

### UFWS 3

Interviewee: Madelyn Lockhart

Interviewer: Katie Kindelan

Date: October 16, 2003

K: This is Katie Kindelan with Dr. Madelyn Lockhart at her home on October 16, 2003. First, thank you so much for agreeing to do the interview. Just to start off, can you give us some information about where you were born and educated.

L: I was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, of Scotch-Irish immigrant parents, who had five children. I was the youngest. We had no money to get to college, but I won a couple of scholarships and went to Denison University in Granville, Ohio, as a music major. Up until that point, I had 16 years of music piano training and had played all over Pittsburgh, so I thought I was going to be a concert pianist. However, after a short while in college I decided I would probably end up playing in a cocktail bar, so I changed my major to economics. This was during World War II when I thought there would be a lot of opportunity for economists. [I thought] that business would be expanding after the war and economists would be in demand, particularly those who were involved with finances, which was my major, the financial end of it.

K: So music was what allowed you go to college, coming from your background of people who had not gone to college. Music was your avenue to get there.

L: That's right. Well, [I received] scholarships through music.

K: How and when did you become interested in economics? Did you choose it because you thought it would be a good future? Were there a lot of women in the field at the time or were you breaking ground?

L: No, there were practically no women in the field. The reason I chose it was because I had worked in the summertime, when I wasn't in school, for brokerage houses. I became fascinated with the investment business and got a lot of encouragement from men that I worked for in that field that I should really concentrate on the financial aspect of economics. I thought this would allow me to be an investment counselor when I finally got my degree.

K: What are you involved in today?

L: Currently, I'm retired. Do you mean what do I do with my time?

K: Right.

L: Oh, well, I still do a lot of consulting, obviously I'm going to Brazil in December. I've done a lot of consulting with universities. In town, I've been an officer in the

Retired Faculty group, I'm on the Smathers Libraries Board, I'm the treasurer of the Alachua County Library Board, I'm president of my Homeowner's Association, and I'm newsletter editor of the Florida Free Speech Forum. In my spare time, I do line dancing and a lot of travel.

K: Why did you come to the University of Florida?

L: My husband got a job here and I had at that point two small children, six months and two years old, and I was taking a year or two off to get them to the stage where they could be cared for in day-care programs and allow me to go back to work. I had worked at that point, not only at Ohio State University, but I had been an assistant professor at the University of Kentucky and I had many, many years of teaching under my belt, as well as a lot of research. So I thought I could spend perhaps a year or two taking care of my children and then getting back into the profession.

K: And how did you transition from going into economics to work in brokerage and finance to going into teaching and the academics?

L: Well, when I got my masters degree I applied for jobs at all the major brokerage houses, Merrill Lynch, First Boston and so on. I got very nice letters back saying that they did not hire women in these positions. I decided the best thing to do was become a teacher, a professor, and I went on to get my Ph.D. in order to be able to do that.

K: When you were going through the Ph.D. program, were you were discriminated against as a women in academia?

L: Well, I was the only woman in about almost one hundred men who were majoring in economics at the Ph.D. level. I'm the only women, of course, that got the Ph.D., many of the men did but some didn't. So I was kind of a sore thumb in the group. I wasn't really discriminated against in any way, [but] it was a little difficult to do some of the work because it was done in groups and the men didn't always want to include me in their group. I didn't drink enough beer, for one thing. But, in general, at Ohio State I was well-treated. I don't really have any complaints about the treatment there. There was very little discrimination.

K: As you came to the University of Florida with your husband, in what capacity did you first begin your career at UF?

L: Well, I had a research program underway at the University of Kentucky and at Ohio State that Florida wanted. It was a methodology to measure income by cities and counties in the state. This had never been done before, we'd never

had measures of income by cities and counties. I had done it for both Kentucky and Ohio, and so they wanted me to do this particular kind of research. They hired me, but in order to do so they had to hire me on what was called an "emergency basis," so I was hired and fired every three months. I was given a title of assistant professor, but I had none of the benefits thereof. I was not on a tenure line. I had no retirement benefits. I had nothing. I was just a three month employee and then I'd be rehired for another three months, and so on.

K: Was that more because of the position or because you were a woman?

L: It was because I was a woman and the wife of a faculty member, and that was never done at the University of Florida. They never hired faculty wives. There was a very strong rule against it and this one vice-president said to hire me on a permanent position would be like putting icing on a cake. So you can see what their attitude was. But they needed me, so they used me. After four years of that, I said, unless you can give me a regular faculty appointment where I can earn tenure and retirement benefits and so on, I'll quit. They didn't want to do it, so I quit and went to work for the county.

K: What did you do for the county?

L: I was the first director of the Community Action Program under President [Lyndon] Johnson's poverty program. You don't remember those days, but President Johnson, in the early 1960s, instituted a program nationwide to solve the problem of poverty. His way of solving it was for each community to develop their own organizations that would apply for federal money and solve their problems. So I was director of the Alachua County program, which was very interesting because Gainesville at that point was highly segregated, the county was surrounded by Ku Klux Klan. The attitude in the county for a white woman to come into black neighborhoods was shocking. It wasn't to me; I had worked with blacks in Ohio and Kentucky and Pennsylvania. That didn't bother me in the slightest, but to the Gainesville community that was a very shocking and very frightening experience for them.

K: Was the black community shocked as well, that a white woman would take an interest and be willing to work with them, or was it mainly the white community?

L: It was pretty much the white community. The black community was a little resentful that I wasn't black, but they saw that I had a possibility of helping them and so they joined in most cases. For example, we set up neighborhood groups all over the county, and with Sheriff Crevasse's help we kept the Ku Klux Klan out. Many times I got calls from Washington saying don't go to Archer, the Klan has moved in, and I would call Sheriff Crevasse and say I have to go there

tonight for a meeting in a black church, and you've got to protect me. He'd say, I'll have a car meet you at the edge of Archer and take you on in. So we'd do it that way and the police would not interfere with the meeting, but they would protect me both going and coming because it was very frightening. The Klan was not kidding, they would have attacked these black neighborhood groups. I'm very grateful to Sheriff Crevasse for that kind of understanding and protection. At any rate, one of the biggest needs was daycare for children. Mothers were leaving their children either in the care of older children or even, horribly, tied to a bed while they went to work. They'd have some food and water for them, but the child would be tied to the bottom of the bed because they didn't want the child to get into any dangerous situations. So I got some funding from VISTA (Volunteers In Service To America) Volunteers. That was kind of like the Peace Corps for the United States, where young people would volunteer to come into a community and help. I got enough Vista Volunteers that we could start twenty day-care centers throughout the county that would accept black children. At that point there was one in Gainesville that would accept black children, but no other daycare programs throughout the whole county. So we managed to start twenty of them, which was a real feat. There were not only the VISTA Volunteers, but the neighborhood groups themselves got excited about it and mothers would take turns. They'd work four days and then work one day in the daycare program. We managed to do that and that was, to me, a very big accomplishment to help those women. We also stopped something else which was horrible. In order to get welfare in this county, you had to stand up in front of a public group and tell everybody why you needed the welfare, in public. This was so horrifying to me that I worked with Social Services and got them to change it so they could do it privately with individuals.

K: What year is this that you're working with them?

L: This was in 1964-65. Oh, we did a lot of other things. We took children out of jail and got them evaluated over at Shands. I got to be so known at the jail that they'd almost unlock it every time I came in. We started many other programs that were just, they seemed like such small things at the time, but they had repercussions in the community. Things like, for example, A. Quinn Jones [Elementary School] was a black elementary school that had no playground in back of it, it was just a muddy field. I got the county to pave it and put in playground equipment. [I did] things like that, that weren't terribly significant, but to the black community it was very important.

K: How were you treated as a woman trying to make those changes? Did you have to go through different avenues and be helped in different ways, or were you able just to come up front yourself and ask for those things?

L: Well, of course, most of the things that I asked for were from the county. I had a very good relationship with the County Commission, and they were very supportive and worked very well with me. The rest of the time, I worked with the federal government and there was no problem there with being a woman. It didn't make any difference what my sex was, they were interested in the programs.

K: How did your role as the Community Chair under President [Lyndon Baines] Johnson [U.S. president, 1963-1969] lead to your appointment on his Council of Social Advisors?

L: After I got through doing research on what I had just spent all this time working on, then I had time to write it up in research elements. This got the attention of the Office of Economic Opportunity, first, and they asked me to be an unpaid consultant. By this time I was teaching at the University of Tennessee, I had a full-time appointment.

K: So this was before the University of Florida?

L: No, I left Florida because I wasn't getting anywhere here. They wouldn't hire me. I left and went to the University of Tennessee, where they would hire me. I had a full-time position, but, as a result of this research, President Johnson appointed me to his Council of Social Advisors to develop programs in his poverty agenda.

K: Can you give me the time frame for when you first came to Florida and later returned?

L: Yes, I first came to Florida in 1958. I got my first position at Florida in 1960. That's the position I described, the three months on, [and] then [I worked for] another three months. In 1964, I left the University of Florida and went with the poverty program, the Community Action Program, in the county. In 1966, I left and went to the University of Tennessee on not only a full-time appointment, but they promoted me to associate professor. So I was much better treated at Tennessee.

K: What was the difference? Was it just a different mind set? Was Gainesville just further behind?

L: Yes. You know, the university had only admitted women after World War II. They didn't know what to do with women. They were so far behind, I couldn't believe it. And, of course, they were terribly segregated as far as races were concerned, and that wasn't true at Ohio or Tennessee.

K: Who was the president at the University of Florida at that time?

L: President [J. Wayne] Reitz [was the president of UF from 1955-1967].

K: Do you think the lack of encouragement for women came from the administration down, and the faculty and the administration took the cue?

L: I think it permeated the whole university because a lot of the faculty did not come from the North. A lot of them were southern trained, and so they were sort of used to the system that the university had set up. Of course, it wasn't any different than any other university in the South, other than ones like Tennessee, which really is a border [state]. You know, Tennessee is different than Alabama, Mississippi, [or] Georgia. It has got a little bit more of the character of the northern states.

K: So how did you end up back at the University of Florida?

L: Well, my husband at this time was not satisfied at the University of Tennessee, so he took a visiting appointment at Ohio State, which I again went on to the faculty there. He didn't like that situation, so he went to the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and I went to Guilford College [Greensboro, North Carolina] as a full professor. [We] traveled around the country like this, putting our children in different schools each year. My daughter used to say, oh, it's not so bad. They don't know me at this school, so they won't know all the things I did wrong at the other one. But I was tired of the traveling around at any rate. In 1970, we came back to the University of Florida and I got a full-time associate professor position.

K: So from 1958 to 1970 the mind set at University of Florida had changed?

L: [There was] a new dean in the College of Business, for one thing, from Michigan State. He brought the northern mind set down.

K: It took almost twelve years for that to change. Were there more women faculty in 1970? Were they all centered in one specific college?

L: Well, there were none in the College of Business; I was the only one. The social sciences and the arts and humanities had women. I can't tell you if there were any in the physical sciences, but I rather doubt that there were any. I didn't look it up, so I don't know.

K: What was the reaction of your male colleagues when you returned and became

the first female professor?

L: They were fairly supportive. I didn't have any problem in the college when I came back in the 1970s. I wasn't given as much of a salary as the males, but I was only in the position for three years before the Graduate [School] dean asked me to come over to the Graduate School. So in 1973 I became assistant dean of the Graduate School.

K: In 1970, was your husband also a faculty member at UF?

L: Yes.

K: So that changed also, where they now allowed husbands and wives to work in the university.

L: Yes.

K: So you taught for three years and then moved into administration. What was that transition like for you?

L: Well, my son says, mom, every time you get into something you have to run it. He's right. I guess I was born to be an administrator. I enjoyed it very much over in the Graduate School because I could do two things, and the dean was very supportive of both of these things. I could start minority programs and I could start programs for women. I was supported by the dean in both of these endeavors, and we had fellowship programs for both groups at the graduate level. We recruited both women and minorities.

K: What was the ratio of women to men in the graduate school at that time? Was it harder to recruit minorities or women?

L: I don't have the facts on that. It was very hard to recruit minorities because this was a white school. I think this is still true, that you have difficulty recruiting blacks because of the feeling that they may not be wanted here and that the numbers are not large enough for them to feel comfortable. I think this is still a problem. But, as far as women are concerned, there was no real difficulty in recruiting them. We didn't recruit the women, necessarily, but we provided fellowship money. The departments were recruiting them. So I don't know, I would guess that the numbers of women were not overly large in the sciences and engineering. I'm sure they weren't. There would be very few women in those fields, but there were plenty of women in English and sociology and fields in the social sciences and humanities.

K: Who appointed you to become dean of the Graduate School?

L: Well, I lasted from 1973 to 1984 as the assistant and associate dean of the Graduate School, and then when the dean left in 1983 they had a search and I was appointed Graduate [School] dean.

K: Were your salary and benefits equitable to the man that you replaced?

L: No, as a matter of fact they were so afraid that the faculty wouldn't accept a woman Graduate [School] dean that they made me dean of International Studies as well, so they could get two for the price of one. So my salary was lower than [what] they would have paid a male dean and they gave me two jobs.

K: Who did you appoint to work under you? Did you have a male or female assistant dean?

L: I had two assistants—one was [a] black [male], who handled the minority programs, and the other was a man who had considerable international experience.

K: How long did you serve as dean of the Graduate School?

L: [I was dean] until 1993 or 1994. It was approximately nine to ten years.

K: What conditions prompted you to leave the position?

L: President Lombardi [UF president, 1990-1999, prompted me to leave]. He decided that he did not want a separate Graduate School dean. He did not like some of the things that I proposed, such as interdisciplinary programs. That was one of my very strong proposals, that we engage in a lot more interdisciplinary work at the doctoral level. He was not very sympathetic with that, so he decided to combine the Graduate [School] dean position with the vice-president for Research and make them one position. So the person who was vice-president for Research went back to teaching and I went back to teaching. The next person they appointed was a woman. She [Karen A. Holbrook] is now president of Ohio State. So she did very well for herself. She left after three years.

K: You and Dr. Lombardi just had a different philosophy?

L: You don't know anything about President Lombardi?

K: No, he left, I think, when I was a freshman.

- L: The students were very much in favor of him because he was very social with the students. A lot of the alumni and people in town thought he was great, but he [acted like] an egomaniac. If you tried to work for him or with him, if you didn't do his way, you could just get out of the way. He was impossible to work with. Most of the people who worked with him were "yes, people." If you had other ideas, you could either shut up or leave, which is why he doesn't have a very big position right now. He was fired, of course, from here.
- K: He is at University of Massachusetts, Amherst?
- L: Right, which is a minor school in their system.
- K: You were at UF during a period of huge changes. What was it like when you left as Graduate School dean in 1994 compared to when you began at UF?
- L: Well, I went back to teaching.
- K: What was the classroom situation like?
- L: I never had any trouble in the classroom, although, in the Business College you almost have all boys. The classes had gotten very large in the interim period but I never really stopped teaching, because while I was Graduate [School] Dean I got very much involved with the African Studies Center. I spent fifteen years [traveling] back and forth from Africa, and I taught a course, all the time I was Graduate [School] Dean, in African economics. Previous to that, I had taught the course in economics of women, which I'm sure you've noted. We didn't talk about the Women's Studies Program, but that is something else. But, at any rate, when I went back to teaching I went back to teach not only basic economics, but also my African economics course to MBA students. So I taught for two more years before I retired.
- K: We can move into the Women's Studies Program and focus on that. What was your connection to the Women's Studies Program?
- L: Well, I knew the people, of course, that were very much involved. They were long-time faculty members whom I admired very much. We'd had close contacts over the many years that I'd been at the university, and most of them had been at the university for quite some time too. People like Irene Thompson [the first director of the Women's Studies Program], Ruth McQuown [first female associate dean in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at UF] and Maxine Margolis [a UF professor in the Anthropology Department] all had their difficulties with the university, which I'm sure you either know or you will find out as you go through this. We began to feel that, in many fields, the contributions that women made were ignored. I know they were in my own field. Nobody paid any

attention to the struggles that women had in the labor market, or the fact that not only discrimination, that was one major part but most people accepted that, but the fact that the cultural view of women was [that] they could work in the factory during World War II but once the war was over you better damn well go back home. [The idea was that] a woman's place is in the home.

That attitude was very prevalent, so, at least in my college, there was a sense that we needed to broaden the curriculum to the point where we could include some of the attributes of women. I came by this naturally, because at Ohio State I had a woman professor in labor economics who taught the economics of women. So it was sort of natural for me to develop that in the College of Business. It was a shock to them. It was also a shock to the College of Business that the majority of people who signed up were men, and it was a large number. We had to move from a classroom to an auditorium-type room because of the numbers, so there was obviously interest. Other women began to develop courses in their [respective] fields. Out of all of this, we began to see that there could be a women's studies center which would allow women not only to bond, if you want to use that word, but also to begin to see course work in various fields that might appeal to them.

K: Irene Thompson seems to be the woman who spearheaded the effort, and she and Ruth McQuown went before the Faculty Senate. I know you served on the Faculty Senate. Were you serving on the Faculty Senate around the same time that they were making requests?

L: No, I was Graduate [School] dean.

K: When did you serve in the Faculty Senate?

L: I served in the senate before and after my dean position, but the Faculty Senate doesn't have administrators, so you can't serve in the [Faculty] Senate as an administrator.

K: The Women's Studies Program was authorized in 1977, which is almost fifteen years after Betty Friedan [author of *The Feminine Mystique* and cofounder of the National Organization for Women (NOW)] and the women's movement. Why do you think it took so long to develop?

L: [It was] the mind set primarily, which resulted in lack of support. Many people [thought] bring women in and we'll teach them what they need to know. Why do they have to go take special courses or associate in a center with other women? We've got all the answers, so what's the point?

K: What conditions, do you think, made it the right place and the right time for the program to finally develop?

L: I think it was the very strong feelings on the part of a relatively small, but relatively vocal group of women; women like Ruth McQuown and Maxine Margolis and myself who had been around for quite some time and had the respect of the faculty. We weren't some kind of nuts that just came down from New York City to tell people in Florida what to do. We were established faculty members. We were full professors, so we had already paid our dues.

K: I know there was an advisory council for the for the Women's Studies Program that you were a part of? How did that work?

L: Mostly, we met on campus and we did talk about what could be done and what kind of courses could be arranged. We also talked about how we could encourage other women faculty and male faculty, we didn't want it to be exclusively women, and how we could include faculty in the program by getting them to open up their curriculum to different kinds of courses. We didn't want to rush the degree program until we had a strong foothold in the course curriculum. Once we got that, we knew we would begin to look at degree programs. And when the time came to look at the program at the doctoral level I had just left the Graduate [School] dean's position, but I still had enough contact to be able to push that through the Graduate School.

K: So you started out with courses, and then moved on to a degree program, and then to a doctoral [certificate program]?

L: Yes.

K: Were there any institutional barriers to the development of the program? How did the administration feel about it and what kind of things did you have to do to get it done?

L: Well, I'm sure there are others who can give you even more information than I on the barriers. There was certainly a funding barrier. Nobody wanted to put much funding into it, so a lot of it operated on a shoestring. Ruth McQuown's position as associate dean in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences helped a lot, because she was very widely respected. She was able to help as far as funding was concerned, but there was mighty little of it. A lot of it was done simply by faculty taking on extra courses.

K: What changes in the program occurred during your time on the Advisory Board?

L: Growth in the number of courses, the number of faculty involved, the number of students that were not only taking courses in this area but also were considering a concentration in this area, and, of course, the development of the degree program [were all changes that were taking place at this time].

[End side A1]

K: Who took the Women's Studies courses initially? Did you have any enrollment by men?

L: Mostly women [enrolled for the courses], except for courses such as the one I described in the College of Business where it was primarily men. But over a relatively short period of time men began to filter into some of these courses. Some of the courses were courses that men might not, in large numbers, take. An economics course, you can imagine, men might take more than they would take a sociology course or a course in the humanities.

K: What do you think drew the men in to take the classes?

L: Well, I know what drew them to the course I taught because they told me. They said, we know we're going to have to deal with women in business and so we want to know what is on their minds. I'm not sure that they found out, but I could see their point. They knew that there were going to be women under them and over them in the business world.

K: How did you use your knowledge and experience in administration to help the program develop a curriculum, obtain funding, and attract students? Did you have more insight?

L: Well, I mentioned Ruth McQuown as an administrator as well. If you're an administrator, you do have a little bit of an in with the administration. As a faculty member, you are [part] of a larger group, whereas an administrator stands out as a separate entity. So I suppose that visibility, if you want to call it that, was of some advantage. But also, in my case, breaking into a field like business, since I was already a faculty member in the college, it made it easier for me to break into the College of Business than it would have been had I been a professor in some other field.

K: What about serving on the Faculty Senate?

L: To be perfectly honest with you, my experience at this university has been that the Faculty Senate has been about as big a flop as anything on the campus. The faculty has not taken the strong positions in many cases that I thought it

could have and should have. Part of the reason, at least during Lombardi's rule, and I understand before that, is that the president of the university served as the president of the senate. Now if you're going to have a free-wheeling senate, you don't want the president serving as president or even to be in the room. You don't want administrators to put the cramp on your discussions. So maybe that is the reason the senate has been so lacking in its willingness to stand up at the university and scream about some of the things I think they might have influenced had they done so.

K: How do you think the Women's Studies Program has changed? How involved are you still today?

L: I'm not involved anymore, obviously, on a day-by-day basis or even a week-by-week basis. I do have an endowment program that I put into the Center [for Women's Studies and Gender Research at the University of Florida], which I'm sure you know about. So that is some involvement. At least my money is involved, which indicates my like of the program and my hope that it can be strengthened. It has grown into a very respectable program on the campus. The Center [for Women's Studies and Gender Research at the University of Florida] has broadened its scope over the years. We've had excellent leadership, not only from those in the Center directly, but also from the faculty that have been part of this program for all the years that it has been in existence. And I think it will continue. It's not a fad. Many people thought it was going to be just a fad, once women got into some of these fields we could forget about women's studies. I don't think so. I think there is a real purpose for it and it will continue and I hope [it will] grow.

K: I know some of the other founders of the program have said their hope is that it would dissolve because then women's studies would be integrated on a course basis.

L: Well, I hope that, as far as course work is concerned, that we do integrate women's activities more into course work. I am thoroughly in favor of that, but women in our society are growing in a different way than just integrating. We are growing to be a dominant part of this society. We aren't just integrating like a minority group into a majority. Forget it. We're beating the majority in many cases. That is why I think we need this kind of encouragement for young women who perhaps don't have the experiences over the years that I have had, which makes me perhaps a little more of a fighter because I've had to fight some battles. But I think that there are other battles that young women today are going to have to fight, and this is not a done deal by any means. Although I am perfectly willing to concede that we need to integrate more women's activities into every course that we teach, I still think that there are ways that we can

encourage women to not integrate into society but become society. Let the men worry about integrating.

K: What kind of role will women have in the future? What kind of future do you see for women and how do you think the program will adapt to serve that future?

L: Well, women will definitely have a stronger academic role on this campus and on most campuses than they have ever had before because they are outnumbering men, and I think that will continue. They are also outnumbering men in many other ways. But even the areas where they are not outnumbering men, such as engineering, they are still becoming a very large part of the total group. I think they'll influence that group, because they will be, if not the majority, at least a predominant part of the total. So I think that in the future the role of women's studies may not be just to aid women to take their proper place in the various academic fields, but it may be to teach men what I think the men were looking for in my course, how to integrate themselves into a world where women are predominate.

K: Well, I want to go back to the faculty and how you think the program, as it grew and developed, impacted attracting women faculty to the university, but not necessarily to teach women's studies. Do you think that had any kind of impact on the campus as a whole?

L: Well, if it did I don't know what it did. Most women don't come to a university because they want to work in a women's studies program. They come for a multitude of reasons, but that wouldn't be one of them. You come because you see an opportunity in a field that you wish to work in and feel that you wish to develop. You see a university that you want to live with for a period of years, and you see a non-discriminatory pay schedule that you can live with. I don't think, for example, women chemists coming to this university would come because of a women's studies center. However, once having made the decision to at least look at the University of Florida, they might be grateful that there was a women's studies program where they could find other women faculty that might have similar interests outside of their professional interests.

K: The Women's Studies Program brought a lot of prominent females like Gloria Steinem [famous feminist and co-founder of *Ms. Magazine*] and Flo Kennedy [Florynce Rae Kennedy, black civil rights activist and feminist] to come and speak. What kind of effect did those speakers have on the community and on campus?

L: Yes, they drew relatively large crowds. I don't remember any protests. I'm sure there were a lot of people that thought it was pretty crazy to invite such people to

the campus because they were not in favor of whatever they were saying, but there were no violent protests of any kind. They drew fair numbers of people, yes.

K: How else did the program interact with the Gainesville community?

L: I really don't know. As far as I know there has been very little interaction. But I'm not the one to ask that question, because I have not been aware of any activities over the last couple of years. There may have been a good many activities that I'm just not tuned into.

K: When you were forming the program, was there any opposition in the community or did the opposition mainly just stay on campus?

L: No, there was no opposition. Of course, there is never any opposition in this community for anything the university does unless it's a riot downtown or something like that. There is very little knowledge in the community of what goes on in the campus. The County Commission doesn't know much about the university, where it is growing or what it isn't doing. Everybody has commented on how loose the town and gown relationship is and how we should tighten it up and be more involved, one with the other. As far as the people on the campus itself, now that the Women's Studies Program has been in existence for quite some time, I don't think there is any adverse reaction from any of the faculty. But again, I'm not on campus every day so I don't really know.

K: In the early years of the program, did you do a lot to interact with different departments and different centers on campus? Did you have to go out and sell the program or were you just focused on developing the curriculum and getting the administration's approval?

L: My concern was with [the] curriculum and the degree programs. I did not go out and convince the faculty of anything. I think by a woman being [the] Graduate [School] dean, I was the first woman to hold any position in the overall administration of the University of Florida, so that in itself was a shock. Once the faculty recovered from that shock, I don't think anything I did with women's studies would have shocked them.

K: As an administrator, who did you use as an example or a mentor to pave your way? Did you have anyone to look to, to see how they did things and how you adapt and survive in that environment, or did you just do it on your own?

L: [I went] on my own. I had a lot of support from a lot of faculty. I think I was pretty well-liked, so a lot of the faculty were very supportive and very nice. But I

didn't have a role model that I was following because I had never been under a graduate dean. Graduate deans had always been male, and some of them, I presume, were pretty good; but when you're a faculty member, you don't deal with the graduate dean very often. Graduate deans deal with other deans and department chairs and graduate coordinators, they don't deal with faculty.

K: Did you have problems with being responsible for people below you? Did you have difficulties with any male department chair who had trouble taking orders or advice from a female dean?

L: Amazingly, I had very, very little trouble with male department chairs, deans, [and] graduate coordinators. I had a very good relationship with almost all of them. The only college I had any difficulty with at all was one college over in the medical area where there were too many sexual harassment cases. It got to the point where I would have to go over and speak to the faculty and say, you know, you're being bad boys, you can't do this anymore. There were very serious cases. One girl committed suicide, so it was not a fun situation. We weren't kidding here. It was very serious, but the dean and many of the faculty and the upper administration were not taking it as seriously as they should have.

K: How did you deal with that?

L: Well, I tried to be supportive of the young women and I tried to attack the male faculty as hard as I could, but without support from the upper administration there is not much you can do.

K: So you did not feel a lot of support from the president?

L: Oh God, no. In fact he promoted one of the faculty members that was involved.

K: And what year was this?

L: [This was in] 1991 or 1992, somewhere along in there. The [Academic] Personnel Board [a group of ten tenured faculty members who are appointed by the president and who do not have administrative appointments] turned down this faculty member and said he should not be a full professor because of the way he treats women students. President Lombardi promoted him over the [Academic] Personnel Board's refusal, so, so much for sexual harassment.

K: You mentioned your work with the Center for African Studies. What was your role with that, and how did that compare to the Women's Studies Program? Did you face any of the same difficulties in terms of getting established and getting

funded?

- L: No. I worked with a national organization, the African American Institute (AAI) that was funded by USAID [United States Agency for International Development]. The [Board] was [made up of] graduate deans from all over the country that were on that board, and we went to Africa and recruited students with federally-funded fellowships. The group was mixed; the graduate deans were female and male. That was a very enjoyable time of my life. Those trips to Africa were very interesting. My first trip to Africa was for the African Studies Center [at the University of Florida], and they sent me to Africa for nine months to go to nine different countries. They had no contacts. I had to make the contacts on my own, and the purpose of my trip was to make contacts with universities in nine different African countries, which is what I did for nine months. I spent approximately one month in each one of nine countries and went to the universities there and went to the government agencies and tried to wind my way around to find out what we could do in terms of cooperation with the University of Florida. One of the very good programs that we established as a result of that was in Uganda, where I convinced the law school to set up a program at the university in Kampala, Makerere University, to teach constitutional law. This was when Idi Amin [a Muslim who rose to rule Uganda in 1971, his dictatorship was responsible for an estimated 300,000 deaths] had left Uganda and the people were trying to establish a constitutional government and write a constitution, and they needed help. So our law school started an exchange program in Kampala, and it has been still going on. It is very successful. So it was a very rewarding trip, although it was frightening as hell. To be a woman alone and have no contacts in all those areas where I knew no one, [to] just go barging in and find somebody, [was a scary experience]. But I was very well treated and it was a wonderful trip.
- K: So you did that for nine months?
- L: That was after I left the graduate school. I had another period in between assistant dean and dean where I had a year's leave, and that is what I did with it.
- K: Let's go back to the class you taught on women and economics. What did the class focus on? How do you think the relationship between economics and women, the partnership, has evolved over time from when you taught the class to how you would teach it today?
- L: Well, I wouldn't have to do so much explaining today that women [are] capable of being administrators and managers, because they are. Today's business world has a lot of women investment counselors [and] women managers. My son, who is a vice-president at IBM, has a woman boss. This sort of thing has

evolved over the years, so that would not be a strange thing to talk about. What we would talk about today is the differentials in wages, where in spite of the fact that we have made all of these improvements, women are still paid about seventy cents on the dollar. So there is wage discrimination and there is still a certain amount of discrimination for upward mobility. Even on this campus, we still have some of that problem, although it is certainly a lot less than it was in the past. All of these problems have been ameliorated over the years, but sometimes they still exist. I think the people who are in the college still have to recognize that some of the fields that women go into are going to be non-traditional. Women are going to be financial advisors. I think men need to have that aspect taught to them. However, I think you could integrate what I would teach in the economics of women into a regular economic course now, a course on labor economics, and be just as successful as a separate course. I don't think it is as necessary now as it was in the past. If it was taught by a woman who would make this effort, there is room in labor economics to teach what I taught in this course and what is necessary and what was taught to me at Ohio State in the 1940s. So I think we have finally caught up.

K: You received an award from the Women's Studies Program in 2002.

L: [I won] an Uppity Woman Award.

K: Can you talk about that?

L: Well, I didn't know they were going to give it to me, but I guess I am an uppity woman. I didn't stay in my place. I was always pushing out of my place.

K: Can you think of any issues we did not discuss?

L: Well, I think the other thing that men need to realize, and I think they are becoming more and more aware of it, is that women can have a family and still be completely professional in their lives, in their work, and their activities. I have two children and I managed to raise them, I think, properly. They are very successful human beings with their own families, and I don't think that they were harmed one bit by my professional activities. In fact they may have gained from them. There is no harm in picking up your child from school and saying, you study in the library this afternoon because I've got work to do.

K: I know Irene Thompson, in her interview, described discrimination against hiring married women because they knew they would have children and would leave. Did you face those same problems after the birth of your children?

L: Well, not at Ohio State, because they had a very different view. I had my two children in Columbus while I was at Ohio State, and all they did was say, well,

you probably should take a quarter off to have the baby, or if you need somebody to teach your courses for a few weeks we can arrange that. It was no problem there at all. When I came down here, of course, I didn't teach until my children were at the stage where they could be put into a daycare center for a period of time or I could hire someone to be at home with them. But most men felt that you could not successfully do both, and I think many men were sort of shocked that it could be done. Of course it could be done. It has been done before. My answer to all of them was if you think that your mother, just because she didn't go off to work, didn't work her tail off, that she had time to sit around a pay attention to you, you're out of your mind. Most women worked very, very hard in the past, whether they were out of the house or not. I know my own mother ran a boarding house in order to be able to support us. So, it wasn't that women didn't work, it's just that they didn't work someplace else.

K: They didn't work nine to five outside of the house.

L: They didn't work nine to five, they worked nine in the morning to eleven at night. So I think there is always a bit of shock for men to realize that because they did so little themselves in terms of child rearing. I think they're doing more today than they did in the past, but, even today, I see my son and my son-in-law, and the big burden of the children is on the two wives. My daughter is a full-time faculty member at the University of New Hampshire and she still has to take care of her two children herself, primarily.

K: Do you think that will ever change, or do you think that is society's view of the mother as the nurturer?

L: Well, men are becoming more involved. They're picking up children more from various activities, and even learning to change diapers on occasion. I think they're becoming more involved. And the ones that do become involved, of course, find out the joy of becoming involved with your children, so that may encourage them in the future. But a lot of men's work is not only full-time, it makes them travel and their time becomes very difficult to manage. So I don't know that it is going to change dramatically.

K: What do you think some of the practical applications of women's studies are? Do you think it helps with things like changing minds and changing stereotypes?

L: Yes, that is one of the major reasons for it, to change the stereotypes and to indicate that life is a cooperative venture, not just between men and women but between women and women. Males depend on each other and women depend on each other too. I think this needs to be emphasized continuously. There is something else, I think, that I would consider important. If a women's studies

center is on your campus, it indicates that university thinks something about women. If nothing else, it is a wonderful symbol. I hope it is a lot more, but as a symbol of what the university feels about the importance of women, I think it is a very good symbol. Not that I think we need a male center just to make people think that males are important, but we have centers for other minority groups. [We have] Hispanic centers, black centers, [and] Indian centers. I think that women studies has a much broader agenda than some of these other centers, but again I would say that it is important to emphasize women.

K: What do you think the link is between women's studies and feminism?

L: Oh, I don't know. You know, I have never been much into the feminist business. I've been too busy being what I am. I don't know if I am a feminist or not. I am for equality, and if that means I am a feminist, okay, then I am. But I really haven't been much into pushing that agenda. I have been much more interested in bringing girls up to the level where they can compete favorably with anybody. You don't have to be a feminist to be a chemist, but you can be a darn good representative of women in the chemistry field.

K: Well, that concludes my questions. Do you have anything else to add?

L: Well, we've covered a lot of territory. I enjoy, tremendously, being a faculty member. I enjoy teaching. I enjoy being an administrator, which is why when I get into these groups I start running them. I like to run things because I like to manage, I like that aspect of organization.

K: Did you all have any conflict with who became the leader of the Women's Studies Program, because I'm sure there were a lot of strong personalities in that group.

L: Oh, no, not that I know of. If there was, then I don't know about it. Yes, every single one of those persons was a strong personality, but we were all very, very good friends. I mean not just casual friends, we were very deeply good friends. I don't know anyone one of those women that I could [not] say I don't admire tremendously. I'm sure that they feel strongly that I was a good friend, and they certainly were good friends to me. It was a strong admiration of each other, and we all brought different qualities to it. In spite of our strong personalities, we had some strengths to contribute. I admire strong people, unless they're egomaniacs. People who can get things done and go straight to the point, I admire that kind of person.

K: That is how you have accomplished all the things that you have.

L: I think you keep busy, you don't quit. I think you find life very satisfying, not just

looking back but looking forward. I have got a lot of things left to do. But I came from immigrant parents. My mother came to this country when she was sixteen years old with no relatives here, nobody. She just came on her own. She had a high school education and she managed to learn enough so that when she finally got married she was secretary to the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad in Pittsburgh. She had worked her way up from a clerk.

K: So you got your spirit from her.

L: Then she took on a husband with four children, he was widowed, and had another child of her own. As I said, she ran a boarding house and raised us all very well. So I had a very strong mother. If I ever needed to learn anything about keeping going, I certainly had her as my model.

K: How did your children react to your involvement and your activism, from women's studies to your work with President Johnson? How do you think that shaped them?

L: Oh, I think it shaped them a lot. In the first place, I took them to various places when I would go. I took them, for example, to Washington when the Poor People's March went to Washington, and they saw it. I took them to other conferences where they could hear things that might not have always been understandable to them but which had an effect on them. They've traveled all over the world with me, so they've become very broad in terms of their cultural involvement with the rest of the world. They've got a very broad view, and they're interesting people because of that. Not just because they're my children, but they are interesting to other people. My daughter, for example, is a professor of anatomy and physiology, but she is also an EMT [Emergency Medical Training] on the ambulance service. So they are very active people that I think will contribute to their children's lives as well.

K: Well, thank you very much. I learned a lot.

L: Well, I appreciate you coming to talk to me.

K: Thank you.