

7-13-2012

Interview with Clay Steinman, Professor of Media and Cultural Studies

Clay Steinman

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/hmcs_oralhist

Recommended Citation

Steinman, Clay, "Interview with Clay Steinman, Professor of Media and Cultural Studies" (2012). *Media and Cultural Studies Oral Histories*. Paper 1.

http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/hmcs_oralhist/1

This Oral History is brought to you for free and open access by the Media and Cultural Studies at DigitalCommons@Macalester College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Media and Cultural Studies Oral Histories by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Macalester College. For more information, please contact scholarpub@macalester.edu.

Interview with Clay Steinman

Alana Horton, Interviewer

**July 13, 2012
Macalester College
DeWitt Wallace Library
Harmon Room**

[00:00]

AH: My name is Alana Horton, member of the Macalester class of 2014, conducting interviews for the “Macalester Oral History Project.” Today is Friday, July 13, 2012, and I’m interviewing Clay Steinman, Professor of Media and Cultural Studies, in the Harmon Room of the DeWitt Wallace Library. First of all, thank you so much for being here.

CS: Thanks for inviting me.

AH: Of course. And, um, if we could just start off by you stating your name, um, where you’re originally from, and the year that you came to Macalester.

CS: I’m Clay Steinman. I was born in Queens, New York, and I grew up on the Jersey Shore. Not the part where the TV show is. My life is a little different than the TV show. And I came to Macalester in the fall of 1993.

[00:48]

AH: Great. And my first question is: what is your educational background and what kind of work had you been doing prior to coming to Macalester in '93?

CS: I went to public high school in New Jersey and then I have a Bachelor's in history from Duke [University], a Master's in journalism from Columbia [University], and a Master's and Ph.D. in cinema studies from NYU [New York University].

AH: And what kind of work had you been doing...?

CS: I—in terms of post-graduate work, after Duke, I went to Columbia for journalism school and then I worked as a journalist. I worked fourteen months for a newspaper in Vancouver, Washington, and I was—I had two jobs: four days a week, I was assigned to write one large story about the criminal justice system, and one day a week, I was the movie reviewer. [laughs] And then, I got a job with Ralph Nader in Washington, before he went crazy, and I worked in—for the—what was called the Capitol Hill News Service. I covered the Indiana congressional delegation for local newspapers in Indiana through this. I think it, it became, eventually became the States News Service and I don't know if it's in existence anymore. But I worked with some great people, including Chris Matthews, so it was a fun experience. And then I went to work for a broadcast reform group called the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting that was started by a guy named Nicholas Johnson, who had been an FCC [Federal Communications Commission] commissioner and wrote a book that was popular in the '60s called *How to Talk Back to Your Television Set*. And then after that, I decided I wanted to go back to graduate

school in film and so I went to NYU. And then while I was at NYU, I worked as an editorial writer and assistant literary editor at *The Nation*.

[02:55]

AH: Great. And, and what made you decide to go back to school for film?

CS: I had taken—when I was at Columbia, we were allowed to take one course outside the journalism school, and I had taken a course in film criticism with Andrew Sarris. I grew up liking movies—my parents used to take me to movies when I was a kid. That was one of their gifts to me. And so—and I had had a course in politics and the media with David Paletz at Duke that...[was] really influential on me. And so, I thought I would take this film course and I really enjoyed the film course. And then I worked one day a week as a movie reviewer and I found out that I liked being a movie reviewer much more than I liked being a journalist. I—the problem with being a journalist, I found, is that, under the rules of conventional journalism, the analysis that you can put into stories is limited to the analysis of the people that you have as your sources. And I felt like I was writing about the criminal justice system and they had just expanded the paper to a Sunday paper—that's why they had hired me. But all my stories came out that were about—these big stories in the Sunday paper, were—they came out, I think, arguing that either that the problem was that there was just not enough money or the problem was that—and without anything about why there wasn't enough money—or that everything's just so complicated. And I also—when I started writing these stories, I started having people come up to me to help me with their problems and there was only a limited amount I could do about that. So then when I went to Washington, and I was covering the Indiana congressional delegation, I was—since I

was writing for local newspapers in Indiana, I was bound by the same kinds of rules. And so I felt like I wasn't able to do the kind of work that I wanted to do as a journalist. I had been very active in student—campus journalism when I was an undergraduate and had enjoyed that tremendously. And so, I couldn't connect up what I was doing as a journalist with what I had done when I was a student.

[05:22]

AH: And how did you make the transition from the, the journalism aspect to, to film school—er, film studies and to academia, and teaching?

CS: It was actually a little—I remember thinking it was a little weird. But only in the sense that I think—and it was good for me to, to learn this—that being a student is a weird status. So that I went from being a student to being in a workplace that was—comparatively—it was a small newspaper—was comparatively egalitarian. And then back into the classroom, and there's all these rules about how students are supposed to behave with teachers, these unwritten rules. And, where I had grown up with them, and always had pretty much—more or less followed them when I was growing up, after being away for a couple of years, they seemed sort of strange to me. So, it was a bit of an adjustment figuring out again how to relate to professors and things like that.

[06:20]

AH: Absolutely. And then how did that lead into you deciding to teach? As opposed to going back to the workplace?

CS: Well, I, actually—my original plan, because I enjoyed writing very much, was to continue writing but having the teaching job, providing me with a steady income. And what I found was that the kind of writing that I wanted to do as a journalist wasn't really valued in the academy—unless you're teaching journalism specifically. I was teaching somewhat about the media but not—and a little bit of journalism at the beginning... And the voice and the language and so forth is so different in academic writing than it is in journalistic writing that I couldn't really mix the two. So, I emphasized the academic writing. As far as the teaching goes, I thought being a teacher would be a good idea. I had had a couple of what I thought [were] wonderful teachers, but I was—you know, in graduate school, it's mostly about learning the subject. And I was interested in teaching and I wanted to teach, but I wouldn't say that I felt called to teach the way that I did later on as I got into it.

[07:43]

AH: OK. And, and so how did you end up Macalester? How did you hear about the open position and, and what motivated you to apply here?

CS: I was teaching at California State University, Bakersfield. And my wife and I were not real comfortable living in Bakersfield, California. And, so, I was on the job market. And I saw the Macalester ad in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, answered the ad, and I happened to fit what they were looking for.

AH: Great. Had you heard about Macalester prior to that?

CS: Actually not. The person who hired me who was my chair for a long time, Roger Mosvick, is a friend of mine. He used to call that my “East Coast provincialism,” and he’s probably right [laughter].

[08:29]

AH: So, what was your experience with the Macalester hiring process? What was the first time you came to the campus and, sort of, what was that experience like?

CS: Well, [as] soon as I applied for the job and then got a nibble, I started doing research on Macalester. And then I found out that it had just come into all—this enormous amount of money and was, in fact, at that time, the richest liberal arts college in the country. And I said, “Oh, I hit the jackpot here!” You know, in terms of the kinds of resources that would be available. And I found out about the kind of students that were here, and I read about its reputation, and so forth. So, I was really excited about coming... The interview was fine; everybody was friendly. But I came at a strange time because the campus was in turmoil. There had been a revolt a year before, I think, against President Gavin, and he had, I think—my understanding, I wasn’t there, so I don’t know for sure—but my understanding is that he had decided he wanted to have a different provost and so everything was in turmoil. And so it was actually a little difficult for me because I didn’t get hired even though I interviewed in a timely way—I don’t remember when—I didn’t get hired until June.

AH: OK.

[09:53]

CS: One thing I do remember about the interview that was funny was that—at the time, and I think this was an interesting idea, they used to normally have the president—as the candidate, you would meet both the provost and the president. Presidents used to be involved a lot more with the internal academics of the college than they—then the current president is now, and the last president diminished it some and the current president even more. And I don't know whether that's a good or a bad thing. We could talk about that. But it meant you met with the president. Well, turned out the president was out of town when I was there. But I did meet, I met with the provost. And I was, I was coming from the California State University system, which was, even then, suffering budget cuts. Although nothing like what's going on now because there was, I think, a mini recession at the time. And in fact, it was—since when you're in the middle of one of those things, you don't know what the bottom is. Because I didn't have that much seniority, although I—there wasn't a good chance, because I had tenure, that I would lose my job, it was not inconceivable I would lose my job. But there were just cuts going on all over the place and it was, it was really hard, you know. And because the school's not that well funded to begin with. And so I'm meeting with the provost, Betty Ivey, and she said to me—and I said, “You know, it must be so wonderful to have all this, this money and be able to do all these things.” And she said, “Yes, it's very exciting.” But she said, “You know, it's got its downside too, because you can't do everything and so there's a—you know, it's not all it's cracked up to be.” And I thought this was a little—coming from where I was coming from, I thought this was a little strange. But, it's—you know, it's wonderful to be well endowed.

[11:49]

AH: Absolutely. How would you describe the general environment of Macalester when you first got here—the relationship between students, faculty, and administration or the, the physical campus?

CS: The physical campus. The physical campus was more or less the same as it is now, except there were some older buildings, you know, [unclear]. Maybe there wasn't quite—there's, I mean, I don't know about all the landscaping, but things have been moved around. But it's not like there's been an overwhelming change in the physical campus. But the—what was the other part that you asked?

[12:29]

AH: The, uh, relationship between students, faculty, and administration.

CS: Well, it was a different time. Even though, the '60s and '70s when—I went to college from '67 to '71, which was a... great time to go to college and it was an exciting time to be alive, and exciting time to be young, and, and it was... And so, I had sort of revved up to a certain pace of activity while that was going on. And then when I was at Columbia, there was also a lot of turmoil. And, there was—that pretty much had settled down, you know, by the time I started teaching in '77. And then with the election of Reagan in '80, it really settled down. But there was—it was—the country had not yet moved to the right nearly as far as it has now. And, you know, you never know when you're thinking about your own history, the history of your institution, the history of the country, to what extent the narrative that you're imposing on it as

you think about it is structuring what you're thinking about the history as being—the extent to which it's structuring that. So, I, you know, I may be connecting dots that other people wouldn't connect, but it seems pretty clear to me that the college is responsive to the general political environment, in its own way. And so, the general political environment was still much more transformational and open when I got here. And the students were much more interested in that. And the college in—even though the '60s and '70s were long gone, there were still most of the people here had been there, had been at the college during that period. And so, their sense of the nature of the college, or what they thought of as the nature of the college—sorry I mean the culture of the college, the history of the college—included certain kinds of social commitments that I think have increasingly gone to the background.

[15:01]

AH: Do you, do you have any specific examples of social commitments that existed in '93 that you can think of?

CS: Yeah, I... Well, I think—but it's related to the general culture—and this is something I think that we'll talk about a good deal. People talked about race a lot more than they talk about race now. I mean, you could probably do a LexisNexis search about race and the presidential campaign and... It comes indirectly, of course, and it comes up in terms of affecting other things, but people don't explicitly talk about race and racism hardly at all anymore. It's not talked about hardly at all anymore in the faculty meetings. I mean, I wasn't around much last year, but, I—unless that—I don't think that changed. And it's not talked about much more in thinking about the planning for the college. Students aren't talking about it as much. It's just

not... I think this is a function of many things, but one of them is certainly the way the country has moved to the right. And, which means that some people take the election of Obama [President Barack Obama], for example, as a sign that there—

AH: —post-racial society.

CS: Right, right. But, you know, I used to—I wrote a piece about and I worked on [studying] *The Cosby Show* a lot. And there's empirical evidence about how people took the success of Bill Cosby's character, Dr. Huxtable, as evidence that things were better for African-Americans. And so, I'm not comparing the two, but I think they're both, both the idea that one person's success says that—you could have success for one sector of a group and still have a lot of misery for a lot of other people, a lot of discrimination for a lot of other people. So, I think that was talked about more. Two other things were going on, I think were—that I remember pretty clearly. One was the—it was the ACT UP and the queer movement were increasingly visible and active, and were a large influence on at least the—a significant minority of the students I had on campus. So, yeah, that's another thing that was really important... I'll think of the other one.

AH: Totally fine.

CS: Yeah.

[17:57]

AH: So those were sort of your first impressions of the political and social atmosphere, cultural atmosphere of Macalester?

CS: Right. Oh, the other— Yeah, the other part is that intellectually—you know, since I went to graduate school in the mid-'70s, there's been a number of turns of the wheel of new ideas that have come in. It's an interesting thing to observe. And it's an important thing, I think, for faculty to understand as they age, that the wheel keeps turning. And postmodernism in the humanities and to some extent in social sciences was a hotly debated topic on campus when I— around the time I arrived. And there was a lot of intellectual ferment around that. And a lot of criticizing of traditional disciplines and traditional disciplinary methods, and so forth.

[18:48]

AH: Great. And what was your impression of the Communication Studies Department when you first arrived? I know it had a very different focus than the current department—the, the department you're leaving, Media and Cultural Studies.

CS: Well, it—before I got here, it was a speech communication department and there's a history to this that I only know secondhand, so I don't know how reliable it was. But there used to be a journalism program at Macalester, and there was a beloved teacher of that program, a guy named Ron Ross, who had been a war correspondent and other things. And so you used to be able to get a minor in journalism. And there were a lot of students who were very enthusiastic about it and I think that the effect of Watergate and the Woodward and Bernstein and *All the President's Men* was even still around. And newswriting and newspapers had not yet, of course, begun to

crumble and so it seemed a viable career for a lot of people. And so, when he died, there was a question of where his position should go. And a committee was formed and the college, as part of its self-identity, reinvention after the money kicked in, has been—and maybe for longer than that—the college used to have many more vocational programs, vocationally-oriented programs than it has now. And, for whatever reason, certain programs are considered vocationally-oriented and other programs are not. That's above my pay grade, so let's not... But the—but journalism—they didn't want to have a journalism program anymore. So to accomplish this, they formed a committee that would say that and would say that this position should go to Media Studies and then it should be attached to what was then called Speech Communication, which had—and Speech Communication had come out of the Theatre Department—

AH: The two were joined.

CS: —was once part of the Theatre Department, that's where its origins were. And the person who hired me, who was the chair at the time, Roger Mosvick, he had gone here. So I think he had been more or less connected to the school, you can look in the catalogue, but since maybe 1957. So he had a long sense of history of the college. And the speech communication people had gone along with this, so the idea was that they were going to change from Speech Communication to Communication Studies. And they were going to bring in somebody else. I was the second choice in the search because they wanted to hire a speech—a majority of the search committee, there was a lot of conflict about this, I understand, wanted to hire a speech person to teach about media. And then in the end, she didn't take the job. And so then they hired me.

[22:07]

AH: And how did you see yourself fitting into the department?

CS: Well, um—

AH: Given that you are not a speech person, I assume.

CS: In some ways, I didn't belong in the department because I had no common course background. But on the other hand, I had taught at commuter state universities for sixteen years. And even though none of the schools I went to had had communication departments, [the schools at which I had taught] all had communication departments and I had been housed in communication departments. So, I was—it's not like it was a totally unfamiliar feel, so I knew how to link what I did—not necessarily with the methods that they used, but with thinking about communication in general. So it was, you know, but we made the best of it. I mean, one of the things I want to say about my experience at Macalester generally is that I personally have always been treated well by the college. If I had conflicts with my colleagues, they weren't about me—or at least as far as I knew. And so in that sense, it was a very welcoming environment. And one of the things that was excellent about the department was the dedication of the faculty who were there when I arrived to, to teaching.

AH: Absolutely.

CS: Very dedicated teachers.

[23:39]

AH: And did you get the sense you were brought in mostly, or partially, because of your journalism background? I just remember reading a *Mac Weekly* article from when you first arrived and it's like, "Clay Steinman has all this journalism experience and..."

CS: Right. I suspect if I had had the same resume I had without my journalism background, I wouldn't have been hired.

AH: But that wasn't the main focus...

CS: Right. But the key was they didn't want me to teach journalism. They wanted me to teach about journalism in an academic way.

AH: Right. So it's not the vocational track.

CS: Right, right. But we continued and we continue to offer a couple of courses in doing journalism. But I wasn't teaching them. But I always felt like I was a defender, I needed to be a defender of that. Because that's part of why I was hired.

[24:32]

AH: Absolutely. You mentioned, just a while ago, that you, your teaching was at commuter colleges, and I'm wondering how, sort of, Macalester differed initially from those colleges...?

CS: Oh, it was like a—it's a completely different line of work. When I got here, I felt like I had died and gone to heaven. And that—I couldn't understand, there was a lot of complaining going on then because of what had gone on before I arrived. I couldn't understand it. I mean, I could figure—a lot of people spent a lot of time telling me about it, but for myself, I was just—I was thrilled to be here. And what made me especially thrilled were—because I had had, at the other schools, because of the job market, there's very bright people and very talented people who teach at all kind of schools. So I had great colleagues at all the schools [at which I taught]. But I had great colleagues here, too, and—who were interested—mostly outside the department—in a lot of the academic issues that I was interested in. And then, the students are so great, you know. And they continue to be great. I don't know what it is. It's almost like magic that we attract not only smart students but we also attract such *nice* students. You know, it's just staggering to me what nice people our students are. And they're so easy to work with, and they're so earnest, and they're so concerned about issues I care about, like how do you live a life in a world where you give back more than you take, where you leave the world a better place [unclear] than it was when you arrived, you know, or when you were growing up. And I just like them so much. You know, it's—not everybody here likes the students but—although that's changing as the students are changing. But, but I certainly—I just thought, “This is so wonderful. I just am so happy.” And then in academic terms, unlike the students I taught at the other schools, the students here are well prepared. They arrive at Macalester well prepared. They have time, and they want to learn. And my project, over the years, has been to create a teaching environment for myself

where I pretty much only have students who want to be in my courses. And so, we can talk about how I was able to do that but—and so that made it all the more enjoyable.

[27:38]

At the same time, the problems teaching at commuter universities are by no means the fault of the students involved, right? They come from radically more disadvantaged backgrounds. And so, you know, very few—almost all of them are first-generation college students, with the exception of—and this is probably different now. This is before the women's movement has accomplished as much as it has. I've always had very bright, what I thought of then as—when I was 27, or 30, 35—as older women, come back and take courses and work on their degrees because, for personal reasons, they had not been able to finish their degrees. And their parents may have gone to college, but in general, or to a greater extent than the other students, so their first [unclear]. I even had people who are on welfare, you know. And the reason they didn't have time was because they had to work, right? They were much older, the average age was much higher. Many of them had families and full-time jobs.

[29:10]

And the reason that I had to sell what I was teaching [was] because they didn't come—many more of them came from families who did not often discuss why learning is valuable for its own sake. And so—which is again a product of economic circumstances and the educational level of their own parents. And so I felt like what I did at Florida Atlantic University and especially Cal State Bakersfield, was much more important and valuable for the students. It was not as much fun. It was *very* frustrating sometimes and it was very hard work. The metaphor I used to think about was that is was like I was wrestling with the students for their time, for their interest, for their commitment. Most of the students that I had were in college because they felt it was—if

they got their ticket punched, then they would have a better life. Which I guess is, especially if the economy were better, can be true. But that's a... So, at Macalester, I've never had a student ask me, "Is this going to be on the test?" And I've never had a student ask me, "How is this going to get me a job?" Whereas at the other schools, they asked those questions all the time. And I understand why they ask the questions all the time.

[30:42]

And I used to have this experience where, every year or two, I would have a student—since intelligence is randomly distributed in the society; it's not class-based. So that there's a lot of people, who just have never had opportunities because we have such inequality in this society, who are very smart. And so every year or two, I was able to help a student figure out that she or he was a smart person. And it was like a light bulb went off. And I just got such gratification from that. Well, at Macalester, that doesn't happen because everybody knows they're a smart person when they come here. So—again, I'm not blaming those students either, but that's not a pleasure that I have here. And I often feel like, or felt like I could not show up and the students would learn almost as much as if I did. Because the students are so motivated. I mean, I rarely missed class while I was here but a couple of times when I did, I'd just have them meet and I got reports back and they had great discussions. So, people do the reading, they are interested in the subject. And it's such a pleasure. The way I would think about my job is that I taught for free and I got paid for everything else. So when I said that about teaching, that it wasn't my calling, I had—it became a calling when I was at Florida Atlantic because I realized how important what we were doing could be in peoples' lives. And in, actually, especially in that group of women that I was talking about, who were such a wonderful pleasure to teach. But in general, for the students, I felt like I was, I could, and my colleagues would, *really* make a difference. And we

would, and we spent a lot of time talking about what was the best way to teach these kids and how could we most make a difference in their lives. And people were very committed to it. And it was a wonderful kind of colleague/student experience in that sense. But it was really hard. Yeah, so... I hope that answers your question.

[33:11]

AH: Great. Very much so, very completely. I was wondering if we could just move onto a discussion of your personal work—

CS: Yes.

AH: I understand that some of your specialties are, um, political advertising, stereotypes in film, news media coverage, and television viewing habits... I took that off your CV [Curriculum Vitae]. [laughs] And I was wondering how, how did those areas emerge as your, your—sorry, how did those emerge as your areas of academic specialization and are those the things you would consider your specialties?

CS: Yeah, I don't know if that's from my CV or if that's from something the college put out, actually. But here's how I think about my work. I have been interested in, since graduate school—I was a very political person when I was a student. Probably mostly because of the times when I went, but I was active, very active in radical student journalism and in the antiwar movement and the civil rights movement and, as it was coming along, the women's movement. And so, my sense of what I wanted to do with myself had to do with my participation in those

movements and by my awareness of a history of similar movements, and precedent movements throughout the twentieth century. And so, I saw my work as primarily— Yes, I always felt like I had an obligation to the students to serve them as students and to give them the kinds of skills, like writing skills, for which they came to college. But I was mostly interested in providing knowledge that would help people to change the world, make the world a better place. And so my academic interests—after about a year and a half in graduate school, after encountering the Frankfurt School, I became more and more interested in the question of the relationship between economic and institutional power, and the specifics of cultural texts. So that allowed me to combine the kind of close analysis that I was learning—close textual analysis that I was learning in graduate school—and the political commitments that I had had since college. And so, I see all my work as being related to that. So that's—I don't know if that answers your question.

[36:04]

AH: No, absolutely. And, and how do you feel that's been implemented in your work at Macalester?

CS: I think that that infuses all the courses that I teach. I've been very lucky here to be able to teach a wide range of courses that I've wanted to teach. My colleagues have always—were always—been entirely supportive of that once I was here and established. And the students have been responsive. So I feel like it's been a wonderful experience. Yeah...

[36:40]

AH: And while we're on the subject of the classes you've taught, uh, what are the main classes you've taught at Macalester and what are the ones you've found most meaningful and enjoyable to teach, do you think?

CS: Well since my department has been in various configurations since I've been here, the courses have been in various configurations. So, in terms of Media Studies... Over the years, I guess the way my work has been, has evolved, is I've taught a lot of—until the end—I taught a lot of introduction to cultural theory and cultural studies. And a lot of basic film analysis. And what we tried to do with our department was set up a prerequisite structure. Since we think that what we're supposed to do here is give the students as challenging [an] educational experience as possible, at least in—as I see my fields, that requires prerequisites. Which cuts against what people perceive as the pressure for high enrollments, but that's—we can talk about that later. So in order to have enough students to take the advanced courses, you have to teach the basic courses a lot, so I've done that. And then I've also taught advanced, much more advanced courses in cultural theory and film history.

[38:08]

AH: So, is this what you were talking about—

CS: —[unclear]

AH: —getting, um, students who want to be in your courses, because they have to go through that prerequisite system?

CS: Yeah, but nobody has to take the prerequisite because they can, they can study something else. So that's—even the prerequisite courses, no one's required to take. We have Gen Ed [General Education] requirements, but they're relatively light—compared to other places. And they don't have lists of courses that specify them. So, whereas at the [other] schools, I always used to get students who were taking my courses to check off a box, that—I'm not saying that never happens here, because one of the courses does count for Fine Arts. But it rarely happens. And I've been—one of the conflicts I've had when I've taught about race is whether to list it as a US Multiculturalism course, because I didn't want students in the course who were just taking it to satisfy that requirement. But then I realized that that was unfair to my other colleagues because then they would get more of them. So I stopped doing that.

[39:11]

AH: Um, so but you—and you also, like, team-taught several courses.

CS: Right. Right.

AH: I found just some names of a few of them: “Racial Formation, Culture, and U.S. History”—

CS: Yes.

AH: “Introduction to Comparative North American Studies”—prior to the American Studies Department.

CS: Right.

AH: Right. And, uh, “Picturing the Past: Film and History.”

CS: Right, right.

[39:31]

AH: Could you talk a little bit about the process behind creating a team-taught course and, and where those collaborations came from?

CS: Yeah, I think team-teaching works best, when two factors are present. One is that there’s great trust between the two people. It’s like writing collaboration, team-writing, which I like to do. You have to decide that it’s more important—that the relationship is more important than accomplishing any preset goals that you have. Of course, you need to serve the students, but beyond that... And then the second is I think it works best when you come from areas of study that are different. So, for example, one of my favorite colleagues here is Linda Schulte-Sasse in German Studies, who does film. And we once taught—team-taught the film analysis class. And I really like Linda and I trust Linda, but it wasn’t such a great experience because we both, we have overlapping knowledges. We have—there’s a lot of different knowledges, but that was a basic course, so the different knowledges didn’t appear. So I didn’t really feel like I learned that

much from her. On the other hand, my experiences teaching with Jim Stewart were among the best experiences of my academic career. I learned so much from him. He is such a wonderful teacher. And, I think the highlight of that was we taught a double course: we taught “Racial Formation, Culture, and U.S. History” as a double course which meant it was half of the students’ load. We got this idea from Peter Weisensel and Henry West who taught a double course in history of socialism and philosophy of socialism. How it becomes half the student’s load, so we had—it was half the student’s load, so they met, we met six hours a week in regular class and then we also had screenings every week. So we were quite a tight—

AH: Absolutely.

[41:37]

CS: —hard-working group. It was a wonderful, wonderful thing. But I learned so much from Jim because our knowledge of the topic—we both [had] common understandings of certain issues, but in terms of the specifics, it was—it just didn’t overlap. So he would talk about things that I just didn’t know. I’ll give you an example. I had always thought about D. W. Griffith’s *The Birth of a Nation*, to some extent, the product of [a] particularly deranged racist mind. And, after studying with Jim, and then actually since then more academic work has come out that supports this—after teaching with Jim, I realized that the way that African-Americans are represented in *The Birth of a Nation* was not only a way that was widely thought among US people but that actually, it was the way that most historians taught about African-Americans...and taught about Reconstruction. It’s mostly about Reconstruction. I was just astounded by that. But it made me understand something that I should have understood based on

the other things that I teach, which is the issue is not individuals and whether or not they're good people or bad people and have, you know, good souls or bad souls. The issue is: what sort of cultural discourses are being reproduced; [what] systems of power do they articulate; who has a stake in these discourses as opposed to other discourses; and why these discourses as opposed to other discourses. So, I think my level of sophistication in teaching film history, for example, just shot up like a rocket after studying with Jim. It was just so great. And the students responded well, as well.

[43:46]

The other team-teaching experience that I had—two other teaching, team-teaching, well, three other team-teaching experiences— I taught a couple of times with Paul Solon about history and film. And I get along really well with Paul. He's one of the people I'm friendliest with here—at Macalester, in the area. And so I got a lot out of that. But we had—our knowledges were a lot in common... And then the two other great experiences that I had were with Leola Johnson, where we team-taught a course called “Whiteness and the Media.” Which was very—it was an advanced topic seminar capstone. And we were both working on learning more about the topic. And she's—my professional background is in film studies and hers is in media studies, so even though I teach some media studies, she knows a lot more about that than I do. She knows a lot more about African-American representations than I do. And we were both getting into whiteness theory and that—and we had a wonderful group of students and so that was a great experience. And then the other terrific experience I had was the year before last, with John Kim, who's an assistant professor in our department, who's a wonderful guy too. And it was called “Spaces of Hope.” And we decided to teach the course because we felt like our students—the generation of student we were teaching—were prepared to believe anything [critical] that they

would read about the system. That it was never, was not a problem of saying, “You know it’s really not as good as you think it is.” They know, they know how rotten it is. And so, at least those students we get. And so that wasn’t giving anything to them. But what we did need to give to them, that we felt like there’s a shortage of, is hope. And I’m not sure how much hope I have, but I think that it’s ideal for us to teach that. [laughs] And so, my experience is that the most hope—the hope that I do have has been generated by the work that I have done with other people on social justice issues. Whether a student [or a faculty member], I was very active in the faculty unions at the public universities I taught at. And I’ve been active in other movements, too. And so working with other people and feeling this, this wonderful sense of solidarity, is I think the source of whatever political optimism I have, plus my knowledge of historical, similar historical experiences that other people have had.

[46:56]

AH: Was, was there a social activism component to the “Spaces of Hope” class?

CS: Yes, yes. Good question!

[both laugh]

CS: I’m glad you asked. So, this wasn’t a double course, but it was a one-and-a-half course. So the students all had to sign up for a two-credit internship while they took the course.

AH: Great.

CS: And we got this idea actually from Karin Aguilar-San Juan, who does a similar thing with Schools and Prisons, her course on schools and prisons [“The Schools-to-Prison Pipeline”]. And the idea was, we felt like Macalester students do wonderful work in the community in terms of community service. But a lot of it is about helping make sure—doing what they can so that the destructive effects of the system aren’t as destructive as they are. You know, it’s trying to help make things a little bit better for people, which is a good thing. And, you know, I’d never be critical of that. But it doesn’t get at, it generally doesn’t get at the causes of why things are the way they are, and why indeed there’s a need for people to do community service. So, our goal was to have, was to read radical theory in the course, including theory about social movements and organizing social movements, but also more abstract radical theory. And while the students were all involved in an internship that had as a requirement that it had to be with an organization whose goal was radical social transformation.

[48:33]

AH: What kind of internships did students do?

CS: They varied. And some worked out and some didn’t work out. The one that worked out the best was one with CTUL [Centro de Trabajadores Unidos en Lucha] which is a labor-organizing project for mostly Latinas and Latinos, many of whom were undocumented and have some of the worst-paying, worst-conditions jobs in the community. Like being contracted out as janitors for Cub [Foods], for example. That worked out great for the person who did that. Another one that worked out fairly well—we had four students who worked with the IWW [Industrial Workers of

the World], who's involved in the Jimmy John's organizing campaign and other campaigns. And we have more than our share of alums who were active in that. And so we were able to make that connection. And then some people did some work with some organizing groups in North Minneapolis, and other kinds of things. So it was—so for some of them, not all—but there were other ones too that didn't work out as well because, just because the work that they did wasn't that transformative. But the discussions were so great! Because instead of us discussing theory in the abstract—

AH: —practice, practice.

CS: Right, exactly.

AH: Beautiful.

CS: It was just—it was like, you know, in the Frankenstein movies where you see these two things sticking up and the electricity bolt, volt goes back and forth. That's what it was like! Between those two areas of knowledge and learning. And it was so wonderful and such a model for—if I were continuing on—what I would like to do in the classroom. I hope that John's able to continue, yeah...

[50:29]

AH: Oh, me too. Are there other projects that you've done that in any way that tied practice in that way to classroom learning or...?

CS: Um...you know, when I would teach radical theory, I would try to get discussions going where students would bring it in, but never that, in that kind of an organized way. And, yeah... I mean, it was just a uniquely great experience.

[50:56]

AH: So, aside from team-teaching classes, did you engage in any other collaborative, sort of, efforts, research projects with Macalester faculty? Sounds like you have a lot of overlapping interests, especially with the...

CS: ...don't remember doing any... I remember talking about, but I don't remember actually doing any research, writing projects with Macalester faculty. But what I do remember is how wonderful my closer colleagues were, in terms of reading and helping me with my manuscripts. Again, especially Linda Schulte-Sasse. I owe her so much in terms of my writing. She was so great. You know, because sometimes—one of the problems with the peer-review system when you use it in teaching is that the students don't tell each other what's wrong with their—each other's papers. Because they're too nice, you know. And I even, no matter how much I say, “Being nice is not being nice. Not being nice is being nice” —you know, whatever. Macalester students are—so the main reason I found to do peer review was just to make sure people would write drafts in time. But that's not true if you have colleagues who you trust and who trust you. And, wow, that was—that's been so helpful. You know. Not only Linda, Leola, Joëlle Vitiello, just a lot of people. [Unclear] off the top of my head, but were just great at—I was involved with

a writing group fairly early on in my career here. And that was just wonderful. And I just have—the book that I worked on, *Consuming Environments*—

[52:47]

AH: Great, I was just about to ask you about that.

CS: Yeah. I mean, I don't know how many drafts I did, but—I think the last major article I published, I think I did like thirty-five drafts. And I just have piles, and they have such great comments from people, that, yeah, that was wonderful. And then I've also been involved with people in terms of program building but that's another topic.

[53:12]

AH: Absolutely. Can we talk a little bit about your book?

CS: Yeah, sure.

AH: It's called *Consuming Environments: Television and Consumer Culture*.

CS: Right.

AH: Which you coauthored.

CS: Right.

AH: How did that project come about? What does it focus on? And how did it, sort of...?

CS: Well, [it] comes out of the same concerns that I talked about before: what is the relationship between economic and institutional power in the specific cultural text. So, that one area of work that—it's not as popular now because people don't watch television as much—but that became increasingly popular in the '80s and '90s, among people who were in film studies was the application of film studies methodology—where you closely analyze form, and narrative structure, and visual design, aural design, and their interrelation—with television. And when I was at Florida Atlantic University, for much of the time that I was there, we were able to build a department that had this wonderful synergy of people who were trained as I was in close textual analysis and then people who were trained in political economy of media. And so we had a lot of projects where we tried to combine the two. Some of which resulted in writing projects, some of which didn't. And it was enormously educational for us. It was just, it was—as a kind of research center, it was really terrific. And so in the early '80s, I had two colleagues, one who was—had gone to Iowa and been trained similarly to me, and another who had his Ph.D. from FSU [Florida State University] in mass communication and he knew a lot about the industry. And we decided—we talked a lot about television, and how television is taught, and how it was written about. And the main critique that we had about the way almost everybody talked and wrote about television was that they wrote about it as if the commercials weren't there. They wrote about it as if—and because this is before DVDs—

[55:33]

AH: Yes.

CS: —and it's just as even VCRs are coming into use. So, at the time, nobody saw things on television without the commercials. And then if you had a VCR, you could go fast forward through the commercials but advertisers have figured that out so they actually designed them so that they could still have certain effects even if you went fast forward through them. And so it was like they—people were rewriting the texts in order to talk about them, in a certain way. We found that very troubling. And then we also thought troubling was most people who wrote and taught about television ignored—except for people who were just interested in the business part—ignored why these programs were there in the first place. Which is to get access to people's brains to get them to buy products that they otherwise wouldn't buy. Well, it's not like this has no effect on content; in fact, this is what determines content. And in general, the theoretical material that I was working with was sort of Marx's ideas about that as read by Raymond Williams, and his concepts of determination. And so we were very interested in—and then also bringing in semiotics and post-structuralism—in writing. So we wrote an article, which was for the *Journal of Communication*. Which at the time was [unclear] a journal in communication. It's not speech communication but communication in general. And it's for the International Communication Association. About *Fantasy Island* and we talked about these things. And it was rooted in work that Raymond Williams had done on what he called “flow”—the flow between commercials and programs.

[57:33]

And so, for example, we noticed that all the episodes of *Fantasy Island* had these problem-solution structures. And the commercials had problem-solution structures. And so what that

meant is that as you're watching the show—we're talking about possibilities of meanings, it's not like we did empirical research so that we know that—we didn't claim facts. But so that the—and we're interested in the shaping of the cultural form. So that you're watching the show and there's a—often they would end, have a hook at the end right before commercial. And it's a moment of a problem. And then, you know, a commercial comes on that tells you, "Well, if you have dirty dishes, this is what you use to solve it." They'd have little dramas about problems and solutions. Like two or three of them in a row! You know? And we thought that this was probably not a coincidence. Although at the time, we didn't do a lot of research into how these commercials were made and... And so we wrote, we wrote an article called "*Fantasy Island: Marketplace of Desire*," and it was picked up by the *Journal of Communication*, which as far as I know had not run any articles like that before. So that was a real breakthrough, in terms of bringing French people like Roland Barthes, and their work, into, kind of, mainstream communication.

[59:04]

AH: We just left off talking about your book—

CS: Right.

AH: —and had just gotten into the *Journal of Communication Studies*, which was—

CS: *Journal of Communication*.

AH: *Journal of Communication*. Which was incorporating French theorists—

CS: Yeah, right, we brought Roland Barthes into the *Journal of Communication*. And so we kept working on this. Then we realized, well, you know, *Fantasy Island* is sort of a junky show and it's like shooting fish in a barrel to be critical of that. So we decided what we should do is start taking on the shows that liberals and progressives really loved. And show that there should—that they were not love objects and once again that, in fact, that they were there [to get] into people's heads, to get them to buy products that they didn't need.

[59:53]

And, so the next one we took on—I think, yeah, it was Mike—the first one was with Mike Budd and Steve Craig. This was just with Mike Budd. Was *M*A*S*H*. And so we wrote a piece about *M*A*S*H*. It was called, “*M*A*S*H* Mystified...” You can look in my vita, I don't have my vita. But it [was] something like “*M*A*S*H* Mystified: Capitalism and Dematerialization [*M*A*S*H* Mystified: Capitalization, Dematerialization, Idealization].” And the idea was that—you know when you look at the opening of *M*A*S*H* and people think they're looking at Korea, right? They're not looking at Korea, they're looking at...California, right? But almost nobody when they watch TV thinks about that—when you watch a film or a movie, I think this is probably what differentiates people in film studies from people who talk about film noir or films—one of the things that differentiates them is that we're constantly aware that we are not watching a story, we're watching a sort of documentary of the filming of the story. That there's not a story inherent in the film. It's in people's heads, because people—so we would bring in some semiotics and stuff—people would read the story in terms of their own cultural and aesthetic codes that they had learned. They would create the stories. And so—yet people would

look at *M*A*S*H* and write all these things about it as if there were actual beings there who were having certain kinds of experiences, rather than that they were actors who were doing a job. And never doing things in continuity. Because if you know about film, you know about how the editing system works and occasionally they may shoot movies in continuity, trying to shoot them in order. But, you know, it's all made up of these single shots that—the other people aren't necessarily there. It's a complicated system of representation. It's not like capturing an event. One of my favorite stories is that when Humphrey Bogart, after he finished making a movie called *The Left Hand of God*, where he played a missionary in China, somebody asked him, "So, what was it like to be a missionary in China?" And he said, "How would I know? I was an actor, I'm an actor in Hollywood."

AH: [laughs] Right.

[1:02:40]

CS: Right? You know, or when you're looking at *Casablanca*—somebody's written about this—when you're looking at *Casablanca*, you're looking at Burbank. You're looking at the making of a movie in Burbank, you know, you're not... So people make these meanings in their heads, and that's how it works. And what film history teaches is how they went to a system that encourages this production of meaning in people's heads, from a system that was based on display and exhibition, to a system that's based on absorption. But, anyway, so *M*A*S*H* was like the telos of this. It was like, this was the show that everybody loved, they thought was virtuous. So we decided to go after *M*A*S*H*. So, we did. And that got picked up. We were lucky. That got picked up in *Cultural Critique*. Although it was interesting—they made us write

about the characters in the story more than we wanted to. Because people are just so taken with that, even though it doesn't exist in the production process. It's produced in the production reception process. Anyway, and then Mike and I also did a piece about another beloved show, *The Cosby Show*, and we talked about it in terms of racism. So at a certain point, we decided to do a—it's got a history—but we decided to do a book. Mike Budd, and Steve Craig, and I. At the time, we were all working together in—we had all been working together. Yeah, when we first started talking about it, we were all working together in Florida. And when we wrote those articles, we were all in the same department in Florida. Then I think Steve left first and then I left. So we got separated. But so we planned this book to have a kind of—not only have a comprehensive review of how television—the production processes of television, the economic basis of US television, and then the design aspects of US television.

[1:04:39]

But two other things. I had read this article when I was living in Bakersfield, that was about one of the right-wing congress people in Southern California. And he had complained that the environmental movement was “watermelon politics”—green on the outside, red on the inside. And after coming up with a proposal that a publisher said, “Eh, it sounded too, sort of, like old New Left stuff that was a critique of the industry,” we talked about it and we decided why don't we make a green book, a watermelon book? [laughs] And so, we were all strong supporters of the environmental movement, really cared about it. But we realized that if we would take our argument a step further and talk about how watching television might well contribute to the destruction of the environment, that that would make a much more compelling book. We got this idea, in part, from a guy named Dallas Smythe, who was a communications scholar in Canada and the US, who had an argument that when you watch television, even though you think

it's leisure, it's also work. If we define work as creating value for other people, when you watch television, you learn about products so that you know what to buy when you go shopping, know which cars to pick, which movies to go see, which kinds of vegetables to buy—all these things. And so his argument was that the vast majority of our time, not only watching television but doing other things, was either using products, and in that sense creating value for corporations, or learning about products, or doing your job. Right? Which is a pretty bleak way about viewing life. But it's—and I don't know that I want to walk around thinking about that all the time. But it was a really interesting critical argument. And so we said that it may be that the most important aspect of television is the way it takes people's time. And now I would say it of all screens, because it turns out that what's happened is people are watching less network television but people are spending *much* more time in front of screens than they—we did when we wrote the book. So, think: whatever we talked about is much, much worse now than it was when we wrote the book. And, of course, the environment is in much worse shape than when we wrote the book.

[1:07:22]

Anyway, so we figured out, OK, what show should we pick as the centerpiece of this to analyze that is, that presents itself as environmental, and pro-environment, and green, and small is beautiful. But is involved in selling products that are not necessarily good for the environment? And so the show we picked was *Northern Exposure*, which was another show that was beloved. And this time, we did work that had never done before. We actually all—a lot of research about the industry. And, uh, and we did a kind of industrial history of how *Northern Exposure* came about, how it is that places go about assembling commercials, how it is that they go about placing commercials, how it is that they go about making sure that the commercials are in the

right place in the show, and so forth. And what we found out was that Tide was developed because—excuse me, *Northern Exposure* was—did I [give] away the punch line...?

[both laugh]

CS: —*Northern Exposure* was developed by Procter & Gamble as a way to sell Tide in the evening to women who were no longer—who were now working outside the home and were no longer watching as many soap operas. So, they actually subsidized—

[1:08:46]

AH: Subsidized?

CS: —the first summer season of the episodes of *Northern Exposure*. And then for—I'm not sure, I don't remember anymore what number of years they were the main sponsor. And so we wrote about that. And then we wrote about the connection between, you know, Tide—what we found out is that the people who run Tide—we found a speech that the president of Procter & Gamble had made to an advertising group where he said that in order to get people to continue to buy Tide, they have to hear about it eight times a month. Because if go to your supermarket, you'll see that you can buy products that do the same thing that Tide does for half as much. So the question is, "Why do people use Tide?" Right? Have they done blind testing in their laundry room? I don't think so. Right? It's because in their head they know what the slogan at the time was, "If it's got to be clean, it's got to be Tide," or because it looks like the rays of the sun, or you know...

[1:09:51]

AH: I just, I just bought some Tide. [laughs]

CS: Why did you buy Tide?

AH: My parents bought it.

CS: Yeah, right.

AH: I couldn't tell you.

CS: Yes, right. It's in your—right. I mean, in a way—

AH: It had, it had an American flag on it...

CS: Yes, we carry—

[both laugh]

CS: We carry the culture industry around in our heads like a conscience. Right? Says, "You got to buy this." So every time somebody buys Tide, it's like we are an idola—like we are engaging

in idolatry. Where we are putting a tribute in the hands of the Procter & Gamble gods, believing that some how our lives will be better—

AH: —cleaner, fresher.

[1:10:30]

CS: —fresher, that we'll sparkle if we use their product. You know, and detergents are not necessarily the best thing for the environment. But even worse, of course, than detergents, we found that, of people who advertise on *Northern Exposure*, are sport utility vehicles. So we did a lot of research about sport utility vehicles. We found out that, for example, at the time, ninety-five percent of the people who—even a lot of people that said that they bought sport utility vehicles to go off-road, they—ninety-five percent of the people never went off-road. Or they would buy small trucks and they were going to haul stuff—most of the people never hauled stuff. So that it's about, it's about this fantasy stuff. And Raymond Williams argued [that] the problem is not that we are too materialistic a society. The problem is we are not materialist enough. That we live in this fantasy world, right, that follows us around whenever we go shopping and gets us to do all these things that are bad for the environment. So we argued that people watching *Northern Exposure*, seeing all these ads for Tide, and sport utility vehicles, and other kind of things, and we analyzed a lot of different stuff. And thinking that somehow they're involved in the counterculture by watching this show. You know, a contemporary example that the—David Bordwell has just written about is *Avatar*. So, *Avatar* presents itself, I think to a lot of people, as an anti-corporate, you know, natural, green kind of movie.

[1:12:01]

AH: OK.

CS: Right? Everybody nods—in the room is nodding their heads.

AH: But it's about the military industrial complex.

CS: No, it's, no it's—shows the military industrial complex in a terrible light! Well, *Avatar* was the avatar of the transformation of the film industry, not just from using film to digital, but also the monopolization of the equipment, of digital equipment, by just a few companies so that they have increasing control over what's on your screens. And making it tougher for independent theaters and independent films and... You know, we're in this moment of enormous technological transformation and almost nobody knows about it!

AH: Right.

CS: Right? But the whole thing is being changed. It's really, it's—but *Avatar*—and James Cameron was a promoter of using all this digital equipment and had financial interests in it. And yet, the film itself seems to be a, you know, this green—

AH: Right.

CS: —anti-corporate movie. You know, it's like...[laughs]

AH: Absolutely.

[1:13:08]

CS: So, anyway, this was the kind of thing we did for television in *Consuming Environments*.

And we also, because the people would say—well, you know, the problem with a lot of the critical books is that they make things sound really horrible and either they propose no solution and then, in my experience, students get upset and they say, “Well, what’s the solution?”

Although actually, I hear that less and less as the students become more and more hopeless.

AH: Aw.

[both laugh]

CS: —which is really sad. I used to hear that a lot more. And so we put at the end, we put a list of organizations you can get involved with to try to change this. But it’s like, you know, having a little peashooter against a tank. So, it was—we felt a little strange about that. But anyways, so that’s—and the book did pretty well, although we wrote it at too high a level. And so our goal was that it be widely used, like in general mass comm courses, but the book is too hard. And so, just on a basic level of paragraph length, and sentence length, and all this—maybe we’ve been reading too much Frankfurt School, or whatever. And so the book did well at selective schools, but has—and parts of it are still used, you know. But, it didn’t—it did fine, but it didn’t take off like a rocket. But, you know, my goal isn’t to get rich.

AH: Get some sponsorship...

CS: [laughs] Right. Get a sponsor, right.

[both laugh]

[1:14:51]

AH: Uh, is there a work of yours that you're most proud of?

CS: I feel really good about that book. And then I also feel really good—actually, the articles that I've written that I think are the, have the most interesting, original ideas are the ones that are almost totally ignored. So, uh, I don't know why that is... But I wrote this book in queer theory that—not this book—an article in queer theory about a show, it was with Burt Reynolds, called *Evening Shade*, that was a kind of variant on these other articles. But it also talked about the—it was an intervention in the arguments about the—that Laura Mulvey made in the '70s about what she called “the male gaze” but people were calling...the masculine gaze or something. And about how it related to men watching men on television. And I thought that was a really interesting argument that I made. And then I think that the last major article I wrote about whiteness theory in the Frankfurt School is [a] really good article but not that many people were—picked it up. But, on the other hand, a piece that I did that was— In the '80s, there was a—and it lasted into the '90s—there was this big move, following a scholar named John Fiske who was at Madison [University of Wisconsin-Madison]... That argued that people aren't—the

kind of populist notion of TV that people watch TV, and make their own meanings, and that it's not that people are influenced by TV, that they have a negotiated reading of TV, and so forth. Which, of course, on some level, is true. But it's not a negotiation between you as a, like, individual and the TV show—it's more the way you think and how it intermeshes with the way that the show is produced, I think. But, anyway, that was *way* too optimistic. I mean, if Fiske had been right and all the people who had followed him had been right, we would be living in a fundamentally different world than the one we're living in. But there was a major movement of this which has mostly, but not entirely, passed. And so, we wrote one article in *Critical S*—it used to be called *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* and it's now *Critical Studies in Media Communication*—that's a critique of that, has been widely cited. So, I feel really good about that. But, other—you know, other people made similar arguments. But I—it's a good article. And in the end, the article is toned down from the article we originally wrote. But, maybe—I'm hoping to put the original version online.

AH: Great.

CS: So, it's like the director's cut.

[1:17:56]

AH: Official version. Well, to shift tracks quite a bit, I'm wondering what your experience receiving tenure was like.

CS: Well, I've received tenure three times—

[both laugh]

CS: —because I switched jobs and I've always been at teaching institutions that require you to go through tenure again. So I've had three experiences with tenure and... I never was worried because I, you know, I had a lot of experience writing, so I was able to write enough and my teaching evaluations were pretty much good enough. But, but you're always nervous. So it's not...

[1:18:35]

AH: Did Macalester put you on an accelerated track, due to your previous tenure?

CS: Yeah, not as accelerated as they do now, but it was, I think, I went up in my second year. I think now maybe people go up in their first year, end of the first year.

AH: OK, wow.

CS: But, um, yeah.

AH: So, it was a pretty easy process?

CS: Yeah, the only—except the year before I went up, four out of seven people were turned down. So, it's like, whoa is there fear among junior faculty. And I sort of knew stories of why

they were turned down, so that made me a little nervous but not, you know, it wasn't like I was— I don't view those experiences [of my going up for tenure] as bad experiences. And then when I got to Cal State Bakersfield, turns out I had been hired to be a piece on the chessboard of a war that was going on in the department. And I had come from a department that was at war. And so that—but anyway... And so my tenure—I had to get—to make sure I got tenure, I had to get incredibly high student evaluations. And I had—you know, since I was on one side of the war, I had a lot of people who were giving me good tips so I was able to do that. That was a difficult experience. In gen—yeah. I can talk—I've been on the personnel committee, I mean, I can talk about the tenure process here generally...

[1:20:10]

AH: If you'd like to.

CS: Um...

AH: How—do you think it's changed since you got here?

CS: Has it changed? The tenure standards for teaching and research are higher than when I got here. I believe. But the problem with it is [that] they're never—there are no tenure standards written down. They change and they're not announced. And when someone doesn't get tenure, the reasons they didn't get tenure are not public. So no one can really learn from it. And the people who don't get tenure—the story they tell of why they didn't get tenure is usually not, you know, "My teaching wasn't good enough," or, "I didn't publish enough." They have some other

story. And, while there—I think there have been people who I—where I wasn't on the—I say this, when I wasn't on the personnel committee, there were people who got turned down who I didn't think should be turned down, but I wasn't on the committee so I don't know the full story. Or for third-year review. But I feel like there was some injustice there. But the, my own experience on the personnel committee is that the administrators here are incredibly fair and generous as far as that goes. It's also, it's an odd experience being on—but the faculty [in general] range from being fair and supportive, on the one hand, to being vicious, on the other hand.

AH: Right.

[1:21:47]

CS: And that has been—but that's not unique to Macalester. And I'd say that percentages here are better than at the other places I have been. And that, for whatever reason, it's a complicated notion of a combination of reasons—I think it's better now than it used to be, although I'm not as engaged as I was, so I—it's possible I don't know about certain things. But the—part of it is that there was this generation of faculty who were pretty vicious, whose testosterone levels have gone down and they seem to have quieted a little bit, gotten a little bit quieter. But, I don't know, you know. I don't hear them as much, but I don't know what kinds of stuff they're doing behind the scenes. But when I was on Personnel and in my own experience being on candidate review committees, I was definitely seeing people being vicious here. And then at the other schools I was at, in ways where the tenured—that part of the tenure decision has had nothing to do with the quality. Although I shouldn't say it has nothing to do with the quality. The way it works is

[that] if you have a perfect record and you're in, you know, great publications, all the students love you, you can be—people can think you're a jerk and you're still going to—you know, not like you, or try to go after you, and you're still going to get through OK. If you have—if you're a terrible teacher *and* you don't publish, then, you can be—people can think you're a wonderful person and you're still not going to get tenure. But, you know, eighty percent—I'm just making that number up—but I think something like eighty percent of the people fall in the middle. And that's where people can do all kinds of mischief. Which I'm not saying that in their hearts they think they're doing mischief. In their hearts, they probably think they're trying to defend standards. But I've seen examples of racism, heterosexism, and sexism at work in these vicious letters that were just awful to read. But in my experience, the personnel committee has—and especially the president and the provost have been good about—they couldn't stop the hurt that was caused by the process. But they were able to limit the effects on people's jobs. And so I feel good about that. The other thing is that—the tenure situation looks very different inside the committee than it does outside the committee. So I was involved in a couple of cases where people didn't get tenure, either on their tenure committee or on their third-year review committee. And the theory—I heard all these conspiracy theories about what had happened and how people—and you know, I was there, and I get—maybe I missed something. But there [were] actually other things, sometimes other things going on and... But, you know, as a committee member, you—it's confidential, you can't talk about it. Although I think confidentiality here is quite porous. Especially over time.

[1:24:59]

AH: One thing I've—

CS: Not for me, of course.

[both laugh]

AH: No, never applies. I, one thing that I've been wondering about, talking to some newly tenured professors, there's this sense that I get that there's sort of a mentorship going on—the fact that there aren't these written rules of how to receive tenure. So you find yourself, as a, a faculty member who has been here longer, taking on a mentoring position? Or, or adviser position?

CS: Oh, yeah. I mean, I think that's a major part of our job. I think we have a responsibility if we bring someone into the department, unless they really screw up, to help them in every way possible to be a success. I mean, I think the—one of the nice things about Macalester is it has no tenure quotas, or so far anyway. And so everybody is hired with the idea that they will be successful. You know, that they're—some percentage of people are not, but yeah. So, actually the personnel committee, in my mind, is a committee that works. It's not perfect. I disagree with some of their decisions. Especially ones that—where I was looking at it from the outside. Some of them upset me quite a bit. But—and it does enormous damage along the way. It can do enormous damage. I can't, I can't overstate the effect of this viciousness on people. The number of people who have left, the number of people who are—just they carry this misery with them. And—

[1:26:32]

AH: And do you think this is indicative of, of the Macalester attitude in general—

CS: No.

AH: —or just academia in general?

CS: This is academia in general. But it goes on much more than it should at Macalester. And I think if we had better administrators, it would be—it wouldn't go on as much. So that the people who engage in this vicious—it's more like a small town. And not only are we a small town, but we're a small town where everybody's got to live together for many, many years. And so, when I—in my early—early on in my career here, I was on a provost search committee. And I remember being on the committee and somebody's name came up who everybody thought would be a really good provost. And somebody said, "Wait a second, I saw—eight years ago, I saw that person park in a handicapped spot. I am not going to support that person." And that killed it for the person.

AH: What...?

CS: You know, and it—I can't swear it was eight years. It's the story that counts. And so, but there is stuff like that all the time, where people offend people one time, and they remember it forever. And so the...it's at enormous cost that people stand up to people. And rare is the administrator who will do that, or do that effectively.

[1:28:01]

AH: So, do you feel there's a lack of collegiality among faculty? Or is this just in certain situations?

CS: It's in certain situations. I think there is a big difference—that's maybe jumping ahead. But when I was going through my office stuff, I saw that the last year I kept a—I used to keep a paper file: one of internal correspondence and one of external correspondence. But the last year I did that was '93-94. Because after that, email had thoroughly taken over. Now, we've had several email systems since I've been here and so I've lost years worth of email. And I remember at the beginning, one of my friends used to print out all her emails because she want—I don't think anyone's doing that anymore. But that makes a big difference. Not that there's not written correspondence and that there's email, but [that] email has had this enormous effect. One thing, almost nobody uses the phone anymore. And people don't go over and personally visit anymore. Plus, email takes an extra amount of time out of everyone's day. One of the things that is true about Macalester that was not true about the other two places where I worked is that everybody I know here works hard. Everybody. I don't know anybody who I feel like doesn't work, you know, work hard. And so that means that anytime anything is added to people's workloads, something else disappears. Well, email—again, this isn't Macalester's fault, but, you know, email came, has gradually taken up. And everybody knows how much time it takes from them and then it doesn't only take the time that you're on email, it takes the time that when you're on email, you're looking at other stuff, too, you know. We're talking about an hour or two, maybe, a day. Some people more, some people less. Some people are better at

controlling it, other people are not. Well that's time that people don't have to talk to each other. At the same time, as I've said, they've raised the standards on what's required for publication. Although not as much as a lot of the junior faculty think, which is interesting. But they'll never say that, you know, you know, it's, which is unfortunate. Or they don't say it enough. Or many people are—there's no central voice clearly articulating what the standards are because they say, "We don't want to say how many articles you need or whether you need a book," or whatever, because they want wiggle room. And so, we have department chairs, some of whom are just scaring the hell out of their junior faculty! Even though their standards are much higher than the personnel committee's.

AH: Right.

[1:30:44]

CS: Right? And they don't get to say... I mean, yeah, we had one person who was just notorious for that. And then the other—but there's others who do that. And so people don't know. And then the teach—I was on personnel [committee] when we were having debates about the raising of the research standards and why at a college, whose primary role is teaching, should we keep raising the research standards which is definitely going to take time away from teaching. And then the next year, they turned down—I don't whether it was two or three people because of their teaching. And of course every time they turn somebody down, it's like—that's how they communicate with people. Because that's the only real communication other than from the chairs which they really don't know what's necessarily going on. That's the only direct communication from Personnel is who gets turned down. And again—as I said, people don't

really know what the reasons are. But I think that to the extent that they find out it's about their teaching, they say that, and that scares other people. And then, you know, and then people who were advising them say, "You got to make [sure] your teaching evaluations are this or that." And then the introduction of PowerPoint into teaching, where—which is contentious in terms of whether or not at a school like this it's actually a good thing in terms of the student learning process, depends on the course I think. Anyway, whatever the answer is to that, it takes a lot of time to do those!

AH: Right.

[1:32:19]

CS: Well, so you have the time that goes into the email and the time that goes into the PowerPoint, neither of which was time that, when I got here, people had to spend. And so, they're not spending time talking to each other. So one of my great disappointments with Macalester is that it pretty much, except for changes we've made in response to grants, our curriculum is the same as when I got here. There's definitely changes around the edges. But it's basically the same. Well, that's scandalous. You know, I mean, and it's because—

[1:32:59]

AH: You mean, our, our core requirements?

CS: Our core requirements, right, right. And, um, and there's never, there's not been any significant college-wide discussion about what our majors should be. Just about what we're

supposed to be doing in terms of our students' education. When I first came here, as I saw going through my paper trail, there are a lot of those discussions. And I would get invited to come participate in formal—both formal and informal discussions about various kinds of curricular problems and initiatives. And some of those are still going on—I think, too many of them I think driven by grants. But the, um, but it's not like—it's nothing like what it was. People don't talk to each other nearly as much because they don't have time. Because they're so busy. And to develop new initiatives and new programs, takes an enormous amount of time.

[1:34:00]

AH: Mm-hm. And there's just not enough to go around.

CS: And people have so much less time. And I think that that's a problem. Now, there was a moment when Jan Serie, before she died, was trying to lead a discussion of: what should our research requirements be for our faculty? And to my great disappointment, after she died, that was dropped both by the provost and the person, by the person who took over the CST [Center for Scholarship and Teaching].

AH: Well—

CS: Or it wasn't picked up by the provost.

AH: —it's my understanding that the college is currently doing a reevaluation of the core requirements. Is that...of any value?

CS: I mean there's...GERC [General Education Requirements Committee], which was the Gen Ed Review Committee... There's an enormous amount of time that a small group of people are spending on those things, but in the end, the amount of action that takes place is minimal. And part of this is because people don't talk, so that the—don't talk enough. So, like, you know, you think about what just happened with Russian and—

[1:35:08]

AH: Yeah, I'm very interested in knowing your impression of that situation...

CS: —it, you know, and these initiatives— We have not, for many years, had administrators who know how to persuade faculty. Or who know how to go out and talk to faculty. And this is quite a disappointment to me. I mean, it seems to me that, given all the money that we got, and I know that when I got here, the money seemed like more than it actually turned out to be, so there's that. But still, we have hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, right? We charge a fortune for an education here. We should have a very—and I think we give our students a good education. But we should have a deliberately-planned, distinctive education. Whereas the—that's developed by the faculty with student input and staff input as a community. But that can only happen if people spend time talking to each other and if the administrators know how to go around and talk to people. And we have not, for a long time, had administrators who can do that and I don't understand. I mean, they make—they get paid big money. But they just can't do that. And so it's an enormous administrative failure when there are initiatives like the Russian initiative, you know. They succeed in getting the faculty to give up the ability to

defeat it by majority vote, they make it two-thirds, and then they lost anyway. Well, I mean, what does that say about their capacity to influence people? You know, or to develop a consensus around things?

AH: Right.

[1:37:03]

CS: I just don't—I think it's probably been, I don't know, somewhere between ten and fifteen years since the president and provost have come to a department I was involved in and asked us what we think about things or what we want to do. This president has never done anything like that, in my department.

[1:37:19]

AH: —and what was your position on the Russian Studies debate, if I may ask?

CS: What was my position?

AH: Yeah. Were you involved in, in the debate, in the vote, or...?

CS: In my last couple of years, once I realized I was going to leave, I decided that I shouldn't have a say in these things. I had, when I was younger, I saw too many people who were either on their way out, or were already out in MSFEO [Macalester Senior Faculty Employment

Option] trying to control the curriculum and hiring and things. And I just thought that was wrong. And so, I have tried my best to stay out of that, so I didn't even...

AH: Didn't even touch it.

CS: —touch it. I do know—I was involved with the Faculty Advisory Committee, whether it was fifteen years ago or what, when it first took this issue up. And again, I think it was a failure of the administrative leadership to, sort of, resolve it one way or the other. Yeah.

[1:38:22]

AH: Well, speaking of leadership, you as a faculty member were chair of the department for seven years, the department in various shapes and forms—

CS: Right, right.

AH: —and I was wondering if you could talk a little bit to that experience and in what ways you feel the position of chair maybe influenced the trajectory of your department or perhaps the, the, um, role of the department on the, on the college, in the college view, in general.

CS: Well, I don't think about my role on campus as being a kind of individual role, so I don't really know how to answer that. I mean—

AH: Well you can just speak to your experience as chair, if that's a too complicated a question.

[1:39:06]

(redacted)

[1:42:29]

CS: So, you know, the college is not—maybe it's changing. I don't know, but I don't think so. It's not a hospitable and protective and safe place for—it's changing over time, so I don't want to generalize. Certainly for African-Americans and I think also for Latino—Latina-Latino-Americans, and perhaps for Asian-Americans, I don't know. And so the—it—it didn't used to be for Asian-Americans, but I don't know. I don't [know] what the situation is now. And the administration doesn't use its capital to fight that adequately. This is all before the current provost got here, so it's nothing against the current provost. But—look at the number of African-American students we have. It's way below what it should be [unclear]. And, at least as serious, is the number of African-American faculty, you know. And the problem is—and then there's a whole bunch of staff who have left. When I got here, or soon after I got here, there was an African-American in the PR [Public Relations] Office, the Vice President for Advancement was African-American... There was a strong African-American presence in Multicultural—it's now called [the Department of] Multicultural Life. I mean, it was just a whole different ball game. And that's changed. You know? And it's—and there have been deliberate decisions that have led to that happening. And deliberate decisions in hiring that have led to that happening. And I'm not saying that, routinely, any of this has to do with explicit or self-conscious racism.

[1:44:55]

But it has to do with there being other priorities, it not being enough of a priority. And you have to, you have to really fight against racism if you want to make a place, to be a fair place for everyone. You know, I mean, people should be able to have faculty they work with who are like them. And all students should have the experience of working with faculty from diverse backgrounds. It seems to me that that's an essential quality of academic excellence, is that you have a range of voices. Now, I don't know—I haven't done a census in the last year, but, as far as I know, the only African-American—there's not a descendant of slaves who is in Carnegie. There's no descendant of slaves, of US slaves, who is in Old Main. The only person in Olin-Rice is Kendrick [Brown], who's not a—he's a psychologist. The number of African-American faculty is very low. You know? And there have been people here, and they haven't been encouraged to stay. I'm not—I don't [know] if anybody was fired, but—I don't know of anybody tenure-track who was fired here. There's definitely people who would be in Old Main who were let go. And so—and there were, yeah. And then there was one tenure-track person who left because she— And the administrators, you know, and they've been pushed on this, they've said, "Well, we've asked them, and they've said it wasn't racism." You know, but... And the other thing is people don't go around looking for jobs unless they're unhappy. There's—occasionally people do that if they have highly specific personal reasons for leaving. That does happen. But it's, you know, there's got to be—there's a combination of push and pull. That's if people are very happy, they're reluctant to leave a place. Because it's, you know, you never know where, what you're getting into. So I think there's been a great failure in that regard. And, you know, the time—when I was in Affirmative Action, I would talk to the president. I think he's for it, he's all for it, but...

[1:47:30]

AH: What was your role in the, the Affirmative Action Committee?

CS: Well, I was the chair of the Affirmative Action Committee, which meant I was involved in hiring decisions with the Allocations Committee. And it meant that I was the chair of a committee that would send representatives to all searches and that I worked closely with the provosts, the two provosts I worked with, about whether or not the searches had met the criteria.

[1:47:59]

AH: And some have been canceled as a result.

CS: One was canceled. Right. And it was canceled, basically, because the search was wired for an individual. I would say. I think that... There was another search where it might have been delayed for another year or something, I'm not sure. But, because the... At the time, the [Faculty] Handbook said—this is before my time that this was put in there—that you had to bring in at least one woman or person of color. But it doesn't—we changed that. It doesn't say that anymore. But this department had brought in only guys. But so that wasn't like—it was like an automatic decision. But in general, the—and the last provost, she just destroyed the system. I quit as Affirmative Action chair because she just destroyed the system. She took the most conservative interpretations of everything. And then just changed the system and... We had chances of hiring wonderful people and she wouldn't do it. She wouldn't push the departments. And it was just...

AH: Has it—

CS: —didn't see any action.

AH: Has it changed since then, do you feel?

CS: I haven't been involved since then. I mean, I was on one search committee with Kathy [Provost Murray] and I believe that she would—she's a strong advocate. But I don't know—I mean, I think we've hired some Latina/Latino faculty. But in terms of African-Americans, I don't know... It's still not—it's nothing like what it should be.

[1:50:04]

AH: Right. And is the Affirmative Action Committee involved in admissions, as well—

CS: No.

AH: —or just job searches?

CS: No, admissions is—the way they have it set up, it's completely walled off from the faculty, which is unusual for liberal arts colleges, actually. When Lorne, Lorne Robinson arrived as—to be the admissions director, several of us went to visit him, talk to him about ideas for increasing the diversity. I think the diversity has gotten better than it was, but it's still nothing like what it should be. And you know—yeah, in terms of, especially in terms of US African-

Americans and US Latinos/Latinas. And I think that, you know, we're going to a world, a country—we're in a world that's overwhelmingly nonwhite. And we're going to a country that is going to be majority nonwhite. And we're not equipping our—I don't think we're adequately equipping our students for...

AH: Right.

[1:51:12]

CS: They're not—people need to have experiences work[ing] together with students who come from different backgrounds who have [unclear]...critical mass and, they're just not making the decisions that will make that become a standard part of life at Macalester. I mean, they trumpet the diversity in their publicity, but when you get here, you look around and... And it's very hard being the only African-American or only Latina/Latino or only Asian-American in the class. You know, especially if race issues come up, it's—and you know, not having an advisor who's sensitive to your particular background and needs and interests, it's very hard.

[1:51:55]

AH: We were talking about affirmative action.

CS: Right. I mean, I do want to say that the college has gotten a lot better about hiring people of color who are born abroad. And that's—they're an important addition to the faculty. And especially as we go global—as the world becomes more global, it's important to have more faculty with more globally-diverse backgrounds. But this specific problem that I'm concerned

with is—I mean, after all, I think twelve and a half percent of the people of the United States are, you know, African-American. And that we have, our students have so little exposure to African-Americans and to students and faculty—compared to what the percentages are like. It has an impact. It has an impact on what's talked about. Not that everyone who's African-American only wants to talk about African-American issues, or anybody who's a woman only wants to talk about women's issues. But the way it seems to work, though, is that it's more likely to come up. Those issues are—or if you have a large number of people, it's more like—those issues are more likely to come up when you have people who are—where it affects them personally. And to be taught by people whom it affects personally. I'm not saying that, you know, the people who teach German need to be German or have German background. I'm not saying that at all. But I'm saying that in the mix of overall faculty that we have, it should be much more diverse. And I do believe that if we had—if that were a high, a genuinely high priority with administrators, as it is at some schools, that we would be doing better both at the student and faculty level than we are. And, again, it's not that they're not for it. You know, pretty much everybody here is a liberal Democrat. There's a few exceptions, but it's not... It's that they're—there are definitely exceptions. I don't want to overgeneralize, but it's that they're not willing to do what's necessary in order for change to come. And I know that's a hard thing to ask. But that's—I think that's what their jobs are, you know? And it's hard. It's hard to confront people on this. I found then when I was the head of—the Faculty Affirmative Action officer. And it costs you friend—not friends—because, you know, people don't like—there's people who won't like you after that. But that's tough! You know? We have to—this should be one of our number one jobs and it hasn't been. And that's really disappointing to me.

[1:54:47]

AH: Would it be right to say that those concerns are a lot of what shape the current American Studies Department? Or was that—do you know—because I, I know that you were very involved—

CS: Yes.

AH: —in creating—

CS: Yes.

AH: —and shaping that department, which was originally the, um, Comparative North American Studies Department—

CS: No, that's not really true, actually, correct. There were two programs. There was Comparative North American Studies, and there was African American Studies. So it's the combination—the program is the combination of the two. But in the mid-nine—well, yeah, they had a couple of years of— When I was here, there was a—a group of students occupied the Trustee's meeting. And as a result, the provost at the time, Wayne Roberts, tried—and they were asking for an ethnic studies program. And there had been efforts before that to get an ethnic studies program. And there was a—Wayne Roberts wrote to a few faculty and asked them to both participate in a committee that would develop a response and also, in their own work, to begin doing more race. Which had a big—the second one had an impact on me. I declined, for

various reasons, to participate in the first one. But the second one had a really big impact on me. And it led to a discuss—there was some talk about having an American Studies program and then other talk about [how] we needed a separate African-American studies program, and what does American Studies mean, and all that... Anyway, after a lot, a lot of effort and work and talk—again, there was conversation, there was a program called Comparative North American Studies established, and an African American Studies program established. And there was a good group of people who were involved. I was involved in the establishment of Comparative North American Studies with—Janet Carlson was the major person in that. And then also Anna Meigs was very involved in that, and Jim Stewart was involved in that. And then there were a couple other people who [were] involved in that, like Cal Roetzel and Mahnaz Kousha. And, and others, I'm sure. And then, eventually, it was decided to combine the two. And then there was a lot of discussion and they ended up calling that combination American Studies.

[1:57:27]

AH: Do you find it a welcome addition to campus offerings?

CS: Well, I was never thrilled about calling it American Studies because it didn't have anything about race in it. And so that's why you have the—you have this compromise where you had this dean of race and ethnic studies [Dean for the Study of Race and Ethnicity], but it's the American Studies program. But I'm sorry, your question was...?

AH: Just a general "What do you think of the program?" I guess.

CS: I think the program is good—has wonderful faculty. But it hasn't been adequately supported. And so there's a lot of issues with that. But... It was also—there was this big struggle about—we used to have what we called “the pillars”—Macalester—do you know about that?

AH: Slightly.

[1:58:16]

CS: Oof. Multiculturalism, internationalism, and service, in the context of academic excellence. And—

AH: And Gavin instituted those?

CS: Yes, this was in—before I came, in '92. And there were—my understanding of the history—but there are other people you can talk to about that. That the faculty had trouble just agreeing on what the strategic plan would be. And then I think he just made a strategic plan. That's the kind of guy he was. And so, that's how it came out. And so, a lot of us were constantly arguing that, “Well, why is internationalism getting all these resources and multiculturalism so much less?” Well, we knew why, but the—we fought against that and so the dean's position was designed to even that out. It was partly a response to that.

[1:59:21]

AH: Why do you think there was and is an inequity between the two?

CS: I think—there's two reasons. One is that there was a lot of grant money to be found in supporting internationalism. Internationalism—the way they envisioned internationalism, it involved contact between elites around the world. There were international alumni, we had this history of internationalism. Ahmed Samatar, who was the dean of International Studies, was a most forceful advocate for it. And it was a way the college was trying to brand itself. And none of these things applied to multiculturalism. And then, in addition, there was a kind of academic snobbery that—I don't know how much this is still around, so I'm not—you know, because the generations change. But there was this idea that the courses about multiculturalism were not—as they used to say about courses in women's and gender studies—are not serious courses the way that internationalism courses are.

AH: [laughs]

[2:00:39]

CS: I've even heard people in the languages talk about a hierarchy of the languages: that some languages are better than other—more important than others. And these discussions always map power relations in the society, right? So, it's—I find all that pretty, really offensive. But it's... And so I think that was—anyway... So, we fought for that, and then, you know, what happened is that after we got—it took us like four years to find a dean. It was very hard. I was on the search—maybe it was three years. I think I was on—I think it was three years and I was on the search committee two, two out of the three years. One year I was away. And then, Ahmed Samatar fought to become the dean of global studies so that he would be like, be above the dean

of race and ethnic studies. Because his argument, and the argument of his supporters, was that global study—that internationalism included multiculturalism, global studies included multicultural studies. And, you know, that the—it was about the institute. It was the dean of the institute that [unclear]. And that the institute included both, but that was always quite [a] problematic matter. Yeah, I'm hoping it gets better but I don't know. I have no idea.

[2:02:09]

AH: Right. And one thing that wasn't on this list of questions, but I'm very interested in asking you—you, of course, were around for our shift to need-aware, um—

CS: Yes.

AH: —from a need-blind school.

CS: Yes.

AH: Did you notice a change in the student body or a, sort of a campus atmosphere as a result of that?

CS: Well, there's a change in the sense that the college—there's a change in the college's self-conceptualization. So, I used to say the reason that I'm proudest to have served at Macalester College is because of its financial aid policy. Which is so much better, in terms of the percentage of people who are getting need-based financial aid, than at the other comparable

schools. And I think—at the college I went to, I think it's around forty percent. And we're around seventy percent of—

AH: Right.

CS: Think about two things. One is: think about the difference in the populations. And the other is: think about the difference in their revenues. So there's always been a tension because this policy has cost the college enormous amounts of money. And had led, I think, to decisions, like involving the athletic building, where they want to build facilities that will attract full-payers. I mean, that's not the only reason that they made a change in the athletic department. But I think that that was a crucial reason that it got such high priority. And so the way in which the need-blind was presented to us, the need-aware was presented to us—I think we're still roughly at the same percentage that we were then, or higher, but that's because of the downturn in the economy. So, I don't know how much it's affected—and I think there's certainly a number of students who would have—who were qualified, who would have been admitted every year since it came in, who did not get to go to Macalester College because of that. And that has made us somewhat less economically diverse than we would have been. But even with this policy, we are nothing like the US in general.

AH: Right.

[2:04:14]

CS: Right? You know, and so—I think that, uh, I think this college...is a private college. But it gets *enormous* government subsidy. First of all, we don't pay local property taxes except on properties that are involved in non-educational activities. We may contribute to things like the median—the traffic medians—to certain small things, but we don't pay a regular in lieu of fee, in lieu of taxes fee. So the city of Saint Paul is denied taxes on us, but not only on us. Also on St. Thomas [University of St. Thomas], St. Kate's [St. Catherine University], and you know. And I think that that confers an enormous obligation on us to be connected to the city and serve the people of the city, which we don't do. You know? In anywhere near the way that we should. Or the way we used to! We used to have this MACCESS program in the summer for disadvantaged kids—

AH: Really?

[2:05:16]

CS: Yeah. You know, to help them prepare for college. Gone. You know? There's just all kinds of things we could be doing that we're not doing. We should—you know, we have a small—again, it's grant-based—we got a small, some Bonner money, I think, where we brought in some local kids. But—this is what we should be doing. We're getting this tremendous subsidized—subsidy. We don't pay sales tax, state sales tax, when we buy things for the college for educational use. We all have this—a number that we can use to avoid that. But the biggest subsidy is the endowment pays no taxes. Plus, everyone who gives to the endowment, gets a tax write-off. So, let's say you're in, I don't know, let's say you're in the thirty-five percent bracket plus you have another ten percent of state taxes. That means that if you give a hundred thousand

dollars, it costs you fifty-five thousand dollars. And the—on your last dollar—I mean I'm oversimplifying it, but the federal government is kicking in the other forty-five thousand, plus the state. Also the state government is—well, the federal and state governments combined are kicking in the other forty-five thousand! That is a hell of a lot of money! Public money that is going into this school!

AH: [laughs] Right.

CS: Plus, the student loans, the Pell Grants... I mean, just enormous amounts of public money coming to this school. We have an obligation to serve the public. But that's not in the thinking of the—as far as I can tell—that's not in the thinking of the Trustees and the top administrators. Beyond, you know, they may give it a thought. Again, I'm sure they're not opposed to it. But they're not going to go out of their way—

AH: It's just not the—

CS: No, no.

AH: —plan of action.

[2:07:04]

CS: No. And, so, I mean, the larger issue is this: we may not be the richest private college in the country anymore. But we have, as we've said, I don't think the endowment is like—now is

like seven hundred million dollars or something. That's a lot of money! For the number of employees we have and the number of students we have... I've been here almost twenty years and I think that having all that money, we had an obligation to become a special place. A distinctive place. We should have used that money well to become a distinctive place. Now, in Macalester's—the history that I know of, which is the history I experienced, and then the history that was told to me by people who were here before, and then some of the history I've read about—at least, since the '60s, if not before, there's been—I mean, I think this goes way back, actually. But it certainly came to a head in the '60s, and since then—there's been a tension between what kind of school are we going to be.

AH: Right. Absolutely.

[2:08:06]

CS: Are we going to try to be an imitation Williams [College] or an imitation Carleton [College]? Or are we going to be something different that takes advantage of our urban location and that has a distinct commitment to social justice? And when I got here, that was actively being debated. And since Brian [President Rosenberg] came in, that—I'm not blaming it all on him. But I think he's got a position on it. [laughs] Since around the time Brian came in, that discussion has been deflated. And I think, by now—when you consider all the turnover in faculty, basically, it's the side that wants to be a lower-ranked Williams or a lower-ranked Carleton. But they don't want to be lower rank. But they want to be at those kinds of schools... And I think that's a terrible shame because there already is a Carleton and a Williams. And we had a chance to be something distinctive and different and make a greater difference in the

world. Not just, as we do, [a] great difference in the lives of comparatively affluent young individuals. And I think that's really a shame.

AH: Do you think the opportunity is lost?

[2:09:33]

CS: No, it's never lost. We could get a new president. I mean, how could it not—it's not lost. But at every turn—I mean, Brian came in and his first speech at his first graduation was to talk about how we need more conservatives' voices on campus. I mean it's—the idea of embracing the identity of—when I applied to the college, I looked at all the guidebooks. And what they said is this is like *the* activist place in the country, you know. We have a strong commitment to social justice, and all that stuff... I don't know this for sure, but they acted as if their goal—this started before I got here, with Gavin. When they hired Gavin, I think the Trustees' goal was to change that description. And they've changed it. I mean, it's still there somewhat but now it's more internationalism, I mean—

[2:10:30]

AH: Wait, what would you give as a description of Macalester in 2012?

CS: What would I give?

AH: Yeah, if you were to describe this college: the feel, the culture...

CS: Well, I think the students are still unusually progressive. And, as I said, they're unusually well-meaning and earnest and just good people. And the school is definitely much less Minnesotan and less Upper Midwest than it was. Which I'm not sure how I feel about that, actually. But the discourse of, you know, there's this Macalester tradition that we honor, has definitely been submerged. And, you—I spent years hearing administrators and faculty rail against the students for being superficial progressives and things like that... I just, you know—it's like they love the school if only there would be different students here. And I love the students here! The students here are great! And they're not that radical actually. The number of students who are, [who] ever have been very radical is really small. Just as the number of faculty who are all that radical is quite small. And getting smaller and smaller. But that's—that's somewhat exaggerated. But they are, you know, unusually progressive. But I think that they're trying to, more and more as they deemphasize that, that's going to change the student—that has changed the student body some and is going to change it more.

[2:11:59]

AH: What is—do you have an idea of what you think the college is going to look like in five, ten years—

CS: No.

AH: —given the current path?

CS: No, I think it—you know, all colleges are facing this crisis of the high tuition, of the money, of...and so forth. And it very much depends on the president and what the president's goals are. Because I know too much about other colleges and how they've changed when they've gotten new presidents.

AH: Right. And who was—how many presidents have you been under?

CS: Three.

[2:12:32]

AH: Three. And you've talked about how the identity has shifted. Are there other ways you've seen the college shift under different administrations?

CS: Well, Mike McPherson was I think, more—he saw—he tried to balance those two visions. But he wasn't great at getting stuff done. That was the problem with him. But he—but I think his vision of the school was different. Where I think Brian's—I don't know what the Trustees told him when they hired him, you know, I mean... Years, years passed, historical memory disappears, so the EEO program [Expanded Educational Opportunities] from the early '70s when they brought in a lot of impoverished students, relatively impoverished students—I think a hundred or two hundred, to Macalester at an enorm—

AH: Seventy-five a year.

CS: Seventy-five a year? So, that's a lot.

AH: Yeah.

CS: Yeah. And had an enormous staff, mostly African-American, working with them. I saw a picture of the staff once. You can actually find it on the Internet. It's enormous! Like there were like eighteen people, or something, I don't know. It was just enormous. And then it got, and then it got killed. The most moving moment of all my time at Macalester, Dave—David Reynolds was there. Unfortunately was not captured on videotape, but I think it's on audiotape. It was during the first big Alumni of Color Reunion that I knew about. And it was this session on the EEO. And they had students—this was my experience as a college student; I assume it will be yours, too—will have been yours, too—is that you know the people that you're in school with. Right? The people that were before them seem long ago and the people after them seem long after them. Right? So that your knowledge of the school extends to, I don't know, maybe seven years worth, or something, right?

[2:14:30]

Well, the EEO program, from the time it was first agitated for, to the time when it completely ended was, I don't know how many years it was, but it was a lot. It was more than seven years. So there were people on the different ends who didn't know each other. And they met. And they had a panel, and they met, and they talked, and people talked from the audience about their own experiences on the program. And there were people crying all over the place. And it was *so* moving. *So* moving. One after the other, people talked about what a difference it made in their lives. And I remember a local kid, who was African-American, got up and talked about

what a difference it made in her life *having it here*, even though she didn't go here. You know? I mean, this was a transformative thing. And it had its problems and all that. But it—you know, like all other social programs. Basically when they fail it's because they're underfunded. And it got underfunded at the end. And the college had a crisis and, you know. But the—when I got here, that was like the devil. President Gavin—I was in a discussion where he personally told us this story of the EEO. And it was in such negative terms with racial stereotypes that, you know—I didn't—I wasn't sure if I had tenure, or whatever, I just didn't. So, I didn't speak up against it. But the—and then I find out—I just found out this year that there was this other program with Knoxville College!

[2:16:13]

AH: Right, yeah.

CS: And nobody knew about that! It's not in Jeanne Kilde's book about Macalester. It was like completely—completely forgotten.

AH: I was at the, um, panel where they were all discussing—

CS: Oh, yeah, wow! Yeah.

AH: —and it just—

CS: You know—there's just this whole history here. And the—it's—except for people who occasionally rediscover it and bring it up, it's gone. And one of the things that's bothered me about *The Mac Weekly* in the last ten years is that they pretty much completely swallow whatever Brian tells them. And so there's all this stuff that's gone on here in the last ten years that's not in *The Mac Weekly*. So, anybody who tries to do a history of the college, using *The Mac Weekly* in the last ten years...

AH: Yeah.

CS: And, well then, where else is it going to be? You know, maybe except for these kinds of interviews, I don't know. Um—

AH: That's the hope! [laughs]

[2:17:04]

CS: Yeah, right. Yeah, I appreciate your doing it. But the—so there is this tradition here, and it's an exciting tradition! You know, we had an exciting connection with the American Indian Movement. We used to have a faculty member on campus who was of—partly of Native American background, but was a famous Native American writer. You know, we have other faculty who are—we have another faculty member of Native American descent. But you can't just—because somebody is of partial descent, you can't expect them... That's prejudice to expect them to raise these issues. And so you want to have a bunch of people, so there's a good chance somebody will raise the issue, right? You can't require it of anybody... But that's gone.

And so when the English Department went to replace her, that became one of the options of what the replacement could do rather than this—we need to make sure we maintain this. Again, it's not that people are against it, it's that it's not a high enough priority. So I think Macalester's chance to be a really distinctive place is—I think they blew it. They had all this money and they blew it. It's still—the kids who come here get a great education, you know. There's things I would change about it, like I would have a real writing program. And you know, other kinds of things. So it could be tinkered with around the edges. But you know, you have such smart, dedicated faculty. And the students are so willing and earnest that there's a lot of learning that goes on here. That's one thing Brian said to me soon after he came here, was that, you know, all this stuff goes on at the top. But the real—what counts is what goes in the classroom. And in one sense, he's right. Except that, I think that not having an abundance of faculty of African-American and Latina- Latino-American faculty, interferes with the quality of the students' education. Because it makes it too narrow—given the country that they're going out to and they're going to live in.

[2:19:09]

AH: Absolutely. Well, I want to ask what your experience with phased retirement has been and what you consider your relationship to the college to be at this time?

CS: I have friends in academia; I know something about what goes on at other colleges. And I believe that I am one of the luckiest people. You know, when I took the job, I didn't know about MSFEO. And I am so lucky to have it. It's just such a great thing. I'm going to China next year; I have a Fulbright. I'm going to be teaching in China.

AH: Really?

CS: Yeah, so I'm postponing entering until the year after so I can't tell you what it's like—

AH: —what it's like yet, but just—

CS: —to be in the program. But it's—without it, I wouldn't be retiring now. And in the way that I talked about older faculty—my resentment as a younger person of older faculty, trying to still exercise control over the future. I sort of always felt the same way about faculty—it's really important to have younger faculty. And I think it's very important to—you know, I was in grad school in the 1970s, mid-1970s, taught by people who were—had been trained in the '60s and the '50s and so, you know. Well, that's like sixty-five years ago!

[both laugh]

[2:20:40]

CS: Right? That they're—that's not right. Right? I mean, so I think there's—I believe in early retire—I'm glad that we don't have mandatory retirement. Because if we had mandatory retirement, they wouldn't need the MSFEO program. [laughs] And there's some people who do manage to keep up. But, you know, I feel like I'm doing good by my students to let them be taught by somebody new. I mean, I can still fake it, but I don't think—I don't want to do that. So this is a—it's a great program for contributing to the vivaciousness of the college. I'm not

saying that my older colleagues aren't doing the job anymore, that I wasn't doing the job, but it's different.

AH: So, do you plan to be teaching at all when you come back?

CS: No, not at Macalester. No. I did take a course on my sabbatical in teaching English as a second language. I took a one-month concentrated course. And so I may do that in the community. But I'm not sure what I'm going to do with that. I'm, you know, we're going to China—my wife's taking a leave of absence of a year from her job at the medical school at the U [University of Minnesota]. And so things—I think we're open about what we're going to do. It's nice to be in that situation again, yeah.

[2:22:01]

AH: Fantastic. So, I guess, we just move on to the general reflections that we usually end interviews with. So, what have you most enjoyed about being part of the faculty at Macalester?

CS: Teaching the students here. And then a few of my colleagues have been great. And a lot—and a number of them have been really good colleagues. And I enjoyed working with some administrators. And with the staff. I mean, the staff here is terrific. They're overworked, you know—as you probably know, the ratio of staff to students here is much lower [than] at most other colleges, which means that people just have to do more and more work. And this is on top of what we were talking about with the emails, and all that. And so this—I think the staff here do a tremendous job. And the students are just terrific, you know. And especially being able to

shape the curriculum so that we have these advanced courses... My goal, once we became a separate department, when we became Media, excuse me, Media and Cultur—I think we were—well when we became—first we became Humanities and Media and Cultural Studies—

AH: Oh yeah?

CS: Yeah, we haven't talked about—

AH: I have a whole list.

[2:23:23]

CS: Yeah, we could talk about that for a few minutes. Was the old Communications Studies Depart—Communication and Media Studies—it became Communication and Media Studies soon—peaked at around sixty. In terms of majors. And so I figured, since about half of the students were speech students, that if we could hit thirty, that we were doing fine. And I think we've met that goal. So, I think we've—we're not, you know, we're not a department where we're trying to be the largest department on campus. We're not a department where we're trying to have high enrollments. There's a lot of courses on campus that are shaped by the desire for high enrollments. It's not that different from the way that the programs and commercials are shaped, you know, on *Fantasy Island* by economic forces. The difference is that, actually, I think a lot of the pressure to have high enrollments is more in people's heads than it actually is real. Obviously, you don't want to have too low enrollments, but... But, anyway, that's not... And so, we've tried to have the most academically rigorous curriculum that we could have, to

give the students as much as we could. And that's meant keeping our class sizes down, putting in these prerequisites, which also functions to keep the class sizes down. And having the freedom to do that. I've, you know, never been hassled about that. Has been a gift. And I think—from the various provosts—and have benefitted our, has benefitted our students.

AH: Great. And—

[2:25:12]

CS: Do you want to go back to the history of...

AH: We can, or we could just move on—it's been a pretty long interview, so...

CS: OK. I could tell you about it for like—in five minutes, I can—

AH: If that would be fine. I just was wondering, sort of, how the evolution of the department went about.

CS: Right, right. When I got here, there were a number of—when I say when I got here, that means [the history I know starts from] when I got here. When I got here, I discovered that there were a number of faculty in various departments in the humanities and social sciences who were dissatisfied with the dominance of traditional methodologies in certain disciplines. Because they felt they didn't talk enough, adequately enough about history and culture and power.

AH: Right.

[2:25:59]

CS: And in their own departments, as junior faculty, which most of us were, or most of them were at the time, they felt like they didn't have the freedom to offer courses that they had wanted to offer and that they might not get the enrollments that they needed, or whatever. And so, a few of us, and I'm thinking mostly of Andy Overman, Jim von Geldern, Paul Solon, and me. And I think also Joëlle Vitiello, and Linda Schulte-Sasse [were] involved somewhat—got together and decided to—we talked about this. Before I got here, I know Linda had been involved in projects, in these discussions—the kind I talked about—to try to set up a cultural studies program. Or some—film and cultural studies, or something like that. And so there was a history of this. So it wasn't like—and there was a humanities program on campus that was mostly led by—which was an older program, which was an interdisciplinary major—

AH: Right.

[2:27:07]

CS: And it was led by older faculty who were mostly getting ready to retire. And we realized, we probably couldn't get enough support because there was a lot of hostility at the time to what was called, "postmodern thought." And to the opponents of post-modern thought, it was a much bigger umbrella than people who were actually—were proponents or who understood it or [unclear] had some sympathy for it. But anyway, we thought we might not be able to get that through. So we negotiated a deal. And this took a lot of conversation of the kind I think

administrators should be having with [unclear]. We negotiated a deal with the retiring faculty that we would have a joint program. And that we would honor their commitments in the program, that we would keep the name “Humanities,” that we would, as much as possible, allow for their kinds of courses to be taught. And then we would also have courses in cultural studies. So the Humanities program became Humanities and Cultural Studies and it was an independent program. And then, when we had the—after we had the problems I talked about in our department, one of the options for us became to make that part of our department. Continue the program and become an interdisciplinary department, and so that’s what we did. So that’s why we became—

AH: Humanities and Media and Cultural Studies.

CS: —and Cultural Studies. Right.

[2:28:52]

AH: And then humanities got dropped last year. It was the last time [unclear] majors.

CS: Right—yes and there were people for many years arguing to drop the label, but I and other people felt that, as long as there were people around from the humanities side who negotiated that deal, that we should not drop that label. So then it finally got to the point where they were all retired or in MSFEO and so then we said, “OK.”

AH: OK. And went ahead.

CS: Yeah. And because it was very unwieldy, and didn't really make sense. I mean, it's, in a lot of ways... And there weren't that many traditional humanities courses anymore being offered and so... Because most humanities faculty now, all their courses seemed to be influenced by cultural studies in one way or another—

AH: Absolutely.

CS: Not all the humanities [unclear] but most of them.

AH: And curriculum changed a little bit in that there's less early philosophers...? [pause]

Sorry, pardon me.

CS: Yeah, don't know.

[2:29:49]

AH: Doesn't really matter. To go back to general reflections—

CS: Right.

AH: I know we've been directly and indirectly talking about these two questions—

CS: Oh right, there's one part of that. So, when we—

AH: OK.

CS: —we became Communication and Media Studies, we dropped—

AH: —you dropped the—Communication Studies—

CS: Communic—and Media and Cult—

AH: —was dropped.

CS: —and right. And then, Media and Cultural Studies, grew out of Humanities. We dropped the Humanities part, and became Media and Cultural Studies. And the reason we did that is we wanted to become a—not an interdisciplinary major, but a coherent major for students who were interested in media studies. So that, yeah, this is where—now I understand your question—

AH: Great, yeah.

CS: So, we used to require students to take courses, a pre-1700 course—

AH: Exactly.

CS: —a post-1700 course—you know. It was a fourteen-course major and now we're a nine-course major that's about Media, you know, Media Studies and Cultural Studies.

AH: Great. OK.

CS: OK. So it's a more coherent major now.

[2:30:57]

AH: [laughs] So, what are your major critiques of Macalester and what do you feel are Macalester's greatest strengths? Which is also what we've been talking about...

CS: Yeah, I think we sort of talked about that. I feel like, uh—

AH: But if there's anything else that didn't [come] out—brought up in the course of the interview...

CS: I think Macalester has an opportunity to be a distinctively wonderful place. And to make a contribution to making the world a better place. I mean, not necessarily in the ways that I would want it to—you know, that I would see it. Because it should be a community decision. But in a way that's much more engaged in a serious way with serving people. Not just by doing small service tasks, but actually having the institution engaged in the community. Bringing more local kids into the college. Helping them prepare for college, trying to have a diverse student body. You know, one of the things that happens when you—as a white person, when you start working

on issues of race is that people of color who are having problems begin to talk to you about their situations in ways that normally they wouldn't talk to white people about them because they think they're not going to be sympathetic. Once that starts to happen, the world, as a person from, you know, a European background, Eastern European background, the world starts to look very different. Most white people live segregated lives. They don't hear anything from African-Americans and Latina- Latino-Americans and Asian-Americans about their experiences of dealing with difference in power in this society. They won't know how people suffer from discrimination and to suffer from being looked at sideways and to suffer from lack of genuinely equal opportunities. People don't know that. They don't hear that. When they hear it, they may hear it from media spokespeople, but that's usually in a far different context.

[2:33:25]

So that the more you work on these issues, the more you find out about it. And then, especially for those of us who work more on the issues academically, you start to really understand how racism functions in this society. How whiteness functions in the society. And then you start to see things differently. And then the problems, the failure of—for example, it's just an example of Macalester—to deal with these issues become[s] all the more serious and all the more dire. And, so you have to get the ball rolling, and rolling fast, to bring people in. And we used to actually have grant-driven—a lot of programs to get people thinking and talking about these issues. But they're, as far as I can tell, they're pretty much gone now. And people don't... And so that's a tremendous loss, especially—we had an opportunity—we have an opportunity, with all the money we have, *not* to do things based on money issues. And I don't think we've lived up to our obligation to the community, to the taxpayers, and to the contributors to be a distinctive place. I don't think we've had leaders with the courage and the ability to—or maybe the

desire—to make that happen. But I think the potential is there but I just—it's—I've had a great time here. More or less. But I'm treated very well. [laughs] But I think that the—so I have no personal complaints. But the college itself has not become what I thought it would be when I arrived here nineteen years ago.

[2:35:18]

AH: Yeah. Overall, what experiences have been most meaningful for you during that time?

CS: The two have been working with colleagues, building programs, talking about our research. But the most important one has been working with just the most wonderful students anybody could possibly want to have. You know? And—

AH: So flattering. [laughs]

CS: —if anything, they've, over the years, have—I'm not sure how I feel about this from a social justice perspective, but we—because there's implications of this, but we've dropped off, in my mind. We seem to have dropped off about the bottom quarter of the students and then the top ten percent has like doubled. And so that makes teaching even more fun and easier and more challenging, you know? And so, you know, that's—it's just been great. I've just—you know, I really look forward to going to class. It's not work.

AH: That's fantastic.

CS: Yeah.

[2:36:21]

AH: And, um, leaving Macalester, what are you most looking forward to in the future? Aside from China, and that's so cool. [laughs]

CS: In general, it's having more control over my own life. Having my life back. As a professor at a place like Macalester, the work is potentially infinite. There's always more you could be reading, there's always more you could be writing. There's always more time you could be spending on your courses. There's always more time you could be spending with your students. And so, especially if you want to have any sort of outside life, it's enormously demanding. And not having that is, uh—yeah, now, is very nice.

[both laugh]

[2:37:15]

CS: You know, it's the first time in—I've been teaching—this would have been my thirty-fifth year teaching. And so, it's nice—and then you had grad school, which is also where the work is infinite. So that's like thirty-eight years. So it's nice to be more like a normal person again, you know, and have time, and to be able to read fiction, you know. Of course for me, watching movies is a great pleasure. And there's more now available than ever so there's all kinds of things I can see that I've never even seen before. And to not have to worry about, OK, what am I going to say about this and what am I going to do with it—but just experience it. To watch the

news and not think about: what am I going to say about this or how am I going to present this or how can I use this as an example in my teaching? That quite hasn't started yet because I have been teaching. But, just that general idea, it's, um—

AH: Buy your time.

CS: What?

AH: Buy your time.

CS: Right—I can now buy time. Yeah. But to have time and not be so busy because I'm, you know... I once read that somebody said that—who worked with people who were dying—that nobody on their deathbed ever says, "I wish I had spent more time at the office."

AH: Yeah.

[2:38:37]

CS: And Macalester's very seductive because the students are so wonderful. The basic project of the school has so many positive aspects, that when you're asked to do stuff and you're—by students or by the administration or by other faculty—it's very hard to say, "No." And I was never—I wasn't the worst person about saying, "No," but I was not the best person about saying, "No." And so it—now, nobody asks me anymore. [laughs]

It's great!

[both laugh]

AH: Great.

CS: And the college gives me the wherewithal to do it, you know, so that's...

[2:39:18]

AH: Fantastic. Is there anything else you'd like to add to the record before we close?

CS: Um... No, I'm just glad that they—you know, the other person didn't take the job. And that I got the job. I'm so lucky.

[both laugh]

AH: Absolutely. Well, thank you so much for agreeing to be interviewed—

CS: Sure.

AH: It's been very illuminating.

CS: Yeah? I hope so.

[both laugh]

CS: I hope it's helpful.

AH: No, definitely.

CS: Thank you. Thanks for your questions. Great questions.

AH: Thanks.

[End of Interview 2:39:48]