

Interview with Robert McClellan
Professor of History, Northern Michigan University
February 2 2001

START OF INTERVIEW

TAPE 1 SIDE A

[Audio cuts in abruptly]

Robert McClellan (RM): *The Mining Journal* and we did little marches and we had signs posted around and you know the usual "Save North Marquette" or whatever it was. All that kind of stuff. It just got more and more publicity and the university just looked terrible. So then the university had a, the university administration had a meeting and George Hill was the university attorney and we went to the meeting and I was there and there were representatives, so called "block representatives" from this area. We went to the meeting and the administration took a very adverse view of the whole thing and that was the beginning of big trouble for me. We refused to back down and the administration was angry and accused us of this and that, me particularly of stirring up people who really weren't upset initially but then I had upset them, all that sort of stuff. So it became quite a cause and it appeared in the downstate newspapers, Edger Harden looked pretty bad, pretty badly. Eventually the administration had to, the administration backed down.

Interviewer (I): Okay. What type of reaction did you get from your colleagues? Were they supportive or not as much?

RM: It was mixed and of course the best evidence for that is, I'm jumping ahead, but the best evidence for that was that we sued the administration. The majority of the faculty joined that suit, but I must say Northern at that time was composed of different groups of people. People like myself who were fresh minted PhD's who came to Northern because that was a good starting job and they intended to move on. So there were some very fine people there maybe that was a third or a quarter of the faculty. Not that the rest weren't fine outstanding people, they were too. But many of them came out of different parts of life. A number of the faculty were UP born and bred and raised faculty, and many of them had served distinguished careers in high schools and had really gotten to Northern and were thrilled to be out of the secondary school environment. They were not happy, they were conservative people and they felt this is not the sort of thing that you did in the Upper Peninsula. You didn't go against the Cliffs Dow Mining Company, you didn't go against the university administration, you didn't go against the hospital. You know that kind of attitude. Lots of people around like that, and I suspect there still are lots of people around like that. So those folks were very unhappy, they thought I was an outsider and that I was causing a lot of trouble and causing them trouble and giving the university a bad name. From that group of people, I didn't get any support, it was just the opposite. But from the younger faculty, many of them said 'yeah that a right cause. What's happening to these people isn't right, so that's a good thing to be doing.' But unfortunately numerically that was probably maybe 30% of the faculty.

I: Okay. Okay, can you briefly explain how this kind of came to an end?

RM: Well, I'm not...I fudged a little bit because I'm not actually dead sure what happened. Everything kind of merges in together. I went from there to being accused of, I had a large Western Civilization class, the administration was trying to save money so we had these huge Western Civ classes, I don't know 300 people. They were taught in the old Kaye Auditorium which doesn't exist anymore. And in order to spark things up a little, bit because it was a deadly dull kind of environment where I was up on a, the teacher the faculty member was up on stage and the kids were sitting out in these seats and I couldn't blame them for being bored to death [laughter.] It sorts of galvanized things. I tried to make thing as vivid as I could and in that process I used, sometimes I used the administration in comparison to the use of excessive power and I used North Marquette as an example as the administration running rough shot over people's rights and how this was the kind of autocratic behavior that one would sometimes find, for example, in Nazi Germany. I must say I probably overreached a little bit but the administration was absolutely furious and proceeded to file charges against me for whatever thing that think I shouldn't have been saying. "Going beyond the scope of the class." Just being a general bad boy, that sort of thing. And so it didn't, the North Marquette thing sort of ended in that the administration backed down and no longer pursued that area, they pursued other areas to expand and I don't know what's happened since I've been back here.

I: It's still just sitting there.

RM: Wonderful. Well good for those people. The people that are living in those little rinky-dink house and I know the administration went in there and bought selective lots, sort of a secret stealth way of acquiring the property, but a lot of people wouldn't sell. So anyway the administration, I guess I must say they got stopped because if they haven't taken over North Marquette by now it looks like those people are gonna be free and clear for a while.

I: Yeah. You kind of touched on it, as what you had said in class was kind of tended to be taken as a problem. One of the things I found was, regarding the four course plan.

RM: Oh yeah.

I: Can you tell me what that plan consisted of?

RM: Well that's one of these dumb recycling of academic structure, everybody does this. You reinvent it, some hot shot administrator comes in and he's got a plan so they're gonna, instead of having classes with multiple or variable credits 2, 3, 4, some of them are gonna have one course that's all, there going have students are gonna take four courses and they won't be so confused in quotes. I never thought students got confused anyway, but the idea was that if you simplify it they would learn better and things would be easier, the courses would be a little longer and every student would take four courses only with very few exceptions. You know what, as I describe it it doesn't seem to amount to very much but at the time people were quite excited about it. The idea was that you would, oh I don't know what. This is more of a private college, an Oxford you know in Oxford, England kind of approach where you have large blocks of educational material that you can leisurely study and do a lot of reading. I mean the idea is a good idea, but it wasn't

worth fighting over. So that went along and I got involved in it. I wasn't against it, I thought the idea was okay. But that was the four course plan.

I: Could you recall what you said about that plan, that got the reaction?

RM: Well pretty much what I said to you, I mean it's kind of silly to, I don't know today the closest thing that I could come up with is something like voucher plan. It really doesn't matter how you rearrange the chairs. Whatever you have to do there's some fundamental interconnection that's going to occur between the student and faculty member, or it's not going to occur. If it doesn't occur, we both know what students are going to do. They're going to tune it out, do what they have to do, and get by. If they need to grade they'll do what the instructor tells them to do and if they don't need the grade they'll blow it off. So it just struck me that that was not the way the move forward in a little, little tiny college stuck way up there at the end of the Earth. That what we really need was to support the faculty, galvanize them, pay them better, and stop going around the halls inspecting and looking at them. I thought the university would be a free place where you give a faculty a block of time and students sign up and they go in there and see what happens. If the faculty is any good he'll galvanize the students and they'll get interested and if he isn't then as I said they'll just turn him off and they'll do what they have to do and to get through the course. Talking like that, it's kind of, I still feel that way if you can tell. To me the guts of the course is the faculty member, not the book, not the subject matter, not the title of the course, not the time of day but the faculty member. If he's any good, or if he or she is any good, then you're gonna have a good class and if they're not, then you're not. And that was my positions, my position today and that was my position then. And that was not what the administration wanted its faculty to be saying. It wanted its faculty to be saying that they're taking the approach that the four course plan would revolutionize learning and that Northern Michigan University would be a leader. I think I heard the other day that your president has decided that everybody should have a computer?

I: Yeah.

RM: Okay, fine I assume most people that want to go anywhere in life already got a computer. But if they don't, then it's probably a good idea. But it's neither here nor there. I mean computers are devices which allow you to learn something, and if you're interested in using a device that way. But they don't make the university a better university, it has nothing to do with that. What makes the university a better university is its top quality faculty who are appreciated and well supported and who will then give their best. Maybe the best won't be very good, but at least it will be the best they can do.

I: Right

RM: Which is all you can ask of a human being. So you get the drift?

I: Right.

RM: The four course plan is an interesting idea, I'm not against it, I'm not for it. I just thought it was basically irrelevant.

I: Okay, there was another issue. I believe you were the chairman for the Committee on Student Affairs and there was a situation with dorms not being complete?

RM: Oh yeah.

I: And a threat of the students suing the university?

RM: Well we discovered that with one of these inside jobs between the political people in Lansing and our good ole then president Edger Harden. And that some bonds, John McGoff who was then the owner of *The Mining Journal* had gotten involved. And there were parry bits of sweetheart loans arranged to pay for dormitories and that Edger Harden had been paid a finder's fee. If you can imagine as the president of the university and others have done well and there's been commissions paid, and all this was state money and it had turned out to have been a wonderful way for various individuals, like the president of the university and the head of the Board of Control which was what John McGoff was, to make a lot of money. And I blew the whistle on that and that didn't make me very popular.

I: Right.

RM: I blew the whistle on it by going down to the legislature and looking in the books and discovering that these names kept coming up. Edger Harden, John McGoff over and over and clearly these were the people who were profiting from the loans. And the loans, in many cases the interest was set high, and finder's fees all over the place, lots of money sloshing around. The students, well eventually yeah they got a dormitory but that really wasn't the primary motivation. The primary motivation was to get these sweetheart loans from the state and for the various participants in the loan funding mechanism to profit handsomely. I pointed that out in the Student Affairs Committee. The students thought that was great, they thought that was a lot of fun. Stick the administration in the eye, but the administration had a very different view of my behavior. It was outside the classroom, had nothing to do with what I was hired for, it was none of my business and I was being disloyal and you know all that nonsense. So I got in trouble for that.

I: Okay, if I could just go back to the expansion into the residential area?

RM: Sure.

I: I did read that a group of community leaders organized a non-profit corporation to acquire land north of Wright Street to provide a location for these homes to be moved?

RM: That's correct.

I: Do you know if that was utilized at all?

RM: No it wasn't.

I: Did that influence the residents at all?

RM: Well no, I mean it was bad deal for the resident. You've got to visualize. I mean don't know what your economic socioeconomic background is, but you've got to figure. Visualize these guys who work with their hands and came home and usually, I mean this is another generation this is almost a different culture. Nice men, and very few women I mean the women mostly worked quote at home unquote and may have had lesser jobs around the community. But by in large, this was a real working class family. These guys came home and on the weekends they fixed up their place and they put on porches and they painted and they expanded and put on a backroom, you know all this kind of stuff. They were proud of these places. So where were they gonna move to? They were gonna move to this area, which was not gonna be like their area. It didn't have the kind of trees that they had planted and it wasn't home. It's kind of like moving these people into adult dormitories. I mean the idea was good, and some of my friends were involved in that. But when you think about it, it was, these were their places which they had built up for their retirement and they had lousy jobs. A lot of them had very bad health working in this charcoal place and so they thought well at least they'll get at least 10 or 15 years of nice quite retirement where they could go home and watch the television and go ice skating or whatever. Limited income people, very decent, very nice people. So to move would have involved costs which really would have changed their lives. They didn't want to move, they wanted to stay right where they were. That was what their life plan had been.

I: Right. Okay, I guess all this sort of leads up to your termination. Can you talk a little about that, how it came about? How they informed you of it and then what happened afterwards?

RM: Yeah. I'll try to be organized and as brief as I can. I think there were several things. Clearly the North Marquette thing was one of their openers and some of the charges against me were really just trumped up charges. I mean the cause of my dismissal, as announced by the administration clearly wasn't the cause. The causes were that, nothing was said about North Marquette or nothing was said about what I had said in the classroom. The causes for my dismissal were one, that I was gay. I was homosexual and this was advertised to the community in a radio broadcast put together by the administration, the higher administration. That was one charge. Another charge was that I was a communist sympathizer. I had been at Berkeley for a while and I was friend of, not a friend, back up. I knew a free movement as it was called then, a guy by the name of Mario Sabio and so the name, I can't imagine it would mean anything to you, but at that time he was considered a communist radical. "Com symp" as we were called s-y-m-p. So that was another charge, that I was a communist sympathizer and I didn't belong in Marquette, I didn't belong anywhere. The third charge was that I was negligent in my duties, that I had missed class, that I had missed committee meetings and various administrative supporters came forward to testify. One of them was the Al Niemi Senior who testified that on the same Student Affairs Committee that you talked about, that I had been absent repeatedly and my attendance was irregular and I was an irresponsibly faculty person. And then they sighted other, they the administration, sighted other things that I had done, not meeting office hours. Fortunately, I wasn't accused of sexual harassment of any students. That really wasn't in vogue I think they would have done it if they had thought they could get away with it. But the three main charges were that I just wasn't doing my faculty duties, that I was a communist, and that I was homosexual. And that was, those were the reasons that were offered for my dismissal.

I: Okay, so they didn't give the reasons as to what happened with North Marquette?

RM: Well no because the real reasons of course weren't reasons at all. I was exercising my right as an American citizen to engage in political organization, to defend the rights of what I saw as underprivileged people who were being abused by the state authority. And you know they couldn't charge me with that, that would only have served to really swing sympathy over to me. That's what the administration... So they used charges which they thought people would sympathize with. After all Marquette, the Upper Peninsula, was a very conservative place, it still is. Being a communist activist, I don't know if you know much about the McCarthy era but being accused of those days of being a communist sympathizer was a very, very serious charge. People lost their jobs for that alone. And being accused of being gay was right there, it was not any better. The fact that I had four happy daughters had slipped through the cracks, nobody seemed to be able to figure that out. But the idea was that I was gay and a bad person in all ways so that's the way it went.

I: Okay were these causes, the three that you listed, were these ever released to the public?

RM: No, not really.

I: Not really?

RM: No. It was kept pretty quiet.

I: Okay. I guess, let's see.

RM: There were other causes, there were other things that caused it, caused my dismissal. One of them was the black guy who was, he was dating the girlfriend of an RA, and she was white and the RA was white and this black guy was dating the RA's girlfriend. Which you could imagine in those days, I hope it wouldn't make any difference now, but in those days it made a lot of difference. The white students were really pretty ticked off. So and that, then the kid was suspended and the charges weren't correct so I represented the kid, I got legal services for him. And then eventually there was, his suspension was lifted. And then the administration, this is under somebody... anyway. The administration went after him in civil court and filed charges against him and anyway. So I was just not what you would call an upright, outstanding faculty member

I: Okay, did what the charges that they were bringing against you, did you feel that this threatened your academic freedom in governance?

RM: Are you kidding? [Laughter.]

I: [Laughter.]

RM: I mean I was a young guy; this is my second teaching stint. I started out, you know my age chronologically I wasn't that young I guess I was about 30, but I had been at the seminary I was

an episcopal priest and at that time and I was practicing actually. Even though I wasn't getting paid for it I had been a missionary in Alaska and I came back and decided that I didn't want to be a full time minister. So I got a PhD at Michigan State and then my first job was at Ohio State, and then I came to Northern I was really excited. I figured this was a nice little school, had been sort of an average teachers college and was trying to be converted into a real university and here it was stuck way up in this little place. And I thought, you know I could come here and have a good time and enjoy being a part of having the university grow up and become a real university, and you this was my idealism hence, and that's the way I behaved and that was a mistake on my fault. I felt terrible, I was devastated. The guy that gave me the news about being fired was actually a good friend of mine. He was a black guy named David Dickson who was the provost at Northern for a while and a very nice man who eventually left largely because of the discrimination in the community. He had some black kids naturally, and he was the Dean of Arts and Science I believe at that time. He called me into the office and he said 'I've got some terrible news for you Bob.' I thought well they're going to take a class away from me or I wasn't going to get a raise or, he said that 'You've been fired!' I couldn't believe it.

I: So you had no?

RM: I didn't know!

I: No inkling that they were going to do that then?

RM: I mean what a dummy! You know as I look back now of course, I can evaluate this that and the other thing but at the time I was totally naïve. You could have knocked me over. When he told me that I said 'Oh David that can't be true!' He said 'It's true' and he said 'I feel terrible. I feel like I should have resigned rather than participate in this.' But he said 'I can't you know?' I said 'I understand that you can't,' but I had four little girls and you know they were young. It was, I would say devastating but that doesn't cover it. It was terrifying, I was terrified. I didn't know what I was going to do next. So, I don't know. What I did do next, maybe it's what I shouldn't have done. But what I did do next was fight back and I went down to, I had some very good friends there in the Jewish community who were extremely supportive financially and emotionally. I went down to the AAUP, I mean the ACLU in Lansing and I said, I told them what had happened and told them how the university had used university funds to go on the radio and condemn me. They didn't believe it! 'They said that's a fantasy, there is no way that the administration could be that dumb! But if that happened to be true, you have a federal case. Not a state case, but you have a federal violation of your rights.' And so, and if that's true that they said, 'if what you're telling us is true and other people told us it is true,' some of my Jewish friends had gotten me introduced down there. 'If it's true, we will take the case.' And so I said 'well, I'll wait. I know it's true and I know you're gonna call me and you are gonna take the case if that's what you say.' So they took the case, and that but a whole different light on things. I was still terrified, but at least I had a way of fighting back. From that I got into the whole business of the lawsuit and a whole group of local attorneys represented me and the thing snowballed, it was really out of my control. Faculty rallied around, good friends of mine formed a financial committee and a couple guys were the treasurers and funds were raised and the students were extremely supportive of me. Some of the student leaders were very supportive and there was that infamous McClellan Week.

I: Yep.

RM: Where the university students claimed that they weren't going to class and many of them did not go to class. I don't know if it was, I think it was a majority but.

I: Why do you think they were so supportive of you like that? To make a McClellan Week and to the committee that you've alluded to? The Committee for Defense of Academic Freedom.

RM: Yeah, exactly that what it was called.

I: Yeah. It seemed like they went to great lengths to really show their support for you.

RM: I don't know.

I: Did you see it that way? Or not really?

RM: I think they were crazy. I think they went; I mean I was overwhelmed. One time I was; I can remember this very clearly. I was walking home from school, we lived over on the east side in a big old house that we refurbished on Cedar Street. I was walking home after my afternoon class and I, and there were a bunch of people walking down the street, students. And I remember I recognized a couple faculty in particular Dutch Barnard who was at Northern for a while, and then I guess two or three years ago was given an honorary degree by Northern Michigan University at the commencement. Anyway there was Dutch, in front of the parade, carrying one end of a large sign which said "Thoreau Lives." Okay? And I honest to god, this is no exaggeration, I didn't know what was going on. I didn't know who they were marching for. I said Thoreau, I mean I know who Thoreau is of course, but what is the reference. And I walked and I said 'Dutch what the hell is going on?' He said 'well we're demonstrating for you dummy! What did you think was going on?' [Laughter.]

I: [Laughter.]

RM: I get a little choked up when I think about it because I figured if people were willing to come forward like that, then I had to hang in there. So I didn't go looking for another job because the AAUP, or I mean the ACLU explained to me they said 'look, if you leave you don't have a case. The only way you have a case is if you are quote damaged unquote.' I don't know if you're familiar with that principal under the law?

I: Not really.

RM: Until damages happen, until someone has actually smashed your car, you can't sue them because you think they're going to smash your case.

I: Oh, okay.

RM: You can't sue anybody until you have been fired and you haven't been fired as long as you are being paid. So what had to happen was, I had to go forward, my job had to end, which it did.

TAPE 1 SIDE B

[Audio cuts in abruptly.]

I: No that's fine, that's fine.

RM: Everybody loves to talk about themselves.

I: Oh, you're yeah.

RM: Their perceptions. [Laughter.]

I: [Laughter.]

RM: You can stop me and say 'Hey you know that's enough!'

I: No, no you're doing fine, doing fine. Okay, were you done talking about?

RM: Yeah I guess it's good that you got off that subject because it, as I said, it really does make me feel kind of funny every time that I think about it, and it's probably that and the student meeting. You know it was in the old gym and the gym was packed. I didn't know what was going on, someone said 'the students are meeting we want you to come.' And I said 'okay, but for what?' And it was in the McClellan Week and they had a fundraiser, that was the purpose, and they wanted me to say a few things. So I got up and talked about academic freedom and you know the usual stuff. And then they passed the hat, and when the money was counted at the end I didn't, you know I had this committee of John Allswang, Steve Barnt [spelled phonetically,] Barnard and the committee and said that there wouldn't be a problem with the funds. They raised thousands of dollars.

I: Wow.

RM: And these were just kids coming to the meeting! You know with a few bucks in their pocket, I couldn't get over it. I mean that kind of support, I just couldn't. I had to hang in there.

I: Can you tell me if maybe you saw what happened to you, your situation, how that would have pushed the faculty to want to unionize?

RM: Well from my perspective, of course I'm 66 I'm real close to being 67, from my perspective I would have to say you know even though that the events were dramatic and I was involved in them, I mean the world goes on. There's been some terrible things in the world in my lifetime and so this can't rank very high.

I: Right.

RM: But on the other hand, there were a lot of feelings among the faculty that this was just plain old wrong, you know with a capital W. It was wrong, wrong, wrong. Maybe I wasn't, say for instance _____, I had my faults. Maybe I shot my mouth off too much in class, and maybe I exaggerated when I shouldn't have and so on. But never the less, this was, apparently this shouldn't happen. So the faculty looked at this and, I think this was the beginning of a, an excitement among the faculty. Along the lines of saying, 'We can stand up, we can be faculty and we can stand up against the administration.' And I don't want to pretend to say, I don't want to propose the administration were all bad people, I mean that's ridiculous. But they, the administration particularly the upper administration, kind of got caught up in this. The background of Marquette is that it's a pretty oppressive place when I was there and there were a lot of faculty that felt pretty pushed down. Particularly ones that spoke out. I think this galvanized that and it made it a lot easier when I stood up to the latter and said 'Hey we need a union' and people didn't just say "Huh? What for?" [Laughter.]

I: [Laughter.]

RM: They had some idea, now a lot of people were dead set, aggressively against unions, a good people that supported me. But anyway, I think yeah. I think it stirred up the pot so to speak, if it hadn't been for that issue, I mean that's a dangerous thing to say because it seems to point a finger at me of perhaps playing a larger role than I ever really played. I'm a historian so I know that running around evaluating events and drawing conclusions is a real dangerous business.

I: Right, right.

RM: So this may not have happened this way at all. But I have to believe that even though, and I didn't plan it. I'm not taking credit for this, but this accidental event I think did raise the conciseness of the faculty. I think that's a fair statement.

I: There was another case, the Fred Harris case?

RM: Oh yeah.

I: That we saw that you were involved in?

RM: Oh yeah.

I: Can you tell me how this case showed a threat to academic freedom in governance?

RM: Well Fred was a fine, fine person and he had not achieved his terminal degree but he was in accounting. In accounting the terminal degree is lots of times the CPA. So Fred was just a wonderful guy, real family man and I'm just very fond of Fred. So anyway I went to bat for him, he was dismissed because, I thought for wrong reasons. He was dismissed, frankly in my opinion, because he was, I don't know how to say this. He wasn't very glamorous; you know? He was kind of quiet, kind of frumpy, not a spectacular performer in the classroom. And you know some people said kind of a dope. I didn't think that had anything to do with it. I mean he was good man and committed and I thought the department was moving against him in a very

unfair way. So I took over his defense. We lost. But he went on and got a job in the accounting department at the University of Kentucky and about two years later, I was in his house a lot, and it was real sad. His wife was really upset and he had a couple of kids. What they were doing to him was just wrong. I mean maybe he wasn't qualified to teach at the University of Michigan okay? But this is Northern Michigan University, we got a lot of dopes on the faculty. Don't misunderstand, I don't mean they were bad people. I just mean they weren't very dramatic people with fancy credentials and lots of publications. They're just kind of ordinary faculty members, you know we have a lot of ordinary students too. And Fred was kind of in that category, but I liked him and he was a fine man and I respected him, a very decent man. And then they got him, in my defense I didn't win that one. He lost, he had to move, went to Kentucky as I said. Two years later I got a fifth of fine aged Kentucky bourbon, what a nice present it was. [Laughter.]

I: [Laughter.]

RM: He was poor as a church mouse, when they threw him out he didn't get a job for years so I kept in touch with him. Fortunately, it turned out okay.

I: Right.

RM: I've lost track of him but he was a good man.

I: When you say he lost did he actually take it to the courts and then the courts decided that no, he was still terminated he didn't have a cause? Or did he?

RM: He lost it inside the university, we didn't go, we weren't able to put together a legal case. We did get an attorney, but it wasn't, the administration got a little smarter. When they want to get rid of someone they didn't run around calling them a homosexual and a communist. That was not a real smart thing to do if you want to get rid of somebody. So in that sense, that was better. But what they said was he was a lousy teacher and they got students to come in and provide documentation saying he was boring and put them to sleep and so on. Then they said that he didn't have the right credentials.

I: Right.

RM: That he hadn't been active in his field. And you know there was some truth in that but that was true with a lot of the faculty. The real reason they got rid of him was because they wanted to open the slot up to hire, with someone with a little more pizzazz.

I: Oh, okay.

RM: So you know, all the wrong wasn't on one side, there's a point to be made there I guess. The administration was trying to expand the university and only had so many dollars. And so here you have, frankly there were other faculty, like I wasn't, well I was involved with some of them who had been high school teachers and came to Northern, didn't have terminal degrees and their departments kind of upgraded and these guys were, and women in some cases, were forced to

go back to high school teaching. So I didn't know, I mean I can understand the motivation, upgrade your faculty. But the way it was done to him, it was cruel. I just couldn't sit still for that.

I: Would you say that was also a push for unionization? For the faculty to see that?

RM: Yeah because there was no way to defend him. There was no way to defend the faculty, you had no means to do it. Even if you have means you don't always win, but if you don't have any means at all there was no rights. There was no, it wasn't, the tenure so called "tenured" system was very ambiguous and capable of all kinds of interpretations. So the means for fighting were, just weren't there.

I: There was, from what I read, there was a few committees. The preliminary committee and a formal committee that reviewed Harris' case and had decided that he did have tenure based on work that he had done at other universities?

RM: Correct.

I: And that he should be reinstated, and the administration didn't take these recommendations?

RM: That's right.

I: Was that a common practice?

RM: Well yeah, they didn't have to. Without a union they don't have to. Tenure is a, it's a traditional, it's a concept. It's academic practice, and it's nationwide. But after having said all those grandiose things that doesn't mean that a given administration has to do, has to honor it. It didn't mean that. It's not written down in civil law. The faculty member at Northern Michigan University served at the pleasure of the administration. Period. I'm not saying that critically, that's fact. When it felt that the faculty member did not perform correctly or had outlived his or her usefulness he could be gotten rid of. There was nothing, there was nothing you could do. Except you could, I guess and I actually I did that as a matter of fact, you could be represented by the American Association of University Professors for whom I worked for a while nationally. I lived in Washington for a couple of years. They could come and exert moral influence, okay? That's it. They could not force the administration to retain that person, they could not.

I: I see, okay. What were some of the, was there any student reaction to this case?

RM: Not as much.

I: Not as much?

RM: No. Fred was not, you know I'd say this if he was sitting in front of me and he would agree. Fred was not the kind of person you would call into a meeting to rally the troops. That was not Fred. Fred was quiet, soft spoken, almost retiring. Perhaps he was in the wrong profession. I mean I have to admit; I wouldn't call him quote a "dynamic faculty member." I wouldn't call him that. Decent, well-trained, honest, well-informed, plenty of room for people like that. After

all, not everyone in the faculty, or the student body for that matter, are rising stars. I mean there are ordinary people out there who weren't spectacular performers. Fred was not a spectacular performer. So there was some reason behind it too.

I: Another problem that I found, it also sounded like there was a misunderstanding with some of the policies that were being used. There was the 1940 statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure?

RM: Yeah, that's the AAUP.

I: Yeah, and the 1971 statement of procedures in the standard and the renewal or non-renewal of faculty appointments?

RM: Correct, that comes from the national AAUP.

I: Okay, and from what I read the administration sort of adopted these but with some changes to them?

RM: Emphasis on the "sort of."

I: Yeah, yeah. It seemed that what the preliminary committee was saying was that under these statements that you say that you have adopted, he should have tenure. He should be reinstated.

RM: That's correct.

I: So that is true? That they weren't really following the statements that they said they had?

RM: That's correct, but the problem is there are a lot of weasel words in there and there's wiggle room.

I: Right.

RM: So the administration will say 'yeah, sure we adopted those. But this guy was not performing. That's why we got rid of him. We got rid of him because he wasn't a good faculty member. Period.'

I: Okay.

RM: And he didn't have tenure, said the administration, actually it turns out he did by accident really.

I: But they consider him not to have tenure?

RM: Well they said, what are you gonna do? The administration says he doesn't have tenure, so what are the faculty gonna do? 'Oh yes he does,' well fine so we're in a he said she said situation. So what? He still lost his job, because it is the administration that writes the checks to

pay him. And if he's terminated then he's terminated. There's no real way that you can, you can't go to court with that kind of documentation, it's not strong enough.

I: Right. Was there any faculty reaction to this case?

RM: The Fred Harris case? I remember it. No, not much.

I: Not much?

RM: No, I spent a lot of lonely hours with Fred trying to buck him up and it was pretty discouraging. He lived out in one of the, Shiras Hills the early Shiras Hills, one of the smaller houses out there. Not one of the big doctor mansions, and it was sad. Real decent, middle class guy and it was hard to turn it into a cause for him. It was real hard.

I: Were the faculty concerned that this sort of thing might happen to them too? Did it get them on that level?

RM: Yeah, but they no, it was something for everyone else. It's not gonna happen to me right it's gonna happen to you. Because you're a jerk, because you're no good, or because you shot your mouth off, or because you're a bad teacher, or because you strayed beyond meaning of the course, or because you didn't get degree, or because you mouth off. You know whatever, whatever the reason. It's gonna happen to you, not gonna happen to me. It's not gonna happen to me because I'm a good guy and I'm a smart teacher and I'm, you know they're not gonna do that to me. Plus, I'm smart, and I don't go up against the administration. I'm not exaggerating really; I'm being kind of cute but really that's the way it is. So it wasn't gonna happen to me, so therefore we don't need a union. Right? Well, maybe not. Maybe it is gonna happen to you so. That's the kind of motivation, plus the women's issue. Women were discriminated against outrageously. Particularly when they made the mistake of wanting to have children, they went off campus, couldn't get their jobs back, anyways. This was, as I said, another generation. I mean this was, the discrimination against females was severe. In terms of job security and in terms of pay.

I: Did that cause of a lot of the women to stand up and sort of want a union because of the discrimination?

RM: As best they could. I had some, I had one of the strongest probably single supporters that I had for unions other than possibly the history department were the nurses. They were tough, tough people. [Laughter,] I loved them! They were tough and one of the reasons they were tough is because they could move. Nurses are in demand. I mean if you're poop all over me Mr. Administration, I'm out of here and I can get a good job in Arizona. I can get a good job in San Diego. I don't need to take this stuff. And so they were pretty independent people, and they'd come from hospitals, some of them were there had been unions. Not among the doctors but among the nurses. You didn't have to spell it out for them, I mean they said 'yeah, we get it. Where do we sign up?' I mean they were wonderful people. I've never forgotten, I remember some of them I mean even though they were personally conservative individuals, they got the picture right now.

I: Was there any, in particular, instances that led the nurses to be that way?

RM: The pay.

I: The pay?

RM: The pay was terrible. You know one of the ways we tried to organize faculty opinion was to publish these salary schedules. It was terrible. From the head of the nursing department on down the pay was just, it was embarrassing. It was just disrespectful; I don't know how they could tolerate it but.

I: And that was because they were women? That they were paid so little?

RM: Oh absolutely. I mean the whole department was, I don't even know if they had male. But it's kind of a no brainer because hey guess what they're nurses, they're female, and they're probably the lowest paid department on campus. I mean it's got to be, as I've mentioned before as a historian I can't argue there's a one to one absolutely clear, definitive relationship here but, I mean give me a break. They're all females, I mean that department is right on down there at the bottom. You can compare professors and associate professors, assistant professors, the nurses are almost always last in terms of pay. In terms of raises, in terms of seniority and so on. Because after all, it's not like it was, is now. A nurse, well you know nurses are nice but what are they doing in a university? I mean what's nurse? A nurse belongs in a hospital right? Who ever heard of nursing as an academic discipline? I mean what kind of nonsense is that? So nurses had a real trouble, and they worked hard of course in the, they had trouble establishing their academic status.

I: Okay, is there any other instances or actions that happen that would have spurred the faculty to consider unionizations that I haven't covered or?

RM: Well you got Fred Harris which has kind of slipped a little in my mind. I don't know, the North Marquette business I guess. I might just, my generally obnoxious attitude towards the administration and my belief a faculty was a faculty was a faculty. While all these administrative rules were more like high school and so forth. I think probably it was my attitude the causes problems as much as specific things. But I was involved in a lot of specific causes, and I'm dodging your question because I'm thinking.

I: Okay, [laughter.]

RM: And I'm not coming up with anything! [Laughter.] It's probably out there, but I don't remember it. So I won't say no there wasn't but I don't remember so.

I: Okay. Well I'm going to turn it over to Marcus now, and he has some questions for you.

RM: Thanks, it was nice visiting with you!

I: So thank you very much for speaking with me.

RM: Oh you're welcome. Good luck to you.

I: Thank you.

Marcus (M): Okay, Dr. McClellan.

RM: Yes, sir.

M: How are we doing with time, are you okay?

RM: I'm fine.

M: You're okay?

RM: Yep.

M: I'm going to ask you some questions more specific to the development of the union.

RM: Sure.

M: My first question is, how and why did you become involved with the MEA?

RM: Well, that is the 64-dollar question. You asked the right question first.

M: [Laughter.]

RM: We went to the AAUP, there was an AAUP chapter around but they were in my opinion kind of the typical AAUP mambi-pambi academic types.

M: Okay, can you elaborate a little bit more?

RM: Well these were guys and you know, and I know a lot of them, and I served with them in Washington. I know these people and they're not bad people. I mean my god they're wonderful fathers and mothers and so on. But never the less, there is a, what's called an attitude maybe? Among some faculty, that faculty are a little better than other people, kind of an elitist attitude. They're smarter they've got degrees, and then the faculty there are those with, among PhD's then there are those with better PhD's. You know my PhD is from Harvard, yours is from wherever so I'm better than you are.

M: So there's sort of a class system?

RM: Well for a faculty to join a union? Are you kidding?! Shoot myself in the foot before I would join a union!

M: Right, yeah.

RM: And lower myself? You know, you get the drift of it.

M: Yeah, that's still something of a problem today. I mean they resist the attitude, and they see us mostly an association rather than a union.

RM: Absolutely.

M: In many ways, yeah I understand.

RM: I'm surprised the thing has survived.

M: So your feeling was then that, from your perspective then the MEA was more of a?

RM: I couldn't any, I couldn't get the AAUP. I mean the AAUP would, they loved to issue documents and publish reports and I was a major participant in the AAUP. And they came to campus, as you recall in some of your reports and all that stuff. It wasn't worth anything, but they thought it was wonderful. That's not what got my job back. It became very clear to me that if you're gonna get anywhere here, you gotta have something to fight with. Besides, and this was gonna be my academic home for a while and I chose not to leave. I chose to stay and I chose to, and the main reason I chose to stay is because I wanted to get tenure. I mean it's one thing to go around and say things about the administration, it's another to actually get tenure. I didn't win until I got tenure. When I got tenure I won, because that showed that a guy who could shoot his mouth off like that could actually get tenure even though the administration hated him for it.

M: [Laughter.]

RM: And I mean I did; those are the facts. Whatever my interpretation, you may agree or not agree.

M: Sure.

RML The fact is I did get tenure, and so that was... So the AAUP, they just said 'we'll wait, you know we won't, we can't, we don't. This is not our style.'

M: So they were ineffective and inactive?

RM: You got it.

M: Is what you're saying? And then there was the combination of that with the elitist and sort of arrogant attitude?

RM: You bet.

M: Okay, and you felt that the MEA was not that?

RM: That was a real union.

M: MEA was a real union?

RM: A real union. I mean...

M: Explain that?

RM: This was a union that stepped in, essentially on the behalf of females. Organized them, teachers in the state of Michigan, and of course the NEA, the National Education Association, did the same thing. Powerful union. Big time, real union. They had organizers, and they raised money, and they did boycotts. You know it was a real union.

M: Okay.

RM: So, in desperation, I went to them. But I must say, from the very beginning I was terrified because of the one thing that would happen, and as it turns out it did happen and it sunk us. The idea was that while the MEA was a real union they were after all, high school teachers.

M: Yeah, K-12 which was the... right.

RM: K-12. So the faculty said, 'hey you've gotta be kidding? I didn't spend all this money and I didn't fight and claw my way out of high school to be represented by a K-12 union.' They hate it.

M: So who were the main proponents on campus other than you? You know with you in promoting the MEA?

RM: It was myself and this other guy who was a pilot, George. George Helfinstine. The name comes to me finally. George Helfinstine was a prince, he fought for the union. He was a pilot; I don't know why he came back to Northern.

M: Can you spell his last name?

RM: H-E-L-F-I-N-S-T-E-I-N, I think maybe S-T-I-N-E.

M: That's a good start for me.

RM: George Helfinstine. He left the university for quite a while but then he came back. Nice guy, very good teacher. Very gregarious, nice fellow. Anyways, once George and I put the thing together. George was a major player as I've said and I couldn't have done it without him.

M: What was the year when this, when you finally established an official chapter here of the MEA? Do you know? Do you remember?

RM: Well, that was a problem. Because I went downstate and I said look guys, we gotta do this sort of on the Q-T. We can't come straight out and form a MEA chapter at the university.

M: Why not?

RM: Well the faculty would go ballistic. An MEA chapter at a college qua university? That's not gonna go. So I explained to my MEA pals in Lansing, I said listen guys this has gotta be done in the dark, it's gotta be done in the closet, or it isn't gonna work. And if you want the glory of representing and little college up there, a little pseudo university, then you gotta play along and you can't come to Northern and talk about your successes in K-12. I said if you do it, we'll be through. And that is what happened unfortunately.

M: And that's what happened.

RM: We lost big time.

M: Okay, that's my next question. Well I think you answered my second question. Let me ask it again. While you were organizing or trying to surreptitiously organize the MEA as you put it.

RM: We had to sign cards.

M: Yeah, okay so you were going around signing cards?

RM: Yeah.

M: Okay, who was signing the cards?

RM: Well...

M: I mean if you're...

RM: Good spirited people who said, pardon me while I hold my nose and I'll sign.

M: Okay, but what were they, like for instance I've heard the majority of the support came from the School of Education. Is that true?

RM: True. Though you have to be a little careful with that. It's true but there's this odd effect. If you've been teaching high school for 15 years and suddenly you get a shot at the big time, I'm being flipped here, but surely you understand.

M: Sure.

RM: There's nothing wrong with high school teachers for heaven's sakes.

M: Right.

RM: More difficult, without question.

M: Absolutely. [Laughter,] I had a taste of it a long time ago.

RM: I would never think otherwise. Anyway, these guys got out of some of these miserable high schools and they got to Northern and so now they want to behave like high school people? No way.

M: Yeah, sure.

RM: So in theory, the School of Education was all in favor but in fact, it was two minds.

M: But you did get a smattering of support from the other departments then and colleges?

RM: Oh yeah, we got a lot of support from them. We got a lot of support from political activists, people who had been around saying, hey I don't care what you call it and I don't care how you do it a union is a union is a union. And if we have a union, then we can take these suckers to court and we can fight back.

M: Sure.

RM: We can protect salaries.

M: Sure.

RM: We can do all kinds of stuff.

M: Now while this is happening, okay, what was the relationship between you and the AAUP? How did the AAUP respond to your efforts in organizing the MEA?

RM: I didn't give them the chance. I mean there was nothing there. I told them were, I mean if they didn't want to support a union then they could just go away.

M: [Laughter,] okay but they didn't make any counter efforts?

RM: Well they did. They were very successful. There was the radio broadcast on the eve of the election.

M: Okay, now when you say election, you're talking about the '71 election right?

RM: Yeah, the first election.

M: The first one.

RM: The one where we lost, horribly. On the eve of the election a couple guys, Ralph Loomis and another guy at the U of M AAUP hired a radio spot.

M: Oh really?

RM: And it played about, it played several times between about 7 and 9 o'clock over the local radio in Marquette.

M: Was it a public station here, or?

RM: I'm not sure.

M: Okay.

RM: I'm not sure.

M: But it was?

RM: It was very effective.

M: What was the gist?

RM: To enrage faculty, not to make this mistake. Wait. The AAUP will help you if you have to organize, organize under the AAUP do not organize under the MEA and here are the reasons. It really just, it was like feeding candy to a baby. I mean there was no way we could withstand that. And the previous week we had had a final organizing conference and a guy came up to speak for the MEA and before I said do not send us a K-12 person, I don't care how successful he is. So they never did get it, the MEA never quite understood what I was trying to do and they kept sending. So they sent this black guy, very nice guy, but K-12 was written all over him. He got up and the faculty, and he was doing okay until he got about two thirds of the way through and then he started explaining, well this is the way. Someone asked him a question 'well how does it work?' And he said 'well this is the way it works in K-12.'

M: [Laughter.]

RM: You could have, I thought the guys were gonna get up and walk out.

M: Okay, can we hold right there for a moment? Just pause, we're changing tapes here.

RM: Sure.

TAPE 2 SIDE A

[Audio cuts in abruptly.]

M: Then you were trying to prod, the AAUP initially but they weren't effective and wouldn't get going? So you went to the MEA and organize the MEA and as you became success in getting

cards and so forth out the AAUP state group came up but the local chapter here just didn't really?

RM: No they wouldn't.

M: They didn't do anything really in response? Okay.

RM: No, they were frank. They were a unit. You've got some guys there, I won't mention their names, but you've got guys there right now in the AAUP, they're still working for Northern.

M: Sure, oh yeah.

RM: They'll give you different versions about it, but those are the facts.

M: Now was your relationship with them cordial? Did you get along or did they try to?

RM: Depends on what you're talking about, if you're talking about unions I would say the relationship was strained.

M: Okay.

RM: If we're talking about the latest snowfall at Cliffs Ridge, no problem.

M: [Laughter.] Yeah we got 10 inches last night.

RM: Wonderful, yeah we loved it. We love the snow.

M: Well you must miss it then in California, eh?

RM: Yeah, we don't have it right here. It doesn't fall.

M: Did you just notice I said 'eh' at the end of my statement there?

RM: Yeah, well yeah I was kidding about that.

M: I've only been here four years but I've already adopted that. [Laughter.]

RM: I dropped it as you noticed. [Laughter.]

M: Yes, I have. Okay, well now we go to the third question. That is the, how is it then, at what point did you believe that you had enough support in '70 or '71 to petition the MERC for a CB election? I mean how did you believe? I mean you must have garnered enough cards or?

RM: Well I had been going to Washington and the AAUP meetings and so on, there's a good guy there. Gerie Bledsoe and I don't know exactly; I just didn't want to give up.

M: So you felt you had enough support, you petitioned the MERC right?

RM: We lost 2 to 1 on the MEA. We were destroyed.

M: Why did it fail then? Other than the radio broadcast, and that guy coming up the week before?

RM: The prejudice of K-12, that's why.

M: That was the bottom line?

RM: Yep, the bottom line.

M: So even though you had success in getting cards, people signing cards, in the end they even though they might have signed the cards, in the end when they voted?

RM: Well we got the cards, which qualified for election but then we didn't get the vote.

M: We didn't get the vote in.

RM: Jarl Roine from geography and myself stood there and it was one of the, I remember it very, very well for one of the low points. One of the lowest points because here we were fighting back and we got hammered. 2 to 1, I remember the pile. I remember very clearly. And they were called "Labor and Unions" no "Union and Management," that's what it was called.

M: Yeah, now had you achieved tenure by this time?

RM: No, no.

M: Oh you still weren't tenured. [Laughter.] Oh that's great, talk about guts.

RM: I don't know, stupidity maybe. I didn't have any choice, I was committed.

M: Okay, good now moving on to the fourth question. Now after the failure of the election, did you continue your activities with the MEA?

RM: Nope, nope.

M: You just completely?

RM: Cut 'em right off.

M: Cut 'em right off? Now did they?

RM: I said 'see you around, that's it.'

M: Okay, so you ended your involvement. But did it continue at all? I mean, I know that it still?

RM: I guess but I don't know much about it. Frankly I wanted to disassociate myself with what I saw as a losing cause as fast as I could. I was like one of those people who come and say 'well you were with the MEA' and I would say 'who me?'

M: [Laughter.]

RM: You've mistaken me! [Laughter.]

M: You know Jesus don't you? [Laughter.] No I don't know him!

RM: With George Helfinstine I had a parting of ways, I mean of course I felt very badly. He felt I had been blunt. And actually he left the university shortly thereafter.

M: Now but they continued at some level because as far as I can determine they were the ones that petitioned the MERC in '75 for the election in '75 not the AAUP.

RM: No the AAUP had to have cards.

M: No I know they did, they gathered cards but when the actual petition occurred I, from what I've been able to gather it was the MEA that petitioned.

RM: It had to be.

M: But you don't know anything about them then after '71 because you just dropped out?

RM: Well I just wasn't...

M: You weren't involved?

RM: I wasn't a player in that.

M: Okay, okay. But they were still active, were they?

RM: Yeah, oh sure. I mean there were lots of people at Northern who belonged to the MEA. Lots of them.

M: Okay, so they continued to hold meetings?

RM: Oh yeah.

M: See we don't have any records for that group after that so it's.

RM: Well they disappeared.

M: They just sort of dwindled?

RM: I mean these guys would go to state meetings. But there was nothing really going on on the campus.

M: So then after you left the MEA did you then rejoin?

RM: I had never left.

M: You never left the AAUP? But did you?

RM: I was curious at the locals, then they kind of carried the ball.

M: Sure.

RM: I was tainted meat as it were.

M: What do you mean?

RM: Well I had been so identified with the MEA I mean people did not want to get real close to me.

M: Really?

RM: Not for another cause.

M: So the AAUP people didn't?

RM: They carried the ball for a while. They carried the ball

M: And they didn't, and you didn't become active with them then?

RM: Well I did. I mean I became active.

M: Later, after the election. But I mean before, before the election after the defeat in '71, did you go to AAUP meetings? Did you get involved in getting cards signed? Did you do any other things?

RM: I did, I was involved in that.

M: You weren't?

RM: I was.

M: You were? Okay. Can you describe some of those activities and how that went?

RM: Well it was hard for me because well you know number one my original project had turned out to be a failure, so I had to eat a certain amount of crow and I was not a shining rising star so I was kind of in the hanger on. And frankly the AAUP, to this day, moves way too slowly for me.

M: [Laughter] Sure.

RM: I'm a Teamster, okay? I'm not an academic unionist but you've got to, if you're gonna do that, if you're going to get these academics to play the union game, you can't behave like a Teamster.

M: Yeah, I have the same problem. I'm very far to the left myself and I have a hard time.

RM: Good for you!

M: I have a hard time getting them to move.

RM: You have to be careful! You have to watch your...

M: I know I have to. I was very involved with the Green Party this summer.

RM: Oh were you?

M: And I'm not tenured, I'm not tenured myself right now and I had some moments were I was a little worried [laughter.]

RM: Yeah, you have to be careful.

M: But, okay so you were, you did get involved. But we don't see a petition, we don't see you writing position papers or anything like that between '71 and '75 okay.

RM: Nope, I didn't have any use for that.

M: So did you get encouraged? Were you encouraged then in '73 when the national union voted to actively promote collective bargaining? I mean the national AAUP at it's conference.

RM: Yeah sure I was encouraged. After all I had been active downstate at Wayne and under some of those guys.

M: Okay.

RM: The problem, the problem at Northern was you know the key, the whole thing was what were you going to do with the Academic Senate? That was the problem.

M: Okay, could you...

RM: How are you gonna fit the Academic Senate into this framework? And if you don't, you're not going to go anywhere at Northern.

M: Okay, explain that. When you mean framework?

RM: Well, the Academic Senate was I mean kind of the smaller the university, the more puffed up the faculty are, if you excuse the reference. Small place, big time AAUP, you know posturing around about us academics and how terrific we are and all of that kind of stuff. So, the Academic Senate, it loved to meet and talk and talk and talk and talk.

M: Sure, still do. [Laughter.]

RM: That's what they do. You could not; we could not have a union at Northern unless the Academic Senate were included. You could not come straight out and say that 'hey the Academic Senate, they're a bunch of old ladies. If you want to get something done you gotta have a union.' If that position had been taken, there wouldn't be any union. The senior faculty would never have supported.

M: Sure. Now, Jim Greene has said to me that the Academic Senate is basically a creature of the union, of the AAUP now. Is that what, I mean is that what you're trying to say in a sense? Is that the Academic Senate was brought into being a creation of the, that you know the union is what creates the Academic Senate, gets it going gives it its power by contract, involves it in the governance?

RM: Technically that's true.

M: Was that then part of the goal was to increase the power and influence in the?

RM: The goal was to incorporate the Academic Senate in the first contract. We did it, and that was one of the high points of my union career. It's one of the very few contracts which incorporates the Academic Senate and gives them, literally gives them power. Which they didn't have before. So all you gotta do is look at the first contract. The first contract was written in front of the fireplace at 424 Cedar Street and I can still see Jerry Roth sitting down because we were, it was time to negotiate. And so the question was how are we gonna negotiate?

M: What's the address again?

RM: 424 Cedar Street, that's where I lived. That big old house on the east side, it's still there.

M: And that's where you guys would meet? Put it together?

RM: That's where we sat down, Joe Roni was there and several guys. We didn't know what we were doing, This hadn't been done before. We kept saying 'well where's the model? Where's the model? Where's the contract which gives the Academic Senate all this power?' I mean they have the right to do this and that, even get involved in grievances. I mean all kinds of things. If we hadn't done that there would be no, the union would have died.

M: Okay so that was?

RM: That was the promise we made. That was the promise that was made at the time that they cards were signed. They would say “well you sign the cards, that’s the end cards, that’s the end of the Academic Senate.” And the AAUP said “no it’s not, we promise we will incorporate the Academic Senate” da da da da da da.

M: Okay, and that was directly related to the whole governance issue right?

RM: Absolutely.

M: The Academic Senate and the faculty would have sole control over the development of curriculum and the power to do that.

RM: That magic word “governance.” I mean that was...

M: Yeah, well I’m gonna get to that [laughter.]

RM: Big words! We don’t have any money but sure do have a lot of fancy language.

M: Sure. Now the election occurs, it’s successful and you agree to be chief negotiator?

RM: Correct.

M: Okay.

RM: The union came to me, the other guy in philosophy, Jim...the tall guy I don’t know if he’s still there or not.

M: Who? Oh Jim Greene?

RM: No, not Jim.

M: Not Jim? Cooper?

RM: Yeah! David Cooper.

M: David Cooper, right.

RM: David came to me and said well we’ve been picking around you know who’ve we’ve been thinking who’d be the grievance...’

M: Cooper’s still here.

RM: Is he still there?

M: Yeah.

RM: And David said 'oh and your name has come up' I said okay, okay.

M: So despite the fact that you were so identified with the MEA, and that you had, they still came to you?

RM: Exactly.

M: Why do you think they came to you?

RM: Um...okay, I'll...

M: Of all the people you know?

RM: I'll sit down, you go get out of here!

M: [Laughter.] Sit down, you go get out of here.

RM: I don't know, what can I say? Maybe because I knew, maybe because I was forceful enough, maybe because I would stand up and they knew I couldn't be bought.

M: You couldn't be bought.

RM: They knew that, because negotiations could be tricky. You could lose!

M: Sure, I was on the negotiating team so.

RM: Oh you know. You don't have to win, just because you walk in the room and say 'okay here we're gonna negotiate, we're gonna take away something for ourselves.' Oh yeah? We'll see. And zero bargaining of course, it's a basic trick on the part of...

M: Absolutely.

RM: They give you nothing now, what do you think, what you thought you deserved.

M: So why did you agree then?

RM: So Cooper came in and said 'can you do this?' And I gave him a little thumbnail sketch of the way Northern had been. See a lot of these guys were new to the university, and I said "let me tell you about Northern in the last ten years." I came in '65 and I knew the town, I knew North Marquette, I knew Cliffs-Dow, I knew the mining and so on. I knew the place. I knew it well, and I knew what we were up against. It was my opinion that we could write a contract that would work for us but that it had to include the Academic Senate in such a way that it would not emasculate the contract. We had to give them something, but not too much.

M: Okay. When you say 'we had to give them something' what was it that you gave them?

RM: We had to give the Academic Senate, at the very least the appearance of legitimacy. And power! They didn't just want to meet and give us, you know, blessing things that we had already decided. They wanted to be really involved.

M: Right.

RM: That's why we had this elaborate structure in the first contract. All you do is look at the first contract and you say 'what is all this stuff in here for?'

M: Well let's move on to that question then. You've, in the first contract the, obviously the primary objective for you was the power of the Senate, the role of the Senate. What other major objective did you have?

RM: Well tenure, we need to protect tenure. That was critical, if we don't have tenure we might as well forget it.

M: Okay.

RM: We needed to protect, we needed to have grievance procedure.

M: Okay.

RM: We really had some teeth in it, and that included a progression, how you went through it and what you had to prove and what terminal degrees meant. And all that kind of stuff.

M: So it was all outlined and explained in detail?

RM: Yes, this was, I mean governance, I'm gonna make fun of the word but actually it was very very important.

M: Okay, alright.

RM: We had a long situation where the administration kind of made it up as they went along and you never knew what was gonna happen to you.

M: Now, didn't Foster though as part of the Harris case, sort of come up with a grievance process that was in place? Or were they just?

RM: Wrote one, under the offices of the AAUP.

M: That was before the contract though?

RM: Yeah, it doesn't have any teeth.

M: But it had no teeth.

RM: I mean, you know unless you have the ability to say 'I won't do that. I'm going to go out on strike, or I'm gonna hurt you. I'm gonna make you look bad in the eyes of the world.'

M: Right.

RM: Unless you can do that. Why should I be nice to you?

M: Absolutely. Okay, so the Senate, tenure, grievance procedure. What were the other, any other major points or major goals that you, that you and Jerry and others sat down in front of the fireplace and worked out?

RM: Salary, but I must admit I didn't have any fond hopes for it because I didn't think we would get them to strike. Without a strike you're not going to get anywhere on salaries, especially the first time around. And the guy that faced us, for the administration...

M: Was Tobin?

RM: Yeah. What a great guy, I mean I admire him, tough.

M: Yeah, I'm gonna ask you about him in a little bit. So what about retrenchment?

RM: Oh right, I forgot that.

M: Yeah, so retrenchment I've come across that, that was?

RM: Absolutely. And that was kind of a way to, you know take a second bite of the apple because the administration was saying 'sure we'll have tenure. Sure we'll have grievance. But oh my goodness, you know if we run out of money oh my heaven's sake what are we going to do? We're gonna have to fire you guys!'

M: Yeah, yeah.

RM: So retrenchment we knew was a code word for getting rid of us. It was a backdoor for beating up on the faculty. And so we had to cover that, we had to close that door.

M: Okay.

RM: And we did, sort of.

M: So now let's talk about the actual negotiation sessions and how did you accomplish them, these goals? Because you were successful on all of those weren't you?

RM: I thought we were.

M: Yeah, and particularly retrenchment. I think we're still using the premises that was put into place.

RM: It's got some teeth.

M: Huh?

RM: It's got some teeth.

M: Yeah, I mean we have a very good, I think we have a very good retrenchment protocol. I mean we didn't even touch it in the last negotiation session. How did you approach this?

RM: We met up in Jamrich Hall in a little room on the third floor and we were there and Jim Tobin walk in late and said something like 'well this won't take long we're gonna talk about wages, hours, working conditions and that's it.' And here I'm sitting with the Academic Senate in my pocket and I can just, complicated language, _____ and saying 'oh boy this could be a tough one.' And so we just start fighting, I don't mean, we didn't duke it out, but Jim and I, Jim Tobin and I, just went after each other. I said 'no we're not' he said 'yes we are' I said 'no we're not.' I used to do various things like, well 'I'm gonna get them out on strike' he said 'they won't strike' I said 'the hell they won't! They'll strike. I'll grab them by the god damn neck tie and I'll make them strike!'

M: So you threatened them with a strike?

RM: Oh absolutely. It was rough, it wasn't fun. In fact my team at one point said 'you know, you make me so mad in there I'd like to hit you!'

M: [Laughter.] Wait a second, let me get that.

RM: 'I mean you're going crazy man! This is an academic thing here, you're not supposed to be beating up on these people like this.' I said 'we're gonna fight until there's blood on the table and then maybe we'll get something.'

M: 'We're going to fight till there's blood on the table' [laughter.]

RM: That's what we did. We fought over the coffee pot, they used to play these little tricks with us. You know come in late, and they had a little place that we went over to the student center. And they had, they the other side, they had the wonderful room over there where they could go back, put their feet up, have coffee and leisure time. They used to hang out there, _____ take naps. And we were in that miserable room, the president's room or whatever it was, hard chairs and there we were. And we toughed it out, you know we got tireder and tireder and tireder, and they'd come back refreshed. You know sometimes they'd go out to dinner.

M: [Laughter.]

RM: What they would say was 'oh well we have to leave. We have to think about this you know.' Then they'd come back three or four hours later and say 'well...'

M: So they were messing with you huh?

RM: Yeah.

M: Now I know that you were, at the first session you requested a laundry list of data from them?

RM: That's right.

M: And the most contentious was the salary information by name, and they refused initially to give you that.

RM: Right.

M: How was that finally resolved? I mean you began to actually go around with release forms requesting it?

RM: I went to the Labor Negotiation Board and I said that 'how the hell are we going to negotiate over salaries if we don't have any, we don't have any data!'

M: Right.

RM: We don't know whose salaries are which. So we got it, we had to get it.

M: You filed a, what do you call it?

RM: Unfair grievance.

M: Right, unfair labor practices with them. Then they finally relented and released the information, right? But you also did in the process, you actually did though start going around the faculty asking them to sign the release form?

RM: That's right we did. Because that's what the administration said, 'we'll do it, if you get all the faculty to agree of course.' So we could have used that, but then we did the other two and that was...

M: Okay, so what was the response, I mean I'll probably kick this up in the minutes, why do you feel you were successful in getting the Senate power or getting a really...

RM: I can think of two reasons. One, in all fairness I think we wrote a pretty good contract. I think it's the kind of contract that a Senate person could look at and say 'you know, I could live with that. There's room for me in there, and I can see something for myself in there and I don't think they've traded away academic integrity.' That was a big word, which was a big code word. That was one of them that was one reason. Another reason was the Academic Senate did not

quite know what was going on, they did not quite get it. In other words, they were not exactly at the bargaining table and I don't think they quite realized where we were going and what the possibilities were. I think they saw enough to feel comfortable, but I don't, I mean after all these were faculty members who admittedly said 'I don't like unions, I don't trust them, I don't know anything about them.' And so they kind of distanced themselves from the union. And this came up at the time of ratification, in fact I remember saying 'gosh, I don't know about this! This is a little scary!'

M: Well why would they be scared with having a clearly defined role and clearly defined powers?

RM: Because it reduced their status.

M: How would it reduced their status?

RM: Because a real faculty member should make it on his own. He should be good in the classroom, his students should adore him, and his, the other part of his life when he isn't taking care of his family, should be publishing papers and getting a national reputation.

M: Now when you say the 'faculty member sees this' or the Senate, because you said the Senate didn't really know what was going on. Now the faculty member himself, or herself, looks at this and is weary about the union because they think it reduces their elitist status or whatever, they're on the pedestal position. You know they have to get down a grope for their, for their status which they shouldn't have to do that. But why would the Senate, as a body, be troubled with...you see where I'm going with this? Why would the Senate as a body be trouble with being given very clearly precise powers?

RM: Because, the power was being given by...

M: A union.

RM: A union!

M: Is that really?

RM: They have to share the stage with the union. I mean look around the state, how many unions are there?

M: Not very many.

RM: Here we were, this little place up here and these guys didn't come up here for this, come up and join a union. And unions were not only not very well thought of in the national environment, they weren't well thought of in the AAUP. And they certainly weren't well thought of in the UP.

M: Yeah.

RM: That's how Peirce told me.

M: Well it's really interesting. I guess I haven't really looked at, well it's hard to from the records to really gauge the whole, this cultural attitude is what you're talking about of academia. The ivory tower cultural attitude, and the concept of the union was really sort of a working class concept that they're, I mean I've encountered that here but I didn't realize it was that...

RM: That's the guts of it.

M: Because one of the things that I've been told from Jim Greene and others is that there was a core group. You know, yourself, Jim, Jerry Roth, Les Foster, some others, who really were the driving force in getting the union going.

RM: That's true.

M: And that everybody else sort of just went along with it almost.

RM: Well you know how it works, for employees. You have a nut group, a core group, and then you have those who are against, then you have the vast unwashed middle group who frankly are just not interested.

M: Right. So you were able, you believe then, the administration was able to accept what you were giving them because you had written a good and rational contract when you deal with different issues?

RM: Well yeah I think the administration saw some room for them in here. They, the administration, I think they believe they could use this contract too, and they did. They did use it, and they do use it.

M: Right.

RM: Because those provisions cut both ways.

M: Right. So that it would work for them and they were willing to, because initially the first proposal that you gave them, Tobin's response was pretty extreme.

RM: [Laughter.]

M: He said you know 'you're out of your minds! I can't believe you're coming in here! I can't believe your serious' you know 'this is illegal' blah blah blah 'you know the Board of Control runs this university, not the faculty.' So the initial reaction was pretty, pretty hostile to your proposal.

RM: Yeah, you might say that.

M: Then do you think that was probably tactical?

RM: Sure.

M: In a way to just try to get you to?

RM: But then, they were dealing with a guy, I'd been fired, I'd be oppressed on, I mean what could Jim Tobin do to me? Nothing!

M: Yeah, right!

RM: I don't care what Jim Tobin said!

M: Were you tenured by now? You must have been tenured.

RM: I did by then, it took me a long time.

M: Right, but...

RM: And I was the only faculty I believe had to make special appearance in front of the Board of Control. Fred Sabin, my physician neighbor. And I had to be interviewed and all that nonsense.

M: [Laughter.]

RM: I just told them flat out, I said 'well I'll play this game, but if you touch me I'll go right back to Lansing. Only this time, you're gonna pay it's gonna be a civil suit. We're gonna nail your ass to the wall.'

M: Can you describe any other interesting moments in the contract negotiations, other than the fact that you guys haggled and they played games with you and you had to file the unfair practices petition at one point. What other points were really tense and difficult that you thought it might all collapse? Or were there any other?

RM: I think Tobin was surprised at our backbone.

M: Really?

RM: I think he was surprise. Now I've used certain language here on the phone and you know for emphasis, it's not the best language in the world. But I must say I think Jim knew.

M: Jim Greene?

RM: No Jim Tobin.

M: Okay.

RM: That we were gonna fight. And I had been in contact with the Teamsters, and they had promised me. They said 'if you go out on strike, we will support you and we will not deliver. We will not cross your line, we will not bring trucks to the university.'

M: Really?

RM: 'We will not supply. We will support you.' And I said 'you guys, you are made in heaven. Like why would you do this to a bunch of snot nosed arrogant faculty up there in the UP?' and they said 'well it's for the sake of the union.' I mean this sounds corny, but the fact is, then you had the secretaries. You had Mary Knault [spelled phonetically] over in English, she's probably gone now. There were some real tough secretaries.

M: Well they still are the one and only union that struck, that has struck on campus.

RM: You mess with them; you mess with them at your peril!

M: Right.

RM: And the nurses...

M: So the CT's were gonna back you?

RM: Yeah.

M: Okay.

RM: Unofficially yes.

M: After you talked with them?

RM: Yeah, and I told Tobin that. I said 'Jim, we're talking about unions here.' And of course I used all my weapons you know. Every once in a while I'd wear my collar to the negotiations. They didn't know what the hell to do with that, there an episcopal priest here I mean, how can you use that kind of language? They thought I was a crazy person.

M: Right.

RM: So I did exhibit a certain amount of quote unquote crazy behavior and I think Jim was convinced that we would fight, and if necessary we would shut it down, we would sacrifice ourselves and you know, on the pier on a strike. I mean we would do what we had to do. Until he was convinced of that, we didn't go anywhere so there was a lot of theatre going on there. The initial meeting just went on forever and whenever there was an occasion where I could back him down, on the coffee pot! We should have coffee! You guys have coffee, we should have an access to the coffee pot. Can you imagine arguing over that?

M: [Laughter.]

RM: Well it was important! This is the shape of the table, you know business, it matters. It matters who's got the chairs facing...

M: Yeah well it's totally different now, it wasn't like that at all. It wasn't like that at all.

RM: We had lots of...we had nothing. They came with the full force of the administration, all the comforts, all the power, all the computer access. They had everything. And there's no question here about what Jim Greene played a major part with his computer knowledge and his general...

M: Yeah he still does.

RM: General genius frankly. He's an extremely brilliant guy. And what was my major contribution? I just, I guess maybe I was just the tough guy.

M: Right. That's what it sounds like.

RM: I would not back down for anybody. And that's the way I am today.

M: Okay well, why is it then that you left the negotiations? Why did you leave as chief negotiator, sorry you have to talk about this.

RM: Because I had promised my kids that we would go for a cruise.

M: Oh, okay.

RM: I took my, I had a sabbatical. And I decide I was not gonna sacrifice, I decided I had done enough. I made the point, negotiations were under way. I said to John, 'sorry John, you know you carry the torch.' And John didn't think much of that, the burning torch he thought that would get annihilated here but frankly, as the record will show, you know things.

M: Things went fine, yeah.

RM: Along the lines that we were going.

M: We're gonna talk to John on Monday. Monday.

RM: John's still there?

M: Yeah, John's still here. We're gonna talk with him on Monday about all of this. Okay now I'm gonna ask you a couple of different kind of questions and one is if you could just talk a little bit about your impressions of, and your relationship with, Jamrich himself.

RM: [Laughter.]

M: Now, you know Jamrich in his writing that we've come across in his, what he said, that he was successful in creating a culture of governance and inclusion of the faculty. And he, from other people said, was just literally stunned in '75 when the union won. Can you talk a little bit about your impressions of him and your relationship with him a little bit? In that relationship to that whole business?

RM: Yeah, he was a snake!

M: He was a snake! [Laughter.]

RM: Yeah! He was a clever guy.

M: He was a what?

RM: A clever fellow.

M: A clever fellow.

RM: You know he was great. He was Dean of Graduate Studies at Michigan State.

M: Associate Dean.

RM: Associate Dean. And the word down there was, 'how did they find this guy? Why did they reach down and get this guy?'

M: Oh, you mean they're saying why did Northern?

RM: I was good friends with...

M: Could we pause, sir, for just a moment here? We gotta pause we have a tape we have to change here.

TAPE 2 SIDE B

M: Okay go ahead.

RM: Hobbard [spelled phonetically] was Dean of Arts and Sciences, he was the guy that led my dissertation, which I got from Michigan State. So he knew Jamrich, he said 'I was flabbergasted.' I said I had no, where did this guy come from? I mean there was some great people at Michigan State, but why this guy? And I don't know. I mean he was a mathematician, and I don't know why. It's not worth speculating. Anyway, John Jamrich was a clever fellow and I gotta give him credit he was an accomplished man, he made his way in life, made a lot of money. His wife was something else.

M: [Laughter.] That's what I heard too.

RM: I mean, there were guys that use to bid on work at the university residence and they'd throw in another 10% because they had to talk to June.

M: [Laughter.]

RM: I'm not kidding ya, she wouldn't leave them alone. She would talk, she was chased into her garage once, heavily under the influence of alcohol. It was a wonderful deal. I don't begrudge him, I mean he did well. He made his life work for him, and I made my life work for myself. But...

M: But how do you, do you feel then that he was out of touch with the faculty?

RM: No, no! He was just, I mean he was from downstate and this was a big promotion for him so he was gonna go up there, and he was gonna be the grand president help these poor ignorant...

M: Poor rural slobs?

RM: Yeah, help them find their way in life. And he was gonna do it, it was the paterfamilias kind of thing, which is very important up there in the UP. This never would have would have worked in downtown Detroit, John Jamrich strutting around. Which is why he couldn't handle the black kids. He didn't get it, he didn't understand it.

M: So would you then disagree with his position that he was successful in integrating the faculty and governance and making them feel a part?

RM: I don't think he had anything to do with it.

M: Huh?

RM: I don't think he had anything to do with it.

M: He didn't have, why would you say that?

RM: Whatever he gave to the faculty, in his, if that's the position, the faculty would have taken at him. I think you have to give the faculty credit. I think the faculty did one hell of a job, and the fact that they're still hanging in there. I mean, you've been close, you've been in negotiation.

M: Yep.

RM: Where does this happen else in the world? You know in the American academic scene? There's some tough people up there.

M: Right.

RM: There's some, Jon Saari is one of them. There's some tough, old, red, Finnish people up there.

M: Yeah, yeah.

RM: Don't push 'em around!

M: Yeah, we're losing them though that's the fear.

RM: Sylvia Pynnonen,

M: Oh she's still around you know. She's not here on campus, but she's still in town.

RM: We'll I'll have to tell you, Sylvia is an angel in my life.

M: Yeah, my wife interviewed her for some stuff.

RM: Is that right?

M: Yeah, really likes her too.

RM: Oh, you asked me for incidences then. When our depositions were being taken and the administration was trying to break the suit by calling everybody in from their vacation. I was there when Sylvia came in and now Sylvia you want to hear very conservative and all this stuff. And so she said, this is exactly what she said I've never forgotten, she looked up and said "well I got up one morning," because they had said 'well why'd you get involved?' She said "I got up one morning, I looked in the mirror and I said to myself 'Sylvia you've got to join that lawsuit.'"

M: And the lawsuit was what that?

RM: This is where the faculty sued the administration.

M: When, what? Over the salary issue? When did you sue the administration?

RM: This is over getting my job back.

M: Oh, this was way back. Okay, back in '68 okay, alright.

RM: And the lawyers, you know for the administration, they collapsed. They said that 'there it goes, that's it.' Here's Sylvia Pynnonen who's just as conservative now probably as she was then. But tough, clearly a tough, decent, fair person, but not one you push around. But anyway, that strain runs through the faculty and in that sense I'm really very proud of the faculty.

M: So, getting back to Jamrich though. Do you remember any specific thing that he did?

RM: Oh sure.

M: That really riled people?

RM: Oh yeah, the sit it!

M: Relate some of the things that you saw that he did that just pissed people off. Or just, you know.

RM: Well, I can remember very clearly. We were outside Al Niemi's office and, oh god the name escaped me, the big black guy. Damn, I can't remember his name. Great guy, a real con artist but.

M: What? The one that died scuba diving?

RM: No, no, no. That was a faculty member, this was a student.

M: Oh, a student? David Williams?

RM: Yeah, Dave Williams.

M: You know where he's, you know he's Vice-President for Finance Administration at Ohio State now?

RM: Is he really?

M: Yeah, in fact he came back up here a couple years ago we invited him back up here as a distinguished alumni.

RM: Oh great!

M: And he got an award and he talked at a symposium we did on diversity in higher education. And he looked [laughter] he got up to the podium and he looked out at the crowd and he said 'do you people remember me? I mean I was stunned when I got the letter inviting me to come up here. I said when I left in 1970 I would never come back!' [Laughter.]

RM: Dave was a nice guy, he's very talented and no fool. He would have been a good negotiator. I'm so glad that they have that information. We're outside Niemi's office and Jamrich was gonna call the police.

M: So that was when they did that?

RM: Huh?

M: That was when they crashed the office?

RM: Yeah, the so called sit in.

M: Yeah.

RM: As much as it was. So, here's Dave's a big guy. You've seen him now so you know he's a big black guy and Jamrich was there. Jamrich came up to about his chest, it seemed that way this was about 3 or 4 in morning. Jamrich said 'we're gonna do this are you kidding me? You can't do this, you haven't got any right' and so on. And so, excuse me just a minute, [background conversation.] Excuse me _____.

M: That's okay, do you want to take a break?

RM: No I'm okay, I just had to check with them. So Dave, he reached down and he took Jamrich by the elbows and he picked him up!

M: Are you kidding? Physically lifted him?

RM: Lifted him like he was a little doll, and he looked in his eye and just shook his head side to side and didn't say a thing. Set him back down again and walked away.

M: [Laughter.] You're kidding!

RM: Just strolled away! It was the most devastating thing he could have done.

M: I had never heard that before. He actually lifted Jamrich up?

RM: He picked him up by his elbows, you know how you can do that guys gotta _____. Squeezed his elbows at the side, lifted up, Jamrich his little feet where off the floor, looked like a little doll.

M: [Laughter.]

RM: It was so _____. It was funny. So anyway, at that deal, Jamrich he made a deal with those guys. That they wouldn't be prosecuted in the deal and then they wouldn't be suspended. Well that happened right?

M: Right.

RM: But then he prosecuted them.

M: Oh.

RM: He went to Ed Quinnell and they were prosecuted in civil court.

M: Right.

RM: And I defended them, along with Kent Bourland from Marquette, I don't know if he's still there or not. Jamrich got on the stand, he testified. The question was 'where was the tape?' There was supposed to be some critical tape of a student meeting and there was an argument over it. And Jamrich said, well he erased the tape. So at that point our guys looked at each other and said

‘whoa, whoa.’ And George Hill was the judge and so we had a recess. They came in and said ‘gee we want to do this, we want to do that.’ We said ‘no way, we’re taking this trial to the very end. We gotcha, you know it. We’re gonna hammer ya. This is a bad trail, you never should have brought the charge and we’re not interested in any kind delay or settlement here. We’re interested in a mistrial.’ So then the whole thing was called off, I forgot which subterfuge George used, but anyway that was the end of that.

M: Wow.

RM: So Jamrich was not a nice man.

M: No.

RM: If Jamrich could hurt you, he would hurt you.

M: Really?

RM: When I settled with Jamrich, it was at a place downstate, and John McGoff was there and Jamrich was there and a couple of the members of the Board of Control. I remember walking outside and John McGoff had hurt his foot and he was kind of limping along. And we were looking at the railroad, there was a railroad train nearby. A train came by and John McGoff was going on about how he liked trains and then Jamrich came out and the three of us stood there and ‘we could work something out’ said Jamrich. So anyway.

M: What do you mean “settled with him?” You mean?

RM: Well that was my case.

M: Oh your case for getting your job back.

RM: It was in federal court at that point.

M: Oh really.

RM: Jamrich came in. So I was quote given my job back unquote. I wasn’t given tenure, and my raise for that year I believe was \$200. And that was my beginning with Jamrich.

M: Any other instances that you can remember that people would remember or think about.

RM: Probably the Vietnam business. The kids put together, made a fake graveyard and tombstones out on the lawn. That was a very sad business, that Vietnam business. And Jamrich thought that kind of protest was going too far and said the name of the university, and all that kind of stuff. Jamrich was not a bad man, I kind of respect him in a way.

M: So, just in general, he had an autocratic style that people just didn’t like?

RM: Autocratic, and he demanded the credit, and you gave it to him so.

M: Right. So let me ask you then about this other fellow who seemed to have sparked some controversy. Bob Glenn.

RM: Oh [laughter.]

M: Okay, now we know what, you know something of the circumstances surrounded his appointment as provost and that that was a very major point. Or the faculty really grab that as an example of Jamrich's autocratic style because there was a committee that was formed and that he basically rejected the three choices the committee presented him and went ahead and chose Glenn who wasn't very well liked apparently.

RM: That's true.

M: How can you, can you describe your reaction to that and what you felt the others?

RM: Bob Glenn was okay, I feel a little sorry for him. I mean he was the guy that was brought in there, and he was a kept man from the very beginning. And I don't like, I kind of felt like I was beating up on him when I would go in with him. He tried to be nice, and sometimes he was nice. Sometimes he wasn't nice. It didn't matter to me whether he was nice or not nice. I got pretty much, you know what I wanted, accomplished what I wanted to. I always felt sorry for him frankly, kind of weak.

M: You felt that he was kind of weak?

RM: Yeah.

M: Why?

RM: Well, I don't think he knew who he was. I don't think he had the kind of intestinal fortitude. I mean, he was Jamrich's henchman. He did what Jamrich told him to do. And so I can't, I feel sorry for him. He's not a guy that you know, he made too many compromises to get that job.

M: Okay.

RM: He was a kept man, so I don't carry any old feeling toward him at all. I just like to know, well, because I'm sure he was...

M: Well, can you describe his reactions, the general reaction to his selection as provost?

RM: Once people got to know him it was fairly severe. This was not the kind of guy, this was a tough guy. This guy who came in to do Jamrich's bidding, and he did that. He fired whomever had to be fired.

M: He didn't have a problem doing that?

RM: Oh, no!

M: Do you feel that that helped the union effort?

RM: Sure!

M: Okay.

RM: Sure! I mean unions are almost always brought into existence by the administration.

M: Yeah, yeah because of their actions.

RM: It's thanks to the administration we support unions.

M: Sure.

RM: Otherwise you wouldn't have unions.

M: Alright. Well, that answers all of our questions sir.

RM: Well if you come back, if you come up with anything else.

M: Yeah, is there anything that I have forgotten that you want to add?

RM: No I think you've done an excellent job.

M: Okay.

RM: You've done an excellent job.

M: Very good. Thank you very much sir, we really appreciate it. But, oh no we already asked that question.

RM: If you want to call back later.

M: We may do that if there's...

RM: Think it out or whatever.

M: Sure.

RM: Get some more input from other people, obviously you'll get some different stories.

M: We'll do that. And I will be sending you in the next few weeks a release form for this interview and so forth.

RM: I hope you will be kind to me and not release some of the language.

M: Oh no, of course not. You didn't use any bad language! [Laughter.]

RM: Okay well there was a little conversation there and I don't want to be...

M: I didn't hear any bad language at all! We really appreciate your time sir.

RM: I haven't told you anything that I wouldn't say in public.

M: Alright, very good.

RM: My father used to say, 'whatever you say is gonna appear on the front page of the paper!' So don't worry about. All I said is true as far as I know it.

M: Right. Well thank you very much sir.

RM: Thank you!

M: Alright, buh-bye.

[Phone line goes dead.]

END OF INTERVIEW