

Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

Marge Frantz with Eleanor Engstrand
Free Speech Movement Oral History Project

Interviews conducted by
Lisa Rubens
in 2000

Copyright © 2013 by The Regents of the University of California

Since 1954 the Regional Oral History Office has been interviewing leading participants in or well-placed witnesses to major events in the development of Northern California, the West, and the nation. Oral History is a method of collecting historical information through tape-recorded interviews between a narrator with firsthand knowledge of historically significant events and a well-informed interviewer, with the goal of preserving substantive additions to the historical record. The tape recording is transcribed, lightly edited for continuity and clarity, and reviewed by the interviewee. The corrected manuscript is bound with photographs and illustrative materials and placed in The Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, and in other research collections for scholarly use. Because it is primary material, oral history is not intended to present the final, verified, or complete narrative of events. It is a spoken account, offered by the interviewee in response to questioning, and as such it is reflective, partisan, deeply involved, and irreplaceable.

All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between The Regents of the University of California and Marge Frantz, dated February 22, 2003. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley. Excerpts up to 1000 words from this interview may be quoted for publication without seeking permission as long as the use is non-commercial and properly cited.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to The Bancroft Library, Head of Public Services, Mail Code 6000, University of California, Berkeley, 94720-6000, and should follow instructions available online at <http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/ROHO/collections/cite.html>

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

Marge Frantz with Eleanor Engstrand, "Free Speech Movement Oral History Project: Marge Frantz with Eleanor Engstrand" conducted by Lisa Rubens in 2000, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 2013.

Table of Contents – Marge Frantz

Interview 1: April 8, 2000

Tape 1

1

Barrows Hall — working at Berkeley for Earl Cheit, 1957 — Earl Cheit’s role in and position on the Free Speech Movement — different perspectives: old Left, New Left — working for the Institute for Industrial Relations and with graduate students — overwhelming influence of the Free Speech Movement on campus — personal involvement in the Free Speech Movement, in between students and administrators — role of the staff, non-academics, and researchers — formation of the Academic Research and Professional Association [ARAPA] Organizing the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees [AFSCME] — organizing fundraisers for the Highlander Folk School — anti-liberal sentiment in the Free Speech Movement — the HUAC demonstrations in San Francisco — Burns Committee attempts to “expose” Clark Kerr, names Frantz a Party member

Tape 2

18

Earl Cheit begins work at the business school, Frantz’s work with business school seminars — Eleanor Engstrand enters the conversation — working on the Study Commission on University Governance — work environment at the Institute for Social Research, working with Earl Cheit — resuming work towards a B.A. at UC Berkeley — family background, education — moving to California, involvement in Bay Area political organizations

Interview with Marge Frantz

[Interview 1: April 8, 2000]

[Tape 1]

[Before tape begins a conversation had begun about Jack Schaar and Sheldon Wolin, two professors of political science at UC Berkeley during FSM.]

Frantz: They were two very different people, and lived in different places in the Santa Cruz area: one lived in Ben Lomond; one lived in Bonny Doon, which is a long way away and very different nature. Very different kinds of communities.

Rubens: Sheldon Wolin lived in Bonny Doon?

Frantz: It's very suburban and it has big estates. There are some small houses there, but the point is it's fairly upper class, and Ben Lomond is redneck basically. Anyway it's different, it's a very different character, a different spirit.

Rubens: So they were both at UC Santa Cruz?

Frantz: Yes, but they were in different colleges.

Rubens: But at Berkeley they were literally next door to each other?

Frantz: Together. Yes, so Barrows [Hall] worked fine for them, although Barrows was terrible and there was a big issue of *Steps* magazine—did you run across that in your archival stuff?

Rubens: Yes.

Frantz: It only lasted a few months, and it's very good and there is a whole issue about Barrows Hall. There's a picture of Barrows Hall on the front. They only had about three issues, if that. Maybe two. And it had a picture of Barrows Hall as I remember it. I haven't got it here. I've got it somewhere.

But anyway, there's a long article, in political theory language, about the horrors of Barrows Hall, about the kind of isolation you're talking about. A guy named Doug Loomis wrote this article. He stayed in close touch with Jack Schaar. He married a Japanese woman, and he used to spend half his time in Japan teaching and half his time here. And I'm not sure what he's doing now, but I run into him. Periodically he comes back to this country.

Rubens: Was he a professor at the time?

Frantz: No. He was a grad student in political theory. One of Jack's favorite students.

Rubens: Regarding your activities during the Free Speech Movement, I'm particularly interested in what staff people were doing.

Frantz: I trust Wofsy is on your list.

Rubens: Yes, I've interviewed him.

Frantz: He's a very sweet man.

Rubens: Indeed. This project in general is trying to uncover some of the—you might say—social categories that weren't identified at the time; those which may have had some influence on the movement, even if not spoken of: for example gender, sexuality, ageism. And we're trying very hard to find people of various racial and ethnic groups.

Perhaps I should start by asking you the lead question I ask all the FSM interviewees: Where were you in 1964?

Frantz: I went to work for the university in 1957. I got a phone call. I had just had my fourth kid. I had always worked and I was just staying home briefly. I got a call from Burt Wolfman saying, "Do you want a job as an interviewer on a big research project?" I said, "Sure."

Rubens: You had not been working at the university, but you'd done other kinds of work?

Frantz: Yes. In Berkeley, I'd never been around the university. The last job I had before that was at Planned Parenthood. I left there to have Alex and then—it was sometime in late '57. Alex was born in September. I just hired on as one of ten or twelve interviewers on a big project studying workmen's compensation and how well it replaced people's lost wages. It was run by an economist named Earl Cheit, who figures largely in the FSM story.

It was an hour-long interview, and there was a page that you had to write on the sort of sociopolitical, socioeconomic impressions you got of the interviewee. And my interviews seemed to be better than others, so they asked me to come in and edit interviews. We were trying to get exact economic history of everybody's workmen's compensation history, and we had a couple of internal checks that helped to see how accurate it was. And it was mostly grad students who had been hired. Some of them were sloppy and some of them worked harder, but none of them were very careful.

Rubens: By the way, did you have to pass an employment check before you were hired? Or was this considered too minor a job?

Frantz: No. I had the usual oath, but I'd been out of the Party for a couple of years at that point. The oath said, "I have not now, nor have I ever been, a member of any organization trying to overthrow the government by force and violence." And I figured I was never part of an organization that tried to overthrow the government by force and violence, so I didn't have any particular qualms. And then nobody had ever been prosecuted for perjury, and never has since. But nevertheless, at one point, when I did start getting red-baited, I was worried about that.

But in any case, I was hired. And then I started working in the office and doing quality control on these interviews. I was also getting after students to do this better and that. They were all a bunch of grad students, some of whom are still friends. And in the course of doing that, when we finished doing all the assembling of the raw material, Cheit asked me to stay on to help work on the book. We got along really well. He's a very smart and able guy, and he liked to have people like me and the guy who called me first, Burt Wolfman, around. I think he sort of had a gut feeling, that he might be tempted by opportunism, and he wanted to be held to a higher standard. He always said his wife held him to a high standard, and he appreciated that. He was very smart, but he was also ambitious. People liked him; he was very outgoing and warm.

Rubens: How old was he then and was it the beginning of his career?

Frantz: He had had one academic job. He had a Ph.D. in economics and a law degree and then he got his first job at St. Louis University, a Catholic university in St. Louis. He was only there a year when he was hired by the Ford Foundation to do this study in connection with coming to Berkeley as an assistant professor of economics. So he had been at Berkeley for a year or two. He was fairly youngish, but he already had two big degrees, so my guess is that he was probably in his late thirties.

Rubens: I interrupted you earlier and I'd like to follow up on what do meant when his wife held him to a higher standard?

Frantz: Well, I remember once he carried on at some length about how fortunate people were who had wives that could push them.

Rubens: Was she an academic?

Frantz: No. She is a lovely person. June had a B.A., I'm sure, but I don't think she had any other degrees. And they had several kids. I think she and I were more or less the same age. I don't think of us as having a big age difference.

Burt and I used to argue with him about various things. And this is really the only useful thing I probably have to say about the FSM that 500 other people haven't said. Cheit and Kerr—Cheit came out of the same tradition as Kerr, he was also a labor arbitrator and so forth. He was interested in labor relations, and he had experience as an arbitrator. They came out of the tradition of the fifties, of centrists who are very good at bringing groups together, arriving at fair compromises and niggling over details to come out with a union contract. That kind of mentality. The mentality of Mario [Savio] and the New Left was completely different. A different culture. It wasn't just that they had different political ideas—it was far from that. It was a whole different way of being in the world, where you just rejected any kind of papering over compromises per se; you didn't even think about it. They felt they had a clean moral slate, and they went with it. I've never seen it written about, but it was so clear to me then. My role ended up being sort of in the middle, trying to make connections between the Cheit types and the FSM people.

Cheit ended up as a leader. He was elected to the executive committee of the faculty early on. He was also on the tripartite negotiation structure at one point, to try and resolve differences. He was one of the two faculty people on it. There were representatives of faculty, the administration and students and they actually negotiated a settlement. Mal Burnstein was representing the students, Cheit the faculty, and I forget the administration person, and they came up with a settlement. (This was before December, of course.) And everybody thought the issue was settled. Then when Mal took it back to the students, Mario objected and the students insisted the whole thing be reworked. They simply didn't trust the university, period. So it fell through.

It's long since been forgotten, but I think that was very important. It was a different mindset. It was two different ways of viewing the entire world that just came up against each other. I think if you don't understand that, you can't understand how the whole thing unfolded and what happened.

Rubens: Well, then tell me a little bit more about how you were able to understand both positions. Let's also finish what you were doing with Cheit.

Frantz: I stayed there and I worked on doing the research for this book that came out of the study called *Injury and Recovery in the Course of Employment*. Burt and I both worked on it. Burt was getting his M.A. His family was an old left family, and he was actually a non-signer of the fifties oath. And we met originally when we came to Berkeley because Laurent, my husband, was working in the Law Library. We came to Berkeley in 1950, and Laurent was

getting a library degree with the hopes of being a law librarian. He knew, because McCarthyism was well under way, that he wouldn't get a job teaching in a law school.

Rubens: A library degree at Berkeley?

Frantz: Yes. And that's where he met Burt. Burt was working in the library, and Laurent was working in the law library. They both refused to sign the oath. The fight had been over the test oath, where you had to list every organization you ever belonged to and that kind of stuff.

So anyway, Burt and I, we had a wonderful working relationship in Cheit's office working on this book. We would argue with Cheit about everything and not just about the book, but about his role in the Academic Senate, et cetera. We were very close. So after the first book was finished, we did a second book about occupational disability, which I also worked very hard on.

Rubens: How were you paid?

Frantz: I got started as a "survey worker", which paid miniscule amounts by the hour, no benefits or anything. But Cheit recognized that I was useful to him, and he had connections with the personnel office. They did a classification study and I ended up being a "senior editor," which was a good job; and I didn't even have a BA at that point.

Rubens: Was the money coming through the university to Cheit, still Ford money?

Frantz: It was a three year grant, as I recall. And I got paid basically out of grants. We worked on one project after another, and at the time of the FSM, we had a grant to do a study on the insurance aspects of workmen's comp. And when we worked on *Injury and Recovery*, the first book we did, I would do two things. I did first drafts of a couple of chapters, and then he reworked those; and then I edited all of his first drafts. By this time Burt had gone on to a job at University Hall and he'd gotten his master's. He got a job with the statewide university working on benefits and that type of stuff.

So at the time of the FSM, I had some history with Cheit and the university, but I didn't stand out in anyway. Well, I also had been quite active in 1960. Laurent was subpoenaed in 1960 at the San Francisco HUAC hearings—you know where the TAC squad used water hoses to wash the kids down the stairs. I think the demonstrations around the HUAC hearings was a very important and significant forerunner of the FSM, and I'm sure you've got people talking about that. So I had been active in the opposition to HUAC and Laurent was subpoenaed, but I otherwise hadn't stood out in any way since then.

Well, there was a Berkeley chapter of the Civil Liberties Union. Cheit was teaching the big Economics 1 class for the first part of the semester, and he had ten TAs for that huge class. I got to know all of them. They hung out at the office and then and one of Cheit's TAs was active in the Civil Liberties Union.

- Rubens: Cheit knew about, was not opposed to those kinds of activities? Was he a Cold War warrior?
- Frantz: No, but he was ambitious and he was careful. In the fifties, he was at the University of Minnesota where there was a lot of activity prior to the fifties. He grew up in a small South Dakota town where his was the only Jewish family in town. They ran the store. He had been told by somebody, his cousin or uncle or father, somebody had told him you can participate in any kind of activities you want, just don't ever sign anything. Don't sign any petitions and don't join anything. And if you follow those instructions, you're safe. He thought that was wonderful advice. I thought when I heard that—which he was sort of proud of—that that was the most feckless—
- Rubens: Lily-livered—
- Frantz: But he was very pleased with that. And that's not too atypical. But his heart was in the right place basically, except that he had this mindset.
- Rubens: Mindset of centrism?
- Frantz: Yes, of accommodation. And when the FSM came along, they felt accommodation was the highest evil—he thought they were literally crazy. He thought Mario was really demented. Cheit didn't know Mario. He sat across the table in negotiation from him, but he didn't really know him at all. He and a lot of other people thought that these guys were just out of their minds. Coming out of the fifties, they just didn't have any place to fit people with those ideas. And it's true; they were fresh and different. They were cut from a different cloth.
- Rubens: Were you pretty clear at that point what you thought about FSM and these fresh faces?
- Frantz: No, I wasn't clear at all. I like to get along with everybody. I don't like to go out and make enemies on purpose, although I've had to do it all my life, because I believe in certain things and I've had to go argue with people and become fairly militant in some situations. But I don't like it. I like to get along with all kinds of people, and I like to help bring people together. I also think that the presence of people who can bring people together in organizations is what makes some organizations live and others die. If they don't have these

irenic personalities that can bring people together, organizations blow up. And I've seen it happen in a long life of political activism.

As I study women's history, for example, I see Alice Paul was an absolute splitter of the worst kind. I think she did great harm to the women's movement, because she didn't have the sense at all of getting along with other people and keeping the Women's Party from splitting the whole women's movement in the early 1920s. I just see that constantly repeating itself. But the thing is that the FSM didn't care about that. They just were going to pursue things no matter what.

Rubens: How did you come to terms with their absolutism? By the way, what is the word "irenic?"

Frantz: "Irenic"—it's a word I got from Carl Schorske. It's peacemaking basically. I think it goes back to the Greeks. It's the opposition between the irenic and the agonistic.

Rubens: Marge, I'm losing the chronology of where you are in Fall 1964. Before you answer how you came to terms with the "new style" of politics of FSM, let's situate you at the Institute for Industrial Relations—ironically, the group Kerr had organized in the late thirties.

Frantz: When I first started working on this project, we were off the campus. We had a room in the Oddfellows Hall. Then we moved up to California Hall, on campus. And we were at California Hall for a long time during this whole period. And then the Institute moved over to Channing Way, and I can't remember exactly when, but it was after the FSM. But we were at Channing Way during the People's Park struggles.

Specifically in '64 we were working on—supposedly we were doing a pamphlet. We'd done one on medical care and workmen's comp and we were supposed to be doing one for the US Labor Department, as I remember. And I was supposed to be basically a research assistant on that project.

Well, the thing that happened at Berkeley, and I think this is true everywhere—but it certainly was true at the Institute, and it was certainly true in our office—is that everything else stopped happening. Nothing happened except the FSM. Everything got pushed out of the way. We didn't do anything on this insurance pamphlet. Because everybody was completely focused on what was happening with the Free Speech Movement.

Rubens: Secretaries too?

Frantz: Well, in my office it was just the two of us. At one point there were three of us, because we had a specific research assistant assigned to Cheit. A wonderful young kid named Steve Engleman, who's now in Scotland. He was a Ph.D. student. He arrived at Berkeley in the fall of '64 from Cornell. He was quite wet behind the ears. He didn't really have much politics except that he had been a friend of Micky Schwerner's, the kid who was killed in Mississippi. I mean he'd known him. He wasn't a close friend, but he'd known him.

And so he got swept up into the FSM from the beginning, and a number of other students—there were twenty-odd graduate students doing research. They had a title—GRAs [graduate RA's]. At one point they all shared one huge, large room. A sort of bullpen room. It may have been somewhere in the basement of California Hall. There were sixteen of them in this room. They all had desks. That was a whole interesting scene for me, because I realized then as I still very strongly believe now, that graduate students learn more from each other than they do from faculty or anything else. There was just this great setting for them to exchange ideas.

And this was a moment that was very significant, far beyond economics. This included economics students as well as "soc" students. But it was very important for economics, because economics was changing very fast at this point. And they were all having to study linear algebra, and do a lot of math that they never had done before, because the field of economics was changing very fast.

Rubens: Quantitative analysis was taking over everything.

Frantz: Yes. Institutional analysis just stopped. And history of labor—nobody cared about anymore. The history of economic doctrine nobody cared about anymore, etc. It was very interesting. So they were all scurrying around, but all incredibly learning from each other. This was one of the top econ departments in the country, and they all were very privileged to be here. They knew it. It was interesting to watch them all. And I became a sort of a mom for many of these kids. I'd invite them out to the house. I had parties for them at my house, had them over for dinner and stuff, and became very close to some of them. And one of them is still a very close friend, she's a full professor at Berkeley now.

Rubens: Who is that?

Frantz: Her name is Fran Van Loo, and she's in the business school here at Berkeley, and she studies nonprofits. Wonderful person.

Rubens: Was she one of those sixteen?

- Frantz: She may have come in '65. Whether she was there in '64, I can't remember. One of them is now the assistant dean, or was last year, the assistant dean of Stanford Business School, which is the top business school in the country now. Bob Flanagan. But Steve was the one who I was closest to, because he worked in the office with us and—
- Rubens: The fellow who's in Scotland now.
- Frantz: Yes.
- Rubens: Why is he in Scotland?
- Frantz: His first job was the University of Glasgow, and then he went to Edinburgh. So Steve became very active early on in the FSM, and I felt that I was sort of an ambassador—I was sort of in the middle between the students and the administration. I didn't have close contact with the FSM. I didn't know Mario then, I didn't know Bettina then. I knew all these institute kids, and Steve ended up as head of the grievance committee for the TA union, but that probably happened in '65 or '66.
- So I was really was not a participant in FSM. I was watching from afar, and I was following very closely everything that Cheit was involved in. There was an election for six people to be an emergency committee at the Senate, and he was elected to it. And he discussed everything with us at length—
- Rubens: With you staff people? Even the students?
- Frantz: Well, mostly just Steve, and me, and Burt, who was in and out.
- Rubens: What was his position, his feeling about the events —you had said earlier he thought the non-compromising nature of the new leaders was crazy? Was he upset or worried?
- Frantz: Well, he's interested and fascinated. I don't think his soul was involved in the way mine was.
- Rubens: Well—he probably wanted to get these studies done. [laughs]
- Frantz: But he really wasn't working on the studies either, because he was totally involved in this other stuff. So he wasn't even pushing me very hard, and I was just fascinated with everything. I had already started auditing classes in political theory, so I was really fascinated with Wolin and Schaar. It was after this, maybe 1968 or '69. Wolin went off to Stanford, and Schaar announced that he was going to Santa Cruz, and he was never going to teach his particular course again on American political thought. This class was a

seminal course for thousands of people. Students just refused to leave. He said I can only have 300—200 of you will have to leave. Everybody heard he was leaving, so that there were 500 people there.

The students just demanded that he create some more sections so they could be in the class. So he took some volunteer TAs, and coupled them up, and I was one of them.

Rubens: Back to everybody being taken up the events of FSM.

Frantz: Everything comes to a stop on the campus. Total absorption in the on-campus political struggles happened several times on the campus over the next few years. Then in between those times, there were these moments of absolute total peace, calm, activists couldn't rock the boat! You couldn't do anything.

Rubens: I want to finish one thread about when you're at the Institute, with Cheit and the sixteen students. You said you watched the FSM a lot; you were impressed with their energy and refusal to accommodate. Did you try to explain, to be "irenic" with Cheit and the students?

Frantz: Well, I tried to help people see other people's point of view, but I didn't get very far.

Rubens: Was there any literal organizing as staff people?

Frantz: Well, yes—there was. When everybody was totally caught up with the Free Speech Movement, suddenly there was this large group of people on campus that felt they had no voice. The students had a voice through the ASUC, the faculty had a voice through the Academic Senate, or the students had a voice through the Free Speech Movement, and the faculty had a voice in committees throughout the university. But others, mostly the lecturers and the non-academics, felt left out. There's a large group of people on the Berkeley campus who are research associates in the various institutes. There are a whole bunch of research institutes, and there are all these assistant, associate and full research associates.

Rubens: They're really doing the work of the university?

Frantz: Well, they're doing a lot of the research. They don't have faculty positions, but they think they matter, and they felt that they had no voice. Everybody was speaking through their organizations, and they had no organization. Then there's a group that I was part of that was non-academic staff as it were—like editors. I don't remember how it actually started but we ended up with a group called the Academic Research and Professional Association or ARAPA. And we, the ARAPA folks, realized that after the December 8th resolution of the

Academic Senate that the rest of the university community all over the state wouldn't have a clue as to what was going on because all they'd read were the newspapers. And they couldn't get the real story in the newspapers of what was really happening.

We went to the Faculty Caucus of 200 and said, "We will put together a document, which we can circulate to the rest of the campuses, so they'll know what's happening and to the public," or words to that effect. So they asked Chuck Muscatine to work with us on it, which he did, and we put together this publication where we got statements from a bunch of leading faculty and speeches that had been made at the—

Rubens: —different rallies or Senate—

Frantz: Mostly at the Senate meeting—and we just put together this four-page document. And the 200 Caucus organized its distribution. I remember Chuck Muscatine and I were up all night long at the print shop where it was being printed. We printed 60,000 of them.

Rubens: Is there a date on it?

Frantz: Well, it was right after December 8th, and we had them ready the next morning. A lot of faculty who had volunteered came by and took 2,000 for Riverside and 3,000 for Irvine, 10,000 for UCLA, and so forth. They went out and drove down to these other campuses and distributed this.

Rubens: You must have been organizing ARAPA during the end part at least of the FSM, to be ready to go to the 200 right after the December 8th resolution. Is there a name you associate with this?

Frantz: Yes. The main guy was Sheldon Messinger and he's still here, I think, at the Center for Law and Society. He's a criminologist—or he's a sociologist basically. There was another guy who was a psychologist, but I cannot remember his name. I think he was a lecturer.

Rubens: Did you have any connections with, typists and secretaries, classified workers?

Frantz: Well, I did have, but that was a different story. My connection with them was that they wanted to organize too, and they wanted a union. And Steve Engleman, whom I mentioned, the woman who later became his wife, Kathy worked in the registrar's office, or somewhere in Sproul Hall. She was helping to organize classified people. And I was part of a committee that was working with organizing them. We interviewed a bunch of unions to see which union would be the best one to get connected with.

We ended up with AFSCME [American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees]. And I was in on the early organizing of that group.

Rubens: Steve's wife brought you in?

Frantz: Yes. Even though I wasn't eligible to join the union, or it wasn't clear who was going to be eligible. I remember these interviews. There was a woman named Maxine Wolinsky, who ended up being the business agent for that union. Have you run into her?

Rubens: No.

Frantz: She was around for quite a while and I don't know what happened to her.

Rubens: There were at least two separate categories?

Frantz: Two separate groups. Yes. There weren't very many. This ARAPA group at one point probably had twenty people coming to a meeting, but it was just three or four of us that were running around doing things. And I can't remember what else we did—but we did do some other things. I'm sure we put out some statements of support for this other group.

Rubens: How long would you say that group lasted?

Frantz: It was probably just several months. It was not a longstanding thing. And this is really the main thing we did: this was at least my project. [shows a bound report] They may have done some other things that I've totally forgotten about.

Rubens: How did you become clear that these two groups weren't talking to each other? And what role did Cheit play?

Frantz: Well, Cheit was, of course, not part of the 200. He was above all that. He was trying to be halfway between the administration and the university. What was the name of the chancellor at that point? Myerson?

Rubens: Strong. Myerson comes in officially in January, but I think he was active after December 8th. He remained acting Chancellor from January to June. He weathered that spring of '65, the response to the escalation of the war in Vietnam, the protests.

Frantz: So are you following through all that?

Rubens: Yes. But not as detailed as I'd like. The mandate of the project is the FSM. We're hoping there will be follow up.

Frantz: A Vietnam Day Rally reminds me that there was a publication that somebody named Charles Fox put out called *Toxin*.

Rubens: Yes. We have those.

Frantz: Okay. Well, there is a big picture of me and Carl Schorske in one of them. There are at least three of them where I figure prominently. There are captions, something like: Raises Money for FSM & Highlander School; Background in Civil Rights at Highlander School in 1940s.

But this was later, because one of the things that I got Cheit to do—he was part of a band, part of a Dixieland band. And Art Ross—who was head of the Institute of Industrial Relations and later committed suicide—Art was also in the band. I forget who else was in the band; but I love Dixieland, and they were very good. I was busy organizing fundraisers for Highlander Folk School. Do you know Highlander in Tennessee?

Rubens: I was there briefly in 1968, but why don't you identify it for the record.

Frantz: It was an adult education center, started in the 1930s, originally for trade unionists in the South. It was integrated far earlier than most groups were integrated. After the Supreme Court's Brown decision, it became a very important place for blacks and whites to get together. For example, young black kids in schools that were going to be integrated the next year, would come to Highlander and meet whites for the first time. They would have some integrated experiences, so they would know how to connect when they got to high school and things like that.

Rubens: Who ran Highlander?

Frantz: Myles Horton who had been a friend since the thirties. It was the one place in the South that I actually saw —when I was there in the thirties and forties— saw white people change their attitudes toward blacks. That didn't happen many places in the South in those days. And blacks and white would come there and work together.

Actually, originally it was a sort of a settlement house scene, based on the Danish folk schools; but later it became a kind of union training center. Some unions would rent the place to use for their own training sessions, for instance the CIO when it was beginning. And then Highlander would have its own sessions, and they would invite other unions to send people, and so forth. I taught down there occasionally in the forties—just went down to teach a class here and a class there about political developments in the South. At that time I was working for the Southern Conference on Human Welfare in Nashville, not far away.

But I actually saw white union members change their attitudes. Sometimes they would come to this inter-racial setting not adequately prepared, and they would leave when they saw that they had to eat and sleep and so forth with black people. Part of the training they got was just how to run a mimeograph machine, how to run a meeting, parliamentary procedure, and all that stuff. Part of it was substantive stuff, full of content about southern history and politics and so forth. It was a great place and I liked it especially because I really saw people change their attitudes—and it wasn't happening anywhere else in the South at that point.

So when I came to California, I wanted to help raise money for it. A person named Beth Kennedy and I were sort of co-chairing a fundraising thing. Her husband was also connected with the Institute of Industrial Relations. He worked in the business school I think; his name was Van Kennedy. And Van could even have been in political science—I'm not sure what his field was.

But Beth had been to Highlander, and she was a very nice person. She'd gone to college in the South; she was from the South. So we dreamed up a big scheme. We tried to use other models for this fundraiser: a silent auction, a gala evening with the band. Then we got all kinds of people to offer services which we offered for the silent auction: a cabin in the woods, or cooking a dinner party for ten—various services people would offer. You ever been to one of those? You know how they work?

Rubens: Sure.

Frantz: And the band would play and so forth. The magazine *Toxin* got hold of this and ran two whole issues about this un-American activity.

Rubens: Tell me about the difference you saw.

Frantz: It seemed to me that it was a very different kind of politics from mine. I grew up in the Popular Front days. You tried to organize the widest possible coalitions, and I didn't think "liberal" was a dirty word. Liberals were people you were trying to pull into your coalitions. And I did not then, and I never did, and I still don't agree with the fact that liberals are the main enemy in the world.

Rubens: This was so clear in the Free Speech Movement, though, wasn't it? That someone like Kerr really became the enemy—an anathema to Mario. You could see it and not necessarily agree with it?

Frantz: So I felt mixed about it. I mean, on one level, I was incredibly thrilled. Look, I'd lived through the fifties, right? And seen the whole miasma and the smashing of the Left. And to see the fight back first in the Montgomery Bus

Boycott and then in the Greensboro sit-ins, and the spreading of Greensboro all over the South; and then in May the response to the House Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco, and the washing down the steps, and the students who went to jail—I just thought that was unbelievably thrilling and wonderful and welcome and nothing could be better.

Rubens: Had you been active in the Bay Area in CORE?

Frantz: No. I hadn't been active in that at all. Charlie Sellers was the head of that.

Rubens: I interrupted you; on the other hand?

Frantz: So that was wonderful. And I still think that the May '60 demonstrations against HUAC were the early—the beginning—a crucial moment in the breaking of the pall of the fifties. And I thought it was wonderful. But on the other hand, I had grave doubts about the counter-culture, and grave doubts about positing the liberals as the main enemy.

Rubens: Well, the FSM seems to slip into the period right before the counterculture is going to dominate. I mean there isn't music and there isn't dope and there isn't filthy speech—it's a kind of pure contest of power. But, still the liberal was the main enemy.

Frantz: Yes. And so I had some questions about that. But I didn't have any question where my allegiance was—if it's between the FSM and the University. And I really did identify with the Schaars, and the Sellers, and the Wolins and—

Rubens: What about Cheit? When he joins the administration—

Frantz: This is a little bit later. Here's what happened to him. The Senate chose him as part of the search committee for a new chancellor to replace Myerson.

Rubens: Right. There was no question they weren't going to hire Myerson. That's a sad story.

Frantz: So he was on the search committee, and they found Heyns—the only people Heyns knew at the university were people on the search committee. And so the first thing that Heyns did was ask Cheit if he wanted to be vice-chancellor of student affairs, and he said, "No. But I'd be willing to be executive vice-chancellor." So that's what happened. Heyns couldn't come to Berkeley the first three months. He was appointed to take over, I guess, in fall of '65.

Whenever Heyns was due to start in the fall, he couldn't come because he was putting the University of Michigan budget through the legislature for three months. So Cheit was acting chancellor for three months. When Cheit got the

job in the chancellor's office, he decided to take me with him to the chancellor's office, but I have to go back and fill in something before that happens.

A year before on my birthday, I got a phone call from the *Chronicle* which said, "You've just been named in a report of the State Un-American Activities Committee, the Burns Committee, as a Communist. And we'd like to see what you have to say about it; we want to get a statement from you." And I hadn't even seen the paper.

Rubens: Now when is your birthday? I should know this.

Frantz: June the 18th. So they made a date to meet me at the office, when I got down to the office. I hadn't seen the report; I didn't know what the charges were. I didn't know anything about it.

Rubens: You hadn't talked to Wofsy or—?

Frantz: But here's the background. Ed Pauley was on the Board of Regents; the Board of Regents considered that Kerr at this point was the bad guy. And Pauley had a scheme for getting rid of Kerr. So he went to Senator Burns and the California Un-American Activities Committees and told them to investigate Kerr. Kerr had been the founder of the Institute of Industrial Relations. He'd long since moved into administration, he had no current connection with it at all. I had met him once at some reception, and that was it. He didn't know me from a hole in the wall.

But they were out to "expose" Kerr, so they worked on the Institute and they turned up me and somebody else—Virginia Norris I think was her name, I don't remember for sure. They turned up two people whose names were on the HUAC list. There was a reporter on the *Examiner* named Ed Montgomery. He did all their red hunting stories. And the *Examiner* was very much a Hearst paper at that point, so they ran a story about this.

So anyway, I denied being a member of the party, which I had not been for several years, a number of years. The university figured that I was protected by academic freedom, as long as I was in a research job, not an administrative job. So they didn't do anything about it. So nothing really happened. There was a story in the paper and that was it. This was before Cheit went to the chancellor's office.

So then Cheit goes in the chancellor's office and he decides to take me. And one of the people lurking in the background of all this was Alex Sherriffs; he was the vice-chancellor of student affairs. And Cheit, once he was going in the chancellor's office, tried to get hold of him on the phone to fire him. But

Sherriffs wouldn't return any calls. So he hadn't been fired, he was still there. And the very first staff meeting that we had in the chancellor's office—Cheit was there, and he was acting chancellor, and Sherriffs showed up, and I was there. Sheriffs recognized me, and he called his friend Ed Montgomery on the *Examiner* and so the *Examiner* ran a story about me going in the chancellor's office. They thought that it would be a weapon against Kerr—and it would also besmirch Cheit's name, too. But people wanted to give Heyns a grace period and there wasn't any reaction.

So Ed Montgomery calls Don Mulford who was then the assemblyman.

Rubens: A very conservative one, dearly departed, just recently.

Frantz: And so Mulford gets on the phone and calls all the Regents. And so they start putting pressure on Heyns to get rid of me, and Heyns tells Cheit do whatever you want. "You can keep her or let her go—whatever you want to do." And Cheit had a good friend named Joe Garbarino; he taught in the business school. And he told him from the beginning that he shouldn't have taken me over in the first place and that he was opening a hornet's nest. I said to Cheit, "Do whatever you want." So he fired me. I mean—I stayed over there about three days. And in retrospect I'm very glad it happened. I really thought that there was going to be a significant change with Heyns and Cheit over there. And I tried to persuade Cheit to hire Schorske to work in the chancellor's office, and Bob Cole from the law school, who'd been active in FSM, and John Searle. And I thought they really were going to have a very different scene in the chancellor's office.

It turned out that Carl was only there for a quarter, and that the Vietnam Day Committee thing blew up shortly after they got there, and that they were very disappointing. I was very glad I wasn't there, because I would have had to quit if I'd been there. At the same time I was also upset about it. I don't like to get that kind of publicity, and I don't like to be on the griddle. In fact, I hate it.

The other thing that happened is that all this happened at a moment when I was planning to take a big vacation. I had planned this three-week backpack trip in the Sierras. I had packed all our food and sent it to the packer to go put in various places in the mountains where we could pick it up and so forth. And when I got called to the chancellor's office, which was a great surprise, we had to postpone our trip for a week. So the food was sitting there in these big cans waiting to be picked up by us; it was weird. When we got there, a week late. We had more food than we wanted, because we were supposed to go for three weeks, but we only got two weeks.

Anyway, I took off as soon as this happened. I just took off to the mountains, and I didn't even see the papers until I got back home and Cheit—and this

was typical of Cheit's sort of weaseling—announced that I wasn't ever hired as a permanent person in the office. He just brought me over there to set up some files for him. He just told me that he couldn't stand the heat; it wouldn't work. But my job was safe. The theory was that they couldn't really protect my job if I was under attack in an administrative job, but they could in an academic role.

Rubens: Well, and also if he told you you were only temporary to set up files—

Frantz: Well, he never told me that—he didn't even know that I knew that. I just read that in the paper when I got back, and I never confronted him about it.

Rubens: Heyns seems to have exhibited some courage.

Frantz: Yes. He just said whatever you want to do is fine with me, I don't care. I go back to the Institute and basically what I'm doing there at this point is the editorial work on their journal called, "Industrial Relations" working under the assistant editor, Betty Schneider. Basically I'm rewriting articles so they can get published in this journal. These are the articles faculty need to get published in order to get career advances. And many of them can't write well, and you have to rewrite their articles. Anyway, I was perfectly happy doing that, and also I was doing another thing, which I loved doing.

Rubens: By the way, where did Laurent work at this point?

Frantz: He was still working as an editor for the Bancroft-Whitney Company. But he did take off a year right along in here. He got a grant for a year to work on an article that turned out to be a really important article for the *Yale Law Journal*. His research was on the balancing criteria for the Supreme Court on First Amendment cases.

This is really funny. Cheit's book came out just on September 8th, 1964. The first copy arrived.

Rubens: September 16th is the initial date of FSM, when Dean Towles letter to student organization is seen as a violation of freedom of speech.

Frantz: Cheit's book is called *The Business Establishment*. [New York, Wiley, 1964] Well, I will tell you about it. Just a second.

[Tape 2]

Frantz: Cheit decided that he would do better to go for tenure in the business school rather than the economics department. He thought he might not get tenure in econ, but he would definitely get it in the business school. And so he ended up

in the business school. And this was a period when business schools all over the country were changing from being primarily vocational schools, training schools for people in finance and accounting, and so forth and instead gave students a broader view of the business world. He was teaching the political and social environment of business, and that was just beginning to be a subject that was being taught around the country.

So he got some money from the Ford Foundation to bring twenty-four people who were teaching in that area from business schools around the country to Berkeley for a week of lectures and discussion. So we organized that for January '64, and I did most of the organizing work. You know, the correspondence and the planning and the entertaining of these guys. I was involved in who we invited and so forth. I was the person that recommended Bob Heilbroner whom I really liked. I just read a book of his that I just loved, *The Present As History*. We got Bill Ward who was then teaching at Amherst and ended up as president of Amherst. There was Henry Nash Smith [UC Department of English] and Richard Hofstadter, and so forth. And we had this really great week.

Rubens: What did you call this? A conference, seminar?

Frantz: It was a workshop and a seminar for a week on the political and social environment of business. And you know there was competition for the people to get in. We chose the students.

Anyway, it was fun and I got to be really buddy-buddy with Bob Heilbroner, whom I just adored. And then we edited their papers. They each wrote something, and Cheit and I edited them for the book, *The Business Establishment*.

[Eleanor Engstrand, Marge's partner of 30-plus years, comes into the room and joins the conversation.]

Rubens: Oh, Eleanor—I'm so glad to see you. Come be a part of this.

Engstrand: Well, just for a short while.

Rubens: We were talking about divisions in UC's Department of History. One had to do with the role of Herbert Eugene Bolton, who attracted a lot of students and money, primarily because he paid attention to the history of Catholics in the American hemisphere.

Engstrand: Bolton did have national standing. I did not think his prominence came from attention to the history of Catholics. Rather it was his study of the history of the American West.

- Rubens: Yes. He did. His talk at the American Historical Society in 1935—where he reconfigures Frederick Jackson Turner’s famous speech—was entitled, “The Epic of Greater America.” He really coined the term “the borderlands.”
- Engstrand: Well, when I was in high school our history teacher took our class to The Bancroft Library—which at that time was on the fourth floor of the Doe Library building, on the side facing the Campanile. And Bolton came and just pulled stuff out—oh, things like songbooks from the Mission; at one point I was reading some of Larkin’s papers. [Thomas O. Larkin, a Monterey Pioneer] Bolton told us a little bit about Larkin and pulled out some of his papers. And it was all very, very informal. These papers were sort of just sitting out on the shelf.
- Rubens: Did they excite you? I know I love seeing original manuscripts. Did it influence you at all to become an historian?
- Engstrand: No. I didn’t go into—I was already interested in history, but I wasn’t especially interested in Western or California history. But it was interesting. We all spent a couple of hours copying stuff and then went back and talked about it.
- Rubens: What grade were you?
- Engstrand: A senior in high school.
- Rubens: And where were you going to high school?
- Engstrand: Berkeley.
- Rubens: Do I know this? That you went to Berkeley High?
- Frantz: Just for one year, her last.
- Engstrand: Just for the one year. Before that we were up in the Sacramento Valley.
- Rubens: That’s what I thought. I thought you had come from the country. But I didn’t know you actually graduated from—
- Engstrand: Berkeley High.
- Rubens: The Bancroft was not in the annex building then?
- Engstrand: There was no annex. No.

- Rubens: Eleanor—I should schedule more time with you alone. For instance, I didn't know about the earlier divisions in the history department, that people didn't talk to each other. You mentioned the Carl Becker dinner—
- Frantz: Well, where would that be? I don't even—unless somebody has done a history of the department, which I doubt—
- Rubens: Well, the Center for Higher Education and ROHO have begun doing some oral histories; there are several of members of the history department, but not, for instance, of Woodrow Borah, who just died.
- Engstrand: He was a student when I was there.
- Rubens: Amazing. He was a graduate student of Bolton's. He came to study with Bolton after his undergraduate work at UCLA. I talked to him briefly. He was very bitter because the history department didn't hire him. His first job was with the Office of War Information, I believe in '41. Marge knew people in that program, for instance Jessica Mitford.
- Engstrand: Could be. I didn't—I knew him to recognize him is all.
- Frantz: Oh, I've heard of him. I thought he did teach there.
- Rubens: Borah claimed there was a lot of anti-Semitism.
- Engstrand: Could well be. Could well be.
- Rubens: I didn't know Earl Cheit was Jewish. Did that make any difference?
- Frantz: No. He was not a serious practicing Jew, or anything. He wasn't observant. And actually his wife, I'm pretty sure June wasn't Jewish. But he grew up in a very small town; his was the only Jewish family in town. And you know if you're the only Jewish family in town, there's no anti-Semitism—because you're not a threat to anybody. For example, I knew somebody who was in the only black family in a town in South Dakota, and they had no problems whatsoever.
- Eleanor's account of the history department was so interesting. She just remembered so much. And history was so different then. You know people who got Ph.D.s in history in those days, really had an education, unlike us. They had to know everything—
- Rubens: You had to have two languages. I think one had to be German.
- Engstrand: Yes. German and French. I studied Russian and French and German.

- Frantz: Eleanor knows ancient history, medieval history, modern history of Europe—and not only that—of the world. Amazing! She just has this amazing historical background. I never had to learn any of that stuff. She can talk for hours about all kind of people I never even knew about.
- Rubens: Back to the business school seminar at Cal.
- Frantz: After the FSM, and we had a second one that I worked on after Cheit already had gone over to the chancellor's office. Heilbroner comes again and then we have another lineup of people. It was a lot of fun. I did various things that were miscellaneous for the Institute. But they were very good about keeping me there. And I made myself useful in a lot of different ways.
- Rubens: Well, you always have.
- Frantz: I stayed with the university until 1970 when I got so mad at the university about People's Park that I just quit with no plan whatsoever about what to do with the rest of my life.
- Rubens: How long were you with the Institute?
- Frantz: I stayed at the Institute until the Study Commission on University Governance was established, which happened after the 1966 strike. There was an Academic Senate resolution that set up a commission of six faculty and six students to do a report on the governance of the university—because one of the big issues that was raised in the '66 strike was “student power”. That was the slogan.
- Rubens: This was called the Study Commission?
- Frantz: —on University Governance. This commission needed a staff person, and one of the graduate students on the commission was somebody I knew. He was at the Institute—one of these sixteen grad students I mentioned. And also Professor Reggie Zelnik was on the commission. So they both suggested that I be hired as the research person. A couple of people objected.
- Rubens: Objected to you?
- Frantz: Yes. Because I'd been smeared and they didn't want—
- Rubens: —any tarnishing.
- Frantz: Yes, they didn't want the thing tarnished. But this was absolute anathema to the young students and to Reggie Zelnik, because this was exactly the sort of thing that they'd been fighting against. I mean, they didn't approve of the red-

baiting, and this is another example of the mindset conflict I'm talking about. If I'd been one of them, I probably would have said, don't hire her either, because you know, they figured they were going to be attacked—and they didn't want to face that again. But anyway—they hired me. And Henry Mayer was the student chairman of that committee.

Rubens: That's how you met Henry Mayer?

Frantz: Yes. That's how I met Henry.

Rubens: How long were you with the commission?

Frantz: So I did that for a year.

Rubens: Only one year. It came out in '68.

Frantz: Yes. Well, I think I started in the beginning of '67 and ended in 1969. Even though it came out in 1968, you know there is always clean-up work to do.

Rubens: Then what did you do?

Frantz: And then I went back to the Institute and did more editing, and then I quit in 1970. And while I'd do the editing—I really was my own boss—I audited a lot of political theory classes.

Rubens: And your relationship with Cheit?

Frantz: Well, we stayed friends, sort of. But the interesting thing about Cheit, the thing that fascinated me—which has just been a sort of eye-opener for me about life—was that he had been extremely popular among the faculty. That's why he got elected to the Senate's executive committee—they really liked him, and they trusted him, and they admired him. And he was very careful to keep up his connections with the faculty.

But the minute he went in the chancellor's office, his whole frame of reference changed. That whole chancellor's office in those days—and probably I think still everywhere—was totally focused on the meeting of the regents, which happens once a month. Everything in the office is focused on being ready for the next regents meeting—what issues came up and so forth—and being prepared to cover their backsides whatever happens at the regent's meetings. And so the people that he associates with now turn out now to be people connected with the regents' scene. And it was so interesting to me that the faculty ceased to be his main—

Rubens: —base focus.

- Frantz: Yes, base. It was really interesting to watch.
- Rubens: Is this an example of what happens when someone comes into more power?
- Frantz: It was a big switch, and we gradually went our own ways—and we have no contact now. Once years later after I came down here, I ran into him. I was coming off of a plane, and he was in the airport. And he recognized me. I'm not even sure I would have even seen him there. We talked for a few minutes. He was dean of the business school for a long time. And his name is on the building there—it's named after him—one of business school buildings.
- Rubens: Was he charismatic in a way? I'd like to know why people liked him so much, why he had been popular? He spoke well, was charming—
- Frantz: He was warm, he was very articulate, and he was very, very smart and very well trained, not only in economics, but in law. He was a go-getter. For example, at his very first job at St. Louis, he ran a column for the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* on all the business and economics books that came out. He just—
- Rubens: —was very energetic?
- Frantz: He was energetic. We really—we had a very good time in that office.
- Rubens: Yes. Apparently it was quite a place to be, for many reasons.
- Frantz: In the first book that I helped on, in the inscription he wrote me he said something about [how] it was fun, which it was. We had fun, and we liked working together. It was the first time that I'd ever had a job dealing with economic issues and I loved it!
- I grew up on a college campus. My mother and father taught at the University of Alabama. Laurent's father taught at the University of Tennessee. I was very much at home in that scene. I had huge respect for the university, and I loved being there, until the Vietnam war. Then it became very problematic.
- Rubens: Let's finish with the study commission before you describe your anti-war activities.
- Frantz: All of '67—basically all of '67 into '68 I worked with the commission. I got to be a good friend of Caleb Foote, who was the chair, and I continued to do stuff with him.
- Rubens: Foote came from—

Frantz: He graduated from Harvard—

Rubens: Oh, I meant from which part of UC.

Frantz: First, he worked for the Fellowship of Reconciliation. He worked with A.J. Muste and he was in California working for Muste at the time of the internment of the Japanese. The Fellowship helped organize what fight back there was about that—but it wasn't very much. He was a pacifist, and he refused to fight in World War II, and he ended up spending twenty-one months in the federal penitentiary as a war resistor. And he was so horrified by prison conditions—he was at MacNeil Island in Washington—that he decided to go to law school when he got out.

He went to University of Pennsylvania Law School. He already was married and had kids; and his first job was at the University of Nebraska Law School. Then he came to California to teach at Boalt in 1965. He got here right after the Free Speech Movement, so he was a good person for this commission, because he didn't have any prior stuff or baggage at UC. And his main interest in the commission was the rules, the law—so much attention during the Free Speech Movement had to do with student rules. He wrote a whole set of student rules—what he thought they should be. But when our report came out, nobody paid the slightest bit of attention to it at UC. I mean none. And it just fell like a dead balloon.

Rubens: But you stayed close with Foote?

Frantz: Yes, Foote and I stayed very good friends. We still are.

Rubens: Wolin and Reconstitution of the University took place when?

Frantz: I think it was 1970. I didn't figure in that as any substantial player at all. Well, I was very involved with the “alternative” political science department. I was in school at the time—here at Berkeley—and we “reconstituted” Berkeley's political science department in the basement of a fraternity house up on Piedmont. [laughter] I do have a lot of documents from that period, actually.

Do you remember my seventieth birthday? Gerda Ray, and one of my students here, Dana Frank—who's now a professor at UCSC —put together a seventieth anniversary book for me. And a fellow student sent me these materials from those days. [shows Rubens the booklet]

Rubens: When did you officially become a student?

Frantz: Summer of 1970.

Rubens: At Berkeley?

Frantz: At Berkeley. I finished my B.A., and then I came down here in '72.

Rubens: Were you in the History of Consciousness program?

Frantz: Yes. Leon Wofsy sent me some stuff for this booklet from the campus draft opposition, which was in '68. Everything of his got burned up in the big fire in Berkeley, but he had some stuff in the office that wasn't.

I became very active on the campus in the anti-war movement. And I did all the staff work unpaid, stealing time from the institute and extra time and so forth, for the Faculty Peace Committee. I did all the secretarial work. You know, I sent out notices of meetings, and I took minutes, and I went to the meetings and was quite active. Leon wrote me something really nice. He said, "I think I enjoyed working with you and Reggie more than anyone else in the sixties."

Oh, here we are. This is "Politics and the Monster: A Radical Organizing Structure at UC." [looking through pamphlets and papers]

When I came back to campus in 1970, when I started at the university as a student, I got involved in—and a bunch of us organized—something called the Educational Liberation Front [ELF] to support several people who didn't get tenure.

Rubens: Marge, we'll have to talk about the ELF another time. I have not asked you about your own amazing background and how that may have shaped your view on and participation in FSM. Where were you born?

Frantz: Alabama.

Rubens: And your father taught?

Frantz: Physics, at the University of Alabama. Then he did full-time civil liberties and civil rights work in the South starting in '37. It was actually late '36, for the National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners, later called the National Committee for Peoples Rights.

Rubens: And your mother?

Frantz: My mother taught English at the university, and she also quit when he quit. She ended up supporting the family by working for the National Youth Administration.

- Rubens: You were born in 1922. And when you graduated high school you did go to Harvard?
- Frantz: Radcliffe, yes. Actually I graduated in January of '38 and I went in fall of '38. I stayed and took courses in shorthand typing from January until June.
- Rubens: And is that where you met Laurent?
- Frantz: No. I met Laurent in 1937, because he was working with my father.
- Rubens: When did you drop out of Radcliffe?
- Frantz: After two years.
- Rubens: How long before you went to Chapel Hill?
- Frantz: In 1947. But I didn't actually enroll in the University of North Carolina. I audited classes.
- Rubens: Your son Alex was born within a year of your being at the university? Who took care of your kids when they were young?
- Frantz: I had a full-time housekeeper.
- Rubens: Where did you live when you came to Berkeley?
- Frantz: We lived first in Codornices Village on San Pablo.
- Rubens: I thought that was married student's housing, but that's down on San Pablo at Marin. I think it was originally built for war housing.
- Frantz: Except that it wasn't the married students' apartments then. It was a national, federal housing project. It was set up—had 10,000 people in it when we first came to California in 1950. There were a whole bunch of those, mostly in Richmond, but this was in Berkeley down in the flats. It covered everything on the other side of San Pablo, from several blocks south of Gilman, all the way to where the university fields are now.
- Rubens: Really? Most of it's gone.
- Frantz: It was at least four times as big as student housing down there. All the way to the bay, and as I say, 10,000 people lived there, and it was very mixed black and white. It was mostly the shipyard workers that came out from the South.
- The last couple of years before we left North Carolina—three years—we were under severe repression there. It was a very bad time. McCarthyism was under

way from 1947 to '50—and we were getting nasty phone calls in the middle of the night. We lived on a dead end street, and there were these cars of thugs that came driving around there all the time. It was really bad. We came to California when my first kid was eleven weeks old and moved into this apartment in Codornices that my father and mother had been in.

Rubens: They had come out ahead of you.

Frantz: Yes. And that's why we came to California, basically. My father had just died and my mother was out here alone and my sister was here. So we came out here and the first night we spent in Codornices village. It was a wonderful area for organizing because there were so many houses compactly arranged. Ten thousand people were packed in this area and there were various organizations there. There was an American Youth for Democracy, and there was a Civil Rights Congress, and there was an Independent Progressive Party—the three big organizations in Codornices Village. The very morning we woke up after coming from this repressive southern state—all these phone calls in the middle of the night, scary phone calls and everything with this new baby—we were lying in bed, and there was a sound truck announcing a meeting of the Civil Rights Congress.

A few years later they demolished all that housing. We had a big fight to try and keep it which we lost. We moved to Essex and Wheeler, near Shattuck and Ashby. We lived over there until '57. Then we bought the El Cerrito house.

Rubens: Should I talk to Bob Flanagan? Just to get a business and Cheit-fellow perspective?

Frantz: He was a sort of rank and file member—he was never deeply involved, but he was partly involved. And he has some memories.

Rubens: I'm looking for that: for foot soldier, for people who may have been influenced by FSM later. Really both these people, Fran and Bob, sound as if they would have a different perspective.

Frantz: They were married at one point.

Rubens: Oh, they were.

Frantz: But then they split up, and they both have remarried. And I hadn't seen Bob for a long time until three years ago. My friend Steve came from Scotland, and he was very close to Bob and—

- Rubens: Yes. I'd love to interview Steve, so if I ever go to Scotland or he comes here again-
- Frantz: The only time Bob could see Steve was when we were at the ranch, so he came up to the ranch. He'd been to the ranch before, but anyway we had a wonderful visit and we just loved each other.
- Eleanor and I did all the cooking for his wedding with Fran. We catered that wedding—did a whole salmon and everything, 150 people up at the Brazilian Room. I had been really close to them and then after they split up, I hadn't seen him for all these years. When we got together, he really loved seeing me, and I loved seeing him. And his wife couldn't come that weekend so I haven't met her.
- Rubens: You're talking about Bob.
- Frantz: Bob Flanagan. Yes. He was an associate dean, or something for three years and he hated it. He got out of it.
- Rubens: Back to FSM specifically: I love your phrase, *mentalité*. Certainly there was a huge difference between Kerr's, the rest of the university's and the FSM leaders. Was there ever any formal reconstitution? This didn't really happen, in terms of the vision Wolin had.
- Frantz: No. No. No.
- Rubens: Okay. All right.
- Frantz: Wolin has written some about this—at least he called me a couple of years ago and asked if I had any data or did I have any documents, because he had to write something for somebody.
- Rubens: I'll call him soon.
- Frantz: I saw him at the recent West Coast meeting of the American Political Science Association, and he was in wonderful shape and he was sharp as a tack. He was terrific. I just loved every second of it. It was just like being back there and listening to him lecture in the sixties. He was so sharp.
- Frantz: There was a big difference between my generation, really, and the young generation. Barbara Epstein came out here from Radcliffe, I think. And she had a graduate research assistantship at the Institute, and that's when I first met her. She wandered in the office and, actually, we had some mutual friends, and she was assigned to work for a guy named [Hal] Wolinsky, who taught sociology. They just gave these automatic assignments. And she went

to the library and got a book of Wolinsky's and didn't like it. She didn't agree with it. So she just announced: "I can't work for him." [laughs] I would never have done that in a million years! No matter where. I would have accommodated to it. I was basically a militant accommodationist. I would fight in other ways, but I would never, ever have done that. And that struck me at the time as a real contrast between where I came from and where this generation was coming from.

Rubens: So the *mentalité* and also the economic opportunity—there were plenty of other jobs.

Eleanor, you have a long story to tell, and we must do it. We really must do it soon. But specifically, where were you in 1964?

Engstrand: I was working in the documents department at Berkeley, as a librarian.

Rubens: And was that your title? Librarian?

Engstrand: My title was Librarian I.

Rubens: How long had you been there?

Engstrand: I started in 1950.

Rubens: Really! I want to just do one little segue. You had been a graduate student and took oral exams at the University of California, in the Department of History.

Engstrand: Yes.

Rubens: You were a Europeanist. And did you have a particular speciality or focus?

Engstrand: Russian history.

Rubens: Did you get your Ph.D.?

Engstrand: No. I didn't. I got stuck in the middle of the dissertation and didn't ever finish.

Rubens: What was your dissertation on?

Engstrand: The conquest of Siberia in the 17th century.

Frantz: She had to learn Old Russian.

Rubens: So when did you decide to become a librarian or—

- Engstrand: Well, when I couldn't finish my dissertation. I couldn't understand why I was unable to finish my dissertation. I spent a year working on it. I spent a year looking at it and not allowing myself to do anything else, and then I decided I couldn't do it. And so, I went to library school [UC Berkeley School of Librarianship] and got a job in the Los Angeles public county library for a couple of years. Then I got married and had children. By 1950 my husband's health was not dependable, and I needed to get a job. I heard of a part-time position in the library and I went—
- Rubens: At Berkeley?
- Engstrand: Yes.
- Rubens: By then you'd come back to Berkeley.
- Engstrand: Yes.
- Rubens: How long had you been in Berkeley by that point?
- Engstrand: We came back to Berkeley in '42 and in 1950 the library was—oh, I forget what you'd call it—they were ascertaining their holdings of various periodicals, and that's what I was doing.
- Rubens: They were doing this when you started in 1950?
- Engstrand: Yes. On microfilm. And when that job was finished, I heard that the documents department was looking for a librarian, and I was much more interested in that anyway, so I went and got that job.
- Rubens: And when did that job begin?
- Engstrand: October, '50.
- Rubens: You had been at Berkeley—
- Engstrand: Well, I'd been there for maybe six months, tabulating periodicals before October 1950.
- Rubens: Six months before—My God! So you had been there a total of fourteen years by the time the Free Speech Movement occurred! I meant to ask you if you had gotten caught up at all in the Loyalty Oath controversy?
- Engstrand: No. Well, I did in that I didn't get paid when I started, and I didn't know why. And each month I went up to get my check and they said, "Well, sorry it's not here." I didn't know why.

- Rubens: Starting in 1950?
- Engstrand: Yes. And finally I went up and I said, “I have a brother-in-law who works in the state personnel department, and if I don’t get my check, I’m going to tell him that I’ve been working here for four months with no check. And maybe the personnel department should find out what gives with the university.” And at that point they called me the next day to say I hadn’t signed the Loyalty Oath.” [laughs] But they hadn’t told me that before.
- Frantz: Had they presented you with the Oath?
- Engstrand: I guess not. I knew that I didn’t really want to sign it, but I didn’t stop. I signed it. And I got a check. So I wasn’t part of that, although I knew there was—I sort of knew that it was going on—I didn’t know the details of it.
- Rubens: By the way, how long did you remain part-time? By 1964 I assume you were full-time?
- Engstrand: Yes. I was only part-time six months, and then I took the full-time job in October, 1950.
- Rubens: The documents job was full-time. Who took care of your children when—
- Engstrand: Well, that was a great problem. They were both in school by that time, and I got university students to come after school until I could get home. And you know, it’s problematic if they’re sick or if—I don’t remember any time when somebody didn’t show up, but I felt two categorical imperatives that weren’t the same.
- Rubens: That’s an apt way of putting it. The anxiety of having two jobs, being divided by one’s responsibilities, as you say, “two categorical imperatives that weren’t the same.”
- By ‘64, you’re in the documents library, and you appear to be a pretty well established person there. Do you remember becoming aware that there was some brouhaha between students and the administration?
- Engstrand: Yes. I was aware of it. We had students in the department that were taking part in it, and one Korean kid especially that I tried to persuade not to go and demonstrate.
- Rubens: Why?
- Engstrand: Well, I just wished for his welfare! [laughs] And this was likely the first sit-in probably. But I didn’t know exactly what it was he was proposing to do, but I

thought that I knew that he didn't have any secure backing at all, and I just didn't like to see him risk it.

Rubens: What did you call these students?

Engstrand: Student assistants, they were called.

Rubens: These were work-study students, probably?

Engstrand: No, just hired. Later we had some work study people. We had fourteen of them in the department always. They did a lot of different things, and they were trained to help people at the desk; so they had a relatively high rank.

Rubens: And did they particularly come from the library school?

Engstrand: No. They were just students. Undergraduates. They were generally students—preferably students who read the “New York Times.”

Rubens: Do you think they had some interest in research?

Engstrand: Yes.

Rubens: How many librarians or assistant librarians were there in the Documents Library at that time?

Engstrand: Probably five.

Rubens: Were you the head of the department?

Engstrand: Oh, no. I was a Librarian I, and the head of the department did not want anybody above Librarian I under her, because she felt that the more money that the department spent, the more she would be subject to her superiors. And she wanted to be let alone.

Rubens: Did she remain your boss the whole time, for fourteen years?

Engstrand: Yes. And eventually, she got into trouble with the administration because I had a lot of accrued vacation. I asked to take it at a time just when finals were over, which was the easiest time for the library. And she said they were too busy, I couldn't take it. She'd said that before, and I knew this wasn't a busy time. So I went to the office and said I wanted to take vacation—I'd lose it if I didn't take it. She got called in and bawled out, and this administrator was not a gentleman, I think. And she was really—she felt very badly. She felt that it had been very severe against her, and she blamed me for it, of course. But what he told her was if she couldn't manage her own department that they would manage it for her.

Rubens: There was no union or association to represent you?

Engstrand: Yes, well, it was just a time that the union was beginning to function. The library had—the library was arranged on authoritarian grounds. The head librarian was Donald Coney, and I think he was a nice enough person. There was no mechanism for people being included in decisions and things like that. And some departments were very oppressive—the order department was very oppressive.

Rubens: Which department?

Engstrand: Order. Or later, acquisitions. And one person there who had—she was excitable—but she went to Israel, because she thought that things were going to the dogs here. In Israel she also had a bad time. Her superiors there were all Oriental Jews, and she really couldn't make any money. She felt that she was living hand to mouth. She finally came back and learned Indonesian so as to have another tool. She already knew Hebrew. And she was very helpful to us translating Indonesian documents that we had, and had to handle one way or another. She would stay after hours and do that. She was a very able, learned person.

She finally was fired by the head of the Order Department. I don't remember what the dispute was about, but it was a personal thing. And then she applied for a state job, and in the oral review committee the son of her former boss was on the committee. The review took place after her exam, which she passed. And she just went home and committed suicide.

And this came up, this was after the Free Speech Movement had been going for maybe six months. And that really galvanized the librarians. They called a meeting to talk about organizing a union. The meeting was very interesting because you met the people that you normally talked to only on the phone. You know, you had professional dealings with these people, you knew their names very well, and you knew what they could do and so forth; but you had no idea who they were as people.

And the union then started a periodical that they mailed to all the academic libraries. And this turned out to be a weapon—it turned out that the administration could not stand the idea of disputes being reported to everybody else. These were mailed, you know, to all the colleges to the big university libraries all over the country.

Rubens: Beyond the UC colleges?

Engstrand: Oh, yes. They went all over the country. To all the big university libraries. And so they were willing to talk; they were willing to consider the librarians'

point of view. And eventually a librarians association, LAUC [Librarians Association of the University of California], was formed. UCLA was organizing about the same time, and so the basic organization of the librarians was really not the union, it was this organization—I forget even what it was called.

Frantz: LAUC.

Engstrand: And their main preoccupation was to get librarians declared academic. And eventually they were. And once they were academic, they were promoted by peer review. And they had well defined stages, and all the rules for promotion were cut and dried, so one administrator couldn't decide she'd have only L-I's.

Rubens: And were you a beneficiary of that? Did you have a period when you were on the academic schedule?

Engstrand: Yes. I was a beneficiary of it in that I was—this came not so long before I left the library, but I was an L-II, which meant a considerable promotion. I was the head of the Berkeley branch of LAUC for one year.

Rubens: Of this association?

Engstrand: Yes.

Rubens: When did you leave the library?

Engstrand: I left in '73, in November '73.

Rubens: I'd like to pick up your discussion of a strike that took place I guess when the union was already operating. Do you remember that?

Engstrand: Yes. The union was created two or three years before the strike, as I remember. There was a strike—I think it was ten weeks. Is that right Marge?

Frantz: Yes, that makes sense.

Rubens: We can look up the specific dates. How did that come about, to the best of your memory? Also, do you remember who called the first meeting of LAUC?

Engstrum: No, I don't, but it would be in the library newsletter.

Frantz: I'll bet Hal, what's-his-name was—

Engstrand: Draper?

- Frantz: Yes.
- Rubens: Was he on the staff at the time?
- Engstrand: Yes.
- Frantz: He was a librarian. And so was Draper too.
- Engstrand: Anne Lipow was the most active person—the most concerned about the union—and the one that really succeeded in calling the strike. How important was the climate of liberalism and liberalizing the university?
- Engstrand: —the climate of standing up, and taking it all apart?
- Rubens: But the suicide you mentioned must have really been a galvanizing—
- Engstrand: It was very galvanizing.
- Rubens: By the way, do you recall where these people met the first time?
- Engstrand: No, I don't.
- Rubens: It was probably off-campus, don't you think? Maybe not.
- Engstrand: I don't think it was off-campus. I don't think—
- Rubens: Here I'm interrupting again, because I'm so conscious that we are going to have to end soon. Were you nervous about getting together? You were under a rather authoritarian system, the consequences could be dire.
- Engstrand: I was very pleased with anything that would pull its tail. I felt that the administration had no respect for knowledge, and that probably wasn't true, but they certainly didn't respect the knowledge in our department. They thought they knew how it should be arranged and they did not.
- I remember having an argument once with the assistant librarian [Helen Worden], and it was probably about my promotion. She said that—I was in the room with Kesslie and Worden—and she said, “Well, it would be much easier if your work had content.” You know, apparently she thought it was just sheer administration, just dealing with stacks of things. And I said, “Well, it certainly does have subject matter—I mean it's political science and economics. It goes over into other things, but those two departments send their classes here to learn. We help those students, and the professors from those departments are here, and we help them. We become quite knowledgeable about these things.” I think Mrs. Kesslie, department head at that time,

thought I had made my case well. You know Worden was a nice person, but she was one of the people who absolutely believed that father knows best.

- Rubens: To clarify: This meeting is called, and there's movement afoot to create a union. How long was it before a strike really was called?
- Engstrand: Oh, it was a long time. The strike didn't come out until I would guess that it was maybe '69 or '70.
- Frantz: What impelled—what was the crux, or the thing that set the strike off?
- Engstrand: It was Anne Lipow, is that her name?
- Rubens: Yes.
- Frantz: Yes.
- Engstrand: She was the one that—
- Rubens: Oh, you were trying to think of her name earlier.
- Engstrand: Yes. And as far as I was concerned, it was her idea. I didn't really think that it would be successful. And I thought that she presented it unfairly, that she presented it in such a way as to make people who didn't know anything about it—who didn't know anything about strikes— think that a strike was harmless. And I thought it could be harmful. And of course, it was harmful in losing wages. But, nevertheless, when the union voted to do it, why, I was on strike and I was—I very much enjoyed the time off.
- Rubens: Which union called this? Was it the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees?
- Engstrand: The AFT.
- Rubens: American Federation of Teachers?
- Engstrand: Yes.
- Rubens: Oh, because you wanted academic status. And ten weeks—that's a long, long time for a strike to last.
- Engstrand: It was a long time, but no, we weren't asking for academic status then; academic status was worked out later by LAUC.
- Frantz: And they were out picketing—

- Rubens: Did you have to picket?
- Engstrand: Yes.
- Rubens: But I love that line, you said—"I enjoyed the time off." It was a long time.
- Engstrand: Well, it was very, very nice. And I felt a little—I thought, well, it shouldn't go too far. I had just bought a very expensive garden cart and I thought, "Well, I can afford this eighty dollar cart." It was eighty dollars or something like a hundred dollars. But suddenly I didn't have any income. It didn't really pinch me, but some people I know really were very pinched.
- Rubens: Did you get support from the—
- Engstrand: Well, the head of our department was also on strike. And by this time, this was a different head, and a very different situation. And about half the department was on strike, and the other half was trying very hard to keep the work going.
- Rubens: And were there any academic departments that particularly were supportive?
- Engstrand: I didn't know about it if they were.
- Rubens: Did this strike literally impact you, in the sense of—
- Engstrand: I do remember that the Third World Strike impacted the whole library, because of the police on campus, and tear gas and things like that. And I can remember somebody who had worked there and then gone to Sonoma State coming to have lunch with all of us. We were very glad to see her, and wanted to have lunch, and the question was which direction to try to go for lunch. Where were we most likely to be able to avoid the trouble? Where would we have to circumnavigate or go around people?
- Frantz: The tear gas—
- Rubens: The tear gas would be later, during People's Park, but—
- Engstrand: Yes. The library strike was completely peaceful. Well, this may have been in '68. When Jean [Day] came back for lunch. I'm not sure.
- Rubens: But, was there ever any question of closing the library?
- Frantz: There was a story at one point that students were going to come in and burn the card catalog.

Engstrand: No. There was a march through the campus. I think there probably were a couple of marches. Anyway, we got word that a march was coming toward the library. And somebody had stolen the two catalog drawers—and you know it's very hard to replace. They did replace them.

Rubens: Two catalog drawers of the documents?

Frantz: No, the main catalog.

Engstrand: No. The main catalog downstairs. And so we got a call to send two or three people down to help defend the catalog. And so two or three people went. I didn't. I was at the desk. But they came back. [George?] had a funny story about one of the more severe librarians spread-eagled in front of the catalog. [laughter]

Rubens: Do you think this was literally during FSM? Or do you think that was later?

Engstrand: It was during the later troubles, definitely.

Rubens: Do you recall ever being called in by your superior, or having discussions amongst the library staff about what's going on with the Free Speech Movement?

Engstrand: No. No. I recall being fascinated by it myself and being—hearing the speeches at the Greek Theater at the time.

Rubens: You went up there?

Engstrand: Yes. And then going back and seeing the crowd at Sproul and thinking—who was it that—which faculty member stood up and—well, somebody stood out and kind of was acting as a lightning rod so the excitement was somewhat dissipated.

Rubens: I don't know. In a way what you're saying is that you were aware of FSM, sympathetic, you had your own battles in the library?

Engstrand: I was aware of it, and it made life a lot more interesting. And of course, the kids were all very interesting. They had their songs and so forth. That I remember—the Christmas record.

Rubens: Yes. I just had to contribute my album cover of that record to The Bancroft. I didn't really want to give it up, but I did.

We still have not come up with the name of the woman who went to Israel and came back.

- Frantz: Dorothy—
- Engstrand: It was Dorothy.
- Rubens: Okay. We'll find her last name. By the way, Eleanor, did you know that an oral history series has begun on library services?
- Frantz: Eleanor—you should tell her your role during the anti-war movement in the library.
- Engstrand: What do you mean?
- Frantz: Well, all the stuff you found for people that were—
- Engstrand: Oh, well. Documents was a good place to study Vietnam. And what's his name? The Englishman—?
- Frantz: Peter [Dale] Scott
- Rubens: Yes. I'm supposed to interview him soon.
- Engstrand: He spent a lot of time—. We had things like—the radio—the foreign broadcast service put out the text of their announcements, and there were, of course, there were hearings. And there were—
- Rubens: Reports on government spending showed how much the national budget had increased.
- Engstrand: Yes. Some of it, of course. They don't detail how they spend their military money. But there was a great deal of information to be found there, and some people were working hard on it, and did find it.
- Rubens: That's what I was actually trying to ask—some of the professors—did you meet in the context of doing this political work—Peter Dale Scott?
- Engstrand: Yes. Well, you met in the context of helping them find what they wanted. For example, there were reports from Cambodia on bombing in the U.N. General Assembly debates before anybody said we were doing it—and there were things like that. If you came across that, why you called it to their attention. Or, if you knew they were hunting for it, you tried to help them find it.
- Rubens: The *Congressional Record* and of hearings where I.F. Stone [A militant antiwar person who published *I.F. Stone's Weekly*] got most of his information. Were you thinking of something else you wanted Eleanor to tell about?

- Frantz: That was basically it. She was very useful to a lot of these people in digging stuff up.
- Rubens: I can imagine how true that is. By the way, Marge, did you know each other on campus?
- Frantz: I was going to tell you when I first met her through the Unitarian church. I heard she was in the Documents Department, and I was using the library a lot. It had some non-circulating publications and I thought, “Aha! I’d like to have a connection there so I can get stuff out of the library.” Well, I was not prepared for the librarian mentality. She wouldn’t dream of making any exceptions to the rules. [laughs]
- Rubens: I was just about to say I cannot imagine Eleanor doing that, or virtually any librarian. There’s a certain honor about it. So, roughly what date is this, though?
- Frantz: When we first met I was pregnant with Alex? Or Virginia?
- Engstrand: Virginia.
- Frantz: So it would have been 1955.
- Rubens: When you met?
- Frantz: Yes, in the Unitarian church.
- Engstrand: She came asking for publications about 1961.
- Frantz: We met, but we didn’t follow-up until 1961. But we started having lunch together when I was in California Hall, and she was right across the way, so we had lunch together once a week or something like that.
- Rubens: Eleanor, you must have known that Marge was not quite doing all her work at the Institute—she had her eye on the Free Speech Movement.
- Engstrand: I remember the night of the sit-in. The first sit-in at Sproul. We had company at the El Cerrito house when I was there. And Marge was practically pacing the floor wondering what was happening; and I did not know enough to pace the floor. I remember asking you, Marge, what it was that you were concerned about. It was FSM and the various causes that succeeded it. So some of the things that I think of as FSM were actually the others, I guess.

- Rubens: A lot of people say that. I'm hesitant to talk about history speeding up, but there are periods when it seems that time moves more quickly and it's hard to separate the different pieces, events, people and all.
- Frantz: Lenin said at one point that people learn as much in one day of crisis as they do in six months of ordinary time.
- Rubens: Were either of you particularly aware of sex discrimination? We talked earlier about how—well, a woman wasn't going to get a job if they got their degree in history, anyway, or so they thought. They weren't going to let a woman be a TA, because she might get married and leave.
- Frantz: It wasn't on my mind. Cheit really did very well for me. I skipped a whole ordinary editor slot, and he just got me a senior editor thing right away.
- Rubens: Well, you said early that he liked being pushed by his wife—and he must have respected you as a strong woman.
- Engstrand: An interesting thing—
- Frantz: His favorite phrase was “put your fertile brain to work on “x” or “y” or “z.”” I was useful to him.
- Rubens: Eleanor, you started to stay—
- Engstrand: Well, an interesting thing about the position of women—. Well, just stop— then I don't have to switch—

[End Interview]