to Psychology and the history of testing in Terman’s analysis of gifted boys and their apparent effeminacy, inversion and possible queerness. In regards to the question of whether sex is necessary in lesbian history Jennings (2007b) argues that explicit sources are not necessary but instead historians can consider context and the ways mainstream society understood desire between women. Without such associations or recognition, as Vicinus describes it, women of the past and their desires are underestimated (Jennings, 2007b). Jennings (2007c) also argues by adopting a queer approach lesbian historians are able to free themselves from the search for historical sources directly about lesbian experience and instead focus on the roles of lesbian sexuality in constructing ‘normative’ sexuality. Though historians should avoid searching the past for women who fulfil modern ideas of
lesbianism, Vicinus (2011) argues that it is still possible to relate present and past understandings, even if those in the past would not have understood our conceptualisations - such relationships between the past and the present are still meaningful. The Rorschach is a potential object by which to do this. As described at the beginning of this chapter, the Rorschach can be understood by queer people of the past as well as the present.

Donogue (1993) suggested lesbian historians are battling a number of ideas which are unnecessary. The idea that lesbian history is one of silence and invisibility, is not strictly true. Rather there is evidence of historical terms for ‘lesbian’ but these have been ignored, and misunderstandings of terms and confusions surrounding sexual acts and identities. She suggests ‘Tribade’ and ‘Tommy’ as potential words meaning ‘lesbian’ in past centuries. 66 Using tribady as a metaphor Donogue (1993) suggests it as a method for doing lesbian history:

‘Tribady, an activity that is rarely discussed, provides a stimulating metaphor for the business of doing history. The researcher is not so much penetrating the past to find what she wants as making contact with it, touching the surface of her present interests to the details of the past; the more she touches, the more she will become sensitised to the nuances she is exploring.’ (p. 24)

What is particularly convincing is that women who desired women in the past, and those today vary dramatically, and it is important to retain that diversity in experience no matter the century (Donogue, 1993).

Vicinus (2011) described the effects of Foucault’s (1976) distinctions of premodern sexual acts and modern identities as still ‘haunting’ lesbian history, referencing Bennet’s similar call for recognition without identification (see Bennett,

66 ‘Tommy’ associated with ‘tom boy’ alludes to masculine women. Similarly, ‘Molly’ was used in the 19th century to refer to men who frequented ‘Molly houses’ which were taverns and meeting places for men who desired men (see Sedgwick, 1985).
Donoghue (1993) specifically argues that we should avoid being bogged down in terminology and what the definitions of ‘lesbian’ mean, as dictionary definitions have not served the lesbian community well and have been void of meaning and culture. Similarly, there are issues with the use of the majority’s language - it is after all difficult to dismantle the masters’ house with the masters’ tools (Lorde, 1979). Yet, there are a number of potential solutions to the issues involved in doing lesbian history. Telling a queer feminist history of the early 20th Century has significant challenges, and these challenges must be overcome in order to successfully tell the female story of the projective test movement.

Overall, very little attention has been paid to how research with the Rorschach and ‘homosexuality’ has impacted the lives of lesbian women. Within the gendered practices of Psychology historically, lesbian women have been erased from discussions and analysis. This paper begins to respond to this and attempts to undo some of this erasure by drawing lesbian women to the foreground.

In conducting my research on these women using biographical data, their publications, my previous review of the Rorschach newsletter and some oral histories I discovered several features that indicate these women led feminist, and in some cases, potentially queer lives. Broad examples of evidence of lesbianism include resisting social pressures to marry and have children, and developing supportive networks with other women (Jennings, 2007; Wittig, 1981). Many, if not all, of the women I identified could be argued to fulfil aspects of this definition. In fact, it could be argued that their mere presence within Psychology at this time provokes a strong sense of their feminist values; or at least that they can be reclaimed by feminist psychologists now. In a time of highly...
gendered expectations of women to be home makers and mothers, all of these women fought against these societal beliefs about what women ought to do. Jennings (2007a) highlights the career women of this post-war period and heavily links them to lesbian lifestyles. There appear to be themes of feminism and queer lifestyles within the history of the women of the projective test movement and these too need to be explored to prevent another hetero-androcentric history being told once more. Giffney et al (2011) recommend that whilst biographies of women of the past are important, these require contextualisation and it is important to view how cultural organisation and sexuality impacted the lives of women. There are indeed certain challenges that come with this especially in the 20th century. Faderman (2011) describes these problems from her 1999 book dealing with highly educated middle-class women in the early-twentieth century who knew words like ‘lesbian’ and ‘homosexual’. Equally difficult in my own work here is that the women I am investigating not only knew these terms but were also psychologists, meaning they would know the pathologisation and illness model of homosexuality and be aware of its consequences. Making claims about such identities is therefore slippery at best. It is possible, however, to conduct queer readings of their lives, or, as Koareas (2014) argues, to read ‘between the straight lines of the archive’.

Below I present my own solution to the issue discussed in the above section. I provide an account of June Hopkins, who used the Rorschach to study lesbians in Britain in the later 1960s. It is through her work that I conduct an analysis of the lives of the potentially feminist and queer women involved in the projective test movement.

4.3 June Hopkins as the analytic lens

June Hopkins, was originally from Texas and in the US Air Force but later came to Britain when her husband moved there for work. She had been outraged by the dismissals of lesbian women she knew from the air force and wanted to prove there was
nothing neurotic or pathological about lesbians (see Bérubé 1989; 1990; Weeks, 1977). She was the first person to publish original Rorschach research on lesbian women in Britain. Importantly, she used the word ‘lesbian’ in her 1969 and 1970 papers instead of ‘female homosexual’ as was more common given the pathological understanding of homosexuality in Psychology at the time. For example, Barker (1970) who conducted the study already mentioned at the very beginning of this chapter also published Rorschach work on lesbians, but identified his participants as ‘female homosexuals’ in the same issue of the *British Journal of Projective Psychology and Personality Study* as Hopkins (1970) was published.

Hopkins published two central papers on lesbian women. In both she drew on data she collected using the Minority Research Group, a group of lesbian women volunteering for research in order to discredit the idea lesbian women were pathological. She tested all her recruited participants with seven psychological tests, one of which was the Rorschach. The first paper compared the twenty four lesbian women to matched-pairs of heterosexual women on two personality tests. It was published in 1969 entitled *The Lesbian Personality*, in which she argued that lesbian women did have a distinct personality. Notably, she described lesbian women somewhat more positively than she did heterosexual women. They were more independent, resilient, reserved, dominant, bohemian, self-sufficient and composed. In her 1970 paper *Lesbian Signs on the Rorschach* she used the same data, and the Rorschach specifically to show that there were particular ‘signs’ on the Rorschach for lesbian women, some of which matched the personality traits she had already found. The lesbian signs were that lesbian women showed ‘deprecated’ female responses (meaning they were demeaning responses about women), often provided less than three responses per plate and that Card 7 was often the least liked card.

Despite Hopkins’ good intentions her research was perceived as homophobic by researchers in the US. As explained in Chapter 3 the distinctions Hopkins made between lesbian and heterosexual women was concerning for many as talk of difference signified
pathology in the US context where the Rorschach was used to detect homosexuals in the military. Morin (1977) called her research homophobic due to her search for ‘lesbian signs’ on the Rorschach. He presumed that by finding lesbian signs Hopkins’ was attempting to diagnose homosexuality, which she was not. Rather, all of her self-identified lesbian participants were engaged in research in order to prevent such diagnosis and pathologisation of homosexuality. This highlights the irony in my using Hopkins’ study in order to frame the lives of women in the projective test movement. The Rorschach has an almost completely homophobic history, yet by adopting Hopkins as a theorist, I make the Rorschach and projective tests in general do something affirmative for lesbian and gay history.

In order to accomplish a herstory without projecting today’s assumptions onto the past I propose to use June Hopkins’ *The Lesbian Personality* (1969) and *Lesbian Signs on the Rorschach* (1970) to frame the lives of these women. In this study Hopkins used psychological tests to propose that not only do male homosexual signs on the Rorschach not apply to women, but that instead of the neurotic picture painted about the lesbian in Psychology, lesbians in fact had distinctive and positive features compared to their heterosexual counterparts. In using this framework, I am not only using one of the central women of the projective test movement to frame both herself and the other women I have selected, but I am using relevant projective psychology. There is no significant historical research to date on lesbian women in British psychology, despite Morawski’s (1994) suggestion that those on the margins are worthy of historical inquiry and reflexive study. Of course a number of biographies of women are available, (e.g. Valentine, 2006) and the project to re-place women in the history of psychology is ongoing. Naturally, there is extensive research on lesbian and gay psychology, the formation of LGBT Psychology and prejudice research. However, there is little literature to provide a framework of doing lesbian history in Psychology directly and so I have developed an analysis from which this ongoing project can begin. Borrowing from lesbian history, as well as psychological literature I propose an original approach to the history of Psychology. Hopkins is one of
the very few reclaimed lesbians in the history of Psychology (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002) and in adopting her papers as a form of analysis I provide evidence that there are other women who have the potential also to be reclaimed. There are a number of possible critiques of such an approach. For example, some may argue that it is an inappropriate application of a psychological study, and for others it may be too ‘queer’ an approach. However, my proposed analysis is not a complete and final solution to the problem of historical lesbian erasure in Psychology. In presenting these women I expose lesbian erasure in the history of Psychology and make moves forward in this broader project of including queer women in the re-placing of women in the history of Psychology (Rutherford & Pettit, 2015).

By using this research which in itself sits more comfortably within the past understandings of sexuality I aim to avoid some concerns of presentism by not explicitly describing these women as lesbian, when the majority of which would likely never have described themselves in such terms. Lesbian psychologists from the 1930s might have been unaware of the term ‘lesbian’, and more likely they would understand ‘invert’, and I would argue it is unlikely they would describe themselves as such because of the pathologised way psychology treated ‘sexual deviance’. Hopkins is therefore positioned in a unique place among these prominent women in the projective test movement, as she is the only one who has identified herself publically as a lesbian. In addition, in using her work to frame my queer feminist reading I manage other historical problems and use an internalist queer subject to frame my own queer externalist perspective.

4.3.1 June Hopkins compared to Evelyn Hooker.

As outlined in Chapter 3, Hopkins’ work is distinctly comparable with the work of Evelyn Hooker. Hooker has been viewed as central to the de-pathologisation of homosexuality in the US through her research on gay men showing that there was no distinction between gay men and heterosexual men on the Rorschach (1957; see Minton, 2002). The differences between these research results are clear and in the different
national contexts both have been reclaimed as affirmative research. Hopkins and Hooker are similar in that they are actually both American women (Clarke, Ellis, Peel, & Riggs, 2010; Hooker, 1992) working within a field largely dominated by men. Both Hooker and Hopkins were studying homosexuality using the Rorschach and the tests’ perceived reliability and validity were central to their findings. Without belief in the Rorschach’s potential to discern people’s psychology, Hooker’s finding that Psychologists could not successfully distinguish between homosexual and heterosexual participants and Hopkins’ findings that there were lesbian signs on the Rorschach would have been meaningless.

Both Hopkins and Hooker were said to have been influenced by their friends and it was their direct experiences of lesbian and gay people that led them to conduct such research. Hooker famously became interested in gay men because of a student with whom she became friends (Minton, 2002). Hopkins similarly, became interested from her experiences in the US Air Force where lesbian women were being discharged due to their sexuality (Clarke, et al, 2010). Possibly because of these personal relationships which led to their research, both Hopkins and Hooker also came from perspectives which aimed to stop homosexuality being considered a diagnostic mental illness. Importantly, they came from two different perspectives, both of which can be viewed as affirmative. In contrast to Hooker’s sameness discourse, Hopkins’ argued lesbian women were different, and used more positive language to describe them. These positives removed the idea that lesbian women were venerable and neurotic, but did echo some stereotyped ideas about lesbian women (Jennings 2007a). Another clear distinction between the two women is that Hooker studies men and Hopkins studied women. It is even more interesting that the two studies on ‘homosexuals’ in Britain were both conducted on women considering the absolute focus on men within the US literature (Barker, 1970; Hopkins, 1970). In fact, Hopkins highlighted androcentrism within the Rorschach research literature (Hopkins, 1970).

The differences in the participants of these two studies are telling. Hooker has said that she had been asked later why she did not research lesbian women and do the same for
them as she did for gay men (Hegarty, 2003a). However she argues that to have asked the National Institute of Mental Health at the time would have meant she would be under investigation of being a lesbian herself. Hooker (1992) describes some of the ordeals she went through in order to investigate gay men, including suspicions of her own sexuality and dealing with the police in regards to both the confidentiality and illegality (at the time) of her participants sexual behaviours. Due to McCarthyism at the time, Hooker was continuously reinforcing her own heterosexuality, or as she described it, she had to be as ‘pure as the driven snow’ (Hegarty, 2003a). In contrast however Hopkins studied women and defied convention and published her paper under her own name and not anonymously. Interestingly too, despite being married at the time, she retrospectively identified herself as a lesbian. She stated that:

‘I was a little worried because at the time it wasn’t acceptable at all. We’re talking about 1969 when the paper [The Lesbian Personality in the British Journal of Psychiatry] was published. I felt I was treading on very delicate ground. I didn’t know whether I wanted to be a lesbian or not, whether I wanted to be identified as a lesbian. I decided later that I didn’t care. After all the literature came out, it felt quite respectful. I was married and my husband knew I was a lesbian but I wasn’t an active lesbian - I was one in my own mind. I had known for years in my own mind. I hadn’t ‘come out’ (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002).

Hooker had to become fully submersed in the gay community and build trust in order to recruit participants for her study (1957). Her work was heavily supported by the gay community (e.g. The Mattachine Review, Hegarty, 2003a; Minton, 2002). However she also described difficulty in recruiting heterosexual counterparts because of the nature of her research (Hegarty, 2003a). Hopkins similarly found it much easier to gain lesbian participants because of the Minorities Research Group from which she recruited her participants. In fact she tested over 100 lesbian women but only reported findings of twenty four because she found it so difficult to recruit heterosexual women because she had only recently moved to Britain (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002). This experience is very
similar to that of Hooker when she was recruiting for her own 1957 study. It seems that being in a new place - a new country or a new community- and the stigmas of such research had profound effects on both studies.

The Minorities Research Group was founded by lesbian women, Esmè Langley, Diana Chapman and Jackie Foster, in order to support research (Clarke, et al, 2010; Jennings, 2007a). The Minorities Research Group were pioneering in their attempts to get affirmative research about lesbian women out in Psychology. They were keen to advertise themselves as participants to show the medical world that the sickness model was incorrect (Jennings, 2007c). In fact Esme Langley, the founder of Arena Three and the Minorities Research Group, also promoted research with Eve Bene and her research on the parent-child relationship in female homosexuality (1965b) and assisted in recruitment of participants for Charlotte Wolff for her book Love Between Women (1971) (see Jennings, 2007a; and Brennan, 2010; for a discussion of Wolff’s other works including Bisexuality, 1979).

Overall there seems to be a major difference in attitudes in Britain compared to the US. Hopkins had a more affirmative approach and struggled less with the specific suspicious cold-war context that was rife in the US at the time (Lemov, 2011; Lutz, 1997). However it should be noted that Hopkins and Hooker were both studying homosexuality at different points in time, as mentioned. The British papers were not published until 1969/1970 whereas Hooker published her work in 1957. Separated by over a decade within very different cultural contexts of each time, these socio-historical differences should be taken into account when considering the differences between approaches. Hooker (1992) described her ordeals with studying homosexuality during the Cold War era, whereas in contrast Hopkins was able to conduct her research in the late 1960s when she could access participants freely using the Minorities Research group. Yet she did still come across prejudice. In her interview with Clarke (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002) she discussed the issues of attempting to conduct sexuality based work in the mid-1960s at Cambridge University. She remembers having to read sexuality literature in a
separate room in the Cambridge library under watch (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002) and many colleagues either did not discuss her work or questioned its relevance.

As discussed Hopkins was a rare affirmative researcher who identified (albeit only in her own mind at the time of publication) as a lesbian. This was in contrast to Hooker in the US who reinforced her own heterosexuality to avoid accusations (Hooker, 1992). Such identification (or non-identification) with one’s participants can be viewed in some ways as either bias or as beneficial. In the early days of Psychology, women researchers were treated as suspicious in regards to their study of women (Morawski & Agronick, 1991). Hooker’s experiences somewhat mirrored this, she argued that people felt she must have some kind of ulterior motive to wish to research lesbians. However upon reflection of Hopkins’ work, she can be viewed as having brave authority to have discussed possible lesbian signs on the Rorschach and lesbian personality traits. Within the comparison of Hooker and Hopkins it is possible to see how the shift of authority has developed. Hooker had to reinforce her own heterosexuality in order to be considered legitimate enough to be able to study homosexuality. The distancing of her own identity from her subjects meant her research was viewed as less biased and more objective. In contrast however Hopkins’ later open identification with her subjects has shown an understanding of her subjects’ experiences and perspectives which also suggests her work is reliable. This shift of authority, from the distant perspective to the personal understanding whilst retaining a high level of authority is an example of Hacking’s (1995) shift of the known (ie. a lesbian) becoming a knower (ie. a lesbian who authoritatively knows about lesbianism).

Another key feature between the work of Hopkins and Hooker is the idea of difference. Hooker in effect argued that gay men and heterosexual men are the same, whereas Hopkins argued lesbian women and heterosexual women are different. Hopkins arguably is providing positive aspects of the lesbian personality to counter the pathology surrounding the psychology of lesbian women at the time. These different approaches also had different consequences in each national context. In America where difference
suggested pathology, discourses of sameness were affirmative. In contrast, in Britain where there was little military involvement and a lesser concern of homosexuality in the post war era, discourses of difference had more potential to be positive. Since, Hopkins’ work has been accepted as early progressive and affirmative research (Clarke, et al, 2010). But what such a comparative analysis reveals is the intersections of history, power, gender and sexuality. In the reversing of lesbian erasure, it is necessary to rethink difference. Within Psychology, difference has so often meant deviation from the norm, pathology and later perhaps diagnosis (Hacking, 1995). Difference is certainly queer, whether that be in the definition related to sexuality, or the definition related to oddness and peculiarity. In both meanings Hopkins is queer. She is a lesbian but also unique. She considered difference to be positive and approached affirmative research from a truly knowledgeable perspective. Changing ideas of what makes ‘good’ research have changed in the 20th and early 21st centuries and because of this it is possible to see the incredible contribution to lesbian history, psychology, and Rorschach testing that Hopkins made in Britain.

Hopkins is the only out lesbian woman involved in the projective test movement. Her interest in using the Rorschach with lesbian women makes her central to my uncovering of lesbian feminist history in the British projective test movement. It is through a lens of her work and her experience that I am framing and comparing the lives of other potentially queer and feminist women involved in the projective test movement. The following analysis requires some strategic belief in the Rorschach, without which using Hopkins’s work would not be very informative. It is necessary to consider the Rorschach from the view point of Hopkins and thus it is positioned as valid and valuable.

4.3.2 The queer women of the projective test movement

I draw from a number of sources in order to investigate the lives of the women involved in the projective test movement. I use biographical data, the women’s publications, my review of the Rorschach newsletter (including those under latter titles)
as well as other better known British journals. Archival materials were used from both the BPS archive and the Lowenfeld archive (both situated at the Wellcome Library). I discovered several features which indicated these women led feminist, and in some cases, potentially queer lives. In addition I also draw on a number of different oral histories, both those I conducted myself and those at the sounds archives at the British Library. The four women I pay particularly attention to are: Theodora Alcock (1888-1980); Margaret Lowenfeld (1890-1973); Ann Kaldegg (1899-1995) and Effie Lilian Hutton (1904-1956).

In the following section I present these women as independent, resilient, reserved, dominant, bohemian, self-sufficient and composed which is in line with Hopkins’ (1969; see 1970) research on the lesbian personality. I deliberately do not explicitly describe these women as lesbians, but rather use the term queer, or ‘potentially queer’. Although ‘queer’ has a number of negative connotations and has only recently been reclaimed by the LGBT community, its use is apt in this case because of its multiple meanings. I also use queer as to not create bisexual erasure which could occur if I were to explicitly use lesbian. These women could have been queer in the sexual sense, they may have even identified themselves privately as lesbians or as bisexual, however this is debatable.68 However using ‘queer’ to mean odd, or peculiar is a possibility – these women were certainly different, and so by using ‘queer’ I highlight their peculiarity considering the social contexts of their lifetimes and indicate potential for sexual queerness as well.

‘Miss’ Theodora Alcock, or ‘Theo’ as she was known to friends, was born in 1888. Very little is known about her childhood and early life. During the Second World War she was a Child Guidance Officer and presumably she did not gain a doctorate as she is continually referred to as ‘Miss’ throughout The Rorschach Newsletter and its subsequent publications. This indicated not only her lack of doctorate level qualification but also her unmarried status. Her life as described in her obituary by Herbert Phillipson

68 A good comparative point here is to consider the life of Charlotte Wolff (1897-1986), whose materials are in the BPS archive. Though she did not identify herself as lesbian in her youth she does describe her having always known she was attracted to women. See Brennan (2010), Brennan & Hegarty (2008) and Brennan and Hegarty (2012).
published in *Journal of Projective Psychology* begins in 1933 when she joined the Tavistock as a playgroup leader (Phillipson, 1981). After the Second World War she became one of the clinic’s first child psychotherapists. It was at the Tavistock that Alcock came across the Rorschach in 1933 and she reportedly taught the technique to psychiatrist CJC Earl. Alcock had an interest in psychoanalysis, especially in the work of Melanie Klein, Anna Freud and Susan Isaacs. In fact, Alcock sent a letter of condolences to Anna Freud on the death of her father Sigmund suggesting they knew each other personally. Alcock also interested many others in the Rorschach including Eric Trist, who after the Second World War joined the Tavistock. Phillipson (1981) argued that at the heart of her work was the aim to master the Rorschach and to pass on such knowledge in teaching and promote its use in research. Alcock was often thought of as the mother of the Rorschach in Britain. One oral history participant reported that:

‘She was a lovely lady. I think that I probably do not remember much of her apart from meeting her because I was full of awe.’

Through her commitment to the Rorschach Alcock, along with Trist and Earl, began the British Rorschach Forum and the journal. In 1954 Alcock’s commitment to teaching continued when the Tavistock appointed her to teach the Rorschach summer schools, which carried on until her semi-retirement in 1968. Those who were taught by her reported that:

‘This was one of the most enjoyable and fruitful training occasions of my life. We met weekly and she ruled us quietly, but with a rod of iron, and woe betide any of us who had not completed this week’s programme’ – Dr Geoffrey Barker

---

69 The letter itself is archived at the Freud Museum, London. In the letter Alcock refers to Anna Freud’s close relationship with her father stating: ‘for you who have been so infinitely close to him, this loss must be beyond all measure’. Alcock finished the short letter by saying that Sigmund Freud’s book (which one is not stated) ‘lies the chief hope for this troubled world’.
‘I leant an awful lots in the seminars apart from the use of the Rorschach. Her basic psychoanalytic understanding, and her even more basic attitudes of respect—and indeed, love— for her subjects was of inestimable value… she always had a light and unassuming touch in talking about her work and ideas. She gave much time, and gave unstinting thought, to help her students understand the records that they took, and the subjects from whom they had taken them’ - Mrs Celia Williams

(In Phillipson, 1981)

Alcock was not only involved in the British scene; she visited the US in 1961 upon the invitation of Bruno Klopfer and France in 1964. In 1963 she published her book *The Rorschach in Practice* which was highly celebrated in Britain (Kaldegg, 1964). She was highly involved in both teaching and in research with the Rorschach. She also went to Dublin to teach the Rorschach and become more involved with religious groups. She became Roman Catholic and in 1967 moved to Dublin permanently from her home in Yorkshire. Her Rorschach work continued and in 1971 she established the Irish Rorschach Forum. Moira Quinlan, who knew Alcock in Ireland, reported that Alcock’s determinant nature had not gone in her old age, instead she continued to wear contact lenses despite cataract operations and drove her 1967 mini ‘held together by faith’ until she was hospitalised shortly before her death. In fact, her erratic yet confident driving was one of the things most reminisced about in her obituary (Phillipson, 1981). Dr Geoffrey Barker 70 provided the following anecdote:

‘She drove us at high speed in her open left-hand drive sports car. Her immense enthusiasm and zest for living were well illustrated on this occasion by a dramatic application of the brakes, a swerve through a gate into a field where, beside a stream, grew magnificent bulrushes. From the pocket of her car appeared, as if by

---

70 The same Dr Barker from Tooting Bec hospital who later did the study previously mentioned in 1970 on ‘The Female homosexual in Hospital’.
magic a pair of secateurs, and we continued our journey triumphant with some splendid decoration for her consulting room.’

Despite her ‘zest for living’ Alcock died on the 1st June 1980. Described as a pioneer she is often thought to be the life force behind the Rorschach in Britain (McCarthy Woods, 2008). As a pioneer she is said to have been loyal, have boundless energy, and a spirit of independence (Phillipson, 1981). Alcock’s attributes frame the question which runs through this chapter rather concisely: was Alcock an independent autonomous woman or independent autonomous lesbian woman? Either way the following analysis remains useful, especially as ‘independence’ was one of the seven characteristics identified by Hopkins (1969) as indicative of the lesbian personality. What is also worth noting is that the majority of the women I am presenting here would have known each other.

Margaret Lowenfeld (1890–1973), or ‘Madge’ to her family, was born 4th February in Lowndes Square, London. She was born to Henry (originally Heinz) Lowenfeld and Alice Evens. Both her and her sister became internationally famous in their own circles, Margaret as a child psychotherapist, and Helena as a gynaecologist and advocate for birth control (Evans, 1984). At the age of six Helena declared she wanted to be a doctor and Margaret soon followed suit. The two sisters shared a number of similarities, especially in their careers, but were unlike one another personally. Helena was exceptionally sure of herself and ‘capable’ as her father said, whereas Margaret was frail, found everything rather difficult and although had ‘ingenious’ ideas struggled to carry them out (Evans, 1984). One shared interest was that of religious spirituality that they had received from their mother (who would regularly hold séances at the house)71.

Both daughters attended Cheltenham Ladies’ College and growing up regularly travelled around Europe, returning to their fathers Polish home near Kraków (Urwin,

71 They were both very much interested in the Fourth Dimension and the paranormal. When Margaret died, Helena, who was with her at the time believed despite Margaret being in a coma, that she was able to communicate to her that she was about to be accepted in her ‘place of rest’ (Evans, 1984). This spiritual interest is very much in keeping with early 20th century cultural interests (Valentine, 2012).
2004). In the biography of Helena\textsuperscript{72}, Evans (1984) described their childhood as a rather unhappy one, with frequent travels and a complex parental divorce in 1902. The two sisters fought for independence and their father was said to have been disgusted that they wanted to gain careers in medicine exclaiming: ‘what has fate done to give me two intelligent daughters?’ (Evans, 1984). He had intended for them to both be conventional women who would marry rich men. The parents’ divorce and their subsequent relationships had a profound effect on Margaret, she was regularly ill and as a teenager suffered great emotional strain resulting in several breakdowns. In 1912 she entered the London School of Medicine for Women following in the footsteps of Helena. Just before the First World War ended in 1918 she finished and was allowed to practise medicine. She began working nineteen hour days at the South London Women’s Hospital as a house surgeon but less than a year later was called for in Poland to assist the staff who were at the family home near Kraków. In 1919 she visited Poland and was heavily involved in the Christian Student Movement (see Urwin & Hood-Williams, 2013). Her experiences of Poland and the poverty she witnessed and the number of orphaned children inspired her to forge her career in child psychotherapy, in spite of the perceptions of such work in upper class circles. An oral history participant said:

‘Well yes she belongs to that ah, the same as Marie Stopes and Helena Wright her sister, she comes from the milieu where she was presented to court, so if you’re a debutante its world I know nothing about. But she was very much in touch with the poorer neighbourhoods and the children in the poorer neighbourhoods in Kensington… to sit there and understand children of the poor that you know, that’s dross, as far as that era was concerned they were dross.’

‘I mean she talks about the deprivations of the rich as well, well you know you have no idea of the deprivations that the rich would suffer, that she suffered. There’s no good saying she didn’t have any toys because she probably did, it

\textsuperscript{72} A joint biography of the two sisters had been originally under consideration, but was changed to just be about Helena (Evans, 1984).
wasn’t that you see it was the deprivation of the, other sorts you see which is not, you can’t buy. With money or position. You see it’s the contrast of what she found during after the First World War, in the aftermath of it, when she was going round with the mission, when she was rounding up all the children who were fending for themselves and she was impressed, she said “it’s ridiculous, these children are surviving by themselves” if Freud was correct, they would be so damaged having lost both their parents that you know, when they were so tiny that they wouldn’t survived. But there they are surviving’

As mentioned, throughout her life Margaret suffered from bouts of mental illness, she was fragile and often sought the help of professionals. On returning to London in 1921 she experienced another collapse and was hospitalised at Bowden House Nursing Home in London, under the care of Wilfred Trotter (Urwin, 2004). She underwent analysis several times in order to try and understand the route of her problems:

‘She had, she said she had several analysis and none of them actually helped her, about what she wasn’t able to articulate anyway any of them and they couldn’t help her in any kind of way or resolve it’

In 1922 she underwent a year of personal analysis, during which time she wrote a note containing some insight into her understanding of herself. She wrote: ‘When I look inside myself I find I am some kind of sham – that inside the outer shell there is chaos, I don’t know really what I want, & don’t know what I think – I only seem to know that I am miserable.’ She continually discussed fear and bewilderment, at some kind of ‘proposal’ and appeared to be writing to someone. She stated:

‘I think I wanted to establish a kind of semi unromantic slightly emotional relationship with you that would put a kind of glamour over these hours & take the edge off the humiliation. Because of that I find I have come to want to gain your
friendship which must necessarily be a hard thing to win & felt a crude stark kind of exposure of oneself can only be revolting.’

The note concludes with the title ‘Ultimates’ of which the final one reads: ‘If I am going to be able to do anything for women I’ve got to go their common way’. It is tantalisingly unclear as to what was meant by this note. Though it is possible to deduce Lowenfeld was clearly struggling with a kind of turmoil and was having difficulty with certain feelings which led additional feelings of shame and disgust. However in many regards Lowenfeld did not go the traditional ‘common way’.

On 25th October 1928 Lowenfeld opened her Children’s Clinic which later became known as the Institute of Child Psychology (ICP) in the ground floor rooms of the North Kensington Women’s Welfare Centre. However it was moved on the 4th March 1929 as

‘… it appeared that a certain amount of suspicion has been aroused in the minds of the authorities owing to the position of the clinic in a Birth Control building. A certain amount of fear existed in some quarters that there might be some connections between the two and the clinic is an obscure form of birth control propaganda. For this reason also, a move to another address became important.’

Interestingly then despite Margaret’s removed interests from those of her sister, the connotations of the birth control movement still affected her work. The ICP was staffed by many women at this point in the early 1930s, indulging a ‘Miss AT Alcock’ as Psychological Superintendent. A participant in my oral history interviews described a conscious distancing from research on sex:

---

73 The note is open access and available to researchers to view in the Wellcome Library, the file from which the extracts were obtained is catalogued under the reference PP/LOW/I.5. The Margaret Lowenfeld Trust however refused to provide copyright for the note to be published in the appendix of this thesis.

74 Recorded in an edited history of the ICP by Ville Anderson, Lowenfeld archive, Wellcome library code PP/LOW/F.2
‘…because at the time you see it’s not just Freud, it was Helena Wright as well was also very interested in sex and sex education and all that, it’s so ahhhh you know.

[Laughter]

So she decided she would leave that to them, “well ok if you think that’s important then you carry on” she thought she was focus on how children develop their, their understanding of the world.’

Lowenfeld’s attention to children was unlike many of the psychoanalytic literature popular at the time (Hutton, 2004). In her 1935 book *Play in Childhood* she adopted the thinking of historian Robin Collingwood, from whom she had developed an interest in philosophy having known him in the 1920s and 1930s. Using what we would call a ‘bottom-up’ approach, Lowenfeld adopted Collingwood’s controversial relativism and allowed children the freedom of expression:

‘This is why, for me that is actually essential. Because I, what she had, first of all, she developed her theories after she’s watched the children play, not before. Whereas the theories of childhood developed by Anna Freud were not that was around, she developed it from her father’s things about adults and she applied it to the children who she sees, which is a very different ways of trying to understand children. So she asked the question you see, after watching children play for several years and then she recorded them, what they took, you know, how did they move them...’

The ICP was moved once again to Hertfordshire due to the outbreak of the Second World War and after the War upon returning to London, the ICP had to be reorganised as a Limited Company as Lowenfeld was greatly concerned about the consequences of the introduction of the NHS in 1948. As reported by Margaret Mead in Lowenfeld’s obituary, although the ‘ICP was officially recognized as part of the training program in
clinical psychology, it remained a rather special institution’ (Mead, 1974). Quite rightly, she described the ICP as ‘somewhat outside the more conventional types of child guidance clinics - stimulated and illuminated by Margaret Lowenfeld's special diagnostic insights, techniques…’.

Urwin & Hood-Williams (2013) described the meeting of two women in the late 1940s as particularly important on the life of Lowenfeld. The first was the famous anthropologist Margaret Mead whom Lowenfeld met in 1948, in London at the World Federation of Mental Health Conference.\(^{75}\) They became friends and regularly corresponded. Mead would later use Lowenfeld’s Mosaic test as a part of her research in cross-cultural anthropology and inspired the use of such tests to other anthropologists such as Rhoda Metraux. The second woman who was to have a profound effect of Lowenfeld’s life was Ville Anderson. Although they met in Denmark, where Anderson was from, Anderson moved to London having been persuaded to attend the ICP for training in the 1950s. Upon completion she stayed at the ICP ‘as a psychotherapist, research worker and assistant to Margaret Lowenfeld, remaining with her as a colleague, living companion and confidante until the time of Margaret Lowenfeld’s death.’ (Urwin & Hood-Williams, 2014, p. 14). The two of them regularly travelled back to Denmark and upon Lowenfeld’s death Anderson was required to go back there permanently, despite them living together. They split their time between their Harley Street flat and ‘Cherry Orchards’, a house in Cholesbury, Buckinghamshire, which Lowenfeld had bought when her mother died.

Despite Lowenfeld’s enduring contributions to child psychology and psychotherapy she was not a major figure in psychology at the time (Hutton, 2004). In all, Lowenfeld contributed two famous projective tests, Poleidoblocs, the theory of ‘e’ and her thinking on the protosystem. Unlike Melanie Klein, Anna Freud and Dora Kalff (who

---

\(^{75}\) Mead herself is also known for her relationship with other women, most notably Ruth Benedict (Banner, 2010) and for her anthological work on understandings of sex and gender in *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928).
visited and took inspiration from the ICP) she did not disseminate her ideas with as much force (Evans, 1984). Great rivalries began between the different schools of thinking and although Lowenfeld had met Jung and Adler in the 1940s she did not consider herself psychoanalytic. Klein, who was also at odds with the psychoanalytic establishment, however took a great dislike to Lowenfeld and disputes appeared quite common between students of the different schools.

‘[Lowenfeld] was very very humble, in the sense that you know, well, she says “that’s what Klein thinks, that there is room for that, we haven’t actually you know, we were at the beginning of our understanding of children, we mustn’t just throw everything out, so everyone has a place if that’s what they want to do then yes, they obviously have another way of doing it”…. but they you see, the Anna Freud one… was less so vicious but then Klein was very vicious. Klein absolutely hated Lowenfeld.’

Considering Klein’s attitudes towards homosexuality (O’Connor & Ryan, 1993) one cannot help but wonder whether the dislike of Lowenfeld was personal as well as professional.

Lowenfeld however did enjoy popularity especially among anthropologists, and educational psychologists. These effects were felt internationally thanks to Mead who adopted some of Lowenfeld’s methods (also see Lemov, 2011 for a history of projective methods in anthropology). Magdalen Vernon and Lowenfeld began a regular correspondence from the mid-1960s and had a shared interest in child psychology. Vernon, like her brother Phillip Vernon, had trained at Cambridge University and having graduated in 1946 became a lecturer at Reading University76. Lowenfeld and Vernon’s

76 Vernon, like many of the women considered by Valentine (2008b) and Furumoto and Scarborough (1986), remained single, had no children, and had a highly interesting career. Vernon remained at Reading for her whole post-doctoral career and became Chair of Psychology in 1956. She was president of the BPS from 1958-1959 (her brother Philip had been president in 1954-1955). Yet she remains conspicuously absent from histories of Psychology. Hearnshaw (1964) for example does refer to Magdalen Vernon in one page, however Philip Vernon is mentioned in no less than nine.
correspondence became rather affectionate, in letters throughout October and November 1965 Vernon was referred to as ‘My Dear Magdalen’ and she herself signed off ‘Your ever, Magdalen’. They discussed premature rumours of Vernon’s retirement, visits to ‘The Guidance Unit’ at Reading and sought each other’s advice on their work. Having arranged to meet on the 26th November 1965, Lowenfeld wrote the following day:

‘My dear Magdalen, It was refreshing to see you yesterday, like a wind off the moors.’

By 1970 Lowenfeld and Anderson spent most of their time at their home in Buckinghamshire, with Lowenfeld only visiting London once a week to lecture (Evans, 1984). By this point, Lowenfeld and Anderson had been together for over twenty years. Towards the end of her life Lowenfeld suffered from confusion and alteration of mood. An oral history participant who finished training at the ICP the same year Lowenfeld died remembered:

‘She once said, you know because the world had changed and demands were still more and more ... When she sort of, going up the steps of the ICP, she trembles because she doesn’t know what she’s going to find behind the door because the world has change so much, and by that time she is old.’

Lowenfeld suffered increasingly from confusion and two years before her death Anderson found her having fallen out of bed, speaking wildly in Polish about her school days (Evans, 1984). She was then moved to a nursing home near her sister’s house in 1972 and died a few months later on 2nd February 1973.

After her death Anderson started to archive Lowenfeld’s papers, letters and work, including her childhood letters which Lowenfeld had given her. The archive now resides at the Wellcome Library. The Margaret Lowenfeld Trust was also set up. However, the ICP was disbanded only six years after Lowenfeld’s death having received a lack of
support from the psychological community. Lowenfeld’s death is believed to have been particularly hard for Anderson. My oral history participant reported:

‘This is why Ville, it was terrible, she had a very lonely life after that because she devoted herself to Margaret and after Margaret died then you know she was in Denmark and it was terrible to her. And you know she didn’t die until much later because she was much younger. And then of course she held on, she said “I’m the torchbearer, I think that’s correct”…’

Anderson is often referred to as a close friend, colleague, or carer of some kind, due to the Lowenfeld’s fragility. For example, Urwin (2004) stated Lowenfeld: ‘was supported by her close friend and living companion, Ville Andersen, a Danish citizen who had trained at the ICP in the 1950s’. Their relationship was described in an oral history interview thus:

‘Well I think Margaret Lowenfeld in that sense was a very difficult person because she didn’t really keep ordinary hours and she has always been frail all her life and so Ville looked after her really, but also you know, kept, she was a I think a was always a champion but she didn’t always understand her, Lowenfeld as well as she might of done. She didn’t quite get all the, what I think, Lowenfeld achievements are.’

When I asked about the potential for a romantic relationship between the two she said that she did not think so and seemed to consider such information as ‘gossip’.

‘Well no, but I’m not very inquiring in the sense that I don’t really bother about gossip. I’m only interested in her life in as far as it affects her work and how we might see her work… Yes, yes, I think it’s very complicated, I don’t really think I would like to speculate, but if you were to ask me and I would say confidentially, probably not you know, it’s a… She’s Lowenfeld, as far as I know was much
more interested in men… Yes she was supposed to have had a, a, a link with the philosopher Collingwood. I think that’s well known.’

The privacy of sexuality is particularly interesting given the exposure of gay and lesbian subjects in Psychology during this period. The sexual ‘other’ was regularly identified as such by psychologists, it appears however the rules change once one considers the psychologists themselves. Charlotte Wolff for example, though a psychotherapist and not a psychologist, similarly expressed a desire for privacy in relation to her own sexuality as it was not something to be ‘worn like a banner or identity label’ (Brennan, 2010, p. 207). That remained the case until her experiences with organisations such as the Gay Liberation Front and the Albany Trust after which Wolff felt it more necessary to be open about her sexuality (e.g. her first autobiography, Wolff, 1969). Such a personal understanding of Lowenfeld however, appears somewhat more difficult and so a kind of ‘projection’ onto the silences, and the gutters, of her life is the only option. Yet what these silences and gutters mean, are of course open to interpretation. An oral history participant stated:

‘But you see, I think, a stable long term relationship is actually quite difficult. Because she is in many respects, one of her because she’s had such a, for her traumatic childhood and youth you know, it’s not at all easy for her to actually understand, to be able to…have a … she’s such an extraordinary person that I don’t think you can expect and ordinary life for her. One should not actually just simply say, did she have an affair with so and so, can’t describe people like this anymore. She needs a very much more nuance, errr, analysis really.’

Although this oral history participant suggests that Lowenfeld is thought to have had difficulty with long term stable relationships, she nonetheless clearly had a long-term stable relationship with Ville Anderson, whether that be platonically or romantically. There certainly appeared to be a reluctance to think of Lowenfeld in this way, or as ‘lesbian-like’ (Bennett, 2000). This is quite in contrast with musings of a heterosexual
nature. My oral history participant was clearly more comfortable with associating Lowenfeld with Collingwood despite the clear presence Anderson had in Lowenfeld’s life and the fact that Collingwood died in 1943. Anderson was described thus:

‘I don’t know. I only met her very briefly when she was meant to be the guru after Margaret died and it was at meetings and things and I sat there as a very junior and ignorant person and I didn’t know her at all. Oh I did actually sort of kneel in her presence to talk to her because she made herself so she was such a… important person in Margaret’s life.’

The concept that Anderson viewed herself as a torch bearer and as such an important figure in Lowenfeld’s life and the fact she made major moves to continue Lowenfeld’s legacy certainly suggests she was more than a mere colleague, close friend or carer. Overall, Lowenfeld has been described as intuitive, humble, innovative yet she continually experienced ‘struggle between the unstinting attention she gave her patients, her urge to expand her work in every possible direction, an imagination that far exceeded her bodily strength, a shortage of funds and a terrific sense that time was running out’ (Mead, 1974).

In line with the thinking of Hopkins (1969) Lowenfeld’s life certainly appears to present a personality that is independent, resilient, reserved, dominant, bohemian, self-sufficient and composed. It appears to me that only by compulsory heterosexuality (Rich, 1980) and through the actions of lesbian erasure is it possible to draw heterosexual and normative conclusions about Lowenfeld. Her life and her work have been surprisingly absent in histories of British Psychology despite the richness, and queerness, both her life and work present.

Another woman who was central within the projective test movement in Britain was Ann Kaldegg. Kaldegg, originally Kohn, was born in 1899 to Jewish parents Max Kaldegg and Rosalia Czises. Her father had changed their surname to avoid anti-semitic
prejudice in his professional life as a financer in the French stock exchange. Though born in Vienna, Kaldegg spent much of her childhood in the Austrio-Hungarian Embassy in Paris but the family returned to Austria at the beginning of the First World War (Francis-Williams, 1996). Kaldegg then insisted on attending university despite the fact she was upper class and was not expected to earn her own living. Defying convention she studied history and business in Berlin until the rising of the Third Reich. Due to the increasing danger she fled to Switzerland with her nearly expired passport and then forged another one to get to Britain. Her brother Erwin, however was captured by the Nazis and spent four years in north-Italian concentration camp of Fossoli from which he was transported to Auschwitz where he died. During the Second World War Ann Kaldegg was interned on the Isle of Man as an enemy alien, and then fruit picked in Glostershire. Here she was billeted with Ann Ridding and her daughter Joyce Ridding. After the War she completed a degree in Psychology in 1947 and went on to do a PhD which she finished in 1952 (Francis-Williams, 1996). She then moved to London with Joyce Ridding, ‘setting up house together’ as it was described in her obituary in British Journal of Projective Psychology and Personality Study written by Francis-Williams (1996). In London she worked as a clinical Psychologist in both Cane Hill hospital and Guys Hospital.

By the late 1950s Kaldegg had become a member of the British Rorschach Forum and in 1958 became an official society committee member. During the 1960s Kaldegg was central in the activities of the British Rorschach Forum and their journal, she continued to publish in the journal and present her work at the annual conferences. She was especially keen on the Rorschach as well as other projective tests such as Lowenfeld Mosaic Test (see Kaldegg, 1966). She reported that ‘There are even people who enjoy taking the Rorschach test!’ In 1965 Kaldegg became Honorary Vice Chair of the committee, a position which she held until her retirement in 1967. In 1969 she published a popular short comment in British Journal of Projective Psychology and Personality Study about a bizarre and curious incidence that have occurred to her when conducting Rorschach tests. In 1973 she and Lady Jessie Francis-Williams were made Honorary
Fellows of The British Society for Projective Psychology and Personality Study. In 1975, aged 76, Kaldegg passed A-level Italian and in 1977 she reported her address had changed as she had moved, with Joyce Ridding, to South West London. To celebrate her 80th birthday she flew over the Himalayas and a decade later went on a cruise to New York on the QE2 and flew back on the Concorde. She died six years later, on 8th December 1995 at the age of 96. Her obituary, written by Francis-Williams in British Journal of Projective Psychology and Personality Study was a year later and described Kaldegg as strict but warm and referred to Joyce Ridding as her ‘close friend’. Unfortunately however, the original obituary called her ‘Janet’ and a correction had to be submitted in the next issue. Joyce Ridding, who was twelve years younger than Kaldegg, died in 2006 in Wandsworth, London.

The similarities between the lives of Ann Kaldegg and Charlotte Wolff are uncanny. They both came from middle-class or upper-class Jewish families, both narrowly escaped Berlin and travelled to Paris and ended up in Britain working in psychological research. They also had important relationships with women and lived what Brennan termed ‘marginal’ or ‘liminal’ lives (see Brennan, 2010; Brennan & Hegarty, 2010; Brennan & Hegarty, 2012). In all, both could be described as independent, resilient, reserved, dominant, bohemian, self-sufficient and composed.

Another potentially queer and feminist woman I am interested in is Effie Lilian Hutton. Hutton is not a major figure in the projective test movement, though she was interested in personality as many of the projective users were (see Hutton, 1945). She was born March 25th 1904 and trained at the Royal Free Hospital London in 1928. Her early psychiatric experience was obtained at Harton Hospital, near Newcastle and at Rainhill Hospital, Liverpool (Nicol & Golla, 1956). In 1933 she began work at Horton Hospital in Epsom as the first medical officer to receive a clinical research appointment under the London Country Council. Here she worked at a clinic treating neurosyphilis. In 1939 she left and joined the Burden Neurological Institute where she worked until her death. Here she focused more on psychotherapeutic problems of neurosis and was said to have a flair
for research. The increase of patients following the Second World War meant she focused more on the physiological psychology. At the Burden Neurological Institute she assisted in the introduction of electronic convulsion therapy and lobotomy into Britain. However her faith in psychosurgery quickly waned and she began research indicating the negative side-effects of such procedures (e.g. Hutton, 1942; 1947; Hutton & Bassett, 1948). In order to show the effects of lobotomy on patients she used projective tests to indicate personality changes (Hutton, 1947) and problems with creativity (Hutton, & Bassett, 1948). Specifically she used the Rorschach, the TAT and Ravens’s projective tests as well as the drawings of patients. The results of her research led to the end of the use of psychosurgery at the Burden Neurological Institute, the first institution in Britain to do such surgeries. However, three years following Hutton’s death they reinstated the use of lobotomy in 1959. In contrast to such physiological emphasis on her work, Hutton had a rather more holistic approach to neurosis.

Hutton was deeply religious and felt psychotherapy could only succeed if one took into account the patient’s spiritual difficulties. She subscribed to Jung’s ideas that neurosis is the seeking of the soul but argued that the process is somewhat more ‘activistic’ than suggested by Jung (Nicol & Golla, 1956). She spiritually believed that to love, and not to be loved was the ultimate goal and that psychological medicine required the inclusion of religion. She was reported to have been loved by all of her patients, both from the small in-patient clinic and her out-patients. She was said to have ‘remarkable success’ with those suffering neurosis and despite publishing little, began to gain an international reputation (Nicol & Golla, 1956). In her obituary she was described as a ‘remarkable’ person and her life certainly was unconventional (Nicol & Golla, 1956). Single and living with her mother until her death Hutton did not appear to be a typical educated women of the 1950s. As shown by her portrait (see Figure 5) she presented as a

77 See Casey (2015) for a review of the controversy of psychosurgery in the 1970s.
masculine figure in a time of great gender conformity and rejected notions of gendered social convention.

Her short cropped hair and shirt convey a masculine style and confidence that would surely have not gone unnoticed in the 1950s. Hutton’s sense of style including shirts and a lack of feminine adornments is similar to that of Charlotte Wolff whose clothing was very much recognised as deviant (Brennan & Hegarty, 2010). However, Hutton’s masculinity is also captured in a caricature by a patient (see Figure 6).
Initially, upon receiving the caricature staff at the Science Museum believed that the figure representing Hutton was the one on the right. The small, feminine figure that appeared to be recording the Rorschach responses of the taller figure. However, they came to realise that Hutton was in fact the figure on the left. She is tall, masculine, short-haired and confident. Again, it is unclear as to who is saying: ‘Wasn’t Rorschach Wonderful?’ and perhaps the ‘joke’ in the cartoon is that the psychologist is being tested rather than the patient. In fact, by depicting her in a lab-coat, a symbol in many ways of scientific masculinity in the mid-20th century Hutton is certainly portrayed as unconventional, different, and I argue queer. Hutton died at the young age of 52 on 8th August 1956, her obituary reported that ‘her death at the height of her powers is a severe loss to psychological medicine’ (Nicol & Golla, 1956). Hutton’s great belief in love was
also conveyed in the obituary ‘She was loved by her patients and loved and admired by her colleagues. Those who knew her only as a physician mourn the loss in the fullness of her powers of a very great teacher and healer, and it is nothing short of a calamity that her early death has prevented her views from becoming made widely known’ (Nicol & Golla, 1956). Sympathy was extended to her mother, with whom she lived.

Spirituality or religious belief is another core theme which links all of these women. Alcock converted to Roman Catholicism and moved to Dublin; Lowenfeld shared a great spiritual belief in the afterlife with her sister; Kaldegg was Jewish, though it is unknown whether she practised the religion in Britain; Hutton’s religious belief extended into her thinking about Psychology; and Hopkins was married to a Chief Methodist minister (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002). This point is worthy of note, though I will not delve much further into it except to say that belief in the spirit world was especially common after the Second World War and this tied in very much with Psychology as a discipline (see Lamont, 2013; Valentine, 2010).

Another link which relates to a number of these women is their relationship with their mothers. Lowenfeld is reported to have had a difficult relationship with her own (Evans, 1986; Urwin & Hood-Williams, 2013), experiencing what was deemed ‘deprivations of the rich’. In contrast Hutton was very close to her mother, she was the only non-professional referenced in her obituary and they lived together. Hopkins also thanked her mother in her acknowledgments of her 1969 paper for assisting her with the coding of the data suggesting a close relationship. Psychoanalytic theories of homosexuality rebounding at the time most laid blame for homosexuality at the feet of mothers (see O’Connor & Ryan, 1993). In fact, mother-blaming theories were every common in light of Bowlby’s attachment theory (van der Horst & van der Veer, 2010).  

Another example of a literature which ties together lesbian women, famous psychoanalysts and relationship with mothers is Are You My Mother? by Alison Bechdel (2012). I draw this to the foreground because of the other link that the book is a graphic novel and a key example, like Watchmen, where Psychology has looped into graphic novels in particular. See Bauer (2014) for analysis on the use of books within the graphic novel in the exploration of difficulty feelings in both Are you my mother? And Beschdel’s other autobiographical graphical novel Fun Home (2006). Bechdel particularly adopts Donald

---
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Interestingly it was Bene (1965a; 1965b) who, like Hopkins, collected data from the Minorities Research Group who countered many psychoanalytic claims at the time that homosexuality was due to over protective or domineering mothers and instead suggested responsibility lie instead with fathers. The above similarities between these women, whether that be their spiritual beliefs or their parental relationships are not identified in order to explain their sexuality or lives described above. Instead, they shed further light on the contexts in which these women were living, that is, a time of widespread cultural interest in spirituality (Valentine, 2012) and a period of post-war psychoanalytic mother-blaming (van der Horst & van der Veer, 2010).

Overall what I consider here is the potential for these women to have led queer and feminist lives (or at least the potential for such an interpretation). These women had other women in their lives, and little personal contact with men, in some cases they lived, worked, and I believe loved other women. They were all unmarried despite the pressure to do so in their lifetimes. They were all highly educated, again something rather surprising and limited for women at this time. Indeed, both Lowenfeld and Kaldegg were from rather high-class families who were told they did not require an education past a certain point and they rebelled against their families (mainly their fathers) and dedicated themselves to postgraduate educations. There is indeed an important intersection here with class. None of these woman as far as I can tell have come from working class families and they were clearly provided for during their learning and early careers. Also there is the concern that women were given the choice of either careers or marriages and it is possible these women chose careers. However, my interview with another player in this field described how having her psychiatrist husband assisted her career rather than
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Winnicott’s work and his ideas about mother-child relationships, as well as the works of Lecan, Virginia Woolf and Freud in Are you my mother?

79 This was for both gay men (1965a) and lesbian women (1965b).
dampened it. She also identified the projective test movement of Argentina and Catalonia to also be mainly made up of women.

The women I have presented here were pioneering in their careers and were central to the projective test movement. These women also knew each other, Alcock worked for Lowenfeld at the ICP in the early 1930s. Kaldegg and Alcock would have certainly known about the work of Hopkins’ after she presented her research at the society’s AGM At on 1st October 1969. Kaldegg also reviewed Alcock’s book in *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. Through their experience in this time and in this movement, I argue they have paved the way for other women in Psychology and so contribute to the feminist history of British Psychology.

As noted previous, Hopkins (1969; 1970) concluded that the lesbian personality has seven key features which distinguishes it from the heterosexual personality. Lesbian women are more independent, resilient, reserved, dominant, bohemian, self-sufficient and composed. Here I will collate these into three sections in order to illustrate how the women of the projective test movement can be shown to fulfil these personality traits.

First, Hopkins argued that lesbian women are more independent, more resilient and more self-sufficient. In regards to the projective test, and women’s independence, resilience and self-sufficiency, it is clear that all of the women took some risk in advancing as they did in Psychology against the barriers of sexism rife in Psychology at the time. Of the women I am drawing upon in this analysis, all were unmarried. Here I exclude June Hopkins herself as she later divorced and said she and her husband were married despite them both knowing she was a lesbian. (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002). Indeed, from the information I have managed to collect from the biographies of these women,

80 This is somewhat unsurprisingly as Rossiter (1982) argued that marriage sometimes acted as a strategy for academic recognition. Equally, Hegarty (2003a) discusses the publications of married couple on topics such as homosexuality, which he recognised as an attempt to separate themselves from the subject itself, or to be ‘pure’ as Hooker described it. Relationships between those who were not married did also occur in the projective test movement, the creators of the TAT for example Christina Morgan and Henry Murrey were lovers (Josselson, 2013).
there is no evidence either of them having children. This is dramatically in contrast with
the gendered expectations of women from the early-to mid-20th century and certainly is
suggestive of a resilience to societal expectations. In regards to their independence and
self-sufficiency, it is first clear that all of these women were in positions where they were
able to support themselves. They may have forgone marriage in order to fulfil their
careers and so received salaries meaning they were self-sufficient. Illustrating their
independence, both Margaret Lowenfeld and Ann Kaldegg were described in their
obituaries as ‘revolting’ against their fathers or ‘insisting’ upon further education and
careers despite being from wealthy families and thus were not expected to work. While
these features are not necessarily indicative of sexuality, they are indicative of feminist
values. They also certainly show how this collection of women, given their socio-
historical contexts, can be considered highly independent, resilient and self-sufficient.

Second, Hopkins argued the lesbian personality was more reserved and more
dominant. There is clear evidence that these women dominated the projective testing
scene in Britain. However to draw attention to their personal lives they were also
described in certain ways indicating a more reserved and dominant personality. Both
Theodora Alcock and Ann Kaldegg were described by their students as harsh, or
relatively strict but also as warm or loving. This somewhat illustrates a tension of
simultaneous traditionally masculine and feminine traits and echos the gendered
obituaries common in psychology (Radtke, et al 2000). In addition, Alcock was described
as a rather erratic driver in an anecdotal description of her driving two men psychologists
from a conference. Even her ability to drive and her apparent confidence, despite a
hospitalising accident involving a lorry, indicates more dominance and a certain
unexpected masculinity. Effie Lililan Hutton also fits within this more reserved but
dominant description. She presents as a tall confident woman with surprisingly short hair.
These features of the women, as reserved and dominant appear to be best reflected in
certain masculinities they present. These features were certainly unconventional given
with the potential claim that masculine dress, including shirts, suit jackets, a lack of jewellery and/or clear feminine clothing, could perhaps be due to the professional status of such women or more fashionable ‘flapper’ looks of the 1920s. Instead they suggest that such visible signals extend beyond the norm of this time. In fact, Charlotte Wolff claimed it was exactly her ‘dressing like a man’ and her masculine hair that almost had her arrested in Berlin in 1933 by the Gestapo (Brennan & Hegarty, 2010). This indicates a particular deviance of androgynous dress beyond that of 1920s women’s fashion. Such dress style is also additive to the previously mentioned features of independence, resilience and self-sufficiency.

Finally Hopkins (1969) found that the lesbian personality was more composed and bohemian. As argued throughout, these women within the projective test movement were certainly unconventional. Kaldegg certainly appears to have more bohemian interests. In many ways Hutton could also be viewed as bohemian for her choice of hair style. Lowenfeld was described as a very successful career women and a pioneer of child psychology assuming a relatively well-composed personality. In fact, it was Margaret Mead, the celebrated anthropologist, who wrote Lowenfeld’s obituary. Also like Mead, Lowenfeld never outwardly described her sexual identity, but did appear to have a close relationship with other women. Ville Anderson is described as Lowenfeld’s ‘close friend and living companion’ supporting much of Lowenfeld’s later work. Similarly, Kaldegg and her ‘close friend’ Joyce Ridding also set up house together having met while Kaldegg was billeted with Ridding’s mother as an enemy alien during the Second World War. The women’s unconventional or ‘bohemian’ lifestyles and their composure in living them aligns with Hopkins (1969) study. Therefore, there does appear to be some key features of the women within the British projective test movement which indicates feminist and potentially queer lives. This is supported by the framing of Hopkins’ The Lesbian Personality (1969) study.

The above analysis presents a history of the projective test movement through a queer feminist lens. By using Psychology’s own tools to frame the history I have aimed to
avoid presentism as much as possible and bypassed some of the issues of conducting lesbian histories. Within the analysis and discussion I have not identified any of the women within the movement as lesbian but instead construct their histories using appropriate framing of an internalist, queer, psychological and projective study. Discourses surrounding ‘sameness’ remain common and such ideas of ‘difference’ are viewed as less powerful, and also the work on women was less powerful as indicated by the lack of citations and references to such research. The research, especially in the US on gay men was much more powerful as it was associated with more rigorous research and objectivity, whereas in Britain research was by women on women and so remained more marginalised within psychological literature. Discourses of difference such as that of Hopkins, show the incredible impact and consequences of such work, and so an understanding of the value of difference, especially within marginalised history needs to be recognised. Within this analysis I have shifted the burden of proof and by temporarily and strategically ‘believing’ in the Rorschach I have gleaned knowledge about these women’s lives. In doing so I leave a rather ironic conclusion directly to those who were involved in the projective test movement: either these women were queer according to affirmative projective Psychology written by a lesbian psychologist, or the Rorschach is not able to discern information about lesbians.

4.4 What was it like for those who were being tested with the Rorschach?

In the above sections I have focused predominantly on the psychologists themselves. Here, I wish to reverse the gaze somewhat and allow for a more bottom-up approach to emerge by considering what it was like for lesbians and gay men to be tested with the Rorschach. In order to gain an understanding of what it was like to be tested with the Rorschach I conducted archival research in the British Library Sound Archive including the Mental Health Testimony Archive, as well as the Hall-Carpenter LGBT archive for mentions of the Rorschach. I also conducted my own oral history interview
with a gay man, who is now a counselling psychologist and psychotherapist, on his own experience of being tested with the Rorschach in New York in the 1980s. Whilst this chapter has been predominantly about women, I also wish to include here the oral history I did with a gay man in order to give an inclusive queer perspective which is still relevant, though not lesbian. As a side note I also reflect upon my own testing experience as a queer woman.

One of the notable features of the four oral histories referring to the Rorschach and/or psychiatric treatment of homosexuality from the British Library Sound Archive is that they were all from women81. Indeed, the gendered social roles of the mid-20th century and the expectations of women remained a feature in some of the interviews. Mrs Doris Breingan for example appeared to have a difficult relationship with a psychiatric nurse whilst she was in hospital and explained their animosity via the expectations of women:

‘I don’t know what was the matter with her. She was…[laughs]well you say oh yes, she was a frigid spinster, I don’t know…you do get people like that, women don’t like younger women, you know, especially married and got a family, all the rest of it.’

Several queer women whose interviews are in the Hall-Carpenter archive also explained some of the difficulties they had fighting against their ‘tomboy’ personas and described a severe dislike of the social heterosexual expectations that were applied to them.82 It was not until 1973 that the APA officially removed homosexuality as a mental illness from the

81 I am drawing on the oral histories of Mrs Doris Breingan and Nicky Nicholls from the Mental Health Testimony archive and Pat Arrowsmith and Nettie Pollard from the Hall-Carpenter Archive. Both collections are at the Sound archive at the British Library.

82 Jennings (2007a) also draws upon these oral histories from the Hall-Carpenter collection in her exploration of lesbian women’s lives from 1945-1971. In her most recent work on Sandra Wilson (to be published) Jennings notes how Wilson’s relationships with women were viewed as symptomatic by psychiatrists and she was tested with the Rorschach during her psychiatric treatment and imprisonment for murder in Australia. Australian psychologists’ attitudes towards the Rorschach was also studied by Turner (2011).
DSM (Minton, 2002). Sandy Martin described being almost forced by a youth group worker to seek psychiatric help at fourteen for her being a lesbian:

‘You don’t have to be [a lesbian], you can be cured…and he produced this little card in a little envelope, with the name of a doctor on it. Dr… at the Stepney Jewish Hospital and it was this…the, anyway the point I’m trying to make is the appointment had already been made for me with this Doctor at the Stepney Jewish Hospital. And Peter said: will you go? And I said yes, I will go and see this doctor…and he gave me this card…’

The card was then accidently intercepted by Sandy’s mother who begged her not to go. Her mother still had memories of Nazi Germany and told her that once ‘they’ got hold of her name she would be in the records.

For those who did see a psychiatrist projective tests appear to have been especially memorable.

‘Well they were called…some of them…they were world tests and synonym tests. Some of them were ink blobs. Somebody had made special kinds of blobs onto a piece of paper…I think they were called the Rorschach…R O R S C H A C H … I think it was, test…and you had to…usually they say ‘What springs to your mind when you look at this?’, and what people say is very indicative of their state of mind, although they don’t realise that at the time.’ – (Mrs Doris Breingan)

Nicky Nicholls also remembered the different forms of tests that she was subjected to:

‘I just remember sort of being in the locked ward, and…I did see a Psychiatrist I think once a week, a male one, who, most of the time just asked how I was, and…showed me blotting paper…had all these tests of…shapes on blotting paper, and what they reminded me of’
'And most of the time they have you the blotting paper to look at, and ask you questions that you didn’t want to answer, like about your childhood or your parents…and…those like square block things you had to put in the right shape, you know.’

The above passages do not only indicate how the Rorschach was used within psychiatric settings but also alludes to the suggestion that psychologists and psychiatrists were perceived as mere testers. There is also some suggestion that the Lowenfeld tests were used, for example, the ‘square block things you had to put in the right shape’ may refer to the Mosaic Test and the ‘world test’ could be Lowenfeld’s World Technique. A certain unwillingness is also evident, as is the background psychoanalytic thinking associated with projective tests.

The psychotherapist I interviewed who underwent the Rorschach did so because he had heard it was necessary to begin his career in psychotherapy and was later interested in psychoanalytic ideas. He had heard that in order to do therapy you must have experience of being in therapy.

‘so I trotted off to start that, or to look into starting that. And part of the assessment for that was, they put you through a battery of, I think they were all projective tests. There was an interview, there was a Rorschach, there was a house tree person [test]…’

The testing itself, although not especially traumatic ‘… it wasn’t the kind of thing as a therapist that [he] would want [his] clients to experience now’. Overall, there was a mismatch of expectations of what the testing procedure and results would be like. A simultaneous nervousness of providing inappropriate responses conflicted with a pressure to produce responses, something I similarly felt in my own testing experience (see Chapter 1, Appendix B).
‘I mean the person wasn’t particularly vocal in either of them I don’t think. I seem to remember a bit of confusion with the Rorschach because, I’d say something and either there wouldn’t be a response, or kind of or, they seemed to want more than I could see, and I guess that’s what a projective test is about, you put some effort into it and you project and something comes out of it. But, I don’t think I understood it full… I think I said something about clouds a lot, and I don’t think they wanted the clouds all the time. I think there was ‘what else?’ question that came up a lot.’

It was the interpretation, and the decisiveness nature of the results of the testing which especially upset this participant. He was described as paranoid and being obsessed with death. This he attributes to seeing a squashed rabbit in one of the ink blots, which for him was a regular sight living out in the countryside on the outskirts of a major city in the US. He rejected the results of the projective tests, and described his feeling of shock at the definiteness of the written report and the way it was verbally presented to him. Perhaps one of the most shocking elements to the results was that he was identified as gay by the projective tests, the House Tree Person test in particular:

‘So … so, um, so I’m just laughing because if I had taken some of it on board sooner I would have been a lot happier a lot earlier. So I was still defended at this time, and it wasn’t that I was gay and I was anti-being gay, I was just, hadn’t embraced me as a sexual being, so the house tree person came back and, I can’t remember the wording used but basically I experienced it as: ‘well you’re a raving homosexual.’ And I was kind of like ‘ah how dare you!’ … But it was done with some kind of authority that, as we’re now talking, I quite liked at work, ‘oh we know something the poor patient doesn’t know’ I quite liked that but when it was done to me I really objected to it… I was quite defensive, well you know just because I’ve drawn people in this way or this, that and the other. You know that could mean all kinds of things… I might just be highly attuned to beauty or - I came up with all kinds of stuff.’
The reflexivity in the above passage is particularly compelling. He was aware of the powerful nature of knowledge, and how being the person with knowledge and power is a much more comfortable experience than being without. He also recognised the irony that if he had accepted the ‘homosexual diagnosis’ he would have been happier with his sexuality sooner. The wish to explain away and make sense of the results is also interesting and is perhaps one of the most intriguing elements to the Rorschach. It is not just what you see, but what it means which is most captivating. Whilst the above discusses a testing procedure in the 1980s, it does provide an insight into how the Rorschach may have been experienced for others prior to the depathologisation of homosexuality in 1973. It was the lack of transparency and unexpected prognosis which created the most discomfort. In fact, the participant described it as a ‘seduce and reject’ tactic:

‘That was part of why I didn’t like the result. It seemed like I was seduced, or it was made to be kind of… there was an encouragement and a kind of … “oh don’t worry about it, just doing it, just a bit of fun, just do this, that and the other, this that and the other, boom! – you are this!”

The deception used in testing practises experienced by the oral history participant was also noted by Derksen (2001b) in his exploration of the manual of four psychological tests. In relation to the projective test called the ‘Four Picture Test’ testees are deliberately told there are four unrelated cards which are spread out and whilst pointing to each one in an arbitrary order testers state ‘You can choose the order in which they are to appear, you can start here, here or here’. The second edition of the manual also stated testers should say: ‘you are completely free to choose’ (Derksen, 2001b, p. 37). However, the order that testees choose is in fact the first aspect of the test that is analysed. The feelings that the oral history participants felt, especially in relation to projective tests is certainly one which in some cases is embedded within the procedure of testing and deception can be rather deliberate.
Such scepticism of the tactics used and the usefulness of the Rorschach was not only felt in psychological circles at this time, but also by some of those being tested. Nicky Nicholls who had been previously given the Rorschach when diagnosed with depression was especially amused once again to be provided with an ink blot test during a later prison sentence:

‘I remember sitting in front of this psychiatrist and... and I couldn’t believe it when more blotting paper come out...[laughs]. I thought blotting paper days had gone and I just started taking the mick out of...mickey out of him, you know, but...I was making things up. He was saying, “what does this one...” and I was saying “Donald Duck”. You know, told him he looked like Alfred Hitchcock, and he wasn’t impressed and he said “I don’t think I need to see you again”, you know and I didn’t need to see him either, you know, so that was my psychiatric treatment in the whole of the... sentence.’

Differences in expectations appears to be a common thread throughout the testimonies of those who were tested with the Rorschach. In fact all of the people I conducted oral histories with reported that clients tended not to expect tests, yet it does remain a common misconception that psychologists are mind-readers, and that the tests act like ‘X-rays’ of the mind. 83 One of my oral history participants described how, at the time of being tested, he felt psychologists had this ability.

‘I still had, I picked up the notion you had some ability to read people’s minds and kind of empathise, it think it was a bit enthralled by, I don’t think I was particularly critical’

Yet later, having been trained, this participant expressed the annoyance of others making this assumption:

---

83 ‘X-Rays of the mind’ is the phrase used by Lemov to best describe the ways in which projective tests were portrayed in the early 20th century (Lemov, 2011).
‘But the moment you go “I’m a psychologist” you get the “Oh, I don’t want sit next to you then” or “hahaha can you tell what I’m thinking?” and that happens at parties but it happens with clients as well’.

The assumptions that psychologists have mind-reading abilities, or super powers as it was described in the interview, has many connotations given the power psychologists can hold.

These oral histories go some way to flesh out what I have already explored in relation to the Rorschach and sexuality. Though not all lesbian, they do inform us of the experiences of queer people being tested which I think is important to read alongside the experiences of potentially queer psychologists conducting the testing.

4.5 Wider Institutional/Organisational contexts

In this chapter so far I have been rather specific and concerned with the lives of individuals. Here I intend to provide more context to the activities of those involved. To begin it is important once again to reflect on the interactions of psychoanalysis in this history. I then consider the motives and actions of the Minority Research Group and finally the wider institutional influences.

Psychoanalytic ideas were still popular especially certain at institutions such as the Tavistock and the Anna Freud Centre from which Anna Freud taught her version of child psychoanalysis (Sayers, 1991). In fact, Hermann Rorschach even sent Sigmund Freud a copy of Psychodiagnosik writing inside: ‘Herrn Professor Freud in Verehrung u. Dankbarkeit zugeeignet H. Rorschach’ which translates as ‘To Professor Freud in admiration and gratitude, with affection H. Rorschach’. Indeed, there are even some
The psychologist who conducted them was Dorothy Burlingham, who lived, and shared children with Anna Freud. Burlingham tested two young sisters, continuing the tradition of Rorschach testing children. Using the Rorschach in 1954, she said that for one sister the test was a painful experience, but the other was more relaxed and ‘did not manifest any severe tension (unlike her sister’). The themes of Psychoanalysis, relationships between women, and the focus on children in the British projective test movement can all be seen in this one example, showing again that despite the small size of the movement in Britain, it still is an important and rich history.

The Minorities Research Group, the group from which Hopkins recruited participants, was formed around the first British lesbian magazine, *Arena Three*. The first researcher to approach the group was Eva Bene who later published ‘On the genesis of female homosexuality’ (1965b). She tested the claim from psychoanalytic circles in Psychology and psychiatry that family child-parent relations was the cause’ of lesbian women, i.e. the presence of a weak father with whom the daughter cannot in theory relate. Bene was a member of the British Society for Projective Techniques and had earlier developed the Bene-Anthony family relations projective test (1957, see Parkin, 2001).

In her early work with The Minorities Research Group, Bene stayed at the house of Esme Langley who ran *Arena Three* and was later involved with some of the activities of the group until 1966 (Jennings, 2007a). *Arena Three* not only had an interest in Psychology

---

84 The Freud Museum has also been host to a number of Rorschach related events. Although these are not strictly related to the test and more concerned with the imagery. The museum was host to a talk by Joe Banks called ‘Rorschach Audio’ (23/07/2015) and exhibited ‘The Rorschach Text’ by artist Martin Bladh which was based on the Rorschach test which were a part of *The Festival of the Unconscious* (24/06/2015 – 4/10/2015).

85 These two records of Burlingham using the Rorschach are available from the Freud Museum archive, London (specifically in the ‘Documents’ part of the archive under ‘Dorothy Burlingham’ and can be obtained by contacting the curator directly). Unfortunately, the Freud museum were unable to allow me to publish the reports themselves.

86 The Bene-Anthony Family relations Test is a projective test where by children have to allocate phrases to each family member by putting the statement in a post box that represents them. The test has since been revised in 1978 and reprinted in 1985 and different version for children and adolescents and an adult version have been developed. Parkin (2001) argued that the test was not reliable enough for research purposes but was useful in therapeutic settings, his conclusion alludes to the idea that he himself was developing a solution to the issues raised in his review of the test.
but also contained articles about lesbian figures throughout history, including histories of lesbian murderers from the 18th century, famous lesbians of the past such as the Queen Christina of Sweden and women passing as men such as Colonel Barker (Jennings, 2007b). An excellent illustration of these links between the projective test movement and lesbian history in Britain is the use of an ink blot on the 1966 issue of Arena Three (see Figure 7).

Fig 7: Arena Three cover (February 1966, Volume 3, no. 2)

I suspect that the ink blot refers to ‘The “Cure”’ article on page 22. It seems Arena Three was not only a magazine, but the product of an activist group highly attuned to the attitudes of Psychology about sexuality. In fact, it was in the face of such pathologisation that Arena Three developed The Minorities Research Group and though at times reported being sceptical about the ways their data was being used, purposely agreed to nine studies in total in order to dispel pathological beliefs in the medical world about homosexuality (Jennings, 2007a). It was at the time the ink blot on the front cover was published that The Minorities Research Group was working with Eve Bene and June Hopkins (Hopkins
began in 1965, Jennings, 2007a). Considering the research of June Hopkins and the Minority Research Group, the Rorschach therefore has a minor yet significant role in lesbian history in Britain.

Whilst Psychology remained in the sickness model, whereby homosexuality was pathologised (as indicated by the article in Arena Three), wider society appeared to be moving towards a more progressive attitude. In the early 1970s the Gay Liberation Front (GLF) was formed and from the beginning academic Mary McIntosh and her lover were involved (Jennings, 2008). It was at their house that a sub-section of the GLF, the anti-psychiatry group met regularly following McIntosh’s innovative paper The Homosexual Role (1968). The paper has been viewed as pivotal in the history of lesbian and gay rights (Weeks, 1981). Waters (2012) argued that McIntosh was central in the move in understanding ‘the homosexual’ as a social problem to a social group. He also referred to McIntosh’s use of Hooker (1957) to evidence the beginnings of more valuable research materialising about homosexuality. Such anti-psychiatric attitudes also explains the relative success of Hooker (1957) in the US and the dislike of, or ambivalence towards, Hopkins (1970) in Britain. It also explains why the history of Psychology is not often used for affirmative action. Indeed, this again illustrates the irony in my use of Hopkins’ work to create an affirmative lesbian and gay history of psychology. The GLF had further influence. It was homophile organisations which inspired Wolff to be more open about her sexuality (1965). These groups were also the sources of participants for many psychological studies, including Bene (1965a; 1965); Wolff (1971; 1979) and of course Hopkins (1969; 1970). Such groups which formed from the 1970s therefore had a profound effect on the history of Psychology (Minton, 2002). Minton (2002) discusses how these groups reclaimed this influence and actively rejected the ‘deviant’ and ‘sick’ models of homosexuality resounding in Psychology and Psychiatry.

The anti-psychiatry sub-group of the GLF were later responsible for graffiti demonstrations at medical institutions like the Tavistock, which was effectively the home of the projective test movement. Nettie Pollard, whose oral history is at the British
Library Sound Archive, joined the GLF in 1971 and also referred to such demonstrations and remembered the relative acceptance of the GLF (also see Jennings, 2007a; 2008):

‘I started, I joined, something called the, the counter-psychiatry group, which was something I was particularly interested in, trying to bash psychiatric theories about gayness and lesbianism…and then I got involved in organising a conference that we held at LSE which was actually held for people in medical professions, quite interesting…funnily enough quite a few of them did come along, come and listen to us.’

The Tavistock was a particular target for some of these attacks. My own oral history interview revealed a perception of the Tavistock being particularly hostile to queer people and perspectives:

‘Ah but then you throw the Tavistock in and everyone’s hackles go up, and it’s ‘Oh no!’ No not going to the Tavi… Yeah. The Tavi is, has been, rabidly, to politely say, heterosexist. And then a few years ago, and so was the BPC [British Psychoanalytic Council], and would either overtly or covertly do conversion stuff’

‘I’ve had such, I’ve had a couple of people that have been in training, I was supervising them and the pain, and the degree of paranoia they experienced in walking through that door and not being able to say, not being able to offer a queer friendly perspective in their supervision group’

The Rorschach therefore has links to political movements, including lesbian and gay liberation. This has been historically from different perspectives. To begin with, especially in the US the Rorschach was used to detect, diagnose and pathologise lesbians and gay men, but later, thanks to the work of Hopkins and Hooker, it assisted in the depathogisation of homosexuality and was used in affirmative research. Yet the relationships between Psychology and queerness has remained complicated as shown here (also see Minton, 1997; 2002).
This shows that Psychology’s tools are powerful and can be used for good or evil. Hooker’s Rorschach work has often been described as pivotal to the development of affirmative lesbian and gay psychology. Hooker used statistical measures in her research and the classic $p = < 0.05$ meant that she could develop this discourse of sameness around gay men and the Rorschach. Using statistics she could conclude that gay men were not statistically significantly different from heterosexual men. In contrast Hopkins’ work was not received as well. Despite being published later she did not use statistical methods which had gained great importance in Psychology from the middle of the 20th century. However Hookers statistical methods have since been questioned. Hegarty (2003b) notes how the difference of using alternative statistics, namely, a paired samples of an independent samples t-test, which would make all the difference as to whether there were differences between the gay and the heterosexual men in her study.

Generally speaking both the Rorschach and women have been considered invalid, unscientific, subjective and bias. They seem at odds with men being conceptualised as objective, unbiased and scientific. Equally statistics have been viewed in this way and it seems that these two histories are more related theoretically. The Rorschach was not created in a vacuum but is, of course, influenced by wider socio-historical contexts including those about women and psychological practises. It goes without saying, I think, that these ideas of women being emotional, subjective, bias and irrational, thus not successful scientists, are associated with power. Equally, despite the Rorschach’s historical power it has in a sense been invalidated by the masculine statistics which have of course been powerful, not just in the context of the Rorschach and Psychology, but internationally transcending scientific and popular domains. The historical pattern surrounding the two institutions the Tavistock and the Maudsley especially demonstrate this, as does the power of the statistical approach and the subsequent rejection of the Rorschach by the Maudsley.

I have demonstrated with the works of Hooker and Hopkins that different kinds of discourses are useful and helpful in different contexts and the use of different tools,
whether they be statistics or ink, can be helpful for feminist and queer causes or
detrimental. It is important to recognise the tools used in psychology for what ends and to
reflect on what tools we use now. Whether it be ink or statistics, each have their own
value having been developed in culture with specific understandings, and so they each
have consequences.

4.6 Conclusion

To conclude, broadly speaking this chapter has demonstrated the need for a queer
women-centred history in order to gain a full understanding of the history of the
Rorschach in Britain. My research has unearthed so many implications, connotations and
links to feminism and queer theory that to ignore this would be to further promote the
androcentric and heteronormative histories so abundant in Psychology. This chapter goes
some way to counter these. Such a history is especially relevant in the history of
Psychology because of the role the Rorschach has played in the hands of psychologists
wanting to pathologise lesbians and gay men and those who wish to develop affirmative
and anti-pathological research.

Throughout this chapter several small conclusions have been drawn. The first, that
there are a number of difficulties raised in conducting lesbian history, especially in the
20th century. The second, that socio-historical context is essential when understanding
discourses of sameness and difference in psychological literature. The third, that an
understanding of the psychologists who wielded the tests and those who were tested is
necessary in order to develop a fuller picture of what the Rorschach did in Britain. In
response to these I have developed an original approach to analysis the lives of women
involved in the projective test movement by framing their lives using Hopkins’ The
Lesbian Personality (1969). I have argued that discourses of difference have value and
need to be further recognised. Finally I present research from a range of perspectives, from the psychologists, to those who were tested and further influential organisations.

In providing a new approach to the analysis there are some limitations which need to be discussed. In some ways the issues of presentism remain, as they always will. As Giffney et al (2011) state, anachronism is almost always inevitable in history. But at least the women are described in language more common at the time; rarely would someone in a psychological study be described as ‘bohemian’ in the 21st century. The women discussed in this chapter would not likely think of themselves as participants and by placing them in a position of study via the Hopkins’ (1969) paper I have put them under analysis they would most likely have rejected. Similarly, as discussed in the introduction identities like ‘feminist’ can also be rejected yet little attention is paid to such an identity problem in projects to re-claim feminist figures of the past. Concerns of anachronistic presentism therefore seem far more present in discussions of sexuality. This issue remains unsolved. On the one hand I wish to claim these women as my own queer feminist foremothers in the history of the Rorschach, and on the other hand this is impossible to do without prescribing identities onto them they would undoubtedly have disagreed with. Certainly, some people may disagree with my equating these women of the projective test movement with lesbian history. In response to such a critique I invite historical inquiry and arguments as to why these women are not queer. Reflecting on the heteronormative nature of history (Hegarty, 2003a; Lochrie 2011; Natz, 1996) I challenge those potential critics to instead evidence these women’s heterosexuality.

The herstory I have presented in this chapter opens many more questions that could be developed in future research. The lives of these women, especially Margaret Lowenfeld could be further explored as there is a rich archive available. Indeed, the links to Charlotte Wolff and the activities of the Minority Research Group, the actions against the Tavistock by the counter-psychiatry group, and the relationships between these women in the projective test moment could all be further explored. The approach I have taken in the analysis regarding the women involved in the projective test movement could
be applied to other figures in the history of Psychology. We could ask about Kinsey’s responses to his own interview questions or perhaps describe him via his own six-point scale or Eva Bene could be discussed in relation to her own family relations. In response to the lack of historical research regarding lesbians in the history of Psychology, I have attempted to begin this project and have presented one possible approach by which to do this. I have developed an approach, or framework, upon which to do the history of Psychology and provided a potential first step rectifying this particular historical erasure. Such an approach may not be appropriate for all manner of historical projects in the history of Psychology, but I propose it as one tool which may assist historians of Psychology, especially in efforts to rectify lesbian erasure.

To return to the first woman ‘deeply involved in a homosexual relationship’ who was discussed at the beginning of this chapter, it is possible to see how through the decades she links to all of the other women, and the oral history participant who was tested, discussed in this chapter. The Rorschach has formed a link between each person (despite the differences in experience). From pathological to ‘bohemian’ the Rorschach has been enacted upon to do the deeds of psychologists, for what I perceive to be for good and for evil. It has been a tool, with a transhistorical nature, which has transcended definitions sexuality to continue to provide meaning almost one hundred years after it was first developed. In the next chapter I further develop this point about queer women and the Rorschach, and the looping of Psychology in popular culture, specifically in the graphic novel Watchmen (Moore & Gibbons, 1987).
CHAPTER 5: The Abyss Gazes Also: The Rorschach, Popular Culture and the Public

Figure 8: Watchmen, Chapter 6, page 17, panels 4-6

Figure 8 depicts a scene in Alan Moore and Dave Gibbons Watchmen (1987).

Watchmen has a particular status as a graphic novel that has achieved considerable acclaim among both comic book and more mainstream audiences. The graphic novel version of the twelve comic book series is the only one of its kind to feature in the New York Times 100 greatest novels: 1923-present (Polley, 2013); it is therefore a significant piece of 20th century literature. Watchmen presents a counter history of the US from the 1940s-1980s with two separate groups of superheroes, the Minutemen and the Watchmen, occupying different times a generation a part. For the most part these superheroes do not

---

87 Originally a separate 12 chapter comic book, Watchmen has since been made into a graphic novel (placing all 12 chapters together) and a film directed by Zack Snyder in 2009. The film has boosted the public awareness of Watchmen and a whole plethora of memorabilia is available including a toaster that will toast ink blots onto bread. Following the film two smaller films have become available as has ‘Before Watchmen’ a comic series about the character prior to the events in Watchmen, though none of these activities have been the actions of the original writers, Alan Moore and David Gibbons.
have superpowers and the novel begins as a murder mystery investigating the death of one of the superheroes, from the Minutemen, the Comedian. Set against a background of impending nuclear war echoing the Cold War, *Watchmen* is largely set in New York, though is written by Alan Moore who is British. Accordingly, this adapted narrative of the history of power in 20th century America may have something to teach historians of Psychology as to how to engage our publics as *Watchmen* has certainly engaged the public as a literature representing Psychology in popular culture.

I have not chosen *Watchmen* arbitrarily. In the scene depicted in Figure 8, psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Malcolm Long gives an ink blot card to a vigilante superhero called Rorschach, here unmasked as Walter Kovacs. This scene illustrates the extent of the inclusion of the Rorschach ink blot test in the graphic novel and goes some way to show how common Rorschach references are in popular culture. What is interesting in this scene is how the gaze is switched using the Rorschach card as the pivot. The reader also ‘sees’ what Rorschach ‘sees’ meaning the interpretation has ‘good form’ according to Rorschach analysis (Rorschach, 1921) and gives us some insight to Rorschach the character’s psychology.

The Rorschach test itself has had a very particular history at the intersection of professional Psychology’s relationship with its publics. In fact, the Rorschach is a rather singular example of a psychological test that has transcended from Psychology to such a great extent. Few members of the general public could recognise the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale or the TAT in the same way that they could recognise a Rorschach ink blot. This is what makes the study of the Rorschach so compelling in relation to public understandings of science. In the following chapter I first overview how the Rorschach has been used in popular culture and then explore what I mean when I talk about looping effects. I then extend this thinking to comic books and explore what relationships comics and Psychology have had in the 20th century. Next, I provide an analysis of *Watchmen* and illustrate how meaningful the graphic novel is for understanding the public’s use of the Rorschach and thus Psychology. Following this I provide a queer analysis of three
lesbian characters which coincides with the lesbian analysis regarding sameness, difference and power outlined in Chapter 4.

The Rorschach ink blot test became popular all over the world (see Sorai & Ohnuki, 2008; Mattlar & Fried, 1993; İkiz, 2011; Manickam & Dubey, 2006; Hubbard & Hegarty, in press). Yet, the country which arguably has had the most complex, controversial and continued history with the Rorschach is the US, where Watchmen is set. The Rorschach also continues to be used in the US especially in forensic and legal settings. These themes of psychiatric testing, sexuality, forensic settings and ethics are worthy of note in the history of the Rorschach, and especially so as they return all at once in 1987 with the publication of Watchmen.

The Rorschach has been picked up in popular culture in diverse ways. Rorschach imagery has been used in a number of films, for example The Mask (1994; which was adapted from the comic book of the same name), The Virgin Suicides (1999), and The Master (2012), and in TV shows, for example, in Peep Show (2003) and the first ever episode of Dr Who (1963). The Rorschach has also featured in poetry and fine art, for example the series of paintings entitled ‘Rorschach’ by Andy Warhol and the music video for Gnarles Barkley’s ‘Crazy’ (2006).88 The Rorschach is entrenched within popular culture across a range of mediums. In fact, the Rorschach has been in some ways synonymous with Psychology. I propose a close reading of perhaps the singularly most significant and rich inclusion of the Rorschach in British literature – the graphic novel Watchmen.

---

Comics and graphic novels have not had a particularly easy history with Psychology. After the Second World War comics became very popular in the US. But some psychologists became increasingly concerned about the effects comics apparently had especially on young children. Psychiatrist Fredrick Wertham claimed, in a whole range of publications including ‘The Psychopathology of Comics’ (Wertham & Legman, 1948) and ‘The Betrayal of Childhood: Comics’ (Wertham, 1948), that comic books were dangerous and were becoming increasingly violent and sadistic. His arguments were accumulated in his book Seduction of the Innocent (1954) in which he claimed comics were responsible for delinquency. Others from this time countered Wertham’s views. Thrasher (1949) argued that such monistic theories of complex phenomena, such as delinquency, were usually the result of bias or a lack of scientific logic and research. Interestingly he also accused Wertham of a kind of projection:

‘Wertham’s dark picture of the influence of comics is more forensic than it is scientific and illustrates a dangerous habit of projecting our social frustrations upon some specific trait of our culture’ (Thrasher, 1949, p. 195)

Despite early criticism it was not until the 21st century that Wertham’s sources were revealed proving he manipulated data and exaggerated his findings (Tilley, 2012). The cultural fear of comics during the 1950s in the US has been accounted for by some extent by McCarthyism and the prevalence of social problems in the aftermath of the Second World War (Lent, 1999). But there was one psychologist who felt very strongly that comics could be used for good. This person was William Moulton Marston (Bunn, 1997, 2007; Lepore, 2014). Martson had been writing the Wonder Woman comics under a pseudonym since 1941. Wertham in Seduction of the Innocent had particular concerns around Wonder Woman and described her thus:

‘She is physically very powerful, tortures men and has her own female following, is the cruel, “phallic” woman. While she is a frightening figure for boys, she is an
undesirable ideal for girls, being the exact opposite of what girls are supposed to be.’ (Wertham, 1954 as excerpt in Heer & Worchester, 2009, p. 54).

In contrast Marston was adamant that feminist storylines and background to Wonder Woman made her ‘psychological propaganda for the new type of woman who should… rule the world’. Using Wonder Woman Marston had hoped to:

‘set up a standard among children and young people of strong free courageous women and to combat the idea women are inferior to men, and to inspire girls to self-confidence and achievements in athletics, occupations and professions monopolised by men’ (Lepore, 2014, p. 220)

The character of Wonder Woman, and indeed of Marston, is particularly compelling in the history of Psychology considering Marston was also the inventor of the original lie detector test (and subsequently, Wonder Woman’s ‘lasso of truth’). This history and the relevance of Wonder Woman for Psychology has been previously explored by Bunn (1997; 2007) and Lepore (2014) adds to this work on the historical intersection of Psychology, feminism and comics. The history of comics in Psychology is therefore similar in some ways to that of the Rorschach. Both are concerned about projection, both involve children, both involve aspects of feminism, and both have been viewed as potentially dangerous. This body of work about comics goes some way to illustrate how Psychology and society are bridged and not distinct. The historical concern of the public’s absorption of comics also echoes the underlying belief that the public are passive in their interactions with literature.

Like the assumption that the public passively absorbs comics, there has also been the accepted idea that the public passively absorbs scientific knowledge. Concerns of mass culture and a kind of contagion of ideas rather than critical engagement demeans the public and removes their active interactions. Yet, simultaneously there has been the concern that the public views Psychology unfavourably. This has been since the
beginning of Psychology’s relatively short history (Benjamin, 1986), as well as more recently (Lilienfeld, 2012a). Both Benjamin (1986) and Lilienfeld, (2012a) identified a lack of open communication with the public as a source for such distrust. They cite previous dialogues between the public and scholars, for example in Harpers and Forum, and concede the lack of dialogue in recent years has led to the public’s unfavourable opinion (Benjamin, 1986). Or, as Lilienfeld (2012a) argued what is given to the public is pseudoscience and often provided by non-psychologists. This could be inferred to be directly related to the Rorschach as Lilienfeld has also developed a body of work directly criticising the Rorschach (see Wood & Lilienfeld, 1999; Wood, Lilienfeld, Nezworski & Garb, 2001; Wood et al, 2003). Teo’s (2012) response to Lilienfeld (2012a) called for honesty specifically about the reflexive nature of psychology and referred to Morawski (2005) as a central paper in this discussion (also see Lilienfeld, 2012b). Teo’s argument echoed Wynne (1992) who suggested if sciences provided reflexive discourses for the public there might be greater uptake of scientific knowledge. In his conclusion Lilienfeld (2012a) stated that ‘we as a field should continually be asking the general public “how are we doing?” and be prepared to take their critical feedback to heart if their answers are not to our liking’ (p. 125). But in effect the public already does provide us with this information. As Teo (2012) pointed out, looping effects should be studied as they are the interconnection between academic psychology and the public, and I argue it is through such analysis that we can develop a deeper understanding of public perceptions of psychology. In effect, we could understand what happens when the public ‘gaze back’.

Hitherto, very little has been done to explore the ways in which looping effects can inform psychologists and historians about Psychology’s relationship with comics, despite the rich history of tension between the comic book industry and the profession of Psychology. By taking on comics as a component of the history of the Rorschach I am in effect further queering this history (see also section 5.3.1) and considering the marginal once again. There is also clear feminist themes throughout the relationship with comics and Psychology, especially in the work of Marston (Lepore, 2014), meaning a feminist
stance is also necessary. The character Rorschach in *Watchmen*, is an obvious looping effect of Psychology. Historians of Psychology have had almost nothing to say about *Watchmen* and yet the history of Psychology – and other sciences – are copiously represented in its narrative.

5.1 Human Kinds, Looping effects and the Public

Psychology, as we know, is distinctly different from natural sciences. Psychologists study humans and in turn (though this is not always recognised) themselves. Psychology is a reflexive discipline and here we borrow from Richards (2010) who outlines this especially well:

‘Doing Psychology’ is the human activity of studying human activity, it is human psychology examining itself - and what it produces by way of new theories, ideas and beliefs about itself is also part of our psychology!’ (p. 7)

As argued by Richards (1987; 2010), Psychology (the discipline) produces its own subject matter (psychology). Psychologists are not the objective observers that scientists in the natural sciences can claim to be. In relation to this Hacking (1995) distinguishes between ‘natural kinds’ and ‘human kinds’ and argues how natural kinds, for example rocks, can be studied by geologists and the study itself does not affect the characteristics or qualities of the rock. Human kinds however, are affected by the study itself. Hacking (1999) uses the examples of autism, eating disorders and multiple personality disorder among others to tease apart the claim that something is ‘socially constructed’. Human kinds are able to receive knowledge produced by Psychology, use it, and argue against it: humans can respond to psychologists, rocks cannot respond to geologists. Human kinds are also of course more morally and socially laden as opposed to natural kinds. Historically, we have seen examples of pathologised groups rejecting their diagnosis produced by Psychology
and this rejection feeding back into how psychologists pathologise. Hacking describes such changes as ‘looping effects’.

In other words, looping effects are the exchange of knowledge between science and the public in such a way that transforms the meanings of the knowledge being produced. Information from Psychology is ‘looped’ into society and its reception is ‘looped’ back to Psychology, which transforms the following loop back to society. The construction of science is therefore mutual; the public are active participants in the construction of psychological knowledge. Similarly, Gergen (1973) argued social psychological theories are reflections of history. Hacking and Gergen’s notions of ‘looping’ position Psychology as a distinctly human and historical science.

Yet, the Rorschach ink blots themselves do not actually change as Hacking’s idea of looping would suggest. They remain today the same as those Hermann Rorschach first gave to the printers in 1921. The public might have changed the Rorschach in many ways but public receptions have not changed the blots themselves. Blue bits remain blue, spidery black lines are still spidery and black. We are therefore left to negotiate how an object that is a psychological test might loop and change, but ironically remain the same. Latour (1986) describes such scientific images ‘immutable mobiles’ and argued they can move from science to society more easily than the information they represent. Returning to some literature explored in Chapter 2, Galison (2004) responds to this to some extent and argues that the Rorschach is an object that ‘talks’; it is powerful and active. Therefore the blots themselves might remain stationary, but their meanings and actions do not, what they do can change from place to place and time to time.

Drawing once again on the work of Hacking (1995) and the construction of human kinds it seems psychological tests are particularly persuasive in such constructions. Tests

---

89 In some ways the Rorschach ink blots themselves are timeless precisely because they remain the same. This is the advantage of their totally ambiguous and abstract appearance. Other projective tests which were developed from much more literal images, for example the Thematic Apperception test (Morgan and Murray, 1935), were considered dated mere decades after their development.
are required to have certain qualities, such as construct validity and reliability, which are believed to demonstrate the objective nature of the test (APA, 1954). Tests are supposedly unbiased, objective measures of attributes, or in the case of the Rorschach a measure of personality and/or psychological wellbeing. However, psychological tests not only configure those who are tested, but also configure psychologists as legitimate. Because of the belief and endorsement by psychologists in the reliability of such psychological tests human kinds can be further reinforced. In this way, like all psychological tests, the Rorschach configures people into types and this is reinforced by diagnosis. It is this configuration that Galison (2004) considered powerful.

The Rorschach also raises the question of the relationship between tests, their users and those who are tested with them. Psychologists have always configured people into types, and of course these types have changed historically, as have the tests used to do this (Buchanan, 1997). Yet, the Rorschach appears to be somewhat different to other testing procedures. First, ‘good form’ responses to the Rorschach require the psychologists to also ‘see’ the same image in the ink blot. The psychologist is involved in the testing procedure in greater depth with the Rorschach than in other forms of psychological testing. Second, the ink blot imagery has been adopted in ways that other tests have not. On occasion there has been a supposed misunderstanding, both deliberate and unintentional, and some have thought that people made blots onto which they then projected rather than using the standardised ones. This is apparently the story behind the ‘Rorschach’ paintings of Andy Warhol from 1984. Finally, not only are types of respondents configured but the test configures the psychologist too. There is a small history of studies that switch the traditional Rorschach roles of tester and responder and the psychologists themselves become those under observation. Hooker (1957) famously found that psychologists, including the great Rorschach expert Bruno Klopfer, could not separate ‘well adjusted’ gay men’s responses and heterosexual men’s responses above
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90 See Grob (1991) for a history of the DSM which illustrates such changes of diagnosis and psychological criteria.
chance (see Hegarty, 2003a; Hegarty 2003b). Chapman and Chapman (1969) similarly found that clinical psychodiagnosticians failed to report the ‘valid’ signs of homosexuality that were present in Rorschach responses but instead reported ‘invalid’ ones that ‘have a high strength verbal associative connection to the symptom of homosexuality’ (p. 280). They called this an illusory correlation. The relationships between those using the Rorschach and those who were being tested have therefore been historically complex; and the Rorschach has not only been an active historical object but it has also occasionally switched its gaze, as evidenced in several places throughout the previous chapters. Such reversibility of the Rorschach is distinctly present in Watchmen (see Figure 8), and other representations of the test in popular culture.

Here I provide a brief history of how the public have accessed the ink blots and psychologists knowledge about them. The idea that they could loop was a great concern for some psychologists initially as it was thought that if the blots themselves became a part of the knowledge exchange then it would devalue the test itself. Wood, et al (2003) highly criticised the Rorschach and described the ink blots as an open secret. They cite Poundstone’s (1983) book Big Secrets which promised on the front cover to reveal ‘...how to beat a lie detector…what your answers to the Rorschach really mean…’ and does publish the ink blots, but only the outlines. Wood et al (2003) also cite Miale and Selzer’s (1975) The Nuremburg Mind in which two of the original coloured ink blots were printed, as well as the availability of John Exner’s books online which both include imagery and explanations of the test. Yet, while Wood et al (2003) state that ‘there may not be much point in trying to protect [the ink blots] privacy’ (p. 21), they nonetheless print alternative ink blots and not the originals citing professional ethics discouraging the release of test materials to the public. The Rorschach plates remained relatively well protected despite attempts to reveal them until the release of the ten original Rorschach ink blots on Wikipedia in 2009 by James Heilman, a Canadian physician.

The release of the ink blots on Wikipedia was highly controversial. Proponents of the Rorschach were appalled and were quick to argue it breached ethical guidelines. It
was thought the release would harm scientific research and if the public were to become familiar with the blots the test would become psychologically useless. The controversy was reported in public media including in the *New York Times* (Cohen, 2009) and *The Guardian* (Sample, 2009)\(^92\). Schultz and Loving (2012) in their review of internet responses to the reveal of the plates appear particularly concerned about the implications of the applied uses of the Rorschach in forensic and legal contexts. They found that of 588 comments analysed 35% were unfavourable to the Rorschach, compared to only 11% that were favourable. The authors note their shock that some of those with unfavourable views were from psychologists themselves and that ink blots were often used to accompany text on web pages. The authors considered the ink blots to be sensitive information, as well as descriptions of popular responses. A year later Schultz and Brabender (2013) experimentally tested whether such sensitive information had effected Rorschach responses in the guise of a child custody situation. They concluded that the percentage of popular responses was greater for participants who had been exposed to Wikipedia prior to testing and again emphasised the implications of this finding for forensic and legal contexts.

The Wikipedia incident is the most recent event of many where the test has changed in response to growing criticisms and concerns about the tests validity and indicates a new era of the Rorschach’s history. It is also a clear example of how the public has been active in the history of the Rorschach and have engaged with it as a form of psychological knowledge, whether favourably or not.\(^93\) Similarly, it shows the unstable yet powerful nature of the Rorschach. Traditionally the public have been perceived as mere receivers of science rather than participants yet in this history psychology’s public
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Also see [http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-18952667](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-18952667)

The public’s interaction with the Rorschach continues. On Friday 8\(^{th}\) November 2013 a ‘Google Doodle’ celebrated the 129\(^{th}\) birthday of Hermann Rorschach and invited google users to interact with a changing ink blot which a cartoon Hermann Rorschach could analyse.
are clearly active and not the abyss into which knowledge is thrown. In this case – the abyss gazes also.

5.2 Turning to comics

One central way in which the public, or the abyss as we extend our metaphor, gazes back in this history is through *Watchmen*. As described above loops are complicated and interactional and this is exemplified by the fact that Schultz and Loving (2012) in the review outlined above, had to actively exclude the search term ‘Watchmen’ ‘because the widely known movie and comic book of the same name (which includes a character called Rorschach) would have returned a large number of irrelevant results.’ (p 75).

The existence of *Watchmen* has therefore looped to the extent that it does effect the work of psychologists. I argue that when studying the Rorschach historically, *Watchmen* certainly does not return ‘irrelevant results’ but should be considered as a major contribution to the history of Psychology. Historically, both proponents of the Rorschach such as Schultz and Loving (2012), and critics such as Lilienfeld (2012a; 2012b) as well as historians, have completely ignored the looping of the Rorschach itself and *Watchmen*. Although, Kane (2015) does provide a short account of the *Watchmen* film for the short ‘Psychiatry in the movies’ section of the *British Journal of Psychiatry*. By including popular uses of Psychology, historians of Psychology are able to provide more inclusive and holistic accounts.

Nonetheless there has been academic interest about *Watchmen* outside of Psychology. The developing field of comic studies has gained ground with journals such as *Journal of Graphic Novels and Comics* indicating a growing academic interest. Lent (2010) chronicles the history of comics in academia and argues that the academy can no
longer ignore the importance of popular culture and comics. Brienza (2010) provided an explanation as to how to approach comics sociologically. Some academics have analysed specific comics, for example Bauer (2014) explored the significance of literature, including psychological academic literature in Alison Bechdel’s *Fun Home* and *Are you my Mother?* The importance of the ‘psy’ disciplines extends as Bechdel highlights the role of child psychoanalysis Donald Winnicott in her understanding of her relationship with her mother in *Are you my mother?* (2012). There is also the aforementioned work of Bunn (1997, 2007) and Lepore (2014) surrounding Wonder Woman and her links to Psychology.

Amongst such comic interest several academics have turned their attention specifically to *Watchmen*. Polley (2013) considered the media’s role in *Watchmen* and highlights the historical influences on the novel, for example the election of Margaret Thatcher in Britain. He also draws upon the work of sociologist Theordor Adorno in his explanations of the power of popular culture to seduce and deceive the public masses in *Watchmen* and cites other ventures of the ‘Watchmen’ industry including the film. The film, directed by Zack Snyder, was released in 2009, the same year the ink blots were released on Wikipedia. In fact, the film itself has also come under analysis and compared to the original comics (e.g. Petrovic, 2010). The philosophy of *Watchmen* has been specifically explored by the essays collected in the volume *Watchmen and Philosophy* (Irwin & White, 2009). Relatedly, Hughes (2006) considered the role of ideology of the superheroes in *Watchmen* and compares it to those in the Golden Age era (1938-1949) such as Wonder Woman and Batman. In relation to Rorschach the character Hughes directly related the role of Psychology:

‘Like an inkblot test, society also sees what it will of itself in Rorschach. Many of the characters in the novel (superhero and normal citizen alike) view him as unclean, disturbing, and somewhat psychotic, but others see him as a powerful vigilante capable of doing great things.’ (original emphasis, p. 552).
This characterisation immediately echoes the attitudes towards the Rorschach test itself within Psychology. But the academic considerations of Watchmen and psychology go further. White-Schwoch and Rapp (2010) do not use Watchmen to further understand Psychology as I do, but use cognitive psychology in order to further understand the experience of reading Watchmen.

Specific analysis of feminist and queer themes has also been conducted about Watchmen. In Watchmen and Philosophy both queer and feminism themes are considered. However, these have not been especially affirmative or useful for queer feminists. The analysis on sexuality by Arp (2009) is certainly not affirmative. He described a personal ‘struggle’ with the concept of some of the characters in Watchmen being gay, namely, the Hooded Justice and Captain Metropolis. His analysis is very reflective of his own homophobic. The chapter begins:

‘We don’t talk about it much, and we may be ashamed of it, but some of us (especially guys) are shocked and bothered when we find out some people (again, especially guys) are gay… That’s why is hard to accept that Hooded Justice and Captain Metropolis may be gay. Superheroes, football players, rock stars, and cowboys can kick your ass, so we feel somehow emasculated in realizing they’re gay. I have to admit that when I first read about Hooded Justice and Captain Metropolis, I said, “Oh, no,” and closed the book. I have a visceral negative reaction to the thought of another man looking at me with desire or “wanting me”, and I’m basically uncomfortable with the gay lifestyle.’ (p. 185-6)

This perspective, which I argue is at its core homophobic and misogynistic, equates queerness with femininity and positions them both as undesirable.

The feminist analysis of ‘Watchwomen’ by Donovan and Richardson in Watchmen and Philosophy is somewhat better and concentrated on the attempted rape of Sally Jupiter and understandings of Watchmen though classic feminist theorists, though
the analysis does not extent much beyond this. Donovan and Richardson (2009) also briefly consider how the Silhouette who ‘dressed in a feminine manner (although not as hypersexualised as the Silk Spectre)’ and transgresses links between being a woman, feminine and the consequential heterosexual expectation. They ponder whether the study of Watchmen could lead to further evaluation of stereotypical expectations in society. It certainly could be argued that this was the intention of Moore and Gibbons, to dismantle gender stereotypes and expectations in Watchmen, as they too represent closeted and out lesbian and gay superheroes to highlight homophobia. Lepore (2014) considered more explicit feminist themes in relation to the history of Psychology in her analysis of Wonder Woman and her research, along with that of Bunn (1997; 2007) and certainly illustrated the ties between comics and Psychology in relation to feminist theory.

Considering the difficult history between comics and Psychology and the looping effects with the Rorschach specifically in Watchmen, drawing an account of the interactions of the two is timely. By conducting an analysis of Watchmen and accounting for its psychological inclusions it is possible to make the history of the Rorschach more contextualised. After all, as I have shown above, the adoption of the Rorschach in popular culture has changed the Rorschach test itself. There has been a looping effect, but here we extend the notion of looping effects to consider how loops can occur with psychological tests independent of the human kinds they construct. War, politics and the development of new technologies are regularly accounted for in histories of Psychology but rarely are looping effects used to show how Psychology is also embedded in social context where it is used by the public. There is also a serious need for more affirmative and useful queer feminist analysis of Watchmen. Intersections are therefore important not only in the history of Psychology but also in analysis of literature representing Psychology. Not only this, but by including popular literature the history of Psychology could become more relevant for people other than historians and psychologists. Therefore, it is important to not only account for the use of Psychology in popular culture but also seriously consider how this effects psychological work as a recognition of psychology’s reflexivity.
5.3 Analysis of Watchmen

To begin, the most obvious representation of Psychology within Watchmen is the character Rorschach. Rorschach – aka Walter Kovacs – is a vigilante superhero whose mask is an ink blot. Rorschach describes his decision to become a vigilante crime-fighter in a context of a Cold War looming with the fear of nuclear apocalypse, in a New York City reduced to crime that ‘reeks of fornication and bad consciences’ (Chapter 1, p. 14). Rorschach’s actions on the whole can be seen as a response to the failed social ethical systems (see Nuttall, 2009). Similarly, the Rorschach test was used, particularly in the US, in response to concerns about the psychological ‘other’ throughout the 20th century, namely in detecting the suitability of officers and gay men in the military during both the Second World War and the Cold War (see Hegarty, 2003a; Lemov 2011). In both scenarios, a Rorschach was required in the face of war; either to act as a vigilante crime-fighter to clean up the streets or to detect and weed out unsuitable men (Hegarty 2003). Rorschach is therefore not just visually similar to the test, but shares many similarities with the history of Psychology.

5.3.1 Analysis related to Psychology

Ink blots and related concepts appear in a number of places throughout Watchmen. Visual interpretation and the use of the ‘gutter’ or white space in both is therefore very important. In Chapter 5, page 11 Rorschach plays with ink blots. He sits at a diner and watches people on the street. In the panel it is shown that on a ‘Gunga Diner’ napkin Rorschach drips something onto one side and carefully folds the napkins in half. In the next panel the symmetrical ink blot that has been created is visible underneath text which shows a diary entry from that day stating ‘I sat watching the trash, and New York opened its heart to me’. This panel suggests two interpretations, one that it could be the activity on the street that led to Rorschach’s understanding of New York, or the blot he created.

The chapter in which Rorschach’s character is revealed through the psychiatric testing session is entitled The Abyss Gazes Also and is situated at the absolute centre of
the graphic novel. As with ink blots, symmetry plays a core role in the structure of the book, and the chapter begins with a large full scale image of an ink blot. Indeed, the previous chapter, in which Rorschach makes his napkin blot, is entitled *Fearful Symmetry*. Interestingly, the test itself is presented as valid as it does exactly what it is intended to do: it reveals Rorschach’s history and personality. It is pivotal in the novel just as in the history of Psychology, and in both it is powerful.

Perhaps the most psychologically relevant sequence in the novel is when Rorschach himself does the Rorschach ink blot test. He is tested by prison psychiatrist Malcolm Long while incarcerated having been framed for committing murder. Initially Rorschach gives false responses. Readers can see that he is reminded by the ink blot of his mothers’ sex work and her being abusive towards him. However, Rorschach claims to see ‘some nice flowers’. Malcolm Long, the psychiatrist, responds:

‘Wonderful. Walter, I’m very pleased with your responses this afternoon. And I want you to know that. I really think there’s hope. Walter, don’t you?’ (Chap 6. p. 5)

Immediately, Rorschach is more powerful and less naïve than the psychiatrist. Rorschach later explains that hearing about the murder of a woman in New York City made him decide to make a face he could ‘bare to look at in the mirror’ and become Rorschach. He also questions why Long is interested in him and appears to be critical of psychiatry:

‘Other people down in cells, more extreme behaviour than mine. You don’t spend any time with them… …But then they’re not famous. Won’t get your name in the journals. You don’t want to make me well. Just want to know what makes me sick. You’ll find out. Have patience, Doctor. You’ll find out.’ (Chapter 6, p. 11, also see Figure 9)

Long perseveres at working with Rorschach despite his growing reservations and the negative effect it begins to have on his personal life. On October 28th 1985 he gives
Rorschach the ink blot test again and in his notes reports: ‘Today he told me everything’ (Chapter 6, p. 17).

Long: ‘I thought we’d try some more blot tests. How about taking a look at this one for me?’

Rorschach: ‘Seen this one before’

Long: ‘Yes. I know. I … uh…I thought you might have been holding back before and I wanted to try it again. Go on tell me what you really see.’

Rorschach: ‘Dog. Dog with head split in half.’

Long: ‘I…I see. And uh, what do you think split the, uh, split the dog’s head in half.’

Rorschach: ‘I did.’ (Chap 6 p. 17)

This dialogue corresponds to Figure 8 at the very beginning of the chapter.

Worthy of note here is my continued use of the metaphor of ‘bleeding’ throughout the thesis referring to the Rorschach’s ability to move in and out of Psychology and popular culture. Here in Figure 8 is the very literal bleeding within the Rorschach interpretation and represents of course the metaphorical bleeding of the test from Psychology to popular literature. In the scene, Rorschach goes on to explain why he sees a dog’s head split in half and how he came to do it. He discovered that a man named Gerald Grice has abducted, murdered and butchered a six year old girl and fed to her to his dogs. Upon his discovery he states:

‘It was Kovacs who said “mother” then, muffled under latex. It was Kovacs who closed his eyes. It was Rorschach who opened them again.’ (Chapter 6, p. 21)
This leads Rorschach to kill the dogs and handcuff Grice to a chair with the option to saw off his own hand to escape the fire about to engulf the house. Having finally received Rorschach’s real response to the ink blot Malcolm Long appears to be rather irreversibly effected by the revelation. Looking at the Rorschach blot later at home, he can no longer see positive images in it but only horror and the realisation that we are alone- ‘There is nothing else’ (Chapter 6, p. 28). Rorschach’s interpretations has left an indelible impression on Long. He has been configured by the tests actions. The Rorschach test in \textit{Watchmen} therefore does things to both the psychiatrist and Rorschach the character. Ultimately, the Rorschach test has also succeeded in revealing Rorschach’s psychology.

In \textit{Watchmen}, Rorschach’s response have ‘good form’ (Rorschach, 1921), but only because Long is profoundly affected by the stories Rorschach tells him and so he is also warped by the same ‘negative world view’. Hermann Rorschach believed that seeing animals in ink blots was relatively normal (1921, see p. 62 for a discussion of animal responses in artists) though he did concentrate more on how something was seen as opposed to what was seen. After the development of ‘content analysis’ morbid responses were believed to be indicative of depression, despair and suicidal tendencies (Holdwick & Brzuskiewicz, 2004) all of which can be seen in the character Rorschach’s narrative in \textit{Watchmen}.

Tellingly, the narrative throughout this interaction is that the psychiatrist, originally the powerful figure, is actually powerless and is highly influenced whereas Rorschach himself is unaffected by the interaction. In writing and depicting Rorschach doing the Rorschach ink blot test with a Psychiatrist Moore and Gibbons (1987) could be interpreted as criticising standardised applications of testing protocols in the ‘psy’ disciplines. In some ways it echoes some of the anti-psychiatry critiques which abounded from the 1970s regarding power, diagnosis and testing. Long does not even appear remotely aware of the connection between the test and the superhero, despite identifying both the blot test as the ‘Rorschach’ (Chap 6, p. 28) and the man he uses it on as ‘Rorschach’ (Chap 6, p. 13). It is possible he is merely following common testing
procedures. Long is therefore positioned as more naïve and powerless despite the institutional influence he holds. Traditional power dynamics of the psychiatrist and patient are disturbed and Rorschach’s interpretations of the blots are suggested to be ‘true’. Long recognises in horror that ‘He’s right. Absolutely right’ (chap 6 p. 13). This switching of gaze and perspective, as shown in Long’s understanding of Rorschach’s point of view, echoes one of the key statements Rorschach makes while incarcerated:

‘None of you understand. I’m not locked up in here with you. You’re locked up in here with me.’ (Chapter 5, p. 13)

Therefore the Rorschach in *Watchmen*, as both as character and as a test do something special; they are able to switch perspective and show an alternative ‘projection’ of circumstances.

Perhaps indicative of Psychology’s reflexive nature (Richards, 2010), Psychology is also embedded in *Watchmen* via Rorschach’s own psychology. The association with Rorschach and mental health is clear and deliberate throughout the novel. Long diagnosed him with an ‘unhealthy fantasy personality’ having been ‘conditioned with a negative world view’ and suffering from withdrawal and depression. Rorschach is described as ‘crazy’, ‘sick in his mind’ a ‘masked maniac’ which leads to the other superheroes dismissing his ideas about the Comedian’s murder that he is investigating. Rorschach’s paranoia is especially linked to his mask which for most superheroes separates the person/persona. Rorschach however, has transformed permanently from Walter Kovacs to Rorschach, as represented by his mask. Rorschach’s mask – complete with ink blots – becomes no longer just a mask but his ‘face’. He experiences it as the essence of his character, describing it as ‘all that’s necessary…All [he] needs’ (Chap 9 p. 9).

Yet, this loop of Psychology in *Watchmen* goes further. To see a mask, eyes or faces in a Rorschach ink blot was actually a sign of paranoia in the psychological literature (e.g. Dubrin, 1962). In *Watchmen* this association is circular. Not only does
seeing a mask represent a paranoid personality in Rorschach, but his own personality is based on the concept of a mask. In turn, seeing masks, and thus being paranoid was also considered a sign of homosexuality (Due & Linder 1945; Hegarty, 2003a). Rorschach therefore, not only sees a mask in the ink blot, but identifies with it so strongly that he makes it his permanent face. The use of white space as the eyes is also telling and, according to Rorschach’s (1921) original analysis, is indicative of stubbornness or obsessiveness, qualities which Rorschach the character certainly has. However, as the end of the novel indicates - Rorschach was never truly paranoid, but right all along suggesting that the psychological interpretation was wrong, perhaps questioning the legitimacy of the Rorschach in Psychology.

Another revealing interaction with psychological literature related to the mask is that Rorschach made it out of a dress. This is telling; to see feminine clothing was another sign of homosexuality according to some (Due & Linder, 1945; Wheeler 1949, see Hegarty 2003 for discussion). Rorschach therefore quite literally ‘sees’ a dress and a mask in the ink blots he wears as his face. But the dress is not just a peripheral detail. It was the dress of the woman whose death inspired Rorschach to don a mask in the first place.

It was the death of Kitty Genovese that inspired Walter Kovacs to become Rorschach and this specific inclusion shows a significant loop with Psychology. Kitty Genovese was a real woman who was raped and murdered outside her apartment in New York City in 1964. Her murder is just one of the many examples of ‘real’ history found in Watchmen. Not only do the news reports of this event inspire Rorschach but it was also her dress, complete with moving black and white blots, that Rorschach later made his mask from.

anything. Nobody called cops. Some of them even watched. Do you understand?

Some of them even watched.’ (Chap 6. p. 10)

Despite the compelling story, Long only regards the story as ‘flimsy’, and not suitable enough to explain Rorschach’s psychology (see Figure 9).
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**Fig 9: Watchmen, Chapter 6, page 11, panels 5, 6, 8 & 9**

But what is most interesting about this particular example is that not only did the death of Kitty Genovese inspire Rorschach, but also many psychologists. In particular, Darley and Latané (1968) who developed the ‘bystander effect’:

> ‘Several years ago, a young woman was stabbed to death in the middle of a street in a residential section of New York City…at least 38 witnesses had observed the attack— and none had even attempted to intervene. Although the attacker took more than half an hour to kill Kitty Genovese, not one of the 38 people who
watched from the safety of their own apartments came out to assist her. Not one
even lifted the telephone to call the police’

(Darley & Latané, 1968, p.377)

The story of Kitty Genovese’s murder has become a parable in Psychology and is
included in almost all introductory textbooks (Cherry, 1995, Gallo, 2014; Manning,
Levine & Collins, 2007). However, the history of Kitty Genovese and the subsequent
biased reporting of her death, including lesbian erasure, has since been more reliably told
(see Gallo, 2014); but importantly it is the parable which is present in Watchmen.

The death of Kitty Genovese acting as a source of inspiration for both Psychology
and the character Rorschach cements their commonalities. This is just one example of the
many ways Watchmen both toys with and manipulates history, yet simultaneously
provides a clear and close narrative of the history of Psychology. Another is the use of the
Rorschach in a forensic setting in Watchmen which mirrors the rise of applying projective
tests in forensic contexts and the increasing legitimacy of forensic Psychology in the
1980s (which of course is when Watchmen was set and published).

Both the test and the character also have questionable ethics. Rorschach’s strict
‘black and white’ ethical outlook resonates with five of the ten original ink blots
(Rorschach, 1921). Philosophers writing on Rorschach’s ethics have concluded that his
ethical beliefs neither fit into Kantian, utilitarian, or virtue ethical systems (see Irwin &
White, 2009). Indeed, Rorschach’s ethics and actions also do not fit into social
psychological ideas of the ‘bystander effects’ as proposed by Darley and Latané (1968).
The ethical implications of using the Rorschach test has also been investigated (see for
example, Wood et al 2003). This has been with particular regards to the use of Rorschach
in court rooms and in relation to abuse cases. The use of Rorschach tests in North
American court rooms has been debated (see Grove & Barden, 1999; Grove, Barden,
Garb & Lilienfeld et al, 2002; McCann, 1998) and in the graphic novel it is mentioned
that Rorschach will only respond in his bail hearing when referred to as Rorschach rather than as Walter Kovacs his original non-superhero name. In effect, he demands that ‘Rorschach’ is present within the court. Despite the critique of both the test’s and the character’s ethics, both were developed in light of ethical dilemmas in the foreshadow of war.

Not only are the ethics of the Rorschach test and character questioned, but both are considered invalid, untrustworthy and unreliable by the majority. Tropes of belief are threaded throughout the histories of both the character and the test. This has been explored in relation to the Rorschach test in Chapters 2 and 3 specifically. Initial enthusiasm for the character and the test are evident in their histories, with a subsequent questioning of their methods and concerns regarding validity. In Watchmen this comes in the form of the Keene Act ⁹⁴ which outlawed superhero groups, which Rorschach was stanchly against, and in the history of the Rorschach ink blot test it comes in the shape of growing critique of the test. Both Rorschach’s deductions in his investigation regarding the death of the Comedian in the early part of the novel, and the Rorschach ink blot test have been disregarded by many, whether they be other superheroes or psychologists. This has led to them both being discredited in their separate contexts. These concerns of truth and believability are particularly interesting when it is considered that in Watchmen, Rorschach was actually revealed to be right but was not believed by anyone. In the end Rorschach is shown to be more committed to truth than to life (Irwin & White, 2009) as he eventually is killed by the superhero Dr Manhattan for trying to inform the world of the true state of events. In Watchmen, Rorschach’s truth did ‘will out’ in the end. Perhaps this is what Rorschach supporters today are still hoping for, that the Rorschach ink blot test will eventually be shown to be reliable, truthful and trusted once more.

⁹⁴ Gorelick (1992) describes his first job in the 1950s as an art assistant being to draw comic pin up character Katy Keene with less cleavage in response to the work of the anti-comics campaign directed by Wertham and the subsequent development of the Comics Code Authority which was set up to censor and monitor the content of comics. It is thought that this Keene Act in Watchmen, which aimed to stop superheroes is named after the censoring of Katy Keene.
Such specific prominence of psychological knowledge in *Watchmen* illustrates the depth of the loop of the Rorschach in the novel. Psychological literature and meaning is embedded within the narrative in significant and revealing ways. As shown in the analysis above, the ways Rorschach the character and the test are presented in *Watchmen* can be considered symmetrical to that of the history of the Rorschach in Psychology. The narrative of this loop of Psychology is of a critical nature and illustrates an awareness of the anti-psychiatry criticisms of the 1970s and the rise of forensic Psychology in the 1980s. In a sense Rorschach observes the actions of the psychiatrist and plays along but eventually he deconstructs what has happened and shows the meaningless of it all. Rorschach’s power echoes that of the Rorschach test. Both have been historically difficult to predict, control and contain. There is even a suggestion of another sort of historical loop of Rorschach knowledge at the very end of *Watchmen* as Rorschach’s journal is found and has the potential to out the truth once and for all.

5.3.2 *Queer Analysis*

Reading *Watchmen* with a queer lens has also revealed a number of interesting aspects of the graphic novel. There is little need to ‘read between the straight lines’ as suggested by Koawareas (2014), because there are a number of explicit references which make a queer reading an obvious approach. As with all media, there is also a need for feminist critique.

Some authors have already considered feminist and queer themes in *Watchmen* and I am not the first to take this approach. However, I think it is likely I am the first to take it from an affirmative perspective in contrast to the analysis provided by Arp (2009) already discussed. Queerness as a theme runs rather quietly throughout the whole novel. This is unsurprising considering the views of Moore and Gibbons. During the 1980s in Britain homophobic policies, most significantly Section 28, came into being and the HIV/AIDS epidemic generated a culture of uninformed, homophobic fear and stigmatisation. In response Moore, Gibbons and a collection of graphic artists and writers,
wrote *AARGH!* which stands for ‘Artists Against Rampant Government Homophobia’ in 1988. It was a collection of comics arguing against the implementation of Section 28, which Moore felt was not only heterosexist, but had the potential to impact him personally as he was in a relationship with his wife and their girlfriend at the time. Moore even set up his own publishing company Mad Love in order publish AARGH! which came out only one year after *Watchmen* was published by DC Comics.

It is likely that in representing queerness in *Watchmen*, Moore and Gibbons continued to respond to homophobia. It is possible that by showing homophobic behaviours and attitudes they intended to expose the wrongness of such actions. For example, the newsvendor, a secondary character we follow throughout the novel, exclaims if a man and woman can’t sexually relate ‘he’s queer as a three dollar bill’ (Chapter 3, p. 18). Flippant comments made by characters make homophobia explicit and create a discomfort for the reader. Of course, such a reading of the effect of these inclusions must be accounted for within social-historical context. The interpretation of such language would be markedly different in the late 1980s and early 1990s in light of the HIV/AIDS epidemic and with Section 28, compared to the 21st century when *Watchmen* was included into the New York Times 100 best novels since 1923. Indeed, the development and changes in meaning of discourse are also essential to understand here. ‘Queer’ as a word has transformed and has had altered meanings throughout the last few decades in very meaningful ways. From an offensive derogatory slur to a reclaimed identity and theory (see Minton, 1997), ‘queer’ has been negotiated in different communities and continues to mean each of these definitions in different contexts depending on intent and perspective. The use of ‘queer’ specifically in *Watchmen* is likely to be a slur and reflective of the 1980s, yet is being used as a deliberate tool to highlight homophobia in society as a way of providing an anti-homophobia message.

In relation to the character Rorschach there are a number of explicit associations with queerness. First, in Chapter 1 of *Watchmen*, Rorschach interestingly questions whether Adrian Veidt, another ex-superhero who is extremely wealthy, is ‘homosexual’.
Rorschach follows this up by stating he ‘must remember to investigate further’ (see Figure 10). What is especially convincing about this passage is that it indicates Rorschach is capable of detecting homosexuality – just as Rorschach users such as Due and Wright (1945), Lindner (1946), and Wheeler (1949) argued could be done using the Rorschach ink blot test. Second, Rorschach is attacked and queer is used as a slur against him, specifically he is called ‘a goddamned queer’ whilst his mask is ripped off his face (see Figure 11).
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**Fig 10:** Watchmen, Chapter 1, page 19, panel 2  
**Fig 11:** Watchmen, Chapter 5, page 28, panel 5

Rorschach is therefore targeted as queer by others, and the mask which represents his identity is taken from him. Such themes of identifying queerness and responding to it with force are of course reflective of the history of Psychology. Responses to, and interventions around, queerness, are often identified first by tests, and such an approach was central to the thinking of people like Terman (see Hegarty, 2013). As discussed in the previous section, the character of Rorschach shares a number of commonalities with the history of Psychology and his relationship with queerness is no different.
In order to continue my focus on the marginal in this thesis, not only do I want to explore a queer approach to the analysis of *Watchmen*, but also to consider the more marginal characters. Rorschach the character is clearly a central inclusion of Psychology into its narrative, but other aspects of Psychology’s history can be gleaned by considering the narrative in *Watchmen*. Having considered the discourses generated by Hooker (1957) and Hopkins (1969; 1970) around sameness and difference in the previous chapter I now extend that analysis to three lesbian characters in *Watchmen*.

In *Watchmen* there are three lesbian characters I wish to focus on. In light of the discussion in the previous chapter about queer women and the Rorschach, it is pertinent to also discuss these characters to see how they related to the history. These characters are: the Silhouette, Joey the activist and Kitty Genovese. Here I will outline briefly the storyline about each of these women and explore how their characters ‘embody’ similar issues of power/lessness and discourses of sameness and difference which were present in the queer herstory chapter.

To begin the Silhouette is the only lesbian superhero in the entire graphic novel. In fact, she is the only ‘out’ character. Ursula Zandt, or The Silhouette, is described as a Jewish Austrian Aristocrat who grew up in a Nazi- overrun orphanage. She was aided by the orphanage Pharmacist Gretchen in avenging the death of her sister. The two of them then escaped to the US. Ursula became a masked crime-fighter and eventually answered an advert for the Minutemen. The Silhouette becomes known to everyone as a lesbian in the famous celebratory image of the end of the Second World War, of a soldier and a girl kissing in the street. It is replicated in *Watchmen* with Ursula as the soldier. However she was later forced out of the group after her very public coming out. When asked about The Silhouette in an interview Sally Jupiter, another member of the original Minutemen superhero group, stated:

‘…First off, I didn’t like her as a person. I mean she was not an easy person to get along with. But, when the papers got hold of it, her being a-what is it-a gay
women they say nowadays, when that happened. I thought it was wrong. I mean Laurence, who was my first husband, he got everybody to throw her out of the group to minimize the P.R. damage, but… I mean I voted along with everybody else, but… well it wasn’t fair. It wasn’t honest. I mean she wasn’t the only gay person in the Minutemen. Some professions, I don’t know, they attract a certain type…’

Ursula is forced out of the group, by vote and pressure due to her sexuality. In the final act which highlights homophobia within Watchmen, Moore concludes the life of The Silhouette in murder. Both she, and her girlfriend are murdered only 6 weeks after her removal from the Minutemen by a previous enemy of hers. In fact the murder itself is explicitly a homophobic hate crime as shown by the words ‘Lesbian Whores’ written out on the wall behind them in their own blood. Such violence towards them frames the homophobia in the novel, as does the powerlessness of these women despite their powerful characterisations as Nazi escapees, and in the case of Ursula, a superhero. In fact there is the suggestion that other characters in Watchmen are also gay, but they are men, they are closeted and so they remain powerful superheroes. It is both The Silhouette’s gender and open sexuality which deems her powerless. She is also distinctly different and it is this difference which leads to her death: she is a women, she is a lesbian, she is out, she is powerless.

The second character which I wish to discuss is Joey the activist. When first introduced the newsvendor asks her ‘How’s the promethean? Still bringing light into the world?’ This inspires a short conversation about politics in which she causally asks who the latest centre fold model of Hustler is. Having been given the centrefold and had a good look, and bought a copy, she then goes onto ask the vendor to put up one of her charity gig posters (see Figure 12). First he responds ‘Gay women against rape? Is this a joke?’ She persuades him with a threat of violence and despite his homophobia earlier in the novel he obliges.
This woman is powerful, and yet she is only depicted on one page in the entire novel. She is active and engaged in gay community organisation. She is different to the vendor, and to any other woman in the novel. Very few interactions involving women in *Watchmen* secure an outcome that benefits women. Women are more often murdered and rape is a minor theme throughout the novel. Interestingly, rape is what the Joey the activist is campaigning against. This activist however is active, strong, gets what she wants and is different. She shares a similar interest in the centrefold with the vendor and is portrayed as distinctly masculine in the novel especially in her threat of violence against the vendor if he refuses to display her poster. Yet she remains marginal and is never referred to again.

---

95 This is especially true for Laurie and her mother Sally the original Silk Spectre. They are the only other women superheroes and their narrative is consumed by the theme of rape. Sally is rescued from being raped by the Comedian with whom she later has a relationship with. Laurie is born from this relationship though only finds out at the end The Comedian is her father and struggles to come to terms with it.
The third lesbian women whose place in the novel is especially significant is Kitty Genovese. As discussed above Kitty Genovese is cited as the main reason why Rorschach the character decides to become a superhero. It is her murder in New York which 38 people are said to have witnessed that persuades Rorschach he should become a vigilante superhero. In fact, as previously mentioned, she has another connection to him in the novel. It was Kitty Genovese who ordered a dress, made of a black and white moving fabric which Rorschach later came across whilst working in a fabric factory. Yet she rejects the dress as ‘ugly’ so Rorschach later makes his mask out of it. Unlike all of the other characters in *Watchmen*, Kitty is significant because she was actually a real woman. Moore and Gibbons (1987) once again threaded both real and fictional histories together.

But what is missed in both of accounts the life and death of Kitty Genovese, in the psychological literature and in *Watchmen*, is the fact she was a lesbian (Gallo, 2014). Kitty has been incredibly powerful in the history of Psychology and the parable telling of her history. Yet this is due to her powerlessness in her murder and is amplified by those who apparently witnessed her death and did nothing. Kitty’s death was told via heteronormative narratives that erased her lesbianism and her relationship with another woman. The psychological literature, the newspaper reports and her history in *Watchmen* erase her lesbianism and position her as a powerless woman. She is talked about as if she is normative. This is referenced as the reason why her death is so troubling, because she ‘could be any one’. She was portrayed in the media as the average young woman in a good neighbourhood to suggest any woman was at risk. Even the photograph used by the media was her mug shot taken a few years prior to her death which was cropped to hide this fact. So despite the portrayal of Kitty as normative, she was different, she was a queer woman with an arrest history. Yet the discourse surrounding her in both literatures is of sameness and powerlessness. Queer and feminist themes throughout *Watchmen* are certainly complicated and the intentions of Moore and Gibbons are difficult to decipher, but this analysis provides a better more affirmative perspective.
The tensions of difference that I explored in Chapter 4 around lesbians in psychological literature are in some ways echoed in the representations of lesbian women in *Watchmen*. These tensions, around sameness, difference and the related power/lessness are ‘embodied’ in these characters. Such power reflects lesbian erasure in both literatures and analysis of these power dynamics can reveal meaningful insight to what has been pushed into the gutter. This is either metaphorically or literally as I consider comics and graphic novels more specifically in this chapter. As in Chapter 4, by rethinking the discourses of difference it is possible to view the contributions of lesbian women in both Psychology and in the world of *Watchmen* more clearly.

5.4 Conclusion

*Watchmen* is a considerable loop of Psychology into popular culture. It is exemplary of how the public can adopt, use and create new meanings of Psychology and has impacted the ways in which psychologists interact with the test itself (e.g. Schultz & Loving, 2012). Yet, this loop extends even further. Hermann Rorschach was not the first person to use ink blots. Historically, they have been used to inspire artists such as Leonardo di Vinci (in the 15th century) and Victor Hugo (in the 19th century). By the 19th century, ink blots had become common in parlour games (Erdberg, 1990). Projective tests are not made whole cloth by psychologists, but tend to be assembled from existing forms of play already existing in popular culture. This can be seen in the TAT (Morgan & Murray, 1935) and the Lowenfeld’s World Technique (Lowenfeld, 1955) as well as the Rorschach.96 The use of ink blot imagery in modern games such as ‘The Redstone Inkblot Test’ published by *Psychogames* indicate the ‘looping effect’ has come full circle from games into psychological testing and back again. The Rorschach has therefore looped

---

96 Christina Morgan developed the images from images in books and magazines. Card 1 of the TAT shows the image of a boy contemplating a violin. This image was influenced by a photograph printed in *Parents Magazine* of famous violinist Yehudi Menuhin (Morgan, 1995). Margaret Lowenfeld developed the World Technique from HG Wells book of Children’s games *Floor Games* (1911).
from popular culture into Psychology, and as this analysis shows it has looped once again, via literature, into popular culture.

In all, by extending analysis to the ways in which the public use and develop loops from the social sciences, historians are able to generate richer and more inclusive histories. By paying closer attention to how looping effects impact psychology we are able to be more explicit about the reflexive nature of Psychology. To de-centre the narrative away from the actions of psychologists, I recognise the actions of the public and so they are presented not as an abyss but as contributors to the history. By paying closer attention to the white spaces of history, including the publics’ use of Psychology, the ‘abyss’ and the gutters looping effects begin to emerge. In this chapter the ‘gutter’ has taken two meanings, first the forgotten aspects of history, and second, the spaces between panels of comics. In using the two I integrate history and literature and have revealed how much action there is in using such analysis. The analysis is also very appropriate for a history of projective psychology as projection is required by both.

The public are not passive in the history of Psychology, and neither are psychological objects such as the Rorschach. In this thesis I have adopted Hacking’s (1995; 2000) thinking about looping effects and complicate them to include the public more centrally and consider how tests can be active in this loop too even without the construction of a specific human kind. While Rorschach is a part of Psychology’s history it remains a part of Psychology’s present and is an integral part of how Psychology is performed in popular culture. Historians and psychologists alike should pay attention to such performances by the public and adoptions of Psychology by the public as they are the communication that the public are providing us. It is the loop which feeds back into Psychology. History as well as Psychology, after all, is not narrated in an abyss.

In effect, this chapter discusses two distinct but related objects: the Rorschach ink blot test and the graphic novel Watchmen. These two objects not only share the similarities and shared history as outlined above but also share a history of concern within
Psychology. Whether that be the concerns about validity of the test or the release of the original ink blots, or the concern of the effect comics have on the public. Both have historically been positioned as dangerous and a subsequent avoidance of comics and popular culture has occurred. I argue comics should be invited into the history as they are already entrenched within the history anyway. Accordingly, the representation of the history of Psychology via comics is likely to teach historians of Psychology how to engage our publics more effectively.

In *Watchmen*, the chapter ‘The Abyss Gazes Also’ finishes with the Friedrich Nietzsche quote: ‘Battle not with monsters, lest ye become a monster, and if you gaze into the abyss, the abyss gazes also into you’.\(^7\) In this chapter I argue that comics, popular culture and looping effects are not monsters; that the public is not an abyss; and that by further studying these concepts we will develop a greater understanding of what is gazed back at Psychology.

\(^7\) Hermann Rorschach also briefly considers Neitzsche and argues when trying to understand what ‘experience type’ an education subject is ‘it is a simple matter to guess his favourite philosopher. Introversive individuals swear by Schopenhauer, dilated ambiequals by Nietzsche, coartated individuals by Kant, and the extratensive group by some ecanscent authority, Christian Science or something of that sort.’ (1921, p. 110).
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

‘The orange I guess just looks like spilt drink on a carpet. Like orange juice or something… Here, just here. The spill just looks like its flowing, like its bleeding out onto the carpet.’

This was my response to one aspect of Card 9 when I did the Rorschach ink blot test (see Appendix B). This bleeding of juice, and the ink of the blots themselves, is a reminder of the behaviour of the Rorschach itself throughout its history in the 20th century. Critics have claimed that the Rorschach no longer has any place in Psychology (Wood et al, 2003), implying the test has ‘bled out’ altogether. I do not take this position, I argue that the Rorschach has bled from popular culture to Psychology, with the help of Hermann Rorschach. It has since bled back out again into popular culture. Despite being ten solid plates accompanying the book Psychodiagnostik the Rorschach has its own liquid properties, or at the very least a transforming quality. The Rorschach therefore presents us with an excellent example of a loop between Psychology and the public.

Relatedly, the Rorschach can transform its shape, like a liquid, depending on what vessel it is put in. The Rorschach looks different whether it sits in a psychologist’s office, a museum cabinet or in a comic book, as shown throughout this thesis. The Rorschach has represented different things as a tool of psychologists (Chapter 2), as an object in the history of British Psychology (Chapter 3), in the hands of lesbian psychologists (Chapter 4) and as a vigilante superhero (Chapter 5). The end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century are particularly interesting times for Rorschach history as the test is present in each of these places simultaneously. However in each of these locations, the Rorschach does not only look different (despite being the same 10 ink blots) but it also does different things. In the psychologists office it is a powerful diagnostic tool that can enact diagnosis upon people. In the museum it acts as an object of curiosity, a relic and
usually as an example of the ‘mistakes’ in the history of Psychology. In the comic book it represents the ‘psy’ disciplines generally as powerful, but occasionally wrong. The context of each of these is also very significant. Just as a liquid might be harmless as a raindrop but deadly as an ocean storm, the Rorschach can appear harmless but then act powerfully against people. But unlike the storm, the Rorschach has not been indiscriminate. As shown throughout this thesis, the Rorschach in Britain was especially used by women on children and adolescents, to study subjects such as personality, drugs and alcohol addiction and the post-colonial ‘other’. Its popularity was swept up in the psychoanalytic ideas of the unconscious and so it became more popular in institutions with psychodynamic sympathies such as the Tavistock. It was used by potentially queer women as well as the public in presentations of Psychology. The danger of the power of the Rorschach therefore depends on perspective: it looks very different from one side of the psychologists’ office to the other.

In order to conclude the thesis and synthesize the arguments I have presented, I first review the original aims and research questions set out in Chapter 1. The ways in which I have completed these aims and answered the research questions are outlined in brief descriptions of each chapter. These provide a recap of the thesis in order to then provide the themes and overall arguments. In this next section I especially focus on the themes throughout the thesis and consider what the contributions of the thesis are. This leads to the implications and then the limitations of the thesis as well as the directions for potential research.

6.1 Aims and research questions

The central aim in writing this thesis was to rectify the lack of historical inquiry into the Rorschach ink blot test in Britain. Only two ‘internalist’ histories were available about Britain and this contrasted heavily with the interest in the history of the Rorschach
in the US by users of the test, critics and historians. This thesis therefore remedies this problem and fills the gap within the literature. However, this thesis represents a history, not the history of the Rorschach in Britain. Corresponding with the original aims outlined in Chapter 1, a history has been produced by exploring how the Rorschach has been active as an object with power (Chapter 2); comparing the Rorschach’s history in Britain with that of the US (Chapter 3); delving into the further hidden histories of queer women in the projective test movement (Chapter 4); and explaining how the test has looped into popular culture via Watchmen (Chapter 5).

The original research questions posed in Chapter 1 were:

- What does the history of the Rorschach in Britain look like?
- What is the specific British contexts in which the Rorschach ink blot test was used and not used?
- How does research with homosexuality using the Rorschach compare with the research conducted in the US?
- What role do women play in the history of the Rorschach in Britain?
- How have the public responded to the Rorschach and in what ways has it been adopted in popular culture?

In order to respond to each of the original research questions I briefly synthesise each chapter here.

Chapter 2 presented the theoretical underpinnings and my epistemological position underlying the thesis as a whole. It provided a history of the history of Psychology as well as explaining the thinking of some authors whose ideas I develop and use within the following chapters. Centrally within the chapter I argued for the constructed quality of psychological tests and their subsequent power when used by psychologists. I argued that the Rorschach is active and can do things. It is therefore important that those who continue to wield the test, namely clinical psychologists,
recognise both the inherent power and the constructed properties of such tests in order to avoid further misuses of testing.

Yet the Rorschach is unlike other forms of psychometric tests. The Rorschach entices and goes beyond what many tests represent; it is visual, playful and somehow becomes very personal. The Rorschach has an affective quality, which may be why the public have adopted it to the extent that they have - it appears to be inherently engaging. The process of ‘seeing’ things in ambiguous stimuli is evident throughout centuries as explored in my evidence for earlier use of ink blot in popular culture. Unlike other psychological tests, the Rorschach has been viewed as art, used in advertising, presented in museums and in each of these locations at different times the test does something different. It has been ‘looped’ into popular culture more than most components of psychology, it divides the beliefs of psychologists, it has hidden and unexplored histories, and it has a compelling quality. Beliefs about the Rorschach were compared to extraordinary beliefs (Lamont, 2010; 2012; 2013) and a symmetrical approach to the history has been taken throughout the thesis.

Overall, in this chapter I applied the thinking of a number of scholars from a range of disciplines to the practise of psychological testing. In this original application I tied conceptual ideas about power and social construction to more practical ideas like diagnosis. In doing so, and considering the actions of the Rorschach as central in this relationship, I moved from Foucault’s (1977) ideas of power; Hacking’s (1995, 2000) ideas about human kinds and Galison’s (2004) ideas of the Rorschach doing something, towards an understanding of the Rorschach as not only active but creative of affect. This chapter began to frame answers to the first research question, what the history of the Rorschach in Britain looked like, by first exploring what the Rorschach itself looks like. It therefore set up Chapter 3 which delved into greater depth of the history of the test in Britain.
Chapter 3 used a comparative approach to contextualise and explain the history of the Rorschach in Britain. This chapter fully answered the question: what did the history of the Rorschach in Britain look like? In contrast to the Rorschach’s popularity in the US, in Britain the Rorschach was confined to a relatively small group. It was established at the same time as the NHS and experienced significant critique from early on, latterly most notably from Hans Eysenck. The prolific career of Eysenck at the Maudsley was central in the decrease in use of the Rorschach as he greatly influenced the teachings of clinical Psychology in Britain. The Rorschach was not embedded in academia to the extent it was in the US and it was rejected for military purposes in the 1940s. Within this national context, and the related history and popularity of psychoanalysis in both countries, the fascination that Rorschach’s ink blots engendered were not sufficient to stabilise belief in its legitimacy, nor its widespread use in Britain. These institutional and contextual influences on the history of the Rorschach in Britain highlight the appropriateness of using a more sociological and ANT approach. The actions of individuals and even the actions of the test on particular people have not been enough to fully explain the history of the Rorschach. An accounting of a range of actors within this history is necessary. I found British Rorschach history did reflect some of Psychology’s normalising projects of the 20th century, that is, the cultural ‘other’, children and issues around drugs and alcohol. However, British psychologists did not engage with Cold War fears surrounding homosexuality in the same ways as psychologists in the US. In fact there is evidence for early progressive thought. There was also a larger proportion of women involved in the projective test movement in Britain than in British Psychology in general; this point was further developed and explored in greater detail in Chapter 4.

This chapter not only responded to the research question regarding the specific British contexts in which the Rorschach ink blot test was used and not used, but also began to internationalise the history of the Rorschach. In using a comparative approach this chapter highlighted the particular, and perhaps peculiar, history of the Rorschach in the US as well and de-centralising American narratives about the history of Psychology
generally. The British history I presented contradicted aspects of the US history and instead highlighted the importance of women, the child, British-specific contexts and a reprioritisation of US contexts which are so often applied to Britain without considering British idiosyncrasies within history.

Chapter 4 developed the ideas around the women involved in the projective test movement and research about lesbians and gay men first introduced in the previous chapter. These themes were expanded upon in much greater detail and efforts were made to approach this chapter with both top down and bottom up perspectives. This chapter demonstrated the need for a queer women-centred history in order to gain a full understanding of the history of the Rorschach in Britain. It successfully unearthed a queer feminist history in relation to the Rorschach and so contributed to the re-placing of women into the history of Psychology more generally. The aim to re-place women back into the history of Psychology is of course important, and I went beyond this broad goal. I managed the consideration of the intersections of such a history and developed a form of analysis by which to do such work. In using the work of June Hopkins I not only added to the project to reclaim her (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002) but also used her as a theorist and generated a loop in queer history and queer theory.

The chapter began by discussing the problems and concerns of doing what I called a ‘queer feminist herstory’ and attributing terms like ‘lesbian’ onto women of the past. In response to this I presented my own form of analysis in using June Hopkins’ research to frame the lives of four women of the projective test movement. I argued that to understand how discourses of sameness and difference were received, wider social and cultural circumstances need to be explained. Indeed, the response to Hooker’s discourse of sameness in the US about gay men was strikingly unlike that of Hopkins’ discourse of difference in Britain about lesbians. This chapter presented the early affirmative work, and the lives, of some women involved in the projective test movement; but also included the accounts of lesbian women and gay men who were tested with the Rorschach themselves. This dual approach was also important in the explanation of related wider
institutional and social contexts in the early 1970s, namely the activities of the GLF and the anti-psychiatry movement. This chapter specifically answered the two research questions regarding research with homosexuality and the role women played in the history of the Rorschach in Britain. This chapter represents a deliberate argument against heteronormativity in the history of Psychology and is central in the interdisciplinary queer feminist approach taken in the thesis overall.

In Chapter 5 I specifically attend to the final research question: How have the public responded to the Rorschach and in what ways has it been adopted in popular culture? I do this specifically around the graphic novel *Watchmen* because it is one of the most well-known examples of graphic fiction and is the largest enterprise in popular culture that includes the Rorschach. *Watchmen* is a considerable loop of Psychology into popular culture. It is exemplary in how the public, and artists in particular, adopt, use and create new meanings of Psychology and has impacted the ways in which psychologists interact with the test itself. Using the metaphor of the abyss and its associations in *Watchmen* I argued that the public are not the passive void that psychologists often consider them to be. Instead the public use and develop loops from the social sciences and by paying attention to the uses of Psychology by the public historians are able to generate richer and more inclusive histories. Plus, by paying closer attention to how looping effects impact Psychology we are able to be more explicit about the reflexive nature of Psychology. To de-centre the narrative away from the actions of psychologists, it is possible to recognise the actions of the public and so they are presented not as an abyss but as contributors to the history. Indeed, the public are active in the history of Psychology, so too are psychological objects such as the Rorschach ink blot test.

In Chapter 5 I considered *Watchmen* as a work of graphic literature just as legitimate as the Rorschach literature I reviewed closely in Chapters 2, 3 and 4. By paying close attention to the ‘gutter’ here, meaning both the forgotten marginalised narratives and the literal gutters in *Watchmen* I constructed both as meaningful. This was in contrast to common approaches in the history of Psychology which usually ignore public uses of
Psychology and do not consider alternative materials in history. Relatedly, in my analysis of the queer women and themes in *Watchmen* I also present the characters of The Silhouette, Joey the activist, and Kitty Genovese as equally relevant and legitimate as the potentially queer women of the projective test movement presented in Chapter 4. It also advanced my own argument about the Rorschach as doing different things in different contexts; and this means it looks different to different people. Just like an ink blot, a Rorschach test looks very different to a psychologist, to a lesbian woman, and to the character Rorschach. Perhaps because of the interpretative nature of both, the Rorschach and comics (especially in the gutter), have been positioned historically as dangerous. Indeed, the similarities and relationships between the history of the Rorschach and the narrative of Rorschach the character in *Watchmen* provide compelling evidence that Psychology is adopted in meaningful ways. I develop this point further in the section 5.3.2 regarding queer analysis which link the ideas of sameness, difference and power first described in Chapter 4. Similarity in both chapter 3 and 5 I used a comparative angle which re-framed the history of Psychology in relation to the US. Overall, in this chapter I argue that the public is not an abyss; and that by further studying these concepts we will develop a greater understanding of what is gazed back at Psychology.

6.2 Themes and contributions of the thesis

Certain themes run through the thesis as a whole as a result of what the history of the Rorschach looks like. In producing a thesis which fulfilled the above aims and answered the research questions I have 1) explored the power of the Rorschach in Britain in a number of different contexts; 2) shown the relational and reflexive quality of Psychology and critiqued notions that test and the public are passive in the history of Psychology; and 3) produced a history which focuses on the marginal, whether that is the marginal use of the Rorschach test in Britain, women’s history, queer theory or the use of comics in the history of Psychology. It is precisely because of this focus on the marginal
that themes of power, relations and reflexivity have emerged. By paying closer attention to historical silences, white spaces and ‘gutters’, I have in effect conducted a reading of erasures. History, as a form of ‘projection’ has required I make inferences about these ‘gutters’ just as a reader ‘projects’ onto the gutters of the comic book.

Throughout each chapter I have provided evidence that the Rorschach is active, doing something and is powerful. Such looping, influence and relational aspects need to be further recognised by both historians and psychologists. Psychology reflects society, the marginal are not accidental but reflect the social hierarchies in social and cultural contexts. It is no accident that (queer) women’s history remains hidden and difficult to uncover. Psychology and history and, for that matter, literature and sociology are all written in context, by authors with identities, perspectives and motives. Psychology is especially reflexive because of the nature of the distinction between psychology (the subject matter) and Psychology (the discipline).

This thesis, through a particularly critical queer feminist lens, has led to an overall revision of norm histories. It has confronted and questioned key trends within the history of Psychology and Rorschach history in particular. Its findings have shown what it is possible to reveal if ideas of illegitimacy around the marginal are corrupted. This thesis may represent a history but it nonetheless presents one which is confrontational, critical and questioning of norm histories. It has confronted the idea that the Rorschach in Britain is not worthy of study by historians and that the Rorschach is passive in its own history. It has contradicted androcentric histories of the Rorschach in the US, including those using queer theory. By studying the marginal ‘contrast case’ of Britain I have forced a reconsideration of the well-known histories told about the US (Brunner, 2001; Buchanan, 1997; Hegarty, 2003a; Lemov, 2011). This thesis has revealed a somewhat different picture of what the Rorschach’s history looks like in Britain. There was no literature in Britain on Nazis or political ‘others’ as Brunner (2001) showed for the US, nor such a homophobic history. Instead British psychologists were more concerned with children, drugs and alcohol and the impact of the NHS on provisions of care. Yet, there was a
similar interest in the colonialized other in the post-colonial period in Britain as there was in the US projective test movement (Lemov, 2011). Similarly, the patterns of testing, and the decline in the use and belief in projective methods, did mirror those in the US (Buchanan, 1997). By considering both histories alongside one another it is possible to see how the power of the Rorschach enacted upon Psychology in different ways and was influenced by different factors or actors in each national context. In the US military engagement and the wider acceptance of psychoanalysis fuelled Rorschach popularity. In Britain however more specific and particular social factors such as the impact of the Second World War, the NHS and the statistical position of the Maudsley created a relatively unwelcoming atmosphere for projective methods. Despite the Rorschach’s power and agency, the test did not manage to pervade British Psychology like it did in the US. It did however manage to infiltrate popular culture possibly because of the lack of professional protection around the test in Britain towards the end of the 20th century.

In adopting an interdisciplinary approach several other pre-existing ideas about the history of the Rorschach have been challenged. I have also challenged the presumption that US histories are applicable to other western countries, as discussed above. I have eradicated the misconception that there is no women’s ‘herstory’ of the projective test movement. I have also produced a queer history of British Psychology that has provided a potential framework upon which to other lesbian histories of British Psychology could be based. I have shown that not only is the Rorschach active, but so too are comics and the public. I have disagreed with historians who ignore the public and presentations of Psychology in popular culture. Instead I have, rather queerly, accepted alternative literatures within the history.

These challenges lead nicely on to the contributions that this thesis makes to the literature. In addition to the exploration of power; the inclusion of alternative literature; and the application of using human kinds, looping and action to the Rorschach; I have explored the affect of the test. This can be especially seen in Chapter 3 in people’s support or critique of the test, and even more so in Chapter 4 in the reports of lesbian
women and gay men reporting their experiences of being tested, and in Chapter 5 where
the affect of the test is used creatively to form a narrative. Yet, historians have not
considered the affect generated by the test before. In fact, by considering the affect of the
test I develop some of the ideas I drew from Foucault (1977) about power. In Foucault’s
(1977) thinking about power, especially intuitional and governmental power (also see
Rose, 1999), very little is considered about feeling, let alone, imagination, engagement,
and curiosity. Yet I show that, not only does the test do things, have power and enact
upon particular kinds of people; but also that it does so whilst creating feelings in people
(both testers and testees, as well as those just being playful).

The test, being embedded within the reflexive nature of Psychology is itself
constructed and constructs (or at least confirms) human kinds. The affect of the test is
especially relevant when considering why the Rorschach has been adopted into popular
culture over other psychological tests. Advertisers, those in marketing and graphic novel
writers are all aware of the affect of the test. This is why it has been adopted to the extent
it has. Yet so little about the imaginative uses of tests has been explored by psychologists
and historians. The irony of course being that the test was originally a test of apperception
and was highly related to imagination. Despite knowing this, psychologists and historians
have been unable to be imaginative about the history of the Rorschach. In this thesis I
have been imaginative. I have shown my own apperception, that is the application and
understanding of new experiences on to old ones. I have done so by considering
alternative literature, being aware of the marginal and associating conceptual historical
issues with that of an object.

The other contribution I have made is my development of a potential approach or
framework, through which historians can consider sexuality in the history of British
Psychology. In my thesis I have drawn on a number of lesbian histories which have been
in effect salvage attempts to not only re-place women back into the history of Psychology
but also to stake claim on women of the past as lesbians or feminists. I have extensively
evaluated the attempts and discussed the problems involved in reclaiming figures of the
past as lesbians and feminists in Chapter 4. However, in my own analysis I have gone one step further in this effort within the projective test movement in Britain. Not only do I make my own contributions to the efforts to re-place women back into the projective test movement, but I also use a comparative approach, specifically around Hopkins and Hooker to apply context and explain the similarities and differences between their lives, research and experiences. In addition I have highlighted the androcentrism in the specific Rorschach history and I developed upon the work of Clarke and Hopkins (2002, also see Clarke et al, 2010). I adopted Hopkins as an important and affirmative researcher in the history of Psychology as Clarke suggests, but I extend this by using Hopkins as a theorist. By using her work as an analytic lens I have presented a new approach from which it might be possible to springboard more British lesbian history in Psychology. At present there is very little attention on sexuality in the history of Psychology which draws the psychologists themselves to the foreground. This work has not only contributed to queer thinking about Psychology but also to intersectional feminist approaches. As Rutherford and Pettit (2015) state, there is a need for a greater level of LGBT and intersex histories within feminist histories of Psychology.

The final major contribution that this thesis makes is the inclusion of alternative literature and lives. By extending my analysis of lesbian erasure to the characters in *Watchmen* I further develop the marginalisation argument made throughout the thesis. As shown via Chapter 5, the public, and the literature produced representing Psychology, is meaningful and should be considered in the history of Psychology. In arguing that the marginal are important, I have attempted to include as much of the ‘gutter’ as possible and that includes what may be considered by some conservative historians as illegitimate sources of information. By exploring the silence, blank spaces and ‘gutters’ I have not only contributed to re-placing projects but I have shown what can be achieved through such an approach. Not only have I considered the gutter in my research but also in my approach, the interdisciplinary nature can also be considered a ‘gutter’. By concentrating on these spaces I have produced an analysis which ties, or ‘loops’, them all together and
focuses on the marginal. By extending my analysis to *Watchmen* I have gone beyond the moral project to merely re-place women and consider marginal histories. Perhaps, the inclusion of superheroes is a bit ‘queer’ but that is exactly what I set out to do. As explained above, I have produced an imaginative thesis. Therefore, the final contribution of this thesis is the ways in which I have included popular literature into the history, considered the public active and expanded notions of marginality.

In producing this thesis I have discussed reflexivity, and in doing so have continued to be reflexive myself. I have attributed actions to a test, historians, psychologists, a superhero, graphic novel writers as well as a faceless public. This thesis provides an example of the relations, loops and influences on and from the history of Psychology. But importantly, I have also attributed action to myself and have been continually reflexive of my own contributions and interpretations. I have not only discussed reflexivity but I have been reflexive within the entire thesis. One component of this is in the methods I chose.

Throughout this thesis I have drawn upon a number of methods in order to provide a comprehensive yet compelling history of the Rorschach in Britain. I have used archival research and literature review in the archives at the British Library in order to review the journals published by the group originally named The British Rorschach Forum. I also conducted research at the Sound Archives at the British Library, namely the Mental Health Testimony archive and the Hall-Carpenter archive. I also reviewed more well-known journals in Britain for mention of the Rorschach and more popular press including *The Times*. I also worked considerably in the Wellcome Library in the Margaret Lowenfeld archive (and her sister’s Helena Wright), and in the British Psychological Society (BPS) archive.

In addition to these more classic approaches to history, I also conducted oral history interviews. These interviews provided a ‘bottom up’ perspective in my research and revealed the more personal and anecdotal evidence. In places where ‘reading between
the straight lines’ or ‘projecting onto the gutter’ was necessary in this thesis, I was able to
draw upon my oral history interviews. They provided not only a helpful resource for the
project but also gave more of a ‘real life’ perspective. Oral histories were a very useful
method to adopt in this thesis considering the aim to give more attention to the marginal,
or those ‘from below’. Individual accounts, with as little interpretation from the historian
as possible, are relatively rare in scholarly approaches. The experiences of those who
continue to use the test, those who were trained in it, and especially those who were tested
with it, are rarely in such histories. By including their perspectives I frame my own
interpretations more explicitly which unbalances the power attributed to me as the writer
and readers are more able to make their own interpretations of the evidence. The use of
oral histories in this thesis has drawn out contradictions, contrasts and disagreement
between archival information, perceptions of an event and even between myself and oral
participants, illustrating the complexity of history.

Such disagreement and complexity highlights another point drawn out in Chapter
2: the Rorschach is a matter of belief. Such disagreements are possible because there is no
agreed paradigm in Psychology (Kuhn, 1962) and the same ‘symmetrical’ facts are used
by both believers in the test and critics (Lamont, 2012; 2013). In recognising this, it is
once again possible to begin to dismantle, or even deconstruct, the power that often
surrounds psychological testing. Throughout this thesis I have maintained a symmetry in
my own beliefs about the Rorschach and am neither committed to faith or doubt in the
test, instead I have considered these beliefs from an outsider perspective as components
of the history.

In all, this thesis is not only the first of its kind to explore the history of the
Rorschach in Britain, it is also original in other ways. The exploration of looping effects
has not been done on a psychological test before. My application of interdisciplinary
theories is rather novel for the history of Psychology, as is the consideration of the
reflexive nature of Psychology for testing practises. My adoption of Watchmen as a core
subject of analysis and my disagreement of the idea of the passive public mean this thesis
combines a number of critical approaches to generate a history of a single psychological test. Therefore, not only does this thesis fill in the gap of Rorschach history, but it also provides information for women’s history, and queer history. I have shown how the Rorschach can be used as a tool through which historians can look at several components of the 20th century, including: the role of women, thinking and pathologising about homosexuality, and the beliefs about what constitutes proper p/Psychology. Not only this, I also provide a new lens through which to consider the history in the US. Plus the thesis goes some way to begin considering the role of comics in the history of Psychology, or the role of the history of Psychology as explained in comics.

6.3 Implications

On the back of this thesis there are a number of implications of both theory and research. Theoretically, this thesis has shown the importance of recognising smaller groups and movements in the history of Psychology. In considering marginal ‘gutter’ histories the loops between Psychology and society have been highlighted. Teo (2012) postulated that this would be possible and would also reveal the reflexive nature of Psychology. I have shown that it is possible to explore not only the reflexive nature of Psychology, and the loops, but also the ways in which the public interact with Psychology through the study of marginal history. In doing so I have also shown the nuanced and particularised accounts of US history. This has de-centralised norm discourses about the history of Psychology, not only with US history, but also my thesis has de-centred men focused histories and introduced a significant history of women in the history of Psychology.

Continuing this theme of focusing on the marginal, theoretical implications also include my deliberate avoidance of heteronormativity. This thesis is one of the first pieces of research to consider lesbians as psychologists in the history of Psychology, the
previous work by Clarke about Hopkins being the only exception (Clarke & Hopkins, 2002; Clarke, et al, 2010). Not only this but on the back of this I have developed a conceptual resource for a possible way to do the history of Psychology. This thesis has shown what it is possible to miss when historians consider only the histories of men, and presume heterosexuality as the default sexuality. Additional implications include the wealth of information available when researchers consider approaches and forms of analysis outside of disciplinary boundaries. My interdisciplinary approach and the use of Watchmen has revealed a completely new side to the history of the Rorschach which has had interesting ramifications regarding the public as active. There are therefore components of this thesis that, while considering the Rorschach ink blot test as central, has implications for wider philosophical and methodological questions.

In relation to research this thesis also has a number of practical implications. The most obvious one is to apply the approach used in Chapter 4 to other relevant figures in the history of Psychology. Sexuality is one area which, certainly for British psychology, has been under explored in relation to psychologists themselves. However, this approach could be used for different facets of people’s lives. Using relevant and historically appropriate research to frame the lives of psychologists of the past it is possible to create idiosyncratic and personalised histories in order to re-place those forgotten in the history of Psychology. My research here also expands this salvage project by highlighting the advantages of considering psychological practises, and the psychologists own psychology, within these efforts. This thesis has considered the Rorschach as central but nonetheless much wider conclusions have been drawn. It is therefore possible to centre such histories around objects, or practises in order to tell contextualised and less presentist histories. This approach would be particularly useful for those who have been more historically marginalised.

Another implication for research is to promote the use of women-centred, queer and critical approaches to the history of Psychology generally. This has implications not only for the history of Psychology but relevant implications for research in the present. In
approaching history with a critical lens and understanding that history is not an accumulation of knowledge it is possible to view the present in a more precau
tious way. Through my research the practises of testing and the lives of those effected has been revealed. By applying that thinking to the present it is possible to begin to view the present as history and so susceptible to the same faults and criticisms that are often considered to be past. Indeed, by recognising the historical power of tests it is possible to view the power exchanges and hierarchies in Psychology today and have the potential, though research, to show the tools of power today. Such an aim - to recognise power in Psychology today and consider the marginal at present - has potential to prevent present and future misuses of Psychology that have been explored in this thesis about the past. The final implication for research based on this thesis borrows once again from the argument of Teo (2012). By exploring the loops of Psychology and including the public’s activities in the constructions of p/Psychology we not only create more honest versions of the history of Psychology, but also begin to listen to the feedback that the public is supplying us about Psychology.

6.4 Limitations/ potential future research

There are a number of limitations in this thesis that need to be outlined in light of these implications. The limitations correspond to some extent to the future directions of research based on this thesis as well and so I supply both here. As previously outlined there is the potential for critics to argue that my analysis of the lives of the women involved in the projective test movement is not appropriate. A potential reason for critics to consider this a limitation is that it would be argued that the probability of these women being queer is smaller than the chance of them being heterosexual. However, as explained in Chapter 3, I challenge those critics to then ‘prove’ those women were not queer and that they were heterosexual. Also I respond to this hypothetical critique by highlighting the relative lack of women’s history and the need to re-place women back into the history
of Psychology. Women are certainly not statistically less likely to exist than men and therefore these marginal histories do not represent statistical probability but rather powers at play in society at large which are reflected in the practises of science.

It could be considered a limitation by some that I do not come down on either side of the debate as to whether the Rorschach actually works or not. In response to this I argue that as a historian I am one step behind these debates and study them in context in relation to the history of the Rorschach overall. In fact, if I were invested in the answer to this debate, which in Chapter 1 I refer to as a matter of belief, I would have written a more internalist or ‘critic’ history. The history of the Rorschach in the US and in Britain has already been written by ‘insiders’ i.e. those who use the Rorschach. It has also already been recorded in the US by those who criticise the Rorschach (e.g. Wood, et al, 2003). The ambiguity and differing beliefs about the test are central within my own analysis. It is what makes it so enticing and engaging, just like the paranormal it is the unknown element of the test that makes so many people interested. Therefore though some may have expected that I would present some opinion on the Rorschach test as a valid tool of measuring psychology I have not felt it necessary nor appropriate to fully work one out. I have many beliefs about the Rorschach. I believe it is fascinating I believe it is a powerful object I believe there is a lampshade in Card Two. Yet strangely, I am not concerned with whether or not the test actually works in the ways supporters claim it does.

Methodologically there are some limitations to the thesis. First, despite effort to interview a broad range of people who have used, trained in or been tested with the Rorschach I was only able to interview psychologists and/or psychotherapists. To counter this I have also included reported of Rorschach testing from the sound archives at the British Library. I was also unable to secure data from the Clarke and Hopkins (2002) interview which would have added another oral history dimension to the thesis. The extent to which oral histories are reliable, due to the nature of memory, is also debatable, however I have chosen to consider oral history to be just as valid as other forms of historical data as already outlined. It is also debateable In addition, despite arguing for a
greater focus on the marginal, it is largely a white history. I have recognised the racism that was rife in Psychology during the first half of the 20th century, and quoted an oral history participant on the racism they experienced in the 1960s and 1970s. However, these themes have not been developed and what has been presented here is predominantly a history of white people. My interdisciplinary approach to some may be considered a limitation as it is not strictly ‘Psychology’. In many ways I have provided an interdisciplinary counter history which some historians may consider incongruous considering the focus on Psychology as a subject matter. However, I think this is one of the advantages to the thesis and as I outline in the introduction, I have produced a history, not necessarily the history. This is because I consider all historicism unrepresentative of what actually happened due to the inherent interpretation required in producing history.

A final limitation of the thesis could also be the scope of the thesis. I am drawing upon examples of one psychological test, which had a relatively short and small history in Britain and yet applying its history to the entire of Psychology to argue for the looping effects between Psychology and wider society. This is certainly ambitious and some could argue stretching the findings of my thesis too far, especially as I only conduct deep analysis on a singular occurrence of the Rorschach in popular culture. I would agree that, with the history of the Rorschach alone, the argument that loops and influences between Psychology and the public is unpersuasive, especially as my thesis represents the first time that looping effects have been explored in relation to tests. This is complicated further by my own argument that the Rorschach has a particularly compelling and intriguing affect. Perhaps the Rorschach is therefore unique in its adoption by the public and inclusion into popular culture. Yet, this seems unlikely as core components of Psychology, including IQ tests, can also be seen in the popular culture and there is also the reflexive nature of Psychology to consider. I have not strictly argued that the history of the Rorschach in Britain alone can fully explain looping effects, but rather that the Rorschach provides historians and psychologists with one key example where these effects can be seen and be explored.
This brings us nicely to potential future research based on this thesis. First, the comparative approach used in Chapter 3 could be broadened to include other countries in order to understand other national contexts. At present the history of the Rorschach has only been largely explored, with the exception of interest in the US, by those who have used the test themselves, or are criticisers of the tests use (see e.g. histories for Japan, Sorai & Ohnuki, 2008; Finland, Mattlar & Fried, 1993; Turkey, İkiz, 2011; and India, Manickam & Dubey, 2006). The use of a comparative account also allows for great contextualisation and understanding of the particulars of an individual national context. Such an approach has the potential to explain how the Rorschach has behaved internationally, and in doing so continues to remove the ‘norm’ discourses of American history and internationalise the history of Psychology as recommended by Brock (2006).

Second, as discussed the approach I presented in Chapter 4 could be broadened out to other areas of the history of Psychology. Relatedly, the lives of the women I have explored in Chapter 4 could be further developed. None of the four women I discuss, and for that matter, June Hopkins herself, have been widely discussed in the history of Psychology. Margaret Lowenfeld has received some attention but the archive at the Wellcome and the BPS archive are relatively under researched. Indeed, the links to Charlotte Wollf and the activities of the Minority Research Group, the actions against the Tavistock by the counter-psychiatry group and the relationships between these women in the projective test moment could all be further explored. Overall, I have presented an unusual form of analysis and there is potential in expanding this analysis out to develop an original framework upon which to do the history of Psychology.

Third, though I have re-placed (queer) women in the history of Psychology, there remains the need to re-place people of colour into the history of Psychology broadly and perhaps in relation to the projective test movement specifically. Though post-colonial contexts have been briefly explored here and in greater detail by Lemov (2011), the focus on race in the history of Psychology could be drawn out more (see Richards, 2003). This could be done especially around testing as some research into IQ tests as discussed in
Chapter 2 has already revealed rife scientific racism of the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. This limitation is especially relevant for Chapter 5 where several characters in *Watchmen* are people of colour, including Malcolm Long the psychiatrist, and yet no analysis has been conducted on this intersection. One future direction of research could be to rectify this and consider how post-colonialism, racist scientific practises and the projective test movement(s) interact in greater depth.

Fourth, throughout my analysis of the history of the Rorschach I have concentrated on the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, so future research could begin to focus on more contemporary uses of the Rorschach. Or for that matter, other objects in the history of Psychology. In my use of the Rorschach, I have studied an object and its trajectory and actions. In doing so I have explored a number of different factors in the history of Psychology including women’s history, gay liberation, and the use of p/Psychology in comics. There is potential for this to occur for the study of other objects too, as well as uncovering more contemporary histories. As I have said above, study of the Rorschach in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century has potential to be particularly interesting as the Rorschach is located in psychologist’s offices, museums and comics simultaneously.

Finally, it is possible to draw upon my example of the Rorschach and see how other components of Psychology have looped between Psychology and popular culture. It is possible not only to consider in what other media the Rorschach has looped, and conduct analysis on this, but also to expand this thinking out to other forms of Psychology. The media that is explored could also be developed, whilst there is certainly the scope to explore the role of Psychology in comics and graphic novels, developing upon Chapter 4 here as well as the work of Bunn (1997,2007) and Lepore (2014) but other media could also be explored. The Rorschach is visible in film, fine art and music, but what other aspects of Psychology are also visible?

In all, to those possibly embarking on a similar project, I would give the following advice based on the research I have conducted and thesis I have produced. First, it is important to
consider literature, sources, methods and conceptual ideas from outside the strict disciplinary boundary. The history, or object, under study has not existed within a vacuum and so influences and loops from elsewhere will be there. Think of the bleeding, looping and actions involved. Second, there is undoubtedly power involved somewhere, it is important to see where this is and who/what has it. Finally, it is important to look at the gutter. What appears not to be there but probably is?

6.5 Final words

In this thesis I have presented a history of the Rorschach ink blot test. I have used an interdisciplinary queer feminist approach, which explains the thesis sub-title: An interdisciplinary, queer feminist approach to one bleeding test. In doing this thesis I have shown the power of the Rorschach, what the Rorschach is doing, and to whom. I have explored the queer and feminist herstory, and I have used the Rorschach as a key example in the explanation of the looping of Psychology.

The history of the Rorschach is effectively just like an ink blot itself. It is all about interpretation. As, of course, are many testing procedures. In writing this thesis I have been tested in two ways, the first was with the Rorschach ink blot test that I described at the very beginning of the thesis. The second is now at the end, ironically, with the actual thesis itself.
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Appendix A: The Rorschach ink blots
Appendix B: My Rorschach test responses

The following was written on the day I was tested. I have tried to transcribe what I remember saying and my responses to questions that were posed.

Plate 1

Immediate thought is of a mask, like the one from the Donny Darko film. A Rabbit mask. There are also some tiny crab pincers.

Inquiry: It’s the whole thing, the whole blot. The eye holes of the mask are obvious. The bits on the sides are the sides of the mask that go round your face. Here at the top are the ears of the rabbit. And the crab pincers are just the tiny bits at the top.

Plate 2

I see two people facing one another touching hands. They are kneeling, like crouching, you can see the position of their knees and their feet. The red bit at the bottom looks like a heart. I really like the layers, you can see the layering of the red and the back. The bit in the middle, the white bit, looks familiar. The shape looks like a lampshade. Hanging from the ceiling.

Inquiry:

Here is the position of the heads, their bodies and their hands. The black blobs are their bodies, the red at the top is their heads. You can see their heels, their toes. Yes, I do like the layering, I mean you can see the red is behind the black, expect perhaps the red at the bottom maybe that is over the black, gives different tone. It’s basically the whole blot. The middle, it’s the shape, here is the top where its attached to the ceiling, its goes round, I don’t know the name of the shape, it’s a light, a lampshade.
**Plate 3**

Two figures, two women, stirring a big cooking pot, they’re wearing tiny high heeled shows, like old Victorian boots that are pointed. Their boobs and bums are sticking out. The red bit in the middle looks like lungs, with the bit joining them in the middle. The other red bits, look like something but I don’t know what. Maybe like rats? Rats falling with their tails in the air?

Inquiry:

These are the women’s heads, their chests, their backs, their legs, this is the pot. They are just the black bits. These are their shoes, the high heels and the pointy toes. You can see their noses on their faces, beak-like. Why do I think the bit in the middle is like lungs? They are bean shaped and have a join in the middle – like lungs. Now I think of maybe the other bits aren’t like rats but like foetuses, they have a shape to them but they’re not yet recognisable. They’re like rats because the tail, their faces are looking upwards, curling slightly as they fall.

**Plate 4**

Reminded of one of those big sheep skin rugs you can buy. Just the whole thing, a big rug. Or these bits could be like bit boots, big feet. These bits at the bottom look like hands, you know the rock hands, the sign at festival? Could also be two jug handles here? Right at the top there’s like a little badger face.

Inquiry:

The whole thing looks like a big sheep skin rug. It is in the shape, also the texture, the inkiness here at the top and the pointed edges at the side suggests it’s fluffy. The feet at the bottom edges look like those children draw, with people’s feet sticking out sideways. The hands are right at the bottom upside down, you know like the rock gesture? At music festivals? I don’t know. The whole thing looks like it’s supposed to be scary but it’s not.
Scary because, I don’t know, like the jug handles are sort of gothic, like it’s got gothic engravings and shape. Maybe it’s not scary because it reminds me of my mum. My mum bought me a rug like this. It’s not intimidating.

**Plate 5**

A bat – it just looks so exactly like a bat. You can see its wings are down like it’s flying, moving forwards. I guess it could also be a bird, like any kind of bird. With the same wings. Can I turn it upside down? Well, I guess these bits could be a snail’s eyes? Like their little eyes on stalks. All wiggly.

Inquiry:

Just a bat or a bird. The whole thing. Yes, the wings are flapped down, it’s moving forwards, we’re looking at it from above. The snail’s eyes are just tiny bits, just the wiggly eyes they have on the stalks, like a snail has, just this bit.

**Plate 6**

There’s lots, it’s like an explosion. I don’t know. This top bits looks like a butterfly, frantically flapping it wings. The bottom bit looks like a vulva. It looks like skin. I guess the top bit could be – on the side- a dragon, reflecting on a lake. Like it’s flying above the lake and it’s being reflected in the lake.

Inquiry:

Yes there just feels like everything is going outwards, there is movement. The butterfly is only this section here. Its two wings are flapping. The bit below looks like a vulva, this whole section just looks like skin, I guess the crease in the middle and the darkness make it look like it. The dragon is just the top butterfly bit too. It’s on the side, the crease in the middle is the horizon, and the dragon is flying over the top of the lake and being reflected in it. I guess it’s the shape that make it look like it, the jiggered wings.
Plate 7

I can see two women facing one another. They are in profile. The whole thing looks like a horse shoe. Or a wishbone without the bottom bit. These bits below look like another pair of faces, like gargoyles, they’re looking down and at an angle. They look like those ones you get on the tops, in the edges of churches. The women look different though, they look serene.

Inquiry:

The two women’s faces are here, the two blobs nearer the top. You can see their noses. Yes, the whole thing is horse shoe shaped. And looks like a wishbone, but without, you know, the bottom bit. The gargoyles are below the women’s faces, their eyes are here, and the snout like noses. Their mouths are here. Looking down like on the top edge of a church. The women look serene just in contrast I guess, they look calm.

Plate 8

I can see two lizards immediately, climbing up a tree. The tree looks, like a fir tree with needles or a Christmas tree. The bottom orange and pink bits looks bloody, just bloody. I guess lizards don’t make much sense on a Christmas tree, though, perhaps they could be bears.

Inquiry:

The two pink bits are the lizards, or the ears, the two greenish bits are the trees. I don’t know what the blood is, it’s like, just like period blood in your pants, it’s not dramatic, just ruined pants, just blood.

Plate 9

280
The three separate colours make it look like a flag, like the Italian flag. The green bit, I can kind of see a boney face, like a skull peeking our between some bushes. The orange I guess just looks like spilt drink on a carpet. Like orange juice or something. The red bit at the bottom looks fleshy. I don’t know what body part. Like legs, I think, like two legs in front. The bit in the middle of the orange just looks like rain, fresh, nice rain. The top bits of the orange section could be like antlers.

Inquiry:

The whole thing could be the flag, it’s just three different colours, the stripes. The skull is here in the middle, it’s got its eye holes, and its boney cheeks. Here, just here. The spill just looks like its flowing, like it’s bleeding out onto the carpet. The legs at the bottom just look fleshy, they’re in a position, it’s hard to explain. Like it’s just a snap shot of someone legs sitting down, their bum is on the floor and their hells, which we can’t see, are tucked near their bums, so you can see here are their legs at the back, like the backs of their thighs, and here are the calves. The rain in the middle, I don’t know it’s not like close up droplets, it’s like we’re looking at it from far away, you can see the greener bits is like land and you can see the fresh spring rain in the blue. The antlers are just these little bits at the top.

Plate 10

Immediately I think the shape here looks like the Eiffel tower. You can see the space the bit in the middle and the top. But, actually overall, I think its looks like being underwater. There’s two flowers too. It’s an underwater scene. It’s got coral, and fish and crabs and seaweed. Everything is just swimming and moving about but it’s calm.

Inquiry:

Its looks like the Eiffel tower here because it’s pointed at the top, goes out, like a capital letter A. Got a little bit in the middle, the blue bit and I think the top is a bit of a different
colour as well. The sea bit is the whole thing, the blue is like seaweed, the pink is coral. The green bits at the bottom are seahorses, there two mermaids purses. The flowers are here, there the darker flower buds and the yellow flower has come out. There’s fish and crabs. It’s calm because, it’s like scuba diving. You have to be calm and its calm underwater, I don’t know. Like everything is moving but its relaxing. You can’t panic underwater.
Appendix C: First oral history interview forms

C.1 Participant Information Sheet

Please read the following information about the present study titled the Oral History of the Projective Test Movement. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask.

**What is the purpose of this research?**

The aims of the present research is to understand the projective test movement in the 20th Century from your perspective. There is very little research about the use of projective tests, including the Rorschach Ink blot test, in Britain despite a wealth of research in other countries, for example in the United States. In my current project I therefore wish to fill in this gap and map out the history in Britain. However, I aim to not only interpret the research from journals such as the Rorschach Newsletter (as it was originally known). I would like to ensure I am encapsulating the history of this movement from different perspectives, most importantly, the women involved in the movement. My previous research has identified a disproportionate number of women involved in the movement compared to Psychology as a discipline around this time. Therefore I think it essential to draw attention to this and explore why this may be and to understand the experiences of women in the movement.

**Why have I been asked to take part?**

You may have been asked to take part in this research for one or more of the following reasons:

You have been asked to take part because of your incredible contributions to the British Projective movement. It is possible that from previous research you have identified as a key figure within the movement and so it would be helpful to understand your individual experience.

It is believed your oral history will greatly contribute to research on the history of the projective test movement in Britain.

It is possible that your experience within clinical and/or psychiatric fields during the period of which the study is interested will be informative to the wider culture of Psychology during projective testing.

You may have been involved in activism or have experiences which may be to individuals within the projective test movement and it is thought your contribution would complement research about these people’s experiences.
Do I have to take part?

No, you do not have any obligation to take part in the present study. Though it is believed your contribution would be invaluable and would greatly appreciate you sharing your oral history with me. To agree to take part in the study you will be provided with a consent form, a recording agreement and a copyright form. You may withdraw from the study at any point and we recording will be stopped. If you agree to be interviewed, once the interview has been recorded and transcribed, you will be given the opportunity to remove any part of the recording or transcript. This is to protect you if the conversation has moved to a sensitive area that you may not wish to be made widely available.

What will happen if I take part?

If you agree to take part you will be asked to fill out the consent form, recording agreement and copyright form. These mean that you agree to be recorded for interview, you are happy to cooperate in giving your oral history and that you hand over copyright of the interview to the interviewer. You will then agree a time and place for the interviewer to come and interview you. You may chose a location and time at your own convenience. Most oral histories are conducted at the interviewees’ home and are over a period of two days. This means that for up to 3-4 of hours each day you will be interviewed.

What are possible benefits of taking part?

By taking part you will be able to provide your very own individual perspective of the history of the projective test movement in Britain. You own history will be recorded and used within research directly influencing the history –telling of the time of which you were deeply involved. Many people also enjoy discussing their lives, their experiences and their perspectives. You can be relived of your stories and many people find it a rewarding experience.

Who is organising and funding this research?

This particular research trip to interview you is funded by the Science Museum, who partially fund my research.

If you have any questions about the research or about being involved in doing an oral history please do not hesitate to contact Katherine Hubbard on k.a.hubbard@surrey.ac.uk or Peter Hegarty who is supervising the project on p.hegarty@surrey.ac.uk
Copy Right Agreement Form

In the creation of our recording a question as to who owns the recording and the interview comes to light. In order to ensure the interviewer can use the material you both develop freely within their research they request you agree to provide them with full copyright of the interview and transcript.

This Agreement is made between Katherine Hubbard, (“the interviewer”) and you (“the Interviewee”, “I”):

Your name:
.................................................................................................................................

Your address:
.................................................................................................................................

In regard to the recorded interview/s which took place on:

Date/s: ..............................................................................................................................

Declaration: I, the Interviewee confirm that I consented to take part in the recording and hereby assign to Katherine Hubbard all copyright in my contribution for use in all and any media. I understand that this will not affect my moral right to be identified as the ‘performer’ in accordance with the Copyright, Design and Patents Act 1988.

If you do not wish to assign your copyright to Katherine Hubbard, or you wish to limit public access to your contribution for a period of years, please state these conditions here:
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

This Agreement will be governed by and construed in accordance with English law and the jurisdiction of the English courts.

Both parties shall, by signing below, indicate acceptance of the Agreement.

By or on behalf of the Interviewee:

Signed: ............................................................................................................................

Name in block capitals: .................................................. Date: ..................

By or on behalf of Katherine Hubbard:

Signed: ............................................................................................................................

Name in block capitals: .................................................. Date: ..................
C.3 Consent Form

Consent Form

I, the undersigned, voluntarily agree to take part in the oral history study about the history of the projective test movement in Britain.

I have read and understood the Information Sheet provided. I have been given a full explanation by the investigators of the nature, purpose, location and likely duration of the study, and of what I will be expected to do. I have been advised about any discomfort and possible ill-effects on my health and well-being which may result. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions on all aspects of the study and have understood the advice and information given as a result.

I agree to comply with any instruction given to me during the study and to co-operate fully with the investigators. I shall inform them immediately if I suffer any deterioration of any kind in my health or well-being, or experience any unexpected or unusual symptoms.

I understand that all personal data relating to volunteers is held and processed in the strictest confidence, and in accordance with the Data Protection Act (1998). I agree that I will not seek to restrict the use of the results of the study.

I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without needing to justify my decision and without prejudice.

I confirm that I have read and understood the above and freely consent to participating in this study. I have been given adequate time to consider my participation and agree to comply with the instructions and restrictions of the study.

Name of volunteer (BLOCK CAPITALS)...........................................................................

Signed.............................................................................

Date........................................................

Name of researcher/person taking consent (BLOCK CAPITALS)
.............................................................................

Signed.............................................................................

Date........................................................


C.4 Recording Agreement

ORAL HISTORY RECORDING AGREEMENT

Interviewee agrees to participate in a recorded interview, commencing on or about ____________________, with ____________________, ("Interviewer") as representative of a member of the British Projective Psychology and Personality Society, in association with their involvement with the projective test movement and the use of the Rorschach.

This Agreement relates to any and all materials originating from the interviews, namely the recordings of the interviews and any written materials, including but not limited to transcripts or other works prepared from the tapes.

In consideration of participation in the interview, Interviewee agrees to the following:

1) To be recorded in the oral history interview

   1) Interviewee irrevocably assigns to Katherine Hubbard all his or her copyright, title and interest in and to the Interview (as per the copyright agreement).

   2) By virtue of this assignment, Katherine Hubbard will have the right to use the interview for research, educational, and other purposes, including print and electronic reproduction.

   3) Interviewee acknowledges that they will receive no remuneration or compensation for either his/her participation in the interview or for the rights assigned hereunder.

   4) Interviewer agrees to honor any and all reasonable interviewee restrictions on the use of the Interview, if any, for the time specified below. Interviewer has the sole discretion to determine the reasonableness of Interviewee’s request.

Restriction:

I understand and agree to the above terms.

SEEN AND ACCEPTED

INTERVIEWEE

................................................

(Signature)

................................................

(Typed name)

................................................

(Address)

Date:  ........................................
Interviewer Information:

Name: _______________________
Address: _____________________________________________________
Appendix D: All other oral history interview forms

D.1 Recruitment poster

Have you ever been tested with the Rorschach?
If so then I would like to hear from you!

I am conducting a history of the Rorschach test in Britain and would like to conduct an oral history (meaning an interview about your life and experiences) with people who have been tested with the Rorschach or have used the Rorschach to test others. These interviews will help flesh out the history of psychological testing and means those who have used the test or have been tested with it can tell their own stories. By using interviews as well as historical research I aim to tell a rich history of the Rorschach in Britain from various perspectives.

Interviews are likely to take between 2-4 hours and can take place at a time and place most convenient for you. If you are interested in being interviewed and would like more information or have any questions about the study please contact Katherine Hubbard k.a.hubbard@surrey.ac.uk

You can also contact Prof. Peter Hegarty (supervisor) p.hegarty@surrey.ac.uk or Prof. Jane Ogden (PhD Director) j.ogden@surrey.ac.uk

The study has been reviewed and received a Favourable Ethical Opinion (FEO) from the University of Surrey Ethics Committee

Recruitment end date: 30th September 2015
The Oral History of the Projective Test Movement

I am conducting oral history interviews to inform the history of projective tests as a part of my research for my PhD on the history of the Rorschach in Britain. Please read the following information about the present study and if you have any questions please do not hesitate to me, Katherine Hubbard, on k.a.hubbard@surrey.ac.uk Prof. Peter Hegarty (supervisor) on p.hegarty@surrey.ac.uk or Prof. Jane Ogden (PhD Director) on j.ogden@surrey.ac.uk.

What is the purpose of this research?

The aim of the present research is to understand the projective test movement from your perspective. There is very little research about the use of projective tests, including the Rorschach ink blot test, in Britain despite a wealth of research in other countries, for example in the United States. In my current project I therefore wish to fill in this gap and map out the history in Britain. As a part of this project I am investigating research published using such tests but I would like to ensure I am encapsulating the history of this movement from different perspectives. I wish to interview people who have either used test, were trained to use it, or have been tested with it.

Why have I been asked to take part?

You may have been asked to take part in this research for one or more of the following reasons:
- You have been asked to take part because of your incredible contributions to the British Projective movement. It is possible that you have identified as a key figure within the movement and so it would be helpful to understand your individual experience.
- It is believed your oral history will greatly contribute to research on the history of the projective test movement in Britain.
- It is possible that your experience within clinical and/or psychiatric fields during the period of which the study is interested will be informative to the wider culture of Psychology during projective testing.
- You may have been involved in activism or have experiences which may be linked to individuals within the projective test movement and it is thought your contribution would complement research about these people’s experiences.
- You may have been tested using projective tests and have a unique experience which will greatly inform the history from a perspective which is rarely paid attention to in history.
- You may have known a key contributor to the movement.

Please note that the interviews are likely to discuss the reactions and feelings of those who have been tested with projective methods. If you are being interviewed because of your experience of being tested please consider that potentially negative feelings and memories may emerge throughout the interview process. Some people find it distressing discussing their mental health. If you have any concerns regarding this it is recommended that you do not take part in the study.
Do I have to take part?

No, you do not have any obligation to take part in the present study. It is believed your contribution would be invaluable and I would greatly appreciate you sharing your oral history with me.

What will happen if I take part?

You and the interviewer will agree a convenient time and place for the interview. You may choose a location and time at your own convenience. Most oral histories are conducted at the interviewees’ home or their place of work. Though we can organise for the interview to be at another location (for example, at the University of Surrey, or a public library) if you would like. If you do agree to participate you will be provided with a consent form, a recording agreement and a copyright form to fill out prior to the interview. These mean that you agree to be recorded for interview, you are happy to cooperate in giving your oral history and that you hand over copyright of the interview to the interviewer (which as intellectual property is owned by the University of Surrey). You may withdraw from the study at any point and the recording will be stopped. In the event that you do withdraw during the interview you can choose whether I am able to use the data collected thus far, or if you would rather the recording can be deleted and so no information you provided will be used. The interview will be the form of an unstructured oral history so that you will have the freedom to discuss areas you think are especially important to this history from your perspective. I will ask a few questions a wide range of areas about your life to gain an understanding of your experiences and context surrounding the projective test movement. Once the interview has been recorded and transcribed, you will be given the opportunity to remove any part of the recording or transcript or have it removed until a certain agreed date. This is to protect you if the conversation has moved to a sensitive area that you may not wish to be made widely available. The interview will be likely to take 2-4 hours and will be in the format of a standard oral history which covers a range of aspects of your life to gain an understanding of your experience.

What are possible benefits of taking part?

By taking part you will be able to provide your very own individual perspective of the history of the projective test movement in Britain. Your own history will be recorded and used within research directly influencing the history developed throughout my thesis and published works. Many people also enjoy discussing their lives, their experiences and their perspectives. Many people find it a rewarding experience. Due to the personal nature of oral histories they are not anonymous interviews but you will not be directly named in my PhD thesis and any publications which may arise from this research. You will therefore have a direct and personal influence on the history I am able to tell about projective testing.

What happens to the recording and transcripts after the interview?

Both the transcripts and the original recordings will be kept secure and personal data will be managed in line with the Data Protection Act 1998. The data gleaned from all the interviews will inform my telling of the history of the Rorschach in my thesis and any publications which arise from the research. As mentioned above, you will have the opportunity to see the transcripts and request certain aspects of the transcript not be used
until a certain date or not at all. Both the transcripts and recordings will be kept for at least 10 years. In the event of a national library being interested archiving the oral histories collected, copyright may be given (with the agreement of the University) to such an organisation so they may be more publically available for the long-term safe keeping and protection of the oral history.

**Use of quotes and anonymity**

Due to the nature of oral histories, the interviews are not be anonymous however, you will not directly named in my telling of the history. Quotes and references you make will be attributed to your position within the history and other characteristics you reveal may make you identifiable. This is what makes oral histories so different from other kinds of interviews for research. If you would rather be anonymous please discuss with me and we will be able to ensure full anonymity for you.

**What are the risks of taking part?**

Due to the nature of oral histories, you will not be automatically anonymous in write up of this history, though you will not be named in my thesis or any subsequent publications. There are potential individual risks and concerns in relation to this, as you may be identifiable by the information gleaned from the interview. If you have any concerns regarding the risks of not being anonymous, please do discuss them with me and we can arrange for you to be anonymous. A pseudonym can be developed and all identifiable information will be changed.

**Who is organising and funding this research?**

My research is partially funded by the Science Museum, and I have also recently received funding from the Funds for Women Graduates and a scholarship from the British Federation of Women Graduates which is presently funding my research.

The study has been reviewed and received a Favourable Ethical Opinion (FEO) from the University of Surrey Ethics Committee.

Many thanks for considering being a part of this research. Your contributions is greatly appreciated. Again, if you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact

Katherine Hubbard on k.a.hubbard@surrey.ac.uk

Prof. Peter Hegarty (supervisor) on p.hegarty@surrey.ac.uk

Prof. Jane Ogden (PhD Director) on j.ogden@surrey.ac.uk.

If you have felt any distress by the discussion of psychological testing and would like to discuss any issues raised regarding your mental health you may wish to contact the following charities:

**Mind**

0300 123 3393 (9am to 6pm Monday to Friday)

http://www.mind.org.uk/

info@mind.org.uk

jo@samaritans.org

Text: 86463

**The Samaritans**

08457 90 90 90 (24 hr)

http://www.samaritans.org/

info@mind.org.uk

jo@samaritans.org

Text: 86463
D.3 Copyright Agreement Form

Copy Right Agreement Form

In order to ensure the interviewer can use the material you both develop freely within their research they request you agree to provide them with full copyright of the interview and transcript.

This Agreement is made between Katherine Hubbard, (“the interviewer”) and you (“the Interviewee”, “I”):

Your name: ………………………………………………………………………………………

Your address: …………………………………………………………………………………

In regard to the recorded interview/s which took place on:

Date/s:…………………………………………………………………………………………

Declaration: I, the Interviewee confirm that I consented to take part in the recording and hereby assign to Katherine Hubbard all copyright in my contribution for use in all and any media. I understand that this will not affect my moral right to be identified as the ‘performer’ in accordance with the Copyright, Design and Patents Act 1988.

If you do not wish to assign your copyright to Katherine Hubbard, or you wish to limit public access to your contribution for a period of years, please state these conditions here:

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

This Agreement will be governed by and construed in accordance with English law and the jurisdiction of the English courts.

Both parties shall, by signing below, indicate acceptance of the Agreement.

By or on behalf of the Interviewee:

Signed: ……………………………………………………………………………………………

Name in block capitals: ……………………………………………………………

Date: …………………

By or on behalf of Katherine Hubbard:

Signed: ……………………………………………………………………………………………

Name in block capitals: ……………………………………………………………

Date: …………………
I the undersigned voluntarily agree to take part in the study ‘The Oral History of the Projective Test movement’

I have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet (version 3 11/05/2015) provided. I have been given a full explanation by the investigators of the nature, purpose, location and likely duration of the study, and of what I will be expected to do. I have been advised about any discomfort and possible ill-effects on my health and well-being which may result. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions on all aspects of the study and have understood the advice and information given as a result.

I agree to comply with any instruction given to me during the study and to co-operate fully with the investigators. I shall inform them immediately if I suffer any deterioration of any kind in my health or well-being.

I understand that all personal data relating to volunteers is held and processed in the strictest confidence, and in accordance with the Data Protection Act (1998). I agree that I will not seek to restrict the use of the results of the study.

I understand that the information I provide is not anonymous, and that although I will not be named in the doctoral thesis and subsequent publications, it is possible I may be identifiable by the information I provide. (In the event that full anonymity has not been agreed between me and the researcher)

I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without needing to justify my decision and without prejudice. In the event that I withdraw from the study I understand that I can chose whether the data collected so far in the interview can be used or whether I would like it to be deleted.

I confirm that I have read and understood the above and freely consent to participating in this study. I have been given adequate time to consider my participation and agree to comply with the instructions and restrictions of the study.

Name of volunteer (BLOCK CAPITALS).................................................................
Signed.........................................................
Date..........................................

Name of researcher/person taking consent (BLOCK CAPITALS).......................................................
Signed.........................................................
Date.............................................
D.5 Recording Agreement

ORAL HISTORY RECORDING AGREEMENT

Interviewee agrees to participate in a recorded interview, commencing on or about ________________, with ________________, (“Interviewer”) as representative of ________________, in association with their involvement with the projective test movement and/or experience of the Rorschach.

This Agreement relates to any and all materials originating from the interviews, namely the recordings of the interviews and any written materials, including but not limited to transcripts or other works prepared from the tapes.

In consideration of participation in the interview, interviewees agrees to the following:

1) To be recorded in the oral history interview

2) Interviewee irrevocably assigns to Katherine Hubbard all copyright, title and interest in and the Interview (as per the copyright agreement).

3) By virtue of this assignment, Katherine Hubbard will have the right to use the interview for research, educational, and other purposes, including print and electronic reproduction.

4) Interviewee acknowledges that they will receive no remuneration or compensation for either their participation in the interview or for the rights assigned hereunder.

5) Interviewer agrees to honour any and all reasonable interviewee restrictions on the use of the interview, if any, for the time specified below. Interviewer has the sole discretion to determine the reasonableness of Interviewee’s request.

Restriction:

I understand and agree to the above terms.

I understand and agree to the above terms.

SEEN AND ACCEPTED

INTERVIEWEE

....................................................

(Signature)

....................................................

(Typed name)

....................................................

(Address)
Date: ………………………………………

Interviewer Information:

Name: _______________________
Address: ____________________________________

______________________________
Appendix E: Ethics Confirmation and Insurance - University Ethics Committee

E. F First Oral history interview confirmation

Miss RA Hubbard
School of Psychology
FAHs

27 March 2014

Dear Miss Hubbard

The projective test movement in Britain from one woman’s perspective: An oral history interview with [Redacted] EC/2014/37/FAHs

On behalf of the Ethics Committee, I am pleased to confirm a favourable ethical opinion for the above research on the basis described in the submitted protocol and supporting documentation.

Date of confirmation of ethical opinion: 27 March 2014.

The list of documents reviewed by the Committee is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response letter to queries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol Cover Sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Research Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Detailed Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Participant Information sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Form and Recording Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Agreement Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Interview Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This opinion is given on the understanding that you will comply with the University’s Ethical Principles & Procedures for Teaching and Research.

If the project includes distribution of a survey or questionnaire to members of the University community, researchers are asked to include a statement advising that the project has been reviewed by the University’s Ethics Committee.

If you wish to make any amendments to your protocol please address your request to the Secretary of the Ethics Committee and attach any revised documentation.

The Committee will need to be notified of adverse reactions suffered by research participants, and if the study is terminated earlier than expected with reasons. Please be advised that the Ethics Committee is able to audit research to ensure that researchers are abiding by the University requirements and guidelines.

You are asked to note that a further submission to the Ethics Committee will be required in the event that the study is not completed within five years of the above date.
Please inform me when the research has been completed.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Ms Susan Douthwaite
Research Governance Administrator, Research & Enterprise Support
Secretary, University Ethics Committee
E.2 All other oral history interview confirmations

Ms Katherine Hubbard
School of Psychology
FAHS

22 May 2015

Dear Ms Hubbard

UEC ref: UEC/2015/023/FAHS
Study Title: The Oral History of the Projective Test Movement

On behalf of the Ethics Committee, I am pleased to confirm a favourable ethical opinion for the above research on the basis described in the submitted protocol and supporting documentation.

Date of confirmation of ethical opinion: 22 May 2015

The final list of documents reviewed by the Committee is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covering email from researcher in response to Committee’s query in email of 21 May 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering email from researcher in response to Committee’s query in email of 20 May 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed covering letter from researcher responding to Committee’s queries in letter of 07 May 2015</td>
<td>File, version 3</td>
<td>11 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering email from researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Application Form</td>
<td>File, version 3</td>
<td>File, 11 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol tracked copy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Asylum Biographical note tracked copy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>09 Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Poster to be circulated on networking sites tracked copy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C: Participant Information Sheet tracked copy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Submitted: 20 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D: Copyright form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>09 Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E: Consent form tracked copy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sub. 22 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix F: Recording Agreement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>09 Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix G: Email Section tracked copy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sub. 20 May 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This opinion is given on the understanding that you will comply with the University's Ethical Principles & Procedures for Teaching and Research.

If the project includes distribution of a survey or questionnaire to members of the University community, researchers are asked to include a statement advising that the project has been reviewed by the University's Ethics Committee.

If you wish to make any amendments to your protocol please address your request to the Secretary of the Ethics Committee and attach any revised documentation.

The Committee will need to be notified of adverse reactions suffered by research participants, and if the study is terminated earlier than expected with reasons. Please be advised that the Ethics Committee is able to audit research to ensure that researchers are abiding by the University requirements and guidelines.

You are asked to note that a further submission to the Ethics Committee will be required in the event that the study is not completed within five years of the above date.

Please inform me when the research has been completed.

Yours sincerely

Dr Sophie Wehrens
Research Integrity and Governance Officer, Research & Enterprise Support

Copy to: Prof Peter Hegarty, School of Psychology, FAHS
28th July 2014

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

We, the undersigned Insurance Brokers, hereby certify that we have placed the following insurance:

VERIFICATION OF INSURANCE

Unique Market: 81282104895114

Type: Clinical Trials Insurance

Insurer: University of Surrey

Period: From: 01st August 2014

To: 31st July 2015

Both days inclusive at Local Standard Time.

Interest: This Policy will indemnify/cover the Insured in respect of their Legal Liabilities arising out of the Insured’s activities and as more fully disclosed within the Policy Wording.

Limit of Indemnity: GBP 10,000,000 Any One Claim and GBP 12,500,000 in the Aggregate, including costs and expenses.

Excess: GBP 2,500 Each and Every Claim, including costs and expenses.

Underwriter: 100,000% Newline Syndicate 1216

This document is for information only and does not make the person or organisation to whom it is issued an additional Insured, nor does it modify in any manner the Contract of Insurance between the Insured and the Insurers. Any amendment, change or extension to such Contract can only be affected by specific endorsement attached thereto.

Should the above mentioned Contract of Insurance be cancelled, assigned or changed during the above policy period in such manner as to affect this document, no obligation to inform the holder of this document is accepted by the undersigned or by the Insurers. The information provided is correct at the date of signature.

Authorised Signatory
Gallagher London.
Appendix F: Oral history Interview Guideline Schedules

Oral histories are unstructured interviews which contextualise experiences. It is therefore important to gain an understanding about a person’s whole life and the context in which they were brought up, worked, and lived. The questions below represent prompts rather than formal interview questions which may be used in interviews to help the interviewee structure their stories and ensure many aspects of life are covered. Some of the questions below are deliberately formed so that mean I will gleam a greater understanding of their experiences of projective tests in particular. Each interview was different as they are tailored to the individual and are not strictly structured. I provide these here to give a sense of the interviews were like.

From Ethics Protocol from first interview:

If you were to hear or read your own oral history what you want to make sure was included?

Starting at the beginning, where and when were you born?

What did you parents/grandparents do?

What was your childhood growing up in (place) like?

How did you meet your husband?

Why/ when and what was it like moving to Barcelona?

How did you get involved with the British Society?

Who did you know from the group in Britain?

- Prompts to people I am also especially interested in
What was it like being a professional women in the 1960s in Psychology?

When were you aware of the declined use of the Rorschach?

-How did this make you feel?

What would you like to be known about the history of the Rorschach?

Any cultural differences in its perceptions and uses now?

**From Ethics Protocol for subsequent interviews:**

Starting at the beginning, where and when were you born?

What did you parents/grandparents do?

What was your childhood growing up in (place) like?

Significant relationships?

Career – how did you get into Psychology/Psychiatry?

Tell me the story of how you were tested with projective tests.

How did you get involved with the British Society/projective techniques/the Rorschach in particular?

Who did you know from the group in Britain?

- Prompts to people I am also especially interested in

What was it like being a professional (women) in this period in Psychology?

When were you aware of the declined use of the Rorschach?

-How did this make you feel?
What would you like to be known about the history of the Rorschach?

Any cultural/historical differences in its perceptions and uses now?

If you were to hear or read your own oral history what you want to make sure was included?

If you were to hear or read your own oral history what you want to make sure was included?