

Interview with Gary Walker

Marquette Women's Center

No Date/Location given

Interviewed by Jane Ryan

Jane Ryan (JR): I am proud to introduce the former Prosecuting Attorney of Marquette County. He is going to join our discussion of the Women's Center in Marquette, Michigan because he played a significant role in its development and its relationship to some of the programs. So I am very pleased that Gary's here. He will give us a little background about his education and career, and then how it relates to the Women's Center and how he got involved. Gary, welcome.

Gary Walker (GW): Thank you. I attended Michigan State University as an undergrad and then went to Law School at University of Michigan. The two are somewhat antithetical. And graduated from Law School in 1971 and was employed very briefly with the Attorney General's Office in Lansing. And while I was in Law school I had, usually to avoid my casebooks and assignments, had ended up reading all of John Voelker's books and found them fascinating. I didn't know how to fly-fish, but it sounded wonderful. In fact, in my senior year I ordered a fly rod and all of the accoutrements that arrived in March. And March in Ann Arbor didn't allow me to go outdoors, but I worked in the Law Library and consequently, I had keys to the whole complex. And the Law School has very large lecture halls. And after my shift when I had closed the library at midnight, I would go over and stand in one of those lecture halls and practice fly casting. I may be the only person to have ever used a fly rod in Room 150 of the U of M Law Quad. But I was fascinated by Voelker's tales and I was fascinated by the U.P. And as I said, I worked briefly after graduation, but in 1971...I had graduated in '71 and passed the Bar that year, in I think November. And moved to Marquette in July of 1972, I came to Marquette as an Assistant Prosecutor. Things were very different. I think there were thirty-two lawyers when I arrived in town. I don't know how many we have now, but I dare say it's probably closer to 100. And, and the practice of law was different. When I had joined the Prosecutor's Office we were part-time. And pertinent to the topic at hand today, the Women's Center, when I had joined the office here, and our approach and the approach as far as I know statewide, and nationally to domestic violence was to tell you, if you made a complaint that you had been assaulted by your significant other, or your husband, or your wife for that matter, although that was extremely rare, that the response by the officer and by our office was, "Jane if you want to continue with a prosecution, come back in a week." Obviously, even to my untutored eyes, at that point, that seemed to, the message we were sending was patently obvious, "We don't want to get involved." We did that, not in the same way, but issues of domestic abuse, child abuse, child sexual assault were by the public considered to be matters of the family. And there was no reason to intercede. We prosecuted some of the cases, but we didn't prosecute very many. And...

JR: Was there the protection plans then too?

GW: Oh Lord, no.

JR: None of that? Okay.

GW: None of that even. There was no domestic assault, we had the assault was the same whether it was, we used the same statute, which was all that was available, whether it was a bar fight or a husband-wife situation. And law enforcement could not arrest, for a misdemeanor that was not committed in their presence. Which meant that they could show up at your house, you could be battered, bruised, and bleeding but unless the injuries amounted to a felony, which would have been very severe injuries, they could not arrest the perpetrator. And in fact, I remember I became Prosecutor in 1974, I was an assistant for the interim. And the then prosecutor resigned and I was appointed to the remainder of the term, just to finish the biography, I...when I became prosecutor, I don't think I envisioned the thirty eight years I would spend there. And frankly, I am blessed. I got to do a job that I don't know if enjoyed is the right term, Jane. But that I, I guess enjoyed maybe, even though there were certainly a number of times it wasn't fun.

JR: But it was fulfilling in terms of your career.

GW: I got to do what I wanted to do, and I got paid for it. Everybody should be so lucky. But when I took over the office, pretty quickly, I got rid of the "waiting period." And said, "That doesn't make any sense?" But at the same time we would, if we authorized the charge...and by the way, the reason given for not authorizing immediately was that the majority of women after their husband was arrested, would come back and say, "I want to drop the charges." So, why start the whole process and go through all of the work to generate it, the expense to kick it off in court, only to dismiss it a week or two later.

The, when I took over as prosecutor, one of the first things I did was to say, "We're not going to have that waiting period anymore."

JR: What prompted you to do that? Just sort of an?

GW: It...

JR: Were you aware of, were you sensitized to that issue for women?

GW: No. It wasn't right. I wasn't requiring a banker to come back for an embezzlement charge, or for someone whose car was stolen, or someone who was beaten up in a bar. None of those were treated that way, so I thought, "Why are we doing that?" And it was obvious to me that the message that we were sending was, "We didn't want to get involved." That if not a tacit approval of the behavior, at least it wasn't, by society's lights, criminal.

JR: Right and some of the women who have spoken have said that the message they would is that, "I've done something wrong," or "I should try again," or something.

GW: It was, there were all kinds of implications and I'll talk a little bit more about domestic violence as we go along, because that is really my connection to the Women's Center is part-and-parcel a result of my job and the domestic issues that we dealt with.

JR: So how did that come about directly? Who...did you approach the Women's Center at some point or did they approach you?

GW: Well let me...there's a chronology here. In fact, I mentioned that the... or the lack of the ability to arrest, initially, and that's been changed by the way. There are a number of legal changes, one of them is that domestic violence and a number of other misdemeanors now can be, you no longer have to

observe the crime. And it had never made any sense to me, I could arrest you for writing a bad check without observing it, but I couldn't arrest you for beating somebody until they were hospitalized. I had a, in fact I had a situation after I became Prosecutor. This was before the days of pagers and cellphones and the like and my spouse and I were at dinner at The Northwoods, and our babysitter knew where we were. And the police, if they needed us simply called the, myself or one of my staff, kind of at random. They'd called and the babysitter said, "They're at the Northwoods." And I got a message there to call the State Police Post. And he said, you know, "We've had a, we're at the domestic violence scene, the woman was beaten up fairly badly. We tried to talk her into leaving, we can't arrest him." And she wouldn't leave. And we get a call to come back and the ten year old boy, who had tried to intercede after the police left, was also injured. And I said, "Sarge." And he said, "Is there any way we can take that S.O.B." I said, "Sarge, have you maybe impugned his manhood." He said, "Gary, I've called him..." he said, "I've been around a while. I've called him every name in the book. The son of a bitch won't swing at me." [Momentary pause] That, fortunately we don't have to deal with anymore. But, so we started issuing charges and if you came in and said, "I want to drop them," we didn't do very much. We just said, "Okay." In fact, we would have you file an affidavit saying I want to drop the charges, and we would dismiss them. And once again, what that did was put the burden on you. It was almost as if it were a private matter that society didn't want a stake in. In 1975, I believe or 6. It's long enough ago now that my memory may not be as crisp as it should be. A woman I used to get letters of inquiry about jobs. And a woman sent me a letter asking me if she could, ask me potentially for an interview, and she came in. I knew, I didn't know her, I knew of her. [Pause] And it was Pat, who is a major force, as you know in the Women's Center and a dear friend now.

JR: And we have an interview with her too, so.

GW: And she came in and Patricia had just come back from their sailboat in the Virgin Islands and I'm trying to figure out why in God's Earth anybody would leave, why come to work for me as an Assistant Prosecutor, our pay rates weren't excessive. And, but in fact, Jane, I talked to her and I sat there thinking, this is before I think that we had gender...Gender discrimination didn't exist but I was careful enough to realize that asking certain questions may not seem appropriate but I finally said, "Pat, are you really interested in this job?" Then I've got some questions of you that I might not ask another...I mean, and it wasn't female so much as it was a young person coming out of law school with a new spouse and no money, I understood. A person who was settled in the community, had a position in the community, and who was, whose family was economically well-off, seemed like an anathema to me. Anyway I asked some searching questions and I got answers and I hired her. And Patricia came to work and as you can imagine, did an exceptional job. But one day she came in and said, "Gary, we pretty routinely dismiss domestic violence cases." And I said, "Yeah, when the victim," I thought I was being progressive, I was, had gotten rid of the waiting period and I figured that I was headed in the right direction anyway. Well Pat came in and we talked for a while, and as you know she had written a paper in Law School.

JR: And that is in the Archives or will be.

GW: And, and I think she had given me the paper during the interview and I had glanced at it. I went back and read it, and she said, "What if we don't dismiss when the spouse comes in and says, 'I want to drop the charges,?'" And I mulled that over for a while and I thought, "We could certainly try, let's see what happens." So I prepared myself to, because I was going to end up talking with these victims. I had my little speech prepared to tell them that this was not just a crime against them, but a crime against

society, and that violence is a learned behavior, and it was in society's best interest if we not allow that to be learned in the home. That we had, that this was beyond them. And the first three or four women came in and I got about three lines into my philosophical discussion and they, to a one, looked at me and said, "So you're not going to drop the charges?" I said, "No Ma'am, I'm not." And I started back into my, where I had been interrupted, they smiled and said, "Thank you." And got up and left. I may not be the sharpest knife in the drawer, but something was going on, and it occurred to me that somebody else, not them, was pushing this forward. And the husbands came in to see me. And gave me lines such as, "She's my wife." "Well, I understand sir but that..."

JR: [Whispers] Can't do that.

GW: "That's still a crime." Or, "Well I didn't hit her with my fist. You know, a man shouldn't hit a woman with his fist, I might have slapped her around a little but." And I adopted pretty quickly to say, "Look sir, this is not between you and your wife. This is between you and me." And I always found it interesting that these men who had anger and control issues never had an anger or control issue with a two-hundred pound guy next to them on the bar, their hundred and ten pound wife now, that seemed to be okay. But we started and we, I didn't think we had done anything terrible extraordinary, but we started to say no and we started pushing the Prosecution over, and in the majority of cases, the cases went forward. If we had to go to trial the woman testified. Sometimes we got to the point where we'd take cases to trial in the face of the woman taking the witness stand and recanting her earlier statements, and we were successful. Juries knew what was going on. After, I think it was probably two or three years after we started this, a Prosecutor out in San Diego by the name of Casey Gwinn was touring the country pushing the same idea. And we just didn't bottle it. But we had started, it's non-victim centered prosecution. And the longer I was in the job, the more I began to understand the whole dynamic. People would say, "Well why doesn't she leave?" You know, "if you're going to..." Well she may not be able to leave, economically, they have children together, she doesn't have a support system, plus, she loves the S.O.B.

JR: And the latest Gary, which you might be aware of is the animals, the pets often get threatened. And the Women's Center just recently has worked on a program to foster out the pets, so they're not at risk.

GW: Yes. It is, there is a host of reasons, and it is a different situation within myself and the guy on the bar. That whole dynamic needs to be taken into account when you are dealing with it. But we've, Jane, in this county and nationally, I mean this whole revolution about this same time they started changing the laws. They allowed us to, they passed a law allowing us to make an arrest. Now, the statutory scheme and the protocol in Marquette County is, we refer to it as "Mandatory Arrest", which is not exactly true, but the police officer, if they have probable cause, their default is to make an arrest that night. Defuses the situation, it certainly sends a message to the perpetrator. Psychologists tell me that rapidity and certainty of punishment are the two best ways to get a message across. Anybody that's dealt with children, that's dealt with training a dog, you don't wait for three or four days after the event, you do it now. So if you take the person to jail now, it resonates.

JR: As well as giving some support to the woman and safety, to a degree.

GW: The biggest part of it is safely. There's an entire protocol in place, as you know Marquette County has a domestic violence council, we have, we've put in place a lethality factor-list that's used by the officers and by the people that set bonds after the arrest. And we have, not that we're that, we've

gotten grants that have allowed our judges to go to trainings, and I hear from the bench when the husband says, well, there's a no-contact provision, he's out of the house by order, and he goes over to the house. And his excuse is, "Well she called me." But I hear from the bench, "Sir, this is not between you and your wife, this is between you and me." But that whole process with the domestic violence is what hooked me up with the Women's Center.

JR: So how did that comingle parallel development or?

GW: The, initially it was the Spouse Abuse Shelter which started, about the...not long after the Women's Center started the Spouse Abuse Shelter came to be, and it was a separate organization. We had a house in town over on the East side. I think I was on the initial Shelter Board and Law Enforcement, who might have been somewhat skeptical by our, when we started this process, became firmly onboard.

JR: Good. And I think many have mentioned and you eluded in one conversation the cultural aspect, change takes place slowly, even though common-sense might dictate. But did you find that with particularly the police, they were trained to respond in a certain way because of....

GW: The police, actually responded much better than you might think. As that little vignette I gave you with the State Police Sergeant he was...

JR: [Whispers] Upset.

GW: Unbelievably frustrated, he wanted to do the right thing, he just wasn't able to do it. And once we started giving them the tools, they pretty readily came on board. They were very supportive of the Domestic Violence Shelter. It gave, it was a refuge they could use to defuse a situation, it provide protection. I think you'll find it's, because I've spent my life in Law Enforcement and got to know the, I wasn't a street cop, but I lived with street cops. And they're there because they have a strong, protective urge. And they don't like to see someone hurt or injured, or if they are, their job is to make it better, or to intercede to stop it.

JR: So when they had the tools, they'd do it?

GW: When they had the tools, they responded appropriately.

JR: Great.

GW: I think you will find Law Enforcement in this community is a hundred percent onboard with the way domestic violence is now dealt with. And you need to understand that there's a call that officers don't like, it's the domestic violence call. The situations are volatile, they don't know what they're getting into when they walk in the house. I mean, they arrest the guy to take him out and suddenly the wife is upset with them. They don't know if there are weapons involved, it's a very, it's a volatile and very scary situation and they're walking into it often. So anything that you can give them that helps them control it is, once they figure out what's going on, you have advocates, rather than resisters.

JR: Would you say, when you were describing the early stages and the things that made sense to you, were you alone in this across the country? I mean, do you feel like we did do some things ahead of it or was it there?

GW: I think we were ahead of the country. Particularly when we started the, what we referred to as our "No Drop Policy." When we kicked that off, that was not the norm, and I'd like to take credit for it.

JR: Well I think, you certainly from what we've heard in other interviews, you get some credit. Maybe you were urged and supported, but you carried the ball.

GW: Well, I just took a handoff from Pat. I mean she was the one who sensitized me. I mean I knew something wasn't working right but without that...

JR: Oh I think the female perspective played in there, don't you?

GW: Yes.

JR: I mean you couldn't see it from, again, we're talking cultural things that...

GW: And I, when I became, I was twenty-seven years old when I became Prosecutor. Which looking back on it, I find astounding. And I was not fully-formed. And the experience of that office changed me in a lot of ways. But that's what kicked off the relationship with the Women's Center. That, I mean, Pat was clearly involved in that heavily. We started doing Rape Crisis Teams, and we did...

JR: It was a whole series of things. And the other thing I'm thinking is as you speak: without you and your office with the attitude you carried, this couldn't have happened, at least as soon as it did. But without the Women's Center and the Harbor House, it would have been hard for you to be able protect women and follow...

GW: There was a synergy there that probably both of us fed off of. And the Rape Crisis Response, ((28:00 end of edit)) once again, when that program started, I did teaching and...for the counselors to try to acquaint them with the legal system: how it operates, what it can and can't do, why it works the way it does.

JR: And the Counselors would come in once you, once there had been an arrest and help the woman see what her options...

GW: The Counselors came in prior to the arrest, the counselors came in if the woman, if the woman reported a rape, she was appraised of the counselors. It was her call as to whether they, and the officers would, although I don't know if they were supposed to, they would push to have the, somebody from the counselor's team come in. I remember in one of the sessions that often the counselors were young women from Northern. And they weren't sure with how to deal with cops, these are big, burly guys with guns and uniforms, and they were gruff and they didn't...

JR: No-nonsense?

GW: Well, and gruff and intimidating, and they weren't sensitive, and they weren't touchy-feely. And I can remember with a group complaining about that saying, you know, that they'd been in the field, as trained as, in their training they had gone along with a trained counselor.

JR: Like were they Social Work students and Nursing students and all those helping fields?

GW: Yeah. And several of them said, "Well, the officers just don't seem to be very sensitive." And I said, "Look, you're dealing with officers, some of whom are twenty-two or twenty-three years old. And they're dealing with a horrific event, and their response, I mean they can be stoic, or they can laugh, or they can cry. And they can't do the latter two, even if they want to. So you are getting stoicism, and that doesn't mean that they don't care." But we did, through the Women's Center we did the rape crisis

counseling and we also collaborated, ultimately, with a number of grant programs with my office and the Women's Center cosponsored grants.

JR: And those were well done because I know we've received significant funding which has made a big difference.

GW: Well and it's, there were, the major reason that our grants. I mean I had some grants, some smaller grants that I had applied for. I have found out, Jane, that one of the secrets to receiving grants is getting to know the grantor. Particularly at Federal Agencies, and I was involved eventually in not just state-level but national organizations that took me to Washington D.C. and at our conferences met the V.A.W.A., the Violence Against Women Act people. And then I hired Matt Wiese, you understand, I mean the whole theme to my tenure as Prosecutor is hire good people and stay out of their way. And it served me well, but I went with Matt. He came into the office, he had a passion for this work, and he became involved teaching on a national level for the V.A.W.A. people and the Minnesota Woman's Justice Project. And they called at one point and said, "You know, we really like Matt's work. We like his teaching, we'd like to use him more." And I said, "Well, I appreciate that, but I have a use for him here." And they said, "What if we give you, initially, two lawyers? [Pause] Will that help release him for more time?" And I said, "You know, given the case load I have, the lawyers produce work for support staff. I don't have enough support staff. How about two lawyers and a support staff?" And....just thinking to myself, "This is working!"

JR: You drive a hard bargain, right?

GW: And we ended up with, anyway, Matt stayed on the staff, spent a fair amount of his time in the field teaching, but also still doing the work in the office. And we had two positions then that came in that helped back-fill. And we started a very heavy Domestic Violence Program.

JR: And, just to back up a little, Matt came then to the office then with background in this as opposed to learning it on the job?

GW: No, no, Matt learned it on the job.

JR: On the job?

GW: Matt came into the office right straight out of Law School.

JR: But he had an interest in this topic?

GW: He had an interest in it and he had got involved with the Women's Center and the Domestic Violence folks reached out. And he, our State Prosecutor's Organization is very vigorous and does a lot of teaching, and I think Matt first encountered the stuff as a teaching-process at the state-level, where he, when he came in, we would send people to various trainings and Matt gravitated there

JR: And I am hoping that we can get an interview with Matt. Before I lose the train of thought, you were active President of that association at one point, the Prosecutor's?

GW: Yes.

JR: And were they also, and when you were involved, responsible or lobbied for the law changes that it took to do this? Because again I remember one of our interviewees was that maybe Pat who was

maybe active in that. So I mean, our local community and Women's Center and Prosecutor's Office were all on the cutting-edge of this?

GW: Yes.

JR: That's quite exciting

GW: And Marquette seemed to be, I mean I find myself out at the frontiers of stuff more often than not. In fact, I did a, on a national level I did more with juveniles and children. But at one point we were at the national Juvenile Justice Conference and the head, Shay Bilczek who was head of the O.J.J.D.P., the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency in Washington, under Clinton. I was there, Mike Anderick was there, we hadn't come together he was there from the court side...

JR: Mike, was the Probate Judge?

GW: Yes. And we were engaged in something and Bilczek looked over and said, "Okay. I've looked up Marquette. What are two of you from that place doing here at this policy conference?" And at a later time when we intersected Bilczek said, "Okay. It's Batman and Robin!" What, where, why, what causes then people to be engaged at this policy level, from a community such as Marquette? And frankly, it is a community such as Marquette that allows it. I've always said we're shaped up here by geography and weather. If your car is off the road, people stop to help you because when my car's off the road, I want them to stop and help me. We are cussedly independent, but always willing to help. It's a strange blend. We have figured out that if we are going to survive, we need assistance from below the bridge or from Washington. And instead of, like many of my colleagues I know particularly on a national level, who would be rebuked by their funding agency for taking time to be off getting, get about Washington. That was never the case here. Our...

JR: Learn as much as we can.

GW: Learn as much as we can, bring it back, and oh by the way, if you can cart a little money in your suitcase, that helps too. And...and the understanding that if we are going to be successful in terms of grants and fundraising or whether they be grants of appropriations, we're going to have to make contacts. People rarely wander through here doling out money without having, and it just off the...with no prior contact with someone up here.

JR: Yeah. Will they use it well, kind of thing? But, yeah.

GW: And we've, but as I've said, that's...I know that there were colleagues of mine who had political trouble because they were engaged outside of their district. And I never found that to be the situation here. So I think that's a part of it. I think this community understands the value of, of learning something and bringing it back, the value of contacts when we do need something, to be able to pick up a phone and talk to somebody who has a name with a face.

JR: And then I always feel on not giving up, there is a persistence here in all realms that you don't always see in other places. If people think it's worth doing, they'll work on it. And that again draws me back to the Women's Center history, which is revealed in a lot of the other interviews. It's had its ups and downs, many due to funding issues as the economy tanked. But that doesn't mean people aren't going to say, "We need this here."



GW: Well and I remember we became very concerned, times fall, because I've been retired now three years, and it was probably two years before I retired thereabouts where the viability of the Women's Center, and because of the, now the relationship between the Women's Center and the Shelter. I mean there was a time when the two were totally separate organizations.

JR: And funded differently?

GW: And funded differently

JR: And the funding for the Shelter just dried up.

GW: Just dried up and the Women's Center took it over.

JR: Saying, again, "We can't let this go!"

GW: But we can't let it go. And we were, it was a lynch-pin in what we did in our office. And as I say, we collaborated with grants and worked hand-in-glove with the Shelter, or Women's Center. The advocates who came to court were, in many places there is a natural tension between an advocate, and law enforcement and the prosecutor. "We want you, the victim to testify." The victim is reluctant, the advocate is your advocate. So, they, while they may prefer that you testify, they resent Law Enforcement pushing. But I saw a lot more antipathy between shelters and advocates in other places than we had here. In fact, I mean it was to the point where one of the advocates would come in, rarely, but occasionally and say, "Have you really taken a close look at this case?" You know, as close as usual. "Huh, you might want to look at it again." Okay.

JR: And you grew because of these relationships to trust that this person has a merited request.

GW: They, they're telling me something, they're telling me as much as they can. And I think they grew to trust us.

JR: That's the sense I have from other interviews. I mean, to me, as quote, "An outsider looking in", we have been blessed with the relationship with having you and Matt in the right place in the right time, having Pat have the influence that she did. And then, I think Pat was on a commission, maybe you were too on the law development. And I'm sure that made a difference both because you had developed some experiences using what you felt the changes needed to be and then you were willing to stick your necks out and advocate.

GW: When they were doing the domestic violence legislation, and about the same time they were changing the misdemeanor arrest, and it was for domestic violence that that happened. The Prosecutor's Association, when criminal justice legislation is up we take, I still, having been gone three years, I still take some ownership. The Prosecutor's Association is heavily involved in Lansing, lobbying on the criminal justice field. It's the only thing we do in terms of lobbying. We don't pay attention to bills that have monetary impact, but for our criminal justice policy, we weigh in. And I can remember going to Lansing and testifying in committees saying, "Look." Matter of fact I think I used that scenario but I mentioned the phone call from the police sergeant. "This is what happens, it's wrong."

JR: And that case, it seems like, and I'm trying to relate it back to Pat's research, is the perfect example of, "If we don't do something it's beyond the family. This is a crime against society."

GW: Yeah. That's, I mean I got to the point, and I got there I think reasonably quickly after we started really pushing domestic violence prosecution. And we pushed them. I mean it was, our intent was to make it stop. And it was my mantra always was: Violence is learned, and the worst place to learn it was in the home. And if we can stop it there, then maybe we can stop it other places. And I became convinced as a Prosecutor, it was very, very necessary for me to authorize charges, bring cases to trial, and advocate at sentencing for offenders. But I also became convinced that that was a tourniquet and that I were going to do my job, which was to keep this community safe, that I needed to do more than that. That's why I became involved in the Juvenile Justice area. If we could intervene at age two, then...I can't remember the numbers precisely, and these are old numbers. A career criminal, which means somebody who starts at fourteen-fifteen, ages out about thirty. Doesn't, not John Dillinger, we're not talking about Bonnie and Clyde, but just the average, get involved, steal a car or shoplift. Then steal a car, break into a camp, and do not terrible stuff, but criminal stuff, costs society, I think it was \$1.6 million dollars. I can hire a whole lot of home nurses for \$1.6 million. And we have longitudinal, medical-model studies that tell us that if you take at-risk families and you put a home nurse in there a couple of days a week, a couple of visits a week, unwanted second pregnancies drop off, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, child abuse, and juvenile delinquency, which means arrest. Longitudinally fifteen years later, juvenile delinquency is down sixty percent.

JR: That's amazing, in the big-picture!

GW: So that, and we know that domestic violence is a generational thing. It's the same... [Sighs] so I don't know that we need Social Workers and...the...maybe the best part of trying to deal with domestic violence is that was something I could try to impact with some immediacy.

JR: Well and again the other interviewees have pointed out the impact, not that we can make it go away totally, but at least we have a system that deals with it as early and as effectively as possible.

GW: Well and I think there is an understanding in this community that you're going to get, I mean if you do this, you're going to be arrested.

JR: We aren't looking the other way or sending her back. Okay, Gary I think we want to, again, kind of bring some closure in terms of, again, you enjoy the philosophy. But what, do you see the Women's Center continuing as of old, would you like to see different things? What is your sense of what we need to keep doing?

GW: You need to be better funding, and we need new blood. When the Women's Center got in serious economic trouble, what did I say, three, five years roughly. We had meetings...meetings sound more formal than they were, within the office. Weise, Matt and I, and Judd in the office sat down and said, "Okay, we have a problem. We know from various sources that the Women's Center is in economic trouble. And if it folds, we lose, first and foremost for us, we lose the Shelter. We can't afford to lose the Shelter. That would be...such a step backward." And we, "Well, okay. What are we going to do?" And we're still kind of dithering, trying to figure out, well, we'll help with grants, we'll help with fundraising in the community. And I think it was Matt came in and said, "Gary, they're back!" [Pause] "Those women who started it."

JR: The Founding Mothers we refer to them as, Oh!

GW: We call them the Grand Mothers.

JR: The Grand Mothers, yes.

GW: And when you look at some cultures...

JR: It's awesome, it's just awesome.

GW: That's...but those ladies came back, kicked it in the shed, and it's progressing. What we need now is that kind of commitment from a new generation.

JR: Amen to that. And that's part of the rationale behind the histories and the archiving. It's like the civil rights movement, or the women's movement, and if you're not aware of the history and what it took to get these things going, you take it for granted. You're not bad, you just don't know that this is not something that can be sustained without everybody still caring.

GW: Far too much of our history is lost in terms of the real societal understanding of it. I look at that with the labor movement.

JR: Exactly

GW: I mean this state has a Right to Work Law? I grew up, and I was born in 1946, I started my life in Flint, Michigan. Ten, twelve blocks from my house two years before at Fischer Two, they had a sit down strike that organized GM. It lasted for weeks. Forty-hour week is not a divine right.

JR: No.

GW: And we've

JR: We can step back from that, we are stepping back, so.

GW: Well and that and a host of things. We've done a very bad job of educating our kids. I don't know if that's an indictment of the schools, if it's an indictment of the country, but they don't know from whence things came, a lot of them.

JR: Right, and we can discuss that in a moment too. If we were drawing to a conclusion, have you left out anything you'd like to mention about the Women's Center and your involvement?

GW: No, I don't think so, Jane. It's clear to me, and I hope through this interview that it was a pivotal part of a pivotal piece of my time in the Prosecutor's Office.

JR: I think so, I think so. And we are grateful that it happened, we in the community. So thanks for your time and your remarks.

GW: Thank you.

END OF INTERVIEW