

David Ward

Education 1-

Colby College 1

graduate school - University of Illinois, sociology 3

Gouldner, Alvin 3

field work in prison 4

social psychology of imprisonment 5

interest in Alcatraz 7

Ward - at Washington State, Pullman and UCLA 10

NIMH research - effectiveness of counseling 11

Comments on academia 12

Judicial Committee 13

research on women's prisons 14

Alcatraz project 17-19

Vold, George 19-20

University of Minnesota Sociology Department, 1965 21

internal troubles 20

Martindale, Don 22

Ward - year at Harvard Law School 23-24

Alcatraz project 25-

Racism in prisons leads to violence 31

Department of Sociology, 1970s-1980s 32-33

majors in sociology and psychology 35

Criminal Justice Studies 37

SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) raid on Criminal Justice Studies office 38-39

Sociology absorbs Criminal Justice Studies 42

Meehl, Paul 43

Department of Sociology (again) 43

Senate Judicial Committee 45-53

Rajender case 48

Medical School case 52

Malaise of academy 54

failure of leadership 54

quality of Sociology Department 57

Interview with David Ward

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

**Interviewed on November 22, 1994
in the Office of Clarke A. Chambers
University of Minnesota Campus**

David Ward - DW
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers. I'm interviewing this morning, November 22, in my office in Social Science Tower, David Ward who's been in the Sociology Department for a number of years, and has done a number of services for the college, and for the university. His field is primarily penology, criminal studies, and as I glance at your vita, when you were a visiting professor elsewhere, it was often in schools of law and sometimes in sociology; so that your training, and your background, and your research is obviously with criminal justice, and to involve the law.

As I suggested before the machine was turned on, it's always helpful to start with a little academic autobiography and you can go back as far as you want. If something turned you on in high school, or grade school, that's swell. Then we'll move through your education, and coming to the university, and then we're off and running.

DW: I think this is very much the kind of things I do with inmates when I'm trying to find out how they got involved in criminal careers.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: For them, there's very unlikely to be one event that transformed their lives and that certainly is the same with me. I guess I could say that when I was an undergraduate at an excellent liberal arts college, Colby College—where I got a lot of individual attention from faculty of the sort that I've never been able to give to students in this factory we're running here—I realized while I was majoring in economics that I was really more interested in labor riots and conflict than I was in economic policy. I met, through course work, a psychologist who

influenced me greatly. I lived at Colby in a fraternity that was the predecessor of something that was later shown in a movie called *Animal House*. It was a completely hell raising, girl chasing, heavy drinking group of athletes. During that time, I and the social chairman of another fraternity were picked up by the local police out of classes at the college, and charged with renting some bars that had been closed by the health authorities, and selling lots of booze to underage students.

CAC: This is the early mid 1950s?

DW: Right.

CAC: Okay.

DW: That was, I'd say, the peak of my hell raising. I got put on probation by the college and if I missed one class, I was out of school and that sort of thing.

CAC: You didn't have to do community service?

DW: I didn't have to do community service. What the police really wanted was for my counterpart in another fraternity and I to identify the distributor that was selling this booze to underage students and, of course, we fingered them without a moment's hesitation.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: From that point on, a couple of the professors at the school gave me a lot of time and attention, sort of as a probation officer does to a client. As I say, that got me interested in psychology and it got me interested in sociology. When I took sociology, I found I was more interested in criminology.

CAC: You understood deviant behavior?

DW: I guess because I was engaging in it for one thing and it's intrinsically appealing. The fields of psychology and sociology dealt with it, so there was a way you could be immersed in it all the time and still stay out of jail. When I graduated from Colby, I had switched my interest to sociology but I hadn't taken much sociology, so I spent a year at Tufts.

CAC: But they knew you were good and you knew you were good academically?

DW: Yes, I did a pretty big turnaround. This is just like convict stuff, you know, somebody who raises hell for awhile then they straighten up; and the staff always liked that because you can see the change instead of the person who's always been good at something or bad at something.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: So, I've complete convict mentality, Clarke. Now, I have complete convict mentality. It's one of the many benefits from my long career in that kind of work.

CAC: You also that you knew how to be consistent and to work the system?

DW: It meant that I understood, learned something about . . . well, you put it the right way, the nice way, working the system. I went to Tufts for a year to take some sociology courses and during that period of time, all the faculty in the sociology department at Tufts were from Harvard; that is, they were Harvard Ph.D.s who wanted to stay close and Tufts was as close as they could be, so I ended up taking courses from people who were very much oriented toward graduate school. I met a very, very prominent sociologist who was then at Harvard, who was going to the University of Illinois, by the name of Alvin Gouldner. I went over to Harvard, and met with Gouldner, and so forth, and he really encouraged me to go to Illinois; and that is the reason I went to Illinois. I was accepted at about five different graduate schools, including Chicago and Columbia.

CAC: At that time Illinois was the preeminent school in criminal justice?

DW: It was one of them. It had two very eminent criminologists but I was very much influenced by Alvin Gouldner who was a very, very strong and charismatic figure in sociology then, and a guy who was always threatening to punch people out; and there were so few academics that I'd ever come across who had that kind of balls to do that . . .

CAC: [laughter]

DW: I really liked Gouldner. I ended up going to Illinois and becoming a teaching assistant. I became a teaching assistant for Gouldner, just a remarkable person, tremendous intellect. Those of us graduate students who were very much influenced by him had the Gouldner Ain't God Club because this guy's intellect was so overwhelming that we had to keep ourselves from feeling that we were crushed all the time by the fact that we never could tell him anything he didn't know. So he had a big influence on me.

CAC: Was there a school of criminology associated with this [unclear]?

DW: I guess I should have said that while I was at Tufts, I had a chance to become the first student intern at the Massachusetts State Prison . . .

CAC: Ah!

DW: . . . the first one they'd ever had. So I went out to this Walpole Prison which was dominated by lots of organized crime guys and really had a remarkable experience there . . . saw

some really incredible things that you see in a state prison where the administration is both incompetent and corrupt. I was there, for example, on the day that a group of reporters were touring the institution and like most prisons, it had a long central corridor. As the group was walking along, there was a strange sound that occurred behind them. It got a little louder and they turned around, there was an inmate dressed completely in a bunny rabbit suit on roller skates coming down the corridor. He roared by them, waved, and disappeared around the corner.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: Now, that's an unusual prison where the inmates' freedom to wheel and deal was so great that they could pull off stunts like that. You can't help liking guys who have got that kind of pizzazz.

CAC: What on earth kind of internship did you have as an undergraduate student?

DW: I was a graduate student then.

CAC: What were you doing?

DW: They didn't really know what to do with an intern, and it wasn't a very professional operation; so I spent most of my time hanging around with the prisoners.

CAC: And talking?

DW: Talking and going to the same activities that they went to and learned right away who the big name convicts were. I was well accepted and well treated by these guys. They didn't have too many free world people who came in; and I was just that graduate student kid, didn't know much, and so forth. They enjoyed telling me stories and I enjoyed listening to them. It was a valuable experience; and therefore, when I went to the University of Illinois and a fellow named Dan Glaser got a great big study to evaluate programs in the federal prison system and he was looking for people to go and work full time in some federal penitentiaries, I was an obvious candidate. I was the first one hired on the project because most of the other graduate students had never been inside a jail or a prison. I went to work on this project which was financed by the Ford Foundation. It was a massive study. I spent eighteen months full time at a federal penitentiary in Indiana. It was a medium security prison. While I was there I went through the same training that the new correctional officers went through and it was very clear to me that my interest was on the custody side of issues; that is, rule enforcement, prison discipline, trouble making in prison. So I identified that as an area that I would do for my Ph.D. thesis.

CAC: Sexuality in prison?

DW: Sexuality? No.

CAC: Okay.

DW: Fighting, rioting, escaping, and so forth.

CAC: Later, you do some research on that?

DW: Right, but at the women's prison.

CAC: Okay. Excuse me for interrupting.

DW: Sure.

CAC: This is such an engaging story. Did you have any sense as a very young person how American prisons were . . . I mean, even then, there were a larger proportion per 100,000 population of citizens in prison than in most other countries.

DW: Right.

CAC: It become more severe later.

DW: But this is the late 1950s and the prisons, especially the federal prisons, were not filled with child molesters, rapists, serial killers. Most of the inmates were federal prisoners, these were of course, in for property crimes, such violence as occurred in the course of a bank robbery, or escaping from a prison, or crimes on a government reservation, and so forth. There were a lot of military prisoners still from World War II . . .

CAC: Ah.

DW: . . . who had committed very violent acts during war and were still doing time.

CAC: The purpose of my question was to wonder whether this opened your insight into larger considerations in American society generally, at that time? Some of my questions are leading questions [unclear].

DW: I don't think that at that point in my career, I was really looking at the big issues and I certainly was not looking at imprisonment in the United States compared to other countries. That certainly came later. I think I was pretty much concentrated on the social psychology of imprisonment. This was a time and this was a prison where there was a real conflict between the new medical model of corrections and the more traditional way; and there was real conflict about it in the institution because it wasn't clear whether the mental health professionals or the custodial staff were running the place. There was a lot of tension between them and when you went to the staff dining hall, it was very clear. All the uniforms were on one side and all the shirts and ties were on the other. Coming from a university as a graduate student, I was certainly

expected to be on the shirts and tie side, and to be naive and liberal, and be for all this treatment business but that really wasn't me. I was much more interested in the custodial side so I started going out to the prison nights, weekends, holidays when the custodial staff were working and the shirts and ties were at home. And as I say, because I went through the training program for correctional officers, the custodial staff, I think, was surprised that I was interested in what they were doing. They were very nice to me and extremely helpful. I began attending prison disciplinary hearings and I attended—I don't know how many altogether—over a period of eighteen months, probably in the neighborhood of a hundred or so. I was at the prison at a time when there was a lot of turmoil; there was a lot of violence. I was in the yard when a riot occurred and found myself standing out there in a very, very difficult position later on because I knew a lot of the inmates and the staff who were out there trying to stop the inmates. This was black and white inmates fighting each other. When I, later on, went to sit in my accustomed place in the disciplinary proceedings—by that time I was doing a systematic study of rule enforcement—the associate warden, after a witness had left the room, turned to me and said, "Well, now, you are the only person who is not an inmate who was standing out in the yard watching everything. Can you help us out on this?" I said, "I can't. If I help you out on this, I can't do another interview with inmates in this institution; so, I just can't be a rat." He said he understood. Now, if the stakes had been high, if an officer had been seriously injured, or if somebody had been killed, then I would have been in a real . . .

CAC: Then, they could have forced you.

DW: Yes, they could have really put the pressure on me to talk. But I had been tested by the inmates who had given me false information about a killing that was going to occur to see whether I would report it to the staff, and I used judgment, and fortunately, I was right. It would have been a terrible mistake if I had been wrong. I didn't say anything to the staff. During this time, I must tell you . . .

CAC: That's a awfully highly developed instinct for a young man.

DW: Well, I think when you're in a penitentiary, you're around people who have got that instinct and you pick it up real fast. I mean, this is not like a university.

CAC: You get socialized in a . . .

DW: This is a unique experience. I spent all my time talking with convicts and custodial staff. What do they talk about? They talk about manipulation. Who's one upping someone? The inmates are always trying to outdo the staff and the staff are always trying not to be outfoxed by the inmates; and both sides give a lot of status to those who are good at it. Plus, you get the good things of prison life, the contraband, and what have you. The staff who are good at it get promoted. During the time that I was working there, a unique experience happened; that is, one day I got a call at the prison from my wife who said, "What did you do on the way to work today?" I said, "What do you mean? Nothing." She said, "Two police officers are here and they

have a warrant for your arrest on a charge of assault and battery." Well, having not done anything that could have called for that kind of attention, I went up to the warden's office and said, "Jesus, the local police have got a warrant for my arrest." He said, "Go on and down to the police station, and then call me up, and let me know what it is." They were prepared to take care of it even if I had been involved in assault and battery because that was the relationship between the prison staff and the local police. Well, I showed up at the police station where I was questioned by a couple of detectives who were investigating a case where a man had gone to the home of a woman in a trailer, and they had some kind of relationship going but she wasn't in the mood that day; and so he cuffed her around a little bit, and she called the police. She did not know his last name but she knew that his first name was David. So the police looked in a directory to see who lived in that neighborhood who had a name of David. [laughter]

CAC: That's good detective work.

DW: And it was me. It turned out that I was the wrong man but this story spread widely around the prison and it did me a tremendous amount of good with the prisoners because they all said, "Now, you know what it's like," because of course, they were all innocent also.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: Since I had gotten a bum beef, why they felt I would be more understanding and appreciative of them. During this same period, Clarke, something occurred that really set the pattern for all the research that I've done in the last dozen or so years; and that is, that during this period Alcatraz was still open as a penitentiary, and periodically, inmates in the federal system are moved around by special prison buses with barred windows and so forth. They go from one prison . . . they drive during the day and that night, they stop at the next federal prison. That's how they make their way across the country. So Terre Haute, which is where I was, being in the middle of the country was frequently getting bus loads of prisoners coming from eastern penitentiaries in Atlanta, Georgia, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, bus loads of inmates, never a whole bus load but a dozen or eight inmates who were headed for Alcatraz.

CAC: Which means they were pretty tough customers?

DW: Right. When they came to Terre Haute, the whole prison, and the staff especially, was completely on edge because these were seen as tremendously dangerous people who were the most prolific escape artists in the federal system; and the job of every prison was to make sure that they didn't escape from your place. There was a tremendous amount of tension when these guys came through. Then during my time there a very, very tough lieutenant, named Ed Siminski, was transferred from Alcatraz to Terre Haute. He was immediately the strongest and most powerful personality among the staff in the institution. He was the toughest looking guy you ever saw; and because he'd been on the Rock, the assumption was that he could handle any situation. I realized that staff got great status from having worked in the toughest prison, in the

Rock. If you had worked out there as an officer you were sure to be promoted to a lieutenant and more.

CAC: It's like combat duty.

DW: Yes. That's where my interest in Alcatraz began. It was a very dramatic prison. It was always discussed with awe by both inmates and staff. At the end of the first year of my time, the people who were working in other prisons all switched places for a month or so. This was called Reliability Interviews; that is, we switched off, and we reinterviewed the same people to see whether they . . .

CAC: Sure, okay.

DW: I went to Leavenworth which was a big time federal penitentiary. It's always been a favorite of people who call themselves convicts instead of inmates. So I went out to Leavenworth to spend a good part of the summer. One of the things you did at Leavenworth, you had to walk the yard by yourself to show that you weren't afraid of the convicts. The guy from our project, who had been working there, was a former All-American wrestler from the University of Iowa. He had a little bit more going for him than I did. He was a great guy and was very well liked by the inmates and he was there the first two days that I was there to sort of orient me. He said, "You've got to go out and walk the walk." So I did. That's the kind of thing you don't do anymore but in those days, if you were a free world person who was going to be spending a lot of time with the inmates, you had to show the inmates that you were able to talk to them on their terms; and that is, to walk out into the one place in the prison where they were in control.

CAC: Now, you say that isn't done by research scholars anymore?

DW: No research scholars don't even go into these places anymore.

CAC: It's too dangerous?

DW: It is too dangerous. They don't go anymore. While I was doing these interviews, an inmate asked . . .

CAC: So you held your poise walking the yard?

DW: Whatever I did satisfied the inmates, and I just cite it as something that researchers don't do anymore; and they probably wouldn't do it if they were given an opportunity because these are very dangerous places now. In those days, it's important to remember, race relations weren't quite what they are today in the prisons where it's become a killing ground. There was hostility. These were the days of early integration, forced racial integration, and a lot of black inmates didn't want anything to do with that white meat, just as white inmates didn't want anything to do

with black guys. There was a tremendous amount of trouble, some killing, lots of fights in federal prisons as the government was trying to bring about integration of the cell blocks, and work crews, and so forth. So it was a very dynamic time to be there.

During this time, an inmate who was in solitary confinement asked to—because what I did at Leavenworth was I immediately got involved in the discipline, going to the disciplinary proceedings there, as I had been doing at Terre Haute—see me and he was an inmate from Alcatraz. He was brought out of the hole at Leavenworth, which was a dark hole, in a white coverall—he hadn't seen daylight for days—brought in to the office that I was using for interviews by two guards, one holding each arm. Then they just stood there. I said, "You guys can leave because I don't do any interviews with staff being present, just as I wouldn't interview you with any inmates being present." They said, "You've got to watch this guy," blah, blah, blah, and so forth, and left. I earlier learned that staff always regard the inmates as dangerous and that's because their role vis-à-vis the inmates is a lot different than my role as a free world person. Because in these prisons, I was able to walk down to solitary confinement and disciplinary segregation units, the inmates knew that I had some kind of special permission that other free world people didn't have; namely, I was working on this Bureau of Prisons authorized project and my part of the study had to do with prison discipline. I started talking to this guy about what he had done to get into the hole at Leavenworth, and he started talking about Alcatraz, and gave me about an hour and a half uninterrupted discourse on how you do time in the hole at Alcatraz. The kinds of mental games that he and other inmates had developed so you could pass the time quickly was absolutely fascinating and I . . .

CAC: These are the kinds of stories you are really after?

DW: Right. I began to realize that these guys were reacting to conditions of imprisonment in a very different way than the rest of us would have reacted if we had been put into similar circumstances. These guys had worked their way up to places like Leavenworth and Alcatraz through the disciplinary segregation units of other prisons; and it really filtered out the people who could take and not crumble psychologically under this kind of harsh confinement. This guy, for example, I still remember he said for him, it was a rest. You got to sleep all the time and work out all the time because you could do calisthenics even in a dark cell. It just didn't have the negative message for this guy . . . the harshest punishment the federal prison system was supposed to have. That attracted my interest.

The next couple of days, I went to disciplinary hearings and an inmate also was brought out of the hole and he was struggling before he came into the room. The guards were holding his arms. He was filled with rage, and the first thing he said to the captain who was conducting the hearing was, "You may as well send me to the Rock because I ain't going along with your fucking program." The captain said to him, "We ain't going to send you to the Rock. You're nothing but a kiddie car bandit," meaning, you're not bad enough. You've got to go back and try harder. You just can't go to the Rock. You have to earn your way there. Well, that was another clue that for the inmates Alcatraz was not so much the harsh punishment to be avoided but was kind

of an incentive system. If you're a real bad guy, it was like getting into the best kind of graduate school.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: Those inmates who came back, like that lieutenant that I talked to you about, had tremendous status among convicts, and even among the staff . . . having done time or having worked at the Rock. So, my interest in this place was certainly piqued. Then I finished my work. In the back of my mind I thought Alcatraz is a place that deserves some study but since I had to find a job after getting through graduate school, I went to Washington State University for one year in the days in which you moved around so freely. I'm sure you remember this. We used to say, "Where do we want to go to spend the next couple years. I haven't been in the northwest. I think I'll go up to Washington State."

CAC: The job market was pretty good in the 1960s, right?

DW: Oh! Unbelievable. When I got to Pullman, Washington . . . They gave me the job. I never visited it. They just sent me a letter saying, "We'll hire you if you're interested." There was an eminent sociologist there.

CAC: There's a big prison there, too?

DW: There was one near Walla Walla, yes. I didn't like Pullman, Washington, at all, and three of us were hired, three new assistant professors.

CAC: Did you teach criminal justice?

DW: I was teaching criminology, yes, and also Introductory Sociology like all the new fish. I didn't like it all. I'd been at Washington State less than a month when I got a call from a guy at UCLA who was going to start a big project in California prisons to evaluate the effectiveness of mental health programs on convicts. So I went down to L.A., and was taken out to dinner at a swell restaurant over in Malibu, then for drinks along the Sunset Strip. They were saying things like, "Do you think you could leave Pullman, Washington, and come down here to L.A.?" So a month after I got to Washington State, I had already signed up to go to UCLA. Incidentally, the other two assistant professors left, too. It was difficult for me to do time in Pullman.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: So, I went to UCLA nine months after. I arrived in Washington state in September, and I was gone in June, and spent the next five years at UCLA working on this project, which was unbelievable. There was so much money, Clarke. There was so much money.

CAC: Coming from federal grants?

DW: Yes.

CAC: And NIMH [National Institute for Mental Health]?

DW: Yes, because the state wanted the project and NIMH had agreed to fund it. When I went down to talk to these guys at UCLA, it's the only time in my career that I was asked during an interview, "Would you be willing to take training and get a pilot's license?" These guys put a plane in the grant because the site of the research at San Luis Obispo . . . They had calculated that if they leased a plane, for the two and a half years we would be on site and going back and forth between UCLA, that it would be cheaper than using an automobile, and the time saved, and so forth.

CAC: You didn't have to hire a pilot?

DW: No, we were supposed to learn to . . . UCLA was going to lease a small plane and we were going to fly it up and back. Well, whose head isn't going to be turned by something like that? It sounded great. We didn't get the plane but NIMH saw this as a chance to do a really definitive study of the effectiveness of psychologically based treatment programs because the state legislature mandated it and because there was a prison that was brand new that was the researcher's dream. It was physically divided into four completely separate 600-man quadrangles but all within the same perimeter. We saw ourselves with brand new inmates or transfers coming in in the bus, three different treatment varieties in a controlled group being randomly assigned . . . it's just the researcher's dream. But NIMH said, "You guys are going to find out that the treatment doesn't work because the staff's going to say, 'Well, that's because we didn't have enough social workers, or they weren't trained enough, or the treatment wasn't intensive enough.'" So they said, "We'll give you more money. Ask us for more money, and hire a couple of psychologists; and we'll have special group counseling where these guys will be trained by an eminent psychologist from Berkeley named Bill Shutz," who later wrote a book called *Joy*. He was going through a divorce so he needed some supplemental money. We did this very, very rigorous study of the effectiveness of group counseling in this California prison.

CAC: How did you come out?

DW: There is nothing in the penological literature that has ever been done that's as rigorous as this study, partly because we had 2400 inmates to work with, a big sample; and we had these three different treatment varieties, plus the control group . . . random assignment, a follow up of three years, a core of interviewers who were spending all their time interviewing inmates in prison and then following them up when they came out on the streets. When the project was over and the results were in—which my colleagues and I had said early on . . . We were going to these group counseling sessions and most of them were absolutely silly and ridiculous. There was so much game playing because inmates had to participate. As part of the medical model,

you had to participate in group counseling, and take it to the parole board who would see that you'd been treated and rehabilitated, and then they'd give you parole.

CAC: It was part of the work [unclear]?

DW: Yes, it was gaming. Of course, the custodial staff thought it was all a bunch of bull shit anyway and so there was this real division still between the custodial staff and the treatment staff. It was very, very interesting . . . a very interesting time because of the struggle between . . .

CAC: But finally you determined that this kind of counseling . . .

DW: We did this study and found that there was no statistically significant between the control group and any of the treatment varieties, including the most intensive. In fact, the control group came within a hair of doing statistically significantly better in terms of our three outcome criteria which were: post-release arrests, prison misconduct—which was important—and two measures of inmate solidarity and opposition to the staff. This was supposed to undo that inmate opposition, you know, you and the staff were working together, and so forth.

When that study was completed and I made the presentation to the director and staff of the California Department of Corrections, I remember very well the reaction of the director who said, "We knew it was a bunch of bull shit." That was one of the first big nails in the so-called medical model of corrections, the idea that a bunch of white middle-class social workers could take a bunch of black and Hispanic guys and say, "Gee, the reason you're in prison is that you've got these problems with authority figures," and so forth. Because, of course now, we're in the 1960s, the Civil Rights Movement is on, race relations are heating up. Black inmates, particularly, and Hispanic inmates are becoming militant. They're not accepting all this psychological bull shit as to why they were in prison. They think it's because it's an oppressive racist society and not because they had trouble with their dad or mom.

CAC: Dave, I'm just compelled to interrupt your story here to make what may be an irreverent or irrelevant commentary that the kind of work you were doing—now you have been in it for ten years as a student, and in Indiana, and Leavenworth, and California, and all over—must have made it difficult to be socialized to the niceties of the academic environment to which you also had to be socialized? What does it mean? Is my guess an accurate one?

DW: I've always done hard time at the university.

CAC: Yes. Can you say something more about that? This is an unusual story. Superficially it seems to me, you're driven to a kind of what some people would call cynicism, or realistic assessment, which is not often the long suit of your more polite colleagues.

DW: No, I've always found it to be tremendously frustrating to be involved in the normal activities of a university professor, meaning departmental meetings and committee meetings.

CAC: Our norms are quite different.

DW: That's right.

CAC: I mean, we work in libraries and in laboratories.

DW: I'm in the Paul Meehl school which is that what we need is one strong person to come in and take over this fucking university and kick ass, get rid of the nitwits and the incompetents.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: And stop spending all of our time doing bull shit. That's Meehl and Meehl is a mentor of mine. I think he's absolutely right. I know that when he was chair of Psychology, he was a terror; and I think the time has come for terror to come back because I think the way things are running now is absolutely ridiculous. I'm very hostile to it because . . .

CAC: That makes you a very alienated member of the department, and here you are a chair, and you've held many and responsible positions within this [unclear].

DW: Yes, but look what I've done, Clarke. I'm on the Judicial Committee which deals with bad guys, only these are the faculty bad guys. I don't have any trouble chairing a committee that's going to boot quite a few people out of here. I think that other academics who might chair this committee might fall for some of the bull shit you get from professors; like one case we had for a guy in the Medical School who pled guilty to two counts of criminal sexual conduct for sexually molesting his own two small children, two small sons, who contended that he could still be a useful mentor in the, of course, Family Practice Department in the Medical School because he was going through treatment. He came before the Judicial Committee and brought two therapists who revealed details so intimate I would go to a penitentiary before I would tell people about those aspects of my personal life. There were faculty members who were actually sympathetic to this; that is, they looked at his poor psychological condition and said, "Well, the university stands for treatment. How can we kick out a patient?" They missed the point that the Medical School . . . We had a had a survey of the interns and residents who said, "This guy will never be a mentor to me. We think his behavior is outrageous." I remember telling the committee, "You want to set the standard here? The two felony convictions and he's still a tenured professor at the University of Minnesota? Then what is unprofessional conduct?" I think I've been able to play my role, to a certain extent, in the Judicial Committee as these cases have become much more termination for cause and much less not having enough articles to get promotion.

CAC: But there are all other kinds of norms that surround—not the unusual activity on the Judicial Committee—but your work in the academy, generally. Do persons in your field reflect, generally, your disposition?

DW: [laughter] No, they don't. They don't. They're a lot nicer. As I say, I think I've pretty much got a complete convict mentality. When it comes to the Sociology Department—just to get to that for a minute—when I came here from UCLA, this was a much stronger department than the Sociology Department at UCLA.

CAC: You came to Minnesota when?

DW: I came here in 1965.

CAC: Okay and now you're going to say something about that department at that time?

DW: Yes. Well, just to finish on the California thing . . . during the period in which we were looking at these various sites for the research project, we picked the obvious one because it was a [unclear] table for us, built in concrete. We visited—just because we were kind of interested—my colleague and I visited the women's prison and the superintendent said, "Jesus, when are you sociologists going to take a look at the women's prison. You've got eighteen different projects going on at San Quentin"—at that time—"from Berkeley, UCLA, all kinds of schools." She said, "There's nobody looking at the women." That sounded like an interesting proposal, so we bootlegged the study of the women's prison on to the other project.

CAC: Hmmm.

DW: I spent two days a week for two weeks at the women's prison and it was a tremendous experience for me because I learned so much from the women. It was a completely different world from men's prisons. It was based on, primarily, love affairs that were sometimes great and sometimes devastatingly unhappy. The whole social organization of women's prison was organized around diads and triads. There weren't any racial differences. It was a very, very different place. I got very familiar with a group of inmates of—I wouldn't call them this now—what then was called an informant group. Every step of the project I met with these women to talk about, Well, I'm going to hand out this questionnaire. Let's go over it and see if I'm getting the right items. Is the language correct and so forth? Okay, now here are the results of that survey. Let's see what your interpretation is on it. How do you explain the inmates . . . 60 percent said so and so? It was a very, very interesting and unusual experience; and I would mention as a footnote here, I was the first male who was allowed into this prison which had a 1,000 female felons in it, the largest women's prison in the world then.

CAC: What range of offenses were they in for?

DW: It was all the women who had felony convictions in the state of California.

CAC: It would be the whole range . . . ?

DW: It was everything. It was women who were in there for bad checks to women who killed their children, their boyfriends . . .

CAC: We used to think that it was just a portion of our sex offenders? Not so?

DW: No, not in the women's prison.

CAC: Okay.

DW: I mean, if it was for prostitution, they would have been in jail not the state penitentiary. A disproportionate number of the women were in for having killed their children, their lovers, their boyfriends, their husbands . . . that sort of thing. At this prison, the superintendent was a terrific person, very, very strong; and when I proposed doing this project and said, we'd want to interview inmates, and it would go on for quite a long period of time, and that I needed to have assurances that the interviews could be confidential, and so forth . . . I was the first male who was allowed to interview the inmates in an office that had a solid front door; that is, not with a big glass window so that everybody could keep looking in. I was warned many, many times about how sexually aggressive these inmates were, that many of them had been call girls, and hustled on the outside, and that they would do anything, and I was young and so forth

CAC: They'd want to embarrass you or [unclear].

DW: Yes, or just have sex. There I am, Clarke, in a prison with a thousand women, spending two days a week there for about two years and, you know, not once did I get opportuned by any inmate. It really got to be kind of an embarrassment because all my colleagues were saying, "I suppose they're all baring their breasts everyday in your interviews."

CAC: [laughter]

DW: That never happened but that was, of course, because so many of the women, including the attractive ones, were all in love with other women. So we were talking about their affairs in prison. When the results showed that the women were so free to talk about their sexuality; that is, their homosexuality—which the female staff regarded as filthy and disgusting, so they wouldn't discuss it with the inmates but it was the dominate feature of prison life—some people started saying, "The only reason they're telling you all this is because you're a young man in a prison with a thousand love-starved women." I decided that I should get a female collaborator to come out to see whether it would be different if there was a woman . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

DW: . . . study to come out and do some interviews. The first day we went to the institution, I took her out for a walk around the yard. It takes a lot of self-confidence to be one man in a prison with a 1,000 women and have the women all whistling and hooting at the woman that you are with—again, one has to understand the context in which this occurred. That little experiment not only led to an interesting facet of the study because while the women in these days—this is the early 1960s, Clarke—are used to talking to a male who's called Doctor about intimate things . . .

CAC: Ah ha.

DW: . . . but when my collaborator came out, then they all talked to her in terms of, Well, listen, if you were in here, don't you think . . . X, Y, and Z? that is, they related to her as another woman, so that she got the same thing but for different reasons. The long and short of it was that she and I ended up getting married; that is, my collaborator and I. We've always felt that she owed a great debt to the women at the prison who were so patient and understanding in telling us about the different aspects of romantic relationships. We learned a lot from them.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: When I finished the manuscript for the book, I wanted a couple of the inmates to read the manuscript and critique it. One of the women, who was a former stripper, had gone back up to San Francisco, and was working up there, and I agreed to meet her one day after she had read the manuscript. I had never seen her outside of prison and she was dressed in a very, very dramatic way; and we sat in this bar, and talked about the manuscript, and so forth. At a certain point, she said, "You know, I've really gotten to like you." We had spent so much time together in the prison. She had never turned out in prison and I was interested in why because she had all the reasons to turn out. She was attractive. She was hit on by . . . She was a highly publicized case. She said, "How about coming back to my place? Let's go back and spend the afternoon in bed together, just because we like each other." I told her, "You know something, Virginia, I can't tell you how grateful I am to you because you are the only woman after two years in that penitentiary whoever expressed the slightest interest in me as a man . . .

CAC: [laughter]

DW: . . . and not just as someone to listen to their stories." Since my collaborator was waiting for me in a hotel, I didn't take her up on her very kind invitation; but I've always remember who grateful I was, and what a lovely way she had of saying, "Let's spend the afternoon together—just because we like each other." [sigh]

CAC: And she liked the manuscript?

DW: Yes, she liked the manuscript, too. That's the women's prison story.

CAC: But you continued that interest as well?

DW: Not in women's prisons.

CAC: Okay.

DW: That study is now being replicated by my close friend and colleague, Candace Kruttschnitt. These days you've got to be a woman to do these studies of life in the women's prison; and she's replicating that study exactly, using the same interview guides, the same survey instruments, and so forth, to see whether, now, about thirty years of the women's movement has had any impact on the prison . . .

CAC: Oh, god!

DW: . . . and our prediction is . . . none. The women are still all falling in love with each other, the unhappiness is over failed relationships, there's no tension between racial and ethnic groups in the prison.

CAC: Maybe, she will have to have a collaborator as male to check it out.

DW: [laughter] I don't know but when she went to the prison this past summer—the superintendent of course is long gone, it's not the same one—the superintendent turned around, and pulled our book off, and said, "We've been waiting for twenty-five years for someone to come back and redo the study, because we think this book had it right then, and we think it's the same right now." That will be interesting to see how that comes out.

While I was at UCLA doing all this stuff, I still had Alcatraz in my mind; so I wrote to the Bureau of Prisons, to the director, and said, "Look, no outside person, no news reporter, no journalist has ever been allowed on the island, and no academic has ever been allowed on the island." If you wanted to talk to the warden, he met you in an office over in the ferry building on the San Francisco side. They knew me in the Bureau of Prisons because I'd spent eighteen months in their penitentiaries, and they knew I wasn't carrying contraband, and I wasn't completely naive.

CAC: Sure.

DW: I got a letter from the director saying, "Okay, you go up to San Francisco"—on a specific date—"and you meet the boat lieutenant and go on over to Alcatraz. If you want to start the study, you give us a proposal. We're interested in it." The place was, of course, being heavily criticized by all those who said we shouldn't have a prison that was devoted just to punishment.

CAC: What's the population of Alcatraz at that time?

DW: Two hundred and fifty inmates. That's all there ever were.

CAC: Okay.

DW: It's a very small prison that operated for thirty years and 1,550 inmates went through it during the entire period because they spent about five years there and they had only 250 inmates at a time.

CAC: [unclear]

DW: Yes, right. That's why it's still the best known penitentiary in the country. At that time, it was heavily criticized by academics and civil libertarians saying it was Hell-catraz, and the Rock of Despair, and that we shouldn't have a prison that was oriented to just doing punishment. I arrived at the dock with my letter two mornings after the great escape of 1962 in which the guys had the dummy heads and got out the back of the cell. It's a wonderful thing about bureaucracy because when I showed up the dock lieutenant said, "My god! we got a visitor here! It's signed by the director. I guess you better get on board." So, I went over and I was taken directly by the associate warden, directly down to look at the cells where the inmates had gone out, and to marvel, as the staff was doing, at the tremendous ingenuity that was involved. I mean, the staff were saying, "These guys are really good. They completely fooled us here."

CAC: [laughter]

DW: Their plan had been going on for months. And it also showed, Clarke, that—because you know the cells as you know at Alcatraz back up to each other and it's got that pipe-chase in between—you can't be going up and down those pipes every night in a very quiet prison as Alcatraz was without dozens, and dozens, and dozens of inmates knowing it. All the inmates today say, "That would never happen now." The rush to get up and cut a deal by being an informer would be so great that there would be a line outside the captain's office. The loyalty and convict solidarity of those days is gone and can't be retained. I visited, and the idea was to start this study of the Rock; but that escape killed the institution because it gave the Bureau of Prisons the excuse it was looking for . . . because Robert Kennedy was then the attorney general and Robert Kennedy visited San Francisco, and they asked him if he was going to visit Alcatraz. It was a noted federal prison. He said, "No, I'm not going to go out there. I'm not so sure about Alcatraz." The staff started looking for other assignments in the federal system. When the attorney general visit a federal prison, then you know that its days are numbered and within nine months, the place was empty . . . all gone. It looked to me as though the Alcatraz study was gone, too. The inmates had been sent to penitentiaries all across the country. The staff had been sent. I put it on the back burner and we did the treatment study, the women's prison study. I came up here to Minnesota to replace George Vold . . .

CAC: Ah.

DW: . . . who I remember very, very well because he very kindly had me and my wife to dinner at his home. He said, "I've been on every committee, commission, and task force dealing with crime and punishment in this state for the last thirty years" or whatever it is. He said, "It hasn't meant a god damn thing. As far as I'm concerned, it's all just been a waste of time." I was very much taken with his cynicism.

CAC: Cynicism and candor?

DW: Yes. Instead of looking back with some satisfaction on his career, he was saying that change hadn't occurred. I was, of course, no replacement for George Vold. He was a very eminent criminologist.

CAC: In a state where the prison system had a national reputation, did it not?

DW: Well, it did about that time. Right, it did about that time because it was early in the bandwagon of the medical model.

CAC: Wasn't it even in the days of Warden Wolfer? Didn't it have a reputation of [unclear] . . . ?

DW: I suppose so. It got publicity and it didn't have the trouble that other states had. I'm trying to think of this guy's name . . . he actually ended up being indicted for . . . Turnbladh. The warden who made it famous was a guy named Will Turnbladh who was here just before I arrived. When I came here, I was an associate professor, brand new; and I was no replacement for George Vold who was just a really great figure in the field. I remember asking him, "I'm going to be doing these seminars next year. Do you think I could get you to come over and participate in a couple of these classes, especially when we get to your book on theory, on theoretical criminology?" He said, "I'm never going over there. I don't want to give another lecture in my life. I'm sick of it." I now know what George Vold was talking about. I wouldn't want to come back and give a lecture. I'm too disgusted with the students here, both undergraduate and graduate . . .

CAC: That was the source of his discontent but also because his advice to the prison system in this region wasn't effective?

DW: Right. I think he felt he hadn't had any impact.

CAC: So, it was a double shot?

DW: Yes. I regret very much to say, Clarke, that his desire was to get out of here, and he very shortly thereafter, in the spring, was on his way moving to Arizona, and he died of a heart attack

on the way to Arizona. I always remember that I thought, god damn it! he never got there! [sound of fist slammed on desk] He never got out of here to the place that he wanted to go to spend a sunny warm winter for once.

The Alcatraz Study was on the back burner and when I came here . . .

CAC: Excuse me. It's a case that all good departments of Sociology have one or more persons in criminology, right?

DW: No. It's not the case. Criminology is a strange field, in that even in those days it was clear that you had to have an awful lot of psychology, economics, history, political science. Criminology was really a hybrid.

CAC: Sure.

DW: It was too complicated and diverse a field for only a sociological perspective to be involved. That has always made it seen with suspicion by the . . .

CAC: Line department?

DW: Core sociologists.

CAC: I see.

DW: There's always been the feeling, well, naturally you get those big student enrollments and students like your class because you sort of pander to the students' love of violence and deviance. There's always been that strain between criminology and mainline sociology and it exists today in the department right here.

CAC: But it's only one of you. I mean, even here, there's usually one person, like yourself? George Vold?

DW: Yes but now there are five of us.

CAC: Ah.

DW: One of them is a psychiatrist, Carl Malmquist, and Joel Samaha, of course, teaches the lawyer historian . . .

CAC: But you all have joint appointments then?

DW: Carl Malmquist is fully in Sociology. He came from the Criminal Justice Studies [CJS] Department.

CAC: Okay.

DW: Joel did, of course, too. Norman Carlson, who is the former head of the federal prison system, is a lecturer for us. His background, of course, is in public administration.

CAC: That wouldn't be a unusual story in a large research university?

DW: It is at places like Berkeley, and elsewhere, where you have these criminology and criminal law programs that have people from diverse disciplines in them because the people who are in those programs know you've got to have your colleague's help, that no one discipline can carry it alone.

CAC: So this is perceived nationally as well within your profession that this field of specialization is an odd one and interdisciplinary by nature?

DW: Yes. I once wrote a book review for the American Sociology Association's *Review Journal* and I called it *The Theft of Criminology from Sociology* in which I talked about this field. It used to be only in sociology and people like George Vold, and Edwin H. Sutherland, and others, were the criminologists and it was all in the . . .

CAC: [unclear] Illinois and you're right there?

DW: Right. So that's changed. To get back to how I got over into the criminal justice side, the . . .

CAC: Now, just a minute. You came in 1965?

DW: I came in 1965.

CAC: And can you say something more about the Sociology Department, generally, at that time? Vold stood by himself. He didn't have a [unclear].

DW: It had very eminent people . . . Arnold Rose, Don Martindale, Reuben Hill, Greg Stone, Ed Gross . . . people who were major figures in American sociology. When I got here, I found that they were all fighting Elio Monachesi, the chairman of the department.

CAC: He was still chair at that time?

DW: Yes! There was fighting and wrangling going on all the time. I saw some unbelievable things. They're great stories now. I really love them. We'd go to a faculty meeting and Monachesi was very oriented toward his stars; that is, Arnold Rose and these other big names. We once had a vote in which the big name guys all voted against the person and the rest of us all voted for the person; and Monachesi, as the chairman, said, "Well, the nos have it." So, it

didn't matter what the vote was, these guys ruled and we all said, "Well, that's the way it goes in the Sociology Department." There wasn't any democracy but there was a lot of personal animus between various faculty members.

CAC: What kind of issues or were they all personal, primarily?

DW: They were pretty much personal. They were pretty much personal. Don Martindale was a paranoid fellow who when I came here had, I've forgotten what it was, seventy-five graduate students as advisees.

CAC: Oh, my!

DW: Hardly anybody else in the department had any because nobody ever didn't get through a degree when they had Martindale as an advisor. He was hostile to the faculty so that he gave incredible arguments like this that I remember once. This student from India is too stupid to pass this exam. Why should we make him take it again. Let's give him his degree and send him back to India. Of course, he didn't go back to India. He became a professor at Missouri. Those are days when things weren't done the way that they are done now. We had a Greg Stone who was sexually molesting students right and left, and showing up drunk in class, and what have you, that would never be tolerated now. [He was] a great intellect but he would have been booted out of here long ago if he hadn't died of alcoholism in Costa Rica. It was a fragmented, unhappy, contentious department.

CAC: Perhaps, we should advise posterity, whoever is listening to this tape, that there is an informal history by Martindale of the Sociology Department.

DW: Right.

CAC: How reliable do you find that is?

DW: It think it should be seen as the writings of a paranoid schizophrenic. When it came out, some people in the department, like John Clark who was chair when it came out, were deeply offended by it. Looking at things in the perverse way that I do however, I thought it was great. It was sort of like the Nixon's enemy list . . .

CAC: [laughter]

DW: . . . if you weren't in there, it means you weren't a very significant person in the department. Even though I was one of the bad guys, and was described in one episode as going in with another faculty member, and looking upon a student who was taking an exam, and giving him the evil eye causing him to fail the examination, I thought it was great. I thought it was great. It's a wonderful little book if you understand the paranoid personality that wrote it. This is a guy who said we refer to foreign students as gooks, and that we were only out to abuse

graduate students, and so forth. It was his unique perspective. This is the same guy who once told me that he should have been the chairman of the department because he'd been a captain in the army. It was just madness. Now, the irony is that his wife left a fairly large amount of money to the department; so that each year, we give out the Don Martindale Award [for Scholarship] and each time I do it as chair, being one of the real bad guys in his book, I think of Don spinning in his grave saying, "God! he's spending my money!" It was a very, very unhappy and contentious department.

CAC: Monachesi was one of the last of the true heads, was he not?

DW: Yes, he was sort of the head for life. I remember Fred Lukermann at one point—who was I think then an associate dean, I can't remember— . . .

CAC: Of Social Sciences.

DW: Yes . . . telling me one time that the administration regarded the chaos in the Sociology Department as part of a carefully conceived plot to wring concessions and money out of the administration by presenting these things that had to be solved by money. I remember telling Fred, "If only we had a strategy like that . . . if only we were together enough to be able to present such a coherent strategy."

CAC: [laughter]

DW: So, it was a very, very unhappy department.

CAC: You had no idea that was the case when you came and were attracted here?

DW: No, I didn't. I knew nothing. I was attracted by big names, the reputation of the department.

CAC: It was a good department.

DW: Oh, it was. It was a big deal at UCLA then to be invited to get a tenure position offer from Minnesota. When I came here, and protests were heating up, there was a program at Harvard Law School, funded by the Carnegie Foundation, to train professors in the Social Science in law. I was interested in that because one of the main figures in sociology, a fellow Lloyd Olin, had gone to Harvard Law School where he was the Sheldon Group professor of criminology. I applied for this position, for this fellowship. It was competitive. There were 100 applicants and they picked one sociologist, one philosopher, one political scientist, and one economist that year. I was lucky, and got the sociology position, and went to Harvard, and had one of the best years of my entire life. It was absolutely wonderful.

CAC: In the Law School?

DW: In the Law School. I took courses in law that have always stood me in good stead. I took a whole year of criminal law torts, took two courses from Alan Derschowitz, who was a young firebrand at the time.

CAC: Now, he's an old firebrand.

DW: That's right. It was the year of the great riot at Harvard when the students struck the university and being a fellow, my three colleagues and I were able to go to all of the student meetings, and then we were able to go to all the faculty meetings; so we were really double agents but staying out of both sides, and listening with great interest to the students protesting the fact that Harvard Law School was just a bunch of bull shit, and why do we do a kind of rain dance around here, and declare ourselves to be lawyers, and what is all this training that they're putting us through, and so forth . . .

CAC: [laughter]

DW: . . . while the law faculty was still trying to bring out people like Erwin Griswald, and others, to march them in with their canes to show these unappreciative law students what a real lawyer looked like. It was a tremendous, tremendous time, in many ways. It was the year that Archibald Cox did the investigation at Columbia. Each week, we invited a famous Harvard professor to lunch with us, and we invited Archibald Cox when he came back from Columbia; and he held forth and told us why it would never happen at Harvard and, of course, before the year was over, it had happened at Harvard. [unclear] was great. We had a seminar for law faculty which was officially called The Contributions of Social Science to Law. We knew that the title was Social Science on Trial so that when we took up a different social science field every other week, in a very, very elegant and nice kind of seminar that they do there . . . When it came time for economics for example, we had heard about this young guy over at MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology], Lester Thurow; so, we called up Lester and said, "Listen, it's Economics on Trial over here this week. Come on over here and take on the Harvard law faculty." The resources were wonderful, the seminars, the access to everybody in the Boston area was great, the courses were terrific. It transformed me . . . the way that I dealt with people later in legislative and congressional hearings, my understanding how lawyers go at issues, and how you make your case, and defend yourself, and so forth. The other three fellows, liberal arts fellows, were outstanding people. One of them was Robert LaCashman who was then the Herbert Lehman professor of economics at City University of New York . . . just wonderful. That had a profound impact on me because it moved me over into the law side; so when you note later on my visits to Berkeley, and Amsterdam, and other places in law schools, it really goes back to that Harvard experience and the connections that I made there that led to a lot of nice things . . . the Salzburg Seminar . . . later on working for the Ford Foundation on an evaluation of the American Bar Association's pathetic effort to influence corrections, and so forth.

Just to bring this back to Alcatraz, in about 1975, I was working for the Ford Foundation as their investigator of a very lavishly funded initiative by the American Bar Association to change corrections by having such things as television ads from former inmates like Johnny Cash saying, "Don't do crime," and so forth . . . unbelievable waste of money. We had a meeting in the Supreme Court in Washington and the board for this project included the former director of the federal prison system, the same guy, James V. Bennett, who had allowed me to go out to Alcatraz back in 1962. We met in the Supreme Court and when we had a social hour before we had dinner one evening, Mr. Bennett came across the room to me and he was shaking his finger all the way. He didn't say, "Hello" or anything. He said, "You get that study at Alcatraz going. What the National Park Service is doing to the Bureau of Prisons is criminal. They are listening to these convict stories. They tell the stories, it was torture chamber." He said, "We've got to have somebody from outside the system who knows the Bureau of Prisons, and knows something about convicts who can do a study of what life was like there, and what happened to the inmates afterwards." I said, "Sounds great to me, Mr. Bennett." So the next day, he went with me over to the Bureau of Prisons where we met the then director, Norman Carlson, who was all too happy to say, "Sure, let's have at it." This wasn't during Carlson's watch. It didn't matter what the findings were. If it was a hell hole, then he'd say, "Well, that was during Mr. Bennett's days." If it wasn't, he'd say, "Hey, we're always open to research by our colleagues from the academic community."

CAC: [laughter]

DW: So it was a no lose proposition for Norm Carlson. Mr Bennett was his mentor and he wanted to do what Mr. Bennett wanted. That was the start of the Alcatraz project. The Bureau of Prisons did everything you could possibly imagine. They got the FBI, the administrative office of U.S. courts which is the parole division, to cooperate . . . every probation office in the country. They set about rounding up all the records of those Alcatraz inmates from every federal penitentiary and federal records center in the country and they are now today, Clarke, still sitting over in the basement in the archives of Walter Library, unknown to anybody . . . the records of Al Capone, the unpublished, lost manuscript of *Bird Man of Alcatraz*, on the history of American prisons . . .

CAC: This is at the university archives?

DW: Yes, over here in Walter Library.

CAC: Yes. That's the raw material for the work that you did?

DW: Right. Right. The Bureau of Prisons turned over all their administrative files . . .

CAC: You've not had graduate students that wanted to use this material for other purposes?

DW: No. I ended up getting a grant, a \$150,000 grant, from the National Institute of Justice to do the follow-up study, and I hired a number of graduate students, and to show you what you happened when they stay around me is that these are bright folks . . . Four of them are now prosecutors. They all got law degrees and they are out prosecuting criminals. Three of them are women and they are the toughest women you'll ever meet. The fourth person is the training officer at the federal prison down at Rochester [Minnesota]. They didn't go into academia but they all have had careers that reflected their experience on the Alcatraz project. They all agreed that it was hard to believe you could get paid for sitting there day after day and reading the files of the lives of "Machine Gun" Kelly, and Al Capone, and all of these notorious characters.

CAC: Are those interviews on tape, as this one is?

DW: The Bureau of Prisons also set about trying to locate former staff and former inmates of Alcatraz. We ended up locating about sixty inmates and about forty-five staff; and they have all been interviewed very extensively, those who were in prison, those who were out on the streets . . .

CAC: Can I read notes on the interviews or are they transcripts?

DW: They're taped. They're all tapes. Some years ago, a person in archives said, "You know, you ought to do something about these tapes to keep them." I'm blanking on this guy's name over there. He said, "Hey, listen, we get some students here in the summertime. Give us the tapes. We'll make copies of the tapes. We'll take all the originals and a copy and we'll store them over there in their climate controlled area of the archives. We'll give you the copies and you can use the copies to work from." I've had them all transcribed anyway. That's the second book that's going to come out is this oral history of Alcatraz based on about 600 hours of taped interviews.

CAC: You're still working on that?

DW: Yes. The Alcatraz history is the first one actually written but it's too long. It's being condensed now. The University of California Press is going to do that. Then, we will do the oral history.

CAC: When you're through with that, you can do this project.

DW: [laughter] Well . . . I'm glad that we were able to get this stuff on tape because I would say of the hundred or so people interviewed that probably sixty are dead.

CAC: Of course.

DW: I started naturally with the oldest people.

CAC: Why do you think you're here with me this morning, Dave?

DW: [laughter] That's right. I've survived long enough for this, Clarke. We got FBI rap sheet information on the inmates at the very beginning of the Alcatraz Study, before we had gone into the files. One thing was clear that you follow up 1,550 inmates, which is all of them, and you look at their post release arrests, my god! it was clear that half of them never went back to prison. This was a stunning finding because these are the most habitual hardcore, incorrigible offenders. Even the Bureau of Prisons believed that they would be psychologically affected by doing time at Alcatraz and all these other places. They never could make it in the free world. Of those 100 interviews that I've done, I've always asked, at the end of the interview, for the interviewee to predict what happened to the inmates after they got out of Alcatraz. Every single person says that the inmates would not be able to make it, including the inmates who made it themselves but regarded themselves as the exception. Here's how I did it and these other guys wouldn't have been able to do this and that. So it was a stunning finding right at the very beginning and, of course, it oriented us immediately to looking at the differences between the people who made it and those who didn't. Nevertheless, to find that half of them had not gone back to prison raised immediate questions about whether it was so psychologically damaging. The question is, How meaningful is this when you don't know what the recidivism rate is for a standard federal penitentiary. Maybe, it's 100 percent. So, we asked and the Bureau of Prisons drew a randomly selected sample of files from Leavenworth for the period 1934 to 1963—exactly the same period that Alcatraz was open—so that we could gather comparable data on the Leavenworth population in terms of mental health problems, post release arrests, and so forth.

CAC: Sure.

DW: The Leavenworth recidivism was about one-third; so it was more successful than the Alcatraz inmates, but nevertheless, the fact that half these guys made it was stunning. The study became very much oriented toward trying to understand why that occurred. I think because the Bureau of Prisons was so taken aback by this that Norman Carlson—in 1983, I was a visiting professor at Berkeley in the Jurisprudence and Social Policy Graduate Program in the Law School—came out and he said, "Do you think it would be any help if you had access to the criminal record files on these guys at the FBI. The new director of the FBI wants to have a new spirit of cooperation with our other agencies instead of the one-way street that J. Edgar Hoover always operated, which is everybody gives something to the FBI and they get nothing back. We'd like to propose to see if they're really willing to cooperate, that you be given unrestricted access to their files, that is no blanking out pages, you get the raw files." Well, that's of course, too good to turn down; so I agreed to that, and then I spent a good part of the next year in the J. Edgar Hoover building reading the raw files of all the inmates who had been Alcatraz to see whether we could find things in their criminal careers that might help us to understand their prison careers. They zeroxed thousands, and thousands, and thousands of pages. I mean, Clarke, when I realize what I have upstairs and I read in the local newspapers about this poor guy who's trying to do a history of gangs, and so forth, over in St. Paul and he's having trouble getting

access to the files of [Alvin] Karpis and the others who did the [William A.] Hamm and [Edward G.] Bremer kidnappings . . . I've got all that stuff that's raw sitting upstairs. I know who all the informants were. I know all the cops that were corrupt. I know the times that the FBI followed the police chief of St. Paul on trips because they were monitoring . . .

CAC: Why doesn't this fellow come over and use this material?

DW: He doesn't know I've got it and, of course, I couldn't let him have it because it's raw.

CAC: Okay.

DW: The point here—and this has gotten way too long—the Bureau of Prisons located inmates that were serving time in state, as well as federal penitentiaries, around the country. They told the staff—who had been forbidden ever to talk to anybody in the free world about Alcatraz—to cooperate fully with me and the Bureau of Prisons paid these guys fifty bucks an interview if they would talk with me. I had a letter from Mr. Bennett, their boss, saying, "Talk to this guy." I have had everything going for me. We knew the findings pretty much in 1983. I had been going to Marion [Illinois] which was Alcatrazes successor to interview Alcatraz inmates who were in the new Alcatraz. Then in October of 1983 after a lot of violence that had been occurring at Marion—major prison gangs were doing a lot of attacking of inmates and staff—on October 22, in the control unit, which is the most secure unit in the most secure federal penitentiary in the country, two officers were murdered in separate incidents on the same day. The next day—they still hadn't closed the place down—the twenty-fifth inmate was murdered and a group of officers was attacked by a group of inmates. At that point, Norman Carlson, the same guy who is here now, said, "We're going to lock the place down and it's going to be indefinite." From that day to this, Marion has been in this lock down regime, which means there is no congregate activity and the prison inmates are in their cells twenty-three hours a day. They come out for one hour for court mandated exercise but only after they've got handcuffs and leg irons on. They're escorted by three officers with clubs to a solitary recreation cage. Anything that they want, food, correspondence courses, communion, comes through the bars of the cell. There's no use of the dining hall. The factory was closed up and sent to other prisons and so forth.

When the government took this step, which they saw as the only way that they could control this violence in the prison, of course the civil libertarians went crazy, and all the same complaints that had been made about Alcatraz came up about the new Alcatraz. At that point, there were many calls for a congressional investigation and the subcommittee on Administration of Justice and Civil Liberties of the house judiciary committee, which has oversight on the federal prison system, decided to have an investigation of Marion; and when they looked around for people around the country who were outside the federal system, that knew something about high security prisons, there weren't too many of us. So, I ended up becoming a consultant to the judicial committee and went back to Marion. I already was in tight with the Bureau of Prisons, and knew many of the staff and inmates at Marion, knew the place was out of control. Now, I come

in with a federal mandate behind me, and of course, everybody's anxious to talk to me because they feel they're talking to Congress.

The result of all of this was that I became immersed in Marion and the opportunity to replicate the Alcatraz Study on the new Alcatraz was just too good to pass by. So, since that time, I've been interviewing the Marion inmates, the Marion staff, and doing a follow-up of what happened to the Marion inmates after they have left Marion, and are now coming out on the street, where incidentally, they also have the same 50 percent success/failure rate as did their predecessors, having come from a place that the American Civil Liberties Union Prison Project describes as cruel and unusual psychological punishment.

CAC: Persons in your field are not surprised by these findings?

DW: I think they will be stunned.

CAC: Okay.

DW: And angry. This goes against the conventional wisdom and it goes against the notions of many mental health people who have never been in these places, Clarke. They've never talked to the inmates. They come, and they visit, and they're horrified by what they see.

CAC: Sure.

DW: They assume the inmates are like them. The inmates are not at all like them. The visitors probably would have mental health problems if they had to live in that kind of violent, dangerous environment. So, they conclude that there must be negative mental health consequences. I think that the findings . . . I've had a hard time keeping them under wraps because the Bureau of Prisons has felt when I gave a presentation. . .

CAC: As a scholar, you have to give presentations.

DW: Yes, I gave a presentation to a Department of Justice conference and when I was finished somebody came up and said, "We want to call the *Washington Post* and have them send a reporter over here right away. I said, "Well, I'm not going to talk to any reporter from the *Washington Post* because I'm going to put out this report and I'm going to have at least my shot at characterizing the findings as applying to this less than 1 percent of the federal prison population." This is not your typical state prison inmate or even your typical federal prison inmate. For example, at Marion now, there are 400 inmates. There are 93,000 federal prisoners and you got 400 of them in this institution. Like their predecessors, they have been screened up through lots of penitentiaries and the best thing that Alcatraz and Marion have going for them is that by the time you've accumulated the kind of record that earns you a transfer to a last resort penitentiary, you're in your mid-thirties. By the time you get out of these places, you're in your later thirties or early forties; and these guys absolutely reflect the powerful impact of the aging

process. They are put into a kind of monastic setting where there isn't a lot of distraction. You have no contact visits. You have no ball games. There's plenty of time to think.

CAC: No T.V.

DW: At Marion, they have small black and white TVs but they have nothing else. There is as I say no congregate activities. There's plenty of time to sit and think; and because these guys are at the right age, they're going through what we've all gone through which is that point in your life where you start saying things like, "Do I want to continue carrying out instructions from this other guy who told me that I should go and kill this inmate? I went and killed the inmate and now I've got another life sentence and this guy never got anything. He never even got nailed for this. Why would I do these dumb things?" Then they turn to me in our interviews and they say, "Listen, you've been asking me a lot of questions. I want to ask you. What do you think it is about me that I would do the kinds of things that I have done, that I would end up spending the rest of my life surrounded by this bunch of ass holes?" The hardest thing is doing time with the other inmates. Marion, like its predecessor, gets inmates at the right time in their lives and puts them in an environment where there's time for a lot of solitary reflection. This is very much the concept of the original penitentiary in this country.

CAC: You bet. Back in [unclear]

DW: They start doing cost benefit calculations. The Alcatraz inmates, for example, would sit in their cells and they would add up all the take they got in the bank robberies they did. They'd divide it by the number of years of time they had served and the rate turns out to be lousy.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: Meanwhile, mom died last year, and of course you were not able to get out there, and your son has been raised by another father, and your wife left you long ago, and life has passed you by. You haven't even seen an automobile. You haven't driven one for years. You don't know what it's like to be in a jet plane. Life is passing you by and you're surrounded by this inmates who were first a pain in the ass, and in these prisons, they also want to kill you . . . because it's blacks against whites and Hispanics against blacks. The body count in the penitentiary shows that it is a violent place. Just to mention one thing about the report that we did for the house judiciary committee . . . It concluded that the lock down should not be ended. The question is, How can I then go back into the penitentiary to face the inmates having recommended that the lock down, that they don't like in all of their public statements, that it not be ended? The reason is that in my private conversations with them, they almost all said, "Listen, publicly I'm going to say that they're treating us like animals . . . "

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

DW: . . . the reason was, they felt it was safe, so that privately . . .

CAC: Right, right.

DW: And it has been safe. The problem with all of this now is that, again, outsiders put themselves in the place of the inmates; and they naturally think it's terrible, and Draconian, and cruel, and unusual.

CAC: It doesn't sound very appealing, that's true. Your story, which is very engaging, compels me to two questions. One is, I think I hear you saying, that it is the increase in racial tension that has increased the level of violence within prisons?

DW: It ended the so-called inmate community.

CAC: And are there other factors operating there?

DW: Yes. Yes. The drug trade.

CAC: Okay. How able are convicts to get access to drugs once they're behind bars?

DW: Oh, they're quite able to do it because the stakes are pretty high now. For example, if you think there's a vulnerable staff member—you want to bring something in—to be a so-called mule, in the old days you might say, "Well, let's give him a \$1,000 and see if he'll do it." Now, you come to this staff member and you say, "If you do this, we'll give you a \$100,000," because the drug money is so enormous.

CAC: This is money from the outside contacts?

DW: From the outside but, of course, as you continue to lock up the major drug dealers in prison, you get people who have the resources to influence people. They had the case in New York of the guy who had a bond of a million dollars and he walked because in the drug trade that's walk around money. So the problem of influencing and corrupting staff because the money is so great is a problem; but it has stopped at Marion since the lock down because there is no longer any contact visiting, so visitors can't bring anything in, and because once the inmates started attacking and killing the staff, then you would have to be an unusual and very engaged in real risky behavior to be bringing in something to inmates that your fellow employees think should be killed.

CAC: My second question is—to get back to the university—how these stories, these perceptions, this kind of research then gets back into the classroom, undergraduate, graduate?

DW: I, of course, do a lot of storytelling in class, and I use tapes, and I have always taken the students down to the prisons here. For the last ten years, when I take them to Oak Park Heights—which is Minnesota’s high security prison which has always housed Marion inmates who have been transferred up here . . . thirty at a time . . . I am the only visitor for many of these guys—I always have a panel of federal prison inmates who meet with the students, and of course, the students are fascinated by them because these are very strong personalities. They’re people who have experience in lots of prisons, not only Marion but other prisons, so they have a perspective on Minnesota. They tell the students that when they got sent to a Minnesota prison, they felt like they’d been released to the free world. The amenities, the freedom is so great in Minnesota that, as I say, their view is it’s like being released to the free world. The Marion inmates who have come up here have given fits to the Department of Corrections staff because they have been principally involved in the six female employees who have been fired from the Department of Corrections for falling in love with inmates . . . just as these Marion inmates all have women lawyers who were in love with them. I don’t find that surprising that women are attracted to these strong charismatic personalities. These are the gang leaders, the prison bosses, the strongest of the strong. They are leaders of men, as well. They and I have sort of gotten old together, grown together. The ones who have come out on the street—the only ones that I give my home telephone number to—are people who have the same rather conservative views on criminal policy that I have, which is that treatment is a bunch a nonsense, and that it’s irresponsible and immoral for the Minnesota Department of Corrections to be releasing sex offenders early from their sentences because they’ve been through sex offender treatment that does not work, putting at risk the mental health and safety of women and children in this state, all in the name of mental health because of the Minnesota good, the Minnesota land of ten thousand therapies business that infects the state here.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: These federal inmates are not in prison for molesting children and raping women. They’re in for bank robbery, organized crime, drug dealing, major crime; and they think that sex offenders and rapists should be castrated or killed, and they’d do it if the Minnesota authorities allowed them to go out in yard and beat of sex offenders . . . which is what they would like to do.

CAC: And your students hear this [unclear]?

DW: The students understand that you can be—I’m not sure what the word is, maybe —impressed by what these men have to say because their crimes are not the kinds of crimes that produce such fear and loathing on the part of most people.

CAC: You’ve not done research on those other prison populations?

DW: No, because they are not in the federal system.

CAC: Okay. But earlier, I caught a tone—and correct me if my reading is not right—that you really were unhappy with the quality of students the last ten, fifteen years, for example? These must be students who are in your class as undergraduates and graduates? Did I misread what you said?

DW: Again, because of my convict mentality, or my warden's mentality . . . In fact, the department last spring in an award's ceremony gave me a plaque that says, "Warden of Sociology." My views about running the department are sort of like running a penitentiary; and I understand that in an inmate population, you have 5 percent of the people who give you a lot of trouble, occupy most of your time, and my view of the students is the same. I am also like a prison staff member in that when I look back on thirty years of teaching at the University of Minnesota, overall, I don't think I've had much impact; but I do have a dozen or so students who I'm still very friendly with and of whom I'm very proud . . . all of my prosecutors who are out there locking up bad guys, and so forth. So, like a probation officer who's had a big case load, you haven't had an impact on many but you might have helped one or two, you tend to focus on the one or two.

CAC: But has there been a change in the receptivity and the initiating capacity, the imagination of the undergraduate or graduate students in your experience?

DW: I wouldn't really know, Clarke . . .

CAC: Okay.

DW: . . . because I've been teaching classes of 150 to 250 students now for thirty years.

CAC: That's 3-level, 5-level courses?

DW: Well, the criminology and criminal justice courses are 3-level and then I teach other courses at the 5,000-level. I've never had any class below forty-five.

CAC: And the graduate seminars?

DW: The graduate seminars, we rarely offer because the requirements in the Sociology Department are so much from mainline Sociology that the areas of speciality that we've had here, including family—when Reuben Hill was here—very often are filled by students from other departments and not from Sociology. That says something about the tension between mainline Sociology and the so-called applied fields.

CAC: Yes. But you're kind of coming out like George Vold.

DW: Yes, except that I've had a chance, because of that treatment study in California . . . That is cited in the literature everywhere as one of the things . . .

CAC: [unclear] professional reward?

DW: Right. It really was the nail in the coffin of the medical model, the idea that people should be sent to prison for indefinite periods of time because social workers and psychologists could treat them and release them when they thought they were cured. That really ended . . .

CAC: That comes in waves, does it not?

DW: What comes in waves?

CAC: I mean, the expression of that point of view, by persons in effective policy positions, come and go, the moment it is not . . .

DW: The movement for the medical model started back in the 1860s or 1870s.

CAC: Sure, but you think it's wrong?

DW: It culminated in the California version and in Minnesota.

CAC: In the 1960s?

DW: In the 1960s, and it is in California—and elsewhere—stone-cold dead. It's dead as a door nail in the federal system. Only here in Minnesota, because the social work field here has so infiltrated ranks of the field that likes to call itself corrections, that it still is a residue here but it's changing. It's changing because the evidence that psychologically based treatments programs can modify criminal behavior isn't there. When the National Science Foundation puts out two reports saying, "We can't do it. What we should be doing is small scale experimental programs that are rigorously evaluated. Then if we find something that works, we'll expand it." Here, it isn't a question in Minnesota, as I wrote in an article not too long ago, of what works; it's a question of who works. Because if we accept of all this evidence, we'd fire all the social workers and psychologists that are causing us to drive up the cost of imprisonment. It costs \$36,000 a year to house an inmate at Oak Park Heights—that isn't the custodial staff. That's all your so-called professional staff. I think that the political climate now is coming around to hard-nosed evaluation and I have lived to see the Minnesota Legislature say that they want to have a rigorous evaluation of the effectiveness of sex offender treatment programs; and wonder of wonders, I am on the task force that is now establishing the research design to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs.

CAC: But you've been on task forces ever since you've been here?

DW: Yes.

CAC: And what you're saying is that your influence has been slight until recently?

DW: Right, except for having been involved in this study that really had a major impact on ending the naive, well intentioned but naive, notion that we could get in there, and cure everybody's psychological problems, and make them go forth and sin no more.

CAC: You're saying that that study had a larger impact nationally than it did regionally?

DW: Yes, oh, that's right.

CAC: Okay. What kind of impact do you have on your students?

DW: The impact is that I never have any social work students in my classes. The last time that I was on a social work student exam, I voted to fail a student because she was going to work in probation. She had never met an offender. She had never taken a course in psychology, law, or sociology, criminology. I said, "I think you're a nice person and I'm sure you're well intended but it's not fair to your clients to have somebody coming out who has been trained in the ideological mode that they do over in the Ag campus."

CAC: In Family Social Studies?

DW: The rest of us, Clarke, we are so incestuous. I co-teach a course called Killing with Carl Malmquist because you've got to have a psychiatrist to understand killing. He does the intensive analysis, and I do the more epidemiological stuff, and it works out well.

CAC: And who are your students in that class?

DW: They're mostly sociology and psychology students.

CAC: What kind of careers are they headed for?

DW: There are 600 majors in Sociology and 300 of them are in this track of Sociology of Law and Criminology. They are in that track because there are jobs at the end of that. There are jobs in law enforcement and there jobs in the field of corrections. Many students who are going to Law School . . . That's been one of my disappointments is that some of the best and brightest of the undergraduates, who I would have liked to have seen go to Graduate School in Sociology—not necessarily here but at Berkeley or other places—really have been more attracted by the law. I think that the students that we have now are very much oriented toward careers—and why wouldn't they be?—in this prison building boom where the only area of expansion in the social services area is the . . .

CAC: The students are quick to pick up these things?

DW: Right. The thing that is profoundly different now is the attitudes of the students. If I took you into the Criminology class of 250 students and we talked about the death penalty, you would

find that—this is the people that are taking this as an introductory course—a majority of the students would say that not only do they want the death penalty back in Minnesota, they want death by slow torture; and they want it for a lot more offenses than for killing people. They want it for child molesters and rapists.

CAC: They come in before they've heard you?

DW: Yes. I always talk to them in the beginning to see what their ideas are on some of these things about criminal policy. They are tremendously conservative. The women, particularly, are resentful of the fact that we have to have an escort service here, that we have to have these things with blue lights. They say that shows the rapists are free to move around with the prisoners. When I take them down to the prisons and they see Oak Park Heights and Shakopee, the women's prison, they are in a state of shock because these places are so superior to any dormitory or fraternity living here at the University of Minnesota. To understand that at Shakopee it costs the citizens \$42,000 a year to keep a woman in prison there . . . You could send someone to a real nice school for \$42,000 a year, give them a trip to Europe in the summertime. So, the students, I think, see the impact of this Minnesota notion that we should be in there with our touchy feely approach. No wonder the inmates at the women's prison don't want to leave! It's the ultimate comment on the prison system here. They don't want to leave because they've never had such good living conditions and because now their lover is in the same place. I would say that my students, as you can imagine, do not escape without getting my views in this course, and so knowing that, I tell them in the beginning of the class that you're going to hear a lot about treatment doesn't work and there is some real question about whether there's any punitive element to imprisonment left in prison anymore and why we do things in Minnesota bass-ackwards; that is, we take the worst offenders, the most dangerous, violent offenders and we put them in Oak Park Heights which is the absolute best prison in Minnesota. If you want to do lousy time, it's at the St. Cloud Reformatory in Stillwater. Instead of earning your way to a good prison, we start you right out in a place where you've got a single room, and female staff, and cable TV, and you bring in food from the outside every Friday so you can have barbecues, and make \$400 a month working on the food that's presented by an outside vendor, and so forth. I tell them, "If you talk to anybody in the school of social work, they'll say, 'Well, I wonder why is Ward so hostile?'" They always attribute it to personality and not to the substance. I say, "If you know anyone . . . if you have a parent or a relative who works in the field of corrections who feels that they have got a program that works, I am inviting you to have that person come in here, and listen! I am not going to criticize the person. We'll come up to the front of the room, take the class, and you tell us we're real interested in hearing what you have to say about it. As far as articles or research, anything you can find about a treatment program that works anywhere, you come in here . . . I will sit down . . . you stand up, and read it, and tell the rest of the class about it." [laughter] This doesn't keep some students from being very disappointed in my lack of objectivity. I feel I do go where the data takes me.

CAC: Oh, that's the chief scholarly [unclear].

DW: [laughter]

CAC: Let's back up to Criminal Justice Studies which was created in the late 1960s and disappears in the mid 1970s—whoever is seriously interested can find the dates in the records. You were present at the birth and were the first director?

DW: That came about because the legislature, without any request from the university, decided to establish essentially a police academy at the University of Minnesota. The good legislators had bought into the whole notion that we ought to have cops who are educated and professional and that we'd have less thumping on the streets if we had college educated cops. The legislature, as I say, in a session—in which the university never even knew about it, didn't ask for it, didn't know about it—told [the university], "You're going to have a police academy." Well, you can imagine, in the late 1960s, the response over here to having a police academy. You know, we would teach things like pursuit driving, and so forth. A committee of faculty was hastily gathered and it included people like Hal Chase and Meehl and even Adamson Hoebel, all of us who had some interest in crime and the law. The idea was, What can we do to take the legislature's money but to have something that is academically respectable and that is consistent with the mission of the College of Liberal Arts? What came out of this was this multidisciplinary program concept . . .

CAC: Which it had to be?

DW: Right. Right away, we were immediately into the question of saying, "If we hired anybody, we can't have somebody in this department that isn't completely accepted by his or her own discipline; so, we won't hire any sociologist that isn't accepted by the Sociology Department," the same for Psych, and the Law School, and so forth. We also said, "This will be essentially a program, so we won't have a major; and we'll all get together and we'll co-teach courses." We did all kinds of collaborative teaching. I co-taught a course with Joe Livermore, who was then in the Law School.

CAC: Yes.

DW: A visiting professor of philosophy, one of the guys who had been a fellow at Harvard when I was there, Adrian Siegler, and Don Dwyer who had just finished as police chief of Minneapolis . . . the four of us stood up there and did the class. It was great. It was great.

CAC: What kind of students were attracted to that? Were they people on their way to being [unclear]?

DW: No, they were people who were interested in the area. You may not recall this, Clarke, but when we had the student protests and the strikes here on campus, the class that they voted to keep open was the class on Criminal Law, which we were teaching then at the undergraduate

level, which they were using as a kind of survival course, like Can the cops do this to us? If we're on the bridge over here and they're thumping us, can they do this and that?

CAC: I see.

DW: There was this kind of schizophrenia about criminal justice, like Are you guys training cops that are going to come and thump the war protestors . . .

CAC: Beat us.

DW: . . . and beat up on blacks in the cities, and so forth?

CAC: Sure.

DW: On the other hand, we need to know what the legal tools are that we can use to counter the cops. We had this program going, and as you know, it got raided by the SDS.

CAC: Well, I know it but we're talking to posterity. Say something more about that.

DW: It got raided by the SDS . . .

CAC: That's Students for a Democratic Society.

DW: Right. They came rushing across the Washington Avenue bridge one day and broke into the department.

CAC: You were on the main floor of Social Science?

DW: Right. It was on the first floor of Social Science so it was very vulnerable. They came in and had baseball bats, and they were hitting the furniture, and so forth . . .

CAC: Because they saw this program as repressing?

DW: Well, they came in to gather evidence that we were maintaining surveillance on subversive students and faculty. They very much frightened a secretary.

CAC: Were they after the files?

DW: They were after the files . . . the evidence. While this trashing was going on, it happened that an African-American police officer, who happened to be a Criminal Justice Studies student, was by the office . . .

CAC: In uniform?

DW: He was in uniform.

CAC: Okay.

DW: He was a university police officer. This group was out of control. There was a certain amount of pushing and shoving and what happened was that, apparently, someone on the third floor where Afro-American Studies was . . . the word got up there that a black male was being pushed around by these white radicals. A number of people, including a number of African-American women came piling down the stairs to make sure white students didn't beat up any black guys. It had all kinds of things going for it.

CAC: [laughter] But you weren't present?

DW: I wasn't there.

CAC: This poor secretary was.

DW: The poor secretary was. She was terribly frightened by all of this.

CAC: I should think so.

DW: Then that evening, they had a victory celebration over in Coffman Union to show . . .

CAC: But they got no files?

DW: Yes, they did get some things.

CAC: Okay.

DW: They got a list of names which they held up as a list of names of students who were under surveillance. What they got was the list of students who had signed up to take the bus trip down to Stillwater Prison but a list is a list. They got copies of the Congressional Record which they said, "This shows the kind of stuff that they're doing over there." They got nothing else.

CAC: There wasn't anything else to get?

DW: There wasn't anything else to get. It showed to me a certain kind of integrity for the SDS because they could have held up anything. They could have said, "Here's a list of all the professors that are under surveillance." They could have said, "We've got a document right here. You can't see it but we've got a document right here showing that they are doing X, Y, and Z." They actually only talked about the things that they got. They never made anything up. It's sort of surprising integrity on my part. It provoked a very negative reaction on the campus and from radicals like Marv Davidoff who said, "This is silly and misdirected. This is absolutely

ridiculous because if you want to do something serious, let's go out and work on Honeywell where they're producing weapons . . . "

CAC: Sure.

DW: . . . instead of this dumb academic program." A person, Clarke, who went to that rally and tried to invoke his credentials as a Socialist and that he felt that this was appalling but who was hooted down by the SDS, was Ed Coen in the Economics Department. You know Ed came over there with his credentials about Listen, I used to be out there protesting and so forth. This is silly. What are you doing here.

CAC: Right, right.

DW: This is not a police surveillance program. These are some of the best known professors in the university because Hoebel, Meehl, Livermore all these people were the faculty of this program. One thing they did get was . . . I was doing a small project up at the training school for girls and the staff had collected hundreds and hundreds of love notes and love letters between the inmates.

CAC: Oh, oh.

DW: They had sent them all down in a carton. We had a female student who was working on a project about the girls in the institution. She was reading all of these things to try to get some sense of the stress in relationships, and so forth. They got those materials and they were dumped out along the river here. I was interviewed by the press and that I was angry about. I said, "These students have violated the privacy of these inmates." If you want to have any integrity, feel that people can talk to people who do research at the university, you cannot be taking their most personal business and dumping it out on the streets. That was the one thing that annoyed me. In a way, it solidified faculty support for Criminal Justice Studies because, I think, faculty felt they had to stand up for the trashing of an academic department. There was obviously nothing going on that had to do with surveillance.

CAC: And the students in your courses?

DW: The students in the courses, for the most part, thought the SDS were a bunch of crazy radicals but they mostly sat on their hands on this. There was too much volatility on campus for them to mount a counter protest. Law enforcement was not held in such high regard in those days. People did not want to be cops.

CAC: Yes.

DW: Prisons were not expanding. They were contracting in size and number. It wasn't a place to go. It's a very different group of students with a very different outlook than they've had in the last decade, and particularly, the last few years.

CAC: This was in late spring, as I recall?

DW: I think so, yes.

CAC: So the summer calmed it down and the program went on in the fall again?

DW: Yes, it did.

CAC: But it fades, and why does it fade, and then collapse?

DW: It fades for a very clear reason; and that is, that we got a petition signed by, I think, 386 students, something like that, demanding that there be a major in Criminal Justice Studies. They sent it to the dean saying, "The faculty of Criminal Justice Studies is refusing to have a major." It's only this program.

CAC: Oh, I see.

DW: "We want a major in Criminal Justice Studies." Well, here I am the double agent. I'm a professor in the Sociology Department and I knew that at a number of other universities where they had gone for a separate Criminal Justice Studies Program . . .

CAC: With a major?

DW: . . . with a major in it, that it drew all those students away, particularly, from Sociology but other Social Science Departments; and the image of criminal justice—we had a graduate program, a master's program—at the graduate level and the undergraduate level was never clear. If somebody told you they were a Criminal Justice Studies student, you'd say "What are you? Are you a sociologist. Are you a lawyer? Are you a political scientist? What are you?" When we did a survey of state agencies, which we did do, asking whether it made a difference that somebody had a major in Criminal Justice Studies versus a Social Science major, they said, "No." They said, first, "Is it a minority person? We're looking for a minority person. We don't care whether he majored in French." And secondly, the notion that you had to have a college education to be a cop went down the tubes because that meant that you didn't get minority candidates if you added this college requirement. We felt that . . .

CAC: It should just stay a program?

DW: . . . it should stay a program but it was under attack all the time by the students for not being a full-fledged major.

CAC: Sorauf had to manage that as dean? I mean, he was dean at that time?

DW: I guess he was. I guess Frank was the dean at that time. What we decided to do was to merge it with the Sociology Department.

CAC: Oh.

DW: So that's why Carl Malmquist, a psychiatrist, is a professor of Sociology. That's why Joel Samaha has all these many years been historian lawyer, has been teaching half time for us. It's why Linda Heath, who subsequently left, who was in the Department of Psychology ended up in the Psych Department full time, and why Candace Kruttschnitt, who was a Sociologist ended up full time in Sociology—all of these were half time appointments—why Barry Feld who came here with a Ph.D. in Sociology from Harvard and a law degree from Minnesota ended up then becoming full time in the Law School here instead of half time in CJS. June Tapp who was in the Institute of Child Development went full time into the Institute of Child Development and I just returned full time to the Sociology Department. All of the faculty in the program were people who had home departments to begin with.

CAC: There was still a way to be a sociology major . . .

DW: What we did was, we created this track in Sociology. There's General Sociology and the Sociology of Law and Criminology.

CAC: How popular a track is this special one, Law and Criminology?

DW: Well, 300 of the 600 sociology undergraduate majors are in it.

CAC: But they take courses from people in these other departments under a Sociology rubric?

DW: They now take them from Carl Malmquist who teaches courses in Criminal Psychopathology and Mental Health but they are listed as Sociology courses.

CAC: Okay. Just a rubric of Sociology?

DW: Right, but it is a multi-disciplinary program. It's unusual to have a Sociology course called Criminal Law, which Joel Samaha teaches, and Criminal Procedure, which Joel Samaha teaches. It's just the residue of that Criminal Justice Program and I, think to be honest with you, that when we retire, and Joel and Carl Malmquist retire, those positions will vanish.

CAC: And 300 students will be left stranded?

DW: The Sociology Department will have to decide whether it can stand that kind of decrease in the number of its majors and go back to its more pristine core mission of training sociologists for whom there are not going to be any jobs, particularly at the graduate level.

CAC: Occasionally, you dropped the name, and he is a towering figure in the history of the last thirty, forty years, and that's Paul Meehl. You knew him through this program?

DW: Yes.

CAC: Say more about Paul and his influence on you or his influence on the college and the university.

DW: [sigh] Renaissance man. He's one of the brightest people I've ever known at all the universities I've attended over the last thirty-five years . . . just a towering intellect but a person with an unusual personality. I feel if he reads my stuff—which I will be asking him to do shortly on the Alcatraz book—and gives it his imprimatur, I'm ready to take on anybody else on the outside because I have such tremendous respect for his breadth, not just in social science, but in the philosophy of science. You know, this is a guy who's good at everything. I know very few people who are anywhere near as broad gauge as Paul Meehl and he's good in everything. Whether it's philosophy or statistics, this guy is on the cutting edge.

CAC: He's generous with his time with colleagues who are up to it?

DW: He certainly has been generous with me and, I think, one of the reasons is that he really likes this stuff about strong criminals who get business taken care of. As I say, I recall that when Paul was for a short period the chair of the Psychology Department, described by many of the people there as a reign of terror, it was what happens when you put a strong person in charge of a department where people feel that they want to have democracy. Everybody wants to chew on every single issue and consequently, very little gets done. Meehl has talked to me about the behavior of these special convicts that I work with as sort of like alpha chimps . . . you know, the people that are the strong and controlling people in that world.

CAC: Sure.

DW: I think this whole line of research is personally appealing to Paul as well as . . .

CAC: His own lines of research are all over the . . .

DW: That's right, they certainly are. So, I've missed him since he's retired and isn't around as much as he used to be. On the other hand, I think, he's now got the time to read my stuff. I'll put it this way, Clarke, if he criticized it, I'd have a hard time going forth with it without going back and really making some big changes. He's a wonderful colleague, a wonderful colleague.

CAC: [unclear] appointments in Health Sciences and [unclear].

DW: He's professor of everything. I'm glad to have had a chance to know him. He's one of the handful of people in universities that I think is as interesting and as strong as the best convict bosses that I've met.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: He would like them and they would like him.

CAC: You've done college and university business, some of it—I gather from the tone of your remarks—not particularly high on your list of things that have engaged your attention affirmatively?

DW: Well, I think it is no accident that when I became chair of the Sociology Department—the first time I was chair—that it was because the department was racked by democracy, and everybody met all the time, and hated everybody else, and the issues that they argued about were trivial and silly, and that we had a totally incompetent office staff that need to be fired.

CAC: That's not easy either in a university.

DW: No, but having learned a thing or two from the convicts—and we had four elderly women who were staffing the office and intimidating the students and were so abrasive and unpleasant that many of our staff were doing their own work at home rather than bringing it into the office—what you've got to look for is someone who will talk, someone who as the convicts say will roll over and tell you things that will allow you to nail the others. When I came in, I approached one of those women, the meanest of the lot, but not the most corrupt of the lot, and said that the department was going to be run in a very, very different way. She understood what I meant. She knew me. She, as we say, rolled over; and she provided information that had to do with really felonious conduct on the part of several of these women stealing stamp money, plus doing things like requiring the junior secretaries to go out and start the engines and warm up their cars during the winter, sending them out on trips to the stores, bringing in their shoes for the secretaries to shine their shoes during office hours, putting people on the payroll for hours they didn't work and then kicking back part of the money. This is just my kind of issue, Clarke. I was the right person at the right time. We hired another part-time secretary, a young woman who I assigned simply to watch and monitor the behavior of all the others in the office. Finally, after a certain period of time, when we felt we had enough information, I called the university police, and said that we have a secretary and two cohorts over here are engaging in criminal conduct, and I'd like to discuss it with you. The next day, a police officer appeared in the office, and demanded the keys from those women, and they were fired. Now, of course, this is the U of M, so they really weren't fired. They said this was all a big misunderstanding and that this really sounded like an effort by this white male to get rid of older female faculty members but

I had this older female faculty member on my side so they couldn't get the mileage out of that argument they might have. One of them is now a secretary in the department in the Medical School, so god help them. In any case, they were all removed and we hired an excellent staff of whom Gwen Gmeinder is one that you know.

CAC: And the internal governance of the department?

DW: Went to what some would probably describe as a ruling junta. The faculty were called together to vote on the main issues like hiring, tenure and promotion but they were not asked to meet for any other purpose.

CAC: Curriculum planning?

DW: Anything where the faculty have reason to be there, changing the graduate program, the inevitable changing of the graduate program, hiring, tenure and promotion, but not the running of ordinary business. It turned out to be, I think, satisfactory so that I was reelected for another term, of which I stayed one year. It was for another three-year term. I stayed one year and I wrote a letter then to the dean saying that I would have stayed longer if the dean would allow me to have one solitary confinement cell and the authority to put a faculty member into it. The dean wrote back to me saying that he couldn't do that because if I got one, all the other chairs would want one.

CAC: [laughter]

DW: Then we went to some other people who were chairs, and then a few years ago that hadn't worked out too well; so I was asked to come back again. I think the faculty felt that it was better to go with the devil they knew than the problems with the devils they didn't know. So I came back for another three-year term. This is the third and last year of it.

CAC: You've had various—I see from your CV . . . Executive Committee of CLA, Council of Chairs . . . three years, and so forth, but you've kind of put first and foremost the Senate Judicial Committee . . . three years a member and four years as a chair. I assume that you would prefer to talk about that as far as posterity is concerned? This has been an important . . .

DW: Yes. It's important. It has nothing to do with me. It's just having been chair at a particular time when . . .

CAC: And what years were those?

DW: I've been chair for the last four years.

CAC: And you were a member when? It's not a broken membership?

DW: It is broken, yes.

CAC: Oh.

DW: I was for three years in the mid 1980s, and then not on it for a few years, and then something happened with the person who was chair. He was deposed by the members of the committee and I was asked to come in and chair it. I think this applies to the members . . . Have you ever been on the Judicial Committee?

CAC: No.

DW: I think it applies to the members of the Judicial Committee. I think this is the best and most meaningful committee in the University of Minnesota for several reasons. One of them, and particularly now, the stakes are very high. It's not only some person's job. It's very often their reputation, their entire career, are the issues to be addressed in evidentiary hearings.

CAC: But it's also the values and standards of the university?

DW: That's right. We get them only because complainants come to us.

CAC: I understand.

DW: And secondly, this is the only committee at the university that actually makes a decision, Clarke. I mean, at the end of the case, we say, "Yea" or "Nay," and then we finish, and go on to the next one. To be involved where there is closure . . .

CAC: But it's monitored, and read by the vice-president's office, and the president . . . on matters of tenure?

DW: Right.

CAC: So in that sense, it's not resolved finally or ultimately at that level?

DW: It pretty much is.

CAC: As a matter of fact . . . but I mean but defacto and not de jure?

DW: Right. It is our findings and recommendations, our advisory to the president, but the president in the last four years has only disagreed with one finding; and I supported him in his disagreement. I differed from the panel's finding and conclusions.

CAC: And pass that along as part of the [unclear]?

DW: Our agreement with the president is that if he disagrees with our findings, he comes back and meets with the entire Judicial Committee, and we have it out. These are long and sometimes passionate debates about how he could have come to this. It's only happened once in four years and a number of members of the committee, including me, supported the president's view of not going along with the panel. The panel somehow got way beyond the scope of authority of the Judicial Committee. It was calling for a full scale investigation, putting the president on probation, and all kinds of things for failing to deal with issues of gender in a particular department. I think it's a meaningful . . .

CAC: Listeners to this should know that the Judicial Committee is too large to sit as a committee of the whole for all hearings and it breaks into panels?

DW: It breaks into panels.

CAC: Yes.

DW: The whole committee sees the original complaints and responses from the administrative side. If it's a termination for cause, five members and an alternate conduct the evidentiary proceedings . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

CAC: Is there a difference over ten years in the range of issues?

DW: There's been a profound change; and that is, that when I was on in the early to mid 1980s, the cases all had to do, every case had to do with denial of tenure and promotion. The issues had to do with whether X had enough articles or publications or their teaching was poor or not. The cases for the last five years have increasingly been termination for cause . . . faculty members who have been found guilty of criminal conduct, of massive civil fraud, of engaging in behavior that some would say is so unprofessional, why would we even hear such a case?

CAC: These persons are represented by counsel, usually?

DW: They're all represented by counsel.

CAC: That would not have been true earlier?

DW: That was not true earlier.

CAC: Occasionally but not routinely?

DW: No. I would say since the . . . What's the famous case?

CAC: Rajender.

DW: Rajender case. Any person who had race or gender as an issue, often has decided to get legal counsel and make a real issue because the university, generally, caves in on almost everything. I mean, the university is like the city of Minneapolis. If you raise a legal issue, their first response is, How much is it going to take to settle? So, it's very much to the advantage of a complainant to get an attorney. It scares the shit out of everybody over here. It get's you deals right away. It's like an offender getting a lawyer. You can cut yourself a much better deal if you're represented by legal counsel.

CAC: Do you have any sense, being on the committee, of the increased cost of litigation, generally, for the university?

DW: Well, I don't know what the cost is but it certainly is in the millions of dollars. I know that when we had this fund for strategic investment in which all the colleges were taxed to give money so that Central [Administration] could give out money for strategic investment that the provost, Jim Infante, told me a year ago that he had had to take money from that to hire two more attorneys for the General Counsel's Office.

CAC: When I came here in 1951, there was one attorney and he dealt mostly with real estate.

DW: Well, now it's a massive law firm and the goal of the General Counsel now is to make it a law firm as powerful and influential as the corporate counsel at 3M. That is a model that has given our committee a great deal of trouble. We have resisted it; and this past year when the General Counsel's Office took the position that it could advise us on legal matters that came before us in hearings, we decided that we had to have our own legal counsel.

CAC: Independent of the university?

DW: Independent.

CAC: Okay.

DW: We felt, for reasons that seemed so painfully obvious to us, that if the complainant sees the hearing officer turn to the General Counsel's Office to rule on a matter that's before the committee, that it certainly communicates a bit of bias . . . but the General Counsel's Office was that we don't want any outside attorneys here; and that they would establish the so-called Chinese Wall, which is the person in the law firm who is theoretically completely separate from all of the others on this particular matter. They never discuss with him or her what this issue is. It's a theory in law but we didn't accept it for one minute. A member of our committee, Steve Nichols in the law faculty, who is connected with the attorney general's office went to the

attorney general's office, talked to Jack Tunheim, the deputy attorney general, and said, "Could you help us on this?" Mr. Tunheim, very kindly said, "We will provide, at no cost, two lawyers from our office who represent the state college system in all of the grievances and complaints they have; that is, they are familiar, and trained, and sensitive to problems in academia and the particulars of education law—which is a whole speciality in and of itself. When we announced that we were going to accept the kind offer of the attorney general's for counsel at no cost to the University of Minnesota, this caused an uproar in the General Counsel's Office. The result of this was, Clarke, that last June, the Judicial Committee met and they authorized me to tell President [Nils] Hasselmo that unless we were allowed to have our own counsel, the entire committee was going to resign. That's the first time, and only time, in my career where I've called the president's office on a morning and they've said, "Gee, the president's busy and the vice-provost is in Rochester but we think that they can be here by eleven o'clock." So, a meeting was hastily convened in which Judy Girard, who was representing our interest also as the chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, and was on our side on this issue . . . I told the president, "You'll have no Judicial Committee. All the cases will stop that are in progress because we are not going to accept advice from the General Counsel's Office and we've got free and competent legal counsel at no cost to the university from outside." President Hasselmo rejected that on the grounds that we can't get in bed with the attorney general. It'll compromise the integrity of the university. His proposal, which we accepted on a trial basis, was that the university would provide the funds for us to hire our own attorney. We have done that.

We asked the members of the committee to generate names of lawyers and we got some excellent people. We've hired a terrific person from Felhaber Larson who is our counsel. The bill—which I get from her and turn over to Martha Quanbeck—is for \$13,000 for the first four months of her work. It's a good investment but the university need not have spent a dollar of it. We could have had it for nothing from the attorney general's office if the president hadn't, I think, succumbed to the general counsel's argument that the university couldn't have that cozy relationship with the attorney general. The Judicial Committee now proceeds with lawyers on all matters. We no longer have hearings where we have a little tape recorder to record the proceedings. We have a professional, and extremely expensive, court reporter. I just met with the Faculty Consultative Committee a few days ago about this. I'm having a very difficult time getting faculty on the committee to be hearing officers because they're good people from the Social Sciences, and Biology, and the Medical School; and they've got the university side represented by an attorney and they've got someone who's represented by Dorsey and Whitney, or one of the other major law firms, representing the complainant, firing out legal motions that the faculty, naturally, do not understand.

CAC: We're not really competent?

DW: We're not competent to do it; so, we have a subcommittee now which is looking at changing the entire format for the Judicial Committee in which the lawyers have at it and the faculty sit as judges. I had to invoke gender as a way of getting them to serve as hearing officers. I said, "We cannot have eight cases and have all the hearing officers male. We have

got to have female hearing officers." [sound of pounding fist on table] What we would do is provide our very excellent counsel to the committee to work with these hearing officers and I provide lots of support. We have meetings now with just the hearing officers to talk about how to conduct the proceedings, and what to do if this happens, and what to do if that happens.

CAC: How does this whole process relate to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action . . . if any? Are they ever a party to these?

DW: No.

CAC: Okay.

DW: We did get a complaint in one case this year that the panel should have had, in a particular case, better representation in terms of race and ethnicity. The problem with that is that, we do not appoint ourself. We're appointed by a mysterious committee on committees that for whatever reasons picks names out of a hat, names of people who say they'd like to be on the committee.

CAC: Do you find it is more difficult to get competent persons to serve on the committee because of the things that you're commenting on?

DW: The inexperienced persons don't know what they're getting into. The experienced people are willing to be on panels but they are nervous about the responsibility of conducting these evidentiary hearings.

CAC: They know what a drain of time it is. The expense is not only in legal fees but it's the expense of faculty?

DW: Right. This past year, the committee was subjected to a very, very critical court ruling from the Court of Appeals that, essentially, said, "What the hell are you people doing over there? This is no way to conduct business. We're remanding this case back to the Judicial Committee for another hearing." The problem was not with the panel members. I can tell you, they all called me and said, "I think I should resign because this is so embarrassing for the committee. The court has said we're a bunch of lunkheads over here. We don't know how to conduct business, and so forth." I said, "There is nothing wrong with what you did. We're following rules laid down in the late 1950s and early 1960s and they just are not appropriate for today's legal proceedings."

CAC: I know that you reflect on this a good deal because of your willingness to assume chairmanship of that committee. In a larger context, how do you account for this within the university . . . that litigation and these cases take the turn that they have, as you describe it, the last ten years?

DW: I can say two things about it. As far as this particular university, my speculation would be that the Rajender case gave a very loud and clear message that if you've got a grievance and gender, or race, or ethnicity can be involved, you better get a lawyer and the chances are, it will serve your interests well. It produced a group of lawyers who now are available to the faculty and we see the same names coming up again and again. They're people who have made a reputation for representing university faculty members. Secondly, the cases that have come up, particularly, as you well know, in the Medical School, I think, reflect the problems of a Medical School that has always been out of control from Central Administration, run by lots of tyrants with lots of little fiefdoms where democracy and due process . . . they said this and they never meant us in matters of promotion, and tenure, and salary, and the rest of it . . .

CAC: [unclear] access to laboratory time?

DW: Right . . . complicated by the interface between the private sector and medical technology where professors now are involved in things where some private firm says, "Hey, listen, we could develop and market this process. We'll form a little company. You'll be a major stockholder, blah, blah, blah. There's a lot of money that's involved here." I think the university's rules have not been up-to-date and too much judgment by the entrepreneurs in the Medical School has been allowed without oversight from Central Administration. I would say that this would be a problem that should apply at other universities, other places that have medical schools like ours, but a year ago, my counterpart at the University of Michigan that chaired the Judicial Committee there called me and said that they were having some problems like this and they knew that we were but that her impression was this is not going on at other universities; and she decided to send out a survey—which she did, and it came here, and I filled it out—which went to all the Big Ten universities and about a half a dozen others, asking Judicial Committee chairs to talk about any changes in the kinds of cases. It turned out, Clarke, very disappointingly, that it's Minnesota and Michigan that seem to be having a very disproportionate share of these cases.

CAC: Because of systemic structure?

DW: I don't know. When it isn't across the board, then the argument about it's just the interface between the public university and the private sector here and how you work out relationships for products and processes . . .

CAC: That's going on everywhere?

DW: That's going on everywhere but it doesn't seem to have provoked the allegations of criminal, if not unprofessional, conduct that have emerged here.

CAC: Now, do you get many cases in the Judicial Committee from the Medical School?

DW: That's where most of our termination for cause cases come from . . . the cases that you already know because they're widely reported in the press. We haven't had the [Dr.] Najarian case yet because that's still being investigated by the IRS and the FBI.

CAC: When that happens, does that quiet then the procedure of the Judicial Committee within the university? You cannot proceed as long as it's proceeding in another public ground?

DW: We cannot, of course, proceed until and unless a faculty member gets a letter from the provost saying, "We are terminating your position on the grounds of unprofessional conduct." The university keeps announcing that termination proceedings have begun against Dr. Najarian. Well, termination proceedings don't begin until he gets a letter of termination and brings it to the Judicial Committee, which will then conduct the evidentiary hearing.

CAC: Yes.

DW: No wonder faculty are confused.

CAC: [unclear] that can't be done as long as it's in other courts?

DW: It could be done.

CAC: It could be done, okay.

DW: I do not know why the university hasn't moved in this particular case. In the Garfinkel case, the professor in the Department of Psychiatry who was convicted on five felony counts, the university has allowed him to continue seeing patients. It is not surprising, therefore, that I get calls from colleagues in the Medical School—not people that I don't know but who are on the faculty in Medical School—that rail away at me saying, "Here is Dr. Garfinkel who has got five felony convictions and the university hasn't moved to terminate him. He's still seeing patients. And here's poor Dr. Najarian who hasn't been indicted by anybody and the university keeps saying that termination proceedings have begun against him. What the hell is going on?" I say, "Call the General Counsel's Office because I don't know any more about it than you do." Cases only come to the Judicial Committee when these letters have been sent out. They present interesting cases. The Garfinkel case . . . One might say to the Judicial Committee, "If five felony convictions isn't unprofessional conduct, then what is? Why would you bother to have an evidentiary hearing?" I cited the case earlier of the physician who argued that he was going through treatment . . . the same things you get in the courts on the outside.

CAC: Yes. You're saying in that case that the Judicial Committee was sensitive to that?

DW: The Judicial Committee conducted an evidentiary hearing. In the Garfinkel case, the question could be asked, Why would you have an evidentiary hearing? There's no question that he's a felon; it's been upheld by the Court of Appeals which reinstated two felony charges that

the lower court had dismissed, had dropped. So, why would you have an evidentiary hearing? What conceivable reason could there be for keeping a convicted felon on the faculty and say that's not unprofessional conduct? Well, it would have been a very interesting case for us but it is not going to be an interesting case because Dr. Garfinkel is resigning.

CAC: We've covered a lot of ground this morning. [laughter]

DW: I just want to say one more thing . . .

CAC: At this point, I say, "What else do you want to share with posterity?"

DW: I just want to say that about the Judicial Committee, I've spent a lot of time on this because it's important, it's interesting. The issues get resolved and because it is the only committee that I know at this university where—as has occurred in a number of times in the last four years—if I need, for gender distribution or sometimes for other reasons, to ask former members of the Judicial Committee if they would come back and serve on a panel, I have never been turned down.

CAC: That speaks well for our faculty.

DW: I think the faculty understand how important this is. One of the problems with it is that the State Data Practices Act means that we operate in secrecy; and there are many cases where we feel, gee, the faculty should really understand what the issues are here, and we're not able to communicate that. It's meaningful. It's meaningfulness for me will end in June. My plans for the next several years are to complete the books on Alcatraz . . .

CAC: Your chairmanship ends next year?

DW: My chairmanship ends in June, too; so I am absolutely like the convict who's got a release date. I know how many months there are until I get out and I get into the free world again and have the life—which I think is very nice—of being a professor.

CAC: You use this term free world. Is that a term that the convicts use?

DW: Yes.

CAC: It's like roll over?

DW: That's right. You see, Clarke, the world of the penitentiary is in some ways like the world at the university and when I'm cranky and out of sorts around the house, my wife says, "Why don't you go down to the penitentiary and talk to the inmates because you always feel better after you've been down there. The issues are clearer. There isn't as much bull shit."

CAC: [laughter] I always feel better, as my wife would report, when I come home from a good interview. She knows that I have learned something and learning is a pretty exciting thing.

DW: I would say in summary that the work that I've been able to do . . . I feel like my research assistance on the Alcatraz project . . . It's almost hard to believe you can get paid for doing this. I think the work that I've done has been so intrinsically interesting to me, so personally satisfying, that it is a wonderful thing to be a university professor and be able to pursue these things the way that I have been able to do it.

CAC: Many interviews end appropriately on that note but I also caught a tone, going way back to two and a half hours ago when we started this conversation, that you had a sense of malaise or melancholy about the state of higher education. Did I misread you?

DW: No, that's certainly true. I feel that this university, and I think most universities, are generally very weak, characterized by very weak administrators who cave in at the slightest excuse. I think the whole political correctness notion that has had such a profound impact here . . . I believe that Christina Sommers is right when she says, "The University of Minnesota has been colonized by the radical feminists." [*Who Stole Feminism?: How Women Have Betrayed Women*] I believe I see it in the kinds of awards that are given out. I see it in some of the tenure decisions that are given. I see it in the finding of support for programs for which there is no student enrollment justification. I see it in the persons who are being appointed to various committees and high offices. I see it in our classes where I have now had two complaints from women students in two classes about two of the instructors in our department. In both cases, the women students came forth saying, in one course on the family, that they would like one time during the term to hear about a heterosexual family and not just gay and lesbian relationships. And in the course that we are currently offering on Social Psychology, the students thought they would learn something about social psychology and not just a course exclusively on lesbian ideology, and lesbian lifestyles, and gay bashing. That, I think, comes from students who have come to the University of Minnesota, graduate students, who understand we have the Center for Advanced Feminist Studies and Women's Studies Department here. I get letters, Clarke, addressed "Chair, Department of Sociology" and I open it up and inside it says, "I am a student at so and so. I would like to do my graduate work in the joint Feminist Studies/Sociology Program at the University of Minnesota." As you know, there is no graduate program in Feminist Studies but the students come here . . .

CAC: One can get a minor?

DW: That's right. The closest they think they can get, I guess, is Sociology but our department is primarily quantitatively oriented department.

CAC: Yes.

DW: It is not qualitative and it has, of twenty-four people, only two who call themselves feminists. The other women who are in the department are feminists but they're not—quote—radical feminists and they do quantitative research on gender and that sort of thing. I think it's going to pose, before this year is over, some serious problems for our department. I think it's a serious problem in the college and in the university; and I don't see anybody strong enough around here to stand up and say that it's one thing to have views represented, but under the heading of academic freedom, a course on the family should have something to do with a heterosexual family. If we don't change it, the students—who are now sending these petitions and complaints to me and are promising me that if we don't do something, they will contact the regents and their legislators—will change it themselves. I don't think the university ever has the—you'll excuse the expression—the balls to deal with these issues unless it is forced to. I think the Judicial Committee is a good example of a whole array of issues in which the university has been forced into a corner and the courts ultimately will make the decision instead of the university.

CAC: Do you think that failure, capacity, is traceable to a climate of opinion or to failure of leadership, and if so, Why is there a failure of leadership?

DW: I think it's a failure of leadership that has to do, in part, with personalities and the fact that people grow up in this rather genteel environment in which faculty get upset if anybody uses even strong words—I don't mean expletives—even raise their voices. People get all out of sorts. They're very uncomfortable with this. In the outside world, in the free world, this goes on all the time. In the free world, real decisions are made about incompetence. You get rid of them instead of protecting them the way that we do over here. I think the atmosphere of academia, generally speaking, is one that's very genteel. I think it's removed . . .

CAC: And has become more so with the passing of time?

DW: Absolutely. Absolutely. When I hear faculty members here at the senate meeting talking about if the citizens knew what was going on here at the university, the way the faculty are being treated, and not being paid, and so forth, that they would be outraged. How naive that is! They think we're overpaid, that what we get is too much for the work that we do. The idea that somehow you can live over here in this pristine environment and be well paid while you've got a good job . . . As I've described my own position, it's hard to believe you can get paid for doing this and get paid well for doing it.

CAC: I'm guessing the median salary is probably in the top 7, 8, 10 percent of salaries of the state of Minnesota?

DW: Probably. And who gets three months off during the summer time, and a couple of weeks at Christmas, and again in the spring, and shows up to teach in class six hours a week? My dad—who never went to college—was always asking me "Now, let me get this straight. You go

into class. You have these two classes and they meet three times for forty-five minutes each? And then what do you do the rest of the time?" We, of course, invoke the magic word . . . research.

CAC: What was your father?

DW: He was a banker who moved up very rapidly . . .

CAC: And never went to college?

DW: Never went to college. A self-made man.

CAC: Small town banker?

DW: Well, it was outside Boston. He was in a big banking system and did extremely well for someone who came from a limited educational background. He had personality skills that made up for it. It's hard for free world people to understand what we do over here and that we get paid as much as we do for things that really don't sound like work to them. Yet, if you ask me, in a day in which I've been in class and gone to committee meetings, if I've gotten any work done, I would say, "No," because my definition of work is my research . . .

CAC: Sure.

DW: . . . and the rest of it just gets in the way. The other thing I would say about the university environment is that in fields like mine, it worries me greatly that some of my own colleagues are so little involved with the world outside the university, that they can teach courses about cops, and courts, and criminals but they don't know any and they've never been there. I think that you get dangerously, almost irresponsibly, separated from reality by spending your life in a field like mine all the time at the university. For the last four years, I've been on the Police Civilian Review Board in Minneapolis. It's been a terrific experience. I learned things about minority issues in the community and the politics of city government that you cannot learn from reading the *Star Tribune*.

CAC: Sure.

DW: I'm a great believer in getting outside the university. Most of my social friends are non-university people.

CAC: Have you, personally, or Sociology, ever reached out to that community ever through the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, for example? Or it that not been a . . .

DW: No.

CAC: Okay.

DW: No. I think many of my faculty colleagues in Sociology have very little contact with the objects of their study except through surveys, and indirectly. I think that's why we're so often wrong in making conclusions about . . .

CAC: Where would you put the quality of your own department in 1994, as opposed to the department—which had a lot of prima donnas, a lot of very able persons—in 1965?

DW: Nationally, I think at that time, it was certainly in the top ten in the country, maybe sixth, seventh, something like that. I would say now that it's somewhere to the mid, to the bottom of the second ten universities. It is a better department. We've hired well because there have been lots of good candidates out there in the last ten years. I've hired almost everybody that's up there now. We have not been allowed by the university to hire stars, so I think in the next National Research Council ratings that will come out in February, we probably won't move up because we have terrific people but they haven't become famous yet. They're too young.

CAC: Do you regret not having the authority to hire stars—which was a deliberate policy based on budget restrictions?

DW: Yes, I think so, because I think it's a wise strategy for the department in terms of getting resources.

CAC: So do I.

DW: It may not be that the star gives you all that much more in terms of teaching, and collegueship, and the rest of it; but when I hear the president going around giving speeches about the top rated departments in the college, and how they are understaffed and under resourced, and so forth, if I was my counterpart in the Psychology Department, Mark Snyder, I'd be over in the dean's office saying, "The president says that I am seriously understaffed in my department and what are you going to do about it?" So, I think the politics of surviving in a competitive atmosphere in the university is such that you're lucky if you have some prominent people who can attract outside attention because this is mostly name visibility in these departmental evaluations.

CAC: I always at this point say, "Any further reflections, sir?"

DW: No. No. I'm honored that you would ask me for my opinions.

CAC: Posterity is enriched for them.

DW: [laughter] Well, they are one person's views. While I am very critical of the university, I'm very grateful for the career I've had.

CAC: I think you're number forty-nine. Historians work with many witnesses, lots of testimony.

DW: Yes, I'm sure.

CAC: Thank you very much.

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[End of Interview]

Transcribed by:

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