

Interview with Louise Lamphere

Interviewer: Amy Goldstein

Date: May 30, 2014

Location: Washington, D.C.

Transcribed by Leigh Thomas and Bennett Knox

\*Notes in brackets were added by Louise Lamphere after the interview\*

**Amy Goldstein:** So, I'm going to ask you just to start by identifying yourself.

**Louise Lamphere:** I'm Louise Lamphere. I'm a retired Distinguished Professor of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico. And I currently live in Albuquerque, New Mexico, split my time between that and New York City.

**Goldstein:** And you had a role at Brown?

**Lamphere:** Oh yes. And I was at Brown. I started teaching there in 1968. Left because I didn't get tenure in 1975. And returned after my lawsuit in '79. Stayed until 1985. I had a year's leave then [1985-86] but didn't resign until '86.

**Goldstein:** Okay, so now that we've done the synopsis, we're going to take the slow story [laughs].

**Lamphere:** Okay [laughs].

**Goldstein:** So I'm wondering if you can start by just talking a little bit about the kind of environment you grew up in. Was there any activism in your home when you were a kid?

**Lamphere:** Well, I come from a staunch Republican family in the state of Colorado. I grew up in Denver, Colorado. My mother's family—her, both of her parents were German-American in sort of heritage. And my grandmother was born in Golden in 1885; she was part of the German community there, the same community that Coors came from. And my grandfather was born in Leavenworth, Kansas, but came to Colorado when he was five. He was also born in eighteen eighty-five. So that part of the family has long roots in Colorado. My father was sort of from a farming family in the, sort of, Iowa-Minnesota border. His mother was Irish—Scots-Irish. Her father was an Orangeman [Note from Lamphere: He was of Scots-Irish Descent and Protestant, often described as Orangemen the color associated with Protestants rather than green associated with the Catholics]. And she was born in Ireland, actually, and her father came after her mother died in childbirth, and [he re-]married and settled in the US. And the Lamphere piece of the family is sort of unknown where they came from. But anyway, my parents eventually ended up in Denver because it was my mother's hometown. They had actually met in St Louis, and we lived there for five years. I was born there. But my mother wanted to come back and get out of the heat and humidity and come back to where her parents were. So I grew up in sort of a middle class neighborhood, went to grade school, middle school, and high school in Denver. I graduated from East Denver High, which at the time

was a sort of Anglo-Jewish middle class/upper middle class population. Now it's a very multicultural high school. The building looks like it belongs in Philadelphia and is on the National Register. And it's a great place. It produced, and still produces really terrific students.

**Goldstein:** And how did you find your way to anthropology?

**Lamphere:** Oh, okay. I went to Stanford as an undergraduate, and I majored in sociology. And I also was in an honors program called "Social Thought and Institutions," but I started taking anthropology courses. I actually read Ruth Benedict's *Patterns of Culture*. I had a friend who was a former camp counselor with me and she was an anthropology major, and so I read this book and it excited me about anthropology so I started taking anthropology courses. And, but I majored in sociology. And then I decided to apply to Harvard because they had, a sort of Social Relations Department that was this, kind of, joint department that had anthropology and sociology and social psychology and was very interdisciplinary. And a fair number of my professors at Stanford were from that department and they encouraged me to apply. Of course in those days, I did get an NSF Fellowship to go to Harvard, but somebody, a professor who was part of the Social Thought and Institutions faculty, had told me, "You can apply for the Danforth but there's a quota on women, so don't expect to get one." Which I didn't. But the NSFs were much more, sort of broadly defined and spread across the country. So then I went to Harvard, did my fieldwork on the Navajo reservation, and wrote my thesis in '66/'67, got a job at Rochester for a year. And in those days the job market was, there were plenty of jobs because it was the period when anthropology classes were becoming very popular. Most anthropologists were in Sociology departments, but there was this big extension of state universities, like the whole State University of New York, the City University, Michigan. Everybody was getting these bigger, kind of operations. And so sociology departments were splitting off the anthropologists. And so there were anthropology jobs. And when I started looking for jobs when I was in Rochester, I was able to get four job offers, you know, about five years later that was impossible. But one of them was for Brown--

[5:00]

**Goldstein:** And the reason that one appealed to you most was, what?

**Lamphere:** Well, it was in a great place, it seemed to me. You know, it was not, it was in New England and I like being in New England. Karl Heider who was a member of the Anthropology Department was somebody from Harvard and knew me, and called me up and asked me if I wanted to apply. In those days there weren't advertisements for jobs. Traditionally, you know, the head of the department would call the heads of departments in the, you know, graduate programs that were most sort of highly ranked, like Harvard or Michigan, or Berkeley, and say, "Who are your recent graduates?" And there was something supposedly called the "Harvard list," which I don't think I was ever on. But I heard that there was such a thing. And that was the list of people who were getting Ph.D.s in a particular year. Anyway, it was through this connection with Karl, I didn't know him very well but he called me up and said, "You know, there's a job at Brown, do you want to apply?" So I did. And I ended up getting it. But, Brown really appealed to me, as I'd never been there before I did my job interview. And, you know, it was very kind

of, you know, like a sort of small Cambridge, or something like that. So it seemed like a great place. It turned out that one of the graduate students in Sociology had been at Rochester. And I knew her, of her, and her husband Shep Shapiro had just joined the Music Department. And so when I went for my job interview I had somebody I could talk to about the place. And, you know, they were quite enthusiastic about it, so, that made it more appealing, too, so.

**Goldstein:** And what were you first teaching when you got there?

**Lamphere:** Oh, let me think. I... we were beginning to build an Anthropology program, because Anthropology at Brown started out with an archeologist named Giddings who worked at the Haffenreffer and did the archeology connection there. And he worked in Alaska and was killed in a car crash a couple years before I came. And so, partly there was the issue of, you know, replacing him with an archeologist, and that was Doug Anderson who also worked in Alaska. But Phil Leis had been hired a couple years before in the Sociology Department, and Sid Goldstein who was chair of Sociology was, you know, I think very kind of interested in getting this Anthropology department off the ground. So they'd already attracted Karl and Dwight Heath, and the year before I came they hired several people. One of the people who came pretty early was Jim Deetz who was an archeologist, and became our most famous person. And then they hired George Hicks the year before me. And the year I came they made three hires, it was—

**Goldstein:** And your role in the midst of this growing program was what? What were you doing?

**Lamphere:** I was doing, I was doing sort of kinship. Niels Braroe was hired the same year that I was, worked with Native Americans in Canada. And he did the Native American class for a long time. But there were two of us who were doing Native Americans. And, the cultural anthropologists were beginning to do—Karl worked in New Guinea and, but George worked in Appalachia. So, this is beginning to be about North America with this sort of Native part, and Phil was particularly—he worked in Africa but they were beginning to be interested in ethnicity and urban research in the US. And I didn't fit into that at that point, but I began to, you know, a little later on. So I was teaching kinship, politics. I did a [graduate] seminar on political organization, one on kinship. I did social rela—social organization as an undergraduate class. And then I started, I branched out a little bit and started teaching, you know, contemporary US urban anthropology class, and I think. So that's the kind of stuff I was...

**Goldstein:** Okay so at the beginning none of this had much to do with women?

**Lamphere:** Nothing. Not until, you know, '73. I mean, when I got there was the year that the Maxwell-Magaziner report actually got voted into existence. So the New Curriculum was voted on by the faculty the first semester I was there. So it was really the beginning of a sort of real change at Brown. And, one of the other things I did was I was part of this Human Thought [Program], that George Morgan ran. It was sort of, sort of an independent major honors program. Ira Magaziner was in it, and George wanted me to be on his committee so I was on his committee. And I did that [was part of that program] for almost the whole time I was there [at Brown University].

**Goldstein:** And can you talk a little bit about what that [10:00] time was like in a collegial sense? I mean did you hang out with your colleagues? I mean, how many women were in the department? Were there any other women in the department?

**Lamphere:** Yeah. Let me go back to this question about activism in my past. Because I came from this very Republican family, the only activism I remember was being, you know, part of the family's interest in getting Republicans elected. And they were just beginning to do things like make sure people got to the polls and stuff like that. So I can remember, like it was probably the 1952 election that we were all getting, you know, people to the polls and had little cards and would call them up and stuff like that. So I handed out literature at the polls and that kind of thing. And my grandfather was treasurer of the state Republican Party. So that was the kind of activism I did as a, you know, besides being in a Bluebird troop. So that was most of the sort of activism that I was, you know, exposed to as a kid. But, Brown. I think... there were several things happening. I mean, on the one hand, you know, almost everybody in my department was male. Niels' wife was hired as a lecturer and taught linguistics, so in one of the early pictures she's there and for some reason I wasn't. But I was the only woman who was an assistant professor. And that was in this joint Sociology-Anthropology Program. But there's a funny way in which the anthropologists were very, kind of, friendly, and we got along really well. And there were sort of three, four families. It was George and his wife Linne,

**Goldstein:** This was George Hicks?

**Lamphere:** Hicks, yeah. And Phil's and his wife Nancy.

**Goldstein:** Phil Leis?

**Lamphere:** Yeah. And Phil Leis, they had a very difficult divorce like right after I got there. So, Linne and I spent a lot of time sort of holding Nancy's hand and trying to help her out. And, you know, Phil was involved with our secretary, and so we all knew her, and so we spent some time with them. Let's see... and then Karl, Karl, you know, was quite friendly to us but he left in a couple years because he married another woman from Harvard who was a cognitive psychologist who got this offer from Berkeley and so he followed her to Berkeley and was only there [at Brown] maybe about two or three years.

**Goldstein:** Okay so you were socializing together as well as teaching together.

**Lamphere:** Yeah, I was spending a lot of time with these folks and, you know, we were all sort of drinking buddies and did a lot of hanging out at each other's houses, and that sort of thing. And so although the department was all male, there was this kind of mixed social group. But I also got to know a number of the graduate students in Sociology. This gal I knew from this connection at Rochester, and there were a couple in English, you know guys and their girlfriends. And I went out with one of the other graduate students who was from Scotland. And so I, there was a bunch of graduate students that I also hung out with. And of course, that all got mixed in with the beginnings of all the change at Brown. Because the Harvard stri--I mean the Brown strike happened in, you know, May of 1970. And that

brought a whole bunch of people together around, you know, the sort of anti-war movement and the feminist movement as well, because we started having consciousness-raising groups. Mostly coming out of an organization called NUC which is the New University Congress or Conference or something like that. Which basically [was composed of ] academics at different institutions who were working against the war. And there was a fairly lively chapter there that included faculty and graduate students. And we did a couple consciousness-raising groups out of that, and that was like in the summer of 1970, something of that sort. And that was also the beginning of starting to do, you know, feminist work at Brown.

**Goldstein:** Right, so the feminist stuff began to, kind of, emerge from the anti-war consciousness, right?

**Lamphere:** Right. Yeah.

**Goldstein:** So you were involved in some of that as well, right?

**Lamphere:** Yeah. Like, you know, I went to all the strike meetings, and the other thing—we have this, there's this Episcopalian church there on George Street, during the summer of '70 after the strike, there were these kind of communal dinners there. And everybody went there and then we had little break out groups and discussions and that sort of thing. So it was one of these times where people in different parts of the campus sort of all came together around this anti-war movement. But the feminist stuff sort of emerged right out of that. Because by that time, I think, you know, was it 1970, or '71, is when notes from the second year of the group Redstockings in New York emerged as something and that [15:00]. So, people were doing these consciousness raising groups.

**Goldstein:** And what were you doing, exactly?

**Lamphere:** What was I what?

**Goldstein:** What were you doing, exactly? In terms of these new feminist consciousness raising groups?

**Lamphere:** Well, I worked on a number of different things. You know, first we did sort of consciousness raising. And then we decided well, we should do something at Brown, right? And, Bev Daniels and Karen Romer didn't come until '72. But somewhere in there we were trying to figure out how to get to the community. And it turned out when we started doing that, the people who were most interested in having some connection with Brown were like faculty wives and other people who lived on the East Side. So out of that, I think, some of the administrators like Karen sort of worked on having, you know, a program for older women to return to Brown. And some of that involved, beginning to sort of do women's studies courses. But we did things like, I mean some people were involved in establishing a rape crisis center. But we also—I remember there was a big hearing at the, the statehouse, over abortion rights. And, you know, we never figured we would get very far with it because Rhode Island was such a Catholic state. But there was a committee that was hearing, you know, an abortion rights bill and a bunch of us went down and did testimony for it. And the room was completely crowded. And the issue was, was it going to get out of committee into the legislature, and I don't think it even did that. But there was beginning to be this

ferment about, around these women's issues like rape crisis and abortion and, you know, women's rights in general.

**Goldstein:** So one of the things I didn't hear you mention so far as much thinking about who was being hired. I mean, were these questions of women in workplace part of that? Or that hadn't started yet?

**Lamphere:** Well, you know, the thing is... turns out in reading Nancy's whole, kind of, chronology, I'd sort of forgotten about all the affirmative action stuff that was going on. Partly I wasn't on the Committee on Women Faculty, which was the one group that was really pushing doing something about affirmative action. And it turned out that the year there was the most struggle about that, I was in England, '71/'72., and—

**Goldstein:** So these had not been issues you had been first-hand involved with at the time?

**Lamphere:** No... You know, I sort of knew about it but I wasn't in the bunch of people who were trying to get Brown to have an affirmative action program. And, you know, I didn't really realize that Brown was not compliant. And they tried two affirmative action plans and they hadn't passed, and they were still working on it. I wasn't terribly conscious about that until just about the time I came up for tenure, probably. I mean, I knew people on the women faculty, because Anne Fausto was on it and I think Michael Rosen might have been. And I know that Mildred Wigdoff was chair pretty early on, and she was, she's a really important person who the case really helped. Because she was a faculty wife over in Physics, who had, you know she was kind of a research professor, but she wasn't a tenured person.

**Goldstein:** So you weren't directly involved with these issues, but at the same time you were putting together an edited book, that was sort of the first big book on women in your discipline? And you were teaching a course that had sort of feminist ethos to it? And as you were starting to do these things, was this all going fine within the department? Or people were looking a little jaundiced at your interests? Or what was that, what was that like?

**Lamphere:** Well, people began to look pretty jaundiced, but the evolution of it is something like this: I started...the reason *Woman, Culture, and Society* got put together was because Shelly Rosaldo and a group of graduate students and a couple faculty—faculty wives basically, put together a course at Stanford in the spring of '71. And then they gave papers at the anthropology meetings in New York, which was the year I was in England, but I came to the New York meetings. And, I was really interested in what they were doing, and I asked Shelly to send the notes from the course. And, you know, I said, "I think we've really got a book here!" And so we began corresponding with each other over that year I was in England, and she was at Stanford teaching, sort of part time in the Linguistics program. And then we started soliciting papers. And by the time I came back from England, we were in the process of trying to find a press. And finally, you know, sort of, she was able to convince the Stanford people that they would, might be interested in publishing this. So in '73, '72/'73, the year I came back, we were basically trying to put the manuscript together. And it got published in the spring of '74, when I came, just about the time the tenure decision was. But in the meantime, I was involved with people trying to figure out, "Let's do

some courses and begin to put a Women's Studies program together." And we did a, a Group Independent Study Program—class in the fall of '73, the [20:00] semester, but you know, the one before the one I got the tenure decision on. And that was a pretty interesting course; we all took it on as extra. We each gave lectures, but we had smaller discussion groups. There were six of us, three graduate students and, you know, people like Anne Fausto and me, maybe I think there was probably one other faculty member involved. And we had about 50 or so kids in it, mostly women. It was quite a success but it was one of those things that, you know, after we did it we thought, "Well this was too much. We need to really get this as a course." But in the spring of '73, the semester before that, I had taught my first Women, Culture and Society class, which had got a pretty big enrollment. And I was using stuff from the book as readings, and that sort of thing.

**Goldstein:** And did you get the sense that this shift, which was kind of far from your Navajo origins, was well accepted by your colleagues? Or not so much, or?

**Lamphere:** Well, I think, I think... not so much. But I didn't really realize that until a little bit later. I think what was beginning to get on people's nerves was the fact that I was supporting, you know, some of the women students. We had a couple of young African American students who came and who were having a hard time. The one, the gal from Vassar was doing pretty well, but the other one was really a very weak student. By that time we had hired Jane Dwyer as head of our museum, because Alex Ricciardelli left. And Jane was quite close to her, but both of us supported not taking away her fellowship at the end of the first semester because she was having lots of personal difficulties. And, you know, I was willing to talk about this in the middle of a faculty meeting—you could hear a pin drop. You know, because she had had an abortion that year and sort of to talk about that, and sort of make a big issue out of it was wheat... and so I forced them basically to keep her on for another semester. And I knew she was probably not going to do well but I just felt that, you know, she should probably be given a chance. So I think part of that kind of activism on the part of students, you know, for some of the students, got me the reputation of being, you know, really soft on students, you know, being, you know, because that was what was said about my graduate teaching. My seminars are bull sessions. I had a lot of them at home, too, in the evening, and they were kind of informal, but I did think people were doing pretty well if I gave them an A, but.

**Goldstein:** And the reason you were teaching in this slightly less orthodox way was, was what exactly? Was it sort of growing out of your belief system? Or...

**Lamphere:** Yeah, I think it was really about, you know, that you really need, needed to, like, have discussions with students and not just lecture at them. And I am not a fabulous lecturer. I've gotten much better in my old age, but I really feel that what helps students a lot is this sort of ability to speak on your own and to think critically about work, and so on. So that's the sort of thing I—and it goes along with what was, you know, the whole kind of movement of changing the Brown curriculum and making it more, kind of, individually patterned, and not just big lecture courses. Except Brown didn't have huge lecture courses compared to, you know, with places like Berkeley and Michigan and even New Mexico.

**Goldstein:** So you knew that your tenure review was coming up.

**Lamphere:** Yes.

**Goldstein:** And did you have any sense that it would go well, or that these, sort of areas into which you were branching might create some problems for you?

**Lamphere:** Well I think that the biggest issue was, what impact the financial situation at Brown was going to have on everyone. Because, I can't remember why this crisis happened, but they were suddenly in the red. Five hundred thousand dollars or something like that, which today looks like peanuts but it was a big deal then. And there was this attempt, probably beginning in like '72, to start limiting the number of people that had permanent appointments that got tenure. And so they started establishing these slots for different departments. And not giving so many people tenure. But our department got two slots out of this first staffing plan that Jackie Mattfeld was actually responsible for.

**Goldstein:** Two slots over the period of several years, though.

**Lamphere:** Hmm?

**Goldstein:** Two slots of a period of several years.

**Lamphere:** Yeah, but it turned out nobody said anything about, "Oh, there's only one in this period and one in that period." I just thought there were two slots. But, you know, now that I looked at the paperwork, it looks like there was one then and one later, but that wasn't the way anybody talked about it. So I figured there were two of us coming up for tenure at the same time, Niels and myself. And, later on I discovered that Phil had made this claim that I [25:00] had been considered for early tenure in, right after I came back from, from England. And I don't remember that at all. I mean, I remember talking to him about how many years I was supposed to be in the probationary period and whether the year I was in England would count, and if it did, I would come up in '73/'74. But I don't remember asking to be considered early for tenure. Also I didn't collect any dossier or give him a vitae but I discovered later, by looking at the documents that he claimed that the department had already voted that they weren't going to consider me for early tenure, but I don't remember that. At any rate, when I came, the year that I was going to come up for tenure, the fall of '73, I wasn't really clear about when I was supposed to get things together. None of this was written down, so there weren't any rules about you have to put this kind of stuff in your dossier, you'd have to add, give this many names for possible outside readers, or anything like that. So I did have a conversation with him in November.

**Goldstein:** Him, the department chair, Phil Leis?

**Lamphere:** The department chair, Phil Leis, yes. And that's when he told me my teach—there were problems with my teaching. And that was the very first time I'd ever heard about it. And, you know, my line was, I didn't think so. These big classes in some respects were a little experimental because I tried to

do sections in them and when I taught the Native American class which was that fall, some of the sections worked really well because I had graduate students doing those. And there were some done with undergraduates that didn't work so well. And, you know, I was gone for the anthropology meetings and I asked Niels to give a lecture. And no one told me until weeks later that he didn't show up, and my graduate students didn't say anything, because people were beginning to cover for when he missed classes. And, you know, it probably wasn't the best class, but I had no idea, because I didn't do—nobody was doing teaching evaluations. And so, you know, after this conversation I thought, "Well, maybe there is going to be some problems." And so one of the things I did was make up a teaching evaluation, which I used, and I don't think anybody else in the department used [laughs]. And so, you know, I think the ones by the spring semester were much better than the rumors—I mean, basically my teaching was being evaluated by rumor. I'm not sure exactly who Phil and George Hicks were listening to but it wasn't everybody, I don't think. So anyway, I began to get worried after that because I had a very strong publishing record. My book on the Navajo was in press, I had six articles all placed in the top journals in the field, and you know, I had a bunch of book reviews, and I had, you know, lots of service to the university. And I had, I thought I had a good teaching record.

**Goldstein:** So let me ask you, during this time did you have the sense that this was just about you and, you know, your advancement through your career? Or did you have the sense that this was somehow a test case for women getting tenure at the university? I mean, how generalized did you understand this to be? Or how personal was it?

**Lamphere:** Well, by that time you know there was enough kind of literature out there about issues about women in, not just academia, but law and other professions. And, you know, I didn't have such a hard time at Harvard, partly because in Social Relations there were lots of women graduate students. It was about half and half. Not that there were any women faculty. The only woman faculty was Cora DuBois, who was the first full professor woman at Harvard, who taught about southeast Asia and did work in India. And I took a class from her. And she was a real amazing person and incredibly hard, difficult teacher in the sense of, you know, doing well in her classes. But, you know, other women were lecturers, or, you know, they were sort of research professors who didn't teach very much. You know, but, there were hardly any women on the faculty. And the Radcliffe undergraduates of course took Brown—took Harvard classes. So any woman in an undergraduate or graduate class, mostly, was... had male professors. But the under—but the graduate students in Social Relations were pretty evenly divided male and female. And, of course the classes at Brown were pretty integrated, except of course until Pembroke was joined with Brown you didn't, you only had a third of the class, of the undergraduates, because of the limitations on how many Pembroke they could take, were women, and then two-thirds were men. But [30:00] I began to realize through reading this literature and also under—talking with other women. I mean, you know, there were a, in through this whole period of the strike and so forth you got to know women in other departments and stuff. There weren't all that many women around. And, and there was no tenured woman social scientist, for example. So in some cases, in some respects, this case was about me and, you know, my feeling that I was really deserving of tenure and I had a good record and losing my job was kind of a very threatening thing. I figured, you know, rather than go home and, you know, just cry about it or something I would really try and fight it. But...

**Goldstein:** But at the point that it was coming along, you said, it was partly about you but you also had a sense that this was a little bit of a, how is Brown going to react to what would be the first tenured woman in the social sciences?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, I mean, yeah, I guess. At least I began to think that, you know... And people like Laura Durand who was over in, over in the French Department was having a hard time getting tenure because you could sort of see that, you know, there were problems coming and maybe the women in Sociology, they just hired some assistant professors who weren't going to be able to manage to stay. So I think, you know, in all of this, you know, getting to know Anne Fausto and knowing a little bit more about what the Committee of Women Faculty was doing was, you know, began to see it more as institutional problem. But I think that most of that came through after we filed the case.

**Goldstein:** Do you remember the day that you found out that you were not getting tenure?

**Lamphere:** Yes. Because it kept, you know, one of the things that happened—

**Goldstein:** Can you just start at the beginning of that day, and just walk us through the day?

**Lamphere:** Well, let's try to get a little farther back, because, you know and some of this I know more about because I've been able to read, you know, documents that sort of are from this period. I don't think that I actually had a—Phil told me when I needed to give him stuff until something like February, but I might be wrong about that. And I gave him, you know, my cv and all my publications, and I don't think I had any teaching evaluations yet. But I did start getting students to write letters, you know, and I also asked faculty people outside the department. Bill McLoughlin wrote me a letter because I'd been working with American Studies kids, and on their committee. And George Morgan wrote me a very nice letter and Karen Romer wrote me a letter. So I had some other Brown people write letters. And I think those came in kind of earlier. I didn't learn until later that Phil didn't send out a letter, a formal letter, to graduate students about asking them for letters until April fourteenth, and he gave them until May first. And the faculty rules at the time just said I had to know by, you know, something like graduation of the sixth year whether I would be getting tenure or not. That's it. I mean they didn't say anything about when the dossier had to be collected, what was in it, you know, what kind of a case you had to make for yourself, how the outside letters were to be collected, how many there were supposed to be. Nothing like that. So part of this period from, all the way from November until May was kind of like, "Well, what's happening? Am I going to be able to find out—when am I going to find out? When am I supposed to do this, when am I supposed to do that?"

**Goldstein:** It sounds like there's a real lack of clarity about how this was all going to go.

**Lamphere:** No, no, no, absolutely not. And of course I was pretty nervous. And at the time I was living in this collective house with my friends Sue and Ed Benson, and Peter Evans who had become my partner by that time, who was in the Sociology Department, was off in Brazil, so. But I did have a kind of support

group of people who were, sort of, there kind of helping me worry, I guess, about how all of this was going, so. I later constructed a diary of what happened there at the end. And I apparently asked Phil somewhere around May 8th or 9th or something, you know, was there any word? And he said, well, he couldn't tell me anything because it was a bit complicated. And I'm not sure that they had had this meeting that they ended up having by then or not. I just know that, you know, Doug Anderson had left town around, you know, May 8th. He went to Thailand sometimes in the summer, sometimes to the Arctic. So I think they must have had the meeting somewhere around May 8th, 9th, 6th, somewhere in there. And he, he had a conference with Niels on like, I think it was the 23<sup>rd</sup>, and told [35:00] Niels he wasn't getting tenure. And then he had a conference with me on the 24<sup>th</sup>, where he called me into the office and told me I wasn't getting tenure. And he said that, well the department was evenly divided. And that there was some thought that my teaching was poor but not so much worse than others, and that my academic work was, especially my recent academic work on women, he didn't put it that way but he did say my recent work, was "theoretically weak." And so that's kind of what he told me orally.

**Goldstein:** And this was in his office?

**Lamphere:** This was in his office, yes. And I was pretty shaken by that, because, you know, up to that time, we always thought it could go okay. Because, I mean, I thought Niels would have a hard time because of all the—I mean, he had published a book but he was having all these issues around his drinking problems, and I think people just felt he just wasn't going to be able to make it. But, so, I mean,

**Goldstein:** Do you remember how you responded?

**Lamphere:** Well, I was pretty dismayed I think. But then I, by the time I left I began to feel I, I was pretty determined to do something. Because the same day, you know, I must have talked to him in the afternoon, but I called Hornig's office, the president's office, I called Stoltz's office, I called Mattfeld's office. And I couldn't get anybody, right? No one would talk to me on the phone.

**Goldstein:** You were calling them for what purpose?

**Lamphere:** I was calling them to see if I could get something done about this decision. To get it, you know, reconsidered. So I started doing things.

**Goldstein:** So that very day?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, no, it's in my little, this little reconstructed diary that I must have done like in September or October of that year. That I, you know, immediately tried to go to the upper administration because what had happened was the department had met, well there were three people who were on leave, there were six tenured men. Jim Deetz who was the archaeologist, was on leave that year, and he didn't participate at all. Though Phil said later, in what I can tell from documents, that Jim had been at discussions they'd had in the fall. They must have had some discussions before he met with me in the fall. Dwight Heath was on leave, so he wrote a letter. George had written, but he was on leave. So there were

three people on leave, and there were just three people in the room to talk about this stuff. Bob Jay, who supported me, I discovered, and Doug Anderson, who I think didn't say much, and then Phil who ended up opposing me. And the way he, in his letter to the provost, sort of, wrote was that, he counted George as a negative, Bob Jay as a positive, and they didn't actually have a vote. I mean nobody said at the end of their letter, "I vote for yes" or, "no." George was pretty clear in his letter that he was against me. And he counted Doug and Dwight as neutral. And so he said it was up to him to cast the negative vote.

**Goldstein:** So, when Phil Leis, the department chair, took you into his office and said, "You're not getting tenure." And you immediately tried to reach three more senior people in the university to protest this.

**Lamphere:** Yeah.

**Goldstein:** Did you understand this as an act of discrimination? Or did you just understand it as an inappropriate decision based on, you were better than that?

**Lamphere:** No, I understood that the biggest problem was I had become a feminist and was doing work on women. And people had trouble with that. So, yes, I thought it was discrimination.

**Goldstein:** And the discrimination was based—was what, exactly?

**Lamphere:** Well, it was this serious work that I was beginning. And it became this sort of nationally lauded stuff. I wasn't, who was to know that right then. But I thought it was serious anthropological work that was very exciting and putting this book together had been this incredibly good, you know, effort. And we had a named university press, Stanford Press was publishing it and had publica—it had just come out. And I was still getting, you know, asked to do things on the Navajo and on Native Americans. And people were beginning to ask me to do other, sort of, more stuff on women and so on, so. I had a sense that there was, you know I was really good in one thing already, and I was transferring over to this new field that I was very excited about. I had plans to try to do, you know, some research on working-class women. I'd started thinking about that already. And so I felt all of that was kind of completely devalued and that that was what [40:00] the issue was. I mean, if I'd stayed being, you know, a "good ol' girl" or something and maybe continued to just work on the Navajo, that would have been fine. But I started to teach about women in my classes, started a class on women in cross-cultural perspective. And that's what was being, had become the issue.

**Goldstein:** Even though the critique was not solely, but principally about your teaching?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, but... I also think that it was, you know, about this recent work as well. I mean, you know, so. And also I didn't think my teaching was that bad. But partly because I felt that helping students, especially young women students, was, was tremendously important. You had to do that with ways in which you could, you know, help them individually expand and grow and so forth. So. But I also felt that personally I was much better than they said I was. And that I had done everything you were supposed to

do. I had published, I had gotten a book, I was actually did—and then I had a collection on top of that. And that was a lot for getting tenure. And [it was] my sense it was more than George had when he got tenure. And that, you know, it wasn't that there weren't any positions and this had to be an exception. There were two positions in the department, and, you know, I was providing a great deal to the university, so. I mean, it was one of these things—I think part of the issue is that women, including myself, have this sort of sense, “Well, if somebody says there's something wrong with you, it's really your fault.” You know, I think women grow up with this real sense of insecurity about themselves, you know. They don't look good enough, they're not popular enough, they're not smart enough, or if they're smart that's not a good thing to be. And so you always have this sort of sense of self doubt; so if somebody tells you you're not doing very well, you figure, “Well, you know, I'm just not working hard enough, or I'm not doing it well enough, or it's really my fault.” You don't—it's very tough for most people in America to see it as a system that's got some rules and [there are] people in power that run it.

**Goldstein:** And you immediately had the context to understand it in that broader framework?

**Lamphere:** I... People were—you know that's the kind of stuff you, that feminists were beginning to teach, right? That's what, you know, if you're in a consciousness-raising group you talk about oppression and stuff like that, and begin to understand that there's structures, and it's not just you. But, it's really hard to overcome this training. Young women now are still like that. I mean, they just don't have a good clear sense of themselves. Men, when they get denied tenure, get pissed off. They get angry at the structure, they get angry at the people. Women think, oh, it's their fault. They're just not good enough. That's, I mean, I had that sense myself. And so trying to overcome that and sort of just thinking... And in part I was able to do that because I could go home and there'd be four or five people around the dinner table who would just tell me, “Look, Louise, you're crazy. You're not, your teaching is not poor, not so much worse than others.” You know they were clearly supportive of me. So every time I would have these doubtful things, people would tell me, “It's really Phil Leis, you know, come on!” You know. So, that made a huge difference to me in that whole, in that whole period of two years. But also in this very beginning. So right after he told me, I sort of spent several days trying to get a hold of Hornig. I wrote him a letter.

**Goldstein:** Who was the president, Don Hornig.

**Lamphere:** Yeah, Don Hornig was the president. And I wrote him a letter laying out why I thought I deserved tenure. You know, sent some other material with him. I never got a response. It turned out a year later when we had, you know, kind of, the council on academic... the CAP, sort of, you know, took a look at my case again, he apologized, for just having found the letter, a year later. It was sort of like, wait, I sent a copy to Stoltz, who was provost, I sent a copy to Mattfeld, who was the academic vice president. Nobody answered. And so I called Stoltz's office, I tried to get an appointment with him. Got a possibility of a phone call, I think it was like the next Tuesday or something, because the day I talked to Phil was like a Thursday. And the secretary called back and said, “Well, he couldn't talk this afternoon, maybe tomorrow.” And I think I went over to Stoltz's office or something. But I ran into Jackie Mattfeld coming out of her office.

**Goldstein:** Who was one of the few female administrators.

**Lamphere:** She was the only top female—she was the first and the only top female administrator. [45:00] And our sense about Jackie was that she was in a pretty weak position, which she in fact said to me on this walk. Because she said, “Well, I’m going to my house because I have a luncheon with…” you know it was just before graduation, with alumnae or something like that. “I’ll talk to you on the way.” So we had this sort of conversation while we were walking to her house.

**Goldstein:** And what did you say to her?

**Lamphere:** Well, I told her, I thought I deserved tenure, I wondered if she could look at my dossier. Could she take a look at my case? She basically said, “Look, my hands are tied.” And that’s what I got out of that walk. I did keep trying to get an appointment with her. She couldn’t, when I first made those phone calls, they said, “Nobody can see you until after graduation.” So then I started after graduation to try and see her. And her secretary, I was going to Brazil because Peter was in Brazil and I was going to spend a month with him. So, the secretary said, “Well don’t delay your trip to Brazil just to see Jackie. Call when you get back.” So when I got back, which was at the end of July, you know, I tried seeing Jackie again. Couldn’t see her. Couldn’t get ahold of Stoltz. So by that time, I had, when I had talked to Phil at graduation, you know, by the time we got to graduation, which was after I’d seen Jackie and I couldn’t get through to the president. I’d sent him a letter, I tried to get through to Stoltz, he didn’t an—he kept putting me off. I decided to hire a lawyer. And part of my—

**Goldstein:** And let me ask you, was that an easy decision? Was it a hard decision? Was it an automatic decision? Did you lie awake thinking about it for nights, or?

**Lamphere:** Well, part of the reason I was, I think I was able to do it was Ed Benson who was one of my housemates, taught at the University of Rhode Island. And they had a union there. And Milton Stanzler was their lawyer, but I knew that people in this firm were, first of all, advocates and sort of social justice people, and that somebody in that law firm would probably take something like this. And that was a good place to go. So I ended up hiring Julius Michaelson, who at the time was running for, which I didn’t realize was going to make such a difference, he started running for Attorney General that summer.

**Goldstein:** And, I’m sorry, how soon after you found out you were not being granted tenure, did you go to this law firm?

**Lamphere:** Well, by the time graduation came along, and it must have been June first or second, somewhere there, I can’t, I didn’t write down when—

**Goldstein:** So it was a matter of a couple days, right?

**Lamphere:** A week.

**Goldstein:** Okay.

**Lamphere:** Because I really worked that week. I think there was probably a week to ten days between the 24th of May, and graduation. And that was the week I was spending, you know, trying to get in touch with the top administrators. And, having no success, running into roadblocks at every time, you know, nobody would talk to me. And so I think, I don't remember how this exactly happened, but I think basically, you know, because, you know, Ed was from this unionized campus and I had some support among my, you know, my housemates, that maybe getting a lawyer was a good idea here. I think that's why I, you know, I went ahead and called Michaelson and he said he'd represent me. And that's what I went and told Phil. Graduation was this gorgeous day, right. Half of graduations at Brown are raining, right? And the other half are lovely. Well this was a lovely one. And we had this nice new building that had been the Bryant College Library, and we had this nice lawn out front. Jane Dwyer had made this lovely kind of wine punch with strawberries in it, and it was a great occasion for the students who were graduating. So I went to that, you know, and kind of enjoyed that. Then I asked Phil if I could see him in his office.

**Goldstein:** That same day?

**Lamphere:** Yes. And he, he had the front office in the building so if you walk up the steps it's this lovely office with a nice glass set of windows and so on. And so, you know, I went to him and I said, "Look, you know, I'm pretty unhappy about this. I've tried to get a hold on the top administration and... I decided to sue, I'm hiring a lawyer." That's what I told him, and I can't remember how he reacted. But I was pretty pleased that I was able to get that far before I went off to Brazil. But then when I came back, I, you know, it—

**Goldstein:** Well, let me just ask you, you know, during this first period, I mean, were you mostly in a, I mean, looking back on it, you're describing yourself in a very active kind of fight mode. And is that how you think of yourself as having been, or was it more like you saw yourself as having your career suddenly in tatters and it was pretty shattering?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, both. I would say both things were going on. And it was like, you know. People like Peter, you know Peter's always been a tremendous supporter and throughout this whole case was—you know, I'm sure the month with Peter was, I was able to kind of [50:00] recover a little bit.

**Goldstein:** And this was Peter Evans, who was your long-time partner.

**Lamphere:** Yes, Peter Evans, who was my partner, has been since '73. So we just did our 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary last year. But, you know, I think I probably waffled around, you know, back and forth between this, you know feeling, "What am I going to do?" Because one of the things that apparently I did, you know, after this, this... you know, talk with Phil in November when I thought things were bad, he did recommend that I look for jobs. So I started looking for jobs. I did an interview at Cornell, I talked to

people from Duke. Nothing ever came of it, but I started being on the job market because I figured that would be of help. I think what they thought was that, you know, I'd get a job and disappear. But since I didn't get a job, and since I was pretty invested in having spent, you know, six years at Brown and built this career, in not letting it go. I mean, it's pretty devastating to have your job taken away from you. And, you know, especially since I thought I was doing so well. And doing better than some of my colleagues. So I think I probably was both in this kind of, "Oh, it's really my fault; I didn't do the right thing," and thinking I had to do something.

**Goldstein:** And you've mentioned your housemates were very supportive and sort of urged you to stand up and fight. What about other women around campus? Did people know that this had happened? Did people rally around you? Or was it very quiet because it was the end of the school year?

**Lamphere:** Well, you have to realize that this happened just before summer, right? And that's a very hard time to organize anything. And so we really didn't organize. And so we didn't really organize. But I, people like Anne Fausto knew right away. You know, there's Mike Rosen who's in the Math Department, and you know, various sort of Committee on Women Faculty kinds of people, you know, knew about it. I mean, I think I talked to people, but, when you do something—I mean part of the reason you hold it off until May 24th is that nobody's going to be around. So I, I don't remember that, you know, there were a lot of people who got involved, you know, during the summer time. Because we didn't start really trying to do anything until the fall. But I did... I must have come back like right at the end of July. I started—then I started having problems with the law firm, because Michaelson never talked to me again. I ended up getting kind of shuffled off to a guy named Skolnik who was another person. And I tried to get an appointment with him. And I would call and I would get an appointment, and then the day that it was to have happened, it would be put off 'til the afternoon and then I wouldn't have it. And that was sort of going on in August, and then I was still trying to see Mattfeld, of course, who never saw me. And so when I was back from Brazil, because what happened was I spent like a month in Brazil and then Peter had a month summer break and so he came back with me, and then he went back to Brazil to teach the rest of the year there. So by the time September rolled around, George Hicks had come back, and I asked him to look at my dossier. And of course George sort of didn't let on that he was, thought I should be denied tenure and was adamant that that was the case.

**Goldstein:** You had thought you were friends.

**Lamphere:** Yes! I had these letters. In fact, I just read one, the other night, which was, "Dear George," You know, I think this was like in February, I said, "I still hope you'll write me a supportive letter. I'm having—this last semester's been really busy, I was teaching three courses," and you know, et cetera et cetera. And at the end, I said, "As I said before, the American Indian class may not have gone so well," and of course I asked Niels to do this class, and he wasn't there, and I was really pissed. So I, you know, had all this nice stuff in the letter. And I think what George said, felt, is, "Are you kidding? I'm certainly not going to support you just because you are writing me this letter." So anyway, I ask him to look at my dossier again. Jim Deetz reappeared on the scene; I asked him. I kept trying to get a hold of this guy

Skolnick who kept putting me off. And then finally just around about—oh, the other thing I did right in that period, I went to that FPG, I talked to Bruce Donovan.

**Goldstein:** The FPG...?

**Lamphere:** Is the Faculty Policy Group, which, the only grievance procedure that there was in the faculty rules, was one, kind of, that wasn't very old I believe, it was only a couple years old. It was a grievance procedure that was administered by the Faculty Policy Group, which also was not a, had only been in existence maybe—

**Goldstein:** But that grievance procedure had never been used before.

**Lamphere:** That's right, it had not been used before [55:00]. So, I went to, Bruce Donovan I think was chair at the time, and I went to him and I said, "Well, you know, I would like to, you know, use your grievance procedure to grieve my tenure decision." You know, ask him what I had to do, and... So then I started putting some stuff together.

**Goldstein:** And did you do this on your own or by then was the law firm—

**Lamphere:** Well, I'm just getting to that, because at that first couple of—I think I may have had a phone call with him and then I went to see him. But it wasn't until after that, after I still tried to get this appointment with Skolnik that Milton Stanzler called me. Because they must have been talking in the law firm there, about who was going to do this. And Skolnik not being very interested, finally Milton who did have some good experience with tenure because he'd been the lawyer for the AFT at the University of Rhode Island, and he was willing to take it. So he called me and said, "I'll be glad to represent you." And then after that, he helped me construct the, what I should have as my, you know, the points I wanted to grieve with the faculty—with the FPG. And, but I guess I had figured out how to do this, I don't know who might have given me some advice. It might have been somebody like my, you know, somebody on the Committee on Women Faculty or, whether I was just reading the faculty rules or what. But I went to them and I was beginning to give them things like my vitae and some stuff. But it was Milton that, he—after he called me, I said, the first thing I sort of talked with him about was, "Well, should I go through this?" And he said, "Well, if you're really going to do a lawsuit or even file with the local affirmative action people in Rhode Island, you should probably go through this grievance procedure, because if you don't do this then, that, they'll really want to know if you're serious." I mean I think you have to...

**Goldstein:** Have exhausted all other avenues.

**Lamphere:** Get to—exhaust all the remedies that are available to you. So, that's why I went to that.

**Goldstein:** Well, that was one of the things I was curious about. So when you went to this grievance procedure, did you think that maybe that would be enough?

**Lamphere:** No.

**Goldstein:** Or you always knew you were going to have to sue?

**Lamphere:** Well, the problem was, is, it was only about procedures. And so we put in four things that were sort of about procedures. One was that there was six people in the department, but only three people were there to consider—I mean, I had no idea what happened, what was actually going on, right? But I thought there was only a meeting of three people on campus, and I didn't know what else the other three people had done. So I said my case wasn't really thoroughly considered by all the tenured members of the faculty. And I did—I think, I did say something about the procedures being really weak. Like there were no deadlines, there were no teaching evaluations, all of that stuff. But also that, I mean, Milton gave me some wording about, you know, there was no, I had been hired under the assumption that, you know, if I performed well I would get tenure, and they changed the rules in the middle of the game. And the last thing I put in was the thing about, I felt that my recent work on women was not being taken seriously. Now, I knew that was not a procedure. But, we decided to put it in anyway. So they, they did some stuff around that. I think that the Faculty Policy Group really felt they couldn't go there because they were really limited to procedural issues. So I knew that I couldn't really get at the sex discrimination cas—stuff that way, except by arguing that not having these procedures made women more vulnerable than men to the kind of way in which “old boy networks” work, and that sort of thing. I didn't really expect that it was going to be terrific as an outcome. In fact, I, it was better than I thought, because they found on my side, for at least two or three of those procedural—

**Goldstein:** And those were just the procedural grounds?

**Lamphere:** What?

**Goldstein:** [coughs] Excuse me. Just the procedural grounds?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, right. And then not on the issue about was my work on women taken seriously.

**Goldstein:** Now, did that matter that they didn't find for you on what you thought was the central reason why you'd been denied tenure?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, because it, for me, that was where the sex discrimination lay. I think it's a harder case to make for, “Oh, well, just because there aren't deadlines,” or, “Just because there aren't teaching evaluations that women are more vulnerable than men.” I mean, you could make that argument, but it seems to me it's not the kind of grounds you can produce statistics about, and stuff. But, so, the Faculty Policy Group hearings were quite an event.

**Goldstein:** What do you remember about them?

**Lamphere:** Well, they were held in the evening. [1:00:00] And they—I think we went on for three evenings. And it was, it seems to me it was like before Christmas, it was in sort of late, late, late fall. And, you know, ... they were sort of confidential but there was a batch of people there. There were not only just the people on the FPG, but, you know, I had my lawyer and, you know, they had their lawyer, and then there were various people who were called in as witnesses. So there was a fairly big bunch of people. And, you know, I testified and Phil testified. And I don't, I can't remember what other administrators were there.

**Goldstein:** Had you known Arlene Gorton, who was the head of this group?

**Lamphere:** Sort of, but not really. I got to know her much better through this whole, this whole process. And then John Quinn, I think, was in Physics was on it. Bruce, I guess I can't remember whether Bruce was head of the FPG and then Arlene took over or who exactly was what on that, on that committee. But they were, there was a, they were a fairly liberal group of faculty members. And at least I thought, you know, and they bent over backwards to be impartial, I think. And to take everybody seriously. So, in that sense I think from their point of view what they were trying to do was to kind of make this a fair procedure so it would be possible to use it again. And...

**Goldstein:** So everybody understood that this was just the warm-up act?

**Lamphere:** Well, at least we were going to—we had already, you know, done the kind of, like, Rhode Island affirmative action kind of... filed with the Rhode Island people.

**Goldstein:** And what did they end up finding?

**Lamphere:** Well, we—we actually—they weren't doing anything. So we just withdrew the claim somewhere in February or March as I remember. And the real big decision was what—whether we were going to try to go into federal court or state court. And Milton just said the state courts will take a long time and nothing will happen. You know, especially in Rhode Island.

**Goldstein:** What do you mean, especially in Rhode Island?

**Lamphere:** Well, it's, Rhode Island is a sort of, you know, a cronyism state, kind of thing. And I think politics—I don't think the judiciary was very strong there. Because one of the things is, Rhode Island didn't have a law school at that point. So everybody had to come from someplace else, and nobody was really... not the world's top lawyers down there [laughs] I don't think. But I was very lucky with this law firm because they were really a good law firm. And so, and Milton was particularly good. And then very soon on, his nephew Jordan Stanzler came back from California and joined the law firm as a kind of junior lawyer. I mean, he was making 12,000 bucks a year which was about what I was making. And he did almost all the work on the case. I think, I think Milt took me through the FPG hearings and then after that Jordan got involved. But, the... I think the Gorton, the FPG report was somewhere in February, which put together all of these hearings. And there are transcripts of the hearings, and so forth. And then

we decided we would try to get a right-to-sue letter from the federal, from the federal affirmative action people. Because they sometimes investigate something, but if you ask for a right-to-sue letter and you get it you can go straight to court. I think that's the way it goes. So in May we filed in federal court a class action. I think it was a class action at that point.

**Goldstein:** Did you go to court that day? When it was filed?

**Lamphere:** Well, I think if you filed, you don't have—the lawyers go and hand it in. You don't have to do anything. But they did have to write the brief. You know, which alleged—and the other thing, the suit was against Phil Leis, Merton Stoltz, Donald Hornig, and not against Brown University. I think that's the way it works; you end up suing individuals. [pause, look off camera] No? Stop?

**Nancy L. Buc:** ... the suit was against Brown University and... and that's really important.

**Lamphere:** And, okay, all right. Okay, thanks. Because, I—that's what somebody said in something, and I didn't — DeWitte Kersh said that or something.. Or no, Jordan said that at some point.

**Goldstein:** So, I'm just going to re-ask the question.

**Lamphere:** Okay.

**Goldstein:** So, as you were figuring out who to name as plaintiffs—I mean, as defendants—in the suit, how... I'm just going to try that all over again. As you were trying to figure out who you were suing, [1:05:00] who did you end up suing?

**Lamphere:** Well, we ended up suing Phil Leis, Merton Stoltz who was the provost, and Donald Hornig who was then President, and Brown University. And we did it—I think, we initially did it as a class action. But, in order to have it as a class action, you have to get it certified. And that, that meant filing another brief, which took a while. And then the judge had to hear that. And so the class action didn't get certified until July of '76, which is a whole year and about three months later. But in the meantime, first of all: the FPG had recommended that my case be reconsidered by the Academic Council. And that the department reconsider it. I wasn't particularly happy that the department—I didn't think the department would change their mind, which they did not. But I did go to the meeting of the Academic Council, which is a group of the top administrators. And I was able to have, I couldn't have my lawyer there, but I was able to have a representative from the Committee on Women Faculty there. And the FPG had a representative there, because there wanted to be some kind of people listening in on what was the discussion. And since then I've been actually able to read the minutes of that meeting, and then I knew right away more or less what happened because Michael Rosen wrote a letter to the Committee on Women Faculty, which he shared with me.

**Goldstein:** So you were talking about this second review of whether you should have gotten tenure in the first place, and how did that go?

**Lamphere:** Well, I took in, you know, my updated c.v., a long statement about my teaching, how my evaluations had improved, and new things I was doing and writing, and so forth and so on. And, you know, gave them to them. And that's when Donald Hornig sort of apologized for having just found my letter.

**Goldstein:** From the year earlier.

**Lamphere:** From a year earlier. And I said, well, I accepted his apology, but I noted that I'd also sent copies to Stoltz and Mattfeld and I hadn't heard from them either, [laughs] so I wasn't sure where all these copies had gone. But anyway, you know, I did my presentation and Phil did a presentation. And then they—

**Goldstein:** This was again, Phil Leis, the department chair.

**Lamphere:** Phil Leis, right, yeah. And, then they had a discussion. And from reading the minutes of that meeting, I discovered that the department made the case that they could actually get someone better than me. That I was a nice person, that I was quite deserving, that I'd spent a lot of time, you know, and effort with students, and, you know, my work was kind of okay but not very good. And that they already had some other possibilities in the department, because they had just hired Jane [Dwyer] a couple years ago and they were in the process of hiring Marida Hollos. So Phil already had lined up some women that could be hired next. So that was the argument: that I was a decent person but not as good as they could get. And since Brown was only about excellence, that's what they went for. And Michael wrote in his piece that he felt the whole thing was a complete *pro forma* performance. And that they really didn't consider anything that I had brought in. And one of the other interesting things is, the dossier that went up to Mert did not have any of the student letters in it. It only had the outside letters and, you know, the letters from the department faculty and Phil's letter. So all this business about how my teaching was terrible—the negative letters from the students, of which there were maybe four, just weren't, nobody ever looked at those as far as I can tell. And who knows if they ever looked at my publications. Michael thought there was, you know, nobody was going to bother with that. So, and Pierre Galletti, who was the vice president for the biomedical program had to leave. And so he wasn't there for the vote; they had to call him up. Stoltz left, I think, a couple times. So it was one of these, kind of like, went on for a while, but nothing much was discussed. And Galletti, interestingly enough, supposedly was a little worried that the quality of the letters on my behalf from these outside evaluators, who included both my dissertation advisors and other really good experts on the Navajo, the disjunction between that and what they said about my scholarship. He was a little uncomfortable. But he felt like, as a, you know, [1:10:00] outside person who was in the Biomed part of the university, he didn't have much he could say in terms of whether the department evaluation was accurate or not.

**Goldstein:** Well, there's a lot of concern about departmental autonomy that was flowing through this.

**Lamphere:** That's right, absolutely. And the idea... you know, I think Mert had a deposition in that same period with us, and more or less said, "Look, there are criteria, but you know they're not ev—" more or less said, "things are pretty uneven. But departments get to decide, and we believe them" is more or less the line. We have department autonomy; you know, how they make their decision is kind of uneven maybe, but, it's up to departments to decide. And that's always been the university's position on this.

**Goldstein:** So the second review was not your salvation?

**Lamphere:** No [laughs]. It ended up with reaffirming the first one. And by that time we had filed in federal court and were beginning to ask for interrogatories. Because if you're going to build a case, as a plaintiff, you have to be able to get from the university or whatever organization it is, the evidence to prove your case. And so they have to answer these interrogatories. And so we put in the first bunch of interrogatories, and there are things like: How many women are at Brown? How many men are at Brown? What positions do they hold? What are their salaries? They wouldn't answer any of them. So that began the fight over answering the questions and giving us the data. And it went on for like an entire year, because we not only wanted answers to these sort of more statistical questions, but we also wanted to have access to files. And because we were alleging sex discrimination across the board, and were, you know, trying to get the class action certified, we felt we could—in order to prove this case, we really needef to not just know about the Anthropology Department, but the Sociology Department, the French Department, the Physics Department, du-dah. And there was a great deal of resistance to that. And so this fight about what do we get access to, of the confidentiality of the files and, you know, they wouldn't even give us statistics because they said it would invade people's privacy. So that was the argument on anything. And it just, it went on for a long time. And Pettine, who...

**Goldstein:** Can you explain who Pettine is?

**Lamphere:** Yes. Judge Pettine—

**Goldstein:** Raymond Pettine.

**Lamphere:** Yeah, Judge Ray Pettine. There were two judges on the federal court in Rhode Island, I believe. And we're in the same circuit that Boston is in, and lots of New England. And he was, I think, the senior judge at the time. And it was really lucky that we got him because he was an incredibly important piece of the whole thing. He was a guy from Rhode Island, you know, grew up in Providence, went to Providence College, I think. You know, a good Catholic Rhode Islander. And, I think my sense is that he had really been transformed as a person and as a Democrat and as a Judge by dealing with a prison case in Rhode Island. Because we had a very bad prison system. And they were under Consent Decree for a number of years. And that was really Ray's deal. And so, he was certainly a guy who was very interested in doing the right thing for people and giving people justice. So on all this business about discovery, he was always on the plaintiff [always thought the plaintiff ] should get to know [the answers to the interrogatories]. So he was always for, you've gotta give her the information. So, then there was

like who could see it after we got it. Because getting these files, the law firm had a third floor that they were going to fix up. It was kind of like the attic, but they were making it into office—

**Goldstein:** And this was downtown, down the hill?

**Lamphere:** Well, it's down at the bottom of the hill, it sort of sits like a bunker at the end of the hill. That's not South Main Street... but it's the one in back of that. And it didn't have any furniture in it, but we could put a lot of boxes in there. So that's where we did a lot of work, was just on a, you know, we moved in some table and put a lot of stuff on the floor and looked at these boxes. But we didn't get a chance to look at them for quite a while because we were still working on—

**Goldstein:** And these were boxes containing what? Because you had mentioned statistics before.

**Lamphere:** Department files.

**Goldstein:** By now you have the departmental files?

**Lamphere:** Well, we didn't get the department files, I think, until maybe something like February of '76 or something like that. So this business of interrogatories sort of starts during the summer, the spring and summer of '75. When, I don't have a job at Brown anymore, right, after graduation of '75. And I was able to get a Ford [Foundation] postdoc to go to the Radcliffe Institute [1:15:00]. But by that time I'd also gotten a job at New Mexico. So I had these two op—I didn't do so bad on the job market given my status as a failed professor. But I put off going to New Mexico until January. So that next six months I was commuting back and forth to the Radcliffe Institute, so I was around some to be able to do, to do stuff. And I didn't have to start going there until like August or September. So in the summer we were still, sort of, trying to get information out of Brown. And Jordan was beginning to work, you know, sort of full time on it. And Sue Benson, my friend and housemate, did a lot of work on the case. And we started trying to assemble a group of people who could look at this material. But when we got to the issue about the files, we had to get the judge to intervene because we wanted, especially because we were thinking about this as a class action, to be able to let some women faculty to look at files. But the university said, "Uh-uh, no women faculty. You need to get outside experts." So our outside experts, of course we were all volunteers because we were doing this thing on a shoestring. Turns out in a Title VII case that the lawyers for the plaintiff can get their legal fees returned if they win the case, if it turns out to be—

**Goldstein:** Well, that's what I was wondering about. I mean, were you, I mean, you were about to be an out-of-work faculty member. Were you raising money? Did you get friends donating money? How did that...?

**Lamphere:** Well, we started, that was another whole issue. Because we started trying to look for money. And so I started going to women's sort of foundations, or you know, sort of... And I wrote around to a bunch of different places. And I have a whole file on, you know, that stuff. But I—the Women's Equity Action League, WEAL, finally was willing to let me send out a letter. I first sent out a letter to all the

women faculty and the men faculty at Brown asking for help. And there was a big issue about whether I could put it in campus mail or not. I think I mailed it and then people got upset that I was sending something through the mail. But then getting WEAL to help me at least gave me a letterhead. And I did send it to a lot of people. Then there was a big deal in the *BDH*, the *Brown Daily Herald*, on campus about whether I could actually raise funds, and was that terrible? But I went ahead and did it anyway. But, what I learned was the people who are willing to give you money are your best friends. It's really your support network. I mean, everybody that gave me money, you know, a hundred dollars here, two hundred dollars there, was somebody involved in the case. And that was true, you know, after the class got certified in that last year when we actually had four people in the case. Anybody that gave support was either a plaintiff themselves, you know, I put some of my own money in there because in the end we had to pay for things like depositions. And when you start doing depositions of people, somebody has to pay for, you know, the person that types the deposition out. And, you know, our lawyers were working for free. The university, I think, was actually paying Edwards and Angell [Tillinghast, Collins, and Graham], who was their first law firm, who was their sort of in-house law firm that worked on the case in the beginning. And DeWitte Kersh was the main person that sort of handled it for the first year. And so, that initial period from like May of '75 until July of '76 was this interrogatory deposition stage. And I think we did a deposition with Stoltz very early on. I think they did one with me, I don't have a copy of it anymore.

**Goldstein:** And do you remember when university administrators arrived at these depositions, I imagine they might not have been that happy to be having to do this?

**Lamphere:** Well, nobody's happy to have to do a deposition. [laughing] I wasn't very happy when I had to do one, either. Because the way they work is, you're under oath. And then they ask you questions. And I think your lawyer gets to ask, maybe both people get to ask questions. But, the deposition I do remember was like the one that was done the next year [summer 1976] when they had hired this law firm Foley, Hoag and Eliot from Boston, who were much better than Edwards and Angell. And the guy that did the interview with me was really sharp and it was really tough. So they brought in a much better law firm after they'd been doing this for a whole year. But you really feel like you've gotta weigh your words very carefully because you want to say what you want to say but you don't want to cross over the line and kind of shade the truth in any kind of way. So, we did a few depositions in that very beginning period, and they did one of me [1:20:00] and we did one of Stoltz. I don't think we did one of Mattfeld for quite a while. And then we started trying to get this information. And then Jordan began working on the brief to certify the class action. And I think the judge heard that in like March of '76, and he handed down the certification in July [1976], the next, a whole year later. That was after we'd had this huge argument about could we see the files [fall 1975]. At first the judge said, "You have to give her the files." And then, "You have to have outside experts, not the faculty look at it." So he gave into the university on that one because he was a little bit worried that, you know, the faculty looking at other people's personnel files was really terrible. Because the whole idea about confidentiality, and these are, you know, records that people write, especially letters of recommendation, in confidentiality. And if they are revealed to anybody else that shouldn't see them, it's a real breach of people's...

**Goldstein:** So what you were doing was basically going up against the norms of the university?

**Lamphere:** Right. But, this was in the kind of period when most universities in the country were doing somewhat the same thing. In other words, they didn't have very good procedures about annual reviews, I mean, nobody was doing annual reviews in those days. They didn't have procedures about teaching evaluations. There weren't, in most places, university-wide or college-wide teaching evaluation forms that got calculated on computers and you got compared with everybody on the faculty, and everybody who was untenured had to do them and some of the full professors as well. Not done. There weren't, you know, rules about how many letters you had to get and whether the candidate suggested half of them or less than half, and how the faculty, you know—and there wasn't what has to be in the dossier, the publications, you know, the teaching evaluations. There was no—there weren't rules about, “Well we're going to count teaching as half and scholarship as half. Or, service is 20 percent and teaching is...” You know, there were no numbers put on that, or even weights. I mean it wasn't like teaching and scholarship were equally important, and service doesn't count, or service is a big deal. Or, personal characteristics, which at New Mexico we still have in the thing, but it's like personal characteristics count? But at least you know that. And in those days, you know, there weren't—nothing was written down about what, what the criteria were for deciding on tenure, not — much less the procedures. And all of that got completely transformed in the '70s. So that now, if you write a letter in lots of places, you get this letter from somebody in the administration saying, “We can't guarantee that your letter will be held in strict confidentiality,” you know, “We will have to show it if there's a lawsuit. If there's a lawsuit we will have to give it up. We will block out your name, but we can't guarantee you complete confidentiality.” And you write your letter knowing that. But that's a whole new era. And so, a lot of what I was trying to get in this suit was beginning, didn't get put, it wasn't because of my suit, I don't think, but because there was enough push on affirmative action in enough places in the university, systematically across the United States. I mean there was a big suit at Cornell, with the Cornell eleven. There were several suits at Tufts. I gave those briefs to Skolnick and said, “Here are some briefs here.” So, there were—

**Goldstein:** So you were in touch with like-minded...?

**Lamphere:** I knew about these. I mean sometimes, sometimes after I filed my suit, then I started, people started writing me. And I started to try to, you know, find a, I didn't have that many personal contacts with people who were suing but every once in a while I would get a call from somebody. But there was just enough of this going on. Because this was the period in Title VII law, it didn't get applied to universities, this portion of the Civil Rights Act, until '72, I believe. And then beginning in the late '70s there was a change in Title VII. And I'm not sure exactly when it happened. But one of the things that made this period so important was, first of all, the burden of proof was on the university. Just like it would be on GE or... Jack's Stores or some trucking company, to prove that there wasn't discrimination [1:25:00]. Well, when they revised Title VII, they shifted the burden of proof to the plaintiff, which makes it much harder to actually do [win]. And then the other thing was that you could get your lawyers' fees. And the other thing, the use of statistics was much more, you know, worked much better as an argument. I think later on people said, “Oh, you can't tell from statistics about this individual case.” But there were cases that were being, you know, won on the basis of statistics showing discrimination. So, a

lot of that changed in the late '70s, early '80s. So then it was much more difficult to win these sorts of cases. So I, my case came in at a particularly important period of time, when there was a possibility of actually having some success.

And where administrators all over the country were sort of saying, "Oh, you know, Smith just had to give somebody, you know, two women tenure." Or, "This happened in that case. We could be in court and have to turn over our files," and so on and so forth. So I think it was a period where there was a lot of movement around the issue of affirmative action. And I think as a result, affirmative action officers in universities were having a little bit more clout. Because it was, it's pretty clear from, you know, reading about affirmative action at Brown, that the initial affirmative action officer, Tisdale, who was African-American, was getting nowhere. I mean, people were just ignoring him for a while. And it wasn't until the first two, I think, affirmative action plans got turned down by HEW. And it wasn't until the third one that they actually had one that was approved. But, I think, in this period, because of some of these lawsuits, including mine, universities were getting to put some of this stuff in place. But it certainly wasn't there at Brown and it wasn't there until the result of the Consent Decree.

**Goldstein:** So there was this context, there were things happening around the country in parallel?

**Lamphere:** Yeah. In fact, I found out from Karen Romer about, there was a case at Penn that was a friend of hers. And there was a—I forgot whether there... I think the cases in Texas were actually these truckers—the people at Jack's Stores, but, you know, I learned about cases from people.

**Goldstein:** So you were aware of this parallel movement, at the same time that you and your lawyers and, you know, your support system were working to try to get records out of Brown University.

**Lamphere:** Yeah. Right.

**Goldstein:** So, what were the records that were little-by-little arriving, in part because you had a very sympathetic judge who kept ordering the university to produce things?

**Lamphere:** Right, right. Well, one of the things that Jordan did was to suggest that in some set of interrogatories we asked if there were diaries, letters, tapes, other things that were held by faculty personally that would be relevant to the case. And so as a result of that, once the class action got certified, he also said, "You have to turn over stuff." And university faculty can look at it. The two things came down at the same time. So, then we were able to get this correspondence in our deposition with Phil, which turned out to be at the end of the fall—of the summer of... [1976]

**Goldstein:** And again, this is the department chair, Phil Leis?

**Lamphere:** The department chair of Anthropology, yeah. But the class action suit in itself was really a complete victory for us. And the thing is, [that] it happened in the middle of July. So nobody knew about it, basically. And the *BDH* article didn't appear until September something, when school started again. And then at the first faculty meeting people said, "Are you going to tell us about this or not?" And they

said, “Oh, well, we talked to department chairs already, they were supposed to let you know.” And then this business about the files, you know, I think even came up at that faculty meeting and, you know, when...

**Goldstein:** And this was fall of which year?

**Lamphere:** Hm?

**Goldstein:** This was fall of which year?

**Lamphere:** This was in the fall of '76. So it's like a year and a half after I filed suit, just about. Because it took us a whole year to get the class certified. But that was, that was really, you know, a big victory for us. Because it made it possible for three other women to enter the case. Pat Russian, who was a lecturer in German, and basically her position got cut in this retrenchment of, “We're going to have slots in each department.” The German department couldn't hold onto her, although she was a really excellent German teacher. And Helen Cserr, who came up in the Biomed department. She was in a division that had about three people in it. And, you know, there was just this, you know, there was three guys that voted on her, and her, or something like that. And she was the only untenured person [1:30:00] or one of just a couple. And they were very un—[pause] The treatment of her research was really—I mean, I think she had a sufficient amount of research, but they just didn't think it was very good or something. But one of the things that we were able to get through this idea that they were supposed to turn over letters, and diaries, and tapes and stuff was there was a tape of the meeting about her decision. Because the sort of tradition in that department was the secretary would be there and tape the discussion, and then she would type it up. And as soon as she typed it up, she'd put the tape in her drawer, and the next time there was a meeting she stuck the tape back in and recorded over it. But when we asked for it, her [Helen Cserr's tenure evaluation] meeting was the thing on the tape. So we got the tape of that, which was very helpful for her case.

And then Claude Carey who was in the Slavic Department, who taught Russian, had been denied tenure. And so she came in. So there were three other women that entered the class with me, which was really helpful in the sense that—Pat herself was—became very much of an activist around this, and helped us recruit people to kind of look at these files, and to help out. And we did have this informal working group of women, that I didn't have much interaction with because by that time I was teaching in New Mexico. So, in the spring of '76, while we were trying to get the class action certified. I think I was able to go to the hearing on it, which I think was in March. But I wasn't around for all this work. I did get correspondence from Jordan, who was saying, “We've got to have more people work on these files, because we're starting to get, you know, this file and that.” Well, I know that Sue Benson worked on the French Department, and took a look at that because she was finding some stuff that was pretty interesting. Because Laura, Laura Durand—

**Goldstein:** And what you were looking for in these files were...?

**Lamphere:** Discrimination against women. We were looking for patterns where departments would say in this process, “Oh, her work is weak.” Or, you know, “We don’t think she’s good x, y, and z.” But also, you know, just ways in which there might be assumptions about, you know, “professors are men, and not women.” So, we were just looking for whatever qualitative stuff we could find. And the thing is is that Brown did not keep very terrific files, because there wasn’t the consistency on what there ought to be in them. So I remember going into Mert Stoltz’s office, the Provost’s Office, at one point to see his files. And there were drawers of files, seven or eight file drawers there. And so I start out looking in the Anthropology files. This was to see how much Mert had sort of just shipped over to our office. And there was nothing in them! In the sense that in the Anthropology Department he had lots of, you know, reprints of Dwight Heath’s publications. But there wasn’t anything else! We expected to find, sheets about salary or various kinds of evaluations. Nah! Nada. It was whatever people sent Mert; he stuck it in a file and that was in the drawer. But, you know, could be different in one drawer than another drawer. So I think what ended up in the Provost’s Office wasn’t much, but the department often had personnel files for people, and that’s the kind of stuff that, that we really were taking a look at and trying to work on. And of course, in Anthropology it was very helpful because... the most helpful stuff was being able to get the letters of recommendation for various people in the department. And I was particularly interested in what George Hicks’ file looked like, because he came up for tenure the year before I did, and Niels came up the year I did. But during Phil’s deposition, which we did after the Consent Decree, he brought in all the letters he’d gotten from George Hicks and other people.

**Buc:** By after the Consent Decree, do you mean after the class action—

**Lamphere:** Oh, sorry.

**Goldstein:** After the certification, right?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, the class action certification.

**Buc:** Not after the Decree.

**Lamphere:** Yeah. Sorry, sorry, Nancy. So after the class action was certified in July of ‘76. I think it was probably in mid-August when we had this deposition with Phil.

**Goldstein:** Were you there for it?

**Lamphere:** Yes, and Sue Benson came with me for some reason.

**Goldstein:** I mean, what do you remember about—I mean, that’s sort of an extraordinary moment, your former department chair showing up in an adversarial legal proceeding.

**Lamphere:** Well, the most important moment was there were these letters that they’d handed over. Which Sue and I looked at during our lunch break, or some break in the whole thing. And we were stuck

in a little office [1:35:00] with somebody from the law firm, who was sitting in the corner watching us. And we started working through these letters—

**Goldstein:** And these were letters...?

**Lamphere:** These were letters from George. They were all letters to Phil, okay? So some of them came from George Hicks, and some of them came from people like Alex Riccardelli, Niels Braroe wrote him. Whenever somebody was away—this was before email and before computers, so people would write hand—you know, typing letters mostly. Some of Alex's are handwritten. But, you know, when people were away they'd write these two-page letters back to Phil because he was chair and they had good personal relationships with him, and so on. So, he had this stack of letters, and so we started reading them at lunchtime. And we knew we were being watched right over there, and so I would punch Sue, would say, "Did you see this? What about this?" You know, it was a sort of amazing moment to see what was actually happening that we had no clue about. And there were really important things in those letters that I considered, you know, pretty crucial. And of course once we had that side, we knew that George had some letters from Phil, so we got those from him. And the first set, the first one, the first set we got were typed pages with white-out over them. You know, with a little piece of paper with a check on it. So they weren't all there. And what they told us was that the parts that had been blanked out were either irrelevant or personally libelous. And we were quite interested in what might be personally libelous.

**Goldstein:** So even with the redactions, though, you were seeing things in them?

**Lamphere:** Oh, yeah.

**Goldstein:** So can you give us a flavor of what you were seeing?

**Lamphere:** So, it turned out the kind of stuff that we were seeing was actually the most important stuff. Well, since George was away on the Azores during the year I was up for tenure, he and Phil had several letters back and forth about what he might say in his letter.

**Goldstein:** His letter...?

**Lamphere:** His letter recommending me or not recommending me for tenure. And he first sent a draft of that to Phil in like February, or something of the sort. And that was the letter that said that he had heard me lecture in his class, because he invited me to come to his class, I think probably in the fall of '73. And he taught the big Anthropology introductory class. And he'd asked me to come and lecture on Margaret Mead, who's a famous anthropologist, who wrote about sex roles very early in the '20s and '30s, and a guy named Lionel Tiger, who wrote a book called *Men in Groups* that was about men, and masculinity, and male sort of dominance. And I, in fact, gave a long lecture about them. But George in his letter alluded to the fact that I didn't really say much about them.

But I had really spent a lot of time talking about the University Club, and about how women were protesting against the fact that women were not allowed to be members of the University Club. Which of

course was a private, and still is a private club, at the foot of College Hill, where Brown is, that did not let women be members. Well, it wouldn't be important except for the fact that the president was always an honorary member, and that a lot of university business was conducted there informally over lunch. So if people had a job candidate come, a lunch at the University Club was the appropriate thing. Sometimes there would be, you know, the provost would meet people and so forth. But women could not be members, and I think—I mean, I never was in the place. But Anne Fausto remembers a time when she could not go to lunch with a visiting person because she was a woman, or she was not invited. But I think you had to go through the back door if you were a female. Anyway, the whole protest, which I was only vaguely involved in at all, was really about the university should not be conducting university business at a private club to which women cannot belong. So, I mentioned that. But the letter said that I had sort of—it implied that I had spent most of the hour talking about that, and that it was a diatribe about sexism, and this was my example.

And George was completely astounded at the illogicality of the whole argument. So this was the example of a) how I was a bad teacher, and b) how my scholarly work was full of kind of ideological statements and so forth. Well, Phil got this letter and replied back to George, “Well, if you really want Louise not to get tenure, you really need to say something about her publications. I can cut off the last three lines of this page if you just give me some more.” [1:40:00] So he did write another, you know, couple paragraphs saying what he thought about my publications and how “weak” and “ideologically muddled” my work was on women. And there are other things in the letters, little—

**Goldstein:** So you discovered this at this lunch break read. And what did you make of it when you saw this?

**Lamphere:** Well, one of the things that was pretty astounding was that I, of course, had thought George was still my friend. So I've got letters in there that I was—I think I mostly saw those when I got George's letters. But it was very clear that the two of them had colluded, and the most shocking piece of it was... I mean, Phil was complaining that I was running a campaign against him because I was getting all these students to write letters in my favor, and you know, he was being flooded by letters, and—

**Goldstein:** This was appearing in this correspondence that you suddenly had access to?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, it sort of came in a February letter that, you know, “Louise is on a—you know, I hear day by day these terrific things about her.” I think in the response to this letter from George he said, “Thank you for your deathly statement.” Or something. “Who is this?” You know, very different from the woman that is being described as a latter-day Jesus, a terrific teacher, and so forth and so on. So, there were these—I mean, both Phil and George had this very kind of ironic humor, sort of sarcastic and ironic at the same time. And there were lots of these kind of slings about, “If Louise could just complete a whole sentence that makes sense, it would be great, I would be willing to recommend her for tenure.” Or something of that sort. So there was a lot of that kind of stuff. Not a lot, but there was enough of it to sort of indicate that the two of them were exchanging information to help George, you know—to get this letter to be as strong as possible. But I think the thing that was most shocking to me was the way in which George was coercing a student of his, who was in the Azores, who wasn't doing very well in his

fieldwork. So there's lots in these letters about this student and how he was having trouble getting off and doing his own stuff, and hanging around them, and becoming basically a failure at doing fieldwork. And he wrote this memo saying, "I hope you take your responsibility seriously, and I'm not really trying to pressure you but I am. You need to have your forthright opinion sent to Phil so he will have it, about Louise's abilities as a teacher. I know you're going to follow through on this." So it was really like this letter, you know. "I'm not going to coerce you, but I am. Please get this letter in." Which I believe he did write. And so I know there were like three or four other women and men who actually wrote pretty negative letters, because at one point I saw—you know, I've seen those at one point. That's to sort of counter my 20 letters of positive things from students.

**Goldstein:** So for people who don't understand how tenure should work, what was so surprising about what you discovered?

**Lamphere:** Well, you know, I think one of the things is—first of all, what kind of teaching evaluations there should be was pretty unformulated. It is the tradition in many departments that graduate students are asked to write letters of recommendation, one way or the other. Usually there is a formal letter that goes out to students that says, "So-and-so is being evaluated for tenure, please send in a letter by X." Well, that didn't go out until April 15th or something like that of the year I came up for tenure. And the idea was that letters had to be back by May 1st. But there were all these letters kind of collecting, because I was trying to get students to write—not knowing when they were going to be asked—and obviously George and Phil were trying to get people to, you know... And there would be little things about, "Have you gotten so-and-so to write?"

**Goldstein:** You describe this very dramatic scene of you and a friend kind of burrowing through these letters at a lunch break, and discovering things that you hadn't expected. So, what I'm trying to understand is what was it that you saw, not the content, but the meaning of it, that was so startling to you. Was it that it was showing discrimination, was it that it was...?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, I thought it was.

**Goldstein:** Because why?

**Lamphere:** Well, I thought especially the stuff about my scholarship, about the "muddled-ness" of my ability to lecture about gender roles, for example. That that was really about, not only was she muddled, but the stuff wasn't worth it. Or she—her ability to talk about this stuff is not clear, which [1:45:00] it also meant to me a real dismissal of what it was. Because people could look at that collection, *Woman, Culture, and Society* and say that it wasn't, it was "theoretically weak"—that my piece was "theoretically weak." I mean, they didn't even say that this was a terrific collection, and this is the weakest piece in it. But it just wasn't a serious look at this work on women that I was doing. And I thought, you know, that it just would not—it would certainly be a case of, "We should get rid of her because she's doing this new stuff. And it's about women." And that's, in some respects, discriminatory.

That's— And it did seem to me that the way in which my teaching was getting evaluated was the things I was actually adding, like this attention to students, and this effort to work with students and so forth, was completely being crossed-off as not relevant, rather than valued. Because my sense about teaching at Brown in those days was that most students expected to have a male teacher with a certain amount of authority and presence, and loud voice, and a certain way of lecturing. And that women, when they were doing a different kind of teaching, got taken advantage of. I had students in my class at the end who were cheating, and I just think they thought they could get away with it. And so in [one of] the last year[s] I was teaching [at Brown in the mid-1980s], I had a hockey player and two football players in my class who were cheating. And I couldn't get them thrown out of school. One guy, the hockey player, handed in a handwritten copy of his female friend's paper that he had been asked to deliver because she was going home early for vacation. And I mean, it's ridiculous to think that I wouldn't understand that it was the same paper, but just in handwriting. And then, the other one came as a late paper from a football player who basically took it from his buddy who was in the class, and just handed it in. And, I mean, one of the problems, of course, was that I didn't have the paper anymore because I'd handed it back to the student. But I remembered it as being the same paper, and I couldn't get him thrown out, either. So there was this way in which women teachers were seen as not being the same as men, and not as valued in terms of the kind of teaching style that women often had. [1:47:35]

**Goldstein:** So, you're suddenly seeing this correspondence. And you and your friend are saying, "Look at what's in here." And what did you understand this would add up to, in the context of the case?

**Lamphere:** I thought we could make a much stronger case for discrimination on the basis of having those letters. And then I also thought that it would not look good on the front page of the *Providence Journal* when we were trying to present it in court. I certainly thought that. And I think if there was really any sense that these letters were a smoking gun, it was partly because the quality of the letters indicated that judgments were not being made objectively. They were being made very subjectively. And that underneath that—I mean, Howard Swearer did say to me that he didn't think there was any discrimination in these letters. It was that, you know, people were being slightly inappropriate, but not, but it wasn't discriminatory. But I think other people read this and say, "Look, this is an evaluation of a woman's work on women. And they're completely dismissing it." So, I think that's the line about how you read those letters.

**Goldstein:** Because there's a lot of mythology that's gone up around these letters.

**Lamphere:** Yes, there is. [laughs]

**Goldstein:** So maybe you can just sort of summarize what the letters didn't do, and what the letters did do as you understood it?

**Lamphere:** Well, one of the things is I discovered that—and this is pretty recently—that there is this sort of urban legend out there that there was a lot of talk about women's bodies and my body, for example. Margaret Randall, who is a close personal friend of mine and a feminist poet came to dinner about three

weeks ago, and we started talking about the case and the fact that this exhibit was going to happen, and she told me exactly what Nancy Buc had told me—that there was this thing about, you know, my tits and ass. And you wouldn't give a woman with those big of tits and a—I mean, I don't have a big either one of those, I would say medium-size [laughs]—tenure.

And I don't have any clue where that came from, because there isn't much in this [the Hicks/Leis letters][1:50:00] about that kind of thing. The really, the only place that there's something that's a pretty unreasonable statement comes from a letter that was handwritten to Phil from Alex Riccardelli, which is about the women at the museum. And that one wouldn't have looked very good on the *Providence Journal* front page either, because it's about—I mean, Phil was writing letters to people saying, “This is really a bad time, and I'm having trouble with Louise.” And so on. And there'd been some conversation with Alex, I guess, about the museum where Jane Dwyer was the head of the museum, and Bets Giddings and Barbara Hail were people who were the sort of curators. And Alex, I guess, had gotten very frustrated with those women. And he'd said, “Well, I—you either ought to have a big Walpurgis Night, or maybe try a Ted Kennedy and drive 'em all off a bridge. You could add Louise to this, and they'd make two couples. Because you know they're all lesbians.” I mean, that was the closest thing. And this was a guy who'd been on the faculty maybe three years before and wasn't involved in all this at all. So, you could argue that the university could say, “Well, not relevant in any case.” So there wasn't that kind of stuff, and there certainly wasn't in my personal life. You know, my friendship with these people—people always treated me quite well. Except for, you know, when I became a feminist we quit hanging around so much, and I think people didn't like the way in which I handled those—you know, who I voted for to hire, and who... and how I dealt with students and stuff. But that was in terms of being a, quote, “weak teacher.” So, these urban legends. First of all, I didn't realize they were there, and second of all they seemed to be pretty wide-spread if they could be—you know, Nancy Buc who lives in Washington, D.C. and was on the Corporation has heard the same thing as Margaret Randall who is a poet who lives in Albuquerque has heard, so [laughter] I don't know.

**Goldstein:** And the heart of what you think is—was problematic for the department chair, for the university, was this...?

**Lamphere:** The problematic way was the way in which they handled the critical evaluation of my work. That it was not a serious consideration of it. That, you know, if this had been a guy doing stuff on men, for example, I think it would have been very much more seriously considered. Or, you know, even my—but the thing is they didn't even really do a decent job on my Navajo work. I mean, they would say, “Oh, this is very serious work; she has good letters.” But they wouldn't—you know, usually when a chair writes a letter having—I've never been chair, but I've certainly seen a lot of this stuff because I've been on deans' promotion committees [at UNM], and looked at a lot of files. You [as a Chair] usually write—there are letters from this person, that person, and one sentence from each one. So-and-so, who was a full professor and an expert on the Navajo said that Louise's stuff on kinship is [dismissive noise]. And this person who is a young and very well-known scholar said this. Or you would say, “These letters are good, but they don't—very effusive—but they don't seem to think [agree with] that...”, you know. It is true that everybody writes positive letters. But you have to take them seriously, you have to say who the person is, what's their background, how well do they know the person's work, what do they say about its national

reputation. You could say, “They said, ‘well, the person’s book is coming out but it isn’t there yet.’ But I’ve read a chapter and I think it’s great.” Well, you can use that to say, “Look. We’ve got a letter from so-and-so, they said this stuff is pretty good but also acknowledged it hasn’t come out yet.” But none of that happened with my work.

**Goldstein:** Okay, so let’s go back to this table where you and your friend were discovering the content of these letters. And the lunch break ended. And then you mention this to your lawyers?

**Lamphere:** Yes.

**Goldstein:** And what’d they think?

**Lamphere:** Well, we got the cop—I mean, we were able to get them. He thought—both I think Milton and [Jordan]— See, the thing is, outside the university, this is true of the judge and both of the lawyers, there’s some sense that Brown thinks of itself as a very privileged place, and you know, they do what they want to do. And then if you see inside of it, that it has all this kind of maneuvering and personalistic kinds of stuff, it’s like, “What do they think they’re doing?” you know? So when Milton and Jordan saw this they thought, “Who are these guys anyway? [laughter] [1:55:00] What did they think?” Which is exactly how it would play out on the front pages of the *Providence Journal*. I mean, people would say, “What is Brown, sitting up there on that hill thinking they’re the Harvard of Rhode Island or something, and they have this kind of thing going on, where they’re not seriously considering somebody’s work.” So I think that’s—I mean, my lawyers were quite pleased to have this stuff. And they were willing to fight to get the whole thing released. So we had to have a hearing with Pettine about getting the other parts of it—the “irrelevant” and “libelous” parts—undone. And that, I think we had that hearing like in late November, December. And of course this was also the period where there’d been a search for a new president at Brown.

**Goldstein:** Okay, so you were starting to talk about the fact that late—excuse me—late 1976 there started to be a search for a new president. So do you want to just talk about what happened starting from that period?

**Lamphere:** Yeah. [throat clearing]. Well, Hornig had left Brown, and I’m not sure when it was—in ‘76 or late ‘75, but Merton Stoltz became president, who was the previous provost. So some of the dealings we were having with Merton as president. But they were also doing a search at the time for a new president, and Howard Swearer was announced as president I think at the beginning of the year, ‘76-‘77. But he didn’t actually arrive until January or something like that, and I think didn’t get inaugurated until spring sometime. But we made an overture to him, to talk to him. And he seemed ex—willing to talk to us.

**Goldstein:** What did you want to say to him?

**Lamphere:** Well, we wanted to see if we could settle the case, or “What will you do about it?”

**Goldstein:** So let me just interrupt the chronology for a second, and say that I haven't had a good sense as to whether you had earlier on wanted to settle the case, or discussed that with anybody?

**Lamphere:** Nobody would discuss it with us. I mean, it wasn't this thing where someone came and said, "We should settle it, what can we do?" As far as I knew, people were just blocking it at every point. But nobody was offering to do anything.

**Goldstein:** And did your side broach the possibility of settling while Don Hornig was still president, or not?

**Lamphere:** I'm not sure how that happened exactly. I know that there's a letter that... sort of sets the terms of having a conversation with him. I don't remember it actually got started, you know, whether it was our idea or his. But I have a feeling it might have been, "There's a new guy coming on stage, maybe something can happen." Because we were also in the process of thinking, "How can we get a trial here?" And I think we, in fact, had some date from Pettine somewhere that we got in '77 that we were going to have the trial in September, because we were beginning to sort of think in those terms. So there is a letter that sort of says, "We agree to have a meeting with you. You can't bring your lawyers, the four of you that are in the case can come. And the president will be there with one other person."

**Goldstein:** And this was once Howard Swearer had arrived?

**Lamphere:** This what?

**Goldstein:** Was once Howard Swearer had arrived?

**Lamphere:** Yeah. And I think it was actually in March that we actually had the meeting, so he'd been there a couple months. And basically—I'm not sure whether he said this in the conversation with us or we learned it some other way—that the costs of the case were beginning to be large. Now, I thought it was more like, you know, they were spending a million dollars on it. But reading the *BDH*, it sort of—the story in the *BDH* says, "Well, it's hard to know whether they're counting just one year at a time, or what. But they're paying out at least—in one year it was 250,000 dollars to the lawyers Tillinghast, Collins, and Graham." But they were also trying to count the amount of labor that department chairs, and secretaries, and Merton Stoltz spent on looking at files, or deciding what to turn over, or somebody in constructing the statistics. And they said about a 150,000, and I think that was maybe for the year of '75, it might have been '75-'76. And the next time it was in the *BDH* it was like another 150,000. So I don't know what the total was. I would say it was somewhere between 400,000 dollars and six or eight, maybe it was getting—maybe they were seeing a million dollars. But anyway, what either we heard or got conveyed in this meeting [2:00:00] was that Howard wanted to raise money for the university. And Brown had never been—I don't think anybody was, except maybe Harvard was—trying to raise money through alumni to build an endowment. Harvard already had a huge one, but Brown didn't really have much of anything. So, one of the things that was on his agenda was doing that, and I think having a case like this would have

made it much harder to raise money. So I think from his point of view that was one of the motivations. And the other is—

**Goldstein:** Did he tell you that, or you inferred that?

**Lamphere:** I can't remember. He probably—we probably inferred that from something. And you know, it might have been a conversation between our lawyers and their lawyers, or I don't know what. Maybe it was rumor. But anyway, we thought that the amount of legal fees was getting to be pretty high. At least it got in the *BDH* a couple times. And they'd already said that they were going to capitalize it for the year of '76. And the other thing is they did not have an in-house lawyer, because they hired Beverly [Ledbetter], you know, somewhere at the end of the whole thing. So they were having to pay two law firms, I think, by '76 when they hired the Boston one. And I just think he felt that, you know, he's a new person. What were they doing with this discrimination case? If there were some way to get it out of the—you know, settled in some way it was probably a good idea. And we had lots of interest in getting it settled.

**Goldstein:** Because why?

**Lamphere:** Well, it was dragging on a long time. And I think we figured that maybe there was the possibility that, that we could get, you know, some of the things done that we wanted it to, like get all three of us tenure and something for Pat. And it became pretty clear that one of the things you could get if you got a settlement would be some real changes in the rules.

**Goldstein:** Rules for?

**Lamphere:** Rules for tenure and promotion, and evaluation, basically. Because Howard was okay with that. He was a little more nervous about giving us tenure, and said, "Well, we'd have to work out some kind of process." That he couldn't just give out tenure right, to anybody, that there had to be some process of evaluation of our research. So we came to the agreement, in this long series of months that went by, that what we would, each of us would do would be to re-do: present a new dossier, and that it would be evaluated by two outside readers in my case, selected by myself. And for the other women it was one. Because I felt that I had two fields of interest—you know, my Navajo work and my work on women. So I really needed two different people. And then they would choose two for me. So there would be four evaluators for me, and Helen and Claude would have one each [one chosen by each woman and one by the university]. And that those people would look at the dossiers, and write a letter evaluating it. And that if those were positive, then he would go ahead and recommend us for tenure.

**Goldstein:** So that was the final deal that you came to. Can you just go back a moment? So you had this initial meeting with him, and you either heard or you had some sense that his receptivity to settlement was a little bit higher than the predecessor's had been. But was it then a completely straight line, like it was definitely going to settlement, or was it very bumpy over a period of months?

**Lamphere:** Well, there was a whole process involved. And we started having meetings. And I remember that the first meeting was, I think, over at the men's gym at the end of the football field, on the second floor. And Arlene was the person who kind of hosted it because it was in the gymnasium. But we had about 30 people there because we had all of their lawyers, which is like two or three people from each firm or something, and then we had our two people, and then us, and, you know, there were some FPG people. So it was a huge bunch of people beginning to negotiate about what a Consent Decree would look like. And I don't think either we nor they knew what a Consent Decree looked like. The lawyers did, but I don't know that the people did. So we started drafting various pieces of it, and—

**Goldstein:** And did you have this meeting in this completely unlikely location so you wouldn't be found? Or what was—why was it there?

**Lamphere:** Well, I do think that it was supposed to be confidential and secret. But I also think that Arlene was charged with trying to find some place she could put us all, and that was as good a place as anything [laughter]. We drafted a lot of stuff. And I think we drafted an initial one and they drafted one, and they were like that far apart. [gesturing at arm's length]

**Goldstein:** What were the central differences, to start with?

**Lamphere:** Well, one of the biggest differences was having goals and timetables, and what should they be. And the notion there is that [2:05:00] you could have goals and timetables at that period in history, but... because I think most affirmative action plans in those days had kind of, "We're going to hire X number of women by this time," but they're always based on the pools. You know, the notion was there are very few women chemists, so don't expect to hire more than one chemist over the next 10 years. But there are lots of women in English; it should be possible to hire many more women. So the numbers were, you know, they wanted lots less and we wanted lots more. And Peter Evans, my partner, being at least somewhat okay to do statistics as a sociologist, started constructing a set of goals and timetables. And then we would argue over whether—

**Goldstein:** So you two just sat at home and tried come up with the math that would work?

**Lamphere:** He worked on the math, I didn't do it [laughter]. Because it depends on how you do this stuff, and what you think of as proportions, and how good your more—most recent figures are, where you get them from, and so forth. But eventually we settled on this number, which was perfectly arbitrary, of 57 women by '87. Because the idea was to do this Consent Decree for ten years, and then Brown could get it vacated. And, you know, I think we started out with a hundred and something, and they started out with 40 or something like that, and we were trying to get somewhere in the middle. So anyway, he played around with these. I still have the tables that have all of his numbers on them. But we agreed to this 57 by '87, it was good, a good sound.

**Goldstein:** And there's no basis for it?

**Lamphere:** Yes, there are, yeah! There's a basis for it!

**Goldstein:** But you said it was arbitrary—

**Lamphere:** It's arbitrary in the sense of which way you do the pools. Do you do X, Y, Z or A, B, C. And they started out with A, and we started out with Z, and we had to, we sort of ended up in the middle, basically. But they're a perfectly decent set of pools, but you can always argue, you know, about what the numbers look like. So it was a negotiation over what the numbers ought to be. So that was one bone of contention, and the other was how do you do the tenure process. And the other thing is, what do you give the class. Because when we got the class, the class that we asked for was all of the women who were hired at Brown and already there, and all of the women who might have been hired at Brown who did not apply because they thought it was discriminatory, or they applied and didn't get the job. And so it was a hundred for the first one, and 10,000 for the other. Estimate. We had no idea. But you always make these estimates, and then you have to—that's what he certified, that's what Pettine, Judge Pettine certified the class as. So then you have to figure out, well what relief should these 10,100 women get?

**Goldstein:** And that was actually an instance of Pettine taking a very sympathetic view towards your side of the case, that he gave a very broad class definition, right?

**Lamphere:** Well, he didn't narrow it, let's say. And I mean, we felt when the class action was certified that he was doing this on precedent. You know, that there are plenty of cases out there where this kind of a thing had been certified. There weren't a lot that were applied to universities. And, you know, when we said something in the—when Stanzler said something in the—Jordan said something in the BDH about, you know, it was based on precedent from industrial cases, you know, businesses. And DeWitte Kersh's or somebody's reply was, "Well, we're not like GE or IBM." But in fact, you know, they're big corporations and universities are big bureaucracies, so yes, they are like that. But anyway, that was always the university's position: that universities are unique institutions, they're self-governing, you need to give departments autonomy, et cetera. And our idea was, you know, American institutions are all institutions, and they all ought to be affirmative-action-based. So, that was another thing, about what to do about the class. So we figured out one set of things, and that was to have the university set aside a certain amount of money, and eventually they agreed to 400,000 dollars. And we would have a process by which members of the class could come forward and present a claim of discrimination. And this group of three people—one chosen by me, one chosen by the university, and a third one chosen by the two of them—would hear these claims. And award this money. So that process was in the Consent Decree. And then there were all of the rules about evaluation; teaching evaluations, when tenure decisions had to be made, annual reviews, all of that. And I think we outlined a bunch of that stuff [2:10:00], and they seemed—they outlined—I mean, we didn't have a lot of disagreement over that stuff, because by that time they had started putting things in place. After we'd been doing this for two or three years they started doing things, like Brown had a teaching evaluation form, and they were beginning to do a little more clearly about when the letters ought to be sent out for evaluation, letters from faculty, when the students ought to be notified, et cetera. So I don't think that was so controversial, but doing this 400,000 dollars for a class—and then the other thing was, well, what do we do about discrimination in the future?

And the way that the Consent Decree solved that problem was to have the Affirmative Action Monitoring Committee. And that would be made up of, under the Consent Decree, two people that I chose—or, the other plaintiffs and I chose—two people that the university chose, and one person that the four of them put together. And that group of people will be on sort of rotating terms, and serve to look at all of the hiring, all of the promotions, and all the tenure decisions, and see whether there was any evidence of discrimination. And they would be able to take things into court if they felt that there was some possibility of discrimination. So that's the way in which this Consent Decree had some teeth in it. In other words, there was going to be a body of people—not a from my side or the university's side—that was going to look at hiring and promotion and tenure decisions for as long as the Consent Decree lasted. And the university was willing to go with that, I think.

**Goldstein:** So this was huge, right?

**Lamphere:** Yeah.

**Goldstein:** Had any other universities agreed to anything like this?

**Lamphere:** Well, I think this kind of thing was getting in place, because when I went to New Mexico, you know, there was a dean's committee that the dean and chairs put together of faculty members who were—eventually there, there was one for assistant professors, and another one for promotions for tenure and promotions to full. You know, there was at least two committees.

**Goldstein:** But not as a result of a court case?

**Lamphere:** Hmm?

**Goldstein:** Not as a result of a court case?

**Lamphere:** No. I know, but there were ways in which department decisions were being looked over by other faculty members, not just administrators. Now, whether the dean followed the recommendations of the committee or not was a whole other kettle of fish. But at least—and those were not just affirmative action committees, but they were ones who were looking at the quality of the recommendation, looking over what the evaluation looked like. Did the department chair consider everything in his letter? Was there evidence of, you know, everybody in the faculty voting? I mean, at the University of New Mexico we all fill out a piece of paper and we put down what we think of the person's scholarship, teaching, you know, service, and their personal characteristics. And everybody fills those out, and so for every department you get 15 of them. And if there are only a few there and a bunch of people missing, then you've got something to say, "Well, what happened?" So, there's a lot more paperwork was being done on tenure and promotion cases. And I think that was going on as a result of this whole period, where there were these cases.

And Brown was probably one of the few cases where it had to be done under a Consent Decree. I mean, I don't know of any other cases. Because a lot of these other cases did not succeed. And I think we

were able to succeed partly because we had a university that was relatively small. It wasn't, you know, Michigan or Cornell that had a vast number of campuses and the state government behind it so that you could get lawyers forever. So it was a small, vulnerable Ivy League university with not a huge endowment, not an internal legal staff. And we had a really good judge. And it was also the time in the affirmative action law when the burden of proof was on the university. So I think some small colleges like Tufts managed to sort of give people individual settlements, and say, "Take 30,000 dollars and go away." And places like Cornell were able to sort of hold people off long enough so that people gave up. But Brown was, I think, a situation where we had enough leverage, both because we had a good judge, and we had a good case, and we had a university without limited—with limited resources, and a new president that we were able to pull off the settlement. And it was a class action. [2:15:00] So there wasn't just me. Because me they could have said, "Okay, take 50,000 dollars and leave." But there were four of us, and there were the other, you know, hundred—10,100 women out there [laughter] that were, had to have some possibilities for grieving a claim if they had one. So under that circumstances, we were able to get this, what I consider to be a very broad and very effective Consent Decree.

**Goldstein:** Now let me ask you a couple of things. During those months of negotiation over what became the Consent Decree, was there talk about whether this should apply to matters of race as well as matters of gender?

**Lamphere:** Well see, when we first filed, we wanted to do a race claim. But we couldn't do it because we didn't have somebody that hadn't gotten tenure. George Bass, who was in the Theatre Department, was almost let go, and I think they let him stay on. And then there was somebody else, like Ferd Jones, or somebody that sort of in a vulnerable position. But those guys managed to get through, so we didn't have anybody that could be a plaintiff, and we would never have gotten anyplace without having a person who had some kind of claim about tenure or promotion or contract renewal or something. So absent that, we couldn't do anything. We could certainly do something for an African-American woman, of which we had I don't think anybody. Or somebody who was Latino or something like that, but the number of those—there was one gal over in English or Theatre who had just started. And I can't remember any other black women faculty. So there just wasn't a person to be a representative of that class of people. So when we got around to trying to write the Consent Decree we couldn't do it either, because we still didn't have a body of people to certify the class, we just didn't have it. If we'd had, you know if George—if they'd let George go, he would have come in with us I think. But they didn't, they kept him on another year. I mean, he eventually was able to stay in some kind of lectureship or something, I'm not sure what. So that's why we didn't do race, because we just didn't have, you know, anybody that could come forward and claim discrimination at that point. So we couldn't do goals and timetables for minorities either, which was unfortunate. I mean, it's not that we didn't want to, but just legally we couldn't have gotten anywhere if we'd tried.

**Goldstein:** So you were in New Mexico at this time. Were you coming back and forth for the negotiations, or—?

**Lamphere:** Well, it's more complicated. Because I taught in New Mexico the calendar year of '76, I was back in the summer of '76. Then in the calendar year of '77, by that time I had gotten a research grant through a center, research center at Columbia. And I had applied to the National Institutes of Mental Health that had a program in Urban Studies. And they gave me a grant to study this project that I had proposed in Central Falls, Rhode Island. So I started doing that work in the summer of '76 with one of my graduate students. And then we got—we really started the project—I think she worked in the fall, too. She lived in Central Falls and did some work in the fall. And then I, we really seriously started in '77. And I had four students do interviews with Colombian new immigrant families, who had these working-class jobs, and Portuguese new immigrant families who had, well, working-class jobs in the textile industry, and various kinds of factories in Central Falls. So I was actually in Rhode Island the calendar year '76 [1977] when we met with Howard, and we started all these negotiations. I did have an apartment along with my graduate student in the same house in Central Falls, so I was doing research too, at that time. So I was actually there the year that it got settled. And I went back to New Mexico in January of '78, after it was settled and taught there the calendar year of '78. Because, and then, this was sort of—it took a while for the case to actually—not just to get settled, but for Pettine to sort of certify the settlement, and then I was able to kind of hold the whole thing off until I came back in the fall of '79.

**Goldstein:** So you were in Rhode Island the day the settlement agreement happened?

**Lamphere:** Yes, I was.

**Goldstein:** And you signed the document?

**Lamphere:** Yes, I re—Well, the thing was, I think it was one of these things where we'd signed the whole thing just before it got announced, and then Brown wanted to do a press release and an announcement and so on, and so forth, and so on [2:20:00]. So that happened, I think, on the 17th of September, when it became a big public thing. And it got into the newspapers, and the *BDH* ran several articles, some of which you wrote, you know, about the case being settled.

**Goldstein:** What do you remember that feeling like?

**Lamphere:** It was amazing! It was great! It was terrific! But it was one of these things that, you know, you knew was going to happen as you got this thing kind of settled. I mean, as you agree to do the Affirmative Action Monitoring Committee, and you, you know it was sort of percolating along. And I can't remember how long it took us to actually come up with a document that everybody was happy with. But then you had—I think the Corporation had to look at it, and, you know, so there was a bunch of stuff that had to happen once we had a document that the lawyers could agree with and Swearer and we could agree with. And then we had to get more people in on it. But it was great, it was really terrific. I mean, I considered it a win. And I think basically the university felt it was not a loss. Because one of the things about doing a Consent Decree that's extremely important for the people that enter into them is the university or the company or whoever it is does not have to say they discriminated. They can claim—so

the first sentence is “Brown did not discriminate.” And that’s one of the things they get out of a Consent Decree.

**Goldstein:** And did that matter to you? That there was never a concession of discrimination, when you were—

**Lamphere:** Yeah, because you got everything else you wanted. Like, you got checks on the future so that women would be protected in the future. You got, you know, you got the kind of procedures and controls on these decisions so there’s a paper trail, and so the person who’s coming up for evaluation knows exactly where they stand. Every year there’s a yearly annual review. Somebody in their department looks at all their stuff. They have to write things down and say, and there are teaching evaluations, you know where you stand. And from the university’s point of view, they make it very clear that they can’t guarantee tenure, and from the minute-go you know what the expectations are. And you know things like you’re not going to be discriminated against if you have a baby, or you know, things that are pretty much in this informal area. You know, that your personality isn’t going to make a difference, or, you know, your personal characteristics. Unless of course, at New Mexico we still have personal characteristics, but it’s not supposed to count for much. You know exactly what the criteria are, and you’re also told all the way along how you’re doing on those. And if they keep giving you good evaluations up through year five, and year six they decide you’re not doing so well and they’re not going to give you tenure, and they haven’t given you any warning about it, then I think you’ve got—you know, you’ve got a case, at least if you’re in a category that’s still a minority category. Women are less in that sort of situation these days, but in some fields—in the sciences they’re still, you know, underrepresented—then you’ve got a real case for unequal treatment.

**Goldstein:** So your view is that because there was of this codification of procedures in a way that you thought would lead to fairness going forward, that was so worth it that having the university not admit what—

**Lamphere:** Well, the other thing is we all got our jobs back. Pat didn’t. She was in the most vulnerable position because she was a lecturer. But she got three years of salary, and she was—that was fine, she was willing to take that, because she wasn’t on a tenure track to start with. But all of us got our jobs back. I mean, if we hadn’t got our jobs back, that would have been a whole other issue. Because that’s what I really wanted. I wanted to have my career restored, and I wanted to have my—I mean, by that time I had tenure at New Mexico, or at least a year later I did, by the time I actually came back to Brown. But I was accepted at New Mexico. I was a welcome person in the faculty, I was a good thing for their department, et cetera. So I did have, by that time, I had another alternative, but I wanted my job at Brown to reclaim the fact that I thought I was a really contributing, important member of their faculty that would do well in the future, and continue to make contributions to the university. I mean, that’s what I wanted, and I got it. And the other thing is personally, at the time Peter hadn’t been able to find a job in New Mexico. And so in terms of whether we were going to have a family, and what we were going to do in the future, getting the job back at Brown was really important, because I sort of needed to be able to have the possibility of being with him, which I wasn’t sure that would ever work out in New Mexico.

**Goldstein:** So you returned the fall of '7-...?

**Lamphere:** Nine.

**Goldstein:** Nine. What in the world was it like to walk back into this department? [laughter]

**Lamphere:** One of the problems was that George Hicks, who had written the very negative letter [2:25:00] was chair. So he and I weren't really on speaking terms at that time [laughter]. And I wasn't really on speaking terms with Phil. So it wasn't, it wasn't easy. The nice thing about it was that people like Jane Dwyer was there, and Bill Beeman who had been a new faculty hire, he was there, and there were other people in the department that were kind of friendly. The graduate students were fine. So it wasn't great. I think what—

**Goldstein:** How did you mediate all that?

**Lamphere:** Well, if you had to go talk to George, you went and talked to him about whatever and that's it. You didn't do anything... [pause] I don't know. I think the other thing is I still had this batch of people I lived with on Hope Street, and then there was this other group of people who'd been really supportive during the case. Pat Russian didn't stay in Rhode Island very long, but—And there were still things going on around the case, because I think it probably was in '78 that the committee that had the 400,000 dollars awarded about half of that to people who came forward. And then the university balked at all of them, and fought every one of them. And most of them ended up with half of what they were actually expecting to get from the decision of the committee. So the university was still, you know, fighting this on each possible level.

And then the [Ann] Seidman case came up, which was in Peter's department, which was a claim of Ann Seidman that she should have gotten a job offer from them because she was third on the list of people in a search for somebody in development, and the first two guys turned it down. And then the department people decided they would change their votes and didn't offer her the job. And so Peter was heavily involved in that, and that was another case that went to court, this time under the other judge, who was a very conservative Republican judge. And Nancy Gertner was a lawyer in that case. And so that dragged on for a while.

So, I mean, there were things going on like that. And by that time, we were involved in getting the Pembroke Institute off the ground, and bringing Joan Scott, and, you know, developing the Pembroke Seminar. And I did a lot of that stuff. So, you know, there was plenty of stuff to do there that was nice and rewarding. What was pretty clear by the time about 1985 rolled around, I'd had my son, and he was growing up, was that I was never—as long as the administration was in place and the department was the way it was, I was never going to, like, be department chair. I probably would never be able to be head of the Pembroke Institute, and I would probably never be able to do anything in the administration, because I was still kind of still *persona non grata*. I mean, Howard Swearer got so he hated the case, and it was partly because the Seidman issue drug on, and—

**Goldstein:** Because he'd expected it to go away with the Consent Decree and—

**Lamphere:** Right, and it didn't. It just didn't go away. And then, you know—I mean, the monitoring committee, I think, functioned pretty well. But you've probably got better evidence on that from talking to other people. So by '85 I had still been going to New Mexico every summer, you know, because I had research interests in New Mexico, and Peter and I started to do some research there. And I actually got an NSF grant and was there all of 1982 doing research on factory women in New Mexico. So I still had ties with my department in New Mexico.

**Goldstein:** Did you maintain tenure at both places for a while? Or how did that work?

**Lamphere:** Well, I—what I was—I resigned the New Mexico position, because Howard was furious when he found out I actually had tenure at New Mexico. He said, "You can't have tenure at two places!" And it turns out of course, you know, in most universities if they're trying to hire away a full professor from some place, they don't make them resign from the place they're at while they're trying out the new place and people usually have tenure at two places for a couple years. So in '79 I resigned from New Mexico, and by the time I wanted to come back—and I went out there, I got a Russell Sage Grant in 1985 to go back and work on the book that the '82 research was about. And then we kept doing research in '83 in summertime and stuff. So, that year I, they had a position came up, and I reapplied for it, and got it, and decided to stay there. So at that point, I think they gave... [pause] I think I had to go through the—I can't remember whether I had to go through the tenure thing again or not. [2:30:00] I think they gave me an associate professorship and then they—I've forgotten how but they had to go through some committee thing to get my tenure back, but—

**Goldstein:** Was it easy or hard to decide to leave Brown? I mean, I've heard you say that you were never going to be chair, or—but this was the institution where you had done all of this.

**Lamphere:** Well, it was—it was easier this time. Partly because I'm a westerner, I grew up in Denver, and coming back to New Mexico was terrific. My research was there, because I'd started doing this work on factory women, and I had still ties to the Navajo reservation, and I reconnected with my Navajo family. And, you know, I taught there for a while in the '70s and I really liked the department, and I had very good friends there, and so going back west for me was really—I felt like it was the right thing to do. I think Peter felt more conflicted about it, because he's an easterner, and by that time—it still took a couple years for him to get a job offer there. And then he did accept a job in New Mexico, but he also had a job in San Diego for a while. But then he got a job offer from Berkeley, and he just wanted to go to Berkeley. So we agreed that he would go to Berkeley, and I would stay in New Mexico. But we did that in the '87-'89 period. So we ended up with this kind of commuting relationship for 20 years or whatever it was. So, but going back to New Mexico felt right for me at that time because I had all these ties and I really wanted to be back in the west.

**Goldstein:** And by the time you leave, did you feel as if Brown was in a place where you were comfortable with it being, or that there was more work to be done and other people would have to take it up, or...?

**Lamphere:** Well, I felt that we were getting someplace. But I didn't feel like for me personally it was a great situation. I felt like a lot of stuff was happening. Because once Joan came, I think she had an incredible presence—

**Goldstein:** This is Joan Scott—

**Lamphere:** Joan Scott at the Pembroke institute. You know, and Elizabeth Weed was, you know, head of the Sarah Doyle Center. And the two of them together were kind of creating this journal, *differences*. And there was a lot of exciting stuff going on around theory, and wasn't particularly—it was the sort of post-modernist theory that I read a lot of, and I got a lot from doing that, but it wasn't kind of my way of doing things. So I felt it was an intellectually stimulating environment for feminists in ways that it had not been before, and so I felt that there were other people to kind of carry the whole thing along. And the Anthropology Department was pretty much the same, but by that same Lina Fruzet—see, Lina Fruzzetti was really my replacement. And Marida was there—she was married to Phil, but. And then Jane by that time died. She died somewhere in the period when I was in New Mexico for the first time. But the department wasn't changing as fast, and it was... I did have a lot of really good students. Mary Moran, who was, came when I came back, and so it was '79-'81, was a student of mine. She teaches at Colgate now, and is really a long-term friend and colleague. So I started having, you know, a fair number of students that were my graduate students, so I felt kind of good about that. But I just felt that the department was like—first of all, I think the suit was not good for the department in the sense that they didn't get positions after that for a long time. And we did make hires, like we did a replacement for Jane. It wasn't a terrific appointment and you know, it wasn't, it didn't look like the place was going to go anywhere for a while. I mean, when I was gone, in the 20 years I was gone, between '86 and 2006, it really transformed itself. You know, they—David Kertzer who was our old undergraduate student from 1968 or something like that had taught at Bowdoin for a long time, and they got him back to Brown because there was a demography center that was being set up and he was recruited to that, and to the department. And he became chair. And then he ended up as provost eventually. But with David, he started bringing—he brought in three or four people to the Watson Institute with joint appointments in Anthropology, and those were new people. And Matt Gutmann whom I knew at Berkeley got a position there, and there was another guy from Berkeley. So the department began to change, but not until almost the turn of the century. And now it's a completely different place. So, you know, but that transformation took a long time, partly because I don't think anybody was interested in funding Anthropology after my suit. But I think I made the right career decision for myself in terms of going back [2:35:00] west, and—

**Goldstein:** Just speaking of funding anthropology, you made quite a gift to your old department. I wonder if you could talk about that?

**Lamphere:** Well, the reason I did that had to do—

**Goldstein:** Well, why don't you say what you did, and then—

**Lamphere:** Oh, I gave a million dollars to the Anthropology Department to have a visiting assistant professorship for somebody who did gender studies. And it wasn't a lot of money, because they couldn't do a full-time thing. At first the idea was to have somebody come for two years and then be replaced every two years, but that was something we made when David was provost. We thought that—

**Background Voice:** [inaudible]... administered jointly by Pembroke and the Anthropology department. Can we get that in there?

**Lamphere:** Yes. Yeah, but the person would hold the appointment with the Pembroke Center, because I wanted them to have an affiliation with the Pembroke Center and the department. But they would have offices in two places, and participate equally in both places. And the idea was that they would teach classes, you know, one class in gender each semester during the two years they were there, and have time to write and publish, and give talks and so on. And we've had two of those people. It turned out that we didn't have enough money to actually keep the thing going every year. So the idea is there's somebody for two years, and then there's a year lapse while we wait for the money to accumulate, and then there's another two years, and we've had two really, really very good women.

**Goldstein:** And why did you do that?

**Lamphere:** Well, I did it because I saw the university changing, I saw the department being transformed, and I also wanted a legacy there that was not the suit, that was more than the suit. And the other thing I've learned from being a feminist anthropologist is that people in my generation are all retiring now or have retired, and the issue is are the younger women scholars going to teach about gender? Or are they going to be interested in something else? Linguistics, museum studies... The women that we've hired in our department are not doing gender, and we've got just as many women as we've got men, but they're not doing gender, they're doing other kinds of things.

But having the gender piece there is critically important if you ever want people to do gender in, you know, the next two or three decades. And the only way you can do that is to make sure that there's a position. And of course departments can change their mind about this stuff, but if you sort of endow something, then it's got to be that way. It's sort of the Nancy Duke Lewis Chair is for a woman, and they weren't legally able to get rid of that, and so there's always going to be somebody that's a woman scholar. Now, it doesn't have to be a feminist, doesn't have to work on women, but at least there's a woman there that's in a senior position. So, that seemed to be one way to make sure that there was a feminist legacy. And to do it at Brown rather than New Mexico, it seemed to me that there was a strong presence because of the quality of the Pembroke Institute, and that was something that was going to keep going, and would be this institute for the study and research on women for a long time, and that wasn't going to go away. I mean, in New Mexico the Women's Studies program is still a program, it's not, it doesn't have any faculty in it hardly. There's one half position, and then the chair comes from outside—I

mean, sort of temporary person who gets a little administrative salary for three or four years and goes back to their department.

So the feminist environment at Brown I thought was much better, and then, you know, Ruth Simmons was president at the time, so here we had the first woman president. My ex-student was the provost, and the department had completely changed around. And it just seemed like a place that you could do something for gender studies in anthropology, feminist anthropology, and it would have a lasting impact.

**Goldstein:** I guess I'm struck by two things, and you can tell me if I'm right or not. One is that it's a way of making sure that what you have cared so much about is not lost.

**Lamphere:** Yeah, right. That's right.

**Goldstein:** So do you want to say something about that, or?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, that's the whole idea. I mean it's got a legacy. It's like, you know, where could I have a legacy other than being the famous Lamphere versus Brown case that sort of changed the [university]—where can I have a legacy about women? And this seemed to be a way to do it.

**Goldstein:** And it's also you having a second impact on that university.

**Lamphere:** Yeah.

**Goldstein:** I mean, was that part of your consciousness or that was just an ancillary effect?

**Lamphere:** Oh yeah. No, but I felt that institutionally the place was ready for it. Partly because—I mean, I went to see Ruth, and the reason I know who Ruth is is because she had been at Princeton and Kay Warren knew her, and Mary Moran knew who she was because she used to teach at Holyoke, I think. There was some way I knew about her, I never had met her really.

**Goldstein:** Did she know what you were coming to talk to her about?

**Lamphere:** Well, I made an appointment and—no, I don't know whether I—[2:40:00] I said I wanted to talk to her, and so I went to talk to her.

**Goldstein:** So you walked into her office and you said...?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, I said I'd like to make a contribution to Brown, this is my idea [laughter].

**Goldstein:** And how'd she react?

**Lamphere:** She said, "Fine, sounds like a good idea to me." I think that was when she had her leg broken or something. That was in the period where she was wearing a cast. And no, she was quite open to it. So I

worked it out with David mostly, we worked it out and then... I had a person at the foundation who helped me too. And I mean, I'm quite please with the people they've had so far, and this year they'll start another search, I think.

**Goldstein:** So this year has been 40 years since you were denied tenure the first time.

**Lamphere:** Forty years since *Woman, Culture, and Society* was published, too.

**Goldstein:** So when you think about the kind of broad effects of what you did, and what it achieved, and whether everything's better now, or whether that's still living work to be done, how do you think about all that?

**Lamphere:** Well, I think that, you know, I really changed the university. And in terms of change and what you can do as a person to effect change, I think I really did something. I mean, I see the suit as the most important thing I ever did in my life. Because it had an institutional change. At the beginning, I don't think I had a conception of how that could possibly happen. And it wasn't until we worked on this—and you know, the whole idea of a class action, I had no idea what a class action was—and the idea that you could actually in settling a class action get something that was different than you started out with, that seemed really possible at that time. And meant you could get somewhere in making things different in a place. And of course, I think that's what the women's movement in general wanted to do was to change institutions.

I mean, we kind of all learned in, you know, consciousness-raising groups in 1970 that what this was about was not an individual struggle, but it was an institutional struggle in the sense that there were structures out there that were—you know, in those days people were talking about oppressing women—that made things the way they were. Things like the way marriages were arranged, the way credit was arranged, the way—you know, there were laws, there were institutions. There were institutions like universities, and companies, and bureaucracies of various kinds that—and categories of how jobs were defined—that kept women over here and men over here in a higher position. And that that's the kind of thing you had to change.

So I think that's kind of what I learned as I did this suit, was kind of how do you start out with what happened to you and make it be something about what happens to women in general. And so when I talk about this to younger audiences, I first of all try to stress to young women that first of all you have to feel good about yourself, and how can you do that when you don't. And one of the things is to start finding things in your own life that you can, where you can believe in yourself. And that you've got to have a strong network of friends and people around you who will support you when you're feeling like, "Oh, it's my fault, I didn't do a good job, I'm not good enough, I'm not pretty enough, I'm not whatever enough." But that you personally can make a change in things if you work with organizations that are trying to make change, become part of social movements that are trying to make change.

And one of the things I'm trying to do in an article I'm going to write for feminist—sort of new feminist stuff going on in anthropology—is about the relationship between women and social movements, because we came out of a social movement in the '70s. And the African-American women and the Latina women in anthropology that became feminist anthropology came out of social movements, out of the civil

rights movement, and out of the La Raza movement. And they all contributed to the diversification of feminist anthropology. But now you get—we get women who are studying other social movements. Some of which they're part of, like women are interested in migration and immigrant rights, doing feminist work on immigrant rights. Other women are working on food sustainability, issues about, you know, things that have come back up like rape, abuse against women, abortion rights still there. You know, that kind of stuff. And then a lot of women are in the LGBT movement, and working for marriage equality and so forth. So I've got students that have been working on those issues, people that are putting out some collections right now.

So there's a whole stream of feminist anthropology where we've taken this idea that the personal is political, and [2:45:00] carried it into our research as being more, sort of, public anthropologists. Anthropologists who are working on critical social issues today, that are being pushed forward by new social movements. And understanding the relationship between these social movements and social change, and how you actually effect change, what mistakes social movements make, how they get anything done, where they get defeated, how they do confront people who have the opposite point of view, et cetera. So I think there's a way in which social movements have been very important to feminist anthropology, and continue to be in this kind of new way.

**Goldstein:** So in the context of your discipline, you've been a case study.

**Lamphere:** [Laughter] Yes, I guess so. [laughter] So, you got any more or you think we're at it? How're we doing on time here?

**Goldstein:** No, I think we're done—

**Lamphere:** Yeah, you get 10 minutes to pack up, 15 minutes to pack up.

**Goldstein:** Is there anything that any of you want—

**Michael Udris:** I was just wondering, in the—

**Goldstein:** In each of these interviews, the people that have been in the room have sort of chimed in at the end with whatever the interviewer forgot to ask.

**Lamphere:** Yeah, right, sure, whatever.

**Udris:** In the—Well, what you were just talking about, in this move from a sense of personal grievance, wanting to get your job and career back to it becoming a class action suit. Where in that process did that consciousness come? Meaning, when you were first meeting your lawyers? Where did you feel that—was it a transition, or was it always there?

[Multiple voices talking, indistinguishable]

**Lamphere:** Yeah.

**Goldstein:** So do you want me to rephrase the question?

**Lamphere:** Yeah, yeah.

**Goldstein:** So, you began out of a very personal event. And this grew into something that was institutional, it was social. Where did that transformation occur, or was it there all along, that it wasn't just about you?

**Lamphere:** Well the part that was there already was my participation in the feminist movement since 1970, okay? So already I had the idea that, you know, there are problems that women have in the world that are generated by their position in the society, right? And those things, you know, maybe abortion rights, or rape, or job discrimination. So I think if I hadn't have been a feminist with that kind of consciousness, I couldn't have come to seeing this tenure case as a piece of a larger thing. But I already had that stuff, plus the literature that was coming out about what happens to women in careers, and how the old boy network mitigates against women. Because I used that in a talk I gave. I'm not sure whether you wrote the article in the *BDH* or somebody else did, about—you know when I was in the middle of the case—about the old boy network. And in my case, I was part of the old boy network because we had this group of younger faculty, until I started spending more time on feminist stuff and less time with them, and more time in the department in taking positions that were not very well received, let's say.

**Goldstein:** But was there a time when you were sitting with your lawyers beginning to strategize, or going through documents, or whatever the process was as it was unfolding, where you said, "Hey, this is one of those examples where this is the broader thing." Or did you—

**Lamphere:** Well, I think when we started think about it as the class—I mean, I don't think I ever sort of theorized it like that. That this is a bigger deal. But you know, when you talk about a class action then you can see that you're going to make a bigger impact than if it's an individual case. And you also can see that it's harder for them to actually win, because you've got more women involved. I mean, that was pretty clear when people started talking about other cases and other discrimination suits and so on and so forth. So I don't know exactly when that transition happened, but it's all kind of mixed in with, you know, being part of a movement that's a movement anyway. You know, and seeing women's situation as being subordinate in these different kinds of contexts.

**Goldstein:** Anything else? Okay. This is great.

**Lamphere:** Good.

[End of Interview]