

Interview conducted by Carrie Frieze with Dr. James Green

9/18/2000

START OF INTERVIEW

(Marcus Robbins): This is Marcus Robbins, University archivist, we are conducting an oral history interview with Dr. James Green of the philosophy department at Northern Michigan University, we are in the University archives reading room, the date is September 18, 2000, the time is 10:25 the interviewer is Carrie Frieze.

(Carrie Frieze): Okay, what was your position when you first came to Northern?

(Dr. James Green): Assistant professor of philosophy, I think. I think I was an assistant at that time, yeah. Could have been instructor.

(CF): What were some of the things that you saw that could have caused the push for unionization. Were there certain instances, certain events, maybe reasons the faculty was unhappy with?

(JG): Some things I'm vague about, some things I'm clear about. Vaguely I think people were concerned about salaries, money for research, the power of the senate to really make decisions and not have their judgments overruled. Those things I think were true. I think also it seemed as though, not just the amount of salaries, but the way things would happen. For example, the administration would say the department has so much money – 4% to distribute – the department head would make a recommendation about who should get what within the department and it was spent at the department then it would go up higher levels and then sometimes it would come back and say the president or the vice president might move \$25, \$25 from one guy to another guy. \$25 doesn't mean anything in terms of money but it meant something in terms of, "Hey why did he take \$25 from me, what's he trying to tell me?" So there would be that. Like you know when the salaries would come out we'd be in the hall here, leaning over people's shoulders to see what we got. So people didn't like that. So those were things that were around. The sort of catalyst for successful unionization was the selection of academic vice president in which I was on the committee that was doing the selecting. We recommended three candidates and those candidates were all rejected by the president, including one who is the president of Eastern Michigan University. The president said he could accept three people – Bob Glenn, Gene Whitehouse, Don Heikennen. We recommended two of those – Don Heikennen, Gene Whitehouse, and not Bob Glenn – and he appointed Bob Glenn. That appointment really got people to sign cards because Glenn had been Dean of Arts and Science during the previous period and during that period there was lots of either cutbacks or threats of cutbacks in our appropriation and this university was constantly under budget constraints. New faculty felt like their jobs were endangered, and any administrator in those positions was making hard, difficult decisions which weren't always accepted by the faculty and I think Bob Glenn suffered from being in that position. So there was opposition to him being vice president and the president – President Jamrich – appointed him in spite of the opposition that was present.

(CF): Okay.

(JG): So once he did that, there had been cards around – the MEA had been trying to organize a second time and I don't think it was very successful - but when Jamrich did that all kinds of people went and signed the cards and that caused there to be an election to be held and then AAUP jumped in.

(CF): So you would say that was, because I did notice that as I was looking through the material there had been pushes for it before, and it seemed like they weren't really for it and then all of a sudden the faculty was like, "Yeah that's what we want," so you would say that that instance is what kind of sparked that?

(JG): Mhm.

(CF): Okay. Let's see, I know you weren't around for the McClellan case but were there still feelings about that when you got here? Was that still maybe a reason that the faculty was looking for outside help like a union?

(JG): I certainly think it was a factor for Bob McClellan and people allied with him. His job had been endangered. I think that, you know, he was sort of colorful kind of a figure then. I think a lot of people felt sympathy for him and so that legacy, it was more a legacy with the board than Jamrich – Jamrich was not the person that tried to fire him, it was other people – so one might think that it was an immediate friction between the immediate administration and the faculty of Bob. But it was still members of the board I assume from there and that was a problem. I think I remember, and you'd have to check this with say, somebody like Whitehouse, that when, so Bob kept his job, then he came up for tenure, and my memory is that when he came up for tenure the board decided they would get more involved with tenure decisions than they had in the past. I think some members voted against tenure for him. I think that kind of intervention into the academic process, which is not typically done by boards, I think that happened before we unionized, I'm not sure. I remember that kind of event occurring and there would be people who would know better like Gene Whitehouse. But if that occurred before unionization that would be another kind of thing that would make people say, "We need better protection than we've got."

(CF): Do you think that it was – did the faculty sort of feel like academic freedom was in jeopardy?

(JG): I think insofar as the board is going to take that sort of active involvement in a tenure decision. I don't know, maybe they even, did they actually interview people that came up for tenure at that time? That may be too. That would be extraordinary. I have some memory of that occurring and if that occurred that would be extraordinary to make people worry about academic freedom because you've got to talk to these people.

(CF): Right. Was there anything that was in the 1975 contract that kind of was an answer to the McClellan case at all? Did you see any, was there anything that sticks out?

(JG): Well, all union contracts have clauses about tenure and firing and for just cause and things like that which is protection so we weren't unusual in that. All union contracts for faculty have clauses which recognize tenure and talk about procedures for burdens of proof for getting rid of people who have tenure or even on tenure track. So yeah, unionizing and getting those standards was kind of an answer to that.

(CF): Okay, I'm not sure if you know about this but before they unionized the AAUP was on campus as a chapter, can you elaborate maybe what they were involved in or what their role was before they pushed to be the union agent?

(JG): The U.P. chapter when I came was very small, small number of people. When one of these efforts at unionization, the earlier one than the one that probably lead to the election, an earlier one run by the MEA, the MEA was I think concerned that the AAUP would oppose it and that would make things difficult. But one of the questions is "Who's a member of the AAUP?" So it was very small, some of the people who were organizing the MEA as I recall showed up at the AAUP meeting and could vote, and so would vote but the AAUP would not interfere with or vote against the MEA effort at organizing. That's my memory, you know, not as clear as I'd like to be on that, but my memory was that people came to that meeting Dave Micheal, Bob McClellan, other guys, and they were there to say AAUP should support or certainly not oppose the effort in unionization. I think that was the decision of the group at that time. AAUP at that time was a fellow in physics who I no longer remember whose wife was active, the humane society maybe he was too I forget his name, but he was very active and another person who was very active was Les Foster. One of the things that Les did, he was active nationally, he's in the English department, and he was instrumental in creating a grievance procedure when we didn't have a union and I think he helped, you know, inspired by AAUP principles, I think he did some writing and he got some help from the national and we adopted this procedure to deal with grievances. There was a case, the fellow's name I can't remember, in the business school as I recall, who team taught a course with somebody. I think he was let go, partly on the basis of the evaluations of performance in that course. This sparked the use of this grievance procedure which involved hearings, you know, call your witnesses, and in fact Bob McClellan was the, this fellow chose Bob McClellan as his representative so he would do the questioning and things like that. This went on for days upon days as I recall. I remember that they subpoenaed as a witness President Jamrich, who wouldn't come.

(Third Party): Did he give a reason why he wouldn't come?

(JG): I forget what the reason was. I can't recall exactly the structure, I think it was a panel of people that was involved in this procedure and I think that the panel recommended that this guy be reinstated then.

(CF): Do you recall if it was the Fred Harris case?

(JG): Fred Harris case, yes, it is. It seems to me that the panel recommended in Fred's favor and Jamrich turned it down I think. That also helped spark the union because there was an alternative procedure that to see if this works and in the eyes of many people it didn't work. So that was another factor.

(CF): Was there any reason, it seemed like the faculty didn't really want to support the MEA when they were trying to push to unionize. Were there any reasons why the faculty didn't really want them to be represented by...?

(JG): Yeah I think a number of reasons. One, MEA sent somebody up here to state their case. At that time there wasn't that many people in higher education in the MEA so they sent what they had which was a person used to working with high school people. The faculty here felt themselves not like high school faculty. So he was saying things probably more appropriate for high school teachers than for us so I think that turned some people off. I think people felt things were going wrong here in certain ways, they felt they needed to make a change, wanted to make the least possible change from what they were. AAUP had long represented and stood for university faculty with no connection to high school and

they felt they had a better chance at retaining their professionalization, university character, if they went with the AAUP rather than MEA. I think that was the main reason.

(CF): Okay, talking a little about Jamrich, he said many times in his defense in certain memos that I've read that he felt that everything was going fine and that things were getting better and he really didn't see the reason for the faculty to unionize. It seemed like he was very – he said many things against it. Do you feel that things were really getting better, that he was actually improving things or did the faculty feel that he was actually improving things?

(JG): It's hard, I don't know what to say about that. I think I remember one time when we were going to organize, maybe it was in the MEA, he'd go around and say, "What's the problem?" We would say, "Well, this and that," and he would respond to those things and try to fix them – promotion, tenure decisions, or whatever. So I could see how he would say that, from a certain point of view he was trying to be responsive. I think the problem we had, from my memory in those years, there was just overwhelming budget considerations and those force you to make hard decisions. I mean, one time, things would happen like a fellow in History got let go, McConnell, and then it turned out he looked at the auditor general's report and he says that university took money out of the general fund to put sidewalks in between West Science and the library so that got called the McConnell sidewalk by some people because he lost his job and we got the sidewalk. But that money – you shouldn't be using general fund money though, I would have said should be using money for construction. Now, to be fair to Jamrich, that's a one-time expenditure, sidewalks, and so might have been able to let McConnell be here for another year. But, things like that, you know, it happened.

(Third Party): So he was reactive to problems? Is that how you'd...?

(JG): I don't know if that's, I mean everybody had to be reactive because suddenly the legislature would say, "We want 2% of your budget back." Well, you have to react.

(Third Party): But I mean, when there was a specific issue raised by the faculty, was he more reactive to single issues? The thing that we've encountered is that Jamrich was consistently saying he had opened the process, he was being more open, that he had integrated the faculty into the governance process, that he had created a culture of shared governance, you know, before that even became a phrase. Was that true? Did you feel that was the case between '68 and '75?

(JG): Well, I came in '70, '71, we don't know when I came.

(Third Party): Well for example, one of the criticisms we came across is that faculty were not really involved, we were just an advisory role, and the advice was just listened to and then forgotten.

(JG): That's always a problem in academic senates it seems to me. You say something and sometimes it's accepted and sometimes it's not. I remember people being upset about decisions that weren't followed through. I can't recall which decisions were so wonderful we made that he shouldn't have rejected them, I can't remember that. Probably there were decisions we made which he probably should have rejected I would guess. Faculty being faculty and we'd go to the Senate and watch them, I mean I had been on the Senate. People aren't always prepared and what's your decision? It's easy to make stands in principle without regard to fiscal consequences or whatever, so I don't know. The Senate evolved from a very small group of people at one time. I don't know which years that was, by the time I came there was one from every department, but I don't know when that happened and he may have been instrumental

in taking the Senate from a small group of elders to one that had representation for every department. In his eyes that would be broadening the, you know...

(Third Party): But did the faculty feel that way? Did the faculty feel that he had indeed opened up the process, and brought the governance process _____?

(JG): There was, because like I say I can't remember specifics, but I think there was dissatisfaction with the Senate and its power to really make decisions. So I would say probably the faculty didn't feel that way. I mean, he may have changed structure, which he would regard as an important change, but I think what faculty would focus on is product and saying, "Well, we made this decision and he didn't follow it, therefore we were just talking." And there would be people who had that experience and they'd say, "The Senate's a waste of time," and, "Why go there?" You know, right, EPC saying we have unionization and how much respect is there for the EPC? What we did in the contract was say that certain kinds of changes the Senate can decide upon and maybe a little less when they wrote it over the years in terms of language but we did try to get certain curriculum issues as something for the Senate to decide but, you know, much bigger issues – whether or not to build the dome – we're not going to get to decide that. In the old days we probably would have taken a stand against that and not followed and got ticked off. Nobody even pretends that we had the power to make that decision anymore. Or a million dollars on parking lots, you know. Senate used to have a right to talk about anything, probably still does, but they don't bother to say, "We think this parking lot idea is not a good idea," We're in a different kind of relationship with the administrations now than we were then.

(CF): Would you see that as a catalyst – the communication differences between the two? Like how the faculty saw what was going on and how Jamrich perceived...?

(JG): Well we saw things differently and people were dissatisfied with the workings of the Senate. A lot of people were, a lot of people were vocal at least. I'm sure that was a factor, yeah.

(CF): I came across something that kind of made me curious. In a letter I found it was suggested that maybe NMU was under pressure to unionize because a lot of other universities around Michigan were going in that direction. Do you think that played a part in it?

(JG): I don't think we... You know, no one came up and said, "Some other universities said you got to unionize here we all have to get together," but I think the fact that other places were organizing it meant, "Hey, this is a way. This is a solution. This is what people are doing." This is late '60s, early '70s. It's a time, politically, of people looking for anti-war movements, all kinds of things. I mean there was just a general distrust of institutions. I mean, there was Kent State, there's all this stuff. The year or two before I came here I was at Georgetown and the whole place got shut down, we didn't finish the semester. So the unrest here was sort of not the unusual – it's all across the country. The university administrations were under fire. They were under fire for ROTC, it was a big issue, university investments in corporations that were part of the war. The allowing of military recruiters on campus was a big issue. So all kinds of issues that made universities subject to criticism by faculty and by students and it was sort of... We were probably hypervigilant almost looking at university administrations – looking for the next failure of those people – and it was a time of strong reactions. So I think all that – because that's an important cultural background too, our decision to unionize.

(CF): Okay. As far as where Northern is set up against other universities in terms of salary, types of benefits, how do you see Northern fitting in with other Michigan universities?

(JG): Now or then?

(CF): At that time.

(JG): Then we thought we were poor – poor in salary, poor in research.

(CF): Were there specific things you were looking to gain that other universities had?

(JG): Money. [laughs] It wasn't just money, you know, offices – most of our offices were down here in the basement in small little cubicles where you had no privacy and not much space for books. Felt like you weren't a real faculty member in some ways. So that was difficult, and I don't know to what extent that was something that was solvable by the administration without getting a lot of money, but it certainly felt bad. The effect of that is that since you're cheek by jaw with other people, and some people would bring radios in to try to drown out the sound of other people around them, so then you've got the sound of the radios. So people, if they could, would get out of here. Try to work at home if you're children are old enough that they're at school all day or didn't have kids or something like that. So I think it really hurt the culture of the place because it wasn't a place for collegial relationships. It was not a place to work. So that was bad.

(CF): So they were looking for better working conditions?

(JG): Yeah, I think so. It was money, it was research, it was the senate, it was the working conditions in the sense of offices. I think there are still remnants of the fight about curriculum that people were concerned about. That the old liberal studies plan with these interdisciplinary courses – origins of human values and stuff like that – some people supported it and lots of people didn't, and eventually that did die. But I think that was still a part of it.

(Third Party): Could you elaborate more on research? What you mean by that?

(JG): There's no money.

(Third Party): Okay. So there was very little administration support for faculty to do professionally developed research?

(JG): Right, and I think the communities tend to fund sciences they say, because they can't do the work without buying the chemicals or the instruments or whatever. So you had to give it to them. The other people could just...Right, right. It was also constant where they'd cut back in times of financial need we'd be cut back in the library. So it was constant no buying books this year, something like that. So it was another evidence of lack of support for a serious part of the university and probably one of the things that helped Eckleberry when he first came is that he tried to really support the library and I think that helped him in the beginning.

(CF): Do you feel that the faculty got a lot of what they wanted in the 1975 contract?

(JG): We didn't get a lot of money. [laughs] No, we got governance. That's sort of a priority we had because it was a very idealistic kind of movement at the time, frankly. We'd meet all summer, four hour meetings and debating things, it was kind of exciting in some ways. It wasn't inefficient. And probably if

we had union officials there they would probably have said, "Cut it out," but then we'd go on in these committees working up these ideal things. So you got a lot of governance and maybe in retrospect that was a good idea, but that's where our energy went. And we didn't get as much money as I think we should have, but we did get the basic governance structure which has survived until this day.

(CF): I didn't really find much about how the negotiations went. Was there a specific formula that was followed do you know? Or what was the feeling during negotiations? Was it tense or were people pretty much working together at that point?

(JG): Well, it was quite tense. Somebody told us that they wouldn't consider meeting with us until we had a full proposal costed out. So I asked him, "Please give us a list of our salary so I can cost it out," and they said, "We can't do that, that's private information," so I said, "Well how am I going to cost it out?" and they said, "Your problem."

(Third Party): They also accused you of leaking information to the press didn't they?

(JG): During negotiations, yeah. They always do that, we always do that.

[END OF SIDE ONE, CONTINUES ON SIDE TWO]

(JG): Yeah, so what are we supposed to do? Well, I said to them, "If I signed a release form saying you may give my salaries to people, would you do it?" and they said, "Well it depends but," and this is Bob Glenn, then vice president who unfortunately for him became vice president when we were unionizing, and he said, "It depends on what the form said," and I said, "Well you write the form," which would satisfy you and I'll get every faculty member to sign it and then I'll have the information I used. So that was wonderful because I had to go to faculty and tell them that they wouldn't listen to us unless we had a full proposal and they couldn't get a full proposal unless we cost it out and we couldn't cost it out because it was information she wouldn't give to us, unless you sign this form. So it was a great tool for recruiting union members because we seem quite reasonable and they seem quite unreasonable. So a lot of people signed up that were incensed by that because we were determining their salaries. [laughs] So if we couldn't do a good job, if they're truly selfish, they'd have an interest in it. But so, we did get together a package and costed it out and sent the negotiating team to the table and they brought in a prominent lawyer from a downstate firm Jim Tobin and he was a formidable person. We brought a little help in from the outside but they were very emotional sessions. Bob McClellan was chief negotiator for our side for a good part of the time, well until sometime in January when he left, and then Jon Sari became chief negotiator. But we had a very volatile group. Temple Smith was a guy in physics who wouldn't join the union and said if there was a strike he'd cross the line. [laughs] And lots of arguments amongst our own people.

(CF): Oh really?

(JG): Yeah. I mean there was struggles. Richard Wright.

(Third Party): Richard Odell. Dick Odell he was very opposed to the union. Can you talk about him a little bit and your relationship with him? I'm curious because he wrote a very lengthy dissertation basically imploring his colleagues not to support the union effort.

(JG): Yeah. Dick was in History, as you know. Was he writing them during this period in '71?

(Third Party): '71 and before the union effort surfaced. I've come across a couple.

(JG): Did you find any after '74?

(Third Party): I don't think so.

(JG): I think Dick may have walked out and signed that MEA card.

(Third Party): Oh really?

(JG): Mhm. I don't know for sure, but I think so because my memory is that Dick was, like many faculty, very enamored of the president of Eastern who applied for the vice presidency here, Sparmberg, and Dick had been here I think when Sparmberg was vice president and thought he was a very good vice president and was happy to see him coming back, and then when Jamrich, who was our number one recommendation for vice president, and Sparmberg had called Jamrich and said, "If I apply is this okay with you? Would you find it acceptable?" and Jamrich said, "Yeah!" So he applied, became our number one on our list, and Jamrich turned him down. That's when I said everybody sign these MEA cards so I think Dick Odell may have signed one of those cards. He was that upset over it. So I'd be interested to know if you saw any letters after that incident.

(CF): What would it mean, I'm not really familiar with that, if he signed that card what did that mean?

(JG): Well it meant that he was in favor of the MEA becoming the union at Northern Michigan University in light of his anti-union activity before. We had the same thing in the AAUP. Les Foster had written an attack on unions and the election, and had suggested somehow the voting structure would be paradoxical and unfair and later on here we were trying to get the AAUP as the union and Les Foster was a member of the group trying to do that. So Jamrich turned that back on us and said, "I'm opposed to this because of -," and trotted out Les Foster's argument against the nature of the ballot that could lead to paradoxical consequences. Actually it turns out they didn't know it was a classic voter's paradox - it's a problem in philosophy - and so I wrote a reply to that pointing out it was a voter's paradox. Not something to be truly bad about this election. But yeah, that's my memory of Dick and it's not a firm memory but I think he either signed it or threatened to sign it. It was people like that who were responding to this catalyst that sort of threw enough cards into the MEA that they could call for an election and it was up to the AAUP. Did they want to get in or choose between MEA and nothing?

(CF): Is that what forced the AAUP to get involved?

(JG): Yeah. AAUP was not looking to organize.

(CF): They weren't looking to then?

(JG): No.

(Third Party): Can you explain why?

(JG): Because the leadership of the AAUP was, the AAUP was very small, and Les Foster was probably the heart of it, Les was not that interested in a union, and he had been opposed to the union I think when MEA's initial organization. I think he was part of the group in the AAUP that was going to oppose it and that's why McClellan, Dave ____, and all these other guys came and had enough votes to push the AAUP out of the way. So I think Les has a very strong sense of university as this community of scholars and I think didn't think that model was appropriate. But then when he saw the MEA was going to come in and could probably win, and since the AAUP in some places in the state of Michigan had begun to organize, I think Wayne State, and I don't know which ones were first, Oakland, Eastern. It seemed to him as a possibility of a small number of AAUP people met and at that time Les was in favor of offering the AAUP as an alternative, so we did that.

(CF): So it was kind of in response to them not wanting the MEA?

(JG): Right, right. The AAUP would not have been calling an election.

(CF): Oh okay.

(Third Party): We did see though that in '71 when the MEA made its big effort, that the AAUP at sort of a late hour responded. Basically almost cried foul to the fact that they weren't included in the process so it was sort of shut out. Was that the start of the AAUP's involvement or...? We have a couple letters from the national state AAUP chapters...

(JG): Saying?

(Third Party): Saying, "Look, this is not right, the MEA is not allowing us to participate. They hadn't been invited to a meeting to discuss the union issue and just wondering if you could elaborate on that?"

(JG): As I said, I remember there was a kind of tension between the AAUP and the people trying to organize under MEA. It seems to me as though one manifestation of that was the AAUP meeting at which these people showed up and said, "We're AAUP too, and we vote that AAUP not get involved in this and let the MEA carry it forward." And there may have been meetings that AAUP was excluded from, I don't remember that part, but what fit in with the spirit of the times, you know, that there was this tension and people organizing in the MEA felt that AAUP should not become a stumbling block to this.

(Third Party): So when the MEA failed in '71 and its influence begins drop and the AAUP's influence rises.

(JG): Well, it's not that simple.

(Third Party): It's not that simple? So when McClellan defects from MEA and goes to AAUP, what point does that happen?

(JG): I just think people got defeated in '71 so now faculty, the faculty didn't have enough guts to let them come in. And then people just moved along with other issues in their life and larger culture politically and so forth. There was this low key effort lead by this guy, what's his name, in education? Starts with 'M'. I forget.

(Third Party): Margaret?

(JG): No. Anyway, he had this low key effort at getting people to sign cards. Because he was in education and education was used to MEA, but I don't think it was going anywhere. Maybe George Helfinstein was helping him and nothing much was happening until the vice presidential business and then everything got going again.

(Third Party): So that's the issue?

(JG): Yeah, it wasn't a case where the AAUP was getting stronger and on the rise or anything like that, the AAUP was still a small organization.

(Third Party): So the Sparmberg and the Harris case...

(JG): Yeah, I think those were big.

(Third Party): Those are the two really big things...

(JG): And there were these constant things of budget cuts and the senate being ignored in the eyes of people. Maybe Jamrich was responding more favorably in the past, I wasn't here to have a contrast from the old days, no. Now people, you know, unhappy, which is probably true at every university. I mean, at the time people were just generally, but I think there were specific things here that were bugging people. It's not an accident that around the state these places are organizing under AAUP at Wayne or Oak or Eastern or MEA's going in at Central and so forth. So it was a time in which all across the country these things were happening.

(Third Party): Okay what I'd like you to kind of now is just sit back and reminisce and describe how it all came about. When we were in the sessions you start to tell me the anecdotes, some of the stories that you can remember. Tell us about how it all came about and how the vote occurred in '74 or '73 or whenever it was, was it '74? The initial development of the union structure, the president, and all of that in negotiations. Then talk about that and your role in it.

(JG): Ah, yeah I'll try to keep to the parts that I think are true. You know, the faculty voted for a union, and I remember myself when we were organizing and trying to win, we knew there were certain rules that, for example, university didn't have to let us use the mails for communication with one another, and instead of doing the rational thing which is using the mails and let them object and then use that as a catalyst for getting people to side with us. We went around and didn't use the mails. So if we wanted to communicate with faculty, we'd get this stuff printed off – not at university print shops – downtown somewhere, or run them off somewhere, and then carry them around to faculty offices all across campus. It was a crazy idea. I can just remember going around delivering these things, so it took a lot of time to do stuff like that, but that's the kind of stuff we did. We were naïve I think. Then I remember, it was just a small number of us who were really doing the work, I mean, Switzgale in education, myself...

(Third Party): What was that name?

(JG): Switzgale. A guy in education, he's a marathon runner. Switz was active, Jerry Rock was active, myself, Les Foster, I don't know if John Sari was active at that time ____ in the beginning, just trying to win this thing. But there was a small number of people that planned to campaign and developing position papers I'd say was seven people maybe or something. Then we'd go deliver these things and I

remember thinking, "Jesus what would happen if we won?" So I felt after delivering these things and writing a lot of things I thought, "Well I did what I could," and now let them vote. I think I half wanted us to lose because I didn't want to do any more work, I was exhausted. I remember that ballots were in, the guy from Michigan Labor Relations administration or commission or whatever it is, came up and supervised the vote and counted the ballots. Typically people go there to, see I liked to jog and did my work and wrote it and went out and jogged. I used to jog into campus around circle drive. So I came in, did my jog, and I thought, "I'll go over there and see what happened," half wishing we'd lose so I'd be out of this thing, and we won. Well, what happened is we got the most votes I think and no agent got second most and MEA third. So it was a runoff between us and no agent and the MEA folks were going to come to our side. But after I got there the story I heard was that the guy counted them and we won and Jamrich said, "Count them again," and the guy said, "You watched me count them I'm not counting them again." But I think Jamrich probably had a hard time to believe he had lost. Jamrich, and I talked to Bob Glenn years later and he always felt that Jamrich was always trying to, maybe to a fault, trying to please the faculty. So that's how Jamrich, you know, that's how he saw himself. The faculty didn't see it that way and he was surprised. All these things he was trying to for faculty and here they, they wouldn't do that, wouldn't unionize on him, but they did.

(CF): Did he really feel that maybe this wouldn't amount to anything like, do you think there was anything like that where he thought that, "No, this wouldn't really happen."?

(JG): I don't know what he felt.

(CF): But he was surprised that it...?

(JG): I think he was surprised that we won, yeah. Asking him to count the votes again, if that happened – I wasn't there – but that's the story I heard, that would indicate shock on his part. So it was a tough time because we won, he felt he was all pro-faculty and we went against him because the vice president had a deal with us, was the catalyst for the vote so. Certainly Bob Gwinn didn't feel too good about the whole business so it was difficult for us to establish a good working relationship with him. Negotiations, once we decided to select the team, McClellan had not been involved in organizing under AAUP, but when we won he said he wanted to be involved, and he became the chief negotiator. Those were difficult sessions with Jim Tobin and...Very difficult. I think it was draining on Bob to do it, and then John Sari took over in January so we went a long time without getting ____, it was long negotiations.

(CF): About how long was that?

(JG): I'd say they must have started in October or November '74 and didn't conclude until, the contract wasn't ratified until the summer I think so that was virtually the whole year. It seems to me the contract...how did it go? Was it a three year contract or two year contract? It seems to me that, I think '76, '77, was that part of the first contract? Let's see. I think it was a two year contract because they offered us an incentive for the third year and I said, "No deal, we can do better than that." So I think it was a two year contract and we had spent one whole year negotiating so the next year which was the second year of the contract we began negotiating again. I do remember that, and that first contract we, besides people haven't paid union dues – three quarters of one percent – and we had it in the contract that we would pay half of any increase in health care costs up to a certain point and that clause kicked in. So it seems to me that one of those years the raise was 3.2%, what was the other year? I don't think I can remember the contracts, and we didn't distribute the money evenly, we gave more money to full professors who were below a scale that we had constructed. So some people almost got no raises at all,

and so here you were not getting much money and then the middle of the next year Jamrich gave huge raises, HUGE raises in the middle of the year to administrators. I mean, thousands of dollars apiece and that really angered people. So the next contract was pretty _____. It was a crazy thing to do. Maybe those raises, maybe they were out of line or something I don't know, but giving us a little then giving huge raises to these people...

(Third Party): Do you think he did that specifically to be vindictive? Teach you a lesson?

(JG): No, I think just oblivious to the impact. I mean administration is one thing, faculty's another, you know people do things that are not sensitive to certain things, you know it's not a parking business. A hundred dollars means nothing to everybody who's receiving the deal, department heads one hundred dollars doesn't mean anything, basically. But gee, you go over by the secretaries union and they're really angry. And everything's a principle to faculty, as you know. [all laugh] Heh, well you're young. It's time for principles. But no really, it's not a lot of dough but it ticks everybody off and I think if they thought about it they'd look back and say, "Is this worth it?" and the answer is probably not. In the case of back then, I don't know, it was an awful lot of money to give to people. I don't think it was, I don't know if it was to be vindictive, I just think...I usually find administrations are just insensitive rather than volitious.

(Third Party): Can we back up a little bit and can you describe how you became the first president of the union? How it is you became that first president and what your goals were.

(JG): I don't know what my goals were.

(Third Party): What did you see as your role as the first president of the elected union?

(JG): What happened was, we won which was not to my delight, because now we've got to go on with this, and was exhausted, and said, "Who the hell is going to do this?" And no one seemed to want to do it. There was only six or seven of us who were really actively doing all this and so someone approached Dave Cooper, and mine the only department – and we have a three person department – and they said, "How about you becoming president of the AAUP?" well he didn't have tenure, and that would not be the job for someone without tenure, he was chair of the academic senate.

(Third Party): Ralph Jendron?

(JG): Right. People had sort of given up on the senate so you let someone come in who's...I mean Dave must have come in...Let's see I came in January and maybe I was here, was I here a year? Or did we let it waste our interviewing? But he came a year or two after me. So he couldn't have been here more than few years and he was chair of the academic senate, which is also odd that someone could come with so little experience at the institution to become chair of the academic senate. People just didn't....

(Third Party): Do you think that speaks to the perception that the senate wasn't really a critical, useful tool?

(JG): Right. That you would send to the senate the newest member of your faculty. Like the guy who carries the bags on the NBA team is the rookie. So they did that and you can become chair. So someone asked Dave if he'd run for president of the AAUP and he said, "Okay," and I thought, "Oh my God." And Dave wasn't that sure about a union at the time. He was, well maybe, I don't know and he had sort of a middle position when he was chair of the senate I thought, "What the heck is this?" Somebody is going

to become president of the union who doesn't have tenure and who is certainly not involved in it and it seemed odd. So I tried to call my friend John Sari who was at the University of Illinois at the time and doing some research and said, "Well why don't you run it?" Because John must have been involved then, yeah, looking back. And he had all kinds of reasons why it would not be appropriate for him, so he wouldn't run, so what the heck were we going to do? So I thought that, "Alright I'll run," so the choice was between two people in the philosophy department. We should have had Greisbock run so that then all three of us would be the only candidates. I don't think there must have been no more than sixty people who voted. That's all there was in the AAUP at the time. My memories of the vote was like twenty-four to thirteen or something like that, some small, small numbers. I don't know, but I know it was a small number of people.

(Third Party): So, Cooper stayed in the race? You didn't approach him...

(JG): Yeah. No, no, no. So there was an election and, you know, it was not overwhelming and not many people participated, that was my memory. Then we went forward from there. Yeah, that's how, you know, tenuous this whole thing was.

(Third Party): Okay, can you... You're president now.

(JG): Yeah.

(Third Party): The contract hasn't been negotiated.

(JG): Right.

(Third Party): This is brand new, it's tenuous. What were you going to do as president? What did you perceive...

(JG): Well, just to try to get a contract. I just didn't know much about any of that stuff and we created this bargaining concept and I don't know whether I chaired that. I may have, may not have, I don't know. We met all summer. I think we elected a president in the spring right after we won the election. Then in the summer I was president and we just tried to get a contract, I had no idea. We knew we wanted governance – that was pretty important. We were idealistic in that sense. The power of the senate was one of the things we focused on. We had these long meetings and then we slept through the negotiating team and I seem to remember the first meeting with the negotiating team was at Bob McClellan's house. What was Dave Goldsmith's role, Dave had some role there. But on the team was Arny Aho and Rich Wright, Temple Smith and Bob McClellan, and I think Dick Swain from the library. I don't know what Dave Goldsmith was, he may have been chair of the senate or something, I don't know.

(Third Party): Who was on the negotiating team? McClellan, yourself...

(JG): No, I was not.

(Third Party): Oh you weren't?

(JG): No. McClellan, Rich Wright, Arny Aho...jeez, it was John Sari? It must have been because he took over as chief negotiator. Dick Swain.

(Third Party): _____?

(JG): No no. Dick Swain was a librarian. Now at Cleveland State. I don't think Les Foster was on there, but I know somebody came late to the meeting, somebody that I said, "Let's fire him," I thought. This is going to be good – our first meeting and ah...

(Third Party): Fire who?

(JG): The guy who came late.

(Third Party): Oh.

(JG): Negotiating can be a process that puts strains on people's lives. In those days we used to say that every negotiating team has one divorce which may be true but I think also sometimes people who go on negotiating teams are going through difficult times in their relationships so they seek out ...

(Third Party): ___ contemporary times?

[laughter]

(JG): That was not my motive. But they seek out some other outlet to grasp on to something and then this other thing falls apart on them. It can be a strain on you if you meet a lot during the year, because we used to meet a lot. You know, you're trying to run your classes and engage in these meetings and writing proposals in the days without computers, doing analyses without computers and financial stuff, it's time consuming.

(Third Party): It's time consuming even with our computers.

(JG): Yeah, this was nothing that we did this time compared to that.

(Third Party): Are there any questions you _____?

(CF): I don't think so.

(Third Party): Do you have anything to add to what we just discussed? Something important that we've missed if you want to...

(JG): I don't know, I haven't thought about that.

[RECORDING CUTS OUT BRIEFLY]

(JG): ...and that's extraordinary for a tenure situation – for the boards to start interviewing – they didn't even just have me greet all these people, I had to do then ___ interviewed him.

(Third Party): Oh so in the 70's you saw the board control interview everybody who went up for tenure?

(JG): Yeah.

(Third Party): Okay, I wasn't clear. You know when in the 70's?

(JG): When McClellan came up. I think he did it one year and that was it. I think that happened. That was my...

(Third Party): And it was all tenure candidates, not just McClellan?

(JG): Right, right. Because you couldn't just...there would be so...kicking them out and a funny sort of way so they interviewed them all. Some people voted against him. I think ah...

[RECORDING ENDS ABRUPTLY]

END OF INTERVIEW