

Patricia Mullen

- A Sister at St. Joseph 14 years 1
 - teaches high school 1
 - graduate work in sociology 1
 - empowerment by John XXIII 3
 - St. Catherine's College, St. Paul 5
 - Mullen leaves order, 1970 7
 - continues to teach at St. Catherine's 9
- Five-College Consortium, 1973-76, Mullen takes position in Urban Affairs 10
 - informal contacts with College of Education, University of Minnesota 12
- Mullen - Equal Opportunity coordinator, University of Minnesota Graduate School 13
 - recruitment of minority students 13
- Mullen becomes assistant to Lillian Williams, 1978 15
 - financial support for minority students 16
 - true diversity 18
 - women's concerns 19-20
- Origins of Rajender case, 1973- 22-24
 - hearing before Judge Miles Lord 24
 - Williams, Lillian - her role 25-26
 - University of Minnesota administration not deeply involved 27
 - order to law, Aug 1980 27
 - many complaints filed by May 1981 27
 - implementation of Rajender 29-
 - responsibility assigned to Hasselmo, Nils 31
 - university strategy 34
 - pressure to settle cases 34
 - Dunham, Steven - retained 35
 - nature of complaints 36-
 - complex procedure 39
 - focus on gender 42-43
- Mullen succeeds Williams, Lillian, 1984 44
 - Keller, Kenneth - his role 44
- Equal Opportunity Employment and Affirmative Action 47-48, 63
- Sexual harassment 49-52
- Keller, Kenneth 52
- Infante, Jim 54-55
- Hasselmo, Nils 56
- Williams, Lillian 57-58
- College differences 59-60

Interview with Patricia Mullen

**Interviewed by Professor Clarke A. Chambers
University of Minnesota**

**Interviewed on November 21, 1994
in Morrill Hall, University of Minnesota**

Patricia Mullen - PM
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: I'm conducting an interview this morning with Patricia Mullen who for some years has been director of the university's Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action office, and has had an earlier career in higher education here, and elsewhere. The date is November 21, Monday morning, and the interview is being conducted in her conference room on the fourth floor of Morrill Hall.

Pat, as I suggested earlier, we're going to start with a rambling, academic, intellectual autobiography or a social one . . . how you got interested in what you were interested in and how it led to this job eventually. So we're going to go back and you can start anywhere that's really significant. What subjects really turned you on? Were they relevant finally to what you do here, etcetera?

PM: One of the parts of my history that's a little off the beaten path is that I had been, for fourteen years, a member of a religious order, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet; so I didn't choose my academic field. My academic field was chosen for me. It was chosen by the fact that the person who was the head of the Sociology at St. Catherine's College here in St. Paul had been made president of the college and that created a void. I was teaching high school, very happily, in Grand Forks, North Dakota, with a bachelor's degree that was really a history degree with some social science—no sociology, zero; but they needed a sociologist. They told me to apply to graduate school and hurry up and take whatever undergraduate courses I could do by correspondence or anyway at all to get this track going. So sociology has been an important field for me but it would not have been my field of first choice. As probably you know as a historian, it doesn't have a lot to do with social justice or with how things operate in the world. It's a discipline that asks a lot of very interesting questions, has a very interesting perspective that I

truly did grow to think was important, particularly about how you value things. But it wasn't something that I really wanted to pursue, so when I left the order, I had a master's . . .

CAC: Excuse me, I'm going to interrupt . . .

PM: Sure.

CAC: . . . and back up. What family and what early influences brought you to the order to begin with?

PM: None. [laughter]

CAC: I know those sisters, and with great affection, and respect. How did you do that?

PM: The reason I say none is that my mother and father, but principally my mother, were very, very opposed to my being a member of a religious order.

CAC: Hmmm.

PM: She was not a religious person herself particularly and she just felt that that life was a waste. The way that I got there really was that I had been educated in Catholic schools, and had gone to a Catholic high school, and the Sisters of St. Joseph ran that high school.

CAC: This was . . .

PM: [Academy of the] Holy Angels in Minneapolis. There were two or three really outstanding individuals—the principal of that high school for one—and other teachers that I admired but I really always kind of laugh because I don't know if you're familiar with Catholic catechism but . . .

CAC: A great deal but go ahead.

PM: . . . well, you know then . . .

CAC: From the outside.

PM: [laughter] . . . three ways of life and the most perfect of these is the religious life. I was a very idealistic kid and so that seemed very simple to me then. If I wanted to make an impact, I wanted to do the best thing. It was also the case—this would have been in the 1950s—there was no Peace Corps. There was nothing else if you wanted to do something . . .

CAC: To be of service?

PM: That's right. At least that occurred to me. So it seemed like a very natural choice. After high school, I made the choice. My parents wouldn't forbid me. That wasn't the way they were but they certainly made it clear that wasn't something . . . My dad didn't like whatever made my mother unhappy and my mother didn't like this. That's how I got into the convent.

CAC: And by chance it was the Sisters of St. Joseph?

PM: Yes.

CAC: Which, I'm guessing, is a more open and liberal order than many that you might have fallen into?

PM: Oh, yes, I think that's definitely true. Particularly, right then, I was also fortunate. One of my mother's fears was that I would never get an education because she was aware of small towns in Wisconsin, little tiny orders that were diocesan.

CAC: Sure.

PM: I had a cousin who always wanted to be a nurse. She had a high school education. She went straight from that high school education to teaching in the country school. Now, that was my mother's idea of the worst thing that could happen to you, so she was very concerned that I would not get an education. Fortunately that was at the time that of the Sister Formation Movement that really stressed education and the Sisters of St. Joseph were right in the forefront of that. In fact, I got a very good education.

CAC: And very soon the sisterhoods would be empowered by Pope John?

PM: That's also right.

CAC: Does that overlap with your early career in the order?

PM: Yes, it does.

CAC: Could you say something? I've never talked to someone who . . . I mean, was that an empowerment? From the outside, it would seem that that was the case.

PM: Oh, there was no question. That was a revolution. That was literally a revolution because at that point—that would have been about 1968, 1969—I would have finished my college and I was teaching. We had a governance organization within the order. One of the things that that Pope did was to say, "All of you have to have a special general chapter." It simply means a convention. "And at that special general chapter, you have to do the business of looking at your . . ."—do University 2000 or whatever you want to call it. [laughter] "Look at your whole outfit and see whether your rules and your mission are what they need to be." I was about twenty-nine

at that time and the province in St. Paul, which I was a part of, had six delegates that went to that chapter. I was the youngest delegate. I had a very good opportunity to kind of see what was happening there. You know who came to help us in that governance, by the way, was Mulford Sibley?

CAC: That's a nice [unclear].

PM: Isn't that interesting?

CAC: Yes.

PM: He was a very respectful . . .

CAC: Respectful and spiritual.

PM: Yes. That, too. He wasn't about to trample on anybody. That change was so difficult for people.

CAC: It must have been.

PM: Yes, it had a profound impact on all of the religious communities, probably more than it did on the priesthood.

CAC: I'm sure of it.

PM: Nuns, for one thing, were used to doing what they were told, so the Pope said, "Do it," so they did it; just like the previous Pope had said, "Open missions in Japan," so we opened missions in Japan.

CAC: A green light in the hierarchial institution works wonders?

PM: That's right.

CAC: Which the university has not?

PM: That's right also. Absolutely right.

CAC: Okay. Well, we'll get to that later.

PM: Yes.

CAC: So you were sent by the sisterhood to college?

PM: Yes. That's right. I attended St. Catherine's College—and probably again, you know something of the history. I was always extremely proud of St. Catherine's, of the early, very intellectual, and very aggressive I suppose would be the word, college presidents and provincials who simply said, "We're going to educate our nuns" and sent them off; so that I had people who had been at Oxford, and the Sorbonne, and Munich, and Madrid. They were sent there because the Pope said, "You can't send these nuns to American universities to get Ph.D.s because American universities are godless institutions and bad things will happen." He wasn't foresighted enough to say, "You can't send them to Europe either" because the real agenda was that you can't send these nuns off to get Ph.D.s. So the Mother Superior at that point said, "Well, that's fine. We'll send them to Europe." So there was this cadre of very bright young women and they all went off. They were just simply told, "Go to Oxford. Get your Ph.D. and come back"—like go to the store and get an onion.

CAC: [laughter]

PM: They just turned out to be remarkably bright individuals. The Spanish teacher got her degree at Madrid. The head of the Chemistry Department went to Munich. It was quite extraordinary. So we got the benefit of that. Going to school there with all of those strong women, you just didn't even think that there was anything you couldn't do.

CAC: Feminism was well underway by the mid-sixties when you're into this, but Catholic feminism must have had a different cast?

PM: Yes, it did. It was an odd thing. We were still being educated by the same people that were educating everybody else so that was still a very male . . . The structure of the disciplines were still heavily influenced. People's day to day behavior, however, like this Mother Superior . . . we had just all kinds of autonomy. In that way, it was a funny combination of things. I think that what really began was, maybe not intentionally, Pope John was questioning authority.

CAC: You bet.

PM: Once that starts, then feminism is going to come in.

CAC: How virtually feminist did you find the older sisters at St. Catherine? That's a pretty slippery term.

PM: Yes. Most of that feminism would not have turned up in the way that they viewed their discipline because it wasn't in the discipline. So their academic disciplines, it probably didn't affect a lot.

CAC: I see.

PM: Although there were some that did. It would depend a lot. I think of Sister Mary Stella, Alice Smith, who was an older woman who taught in the English Department—very talented. I think she got her degree at Oxford. Now, she gravitated towards feminist authors. She also gravitated toward Catholic authors. I think that those a little bit balanced each other off. She was interested in Flannery O'Connor. She was interested, however, in May Sarton.

CAC: Ah ha.

PM: They had a funny kind of line that they drew, I guess, because the Catholic bedrock was still there. The Pope was still the Pope. Abortion was still abortion. Those deeply rooted value things which play out differently in the feminist movement were certainly not part of that time, even though now there are some questioning about that.

CAC: I suppose I shouldn't interject this but about twenty years ago, I consulted briefly with the sisters at St. Catherine's and the oral history project; and they joked very early on, and finally, I think they abandoned the program largely because they were disciplined to say nothing evil about anyone else and nothing good about themselves.

PM: [laughter]

CAC: And the oral histories were pretty bland. [laughter]

PM: There was one that wasn't . . . *On Good Ground* [:*The Story of the Sisters of St. Joseph in St. Paul* by Helen Angela Hurley].

CAC: Don't know it.

PM: *On Good Ground* was a history. I thought about it when you started talking that was done by a kind of a cranky old nun and so it wasn't certainly as much as one would want it to be but not quite as badly . . .

CAC: But I bet not boastful about her own contribution?

PM: Oh, absolutely nothing about her own contribution. You're right. Nothing at all.

CAC: They sent you to graduate school, too?

PM: Yes.

CAC: You taught awhile?

PM: That's right.

CAC: With a bachelor's degree?

PM: That's right.

CAC: And in a parochial school?

PM: Yes. I taught two years at St. Margaret's [Golden Valley] and two years in a co-ed school in Grand Forks and went, in summers, to St. Louis University.

CAC: Washington?

PM: Not Washington U but . . .

CAC: I understand. St. Louis.

PM: Then they wanted to hurry up the process a little bit so then I went one academic year and finished my degree down there.

CAC: Do you know how many sisters came here to study in the 1960s and 1970s? It would be an interesting . . . I had a certain large number.

PM: I'll bet you did because that was the Sister Formation Movement that was [unclear].

CAC: Coming even to a secular university?

PM: Yes. Yes. That had changed by that time for the most part.

CAC: Then you leave the order?

PM: I left the order in 1970.

CAC: For reasons you would care to share that would be relevant to this discussion?

PM: In a way they were relevant. I have a deep respect for the order and what it does. I did have the feeling—now that general chapter was in 1969 and a lot of change occurred—that I was too much off the track of where most of the order was. I don't believe in being part of an organization and being a dissident.

CAC: Sure.

PM: I really thought that it was better for me. I thought the order would catch up to that position but that if I hung around, it would be negative, particularly, since I had this kind of odd

leadership role at that time. For whatever reason, the older nuns liked me and the younger nuns liked me.

CAC: You must have thought about that. To what do you attribute that to?

PM: That I've always liked people, and that what I'm able to do usually is to kind of put away the outward things that kind of confuse people, and get to what I like about them. So, I like them all. I didn't have a particularly ideological view of . . .

CAC: So, you didn't have a party line?

PM: No, not very much. Although, I was certainly more in gear with what the younger group wanted but I could usually say that in a way that wasn't offensive to the whole traditions because I didn't feel offended by the traditions.

CAC: This is just an inborn personality character trait?

PM: I suppose. My dad liked everybody. I like people. I think that's about all it was.

CAC: This may be relevant later when we talk about your position.

PM: It is. It is.

CAC: This difficult . . . the complexities of the issues you deal with. Finally, they are personal.

PM: Yes.

CAC: Yes. Well! Some of your co-religionists, to use a very academic term, find that the University of Minnesota is not so much hostile as indifferent to these values. That was an interesting revelation to me. I began to ponder what that meant.

PM: Right. As you were talking, before we started, about people's feelings for the university, one of the things that I've noticed—I've been here seventeen years in January. I don't mean this to be . . . It's hard to say this . . . I don't have a feel for the institution. I don't have that feeling that many of the people, probably that you yourself have or that other people, have. I do think that has something to do with not finding a core of values. That was certainly present at St. Catherine's. I still, psychologically, identify with that institution, as long as they keep doing what I think they need to be doing. It isn't really about the Catholic religion exactly . . .

CAC: I understand.

PM: . . . but it has something to do with that. It has a core that one can identify. I haven't felt that here.

CAC: But you used the word earlier respect.

PM: Yes.

CAC: It may be that's one way to express . . .

PM: That could be, too, or it could just be a function of the job I've always had here. If I'd been a faculty member, I might feel quite differently.

CAC: Sure. So your training . . . you get a master's degree?

PM: That's right.

CAC: In sociology?

PM: That's right. Then I come back and I'm made chair of the Sociology Department because that's how things worked in those years. I taught. I loved teaching. I was very good at teaching in terms of engaging students in finding an interesting enterprise. At some point, I was asked to go to the motherhouse and be what they called the juniorate mistress. When you're trained to be a nun, you have a first three-year period where you're getting your early formation which is mostly spirituality. Then you have a two-year period where you intensively go to college and that's the juniorate period; so I was asked to take over being the superior for that group of young women, which I did not want to do, and asked them not to make me do. For one thing, I didn't want to have a long hiatus between the master's and the Ph.D. For another, I just didn't want to do that. But anyway, they said, "You're going to do that." That was part of the deal so I did that for awhile.

Then when I left the order, I continued to teach at St. Catherine's. That was an innovation. The president of the college at that time was Sister Alberta Huber. She was a very gifted individual. I'm sure we'll come to this later when we talk, but my observation of people who run things—I always do fall back to my convent experience—on the one end, you have Mother Bertha. Mother Bertha was the provincial when I was first a young sister. She had a beautiful round face. She had a smiling face. Everybody liked her. She could listen to the nuns, and hear what their problems were, and take care of them. But she didn't make decisions all that quickly. She was somewhat indecisive. She wasn't quite the kind of leader that you would need to move things along. All right. That's the Mother Bertha model. Over here on the other end is the Sister Mary William Brady model. Sister Mary William Brady was the archbishop's sister. She built the library. She was . . . Well, you can see where I'm headed later. Now, Sister Alberta was one of those few individuals who combined both of those traits, I think, probably not enough to satisfy everybody that's looking for the Lord himself. She had a human capability but she also had a leadership capability. I asked her if I could continue to teach at the institution even though I was leaving the convent, which I knew would cost her something. Although there was not a hostility, most people went away and did something else. But I had only a master's. I by that

time had tenure. It just felt too much change in my life to try to get a job as well as leave the order. She let me continue to stay there. I stayed there in the Sociology Department. That's when I got involved in a lot of community things. Back to your really original question here which is What brought you ultimately into this work? It probably was getting into sociology in the community. Some of the tutorial programs were starting to happen at that time.

CAC: Now, is this the Urban Affairs coordination position?

PM: Yes, that was coming up soon. I took that in 1973. The Five College Consortium that was funded by the old Hill Foundation, now called Northwest Area, had a position for an Urban Affairs coordinator. It was a throw away line in a proposal at a time when they knew that urban affairs were kind of interesting to people. They had a long proposal about cooperation among the five colleges, and it had a paragraph that said they were going to have an Urban Affairs coordinator who would coordinate urban affairs, or something. I thought that would be an interesting job so I applied for that. I took a leave of absence from St. Catherine's and did that for three years. Essentially, there were two directions there: one was to create a teacher education program for students in those five colleges that would ultimately want to teach in inner-city schools and the other was to try to coordinate their urban affairs more like their public affairs programs. I did that for three years. Again, that was a time when I was very heavily involved in the community and then I had this wonderful resource of those five colleges as well.

CAC: Did any of these curricular, tutorial, and service programs—I assume there was a service program as part of it—involve women's issues, explicitly or just implicitly?

PM: You know that's an interesting question. For the most part, no. For the most part, those were programs that addressed themselves to issues of race.

CAC: Race. Poverty?

PM: To some extent poverty, yes. Yes.

CAC: But not sensitive to the gender issues within race?

PM: No. Definitely not.

CAC: I see.

PM: Neither was I. I'm sure it didn't occur to me as I look back on it. Now, it may have occurred to some of the people in the programs but not to me. I don't think I saw it as an issue.

CAC: This is part of your visiting professor at the College of St. Thomas?

PM: I made a decision at that point, at the end of my three-years, which was the end of the grant. The department was limping along over here. I was away on a leave and they really had to know if I was going to come back or not. At that point, I made a decision that I really needed to go and do something else, not because so much I was dissatisfied with the college; but I knew that if I didn't at that point, I would be there until right now, today.

CAC: Sure.

PM: So, I thought, I'll do one of two things: I will either get a job that I like or I will go back and finish my Ph.D. I really left it kind of to chance but I gave notice to them. The reason I happened to be at St. Thomas that year was that somebody was going on leave.

CAC: Okay.

PM: So I filled in for him but during that time, I was looking for a job.

CAC: During this time, you're working at the University of Minnesota's program in Philosophy of Education?

PM: No. Oh. [laughter] That was something else. When I was still at St. Catherine's, Ayers Bagley was very active—Shirley Clark, I believe, Bob Beck—with a group and I can't remember its name right now. It might have been the Social and Philosophical Foundation for Minnesota, something like that. I don't know how I learned about that group. Anyway, I met with them a couple of times. My interactions with my Minnesota sociologist friends were extremely unpleasant. As a group of people, they were—with the exception of Don McTavish who was always lovely to everyone—either hostile, indifferent or in the case of one man, lecherous. I was not interested in being with those folks. But this other group . . .

CAC: Excuse me, you'd be surprised how many people identify those characters.

PM: [laughter] I'll bet you can put your names right on them. Bob Beck then asked me teach a course . . . Doris Wilkinson, who was a black woman at Macalester and I. I think he was looking to diversify.

CAC: Yes.

PM: Of course, they were just stunning people.

CAC: But your contacts were informal?

PM: Oh, yes and very irregular.

CAC: But that isn't to say they were unimportant?

PM: No, they really weren't. No, it gave me a lot of respect for the institution. I really enjoyed it.

CAC: That was really your first introduction to the University of Minnesota?

PM: Yes and one of my great . . .

CAC: And you do it through Ayers Bagley, Shirley Clark, and Bob Beck . . . pretty lucky.

PM: That's right. The one thing I was surprised about was—one of the reasons why I did it was I expected a diverse classroom because I'd taught white women, for the most part, and by that time there were a lot of young men from St. Thomas—I was stunned to find that the classroom was virtually all white.

CAC: And male/female?

PM: That was pretty mixed.

CAC: Okay.

PM: Yes.

CAC: Was this the contact that brought you to the university?

PM: No. When I began looking for a job, at that point, Bill Thomas was in the Personnel Department here. I don't know if he was the director of personnel or not. I had gotten to know him. It was through some community thing. He said, "You know, you've hardly ever even interviewed for a job. Why don't you interview for a job in the Graduate School. You're not going to get that job because they're probably looking for a minority but it wouldn't hurt you." I agreed with that. The position was Equal Opportunity Coordinator for the Graduate School. I was still teaching at St. Thomas.

CAC: Excuse me. Was that to represent the students or to represent the institution to the students?

PM: It was essentially to recruit minority students.

CAC: Okay. This was what date, approximately?

PM: This would have been . . .

CAC: You say 1977.

PM: That's right. I would have interviewed around December of 1976.

CAC: Okay.

PM: I remember it was final exams and I remember they kept me waiting an hour for the interview. I remember that it was a Search Committee which completely floored me. I walked into this room expecting one person to interview me and here was this group. I did the interview in the way I think you do it when you don't care if you get it or not. You have no expectations.

CAC: Best way.

PM: Here's a little piece of institutional history. Now, Warren Ibele was the dean. Warren knew that he should be hiring a minority person, and there were a couple that applied; but the committee did not apparently refer them, or I don't know what else, for whatever reason. The next step in the process was an interview with Lillian Williams.

CAC: Ah. And this was on his initiative? Ibele had set this up?

PM: I didn't know how it was but I assume so. Later, this is how I pieced this together. I called the office here. The same woman, Marilyn Trevor, who works for me now was here at that time and I said, "I've been asked to interview with Lillian Williams. I'm a candidate for . . ." such a job. I could tell she didn't know what in the world I was talking about; but she dutifully made the appointment, and so on. Later on, I learned that Warren was very nervous about making this appointment to anybody but a person of color. He wanted, sort of, Lillian's blessing on this enterprise if he was going to get himself out there. Lillian, in the interview, said, "I've got a vacancy myself for an assistant director and if you don't get this job, why don't you think about that?" Warren Ibele offered me the job. I was a bird in the hand person. I'm not very adventuresome, although I did give up tenure. You know that it never even crossed my mind. It just did not cross my mind. Tenure was about academic freedom. I didn't expect to have any problem with that anyway, so anyhow, I gave up tenure.

CAC: There's something happening here. You entered the order. You left the order. That took a good deal of feistiness.

PM: I don't know. I suppose.

CAC: Autonomy. Sense of yourself.

PM: Maybe. Yes.

CAC: Okay. Go ahead. [laughter]

PM: I took the bird in the hand and began working in the graduate program. It was a broad program. Its major emphasis was the recruitment of minority students because that's where the vast deficiency was.

CAC: Into graduate programs?

PM: Into graduate programs.

CAC: All colleges and departments?

PM: Exactly. That's right. They had had a woman in the job before, a young black woman who had died. Aliniece Crosby, I think.

CAC: Yes!

PM: Did you know Aliniece?

CAC: Yes.

PM: Very sad.

CAC: Yes.

PM: She died very young.

CAC: Yes. Oh my! Okay. I hadn't thought of her for a long time.

PM: I followed Aliniece. Yes.

CAC: How did you function that position? How could you reach out with so many different programs and departments?

PM: Well, I tried to work with the directors of graduate studies and I tried to select those areas either where they were already doing some things. We administered a small grant program. So generally speaking, people that were in that program were interested already. What happened was I really only stayed full time in that job for about nine months because Lillian was very serious about this assistant director business. She kept sending Bill, who was her friend, back and encouraging me to apply for this job. I said, "I just took this other job. I can't." Finally, I said, "I will be a candidate."

CAC: Okay. Were you there long enough—nine months is a short tenure, I'll grant you—to get a sense of the availability of a pool of candidates for graduate studies, and different programs, and areas, and the receptivity of different programs and departments to that?

PM: I was because, not so much of the nine months, but because the end of this story is that Lillian hired me but Lillian was absolutely the best politician—I mean that in a positive sense—that I have ever encountered here; and she knew that it would make Warren Ibele very unhappy to snatch me away. So she cut a deal with him, and I worked half time for him, and half time for her.

CAC: For awhile longer?

PM: At least three years.

CAC: I see.

PM: Too long really.

CAC: Well, that made it difficult for you.

PM: It was hard.

CAC: When you work half time two places, you're working 150 percent.

PM: That's right. She was very good about that. She said, "I don't want to wear you out." She really wanted a second in command that she could teach. It wasn't so much about her workload in her own mind, although she had way too much to do. It was clear to me that if I had a conflict, I was to do the graduate school stuff. And they hired a TA [teaching assistant]. I had some good TAs . . . a young man who is now at Wisconsin, Paul Barrows. Well, you know Paul Barrows in History, maybe? It wasn't as bad as it could be. To go back to the first part of your question. That was still at a period of time where there were a number of programs that were very interested in trying to bring students of color into the program. The first thing that I tried to do was get a picture of the history. The history was that in the probably middle 1960s—it was hard to determine—there was a large influx of graduate students of color who were University of Minnesota graduates. That was reasonable I suppose for several reasons: they were here; people knew them; it was easier to recruit them. But I'm not really sure that either group were very prepared for that, so you saw this blip upwards that fell off.

CAC: This would have been the mid 1970s?

PM: Yes, by that time. That's right. Then people had more of a recognition that you didn't just reach out, and even if they were bright, kind of fold these students in until you knew that they had some idea of what this was all about. By the time that I came in, there was more recognition that you recruit graduate students of color in the same way that you recruit all graduate students, not in the identical way but not in this kind of frenzied, more random, more what I would now call . . . It just wasn't thoughtful enough.

CAC: So what steps were taken in your office with Warren Ibele there to regularize or to make the process more regular and effective?

PM: Probably the major one was trying to provide financial support. There was a federal program that began at that time called GPOP and now called Patricia Harris fellowships. We wrote a successful grant for that program. That program had the right idea. It was never funded enough but the idea was that you would select five or six fields. They could be professional or graduate and you would give a cluster of fellowships to those fields. I can't remember exactly how these fields were selected. I think partly self selected. We did a call to directors of graduate studies, "Are you interested?" Some responded. So, for instance, we had horticulture, probably because two or three faculty over there were interested in this. They got a group of fellowships. I do think that that's an effective way to do it so that you're not just bringing one student in here and one student in there.

CAC: They feel pretty lonely if they do come.

PM: That's right.

CAC: What other programs can you remember? Would the records show it?

PM: The records would show, yes. Forestry was one. That was a kind of a disaster.

CAC: Now, there are two in St. Paul.

PM: Yes, two in St. Paul, that's right. Now, the federal people had put out sort of a gentle warning which was Don't come to us with a bunch of people in education? Why not? Because relatively speaking, that was already pretty well represented. It was challenging to select programs where there would be enough people coming in.

CAC: That means that you had to know the availability of the pool, the reservoir?

PM: That's right. We took a few risks. Forestry was one of those risks. There were two professional programs, Law and Dentistry. Law was easy. We always had plenty of law school students. They let you move the fellowships around if you couldn't get them. The surprising one was Dentistry. That was my first lesson about how you really do this. Dentistry got five fellowships. Dentistry was so white, I just thought . . . They didn't let us know until August. August! These kids were coming at the end of September. I didn't even want to call them to tell them that they were going to get these fellowships because I knew what they were going to say. But there wasn't any "they." It was Ralph Katz, one faculty member, who was a New York Jew and identified himself that way. He had grown up with kids who were very diverse and he had a personal commitment. But he wasn't over here sort of doing this because it was good to do. He was doing it because he had grown up with talented kids, some of whom were dead.

CAC: Now, was he a chair of something so he had . . .

PM: No, he was nothing.

CAC: Ah?

PM: They had about a thousand little divisions in the Dental School at that time. Everybody was chair of something.

CAC: Well, we have thirty-two teeth after all, right?

PM: [laughter] I don't even know. He just had the commitment and he produced five students. Because why? Because he was sitting around waiting for this.

CAC: That's a remarkable story.

PM: He was already out there working, and moving, and doing whatever he needed to do. When he got those students, he worked them through four years of Dental School. Those kids went whenever there was an opportunity. There was some kind of a thing for dentists in Washington in the summer . . . a research not really about dentists but about the research dimension. The brighter one of the kids were out there. The American Indian woman was in Pueblo doing an internship in Pueblo.

CAC: Heavens!

PM: He was extraordinary. When he left the university—sad to say because he got recruited away by some eastern school that had nineteen vacancies to offer him; it was a phenomenal thing—the first thing he did when he got out there was to call me up, and get me to pay for sending one of these very bright persons, whom he now had gotten through the Dental School and into a master's program, out there to interview with his faculty; and he brought that student on his faculty. I didn't have to tell him how to do any of that. He did all of that in the same way he did it for all of his students but he had a commitment to this particular group.

CAC: I suppose I shouldn't have been surprised by the Pueblo Indian mention because I was assuming in the early 1970s that the focus was primarily with African-American or Black as we called then.

PM: With most places, it would have been. With Ralph Katz, it wasn't. See that's how on target he was.

CAC: But with the university?

PM: He didn't care about the university. This was a federal program.

CAC: But you were in a university position, the Graduate School.

PM: Right.

CAC: Were Hispanic, Asian-Americans, American Indians part of this perception?

PM: Yes, they really . . .

CAC: And did the university really work at that?

PM: With respect to this particular program, yes. The man that ran this program in Washington was himself a kind of an interesting guy. He probably got his degree at Harvard. He was the epitome of the eastern establishment, of the eastern education in schools, and whatnot; but he had a very broad sense of things, and so some of these GPOP programs applied, for instance, only for American Indians.

CAC: Will the future people know what GPOP means?

PM: Graduate and Professional Opportunities Program.

CAC: Thank you.

PM: Now called Patricia Harris.

CAC: All right.

PM: He loved it. He liked GPOP. He liked the way that word sounded. Donald Bigelow was his name. He did have a commitment and made it clear that this was going to cross all lines. In terms of Asian students, the emphasis was more likely to be on refugees.

CAC: Yes.

PM: And in Ralph Katz's case, I know he had American Indians. He had Blacks. He had Southeast Asians. He had Chicanos. Ultimately. This was a program that ran several years.

CAC: In a sense, the three programs you mentioned so far are really professional rather than typically departmental or disciplinary?

PM: That's right. You know, I'm trying to think what the fifth one was. You could apply for five fields and I cannot remember what the fifth graduate one was.

CAC: Whoever is doing this will have to look it up.

PM: That's right. That's good.

CAC: Well, this gave you a good introduction to the university because you were doing two things and your role here in the office as an assistant had many portfolios?

PM: That's right. It was whatever . . . duties to be assigned. It was whatever Lillian asked me to do. Now, I didn't know one thing at all about this office. I still remember the job interview that I had. She asked me the distinction between affirmative action and equal opportunity. I didn't know the answer. She had to tell me the answer in the interview. She didn't care about the answer, by the way. Lillian was a black woman. Lillian knew that she needed a white woman or a white person, but probably a white woman, to deal with the women's agenda. And that was really what she was looking for. She was looking for somebody who could relate to a broad spectrum of women and I think that's why she hired me.

CAC: Okay. Historians deal with change. I'm going to make a statement but really it has a question mark at the end. When the programs were set up initially in the Graduate School or in here in Central Administration, it was minorities of color that were chiefly concerned with affirmative action/equal opportunity?

PM: That's right.

CAC: And somewhere along in the line, the gender issue must have come in. Did that insinuate itself slowly, or consciously, or deliberately, and when did that happen, etcetera?

PM: That's an interesting little piece of history, too. You must be asking good questions. When I started over there, we had two financial programs and not very much money, \$50,000 in one of them, and that was for all graduate programs. What did we have? Two hundred or something . . . a huge number. The language was ambiguous, as it still is today, to try to keep it legal but there were some fields who wanted to support white females with those monies. I distinctly remember Educational Administration being one of them. Anybody could apply for these. I can't think what they were called but they were some kind of a matching grant, and the department put some money in, and the Graduate School put some money in. They were for TA-ships. They were not grant and fellowship. They were TAs. So, this particular Ed Ad Department wanted to hire a person to run an affirmative action effort on the department level. They wanted to offer it to a white female and get this funding half and half. We had a terrible fight between myself and the department because I said, "White females are not under-represented in Ed Ad." "But don't you agree with this purpose?" I said, "I don't care how good this purpose is. To me we've got such a severe problem in terms of representation of people of color and I'm not going to use any of this money for females in these fields unless it's something very under-represented."

CAC: This was legally okay?

PM: I don't know.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

PM: . . . and again, we made . . . I don't know who the we was. Maybe it was really me because I reported to the dean of the Graduate School. They don't have time to really spend much time. For whatever reason, I made the decision that I was not going to focus this on white females but I was going to focus this on females of color. So that in the five fields where we got funding, my goal was to have 50 percent female of those people. I was not unaware of the need to have this be palatable to the women's community on campus. I put it out there that way and I said, "Look it's possible to get money for white women this way. I've made the decision not to. But I haven't made the decision not to fund women."

CAC: When you say reaching the women's community, how are they represented? Is this just informal networking?

PM: It was very informal.

CAC: So you just talked to friends or colleagues whom you knew were concerned and interested?

PM: At that time, I really didn't have very many ties on this campus.

CAC: Whom did you talk to then?

PM: I must have talked, probably, to Anne Truax. She was one of the early people I met—probably made a point of meeting me. I certainly would have been talking to Lillian Williams because she was the director of the office. I also was on a committee very early and I think it was a subcommittee. It was a senate committee but it was a subcommittee of Faculty Affairs called something like Equal Opportunity for Women.

CAC: Okay.

PM: Lois Erickson was on that committee and I've forgotten who all else . . . Janet Spector, I think. So I certainly would have talked to that committee, but it probably wasn't a lot of people.

CAC: There were a lot of freestanding women in different places.

PM: Right.

CAC: And in some part—I'm again making a statement that's a question—they were focused at least in Women's Studies? But that is not an outreach . . . a group that you used?

PM: Not at that time.

CAC: Okay.

PM: I wouldn't have, I'm sure.

CAC: Did you relate to the undergraduate Martin Luther King Program, for example, in that community?

PM: The Martin Luther King Program director was one of the people I would guess whose nose was out of joint when I was hired in the Graduate School. So he made it a point to see me right away and to provide me with a resume. He had gone to a non-traditional [college]. I don't know if it was Oberlin. It was someplace that didn't give grades. He kind of tested me out by seeing whether or not I was interested in his situation and that's how I got working with Martin Luther King. Although, I really did not want to get back into that 1960s business where we always took our own; so the direction that I tried to take was—and I did this with the CIC group—I said, "You know if each of us instead of running around . . . "

CAC: The CIC meaning?

PM: Committee for Institutional Cooperation . . . the Big Ten, the football group.

CAC: Thank you.

PM: But within that group, a group of people who worked in graduate programs met. I tried to sell the idea that if instead of my going off recruiting on field trips—for which we had no money, and which was very ineffective, and still is an ineffective way to recruit people to Graduate School—if we worked with our own students, and we were encouraging our own students to go someplace, and everybody else was doing that, somehow you would get the return. So what I wanted to do with the Martin Luther King students was to help their advisors work with their seniors, or juniors, or whomever, to interest them in Graduate School. We had a little program that did that. There was an exchange program that did that.

CAC: But you had to figure this out. There were no lines of institutional relationships where this would be formalized or bureaucratized?

PM: No. Like almost every job I've ever had, I did not have a real boss in the sense of—just like everybody else here—somebody who was going to set my agenda or say, "These are the five

goals I have you need even to get there." It was a very broad charge. I was expected to work it out. Yes.

CAC: Do you think that was the way things were done at other universities? This is going on everywhere. You go to national meetings, is there anything peculiar so far? I mean, if we're still in the mid to late 1970s, is there anything peculiar about Minnesota's program or perception?

PM: We were under funded compared to some of the rest of them. Certainly in this group of the Big Ten, the CIC group, Ohio State had a booming program, highly funded, highly funded by the state of Ohio, as well as the institution. Illinois had the old Chicago circle, very invested by the state of Illinois. Michigan, the same thing. We didn't have that. We were more like Madison.

CAC: Did the other comparable universities have a Rajender decision hanging over them?

PM: None.

CAC: Did this make a difference in the Minnesota story then?

PM: Not so much at that time we're talking about . . .

CAC: Okay.

PM: . . . but certainly later.

CAC: Although the case is here in the mid 1970s?

PM: That's right. But that case didn't blossom, in my opinion, until probably the 1980s.

CAC: Let's come back to the Rajender then.

PM: Okay.

CAC: But the case itself . . . The court order to the university is what date?

PM: August 13, 1980.

CAC: That late? But it was in process?

PM: Yes it was in process.

CAC: For how long?

PM: It was in process really since 1973 when it started . . .

CAC: So you had to know that. Is this the time to look at the informal history of that then?

PM: Sure.

CAC: Okay, go ahead.

PM: This is as good a time as any. When I first came to the office, remember that I said that Lillian was interested in getting herself a white female who wasn't too crazy. I didn't say it that way but let me say it that way. What I mean by that is someone that wasn't real highly ideological, someone that could work with her, but someone that could work with the women. By that time, the women that were finally Rajender activists were on a number of committees; and although Lillian was really a peacemaker, she did find it difficult to work with them. She knew that. She was smart enough to just get herself out of that situation.

CAC: How could she get herself out?

PM: By sending me.

CAC: Ah! Okay. Not the office out but herself out?

PM: That's right. No, not the office. She thought it was a legitimate agenda.

CAC: Sure.

PM: They were taking her on pretty hard. She always talked about having a box. I never quite understood what brought this about but sometime in the 1970s, there were a number of women unhappy about something. She had a box, and it was like a suggestion box, and they would put all their complaints in that box, and then literally took it to Washington—where it probably is still in some corner with the dust on it.

CAC: I don't understand that. What do you mean they took it to Washington?

PM: I never understood it either exactly.

CAC: To what office?

PM: The HEW [Department of Health, Education, and Welfare]. The old HEW.

CAC: What an archival little find that would be.

PM: Yes! Oh, yes. I don't know whatever might have happened to that.

CAC: [laughter]

PM: Of course, that was an early Title IX . . . suit was filed in 1973, and I doubt that anybody in 1973 had much of a profile on Rajender. Well, no, that's not true. Lillian served on the internal committee that looked at the Rajender case and decided in her favor. Lillian was sympathetic to that decision. She was part of the majority on that decision which was then overturned by Malcolm Moos and the regents—at least as I understand it. Now, for anything pre-1977, I'm kind of going on my vague recollections and hearsay.

CAC: That's fine. A good historian will check it out.

PM: Good! because I could be wrong on these things. But my perceptions, all of which I gained from Lillian, were that it didn't gain much importance until finally Paul Springer came in, made it a class action, got the class certified, and Miles Lord is appointed as judge. Then it became high profile. That was just about the time when I joined this office in 1977 and 1978.

CAC: Did you know about Judge Lord?

PM: No, I didn't know a thing about him.

CAC: The office? Could you anticipate, by chance, that was the best, so to speak, place to go to?

PM: I doubt it. I doubt that Lillian did either.

CAC: Okay.

PM: I do remember the day that she was called to witness for the trial. The trial I think ran only one day. I think she was the first witness. Charlie Mays was the attorney for Leonard, Street, and Deinard—that is to say, the university's attorney—and she went into that hearing with a lot of trepidation and almost no preparation. Now, if you go to court today—I don't know if you've done this—the lawyers spend a good amount of time with you. So, even though it was there . . .

CAC: There are a whole series of depositions leading up to it.

PM: . . . and your own attorneys prepare you.

CAC: Yes.

PM: They rehearse you. For whatever reason, that didn't happen. And Judge Lord took over the questioning from the bench. Paul Springer always liked to pretend he was a bumbler. I don't know that he really was. He is a shrewd man. So Judge Lord didn't think that he was really

getting down to it. He said, "Mrs. Williams, I want to ask you some questions. Is the university doing all that it can for women? You may only answer yes or no." Well, Lillian never answered just yes or no in her whole life ever! She just never did. So she didn't then. He said, "Mrs. Williams, you must answer that question yes or no."

CAC: [laughter]

PM: So she said, of course, what anybody would have to say I would think, "No, it's not doing all that it can for women." The questioning went on from there. I think she was on the stand all morning. Paul Springer had next called the regents. That day ended. Maybe she was on the stand all day. I never took in how hard this was on her, or how worried she was about this, or anything about it.

CAC: Ah, yes. Oh my.

PM: I didn't really understand. I knew she was going to court but that's really all I knew. It wasn't till much later that I understood how difficult it was because, of course, her testimony was characterized as being bad for the university. Nobody, I'm sure . . . Peter Magrath was president. He wouldn't have said anything to her. He wouldn't have been in the position of saying, "I'm disappointed in you." The vice-presidents wouldn't have said that to her. The only vice-president that comforted here was Lyle French.

CAC: Hmmm.

PM: The Health Science vice-president.

CAC: And that's out of his jurisdiction really.

PM: Yes, but he was at the end of the hall on fourth floor.

CAC: I see.

PM: Besides that, he said, "You only had one choice which was to say what you truly believed under oath." The regents were very cool to her, for the most part, and it was a very difficult time. She stopped attending regents' meetings after that. So that was her part of Rajender.

CAC: And never went back?

PM: Never went back.

CAC: That would be isolating.

PM: It was very isolating. Then the regents were no way going to testify, you know. They were no more going to get themselves on that stand; so all of a sudden after that first day of testimony, we began to have serious settlement discussions.

CAC: How could they refuse to be witnesses?

PM: They couldn't refuse. The only way they could refuse . . .

CAC: Was to settle.

PM: . . . was to say, "Let's have some serious settlement discussions." Those discussions took years. I remember having some of those float up from the regents up here and they would say, "How do you think this procedure would work?"

CAC: But Lillian Williams had to be engaged in these conversations all the time?

PM: Very peripherally.

CAC: Who was carrying them on then, the lawyer?

PM: Robert Latts who was a regent. Bob Latts who was a regent and a lawyer.

CAC: And his sympathies were?

PM: I would be surprised if his sympathies were with anything but settling this.

CAC: I see.

PM: Rajender had not been able to really generate much interest among women. There were only five plaintiff interveners. I remember her coming to some early meetings, that I attended, trying to ask people to come along. I think several things happened there about why people didn't. Paul Springer didn't really have a strong interest, I don't think, in taking on a lot of additional clients, a lot of extra work. He didn't need it. He had been quite hostile at the outset to bringing people in. Then when he needed them, he wanted to get them. Well, you know, that doesn't go down to well. And people were afraid. Lawsuits were big deals. So for whatever reason, the profile and the belief still was we have five or six women out there who are pissed off, we'll take care of them, and we'll make these changes, and let's get on with life.

CAC: They had no anticipation of the sweeping nature . . .

PM: Oh, you're not kidding. They had no anticipation.

CAC: Okay.

PM: Zero. Now, remember downstairs in the attorney's office, we had three attorneys. We had Joel Tierney, Jeff Lalla, and then a third position that people kind of came in and out of, but usually women. We had Marcia Staton down there for awhile. We had Pam somebody who was down there when I came. That was just a tiny staff . . . tiny staff. So all of this Rajender business was farmed out, first of all farmed out to Leonard, Street, and Deinard; but Leonard, Street, Deinard knew that Bob Latts was calling the shots. Parts of this settlement document would float up here, and Lillian would usually talk to me about them; but I don't know that we ever had a sense of the whole thing until we got into the 1980 where it was clear that it really was going to settle. By the spring of that year, things were pretty clear but they had to have a hearing on August 1. At that hearing, Claire Woodward, and Charlotte [Striebel], and a couple of other people still had some objections, so they made some further adjustments; and then it was ordered into law, I think, August 13, 1980. It had a number of things that our office had to do and they had to do several of them by September 15. I remember that because my one and only trip to Europe was planned for three weeks in September, or maybe the last week in August, and the first two weeks in September. On the assumption that this thing was going to go through, I had started working on those. They were things like getting a computer program up and some procedural changes. Every college had to write procedures for how they were going to hire people. They had to get those procedures in and we had to approve them. I was the most motivated individual on the globe. Lillian pretty much let me do all of that. She was a person who was never threatened by strong people.

CAC: So the monitoring system had to be set up very quickly and you did it?

PM: That's right because I was going to go to Europe. I didn't care what was going to happen. That was all about procedure but then there was this big part of the consent decree that was about cases, complaints. What happened was, there was a window of, I think, nine months from August 13 to May 1—or it might have been June 1—for people to file. Time went along and maybe one or two people filed by December. We might have had another little bunch in January but it still didn't seem like a very big number. Then all of a sudden in the month before the deadline—April if the deadline was May or May if the deadline was June—we had an avalanche of cases.

CAC: This women's group must certainly have played a major part in doing that?

PM: Absolutely. I'm sure at some point you'll be talking with them. By that time the FACW, the Faculty Women's Advisory Committee, had formed itself at least informally and what they did was call people far and wide . . . colleagues that they knew that were women that hadn't gotten tenure . . . colleagues that they knew that had applied for jobs and didn't get them. Meanwhile of course, also in a consent decree, there's required advertising that's happening in the *New York Times*, and the *Boston Globe*, and whatnot; but I really don't think that's the source. It would be an interesting study. Miriam Cohn was one of those early women and I think she has done some work on this but I'm not positive. It was word of mouth. When people finally

began to file their claims, there was not only a set of claims, there was a group, and that group was going to reinforce each other.

CAC: Approximately what was the size of that group finally that filed by the deadline?

PM: That filed by the deadline, I would guess 100, maybe 150.

CAC: Oh, that's a lot.

PM: Yes.

CAC: I'm hearing here that the university was surprised by Judge Lord in the first place and surprised by the size of the response by April or May?

PM: Absolutely right.

CAC: There was no anticipation of this?

PM: Nothing that I ever saw.

CAC: And nobody was really riding on it? Was there someone in President Magrath's office who was trying to ride this?

PM: This was an absolutely headless thing. There was nobody that was in charge of this.

CAC: [unclear] out of control as far as Central Administration was concerned except for your setting up the procedures?

PM: That's right. I should talk about the reporting line of this office a little bit because it has a bearing on this.

CAC: Good. Okay. Now, this is the reporting line when you came into it with Williams still director?

PM: That's right.

CAC: Okay.

PM: When I came in in 1977, this office reported directly to the president of the university; however, there was a kind of communication line—Lillian always called it her dotted line—that was to some vice-president. I think we had a vice-president there called Planning or Administration. When I first came in, it was Walt Bruning.

CAC: Yes.

PM: When Walt left, I think the next one was Bob Stein, and then Nils Hasselmo.

CAC: That was the one that Don Smith occupied earlier?

PM: That I don't know.

CAC: Okay.

PM: It certainly could be.

CAC: That is, it is a floating line, and they get different portfolios whoever is there?

PM: That's right. At the point of the Rajender decree, the early part of it, if anyone was in charge, it was the attorneys' office; but they had ripped this out of Joel Tierney's hands, who was really hired as a real estate lawyer in the first place.

CAC: Sure, I know.

PM: It was not fair to Joel. I always felt badly about Joel.

CAC: He had no support staff.

PM: He had no support and he had no staff . . . two things.

CAC: [laughter]

PM: So, now, it's in the implementation phase and I remember asking, "Who am I supposed to talk to about what these pieces of paper mean?" I sat down with Charlie Mays and he said, "A consent decree means . . . "

CAC: Who is Charlie Mays?

PM: Charlie Mays was the Leonard, Street, and Deinard lawyer who was handling the case.

CAC: Okay. Thank you.

PM: He said, "A consent decree is a literal document and you must take every word in there literally. So, if it says that you must search for all positions . . . all means all. If it says you must search for some . . . some means some." Well, I got the hang of that pretty fast. I quit talking to attorneys and I just did what it said.

CAC: This didn't mean civil service as well . . .

PM: No. The class was defined as all academic women who were either employees of the university or who, but for the climate at the university, would have been employees.

CAC: Okay. Whew.

PM: It was the biggest class that ever classed, I'm sure. Now, you remember that the consent decree also had a provision that there would be a special master appointed which is customary. Three special masters were appointed originally: Leonard Lindquist, Viola Kanitz . . .

CAC: [gasp]

PM: Yes, Viola Kanitz and another man. I can't remember his name right now. He went to be a judge. Viola Kanitz was assigned something like . . . she had a little different title. In other words the idea would be, she would be the full time special master. These three special masters hired a law clerk and the law clerk's name is Sue Stengley. The first thing that Lillian did was she said to me one day, "Don't you think we should get acquainted with those people?" So, without, I'm sure, asking anybody's permission, she and I visited with Viola Kanitz and Sue Stengley. Viola Kanitz had been a candidate for Lillian's job when she was hired. Viola was one of this group of women that were giving Lillian trouble but that was never personal with Lillian.

CAC: Yes.

PM: So she was smart enough to see somebody should start talking to these people. We were the only people talking to them. Viola Kanitz could not get anybody's attention. She, finally one day, went with Sue, and I don't know who all else, and went through the halls of various buildings looking for office space which got back to Peter Magrath who said, "Whoops! This is not a good thing."

CAC: [laughter]

PM: And he assigned this responsibility to Nils Hasselmo.

CAC: Ah ha.

PM: By now, by the way, I think Ken Keller was either the acting or the actual vice-president for Academic Affairs.

CAC: Okay.

PM: There is a personal note I'll have to put in there, too. Ken Keller is married to Bonita Sindelar.

CAC: Yes.

PM: Bonita Sindelar worked in the Graduate School when I first took a job over there.

CAC: Was she a lawyer at that time?

PM: No. She was a law student and I think she was a secretary or a graduate student. No, it couldn't have been graduate student. She had some clerical job over there.

CAC: Okay.

PM: So I became friends with her over there and continued that friendship. We'll get back to that. Nils . . . I mean, this was one more . . . he had the portfolio at that time that was full of things like athletics . . .

CAC: Yes.

PM: . . . planning, the police. I mean it had nothing to do with each other.

CAC: Yes.

PM: And on top of this, he got this. By now, Viola Kanitz is mad at the university. Sue Stengley is mad at the university and all these women were already mad at the university. They asked the masters to hold a special hearing downtown. Betty Robinette is the personnel person at this point, full professor; and she, and I, and Nils had to go to that hearing. It was downtown and once again, the university was completely unprepared and the other side—if we may call the women the other side here—were very well prepared.

One of my side interests is community organization. I think my interest in a lot of this came from Saul Alinsky and hearing speak when he was still alive. I was very active in community organizations at that point. We can pick that up at some point. I was president of a group called The Twin Cities Organization. It was an Alinsky based model and I knew what they called an action when I saw one. We got into that room and the three special masters are up at this table. I don't know where we were physically but the room was jammed. Nils was in the front row by himself. Betty and I had gone to lunch at the Tea Room at Young Quinlans together, and come from there together, so we're in the back of the room. I don't even know if we were in the same chairs but that's a symbol of how disjointed we were. The women were completely organized. The subject of the hearing was to determine whether the university was dragging its feet about implementing the consent decree. The line-up—I'm sure I won't remember it exactly but I'll tell

you I remember a couple of them—one was Laura Cooper who was pregnant, smart as a whip, first speaker out of the bag.

CAC: And representing?

PM: Representing women.

CAC: But by department or . . . ?

PM: No, they were really completely unofficial.

CAC: Okay. But they were departmentally based?

PM: Of course.

CAC: And Laura Cooper was what?

PM: In the Law School.

CAC: Oh, okay. Thank you.

PM: Yes. She got up, and spoke about her situation, or the situation of women . . . I don't remember the text of it. Pat Faunce got up and made a very strong speech . . . among other things, calling Nils Hasselmo a liar. A woman from General College got up, Evelyn . . . oh, I can't think of her last name. I think she was associate dean over there. She probably had never done anything in terms of women's issues in her life before that date. She got up and talked about how all of her life, she had worked in a subordinate position at the university. I mean, it was a tear jerker. So you had people who were mad, people who were sad, people who were whatever . . .

CAC: And experienced?

PM: There were probably twelve of them. The university is sitting there, not even prepared about what we were going to say. Finally, they turned to Nils and Nils would never go on the attack. He's not that kind of person. I don't remember what he said, but I do remember that he was willing to give away the store. They wanted something done that I knew was just physically impossible to do, and he said yes to that; and I scuttled across the room and said, "You can't promise that. We can't deliver that." [laughter] It was crazy.

CAC: You don't remember what that thing was?

PM: Something about the computer and how it had to be done by tomorrow or something. It was just not, in my mind, possible.

CAC: Okay.

PM: Among the other things the university was ordered to do as a result of that hearing was to fund this FACW group, to give them a secretary, to give them office space. If you wanted a parallel for that, it would be as though you went to court in a union dispute, and the union said to the employer, "You are going to pay the salaries. We're going to cut out union dues and you're going to pay the salaries of these union agitators to kick you around for the rest of your life and do you get it?"

CAC: [laughter]

PM: And poor Nils could only agree.

CAC: This is beyond your realm of experiential knowledge, but did these masters have access to Miles Lord so that they had the support from upstairs, or are they doing these things on their own?

PM: Oh, they absolutely had Miles Lord's support.

CAC: Okay.

PM: He hand picked them.

CAC: Okay. They were in communication with him on what to tell?

PM: I'm sure they were.

CAC: All right. Thank you.

PM: Oh, absolutely. And nobody wanted to go back into court before Judge Lord.

CAC: Yes.

PM: Why would you want to do that? So there was lots of motivation to settle it in that room. By now, we've got a lot of complaints, and we're still downstairs with three lawyers, and it's now clear to people that this a bigger deal than we thought. They were now mad at Leonard, Street, and Deinard, for not particularly good reasons, I'm sure; so they shifted their interest to the Dorsey law firm. Tom Tinkham is a Dorsey lawyer who had been doing a lot of judicial committee cases for the university.

CAC: I know that.

PM: I bet you do. Tom sent a graduate of the Hamline Law School whose name was Joel Labintman—a very nice young man who had probably been a lawyer about ten minutes—out to help with these cases. He had about as much hope of settling these cases as flying to the moon. He had no authority. He had no knowledge of the institution. He had nobody to back him. It was pitiful. We couldn't answer the question, How many law suits are there? I finally went to Ken Keller, partly because I was sort of a friend of his through this Bonita.

CAC: By this time Bonita is a lawyer herself?

PM: I don't think she is yet. I can't remember. I don't think so but it's coming soon.

CAC: Okay. That's a later story. But he would be well advised on these issues by Bonita Sindelar?

PM: Might have been. Might have been. But more, he would have been talking to Nils. He would have known that Nils was really now thrust into this problem. I said, "Ken, this is a terrible mess. I think you should appoint me sort of to work with this, to give the attorneys' office some help, and to be an official liaison." Once again, Lillian was fine with that. She was enormously flexible with me.

CAC: But she was pleased not to be the point person herself?

PM: That's right, absolutely right. I spent a lot of time during that time. Now, also during that time, the university figured out that this situation in the Legal Department was untenable. There weren't enough people. Joel was being asked to do things he couldn't do. So they started a search. I remember Betty Robinette and I interviewing with the candidates for the position because they wanted every candidate to know what they were walking into in terms of the Rajender decree. She and I briefed people. I think there were ten of them. It was a huge number interviewed. Every single one of those candidates for the job said, "When you've got this kind of a situation . . ."—by now it might have even been 200 or 250 cases because it's mounting—"what you want to do is try a few of those cases that look like winners, win a couple, settle all the rest. You can't have this much turmoil going on in your institution. You can't have associate professors testifying against assistant professors." I mean it was just impossible.

CAC: And this was legal advice?

PM: That's right.

CAC: And it came from whom?

PM: Every single candidate for the job.

CAC: Ah! They all said the same thing?

PM: All said the same thing.

CAC: They all knew it. Okay.

PM: I've subsequently learned that all lawyers tell you to settle. I didn't know that at the time.

CAC: But it meant there was a core of persons who were familiar with the case and made themselves familiar with it?

PM: And had no stake in this. They weren't university people. Out of that search, the university hired Steve Dunham as its general counsel which was absolutely one of the best things for women that ever happened at this institution. Steve was and is—he's not dead—one of the fairest, most professional, most competent individuals I have ever worked with in my life. He was just a joy.

CAC: Is he still with the university?

PM: No.

CAC: Is he in private practice?

PM: He's in private practice. His wife is also an academic. She doesn't have his last name. Vicki something or other. She was raised by missionary parents, I think in China; so her field was Chinese Literature, and whatever that department that bounces all around . . . she was a member of that department while he was here.

CAC: I see.

PM: She got a job opportunity in Denver just about the time everything was falling apart here, when Ken was getting run out of town, and everything was going to pieces. So they moved to Denver and he took practice in a Denver law firm.

CAC: I see. So if I interview him, I have to go out there?

PM: He comes into town every so often.

CAC: Okay.

PM: But that would be fine. [laughter]

CAC: I knew Steve by reputation and you confirm it.

PM: Do I? I'm not surprised. We never would have gotten through that both in terms of competence but also values. He was just absolutely a person of integrity. You could trust him. What he said was true. What he said he would do, he did. He was wonderful.

CAC: This is to suggest that there were persons on all sides who did not share that value?

PM: That's probably true.

CAC: It would be remarkable only in its absence elsewhere?

PM: That's right. Yes. The process of trying to look at those cases and settle those cases was something that I was involved in, again because of this kind of special role. The way that it was structured was . . .

CAC: You're still an assistant?

PM: I'm still an assistant in the Office of Equal Opportunity.

CAC: Okay.

PM: No different title or anything. The process that was set up was that if you filed a law suit against the university under the consent decree, the university had 180 days to try to look at that before it went before the special masters. It was sort of a second chance to settle this before a little mini trial.

CAC: I see.

PM: That's where I was involved . . . Betty Robinette and I in particular. One of the first set of cases that we did was Duluth. Duluth had a union by then and the union was willing to pay for the legal fees for its lawyers to represent women in Duluth. So there were eighteen or nineteen women in Duluth who had Rajender consent decree matters. We went up there to hear their stories and then came back down here . . .

CAC: These are salary adjustments as well as appointments?

PM: Everything.

CAC: Yes.

PM: Promotion and tenure. Salary. I didn't get a job. I should have gotten . . . I was an applicant for a job that I didn't get. There were some up there. I was pregnant, and went on leave, and they didn't do this or that. I mean, it was everything you could think of. Probably about a fourth were salary, about a fourth were applicants for jobs that didn't get jobs . . .

CAC: That would be the most difficult one, I should think, legally to establish.

PM: They're all hard. Salary is a little easier. At least it's about money and you can see a dollar.

CAC: Here you've got a comparable budgets.

PM: That's right, but you always get back to what the person is worth, and that's always subjective. One of the interesting things in talking with people, department heads . . . Each time we had a case, we would talk with the women, then we would talk with the department head, and usually the dean. There were a number of deans and there were a number of department heads who would say something like this, "You know, I do believe that the university discriminated against women. I think that happened—but not in my department." There was not a single individual in all of those cases whoever believed that it was their department or that what they had done constituted discrimination. That's understandable, I'm sure.

CAC: In some cases, it may even have been the objective case.

PM: Sure. Certainly. Absolutely. There was something else. There were old cases and new cases. In other words, there was that window between August and May when you could file if anything bad had happened to you back to 1972. But then after that, you could only file if you had a new offense.

CAC: Ha. Okay.

PM: So, we had old and new cases; and especially in these old cases, we couldn't even find some of these people.

CAC: Sure.

PM: Some of them were . . . probably a fraction of them . . . There was one woman that had fourteen or fifteen law suits; and she applied for everything that anybody ever had open anywhere, as far as I could tell, and then she sued them all; and she wasn't remotely qualified for those jobs. Those were some of the cases they took to trial. They took one promotion and tenure case to trial and that was a risk. That was in the College of Education in the Phy-Ed Department. It was two women and they filed on lack of promotion from the rank of associate to full, on salary, and on something else. They got Kathleen Graham as an attorney, maybe Carolyn Chalmers and Kathleen both. Kathleen won that case. That was the last promotion and tenure case that went before the masters because in the view of the university—now again, this university that says it's the university—being ordered to promote somebody is about the worst thing that could happen in terms of the academic process. That is what happened in that case. Now, you could appeal that but you would appeal it to Judge Lord? Judge Lord was not going

to go for you. You could take it to the [unclear] circuit but that's an unpopular and not a very good idea.

CAC: I'm sure someone was looking at the cost of this as well, the cost in pure money?

PM: That's right. Sure. Absolutely.

CAC: You're suggesting that Mr. Dunham was making these decisions finally, not all by himself but in consultation with what other clusters of persons in Central Administration?

PM: Betty Robinette for the academic vice-president—that would be Betty operating for Ken Keller—myself for this office, the affected dean, and the affected department head.

CAC; Okay.

PM: That was about it. In general, the dean or the department head would be advised to settle. If the case looked very ridiculous or the person wanted a settlement that was just completely out of line, sometimes those didn't settle. We still have some Rajender cases.

CAC: Hmmm.

PM: There is one that was heard last week. I don't know how many they've got left but maybe ten.

CAC: I'm going to come back to a comparative thing here. This was a condition at Minnesota that did not exist in the same degree, or at all, in comparable universities?

PM: The only university that I ever got wind of that had something more or less similar was Brown. To show you how completely dissimilar it was, their class was ten women . . . all said and done.

CAC: But a thing like this might have happened. This was going on—in departments of Chemical Engineering, just to say one—everywhere.

PM: This meaning that women weren't getting hired or they weren't getting treated right? Sure. But most courts were demanding much heavier evidence than we ever had to bring to bear.

CAC: I see. So the Lord decision really is the crucial matter here?

PM: Absolutely critical. Absolutely. I truly believe that.

CAC: Now, did this make a difference in the way the university ran this office then?

PM: It made a tremendous difference. For one thing, it shifted a lot of resources and energy to the issues of women, and it shifted a lot of resources and energy to the issue of procedure; because this role that I'm talking about in settling the cases is kind of an extracurricular thing to the office, important for the university but not what this office is really primarily looking at.

CAC: Sure.

PM: So, the consent decree—remember I said this business about it's a literal document?—wasn't very well put together on the procedural side. It was hurried. It was done mostly by people who didn't know how the university operated. For instance, the requirement to advertise in the *New York Times* whenever you had certain circumstances pertaining was crazy. The number of applicants collectively that we got out of the *New York Times* was probably fifty over ten years.

CAC: The *Chronicle of Higher Education* was a more logical place?

PM: That's right. That was in there, too, but the *New York Times* got in there by some fluky way. It focused this office strongly on crossing "t"s and dotting "i"s because any one department that didn't send its post docs a list of the openings—as they were required to do or any one of these other things that were procedurally in there—would not just be doing something that we didn't like over here, or would not just be breaking a guideline, but they would basically be in a posture of contempt of court.

CAC: Does this in turn mean that the university, therefore, having to elaborate these policies and implementations, did in fact move forward more affirmatively with Affirmative Action than other comparable universities?

PM: I think, if you measure that by the women hired, not women in the faculty, but women hired—that's an important distinction because if what we want to look at is in the year 1990, how many women were hired, that's one thing; if what we want to look at in the year 1990 is what is the net number of women, which takes into account women that die, leave, and retire, whatever—the hiring looked better than most Big Ten and that was what I looked at mostly. The Big Ten is generally ahead of the rest of the country, so I don't think there's any question that the hiring that we did during the ten years of the consent decree was influenced by the decree in a positive direction. Yes, I think we hired more women.

CAC: And promotion, tenure, and merit as well?

PM: I don't know about that.

CAC: It would be more difficult to establish?

PM: It would be.

CAC: But it could be done?

PM: Probably. What it would take to do it is . . . As you know, the promotion process or the tenuring process begins in the department. There are individuals who don't choose to fight cases so there are people who go away in the sixth year, and then they're not counted, so to speak. Certainly, you could get those documents but you would have to get to that level. My impression is, however, yes . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: We're talking about the implementation of Rajender and its complications, and whether one could entangle merit, as well as tenure and hiring.

PM: I think that I was about to mention that there was another avenue in the decree that kind of didn't get much attention during the first period. There were the procedures. We put those in place. There were the individual claims. I come forward and say, "Something's happened to me." But there was also a possibility for submitting a petition and I could say, "I haven't been individually harmed but the university has a pattern or practice that's bad."

CAC: The law recognizes that, sure.

PM: After the women who had organized, this FACW and their friends, kind of got their cases done, they turned their attention to the petitions, and they filed six petitions. One of those petitions was about equal pay for equal work.

CAC: Ah.

PM: Many people get this all mixed up.

CAC: Boy! that shifted the grounds right there.

PM: That's right.

CAC: Sara Evans was doing this study nationally?

PM: Right. That's right. There were some other petitions as well but probably that was the biggest one.

CAC: But comparable pay never got legally . . .

PM: No.

CAC: That's even a more sticky one.

PM: Oh, it's very difficult, you bet. In this one from the outset, the important thing were statistical studies. Charlotte got . . .

CAC: This is Charlotte Striebel?

PM: Charlotte Streble ran a bunch of numbers, did a regression analysis on salaries, developed some variables with Carolyn Chalmers and Andrea Rubenstein, the two lawyers on this case. Meanwhile the university, David Berg's shop, ran a regression analysis, and not surprisingly, David Berg's shop showed there was zero difference between men's and women's salaries, and Charlotte said, "There's a 12 percent difference." The special masters said, "We're not going to hear a case where you folks have us trying to decide which statistician is right. The court will appoint a statistician and that statistician will be the one we listen to."

CAC: Ah..

PM: They appointed someone from our statistics department here; but the real fight was not even about the numbers, it was about the variables . . .

CAC: Of course,

PM: . . . and getting a data base that was accurate and so on. So, that took about four years.

CAC: [gasp]

PM: That and a lot of money.

CAC: A lot of support staff. Everything you're talking about here means an enormous budget.

PM: People have no idea.

CAC: I mean, beyond professional staff.

PM: People have no idea how much this all cost.

CAC: Yes.

PM: That's right. At the end of that, the compromise was a 6 percent difference—and neither side believed that was the true figure but they could live with it—and a 3 million dollar settlement. That settlement was not something I was very much . . . by now, I'm out of this special role.

CAC: Okay.

PM: Carol Carrier might be able to tell you more about that.

CAC: Does she hold that portfolio now?

PM: Yes, she holds Betty Robinette's portfolio.

CAC: Okay. How long has she had that?

PM: Six or seven years now.

CAC: That long?

PM: Yes. That's how I feel. Right. It seems like yesterday.

CAC: You'll notice I'm jotting down things to do here.

PM: Yes. Well, Carol, particularly, would have been involved at the salary settlement stage. In terms of institutional attention and the attention of this office then, the consent decree was a major, major focus. We didn't have a big office, for one thing, and it was just a huge burden of work.

CAC: Now, did this distract the university and this office from the minorities of color?

PM: Oh, yes, I think so.

CAC: Could that be measured ten years from now by the same kind of statistics you're talking about here, whether Hispanics, Blacks, etcetera, were disadvantaged because of the focus here?

PM: You could try. Usually the numbers are small but you could try. In the middle of this period . . .

CAC: But just subjectively, you're suggesting that the focus on this was so all consuming, it was difficult to pay attention to the others?—not that it was dropped.

PM: I think the other thing is that the focus in the decree was procedure.

CAC: Yes.

PM: There is a real split that I have usually encountered when I've talked to women, as opposed to talking to people of color, either men or women, and that is, procedure works for white

women. If they can nail the procedure down, it will deliver the result by and large. Why? Because the numbers are so vast. We are 50 percent.

CAC: Ah.

PM: Now, we're 23 percent of this and 30 percent of that and so on.

CAC: And that's a larger pool?

PM: We're not a half a percent.

CAC: Yes.

PM: Procedures, while they're important, especially legal procedures to people of color, are not the guarantee to a result that procedures are to white women. My take on that is that really to the extent that we had these very, very entrenched procedures, we were not as flexible as we needed to be; and mostly institutions that made much progress in that time did it by being flexible. Until the very end of the procedure, we didn't start doing things like spousal exemptions; that is . . . You're familiar with those?

CAC: Yes, indeed.

PM: A person is hired through a search. They say, "I'm not coming to the institution unless my spouse can come." The institution gives that spouse a job. That of course couldn't happen under the decree because all jobs had to be search . . .

CAC: It couldn't happen under older standing principles that universities followed.

PM: Under nepotism policies. That's right. Those were almost all illegal by then . . . the nepotism policies.

CAC: It wasn't the process that overruled them but really legal cases on nepotism?

PM: Almost always in practice. What nepotism meant was that the male shirt got what they needed, and Phyllis Freier got to be the research associate, or whatever.

CAC: Yes.

PM: That's what happened but they're not flat out illegal, per se. No.

CAC: Okay.

PM: Another part of this history of this office . . . In 1984—by this time, we're not quite to the mid point of the consent decree which ran for the ten years—the director of this office, Lillian, got lung cancer and really very suddenly. I mean, she didn't get it very suddenly but it was diagnosed in April of 1984 and she died in June. It was awful, awful.

CAC: How old was she?

PM: She was sixty-four or sixty-three . . . that was never determined definitely.

CAC: Okay.

PM: Peter Magrath was still president. I was appointed acting but he was leaving. He was on his way out. I was appointed acting director and a search was done. It took a year and I was hired at the end of that year, in May of 1985. By that time, Ken Keller was president and so I was working for him. I said to Ken, "I'm not going to have any dotted lines. I'm either going to work for you or I'm not going to work for you but I'm not as flexible as Lillian." Lillian when Nils had left—you know they didn't fill that vice-presidency—picked up her dotted line and attached it to Steve Dunham.

CAC: Ah.

PM: Why? Did it make any sense logically? No, but he was a good guy so that's what she did. I could see that that was not going to be viable. So I said, "Ken, either I'm going to work for you or I'm not going to work for you."

CAC: You said earlier that Lillian Williams was a good politician.

PM: That's right.

CAC: She's doing all kinds of things that aren't bureaucratically appropriate?

PM: Oh, she was the antithesis of a bureaucrat. [laughter]

CAC: You think very well, obviously, of what she was able to accomplish in the years she was here.

PM: Yes. Yes.

CAC: That may be one of the paths, one of the strategies that makes it work?

PM: I think it is.

CAC: You see, what I hear increasingly—just to interject from my other interviews—is that there has been over the last, ten, twelve, fifteen years a decrease in flexibility, an increase in following rules, complicated rules, that really has tied up the university, and made academic people unwilling—not all of them obviously—to assume these kinds of . . . because they don't have the elbow room.

PM: Yes. I think that there is something to that. Again, we'll probably get to that point, too, in the interview?

CAC: Okay.

PM: But in 1985 when I took the job, I interviewed the deans, every dean, in the summer. I asked them about their minority faculty. I said, "Who do you have now? Where are they in their process?" Pretty much, deans knew.

CAC: There are so few.

PM: That's right. In 1985, my recollection is that university wide, in all the hiring that went on that year, only one person of color was hired in a faculty rank. So, I went to Ken and said, "This is a crisis. Look at the situation here."

CAC: You attributed that to what?

PM: I didn't bother. I never bothered.

CAC: Okay.

PM: I just said, "Here's the fact. It's not okay. Let's do something about it." I don't know what he attributed it to. I said, "Let's do something."

CAC: At the line, many persons would have contributed it to the fact there wasn't a pool.

PM: Maybe, that's right. Although, even if you looked at previous years, we would usually have five or six people we would hire; so why were we down to one, I don't know.

CAC: Yes. Okay.

PM: He then established what is now the bridge money, for which he never gets credit. He set that fund up. He set money aside.

CAC: Bridge money?

PM: Bridge money. A department who was going to hire a faculty of color can get up to three years of funding to fund that position.

CAC: Why was it called bridge?

PM: They'll bridge you until your open line comes available.

CAC: All right.

PM: In other words, they're not going to give the line to the department but . . .

CAC: If it was filled by a minority of color? Now, we're talking minority of color and not gender?

PM: That's correct.

CAC: Okay.

PM: And I said, "This can't be for white women. We cannot do this for white women. We've got the decree. That's enough. They don't need it, in general, and this really has to be this way." So that program began. The Taborn Committee then produced the report that resulted in the establishment of Dr. Josie Johnson's office. When that was established, that was established specifically to do the programmatic work, to encourage the hiring of faculty of color, and the enrollment of students of color. Then that's a whole other chapter that came in.

CAC: I'm interviewing Josie Johnson . . .

PM: I had anticipated that you would and that's great. That kind of at least made me feel relieved because . . .

[knock at the door]

PM: Excuse me.

[person enters room and says "Excuse me. Patricia, do you want to come along?"]

PM: Yes. I have a twelve o'clock I have to go to.

CAC: Okay.

PM: The Sexual Harassment Board. That's another thing that came in in the middle of all of this that we should probably talk about if we have time.

CAC: Yes.

PM: On the bureaucratic side when the decree expired—which it did in December of 1990—for the two previous years before that time, I worked with a committee to try to adapt the rigid procedures of the decree to a more flexible set of procedures. I did that because I thought that was important. We monitored every single hire that was an academic hire, if you worked more than three days in this office . . . every Continuing Education hire, every . . . It just didn't make any sense. It was just impossible. So, we tried to get rid of a bunch of that. Because perception is as important as reality, there's still a lot of people that are operating as though we had a decree, by the way.

CAC: That's okay.

PM: Yes. It had to be a compromise. We couldn't throw it all out but we had to have more flexibility. The other thing that happened in those years that really made a very big difference in the work of this office was the establishment of a sexual harassment policy. That was done, really I think, under the auspicious of CLA [College of Liberal Arts]. Fred Lukermann really had some problems that he wanted to address, and finally, Leo Raskin from the Law School was set up as chair of a faculty committee that wrote and adopted the policy and procedure which was put in place in 1980. It was administered for the first four or five years by Betty Robinette in the academic personnel area. When Ken became president, he shifted that responsibility to this office, to me—and to me personally. I said after a year or so, "Ken, I can't do this. There are too many cases. I've got too much else to do as director. I've got to delegate some of this." He said, "I don't want you to delegate any of this. You just can't have just anybody doing these. It will be a problem," and so on. So for three or four years, I did all the sexual harassment cases and was director of the office.

CAC: I hope with increase of staff to cover other things?

PM: No. No. No. But it wasn't impossible but it was difficult.

CAC: Let me back up here for a minute. There is equal opportunity. There is affirmative action and there's sexual harassment. Initially when you came in, you couldn't answer the Ph.D. question and Lillian Williams told you.

PM: That's right.

CAC: What did she tell you?

PM: She said, "It's very simple. Equal opportunity has to do with getting everybody to the same starting point; that is, that despite whatever your age, or your religion, or your status with respect to welfare, or your ethnicity, or your race, or your gender, we are going to not bar you from

anything the university has to offer. It's kind of a negative obligation. It's the obligation not to discriminate.

CAC: Ah! Yes.

PM: Not to discriminate. But it doesn't say that we're going to do anything more than bring you to the opportunity, whatever that is. Affirmative Action, legally, springs from a presidential order which said, "For four groups of people, we're going to do more than not discriminate. For four groups of people . . . women, racial minorities—which meant American Indian, Asian-Americans, African-Americans and Latinos—we are going to do affirmative action programs. You're going to have to analyze your work force, see where you are lacking in numbers, look at availability nationally, put those two statistics together, and generate numerical goals. The Affirmative Action obligation . . .

CAC: Those criteria were there that early?

PM: Yes. That was 1972.

CAC: All right.

PM: What's the obligation of an Affirmative Action Program? It is to attract to pools—the way we do hiring here—a proportionate number of women and minorities. It is not—all other things being equal—to hire the woman or the minority which is what almost everybody believed. Now, the consent decree had a preference clause in it; so that really mixed us up at this institution because at this institution we did, in the decree, have both a quota for the Department of Chemistry, and a preference clause which said, "When you're done, if all other things are equal and you have a goal to hire a woman, you must hire the woman unless there's a person of color in the pool," which was a very deliberate thing to try to keep that rivalry down . . . which was very smart. That's what Affirmative Action is. There are two other groups. Remember, I said there were four? Persons with disabilities and Vietnam era veterans . . .

CAC: Oh.

PM: . . . have Affirmative Action Programs in federal law but people don't know about that in general because they don't allow you to do an availability analysis or generate goals; but unlike religion, where we don't go out and look for a certain number of Catholics or whatever, with those four groups, our obligation is to be affirmative, to go and get those people into our pools, and that's the distinction. Now, the work of this office has grown, like everything else, as kind of trends have continued for both groups. At another point, the age discrimination law came in. The university added to its list of protected class people—these people your not going to do bad things to—sexual orientation. The Americans with Disabilities Act came in, although we'd already had a kind of similar act but that always brings it more into the fore.

CAC: Sure.

PM: All during these periods of time, we've got competing agendas and sexual harassment—which really is in the discrimination, it's just Title VII law; it's another form of discrimination—comes into play. There are lots of competing . . .

CAC: But a whole other set of issues and evidence?

PM: That's right. That's right. And work.

CAC: So really, as far as process is concerned, one has to develop new procedures, new processes, for sexual harassment?

PM: That was done. I don't know that one has to. I happen to be of the opinion that we have made a mistake by setting up a separate policy and procedure for sexual harassment.

CAC: I see. Could you say more about that?

PM: What we've done is to elevate one form of discrimination against others.

CAC: Ah!

PM: That is not to say that sexual harassment is not very serious and not a bad thing but we're a little out of balance and ultimately that's created a lot more problem for us than the Rajender decree ever did. Racial minorities at this institution handled the Rajender decree very, very reasonably. They just didn't hassle about that. I still believe that there is resentment about the fact that we have a Sexual Harassment Policy but we don't have racial harassment policies, and so on.

CAC: Hmmm.

PM: I don't think it's possible to create a racial harassment policy that doesn't run afoul of the First Amendment. So, the answer to me is you should just try to make all of it a little more in balance. But we can't do that yet. That will happen at some point.

CAC: The three major segments here . . . well, more than that because of the age discrimination and the . . .

PM: Disabilities and sexual orientation. All of those have programmatic dimensions.

CAC: Oh, yes.

PM: Then one that's just come back in the last year or so that was very much a part of the early office . . . The early office focused on hiring. It focused on women and minorities. It resolved complaints, mostly from those groups but from other groups as well, and it concerned itself with minority construction and purchasing policies. We had quite an active . . .

CAC: And that was through this office, also?

PM: Yes. Yes. In fact, Lillian started that way.

CAC: Good grief!

PM: Lillian's first job was she was some kind of a support staff person for the people in Physical Plant. The very first form of Affirmative Action we had here was an apprenticeship program for laborers.

CAC: That program still exists?

PM: Not in that form, no. No. As we had less money to build buildings, those programs just kind of faded off. But the agenda of the office grew and grew.

CAC: And the staff not correspondingly?

PM: It did eventually. Yes.

CAC: And by what process?

PM: Two processes. In a couple of cases, we took people into the office that no other office wanted. We took somebody in here whose department was so eager to get rid of her that they gave her to us line item and all. That was a support staff person. In fact, we did that twice. Then I finally went to somebody—see I learned my politics from Lillian—I went to somebody, I don't remember honestly if it was Ken or if it was Nils, and said, "I've got to get out from under this. I've got to have a position to deal with sexual harassment and I've got to be able to delegate some of this." I got an additional position there. We're not really under staffed if you compare us with other offices of Affirmative Action.

CAC: Do other offices of Affirmative Action take on sexual harassment as well typically?

PM: Oh, yes.

CAC: I see. What percent of the business in sexual harassment has that taken over, what percent of the staff time?

PM: We have one person who does virtually nothing but sexual harassment. Now, she does training as well as handling cases and that's Anne Truax. I try not to do complaint work anymore. I have an assistant director and two other people who do complaints—not full time, of course. I would say complaint work, in general, probably takes up two and a half positions full time. We do a lot of complaint work.

CAC: Did the sexual harassment involve the law externally as the Rajender case did?

PM: Yes, in a lot of ways. Almost every institution that had its wits about it, simply took the federal definition of what constitutes sexual harassment and made that its policy.

CAC: And this university did so?

PM: Yes.

CAC: That would be a decision of yours, or recommendation of yours?

PM: No, that was the faculty's decision. We were not on that original committee and had no input about what it was.

CAC: They did not consult with you?

PM: No. No. That was the early 1980s.

CAC: Whose committee was that, do you know?

PM: Leo Raskin.

CAC: Okay. I'll check with him.

PM: Yes. Now, Lillian was alive, so I don't know if they talked with her but the faculty were very nervous about that policy. They were very supportive of the idea that sexual harassment was bad but they were very nervous about corruption of that . . .

CAC: Sure.

PM: . . . and they wanted it lodged in the Academic Affairs area. That's how it got in Betty Robinette's area . . .

CAC: I see.

PM: . . . which was a good institutional decision in terms of structure but if your concern was due process, it was not a good decision. Betty's a lovely, wonderful person but she's a very judgmental person. It was very difficult for her to handle those cases—and Ken knew that.

CAC: So this was the occasion for Mr. Keller's asking your office and you specifically, to take this on?

PM: That's right. It was just too much for her to do, too. It was way too much.

CAC: Could you say something more, something else, about those persons at Central Administration over the tenure of your occupation here who were clearly imaginative and supportive and in what ways?

PM: Yes. I started with Peter Magrath. Peter was followed by Ken, right?

CAC: Sure. Acting and then . . .

PM: That's right. Acting and then actual and then he was followed by . . .

CAC: Mr. Hasselmo.

PM: Well, Dick Sauer, important in a couple places. Then Nils Hasselmo. I only worked for Peter so briefly that it really wasn't . . .

CAC: But your description of Central Administration and its lack of insight into what was likely to happen . . . which is not to fault them unduly, I'm sure, but that was a hard thing to see coming?

PM: Yes, it was.

CAC: But there was a disorganization of this during the Magrath years clearly?

PM: Yes. Lillian and Peter got on very well. She liked him very much. She valued him very much. He was in his ninth and tenth year by the time I came on and I think things were just getting more and more difficult. It was time for him to move on. Ken came into the office with a very strong academic agenda. Lillian didn't particularly like or trust Ken. He'd been dean of the Graduate School . . .

CAC: I think acting dean.

PM: And I think she was influential in his not becoming dean of the Graduate School. Ken was a very plain talking individual. Peter was a, oh, Lillian, you're fine and whatever you want is okay. Peter was a Mother Bertha and Ken was a Sister Mary William. What can I say.

CAC: [laughter]

PM: Ken and I always got on all right because we had the following understanding which we arrived at one day when he got into my business. I said, "Ken, if you want to be the Equal Opportunity officer, you can sit up here and be the Equal Opportunity officer, and I will just collect my paycheck; but we are not both going to be the Equal Opportunity officer." He was good about that sort of thing when directly confronted. He said, "Okay, I understand. I will stay out of your hair." And that's what he did. In general, he was very supportive of anything I ever recommended to him . . .

CAC: I think that was true.

PM: . . . but I was very careful about what I did.

CAC: I think that what you're saying is probably true on other issues. He liked the lines clear and liked people to say where they were.

PM: That's right. And some people found that enormously difficult to do and I can understand that.

CAC: Oh, you bet.

PM: I just wasn't one of them. Certainly part of that was this personal relationship but part of it was just our personalities. I was pretty frank, and he was frank; so that worked quite well. He also had a lot of regard for Steve Dunham, which he more and more got as Steve went along, and so that didn't hurt me because Steve was a very strong protector. Steve was really a very key supporter of this office.

CAC: How long was he in his office?

PM: He was in there at least six or seven years, I think.

CAC: That's not long as such things go.

PM: No, it's not. Ken was certainly supportive. Dick Sauer was also very supportive but not here for very long.

CAC: He was well informed about these complex matters?

PM: Pretty well.

CAC: I mean, do all Central Administrators have to know about your office as well as all these other things?

PM: In general.

CAC: Where do they pick it up?

PM: If they've been in the institution, then they've picked it up as they've gone along. Nils, for instance, is uniquely knowledgeable about the Rajender matters because he was right there.

CAC: Yes. yes.

PM: Ken was just . . . everything was his business. Like Jim [Ettore] Infante, everything is his business. That's how they knew it. Other people might come in knowing nothing. It varies widely.

CAC: Where did Dick Sauer pick up his understanding?

PM: He came through the chain of command. I don't know how exactly.

CAC: Okay. Well, some people are quick learners.

PM: Yes. The Extension Service. Norm Brown had come into the Extension Service as director, and really jolted them out of their seats, and hired a bunch of women. That might have been part of it. But I really honestly don't know the answer to that question. Of course, most of them don't know and most of them just have to say, "I trust you. Go on ahead and do your job." You try to keep them informed as well as you can but, in general, it's very tough for them to really have a good grip on it. I think Nils, in looking at the office, has a natural sympathy about fairness, a natural sympathy about men and women of color, about treating women well; and he treats people well. You can't imagine him really, can you, doing anything that would be harassing in any kind of sense? His values are along this line. He trusts me but we don't have a lot of interaction. I pretty much just go on ahead and do what I have to do. Ken had a more hands on kind of thing.

Let me tell you one story about how people learn this. Let's take Jim Infante. Jim Infante came in as dean of IT, the Institute for Technology. For the first two or three years he was there, I never knew him or saw him except at ceremonial events. Then in the middle of his tenure, one of the two women who was hired under the quota for Rajender came up for promotion, and the other one came up for tenure and promotion. The department committee denied them both. Jim and Gordon Beavers, who was his associate dean, had to take a very strong look at that and really had to embroil themselves in this. There was a lot of fallout from that. It was kind of like a second Rajender.

CAC: And the same department?

PM: Yes. The dean and the IT committee overturned the department on both the cases of promotion and tenure and that created tremendous backlash in the department. The backlash took a lot of forms but I think its apex was the day that Essie Miller, who was one of these two women, the one that was up for promotion, came to her desk and found feces on her desk.

CAC: Yes.

PM: That leads to the story, by the way, of the Commission on Women and Janet Spector's job.

CAC: Yes.

PM: It also brought Jim Infante over here, and he sat himself down across the table from me, and he said, "You are the expert! I have this situation. What am I to do?" [laughter] Which really was kind of a nice thing, in a way, you know. Usually I'm in the position of wheedling and cajoling.

CAC: [laughter]

PM: So when somebody finally says they're going to do what you say, you have to know what you want them to do. What I noticed about him was that he was a very apt learner. He really wanted to solve this problem. He put everything else aside. He spent that entire summer hands on trying to deal with that problem. He interviewed everybody in the Chemistry Department at length.

CAC: Heavens.

PM: Even the other department heads got mad at him because he wasn't spending enough time on his other things. But he was determined to get that situation under control. Jim has the values. He doesn't have the vocabulary. He doesn't have the ease in navigating the cultural waters either for minorities or women but I have a tremendous respect for Jim.

CAC: Yes.

PM: Once he understands what's fair, he will try to do it. He will really try to do it. I have generally found that I have, in all the administrators I've worked with and for, certainly had no enemies. I've never had anybody who would try to influence me either about a trial or a case or whatever. I've had not as much pro-active . . . saying here's my agenda and your job is to carry it out, as people like to have in jobs like this. On the other hand, I've never been interfered with. This has been a time—this last period of time since Ken left the presidency—of tremendous turmoil in Central Administration.

CAC: A churning of personnel or more than that?

PM: Both personnel but you can't . . . You know, the bureaucracy goes on. You can change the president. You can change head of [unclear].

CAC: [unclear] permanent under secretaries . . . sure.

PM: That's right. One of my favorite television series is the British series *Yes, Minister and Yes, Prime Minister*. Absolutely magnificent. What happened after Ken left was that even the bureaucracy began to flounder, so that as far as the direction of the institution, people's morale, even people's ability to stay on task, it just was severely diminished.

CAC: That was a great trauma.

PM: Yes.

CAC: How does an institution and its Central Administration recover from that kind of trauma?

PM: [sigh] Well, we were in the Mother Bertha mode and so we brought in Nils. That certainly was a very important piece in terms of trying to heal both the state and some internal healing. It seems to me the ideal thing is that you try to then have some other people who present the Sister Mary William dimension, and that as a team, you try to move the agenda forward on all of those fronts; and we have not really been able to do that, I don't think.

CAC: Yes.

PM: I am almost the senior member of what is now called the Administrative Council, the president's cabinet.

CAC: Which consists of how many persons?

PM: About seventeen.

CAC: Okay.

PM: I got on the president's cabinet because a bunch of women outside the university got mad at the university and one of their demands was putting me on the cabinet [unclear]. It's a learning curve, too. People get into these jobs. They have no idea what they are.

CAC: Has your office had to concern itself with the athletic department and that whole women's issue there?

PM: Yes. Yes.

CAC: So that falls in your domain?

PM: Yes.

CAC: Do you wish to say something about that?

PM: That's one that's too much still in process.

CAC: Okay. That's fine. I told Nils and others that some issues somebody would have to do in the year 2000.

PM: That's true.

CAC: Yes. So that's fine.

PM: There are still issues, believe me.

CAC: I guess I'd like to have you speak a bit about the culture of the university and its provinces, which is to say in the concerns that you have had. I have a sense that things go on that the university has done at the provincial level. You may not share that?

PM: So do I. Oh, yes, absolutely.

CAC: There must be a terrible broad differential in the way different elements in the provinces respond to the three primary missions you have of Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, and Sexual Harassment?

PM: No, don't elevate Sexual Harassment to one of those three.

CAC: Okay. But it's bureaucratically elevated? And it is also in the amount of business that you have?

PM: Well, that's true but it's still just Equal Opportunity. If you look now, I've got a person full-time . . .

CAC: You said early that that's a subset of Equal Opportunity.

PM: That's right.

CAC: I understand that. But as a matter of fact, people think of it, and the clients you get, and the cases you get are in those three categories?

PM: True. But we've got a whole bunch of our work that isn't about complaints. For instance, I've got a full-time staff person who does working with minority construction and purchasing.

CAC: Let's come back to that in a minute. I want to pursue this other matter about the culture of the provinces.

PM: Yes. When I think about who it was that Lillian talked to and dealt with . . . she talked to department heads and she talked to deans.

CAC: Okay.

PM: She knew all the deans personally. When she put on a workshop for deans and their Equal Opportunity officers, she called each dean and invited usually him, but sometimes him or her, personally to come to that workshop. And they came to that workshop because of the content, and whatnot, but because she invited them personally. When a department head wanted something, they called her personally. If the Medical School was going to hire an endowed chair for doodle-dee-do, they would call up and say, "Oh, Lillian, don't make us do a search for this. We have the best person in the United States, or the globe, or the universe; and it would just be silly for us to do a search. You don't want us to go through that . . . "

CAC: There have been fictional searches.

PM: These weren't fictional. These were just no search. She would say, "Okay." This is before the decree. Now, the negative of that was that it was not fair, that you had some departments who didn't have to search for things. You also got a problem with fictional searches. That's another one. These people simply didn't have to search at all. It really depended on their personal relationships. It had flexibility and sometimes, I'm sure, it was the right thing to do but it also led to the perception of unfairness. The good part about what she had going there was, I bet she was more in touch with the real university than anybody in Central Administration. I really noticed from the day that I was put on the president's cabinet—which took up more of my time running off to meetings and so on—I had less interaction with deans and virtually no interaction with department heads. Now, some of the people that work for me have quite a lot of interaction with department heads, but I bet what I'm doing is more like what other Central Administrators are doing which is way too much talking to each other, and not nearly enough . . . there's no time . . . except for, of course . . . This is one way the provinces have always operated. The disgruntled individual, whoever they are, will get the president's ear. They will get a personal audience which is an insane way to do business . . . not the good old guy department, or the bad old guy department. He's not going to go and meet with the Department of History or the Department of Sociology but if there's a disgruntled individual in the Department of History and if they work at it long enough, they're going to be in his office. One of the reasons why we've got such a crazy way that we do business here is way too much attention to individual cases and not nearly enough attention to policy.

CAC: Okay, I'm going to come back to that in a minute. I'm going to press you a bit more on this point. There are the Health Sciences. There is the Institute of Agriculture. There is the Institute of Technology. There is the Arts College. There is the College of Education. Then

within each of those there are departments and so forth. Is there a difference on these three areas in the culture, the way they respond, the way they initiate action, the way they resist policy, etcetera?

PM: On these areas, meaning Equal Opportunity areas?

CAC: And Affirmative Action and Sexual Harassment.

PM: There are clear differences but the differences are more about, I think, how their governance works than about the subject matter of Affirmative Action . . .

CAC: Or about values?

PM: Yes, or values. That's to me saying the same thing. Yes. So, for instance, CLA operates much more like a democracy than do any of the Health Sciences. In the Health Sciences, the department head hires. Generally speaking, there is a search committee and the search committee might even involve a faculty group in its deliberations but the department head hires. In many departments in CLA, the department head does not regard himself or herself as the hiring party. They regard themselves as the talker. The faculty has made a decision and they're implementing it but they don't regard themselves as having a decision separate from the faculty. I can't ever imagine a situation where they would overrule a faculty and bring in candidate A instead of candidate B. That would happen in the other colleges, or could. It wouldn't be frequent but it could happen. If you take Affirmative Action . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

PM: . . . but they're not particularly predictable on a conservative/liberal line, and they're not particularly predictable on a process line, and they're not the same colleges . . .

CAC: But you're suggesting it's a political system line?

PM: Oh, I think so, of some kind . . .

CAC: That's an interesting comment.

PM: . . . often having nothing to do with anything except whoever the power [unclear] and what they need at the time. In general, I think there is a very broad consensus across colleges about sexual harassment.

CAC: I'm going to interrupt a moment.

PM: Sure.

CAC: Certainly, it must have been something cultural in Chemistry?

PM: Oh, definitely. Definitely.

CAC: Because they persisted?

PM: Chemistry not only did not believe in Affirmative Action, they had a core group, not very many people, but they had a core group . . .

CAC: But an effective core group?

PM: . . . very powerful and effective core group that really were anti-female.

CAC: Sure.

PM: There's just no other way to put it. The sad thing was, they had a majority of people who were at least neutral and some very positive because I got to know almost all of them over there in the second round . . . but it wasn't the leadership group. There are still departments like that. Then there are some that are just neutral. They just aren't going to spend the energy or the time. It's not important. They're not going to run around trying to find, out of a pool of two or three this or that, the one that they can persuade to come here.

CAC: Even though they're not uninformed about the law and the procedures internally [unclear].

PM: No, but it's just not high on their agenda.

CAC: How do you account for that?

PM: That they've got a lot of competing priorities.

CAC: But not different values?

PM: I think for the most part, not necessarily different values.

CAC: Okay.

PM: No. I really don't think so. And it's not very easy for them to act on those values. Often, we've had far more help on the procedural side than the substantive side. That's why when Dr. Johnson's office began to operate, things began to get better, I think.

CAC: I see.

PM: Not just in part because . . .

CAC: This is Josie Johnson?

PM: That's right. It offered money and it offered help. So some of those departments that were in the neutral posture could get some easy programmatic help.

CAC: What is the relationship of your department to hers?

PM: It's a kind of a confused relationship, actually; that is to say, we've never carefully been able to delineate exactly what belongs here, and what belongs there, but in general, my office is not programmatic. We don't help recruit people. We don't have time to do that for one thing. Her office is programmatic. It runs programs to help Affirmative Action.

CAC: But you said earlier that your office also runs constructive programs of education or orientation. Did I misunderstand you?

PM: No. What I meant there was we are now doing a program that carries out our obligation to have what used to be called set asides for construction. If you did business . . . if you were a contractor out there building a university building or selling us a service . . .

CAC: So, now you're dealing with Physical Plant?

PM: That's right. That's right. Which we were in the very beginning and then the university had less money, wasn't building as many buildings. Recently again, the minority community got very angry about this. Some of the contractors got very active, and we've got a vice-president for Finance who is interested in this; and so I now have a staff person working full-time on that, on implementing the university's policy for when it does business, finding minority construction, women construction, construction for people with disabilities. We have a small training program.

CAC: This is to train . . . ?

PM: But that's a different thing altogether.

CAC: This trains what set of persons?

PM: That program was for any university employee and it was called Diversity Training. It was a program called Building Cultural Bridges.

CAC: Yes. Who came?

PM: In general staff, either Civil Service or P & A [Professional and Administrative].

CAC: But from all around the university?

PM: Yes.

CAC: Okay. You didn't identify places for special invitation?

PM: We thought we would but we had as many as we could handle by people who wanted to come.

CAC: Good.

PM: Yes, that was good.

CAC: Frequently at this point of interviews, the questions jump from one thing to another.

PM: Yes.

CAC: But then I want to come back to kind of reflective question to resolve our conversation. I had mentioned what in the provinces we know as fictional searches. How extensive, how serious, how can they be identified? Do you have any idea that . . .

[knock on the door]

PM: That's somebody who is [unclear]..

CAC: That's good.

PM: Fictional searches are not a big concern of mine. First of all, there's nothing to be done about them. They can't be controlled. Secondly, I don't think they're very frequent. I really find that search committee members are among the most genuine individuals you'll ever run into. They are not on those committees to try to . . .

CAC: Oh, because they're interested in their discipline and it's for advance!

PM: That's right. And that's fine with me. People are very sure that they sometimes know things they don't really know. They'll say, "Oh, I just know that this internal candidate is going to get this job and this is all wired." It's like the people that predict the end of the world, and then the world doesn't end, and you say, "Look, the world didn't end."

CAC: [laughter]

PM: They still think it's wired even though the person didn't get the job. I just honestly don't think that's so much of a problem. I'm sure it happens sometimes but I'm not going to spend my energy chasing after that particular thing.

CAC: No. Let's conclude then at least this conversation. Sometimes people go home and they say, "Oh, my god! I should have talked about such and so." Right? We've covered a lot of territory.

PM: Yes.

CAC: Are there some grander or global things that you wish to reflect on on the experience that you've had here? Maybe, I'm pushing you back to values again. How does one sustain a commitment to respect, to the true undergirding principles of Affirmative Action, for example? Can you reflect on that briefly?

PM: This is an enormously difficult agenda.

CAC: You bet.

PM: Let's go back to that distinction between Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action. It's difficult on the Equal Opportunity side, not because there's really almost anyone in this institution who would consciously do harm based on one of those categories, but all of us do things on some unconscious and subconscious levels as well. If, for instance, in our homes it was a very negative environment about Blacks or American Indians, we're carrying that along. The unique thing I think about educational institutions is that the people who have the power are very smart and it is the hardest thing in this world to get them to change their minds—not their behavior maybe, but their minds.

CAC: Ah. Isn't that interesting.

PM: Because that's their long suit so if I have a dispute and I try to say to this person, "You've discriminated against this person." The first thing they think of is that I mean that in their heart they've done something bad, which I don't even care about. The second thing is that I'm stacking this judgment that I've made up against a judgment that seems rational to them. Their lives are about rationality. It's so much more threatening. If I've got a Physical Plant worker, and they're calling names to their co-worker, and I say to them, "You can either stop those names, my friend, or you are out of here!" We're done. He may think I'm crazy or she may think I'm terrible. It doesn't matter. It's over. But in an academic institution, it is never that simple. And so the judgment element is just very, very key. People are willing to compromise because they're not angry or vicious or whatever—maybe a tiny fraction—so in general, if you can move them off of this business about the judgment part, and hold that in abeyance, and say, "Well, we've got to resolve this problem," then that's usually a better way to do things . . . at least in my opinion. To the extent that therefore this trend that started out very kind of loosey goosey, no rules, a lot

of personal interaction, then got highly bureaucratized, both with Sexual Harassment procedure, Rajender consent decree procedure . . . if we can possibly come out the other end of that mill with something that combines both elements, that is, fairness standards but not this rigidity and not focusing on trying to determine who's wrong but trying to determine how we solve this dispute, we'll be a better institution. I don't think that means you have to leave your values behind but I do think it means that—now, I don't usually say this for public consumption because it's so easily misunderstood—for instance, we need to decriminalize racism because we're not making any headway. If I accuse most people in this institution—again let's talk about faculty right now—of being a racist, there's hardly anything I could think of to say that would be more offensive to them. Maybe not this person over here in Physical Plant but the faculty member. It's putting a burden on me that I can't bear when all of what I really may be saying to them is "You're treating this person differently from that person," and this person is black and this person is white. The person themselves, the injured party isn't even as concerned about it as you are. All their lives they've been kind of getting this differential treatment. All they want you to do is stop calling them honey bun and call them something else.

CAC: [laughter]

PM: But the obstacle to trying to resolve things when you're trying to move at it ideologically or categorically just about does you in. We've got to move beyond that and that's hard.

CAC: It's clear that you have a source of strength and poise. I'm talking about you yourself personally. I'm really asking you a parentheses question that goes back to where we started . . . whether religious or spiritual or moral issues . . . how they play out in your career.

PM: Yes. I have a couple principles. One is telling the truth. Sometimes there is nothing I can do for people except tell them the truth. That has just been a paramount thing for me. I've always felt good when I felt as though I was doing that. Sometimes when I would have to go to a trial, somebody would say, "Oh, isn't this difficult?" That's the easiest day in the world because that day all I've got to worry about is telling the truth. I don't even have to worry about saying it nice! I've only one job that day and it's to tell the truth. What could be simpler? The second principle is to do the best you can. I often ask myself the Judge Lord question in personal terms, Have I done all that I can? I can't do more than I can so I try to do all that I can. I have tried consistently to not be worried about relating to anybody's standards but my own because 50 percent of the time, someone's going to be unhappy with whatever decision I make. Almost everything I do is about disputes.

CAC: You've a pretty strong sense of who you are?

PM: Oh, yes. I would have left this job a long time ago.

CAC: And early training may be fortifying a strength in that regard?

PM: Probably. Yes. And that basically, I've liked the people. I like the bad guys. I really have very few people I don't like.

CAC: You spoke of that earlier, right.

PM: Sometimes they are doing things I just don't want them to do and saying outrageous things. I wouldn't want to even put this person in that category. Norman Fruman and I had lunch one day at his request. I found him quite engaging. Now, he and I are not philosophically on the same road necessarily, although, in a couple places we are. He's a person of integrity.

CAC: Yes.

PM: He's trying to do what he believes is important and right. I respect that.

CAC: And he represents a conservative point of view within the faculty of the English Department.

PM: To the extent that I've been able to stay with trying to continually challenge my values but being aware that if I can't satisfy myself, it doesn't matter whether Nils likes what I do, or Ken does, or Department Head X does, or some woman does, it just doesn't matter. So that's been my anchor.

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[End of Interview]

PM: That's right.

Transcribed by:

Hermes Transcribing and Research Service
12617 Fairgreen Avenue, Apple Valley, MN 55124
(612) 953-0730