

Ingeborg
Paulus
Interview
1996 July
10

An Interview with Ingeborg Paulus

July 10, 1996

Interviewer: Kathryn Anderson

Western Washington University
Centennial Oral History Project

Center for Pacific Northwest Studies
Bellingham, W A 98225

Western Washington University Centennial Oral
History Project
Center for Pacific Northwest Studies
Western Washington University
Bellingham WA 98225-9123

Interview with Ingeborg Paulus 7/10/96
Interviewer: Kathryn Anderson

[Tape One, Side One]

K: This is Kathryn Anderson. I'm interviewing Ingeborg Paulus, Associate Professor Emerita of Sociology, in my office at Fairhaven College July 10, 1996.
[break in tape]

K: Okay, I wonder if you could start by telling me about the personal and professional paths that brought you to Western Washington University.

I: I was doing research in Vancouver, British Columbia. Basically, on drugs, in a foundation that tried to help drug addicted persons. And I had done a bit of follow-up research on people who had taken methadone; I had done some research on marijuana and LSD with a group of young people that I went out into the community to find and interview. I had been there for three years, and I found there was a lot of opposition to my findings, because you can well imagine with drug research it wasn't [easy to dispel preconceived notions], especially with marijuana. And I was not going to change my report, so I had a few hard words with the executive director, and I decided that my time as a [drug researcher] had come [to an end]. So I went around to speak to my university mentor, and he suggested that I try Western Washington University, because they had placed some UBC graduates - UBC is my alma mater - they had placed quite a few people down here on a short term, actually two year terms. My mentor got in touch with Herb Taylor, who needed a researcher, an applied researcher for the Ford Foundation project on some communications education research. And that's basically how I came down here for the first [two] years. I was doing part time research and part time teaching with the sociology department. And then at that point I had decided that - I just had my MA - that if I really wanted to stay in academia, I better get a Ph.D. [By that time I had] done research for four years altogether; one year for the Alcoholism Foundation Where I could use the data that I had collected ... for my master's; and then three years at the Narcotic Addiction foundation. I decided that I probably liked academia better than just doing plain research. So I decided after the two years at Western - I was down here on a special contract from Canada - I would go off to get my Ph.D. I went to the university of London, England, but that was 1969-1971. In 1970, it became quite clear that it wasn't so easy anymore to get academic positions especially not where you wanted them to be. So I came home for Christmas, and came down here to the sociology department and talked with ... Doctor Call, [who] said to me that they had decided that if I wanted to come back, I could come back. So I followed the whole process of emigrating from Canada to the United States, and of course they had to put in certain kinds of forms and whatnot. In the fall of 1971 I started my teaching career at Western.

K: Now you said earlier, if you wanted to stay in academia ...

I: Yes ...

K: And ...

I: I needed a Ph.D. for that.

K: Right; and, and it was basically the environment 'that you liked rather than research that made you decide that you wanted to spend

I: Yes, I liked the academic environment. My first [two] years at Western were a wonderful experience. And I really liked the academic environment.

K: Okay, and how did you happen to pick London, was it University of London, or

I: London School of Economics and Political Science, which is a college of the University of London. Why did I choose London? Oh, because I didn't want to go - since I'd already done some research in Bellingham [while] teaching. I didn't want to go through the tedious process of having to start at an American university, because in the University of London, you were classified as a research student, and the work that you had done in the past was sort of given to you as credit that you were able to do something. You had to prove yourself for your first year - that you could actually do independent research - because that's where they were putting the main emphasis for a Ph.D., on independent research. If you proved that to your mentor during your first year that you were there, then they would advance you from a candidate [of M. Phil to a Ph.D. candidate]. And then you were on your own, you didn't have to take any more classes, you were out on your own doing your research. I had looked around, I had gotten in touch with a number of universities, but not very many - actually Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada. When the offer came from London, I decided to go there. But I ... did not put out any feelers anywhere else.

K: Now the process by which you were converted from a contract position, how did that work? Where you actually become involved with the department too, were they eager to have you come back from there, or not?

I: Well, they knew me quite well, because I was doing half time teaching, as well as half-time research [during my first stay] and they must have thought it was satisfactory what I did.

K: Were there any particular mentors on campus?

I: Not particularly, no. No. I did not ever at this university have any mentors. You must remember too, that I was older already. I had been doing a number of things before I even went to university, and by that time you see, I was forty years old. And so I was pretty well on my own, and I knew what I wanted to do.

K: Would you talk about that just a little bit? I'm interested in paths by which women became involved in higher education. What about that period of time before you went to university, and how did you get there?

I: Kathryn, that's a long story. I grew up on the border between Germany and France. When the war ended in 1945, I did not have a school to go to, because the school I had gone to during the war was in France, and of course I was German, so I would have had to go to continue what they call high school in Germany, my studies somewhere else. But unfortunately, I also ended up for a five month period in an internment camp in France. When I came back, I was quite ill and the doctor did not think I should go back to school, so I left school pretty well at the age of 15. Actually, I didn't really have any more schooling since 14 and a half. So my education was very deficient. When I was in internment camp, I met a young woman who was on her way from East Germany to West Germany via France- a long story, these paths which people traveled at the end of the war were quite intricate. Anyway, she had made it as far as the Elsass where she was caught, and being German, she was also in the internment camp. And she had apprenticed at a farm in East Germany to become an agricultural home economist. Something like that; and when I came back from internment camp and I couldn't go back to school, I said to my parents that it would be something I think I would like to do. It entails a two year apprenticeship, and a four year special schooling. I may just add that in Germany the school system is much more of a fork system, you have many more opportunities. [If you finished] high school, then you can go to university. If you have the equivalent to what the English call A-levels, you can go into many [specialty] schools. I had more or less the equivalent of A-levels, Anyway, I was given the equivalent. So I became an apprentice on a farm for two years. Then the currency reform came in 1948, and my parents didn't have enough money to send me to the requisite school, which was quite expensive, it was a boarding school and [the fees were high]. I decided to stay home and help my mother for a year, because we were a pretty large family. And then for a while I was at odds, and didn't quite know what to do. So then I decided I'd learn some English. During all these years from post-war 1945 to about 1950, we had quite a good correspondence with my uncle in Canada. I decided I was going to come to Canada, and I learned English in Germany, and built on my schooling that I had. And then in 1952 I came to Canada. I worked in an office. And I found that even though I took the same kinds of examinations for an insurance underwriter position that the men did, and I passed the exams, just as the men did, I was never going to become an insurance underwriter. I was

destined to "punch a typewriter" for the rest of my life. That was the situation in the early fifties, so I decided that was for the birds, and decided to go to university. Now to go to university I had to go and get my university high school graduation certificate, which I did in two years time, at night school and by correspondence courses. And then in 1958, at the ripe old age of 28, I started at the university of British Columbia, and stayed there for six years, until I had my MA.

K: That is a long story, but it's a very interesting path. You knew you were going to be working [something] and then you needed something to do, and so this was a path from farm work, to secretarial work.

I: To research work.

K: To research, to an academic setting.

I: Yes. Now you can see why I wanted to go to the University of London, why I didn't want to be sort of [starting from scratch].

K: Okay, you mentioned an observation that your gender seemed to affect your options, especially if you were going to work as an insurance underwriter. I know that later on, when you taught in that last clinic, you began to do research, speaking, writing, and teaching in the area of gender issues. Can you talk about maybe how that developed for you, as an academic interest, as a scholar?

I: Well, actually, I didn't do so much research in gender issues. I was actually as a criminologist, much more interested in white collar crime. I think the gender issue came about because I was for nearly 18 years, one woman in a seven to nine man department - and that was not easy.

K: What was that like? Can you tell me about that?

I: But I will tell you something else. I did become interested in gender issues, but it was through the sociology of law. Because you see, I got my Ph.D. in the sociology of law, and I was always interested in [it]. And when I came back to Western in the early 1970's, it was a real fermenting period. You may well remember when legal issues for women became very important. And that's when I taught first a workshop and then a course on women and the law. So that's how I really got into gender issues, but it was a side interest, not a main interest, not my main research.

K: Let's talk about what it was like being the only woman in the 7 to 9 man department.

I: It wasn't particularly fun, and it was at times very difficult. Now, I mean, I'm not the only one to say so - many women sympathized with me - even contemporary members of the department right now would like to leave. Because there are a few people there, two persons to be exact, in the department who've made life hellish for women, didn't matter who the woman was. Sometimes a female graduate student, sometimes undergraduate students, and sometimes faculty members. But these two men were pretty powerful for a while. They're not now, but they were pretty powerful then. So it wasn't any great fun. Because you see, when you are in a position of power as a man, it doesn't take much to take some male students and turn them against the one female faculty. I have been evaluated behind my back; I have had things taken away from me because students were believed rather than I; and things like that happened quite often. But I must say, [it only happened] with the two people, the rest were okay .

K: But those two people really dominate your memories of that.

I: Oh yes, there's no doubt about it, certainly, for the first, I would say for the first ten years that I was there, definitely.

K: What was your contact with other women faculty on the campus at that time.

I: Well, I went to a lot of the gender issue talks, I had a number of women friends on campus, and I certainly went to see women. But you know, when you're a young, well, I wasn't so young anymore, but as an incoming faculty, your life is pretty dicey. I mean, this "publish or perish" seems to even hold more for women than for men. I'll tell you something interesting, just to give you an idea what life could be like. I had done a translation from German to English. It was a very very difficult book and when I came up for tenure, one of the members of the department - best unnamed - said, "Oh! She shouldn't get credit for that, after all, that's her native language." I ask you, what was he teaching in? What was he doing research in? Certainly in his native language! Anyway, things like that, you see, they would have probably never cropped up with a man, but men have this strange idea that women somehow shouldn't get credit for things that they get credit for. And you know, it was little things like that. Sometimes you would never be aware of them, but sometimes the students would tell you something that they heard, or a faculty would tell you something that he knew, and so all of a sudden, it sort of it builds up, and in retrospect you think, darnmit, how did I make it through all this at the time?

K: Well, how did you? What sort of support did you have? Where did you get support?

I: I got support from my friends and from my family. I have very good long-standing friends, and I got support from them. I have a women's group, four of us, with whom I had lunch regularly once a month, ever since I came back from London in 1971.

K: Other people on campus?

I: [Yes; there were other women on campus who were very helpful and supportive as friends, but the aforementioned] women are all in Vancouver, Canada. They are my long-standing friends from university and from [my time living in] Canada. I have a good family, and then I met Roy. I must say I usually had good outside support. I got through my work by basically not being too much involved other than in my research activities, my teaching activities, and the students. And I just disregarded the faculty with whom I couldn't interact very well. Some people get very aggressive and fight, but I think I basically retreated and did my work. Also, I'd always been very self directed. So I thought what I was doing was okay. I had put together a concentration in criminology because this was the area of my studies. Another faculty member and I taught it, and we got along very well. We had no trouble making sure that we taught the courses that each one was competent in. It worked very well, we always drew quite a high number of students. So I knew, as far as the department was concerned, it didn't really matter what the others said, as far as the department was concerned, I knew that I was doing my fair share. And so found it not too difficult to do what I thought is the best thing.

K: I know you were also in Canadian studies.

I: I was in Canadian studies for a while, yes.

K: Did that provide a collegial home to you, or what was that like for you?

I: Well, it was certainly ... a much nicer atmosphere than it was in the department. But again, you see, the faculty came from different departments, and so you still did your own thing in your own department. And of course, you only met every so often. It was nice to have been part of the action. It was a very nice, very good, very interesting part of my being at Western, but it was again not my major involvement.

K: I know you got a lot of publicity for some research that you did on smuggling between the US and Canada Border, do you want to talk at all about that, and what that meant for you here?

I: Well, as I told you my interest was basically in white collar crime, and I consider this white collar crime. There was nothing in the literature [on smuggling;] nobody had ever done any research in this area. I was close to a

border, I'd also grown up on a border and I knew lots of smuggling stories, from my own childhood. So it was even interesting that I could use the border for research purposes, and so I started. Now, I did the usual, trying to get some support for it. But in the criminal justice system at that time, the support was for robbery, perhaps burglary, but definitely robbery and violence. I said, "I'm sorry, but I am not in a location where there are a lot of robberies. I'm in a location where people cross the border all the time." But there was no money for such a study. So it basically was my own interests, my own time, and through the Canadian studies, some monetary support. That helped me, and I did it just in my spare time. Without major support from anybody. But it was interesting. It involved a lot of going into the field, interviewing people, and standing on the border handing out questionnaires, and this kind of thing. So it wasn't just looking at the statistics and trying to make sense out of it, because there weren't any. Or certainly not statistics that would lend themselves to finding out how many people had smuggled or not, or what people were taking across, and how they felt about it. So it was interesting, and it certainly was time-consuming.

K: And I'm sure there was a lot of interest in the results.

I: Well, actually, I'm not sure whether the interest in the results was all that great. I did a, I did a comparative study on the customs courts - the American and the Canadian customs courts, and I gave reports in mimeograph form to the Canadian customs, and ... I think I must have sent one to the American customs too, because it was a comparative study. But people are much more involved in their own than they are with comparative issues, you see. So I don't think there was really that much interest.

K: Interesting. Because the problems we're facing now ...

I: It could be, yes.

K: You said that your work was largely confined to teaching these students [something]. Any sense of change from ... what exactly is the time period before you retired?

I: I was here for a full twenty years. That is including the first two years that I was here before I went off (for two years) to London, England.

K: Any forms of change, or cycles, or of the student body that you dealt with over that period of time?

I: Yes. I felt - and I know the issue is very mixed - I felt that the students did not get a better background. Their SAT scores may have been higher, but I did not think that they could spell very well. I didn't think they could think very clearly. Now, some of them could, but I thought that on the whole, the

caliber of the students - at least in my eyes - [has not improved]. Now, I don't know whether this is a function of my getting older and they're getting younger, ... or just jadedness, but they have not gotten better overall. And there was another thing that I always felt, and that I really found very bothersome. I always felt that, because I taught only three hundred and four hundred level courses, my colleagues had not prepared the students sufficiently well. I always felt that they did not teach the kind of things that the students should have known by the time they reached a three and four hundred level course. And that was another sort of not very satisfying issue, because somehow I had to do a lot of teaching in basic requirement when I should have done other things.

K: Did you have a graduate program or graduate students at that time?

I: I had some graduate students for a while. And then I didn't have any graduate students anymore, for the simple reason that the department thought that graduate students could take a body of statistics and manipulate them. They did not think that graduate students should go out and do research in the community or should learn the rudimentary research methods. But that again had to do with the fact that the department for so many years was dominated by people who crunch numbers. Because they thought that was the only way to turn sociology into a scientific discipline. They really believed that, and they were trying to do everything possible to get the department in that direction. Now I think sociology is not that scientific a discipline. It is like medicine, you have science, but you also have some other issues involved. You may call them art for simplification, but I do not think that you can do sociology by just crunching numbers, you have to go and get the numbers, too, because even though there are plenty of numbers available, they may not always be the kind of numbers that you want.

K: Now, this doesn't sound like something that could have been typical of sociology nationwide and worldwide. Is that sort of a microcosm of the larger issues of the discipline?

I: Oh, I would think so, yes, definitely.

K: How would you describe the development of sociology as a field at Western?

I: Well, that's a good question. When you become fairly specialized, and deal mostly with criminology as a subject matter - and it's a very wide subject matter; it embodies a lot - you tend to go to criminology meetings, you tend to get involved more with criminologists than with anybody else. I can't really tell you, and since I've been out of the university for seven years, I really don't know where the discipline is going at the moment.

K: So when you left the university, you left the discipline?

I: I left the discipline. Yes, I left the discipline.

K: What are you doing for the rest of your life?

I: That's a good question. I ask myself that every day, what am I doing? When I retired, I had worked for forty-three full years because I started work at sixteen, and I worked my way through university and everything. So you know, I thought I had enough. I had worked where you had to be ready every day to do something, get up, go somewhere, be prepared, and do it at other people's bidding, and do it too, you know, on a timetable. I thought I had enough of that. So I decided I wasn't going to do anything that involved any more timetables. So consequently I do not sit on boards. I do not do anything where I have to travel other than for my own. And I'm just at the moment enjoying life. I do some, well, call it charitable work - I don't know - but I have a number of elderly ladies that I visit regularly and bake for, and do little things for. And then I have a mother with whom I spend a full day in [West Vancouver]. That means traveling over three hours once a week, so that's how I spend my time. I decided I'd spend my time on the people that are meaningful to me, and the people who have supported me in the past, and who need somebody. So between my mother and my friends and my husband, and a garden and a house, and nephews and nieces and brothers and sisters, I mean, sisters-in-law actually. My time is fully taken up. I was going to take some history courses. I have always been interested in history, and I had never known very much American history because I did not grow up in this country, and so I was always going to take some history courses. I have not yet found the time to take a history course, because I am too often gone. We travel a fair amount, but what I do regularly - and I have done for the last 20 years - is exercises. I've done aerobics for 17 or 18 years, and I now go to the gym three times a week. So I do try to keep fit in body and I keep my mind fit by reading what's going on in the world.

K: So more current events rather than scholarly research.

I: Mmm-hmm. That's finished. And you know, I'll tell you why I don't do any scholarly research. I thought that the amount of work that you had to put in to get one paper published was not worth the time anymore for me. I have other things to do with my time. [laughs]

K: When you came to Western, you mentioned that you were a junior faculty but an older woman, and at that point you were a single woman. What was the collegial climate? Did that affect ... your role among colleagues, ... what was Western like as a place, to work, to be, to grow as ...

I: Well, the collegial climate when I first came was actually quite nice. The department of Sociology and Anthropology were together. There were some very nice people in there, and they interacted. The collegial climate became strained when people in the sociology department - again the two unnamed but often mentioned people - tried to push sociology into a more scientific discipline and when finally they were also successful in sloughing off the anthropology department. So [anthropology] became their own department, sociology became its own department, and then the collegiality pretty well sort of diminished more and more. I had much more collegiality with my anthropology colleagues. They also then had some women, you see, so I would tend much more to be social with them. But the collegiality in the soc department diminished quite rapidly over the years. By the time that I left the department, there was hardly any - only among small groups of people, but not among the whole department anymore.

K: Did things happen on the larger campus? And you were here during the same period that had people [reductions] What kind of impact or effect did that have on you?

I: Well, it didn't have that much impact on me personally, because as far as my own position in the department was concerned - from a protectionist standpoint - it was pretty protected. As I was the only woman and I had been there as long as at least half of the members of the department. I was not last one hired, first one to go, so from this point of view, a reduction in force did not affect me. Or was not going to affect me personally for quite a while, but what I always found very dissatisfying was that it was always the faculty that was cut and never the administrators. And even though our students were supposed to grow in numbers, the courses and the course offerings did not grow. And I always felt from my point of view, the most unsatisfactory result of the reduction in force was always the fact that the students suffered most, and that I always thought that the administration got bigger, and the faculty student directed activities got fewer.

K: Were you involved in any of those conversations about planning and cutting and ... ?

I: I was on the so called planning committee for two years, I think, and all that was basically done was reams and reams of paper being turned out. At the end I got so disgusted, I thought - there goes another tree again - when they gave me yet another report, because the faculty input was nil. These planning reports, I really felt it was just the usual sop to appease people who wanted to have a say, but I don't think the faculty had much say - at least I didn't think so.

K: Was that your opinion on other committees as well?

I: Yes. I stopped attending committees I think, five or six years before I retired. I wasn't going to go waste my time on committees anymore. I found committees - at least the ones that I was on - very wasteful of my time.

K: Were there areas outside of teaching that you found more satisfying, or was teaching for you ... ?

I: . Well, I liked doing research, it's just that I had so little support, and I had to do it on my own, and so teaching and what little research I did, I think were my two major areas. But in the last three years before I retired, when I knew I was going to retire, I certainly did not participate much in university activities outside of my teaching.

K: What kind of support could the university have given you that would have helped. support financially? Emotionally? What is there? I mean, do you have thoughts on ... ?

I: That, you know Kathryn, that's hard to say, because you know, we're all different. And I'm probably quite different than a lot of women. And I have never been all that vocal, nor have I been all that involved. But that is my own, that's my nature, you see. And so I think that as a whole, yes, the university could do more. I think in terms, perhaps, of financial support, but I think that it's very difficult to speak about the university as a whole, because there are so many problems; there are areas where people are well-supported and women are well-supported, and then there are others where they are not. So I think that probably for a most satisfactory teaching career, I think a department is probably the place where you would start, and that ,of course, is very difficult when you have no other woman [to share this with you].

K: So you retired before any other women were hired in sociology.

I: Yes, the year I retired, they hired another woman, and then as more people retired, more women were hired.

K: Does that apply to ...

I: Yes.

K: Do you ever look wistfully at that list of the department and wonder what it would be like to be in a department that was more gender-equal?

I: No, I don't look back wistfully, I'm just enjoying the present. I enjoy the present so much that whatever happened in the past, as far as I'm concerned, is passe. It was a good part of my life while it lasted, that is true. I had, well, certainly a good degree of enjoyment and freedom and satisfaction. But I don't look back at it. I have so much to look forward to now. I find

retirement wonderful. And do you know something? Most women that I know like retirement. It's the men who have the difficult time.

K: How do you explain that?

I: Because women have much more involvement, involvement in families, in the community, and at our station in life, one usually has a house. And you have things that you have to look after, unless you want to hire somebody. You have to, or you want to, spend a certain amount of time around your house, your garden, cooking, traveling, seeing your friends, and reading. Doing all kinds of things that can be done, being involved in the community, you just don't have time to be bored.

K: So the men you know really find it a different experience.

I: Yes, especially in the beginning, when they retire. Yes. Because you see, they come home and they don't have a place to fit in. You see, while I was working, it was the weekends and the evenings when I had to do a lot of work. Now I don't have to do this any more. I can do it in the daytime, but many men didn't have that function to fulfill. Or not in the same way I think that women do on the whole. And it doesn't matter how modern the household is and how young the men are ... there's always a certain amount of work that needs to be done. And it's nice to have some spare time. [laughs]

K: As you think back over [your time on] campus, is there any particular [memory], does anything stand out about events that happened on campus, or any controversies or funny stories ...

I: Unfortunately, I have a very poor memory, and since I have never kept a diary, I've never looked back much. I can't really think of very many funny things that happened on campus. I have always enjoyed Western for the opportunities I've thought that it gave people who lived in Bellingham. I've thought it had wonderful musical offerings, theater offerings, the book reviews, the various library talks, other talks. You know, the professional talks, I thought that in this respect Western offered a lot, and I found that always very enjoyable.

K: Did you participate in a lot of these activities?

I: Yes, I went to a lot of these activities, yes. I don't do so much now, because I don't seem to have the time, but yes, I did go to a lot of talks, and lectures, and events, yes. I thought, I really, I really appreciated Western for, for that particular aspect. [And the general setting, the landscape. I love the campus].

K: I know you've been involved in some things in the community, *AAVW*, and you're still involved in it. Was that ...

I: I was involved in *AAVW* quite actively for five years on the program committee, but I'm not involved in *AAVW* right now. I let younger people take over. And I'm not involved in the community on a professional level at all.

K: Okay, in picking back over the decision making process by which you ended up here, would you say that there were, you said you don't look back, ... but were there any costs for the decision that you did make to spend a big chunk of your [academic] career at Western?

I: I don't think there are decisions in life that are not without costs. And I think as far as when I look back the "costs" that I bore, I think they were bearable. I did try for a while to get another position; in fact I had another position in Canada. I had tried very hard to get out of the department and go somewhere else. And when I went to Simon Fraser, I taught for two semesters, but I hadn't resigned from Western yet, because I was in the process of going to London on the foreign studies program. And so I didn't resign, but I did teach one summer, and then one other semester at Simon Fraser V., when I took a leave of absence from here. But when I got there to start my contract with Simon Fraser to start my teaching career there, I got into the same dilemma that I had been in down here. That is I was again on the side of the underdog and there was a struggle within the department there were factions - and as soon as I became fully aware of how things were going, I broke my contract and came back to Western.

K: Interesting. We have to flip the tape, I want to make sure we don't get interrupted.

[Tape One, Side Two]

K: So at Simon Fraser, you found some of the things had changed that you found at Western.

I: Yes, there were some young hotshots with different ideas who thought that the chairman wasn't doing the right kind of thing, and they formed a little cabal, and tried to oust the chairman. And since the chairman was someone who had hired me, and I wasn't really quite sure how to behave. I thought, uh-oh, I'm going to be out of here, and I can't afford to be out of the university at my age, [I didn't have tenure]. So I broke my contract and stayed at Bellingham.

K: Did you keep in touch with what happened at Simon Fraser?

I: Yes, a little bit in the beginning, and I found out that I probably would have been on the side of the underdog, and I probably would have been out. [laughs]

K: How did it happen that you'd end up on the side of the underdog?

I: Well, I don't really know, Kathryn, but I think I'm basically an honest person and not a windbag, and I think at universities, people who toot their own horn and think a lot of themselves usually manage to be heard.

K: And that wasn't you.

I: That wasn't me. No.

K: You were in sociology during the period when scholarship and gender were huge [issues], exploded really enormously. I'm interested in, can you talk of women, how did you see that whole area, the sociology of the law and gender issues, developing and changing over the years?

I: Developing and changing. There was a tremendous amount of interest in the issue in the early 1970s. By the early 80s that interest among the students had waned considerably. Somehow, I think what happened in the 70s, the advances that women actually made, the affirmative action programs, the idea that women actually could get ahead in business to some extent. I think probably the publicity was still contrary to [reality], some of these successes either never got to the young women students, or else they just thought, you know, women had made it, and they didn't have to put in any more effort. And somehow I felt that young women thought the issues now were won for them, that the struggle was over. That after all these years that women had really struggled for equality, that they could now just do exactly as men did. And they were no longer interested in women and the law issues, because I really felt that they thought that they were equal now; fully equal. So then in the early 80s, I stopped teaching that course.

K: Wow What about the scholarship in your field, with regard to women's issues, how did you see that developing?

I: Well, there wasn't really in criminology, per se. [but in aspects of women crimes (prostitution e.g.), sentencing: prison treatment, etc. There was scholarship and I was very familiar ,with it - and taught it to my students].

K: In white collar crime in particular?

I: No, there wasn't really that much done. And because criminology as a teaching subject was such a rapidly expanding subject, a lot of women actually found work in this area. It wasn't an area in sociology where it was hard to

get a job for a while. And it certainly wasn't like it was with English, or with History, where women had a very difficult time getting jobs, simply because there weren't any jobs. But criminology was expanding in the teaching field, in the research field, in many different applied areas. It drew well in terms of students on campuses, because that was an area where there was work for people once they graduated, you see. I mean, it might not have been the most glamorous work, but there was work, so this was an expanding area, and a lot of women found jobs there, so the gender issue with regard to equal opportunities, was never that great. Oh sure, there were the odd things here or there that you read or heard about. But basically it wasn't a hot issue. The issues were really more about the professional areas, like women and crime, subject matter rather than gender issues in criminology as an employment subject.

K: I was thinking of a question as you were talking, I got so involved in what you were saying, I forgot. So the contrast of the students between the 70's and the 80's, and their interest is an interesting one. Any thoughts about why those changes ...

I: The change from a more liberal world view to a more conservative world view, I think that had something to do with the students. I'm concerned too, and I'm quite sure that the rise of the religious right had something to do with it. I think especially at Western, you get quite a few students who come from fairly standard religious backgrounds, and I think they did not see any need to learn a different world view. I think because they were quite enmeshed in their religious world view that was sufficient for them, and legal issues were of no concern to them. I mean, they came here to study, to get a job, if possible, then get married and have children. Be good housewives and if you were a little educated, that helped. I think a lot of the students did not have any high career aspirations. And I also felt that a lot of the students - and I'm talking about female students - still thought in terms of that "knight in shining armor" coming to rescue them, so they would be taken care of. I felt a lack of willingness to be responsible for one's fate; to really work towards being self-sufficient. And I think that still holds. At least that's the way I felt.

K: I know in the early seventies you were, from your interest in law and .. I don't know whether you wanted to say anything about that period for you.

I: Well, I believe in the Equal Rights Amendment, because my saying has always been; "legislation give and legislation takes." At least if we had an amendment, it would be much more difficult to take again, because it would take another amendment. So at least you would have the law more firmly behind you; that is why I was a great believer in the Equal Rights Amendment. And I think women should have HAD an Equal Rights Amendment, but alas, it was not meant to be, and I was very disappointed. I

was very disappointed in the whole issue, but I also sometimes was disappointed because I felt that some extraneous issues were receiving so much publicity . You know, the "bra-burning women" issue, and this kind of thing, that feminists were not getting the best [representation] at times. And so I felt that certain issues - at least to my idiosyncratic way of thinking - that the issues that were more private, i.e., less unifying, etc. should have been pushed into the background. I think that women did not realize that as a force, they should and would have been more effective had they insisted on the regular legal issues of equality. And put some of those more - what to call it - volatile social issues that were going to get up the ganders of a lot of people, into the background. But, that's my way of thinking. Now I know a lot of feminists would not think that way, and I call myself a feminist. But I felt that for the sake of the greater good, we should have done a few sacrifices for a while, because I felt these issues could have been taken up later. But then, I also feel - from my own point of view - that sexual issues are private issues. And I think what you do in your own home and in your own bedroom, that's your business. And sometime when the society is not ready for some of these issues, then [discretion is] sometimes the better part of ladies' [valor].

K: As somebody interested in the law, you must be interested in the legal cases that followed and raised the whole issue of sexuality, and of a political nature, but ... those were not the areas that you actually ...

I: No, I was more into laws that affected education, employment, pension rights, [marriage and divorce and property rights], things like that. The basic bread and butter issues.

K: Are there any other aspects of your experience here that you haven't talked about, that stand out as being a significant part of this--half of your working career?

I: I know, I know. Frankly, I can't really pick out issues that were really outstanding. I can't say that having changed presidents was a landmark for me.

K: You mean, which president?

I: No, from one president to another one.

K: University president or president of the united states?

I: Yes, university presidents; I mean, there was one university president today and there was another one tomorrow, but it didn't affect our teaching. it didn't affect departmental policies much. What other events happened on campus? The increase in students, you see, was just before I retired. You

know, for a while the numbers were pretty stable. So there wasn't much change there. Oh yes, there were a few new buildings on campus, and that was good because we got better offices, and so that was something that affected us, in that we did get better offices, when we moved to Arntzen Hall from Old Main. What else? You know, I think campus life, by the very fact that it is not really a total part of society, you are isolated, and you are on a campus that is isolated from the rest of the society. You are in a little city of your own, you get enmeshed in the every day activities, and unless the changes are of such a nature that they, you know are sort of almost earthquake like, they remain almost the same, because you have a job to do, you do this job all year round. You have lectures at a certain time, and you always are on time. And it is a very regulated kind of an existence, you see. At least I cannot think back and remember any great earthshaking events that I would have gone around wringing my hands about and saying; "Oh my Lord, what is happening here now?" [Even the airplane death of one president did not affect the teaching schedule for more than one day].

K: That reflection in and of itself I think is meaningful--the focus on the daily .. Do you ever think, what if? What if you'd been able to go to school in Germany, What if you hadn't come here to Canada and to the U.S.? You've lived in three nations in your time.

I: Yeah. Well, as far as Germany is concerned, yes, I would have. I would have been wanting to finish school, and I would have probably gone to medical school as I had planned, because that was my idea of what I wanted to do. And with regard to having been to universities in three different countries, in retrospect, well, it became actually quite clear to me after a few years, after I started my career, it would have been much better if I would have had a network. Because I went to university as an older student in Canada, then did some research, did not stay in the university, very few of my fellow students became criminologists - and then I went to England and came back to the states again, I didn't really have a network. And that is one thing for somebody who would like to be a university professor that is important, I would say to all the women, get yourself a network. I said that to my students all the time. I said; "Look, get yourself a network!" I think that was my major regret, that I did not have a network. Nobody ever told me of the importance of having a network, and how you in effect get a network. So I thought that a variety of experiences in different countries would be the thing that would be valued, but no, that was not the thing that was valued. I think it would have been much better if I would have had a deeper experience in one country. At least, that's something that I feel in retrospect. Because my schooling did not allow one to build up a proper network.

K: Did you develop a network professionally within your own [subject] internationally?

I: Not very much, not very much. I had some people for a while. When I was going to meetings, when I was giving talks, when I was publishing, but it was obviously difficult, because again you see, the closer support for this area was lacking. There was support in Canadian American studies. But they didn't really bridge the area of criminology very much. Because you do have different laws, you see. The law is quite different in Canada, that governs criminal matters than it is in the United States from an administrative point of view. Because you have a federal law in Canada, whereas you have state law here. So there was not this big bridge here. And then Bellingham is at the edge, in a sense, isn't it? It is at the edge of a country. You can't go much further west, because you jump into the ocean, and you can't go north because there's Canada. So I think that if you are the only person in the department, and if you are not very aggressive, which I am not, you sort of get stuck on the edge, and that's probably what I was.

K: Well, now you're off the edge. And that sounds like it's great.

I: Yes, mm- hmm.

K: I don't have any other questions, if you don't. Maybe we could stop here. Certainly if things occur to you, we can pick up where we left off and add on to any of the areas that you think we should. But thank you very much for participating in this.

I: Oh, it was a pleasure. Thank you.
[break in tape]

K: Since we have a few more minutes, you were talking when we finished, about retiring, and how you came to decide to retire, maybe you could go into that.

I: Well, when I thought about retiring, Kris had worked off and on in the department - a quarter here and there. She was away and then she came back again to teach for us, and as I told you before, we had no full-time woman. We've had a woman for a quarter when somebody was on sabbatical or something, but we never really had a full-time woman. And I knew that when I retired, the University would insist that the department get another woman. I mean, the department wasn't perhaps insisting, but the university would insist, and since I knew Kris was available, and she had some other job offers, but really she wanted to stay in the area. I knew she was available, and I really wanted to retire and make sure that Kris got the job. I felt first of all, she had wonderful teaching evaluations; she had a really really good rapport with the students both male and female, but especially with female students. And I really felt she would be the kind of role model that female students needed. You see both my high school experience, and my university experience, I never had any women role models. They were all men. My

high school teachers, with the exception of one person; were all men. My university teachers in the sociology department at UBC were all men. There was not one woman. I had never, in all my university experience, all eight years of it, I never had one woman teacher in sociology. They were all men. So you see, I had no role model, and I really felt that a good role model would be extremely important. So when the university then did hire Kris, I was very happy to retire.

K: And that created a place, a permanent, full position that she could then be hired.

I: Yes, yes, it was a tenure track position. Because you know, she had been here and there, and she wanted a tenure track position. Mine was a tenure track position, and I knew they couldn't take it away. We also had other retirees, a year later, and that was good, because one woman in such a heavily "manned" department, wasn't very good. So I knew there were going to be some more women. And of course, they would also have a female colleague, so I think starting with my retirement, people in the department certainly have changed, and it's much easier, I think, for a woman to be in the department. And I think it's also, it's also good for the female students, because there are a lot of female students in sociology, to have good role models. You see, I don't think that I was a particular good role model. I was to some students, especially to the older students, but not to the younger students. After all I was, I was at least 40 years older than the majority of the female students. That's a big gap. And when you are, when you are 20, somebody who is 60 is very old. [laughs]

K: Indeed.

I: Makes a difference, yes.

K: You also talked about the university experience as being kind of an interlude--because you had a lot of experience, and a very rich and full life after here. I don't know if you want to say any more about that, or how you felt that compared to other colleagues, or whatever ...

I: I don't know whether it compares to colleagues; but I think it compares well to other women that I know. For whom I guess the university teaching was just one aspect of their lives. And that is not to say that it was not a significant, it was a very significant aspect of my life. I am forever thankful that I was able to be an academic. I enjoyed being in the university. I enjoyed the university environment, I enjoyed the freedom, I enjoyed the fact that I could teach my courses the way I wanted to teach my courses. First of all, I set them up, and then I taught them the way I wanted to teach them, I was pretty independent in our concentration. There were only two of us who taught the concentration, and since I pretty well had set it up, I really felt that I had a

good thing going in terms of a working environment. You see I didn't really need my colleagues all that much, because Don Call and myself, we had our criminology concentration. We always had a good body of students, and since we taught mostly three and four hundred level students, we had a good rapport with the students. Even though I did not have collegiality in the sense that I interacted with my whole department, I would interact with many of them. Then there was [something] collegiality, but there was also a good teaching experience. So I would not look back on my 20 years at Western with regret or anything. It's just that sometimes it was very hard. [laughs] But then I don't think that's any different in any other positions, but on the whole, I would say that my 20 years at Western were pretty enjoyable. Compared to other situations where I may have had different colleagues, I may have had a different working environment, but I still think that considering the ups and downs that life is made up of, it was overall a satisfactory experience.

K: Thanks, I wanted to get that talk, as we got into it.

I: Yes.

K: Okay.

[End of Tape One, Side Two]