"Faculty and Students Together in the Redwoods":

An Oral History with Carolyn Martin Shaw

Interviewed by Sarah Rabkin
Edited by Sarah Rabkin and Irene Reti

Santa Cruz
University of California, Santa Cruz
University Library
2015

Table of Contents

Interview History

Carolyn Martin Shaw joined the UCSC faculty in 1972, hired by the anthropology department and Kresge College, where she served as provost from 1991 to 1996. In selecting Professor Martin Shaw in 2004 for the Dean McHenry Award for Distinguished Leadership in the Academic Senate, the Committee on Committees noted her "intelligent, imaginative, indefatigable, and principled work to create…communities of scholarship and learning characterized by openness, fairness, and respect." Martin Shaw's abiding interest in the nature of human community and her dedicated efforts to help build robust communities at UCSC emerge as running themes throughout her oral history.

I interviewed Martin Shaw for a total of seven hours during four sessions in May and June 2014. (We were already acquainted, having served together a few years earlier on the board of the Santa Cruz County chapter of the ACLU.) The oral history begins with her childhood in a lower-middle-class, all-black neighborhood in southern Virginia—a social setting whose racial dynamics she later saw echoed in segregated East Africa, where she conducted cultural anthropology fieldwork among the Kikuyu people. Encouraged by a high-school math teacher who had graduated from Michigan State University, Martin Shaw attended both college and graduate school at that institution; later, arriving at UCSC, she found herself in a small minority of faculty who had not been groomed at small, prestigious private universities.

UCSC in the early 1970s presented her with other kinds of foreignness as well, in its whiteness and in the economic privilege enjoyed by many of its

students. Landing in what was "really a world that I'm not familiar with," Martin Shaw responded by rolling up her sleeves with curiosity, clear-sightedness, and a sense of civic responsibility: "Well, let me see what this world is like. …I've entered into a contract, and you've done so with me, and we've got to figure out a way to talk to each other."

This attitude characterizes her discussion of many community-building challenges she engaged over the years at UCSC, in college, departmental, campus and system-wide contexts: identifying unrecognized power imbalances in Kresge's purportedly liberating and egalitarian "touchy-feely" early culture (whose salubrious innovations she champions even as she critiques its problems); cultivating a supportive campus environment for students of color and other historically disenfranchised groups; navigating contentious periods in the evolution of the anthropology department and women's studies program; developing sensitive and effective policies for addressing sexual harassment; obtaining faculty recognition for the dignity of staff labor and attention to the service of non-senate faculty; achieving senate support for a bold plan to revitalize the colleges as sites of academic endeavor; attempting to reduce the administration's use of police force to quell student demonstrations.

The seed of Martin Shaw's interest in UC Santa Cruz was planted by her elder colleague William H. Davenport, of the University of Pennsylvania, where she was a student and held a research job after leaving Michigan State. Davenport, who spent three years at UCSC, kindled her imagination with his description of the campus as a place where "students and faculty lived together in the redwoods." As it turned out, that vision ended up the basis for a lifelong

career at UCSC. As Martin Shaw notes, "This is my first job; this is my only job: UCSC. Who I am as a professor was all shaped by the UCSC experience."

Sarah Rabkin transcribed the interviews and Irene Reti audit/edited the transcript. The transcript was returned to Martin Shaw, who edited it for flow and accuracy. Copies of this volume are on deposit in Special Collections and in the circulating stacks at the UCSC Library, as well as on the library's website. The Regional History Project is supported administratively by Elisabeth Remak-Honnef, Head of Special Collections and Archives, and University Librarian, Elizabeth Cowell.

—Sarah Rabkin, Interviewer
Soquel, California, January 2015

Rabkin: Today is May 8th, 2014. This is Sarah Rabkin, and I'm in McHenry Library with Carolyn Martin Shaw for the first of our series of oral history interviews. And, Carolyn, I will begin by asking you the question that usually kicks off these interviews, which is: When and where were you born?

Growing up in Virginia in the 1940s and 1950s

Martin Shaw: I was born in Norfolk, Virginia, in 1944. I started out as a math major when I went to college. I was really into math when I was an undergraduate, and I think maybe from the time I was a little kid. So I'm always thinking about that forty-four in relation to something else. I was telling a friend of mine that I think it's because I was so much into numbers that immediately, forty-four in 2014—that means I'm seventy, right? [But] I don't turn seventy till December. I'm celebrating my birthday in July (laughs) as well as in December, just because of that number—I'm always thinking about it.

That was a long answer to a short question!

Rabkin: Interesting. Thank you. Can you tell me a bit about your ancestry and your parents' background?

Martin Shaw: I don't know very much about my ancestry. My brother is doing a chart, and he's looking at our father's side. He's actually gotten back to something like, it seems to me, 1814, and a slave girl in North Carolina. That's as

much as we've done. I'm supposed to do our mother's side, and I haven't started on it yet. It's too much like work (laughs). It's anthropology.

So my father's from North Carolina and my mother's from Virginia, and my mother's family lives not very far from where they had been slaves. The property has changed: when I was a kid it was a dairy, and before then it was a big plantation—and now it's *big* houses. All the farmland has been taken out, with these big houses.

I don't know when, but sometime after emancipation, those people who had been enslaved on that plantation were given plots of land. Not "forty acres and a mule," but a big plot of land, which is heir property today, gone down through the generations. My brother and my sister live on that land. My grandmother lived there; my mother bought land next to my grandmother. My brother had to contact or make an effort to contact all possible heirs to be able to claim a piece of land, and my sister lives in what had been my mother's house in Virginia. I find it fascinating, and I would like—since that's part of my charge—to understand more about that. So I'll probably go to Virginia and look at some more of the documents to see what I can do.

I assume that we had Native American mixture. Near Lumberton, North Carolina, there's a Cherokee reservation, and my father, from North Carolina, would turn his head to profile and say, "Look at me: I'm an Indian," [pointing to her own nose in profile]. We have a relatively pronounced nose like an Indian.

My brother's found no records of any intermixture with Indians, but I'm assuming that there is something there. [I have since learned from a *National Geographic DNA* test that I do not have recognizable Native American heritage.]

Also, my grandfather's (on my father's side) mother was Maggie Murphy. So we assume that there's some Irish somewhere in the background (laughs) and we'll start looking at some of this information. My brother's been retired a little bit longer than I have, and that's been his plan. So I'll keep looking at that.

I was going to tell you this because I've been thinking about it: When I was provost at Kresge, I had a group of people come over to the house with the "IHAD" program. ("IHAD" is "I Have A Dream.") They take, I think it's middle-school kids, who have some sort of disadvantage, and try to help them in high school and encourage them to go to college. So I had these kids over once, and at the end of some talk, one of the kids turned to me and said, "Now tell me about *your* disadvantage." (laughs) This was a young black kid, really bright. And I never think of myself as disadvantaged. So I had to take a little step back from that. And the first thing that comes to mind is that my father had a union job: really, really elite in the community that I was in, where many adults were day laborers, janitors, and maids. We're talking about the 1940s, 1950s, and he's a longshoreman and there's a union. That kind of stability, security, was really important for me as I was growing up.

I'll tell you one more story about that. I had five girlfriends that I was really close to and one day I got into a fight with one of them. I must have been twisting her arm behind her back, which was not a nice thing for me to do. And she said, "Go ahead and break it. Break it! Your father's rich—you can break it. He can pay for it." I went, "*Oh*, my father's *rich*!" I'd never thought of it—that his having this union job gave me standing within that community. Of course, I told my other friends about that and we just about peed on ourselves laughing about it: [in a mocking stage whisper] "*Break it, break it, your father's rich!*" But we were not scrambling.

My mother always worked. She worked as a maid. She used to bring clothes home for us, and I got brownie points because I would wear all these clothes that were not in style in the black community, and my sister just refused to put on light-blue-and-dark-blue saddle shoes. I had *jodhpurs*! I mean, what am I doing with these riding pants, right? But when my mother brought them home from whomever she worked for; I wore them.

She worked as a short-order cook. She worked as a janitor. Sometimes I'd go with her to the offices [she cleaned]. She worked late at night. My father left home early in the morning and my mother came home late at night, and he would bring her home. (She'd take the bus to work.) They would be gone, sometimes, when I was in high school, from four in the morning until eleven o'clock at night. So I looked at a lot of television. And I had to cook dinner: my mother would sometimes leave things out for me to cook.

I think her last job was—there's a Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel that connects Virginia to Maryland—twenty-six miles, a really major feat of tunnels and bridges—and she worked at the coffee shop there. That was not very far from her house. (That's where my mother moved when I went away to college. I went away to college and my family left home, so I had no home to come back to. They built their own home near the Bay-Bridge Tunnel. [On the heir property mentioned before.]) And she'd always say to me, "If you ever get lost, follow the seagulls"—because that's the symbol for the Bay Bridge-Tunnel. And of course, I'm *here (on the Monterey Bay)*, right? And I can follow the seagulls home as well. (laughs) So that works really well for me.

Oh, this is a good story: There was a time when she worked in a factory. She didn't work in very many factories. She worked in a candy factory and she worked in a mattress factory. In the mattress factory I don't know exactly what she was doing, but I think she was part of the sewing-on-of-the-buttons. In the candy factory she worked a big machine. She was at the end of one machine—I don't know what candy process it was—and somebody else was at the other end, and they had to alert each other when they were turning a switch. Somebody turned the switch when my mother wasn't ready and she had the tip of her finger cut off.

Rabkin: Oy, oy, oy.

Martin Shaw: And they didn't stop the machine.

Rabkin: (gasps)

Martin Shaw: The machine kept going.

Rabkin: Did the bosses know that she'd been injured?

Martin Shaw: They knew that she had been injured; they knew that there was some human material in the candy (laughs)—and nothing happened, right? She actually didn't lose *all* of her finger. But she had a blunt end of her finger that looked like a healed wound. That's my mother.

My mother went to eighth grade in school. She went to Catholic school. She went to an all-black elementary school, which was founded by a relative of hers, and then she went to Catholic school, must have been for seventh and eighth grades. Because she went to Catholic school she did not say "Yes, Ma'am" and "Yes, Sir," which, in Virginia, everybody did Of course my father did. When he was talking to any girl twelve or over, he'd say " Ma'am" to a girl. But if you're talking to nuns, you don't say, "Yes, Ma'am." You say, "Yes." (You could say, "Yes, Sister.") So I grew up without the same pressure of the "Yes, Ma'am" / "Yes, Sir" that many people around me had. It's a little bit of a difference.

Rabkin: So it was your mother's expectations that shaped your behavior around that, more than your father's expectations.

Martin Shaw: Exactly.

My mother wanted to go to school. She tells the story of, when she was—must have been, fourteen—she was at the pump. My grandmother's house did not have running water, and it had chickens in the yard—those chickens were very mean—and it had an outhouse. She was at the pump getting some water, and a boy came by to talk to her, and she was laughing and talking to the boy. She went in the house. Her mother says, "You're talking to boys? No more school." That was it.

She started working as a maid in a hotel. The stories that she tells about that have to do more with sexual advances of the men who came to the hotel, as opposed to the bosses. But she felt that was a really difficult job. She also felt that being a maid in a house was a difficult job—but she raised me to be a maid. I talked about this once in a Kresge [College] speech. If I were sitting at the table peeling potatoes, she'd say, "Stand up to peel potatoes. If you're working for the white lady, she's going to think you're lazy, sitting and peeling potatoes." So I'm learning my domestic duties at home, at the same time as this kind of expectation that I might go in to do this kind of work. She certainly didn't *want* me to do it, but I did end up doing it. I don't actually know why I decided to become a live-in maid, but I was a live-in maid between my sophomore and junior years.

Rabkin: Of high school?

Martin Shaw: No, of college. The first year, [between] my freshman and sophomore year, I worked in New York City in an office. That was a job given to me through corruption in New York City. My cousin, somebody my mother's age, was a chauffeur for a commissioner in New York City, and he said, "I've got a cousin who needs a job," and so the commissioner said, "Okay, she can go work in this office." I didn't have any office skills. I was pretty good at the alphabet, so I did a lot of filing. I thought, oh, I don't think I want to do this again.

I had a scholarship to go to college from a philanthropic group in Virginia, and they paid almost everything I needed to go to college. One of the members of that group knew somebody in New Jersey who usually would take black college students from the South to work as maids. Through that person, I went to work as a maid in New Jersey. What was difficult about that experience was partly the lack of privacy, and being on call at any time. I had two children in the family, a wife, and a husband. I don't know if I saw him twice in the summer that I was there. I don't remember much about him. But if the kids had any problems, or they wanted something to eat late at night, or any of those things, I was there to take care of it.

But here's the thing that struck me the most. That was the summer of the March on Washington. I had some friends that I'd made in New Jersey and they were going down to the march. I asked for the day off to go down for the march, and I was denied that possibility of going down to the march. I stayed, and I continued my duties. And because we're now celebrating the anniversary of that march, I keep thinking, why didn't I leave? It was toward the end of summer. I didn't really need [the job anymore]. I didn't have any loyalty toward these people. But I guess I had something that was a kind of work ethic, that said that if you've entered into this contract, then you finish it up, and then you don't do it anymore. So I did do that.

[There was] great surveillance of all my activities: how I'm working in the kitchen; where I'm going; who are my friends; what am I reading. I think, to some extent, both the group of people who had gotten together for the scholarships and the person who hired me, and probably other people in that world, thought they were grooming these raw black girls from the South, and they were maybe turning us into good homemakers. I don't know what they thought they were doing, but it was an awful lot of surveillance.

The next summer I was on my own. Actually, the next summer is the summer before I got married. I got married in the beginning of my senior year. And I decided I'd stay at home, because I'd never really lived in this house my parents were in, and I'd been away for most of the time. I started looking for jobs. I got a job as a mother's helper. I felt, I've got three years of college now! I've worked as

a maid already! I've worked in an office! But I just couldn't find anything other than mother's helper. I babysat some kids, not very far away, so I could walk there. Then on Saturdays I went to some other houses to clean the oven, iron the clothes, do whatever housework needed to be done. That really shocked me. I just really thought that—I could sell shoes; I mean I thought I could do a whole host of other little things. I didn't think that I'd be able to go off and get an office job, but I didn't think that I would, once again, be working as a maid.

Rabkin: What was your sense at the time—or what is it retrospectively—of why it was so difficult to find other kinds of employment?

Martin Shaw: Well, at that time—we're talking '64, '65—there was still a great deal of segregation in Virginia. I know that if I could have gone to a black neighborhood, I could probably have found a shoe store that would hire me, or some retail place. But I think that's also through networks, and I didn't have that network. There just wasn't the kind of integration that they would have now, where you could go into Macy's and find a black clerk. I wouldn't have seen that in Virginia at the time. I think that's a big piece of it. Also, Virginia was just coming off of massive resistance to desegregation in the school systems. I'm pretty sure that was a part of it. Plus, I was limited in where I could work during the week because I didn't have a car. I had to find out what was in that part of Virginia Beach where my mother was then living.

Let me step one more step back and say that when I was born in Norfolk, my family was living in something that looked like a tenement in the city. They moved from that when I was about five years old, and they moved into this area called Crestwood. Crestwood was an all-black community. I always thought about it as being for servicemen coming from World War II, but it was actually built a little before then, probably in '42—with this idea in mind. At the time, Crestwood was definitely a step up from a tenement in the city. Right now it's back to a pretty high-crime area. But when I grew up it was a really nice area, with lower-middle-class people who could afford these little houses made of cinderblock: two bedrooms, a living room and a kitchen, a bathroom. It's remarkable to me when I think about it: the bathroom didn't have a tub, it had a shower—and we used the shower as a closet. (laughs) Clothes were really important! And we had a tin tub that we would use to take our baths in. There was a wood-burning stove in the kitchen that you could heat the water in, but we seldom used it. We would probably heat the water on the gas stove.

That area, being a relatively large black area, had an elementary school and a high school. So I always walked to elementary school and walked to high school. But everybody in the high school who didn't live where I did—they were all bussed in. They all passed similar white schools to get to this one school in the county. But I felt pretty fortunate to be able to always walk to school and to have a group of friends that I went to school with who were also in the neighborhood. So that was my early education experience.

I was thinking when I came over [for today's interview] that part of not feeling so "disadvantaged" had to do with the changes that I made in my life at an early age. I think somewhere between nine and ten, probably in the summer, I went with my grandfather to New York. My grandfather was a big baseball fan. He would drive without stopping to get to New York, or to Cleveland, Ohio—there were few hotels or restaurants easily accessible for "colored people"—wherever he was going. He didn't usually like to take me, but he took me this one time. Unfortunately, I went to sleep at the baseball game, and he never took me again. (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs) Oops.

Martin Shaw: So anyway, he took me to New York, and I heard different accents. It was the first time I'd heard people not speaking in a Southern accent. We'd got the television, I think, maybe when I was about six, and so that was a time when I began to hear—and mostly you heard white people. In New York you could hear black people speaking differently. And so, at that age, I changed my accent. It's pretty much the same one I have now, which is not the way I was brought up. It's not the way anybody else in my family talks. My accent is a little bit more relaxed than it used to be. I was extremely hypercorrect. I would not say a word in which you didn't hear the ending, *and* [enunciating with exaggerated precision] *each syllable*. That's, I think, a mark of being self-didactic. I'm teaching myself how to talk.

But at that point, people wanted me to be a spokesperson. My elementary school would put me forward. "You're the one who gets to come to talk to the PTA. If we have a program for Black History Month," which was February, of course, "you get to do the major speeches." From a relatively early age, I was chosen for these things. I was chosen primarily, I think, because I could speak in this way that wasn't a Southern drawl, but also because I was smart and because I was attractive.

And that wasn't unusual for my family. I had three siblings, and they [mostly] were toward the top of their classes and very articulate. (Except my sister wasn't.) We've had very different patterns. My older brother was killed when he was nineteen. He was shot by a policeman. He had left home a couple of times. He left home to join the Air Force. My family had found him there and told them that he was underage, and he had come back home and tried to go back to high school, unhappily. Left again. He was in New York, on the sidewalk with a friend. A policeman said that he had fired a warning shot and unfortunately killed my brother with a bullet in the back of his neck. That doesn't seem to me to be a warning shot. He also said that my brother and the friend he was with, who escaped, had a gun. But we never saw that gun either.

Rabkin: Is that what the warning shot was supposedly about, the fact that the cop had seen a gun, allegedly?

Martin Shaw: I don't think so. I think it was that there were two black men in the wrong neighborhood at the wrong time. I'm sure it was at night, but I don't remember exactly what time they said it was.

Rabkin: How old were you at this time?

Martin Shaw: Twelve. He's the first-born. It's amazing to see how my parents—how broken up they were. And then all of us, the three of remaining, [feeling], "Do we *count*?" As an anthropologist [now], I think: they've lost the person who's made them parents. This is the transition in their lives. This is their first-born. Of course they loved us, but that loss was really great. My brother had a girlfriend, and I think she got pregnant about a year and a half later, and my mother wanted to say it was my brother's. I'm thinking, "You know no pregnancy lasts that long, Mom!" (laughs) I mean, it can't be—he really is gone! So that was my brother. He was extremely promising. All the things that I was.

My sister got pregnant at fourteen. She's quieter. You could never put her in the category with either of my brothers or me. She's just really a bit more withdrawn and very quiet. She got pregnant when she was fourteen. That baby died. She left school, and then she got married at sixteen. I was just looking at my granddaughters: they're sixteen and twelve. So that's our ages; the age that I was when my sister got married. It's amazing to me that that happened. And she's been married for the last fifty-seven years.

Rabkin: To the same guy.

Martin Shaw: Yes. And then my brother who's closest to me went away to college. My father had gone to college. I can't remember now, I have to ask my brother, but I think he did two years. It could be that he did one and a half years. I bet you it was one and a half, because he was playing football and had a football injury; after that injury he did not go back. I have a feeling it was his second year in college that he had the football injury. My brother went to the same college that my father had gone to. And *he* left after two years. I'm not sure of all the reasons that he left but I think he was uncomfortable being poor.

Rabkin: At college?

Martin Shaw: Yes. Then we're not so wealthy as we were. Times have changed, and he's in college. Jesse Jackson was there at the same time that he was. He's with all these other people who've come from lots of parts of the country and have *so* much more. I actually think that's a big piece of why he left, the disparity within this black community. It's a historically black school that he went to.

Rabkin: What was the college?

Martin Shaw: North Carolina A & T. (His daughter also graduated from there, in engineering.) So he left, must have been drafted during the Vietnam War, went to Germany. He hated Germany so much, he tried to get transferred to Vietnam.

Rabkin: (raises eyebrows)

Martin Shaw: That's exactly the experience that he said he had when he talked to, I don't know, the sergeant or somebody about that.

Rabkin: Astonishment.

Martin Shaw: Right. (laughs)

So he served his time in Europe, and then he came back home and went to school, and graduated a physics major. He worked in Xerox in middle management and did quite well.

The four of us are pretty similar in terms of our kind of academic attitude and our ways of thinking about the world—but took such different trajectories, given the world that we live in.

Rabkin: Did your sister go to college?

Martin Shaw: No. My sister ended up doing a GED, and working. Her longest job was working as a cashier at a grocery store, I think, or something like that. But different jobs off and on. She had four kids, and she didn't always work. Her husband was in the military for twenty years, and retired from that, and had

some other job like that—either guard, or something, and retired from that. Then he ended up working at a hospital, and he's retired from that, in the last two years, at seventy-five. He's finally finished, and he's now totally retired. She didn't always work, but she always read. She's voracious, and really smart, and knows an awful lot about lots of things. But that was as far as she went in school. Her friends that she knew in high school still look at her as a member of their high school graduating class, which is really nice. But she's quiet. She doesn't have a lot of friends.

Rabkin: So you were the youngest.

Martin Shaw: Yes. I could see all the mistakes they made.

Rabkin: Any in particular that stand out for you?

Martin Shaw: (laughs) I don't think so. But being the youngest and being a girl, I felt extremely responsible for my brother, who was two years older than I am. I was the one who had to make sure he had dinner. He was a better cook; he's neater, cleaner. He could iron clothes; he could tailor. He could do all these skills, but I had to take care of him. And I remember even as a little kid, when people would tease him, I would get into fights with them. There's one boy that I would always fight when they were teasing him.

My sister was always sensitive. She would cry easily. So that was one of the things that I knew I wasn't going to be: sensitive. I couldn't even figure out what "sensitive" was when they were saying it. I went to camp when I was a kid, to Girl Scout camp. But, well, my sister was "too sensitive" to go to camp. I didn't know what it meant, but I do think that it had to do with her uneasiness around people and the fact that she would cry easily. My sister once burned up the rent money. She was sort of forgetful and didn't think about things. My sister once gave her winter coat to a friend. So these are things that I knew that I needed to make sure that I was on top of. Money—

My grandfather—I don't know his exact position, but he was in the union, the longshoremen's union, and he was responsible for paying some of the workers. (I wrote about this when I first started therapy, so I'm not trying to use you as a therapist!) The abject way that these men stood in front of my grandfather, asking sometimes for loans or advances. To some extent I think my grandfather was a loan shark. They'd stand. Their heads were bowed. They'd have their hats in their hands behind their backs. They are telling him what they need. My grandfather was very strict. If you haven't paid him his 35 percent interest (laughs), if you hadn't paid him whatever you'd borrowed from him the last time, he's not going to give it to you. I still think about that, and about his control of money, when I think about what does it mean to be abject, what does it mean to be down and out, what does it mean to have your life, your livelihood, your sense of yourself dependent on this person and money?

This grandfather lived in the city. I would sometimes go to the city; I had music lessons in the city. And I'd sometimes spend all my money. I'd go to my grandfather and say, "Could I borrow twenty-five cents for the bus home?" He said, "Yes, and you pay me thirty cents when you come back." And he collected thirty cents. There was no way that I could come back and ask for another twenty-five cents without giving him thirty cents. If I gave him twenty-five cents, I'd still owe him a nickel. He'd add more onto it.

I grew up that way. That's the way you handled money: you were very careful with it, and if you were borrowing you were going to have to pay. My brother said he never had this experience with our grandfather. He said it's because he never asked to borrow money. He said, "Could you *give* me…?" (laughs)

Rabkin: And your grandfather acquiesced? He would *give* him the money?

Martin Shaw: (laughs) Yeah. But he asked for his interest from his granddaughter.

The story of love is the story of my father's love for his father, for my grandfather. My father just about worshipped the man. He wanted to be like him. He never could manage to be like him, because my grandfather was a big figure. My father tried to join the clubs that he joined, or tried to be that person that all the men came to, and it was never the case. But he hadn't grown up with his father. His parents weren't married. He came to live with his father, I think,

when he was about seventeen, and he graduated from high school in the community where his father lived. It was finding his father, and showing that kind of love and admiration for him. That was the strongest representation of love that I had ever seen as a child. I've had some more experiences since then. But that relationship between my father and his father was so strong.

Rabkin: Was it mutually strong?

Martin Shaw: I don't think so. I think that my grandfather liked him. I know my grandfather recognized him as his son. My grandfather was the only boy of several sisters, and none of them recognized my father as their nephew—even though some of them were pretty nice to him—but they just thought, now, who is this interloper? Then there were lots of things about money that happened when my grandfather died and my father didn't get the inheritance from him.

Rabkin: Wow. Carolyn, before we leave your childhood, is there anything else you want to touch on? We haven't really talked about school itself. I don't know if there are any memories there that seem relevant.

Martin Shaw: There are a couple of things about school. This is a story that's been told to me, about me and school: Around this time that I started talking differently, they did IQ tests, and my IQ was the highest or second-highest in the school. It wasn't that high. But, you know, poor kids, not a lot of resources. So everybody started putting resources into me. And it was said that I wasn't

working hard enough, and not living up to my potential, according to this little test. By the time I got into eighth grade, I do remember there was a student brought into school, and they said, "Ah! She will be a good challenge for Carolyn." It turns out that she was. She ended up being valedictorian and I ended up being salutatorian. (laughs) But it was, "We recognize this little girl, and she's got some talent, and we want to push her a little bit harder."

When I was in high school, I used to substitute as a teacher for my peers. Fortunately, they liked me. The stuff that was given to me (laughs) would not have endeared me to some other kids, but in fact, I liked people, and they seemed to like me, and it was kind of fun, going and teaching English and geography—and, not so much, math—to other people.

By the time I was in high school, we were on tracking. I was in the "A" group. It was 10-A, and then 10-1, -2, -3. From that point on, I was always with this same group of people, and we got tons of resources. We studied for a year for the SATs, and we blew them away. They had never seen any black people do that well. There's a little newspaper article about me winning twenty scholarships. (laughs) They had a whole newspaper article on that in Virginia. It's funny, because my daughter just saw it for the first time. I *think* all these things from my history are [things] that everybody in my family knows, but I guess I maybe don't talk about them so much.

Those schools [where I got the scholarships] were all historically black schools. There was one that I was really interested in going to. It was an all-girls school: Bennett College, in North Carolina. But my geometry teacher had gone to Michigan State, and she thought that that was a good place for me to go, and I was starting off to be a math major. So I went to Michigan State. I went with this friend of mine, the one who was the valedictorian. We went on a weekend visit when we were still in high school. (I'll tell you a little bit more about that one.) I thought, these people that I trust think that this is a good place for me, so I will go there.

My life would have been so different if I'd gone to Bennett College. I sometimes think about that. I am very sure that I would have been the middle-class black person that I think is so narrow, the person who goes to church, and has a sense of membership in these clubs and service there. It's not that I dislike those people. But I know that the choices that I've made [have been different]. I think that if I had been in a community where that was the goal, that would have been me. I do have this kind of different vision. Maybe I should write a story about that: who would I be if I had lived the life that I had originally thought, as opposed to being challenged in the ways that I was at the university?

From Mathematics to Anthropology

I have one more thing to say about high school and schools, before I go on to talk about the university. I had a friend, recently, who's a mathematician, ask me why I had majored in math—what was it about math that was exciting to me.

And I always start off, as I did this conversation, with, "I'm interested in numbers." Some of the numbers have to do with trying to find things to talk to my father about. First of all, we'd be tested, sitting at the table, about adding up columns. There's my grandfather and his machine, and there's my father with his baseball statistics. You just had to know numbers. That was one piece of it. But the other part of math, I think, was being able to find solutions, knowing that there *are* solutions, and a kind of a beauty that is an aspect of geometric relationships, but also a beauty that's an aspect of the symmetry that comes with numbers and equations. And moving from math—which I did pretty early on, when I was in college—moving from math was moving to uncertainty.

Rabkin: Mm-hmm.

Martin Shaw: (laughs) And that's really scary. I liked math a lot; I was good in math; I enjoyed math. Then when I got to university, I did not do well in my math classes. I wasn't sure what to do. So I went to the college counseling services, where you take these tests and say what you are interested in. I experimented with different social sciences, trying to figure out where I would go.

I thought that I would end up in psychology, but I took a class in physical anthropology, on human evolution, and that blew me away. It was so *big*. It was how we came to be, and how we came to be different, and what kinds of things we had done in the past, and what kinds of things we might be able to do in the

future. And I thought, these questions, these Big Questions, I can get into. I must have thought that there would be some Big Answers I would come up with.

I did write about this as I continued in my anthropology major, about how much smaller and narrower my questions were getting, the more I studied. This is really tiny. But that was good for me, too, because I had a sense of my work fitting into a bigger picture, even though my work was going to be this tiny little thing, understanding something about kinship among a group of Africans. But it fits into this bigger human-evolution and human-change idea.

Rabkin: So it was the great size and reach of those initial questions you encountered in the physical anthropology/evolution-of-humans class that sparked your enthusiasm and interest for anthropology, and sort of the *grandness* of those questions. And then, gradually, that got narrowed down into a focus.

Martin Shaw: Yes. So, it's really big, and then I end up wanting to do cultural anthropology, but where do I want to do cultural anthropology? Do I want to do it in Africa? Do I want to go to Alaska? When I first started dealing with this—again, it's sort of interesting in relationship to my earlier math interest—it was, there are some interesting theoretical questions, and wherever those theoretical questions lead me, I'd like to go there. I ended up going to East Africa (laughs), and I'm not even sure it's because I maintained this "there's an interesting theoretical question there" in East Africa, but I did *write* an interesting theoretical

question that got funded, that allowed me to go. My advisor also worked in East Africa.

[The fact that I went to] East Africa is significant. If you're interested in African American history, you work in West Africa. You've got Ghana and Nigeria; you've got all those countries over there. You've got the slave trade; you've got continuing influences back and forth, if you look at things like music, for instance, or food types. When you go way over to East Africa, you don't have any of these things.

So was I forgetting my *self* in this? What was I going over to do? When I started thinking about East Africa, the first thing that occurred to me was, I really want to understand more about how kinship works. So that's the first thing. But the second thing was, East Africa felt like Virginia in some ways. I really felt that way when I went there for the first time, in 1971. It was a segregated community. Kenya was a settler community. It had a lot of white people in it, not like West Africa, which had few white people in it. It had a core white center city, and then around the city there were Asians and some blacks, and then outside you have all the black communities, urban and rural. The core of the city had lots of black servants, and maybe some blacks working in retail. But in '71 they had been independent for [only] ten years. It still hadn't been so well integrated then. I felt that in some ways I was looking at a historic situation of segregation and integration that mimicked some of the experiences I had [in Virginia].

Then I studied Mau Mau. In the 1950s, Mau Mau were the "arch savages." *A Raisin in the Sun*, which I think is going to be playing in San Francisco—I've seen it in Africa. (It's really cool to see them trying to represent black Americans in Africa.) In *Raisin in the Sun*, Lorraine Hansberry has somebody who talks about Jomo Kenyatta. The male lead teases his sister about her affection for Africa, putting down this kind of Africanism. That's a piece of what's going on there. In the US in the 1950s we've got, "Who is this guy, "Burning Spear," Jomo Kenyatta; what is he about?" And in the newspapers, but also in the magazines and books, we've got a sense of a reversion-to-type of Africans: they had been moving up, and then they go back into this kind of savagery, which is the image of Mau Mau. So I wanted to go and study these guys. I wanted to understand a little bit more about what life was like for them, for the Kikuyu people who have become Mau Mau, and how they lived on a daily basis, and then, what did it mean for them to be in this colonial situation. That drew me.

Maybe it's because I discovered white people so late. I didn't tell you about that part, yet, where I was growing up. But there was something about how blacks and whites come together within that environment that seemed important to me. Okay, why do I say I "discovered white people so late"? I mentioned television. I watched soap operas. "Oh, that's the way white people live! Oh, how interesting! Oh!" I really [thought] that white people lived just like they did on soap operas. It took a while for me to get it that this is fiction (laughs), and a slice of life, if that. The black community that I grew up in is a pre-integration community. Almost everything is black. There are black doctors and black lawyers. There are

black stores. I actually didn't know any white people at all—at all. There is a soda fountain, a little drug store or something, not too far from my high school, and we would go there sometimes, and that was owned by whites. The people who collected rent where we lived—they were white. But I wasn't ever the person who would go and pay them money; it would be my sister or my brother.

So I didn't measure myself by white people. *Class* was really big for me, and there were definitely black people in higher classes than I was. Some of the teachers would live in Crestwood, my neighborhood, and some teachers were married to longshoremen, so we'd know some of them through my father's network. There are the teachers; there're the people who work in offices. I knew one kid whose father was a doctor. We knew of lawyers; I don't think I knew any. There are nurses. All these people were black, and these were people that, if you wanted to do something for the world, you could be like them. The assistant superintendent who came to our school was black. So I didn't have a sense that I'm thinking about myself in relationship to white people. When I went to college, that was when I began to discover this whole world of whiteness, and what whiteness means within the US.

When I think about this, I want to ask a question that I would assume that you would ask: "But what about growing up peeling the potatoes? That's really about whiteness, isn't it?" I was taught that there's a world *over there* that's about whiteness, that if I don't watch myself I could become a part of. I think that's what it is. That if I get pregnant too soon, if I drop out of school, if I'm not really

good at the stuff I'm doing—you can be integrated into that white world, at the bottom.

Rabkin: In a subordinate role.

Martin Shaw: Right, exactly. That was always there. That was always there. I'm helping my mother clean offices where white people work. If I don't do well in school, I will be at the bottom of some white heap. If I did well in school, I didn't think that I would be with white people.

Rabkin: Ah.

Martin Shaw: It wasn't, "Do well in school, you can go be with white people." It was, "Do well in school, and you'll be with these black people who are way above you in this little hierarchical ladder that you have here." I think that was it.

At college, then, I'm totally thrown in. The first time I went to this weekend visit at Michigan State—

Rabkin: This is before you were actually enrolled at Michigan State; you and your friend went to check out the campus?

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm. I was assigned a "big sister" who was going to look after me. I somehow got separated from her, and people started asking me what

she looked like. They asked me, "What is her eye color?" I *never* noticed anybody's eye color in my life. Almost everybody I know had the same eye color. (Actually, there was one girl who had gray eyes in my high school, and there may have been somebody with green eyes—but the gray eyes I do remember.) I couldn't tell them what her eye color was. It's, "Well, what color was her *hair*?" (laughs) "She's *white!*" (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: I could tell them what the shape of her face was; I could tell them what she looked like when she smiled. I could tell them a whole host of things, but I didn't even have the qualities, the characteristics they were looking for, to be able to identify people. This is how strange white people were to me. "People look at *eye color*!"

I still don't always look at eye color. I look at teeth, because I have a gap in my teeth. I was teased about it as a kid, when I was growing up. It's called a "liar's gap," and so I was said to be a liar. (laughs) My mother had a gap. (Actually, my father had a gap, but I never paid any attention to it.) I said to my mother, "If you knew you had a gap, why did you have children?" (laughs) I thought, oh, boy, I don't want to have a gap in my teeth! My brothers and sisters don't have gaps in their teeth. Actually, I'm the only one who ended up with the wonderful gap gene.

Many years later, when I went to West Africa—where the gap is a sign of beauty—I was in a hotel room by myself. My phone was ringing off the hook with men who had seen me go there, who wanted to marry me. (laughs) Yeah, right. Forget it. It didn't make me feel better about the gap. It was just more bad stuff about the gap. My mother got all her teeth pulled out by the time she was forty, and had no gap. She got false teeth that she really loved.

Rabkin: [She got her teeth pulled out] *because* of the gap, or because she had other things going on?

Martin Shaw: She had other things going on, but she did like not having a gap.

Rabkin: Carolyn, can I take you back—talking about this whole business of the world of whiteness and your relationship with it—take you back to deciding to change your accent at age nine, and what you feel that was about? Was there an element of that that was about sounding more white? Or was it just about sounding less Southern?

Martin Shaw: It wasn't about sounding more white. My brother and I used to listen on the telephone. We had a party line, and we'd listen to white people, and we'd crack up. They had the worst heavy Southern accents we had ever heard! I mean, we didn't talk that way. Black people didn't necessarily talk that way. We loved that party line. We just listened. And we'd see that sometimes on TV. I remember when we saw Elvis Presley for the first time, we were rolling on the

floor. We were actually on the floor, laughing at the way this guy sounded. A lot of white people really sounded bad (laughs) to me, with such a heavy drawl that it was really hard to understand. I just thought it was really funny. So I didn't try to talk like people on the television—although I'm sure television did influence me. Actually, finding out that black people could talk differently, when we went to New York, because we were staying with New York relatives—that seems to have been really important.

And you know what, I don't have an accent like anybody. So it's not as though I were trying to mimic somebody, but it's that I got this idea that if I talked differently, I could—what—get more of the things I wanted.

Rabkin: And that was, in fact, as it turned out, reflecting some kind of shared prejudice about the way people sound, because as soon as you trained yourself to speak differently, you were the one put forth to be the spokesperson. So you knew, on some level, that there was a preference for a less Southern-sounding voice.

Martin Shaw: Yeah. I think that's what it was. Now, when we think about how language and accents have changed, we talk a lot about television and radio as being a kind of modifier or a neutralizer somehow, in the US. And it is the case that I must have been influenced by those. But, see, the radio was black radio. We didn't listen to any white people, and if we did, the music they were playing, we would laugh at. But the radio was actually black people speaking in ways

that just—I didn't want to sound that way, particularly once I heard the way these other people talked. So I began to change.

There's another girlfriend of mine who also changed the way she talked, and I *don't like it*. She ended up being an elementary school teacher. But it is *so* hyper-correct and—*false*. I started this particular accent I have now really a long time ago. I've made it my own and it's softened. I have a little bit more Southern in it than I used to have. But, see, I get mad at people like Obama, when he says "*gonna*." Why is he saying "gonna"? He didn't grow up saying "gonna"! "I'm gonna do this," and, "we're *gonna* make this—" Where is this coming from?

So we can get to "Black Is, Black Ain't" from that. Marlon Riggs suggests to us that black is big, and varied. He starts this by looking at New Orleans. It's a really fascinating place to look. Because when we think about New Orleans we think about Creole, but New Orleans has all these different layers, some of it having to do with skin color. Some of it has to do with language, and all these other things. But what he wants us to get at is, there is not a single marker of blackness. We've got so much about marking blackness by a particular kind of way of being in the ghetto. It seems to me Obama is (laughs) doing a little bit of that, because he's got to be "*black*." I don't think I ever had any problems with presenting myself as black, but he *has* to present himself as black, so he starts letting some of his diction go. And maybe because they call him "the professor," maybe that also *softens* him, so that he can be like George Bush or somebody

[else] who has little control of the English language. (laughs) Maybe that's part of what's going on.

Rabkin: Because in this culture there is, attached to erudition, a stigma.

Martin Shaw: Exactly.

College and Graduate School at Michigan State University

Rabkin: Let's pick up now with more about college and Michigan State.

Martin Shaw: I went to Michigan State because of my geometry teacher. She felt that it was a good place to be. When I got to college, I was in an old dormitory. Michigan State is a land-grant institution. Sometime after 1865, it got started, and this is one of the older buildings, probably from 1928 or something like that. There were *no black people* in my dormitory. There were black people on campus; they happened not to be living in this little all-girls dormitory. There were some dormitories that were becoming co-ed. I think maybe there was a tower for women and a tower for men. They weren't living together as kids do now.

I loved being in college. You could just study all the time, and you could just stay in the library. I love libraries. You could stay in the library. I used to go to the library, go to sleep, and then wake up and stay for hours, reading and hanging out at the library. So that was great.

Rabkin: Did you have a job while you were in school?

Martin Shaw: I had a job starting—I'm trying to remember if it's my second year or my second term—but starting very early. I had a job throughout. That was key for my success in college because I had to take advantage of all my free time. I had to be organized. If there were only forty-five minutes, then you used the forty-five minutes. I think if I hadn't had the job, it would have been, oh, I'd better wait until I have three or four hours to do something. But I was really pretty organized there. I worked in the student union, in the cafeteria, and there was an old Jamaican man and a black American woman there who were my immediate supervisors, and they were great. I got to know them really well. And there was another woman in town, a black woman, who was my beautician. These were my "parents." And there was a black woman who worked in my dormitory. She saw me ironing once. I was ironing my shirt collar, and she goes, "You are really doing that wrong!" Of course I thought that I was ironing right! She came in and tried to show me. All these people tried to take care of me. That was great.

In the dorm, one of the most decisive moments was when I got an obscene phone call. It's interesting that I got an obscene phone call. I grew up in a Navy town, and now and then I would get random obscene phone calls. I just assumed it was all these Navy guys. I didn't think anybody was after me.

Rabkin: Were they calling for you, specifically?

Martin Shaw: Mm-mm. And for some reason, I think that maybe there had been some other phone calls like that in the dorm, because I had the impression that I should stay on the phone as long as I could. Either this, or maybe I got a phone call twice. Anyway, I stayed on the phone talking for a really long time, and then finally hung up and went down to tell the housemother that I'd gotten this phone call. I said it was a white man, and they said, "How do you know?" I said, "I know by the way he talked, it's a white man." This was the first time that all these people were able to say that race existed. They [had been] saying things to me like, "I'm going up to suntan. Would you like to suntan?" They were so afraid of mentioning anything about difference, about race, that I was beginning to feel invisible. So I had the housemother, maybe my roommate, and somebody else, maybe my RA from the floor, somebody actually sitting and talking about race for the first time. I felt, oh, well, now you can begin to see who I am! It did make a difference, because before then I felt: why are you trying to *ignore* differences? It doesn't make me feel good to ignore differences. It makes me feel as though you were seeing through me.

That made a really big difference. But there was another moment when I began to find out that people were *afraid* of me. Wow. I have to say that I had never had anybody afraid of me before. Even the little boys I was beating up—I don't think they were afraid of me, either. And so I just started using it: "Oh, you guys are afraid of me, so I can do whatever I want, and you won't make me follow the rules that are for everybody else." That's what I started doing! This was the 1960s, so you couldn't wear trousers in the dining hall. I wore my trousers in the

dining hall: see if you're going to call me on it. You can't get a second dessert? I get my second dessert. It's like, you people are afraid of me! It was amazing to me. It's like, I'm black, and therefore I'm dangerous. It was nothing of my earlier upbringing. I didn't even tell you I was homecoming queen *and* queen of the prom. *I* was not *dangerous*! (laughs) But here they were. That was great fun. I loved it. I don't think I've ever had that kind of power since then. But it was such a revelation to me, the kind of fear that the white people had.

I tried to mimic that fear once. I tried, in San Francisco years later, walking down the street clutching my purse every time I saw a white person. (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: And I just got tired. (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: It didn't work. But it was a kind of fear that I wasn't familiar with, that I didn't live with. I didn't grow up in a community that was endangered, or where people were doing drugs, or where they were shooting each other. So I didn't have this sense of black women being particularly tough and rough.

Well, I started off as a math major, and I placed high out of the introductory math classes. So I went into math classes that turned out to be above me—maybe

I would have been a math major; that would be another history that I could look at, another path not taken—if I hadn't placed out of some of the classes. I might have been able to build the skills up at the college level. But I didn't do well [in the more advanced classes. I thought, I don't know what you do with math. I can't figure out what math should be all about. That's when I started switching around to find other things to do.

We talked a little about my major. I had one woman teacher my entire college career—

Rabkin: Wow.

Martin Shaw: —and she taught German. I took German because I was a math major. If you're in math and sciences, then you have to know German. So I had two years of German.

Rabkin: Because so much scientific publication was happening in German?

Martin Shaw: Well, that's what they thought, and maybe it had been the case in the fifties, but I think there are a lot of Germans that write in English now in a lot of the sciences. But anyway, that was it: if you're in a science, you have to study German, so I did two years of German. That was my only woman teacher when I was in college.

I'm going to tell you about my *American Thought and Language* class. The first class [term], I was told that I couldn't write, that I didn't know how to write. I went to see my TA, and I said, "I was the editor of my school newspaper, and I was the editor of the school yearbook. I know how to write!" He looked at me very seriously and said, "Well, then you don't know how to *think*." I had gotten a D, I think, on some work that I had handed in. I'd been told he wasn't going to argue with me. If I thought that I knew how to write, he was going to let me say that I knew how to write, but then I'm not *getting* the stuff in the right way.

Rabkin: What was this class?

Martin Shaw: I think this was *American Thought and Language*. *American Thought and Language* was a required one-year class.

Rabkin: For first-year students?

Martin Shaw: For first-year students. You take *American Thought and Language* 1, 2, and 3, because of the quarter system. I think this is my first quarter. And I went to kill myself.

Rabkin: (gasps)

Martin Shaw: I went to the river. There's a river that runs through the campus; it's called the Red Cedar. You can get to it from behind the library. I thought that I would just jump into the river and die.

Rabkin: Whoa, Carolyn.

Martin Shaw: Yeah. Well, you can imagine, I never had a D on anything in my life. I know I've talked a lot here about being a former math major, but I used to write short stories when I was in elementary school and high school.

I was thinking about this during our break [during the oral history]: We cheated a lot in high school. Mostly, I was doing other people's work. I would read a passage from, usually, the encyclopedia, and write something for somebody's work. I ended up hating all of the cheating that we were doing, so much that I decided to take biology away from my high school, and I went to one of the historically black colleges, Norfolk State College, to take biology in a special summer program, which was really great. I loved it and learned a lot. I was getting tired of the whole cheating thing. Once when I was in my French class in high school, (laughs) my teacher threw my exam in the wastebasket because she found me cheating. (I was writing the answers on somebody else's paper.) It did get to be pretty bad. At some of my high school reunions they actually talk about how much cheating we were doing back in those days. I don't even remember if I asked anybody for help, but I bet you I did, because I'm sure there must have been something at some point that I looked at and I went, "Oh gosh, what is this,

I don't remember this." I probably asked somebody for help. But it felt to me like I was doing everybody else's work. I didn't like the environment.

(I don't know how I got to talking about the cheating, because I was back at Michigan State.)

So at Michigan State, I got the D. I thought, I cannot go on. I am a failure. Failure, I think, is the biggest problem for me, because I was always thought to be The One, the success, the golden girl, the one who's going to bring honor to our family, to our community, to our whatever. Here I am, my first term, and I'm getting a D—and not only do I get a D, but somebody tells me I can't write and I can't read. "You have problems thinking; you can't put stuff together."

I don't know exactly what convinced me not to jump into the river. I probably just got scared (laughs) and went back to my dormitory. At that point, then, I wanted to be everything that Michigan State wanted me to be. I could say that I lost myself in this. I took writing classes; I wrote like Hemingway. I tried to find other people who I could write like, rather than trying to figure out what it was that I had to say and how I could say it. I didn't have that sense that I could pull something out of myself that was going to be okay.

Rabkin: And you didn't have a teacher who encouraged you to do that?

Martin Shaw: Oh, heavens, no. Michigan State is [even] bigger now, but it was about 20,000 when I was there, and it's probably 45,000 now. I didn't have any small classes except for the language classes. And I didn't have any confidence. I just started to work really hard.

I have another work-really-hard story: We were talking about elementary school. My family moved from the city into this little suburban area when I was about five years old. When I was in the city, I had had one half a year of kindergarten, because back in those days you could start school in January; my birthday is December. So when I got to elementary school in the suburban area (I usually call it "peri-urban," but anyway, in the suburban area) (laughs), they didn't know where to put me. I had already had some kindergarten. Maybe I'd already had a half-year of first grade. They put me in second grade and I was totally lost. For years and years, I said, "I never worked as hard as I did in second grade." (laughs) I thought, what are you expecting? What am I doing?! So I worked really, really hard. I was so lost in second grade. And then I did well.

So I was back in second grade, with this D in writing in my first term at college. I started looking around to see, what are the models? What am I supposed to write like? From that point, I studied *really hard*. I improved my grades in that class. I probably ended up with a B. But I didn't have the confidence that I had had up until that moment, and was always searching, trying to pull from here [and there], feeling: what is it that I'm supposed to be doing?

At one point, when I was doing all of this, I began to get interested in social science. Social science, I have to say, does not present the best models for writing. I'll just leave it at that. (laughs) So I was writing in a very kind of [dry] manner: "These are the results, here are the facts, this is this—" I don't know if I began to be unhappy with that, or if I just felt I had pulled all this stuff from other people and couldn't figure out what I wanted.

Then I started taking writing classes. And then in the writing classes, I was able to break out, a little bit, of the stuff that I had laid out myself because I felt inadequate. All the, "You have to sound like all the social scientists whose work you have read."

So that's my first year: Problems with math, which I'd loved from being a child; problems with writing, which I felt was one of my strong suits, and finally getting people to recognize me in the dormitory. It was a pretty rough first year.

Rabkin: Yeah. In retrospect, do you have a sense of what that professor was responding to, or seeing, who gave you the D and said he didn't think you could write or read or whatever it was?

Martin Shaw: No. I really don't know exactly, and I would have to go back to it. But I'm going to skip ahead to talk about the next term, when I won the [award for] "Best Naïve Essay." This is another *American Thought and Language* class. [I went from] "you can't write," to "Best Naïve Essay" in the class. I think that

"naïve" has to do with not paying attention to symbols. I think that may have been part of what the first teacher was looking at. I'm not asking, what does the light in *Great Gatsby mean*? I'm telling you something about, maybe the effect of the light as I read it. (Of course, my award is for *Huckleberry Finn*, and I can't even remember what I was talking about in *Huckleberry Finn*, but the light in *Great Gatsby* is a great one, because there's so much that people put on what is the meaning of that.) And I think I didn't have that kind of analysis.

So I think that was one piece of it. That's where he says, well, if you think you're writing grammar correctly, then you're not saying anything of *interest*. That's what I think he was saying to me. That's why he wasn't going to battle me about, "Can you write." He was basically saying, "You're not saying anything of interest." When I won this award the next term, it was more that I'd figured out something to say of interest, without knowing anything about what anybody else had ever said about *Huckleberry Finn,* or that *Huckleberry Finn* is supposed to mean something else, or the nature of allegory in it. I'm reading this thing and I'm allowing myself to give to you what I think about it.

Rabkin: So it's an original response. You're not synthesizing other literary critics.

Martin Shaw: Yep. Two things: It was was not synthesizing, but it was also not using the tropes that people learn to use when you're looking at literature. I didn't know those tropes. I didn't have them. We read stuff in high school; we talked about it; I did well—but I just didn't have all these other ways of

analyzing. Literature wasn't my area. I didn't go into it. I just thought I loved to write.

So that's what happened with that one. I did get through that first time in which I thought, there's no reason to live if you're going to go away from home and get D's, and not do well in your major either. I mean, so there's arts and there's letters, and (laughs) I wasn't doing well in science, arts or letters, so what can I do?

The next term, I still was trying to figure out: what does it mean to be an academic? What does it mean to be in this place? I'm totally torn down. How is it that I can make something of this? That I was able to write that essay and be recognized for it was really important. "*Naïve*" essay? At the moment I didn't even care [about] what does "naïve" mean. I had now been recognized. I can actually write, read and think. That did make a big difference.

Unfortunately, I've forgotten all the names of my teachers except the anthropology ones. That teacher [who chose my essay for the award] was really quite encouraging of me to keep writing. But then he also started these conversations about—either he's dreaming that he's having sex with me, or he's dreaming about a relationship between the two of us. He would sort of tell me these things. He never touched me, but I had to hold on to [the knowledge] that he didn't know who I was when he recognized my writing. Maybe he liked gap teeth—who knows? But once I started talking to him, then it got really murky,

and it got disturbing, and I did not continue a relationship with him after this course was over. That was hard.

Rabkin: Did that innuendo in his interactions with you undermine, for you, the value of the award—make you question his motives in giving it to you?

Martin Shaw: I don't think so. It then became more about how I present myself (to me): am I doing something that makes it seem as though I am interested in him? That I am less a brain and more a body? The brain-body thing was really big for me. Once when I was in high school, I had my picture on the front page of the *Journal and Guide*, the black newspaper. They said, "*Brains AND Beauty!"* What? Please leave me alone! (laughs) That was in relationship to winning all those scholarships. I had my cat-eye glasses on. (laughs) Usually you don't call people wearing glasses beauties. I wasn't sure what was going on with that, but I know that he did not know who I was when he read the essay.

Rabkin: I see.

Martin Shaw: It was a really big class. I sometimes say it was 1500, but I think it was probably around 500. It was one of the biggest classes there. So he didn't know me. But the whole question about how you present yourself then became really significant. I started wearing nothing but baggy clothes after this. I was wanting to make sure that it wasn't about my body that made people interested or attracted to me. For the rest of my career I went through wearing baggy

clothes. My first husband[1] told me about that. He mentioned it. I met him in class also, in my junior year, and he said something [like] "Oh, yeah, you just wore sweatshirts and sweatpants all the time, and *one wondered*!" (laughs) It's like, okay, [sardonic tone of voice] so you were wondering. (laughs)

That was the first year. By the end of that first year I had taken my first physical anthropology class and gotten interested in anthropology. Another thing that moved me in the direction of anthropology was another required class. It was called *Humanities*. *Humanities* is Western Civ. (Oh, isn't that interesting?) (laughs) I'm taking *History of Western Civilization*, and there are no black people in *History of Western Civilization*. This must be 1963. I graduated high school in '62; '62 to '63 is my first year, and '63-'64 is *Western Civ*. It's a sophomore required class, also three quarters—1, 2, and 3. Not only are there no black people in *Western Civ*.; *Western Civ*. is talking about things that I find far beyond me—mostly about art. We learned about the evolution of art. I actually wrote about this when I was a sophomore in college. I still have this essay that I wrote to myself, and I've gone back to it several times and updated it. The last time, I think, was probably twenty-some years ago, after I'd gotten tenure; I went back to it to look to see—Maybe I should look at it now that I'm retired. We learned about the evolution of perspective. We got these flat images, and then we have this perception of depth, and I'm looking at it and going, "I can't draw that way. I can't draw that way! Am I out of 'civilization'"? (laughs) And what about all those other people that

[1] Martin Shaw's first husband passed away as she was editing this oral history. See: http://www.legacy.com/obituaries/trentonian/obituary.aspx?pid=172520296

we know about who don't draw in that way? How do they fit into this "civilization" that we're talking about?

So I ended up spending time thinking this one through, trying to understand how there's this big "civilization" thing, and then there are these people who are part of this "civilization" who don't share in all this big stuff. I thought I was talking about "subculture"; I think that was the term I came up with. Maybe there's a black subculture. How does this black subculture fit into this larger ["civilization"]? That question also pushed me into anthropology. You can look at it in my book, with "interculturality" and "nesting." I didn't get very far. This is why I go back to what I wrote when I was a sophomore in college and say, "To what extent are you looking at some of those same questions?"

So it is, "How do these different groups fit into the larger whole? Do they share something with them, and then have modifications? Do they kind of grow from the same base, but use a different kind of fertilizer to make it go in some other ways?" I wasn't sure of either the metaphors I used to talk about it or what it meant, but I really understood that there's something about what it means to be black in the US that I needed to understand in relationship to what I was learning in *Western Civ*. And, personally, what it means to say that you are part of Western civilization, and not be able to do or access those things are supposed to be Western civilization.

So, starting with physical anthropology, and then with this humanities course, which just was fascinating—I loved studying *Western civ*., but it raised all these questions for me. I decided that I needed to go ahead and try to understand something about culture and how it develops, how it changes over time, how it relates to different kinds of environments. By the time I was in my sophomore year, I think I probably had declared my anthropology major and was ready to continue on into anthropology.

Rabkin: Wonderful. I'm going to stop there for now.

Rabkin: This is Sarah Rabkin, and today is Tuesday, May 13th, [2014], and Carolyn Martin Shaw and I are again at McHenry Library at UCSC. This is our second oral history interview. And, Carolyn, when we wrapped up last time, you had talked about your undergraduate experience at Michigan State. Mostly we talked about your first year, about your *American Thought and Language* class and *Western Civ*., and how you got into cultural anthropology. But I'm wondering if there's anything else you'd like to touch on about your undergraduate years, from the last interview, before we move on.

Martin Shaw: I think I might have mentioned that I wrote a short story about that first year. And I told you about that D that I got on that paper in my, I call it [in the story] "English class." I believe this memory. It was 1974 that I wrote that version. It says that I got the D. I went down by the river, and I cried. It doesn't say I tried to jump in. And then I went to see the TA. So going down to the river,

sort of thinking, this is the end; I can't go any further than this," I somehow got the courage to go and talk to somebody about the grade. I didn't get the grade and [immediately] go and talk. I think that would have been scary for me. But what I had in the story is that [the teacher] did say, "Well, if you can write, then you can't read." I wasn't exactly sure, but I'm trusting 1974; it's much closer to the experience than I am now.

Rabkin: So what you've given me is a short story—but it sounds like it's based on the facts of that experience.

Martin Shaw: That's right. It's pretty much based on the facts of the experience. The story is [about] a lost friendship. There's another black girl who comes to the campus, and I don't make friends with her. I don't know whether that part is true. What I do know is that I didn't find myself in a position to help others during that first year. I was trying to buck myself up and keep going in the ways that I had been. I think that's a part of the sense that I had—people have high expectations of me; I have much that I have to give back.

It felt really awkward talking so much about myself, particularly talking about myself in positive ways, like we did [in our last oral history session]. I was trying to think about why. And there's a poem by Nikki Giovanni that's called "Nikki-Rosa," and what I remembered from this poem is—I'll read the first four or five lines. It says "childhood memories are always a drag/if you're Black/you always remember things like living in Woodlawn/with no inside toilet/and if you

become famous or something/they never talk about how happy you were to have your mother/all to yourself." She goes on to say, "and I really hope no white person ever has cause/to write about me/because they never understand/Black love is Black wealth and they'll/probably talk about my hard childhood/and never understand that /all the while I was quite happy." I wanted to read that.

Rabkin: Thank you.

Martin Shaw: I don't think that "all the while I was quite happy." But I do think it's important to talk about the feeling of love, support, and being treasured that I had during that time. That's more what I wanted to get across last time, rather than various accomplishments. That feeling of being loved, supported and treasured is a good feeling—and it has burdens. The burdens were what I was feeling when I was in my first year at MSU, trying to be this bright and happy person that I was supposed to be, and just not being able to cope because of everything that was put before me, from the stuff they felt I wasn't good at, to all the social relations that were so overwhelming to me that I couldn't manage.

Anyway, that's what I wanted to go back to, and put that one in—this line, "and I really hope no white person ever has cause/to write about me" was going through my mind a lot—thinking, "what is the story that I'm trying to tell?" The story is not a story of victimization, and it's not a story of triumph, but a story of support—which I don't think we get very often.

I've spent a lot of time thinking about my first year, and even writing about my first year, at university. Getting through that year made the big difference. After that, I continued to take these writing classes, because I wasn't sure of what the right way of writing was. (There had to be a right way, and I just hadn't found it, right?)

But I really got excited by the things that I was learning in anthropology. I met my first husband in an anthropology class. He had just come back from the Peace Corps. He was in the second group of Peace Corps volunteers in Nigeria. We were in a class on Africa. The teacher of that class became my advisor. He was really a tough grader. I remember once I was in a seminar with him. When he asked a question, there is a particular answer he was looking for. If you don't get that answer, you're wrong. Everybody was trying, and I tried, and he said, "Even the smart ones are dumb." This is my advisor! (laughs)

At one point in my graduate career (he continued to be my advisor in graduate school), I wanted to go to somebody else. This person I want to talk about just briefly. Ralph Nicholas had been a teacher in social organization and kinship. That was my major area as a graduate student in anthropology, and I took a graduate course [with him]. I was the only undergraduate in the graduate course, and not only did he recommend that I go [on] to graduate school there, but he started my application, and started my application for a grant so that I could go to graduate school. So by the end of this one course, I had this professor

coming to me saying, "You should go to graduate school, and here's money to do it." Yeah. I'm blessed in some ways. That was pretty amazing.

He was open. I loved thinking with him. I went to my department as a graduate student and asked to change from my advisor who had said, "Even the smart ones are dumb" to this man. And they said no. So I stayed with my advisor all the time there. My advisor during the time I was in graduate school had one grad student—that was me. Since then I think he's had two. He went to the University of California at San Diego. I just recently talked to somebody at San Diego about him, and they said he's disappeared; he's hardly ever worked with anybody. He's a really, really hard person to work with.

Fieldwork, Dissertation, and Being Hired at UCSC

I'm skipping ahead a little bit, but when I wrote my dissertation, I wrote it on kinship. I had been really excited by some new ideas coming out that took kinship away from biological reproduction and genealogy into mental constructs by which people talk about their relationships with one another. It's not so different from what some of the older anthropologists were doing when they said that if you come to a village and they tell you, "We're all descendants of this one man," if you look at who's there, you will find sisters' husbands who are not descendants of the one man; you'll find people who are related on the mother's side. But there's something about a kind of ideological construct that they make about themselves that allows them to think about themselves as being a member of a kin group.

I was looking for, from the Kikuyu, what *is* that construct that they use? It all had to do with various ways in which you show loyalty and support each other, sometimes materially. So I wrote a dissertation on that subject. It was influenced by David Schneider, who was very much thinking along those lines. David Schneider came later to UCSC and he was a member of the anthropology department. I was totally tongue-tied when I went to talk to him. He had an office over at Cowell. I just stood out in the hallway trying to figure out, how can I say what I want to say to this guy? Because it was so amazing that I would actually get to know him.

I was writing my dissertation while I was here [at UCSC]. I don't know if they still do it any more; I was one of the few people hired as an "acting assistant professor," because I had not finished my dissertation. I'll tell you a little bit more about that, and then I'll backtrack a bit. So I wrote the dissertation. I sent in—and it was rejected by my advisor. He did not allow anybody else to read it. He just said, "Your definition of kinship is wrong. It's wrong. That's not what kinship is about."

Now, I'm not proud of myself at this point, because what I did was I got really depressed, and I actually did almost nothing for—my daughter was born by this time—I did almost nothing for something like six weeks. I think I'd got that message in January. And after six weeks, I wrote another dissertation, based on

his [my advisor's] ideas. I wrote that in about three months and in June I was done.

At that point in my career, I had not finished my PhD in two years of working here, and I was demoted at UCSC to lecturer. (laughs) I started off as acting assistant professor, on the tenure track, and I didn't finish my dissertation in two years—and that's what they gave me, two years. Then I had this one year as a lecturer, which I usually put in my bio-bib: lecturer for one year. And then I went to assistant professor, because now I had finished the dissertation.

So why *was* I here without my PhD? What was going on with that? My first husband was a professor at Stanford. When I was in the field, he went to Kenya with me, and he was with me for six months. I think he had spring term and summer term. Then he went back to work and I stayed in Kenya. Then Stanford University brought me back for a job interview in the fall. I had been in the field less than a year. I came back for the job interview. I [also] went down to San Diego for a job interview, where I heard the most racist comments I'd ever heard—not about me, but about one of their other colleagues. They just, in front of me, talked about why she shouldn't have been hired, problems with black intellectuals, I mean, whatever was on their minds. I did an absolutely terrible job interview at San Diego. My job interview at Stanford was *okay*.

But some UC Santa Cruz people had come up to the Stanford job talk, and they invited me down to meet people, to see if they wanted to hire me. I always say I

got hired at the place that I never did a job talk, and the truth is, I never went on the job market after that. That is it. This is my first job; this is my only job (laughs): UCSC. Who I am as a professor was all shaped by the UCSC experience.

So I went back to the field. I think maybe I was home for six weeks, but it may have been a month, or less. I came home; I did these job interviews. I went back into the field to finish up. I think my then-husband was just dumbstruck. He never really believed that I would go back. I'd been in the field maybe six months, eight months, and I had expected to be there for a year; I'd gotten money so I could be there for a year. I wanted to go back and finish up.

That was a really tense moment, with him not wanting me to leave—and, when he was there, not being really supportive. A lot of my early fieldwork is about how to manage this person that I had brought along with me. But here's the best thing about this person that I brought along with me: When I was writing grants to get money to go into the field, I wrote grants to support him, and I said he was going to be my typist. He's a really excellent typist (laughs); he was much better than I was. But he didn't do any of this work, of course. He just lay around. By this time he was very into drug culture, and he just lay around and said things such as, "You should be reading Carlos Castaneda. Now, this is the person who really understands how society works and what's going on in people's minds." It was a lot of hassle trying to deal with him, and trying to keep my own goals in mind. Where I was working, looking at the Kikuyu, who had been these vicious

Mau Mau, trying to understand something about their social lives, I found it really hard, sometimes, to get people to talk about what Mau Mau was. I found it really hard to get them to talk about their kinship expectations. And I found it hard to *observe* these things. I felt I had a really difficult task, just with the things that were most important to me, instead of trying to consider the things that were important to him. It was hard.

We ended up living with a family. That family had two different dwellings, and we lived in the one that was outside of town, but that allowed us to move with them when they went to a more rural setting, and then to study the rural village as well as have some sense about what was going on in town. It was there that I began to understand how gender plays a big role in the social lives of men and women. I think that's a strange thing to say. It's not as though I hadn't thought about gender, or I hadn't thought about: why am I doing this; my brother's not doing this? But there was a daughter and a daughter-in-law in that family who just didn't do what they were supposed to do. And if I looked at the anthropological data that I had, it was that if they had done what they were supposed to do, they would have been definitely in subordinate roles, and never being able to express their will. So, finally I had to understand something about the politics of resistance: the way in which even the subaltern, these people at the bottom, can make a difference in their own lives. I have to say, in the beginning, I just thought, you guys are messing up my data! (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: I don't want all this stuff! I want it neat. I want it clean! Why are you doing this stuff?! Why are you calling in your mother's brother to say, "Oh, if you do this—

So, letting go all of my research design and trying to understand actually what was going on with the women in the family, actually was probably the biggest change in my life. Before then, I didn't particularly want to study women, because that's what Margaret Mead did, and people just laughed at Margaret Mead. Margaret Mead—she wrote for *Redbook* Magazine—she goes around talking about women and other "unimportant" things. I wanted to be taken seriously. Kinship was the most technical of the subdisciplines within social anthropology. I think that probably did attract me. I didn't want people to say, "Oh, she's one of those people who studies women."

But in this field situation, it was impossible to do what I wanted to do without studying women. From that point on, I've studied women. I can't even imagine, now, trying to talk about the ways and lives of people without having a focus on women—although all the anthropologists say (and I agree with this) that if you want to understand the position of women in society, you should look at various hierarchies in society. So I definitely have to look at other kinds of hierarchies to get at women. But still, I maintain this particular interest in women. That came from that first fieldwork experience.

I left my fieldwork for the job at UCSC. I mean, that was it. I came home. I had a bunch of field notes, nothing that looked like a dissertation. I had to give a talk before I left Kenya. I loved this little talk. I never published it, but I gave it to Jerry Neu when he was looking at insults. I looked at court cases over a ten-year period. I did a structured sample of 100 court cases, and I tried to figure out what the main thing is that people took to court—and it was insults, primarily. Verbal abuse, they called it. And what is the main thing that's said? The main thing that's said is, "Your mother didn't have a clitoridectomy." It's like, "She's a dog." I mean it's pretty awful. You can fight over that one. And probably the next one is something like "motherfucker." But both of those things were really important for shaping who you're going to stand with and who you're going to stand against.

That's what I gave my talk about at Stanford and that was as much as I had written by the time I came to UCSC. I got pregnant that first year; my daughter was born the second year. When I was writing the dissertation the third year, she was sitting on my books. (laughs) If I'd get up early to try to write something, she'd come and sit there and be really distracting. But I did that, trying to work through these new ideas from David Schneider. And then, as I said, it was totally rejected, just totally rejected.

The reason I hesitate to talk about that story—I don't know if I've told people that story. I just wonder what it would have been like (all these alternative lives of myself)—what it would have been like if I had said, "No. I really believe this,

and I can't write anything else." I don't know. I could have probably tried to go to another school; maybe MSU would have given me another advisor. But I felt, oh, this is my life; this is my daughter; this is what I'm going to do. (I did have that husband there, but I don't know that I thought, this is my husband.) I've got responsibilities, and if getting this dissertation written is part of how I meet my responsibilities, then I'm going to write a dissertation that can be accepted, so I can go on. And I can write other things, if I like, but this won't be the only thing.

Rabkin: So you saw it as a matter of practical expediency.

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm. But every now and then—I think I told this story once to a graduate class—I don't remember whose, maybe Susan Harding's or Loki Pandey's. And I could see the graduate students' faces sort of fall when I said, "And then I rewrote it using his ideas." It's like, "Oh, well, don't you have any integrity?" They didn't say anything. But that's what I'm thinking. And I thought—oh, I don't know if it goes back to math or not, but social systems are a puzzle. They fit together; some things don't quite fit, like the material I'm talking about with these women. Sometimes it seems like a functioning machine and sometimes it seems like a kind of blobby, organic thing. And I think there are many different ways of looking at them. When I chose the "okay, I'll do it the way you want" method, I certainly showed some of the problems with doing it that way. That is the dissertation showed the limitations of thinking of kinship systems as only biologically based.

Rabkin: Mm-hmm.

Martin Shaw: *And*—okay, now, this jumps far ahead—I later came to have really serious problems with the David Schneider method that I used, and felt that it was probably, I was going to say, too mechanical: a theoretical imposition that didn't also speak to the life on the ground. So it's probably two things that are going on with this kind of mother-child (this is what my advisor thinks—this is the core of kinship: mother-child): this kind of mother-child bond that [anthropologists] look at a lot, and these other ways that people look at themselves. It's probably some mixture of those two. I actually ended up just going from one extreme to the other, but with the dissertation I did write trying to keep in some critiques.

So: coming to [talk about] UCSC. I hope I'm ready to be at UCSC now. I'm thinking that this is a good time to come to UCSC.

Research and Teaching Jobs Before UCSC

Rabkin: Do you want to first talk at all about the brief teaching and research appointments you had in between?

Martin Shaw: Oh, yes! I graduated from Michigan State and stayed there to go to graduate school. My ex-husband was a graduate student in communications—and he was a graduate student when I met him. I finished my graduate [course]work in two years. That was all you needed to do. I had been there [at

MSU] before; we had a first-year exam, and then after the first-year exam the next exam was the qualifying exam. I studied for the qualifying exam after I'd left Michigan State, and went back to take that exam. I did two years of coursework, and then the next year I studied for my exam and I took that exam. It was not so bad; it was three years in all.

I have to say, I loved my qualifying exam. I told all my professors, "These are the questions I've been wanting to be asked!" I just was so happy. I got tense when I was studying, and I had to go to a doctor and get some muscle relaxants (laughs). But when I got to the exam, at that point, the critical questions about kinship, they posed to me. I was really excited. I passed the exam with distinction, which is really nice. And they had something which our graduate students would just laugh at, but it's called "Anthropology from A to Z." They'd throw out twenty-six terms, and you'd have to write what these terms are. "Nahuatl" was the one I missed. I thought it was a pottery form from Jordan or something. It's a language. (laughs) But anyway, I loved it. I thought it was great.

That year, when I was studying for the exams, my then-husband was a post-doc at the Annenberg School, and I applied for jobs working at the Annenberg School in TV violence, children's violence. They were trying to look at the effect of TV violence on children. I also worked as a library assistant at the University of Pennsylvania (this is where we were), and I took classes. The classes were great. They're on a semester system—I think it's sixteen weeks. Michigan State is on a ten-week quarter system. I finished my work in ten weeks. (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs) You were so trained into the quarter system.

Martin Shaw: I couldn't figure out what to do! Maybe if I'd started off with a semester system, I could have stretched out my research or something. But anyway, it was great. I took this class with one of the leading scholars in kinship and social organization, [William H.] Davenport[2], and he ended up coming to UCSC. And I think it's when I was there [at Penn], that he was talking about UCSC, because by the time I got here he was already a faculty member at UCSC. I'm sure his knowing me from that class I took from him helped me to get my job here at UCSC. I think it was he who mentioned this great place, UCSC, at Santa Cruz, where "students and faculty lived together in the redwoods." I don't remember *why* that was fascinating to me. But it's students *and* faculty, living *together*, in the *redwoods*—I mean, it's that whole thing; I had this image of, I don't know, of people living in treehouses or something. (laughs) I was fascinated by it.

My husband then left the University of Pennsylvania for a tenure-track job at Stanford. I went from working at the Annenberg School on TV violence to working at Stanford on TV violence. Both of them were really interesting. First of all, I was dealing with little kids. (I had one program where I did deal with high-school kids.) I was dealing with little kids, and looking at cartoons. There's *so much violence* in cartoons! Maybe it's changed from thirty years ago or forty years

[2] http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/v50/n28/deaths.html

ago—maybe it's forty-five years ago when I was doing this. But there was so much violence.

The first thing that we had to do was to look at the violence on the cartoons, and to see how many incidents there were per second. Then the next thing was trying to figure out, to what extent is violence in these cartoons punished? What we found out was that for kids looking at violence in cartoons, if there's no punishment directly after the violence occurs, they don't make the connection that this punishment is related to that action. When kids are looking at violence, it's just total violence with no consequences to it. So that's the first thing. I got that at the University of Pennsylvania study.

When I came to Stanford, I was working with Aimée [Dorr] Leifer—who's now our vice-provost, I guess, [provost and executive vice-president] for the UC system—in a program at the Bing School. It's a nursery school. What we were trying to do then was to understand how kids actually respond when violence occurs within their context. (We weren't *creating* violence there.) (laughs) We created a little questionnaire that kids could understand, and then asked something like, "If this happens, what would you do?" There were [choices] like, "Leave the field" (like, go someplace else); "Tell a teacher"; "Confront the person"; "Cry." I can't remember all the outcomes of that particular study. I think that what we found out is that a number of kids do try to tell the teacher; some leave the field. But I don't know if there was anything associated with: kids of this type do this or kids of that type do that.

The next thing that we looked at in the Stanford study was *Rebel Without a Cause*. I don't even know what people would think about that movie nowadays. But we looked at that movie to try to understand something about the way kids see motivation for violence. That was done with teenagers, I think. I don't remember the particular outcome. But both the Annenberg experience and the Stanford experience helped me to think about how to pose laboratory experiments, whereas I come from a field [background]—more natural history: you look, and you see. It did help me to start thinking about variables. Anthropologists may not necessarily be taught to think about variables. We're more like natural historians.

While I was staying at Stanford, I got a job teaching at College of San Mateo. I think I tried to get jobs as a TA at Stanford. I don't remember what happened. I don't remember if I didn't like the jobs, or I didn't get them, or whatever. But this idea of having your own class, I think, was pretty good. Now here's the thing: I was living in Menlo Park. College of San Mateo—I don't know how far away it is, but let's say it's twenty miles at least. I didn't drive. Here I am in California, not driving. I finally did take driving lessons. Actually I had my license, but I was totally frightened of driving. I did take driving lessons, and I started to drive. But during the time that I'd gotten the first job, I had to get rides with other faculty members.

The job was ninety dollars an hour.

Rabkin: And that's just for the classroom time.

Martin Shaw: That's all the money you get; that's right, the classroom time. I think my class may have been an hour and a half, so maybe I made 135 dollars, and I did that four times a week. The first time I asked somebody to drive me, she looked at me like, "Oooh, you don't know how to hold a fork?!" I mean, she just didn't understand (laughs) what it means to not drive! I'll tell you this part and then I'll talk a little bit about what happened in the classroom. Eventually, I asked a student in the classroom to give me a ride. And this student was a policeman. He gave me a ride, but I was really resentful, because I had built up animosity toward policemen for killing my brother. I noticed that when I was on the highway, I would look at police cars and wonder if it was my student in there. And I didn't want it. It just felt like I was protecting my brother, and my brother's experience, by not looking positively—not thinking that there could be a policeman who's my student, and that's a good thing. And I had had this experience in college as well, because one of the girls in my dormitory—her father was a policeman. She was a perfectly fine person. I just felt I would be disloyal to my brother, who was killed by a policeman, to be able to think positively about them. Over the years I've changed, and I have begun to see policeman as people. But anyway, at that point I just felt caught in a bind.

I felt caught in a bind in the class as well. The class was on a subject that was not my area of expertise—although it is what interested me in anthropology in the

first place: physical anthropology and human evolution. But my very first class, a student came up to me after class, a young white woman, and she said, "I can't learn from you. I can only learn from men." It probably meant older men, as well. I was devastated. I just couldn't figure out how to address this problem. Think about it as a problem that's being presented to you: you have a student in your class who says, "I can't learn from you. You are not a white man." (This is the way I looked at it.) What do you do? I remember I was living in University Terrace, not far from here, and there was a little playground with a swing. I went and sat on the swing and went back and forth and back and forth: How do I solve this? What can I do? What can I deal with? How can I do it? Finally I just said [to myself], you're just going to have to go in there and give the best that you can. You can't let this stop you. And that student really did drop the class.

But the next thing that happened to me was, once I was in the class—and maybe it even happened even before this student came up—I kept on seeing a sea of white faces. I kept on thinking, "These people are not like me." And maybe that student helped me to also think that these people are not like me. How in the world am I going to be able to reach them? How can I talk to them? What can they say?

Here's something—I have to tell you this. This is so funny. It breaks the mood of what I'm just saying, but— After I was teaching at UCSC for a while, I taught a class with somebody we brought in, because we were trying to develop [the]

Ethnic Experience [course] at Kresge.[3] A student came up to me after class, a white woman, and she said, "I find this class fascinating. I just love it." And I said something to her, maybe asking her something about it, and she said, "Well, I don't know, I'm just fascinated by the gap in your teeth. I just look at it the whole time." (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: She "*loved*" the class! But she just focused in on my face, and didn't even know what was going on in class. Okay, that's fine. That's funny. But that's a difference, right? I realized, maybe by the time I graduated from college, that white people probably have gaps in their teeth, but they also have money, and they have orthodontists, and they don't *see* gaps in teeth as often. So part of what was going for me at College of San Mateo was, how can I now bridge this gap? I knew that I couldn't just go in and hate my students. What am I doing there, if all I'm going to do is feel: Who *are* you? You have privilege. I don't have it. I can't hate the students. I had to actually consciously work toward making myself see these folks as individuals. And to a certain extent that's why I was so angry at myself about the policeman. I'm working to see you as an individual, and you're working to change my world. And as I see you as an individual, I've got to change all kinds of prejudices I come to this situation with. I think without that job at College of San Mateo, I wouldn't have been ready for UCSC.

---

[3] According to the UCSC Schedule of Classes, *The Ethnic Experience: From Colonization to Liberation* was first taught in fall of 1975. Carolyn Clark [later Martin Shaw], Mario Luis Davila. and Carol Proudfoot are listed as faculty. The following year (fall 1976) the course was taught by Gini Matute Bianchi, Mario Luis Davila, and Byron Wheeler. A syllabus for the course is available in the UCSC Library's Special Collections department—Editor.

Kresge College

I come to UCSC surrounded by whiteness. I don't know, when they said "students and faculty living together in the redwoods," if I thought they were black and white students or not. (laughs) But anyway, coming here, I had to reach out and see the humanity in those folks. That's what I did when I started working with Nancy Stoller (Shaw) and doing unlearning-racism workshops. We mostly worked with feminists in unlearning racism, and those people were really motivated to unlearn racism, and to see the ways in which there's white privilege within their lives. But the goal in unlearning racism is for the racist and the victim of racism to both see themselves as human—to be able to find some core. And what I had to struggle with in that first class at San Mateo made it a lot easier to come here. I actually don't remember ever thinking, at UCSC, about the fact that—I can't say not ever—but not having the fact that I'm working primarily with privileged white students be a big piece of the way I think about things.

Kresge had a reputation—now I'm skipping—Kresge had a reputation for, what did they call them: trust-fund kids, but it was something like "hippie trust-fund kids," right?

Rabkin: What they now call "trustafarians"?

Martin Shaw: Yeah, "trustafarians," that's right. Somebody would say to me, "You see that girl over there in those moccasins and the holey jeans? Those are really rubies she has in her earrings." Right? (laughs) The very first time we tried to do something at Kresge for a fundraiser—and I can't remember, I think it might have been a fundraiser to do something for ethnic students, the students said, well, let's have a tennis tournament, and invite these people from Monterey. So I'm kind of, oh, yeah, this is different. This is really a world that I'm not familiar with. But without having gone through that experience at San Mateo, I don't think I would have been open enough to say, well, let me see what this world is like. "I've got to work with you. I've entered into a contract, and you've done so with me, and we've got to figure out a way to talk to each other." I worked through a lot at that particular college.

Rabkin: I'm wondering if you remember how the politics of the culture at the time interacted with your personal experience. Because that was the civil rights movement evolving into the black power movement, and there was a lot of public discourse about those things.

Martin Shaw: Right. It's interesting. I'm not sure of that. But in this short story that I gave you, that's based on my first-year experience in college, I talked about "sitting down with the devil" and "talking to the devil." And I don't even see that as my language. I don't know how I got there. But, of course, my first husband became a Black Muslim. I did happen not to mention that. (laughs) When I went back to Kenya, I [then] came back [to California], he was a Muslim.

Yeah. Great story. When I came home from Kenya in October (he'd left maybe in August), he was wearing pimp clothes: the wide hat, the brocade shoes, the fancy clothes. And women were going braless. This was '72, '73. He says, "Now you should wear hot pants and go braless." And I went, *whoa*. I said, "I don't think that's me." I went back to Kenya. I had a hot-pants suit made out of black cloth, and I got African beaded belts to wear with it. I come back and I'm going to go braless in my little tank-top thing and my little hot pants—and he's a Muslim.

Rabkin: Oh, my goodness. (laughs)

Martin Shaw: (laughs) "Cover up. Cover your head!" (laughs) Yeah. So much for that. Don't pay attention to this man anymore. (laughs) I'm pretty sure that some of my language about the devil comes from that experience of trying to figure out a way to be in the world. At that point, I really did set myself in opposition to him. I wore long clothes all the time; I oftentimes covered my hair. I was not going to join the Nation of Islam. I was not going to abide by the kinds of culinary habits. For example, I didn't feed *him* pork, and I *did* eat it. And, of course, when I was pregnant with my daughter, I was going, well, should I eat bacon, because it's his kid? And he goes, "*My* mother ate bacon." (laughs) And he smoked dope, too. So he was not the best Muslim. That was a big piece of it. He was active in a group, the Association of Black Psychologists, and they did a book called *Even the Rat Was White*. (laughs) Their world was so oriented toward race that I didn't want it. And they were extremely sexist. I mean, not to mention that they had to be represented by the way these women look, right, and if these

women don't do these things, then they are damned. I realized that I was never going to buy into his kind of theology or his philosophy, but I could try to accommodate him as much as possible.

I left him when our daughter was four years old. But we had been together for a number of years by then, because I got married when I was twenty-- and she was born when I was almost twenty-nine— I was thirty-three when I left him. So we'd been together for a long time. And the divorce didn't happen until another four years after that. So it was a really long time, from the time that I was twenty years old, to be with him. A lot of that was really influencing me.

In the short story I gave you, the civil rights movement doesn't figure in very much, except to the extent that I felt that people wanted to be nice to black people at my university—and it was driving me crazy. I felt that nobody wanted to know who I was, or see me, except that there's a black person here, and so you've got to be nice to black people. I thought, I'm nice enough, but why should everybody know me, and everybody want to have a piece of me? It just felt bad.

In Virginia, we had undergone massive resistance to desegregation. Our school was not closed. Because our school was actually in a black neighborhood; it would be really hard to get any white people there. So it could go on. But all around me, and particularly in northern Virginia, schools were closing, and people were coming down on the buses. We were having freedom schools there. But we continued.

So my family participated, but none of us were marching. We profited quite a bit from the civil rights movement. But at the same time, the civil rights movement, as you know, helped to break up these black communities, which is what I was most familiar with. My high school became a junior high school. My elementary school was closed. Because the high school never had what the white high schools had. They weren't at the same level, when they were integrated. My high school, as a junior high school, was primarily black, and teachers were white. That was one of the effects. I had a black teacher who came into the dining hall and showed me how to use a knife and fork. We didn't particularly use them at home, particularly if you're eating something difficult like chicken or fish. Why are you going to be trying this when you've got all these little bones there? But you wouldn't find that anymore. You wouldn't find the teachers taking the time to groom these kids in ways that would make them feel like there are better things out there for them. I'm sure there are good white teachers there, but the identification with the community fell apart.

So, the civil rights movement going on—a kind of a tug, from my sense, between Martin Luther King and Malcolm X. At home: the Malcolm X scene. My husband became Cedric X, and rather notorious at Stanford. I'll just tell you briefly: he was denied tenure at Stanford, went to San Francisco State; he was denied tenure at San Francisco State. He went to Marist College in upstate New York, was denied tenure there. At that point I think he just actually stopped trying to get a tenure-track job, and he did some classes here and there after that. At one point,

he taught a class at Princeton (when he was living in his hometown, near the campus.) He lives with our daughter up in Oakland.

I think the civil rights movement influenced the way I think about things. I wrote another story back when I was a freshman in college. It's about what is necessary to try to make a group stay together. To some extent, I was actually trying to figure out where I would be in terms of a kind of more militant and a more, I don't know if you want to call it moderate, because certainly people were killed in the civil rights movement, and they were seriously injured—but a movement that was not so much about turning the other cheek, versus one that said, I will stand up and I will fight. I wasn't sure if either one of those would work, but I knew that there was something that you had to create that would bring this group together. It never did have a real content. It's not just about civil rights, and it's not just about a kind of human rights, if you look at those two ways. There's got to be something in the middle that talks about what it is that we, as a group, will find that will bind us together and will make us seem that we share something. Neither one of those was getting it for me. I think I was in a quandary, personally, about this. I'm sure that all these things were influencing the experiences that I was having then— To some extent, it's sort of like the women in Kenya. It's what I'd been experiencing all along—walking into this classroom, or having this young woman come to talk to me become more conscious for me, and I have to now start to deal with that.

Rabkin: And at the same time, the second wave of the feminist movement is burgeoning.

Martin Shaw: Yes, indeed. Mostly, I'd think about [women] once I'd come here to Santa Cruz. Because when I come to Santa Cruz, I'm writing the dissertation about Kenya, and I'm at Kresge College that had quite a few young women faculty members. I came to Kresge maybe its second or third year. I wasn't one of the founding members. But they hadn't built Kresge when I came, so we had some trailers over by Married Student Housing, and then we were in College Five, and then we were at Kresge. It was pretty early in the Kresge experience that I was here.

But let me tell you a little bit about the hiring. I told you about the job talk. And then I got the job offer, and it was $9,900 for the year—which I thought was great (laughs), and I said—

Rabkin: This is for acting assistant professor?

Martin Shaw: Yes. I said, "Yes." Rich Randolph, who was chair at the time, said, "You're supposed to bargain." (laughs) I actually think I might have started somewhere around $11,000. But rent in University Terrace was $95 a month for a three-bedroom house, and the rent was raised to $125 and I moved out. I said, "That's rent-gouging." Now, those places are—I don't know what they are now,

but twenty years ago they were around $1500. But, I don't know, they're probably $4,000, to be able to rent there.

I mention this thing about not negotiating just because it is common for women to not negotiate, to feel, "Oh, I'm lucky to have a job offer." So here you are. You're an academic; you're doing something that you like and you're getting paid for it. From that point on, I did try to tell my students to *think* about negotiation, at any rate—even if it doesn't raise the salary, to think about what kinds of things that you might need, and what kinds of leave time that you might need, to be able to be there.

Rabkin: Do you think that your male counterparts at the time were more likely to be negotiating?

Martin Shaw: I think they were more likely to be negotiating, and I think they were more likely to want more money. And I think they were more likely to be *offered* more money. The fact that I had a husband working at Stanford probably did make it easier for me to say yes to the $9,900, as opposed to if I had a wife, working or not working.

I have to tell you one more story, and then I'll get back to Kresge. When my husband finished his PhD, he had two offers. One was a job offer at the University of Wisconsin, and the other one was the post-doc at the University of Pennsylvania. The job offer at the University of Wisconsin came with an offer for

me, as a lecturer, I think, to do something—maybe it was in anthropology. And I refused because—and it's a problem for me nowadays as well—because [I felt]: they didn't know me. They're just giving me this job because they want to hire my husband. I know spousal hires are all in but it took me a long time, as a feminist, to say yes to spousal hires. Now, with spousal hires they are mostly hiring a woman and bringing her husband on. (laughs) It feels a little bit different than it did back in those days. But first of all, I couldn't believe that they were offering me a position. I don't know what they had of me; maybe they had a vita, or something. But I hadn't finished my dissertation.

Rabkin: They hadn't interviewed you.

Martin Shaw: No. No, they just wanted my husband. I said, "No, we can't do that." So he took the post-doc at Annenberg, and then of course he got Stanford. That was a good career move for him, to go from the University of Pennsylvania to Stanford.

Rabkin: Had he wanted the Wisconsin job?

Martin Shaw: I don't know. I think he had them [the offers] both at the same time. His family is in New Jersey. Pennsylvania is really kind of attractive; his family is not very far from Philadelphia. I don't know if he wanted it. It wasn't a big battle; I just wasn't going to go. I just couldn't see it.

I think that's the same thing that happened when I came to Kresge, came to UCSC. I get the interview with anthropology; they like me. And at that point, you had to have an interview with a college: you were hired half-time by a college and half-time by your board of studies. I interviewed at Oakes College. It seems to me that that interview at Oakes College was an interview with Herman Blake. I could be wrong in my memory, but I remember sitting in a room talking to him, and his saying, "We'd love to have you at Oakes"—and then going to Kresge, where I talked to three or four different groups of people, all actually knowing a little bit more about me, and having specific questions that they'd like to ask. And that meant, for me, that Kresge was interested in *me*, more so than Oakes. Herman had talked an awful lot about my husband—who was making a name for himself by then as Cedric X (his name is now Syed Khatib), and had been standing in opposition to some things at Stanford and also doing some community service, I think, in the area.

Kin Groups, T-Groups, Straight Talk: Kresge as the "Touchy-Feely" College

I think Herman just thought I would be a good person to have, and he thought my husband was an interesting person. It just wasn't enough for me. Whereas Kresge was organized according to "family groups." At that point they called themselves family groups; later on they started calling themselves kin groups. A family group was the group of students in one section of the core course; faculty teaching the core course, some other faculty members associated with that group of students; and staff members associated with that group of students. Kresge was trying as much as possible to break down the hierarchies of administration,

faculty, and students, and have people all together. They wanted to know from me a lot about how kinship and how families work. (I think maybe they wanted to know more about kinship, because psychologists think they know how families work, right?) That was my specialty. And even though I realized that they needed to understand that families and kinship don't work the way that they think they do (laughs), I thought that these were people who were interested in *me*.

There were two things that I let them know about family and about decision-making processes, because those were the two things that were really important to them. The first one was that kin groups usually come together for some *reason*, whereas in Kresge, they wanted to bring together their kin-group members so that they could assert kin-group-ness. (laughs) I said, No, they come together for funerals and weddings; they come together to make decisions about members of the family; they come together for dispute settlement. Actually, if you're trying to mimic real life, then your kin group probably needs something that it *does*, as opposed to just, we sit here be-kinning." (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: And the other thing was, Kresge was, in this non-hierarchical system, trying to make consensus decision-making. I think you can come at that from lots of different ways. One of the things that was being said, and I don't know where it was coming from, is that Kresge in itself was trying to "wither

away the state." This is a Marxist idea, right? We're going to wither away the state. The "state" is this representation of the provost in the center, and the provost's connection to the chancellor. We wanted to wither that away. We wanted to have all of the functions that the provost is supposed to do, and all the other functions that are a part of the community-building and academic mentoring-sections part of the college, come together throughout the entire college. The staff will do some of it, the faculty will do some of it, and the students will do some of it.

[Chancellor Dean] McHenry never accepted this notion of the withering away of the provostship and the withering away of the state, of the college. So whenever we had to interact with the outside world, sometimes we'd have to pretend that we actually had a provost who did the work, and he'd have to go out there. Because before then, we'd try to send a little committee, or a group of people, and that was never accepted. Particularly, when you have students as a part of this, you needed to have a real administrator.

Rabkin: So, for example, Kresge's delegation to the Council of Provosts would be, not just the provost, but some students and staff—

Martin Shaw: That's right. And we didn't have a Council of Provosts then.

Rabkin: Ah.

Martin Shaw: (laughs) There are lots of stories about McHenry and to what extent he was "controlling." But it could be that McHenry didn't want that layer of power in between him and these various provosts. So it was McHenry [giving direction] to the various provosts, as opposed to a Council of Provosts.

Rabkin: I see. So that came around later.

Martin Shaw: Yes. It's an interesting question. I think I might remember when it came around, because I was on the Council of Provosts for a while. 1991 was when I became provost.

The other thing that Kresge really wanted was consensus decision-making. If you have this flat organization, then you have to figure out how all the participants in this organization can have a say.

Rabkin: "Flat" as opposed to hierarchical?

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm.

Rabkin: I see.

Martin Shaw: Now I have to talk a little bit about what a "T-group" is. Given that people are supposed to sit around talking to each other, and take responsibility for the running of the college, how can you do that? What is it that

will make that happen in the best way? I tried to talk about consensus decision-making, which was part of the way the Kikuyu worked when I was in Kenya. Maybe not so much when I was in Kenya, but it's the way they thought that things would ideally work, and had worked in the pre-colonial era. A major piece of consensus decision-making is time. You have to spend the time to hear all these people, and then spend the time to start suggesting possible solutions, and going back and forth. With a ten-week quarter system, it's really hard to be able to have that kind of time.[4]

Kresge started creating a system called an "advance." An advance is the opposite of a retreat.

Rabkin: Oh, I see.

Martin Shaw: (laughs) I don't know how often we had advances. It could be that they were once a year or it could be they were once a quarter. But the advance would bring together all the people, all of the Kresge community who wanted to have a say in anything that would go on at Kresge. And the advance would take a really, really long time. So maybe the advance happened at the end of the year; maybe the advance was setting up the beginning for the next year. I mean, they

[4] In what follows, I talk about the experience of working as a teacher and colleague in Kresge with the T-group as a model form of interaction. What I understood about the T-group then is that is was a method derived from Rogerian psychology that emphasized each person getting in touch with his/her feelings even as they discussed academic, political, and administrative issues. In seminars and faculty meetings, we were trained to speak in a way that did privilege an integrated approach to emotion and intellect.

weren't totally crazy; you couldn't make all these decisions on the fly, as you go. Something has to be in place when you start the next time. (laughs)

But anyway, those two things from my own field experience: working with kin, understanding when people mobilize their kin relations; when is it important for you to get together your kin; what kinds of things can you expect from your kin—that was part of what I offered to Kresge. And this whole experience of participating in consensus decision-making was a piece of it.

I think I should probably go back to talking about coming into Kresge. What was it like when I first got there? What was expected of me? I told you about the interviews, being hired. I had several meetings. There were different groups of students and faculty combined. I remember my first faculty meeting. People were sitting around rubbing each other's feet. (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: I'm going [gasps] oh, gosh! (laughs) [stage whisper] *What's going on? Put your feet back in your shoes!* (laughs) *And why are you touching her?*

Rabkin: This was a Kresge faculty meeting.

Martin Shaw: A Kresge faculty meeting, yes. Anthropology wasn't that way. (laughs) There was a geodesic dome that was out by Married Student Housing,

and that's where Kresge had its core course meeting, and we had some of our early faculty meetings there. We were asked to do things like lie on the floor, visualize different kinds of things, and divide into groups of various sorts to talk about some topic that was given. We were actually asked to touch each other. Kresge got the nickname "touchy-feely" based on some of these things. But you weren't asked to touch in any intimate way. You didn't have to hug people, although hugging was a big piece of Kresge back in the old days. But breaking this barrier between individuals, either touching hands, or standing behind them, or touching them shoulder to shoulder, or something that will begin to make that cluster a little bit tighter.

Some faculty members had a really hard time with it. I think that Gary Lease was one of the early Kresge members—he wasn't there in the first year I was there; I think he came shortly after that—but he was a big, blustery guy, and he could say all these outrageous things. But he stayed, for the most part, and pushed people to think about: do you really want to do this, and do you really want to have this kind of sense of earnestness in your conversation, in this big old public group?

I was absolutely fascinated by it, and at the same time a little frightened. The last time, I was talking about creating this accent that I have. This kind of felt like creating a *person*.

Rabkin: Mm-hmm.

Martin Shaw: And it was kind of interesting, to see what person I would be if I moved in some of the ways that Kresge was pushing me. Kresge's first theme was Our Human Environment. What an interesting notion, Our Human Environment. "Environment" now is so taken up with the natural environment that we forget what that term could mean. But "Our Human Environment," in fact did mean the natural environment. And I mentioned that there were several natural scientists—Bob Edgar as provost, Henry Hilgard, Matt Sands, as being the core group starting Kresge—and then Michael Kahn as the psychologist who was helping us to figure out how we could talk to each other. Our Human Environment did include the natural environment, but it also included our psychological environment, and our social environment, and those are the things that they were most interested in at Kresge. It took me a long time to figure out what they were talking about with "Our Human Environment" and that our human environment gets to be this relatively small group that allows human beings to fulfill potential. Actually, this self-realization piece was part of it.

So we do things that make us uncomfortable—touching people that we hardly know, saying things that we feel deeply about, getting into groups and breaking those groups up so that you can move around and get to know as many people as possible. And from that point on, Michael Kahn begins to teach us how we best realize our human potential through conversation. That is called "straight talk."

And straight talk is—people talk about using "'I' statements," how you do that. But you also almost always talk about, what is the emotional load behind any intellectual statement. Really hard stuff—particularly if you're just used to getting in there and saying the thing that you want to say, without considering either how I *feel* about the thing that I am saying, because I've just got to get these ideas across to you, and how I feel about it doesn't matter, or how *you* feel about it—where *you're* coming from that my words might affect you. In Kresge, we had to consider both these things at all times.

Now this is considered in the faculty meetings. I had to say how I'm feeling when I come in, what it is that is bothering me. And when I talk about something to you, I don't disguise the emotional load of it. I don't say, "Well I'm just telling you the way it is," or, "This is the way it was reported to me by such-and-such," or, "All the scholars say blah, blah, blah." The question is, *why* am I telling you this, and what is the *feeling* sense I have when I'm telling you this? And what can I expect from *you*, from the information I've given you? The information I give to you, you're getting on two different levels, if not more, right? You're getting it on the level of, okay, this is information, a set of facts, or this is a story. But you're also getting it on the level of all of the emphatic communication that I'm doing, right? And straight talk brings that stuff up to the fore, makes it all conscious.

It's a lot of work! It's a lot of putting yourself out there in vulnerable ways. When I started doing this, as the only black person—I'm just trying to figure out when Byron [Wheeler] came. He might have come my same year. He's a *theater* person!

He's a person who's used to being on stage. (laughs) So I won't say "only black person," but two of us there. And Byron, I don't know what was going on in his head, but it felt to me like he was just comfortable with this scene. He can do it. I was having a hard time doing it. So hard that at one point, during the—maybe not the first year, maybe I had to go through the second year (and I'll talk about other things that I did)—but I had to go talk to Michael Kahn.

Michael Kahn was our guru. He taught a class in humanistic psychology. It was taught in the quarry. It filled the quarry. He would get there—I always think of him taking off his shirt, but maybe he didn't take off his shirt—he, they say, he could pull an eagle from the sky. He was the guru. He was the master. He had charisma. He had all these students at his feet all the time. And in our dealings, he was the father of the group, who taught us how to do straight talk, who taught us how our lives could be better if—and I've kept a piece of this, of course—how our lives could be better if we recognized that individuals are whole. They are not just brains. But if we wanted to deal with students, if we could recognize the *whole* student, then maybe we could be more effective. Not only could we be more effective, but also maybe the students could get this message and make changes in their lives that would also allow them to lead wholer and more fulfilled lives. So he would tell us this.

At the same time, he is the guy who is massaging other people's feet, and getting his feet massaged. And he's really, really, touchy. He will hug you when he sees you; he will put his hand on your shoulder. I was beginning to feel

uncomfortable with both the attention that I was getting—verbal attention—it probably felt like the attention I was getting my first year of college, when people felt like they knew me, or they wanted to know me, or there was something about me that was attracting them. I needed to tell him to back off.

It took a while to get the courage to do it, and I finally did. And I can't remember where now. I think I might have gone to his house. He, at this point, was living on campus as a residential preceptor, and I actually ended up living on campus as a residential preceptor as well, but I think his place was next door. I asked to talk to him, and I told him I was really feeling uncomfortable, that I felt that—I wish I could remember the exact words—I felt that he was coming on too strong, and that I would appreciate it if he backed off. Now that's what I meant to say; I don't know what the words were. And he looked at me and he was very serious when he said this. He said, "Thanks for coming to talk to me. It shows you care." What I wanted from him was to say, "I hear you. I will back off." Not that I "care" about him. It wasn't that I was trying to say that I cared. I was trying to say, "This is too much for me to cope with at this point, and I would appreciate it if you would stand away." Now he may have actually stood away. Who knows, he may have wanted to bear-hug me all the time. He may have only hugged me every fourth time, right? (laughs) But it was really symptomatic of being drawn into a kind of conversation where I felt I was trying to do all the right things; I was trying to show that I'd learned, and I'd heard this stuff. But I also wasn't being effective in that communication, because it wasn't working that way.

And this idea that it's not working that way, I think, sets up one of the problems that I think occurred in some of our early communications, or this early structure at Kresge. Michael had taught us all how to talk. If you looked at Kresge, I think even Matt and Henry and Bob were following Michael's plan for us. So Michael cannot be a part of this egalitarian consensus-building process. I remember sometimes, in some of our meetings, when he was silent. All he had to do was to say nothing, and we started re-thinking what it is that we're doing. His silence means that he hasn't given us his approval. It means that he is still withholding in some way. You look over there [at Michael]: "Okay, Michael hasn't said, 'You've reached a conclusion.' He hasn't said anything." Then we'd start rethinking what it is that we're going about, until Michael gives us this kind of seal of approval. I think that power that he had, that wasn't official, and wasn't recognized, was a big piece of a disconnect—but that's not the word I'm looking for. It's a deceptive feature of that process that we were trying to go through. I'm not trying to say that it was a conscious deception, or something like that, but it made what we were doing sort of illegitimate, because it *wasn't* a real negotiation among peers.

Rabkin: It was a tacit and unacknowledged power dynamic that was running beneath—

Martin Shaw: Right.

Rabkin: —the description that everybody articulated and bought into.

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm.

Rabkin: And did it ever get articulated? Did people eventually start to recognize and be able to put a finger on that?

Martin Shaw: Yes. But at that time he is gone.

Rabkin: Uh-huh.

Kresge's Evolving College Culture

Martin Shaw: He's not *gone*; he doesn't leave. I don't know where he is now; he's probably retired. When he left Kresge he went to the California Institute of Integral Studies. He was there for some years. I don't know if he's still there or not.[5]

We brought in May Diaz as provost of Kresge after Bob Edgar. May Diaz is one of my favorite people in the world. I was on the committee to hire her. She's an anthropologist. It's funny: all I heard was she's an anthropologist, she's at Berkeley, and she's from Sweden. So I started writing her name as "Dyasks" or something. But she's married to Bill Diaz, from Mexico, so it really was Diaz. It's May *Nordstrom* Diaz. (laughs)

[5] Michael Kahn died in 2014—Editor.

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: No-nonsense woman. Great Swedish values—that is the small community, the face-to-face, the sense of responsibility people have for each other. So she came in and she would have nothing to do with Michael Kahn or any of that Kresge stuff.

Rabkin: No straight talk, no kin groups, no T-groups?

Martin Shaw: Not "no." By the time Michael writes this essay called "The Seminar," that group is called the "corner" of the college.[6] So it doesn't disappear; it goes into a corner. The "corner" of the college is a tiny little group of people at Kresge who continue to live in that way.

Rabkin: I see.

Martin Shaw: They don't stay there very long. They don't get fed and nourished in that little corner, so they leave. Our former [campus] provost was there, too: Dave Kliger. He was at Kresge as well.

Lots of marriages had problems because of what was going on at Kresge. There were two things happening. Faculty members are pushed to have contact with students almost all the time. You have dinner with them maybe two or three

[6] Michael Kahn, "*The Seminar: An Experiment in Humanistic Education*," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 21(2), 119-127, Spring 1981.)

times a week. You form really, really close relationships with them. I mean, you're doing all this emotional talk to the students. They're in your core course. You're trying to do all this stuff. This can cause pressure on your marriage because you're not there. But you can also have pressure on your marriage because you're forming really close ties with others. And that's part of what was going on as well, in terms of faculty and students, sometimes moving over into sexual relations—some of which I know about. Some marriages came about between faculty and students from those early days as well.

When May came, she didn't like the old Kresge ways. But they didn't disappear; they were pushed into a corner. These guys—Michael and Bob Edgar—wore black armbands when she came, when she was hired. We announced that we were hiring May Diaz, and I think almost everyone—faculty and staff—working there wore the black armbands. These two were faculty members, I know, but they wore the black armbands: "Kresge is now dead," when May Diaz has come on.

Rabkin: How did she get hired, if so many of the Kresge people were in opposition?

Martin Shaw: There was always Dean McHenry. (laughs) She's an anthropologist; she's hired by our board. I'm a Kresge person and I'm an anthropologist; I was in favor of her. Who else did we have on the Kresge committee? I think that we had some more young women faculty. Talk about the

seventies: it's a kind of moving out of the male hierarchy that was there. And some of them, like Nancy Adler (she's now at UCSF)—I don't know if Nancy was actually on the committee, but Norma Winkler was at Kresge; Marcia Millman was at Kresge. So there were some people at Kresge who would be interested in having May come. McHenry was extremely interested in getting rid of Bob Edgar, as I recall. And anthropology liked her. So she came on.

Besides, I think by this time, Kresge was beginning to change. Let me just tell you a couple of interesting structural features. The buildings at Kresge remain the same [today on the outside]; but the inside of the buildings are totally changed. The buildings that are down by the office were—the rooms were one single room. Those were to house four students. No interior walls. The set of buildings that you're passing as you're going up toward the coffee shop—those were to house eight people, and the major hallway meeting room was around the bathrooms. The bathrooms originally did not have stall dividers, so you'd have a toilet and then a toilet. (laughs) Then when you get up to where the coffee shop/restaurant is, facing it, the rooms over to the left, that was called the "octets," so eight people were to live there, and they had no dividing walls on the first and second floor. And then one room with a door—it was called the "sex room,"—the one room that had the door that you could close. (laughs) Almost immediately, that changed.

Rabkin: I was going to ask how this went over with the parents of arriving students.

Martin Shaw: I don't know. Some of the parents of arriving students at Kresge were somewhat countercultural. Some of them felt that the world could change, and perhaps this was one of the good changes. Students, on the other hand, weren't that way—and they started building walls. Kresge gave them supplies. One of our early maintenance people said that all Kresge students learned how to do things with their hands. (laughs) They actually started building walls. And then, eventually, the organization of suites changed so that you actually had a little hallway, and a kitchen area with a sofa that people could sit in instead of standing around the bathroom. Two people I know have written on the Kresge residential community. One is my student Phillip Guddemi, now an anthropologist. He did his senior thesis on living at Kresge. And my good friend, the one that I see sometimes when I leave here [our interview room at McHenry Library], Nubra Floyd, she did her dissertation at UCSF, at the medical school (but there's a psychology program there), on Kresge's residential community. Fascinating stuff. They developed little incest taboos and all kinds of things that they could do within the structure. But, in fact, the structure on the inside of all of these buildings had become much more conventional than they were when people got started. They really did need more privacy.

I think what was going on is that this change was coming before May came—pushing the Kresge ethos, the touchy-feely ethos, into a little corner, and eventually that corner died out. People stopped doing some of those things.

Now, where am *I* with all of this? I am coming from a place that's really different from them—and, at the same time, really fascinated by what it could mean to have an integration of intellect and emotion. It's not something that I would necessarily say, "Well, this is ridiculous, why would anybody want to do that?" There was something good that's a possibility from there. It did help that this friend of mine I just mentioned, Nubra, was trained in T-groups, went to Bethel, Maine.[7] She's a black woman; she always says that she replaced me at Kresge. When I stopped being a residential preceptor, she started being a residential preceptor. But this is her world, and she still does it. T-grouping is part of the way she actually teaches, *now*. She's maintained it. Having met her, I didn't have to say that this is "anti-black." Here's this black woman who's doing it, and who's actually teaching other people to do it. I also forgot to mention that a Native American woman, Carol Proudfoot, was a psychologist at Kresge who was trained in T-group methods and was second in command to Michael Kahn, if we recognize the informal structure. She later married Bob Edgar, the first provost.

Women and Feminism at Kresge

I was fascinated by it. I moved into doing feminist work—feminist organizing and feminist process(which we made all those jokes about: "How many feminists does it take to screw in a light bulb? One to hold the ladder, one to screw the bulb in, six to process it.") At Kresge, that would have been our process; that would have been the way we did [things].

[7] Bethel was the site of the National Training Laboratories, now NTL Institute of Behavioral Science, created in 1947 by the Office of Naval Research and the National Education Association, and the place where T-groups were pioneered.

I didn't find that what I'd learned at Kresge was antithetical to changes that I'd like to see made in the world. And all along, even when I became provost of Kresge, I wanted to recognize some of the goals that Kresge had. *Oh,* not all the methods, and not all the insidious power plays and hierarchies that were going on there, and not the taking advantage of young women that one could see so easily happening within that environment. But could we come together as full human beings and talk about the way the world is and the kinds of changes we wanted to make, without suppressing our emotions on those things? And if we brought our emotions to those things, how *would* that make a difference? Would we have greater clarity? Would we have better abilities to structure our actions? To me, there was an interesting segue from the Kresge that was male-focused and male-dominated and based on "straight talk," to the women's movement and working in consciousness-raising groups with women, trying to do some of the same kinds of things with women, feeling that we had a much better chance of both being honest with each other, and of trying to act on it.

I worked with a group of women. I was the only faculty member, and there were three graduate students and one undergraduate. In that group, women did not want to be lovers with each other. Most of them were lesbians or lesbian-identified. (They didn't *have* to be.) But there was something about, if you could keep this group open and free, the best way to do that would be to not allow sexual relations within it, that allowing of sexual relations that had happened with Kresge. So, if I'm pouring out my heart to you, I don't expect then you to

come on to me at some other point. What I took from Kresge into this women's group was this possibility of actually having deeply focused conversation with other women that didn't necessarily bring the snake into the garden.

It didn't always work. Some of my group's women started being lovers with each other. We started getting mad about it—what's going on with that? Maybe what I'm getting from that is that there has to also be a way in which we begin to talk about sexuality as a piece of who we are, and not have sexuality be the one thing that has to always be put onto the other side. That wasn't exactly where we were at that time. In my writing group, we had to finally begin to talk about what does that mean to us, to have [sexual involvements between some of the group members], and would it then mean that we don't have the same kind of openness that we could have with each other, if we're all potentially going to be lovers with one another. So that was a little hard for us.

Rabkin: Such big, important questions. Interesting questions.

Martin Shaw: Yes. It's really fascinating.

I joined UCSC in 1972. My first year at Kresge, Kresge was in Married Student Housing, the second year at College Five, and then the third year we were in the buildings. Maybe we started *The Ethnic Experience* before we went into the buildings, because our first classes were in the geodesic dome. And this was when we decided that if Kresge wants to organize itself according to kin groups,

we needed to be able to cut across those kin groups to be able to find some of the ethnic students who wanted to come together. It's an age-old problem of being integrated and also being segregated, so that you can have the solidarity and support that you need. We weren't trying to go against the kin groups, but we were just trying to have something in addition to them, and those we called "affinity groups."

Rabkin: This is Sarah Rabkin, and I am with Carolyn Martin Shaw. Today is May 15th, 2014, and today we are in the Science & Engineering Library at UCSC. So this is our third interview. And, Carolyn, last time, we were just beginning to talk about the transition from a sort of male-dominated Kresge College to one that was influenced by the second wave of the women's movement. And you had also been talking about consensus decision-making. I wonder if you'd like to pick up from there.

Martin Shaw: One of the things I think I mentioned last time is that I found a continuity between some of the things I was doing at Kresge and some of the things I was doing in the women's movement, consensus being one of those things. In the women's movement, there was a "technology," and that's part of what I introduced when I was in Zimbabwe: the note-taker; the person who keeps you on track (it had another name; it may have been the "census-taker"—the person who is trying to tell you what are the dynamics going on there); feedback mechanisms, all these kinds of things. Those techniques weren't a part of Kresge. But one of the things that was really clearly a part of Kresge was this

long consensus-building process. At any point in that process, a person could say, "Stop the train. I am unhappy with the way things are going." And you could just see us all groan (laughs), after so many hours.

I had one particular student—and I'll mention him, Phillip Guddemi—who was extremely active in the college, and did his senior thesis on the college. Phillip was one who had the sense of integrity. If something was going in the wrong direction, he was willing to stand up and say, "Let's stop, and let's rethink it." In fact, we would do that. The process probably still had some of the subterranean aspects of who has power to speak, and how can this thing be pulled back. Because quite often, if somebody like Phillip or another student—or even a faculty member—would say, "Stop the train," they wouldn't necessarily get what they were wanting, with the "stop the train." We would make a kind of compromise that probably kept us pretty much in the way the train was going, but maybe just a few inches off. But that was a big piece of the way that Kresge tried to do its work.

Rabkin: So are you saying that some people had more power to change the direction of the train than others?

Martin Shaw: I think that's true. That that is not what we *said* (laughs). I think because some people had more power per se, and particularly people like Michael Kahn—and probably students who had similar notions to one another, might have a bit more power than the single individual saying, "I don't like the

way this is going." That single individual, then, is called up on to work with this larger group, and quite often, something of what the individual wants is there. It wasn't very often that it would be a group of people who would stand up and say, "We've been caucusing here, and we think that this thing is going in the wrong direction." Kresge is about trying to make sure that these individuals are on board fully with what's going on, so you didn't have to say, "I don't have enough people behind me to speak." You were certainly empowered to speak as an individual. Being empowered to speak as an individual and getting your way are not quite the same. (laughs) I think that's the point I was trying to make.

When Kresge changed, when May Diaz came—and May wasn't a slash-and-burn: she said, okay, there's something going here. She did get a pretty good idea that whatever's going on there was not particularly helpful to students, and some women students especially. But she did say, to the extent that there's a valid academic component to this, you have your corner of the college, and you can continue. I think some of these same processes continued there—I mean, the good ones: the consensus; the sense of straight talk. And gradually that faded away.

Kresge was a great place to be as a woman faculty member. Just thinking about walking down the hall and seeing how many young women [faculty] were all there: Madeline Moore was there (I don't know if you remember her); I mentioned Marcia [Millman] and Norma [Winkler], and others who have left to go elsewhere. Nancy Chodorow was also at Kresge in the early days. I don't

think she stayed at UCSC very long, but there was a time, when I moved to Oakland, that I would travel back and forth with her.

A number of these women—I'm not sure if they were making a stand against the touchy-feely-ness of Kresge, although I know some of them were uncomfortable with it, but they wanted the college to go in a different way. They were, I guess, a support for this committee that hired May Diaz.

I feel so fortunate to have seen May in both these ways: I hired her at UCSC while I was an assistant professor. *And* she is my mentor. So, that kind of *choosing* your mentor from the pool. I think when May was hired, I believe in the pool was Elliot Aronson. Elliot Aronson is a continuation of the Michael Kahn, T-group, Kresge touchy-feely. It was a clear statement then: It was not just that we were hiring May and we were going in this direction, but we were *not* hiring Elliot. Elliot, I think, at that time, was coming to UCSC. I think he wasn't a faculty member at that point. He did come, and he did well. But it was really clear that we were thinking that it was time to make a change.

Rabkin: So the hiring you're talking about is specifically as provost of Kresge College.

Martin Shaw: As provost, yes. May was a faculty member at UC Berkeley, and came down as provost and joined the anthropology department. So I want to mark that, because I was just talking to a friend last night; I said, "I would like to

have you in my oral history!" She was a student in the social organization class when she was nineteen years old; she's now fifty-six. She was saying last night, "Somebody should write a history of *our* relationship." What I think is interesting about that is that it's sort of the opposite of my relationship with May. That is, she's a young person that I actually turn to for advice all the time. It's this relationship that's grown over all these years. She was in one of my social organization classes, and drove me crazy talking about the "Lesbian Nation."[8] "'Lesbian Nation' is not a part of social anthropology!" If you go back to my advisor, "It's biological reproduction!" (laughs) and there's all these other ways that people organize themselves. I was trying to say, "How do you do this lesbian nation if you don't have biological reproduction?" (This was forty years ago, so we didn't have as many technologies as we have now.) Her name is Julia Dodd Tetzlaff.

Talking about that opens up what that environment was like at Kresge, when we were moving from having the T-groups to a feminist focus. I'm sure that we weren't using the word "feminist" in the same ways we are now, so maybe it was "women's movement." Because when the women's studies group got organized, it was "women's studies," and I think it was the Women's Studies Caucus. There was no department; there was no program, and there actually were no faculty devoted to women's studies, although we had a number of faculty members at Kresge in literature and sociology and psychology who were very interested in women and women's issues. Norma Winkler's work on what it

[8] Feminist writer and cultural critic Jill Johnston invented this term and explored it in her 1974 book *Lesbian Nation: The Feminist Solution* (Simon and Schuster, 1974).

means to be a female teacher or female professor: have you read that one? It's great. Norma says something like this: "Female" and "Professor" counteract each other. And when students—and especially, she says, women students (I thought it was fascinating) begin to see these two things, they've got one—that "female" they're expecting [to be] kind of nurturing, and this "professor" part of it, they're expecting this father, right? That dissonance creates problems in the classroom and problems in the mentorship relationships as well. She was great.

I will tell you another story that Norma and some other women in the faculty were a part of. The heart of Kresge College was Betsy Wootten. Betsy was the office manager for the college. She was a secretary at the college. She had a chair right by her desk, and we would all come by and sit there, and she'd just, I don't know, *smile*, and you just started talking; you'd just go on and on and on about whatever was going on in your mind. I got to know her well. She's just a couple of years younger than I am, and had worked at the university a little bit longer than I did. And she had another assistant, Shelly Starr, who became a lawyer later on, but while she was working as a secretary, she complained to me about women faculty. She said women faculty would come in and give her work to do, and very apologetically say, "I'm sorry to give you this shit work." They [Wootten and her assistant] were livid. They'd say, "My work is important. Why are you doing that?" I ended up getting together the secretaries and the women faculty in the Red Room—one of the meeting rooms at Kresge—to sit and talk about respecting the labor of the secretaries. And I think it improved. At least, the language improved, and the women faculty began to understand a little bit

about, I don't know, the honor that these women had, the kind of sense of professionalism they brought to their work. And even though, I say (Shelly Starr was her name at the time), Shelly decided that she wanted to go on to be a lawyer, but while she was working there as a secretary, she wanted the respect that she should have.

That was one of the things I did at the time when we were making this transition from being so male-focused to having more women. It's not an easy thing, and there are lots of little areas that we might not be aware of. But certainly with Betsy and Shelly being able to speak up and say, "These are problems for us," I felt, okay, well, there's a problem; let's sit and talk about it and see where we can go with it.

Now, why did I feel I could say, "Let's sit and talk about it"? I am sure that some of the things I learned from the T-group, I felt, could be useful in sitting and talking about this, so that I could have these people listening to each other. I feel the same way about the Unlearning Racism workshops that I did later on.

The women's studies collective—I don't know how it got started. I was there; I wasn't a part of it. Lots of students with really, really passionate interest in trying to understand women's position in society, women's history, what does it mean to be a woman within the university? All these things. And they were willing to get together on their own and talk about this. What they wanted to do is to pull some of us in—those people who were at the university saying that their work is

with women—like me, and like Norma, or Marcia, or Nancy Adler, or Nancy Chodorow, or Madeline Moore. Pull people in to say, "Tell us. Tell us what you're learning; help us understand this." They did a great job. They put on programs; they helped to educate *us* about what the issues were for young women.

But when it was time to say, "Let's move from being a caucus or a collective into something that becomes more institutionalized within the university," these young women [students] felt marginalized and disenfranchised. They had, in fact, been the center of women's studies on campus, and at the time when they said, "Okay, now we got something going," then [the administration said], "Where are the faculty members who can run this thing? Where's the staff who can administer it, and then, what's the relationship to the center of the university?"

Kresge's Ethnic Experience Course

I want to talk about the *Ethnic Experience* course at Kresge. The *Ethnic Experience* course at Kresge came from our wanting to do affinity groups, trying to cut across some of the divisions according to residence, or according to core courses, and those related to the kin group. The people who put together the Ethnic [Experience] course were Carol Proudfoot, Cliff Poodry, Byron Wheeler, Gini Matute-Bianchi, Katia Panas, Josie King, and me. We had four students working with us in developing the course. I am not sure of all their names: two were from

Kresge, Cynthia McMilan and Yvette Holland, and two were from Merrill, Patsy Ihara and Barbara Gonzalez. I miss Katia and Josie; they would remember the names.

Katia was the counselor at Kresge from the counseling center, and Josie was counselor at Oakes from the counseling center—neither of them with an academic appointment. They're doing this on their own time, of their own free will. At the same time, they were *community* counselors. They felt that part of what their task was, was to work outside of just doing individual counseling. They were so different, and they were good friends, and I almost always think about them together. But Katia, if I ran into her on campus, the first thing she would tell me is what's going on; who's been oppressed, abused; what kinds of political issues are happening, and what am I going to do? Josie—I would look at my watch if I saw her coming by, going, like, how much time do I have? Do I have time to talk to Josie? Josie is, "*How are you?* Are you taking care of yourself? Are you spending the right time with your kid?" They were a pair. You had to figure out how you were, so you could start working with Katia on any ting else.. Katia would call me in for all kinds of workshops. Any time that she needed to train counselors on how to deal with ethnicity, I would be her best example.

I don't know if you have anybody talking about this, but those early years, there was a great deal of black-brown animosity on campus. Are Chicanos getting more than blacks? Is the university putting more resources over here? Do you have more Chicanos in high levels than you have blacks? That kind of politics.

Some of it had to do with the person—I think it was Roberto Rubalcava—who was running EOP and working in ethnic studies.[9] Some black people felt that they were not getting anything, because "that is a Chicano thing over there." I tried as much as possible to stay out of this battle with the black and brown, and my relationship with Katia was one of the ways that I was trying to make sure that we could model, at any rate, that black and brown people could get together, and that we didn't necessarily have to fight over this little piece of pie. But it got really ugly, and students were sort of pulled into it, particularly black students, thinking that if Chicanos have something then we don't have it. It's this kind of zero-sum game: there's only so much that can go around. Katia was not a part of that, although I have to say that her heart was in getting the most and the best that she could for Chicano students, and having a Chicano presence. She was one of the people who started the Chicano graduation. I must mention that Katia was of Greek origin, but had spent a great part of her adult life in Mexico.

She would give up all her time working for students. At the end of the year, Katia was beat down. She was maybe ten or fifteen years older than me, but she looked old. She was wrinkled; she could hardly move. She put so much into this campus. And she'd go to Fresno, and she'd come back in the fall *totally* rejuvenated. Fresno has a fountain of youth—I have no idea what went on in Fresno. But Katia at the beginning of every year had that energy that she could just fight for the cause. It was making sure that Chicano students, no matter what they were looking at—whether it's their degree in sciences and engineering, or

[9] Roberto Rubalcava was the director of the Educational Opportunity Program in the mid-1970s and was dismissed by Chancellor Angus Taylor for a variety of reasons that he details in his oral history. See http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/taylor

their wanting something for their parents, or having some kind of cultural experience—*all* those things, she wanted to make sure that it happened on the campus. She was great.

Josie wanted those things for blacks, but she spent most of her time working with us individually, trying to make sure that we wouldn't look like Katia at the end of the year—that we had the wherewithal to survive what's here. And she would bring us together, so we'd get to know each other. The two of them were important for me during those first years.

There's one other thing that I have to mention while I'm saying this: Julia Armstrong came to this campus as an ombudsperson.[10] This is another time when I get trotted out by the administration, to tell her what it's like to be a black person in Santa Cruz, right? I told her, "You can really survive here in Santa Cruz. Santa Cruz is really good; you can make all these connections." I think I was thinking about Josie, and the way that Josie helped. Julia—who did very well at Santa Cruz, becoming assistant chancellor—has two or three times reminded me that I lied (laughs) when I told her that. She said, "Why did you tell me that?!" She's made really good friends with Byron [Wheeler] and Michael [Cowan][11], and she's done really well, and she's married, and all this, but she'll still remember, "You know, Carolyn, it is *not* that easy to be a black professional

[10] See Irene Reti, Interviewer and Editor, *Adding a Plank to the Bridge: Julia Armstrong-Zwart's Leadership at UC Santa Cruz*, (Regional History Project, UC Santa Cruz Library, 2014.) Available in full text at http://escholarship.org/uc/item/56h206hb

[11] See Irene Reti, Interviewer and Editor, *"It Became My Case Study": Professor Michael Cowan's Four Decades at UC Santa Cruz*, (Regional History Project, UC Santa Cruz, 2013). Available in full text at http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/it-became-my-case-study-professor-michael-cowans-four-decades-at-uc-santa-cruz

in Santa Cruz, and you should have told me." I thought that perhaps I said, "You *can* survive (laughs), and it's possible to do it—look at me, I'm still here. But it's not easy." But Josie was one of the people who helped to make it easier.

Josie and Katia came together to work with us. Katia was good friends with Luis Valdez, who runs the Teatro Campesino. She brought him in one year, so one year he taught the class with us. We taught it twice, I think—Byron will have to tell me for sure. I think the second year, Luis Valdez taught it with us, and we did fantastic theater in the class.

Okay, let me tell you one thing that we did. I don't know why Luis got this into his mind. We gave these students a pop quiz. We never had a test in this class, and I think students had to maybe write a paper at the end of the term. Back in those days, Santa Cruz didn't have pop quizzes. But we gave a pop quiz: took them into a classroom instead of the dome that we were really in—a classroom over at College Five; sat them down; asked them to write [answers to] some questions. And the questions—I made them up, and they were relevant to what we were doing. That day that we gave the pop quiz, we also cross-dressed. Well, I don't know that it was cross-dressing. But my cross-dressing was to appear as a worker in overalls. I have to say, I have never worn jeans to teach a class. I was totally, really, really uncomfortable. I can't remember what other people did that day. They sat down and they took the test. And then, at the end of the test, Luis put a wastebasket on a table, and he had a movie projector going with nothing in it, that gave up white light on a screen—and then we burned the tests. In the

wastebasket. That was it. I still don't remember all the reasons that we did it (laughs). Luis might have said something afterward, either about theater, or about preparedness, or about standing your ground—I have no idea.

That was one of the things that we did in that *Ethnic Experience* class. And what we were doing in the class was mostly trying to get students to think about what they learned about ethnicity as they were growing up, and to get them to see their ethnicity as a tool that they could use in the world—as something that is not a negative for them, but a powerful positive that could help you to pull on reserves that you didn't know that you had, or allow you to make connections that you hadn't thought were possible before.

The class was organized—and I think we actually worked this out with Luis—on an understanding of how colonialism works. One of the things that Luis said to us is something like this: "Whenever you have colonialism, you're going to have those people who are going to stand in opposition to colonialism, and those people who will work with colonialism." First of all, we wanted to get people to understand that they don't have one single response to the powers that are coming in. And if we begin to recognize that that response is broad, then maybe we'll begin to have more patience or tolerance, or more hope for the future. Because what we're looking at now is that somebody might have actually started off with—I'm just going to have to use an example from Africa, because I can't think of exactly what we said in class—somebody might have started off with: I just had twins, and one of them has to be killed, according to my culture. So if

I'm going to live with my culture, my ethnic experience, then one of my kids will get killed. But a colonizer comes in with Christianity and says, "You don't have to kill those kids; they're fine." You can see there's going to be a pull for that person. That person already has something within her own culture that they are unhappy with. And that's a possibility for an opening.

But see, it's a possibility for people to say, oh, I can trade with them. I can get higher status and more wealth if I do this. Then there are those people who will say, "I'm going to fight them no matter what." And there are the folks who say, "I don't know what I can do. I am going to stay here and suffer. I'm going to see what happens next." It was important for us to start off by saying, "We're not all Cesar Chavez. We're not all the people who are going to just stand up and say I'm going to fight against the powers that be. And if we begin to understand that, we may have more compassion for our ancestors; we may have more compassion for the people that we see struggling now, who seem to be powerless, and you don't know all that's going on."

We had a little wheel that Luis helped us make, that started off with the oppressors coming in, and then these various responses, and then it goes all the way around, and the last one over here is the "keeper of the faith." There's something that can happen through all this oppression that may allow some of these early ethnic experiences—particularly the ones that were found to be satisfying, or that were found to be fulfilling or empowering—so some of those could be kept, even as you go through all of these other things. Some of these

other things would include things like calling people "sellouts." My Spanish isn't very good, but the "sellout" term is one that is important within some Spanish-speaking communities, and in my own research, "sellout" is also another one that's [important].

If you can allow yourself to see the ethnic experience as vast—it's not just about what you learned at your grandmother's knee; it's not just about how you want to stand in opposition to something, but it's all of this—you can go through all of that and come out with a sense of yourself as a whole person, pulling from the past and able to understand the problems of the present, and figure out a way to empower yourself in relationship to that, and then be a conscious, aware person about shaping the future. *That's* what we tried to do.

And we tried to do it in all kinds of ways. I remember once we all went out and got found objects, and then we had to come back and talk about the found objects in relationship to some aspect of our personal history. That was interesting. I remember once we all brought in music, and we had to dance to that music—maybe with a partner, because I remember I chose Katia to dance with me. I brought Roberta Flack, "I told Jesus be all right if you change my name."

Now, I'm going to take a little sidebar here and tell you about changing my name. That was important for me, for two reasons. One: my husband had changed his name from his given name, Cedric Coles Clark, to Cedric X. He

hadn't gone to his Muslim name yet. And I had a hard time changing my name when I got married as a senior in college, so I thought, "Oh, I'd like to graduate as Carolyn Martin. This would be a good thing to do." His name was Clark. And Clark candy bar had a slogan, "Clark—A Great Name." He put this label all over everywhere. It was on my mirrors; it was on my notebooks, (laughs) it was on my refrigerator. In fact, by the time I graduated, I was using Clark. So I had Carolyn M. Clark. When I married my present husband, I had learned, maybe a few days before, that my first husband's mother had died, and that the funeral had happened, and all this without any member of the family telling me about it. I was disappointed that they hadn't let me know. I said, "*Pfft*. Why am I carrying this Clark name anyway? I don't want to be a Clark." And my husband said, "What about Shaw?" So that's the proposal. (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: So, I go, "Oh! I was just going to go to Carolyn Martin, myself!" I was just going to go back to Carolyn Martin. So that, "Be all right if I change my name," at this point when I'm dancing with Katia—I didn't feel that I could change my name myself. That is, I didn't feel that I could be the person that I wanted to be. But that's what the Ethnic Experience thing was about, wasn't it? It was all about trying to figure out how you are named; where that name that you want to claim comes from. Right? And I'm not a religious person. So I've got, "I told Jesus," that's really significant for me, is that I'm saying, "*I* stand up and tell Jesus what I want to do." I'm not a part of this kind of tradition where Jesus tells

me, or I try to *ask* what he wants, that I can't define the person that I am. That's a little glimpse of what we were trying to do.

I have to tell you about Carol Proudfoot and Cliff Poodry as Native Americans in this group.

Rabkin: Before you do that, can I just ask you one follow-up question, about the story you told earlier, around Luis Valdez? I was just curious if you remember what the cross-dressing business was all about.

Martin Shaw: We are turning everything we do upside-down. We don't give tests. We don't sit in rows. But those students were really upset about burning those tests. I mean, first of all, we'd never given them a test in our lives, and we weren't *going* to give them a test, but they sat down, and they seriously considered the questions that had been posed to them—which were not silly questions. They were probably questions somehow related to the ethnic experience, because I had to make it seem as though it was a real test. And they *wanted* them to be taken seriously. I don't know if they wanted them graded. We didn't have grades then; I don't know if they wanted us to read them. But they had *produced* something.

Rabkin: Oh, and they became attached to them [the tests]? So that then having them burned felt like the tables had been turned on them.

Martin Shaw: Right. It could be all those different levels that Luis was working at, and I may have understood it at the time, but some of it's gone by now. But I do remember the theater—

Rabkin: —the theater itself.

Martin Shaw: Exactly. I think what was going on was, what was it like for me to dress in those clothes? It was really strange. I *still* can't dress down if I'm going to be in a classroom. I had to—back to being myself—I had to go into that classroom in these overalls and be the professor, because that's who I needed to be to get this thing on. And that was really hard. I mean Luis's notions really pushed us in different ways. I don't know if Katia and Luis changed [clothes], or Josie. I don't know exactly what else people did in that. But it was a fantastic moment for me.

Basically what we were trying to do is to get students to go through that wheel: to think about all the different ways that it means to be "ethnic." Ethnic isn't just one thing, but being ethnic does mean holding onto something. It is not all free. You can't just create yourself anew from pulling things from the air. There is something that you're also trying to get at that is part of a legacy. What do you do with this legacy? If it's a brooch or a pen or something, you will change it into something else, or break it up, use it. But still, you have been given it. You don't have to hold it as it was, but you do recognize what that little thing is that you've gotten. That's pretty much what we were trying to do in that.

Rabkin: I think you mentioned, when we talked about this course earlier, before we started recording the interviews, that there were a number of Jewish students who found their way to asserting their identity through the class.

Martin Shaw: Yes. I think that was one of the major outcomes of that class. We did try to pull ethnic students in from around the campus, but it seems to me—and maybe we had thirty students in the class, and I would think that maybe twenty-five of them were from Kresge, Kresge students, and a large percent of those were Jewish students. I don't know exactly why they were attracted to the class, but when they came in, they did everything we asked them to do. They looked at, what did it mean to be a member of this group? When you're oppressed, how do you relate to the powers? How do you change? What happens when you you want to be them and not the person that you are now? What is it, if you really are the keeper of the faith in the end, what is it that you actually do want to keep? And what I found out, because we listened to the students talking, is that they all wanted to go back to something that many of them had gotten from their grandparents: some Jewish identity, some Jewish ritual, some language, some bit of identification, and begin to claim that. And some went further, in terms of eating habits or Jewish practices. That was really significant. What I think is that they had something all along that they weren't sure was a pearl of great distinction. They weren't sure what it was, but they knew it was there, and we allowed them to look at it. Once they did, they

discovered that this is something that they would like to have in their name as well. That was really significant.

Carol and Cliff, with the Native American experience: We did do a medicine wheel, or something similar to that, that came from Carol's tradition. Carol is Sioux, and Cliff is Iroquois. Iroquois are matrilineal, and his mother was Native American; his father wasn't. He talked a lot about what it was like to grow up on the reservation with people calling him white all the time. He had to claim his Native American heritage.

Here's the thing that's most significant for me: These people don't talk much, Carol and Cliff. I learned to not talk. I had always been told that I talk too much. It was one of the problems I had with my grandfather who stopped taking me to the baseball games. (He would take kids, and he would never stop driving, and I thought that [talking] was a good thing, because I talked and talked and talked to keep him awake.) But Carol and Cliff had a way of being with people in silence that I was really impressed by. Carol was assistant to Michael Kahn, so she was an extremely powerful person. Just as it was the case that we were concerned about what Michael Kahn would think about us, whether we were going the right direction, or whether we were "straight-talking" in the right way—we shared that about Carol; we were worried what Carol would think about us as well. She was very powerful, very grounded, and, like my friend Nubra, extremely a part of the NTL [National Training Laboratories] T-group training program. This inclusion of ethnic people into Kresge was there from beginning.

It wasn't, "Oh, there are those white people over there doing all this touchy-feely stuff." It's got this kind of ethnic component, particularly with Carol being so strong in the college. Carol was also a counselor. I'm trying to remember what her appointment was; I can't remember but I think that she had both Counseling Center and Kresge affiliation.

Okay, I know I've talked too much about Kresge. But let me tell you this one thing about Kresge. As a faculty member, I had to learn how to deal with students having a bad trip on LSD.

Rabkin: Wow.

Martin Shaw: They're just, "Here we are. These are our students. If you're going to be—" It wasn't that we were encouraging students to do drugs, but that's part of how we got the reputation. We *recognized* that they were going to do drugs, and we wanted to try to create an environment that was safe. But I was totally blown away with, what is it that I'm doing here? (laughs) In faculty orientation, we were told if a student is having a bad trip, "Okay, now, you have to be calm. They're going to come out of the bad trip."

Byron was a part of this [Ethnic Experience faculty] group. Byron's a very funny guy. Almost at any point when we would be going in some direction that seemed to be sort of serious and deadly—it's not that he would make a joke, but he would in fact bring up a really important point in opposition to where we

were going. He almost always kept us on our toes. "You may be going too far in this direction, or you may be thinking too—I don't know, too 'politically correct,' or maybe thinking too much about trying to change people," or something along those lines. He would pull us back. It was great working with him. He did, in fact, engage us in doing some dance. It was an interesting group of people: Cliff is a biologist, Carol is a psychologist, and Byron's in dance. The two counselors, and me in anthropology—but we had an awful lot of arts and humanities involved in doing that class. I think that's it for the *Ethnic Experience*.

An End to Community Counseling on Campus

Rabkin: Did you want to say anything else about working with the counseling center?

Martin Shaw: Oh. I was thinking about that, working with the counseling center, because there was a switch in the way the counseling center was done. Somebody called me in. (I got called in a lot.) Somebody called me in: there was an incident of racism at Merrill College. I actually can't remember what the incident was at this point. I was called in, and I immediately went to the counseling advisors that I knew over there—Katia, and there was another Chicana at Merrill, Max Camarillo, and then I might have known one other, and then Josie—and tried to see if I could get them together to figure out what we can do to deal with this. I can't remember now if we were in one dorm, and trying to get those students together to talk, but I set up what I thought would be a good structure for dealing with the issue. It left me not the only person coming in to

try to figure out how to handle this racism issue, but a number of professionals who could talk about it.

Each person I got in touch with got into trouble. We pulled off the intervention that I did. But Julian Silverman was the head of the counseling center at that time and he said counselors cannot be used in that way. He was pulling back from this kind of community involvement. He wanted more of the one-on-one. And I think that's the end. Before then, I was working with counselors; I was trying to talk to them about my experiences; I was trying to understand what was going on with students on campus. And I moved to try to pull them in to solve this issue of racism because I already knew them, and because I knew that they had some skills along these lines. But the campus itself was already pulling back.

Counselors are still in the colleges, but they're much less college-bound now. The counseling center doesn't see the counselors as college people; they are this central group. And at one point, I know, similar to our reorganization, counselors were supposed to only be in the center, and students not see them in their colleges but only go to the center. I know that Peg Shemaria stayed at Kresge for a long time, so I don't know if it did happen that more and more of them got into the center. My work with Katia and Josie had led me to believe that you could call on people trained in psychological counseling to deal with problems of students in the dormitories (because I'm sure this is what that was at Merrill). I was just told at that point, "You can't do this kind of intervention anymore. We have to back off from it." The counselors I had called on were told

they "overstepped," and they weren't supposed to go in and try to work on issues of racism with students in the dormitories. I had lots of other experiences with the counseling center before then, but that was the beginning of the end.

I have one other thing to say about counseling. Women's studies has resisted—I don't know if they have now or not—getting a psychologist as a faculty member, getting a person in psychology. It is because when you have a person in psychology, they tend to say it's an individual problem. Women's studies wanted people who could look at the social-political-ideological components of what it means to be a woman—or sexism. I think part of what was going on with me, in thinking about working with the counseling center, is that I had this sense of this kind of community counseling that I'd gotten from Josie and Katia. And in fact, they are moving more toward, "we do our best work when we're working one-on-one, when we think about the individual." Katia finished her dissertation while she was working here at UCSC. Her dissertation is on race and ethnicity as factors within counseling. It's the kind of thing that she spent most of her time thinking about, and she looks at it not only in terms of the relationship between the one person and the other person, but the whole broader social context. And the broader social context part was what was changing on campus.

Revitalization of the Colleges

Rabkin: So let's pick up, then, and start to talk about the campus reorganization and the work that you did with Carol Freeman.[12]

[12] For Carol Freeman's narration of this committee work see Sarah Rabkin, Interviewer and Editor, *Teaching Writing in the Company of Friends: An Oral History with Carol Freeman* (Regional

Martin Shaw: Okay. I'm not sure of all the reasons for reorganization, but I was in the senate when the reorganization vote passed. I have never heard such thunderous applause, ever, in any other place. There were so many people there who were so happy that they did not have to have a college presence. My understanding, mostly, is that it was a burden on scientists, who had their labs and their college offices. If you look at it that way, then it's a lot of space that's being used that could be used in different ways. But also, people felt that their careers weren't being advanced because they had to spend so much time in the colleges—that would be two classes per year—and they needed to do more, either in their own research, or they needed to do writing, or something else other than spending time in the colleges.

Rabkin: They had college teaching responsibilities, and then they also had some college-focused meetings they had to attend.

Martin Shaw: Yes. It depends on the college, what they would ask, and it depends on individual faculty members. I happened to be in a board of studies, in anthropology, that had a provost (Rich Randolph was provost of Cowell); an academic preceptor (Stu Schlegel was academic preceptor at Merrill); Adrienne (Zihlman), before she moved to Oakes, had been at Stevenson, and was very active there. Shelly Errington had been a residential preceptor at Stevenson. I had been residential preceptor at Kresge, and worked with the academic services

---

History Project, UCSC Library, 2013). Available in full text at http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/freeman

there. Gary Gossen (a name that you won't hear very often): he was a Cowell faculty member, and I think he'd worked as academic preceptor. So I was with a group of people who balanced their services to the college and their service to the boards. But I think, if you look across campus, there'd be lots of people who would do *nothing* in the college. They wouldn't come to their college meetings. They still had to teach college courses, and their college courses were not particularly creative.

In the old days, the college courses were very interesting. You've probably come across this one: I can't remember, it's Mary, Joseph and—somebody. Mary, Joseph, and Freud, or—I can't remember. It was some [faculty member] in religious studies, somebody in literature and history, teaching a college course, and I think that was a Cowell course. There was a course on wine that looked at wine in all these different directions. And I think Henry Hilgard's class on cancer started off as a college class. It became a really big class on campus, and a really fascinating way of combining sociology, immunology, history, to be able to look at cancer. I thought that was a great class.

Rabkin: Did the college courses tend to be interdisciplinary?

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm. They didn't have to be, but they tended to be. If you wanted to do interdisciplinary work, that was where you did it. Plus, the colleges at that point *were* interdisciplinary. After reorganization, colleges became more like boards or departments. You got departments then. Let's take, for instance,

anthropology. We [anthropology faculty offices] were in all colleges, as far as I can recall, and at reorganization, we were asked if we wanted to go as a department to Stevenson or to Merrill. We sat and talked about that a lot. We had people active in Stevenson and Merrill, but there's me at Kresge, and Loki [Pandey] at Crown, and all these people who had real associations and attachments to their colleges. Diane Gifford-Gonzales suggested that we not choose "A" or "B," but choose "C." And we all went to Kerr Hall. Now, it's kind of interesting to think about it, because it seems as though we're being more "department" than anybody else (laughs) because we all actually went together to this one place that's not associated with a college. But we did that so that we could maintain our college affiliations, and not feel that we were being torn apart because of that [move.]

So people could really do nothing in the colleges if they wanted to.

Rabkin: Even before reorganization?

Martin Shaw: (laughs) Even before reorganization, that's right. It's just that the courses were still divided in that way.

My very first course was probably my Kresge course called *African Women*. And it was heavily influenced by literature. I ended changing that course, after we didn't do college courses anymore, into an anthropology course, and I kept *some* of the same material. I had students reading poetry and plays, and acting out

plays in the course on African women because I, again, thought that was a good way to try to learn about another, by trying to put yourself in that place. I also had various little activities that I organized—like a colonialism activity in which people had conflicting goals, and they had to work together. Some of those activities I kept. And I continued to have them read some novels when I moved the course into anthropology, but I had less of the kind of emphatic learning—acting out, and things of that sort. But I felt comfortable doing the first thing within the college course because the college course is not an anthropology course. It has to be something different.

I think over time people stopped doing that; they stopped trying to make [the courses] have some difference from their department or from their board, and the college got to be redundant. You're just taking your Math 2 at Crown, instead of taking it in [a] math [department classroom]. Faculty members were really, on the whole, very happy when that change came about.

I'm not sure how long after we got rid of the necessity for every faculty member to be a part of the college that I got together with Carol [Freeman] to do the "revitalization." By this time, [newly hired] faculty members coming to campus didn't necessarily get assigned to a college. That was a surprise to me. I'd actually thought that we were still *assigned* to a college, even though you didn't have anything to *do* with the college. But that was one of the things I found out when I started calling around and trying to check on, where *are* the faculty

members. What Carol and I tried to do was to come up with a sense of what people felt was missing in what they were already doing on campus.

Let me take a step back and say this joint committee was the Committee on Planning and Budget working with the Committee on Educational Policy. I chaired the Committee on Planning and Budget, and Carol was chairing the Committee on Educational Policy. It was a *great* committee. It was one of my best experiences. I think that's primarily because I got to know Carol there, and getting to know her is like getting to know a powerhouse, a kind of fountain of ideas. You present a problem to her, and she's got a set of ideas; she's got a way of thinking about it, and she's got a way of phrasing it such that people can understand and begin to work with it. What I brought to the table was a kind of nuts-and-bolts, how-can-we-get-some-of-these-things. For instance, what it is it that faculty may actually want to have, or do, or say, or be involved with on campus? That's the questionnaire that I developed. I wanted to go out there and find out what it is: how happy *are* people, now that they don't have this college affiliation, or now that they are in their department "silos," and not having any relations with others.

What I found out was that a number of people *would* like greater interdisciplinary relationships with others—that some of them would care to be more directly involved with undergraduates if they could. But nobody really, really wanted to do an overload. (laughs) Nobody wanted to say, "I've got four classes for my department; now let me go and teach something else for my

college." The first thing that we did, besides going around talking to all these people and trying to get as wide a survey as possible, was we tried to get together to talk about what a vision for the college[s] could be. If it's not going to be everybody is sitting in the college and getting to know each other, what kinds of things could you come up with?

We came up with quite a few. The one thing that seemed to work the best was to think about having everybody agree to teach one course for a college every third year. A major change that allowed that to happen—and I wasn't even sure, myself, what I felt about it—was for the first time we went away from all classes being five units at UCSC. Some people really wanted that for a long time. I think it makes sense and that we should probably do more of it, because it's clear that all classes aren't equal, and it makes sense for the way students plan their workload to have some classes be three [units] and some be four. And to even get away from our standard as five—just to open it up. But that was a scary thing, to begin to say one, two, and three [units]. That was the first thing. This was when that was introduced to campus. I'm sure it was Carol's idea, because I couldn't imagine that I would have been courageous enough to say that let's break this up and do it in this way.

So, if it's one, two, and three [units per course], it's fewer hours that are required [of the instructors]. We actually weren't asking very much. I can't remember what it was now, but I think a one-unit class could be three hours, or it could be six hours, or something like that. It wouldn't even have to meet one hour a week.

These classes could be weekend classes; they could be modules; they could not have to go the whole term—all this kind of openness to the way that we do things. I think some faculty members really liked that as a whole, because we still have it. We don't have it for colleges anymore—and that was what happened shortly after we got it, but I won't get there yet—because what a wonderful moment, when we worked with faculty members from across the campus trying to figure out what the colleges could represent.

A piece of this is why did [faculty] people come to UCSC in the first place? I'm sure that some people came to UCSC because there were great laboratories and they had just the equipment they wanted, or because of the ocean, or because there was some faculty member here that they really felt like they needed to work with, or that had influenced them. But some people came here because we offer a different structure. What we were trying to do is to try to revitalize that, and to see if we could get more folks interested in participating in that. And we did.

I don't know how it happened. Carol is a magician. After talking to people about what they wanted, we presented a proposal to the Academic Senate. There was debate on it. The proposal was to ask all ladder-rank faculty to teach one additional course every third year. The bookkeeping would be done at both the college and the department level, but I think it's mostly the department level that would be doing the bookkeeping. And it passed! (laughs) It passed! Again, with great acclaim. People really liked it. Here I am, always trying to do some work in

the community, making sure that there *is* a community there. That felt affirming. People really felt that there's something the colleges offer; they were interested in the interdisciplinary, and they were willing to work a little bit more.

I don't really know how long it lasted. Maybe I don't want to know. But I was there at the meeting when, a few years later, there was a motion presented to do away with the college service courses. And there wasn't such thunderous applause as there was when reorganization happened, but it was pretty broad.

What you can say about this is: some things that we talked about [in the revitalization-of-the-colleges discussion] are still happening. One of the things that people said is, "We like this one-, two-, and three- [unit class option]. We like being able to have one, two, and three. We want to do it for our majors." So that is happening. We allowed a little bit more creativity and a little bit more flexibility in how you do some of the courses.

I think it did last at least four years, because I think everybody had to do it at least once. Because it would have to be (laughs) three years to get through this, and it may have been four or five years. I think most people did it, but I think they found it was an overload. They weren't as happy as they thought they would be.

It's really hard to make colleges work without a senior commons room. People don't know each other; they don't necessarily talk across their disciplines. When

they think about subjects that they'd like to teach, they think within their disciplines. It would be really interesting to have people think *with others*—to have them think about how all the stuff they do outside of their disciplines—their hobbies, and their readings, and their going to opera—might actually influence some of the things that they may talk about within this [kind of course]. But some of that didn't happen, and I don't know all of the reasons for it. It was really hard. But it was a great moment, to have the faculty members begin to see that this university experience could be more, and have them buy into it.

Rabkin: It sounds like exactly what it was called: a revitalization. There was a new energy in the senate, at least at that moment.

Martin Shaw: It was wonderful.

Rabkin: What was behind the formation of that committee in the first place?

Martin Shaw: We should check to see who was the head of the senate. I believe it was Michael Cowan. I think that he was the head of the senate at that time. He's a big college person. He had been provost at Merrill at one point. I think partly it came from him. Because it came to me. It wasn't generated from CPB, and I don't think it was generated from CEP. But it could have been from the senate—the sort of executive committee, although I think we didn't call it that at that time.

But when it came to us, it was something like, "If we were going to revitalize the colleges, which committees should be a part of it?" Planning and Budget, because of money and those implications, would be one, and the undergraduate curriculum [overseen by the Committee on Educational Policy] would be the other. From the beginning, a criticism of the college courses was that they were for undergraduates. Many faculty wanted to use it for graduate courses.

But it was a great time. It was a time of affirmation: UCSC has a mission, and we will get together to try to work on that. And it was wonderful working with Carol on it. I don't know how we could have done it otherwise. That was really great.

Rabkin: You were a good team.

Martin Shaw: Yeah. It was really good.

Provost of Kresge College

Rabkin: So right at that moment, when you and Carol came together to work as joint chairs on that committee, you also were facing the possibility of becoming provost at Kresge.

Martin Shaw: (laughs) That's right. I had served already for a year on the Committee on Planning and Budget, and that committee made some changes in the way the university is structured—and I'll talk about that a little bit later. I

really wanted to be on the college's revitalization committee. And at that point, Kresge was looking for a provost—so what was I going to do?

I wanted to be provost at Kresge. I think from the time May was provost at Kresge (laughs) I wanted to be provost at Kresge. I was a residential preceptor when she was there, and I spent a lot of time with her, and looking at administration, and trying to understand the students. I didn't actually come in as provost at Kresge with a set of goals that I wanted to reach, but I wanted—and it's one of those strange things about me—I wanted us to not deny or denigrate our past. I wanted people to hold up their heads when they say "touchy-feely." (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: I didn't want touchy-feely, but—maybe it's part of the same thing I'm talking about with *Ethnic Experience*: that is there is a past. There is a past that has to be recognized. Sometimes that past doesn't have everything in it that we want, or sometimes things are cruel, or sometimes we made mistakes. But that's the road that we traveled, and that's something that we have to look at. So that's a piece of it.

The other part of why I wanted to be provost had to do with trying to see what is now possible in terms of a revitalization of the colleges, in terms of getting different kinds of groups together. Okay, I'll tell you the one I was working on at

Kresge. I don't know how naïve I was! It turns out that there was no center for Asian studies on campus. [The campus] may even have had that Latino/Latin American Studies major by then. We had American studies, which I thought was pretty good for looking at different kinds of ethnic relations. But I kept on hearing about people working in China, or people working in Japan, or people working in Southeast Asia, and I said, well, maybe Kresge could be this place. So I started talking to people working in these areas, and they went, "*Asia?* We don't recognize *Asia*." "I work in China; it has nothing much to do with India. I don't know about Indonesia." This whole kind of area studies was under attack, probably wider in the academy, and I wasn't aware of it. But I actually did get some people to move from where they were and come to Kresge and have a little Asian [studies cluster]. So I got Raoul Birnbaum from art history, and [Earl] Jackson, who works in literature, and maybe one other person to come and sort of be a little bit of a focus of Asian studies. But that didn't work very well.

Some of these people I got to know through a lesbian-gay-bisexual reading group that we had on campus, at which point I was identifying as bisexual. (I had identified as a lesbian at one point.) And what I found out with my reading group is that they didn't actually think that bisexuals should be in that group. (laughs) I was having a little bit of a problem with it. But I would go, and I'd join in the reading group, and we'd talk about a wide range of topics. But bisexuals were always—oh, you're suspect because you can pass as heterosexual.

One night, after that group, I was walking to the parking lot with Nancy Stoller, who was also in the group, and I said, "Oh, Nancy, I want to be provost of Kresge, but I don't want to do it next year, because I want to work on this other committee. Do you want to be provost?" She said yes. (laughs) That was it. She said yes, and I said, "Oh—okay. Let's interview for the job together." I went to the people who'd asked me—I can't remember who it was now—to run for provost. Because not that many people wanted to be provost back in those days, and if I had said yes, that could have been it. (It's been that way for a long time. You don't get much for being provost.) I said, "I'd like to become provost. I'd like Nancy to take over for one year, and then I'll come after she finishes."

I hadn't even thought about what a big deal it would have been for Nancy to be provost. Because Nancy had been denied tenure at UCSC, and she fought for—I don't know, five years.[13] She was *all over* the news with her battle. Her battle was a good one. Because it was clear in her record that there were political considerations in her academic review, she decided that she wanted to fight, and she made a really big fight, and it was really well known throughout the country. So when she came on [as provost], it was, "Person Denied Tenure at UCSC, Fought, Came Back—and is now Provost!" (laughs) *And* lesbian. (Okay, *lesbian* wasn't one of the things that was said in her tenure review, but it was one of those things that was *un*said in her tenure review. But it was the political stuff.)

[13] See the oral history with Nancy Stoller in the *Out in the Redwoods* oral history project http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/oir.exhibit/nancy_stoller.

When Nancy came on, of course, it was big news that she was going to be provost. We'd just changed the theme of Kresge. Kresge was a humanities college at that time, and its theme had something to do with literature.

Rabkin: So it had moved on from The Human Environment at this point.

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm. That's right. After reorganization it was a literature college, and almost all literature faculty were there. So I, working with Nancy, we came up with Cultural Intersections, which is part of my own research, and part of what we do in feminist studies—all the intersectional stuff, trying to understand race, gender, and class, and sexuality as a component of who we are. So we brought that on. And again, I was surprised that when we brought that on, it was [perceived as being] about lesbianism! Because I had thought it was about *all* of us having race, gender, class, and sexuality. But because it's Nancy starting as the provost under this new title, then we got people almost always thinking about sexuality as being about homosexuality.

I started teaching classes on sexuality, but including heterosexuality and homosexuality, probably in the 1980s, and my research shows how *varied* the construction of "heterosexual" is. You think you know what it means to be a heterosexual? Well, try being a heterosexual in *this* society. In this society being a heterosexual may mean that you can have sex with lots of people, including men and women. But over here, *this* construction of heterosexuality means that a man approaches a woman once every five years to have a baby, and other than that,

you've got this kind of separate existence. Or *this* construction of heterosexuality means—I mean, it goes on and on. It seemed to me that sexuality was as fluid as some of these other identifiers that we were talking about. But that wasn't the case when we first got started.

Rabkin: Are you saying that people within the college—students and faculty alike—interpreted the sexuality part that way, weighted toward lesbianism? And/or that critics from outside saw it that way?

Martin Shaw: Critics from outside saw it that way. In fact, when we did our first core course, which is now what the theme of the college is about—we did include something on lesbianism. I think the next year we also included something on it. We were doing novels and I included this great book called *Cambodia*. It's a book of essays, and it's a political theme, and it's mostly about "What do we do with the knowledge that we have about the world? How do we integrate it into ourselves? And what kinds of changes are we willing to make?" We had some essays, but we also had mostly novels. And we had novels each time, for the first two years at any rate that dealt primarily with lesbian or gay relationships. Lesbian and black was the theme of the first novel, as I recall, and gay and Chicano, the second.

At that point, I'm coming on as provost. And we've always had a hard time getting ethnic students over at Kresge. So I think, maybe Kresge is a place for queer ethnic students, maybe ethnic students who are queer and may not find

themselves so comfortable elsewhere. I thought, if we already have this reputation, because Nancy started off, and we've got the word "sex" in our title of what we're trying to do, why don't we try to make it that kind of space? Well, that worked out, to some extent, because Kresge was pretty open, in terms of sexuality. But we still didn't get the kind of ethnic diversity that we were looking for.

Eventually I moved, with Carol Harper, who was the college administrative officer, to thinking about Kresge as a place for transfer students. That worked. Kresge has always been all flats, or suites—no dining hall, no joint dormitory-type residence. It's a good place for students who have some sense of independence. It's a nice place for students who want an on-campus experience but don't feel like they can deal with a dormitory. And we've done great work there.

Rabkin: Was it during your time as provost that the Services for Transfer and Re-entry Students moved into Kresge?

Martin Shaw: Yes. They might have come right after I left, but that was what we were working toward when I was there. I think Kresge works well with this. When we got started, we had assumed that we'd have all of our students living on campus. More and more, we realized that some students wanted to move off. Some of the first-year students had a really hard time adjusting. The parents would come at the end of the first year and go, "*[Gasp!]* My son is cooking! I am

so happy!" They didn't think that their kids would be able to do it. And I think some of the kids didn't think they'd be able to do it, either. It really did work well to have us move in that direction.

Affirmative Action, Campus Service, and Promotion

Rabkin: [It's June] 5th, 2014, and this is Sarah Rabkin once again with Carolyn Martin Shaw, at her home in Scotts Valley, California, and we are embarking on our fourth and probably last interview in our oral history series. So, Carolyn, you wanted to start by talking about affirmative action and civil rights activism.

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm. I think what I want to do is, again, bring it back to myself and talk about the fact that without affirmative action I wouldn't be here. Now, there are so many people who don't say that. They believe that they have made it on their own, and I think that we all want to believe that we have made it on our own. And I'm sure that I have—but the doors would not have been open. A good example of it is that I am from Michigan State [University]; when I got here, I didn't find anybody else from a large state school. Now, they have hired people from large state schools since then, and two [other] black women on campus: Margo Hendricks, who was over in literature, a Shakespeare scholar—she came from San Jose State; and in my department, Diane Lewis came from San Francisco State. One of my colleagues would always talk about the fact that I'd been at University of Pennsylvania for one year before I came here, rather than that I did my PhD at Michigan State.

Rabkin: Because Penn was more recognizable?

Martin Shaw: Because Penn is Ivy League. Ivy League. (laughs) We don't always realize that University of Pennsylvania is Ivy League, but it's Ivy League, and I think that's why. If it had been Penn State, it wouldn't have been mentioned, because Penn State, Michigan State—they were about the same.

I would look at the catalog, and look at the faculty, and I'd just see Ivy League Colleges; small, elite colleges. Seldom would I see [faculty who had come from large state institutions]. Actually when I first got here I don't think I ever saw any. There may have been some; I just don't remember them. Finding my feet, finding my voice within this environment, was a little daunting. I think to some extent that's one of the reasons why I began to do service and shape the environment so that the campus would be more like me (laughs), so that I could feel a better part of it. Because certainly I did not feel that when I first came.

Rabkin: So what did you mean in saying that if it had not been for affirmative action, you would not be here?

Martin Shaw: I do think that the women in the anthropology department were looking for diversity. They wanted a woman; I know that for sure. The year I was hired, three black women were interviewed. Two of us were hired. That has to be a concerted effort by people trying to act affirmatively in relationship to the pool that's out there.

Rabkin: Not necessarily because they are institutionally required to do so at that point, but because they're doing it on their own initiative.

Martin Shaw: That's right, exactly. They were doing it on their own, especially under the influence of Nancy Tanner and Adrienne Zihlman, two staunch feminists. Along those lines, I want to say that that is the case—*and* another thing that I hear faculty saying all the time is that, "I didn't get here because of service." And I can't say that. I am tenured because of service, and almost every step I went up the ladder, I went because of service. I don't publish as much as most other people. I take a long time to get the work done, and partly that is because I'm doing many other things. But it is, in fact, the service to the institution, and dedication, or the big piece of my life that the service occupies, that's a part of my own trajectory through the university. I think most people don't want to admit it even if it's true. It certainly happens to be more true for women of color, and maybe some men of color than it is for white women and white men—although I have to say maybe it's more true for white women than it is for white men. At some points in my darkest hours I go, "I'm still a maid. I'm still cleaning up!"

Rabkin: It's all about service.

Martin Shaw: That's right. I'm still *taking care* of these people around here, right? At other points, I say, "Service is part of the gift that I can give." So I can go back

and forth with the service thing. But certainly it [my hiring and advancement] had to do with the kind of consciousness of the people on the board, with a change in the way they were thinking about who to have on campus. And I don't know to what extent there was a push from the center to get greater diversity, but I think when I came, '72—everybody could read by '72 that things were going to change.

Rabkin: Can I ask you something about this service component? Do you feel, in general, that the institution rewards service in decisions about career advancement? Or do you think that's something of an anomaly in your case?

Martin Shaw: I think they *don't* reward service; however— I think I might have mentioned that when I came up for tenure I was turned down. I was given a tentative negative.

Rabkin: Because you had not finished your—?

Martin Shaw: No, that wasn't the dissertation—that was when I was coming up for a regular appointment. [It was] because I hadn't published enough.

Rabkin: Ah.

Martin Shaw: A simple thing to do is to go back and look at the university rules about promotion. The university rules say that it is "research and publication,

teaching and service." And in fact, the university rules say that they expect that there will be differences. Isn't that interesting? They expect that there will be differences in the proportions of these that you do over time. So I hired a lawyer; we used the university rules to talk about it. But that's not how I got tenure. I got tenure through the friendship of Nancy Tanner, who I had been teaching with. In that teaching I'd developed a lecture on black language. It was comparing black communication styles to the Balinese communication styles. This was the time of *Roots* and Chicken George. Clifford Geertz had a famous article called "The Balinese Cockfight."[14] I looked at Chicken George's cockfight and the Balinese cockfight, and the construction of person and personality, and the nature of communication through those. I didn't write it down, but Nancy had it recorded; somebody transcribed it, and she sent it off to Clifford Geertz. (laughs) And he wrote back a nice, positive letter for me, which helped me to get to the next stage. Then other friends of mine pulled from my hands an article I was writing on virginity—virginity and the state. It's along these lines: virginity is most valued in societies that have a kind of hierarchical structure. And virginity is just one of the things that people can use to say they're purer and better than others. When you have a more egalitarian structure, virginity seems not to be so important. Anyway, I was writing that, and a friend of mine pulled that from my hands and sent it off to somebody, and they wrote back saying they would accept it. And eventually they didn't. Yeah. That was really interesting. They wrote back a letter saying they would accept it, and I worked on it a little bit and sent it in, and they thought it was a little too broad; I was making big comparisons, such as "Europe

[14] See Clifford Geertz, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight" in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (Basic Books, 1973).

and Asia compared to Africa." Anthropology usually is much smaller and more precise in comparison. That became a chapter in my first book, so it did get published. It turns out to be the most popular chapter in the book. I'm happy about that.

But service isn't recognized. I needed to make an argument about service—and I also needed to be able to pull together some writing. Without those people who were so instrumental in hiring me continuing to support me, I wouldn't have been able to do it. In fact, it was Nancy Tanner and Adrienne Zihlman, who were the powerhouses in anthropology, who made a big difference for me.

But I have to tell you that it was Roger Keesing—and I don't know if you've heard that name before, because he left and went to National University of Australia [Australian National University, in Canberra], maybe, I don't know, thirty years ago, maybe seven or so years after I came, so maybe forty years ago. And then he died not too long after that. But he's the person who went to Stanford to hear my talk, and then said I was okay. When I came to Santa Cruz, I just had to talk to people; I didn't have to stand up and give a talk, and that worked out really well.

Anthropology at UCSC

In the anthropology department, I think when I came in with two other women, we probably tipped the balance to have more women than men. Two of the male faculty—Gary Gossen, who studied Mexico, and Tom Rohlen, who studied

Japan—left. They, I know, were being teased on campus. Ha-ha—isn't that funny? They were "henpecked"; they were in a department with mostly women. That was one piece of it. And I saw them struggling with how to treat women as equals. There's a thing that many men do: they make you feel like you're "special," and put you on a little pedestal. If we're actually working together, you have to engage me, as opposed to treating me with kid gloves. They were having a hard time with that, and they finally went someplace else. And I think they've done well.

Rabkin: Was it your sense that their departure had to do in part with these gender dynamics?

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm. And I heard it on campus as well, "What's going on with anthropology? Anthropology has too many women." Now, the *field* has an awful lot of women, but on campus we were really unusual at the time. I don't know where else we would have had as many women. At one point in the campus' history, the statistic was that there was no school with the same percentage of women other than nursing school. This campus at one point, probably in the seventies or eighties, had that.

Rabkin: Among the ladder faculty?

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm. Our department has retreated, and now, I think, we're probably balanced, men and women. But for a long time, we'd try to hire men, but the women just were so good (laughs) that we didn't go in that direction.

I want to talk a little bit about what it was like in the department at the time when we were a board. Adrienne Zihlman started a series of teaching workshops for women faculty on campus. She had a friend that she worked with—her first name is Dawn; I can't remember her last name—who taught how to do oral presentations, public presentations. Adrienne, for maybe about four years, got women from all over campus to come together to work in that. I thought that was really useful. As a matter of fact, I learned so much in those workshops, I started using some of it in my classes. And when I went to Zimbabwe and I started doing the sexual harassment workshops and gender and sexuality workshops, I used the same structure that Dawn had used. Adrienne was interested in trying to see how we could improve our craft, and she was interested in developing professionalism.

Rabkin: For the women in the department in particular, or from all over campus?

Martin Shaw: For women in the department *and* all over campus. I know Aida Hurtado participated, Judith Aissen, and some women from the sciences. Yes, she brought in quite a few women. Nancy Tanner is one of the women who participated in this. By the time Nancy took part in the workshops, she and

Adrienne were at loggerheads. They collaborated in research and publications; they'd done lots of research together—and they were falling apart. That tension between these two women who had been so supportive of me made me feel like I was caught in the middle, and reminded me of old family dynamics. That was one of the tense moments in the department, and I ended up trying as much as possible to help Nancy and give Nancy support. Nancy died in her early fifties, not too long after their relationship broke up.

In the department we had, eventually, three people who worked in Indonesia. We were a relatively small department, and we had three people who worked in Indonesia. Indonesia is big, and they worked in different parts of Indonesia—but that gives you an example of what they were looking for when they'd go out [to hire new faculty]. They were looking for people who were good in their fields, who'd bring something to the department. And we are allowed to follow our specialty and our special interests. This is not a department that said, "We need to cover the world; we need to cover the map." They were saying, "We want people who fit in in terms of their interests, their ideas, their approaches." Then you're given leeway to develop whatever you want to develop. I felt that was very helpful, and that's what I did do.

For a long time, I taught classes on Africa and social organization, and theory classes that dealt with the nature of social change. After doing this for a few years, I was asked to teach the *Introduction to Cultural Anthropology*, which was

our biggest class, and I had one of the biggest enrollments ever: I had 500 students in Classroom Unit Two—

Rabkin: Oh, my goodness.

Martin Shaw: —because that year, I decided that instead of a final paper, they could do a final media project. I did it once after that (laughs), but I realized *that's* why those students were in that class: "Oh, no paper!" Then I had to train teaching assistants about how to judge media projects. So there are photographs, and videos, and we had no sense of what are the parameters to look at this—that was a big deal. *And* I wanted to exhibit it. I had to make some space to be able to exhibit students' projects.

I'll just say, while we're talking about exhibiting, that that's been one of the things that I've done in the department quite a bit. I would have students do some sort of project that shows their level of empathy or understanding—particularly in my *African Women* class—and I would try to put them up somewhere. I'd put them on bulletin boards, or put them in the department library, or do something like that.

Now, in the *African Women* class—I think I mentioned that when I first started teaching it, I had lots of plays and poems and literature. So I kept some of that, but I also kept a final project: Write a speech that you would give to your high school, or some civic group that you participate in, about African women. Or

write a short story or an essay that brings together two different characters that you've read about in this term. Or do an art piece. I got some *great* art pieces—some of them a little overwhelming. One that I still have, that the student didn't pick up, is [about] clitoridectomy, and she's got a razor blade in silver, really metallic against the dark skin of the girl, and people holding her down. It's a big oil painting. I took a picture of it, because I don't actually want to have it on my walls. But it's been really great to see the creativity students bring to the subject. I really enjoy when the students take some of the things that they've learned from me and do something with it in relationship to an art project. Sometimes they will write a poem. I also gave them enough time to also answer some of the questions that I've been going over in an analytical way, but I was interested in the development of empathy, and the development of a kind of understanding of others, and the art projects really helped with that.

I took that class from Kresge into anthropology, and continued to do it. Another thing I have to tell you—at the beginning of the school year, when we are all asked to introduce ourselves at the undergraduate orientation, I would say, "I am teaching a class on Africa. It covers social organization and kinship," and this and this and that, "and there's *no drumming and no dancing*."

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: (laughs) Because that's what students want to come in for: drumming and dancing. The truth is, I have drumming and dancing in every one

of those classes. I have a potluck, which I developed years ago, that divides people according to their day of birth. Day names are important in West Africa, so you could get what your day name is in Yoruba or in Ashanti, and then, based on that, they'd bring certain items, such as cups, napkins, plates, etc., or they'd cook. I'd have five or six African cookbooks on reserve at the library, so they can get the books. Then I'd hire a teacher to teach dance. And most of the time she'd bring a drummer; sometimes it will be from some taped music. When there was no teacher, *I* had to do it—and I was glad that there are some teachers around who were really good. (laughs) I've got lots of pictures of my students, and some videos, of them engaged, over the years, doing the African dance. It's a wonderful experience for them. I had to finally back off from "there's no drumming and no dancing," because, in fact, I always included it. It's another way that they could get in touch with what it means to understand how Africans live.

Rabkin: So that caveat at the beginning of the class was just so that you weren't flooded with students who were there *only* because they were interested in drumming and dancing.

Martin Shaw: That's right. And there were a number of students who wanted to just talk about that, and there's too much history to go through to just do that.

For years, in the anthropology department, we had a really open process of talking about what to teach, when to teach it. We had some required courses that

a couple of people always taught, and after a while we started moving those around. Those were heavy theory courses, and for the most part I didn't teach them until maybe about fifteen years ago—and then I taught all of them, it seems. We tried to develop a little core for students who wanted to go on to graduate school, and there are three courses in that little core—I think there are probably five—but two of them are from social anthropology, and for two years, I taught both of them. When the students came up to get their little award, I thought, "Yeah, you got your certificate in Carolyn Martin Shaw." (laughs) And I enjoyed that. I had some students who ended up making a little booklet based on the way I taught the class. It would be something along the lines of, "Here's the theorist. Who's he talking to, and who's he arguing against, and what are his main tenets?" Somebody did a little book in anthropology with, "Here are all the theorists; this is their time period; these are the people they are arguing against; these are who they're talking to." That was really quite useful for a number of students.

Rabkin: So that became a resource for subsequent classes of anthro students?

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm.

Rabkin: Is it still around?

Martin Shaw: I don't think so, because there's another one that some students did that was a resource for transfer students that introduced them to the

vocabulary of UCSC. Of course that vocabulary has changed over the years. But I think that one probably stayed around for two or three years and then disappeared. I don't know exactly what happens to all these materials. I think they give them to people in the office, and the materials become less useful as time goes on.

The other course I taught was the writing course, the disciplinary writing course that we had to do back in the old days. I used a lot of material from critical thinking, critical writing. Then I used some of the same things I learned in the workshop on public presentations. I actually ended up having some of the students do presentations within that class. That was a good class; I think that was probably my favorite one. I divided the class up into little writing groups, and then I could circulate to the writing groups sometimes within class and talk to them about their various issues.

Instituting an Anthropology Graduate Program

Things went really well in the department until we decided to get a graduate program. I think I've mentioned already that I had some concerns about how graduate students are treated, and whether or not I really wanted to be a part of the kind of divisiveness and competition that is a part of graduate education. To my surprise, I have found great joy in working with graduate students, but I don't tend to teach them courses that have to do with my own thinking or material that comes from my work. I teach them grant-writing, where I get a

sense of what they're doing and try to help them improve their arguments and such. That's been really good.

But when we decided to go into a graduate [program], then we wanted to beef up our department and bring in big names from elsewhere. Bringing in those big names, you also brought in big egos. We brought in the division between the sociocultural component of the department and the scientific component—that's archaeology and physical anthropology. This happened right around the time when I was chair of the department. It was probably the worst year of my life. I did it for two years, and I was provost at the same time—which was also very hard.

Being provost, I'll just say, because we've talked about it a little bit: I was not familiar with how offices run. I'm a faculty member (laughs). I spend most of my time in my office or talking to my students. And then, all of the kinds of complaints that people on [the college] staff make about each other—I took it all seriously, and I meddled too much. It was just really hard. I had a hard time there.

Over in the anthropology department, where I *know* all these people, I know their personalities, I know where the issues are—I was chair at the time when one of the people I liked very much there came to me and said, "We will oppose you." "We" is the new group of people who are coming in to build the graduate program. They will "oppose" me. I still to this day don't know exactly why I will

be opposed. I think partly it's because I was open to physical [anthropology] and archaeology. I felt that we had something to say; we could talk to each other. At one point, when we got our graduate program, we only took sociocultural students, and we had them in a core course. One of my faculty members in my department said to physical and archaeology students who would be coming into another graduate program, "You cannot take this course. I don't want the issues, the questions that you raise to be raised in my classroom." It's that kind of division that was going on there. It was really a difficult point in time.

Rabkin: This group of colleagues who threatened to oppose you, said they would oppose you: oppose you on what?

Martin Shaw: She's one of the people I liked a lot, who was coming in as one of the up-and-coming folks. I think it was to any extent that I would make overtures to physical and archaeology. I'll give you an example. I'll just talk about David Schneider, because he is dead, and you can speak ill of the dead. David Schneider, when he died, he left some money to the university. I think he wanted it to go to the anthropology department. He had an explicit statement that said this money cannot go to support archaeology or physical anthropology. He had his son, who is an archaeologist, present that to us. Maybe he didn't have his son [do it], because he [David] was already dead, but he left that message to his son, who actually came to campus to follow his father's wishes and tell us that his father has left money to this campus—but it can't go to this part of the department; it has to only go to this other part. Now, David Schneider is the

person I've already told you about, that I was tongue-tied [about when I first met him]. I *loved* him; I thought he was so great. He became my worst enemy, and it was really, really hard. I actually didn't even realize how much of an enemy he was, and one of my colleagues said to me, "David Schneider has come to campus to hear everybody give a paper in the department, but he did not come to hear you?" I thought, oh—I didn't even notice. Too bad you mentioned that to me. (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: I think it's deeply theoretical, this kind of division—but I also think it's aligning against Big Science. There's a fear of science, that science is going to take over. When we moved into College Nine from Kerr Hall, we were allocating space. The scientists have big ol' labs. Adrienne has things to dissect, and other people have things to break up, or use microscopes—whatever they need. Sociocultural anthropologists didn't have that. So how can sociocultural try to get something like these guys are getting? They actually started claiming space. (laughs) The sociocultural people said, "Well, we want this. They've got that." That's the kind of stuff that was driving me crazy during that time. I was also having bad asthma. I couldn't breathe.

Rabkin: Literally *or* figuratively.

Martin Shaw: Yeah. I just couldn't. I would be in meetings and I could just see everybody was just listening to me. [simulates a strangled intake of breath] I couldn't. It was really, really hard.

That finally did die down a little bit [both the asthma and the hostility in the department]. About 1999, after I'd finished being chair and provost (or was it '98?), I went on almost two years' leave. When I came back, things were good. I think that my being away helped. My being there represented an old-school, a way of doing things that, even if I didn't say anything about what was going on, there was this kind of "She's the history of this department sitting there." I think without that, things got a lot better. There's a little bit coming up again, right now, this division between the scientists and the social scientists. But I don't think it will ever be as bad as it was at when I was chair. Those were my worst moments.

I could talk about memorable students.[15] I actually have a lot of great students, but I don't actually remember all their names. (laughs) I just want to mention a couple. Julie Dodd Tetzlaff is one I mentioned who became a good friend. I think she was eighteen or nineteen when I first saw her, and she and her friend ruined my class with this continual talk about, how can we have this lesbian nation? And it's [the class is] on kinship, right? Kinship and social organization. Now

---

[15] I would like to add mention of two other anthropology undergraduates who have gone on to earn PhDs: Ruth Mathis in archeology and Sam/Susie Bullington, who developed great teaching resources used in anthropology and feminist studies classes. Ron Eglash, a history of consciousness graduate student, took or TA'd in all of my Africa classes and was a great guide to the campus when my mother came to visit. He has made a name for himself in the cultural studies of fractals—Carolyn Martin Shaw.

what happened with Julie Dodd after that is that she had lots of really interesting ideas, and she would continue to come and talk to me. I found her really fascinating, and we became friends. Today she's one of my best confidantes. I would definitely have to say that she's one of the students I remember most.

Rabkin: Was she one of your undergraduate students?

Martin Shaw: She was an undergraduate. I'm talking mostly about undergraduates now. I looked for the two black yearbooks [a compilation of stories, poems, and photos produced in a Kresge course that I led], and I don't have it here, but I know that we gave it to Special Collections. The first was called *Just Us* and the second, something like *The Beauty of This Very, Very Dark World.*

Rabkin: Okay.

Martin Shaw: —and so they will have it. Three to four students worked closely on that. Kelvin Filer, I think I've mentioned, who's a judge down in L.A., who made many copies of it and gives it out to people that he sees all the time.[16] And Gail Jordan, who became a schoolteacher. Jennifer Smallwood, who now works at a camp that my grandkids go to. And then Bob Taylor, who was an academic preceptor at UCSC. All four of them were among the most active at working on that.

[16] http://currents.ucsc.edu/05-06/07-11/filer.asp

There's a student whose name I don't remember, and I've learned so much from him. He had a disability: he was dyslexic. Very handsome, very outspoken, and very smart kid. I had him in my senior thesis class. And the senior thesis class is another writing class I developed, based on Peter Elbow.[17] So we used that, and I used some of the Peter Elbow ideas in the grant-writing class as well. I asked him to read what he had written—and he couldn't read it. He couldn't read his own writing. It just gave me such empathy for what he was going through. Really, really brilliant, and wrote beautifully, but had to have every service that we had at campus to be able to do it. I saw him maybe a year or so after he graduated, and I don't know why he was back on campus—but he became a cook, and I think he's probably a great chef someplace.

Another student, a brilliant student, really hardworking, had a disability. She has a back problem, and she's obese. I asked her and some other students to be TAs in my upper-division class on sexuality. The department was cutting back; they wouldn't give me a graduate student TA, so I got six of the students who had taken the class before. That was a great experience, and working with her was wonderful. She won the Chancellor's Diversity Award one year, and I went with her when she got that award.

[17] Peter Elbow's innovative book *Writing Without Teachers* is a classic text used in writing classes at UC Santa Cruz and across the country—Editor.

Rabkin: I think I came across some publicity about that on the campus website when I was doing research for these interviews. She had some lovely things to say about working with you.

Martin Shaw: Yeah. She is a great person. She went to NYU. I visited her in New York. She finished the master's degree there. She was really miserable. And then she's gone to the seminary [Graduate Theological Union] in Berkeley.

Rabkin: Up there on "Holy Hill."

Martin Shaw: That's right. She's getting her degree there, and she seems very happy doing that. Those are some of the undergraduates. There are other undergraduates that I never hear from, that also stick in my mind. They grabbed onto what it is that I was doing, and went off in the world to do whatever it is that they wanted to do. I feel fine about that. That's great. They don't have to get back in touch with me. Carol McCormick is one of those, and Cole Cottin is another. There's one black woman student who sticks in my mind; she came after the yearbook students, and I don't remember her name. She was from Boston, and when I saw her, I thought, that is the kind of student I was, bright and eager. We talked about gang warfare, and of girls hiding guns for their boyfriends. She left after one year and went back home. I hope that she continued her education.

I worked with five graduate students, and they have taken very different paths. Everybody knows the top graduate student went to Yale. Actually, she got

tenure at Yale. It was her first job, Yale. She got five interviews her first year out; she got four job offers; she went to Yale. I said, "Okay, don't expect to get tenure at Yale. They will not give you tenure at Yale. They will expect you to go someplace else." She got tenure at Yale. She got to be full professor at Yale, and now she's moved to University of Pennsylvania. She's done really well. Others of them are—one's in the north of Sweden teaching social work and nursing students, Lena Sawyer. Tia-Nicole Leak worked for the CDC; I think she's working in the federal government on the Affordable Health Care Act. She's an analyst in the Department of Health, with an impressive portfolio. And that's just what she wanted to do. It's so great. Debbie Klein is at Gavlian, after getting tenure at Cabrillo; she continued to do research and was awarded a Fulbright while working at a community college. Kristin Cheney is now at an international research university in the Netherlands. She is extremely active in research and humanitarian service in East Africa. Melissa Hackman just finished about three years ago, and she's done so well. She hasn't gotten a full-time job yet, but she'd gotten a named post-doc at Brown, and now she's at Emory, with another post-doc. And then, of course, there are lots of other students that I worked with (but I'm not their advisor) that have done great. I just want to mention Kristy Bright, Annie-Lorrie Anderson, Noah Tamarkin, Sarah Chee, and Aaron Montoya in anthropology and Mischa Adams, Margaret Daniel, Mary John, Herb Perkins, and Will Roscoe in the history of consciousness program.

It was a good place for most of the time. It's a good place now. But there was that moment of trying to start a new program and to make a space for this graduate

program in the cosmos of all the other graduate programs. And they actually did it. UCSC actually made a big change in the way anthropology is done. Anthropology, probably because of Jim Clifford and others, went through what they call the "crisis of representation" in the 1980s. Our program was one of the answers to that. For about, I don't know, ten or fifteen years, we were at the cutting edge. Then we dropped back a little bit. Now I think we're there again, but it's now with environment: with multi-species, and the Anthropocene, trying to re-think some of the issues about what it means to be in this world with other beings. Margaret Mead once said anthropology is the study of Man, embracing Woman. So they're moving from men and women into a wider [context]. And I think our department, particularly with Anna Tsing, is making a big difference there.

Rabkin: Could you say a little bit more about what this crisis of representation was about, and how UCSC's department became an answer to it?

Martin Shaw: The crisis of representation primarily comes about from a critique of anthropologists writing about others. Part of the [answer to the] critique of writing about others is to write about yourself, and that's one of the ways that anthropologists started to do it: they started, not with, "I am an objective observer of this," but with, "I am a person influencing the environment that I am trying to study," is one of the resolutions of the crisis of writing about others.

Rabkin: And being influenced by it.

Martin Shaw: Right, and being influenced by it. So that's one piece of what they tried to do. Anthropology wasn't the only department doing that. The other thing had to do with a recognition of: what are the power differentials that you're looking at when you are going out studying the lives of others? *You* are going *out*, studying their lives. When you walk in, you have power. You got there, for one thing. How do you begin to address that, and how do you begin to understand how power plays out within these different cultural settings? Our anthropology program was called "Power and Culture." I have friends who don't like it, but "Power and Culture" recognizes inequality, and it asks about different forms of power, and about state power as well as interactional power. I think bringing all those concerns in begins to walk away from this notion that the anthropologist, sort of god-like, represents the lives of others. It begins to complicate that in different ways.

Rabkin: Thank you.

Martin Shaw: Now the theme of the department seems to be something along the lines of "Emerging Worlds." Emerging Worlds is more multi-species. But it's also—I think Anna uses the term "frontier": what happens when you have different things coming together in some sort of frontier; what is the new thing that comes from that. She looks at lots of different kinds of frontiers: physical frontiers, but [also] ideological frontiers, and frontiers that involve environment, social organization, state. That's the latest in the anthropology department. I

think they're doing really well. I am amazed at how influential the department is. But there's a saying—my present-husband likes to say this: "We're one of the fifty departments in the world that says that it's in the top ten."

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: (laughs) I think that's true. (laughs) And maybe we're in the top twenty. We certainly say we're in the top ten, but there are lots of people who say they're in the top ten.

Rabkin: The other follow-up that occurs to me, before we move on from anthropology, is about your skepticism or wariness about graduate education—what it is that you see as potentially divisive and competitive about the introduction of [graduate programs].

Martin Shaw: That's interesting, isn't it? I'm not sure to what extent it's my experience—because I think I mentioned I was with a graduate advisor who had no other students (laughs)—but I know from what I've seen in Britain and other places that faculty members use their graduate students to argue with each other. This graduate student is going off doing something directed by a faculty member with a particular theoretical bent; instead of a faculty member saying [to a colleague], "What you're saying is poppycock," that faculty member goes after the student.

Rabkin: Oh.

Martin Shaw: And that student's life is made miserable. I know people who have been caught in that. That's one piece of it. The other thing is that graduate school is a gauntlet. But what we learn as graduate students is to take whatever is given us and find interesting relationships among those things. It doesn't matter if somebody gives you salmon and mushrooms. (They may work together well (laughs)—but if you're talking about these salmon and those mushrooms—ones that are swimming and ones that are growing in the forest—you might not see the relationship. But a good graduate student will. A good graduate student is always trying to get to the overarching properties. I must add that this contrast came to mind because Shelly Errington did a wonderful cartoon on moieties, using Levi-Straussian concepts of dual organization, based on a panel on mushrooms and salmon organized by members of our faculty.

So they're working really hard, they're trying to please—and at the same time, they are losing something of themselves. They're subsuming something because of the power of the advisors. I think anthropology is a pretty established discipline, and it will last forever, and it's great to have graduate students out there trying to influence the discipline. But I'm not sure that it's the highest calling that anybody could ever have, is to be able to churn out more PhD's and have more graduate students.

We actually were turned down for a master's degree, because in anthropology there's hardly anything you can do with a master's degree. Before we got the PhD program, we tried a little master's program. I think it was narrow, and I can't remember exactly how it was focused. But UC didn't want us to do a master's program, so we had to do the PhD program.

And the other thing about PhD programs—because around the time we were doing it, they were happening all over campus: another PhD [program], and another PhD program—is you take away from your undergraduates. You take time, you take energy, you take concern. When one of my students—a French student, went to Berkeley as a graduate student, I said to her, "Okay, they don't treat their undergraduates like anything. They don't even talk to undergraduates. But you're a graduate student; you'll be able to talk to your advisor." She actually had a really hard time talking to her advisor. She was sitting out in the hallway for hours, trying to get [to] her advisor. So even that wasn't true. (laughs) But it is the case most of the time. And it happened with us: we got rid of the senior thesis. But lots of people got rid of the senior thesis: "We're not going to read students' senior theses at the time that we have graduate students." We're not going to spend the same amount of time working with our undergraduates that we would have before we had graduate students. [That was the] kind of loss to undergraduate education that I was concerned about.

But there is a big push—and maybe that becomes a part of talking about the senate and about narrative evaluations—there's a big push for us to look like everybody else. My thought, always, is that if we're trying to look like Berkeley, we will always be second-class. If we try to be on our own course, doing our own thing, we might have a chance of rising to the top. But faculty compare themselves to people at other places. They found it very time-consuming to do the kinds of things, like narrative evaluations, or working closely with undergraduates, that don't bring you very many resources or awards.

When I was on the Committee on Planning and Budget, we found out how money comes to the campus. UC gives us more money for graduate students, and gives us less money for undergraduate students. If you want more money, and if you want to look good to everybody else, then you have to have graduate students. Those aren't particularly games that I like to play. To the extent that college education is about more than training, and it's about more than vocational education and what we're trying to do is to give people a sense of the possibilities in the world, and open up some of the avenues for greater creativity, then working with undergraduates is really great. (laughs) Because they can go out and do lots of things.

But of course, one of the things they can do is go to graduate school. And that's what we did here.

Administrative Committee Work

All right. Now I want to talk a little bit about senate and committee work. But before I get to that, I want to go back to Julia Armstrong. Once Julia Armstrong became an assistant or associate chancellor, she had lots and lots of administrative committees that she wanted me to be on. I want to talk about two of them. One was a committee on career balancing. What we actually did was to put together workshops or orientations for new faculty. It's primarily for new faculty, women and men. I remember facilitating the conversation with some women and men who were new faculty, and talking about what it means to be a faculty member. I mentioned that I'd always felt inauthentic as a faculty member—that the "real" professors are those men who taught me, and not me. And then we went around the room—and the men in the room felt inauthentic as faculty members (but I do remember there was one Latino man who said this most strongly), and the women did as well. I was so surprised when I found this out, that we all—I guess as sort of newbies into this world—feel that we can't measure up to the people who were our mentors.

Rabkin: What a revelation! So it turns out everyone in the room is suffering from impostor syndrome, trying to "fake it till you make it."

Martin Shaw: (laughs) That's right. Exactly. And at that point, as a facilitator, you have to say, "I guess we *are* the faculty, aren't we?" (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs) Sounds like a very useful moment. An epiphany!

Martin Shaw: Yeah. It was amazing. Because I've talked to various of my colleagues, Diane Gifford-Gonzales being one, about what it means to be working-class and in the university. Shelly Errington works with the Faculty Association, and she's had a couple of meetings where people have talked about what it means to be working-class and why we don't have a union? That stays with you. Okay, I'm not working class anymore, but I have a working-class mentality, and I can still see some of the ways in which the university is elite, and feel I'm on the outside of that.

We talked a little bit about being from Michigan State, and we talked about being black, and we talked about being a woman, but there's also this other thing about class. That was one of the administrative service jobs I did. This probably appears on my vita, but it is not senate service; it's somebody like Julia Armstrong saying, "Carolyn! We need this help!"

Rabkin: This career-balancing committee.

Martin Shaw: That's right. And I remember, on the career-balancing, I got together a little panel to talk about getting tenure, and what it takes to get tenure. I had to tell my tenure story about being turned down. Three of the four people there [on the panel] had gotten divorced during their tenure process—

Rabkin: Oh, my goodness.

Martin Shaw: —and one during his dissertation writing. Every one of them had found that the tenure process was really hard on their relationships. So—it's interesting. We're not trying to turn off new faculty, but we're trying to apprise them of what the hurdles are. UC has more hurdles. You never settle down. There are big reviews after gaining full professor status.

Rabkin: So you wouldn't think it would be that big of a deal.

Martin Shaw: Yeah, exactly. It's like a tenure or full-professor review, because you have to send your publications out, and it's something that says you've been around for a long time and you have an international reputation—I think that's what it is now saying. But that kind of experience at the UC—we're trying to let people be aware of the kinds of resources that they're going to have to call on. Maybe it's about just planning your life in a way that you don't get stressed out; you don't get overstretched. You find what kind of support you can have at home, so that you can get through this thing. But what I found out is the kinds of frictions—and sitting there with the four panel members all having gotten divorced around tenure or dissertation—I'd gotten divorced around tenure, too.

Rabkin: Did you garner a certain sense of solidarity from these revelations from colleagues?

Martin Shaw: Yeah, I think so. I don't remember that I continued to be in touch with many of them. (There's one that I did.) Because they were from all over, and they sort of disappeared into their departments. But it was wonderful, particularly at that moment of "inauthenticity": "We really are faking it, and the real professors are going to find out what we're doing."

So that was one. And then the other one that Julia got me into was with Dana Takagi, and I wanted to mention that, because it's similar. We did workshops on faculty development. I think this one was for women and minorities. I did them on Tuesday on the west side, and she did Wednesday on the east side, and then we switched, and went back and forth. Again, it was really interesting. We didn't get many people showing up, maybe about four per session that we did, so that's not too bad. But just hearing the kinds of issues that they're raising: what department is supportive; how to go about getting your article in the right journal—all of these kinds of things.

So that's the kind of service I did. Doesn't count for much of anything professionally. It probably will go on a line someplace on my vita. It takes a bit of time. Dana and I had to get together to try to talk about how we would do it, and then we'd get to meet people from across the campus. I think we tried to do it east, west, and then maybe we did something that was closer to the sciences on Science Hill, and someplace else—trying as much as possible to let faculty know what are some of the resources on campus; to begin to air some of their concerns. We couldn't solve all their problems, but we hoped that just sitting together,

talking to each other, they'd find that there would be some help that could come from there. Those were two of the non-senate service activities that I did.

Rabkin: Right. And it strikes me that in encouraging those kinds of dialogues among faculty from different neighborhoods at the university, you were actually nurturing some of that interdisciplinary collegial interaction that had gone away, to some extent, when the college lost their centrality.

Martin Shaw: To some extent. I'm not sure that they actually talked ideas.

Rabkin: They were *connecting* with each other, but not necessarily around their academic work.

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm. And that's one thing that the senate would do as well. That is, the senate is a place where you actually can connect, and you get to know people, [so] that you don't think that they're all some aliens over there in another discipline. And you find that you have some similarities of purpose and orientation. You don't even find out what the research is that people do, in the senate, but you do begin to make some friendships that go across.

Committee on Privilege and Tenure

So, talk about friendships that go across disciplinary lines, I found that to be true especially in the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The Committee on Privilege and Tenure looks at grievances, so any faculty members who have a

grievance, usually against the university, would come to us. There is another committee that's an administrative committee—John Isbister was always chairing that committee—it's the committee that looks at violations of the faculty code of conduct. It's an administrative committee, so it's not a senate committee. But we're actually saying what are the rights and privileges that you have as a member of the senate. And those include the ability to bring a case against the chair, or the dean, or someone who has aggrieved you. And in that one, we had to spend time with each other, getting to know how each other thinks.

We have a lawyer at the university who is an advisor for the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. So when I was chairing, I brought her in to talk to us about how we should be thinking about cases, and she said, "Don't try to think like a lawyer. Why you're here is that you're a faculty member with experiences in this university, and what we want you to do is to treat this as a reasonable person interested in justice, and not to try to do the [legal] ins and outs." So when you're doing that with other people, you do begin to get to know them, where you have to understand where they're coming from as they're looking at a particular kind of case. I won't talk about the cases, but I have to say there were some really difficult ones that would try us, and push us to re-think. Partly what you have to do in Privilege and Tenure is to read a letter and see if, in that letter and nothing else, a prima facie case has been made. And if they have made a case that on the face of it, it looks like something went wrong, then you can go on to the next step and start collecting data and investigating the facts.

That was a committee where you actually did get to know people. I was on that committee with the chancellor, with George Blumenthal. He was chair. I followed George as chair of that committee. I learned a lot from George, and would go back to him after he wasn't chair any longer. He left being chair to be chair of the senate, I think. I would go back to him and try to talk to him about some of the issues we faced.

Let me take one step back and talk about the organization of the senate office, because there are people there that are really very key, such as Mary-Beth Harhen, who is now the director of the senate office. Very important for almost everything that we do. She either *has* the history, or she has the history at her fingertips, what happened in the past, and she has a really good understanding of how the university works.

I want to mention Julie Dryden, who was also the director of the senate for a number of years, and such a major, strong influence for good on our campus. During the time that she was director of the senate, we had more interactions between faculty and students than we have had before or since. Julie would call in the head of the student union and sit and talk to him or her, and ask about the issues in the student union. And she'd call in the head of the senate and do the same thing. I was there, sometimes, because I was on the Committee for Planning and Budget. I felt that during that time, the campus was what I wanted it to be. It was "faculty and students together in the redwoods." (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: We really were listening to students. And they heard a lot about what our concerns were, as well, so that when they had demands, then those demands could be heard, and be— I'm not so sure *modulated*; maybe they'd be more pointed. At any rate, I loved that communication. I think that Julie was really, really important in that.

I just wanted to mention Bill Domhoff as chair of the senate, because he, with his outsized personality, also did the same thing.[18] So it was Bill Domhoff and Julie Dryden. And during the Kresge secession**,** the chair of the students was the person who was leading the Kresge secession, so that we had those folks coming together. It was a great moment. It was—what are some of the possibilities of how you can re-shape this environment and *do* things? Of course, Bill was very strong in that, but I also think that Julie, with her openness and willingness to listen, and taking initiative. There was a Korean student, Amy Cho, who came in [as student senate representative] after the student from Kresge. She started off being a little shy and hesitant, but under Julie's tutelage, she was absolutely outstanding. And she actually was in a play that Mary Kay Martin directed, down at the Art Center. She had been chair of the student body as well, and worked really closely with Julie. I wanted to mention, while we're talking about the senate, how important these folks can be. Mary-Beth is great, and Julie was

[18] See Sarah Rakbin, Interviewer and Editor, *G. William Domhoff: The Adventures and Regrets of a Professor of Dreams and Power* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2014). Available in full text at http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/domhoff

just phenomenal—as a kind of liaison, as a networker, as a person of depth and quality, that you felt good about talking to.

Rabkin: You alluded to Kresge's secession. Can you say a little more about that?

Martin Shaw: I'm trying to remember all of the issues that came up with the Kresge secession, and I don't remember all of them. But I do remember that Kresge always thought of itself as sort of loosely attached, anyway. You have to get to Kresge through these bridges, or through these roads. Kresge is easy to secede. I cannot remember what all the issues were, but I do remember that it wasn't all of Kresge doing it. It was this one student who was really very outspoken, and quite conservative. I remember in core course, he was one of those guys who would always be pushing me to try to move toward the right in relationship to political issues. I think that his sense of the world and the nature of power blossomed here. It was a wonderful moment, if you're interested in moments when students understand themselves as not powerless, when they see that there is a way that they can have an influence on what's going on around them. What their issues were, I don't know. Students understood that they could make decisions. That's the context [in which] I want to think about this [the secession], but I can't remember all the details.

Rabkin: Thanks.

Committee on Planning and Budget

Martin Shaw: The Committee on Planning and Budget was the committee that I stayed on so that I could work with Carol on the revitalization of the colleges. But the Committee on Planning and Budget I had *wanted* to be on, because I knew how important it was. But I really didn't like the committee, because it's all about, "What is the governor going to do, and what is the budget that we are presenting at this moment? *Oh*—no, we *changed* that budget. Okay. So, what is the budget we're doing now— *Oh*, well, what about the—?" The big numbers I forget sometimes—whether we're talking about millions, or thousands (laughs). I just didn't like it. I turned down some other positions I could have had on campus because I don't like budgeting. My present-husband says that I could have been a college president if I had greater tolerance for financial discussions. *But* the planning part is more interesting to me, and part of what my committee did—when again, Bill Domhoff was chair of the senate at the time I was chair of Planning and Budget, and that's why I was working so closely with him, and [Robert] Stevens[19] was chancellor—was to try to figure out how the campus is run, and what kinds of decision-making should be where.

Some people felt that McHenry was (our very first chancellor) extremely centralized, and that the board structure kept the power with him. The department structure decentralized [the campus's academic organization], to some extent, in that [Chancellor] Sinsheimer made changes to foster

[19] See Randall Jarrell, Interviewer and Editor, *Robert Stevens: UCSC Chancellorship, 1987-1991* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 1999). Available in full text at http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/stevens

decentralization.[20] I think that that's probably true, and we may have had a great deal of decentralization [compared to earlier days]—which I actually know is that that is not the case compared to San Jose State. At San Jose State, departments actually have more control over their budgets than the departments at UCSC. At UCSC, the deans still keep an awful lot of money there [in the divisions]; departments have very little, and they have a really, really small discretionary budget. But San Jose State will have all of its money—not for new hires, but for new equipment, for TAs, for lecturers—they will have a lot of that right in their department. You don't have to keep on going back and forth [to the deans to ask for money]. My present husband served as chair of the philosophy department at San Jose State for eleven years. We spend a fair amount of our time together discussing issues from our different campuses. Ours is a wonderful collaboration.

So this campus didn't *really* decentralize, even once it became departments as opposed to boards. But that was the way that we were moving. What I was concerned about, and other people on Planning and Budget when I was there [were concerned about], was the weak center that the chancellor was. Chancellor Stevens had a hard time making decisions, was not very well liked, and not very effective in dealing with people. I don't know how long he stayed, maybe two or three years.[21]

---

[20] See Randall Jarrell, Interviewer and Editor, *Robert Sinsheimer: The University of California, Santa Cruz During a Critical Decade, 1977-1987* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 1996.) Available in full text at http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/sinsheimer

[21] Robert Stevens was chancellor of UC Santa Cruz from 1987-1991—Editor.

Bill Domhoff and I decided that we would try to understand a little bit more about how things work at the chancellor's level, the vice-chancellors' level, the deans' level, and the associate deans'. I went around talking to all these people. Bill Domhoff thought that was just great: "She went; she did *interviews*!" Like, this is what anthropologists *do*—we do interviews, right? We go and talk to people. So I'd go and talk to an associate dean and ask him about allocation of funds, and how things are working in terms of planning, and all these other issues. What we found out was that the chancellor's office was missing one level, and that's what now is called the executive vice chancellor. At the time that Stevens was there, and Sinsheimer, and McHenry, there was a chancellor and there was an academic vice chancellor. That person is the one who would oversee faculty promotions and things like that, and development of new programs, but would have little to do with—let's say, [for example], where a lot of money goes on campus: student services. And little to do with (and still would have little to do with) fundraising, and some other units on campus—oh, let's say police, or buildings, or maintenance. So because Stevens was ineffective, the Committee on Planning and Budget came up with the possibility of having an executive vice chancellor who actually would do a lot of the running of the campus, and then the chancellor could do a lot of the liaison with the UC, and the fundraising.

We all thought that was great, and it probably is great. I think Alison Galloway, who is in that position now, is fine. But we hired Michael Tanner for that. Lots of people thought that we made a mistake (laughs) in both ways: getting the

executive vice chancellor [position] and getting Michael Tanner [to fill it]. Michael Tanner was the academic vice chancellor at the time. We created the new position: executive vice chancellor. To tell you the truth, I have no idea how it happened, but it was created. (I know that we recommended it, but I know that we don't have power to make it happen, so there are some other steps that I'm missing.) And then there was a search for the executive vice chancellor, and our present academic vice chancellor became the executive vice chancellor. I was also on that committee that hired Michael Tanner.

I worked really well with Michael Tanner, but the problems that people had with Michael Tanner had to do with some of the centralization issues, and the kind of rubric that he used to try to figure out what to do with money. There's one saying—"all money is green." "All money is green" means that if money comes into the university, you can use it in any way that you can. The way that Michael Tanner wanted us to look at this thing was that some money is "hard," some money is "soft," and some money is somehow in between. The joke was that this metaphor brought up images of penises. (laughs)

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: What was that little squishy thing in between? (laughs) So here we are. And it sort of works to think that there's some money that must go here, and there's some money that can be maneuvered and—squished—in different ways.

I think that Michael Tanner wasn't a disaster, but I do know that once we got the executive vice chancellor position, it was so new that people weren't sure exactly what to do with it. In fact, because the executive vice chancellor came on with a weak chancellor, then that executive vice chancellor had a lot more power. But I think, probably, if we look at Alison Galloway and George Blumenthal, that there's probably better communication and better distribution of power and authority between the two of them.

So that's one of the things that we did on the Committee on Planning and Budget. There were a number of other things.

Working on Campus and UC-Wide Sexual Harassment Policy

Three other things I wanted to talk about. Sexual harassment policy: I was engaged in that as a member of [the Committee on] Privilege and Tenure. But (I just want to say this briefly, and I won't go into great detail about it) before I was on Privilege and Tenure, I was on a sexual harassment case. I think it was an administrative committee, so it wasn't senate. I was appointed to this by the administration, and we looked at a faculty member's sexual harassment file—case. And this person—I have to say, at that point and now—is a friend of mine, and was found to have sexually harassed students.

Rabkin: Were you not required to recuse yourself [from the case]?

Martin Shaw: Isn't that amazing? No!

Rabkin: And they knew that you were a friend of this person.

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm.

Rabkin: Interesting.

Martin Shaw: I think I was there so that the person wouldn't seem to be railroaded.

Rabkin: Hmm.

Martin Shaw: At the same time, I could have said, "I don't want to do this." I have to say I was shocked. I had no idea of any of this stuff before I was on this case. Once I was on the case, then I was *on* it. Then I wanted to see justice done, and I wanted to see the young women who were complaining about being sexually harassed be made whole. I mean, you can't do much else except make them feel as though they've been heard, and that the university has gone through the right course of justice. So I did, and the faculty member was punished. I treasure the fact that we went through that, and we can be friends now.

Rabkin: Your friendship survived.

Martin Shaw: Yeah.

Rabkin: And you felt you were able to act with integrity as a member of the committee, and not withhold any action that you thought was appropriate?

Martin Shaw: Exactly. It was hard.

Rabkin: Wow. How'd you do that?

Martin Shaw: It was hard. I mean, you can't talk to very many people about it, so that's another committee where you've got people from across campus and you really do get to know them really well. I did talk to my husband about it. But I had a really hard time. But once I saw the evidence—I was blown away. And I have to say: I don't want to go into much more detail, but I do treasure that friendship; I do feel like we've gone through a lot to be here today.

Okay, I chaired our Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and then I was chair of the University-wide Committee on Privilege and Tenure. Systemwide, I think that's what we call it. At the systemwide committee, we were then looking at sexual harassment policy, because it's kind of weak. We needed both protections of the faculty members and protections of the students. We needed to make sure that everybody knew what the procedures were, and that there was a kind of openness to it. Now, I think UCSC, actually, is pretty good about having a sexual harassment office that students can call. A few times I've had students call me,

and I've said, "You need to talk to this person." This person sometimes will say, "Oh yes, this seems like something I can do. Let's see what you want to have happen." And once, I know it was that they just had a conversation with the faculty member. (This faculty member has never spoken to me again. He shouldn't have known that I was the one who told the student to go talk, but—anyway.) Sometimes it would be a letter put in the file. But anyway, there are a few things that can be done pretty easily without having an administrative case be brought, and I think we are pretty good at that. I know that our president of UC now wants even more stringent rules, and that's fine with me. But it was really hard getting the change at the UC level that we did do.

Rabkin: Had there previously been a systemwide sexual harassment policy?

Martin Shaw: The faculty code of conduct didn't actually include sexual harassment. I had to talk with George [Blumenthal]. I don't think he was chancellor at that point, but he was chair of our senate. He wasn't sure that we should make it so explicit that sexual harassment is a violation of the faculty code of conduct. We talked about it a little bit, and he came around to saying that, yes, I can see why this should be in there.

There are a whole host of things that faculty shouldn't do, but we actually made it much more explicit. Sexual harassment has lots of components to it, but one component would be (and I had a case like this when I was on the administrative committee)—it was [with] staff. There's a sexual relationship between two

janitors. One is a supervising janitor and the other one is a janitor. And a third janitor brings a charge. The third person is bringing a charge saying that this non-supervising janitor is getting special treatment because of that relationship. There's nothing written about that kind of situation, so that's one of the things that we had to deal with.

So some conduct that can be called sexual harassment wasn't explicit. We needed to make it explicit, particularly because of this third-party accusation: "Because this person is having sex with such-and-such, they are getting greater things that I'm not, and I'm at a disadvantage because I'm not having sex." We don't always think about that as sexual harassment, but it falls within that category.

We were looking at a whole host of things, including quid-pro-quo, you-do-this-for-me, I-do-that-for-you. The campus had already developed—and Helene Moglen[22] had been really instrumental in this—[provisions concerning] the intimidating or unpleasant or hostile environment that can be created. You don't have to actually say to me, "You sleep with me, or I'll do this." All you have to do is create an environment in which I feel this kind of hostility. Some of that can be gender harassment as well as sexual [harassment]. We're trying to make some of that more explicit in the Faculty Code of Conduct. That was one of my major accomplishments (laughs) as a senate faculty member, was to get some of that language in the faculty code of conduct, working with the systemwide committee on sexual harassment. It will be really interesting to see what Janet

[22] See Irene Reti, Interviewer and Editor, *Helene Moglen and the Vicissitudes of a Feminist Administrator* (Regional History Project, UCSC Library, 2013). Available in full text at http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/helene-moglen

Napolitano creates, or works with the senate to create, in terms of even stiffening that. She's also interested, of course, in students, and looking at a student code of conduct, and how that works. So that will be great.

Special Committee on Non-Senate Faculty

I just want to talk a little bit about the Special Committee on Non-senate Teaching Faculty, and the committee on Tent University. The Special Committee on Non-senate Teaching Faculty: I think I must have been on that because I was chair of Privilege and Tenure at the time. It turns out I was *chair* of that committee—which I didn't actually remember. (laughs) And when I looked at the senate resolution on it, it said that the people on that committee should be from Privilege and Tenure, Committee on Educational Policy, and maybe one other committee.

When I presented this report (I'll talk a little bit about what's in the report) to the senate, we were meeting at Kresge, in the large auditorium there [Kresge Town Hall], and the first thing I wanted to say is, "Non-senate faculty members are faculty." *And I got criticism*. I actually was blown away! I was standing there—(splutters) —My first sentence, before I get to what are our recommendations, is now being criticized. I was floored! I didn't know what to do. As I recall now, one of the faculty members (maybe it was Mary-Beth [Harhen], I can't remember now) who knows the senate manual *read* [from the manual], and said: "Senate 6.1-such-and-such says 'this is faculty,' and therefore *they're faculty*."

But I just couldn't believe that this was the argument I'm going to have to start off with: *Are these people faculty?!* I think I must have practiced a little bit on my speech, (laughs) but I was really thrown. I was so thrown. I just couldn't believe that this was the level that we were arguing at. I know there was somebody from the sciences [who opposed the idea that non-senate instructors should be called faculty]. But, you see, it's from the sciences that this [initiative to address the situation of non-senate faculty] came. I told you about Joe Bunnett coming up, old and slowwalking, and his saying, "Our faculty, our *colleagues*, they're not treated well here. Can we do something better?" So I'm not trying to say that *everybody* in the sciences is doing something negative over there. I was shocked that this is the level of the conversation.

I just went back to look at this material [the records of the senate committee on non-senate faculty] this afternoon, after I came back from the gym. What I'm thinking about it now, after I went through it, is that the senate members are saying something like, "Senate service is wonderful. It's a great thing. This is what we do. We will offer it to you [non-senate faculty members] as well!" So maybe it's more our world, thinking, what is important: what is it that we [senate faculty] fight about; what is it that we get excited about. And a big piece of what we were doing is saying, "Come and join us in this conversation." We had done the same thing with students, and that was one of the things that Julie Dryden was good at. Students were dropping off from senate service—and for senate service, for students, there's a nice mechanism, because the student union has

similar kinds of committees. So we had to look for another kind of committee.[23] But what I remember most is that what we came up with is that we want [non-senate faculty to be allowed to serve] on particular senate committees—and then that's *another* battle in the senate. I just couldn't believe these people. I actually couldn't believe it. I don't know why I was so naïve. But anyway, there's another battle about *which* committees.

Rabkin: Which committees could admit non-senate faculty—for service?

Martin Shaw: Yeah, that's right. (laughs) So we had that little battle. And the things that I think were really important to us [were, first,] this idea of professional development funds—which I think is still working, that there are professional development funds. And then, I think, from the sciences especially, that non-senate faculty members could be principal investigators—because that's grants, and that's bringing in money. These are people who are doing this work all the time, and [according to the old rules] can't be the principal investigators. And the senate review of the "intent to dismiss"—I have no idea if anybody has anybody has ever done that. So of course I had to study Unit 18 [the labor designation for lecturers and librarians] and know that [union] contract.

I have to say, as an aside: when the chancellor has his Christmas parties, if you go there, what you find out right away is that the faculty is a small part of the

[23] Martin Shaw added the following footnote during the editing process: "The appointment of members to senate committees was regularized for students, but we were not sure how non-senate faculty would be appointed to senate committees and we were not sure which committees they should serve on."

university. I think that my experience at the university has given me that sense of who else is here. I'm always working with others, and not so much only with the senate faculty, working with the people over in counseling, or working with the maintenance people, or working (we'll get to that later) with the police. But anyway, having that bigger picture of this university we sometimes think is all about the senate.

Once I studied the contracts for lecturers, what I understood is that there is a procedure that you follow, according to that contract, if you receive an intent-to-dismiss letter. However, we found out that you can also use a senate review for an intent-to-dismiss letter. I have no idea if anybody has ever done it. But that was one of the things that we discovered. The other thing that was really fascinating to me to discover (again, how naïve I am, how much I learn) is that there are quite a few housekeeping things that we recommended. And that is, non-senate faculty members [must] have mailboxes. I mean, a whole host of things that are just saying, "You make the experience of being on this campus better, so that they can *get the job done that you've hired them to do*."

Rabkin: That one, I think, is in the contract.

Martin Shaw: Yeah. (laughs) Well, I'm glad it's in it, because when we were looking at—and I didn't print that piece up, but when I was looking at the things that we were recommending, some might have been in the contract, but not

acted on. Non-senate faculty would not always speak up for the little things that they are entitled to, but the absence of these accommodations annoyed them.

I mentioned to you before that Joe Bunnett had brought this [issue to the senate], and I said, "This is important." But I have to say, now, that I was on the committee not just because I thought it was important, but because I was chair of the committee that was mandated to work on the non-senate faculty. It wasn't just my own volition. But it was important to me. And what an eye-opener—especially that first debate: "Are they faculty, are they not faculty?" These are people you're working with!

You probably know this saying that people at universities fight over small things because there's so little at stake—yes, right? Well, that does seem to be the case—that we're always fighting and we're protecting our privilege in all these different ways. It was an eye-opener for me to work on that committee, to begin to understand a little bit about what the experiences of my colleagues are that I really didn't know. And also, of course, I had to read the contract and then talk to people in the office and get a better sense of what's going on with that. That was also a good experience for me.

Rabkin: When Joe Bunnett made that comment to you, was he referring specifically to non-senate faculty?

Martin Shaw: No, it wasn't a comment to me; it was to the senate.

Rabkin: Ah-hah. He spoke to the whole senate, saying, "We have to do something about this." I see.

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm. And after that, we got the resolution, and then we got the committee. So it was based on his coming forward and saying this is not right; we've got to do something about it. He said it to the senate, and I just happened to be in the meeting.

Rabkin: I remember some of the vocabulary that used to get used: people would talk about "*real* faculty" and non-senate faculty. Or they would distinguish "capital-F" from "small-f" faculty.

Martin Shaw: (laughs)

Rabkin: Sometimes non-senate faculty got referred to as faculty, but with a very important qualification!

Martin Shaw: Yeah. Of course, now, we had worked on this thing for months at the time that I was going to present it to the senate. I had tried to figure out the four or five things that I could say in the senate that could get across what we had come up with. And to be stopped at my first sentence—(laughs)

Rabkin: So eventually, the proceedings went beyond that initial impasse, and you were able to establish some—

Martin Shaw: Right, exactly. And we did. But I don't know what's lasting from what we did. The one thing that we continued to do for a while after that was to work hard at getting non-senate faculty on those senate committees—and make sure that there was this pool of [professional development fund] money that people could apply to. I know that Annapurna Pandey, in our department, just got some of that money. Those things were really significant.

Rabkin: Well, I just have to personally thank you, because I benefitted personally from both of those moves. I had the pleasure of serving on at least one of those senate committees—and had a chance to meet some of my senate colleagues who I would not otherwise ever have worked with. And I did also get some professional development funds. I don't remember at this point whether, in fact, those came from this pool you're talking about. They may actually have come from my union. But in any case, I think it made a big difference.

Martin Shaw: Yeah. I think it made a difference just to have that conversation once again.

Tent University, Science Hill Tree-Sit, and Responding to Student Activism

Okay. Why was I on the Tent University committee?[24] How did I get to be on that one? I don't know. Anyway, there I was, I believe, *chairing* that one. (pauses)

Rabkin: Do you want to talk about that one?

Martin Shaw: Yeah, I do, but I don't even remember how I got there. Look at this.

Rabkin: This is the Report of the Tent University and Restructuring Emergency Response Procedures Task Force, January 8, 2006.

Martin Shaw: I became concerned about the way that students had been treated at the Tent University. And, as I said, I don't know how I ended up being the chair of the committee, but I was passionate about it. I wanted to understand

---

[24] Tent University (TU), was organized by UCSC students in spring of 2005 as a protest against traditional higher education and a rally for a number of social causes. TU organizers had advertised their event broadly on the Internet and in various print and broadcast media, inviting anyone to camp overnight at the entrance of the campus. UCSC policy bans camping, and general public access to campus is prohibited after 8 p.m. In addition, campus officials emphasized that the base of campus is inappropriate as a 24-hour-a-day venue because of its proximity to the Granary child care center and adjacent residential neighborhoods. Officials also expressed concern about their inability to provide overnight security for students in an open area at a busy intersection. Through a series of meetings occurring for more than a week prior to the event, Student Affairs staff informed TU organizers of these policies and concerns, as well as the potential consequences of their proposed actions. Several alternatives, all of which were rejected, were offered to TU organizers regarding the time, place, and manner guidelines for their event. Nineteen students were arrested when the protests continued. A day after the arrests, protesters decided to accept the campus offer to waive its camping ban, thus permitting the nighttime activities to relocate to the Quarry Amphitheater. Adapted from http://currents.ucsc.edu/04-05/04-25/tent.asp For student and faculty perspectives on the protests and arrests see https://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2012/03/22/18709924.php

what was going on. I think I'm much better now at understanding what was going on. I kept on telling people, "Something new is happening here, and I don't know how to talk about it." It's almost like Flash Mobs, or communication—the way the telephones [cell phones] are being used. All that stuff was different; we hadn't seen it before. You say, "I'm here; you come." There wasn't a central organization of the group. There were loose coalitions.

When I tried to talk to people—and people told me I was naïve, so that may be another moment—when I tried to talk to people about who's running this show, I really did get a sense of a decentralized organization. At the same time, I know that even with decentralization (sort of like going back to Michael Kahn), there are individuals who carry authority and have power. Those individuals would not talk to the university. They'd say, "Oh, no, we're not running anything. You have to talk to us all." It made it very difficult for the administration to interact with students.

But when you look at Occupy Wall Street and other movements—I think Tent University represents a new kind of movement of that same sort. I was trying, as much as possible, to get the university to think about how people have organized in Tent University, what it means, and whether or not we need to be as nimble and flexible at trying to work with them as they are at organizing. Here we've got a kind of strange little amoeba-like thing going on, and we're going to stand right here and say, "Do this, and don't do this, and don't do that." I think we needed some other kind of system to work with this. That was in the back of my

mind. It's not in the report, because I couldn't articulate what was going on. I knew something else was happening.

The other thing that I knew was happening was the commitment that students had had to nonviolence was no longer there. And our relationship with the police was no longer what it was. When students were protesting apartheid, it was almost a case of they had appointments about when they were going to be arrested. They blocked the entrance to the campus; the police came and took them away. I know some of them went limp; some of them walked away. But they were using a nonviolent protest movement: "We stay there, we have our speeches, we do these things—and when it comes time, when the police come, we're not going to fight; we're going to go." That's nonviolence.

These guys [Tent University] were not going to do that, and the university was all up in arms about the fact that they [some of the Tent University protestors] had gone to a nonviolent training with people from Seattle, from the WTO demonstration there, which was extremely effective. The administration was certain that they would have a similar situation on their hands. It seemed to me that they used very little massaging, very little integration, very little *conversation* to talk to students, to try to see what they could do with it. Even when I started studying (I spent a lot of my time studying contracts and other things) what went on at other campuses that had Tent Universities, there were lots of different responses to the Tent University, and some of them incorporated the university. Like at, I think it was Rutgers—Rutgers was one of the first ones—the university

administration actually had people at Tent University calling prospective students about actually coming to the university. They used their Tent University as a kind of outreach to other students, in some positive way. So you can call them, you can talk to them about what it's like here, and you can also tell them there are student demonstrations. There are lots of different ways of approaching it, and I didn't see UCSC doing any of those things.

I didn't see UCSC doing it with the tree-sit either. I had a conversation with the student affairs vice chancellor, Felicia McGinty. I asked her two questions. (This is about the tree-sit; sorry, I'm skipping forward a little bit.) I asked her two questions: Was the demonstration response team effective? The demonstration response team is the mechanism that came out of the Tent University report. We studied what went on. We talked to students, we talked to Student Services folks, we talked to the police, we talked to some of the people who had been early organizers, trying to get a sense of what their goals were, what kinds of ways they tried to work together—and from that, we came up with some recommendations.

The recommendations include establishing a demonstration response team. The demonstration response team should have faculty, staff, and students; it should be keyed into the vice chancellor for facilities—who's over the police—as well as the chancellor. And the lines of communication should be open. The various strategies to be used should be talked about. We found that was missing in Tent University. I had to go and talk to the police, and they showed me their holds;

they talked about all their procedures. (I do get to know a lot of people on the campus.) And my understanding is, from the holds that they actually showed me—there's something with the shoulders, something with the hands, and a number of others—from the holds that they finally showed me, that they were, in fact, inflicting violence on our students. They were trying to say that wasn't the case, but then they would say, "It's light. We had to move them. They were creating a fire hazard." That's the main thing they used. They [the protestors] had some candles. Because they were blocking that entrance, I think there was both the question of fire and then some other safety issues. I argued that their [the administration's] discussion of safety issues was very not to the point of what was going on, and that they needed to actually begin to engage the students and engage their issues.

Rabkin: Were these safety arguments in justification of their having used holds? (I don't know if "choke-hold" is the right term.)

Martin Shaw: Yeah. Not choke-holds, but there are some holds that are not choke-holds. But they're really similar.

Rabkin: I remember seeing a photograph—probably it became one of the more infamous photographs from the Tent University demonstrations—that looked scary.

Martin Shaw: Yeah. That's right. I got the diagrams of what the holds are, and the looked at videos of the demonstrations. And had a pleasant conversation, not a hostile conversation, and tried to understand things from the point of view of the police.

Rabkin: Was this the campus police or the Santa Cruz police who were called in?

Martin Shaw: The campus police, for the Tent University. By the time they got to the tree-sit the university called in police from everywhere. When I got to campus on the tree-sit, Scotts Valley police was there. See, when I'm going in to College Nine, I park by the fire station. And all the police were there. I had no idea what was going on on campus. And my brother was killed by a policeman. I just saw all those police cars: Berkeley was there; Scotts Valley was there; Santa Cruz was there. I walk in, and I ask Shelly Errington, "What's going on on campus?" And she showed me a cartoon. It's a cartoon from the civil rights movement, and it's one of the girls going into an elementary school, a black girl, with all these buses and guns and people. And she [Shelly] says, "There's some kid up a tree—and this is what they do: they bring in all this ammunition for it."

Okay, you can see I've got these two things going together, the Tent University and the tree-sit. So, with the Tent University: there was something new happening with Tent University—I mean, not only that Tent University didn't take off. (By the time it was at UCSC, I think it had been at five schools, and I don't know how many more schools it went to. It didn't seem to become a big

phenomenon.) But there are different ways of responding to Tent University, and what was done was to talk about fire and safety, and "time, manner, and place"— "Time, manner, and place" is in the student handbook. Basically, the staff of Student Services were telling me that students' behavior has to be "appropriate in time, manner, and place," and this was not the time, manner, or place for that event. They [the students] could move it (this didn't come until much later) to the quarry. (It would have no effect whatsoever, or it could have a little effect—I don't know.) I don't even know when they presented "move it to the quarry." But I do think that "move it to the quarry" was mentioned before the police came in. So, "move it to the quarry," or do something else; this is not the time, manner, or place. There's the childcare center there [near the Tent University site], and there's the entrance to campus.

My concern was that the university's response was heavy-handed: that the actions of the university helped to blow this out of proportion. The university, like Rutgers, could have done something else. They could have seen to what extent Tent University could be co-opted. But the organization of Tent University made co-opting it really difficult. Again, a good thing from their [the students'] point of view: that when you've got this kind of decentralization, this kind of dispersion, and it's almost like back when we were starting women's studies—you've got a caucus, you've got a committee, and you have to have members of all these different groups join in, and the university's frustrated with that. The university's line is, "We're just trying to talk to the *leader*" (so we can go and co-

opt him, right?) "We're just trying to talk to the leader, but what we have to do is sit down and talk to thirty people!"

I was there [at the Tent University] once, at one point, when they were actually sitting and talking, and that wasn't too bad. I can't remember who: some people from Student Services; some faculty members, because there were some faculty members who had taken their classes down there. And they were sitting and talking. You can sit and talk, but as long as the university is saying, "You're illegitimate; you can't be here; you can't do these things," then you don't get very far with the conversation. The one that I participated in was a really respectful conversation. Somehow it's gotten in my mind that there was a Native American there who was sort of setting the tone, and maybe we were passing a stone—whatever we were doing, it worked to have that conversation, but it didn't work to deflect the concerns of students.

Let's look at the other thing: the set of concerns of students. That's another feature of this decentralization: "We're all going to come together for this issue—but our issues are really not one. We are a very loose coalition." Then when they gave their set of concerns—it's long, and overlapping and contradictory. And the university couldn't really address that list. If the students could have come together to get it down to five, and rank-order them— But that didn't happen.

Again, this kind of organization that is Tent University is different. It was fascinating to me as a social scientist, trying to figure out what's going on, how

the cell phones work within this context, and what it means to come down here, not necessarily agreeing with those people over there—but because you've got something that you also want to throw into the mix. It was some years ago. Maybe the university has gotten better at being able to handle this. But they were used to the kids from the anti-apartheid work. When I first came here, there were all the kids who had never seen a grape, so there were the grape boycotts, and things like this. That's really not what these guys are doing. They really are much more robust in their sense of trying to make a stand. Their stand is no longer filling the jails, or capturing the hearts and minds of the people, or getting publicity. They really wanted to start to work to see how they could begin to change things—and the university just was not willing to do it.

It was great for me to learn an awful lot about different parts of the campus, how the students were thinking about a number of issues, what the university felt it was doing. But I felt the university was hunkering down, was getting into a kind of bunker-like mentality. They wanted to fight the students, no matter what. Even this conversation that I participated in, where we were sitting in a tent and going around talking—nothing came from it, because the university's position got harder and harder. But also nothing came from it because the students' demands were just all over the board and not easily dealt with. And some could not be accomplished. (laughs) I remember, years ago, the students for the Third World and Native American Studies program—they did a hunger strike. They had, something like, three things that they wanted to see changed and those were within UCSC's purview. But some of the things that Tent University

wanted had to do with changing the budget structure for [the entire] UC [system]. How long are you going to be able to stay there and have UCSC say, "I can't do it."

This kind of event that is Tent University—I think we'll see more and more of it. I think that Occupy Wall Street (I was in Hong Kong, and it was Occupy Central, and they stayed there for a long time)—I do think that we'll have more of these same kinds of events. And the Flash Mob, on the other side, is the fun side of it—get together a group of people and do something and have an effect. That's what I was trying to get across, personally. (The committee came up with a lot more.) The university has got to figure out how to deal with a new kind of demonstration. I thought that the demonstration response team—having that, and having people come from different places within the university, would be good. But it didn't work.

Rabkin: You were beginning to talk about your conversation with Felicia McGinty. And was this following the tree-sit, or was this following—

Martin Shaw: Tree-sit.

Rabkin: Okay.

Martin Shaw: So we had the Tent University background. And also, I had worked with students at the jobs fair. The jobs fair issue was: the military

[recruiters] came on campus, but the military was anti-gay. You couldn't be openly gay in the military at that time. Students were protesting that as well: "We don't want this on the campus." Again, I felt that the administration was just too hard-line: Students can protest. I mean, they [the protestors] weren't going in and throwing blood on anybody, and they weren't preventing anybody from going in. You just had to cross their line and go in. (They did do the kiss-in at one point. They did do some things, and then the students who were protesting went inside and got in long lines to talk to the military recruiters, so that they couldn't talk to anybody who actually wanted to join the military. The military recruiters did not get a chance to convince anybody.)

But anyway, maintaining an area that allows for this kind of protest seems to me to be important. After I talked to Felicia about the tree-sit, then I think she actually did put together a response team for the jobs fair.

I asked Felicia two questions: Was the demonstration team effective in the tree-sit, and what can be done to lessen the use of police force on campus? Felicia told me she hadn't read this document.

Rabkin: She had not read the report of the Tent University response.

Martin Shaw: She didn't know about the demonstration response team. She "would read it," and would set up a demonstration response team. Okay, nobody could say to her, "Well, you'd better read the Demonstration Response

Team." But you would think that, with the kind of attention that we gave to this, that at least someone would—

What she had done is that she'd talked to Bettina [Aptheker], and maybe Gail Hershatter. And I think she talked to me. She asked those faculty members if they could come and do something, and hang out and talk to students. I said, "Yeah, I'll do it." I went and talked to students. But this isn't the same thing. You don't get to just cherry-pick that you want this person and this person, and they're going to come, and they're going to be your people. It's not that the demonstration response team is supposed to be a group of faculty members who you like, and who can be conversant with what you want. I mean, that's not what this whole thing is all about. So I had to try to tell her that again.

Another point I'm trying to make here is that Felicia thought it was all about white privilege.

Rabkin: She thought what was about white privilege?

Martin Shaw: The tree-sit. Many of the protestors, from her point of view, were privileged, and want to keep the resources of the university for a few. To a great extent, she saw white privilege at work in the protest. The tree-sit is about "trying to keep the university's resources for a few." White people who are privileged who want to keep their privilege.

That kind of thinking really annoyed me. (laughs) I heard her telling students of color, "This is not your issue. These are white people. You don't need to be there." And then she told me—in answer to my question that she believed that people who were sitting in the trees are against diversity.

Was there something about the environment that was there (laughs)—maybe a more diverse environment?—that everything was being turned around into race? That was one of the reasons that I was so upset with her. Not that UCSC has had great race relations, but that we don't take race as the kind of given battleground. It sometimes *is* a battleground—I already I talked to you about the black-brown split on campus, and, the sense of black students feeling disenfranchised or lost—or the way they usually talk about it is, "There are more deer on campus than there are black students." All of these things do happen. But you don't take something like the tree-sit and turn it into race—and race-baiting, at that.

Then the next question on that list in the report is—

Rabkin: (reading) "What can be done to lessen the use of police force?"

Martin: Some people thought there could be some guerilla theater. They could do another "Rockabye baby, in a treetop." They could come in and put up ladders and throw confetti, or TP (toilet paper) the tree—or *whatever*. I mean there are ways to think about how do you lessen the impact of the tree-sit without having the police come. But not having a demonstration response team,

where you get students, faculty and staff together to be able to talk about these concerns, and not having a creative way of thinking about things—

I was devastated. I actually was so upset I went to the senate and said I was ashamed. And there's George [Blumenthal]. I followed him on P & T [Privilege and Tenure]; I talked to him all the time. He's our chancellor, and how could he *do* this? I had so much confidence in us. And maybe I had confidence in me, having done the Tent University thing, and spent some time trying to figure out what are better ways to do things—to have all these police cars come, and to hear, "There's a student up a tree."

Again, these students were not the kind and gentle folks that I was used to from the anti-apartheid movement. (laughs) In the anti-apartheid movement, I remember once when I was picketing at the Bank of America, I stood there with my brochures, and then after I finished handing out brochures against apartheid, I had to go to Bank of America.

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: The Bank of America people weren't so happy with me when I went in. And so I'm, "*What? What are you talking about?*" (laughs) They thought I was going to hand out brochures in the Bank of America.

Anyway, they [student protests now] are different. I think the university wasn't prepared for some of the differences. When I presented this kind of resolution in the senate, to say we should censure the administration for what they're doing, the faculty members from the science buildings who got up talked about people dumping feces on them (I guess maybe if you're using a bucket up in the tree, some of it—). Electricity being cut. The electricity was cut by the university; it wasn't cut by the tree-sitters. But because of the tree-sitters, they had all these disruptions. They [science faculty] couldn't hear anything about, "Perhaps we should do things differently." I was profoundly disappointed in the university.

I don't know. What is it that I expect? I expect there are some free-speech issues that are involved: that the university will get used to student demonstrations (it's not like they're new!), that they will have a reasonable response to them. I don't expect that students will be able to do everything they want, and disrupt things at all times. But I also don't expect that there will be policemen brought onto campus any time something goes wrong.

Rabkin: Do you want to say anything about attempting to bring an actual resolution, and what happened with that?

Martin Shaw: I'm trying to remember now about the resolution. I decided I'd go forward with criticizing the administration. I had several people—mostly people I had gotten to know from the senate committees, especially the privilege and tenure committee—call me and ask me not to do it, including Loisa Nygaard,

who I knew from another committee, but also the ACLU. Luisa said, "There's going to be a big movement; there's something going on over in the sciences; you should think about it again." Then two other people from the Committee on Privilege and Tenure called and said, "Carolyn, could you think about doing it at another time, or not doing it right now?" I was already committed to it; it was already in the senate call. But I worked on what I was going to say, and I tried as much as possible to separate the issues from the tree-sit itself, to say, "I am concerned about the use of police violence and police force on campus, and the lack of a demonstration response team that could use other kinds of methods." I actually tried that, but it didn't work. I have to tell you: to prepare for this, I went to yoga meditation class, I think it was the night before; I had my little mantra I was going to say in the back of my mind. And at the end of it, when my resolution was voted down and the resolution of Joel Yellin to commend the administration for its "work well done"—I think it was some general statement like that—

Rabkin: In response to the tree-sit?

Martin Shaw: No, I think it was a general statement. I don't think his had "tree-sit" in it. He just said this is a commendation to say that they'd been doing good work. But it wasn't specific to tree-sit. After that I was really buoyant. I went to Yellin, and I shook his hand, and I know I said, "I disagree with you, but it's really nice to see you doing something positive for a change." (laughs) Because at senate meetings, he mostly just says, "no, no, no," and interrupts, interrupts,

interrupts. And there he is, standing up saying, "Let's commend our administration!" I thought, "Whoa, look at Joel Yellin!" (laughs)

I had several people speak in favor of the resolution that I'd presented—Don Rothman, I remember, especially, and Shelly Errington, and I think Loisa [Nygaard] did. But it was what the scientists had told me. It was really the wrong time. Because that's when, I think there were about thirty of them [scientists], got up, and they were so emotional. They were so upset. I'm glad I had done my meditation before I went, because I would have had a hard time getting through that. They were talking about how horrible this [the Tree-sit] was, and how they had been mistreated because of people sitting in the trees. I had a little PowerPoint presentation where I tried to separate out the issues and say, "The tree-sit is over here, and these are the issues I'm trying to talk about over there," but they just couldn't hear it. They just couldn't hear it.

Rabkin: They were just still so steeped in their own emotional response to the tree-sit that they couldn't separate that particular issue out from the larger, overarching questions you were trying to address.

Martin Shaw: Right. I was trying to say something about "How do we handle demonstrations on this campus? And when is it that we want to call in the police? Why do we call in the police so frequently on this campus?" But it wasn't heard. The head of the student union was there, and he must have been very moved by what happened, because at the next senate meeting when he spoke, he

called on the faculty members to be less emotional, and to listen to issues better. (laughs)

Rabkin: (smiles)

Martin Shaw: Yeah, I know. I was so touched by that. Of course by that time, everybody's gone off to something else.

I felt compelled to do something. I could foresee us moving more in the direction of increasing use of force. If you're calling in the police at this point—going back to Shelly Errington's analogy, the one little girl integrating the school with all of the state coming down on her—if you're calling in police at this point, when we have something even more disruptive, what will you do? I felt that we needed different messages, different strategies, and that calling the police is too easy and too much.

Rabkin: Mm-hmm.

Martin Shaw: I was definitely in an altered state that day. I knew that I was going up against a lot. I didn't actually realize how much until I sat in the [senate] meeting, and people who hadn't been in those meetings in years showed up—many, many of them. So I knew something was up, but I hadn't realized that Yellin had decided to do this. I did say, "Joel, it's great to see you doing something positive"—even if it's in opposition to me.

Rabkin: So even though this resolution did not pass, and you faced a great deal of opposition to it, and there was a lot of emotional turmoil at the time, I get the impression from what you're saying and the way you're saying it that you're not sorry to have done it, and it made a difference of some kind.

Martin Shaw: Yeah. The only reason I would be sorry is that, when you look at the resolutions passed by the senate, there are only two major ones when you go to the senate page—and one of them is this commendation.

Rabkin: Oh.

Martin Shaw: So it's gotten really big play. When you look at that and you see, "Oh—commendation for the administration for their great service," or however it was phrased—that does make me feel a little bit bad, that the whole history that I was trying to raise, that whole set of issues, is now subsumed under, "The administration is commended for its great work." That's front and center. The rest of it—I do know that there are faculty members who remember. When I was in Hong Kong, somebody asked me for a copy of the Tent University report, because they were concerned about what was going on on campus. I've talked to somebody new, an untenured faculty member, who also mentions my work with Tent University. I know that people are talking about it, that it has a life; it has legs, as they say in the theater.

When I think about how I could have been more effective, I think about how I could have networked it better, who else I should have talked to, how I should have pulled it together. I think I mentioned to you [before we began the recorded interviews] that when we were trying to get an ethnic studies program on campus, I had to go to the hospital [for surgery] and the whole ethnic studies program fell apart, and I felt, "Oh my goodness, I *am* the ethnic studies program person, so if we can't have more than one person, we don't have it?" Well, that's probably the way I should have thought about this. I should have thought, "I'm too central. If I can pull in some more people, maybe it would be more effective."

But I, in my own way, had a set of emotions—

Rabkin: Yes.

Martin Shaw: —that were propelling *me* to get up there and do that.

I talked to Bill Domhoff about it. Oh—I *sent* [my resolution] to Bill Domhoff, because Bill Domhoff has been one of my political advisors. I sent it to him before I presented it, and asked him what he thought. And he said, "Oh, I think it's great: a black person standing up there being the moral conscience of the campus." He studies race, and that's the way that he thought about it. It's like, "That you are black will make a difference." And I thought, *hmmm*—that's not exactly what I was going for.

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: (laughs) But I do believe that it was the right time to do it, and that I probably should have worked a little bit more with getting a little group or a little committee or something together. But that was one of those moments when I felt, ach. If I don't do it, who's going to do it? A lot of times, we learn a lot from our failures. That was a failure. I mean, that resolution was *way* voted down. I think it was a voice vote, (laughs) and the voices against it were *really, really* strong. There were voices for it, but— But sometimes these failures *mean* something, and that's what I'm going to hang onto.

Rabkin: Thank you. We've been going for quite a while, and I don't want to keep you too long. There is one other item on my list having to do with the senate, and I think that's to do with narrative evaluations. I think you served on a committee that addressed evaluations, and I wonder if you want to talk about that.

Martin Shaw: I think I did. I actually have it scratched out on my list; I don't know what I want to say about it. I wasn't on the committee on narrative evaluations at the time that narrative evaluations were done away with. That wasn't me.

Rabkin: (laughs)

Martin Shaw: (laughs) I wasn't there! (laughs) I think what we did with *this* narrative evaluation committee was to begin to look at ways to make writing narrative evaluations easier. From that time, lots of different rubrics came out. People started using "Performance in class: (this, this, this)," and they'd give numbers to it [in electronic menus] Or—there was an administrative office that could help you to create a rubric for your narrative evaluations. So I might have worked with that.

I love narrative evaluations; I think they are great. And I was one of the faculty members who was always late with the narrative evaluations. So—*ahem*—so while I speak up for narrative evaluations, I understand the overwhelming problem with getting them out. One of my earlier faculty members in the anthropology department, Gary Gossen, asked if he could submit his narrative evaluations as part of his writing for his tenure review. (laughs) You spend so much time writing them! And I think they're important. And I served on committees that granted students, ah—

Rabkin: Honors?

Martin Shaw: Honors, but also off campus, when people were actually going for grants, like the Ford [Foundation]. And also the president's post-docs, and the president's pre-docs. I served on those committees when we had narrative evaluations, and I didn't hear people complaining about the narrative evaluations, but I did see what happened with them. What happened with them

is that sometimes UCSC students were put to the side, because they [the selection committee members] are going to go through the easy ones first, and they're going to come back to it. That could hurt our students.

Rabkin: Their files were longer because there was more to read.

Martin Shaw: Exactly.

Rabkin: So that was the reaction, rather than, "Oh—we have some substantive information about these students."

Martin Shaw: Actually, I heard more that we had substantive information about these students. I heard more that, "These are thirty-six letters of recommendation! I really know this student." *And* I heard, "I can see where this student didn't do well." And if narrative evaluations hurt our students, it's because people had so much information. I seldom saw anybody say, "I will not read this file." I did see some people put them aside. But mostly I got from people, "I know this student, and, from what I know—*yes*. And, from what I know [about this other student]—*no*." They knew much more than if they just had a B+ or an A-. I would always say this—again, talk about the things that I've done at the university—for years, I was always on an admissions panel. When you bring students in for orientation, you bring faculty out—"who are our faculty; here I am"—and then I would talk about colleges and narrative evaluations, and how important they are, and how much students get from

them, and the fact that since I served on these other committees that gave money to students from our campus, that I could see how effective our evaluations were. The only reason that evaluations worked against students is that students didn't do well.

Rabkin: Mm.

Martin Shaw: If they did well, they had thirty-six stunning letters. If they didn't do well, if they didn't come to class— Everybody was reading between the lines about "this student turns in papers late; this student is very good in class but can't write very well"—even though you're not saying it quite that way, these people know how to read these things, and they get the information. They don't take that student—not because there are narratives, but because the narratives capture students' shortcomings; they don't show the kind of student that they're looking for.

I didn't think that we should have gotten rid of narrative evaluations. And I say that as a person who would spend a lot of time working on narrative evaluations—sometimes two or three terms late. I gave plenty of written feedback during the term, so students had a sense of my judgment of their work.

Rabkin: As a faculty member working with undergraduate students who were applying to and going on to graduate school, what did you think about the most

common criticism of all—that some graduate schools didn't like reviewing admissions files from applicants with evaluations?

Martin Shaw: I just didn't believe it. I remember talking to somebody from a University of California dental school, and maybe one person in a medical school. These are the schools [where] we hear on campus that they don't want to read narrative evaluations. And both of the people I talked to, the dental school and the medical school—they both said, "We love them."

Rabkin: Hm.

Martin Shaw: Okay—sample of two. (laughs) But I trust them, and I think there are probably more people like them. I do think that we may get hurt by people doing the easy stuff first—they can say, "Oh, I've got a student here with a 3.9." This student over here, of course, has thirty-six stellar letters, but they might say, "Okay, we're done. We've taken all of our students before we get to the next one." But I actually think that was seriously exaggerated.

The other thing that did happen on our campus, however—and it's not supposed to have happened—is that some people actually translated narratives into grades.

Rabkin: I read some of those when I was reading honors files. Quite a few. In fact, I read several—I know this was not supposed to happen, as you say—but

one-sentence "narrative" evaluations that said, "This student did work in this course equivalent to a grade of B."

Martin Shaw: (laughs) Yeah. By that time, of course, the whole system had disintegrated, and we needed to do something. But I think it's too bad. I think students did benefit from the narratives. I would try, as much as possible, to give my students lots and lots of feedback, so that they would actually know pretty much what their narrative was going to say by the time they got the narrative. But it is an awful lot of work, and I think getting rid of narratives goes along with getting graduate programs—with looking like everybody else, and having the same kind of scale for evaluation of faculty status. And it's, "We give grades; we don't spend a lot of time with undergraduates; and we have PhD students, who are the better kind of people to have." Yeah. It's too bad.

Rabkin: Well, thank you. I think we've come to the end of the list we set up of topics we wanted to make sure to cover. My question for you now is: is there anything we haven't talked about that you feel we've omitted, that you'd like to address?

Martin Shaw: No, but there are two names I wanted to put into the record. Back at Kresge, I mentioned Betsy Wootten and Shelly Starr in the office. Cathy Castro was another person in that office. Cathy became an assistant dean in Natural Sciences. She was also a wonderful person to be around and to be with when we were there: quite bright, and a good person to talk to about things. And then, on

the staff, Darien Rice was the gardener. Darien told me about 9-11. I arrived on campus, and when I was getting out of my car, she told me that the Twin Towers had been struck. It was just really hard to wrap your head around it. Darien was a really great person in the staff meetings I used to hold. I would come late for the staff meetings, and Darien said to me, "Oh, you're always late," and I said, "Oh, no, no, I go to my classes on time." She says, "Oh, it's just that you don't care about *us*." I thought, "Whoa, Darien! Pretty good!" (laughs) So I tried to be on time. (laughs) Also, Darien did the garden at the provost's house. We had some foxes come live under our deck in the garden, and—

Rabkin: Foxes?

Martin Shaw: Mm-hmm. Babies.

Rabkin: Wow.

Martin Shaw: They were born there. And we could see the mother and the father sometimes out there. Bill and I just loved watching them. And Darien said once, "So: foxes, or a garden?" We did have to get rid of the foxes. (laughs)

Rabkin: The foxes were tearing up the garden?

Martin Shaw: Yes. And it was getting to be time for a reception for graduation and all those events, and so we called the animal control people, and they took them someplace.

Rabkin: They relocated them?

Martin Shaw: Yeah. That's Darien. And then Robin McDuff: Robin was the maintenance person at Kresge, and she's one of the people who helped all those students put in all those walls.

Rabkin: Oh. Back in the early days.

Martin Shaw: Yes. She's a Kresge graduate, and an opera buff—I've seen her at the opera a few times—and also a wine connoisseur. Robin [McDuff]—a wonderful person. The hands-on, "I remember the old Kresge, and I am going to bring to life as much as I can the kinds of experiences that shaped me." All those young people working with her—I bet you a lot of them have gone into construction. She had a wonderful work ethic, and she worked really well with them. I wanted to remember those folks.

Rabkin: Thank you so much, Carolyn.

Martin Shaw: Thank you, Sarah.

About the Interviewer and Editor:

Sarah Rabkin taught in the UC Santa Cruz writing program and environmental studies department for over twenty-five years. She holds a BA in biology from Harvard University and a graduate certificate in Science Communication from UCSC. Her book of essays, *What I Learned at Bug Camp*, was published in 2011.