

Interview with Margaret Dunkle
Washington, DC
July 10, 2006
With Julia Lamber and Jean Robinson

Jean Robinson: We've read through some of your papers, not all of them.

Margaret Dunkle: I was going to say, if you started a couple days ago and you were going to read through them all, I thought —~~the~~ women are really quick."

JR: We still have many more to go. We know that you have a short amount of time, so if you could quickly go through how you got involved with the Project to begin with and then when you went to HEW, were you still engaged with sex discrimination work on the inside as opposed to the outside?

MD: Okay, yeah, it's probably useful to take a step back.

When I first got out of college, I worked for a woman named Lana Astin, now retired from UCLA, as a professor of education. Her husband, Sandy Astin, ran the Office of Research at the American Council on Education. I worked for Lana at University Research Corporation and then was going to work for Sandy when URC ran out of money. I ended up moving to Boston and accepting a job there where eventually I ended up working for Adele Simmons, who was Dean of Jackson College [at Tufts], then later became President of Hampshire College and head of the MacArthur Foundation; just a wonderful, wonderful person.

One of Adele's little projects for me was to finish up a book on discrimination in education and the workforce. As a kind of a quasi-Tufts employee, I worked with Adele and two other people, Francine Blau and Ann Freedman. Fran's an economist and Ann's an attorney. We developed a book for the 20th Century Foundation called *Exploitation from 9 to 5*, which looked at employment and education issues. There was a relatively small group of women who knew each other then. Bunny and Adele and Lana all knew each other. I think I got the job in Boston because of Lana knew Adele. Adele offered me the job to be assistant dean at Jackson, to work with her, and then she had the good luck, or poor taste, depending on how you look at it, to accept the job as dean of students at Princeton. There really wasn't a spot there for me, so I started thinking about coming back to Washington. That's when Adele sent out a note to some of her friends and Bunny Sandler said —~~Q~~, I'm just starting this new project, da-da-da" and so I ended up coming down to work for Bunny first as a research associate and then as associate director at the Project on Women [Project on the Status and Education of Women] in, I think, July of '72.

That was right after Title IX passed, and so I was kind of thrown into this whirling dervish of activity as people were trying to figure out what in the world they had done, which they didn't know at the time. They really didn't know at the time. I don't know if

you had a chance to look at my publications and stuff back then but with Bunny, we did a lot of the original research around what constitutes equality. I actually pulled out a bunch of stuff here.

What's the name of this publication? The Center for Law and Education and it was kind of the first real outline of a lot of Title IX issues, what they meant and the implication. It kind of spelled them out. The first couple years I did a lot of speaking. I got all the speaking engagements Bunny rejected.

JR: Because she didn't like to fly?

MD: No, she would accept Minnesota in July and Austin in February, and I got the opposite. [laughs] I remember one time we were actually going to the same place. We had different theories about flying. We were going to the same place, and she left to go to the airport the same time I went home to pack. We both made the plane. Somewhat different operating styles, which we still do. Actually I'm having dinner with her tonight, so it'll be fun to catch up. We've remained close friends.

She's a wonderful, wonderful person. The first couple of years I ended up doing a lot of work on the newsletter, *On Campus with Women*; I don't know if you got a chance to look through that.

Julia Lamber: Yes. We have both also been involved in women's issues on our own campus.

MD: Were you the people, I can't remember the names, that got in touch with me a couple years ago?

JL: Last year, that was me; Jeff Orleans gave me your email.

MD: Okay, that was it. When I heard from you last week, I thought, I have already talked to these people.

JL: You and I exchanged some emails and you sent us some information.

MD: That's right. Sounds like you're in phase two now, and that's more substantial, which is great.

MD: Starting in '73, we started to focus on what the Title IX regulations might look like. That's when I did the research on what constitutes equality for women in sports. That's what's quoted in Michener's least read book.

JL: You mentioned the book, but you didn't say which of his books.

MD: *Sports in America* [1976].

JR: Several people have said to us something along the lines of what you have just said: that people didn't know what they had done when they passed Title IX.

MD: Including Edith Green.

JR: Sometime in that six-month period, after the passage, clearly *you* understood that one of the issues was sports. At what point did other people start saying "oh my God, this is gonna ruin men's athletics?" or whatever it was that they said.

MD: Um, that actually popped up pretty quickly. One of Bunny Sandler's many endearing traits is she's really good at spotting what's going to be in the headlines. She's said, "this is going to be really important" and I said, "well, sure I can do that, what the hell?" And she said that women's athletics was going to be really important and we really don't have a clue what it means. At that point, just the categories in this paper [holds a copy of the paper] saying "facilities, publicity, scholarships," just outlining those categories was a major, major breakthrough in the research because nobody had thought about it that way. Looking at it now it's kind of hard to realize that, but then these categories were actually used by the Office for Civil Rights when they developed the Title IX regulation. It's not a coincidence that the categories in the Title IX regulation look a lot like the index of this publication. There's a lot of back and forth, both formal and informal, during those times. One of the things I sent to Schlesinger, maybe I shouldn't have sent it, was the compilation of all the drafts of the Title IX regulation that I had -- the leaked drafts. There were a couple of notebooks up there. Did you ever see those?

JL: You did send those, or you didn't send those?

MD: I did.

JL: No, I didn't see them.

MD: I hope they didn't throw them away.

JL: No, I'm sure they didn't throw them away. We haven't gone through everything.

JR: I started at the beginning and she started at the end and there's still a middle to go through.

MD: Okay, but there are several notebooks of the drafts of the Title IX regulation and the different drafts we got along the way; what was and wasn't in them. You might be interested in weaving in what was going on and what influenced what.

JL: You got them from Jeff or were they readily available?

MD: I have enough archivists in my own history that I just put them all together in one place, which most people didn't do. There are notebooks with my handwritten notes on all the drafts of the Title IX regulation that I ever got. A lot of them were leaked by Holly, from her friends in government; I got them from other people too.

JL: After the regulation was out, is that when you went back to HEW?

MD: I didn't go back. I went.

I was just ready to switch to HEW. I mean a lot of people stayed working with Title IX, stayed working with this stuff for a long time. I loved what I was doing and I loved the people. I just wanted to try something different. When I was in HEW, I worked with a whole range of other issues, from student financial assistance to veteran's cost of instruction program and tuition tax credits. I certainly stayed involved with the Title IX issues and there was a bunch of us who had worked together before the Carter administration came in on these kinds of issues. We stayed in touch and worked on them, but that was not a major part of my work at HEW.

JL: And where were you at HEW and when?

MD: Office of Legislation. I'd say '77 to '79, something like that. I was there for a couple of years. I learned an incredible amount, worked with some great people. Dick Warden was the Assistant Secretary for Education, who had also been the legislative director for the United Auto Workers. I just worked on a whole range of issues there. It was one of those things. I was young; I was always the youngest person in the room. It was doing something different. It was an incredible experience to learn about the government.

I did some things more quietly with women's issues while I was in the administration, but I didn't do a huge amount. This is when Cindy Brown started playing more of a role, because she had been co-director of the Project with the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and then she became the deputy director at the Office for Civil Rights at HEW. Because she is a big sports fan and da-da-da-da, she became one of the people inside of the administration who pushed for the sports guidelines. But Cindy wasn't really involved earlier. She worked with things like vocational education; her focus has always been more on minorities groups, especially black and African-American issues.

JL: Then after HEW?

MD: I got a grant and formed the Health Equity Project where I looked at sex equity and health services. Did you ever get a copy of that book?

JL: We've seen it.

MD: I may have copies around here. These are yours.

JL & JR: Thank you very much.

MD: I'm sure they'll be priceless collectors' items at some point. (laughs). I did a study of what nondiscrimination through the Title IX lens in student health services would be. A lot of issues came up. A lot of that stuff is still relevant; there's some remedies that haven't been explored yet. It's kind of a difficult publication to read because the first part is ~~here's~~ "here's the problem," and the second part's applying Title IX to it. You have two kind of different audiences. There were two kinds of headline issues that came out of that and one of them was teenage pregnancy. There's always a headline issue that comes out of the jumble of issues that ends up driving the whole debate. For Title IX it was athletics. In terms of looking at these issues, it was really teenage pregnancy and insurance coverage.

Those issues are still around. In terms of the stuff I'm doing now, which has to do with issues around kids with disabilities and delays, the headline issue is ~~you can't~~ "you can't do anything if you don't know who these kids are." Actually, I'm using a lot of the same kinds of approaches and skills that I honed earlier during my Title IX work and as chair of the Coalition of Women and Girls in Education.

JL: So, this [report] is from the Equality Center, right?

MD: It is from the Health Equity Project, which was a separate, free-standing entity. Then Cindy and I formed the Equality Center.

JR: Cindy and you?

MD: Oh yeah.

JL: In the archives, there is a draft of a book about Title IX with all these wonderful interviews about what happened with the policy interpretation. Was that ever published?

MD: No. It was never published. It was done in kind of two halves but it was never published. By that time –

JR: Everybody kind of moved on?

MD: Well, the administration had; they weren't really interested in publishing that kind of thing. It would have taken a huge effort to get it to publication. There's a lot of good research. It's interesting because part of that research is colored by who did the research, as you well know. There is more emphasis in the research on the later efforts when Joan Reeve [**check name**] was doing the interviews. Because she was in the Office for Civil Rights and she was pretty unfamiliar with the early start of Title IX. But, there's a lot of good information that you could mine. Were there transcripts of those?

JL: Some of them are notes and some of them are typed but no tapes as far as I know.

MD: Oh, I think I still have the tapes.

JL: Our strategy when we saw it was there and it was a draft and I was hoping, if it turned into a book then I could get the book. I wouldn't read the material in the archives. This just means that we need to go back and read that material.

MD: I gave this stuff to Schlesinger a long time ago; first in 1986 and later in 1994.

JR: When we went there last summer we said, "You have the Margaret Dunkle papers and we'd really like to see them." They said, "It takes a long time to get them ready."

MD: So, you guys helped push that.

JR: We really want to see them.

MD: It's interesting because my papers are very complementary to the papers from the Project on Women [Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges]. I organized the file system for the Project on Women, even though I know it morphed over time.

JR: The project's weren't ready either.

MD: No, they say that are not going to start on them until after Bunny dies or she stops sending them stuff.

JR: They are also complementary to the WEAL papers.

MD: Well, a lot of WEAL's papers are also Bunny's papers.

I mean, there's not that much difference between WEAL and Bunny. Bunny and I wrote the WEAL/Abzug analysis of the Title IX proposed regulation. Then we put out a publication saying, "Here's what women's groups want." It was kind of one of the things we called "Mythical Marching Millions" because we're quoting ourself in another hat.

JL: We've done a pretty good job of looking at all the PEER papers from Holly and then we talked to Holly last month.

MD: She had a good interview.

JL: We have this question -- we think we can ask you this question.

MD: I can always say I won't answer it.

JL: It sounds strange, but as we see it, the opponent to the athletic regulation is the NCAA because Title IX turns out to be mostly about athletics, right?

MD: No. Title IX did not turn out to be mostly about athletics, but athletics was the issue that drove the Title IX debate. The most lasting changes from Title IX really have to do with admission to graduate school and professional school and the opening up of undergraduate public institutions to women on a legal basis, because before Title IX there was an out and out quota on women, like 40 percent on undergraduates.

JL: Why do you suppose that didn't make the headlines? The lasting effects part?

MD: Not as visceral. I can give you an example from the work I'm doing now. Sometimes I tell people I am a person with no current expertise but with lots of previous depth, which gives me breadth. One of the things I just developed for the work around early identification and intervention is a policy toolbox, about how you change policies. It's one of those things that come across, in the end, so simple but it took a long time to get there. People who don't know much about policy...I hope I'm not offending you....you can have so many PhDs and dissertations but it doesn't change policy one wit.

So I thought what can I do, especially working so much in Los Angeles and California, where you have all these smart people, but people who really don't play well with people in Washington, and Washington people don't play well with them, and are really not very involved in policy process. What can you do to help stream-line this in a way that's meaningful and also something they can actually use. I developed a policy toolbox, which talks about carrots, sticks, leadership, and knowledge as the four tools and the federal, state, local and private/non-profit as the levels. You can actually come up with a matrix based on that. And knowledge is highly overrated as a vehicle for change. I mean, everyone says they want stuff that's evidence-based, but what really drives people to action is something that is much more visceral.

So the knowledge base is important more for identifying the issues than for pushing people forward, even when they tell you differently.

To bring that back to Title IX, the emotional issue -- and it was also related to the dollars issue -- that drove Title IX was sports and athletics. There was no way that was not going to be a headline.

JR: Drove the opposition?

MD: Yes, and also those in favor of Title IX because it was such an emotion topic. But the more academic part, literally and figuratively, in terms of women's access to higher education, which is actually why Title IX got passed in the first place, receded because it was longer term. It wasn't as immediate. It didn't have the visuals to go with the media. I mean, you're talking about your kid, who's six now, being able to go to college, or is there going to be a 40% quota, so her brother can go to this college, but she can't or graduate school or whatever.

JL: Those changes happened fairly quickly.

MD: But not as quickly as you might think. The Public Health Service Act was amended in 1971, the year before Title IX. These amendments to the Public Health Service Act prohibited discrimination in the health care professions by sex. I remember in 73-74 having conversations with this woman researcher through the American Association of Medical Colleges who was saying, "This was just ridiculous; we can't do it [nondiscrimination] because these women are never gonna practice medicine." There was huge resistance. There was huge front-line resistance for women going into some of the better compensated specialties -- surgery, huge discrimination in veterinary medicine because all these veterinarians were gonna have to wrestle with alligators as opposed to Chihuahuas and cats. So it really did happen fairly slowly, but in the grand scheme of things, it was pretty expeditious.

JL: To go back to athletics, we think we understand that the NCAA was a kind of the flashpoint or the coordinator of the opposition to Title IX.

MD: And their law firm, and Margot can tell you a lot about this.

JL: As we see it, the NCAA is full of good ole boys. The leadership positions of HEW and the government, whether we're talking about Republicans or Democrats, it doesn't really matter—they're good ole boys. Congress is full of good ole boys and former athletes. It seems like the NCAA should have won and they didn't.

MD: Even good ole boys have daughters.

JL: I don't think the NCAA changed its mind because of daughters. You think they changed their mind?

MD: I don't think the NCAA changed its mind.

JL: Who changed their mind because of daughters?

MD: I think if you go back and check it, some of the men in the traditional power structure who turned out to be pretty good on these issues had daughters. This [nondiscrimination] may or may not have been something that they wanted for their wives. But it sure as hell was something they wanted for their daughters. David Matthews [Secretary of HEW in 1975] had daughters; congressmen and congresswomen had daughters. Martin Gerry – have you talked with him? [He was Deputy Director of OCR in 1974-75] and was quite key in the initial drafting of the regulation – he is now Deputy Director of Social Security and Disability so he is still involved in equity kind of issues -- Martin had daughters. The Democrats weren't necessarily better than the Republicans in a lot of respects.

JL: That is pretty clear.

MD: Jim O'Hara was a Democrat from Michigan. The NEA didn't support him so the next time around he lost. And he deserved to have his ass fried. He deserved to lose the

election. In some ways the NCAA should have won—it was David and Goliath. But this was not just a public issue. It was a private issue in individual families.

There are also different reward structures.

JL: In what sense?

MD: The big money in athletics is from TV revenues and stuff like that. Their organizations and institutions get a chunk of that, and so the NCAA went from totally disinterested to them taking over women's athletics. I mean those economic and structural issues overcame their daughters. I would assume, although I haven't personally talked with them about this.

JR: I'm intrigued by this daughter thing.

MD: I bet you're somebody's daughter, too?

JR: I think you're right about the difference between wives and daughters. But there have always been daughters, so there had to have been more.

MD: Well, there's a vehicle. One of the other things about this construct that I've developed for the work I'm doing now which really grows out of stuff I've done for years -- you look at all these venues and levels of government, public, private, non-profit, local, neighborhood community, state, state-wide, regional, and federal and national and then the carrot, sticks, leadership, and knowledge. You get all of these possible things you could do. The three criteria that I came up with to figure out what you do: the first one is impact: is it going to make any difference? The second one—opportunity: is there some vehicle. This brings me to the point you raise, is there some vehicle to make a difference there. And the third one—partners: do you have lots of partners or do you at least understand your opponents. It seems like a pretty simple construct, but it actually works. So the opportunity part. Things don't bubble to the front unless there's some opportunity or some vehicle or some event or something's on the front page. It may be a personal life experience or whatever, but there's something that presents this moving train and opportunity so that you're not moving from scratch. What I think happened is that this [Title IX] provided a moving train and a vehicle for change.

JR: I don't know if you were in HEW by this time, but at what point did NCAA kind of decide: ok, we're not going to be able to ignore this, we're clearly gonna have to adapt. The colleges and universities realize they're not going to let us do it on our own because they don't trust us. Do you have a sense of what it was that convinces the NCAA: Now, we're gonna take over what the AIAW does?

MD: You have to ask them directly. At the same time, it became clear that this issue wasn't going to go away, that women's sports were viable. They would say things like —why should we do equal publicity when nobody's going to come see them,” or —why should we bother to provide transportation, it's just a waste of money.” They saw that

there really was some energy in the core there (remember the Billy Jean King/Bobby Riggs match). There was some viability in the longer term. I think that's when they really shifted to take over the AIAW. It's really economics and power. It's not all that subtle.

JL: Are there other visible opponents? Jim O'Hara, the NCAA... were there others as you think back on your fight?

MD: I'm assuming you have all of the hearings there were. I mean the Tower hearings and the hearings in the regulation and all that stuff. You can pull stuff out of that. It's just hard for people to change. You had this Strong Vocational Interest Inventory which had pink and blue forms, and depending on which form you took you'd be a legal secretary or a lawyer, a nurse or a doctor. Higher education was very slow to come on board and that's why the position of Bunny and me and the Association of American Colleges was particularly interesting. I don't think it was a coincidence that Fred Ness, president of AAC, had five daughters. The American Council on Education was slow to come around. George Hentry was a big wig and he later did some of the stuff in terms of the economics of college sports and financial stuff. The real hero for ACE was Donna Shavlik who was the Associate Director and then Director of the Women's Program. Nancy Slosberg had come in from Michigan. Her husband was real involved with the labor movement and stuff. She was head of that office for a little while and took on the some of the TIAA-CREF issues which were also Title IX issues in terms of pensions. Nancy's style did not work for ACE and Emily Taylor came on as a classic Dean of Women.

JR: How would they've described her? Too abrasive, too abrupt, too demanding, too uppity?

MD: Too confrontational, too provocative. Nancy's one of those people who probably brushes her teeth with flair. That was not the right institutional setting for her. When Emily was there, Donna was the real strength as she continued to be. In some ways Emily provided protective coloration. Who messes with the Dean of Women, right?

JR: That is an interesting way to get at that. The other question we have is the ways in which these women's groups work together. We know about the Coalition. We know that there are women from all of the mainstream organizations, maybe at low levels, or like Donna at ACE. I think we have a handle on the structure. Now we're interested in the decision-making process. Did you get together and sit around a table and say "this is the position we're gonna have on textbooks," "this is the position we're gonna have on pensions." Exactly how did that happen?

MD: It was organic in structure. Holly and I were trying to remember; I communicate with her by emails. The first meeting I found was in May of '73, which was about the time she was leaving HEW; she had been in the Office of Legislation, working with the deputy assistant secretary. Bunny and I had been doing a lot of writings; I was coming up to speed. I was a kid. Holly had been in there when the language was written; she'd

been in the Office of Education. We were all doing a lot of stuff separately. In '73 I started to look at athletics, because Bunny was like "this is really gonna be an important issue" and that's really early, a year before the regulation. We have to think about the regulation process and what happens there. I looked into some of my old calendars and the first meeting was like in May '73. I had "meeting of women's groups" or "projects on women" noted and there were a couple things like that which continued on sporadically. I kept a notebook from when I was chair of the coalition. The first thing I had notes from was March 5, 1975; there were like nine people at this meeting, including Olga Margelin. She was very important in terms of the process. Olga Margelin was from the National Council of Jewish Women.

JL: We've read the papers from National Council on Jewish Women in the Library of Congress.

MD: She'd been really tied in with the labor movement. She was always old as I remember. She was an incredible woman who really knew the politics, knew everybody. At one point I had a party and I lived next to a guy (I call everyone a guy), well this distinguished gentleman who was my next door neighbor, in Columbia Heights. This was a man who had gone to the all black high school here and Amherst College and gotten his MD from Howard and his PhD from Ohio State. He'd been former President of the National Medical Association which is the Black medical association. He and Olga met each other and said: "We've seen each other before." "Oh ya... it was on Air Force One going out to sign the Medicare bill." Olga's been involved with politics for a long time, with the labor movement. Nobody messed with Olga. I mean she would tell your mother; it didn't matter if your mother was dead, she would tell your mother. Nobody messed with Olga and she was incredibly important in terms of my learning process and also the group because she did not allow the group to trample on the rights of any of the participants. In the rush to move forward, that's where a lot of coalitions often fall down, because they say we have to do this and we have to do this right now. She would just stop things, in terms of saying "you really can't do that." They won't say anything now, but they will say stuff later. She was just incredibly important in terms of the process of establishing the kind of procedures that we had. One of the ways you can make things happen is by establishing procedures that look totally benign that you only use when you have to -- or social change by boredom. She was really good at helping me as the first chair, actually even before I became the first chair when Holly was the Education Task Force Chair, making sure that this became a viable coalition. It still exists today.

It [this group] was Olga, Judy McCusik who worked with Shirley McCune at the Research Center on Sex, Equity and Education, which later became the Research Center on Educational Equity of the Council of Chief State School Officers, Caroline Smith with WEAL whom I don't remember that well, Emily and Donna from ACE, Lois Schiffer from the Center for Law and Social Policy. She was with Marcia [Greenberger]. A lot of women's organizations are being formed at this time. Holly was PEER and Margot was the attorney for AIAW and me. Our issues were the grievance procedures and how to

improve them. That was our major issue. We tried to get a meeting with President Ford. We organized a letter writing campaign.

[Dunkle is looking at notebooks, recalling people and meetings]

The Schlesinger Library threw away a lot of these articles, which is kind of a shame. If they threw away the newspaper articles, then they threw away a lot of what was guiding what we did. I don't know if they actually did throw them away, but if we didn't have the information, it means we weren't acting on it. In the Library's letter they said they threw them away; I have to ask them about that.

Like here's a newspaper by Nancy Scannel, who was a reporter for the Washington Post, (I think she later died of cancer), -Senator John Towers' daughter Jean will be a freshman this fall at Southern Methodist University. Her father says that she hopes to play varsity tennis." (laughter)

JR: They always thought tennis was ok.

MD: There's some great testimony that never got into the record, too, that I wrote with this woman who was the former head of the IAWS (Intercollegiate Association of Women Students), Margie Chapman. We wrote this testimony for this other woman for the Tower hearings, and she forgot to ask that it be included in the record. It had all of these names; and it talked about specific things and all this stuff. Here's a March 6 memo from Donna talking about the next meeting of the Education Task Force for March 17. Mostly about grievance procedures. I think it's about March when we started talking about the -Education Task Force" instead of the ad hoc women's group. [MD reads another memo:] March 31st Donna, Emily, Judy Lichtman, Holly, Barbara Burton (with the League of Women Voters), Carolyn Smith at WEAL. Here it is: Holly's chair of the Education Task Force for three months, April-June. [Still looking at memos:] Judy will talk to Margot about a meeting with Ford; naming press contacts. . . .

JL: What happened when the women just disagreed with each other?

MD: We focused on what we agreed on. And some people dropped out. For example, when the Title IX regulation came out, we had a big meeting at the Kellogg Room at the American Council on Education. It really was like a summit meeting, talking about what are the issues and whatever. The Women's Rights Project in ACLU really didn't think the Title IX regulations were strong enough and they chose not to participate. They didn't oppose it; they chose not to participate. The other groups then coalesced around getting the Title IX regulations through. Do you know about the disapproval process [legislative veto popular during the 1970s]? So a victory was no action; the big thing was not to get the regulation disapproved. That's when we started to develop materials. Probably the most experienced politically were Olga and Margot, although they often clashed. It was fun. They clashed over process.

JL: Over process... not over substance?

MD: Over what to do when. Margot wanted to represent her clients and wanted to do certain things. That's like two immovable objects, that was really fun. You've talked with Margot?

JL: We're going to talk to her tomorrow.

[MD left room to gather some political buttons and Title IX "campaign" stuff.]

MD: These are the ones Bunny would hand out. They would sell for a fortune on e-bay. I've the world's only supply.

Have you read, *Let me play*? It's a kids book, came out about a year ago, I think the author is Karen Blumenthal. I spoke a lot to her about some of the history. You might want to get her notes; she's in Austin. She used to be a Wall Street Journal reporter.

JL: We knew there were three or four books that came out on Title IX and I knew one of the books was for children. And one of which was by Suggs from the Chronicle of Higher Education.

MD: I had many conversations with her. I even have a contemporary comics collection about the time of Title IX. I shared that with her. I was so annoyed with her because she took the "God Bless You Title IX" button and put it on the cover of her book but it said, "We Love You Title IX." It sounds like a minor thing, but you know, pandering to political correctness is one thing, but don't present it as history. She sent me her book and I never wrote her back because I was just so annoyed. I thought it was just sloppy journalism. Not that I have any opinions.

JR: Let me ask you one last question about National Coalition of Women and Girls in Education.

MD: We used to call it "Making Decisions through the Ouija Board." One of the reasons we like the name "National Coalition of Women and Girls in Education" was because it was so difficult to come up with an acronym. We were like "what do you mean—we can just do everything on the Ouija board."

JR: Was the chair elected?

MD: Yes.

JR: For a two-year term? Or was it a rotating thing?

MD: No, I don't think it was two years.

Here are notes from our White House meeting. It's interesting I have all these. I have the actual sign-in sheets from the meeting.

JL: There are some sign-in sheets for meetings at Schlesinger.

MD: From my stuff or other people's stuff?

JL: They were in your papers.

MD: They weren't from the actual meetings then because I still have them. That might've been a specialized meeting. These were actually the coalition meetings which we held weekly. ...

I stopped doing minutes because it took a lot of time and it made sure people showed up so that they knew what was going on. I was elected chair on July 21, 1975. One of the things that was interesting was that Bunny was kind of like the senior or guiding light. Bunny and I had a great working relationship. The fact that we're having dinner tonight, thirty years later, is an example. We have different strengths and different skills. She's a morning person and I'm not. She would tell me her top rate ideas at 8 o'clock in the morning and I figured out to do that to her at 6 o'clock at night. We'd meet in the middle. In some ways the fact that I was so young provided a great way to enable a coalition to happen because I didn't need to control everything and it might have failed if I tried to take control of everything. I learned that you can really determine what happens if you know the people and you keep a handle on the process. A lot of the people said that the Coalition just sort of worked. Well, it didn't just really work. If I knew someone had a problem with something, I would be on the phone with them working it out and working it out and working it out, so that when they came to the meeting, it did just really work and looked like it wasn't a problem. But that person wasn't caught off guard. They had options. They weren't embarrassed in front of their organization. They weren't embarrassed personally; they didn't look stupid; you didn't go around them. There are a lot of really capable, high maintenance people in this group. And so the fact that I didn't particularly have the need to do everything myself was a real advantage in building the coalition, which a lot of people don't realize. They think the best way to build a coalition is around a charismatic figure.

So the fact that I didn't need to do that was a real strength. The other thing that was happening was everybody was really busy. Later on I went to one of these life planning things. They said, —"Just because it's easy for you doesn't mean that it's easy for someone else." So I did a lot of the stuff to bring people along, to keep people included even when they didn't participate, figure out who needed the call, share information either written or orally, give someone credit in public -- all the subtle things that make a coalition work. That's the same thing I'm doing in Los Angeles. Even though I'm in a different stage in my career, I still don't have the need to control everything myself.

My dad desegregated a southern school district and sometimes it was desegregation by boredom. He would come up with procedures that would make stuff happen, like playing a game of chess, and other folks would go along with the procedures one-by-one.

Cumulatively, the result was clear, which was to desegregate. He used to say people had to integrate themselves. He would desegregate.

JL: Where was he?

MD: Southern Maryland, which is kind of like being in Mississippi. There's a 50/50 black-white school district.

JL: On the Eastern Shore?

MD: The Western Shore – just as provincial.

This kind of process and following things along was important, especially when we're meeting weekly. It was really, really important to have continuity, bringing along people who came to the meeting, translate the jargon, and explain the context. When you do that, you have a conversation where people are actually communicating early on. You're much less likely to have serious problems.

JL: It's a tribute to their leader if they say –Well, the Coalition just happened" because we all know that it doesn't just happen. It's a real tribute to you.

MD: Thank you, but they really think it just happened. Still today they think Bunny –let" Margaret do that, which is not true at all. Bunny and I said this is really a great way to get a lot more people involved in the agenda we have. Just as now the work I am doing on early identification began with autism and the best way to see kids early is not to screen for autism but to see them in terms of early development. So the best way to move ahead on Title IX was not to focus on higher education but rather to focus on all education and all the kinds of groups. The most direct route is not always the one that seems that way.

JL: Since we're seeing Margot tomorrow, it seems to us that Margot, partly because of her knowledge about sports, was the leader on the sports issue, on how Title IX would apply to athletics?

MD: Yes and no, yes and no. Margot was really not that involved with the original research I did. That evolved separately. Margot was probably most important for political knowledge. She had worked as Bella Abzug's AA [Administrative Aide] and had a real sense of the Hill, how it worked, which I certainly didn't have at that point. Ask her how she became the AIAW counsel. Because it was a mistake. They were actually trying to reach Carol [P? name?] who was the attorney for the AEP [what group?]

JR: And they just had the names wrong?

MD: They had the names wrong. They met and she said this sounds good. I didn't find this out until one time I came back to Washington a few years ago and we had a big party

here. Margot, Judy, Bunny, and Holly came up, and people from the later stages and we were all telling stories. That was when I learned that Margot was a mistake, and I heard it from her. Margot was really representing the AIAW. Working with the people there who were very good but they were used to having no power, to being very uptight, and to not being particularly bold, so she really did a lot to translate what they wanted and what they knew into a political arena. In terms of the actual research, Margot wasn't really involved in that. She and Bunny reviewed this paper and reviewed the later thing I did. Do you have ~~Competitive Athletics in Search of Equal Opportunity~~?"

JL: So when people sat down and said ~~what does equality mean in terms of athletics?~~" The first thing that I would think of would not be separate teams. The first thing I would think of would be opening things up. With employment you just open things up as opposed to having separate tracks. How did that conversation go?

MD: That's where it started. And the I think the ACLU Women's Rights Project came out with some stuff early on talking about wanting all co-ed teams, but it's pretty clear that that would be an apparent victory which would be a real defeat in most sports, or at least sports which got any funding or any support. The sports where women were likely to excel which involved flexibility and endurance really didn't get any support. A lot of that is actually described in there [publication] —have you seen that?

JL: This first one, ~~what constitutes. . . .~~"

MD: Yes, that really was the first thing. Somewhere I have an annotated version which actually gives which institutions we're talking about. We couldn't quote them because we worked for a higher education institution. It was all hearsay and secondary sources. A lot of the sources, I think, are in the information that I sent to Schlesinger, unless they threw them away. Like I said there were newspaper articles and verbal reports.

JL: Are these ours?

MD: They're mine. You just want to mail these back to me in California?

JL: Sure.

MD: You can have those if you want. This is actually a really good article, kind of describing how groups worked together. These aren't extra copies. Will you make a list of what you're taking and give me a list?

JL: Let's just do these.

MD: Did you ever get this [publication]? It's a special thing for women's sports. It's interesting because probably about 50% of the stuff in here is from my stuff. Even though they didn't give me credit. This was like an article I did published in '94. Did you get the Women's Coalition one?

[Dunkle is going through notebooks and files]

JL: No but a lot of this stuff we do have.

MD: This is interesting; I haven't read this in years. [reading:] "Some people who are totally against you on substance are people who are sympathetic but are afraid to take a strong stance. They support you for technical reasons." It was one from a woman's sports magazine, a special pull-out section. Here's the stuff in there that comes from the research I did.

JR: Do you remember Anita Aldridge?

JL: Yes, she was still around when I was Dean [for Women's Affairs]

MD: I know, lots of these people are getting really old now.

JL: Our first oral history was with Bunny. Actually, I interviewed Birch Bayh several years ago.

MD: I was about to say, how did you interview Birch Bayh. That was pretty impressive.

JL: Indiana connections.

MD: Isn't he dead now.

JL: No. We were interviewing Bunny and we were mentioning names —and now he's dead... and now she's dead..." So we decided that we had to hurry on these oral histories.

MD: I realize that that was what was going on....

JL: Not that you were dying off.

MD: Oh, this is interesting [finding another document]. This is talking about merger of athletic departments in terms of women's and men's athletic departments.

Did you get the compilation of positions that the Coalition took?

JR: Yes, I made a copy of it.

MD: Oh you copied the whole thing?

JR: Yes, I don't have it yet; Schlesinger is copying it.

MD: Too bad because I probably have an extra copy floating around here someplace.

Just let me give you a little perception. Some of the questions you're asking in terms of the process and stuff, as you interview other people, I'd delve a little more deeply. I think there is some revisionist recollection stuff going on here. As I actually pull out my notes here and look at who was there.

JL: One of the things about oral histories, of course, is that people's recollections are often different from what really happened. But that is one of the things that makes them interesting.

MD: It does make it interesting but it is important to put that in the context of what actually happened...

JL: In terms of fact.

MD: Yes, and I know everyone sees themselves at the center of everything. One of the things that was so interesting about the Title IX effort was that there were so many highly capable, charismatic people that were all working together.

The other thing that was important in all this was that the traditional women's organizations were involved, but they had no intellectual involvement. Their involvement was really because they had representation so broadly across the country. Holly was really good at identifying groups like the AAUW and the League of Women Voters and the BPW (Business and Professional Women). One of the things that they would do is that they had the resources to bring in their leadership. This is an example of how we reached consensus. Before our meetings with the White House people, or the people writing the regulation, or Matthews, Califano, Peter Holmes or whoever, we actually had a script in terms of who would take what position. People could not participate in the meeting or speak unless they bought into the script. The AAUW people and the BPW people had to bring in their elective representatives and then brief them about what their part of the script was.

JL: I've seen the notes from the pre-meetings developing scripts.

MD: It was very tightly scripted and people really didn't deviate from that. Margot did a couple of times, but she was very careful not to do it too much because she would've been shooting herself in the foot. This was a way people knew what to expect, like the AAUW people could have their moment in the sun. They could say they did this and it was good for them. Yet their elected leadership was very unsophisticated and very unknowledgeable about the issues. There was a woman there, Ellen McCartney, who was a regular participant early on. She did a lot to bring the AAUW along. But to get to your question of what you did with disagreement -- we had these pre-meetings to really hammer that out. What are we going to bring up? Who's going to bring it up? Then it was kind of my job as chair to make sure that happen... which I did.

JL/JR: Thank you very much. This has been terrific.

JL: What I will do next is to have this tape transcribed and then I will send you a draft, which you can edit as you like. Send it to California? Thanks again for taking the time to see us.