

BARNARD COLLEGE CLASS OF 1971 ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION

The Reminiscences of
Carrie Menkel-Meadow

2015

PREFACE

The following oral history is the result of a recorded interview with Carrie Menkel-Meadow conducted by Janet Price on August 13, 2015. This interview is part of the Barnard College Class of 1971 Oral History Project.

The reader is asked to bear in mind that s/he is reading a verbatim transcript of the spoken word, rather than written prose.

Barnard Alumni Class of 1971 Oral History Project

Interviewee: Janet Price

Location: Los Angeles, CA

Interviewer: Carrie Menkel-Meadow

Date: August 13, 2015

00:00:01 Videographer: Recording. What day is today?

00:00:07 Q: Today would be August 12, 2015.

00:00:12 Meadow: Isn't it August thirteenth?

00:00:13 Q: No, that's tomorrow. No, you're right. It's the thirteenth today. We came in on the tenth. Let's have a do-over.

00:00:24 Videographer: What year is it?

00:00:26 Q: 2015. In the year of our lord.

00:00:28 Videographer: Anno Domini.

00:00:32 Q: Yeah. And I'm here with the wonderful Carrie Menkel-Meadow, who is about to be interviewed for the Barnard Oral History project, and I am Janet Price, and our loyal

videographer is my wife, Linda Rzesniowiecki. And now Frances [Connell] will be happy with me because you're supposed to do that at the beginning.

00:00:52 Meadow: Hi Frances. Frances's husband was my student. Ex-husband I understand.

00:01:02 Q: So, um, Carrie, we have to decide where to begin. Do you like to do things chronologically?

00:01:08 Meadow: It doesn't matter.

00:01:09 Videographer: Say today's date.

00:01:10 Q: We did that already. It's still videotaping.

00:01:12 Meadow: Okay. August 13, 2015. Janet Price with Carrie Menkel-Meadow.

00:01:18 Q: Okay, so let's start from the very beginning. Tell me about your family, and where they come from, where you come from and your early childhood.

00:01:28 Meadow: I was born in Peter Cooper Village in lower Manhattan. My parents are German Holocaust refugees. I'm very careful these days not to say survivors because neither of them were in camps, but they, um, they have an interesting story. They were from the same town: Cologne, Germany. My father was raised as a Catholic. My mother was an ethnic, not

religious Jew. So when they met in New York City many years later, during the war, after my mother had escaped in 1941 on the last boat that made it across the ocean. The boat that she was on was sunk on the way back, so she got out very late—1941. And my father had told his German girlfriend he was going to send for her. And apparently there was some kind of underground network in Germany, so my father's girlfriend had gone to call on my mother and said, "When you get to New York City"—1941—"find out why Gunter Menkel hasn't sent for me yet." So my mother went and found my father on 73rd Street and Amsterdam and went to visit him and he said, "To hell with Inga. What are you doing tonight?" And they then discovered that as teenagers they had been at the same football, soccer matches, they'd gone to the same middle-class dancing schools, but my mother behind the yellow ribbon with the yellow star because the Jews were allowed to go to some of these places in the thirties, but restricted. So, apartheid basically. And so my parents were from the same town, but didn't know each other as children.

And I grew up in New York—born in Manhattan. Moved out to Queens when I was about five. And every Sunday of my life, including my years at Barnard [College], until my junior year, every Sunday, all four of my surviving grandparents came over, and we had Sunday dinner. And in German—which I understand fluently, though I don't speak it—I heard the story of my parents' histories in Germany, which were pretty interesting. So it's a very important part of my background that I—the children of Holocaust refugees—I do a lot of work on Holocaust refugees now as an academic and boards I serve on. But I also think it led me to go to Barnard because I was a good Holocaust-surviving kid and I didn't want to leave my parents, even though I think I might have been better off leaving. So, I grew up in Manhattan with my grandparents every

Sunday, and then we moved to Queens where I went to public high schools, which—I think you’d appreciate this—I think going to public high schools is one of the best things that ever happened to me.

00:04:15 Q: And why is that?

00:04:16 Meadow: Um, because I went to a very big high school in Queens—Jamaica High School. (See recent article in *The New Yorker*, Jelani Cobb, “Class Notes” *New Yorker*, August 31, 2015, pp. 32-40 about Jamaica High School and its diversity and sad demise). It was enormous and quite diverse. Actually, a number of my friends in my crowd were black, which was pretty unheard of at the time, and there were also sororities and fraternities which were terrible. I was rejected by every cool sorority, which really framed my existence. I later on ran for office in high school, and I ran on the fraternity and sorority party to show them that I could, you know, do stuff they didn’t want me to do. And my husband, who I met in high school, but was not boyfriend and girlfriend with, was president of the fanciest, coolest fraternity for boys. You know, he was a basketball player and he was very cool. And so I had to prove to all these snotty New York girls that I was my own person. So, I think it framed my being independent and being my own person. If I’d actually gone into a sorority I might have been one of those horrible conformists, of which there were many in my high school. And I’ll just say that my mother, who suffered a lot in her life, said that as a mom, it was the hardest experience of her life, because when I got rejected by the sorority I cried for about six weeks and thought I wasn’t going to have any friends, and there was nothing she could do about it. It’s very sad. My mother said for her, it made her feel very powerless, even more so than when she was dealing with [Adolf] Hitler in

Germany in some bizarre way. So, um, the bigness of the school, the diversity of the school, and my deciding to show those folks who didn't think I was cool enough for them made me a very good student; I studied hard, and I think I learned in those years to be my own person. You'll appreciate this—when I registered at Barnard that first day as a commuter, I remember going to fill out my forms, and the person on the other side said to me, "I think you're in the wrong line, dear. You should be with the seniors." And I said, "No, no. I'm a freshperson, woman." I guess we said freshman at the time. I was quaking inside, but she said, "You seem so secure and mature." And she thought I was older than I was! So that's what the New York City high schools gave me. (telephone rings)

00:06:36 Q: Did you have brothers and sisters?

0:06:37 Meadow: Yes. I have a younger brother, and his name is Robert Adlai Menkel. He's a doctor in New York and his interesting issue is that my parents—I remember them fighting, I was four years old—my father wanted to name my brother Adlai, for Adlai Stevenson II, their hero. And my mother said, "You can't do that to a little kid who's not going to be able to spell his own name. And someday he may have a Republican teacher, and that would be terrible." So they argued and the compromise was Robert Adlai Menkel. And my mother turned out to be right because in sixth grade, in our public Queens elementary school, my brother had a Republican teacher who gave him a really hard time all year, and he couldn't spell it until he was in ten years old. But now—I'm very proud of him—he's a doctor and a very progressive Democrat and he's very proud of his name. And we were very close when we were kids. Very close.

00:07:31 Q: What's the age difference?

00:07:32 Meadow: Almost five—four and a half to five years.

00:07:37 Q: _____ (??) So, describe your neighborhood that you grew up in.

00:07:40 Meadow: So, I was originally in Peter Cooper Village, then in Stuyvesant Town (Manhattan, 23rd St.). I was what I would call close to but not completely a red diaper baby. My father's father in Germany had been a communist, and actually he was a pacifist. He shot his pinky off in World War I so that he wouldn't have to be in the war (WWI). So, Stuyvesant—Peter Cooper Village in Stuyvesant Town in those days—that was a very progressive community, and I loved it. I was born in Peter Cooper Village, which I believe only had two bedrooms. So when my brother was born, we moved to Stuyvesant. What I loved about it, there were a lot of kids, I remember the playground; my first memory as a kid is falling in the playground. I have a scar here on my chin. But my parents had very progressive friends, um, and it was a real community. And my father wanted a house. If the Holocaust hadn't happened and he hadn't been kicked out of school in Germany—that's an interesting story—I think he would have been an architect. So we moved to Queens in a VA [US Department of Veterans Affairs]-subsidized house, and my father completely redid the house. All of the paintings that are in this house now are his (over 30 of them). He was an engineer by training, but he was an architect and a designer and he made most of the furniture that is in this house still. He just died last year at ninety-three in New York. So, um, I grew up in a house that my father was always changing, and

I hated that. I hate change, even though there's been a lot of change in my life, and, um, so there were always projects in the house. There was always construction. He was always making things. The house was pretty small. Um, nice little Queens three-bedroom house. And when I was in high school, he designed and had built a house in Holliswood, so it was the fancier part of Queens—Jamaica Estates. And the bratty kid that I was, I decided—I was already beginning to be pretty political—I didn't want to move to Jamaica Estates, that was too fancy. So I moved in with a friend for a while. Terrible, bratty kid. Eventually, we moved into the house and it was beautiful. But that neighborhood had the upper-middle-class kids in my high school, and I had identified with being, you know, a lefty, middle-class kid. My original block in Jamaica was also very mixed, both religiously and also a little class-wise, and as a kid, I was raised Ethical Culture. My father had been raised Catholic; my mother, [an] assimilated Jew in Germany. And my father told this incredible story—which I just recounted in his little memorial service—when he was twelve years old playing the organ in the Kölner Dom, the big cathedral in Germany, he read a poem by [Johann Wolfgang von] Goethe called “Prometheus,” which says, “Poverty, illness, death, war, destruction. God, if you made these things, I can't believe in you. And, God if you made these things, why can't you correct them?” Or something like that.

So, when I was quite a young girl, my father said that he didn't believe in religion, and we joined Ethical Culture, which in the fifties was a religion founded in—actually, it was founded in your hometown, in Chicago—in the late nineteenth century by Felix Adler, very progressive. But the kids who went to Sunday school were almost all the product of mixed marriages. And I wanted to read the Bible, and then I got this idea in my head I wanted communion when I was seven years old because our street was filled with Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. It was quite

extraordinary. It was the best of New York, and so I had an interesting childhood of friends that were quite different, and pretty ecumenical. I mean, the big issue on our block was whether you were a Yankees fan or a Dodger fan. And I now say that I'm in a mixed marriage because my husband upstairs, who grew up—born in Brooklyn, grew up in Queens—he came from a Yankee family, and I was a Dodger girl, which was cute when we moved to LA [Los Angeles] because the Dodgers were here. So I won that one.

It was a gritty, 1950s but fairly diverse community. Ethical Culture was great. I belonged to the Long Island Society, so I had friends in Nassau and Suffolk. And a few in the city. And I think, along with my public high school experience, Ethical Culture really made who I was because it was very different. When people asked, What are you? in New York City, everybody in my community was mostly Jewish, but some Catholics and Protestants. I remember, actually, there was a very interesting incident when I was in junior high school—this is before the New York City schools closed for the Jewish holidays, and my parents sent me to school on Jewish holidays because I wasn't actually raised Jewish. So on Yom Kippur I was at school, and my best friend from junior high school came to call on me after she'd been to synagogue, and when she was told that I was in school, her mother said, "You can't play with Carrie. She's not one of us." And my mother marched over there and said, "I almost died in the Holocaust. You don't tell my daughter who she is." So I was very conscious of these conflicts and about being a little bit different, and I was very proud of being in Ethical Culture. In Sunday school, every year we studied another religion. So it was ironic when I got to Barnard and so many of my friends—in fact, Ruth Katz (B'71) was just at my house a few weeks ago. She spends summers in LA occasionally. And she was a religion major, and everybody was reading the *Bhagavad Gita* at the

time and I had done all of that stuff in Ethical Culture Sunday school. So it was a very important part—and the other thing I will say, actually, we also spent time in Ethical Culture reading Margaret Mead, and that was probably one of the reasons I went to Barnard, because in Sunday school they were trying to teach us about other cultures, and probably starting in seventh or eighth grade in Sunday school, we started reading *Coming of Age in Samoa* and I was just fascinated by it. So it's sort of interesting I didn't become an anthropology major, but it was a very important part of my background.

00:14:09 Q: So, you were getting this amazing education in Ethical Culture society; how did it compare to the education you got in New York City public middle school and high school?

00:14:19 Meadow: Interesting. Um, I think my high school education was excellent because of Advanced Placement. My English teacher my senior year at Jamaica High School was better than—sorry about this, folks—but better than anybody I had at Barnard. He was fabulous, and ultimately he became a professor and taught at Hofstra [University], so he was, you know, university level. So we read [Fyodor] Dostoyevsky, really sophisticated texts. And he was as good as any teacher I ever had. But my junior high school experience was horrible. There I was in Ethical Culture learning about other parts of the world, and junior high school—this was the early sixties—was about conformity, and being a cheerleader—and I was a cheerleader—and I had, like all of us, these incongruities in my life. On one hand, I was this sort of political, independent person. On the other hand, I wanted to be a cool girl. So there was conformity and cheerleading, and I was very unhappy in junior high school. Very unhappy. But in high school, the classes were quite rigorous and very good. I had taken the test to go to Hunter [College] High

[School], which was ironic, because when I first got to Barnard, my best friends were all from Hunter High, but my mother wouldn't let me go because from where I lived in Queens, it would have been a very long subway ride. And so she sent me to Jamaica, and that was a good thing because it was coed, so I had to deal with boys, and this horrible sorority thing happened that I think toughened me up. So I think my high school education was quite good; junior high school was terrible. And I feel very thankful that I had this Ethical Culture Sunday school experience, which was deeper and richer and actually pretty intellectual instead of religious.

00:16:05 Q: Did you have friends from Ethical Culture society as opposed to your schools?

00:16:10 Meadow: Both. The big deal that I remember—the first time my parents let me go on the train by myself was—I think I must have been in sixth grade or fifth grade, and I took the Long Island Rail Road to Mineola to spend the weekend with one of my Ethical Culture friends. And I remember, that whole weekend—her father had been sort of black listed during the fifties—and so I remember I spent the whole weekend learning about her even more political parents than mine. And Ethical was full of those people. So it was a great counterbalance to all this, you know, being cool stuff, so it was really nice. And then later in high school, after the sorority rejection, I wanted to be a writer. Like, who else didn't want to be a writer in those days? Long hair—I didn't look much different; I'm older now—but long hair, I guess then in those days I wore makeup, and I hung out in the Village, inappropriately picking up older men at coffee houses and things like that. And my Ethical Culture friends were more likely to be allowed to go do those Bohemian things than the more conventional kids in my Jamaica Estates neighborhood.

00:17:22 Q: Um—so tell me a little bit—you had an interesting story to tell about your dad that you didn't tell. Why he got kicked out of school. And let's also hear a little bit more about your mother and her education and what she did.

00:17:42 Meadow: Sure, great. Stories I love to tell. My mother always wanted me to write a novel about our family. So, my father was raised Catholic. His mother, who was quite beautiful, was Catholic and apparently earlier on, had had an affair with a Czech Jewish writer, and as a kid, later on, I always thought I was [Franz] Kafka's granddaughter. I was going to find out that it was Kafka that my grandmother had had an affair with, and it turned out that it was some lesser-known guy. And so, my father's father was Jewish, and my father was raised Catholic, and when the Nuremberg Laws were passed in Germany, on Kristallnacht, November 19th, 1938, [Kristallnacht took place on November 9 and 10, 1938. The Nuremberg laws were passed in 1935] um, my father is kicked out of his gymnasium, his high school, and I am now, as a lawyer, have been a student of this. And it turned out that my father is technically called a *Mischling*—that's "mixed race." This is all relevant to my later work as a civil rights lawyer, because as we know in the United States, the amount of black blood that you have constitutes whether you're black or white. But what people don't realize is that the race laws, the Nuremberg Laws, were actually a little more generous than the American race laws were. So my father, as a *Mischling*, actually had rights. Although partially Jewish, he was allowed to remain in school. So even though he was kicked out of school as a Jew on Kristallnacht, my grandfather—my Jewish grandfather—went down, with the laws, and told the school they had to take my father back. So they did, and my father said for the next year he was beaten up every day by, uh, a Nazi

sympathizer. He was in a very good gymnasium in Cologne, Germany, studying to be a scientist or engineer. And, um, so he's beaten up and treated very badly, and as soon as he graduated, he left and he spent a year and a half in England and Scotland before he was able to emigrate to the United States. My father's parents preceded him. They smuggled a lot of money out of the country. My grandfather (Berthold Menkel) was a Bauhaus-influenced designer and owner of an advertising agency (Menkelbiltneri), and they started smuggling money and jewels into Belgium, into Brussels and Antwerp, starting as soon as Hitler was elected because my grandfather was a communist. They knew they were going to have to leave.

So my grandfather was almost sent to Dachau—most people don't know this—in the early thirties, not because he was a Jew, but because he was a communist. So Hitler went after his political enemies long before he got to the Jews. And in fact, he didn't really start incarcerating the German Jews until much, much later. That's why my mother didn't leave until '41. Cologne was a Catholic city, and it was pretty gentle. I mean, the Jews were separated, but they were not sent to camps until relatively late. The Jews in other parts of Eastern Europe were sent off to camps earlier. So, my father wound up going to Scotland and England, and he finally got to the United States.

My father's parents had a beautiful, fancy apartment—I'll never forget it—on 73rd and not quite Central Park West. And as a child, when we went there on Sundays, they had ten bedrooms, um. It's still there now; one of my friends lives in the building right next door. It's all been divided now. But they took in boarders. They took in other German refugees both to be kind and also to help pay the rent. And they lived there for many years and it was quite grand. And my

grandfather was an artist—I guess that’s where the Bohemian part comes from—and a designer, and they had quite interesting friends.

My mother’s family was much more bourgeois. My mother’s father owned a shoe store chain in Germany, Schuhhaus-Sinn, which was confiscated by the Nazis. And my mother’s family—my mother had a governess and a maid—they lived, apparently, in some rather large apartment in Cologne, and they had to take in boarders—they were required to take in other Jews who were kicked out of their houses, which is how my aunt met my uncle. My uncle was a Dutch Jew who was studying at the University of Cologne. He became a tenant of my grandparents, and they married. My uncle (Dagobert deLevie) was the only professor in my family. He was a professor at Penn State [Pennsylvania State University] for many years. He taught twelve languages. And I’m only here today, telling you this story, because my mother was actually related to the Lehman family. Herbert Lehman, L-e-h-m-a-n. Governor and senator of New York. And my mother was able to come because of a private bill. The quotas had already been filled—however many Jews were allowed out of Germany—had already been filled, so there was a private bill. And the Lehmans did a family tree, and they offered passage—both money and legislation to the remaining family. Many years later, um, when I was living in Washington, the *New York Times* did an article about the Lehmans. They’re related to a lot of well-known people—(the Bronfmans—the Canadian liquor family (Seagrams), the Bittenweisers and some of the New York first Jewish families). But anyway, my mother came over because she was a Lehman, and they provided some assistance, and a few years ago, just before my mother died—she died in 2009—we actually got the original social work report that was written on my mother’s family when she came over, because the Lehmans had created a small fund for their relatives, and so

somebody was sent out to examine them. And it was just wonderful. Somebody wrote that my mother was this sixteen- or seventeen-year-old girl with a lot of spunk and was very pretty and was very kind. And it was just a lovely description, and when my father looked at it—my mother was very ill at the time—and he said, “That’s why I married her.”

So, as I said, they came from the same town, and they were both relatively wealthy. My father’s father was a character. He went to Berlin. He had lots of lovers. I have, in my closets, all these presents that he brought my grandmother out of guilt. So I have this—I never wear it—a big fur stole and an opera coat and lots of jewelry. Every time he came back from screwing around in Berlin, he would bring my grandmother a present. So, um, in my growing up, I would say—and all this was known—I mean, I knew my grandmother and grandfather—so there was a European sensibility in my house. You know, we talked about people having affairs and what it meant to be a good family person. My father had a love-hate thing with his father, because his father’d been so mean to his mother. But he also really loved him, and many years later when my grandmother had cancer, my grandfather couldn’t have been a better nurse and caregiver. So, I grew up with a kind of sense of complexity in relationships.

And I’ll just fast-forward a little bit because in ’69, while I was at Barnard, we took a family trip to—my father had been back on business—to Germany, because on my father’s side, the Catholic part of the family was obviously still there. And my mother was very upset. She didn’t really ever want to go back. She was one of those, “I don’t ever want to go back there.” And it’s the only time I remember my parents having big fights. My mother saying, “I don’t really want to go back there.” And we went, and they fought a lot during the trip. And I met an uncle of

mine, a cousin of my father's, who worked for Pepsi-Cola, and it turned out he had a pretty interesting story to tell. He'd been in the German army. He'd been captured in Russia. He'd been in a Russian prisoner-of-war camp until 1952, something which we never learned in history. Now we know a lot more about the fact that the Russians actually helped win the war. Not so much—I mean, the US did its part, but it was really the Russians. And so my cousin (I called him uncle Gustav), learned Russian when he was in prison, and in the early sixties, when the Soviet Union decided they were going to allow cola, they didn't want Coke, because that was to identify with the US. So my former prisoner-of-war, Nazi-sympathizing uncle became the person that coordinated the Pepsi move into the Soviet Union. And as a kid—so it was '69; I was nineteen or whatever I was—I observed that he was about Pepsi-Cola as I imagined he was about the Nazi regime. You know, Pepsi über alles. He was just one of these, um, corporate, you know, had to believe in something bigger than himself. So we were not allowed to go to a restaurant that served Coca-Cola. And we took some trip on the Rhine and my little brother—he was fourteen—he ordered a Coke on the boat and Gustav went bananas. Um, so I became interested in the psychology of how people develop their loyalties. And he was a very nice man, but my mother kept saying—I kept being conscious at nineteen that half of my family was killing the other half of my family, which becomes relevant to work I'm doing now as a peace person. But I found it quite interesting. And we maintained ties with that part of my father's family for many years, and it was just a very interesting experience to have.

Um, but the only place where my parents had any real conflict was my mother had had it with Germany, never wanted to go back. And my father would constantly reminisce about the chocolate cake was better, the *küchen* (cake) was better, the this was better, and twice or three

times I went back to Germany with my parents as a grownup, and my mother couldn't stand it. Finally, when President [Ronald] Reagan went to Bitburg (a cemetery for the fallen German soldiers of WWII)—sadly for me, one of my law school classmates Marshall Breger was the architect of that trip for President Reagan, and we were all furious. When Reagan went to Bitburg, my mother said, "I'm never going back there." And so my father went one more time on his own and that was that. So, they, you know, they came from the same town and they had a wonderful marriage for sixty-five years but, you know, the past is the past, and it was very different for the two of them.

00:28:00 Q: So, these complexities and paradoxes and ambiguities in your family history you brought with you in your experience in school. And in your middle school, in Jamaica High School, was there any racial diversity?

00:28:22 Meadow: Yes. Um, junior high school not so much. That was closer to Briarwood (a part of Queens), which was an apartment building, mostly Jewish community, but Jamaica High School included South Jamaica, which included Ozone Park, which was African American. Negro or black, at the time. And I had two very close black girlfriends who lived literally on the other side of the tracks, the other side of the Long Island Rail Road. However, that was St. Albans; part of it was very wealthy and one of those girls lived next to Count Basie [William James Basie]. So, um, I went to her house to play and it was sort of cool to see that there were these upper-middle or middle-class black musicians, professionals, teachers, police officers. That's why I say one of the good things about public high school for me was that it was diverse. Um, it was before, um, busing.

My parents had another fight; I forgot about that. When my brother started high school, there was actually a busing order in Queens, and my brother was supposed to go to Andrew Jackson, which was a more African American school, and they fought about that because my father believed in integration and he wanted my brother to go to Andrew Jackson, and my mother didn't want him to because, like a lot of white people say, "It's too far." So, again, they compromised and he ended up going to Jamaica because he took some test that showed he had some scientific talents that needed to be, you know, in the Jamaica High School science program. But I had a good experience, I think, of it being quite diverse, in terms of race, ethnicity and also class. There were three tracks in the school at the time – academic, commercial and vocational.

My husband, who is sitting upstairs, was sort of in the same crowd towards the end, but one of my closest friends [who] went to Columbia our year was a guy named Doug McKay, who was Irish-Scottish-American and who ultimately ran for Congress from Queens; he lost. But we had a quite diverse group, and Doug took Debbie Price, one of the black girls in my class, to our high school prom. And my parents had a little cocktail party for us, and my father was so proud, because he had been—another interesting story—My father tried to get into the US army when he got to the United States, because he wanted to bomb Germany. And through my grandfather's work, he knew where all the factories were. But because he was Catholic, the US authorities didn't trust him; they thought he might be a spy. So he winds up getting sent to the Pacific theater, and he was in Hawaii where he says one of the best experiences he ever had was how diverse his army unit was. So he had black friends and Chinese friends and Japanese friends that were actually serving with him. So when we had this high school prom party and Doug brought

Debbie, my father ran around taking a million pictures to show that I grew up in the school that was very mixed with lots of different kinds of people. And then when we got to the prom itself, Doug, when we're all taking our pictures, disappeared from the picture. And I said, "What's going on?" He said, "Well, I might want to run for president someday, and I don't want to lose the South with people seeing that I had taken a black woman to the prom." And I was appalled. So, um, this is fun to relive this story because ultimately what happened was—and we're going to get there—Columbia '68, Doug was, uh, knew he wanted to run for office, so he was trying to figure out his role and where he should be, and he didn't occupy a building or anything, and the night of the busts, when the police came in, *New York Times*, *Life Magazine*, *Time Magazine*, they were all there. And there's Doug McKay—he winds up on the front page of *Life Magazine*, in the middle of the melee when the police—and he had just happened to be standing in the wrong place. So I remember saying to him, some weeks later after the dust cleared, "Well, Doug. I guess you could, you know, you prevented yourself from having your picture taken with a black woman at our high school prom, but now you will forever be indelibly linked to the Columbia revolution of '68, and we'll see how that goes when you run for office." So, yeah, there was a little of that. But he was a good guy and it was very sad. He ran for office. He went to law school and he had a solo practice. And ultimately, interestingly enough, Doug wrote the wills for a lot of my parents' friends, and then sadly he died quite young of colitis. So, yeah, in his forties, I think. So it was sort of sad. But I say that just to say that we had this very diverse group—Irish, Catholic, there were a few WASPs [White Anglo-Saxon Protestants]—not too many, African Americans. I guess the only group we were missing at the time were Hispanics in New York. And lots of Asians. My best friend in elementary school was Chinese American and she went to Hunter High and was ultimately friends with, um, a lot of my friends at Barnard.

00:33:13 Q: Ah. New York geography—

00:33:14 Meadow: Yeah. I've actually been told—I think someone told me that—her name's Patricia Yuan—I think she's the director of admissions at Horace Mann [School] now or she was, or something like that.

00:33:23 Q: Did you find that, um, the mix was different in your AP [Advanced Placement] classes than it was for the school as a whole?

00:33:32 Meadow: Um, yes and no. I took—it's one of the places I hung out with my husband, we were both language people—and I took AP French. And our AP French teacher was black, African American. Fabulous French speaker. And so there were a number of black students. And this was before the Haiti migration or any of that stuff, so there were a number of black students in that class, and my social studies class, also, I would say. These girls that were my friends were terrific students. One of them wound up in my year of law school graduates (at a different law school) . So they were pretty high achievers. More black women than black men. Some of the other classes, maybe not so diverse, but I would say—probably if I looked at the numbers—the AP classes were, I don't know, 65 percent Jewish. You know, Jamaica Estates, Jamaica, that community. But it was not quite as homogenous as I think some of the other schools in New York City were. You would know from doing the interviews, when we got to Barnard, there were so many girls from Erasmus [Hall High School], you know, the Brooklyn schools and Hunter, and I think those were less diverse, but I don't know the numbers. You're in New York

City? So you know that, yeah. But when the film project started, and I saw some of it and I heard people talking about, you know, how the black women at Barnard felt, for example, it was not— A lot of the stuff I saw in the original film was not my experience. Between, um, Jamaica High School—I also want to say Ethical Culture had a lot of mixed marriages, and it wasn't just mixed religion. There were a lot of black and white couples, and Ethical Culture was a place where people that were different went. So I had a couple of, um, African American friends there, too.

00:35:245Q: I've been dying to ask you this: why do you think you didn't get into the sorority? And why was it so important to you?

00:35:31 Meadow: Yeah. That's a great question, Janet. Um, a great question, because I had a cousin who was two years ahead of me who was in the fancy sorority that I really wanted to get into. And she knows the answer to that question. She's now a tennis pro in Florida and she's never told me. So the question you're asking me—My mother was adorable. My mother liked to say because I was a wise aleck and a big mouth and I'm not a conformist, and I think, very sweetly, told me, "Because you're much smarter than they are and they know that." Or something. I mean, she was adorable; she was trying to make me feel better. Um, part of it was that. Part of it was I've always been a little chubby. I still am, I mean, you know. Not terrible, but I'm a little round, and I basically look the same, in that sense, as I did in high school. And they had a sense of, um, all those girls—the disgusting part of those girls was there was a competition in my high school for how long you could go without wearing the same outfit twice. And my parents brought me up not to have a clue how much money they had. Turned out they had a fair amount and I didn't know that. I wasn't allowed to shop in Saks; all these girls shopped at Saks

[Fifth Avenue] and Lord & Taylor. My first trip to Saks Fifth Avenue was on my babysitting money, and I bought myself a little dress for ten dollars. I've never forgotten it. My mother wouldn't let me go in there because she didn't want me to have airs and she didn't want me to—and also my mother had been rich as a young woman and she'd lost everything. And I told you, my mother grew up with governesses and maids; well, my mother never had a cleaning person or a maid in her life. She had a house, not mine, that you could eat off the floor. So she was trying to bring me up—I went to work summer after tenth grade; I worked every summer. And I probably didn't have to, but they told me I did. So I think I was not upper middle class enough for those sorority girls, and not thin enough, or I didn't have enough clothes because I couldn't go as many days as they could. This was an era—and I don't know if you had this in Chicago—where I remember this girl in my class so vividly, especially after Hillary Clinton came along, who had a headband that matched every outfit that she had. And I didn't do that. Also, I had very straight hair, and my poor mother, she kept giving me permanents because, you know, having some curls was stylish. And my mother kept giving me permanents and they wouldn't take. So, the irony for me, later on—junior year, I started hanging out in the Village and it was perfect: Peter, Paul and Mary, Joan Baez and all those people with the long hair. You know, in that crowd, I looked exactly the Bohemian way I wanted to, but that's not what my high school girls looked like.

So when I got to Barnard, I thought I had died and gone to heaven, because I could wear jeans to school. In the public high schools in New York City, there were dress codes. No overblouses because they didn't want anybody hiding pregnancies. So your blouses had to be tucked in and I don't know if you remember this, there was a fashion thing—we must have been in junior high

school—with Dr. Kildare on television, and we had these little blouses that had, you know, little buttons, and they were overblouses, so we weren't allowed to wear them. So when I got to Barnard, the notion that I could wear anything I wanted to was just great, you know. So I wore a lot of heavy makeup in those days—you know, white lipstick and the black stuff here. But jeans and a black turtleneck every day. And I was thrilled when Barnard was on "It's Academic"—I wasn't on the team or anything, but I went to the show, and mid—you know, during the break, they always show a film of the college, and there's this clip of—I recognized my rear end—there's a clip of me going into Barnard Hall in my jeans and my long black hair and I was so excited; there was my ass, you know, "It's Academic." It wasn't my brain but it was my ass and I was wearing tight jeans, and I wanted to say to all of those sorority girls, "Ha ha, you know, I'm in a good college and I can wear whatever I want and I don't have curly hair. And too bad." So I think that's been a part of me, like, wanting to show up all these people or something like that. It's interesting.

00:39:43 Q: Did your mom work outside the home at all?

00:39:44 Meadow: Very interesting. My mother is the only one who, I think, belies Betty Friedan, who I later met in my feminist life. My mother was thrilled to be a fifties housewife, and my mother's biggest regret was that she had the two of us and she had two other miscarriages, and she would have loved to have more children. She was the homemaker par excellence. She started cooking at three o'clock in the afternoon. Occasionally, I was her little sous-chef and I would chop stuff up for her. But my father worked very hard; he was an engineer and he worked in Long Island City and we ate European hours. So he worked until seven o'clock

every night, and we didn't eat until eight thirty or nine. So no telephone calls with the high school crowd, because my girlfriends would all have dinner at six and then they'd be on the phone gossiping; I wasn't allowed to do that. So we had a very formal European dinner where I learned European history from my father at the dinner table. And my father and I talked nonstop. My poor brother—the more I talk, you know, I'm a talkative person, you can hear that—my poor brother hardly ever speaks and I think that's because he grew up with my big mouth always at the table. And my mother made a big deal out of dinner every night. She gave incredible 1950s dinner parties. I would love on a Saturday afternoon to help her make a lot of German food, um. They had three crowds of friends. They had their German refugee friends. My mother's two best friends from her high school survived. And they had a crowd—two of them are still alive, I still call them. One of them's here in a nursing home and the other one's in New York. So that crowd, their German refugee friends, did New Year's Eve together every year, and my mother did these elaborate, you know, canapés and—She loved cooking, she loved having parties, they wore costumes, she sewed all my clothes in elementary school. She'd been a seamstress. When she came to the United States she had to support her parents for a while, so she worked in a sweatshop, and she worked until she was eight months pregnant and she said to me, "I will be happy never to work again." And so she was a homemaker and, unlike the Betty Friedan "feminine mystique," happy as a clam.

Later, their second crowd—they joined a tennis club on Long Island, so she played tennis, she took tennis lessons, she was adorable. My mother was short and much thinner than me and absolutely adorable, and she had these friends that she played tennis with, and my mother was a bon vivant. My mother came much closer than my father to dying and she suffered a lot in

Germany. And she was just happy—to the extent that I have a cheerful part of me, it's from my mother. Everything was always glass always full. Very cheerful person. She nursed all four of my grandparents. So she devoted herself to care, and when my last grandparent died, she worked for many years as a volunteer three times a week in a nursing home in Queens that my grandmother had died in and that we learned later that the Lehman family had actually built, so it was kind of an interesting irony. Um, and so, um, she loved being a housewife.

But it's an interesting question because very, very early on, my mother bought me a book called *Living Biographies of Great Women* [Actual title: *Living Biographies of Famous Women*].

Cleopatra, Elizabeth I, Theda Bara—you know, the first movie star—, Catherine the Great. So I must have been maybe eight or nine, and from that moment on I decided I wasn't going to be my mother. And she was fine with that. There was no hostility. I was going to have a profession.

And so, ironically, this will get us to Columbia '68—when I was younger, I wanted to be the first woman senator from New York. I figured with the Lehmans it ran in my blood, so I was going to become a politician and do good for people, and I wanted to run for office. So from pretty early on, I wanted to go to law school. And there were no lawyers in my family, so I didn't know how I was going to do that. And my mother and my father were both unbelievably, fabulously supportive. My father wanted me to be an astronomer, which was his dream, and he always pushed me to take science courses. My mother wanted me to be a novelist. And when, instead, I chose social studies and social sciences, they were all fine. And to my father's credit, when I was growing up in Queens, a lot of my girlfriends had younger brothers, and the fathers visited all of their ambition on the boys. My best friend in high school—her parents were lower middle class; they didn't have that much money. They took whatever money they had and they spent it on her

younger brother's bar mitzvah. So that when she got into Smith [College], she couldn't go. They couldn't afford it. And you look at these things, and they affect people's lives. I mean, she's got a perfectly good life. She's living in Toronto now, and she's ultimately had a good life. But she was higher than me in our high school class, and she wound up going to not as good of a school as she might have, because the parents visited all of their ambition on the boys, and I didn't have that. So, you know, bless them. They were amazing. They were very proud of me, and they always encouraged me to have a career.

And then, uh, the irony was when—you know, I had this long history of communists and socialists in my family—by the time I got to Barnard, I was much too radical to ever run for public office. I joined SDS [Students for a Democratic Society] during Columbia '68 and I laugh now because—you know, at some point, you'll probably ask me about my regrets—I was very proud of the radical stuff that I did, but later on in life, when I taught at Georgetown [University] for many years, my students all worked on the Hill, um, they worked in the supreme court, and I could never do any of that stuff, because at that equivalent age, I was still too radical. And in the Nixon years, you know, who wanted to work in the White House or on Capitol Hill? So for someone who had wanted to be a politician initially, I missed the whole mainstream thing because I was busy doing more radical politics at the time. And I just think, when I watch my students doing pretty interesting stuff on Capitol Hill, that's one little piece of my career or my life that I feel is missing. It might have been fun to have one of those jobs.

00:46:02 Q: Ah. Well, let's go back in time to when you were deciding about colleges. You'd mentioned before that you went to Barnard because you were a good child of refugees and you wanted to stay close to home for them. Did they feel that way, and what were your other options?

00:46:24 Meadow: Oh, did they feel that way! Well, the New York City high schools at the time only allowed you to apply to three schools. My husband and I have often talked about the fact that we're surprised that nobody sued them. My father said that if I went to Queens [College, City University of New York], NYU [New York University], or Columbia [University], he would buy me a car because they really didn't want me to leave and they wanted me to live at home. And I was an idiot. I applied to Penn [University of Pennsylvania], which is where my husband went. I applied to Penn early decision. They were okay with that. Philly was close enough. I didn't get in, which is a joke in my family because my credentials were much higher than my husband's, who got in, but there were fewer women at Penn. So, my father did everything to bribe me to stay, and so I knew they wanted me to stay.

And what I remember very vividly—you'll love this story, too—the college night at Jamaica High School, all the Seven Sisters schools had representatives. Every one of them was Miss Somebody, except for the Barnard person—I don't remember her name, but she was Mrs. Somebody who was in charge of admissions. And my mother said, "That would be a good place for you to go because it's a really good school, it's in the city, you wouldn't have to leave, you could live at home, and she's married. So you can go to a really good school and still get a husband. Even though it's a women's college, you know, there's Columbia across the street." So my mother was very supportive of my having a—sure I was going to be a teacher. A lot of my

teachers at Jamaica High School actually were Barnard grads, because in the generation before us, smart women went to college and became teachers, and they were fabulous. And so that's what my mother thought—And ironically I am a teacher, a professor, but a teacher, so I did what my mother wanted me to do. So I will never forget that—that my mother loved that the Barnard person had a Mrs. in front of her name.

And then we went for my interview and I will never forget this because, in terms of the sorority stuff, Penn would have been the cool fraternity-sorority, big-school experience. I wound up hating a lot of things about Penn. I spent most of my weekends there in college because I was dating my husband. Um, but when we got to Barnard, it had just snowed. Barnard never looked so beautiful, ever again. It never looked like that the whole time I went to school. But it had just snowed and it was magical. So this was this Ivy League school, Butler Hall, the whole Columbia campus just engulfed in snow. It was gorgeous. I just fell in love with it. And I said, "This is great." A really good school, and by that time I was kind of a nascent feminist, and I thought, I can go to a women's college, and there'll be boys across the street if I care, and so it seemed perfect. And so as soon as I got in—and my parents were thrilled. What I didn't reckon with was I didn't realize, I really didn't, someone who reads well, I didn't see it—was that as someone who lived within fifty miles of the school I had to live at home, so I was a commuter. And I was miserable. So when school started, I was deeply depressed. I spent three hours a day on the subways. In the dark subways. I had to take three separate trains and a bus to get to Morningside Heights and so I was very, very depressed. So the family doctor prescribed tranquilizers, which I did not take, in part because I started dating some guys at Columbia freshman year who were heavily into LSD, and drugs freaked me out. I did my share of dope, of marijuana-smoking later

on, but I was never a person who—I was a bit of a hypochondriac. I was terrified of hallucinations. So although I hung around with plenty of people that were doing drugs at Columbia, I couldn't stand it and I got very depressed. Um, you know, now as a law school professor, we worry so much about students' mental health, and I never thought of myself as having mental health problems, but I did. I was very depressed. I was very lonely. I was on the subways. All of my friends were girls that were other commuters from mostly Hunter High; terrific women, all of whom are just incredibly interesting people. But I thought, This isn't what college is supposed to be. So I don't know how many people have told you this story, but I went to go see some counselor at Barnard, and my first semester freshman year, I got the worst grades I'd ever gotten in my life and all of us at Barnard were good students, and I'd been doing very well and I was getting B-minuses and I was petrified and scared and unhappy and crying all the time and I'm very depressed. And so I said I was going to transfer. Um, and some person—and I've now learned they did this for a number of people—said, “Well, if you just stick with it for your first semester, there will be dropouts, and we'll get you a dorm room.” And so that's how I met my Mary McCarthy friends. I got told in December that I was going to be able to move into the dorms. So in January, when school started, I moved into the dorms. And ironically, my roommate, Ruthie [Ruth] Garfield, her roommate had been one of the African American Barnard girls who chose to move in with—this was freshman year, so it was a very early version of a bunch of the African American girls wanting to move in together. So Ruthie became my roommate, and I met her three best friends, and we wound up having this little foursome.

00:51:49 Q: And that's what you call your Mary McCarthy group?

00:51:51 Meadow: Right. Because I read the book, *The Group*, at some point in high school. We hung out together, we had dinner together, and I thought by that time I'd died and gone to heaven because now I was having college, you know—horrible food in the dorms, I loved it, I gained ten pounds, take-home, meatball gyros at two in the morning, staying up all night talking about life, um, and it totally transformed my Barnard-Columbia experience because I could actually be resident. And I was so glad when Barnard finally had enough housing for everybody. I think the disparity in the commuter/non-commuter experience was just enormous, and I thought—and it's an interesting lesson when I reflect on it now; I don't think I was conscious of it at the time. Something in me asserted and said, "I'm not happy," and I went to go talk to somebody, and I did something about it. And I got into the dorms, and my whole life changed. And I think about the girls who didn't do that. I don't know where the assertion came from. I think from some of those earlier experiences of being my own person and being independent and having a slightly different background and deciding I wasn't just going to be passive. But when I think about it, it's terrible, because there were other commuter girls having a hard time. They were my friends, and they didn't do anything about it. The other thing I think about in retrospect was that my grandparents lived in Manhattan, my parents had relatives, and I could have cheated. I mean, my mother said, "Uncle Hal would be happy—" He lived on the Upper East Side—I could have lived in the city. But I was a good girl. I was a Holocaust kid, and I didn't violate rules then—later I did—so I commuted when actually an easy solution would have been living with my grandparents on 72nd Street and at least I would have had a life in the city. So, um, my second semester was totally different, and from that point on, I got straight A's, pretty much. I just was happy. I loved being in school. I found it intellectually very stimulating. And so the hard part for

me was keeping my commuter friends while I was meeting more interesting women from all over the country.

00:54:09 Q: Who were the, um, professors that you remember most fondly?

00:54:16 Meadow: This is really easy for me. So I was going to be an English major because I wanted to be a writer and one of the things that I discovered early on was all the prep school kids that were at Barnard. So I did miserably in my English composition class with Anne Prescott. Ruth Katz, who was just here a few weeks ago, and I were talking and we realized that we were in the same class. And Ruth had gone to Hunter and she was doing great, and I was doing terribly. I don't think I'd ever written a really long term paper, and that was our freshman English project. So Anne Prescott was a pretty tough critic. And I realize that I told you I had this wonderful English teacher in high school. So I read [William] Shakespeare and [Geoffrey] Chaucer and Dostoyevsky, but I had no idea what their relationship was to each other. You know, we did kind of what I learned later was New Criticism; we just read the texts and I didn't have any context, and so when I saw these Dalton School [The Dalton School] and Brearley [School] and all the prep school kids in my class, I figured I can't do English, they're all too good at that. So then I started taking social science courses, and I decided out of my radical side to be a sociology major.

And the person most influential was Mirra Komarovsky. We were actually quite close. Quite close. And we stayed friends—I stayed close to her and I wanted to do a biography of her, and I used to go visit her in her apartment when I went back to New York many years later. And then

she told me—I'm blanking on her name now—there was a woman older than us who was a sociology professor at Brandeis [University], whose work I used to know, and I just forget. So Mirra told me that Mirra had granted her the biography rights. I don't think she ever did it. But Mirra was wonderful. I took a course with her early on in family sociology. And what's important for all of us in the feminist movement was—I've never forgotten—Mirra's own work in the 1930s, when she was getting her doctorate at Columbia, was on women who went to work during the Depression. And her question was, What was the effect on children of women working? And I now have done academic work on women professionals and work-family balance, all of that. I've never forgotten Mirra's work, because Mirra's work is more complicated. It doesn't say it's either good or bad to work or not work; the key was how the woman felt about her work. If she was happy working, then she was a happy mother. If she was unhappy working, she was a guilty, unhappy mother. And just like my mother was perfectly happy staying at home. So the key variable was not work/non-work. It was contentment with whatever life had given you and your choices, and I never forgot that. So she was very influential.

The other person—in a negative way—I loved her; she's a fabulous teacher. Gladys Meyer. When Columbia '68 started the revolution—and so it's before we took over the buildings. We must have had some preliminary skirmishes that I can't remember so well. But I was taking an introduction to sociology [class] with her the spring of '68. And the first of the seven demands—there were seven demands, you know: no gym, disrupt the military-industrial complex—The other day I was trying to remember what all the seven demands were, but there were seven demands. And Gladys Meyer said she'd been in Germany in the thirties studying sociology, and

all the anti-Nazi, pro-democracy, and lefty demonstrations were going on, and she said, “Those were real political revolutions. What’s going on here is a glorified panty-raid. This is just spring fever.” And I went ballistic. I got really upset, and I said, “We are very serious. We’re going to make a revolution.” And Mirra, who was much more bourgeoisie than I was—Mirra was a quite wealthy woman coming out of the Russian Revolution as an émigré to the United States—Mirra was much more open to understand that we were trying to make something happen. So I never took another course with Gladys Meyer again, even though I respect—I read her work. I thought she was terrific, but I was very annoyed at her for not taking us seriously. And Mirra was my mentor. So I took every course that she taught, and then she retired, I think, in our junior year. So when I was doing my senior thesis in sociology, she agreed to take me on even though she was retired, but my senior year, I decided to go to Philadelphia—Bob and I were living together—and, uh, so I was a Penn—I did my courses at Penn, but I did my thesis at Barnard. So I came up to Barnard once a month to meet with Mirra and then I got assigned an advisor at Penn who’s a very, very well-known family sociologist named Frank Furstenberg, and I had both of them. And Frank was pretty amazing. He became a very close friend later on when I stayed at Penn both to go to law school and then to be on the faculty at Penn. But Mirra was really it for me.

And then I would just say, in an odd way, the other person I remember—I was just talking about this with Ruth. I took a lot of history courses; –you were a history major, weren’t you? I remember that. And Wilma Liebman, who is my close friend now, was a history major. So I took a European History course with Chilton Williamson, who was as WASP-y and snooty as you could possibly imagine. And we need to be careful; I believe his son is still on the faculty at Columbia. But what he said that I never forgot was he said, “My Columbia friends always ask

me why I'm wasting my time teaching at a women's college." And he said, "And I tell them that I'm doing a much more important thing because I'm teaching two generations at once. I'm teaching these very bright women, who will then have children, and because they're so well-educated, they will be bringing up the next generation with their education." And I never forgot that, either, because it was this kind of interesting, mixed message, which was, "I'm proud to be teaching intelligent, bright women, and they're all going to go home and be mothers." But he was a terrific teacher. And what I remember about him—and it's become quite important to me as an educator—was that was a hard course. We read a book of interpretive history every week. So it was, I don't know, what? A thirteen-week semester or something? And we had a stack of books like this. And no text—you know, I'd gone to a public high school where we'd read textbooks, and there was the didactic narrative story of what happened, what were the four causes of World War I or something. And he taught us to read interpretive history. So there was the Thirty Years' War, and there were many interpretations and many factors. And, um, as an educator, that just stayed with me.

When I lecture now—I've lectured all over the world. When I go to another university, I go to the bookstore. And particularly in the United States, what I worry about is—and this would be true of the UC [University of California] system in which I teach at the University of California—in very big state public schools, introduction to psych, introduction to history, introduction to sociology—pick the subject, there'll be a textbook. So people are getting a single text, a single story. And what I got from Barnard was in no subject is there a single story. So I go to the bookstores to look: is the professor assigning lots of points of view, lots of book-length treatments of an issue, or are people just studying a single text. And, sadly, you know, I can tell

you—so I’ve taught at Harvard, I’ve taught at Stanford—those are places in which people read lots of books in every class. If you go to UCLA’s [University of California, Los Angeles’s] bookstore—I taught at UCLA for 20 years—um, you’ll see in those big introductory courses, textbooks. Not in the upper levels—the education at UCLA at the upper levels is just fabulous, world-class. But I’m very interested in how people teach the introductory subjects. And from Barnard and from Chilton Williamson, I early on learned that if you’re going to be an educator, you’re going to be an educated person, texts are not the answer. I’ve now written texts. I’m a textbook writer in law school. (laughs) But my texts are excerpts of lots of points of view. I have never written an expository, you know, “This is how it is.” And that’s what I got from Barnard. So Mirra and Gladys and Chilton Williamson.

Actually, one other story I’ll tell you is that—and you may have had this experience—as a history major I wanted to take courses at Columbia, so I just remember this unbelievable process. It was very hard. The only way you could take a course at Columbia in our era was to show that there wasn’t an equivalent course at Barnard. So I wound up with Basil Rauch taking some American history course at Columbia. And he was okay, but I actually thought, sitting in this huge lecture course, that we got a better education at Barnard because the classes were smaller, and we didn’t have TAs [teacher assistants]. We didn’t have these graduate student TAs.

And then my other formative experience—this is pretty funny; it’s fun that this comes back up. So I did get into a methods course in sociology at Columbia College with Jonathan Cole, who subsequently became the provost of Columbia. This is an interesting tie to my later career. So I wound up getting into this methods class because I think that semester nobody was teaching

methods, and until our year Barnard sociology majors took a sort of soft methods class that was more qualitative and I wanted some statistics and so I wind up in this class; I'm the only girl in this class. And, you know, this is after [Katherine Murray] Kate Millett, this is after '68, and I'm a pretty serious feminist at this point. It's my junior year and in that class, Jonathan Cole looks at me and says, "Do you think that you have to be a woman to study women?" And I say this to you because I've written a lot on the epistemology of feminist thought and how women approach problems. It's one of my—to the extent I'm famous about anything—I don't know if you know Carol Gilligan's work? So I'm the law person in, you know, I've written about "law in a different voice," "Portia in a Different Voice: Speculations on a Women's Lawyering Process," [1 Berkeley Women's Law Journal 39-63, 1985]. And on some level—I never attributed, I never thanked him for it, but I could probably point to those moments in Jonathan Cole's class in which I said, "Yeah, I think so." I actually think that there's certain things that you learn experientially or that over all the sociology I've read in my life, you know, men just don't get it. And so I became this foil in the class for, you know, the woman's perspective, or the idea that knowledge and epistemology depended on *who* you were. And later in my life I became very good friends with Sandra Harding, who is a very famous philosopher in feminist epistemology. I brought her to UCLA when I was directing the women's research center [Center for the Study of Women] at UCLA. And so in an odd, again, negative mentorship thing, I think that Jonathan Cole's doing that to me, um, began to frame—you know, formed by Kate Millett and Cate [Catharine] Stimpson, I went to—you know, I took their classes. I read *Sexual Politics* early on. I was a very serious feminist. So I don't want to give all the credit to Jonathan Cole, but it was in the context of being in this Columbia class and being the only woman that I decided that there's something about methods and knowledge that is different depending on who's actually doing the

research. And that became a very formative part—So, it's an interesting—it's a fabulous question, Janet, because we think of who mentors us in a positive way, but I just told you two stories—Jonathan Cole and Gladys Meyer—who affected me by negative things.

01:06:11 Q: So, was he asking it in an adversarial way?

01:06:13 Meadow: Oh, completely. And so here's the part you'll just love. Fast-forward, I don't know, twenty-five years. I mediate a lot of tenure disputes. Um, you know, and when we get to—I'll have to tell you—I'm a mediator, in part because of Columbia '68 stuff. So, I taught at UCLA for a long time, and then I went to Georgetown. So while I was in Georgetown, I became a mediator for an insurance company, Educators United [United Educators Insurance], or something like that. It was one of the first insurance companies that underwrote insurance for universities, um, in employment cases. Universities have always had insurance for accidents and sports, that kind of stuff. But Educators United, I think it was—they offered a policy for universities that were going to be involved in very complex litigation in tenure cases. So I was in the East, and I wound up doing a bunch of tenure cases. Lafayette [College], Lehigh [University]—I'm not supposed to mention names, these are all confidential—but in a very famous case, that I was only involved in at the beginning, and then a very famous lawyer in New York City, Judith Vladeck, whose son is one of my best friends in Washington, David Vladeck—But Judith Vladeck was one of the most important plaintiffs' employment discrimination lawyers. So her daughter, who's still in the firm, represented a scientist at Columbia who did not get tenure. And, um, as I recall—I'm going to get this all wrong, I should look it up—but basically, um, the story was that this person was denied tenure. She grieved in the internal

university proceedings. I forget what happened. She sued, she won, and then it was reversed in the Second Circuit. And the Second Circuit decision, which I read—actually, it's all in the decision, it's unbelievable. Number one, I forget who the judges were; I know all the judges in the Second Circuit. The judges deferred to Columbia. Jonathan Cole was provost, and they said, We're just a court, and we don't have any expertise into who should get tenure as a scientist, and we trust these great, brilliant scientists. Jonathan Cole had won all kinds of awards. Ironically, his professional field was about women in science, ultimately. He wasn't doing it when I was a student, but he's now famous for having written several books about and articles about women in science. And so the court said, We defer to him, and what turned out had happened was that, at some point in this process, the department actually did vote her tenure. And in the record, it says that Jonathan Cole didn't want her to get tenure so he called up a bunch of other people in her field to send in letters against her, um, after—this is all going to be archived, right, at Columbia? So I hope I'm not libeling or slandering anybody, but it was all on the record. And I just found this ironic, that many years later—I mean, he was not an evil man and his academic field was about diversifying science and talking about women in science, and I don't know what his relationship was to this woman, but as a lawyer, I was appalled—appalled—that at Columbia University, this kind of outside-of-the-process thing [would happen], and that's what had happened. So he ginned up or got people to write negative letters and then this person lost her case in the Second Circuit. So—and I was mediating in the Second Circuit, so whenever I would mediate, I'd have to tell people, you know, "Settlement's a better idea because you have no idea what's going to happen." I had to cite the case often when I was talking to people in the middle of the case. "This is what can happen to you if you don't settle. You'll go to a court that's gonna—that may defer to the university."

01:09:59 Q: Do you think he got into, um, women in science because he was answering your challenge?

01:10:05 Meadow: I have no idea. Um. (Price laughs) I have a more interesting Columbia story to tell you like that. But, because I never—I don't think I've ever seen him since then. But what *is* really interesting, you know, we'll get to in a minute. So in Columbia '68, um, I went into Mathematics, the most radical building to occupy. I was, you know, radical. I literally—I believed the revolution was coming—it was 1968, you know, we'd already had the French students in the streets, and I truly believed the revolution was going to happen. So I go to Mathematics. Here's the fun part of my story. Husband upstairs, there, is at Penn in Navy ROTC [Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps]. Uh, I'm demonstrating against Navy ROTC. So you need to know—I should go step back a little bit. Bob [Robert] Meadow, my husband, was in my high school crowd. My mother always liked him, and she used to say, "Why don't you go out with that nice Bob Meadow?" And I said, "No way." In 1964, when I met him, he was supporting Barry Goldwater, and I said, "He would not fit in this family, and just forget him. He's a nice guy but, you know, his politics are just totally—excuse me—fucked." Um, so we were friends and we studied French together, and we were good friends, but, um, in October of our freshman year when I was so depressed, as I told you, Bob invites me to a weekend at Penn because he couldn't get a date. So I went as his friend. I didn't go to Columbia football weekends, so I thought, I'll go to Penn. I'll go to a football weekend. So I went to Penn, and it was one of those weird things that this friendship—you know, little things going on there that we didn't realize, and so we became involved. Um, and, so I was sort of dating him in the spring of

1968. And he tells me that the Navy ROTC program is having a big military ball, and that if I love him, I'm going to have to come down. So I leave the building, go home to Queens to get my high school prom dress, um, wrap it up, go to Philadelphia, go to this thing, which you can imagine, is anathema to me, where I'm hanging around with a whole bunch of Navy officers, and he's wearing some Navy suit, you know, some white thingy, and I'm in my little yellow prom dress. I mean, think of the incongruity. This is why I'm a mediator because, you know, I operate from "both sides now" to quote the great Joni Mitchell song that Judy Collins sang—my favorite song. And so I go to Philadelphia, and whatever night that was—we can look it up—military ball starts. Martin Luther King [Jr.] has been shot, like, the day before, I believe, and rioting breaks out in Philadelphia. So they tell us they're closing the ball down and we have to go home. And I go, "Yay! Right on." And I'm out there, you know, power, doing all this stuff. And so we have to take a taxi to leave the ball, and they're all very concerned about—and I'm like an idiot, screaming out the cab, "Yeah," sort of in favor of all the rioting that's going on. Pack up my little gown, my little suitcase, go back to New York, and try to get back in the building. And they won't let me in because, I mean, they didn't know where I was. I didn't tell anyone I'd gone to a ROTC ball, but they wouldn't let me back in because by that time—I was gone for two days—things had gotten very tense.

And, so, I have no idea—I did not see it in the film; I don't think anyone told this story. So, whatever date that was, it was decided by—it wasn't SDS, some other group—there was rumors that Grayson Kirk was going to call the police, um, to break up the occupation, and so a group of us decided that we were going to sleep on the ground, on the campus, and there's no way that Grayson Kirk, the president, was going to call police and then stomp on people. So we had

hundreds of students that, when I think about it because I'm a mediator now, were sympathetic but not in the buildings, but also wanted to prevent violence. So there was this interesting combination of pacifist, nonviolent people, people that were sympathetic but hadn't gone in in the beginning. And so I have a little square of bricks right near the dial in the main part of the campus that I think of as my bricks whenever I go to reunions or whatever. I actually did a lot of work on the Upper West Side as a mediator training people for a while. So I used to go there pretty often. I'd go visit my bricks. I slept on these bricks for three days. We all thought we were preventing—and of course, that wasn't true. Three days after sleeping on the bricks, the cops were called in, and, um, a bunch of us were stepped on, and billy clubbed. I didn't get hurt, but we kept thinking that our job was to prevent violence, and then they went in and arrested a whole bunch of people in the buildings, and I often think, If I had been in the building, I would have been arrested; who knows if that would have affected my law school admissions? Who knows? I don't know. All I do is remember—right, because you went to law school, were you arrested? I figured—And now I've counseled a lot people in those settings. So I probably would have been okay.

But as it turned out—So we're all walking around in blankets, and I remember it. It felt—I imagined this is what [Leon] Trotsky and [Vladimir] Lenin were doing. It felt like, you know, 1917 in Russia, whatever, 1968 in France. I really believed the revolution was going to happen. So, people, you know, go off to get arrested, and I was on part of the committee that helped find lawyers for people, and what I'll never forget was, when the dust would have cleared, I went up to the top of Reid Hall with a bunch of Barnard women who were activists, and we stood on the top and screamed, "Cops eat shit – you are what you eat." And the next day, the *New York Times*

wrote, “Coeds were screaming obscenities from the wall.” Or something. And that was a dramatic experience for me, too, because when I read the report of what had happened in the *New York Times*, I never believed journalism ever again. That’s one of these lasting experiences for me. I’ve now been in a number of stories that have been covered, you know, by the press, and if you’re in a story—and I have a lot of journalist friends, so I appreciate what they have to do to put a story together—but so many facts in the way the *New York Times* wrote it up were not true.

But what was interesting was—maybe you’ll remember better than I, Janet—two days or three days afterwards, there was a solidarity march. So we had this huge march that started at Columbia for us and CCNY [City College of New York], which is where my father went to school, and we were going to converge in Harlem. So it was still about the gym and Harlem. So there was this big march. And here’s the story. I don’t know why—I was not a leader, I was a follower. But I was somehow in the front of the line, and Mike [Michael Ira] Sovern, then a professor of law at Columbia, comes out and says he’s been asked by Grayson Kirk to mediate a dispute, and he stands there and he starts trying to engage us in a conversation. And I start screaming at him, “Get out of the way, you—” you know, I don’t know what epithet I yelled at him, you know, “you establishment!” You know, whatever, “This is revolu—” I mean, I still believed it even if people—

01:17:17 Q: You running dog.

01:17:17 Meadow: —Yeah, whatever. I just started screaming at him, and I’ve never forgotten it. So, I did that and we had the march and then we all went back to school and didn’t take exams.

Again, fast forward, it would have been exactly twenty years later, in 1990—I am on the committee, the reaccreditation committee of Columbia Law School, and Mike Sovern is the president of Columbia University, and the dean was Barbara Black, the first woman dean of Columbia Law School. And Mike and Barbara had been law school classmates, I believe at either Columbia or Yale—I forget where. Um, and Barbara—it was a big deal for Barbara to be dean, the first woman. (coughs) And the night before our accreditation, we’d had a big meeting at University Club [University Club of New York]—I have another story about University Club (when they almost didn’t let Senatorial candidate Hillary Clinton in!)— 53rd Street and 5th Avenue—and she was trying to get money to build a new building at the law school, and she said, “You know, Mike and I have been rivals since law school, and he’s not giving me what I need. And if I don’t get what I need, I’m going to quit.” And I was getting nervous because I had done a lot of accreditation site visits, and I’d been on about four of them where after the site visit was over the dean quit. So, I said, “Uh, oh. You know, I think I’m going to be a jinx or something.” So we had a wonderful conversation and the neat thing about that was the University Club had never had women, and I’d been in a bunch of meetings there and they wouldn’t let me go in. But Barbara Black integrated the University Club first—as late as 1990—because she was the president, or the dean, of Columbia Law School, so they had to let her in. So, when you do the accreditation site visits, there’s three days, and they typically end with an exit interview, where you tell the dean what you’ve learned about the school and where they should make improvements, and then you have a super exit interview with the president. So we march into the president’s office—the famous president’s office where what’s-his-name had his feet up on the desk with Grayson Kirk’s cigar—who was that?

01:19:10 Q: Was it Mark?

01:19:10 Meadow: Was it Mark Rudd? It might have been Mark Rudd. Yeah. So, I sit down and Sovern looks at me and he says, “You look very familiar to me. Do I know you? Are you a labor law professor?” I said, “Well, I’ve taught labor law.” “Do I know you from labor law circles, or how do I know you?” And I said, “Mike, the last time we were this close was in 1968, and I was screaming, ‘You eat shit’ or something like that in your face.” And the other accreditors, like, look at me, you know, because to get on these committees you have to be—I wouldn’t say an establishment person, but a pretty, you know, major law professor. And he looks at me, and he says, “Well, you must have changed your views to be on this committee” or something like that. I said, “Not a jot. I haven’t changed my views at all.” So it was this hysterically funny moment. And then, you know, what do I care? He has no power over me. And then I said, “Let’s talk about what financing you’re going to do for the law school, because Barbara Black is a really import—” And I think he was just—it was, you know, nothing ever comes of these things, really, because nobody’s going to de-accredit the Columbia Law School, and so these presidents and these deans just have to sit there and smile knowing that if you’re a major school like that, nothing’s going to happen to you. But I really—I loved it. I got to sort of sock it to him, in a way. And I just said, “Barbara Black’s a very distinguished dean and if you don’t do the right thing, you’re going to lose her.” And he did. He did not approve financing at that time for the law school to get more money, and the irony was, so Barbara resigned shortly after I was there, and the new dean of the Columbia Law School was Lance Liebman, who had been a Harvard Law professor and is a dear friend of mine. His wife is a mediator and one of my good friends and she became a Columbia law professor too at the time and so it was pretty funny. So Lance called me

up right after he took the deanship and he said, “I understand you were just on the accreditation committee. What can you tell me?” I said, “Oh, I can tell you a lot.” So I told Lance everything I knew about Mike Sovern. So that’s one of those funny moments in life that—I just thought it was funny that he remembered my face, because he knew that he knew me from somewhere but he didn’t know where, and he had clearly—I mean, Sovern had become a very establishment person by that time. And I believe—you know, I don’t know if anyone’s interviewing Ellen Futter, but there’s a very interesting story about how Ellen Futter got to be president of Barnard and Mike Sovern’s involved in that story, so someone ought to go get it.

01:21:37 Q: Yeah. Um, we’ll probably be interviewing her. _____(??)

01:21:45 Meadow: So, um, where were we?

01:21:48 Q: Well, you know, let’s back up a little bit because—did you get involved with SDS while you were still a commuter?

01:21:54 Meadow: Yes, um—

01:21:56 Q: And what was your experience, um, in SDS, even before the takeover, in the fall?

01:22:02 Meadow: Right. So, Students for a Democratic Society—it seemed interesting to me, and I went to a bunch of meetings—Columbia, mostly. And, um, and it was very odd, because—again, my father was so supportive. In 1965 or ’66 was the first anti-war march in Central Park,

and I went, and it was pouring rain, and we got drenched. And when I got home, my parents were having a dinner party of their German refugee friends. And when they'd heard where I was, several of my father's friends—they were all probably voted Democratic—but they said to my father, "How can you let her go? This country took us in." And my father said, "That's why we came to this country. Because they allow people to protest things like this." He was amazing. So the adults all wound up having this huge fight. And, again, I remember the next day the *New York Times* said something like one hundred thousand people had been at this march. And we all knew that it was over a million. It was enormous. It was the first really big demonstration. So my father was always very supportive of my political activism, but when I went to the SDS meetings, he got nervous because he had actually, um, been going to Communist Party meetings in the forties when he came to New York. He claims that he never joined, but he was in Paul Robeson's cell, which is pretty amazing. Also, my father then told me, when she subsequently became a friend of mine—Lani Guinier, when she wasn't confirmed—her mother—I want to get this right—her mother was Jewish, Jewish doctrine. Her father was black, a professor. And my father said they were both in the same cell as he, which I later told Lani about. So it's all this, you know, "Were they members or not?" My father was very supportive but he was also worried that I not get into a lot of trouble. So I went, I think, very enthusiastic, but also very careful. I was very careful. I was radical, but I was already—I was prelaw, so I have a feeling that I probably had some vocational concerns.

And I went—and I will tell you this, because I've written about it in some of my writing: Early on, from the very beginning, I thought the guys were awful. And so for me, what comes out of Columbia '68 is my feminism, among other things. I just said, "What?" I write about this—we

were making the coffee, and I have no—despite my wonderful father, the artist—I have no artistic talent, and they were telling us to do the posters and the handouts and all these auxiliary—I'm not a radical to be—You know, Rosa Luxembourg was my hero. You know, I wasn't going to be a Ladies Auxiliary revolutionary. So I went, um, I kept going to meetings, but I was not happy. And then I remember around the same time, there was a meeting with Cate Stimpson and Kate Millett and ironically, Carolyn Heilbrun was there. I later became a huge fan of hers. She's the mystery writer whose nom de plume is Amanda Cross. So she was then teaching at Columbia extension, and I learned at that meeting there were no tenured women on the Columbia faculty. So, I'd have to go back and check the dates but it was around the same time as the revolution was going on—

01:25:10 Q: At the West End?

01:25:11 Meadow: Yeah. So I just remember that there was this sort of mainstream, lefty political thing and then there was the feminist movement, and I wound up—So I was in SDS. I remember, um, that I quit in the sense that I stopped going to meetings after the Weatherman bombing in the Village. And that's because—that's ironic, too, because that's the Boudin household, and one of my mentors in law school was a woman named Martha Field, who was the only woman on the Penn faculty, and she's now married to Michael Boudin, who is a First Circuit judge, and was the brother of [Kathy Boudin]. And I also, through my law school clinical work, knew the Chicago crowd, who you probably know. So it was very odd that—it was interesting because I came from these lefties, but also my grandfather was a pacifist. So the

minute it got violent, I said, “I’m out of here.” So the SDS-Weathermen split was a big deal, and then I became more active in feminist stuff at Barnard.

So I always thought of myself as a progressive political person, and the other big moment for me at Barnard was in—actually, it was probably Gladys Meyer’s class—my Introduction to Sociology [class where] I read *The Other America*, and that’s when I formed my career plan. I was going to be a poverty lawyer. So freshman year, before ’68, um, I read *The Other America*, and I said, “This is appalling, and I’m going to be a poverty lawyer.” So, um, two things were going on: the political, wanting a revolution, but also knowing that I wanted to be, you know, then I guess we called them legal aid lawyers. It was just before Legal Services Corporation happened. But I really wanted to go to law school to do good, so I was really careful about not getting arrested and not getting into trouble. And so I had this, you know—And then I started going to all the feminist things. And that’s when I had some issues with my, um, Mary McCarthy crowd because the positive part of that group was that all four of us, the girls freshman year, were ambitious. Ruthie (Garfield, B’71) wanted to be a doctor, which she’s now become. She’s a psychiatrist, but it took her a while to get there. Barbara (Ginsberg Shaw, B’71) was going to be a writer, and Renee (Russian Taketomo B’71) was going to be a social worker, which she is. And we had this vision—it was wonderful—we were going to get a house somewhere and be a feminist, you know, professional service—This has happened all over the world now, or at least all over the United States. But that was our dream. And ultimately, this is a big moment—as my husband comes down the stairs—at some point freshman year, there was a Columbia medical school mixer, and Barbara and Ruthie and Renee said, “We’re going up to Columbia P&S [Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons] to go to the mixer.” And I said, “You

mean you're all looking for husbands." And I said, "Not interested." And I wasn't dating him [my husband, who is now a political consultant] yet, but I said, "I do not want to be a doctor's wife." And so that was the first little tension that we had. So Barbara goes and meets Peter that night, early freshman year, and they're still married. Incredibly happily; they have a wonderful marriage. Um, and I forget if Renee and Ruthie met anyone—but so we had this tension that—just as my mother said, what she liked about Barnard was the Mrs.—the M-r-s-es at Barnard. All of them are still, you know, professionally interested, but I was professionally driven and I knew I was going to law school. And they were also looking for husbands. And so Barbara was in the creative writing crowd, you know, so she took writing classes with Mary Gordon and Francie (Garrett, B'71) and Elizabeth Hardwick was teaching. And I, you know, that's where my heart was, but I was more a political activist. So I took those courses vicariously. I loved Barbara talking about her writing classes. And Ruthie, uh, had a sort of breakdown and had to leave school. So Ruthie was premed. Ruthie was a twin growing up in Baltimore, and her parents had done the classic thing of overcompensating. Ruthie was doing better in school than her sister, who was also beautiful. So the parents actually told Evie, her sister, how great she was and told Ruthie how terrible she was and it was very sad. So Ruthie, um, I guess it was—it must have been junior year. She dropped out, went back to Baltimore. She ultimately finished. She finished with our class and then had a very conventional marriage for a very short period of time, and then went back to the Bryn Mawr program postbac [Bryn Mawr Postbaccalaureate Premedical Program] for medical school, and she is now a psychiatrist in Philadelphia. But, um, and Renee met Tosh (Taketomo, C'71), who's an architect who was [in] a Columbia art class. And the four of us—my husband and Renee and Tosh and I—were very good friends for a while, and Tosh and Bob lived together for a summer. And Renee is a very, very talented, skillful social worker

in Boston. But they've had issues in their lives. One of their kids has diabetes and Tosh had a very difficult time for a while, and so I stayed closer to Barbara (Shaw) all those years. But I think, because I didn't have children, I was very professionally driven. And I would say, uh, you know, it's a very important issue for Barnard. We were the first generation, I think, that really had a choice. And, um, and so I didn't write the Mary McCarthy version of Barnard, but you could take any group of Barnard women that were friends, as you're doing with this fabulous project, and see how world events and our choices intersected. So I've been very privileged to have an incredibly good marriage. Next week is forty-four years. My biggest regret—no, we never had kids. Didn't want them for a long time, and then when I finally tried, I had a bunch of miscarriages. And, um, we were so used to our very interesting life; we travel a lot and do a lot of things that we didn't have time to settle down in one place—So, and Ruthie never had kids either. She's now a stepmom to her second husband's children. But I would say Barbara and Renee both had interesting jobs. Barbara went to law school later in life. For me, my identifications were more as a professional woman than as a mom or a wife, and so we kind of—I wouldn't say drifted apart—but, you know, I really care about them and it's been wonderful to see them. But my friends, the rest of my life, were people in law school and in teaching and in my professional life. And that's why it was kind of neat, many years later, when I moved to Georgetown in Washington and I was mediating, a friend of mine asked me if I'd ever been friends with Wilma Liebman, and I said, "Yeah, in college, but I've lost touch with her." And Wilma had been the head of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and this mutual friend of ours put us together, and we've been really, really close ever since. And that's just been—so we've kind of had this Barnard history, but that's also a friendship that's based in labor

law and professional interests and so in an odd way I feel much closer to Wilma now than I do to some of my friends when I was at Barnard.

But you asked about SDS. So I go to law school. I go straight from Barnard, spend a year in Philly, um, and so we had the issue—we got married right after college—of finding schools that both of us got into. And we wound up going to Penn. Bob has a PhD in political science, and I was in law school, and the best thing about my law school group was we had a self-identified group of radicals. So I think there were maybe fifteen or twenty of us that knew we were going to be legal aid, public defender—we didn't call it public interest then, but whatever. And that was neat because I actually didn't hate law school like a lot of people, I liked it, but we did resistance, so we were called on Socratically and we resisted. There weren't that many women in my class; my class was two hundred and I think there were thirty of us, maybe not even that many. The next year there was a big bump. So my little group of friends were, um, occupationally supportive. We were all going to be progressive, and we refused to answer when we were called on by our professors, and we formed the SDS equivalent of law students. We were in the [National] Lawyers Guild, and I did a lot of political activity. Two of our more progressive teachers were denied tenure, so I organized the put-our-tuition-in-escrow thing, and then we boycotted classes for a while. This is also ironic because the then-dean of Penn Law School, Bernie [Bernard] Wolfman, was also, I'm sure, a progressive Democrat on the national scene, but an absolute dictator in the law school and tried to expel us. It was, you know—so I was still quite politically active in law school. And again, ironically, he was my tax professor; about a year after I graduated, he went to teach at Harvard Law School for the rest of his life, and in 2000 I was a visiting professor at Harvard Law School, and when I got there, the first phone

call was from Bernie saying, “Can I take you to lunch?” And he said, “I’m so proud of you. You were such a pain in the ass in law school and organizing all of these radical activities. But look what you’ve done!” Just adorable. It was like the prodigal daughter or something like that. And he was a very conventional, brilliant tax professor, but he could still appreciate a feisty girl, so it was very touching to me that he would do that. So my law school education, it was both good, but it was very rooted in my politics. And then we also had one of the first women’s organizations. Um, and two of my good friends at law school were Barnard girls. One was in the class behind me, and one was in the class ahead of me. So it was sort of an interesting connection. The other thing, you know—did you go to law school right out of—?

01:35:23 Q: No.

01:35:25 Meadow: Do you want to take a break at all or should we—it’s up to you. Do you want to keep going?

01:35:29 Q: I’m good. If you’re fine.

01:35:30 Meadow: I’m fine. [side discussion about chair] So I knew I was going to go to law school, and I went straight through, and so I went before there were that many of us. And it was, you know, 1971, so it was a pretty political time. We organized, um, we went to every anti-war march in Philly and in Washington. And that’s what was so funny. In Washington, I went to every march I could, you know, threw blood, you know, did the Pentagon march, all of that stuff. Um, but we had a couple of professors at Penn that were also lefties, and this was just before

critical legal studies got founded. So these lefty professors sort of adopted us, and that was also—again, different from my Mary McCarthy group—an incredibly supportive group of, um, people. And some of the men and women in that group paired off, and I will say, of all the relationships that I’ve known, every one of those marriages has lasted. So a whole bunch of that group went to the West Coast. They’re in the Northwest. So, um, two of my friends that married each other—Kris (Hauser, Penn Law ’74) is still a progressive plaintiff’s lawyer—we were all legal aid lawyers or public defender lawyers—and her husband [Steve Scott, Penn Law ’74] was in my class and then became a judge in Seattle. Um, another guy was a public defender. Another went to Portland, Oregon. So I’m proud. When people ask me about SDS, every time someone says, “You know, the sixties are over,” my little cohort in law school stayed absolutely—I mean, they think I’m the sellout. I live in a relatively fancy house in LA. I’m a mediator. Um, I’m an academic. They’re all still fighting the fight. So when I became a mediator professionally, they all thought I was a sellout, which I’m not—it’s ridiculous. But, so there’s been some tension in that because, you know, I think I’ve done plenty of good, progressive work from this place. But that particular cohort of my friends stayed very pure and clean in terms of our politics. So every time *New York Times* or somebody else writes about our “sellout generation,” I get really annoyed. Um, so it was very nice. We had this little network for a while after a law school of all of us in legal aid, public defender, and staying in touch with each other, and it was really terrific.

So the issue from an SDS or radical perspective is whether to work within the system or without. So I was a legal aid lawyer in Philadelphia, and I was civil rights, I did Title VII employment cases and welfare cases and landlord/tenant cases; I had a caseload of three hundred cases. And what’s interesting, the other big influence of my life was sitting in that office, and not unlike

SDS, all the guys were very macho, um, and the way to be, um, well regarded in that office, you know, was to try cases and to win. And in my office in North Philadelphia, was a woman who was two years older than me who had gone to Penn Law School, and she sat in the back, and every time a client came into our office – whether it's welfare or a school problem or employment problem or a housing problem – she'd ask the person, "What's the problem, and who's hurting you?" and then she'd pick up the phone, and she'd negotiate it. So I tell you this to say, in that moment, the rest of my career was forged because I watched Linda solving all these peoples' problems on a one-to-one basis. And then I would work on these big cases and we'd win the case then and two days later, they'd change the rule. And from that moment on, I said, "This is what they should be teaching in law school: how to negotiate, and how to solve people's problems." So that's what I'm known for now—as a legal scholar, teacher and professional dispute resolution expert.

A few years after that, I was invited to go back to Penn where I'd gone to law school, and help found the clinical program at Penn. I was brought in by one of my former teachers. And I was the third person in the United States to teach negotiation at a law school. And then I wrote an article in 1984 on "Toward Another View of Legal Negotiation: The Structure of Legal Problem Solving," [31 UCLA Law Review 754-842]. And so I started teaching negotiation, and that's when my friends thought I was a sellout, because if you're teaching how to negotiate and settle, you're not fighting as much anymore. But it had come from my experience in a lot of employment discrimination cases that I had done that even though the evidence was very strong, we would lose jury trials that I did a couple of. And then I had a couple of very successful settlements when, on behalf of my client, we would, you know, work out a voluntary hiring or

promotions schedule. So I became a big proponent for settling cases—still based on principles—but that you can often get more by getting people to work things out. And so I started teaching negotiation, (coughs) and I was teaching at Penn, and Penn was not tenuring clinical professors. So I was active as a legal feminist, and as a progressive lawyer, and the other movement that I got active in, in the 1970s was the clinical education movement. And so a group of people at Chicago [University of Chicago Law School], Harvard Law School, Northwestern [Northwestern University School of Law], (coughs) NYU [New York University School of Law], Columbia, Penn, Georgetown, American University in Washington [American University Washington College of Law]—we were the first generation of clinicians. And we got to teach, but nobody would give us tenure.

And then, um, my husband finished graduate school. He was teaching at Penn also. So we had this charmed life for two years, in which we were both teaching at Penn. We worked a block away from each other. So, um, we were political activists within the legal academy because we were teaching students how to actually be lawyers, not just to think like lawyers. And all clinical education has sort of a progressive idea behind it, too—justice. So Bob finished graduate school, he's teaching at Penn, and then we both decided to go on our markets because I was not in a tenure track position, and he was teaching at the Annenberg School [Annenberg School for Communication] at Penn, and they were about to cut off all their junior faculty because they weren't getting a lot of support. So, anyway, I see a notice that UCLA is hiring clinical people, and they were the first school in the country advertising tenure track. So I was a New York kid, and perfectly happy in Philly and very East Coast. Come out here and interview, and fell in love with it. I had always been one of those people who thought California was crazy and not serious

and I could never live in this land of sunshine and movie stars. (coughs) But I was just very impressed with what was going on in UCLA Law School. So it was 1979 and Bob got a job at the University of California in San Diego, as a professor of Political Science and Communications. And that was probably one of the reasons why we didn't have children because we commuted. We always had a house that we lived in together, but one or the other of us was always on the road for those first few years. And I taught employment discrimination and labor law and trial advocacy and we represented tenants in landlord-tenant court, and parents accused of child abuse, and the hard part—Janet, you would appreciate—was it was hard to stay, um, very political out here. That part that you feel is absolutely true. So the clinicians in the East and in Chicago, I think, stayed much truer to the progressive side of legal education. What was going on here, which was very exciting but different, was to really theorize and teach how to be a lawyer. So my negotiation stuff fit in with a plan that was going on at UCLA to teach trial skills, client interviewing and counseling skills, and ultimately mediation as well. I started the first mediation clinic. And so here the focus was on recognizing that people needed to be taught skills. The East Coast clinics—and so later when I went to Georgetown, I could see it at Georgetown—the east coast clinics stayed much more committed to political causes, and those clinics tended to be substantive, law related. So there were housing clinics and criminal justice clinics and that kind of stuff. And our program here was based on lawyering skills. So there was an interviewing course, a counseling course, negotiation, and then I did mediation. And it always had a clinical component. We represented clients, but I had lots of arguments with the head of the clinical program here, because he was much more apolitical than I. So that was always an issue for me. I loved doing the work that I did, but it was a little less political here. And as you can see, even very progressive, lefty people can live, uh, very nice lives here. When we first

moved out here, we lived downtown—Silver Lake—in a much more diverse neighborhood than this is. This is, you know, the west side of LA. All kinds of movie stars on this block. Drive down the street, Harrison Ford's down there. Arnold Schwarzenegger and Gwyneth Paltrow live in this [Mandeville] Canyon. So, you know, life is very pleasant here.

And my husband just loved it. In the early eighties, he was asked to consult on a political campaign in San Diego and so he became a political consultant and stopped being—he was an academic—and gave up being an academic, and so, ironically, as I tell you my life story, he wound up doing mainstream politics. He's been a democratic pollster since 1983. And so when we wind up going back to Washington in 1992, all those things I told you that I sort of regretted not doing in my childhood or my youth—working on the Hill—all of a sudden, I come back to it as a grownup, because he's working on campaigns. And in 1992, I was called and asked to come teach at Georgetown because Eleanor Holmes Norton, one of my heroines, had been the negotiation teacher at Georgetown, and she got into Congress. So one of my—you may know this an education person—one of my good friends, Peter Edelman, who is Marianne Wright Edelman's husband, and a dear friend, invited me to come teach at Georgetown. And I fell in love again because I loved Georgetown. It was partially the Jesuit influence, the clinical programs, incredibly progressive law school, wonderful friends. And I went back to clinical teaching as well as teaching employment discrimination and negotiation, and I became a legal ethics person, so I got to teach whatever I wanted. And UCLA was very diverse; more diverse than any other school in the sense that UCLA had a very strong affirmative action program, but diverse in every way: Asian, Hispanic, African American. Just about—a little bit after I went to Georgetown, Prop 209 [Proposition 209] passed here in California. I was very against it. That

was to eliminate affirmative action programs. So as I was visiting at Georgetown, the demographics of UCLA Law School changed completely. And Georgetown was pretty neat. I mean, it was less diverse in the sense—I would say less representation of all different minority groups, but many more African American students at Georgetown. I thought I'd sort of come home to my civil rights and poverty work, so I did clinical stuff there, and I just fell in love with it. And then Bill Clinton won in 1992, so Washington was just—I mean, I feel very, especially lucky; it was just totally perchance, you know? I wasn't formally in the Clinton administration, but everything in Washington—I would say those were the best years of my life, from '92 until about 2005. Um, went to Washington and Bob's practice then became national. And he'd been working in California. He opened an office in Washington and was doing congressional campaigns for Democrats, and I just loved it. A whole bunch of my friends were in the Clinton administration, so they got appointed to various things.

And then I had the great, um, weird, weird pleasure and honor or whatever to train Janet Reno, the attorney general, in mediation. Um, I got a call from a very dear friend of mine—I don't know if you know her—Roberta Achtenberg. She was, at the time, the highest-ranking, openly-lesbian person appointed. She went through a full confirmation hearing, Clinton administration. Deputy secretary of housing under Henry Cisneros, and her partner Mary Morgan was sitting next to her at the confirmation table. It was a really big moment on many levels. And Mary had given up a judgeship here in California to go become an aid to Janet Reno while Roberta was in the housing department, and one day Mary called me up and said, "Janet Reno's interested in being a mediator. Do you think you could come train her?" So it was really funny. I went with a colleague, and she wanted to be trained alone, so she asked us to construct a training program for

the attorney general and all of her deputies. And we went in after-hours—she didn't want anybody to know she was doing this. So we went in after-hours—maybe about five times—and did a combination of—the way I do a lot of mediation training—of lecturing and then role-plays. And I loved Janet Reno to pieces, but she was a terrible mediator because she was the attorney general, you know, and she'd been the attorney general and the head DA [district attorney] of Florida. So the way I teach mediation is that your job is to facilitate the parties negotiating the solution that's right for them. An arbitrator decides things for people; mediators don't do that. Mediators facilitate communication. So she was a decider, not a—so it was pretty hard. How do you give negative feedback to the attorney general of the United States? It was pretty weird. And then, I don't know if you remember this, but right around the time I was doing this, the Elián González thing happened. And ironically, the person who facilitated that was a law school classmate of mine, Alberto Ibargüen, who was then the editor of *The Miami Herald*, and he and she together—so she went down to Miami to try to negotiate and mediate a deal between Cuba and the United States, and she failed miserably. And so my people, my friends from Washington knew I was training her and they would say, you know, “What did you do?” And I said, “Well, I did the best, but she's used to telling people what to do.”

So it was—I tell you that story just to tell you that it was a very heady time in 1992. It wasn't Columbia '68, but we thought another revolution was going to happen. The Dems were back in, and there were a lot of really exciting, progressive things going on, and Georgetown's a big place—about 100 people on the faculty, and I would say probably about 20 of them went into the government. And we had a phrase in Washington whether you were “going in or not.” Going “in” to the government happened again during the Obama administration; again about 20 of my

Georgetown colleagues went into the government. And I was very lucky in the sense I never—I didn't go in in any formal way ever, so I didn't have to go through the confirmation hearings, all the SDS, you know, smoking pot stuff never came up for me, but I got to do training and mediation in almost every department in the government.

And the most exciting thing, actually, it was pretty interesting—when Hillary was doing the first healthcare plan, a whole bunch of my friends in Washington were involved in that. One of my law school classmates was working on the Hill, and then he went to work for AARP. And one day, I came back to my classroom, and my secretary comes running in with this note, “Hillary Clinton just called you.” And it wasn't Hillary Clinton, but it was somebody on the staff of the healthcare plan that she was going to do, and they were looking into different forms of alternative dispute resolution to put into any healthcare bill that would have required mediation in malpractice cases. So, I would say, as a professional, I've done a lot of really interesting things, but the most interesting thing was, I was told that I had to do a five-page, no more, position paper to describe what mediation in the healthcare law might look like. And make the arguments for it, draft some legislation, and be prepared to come and report to the committee. And I never worked on anything so hard in my life. I'd done appellate arguments, I tried a lot of cases, I'd been teaching lots of big classes, but to take complicated ideas and to get them down into five pages is really hard. So I pulled an all-nighter kind of thing. And this is one of the things I sort of regret—it was pretty funny—so I sent the paper off, and they really liked it, and by that time, I was back in LA for some reason. They asked me to come to a meeting on some day that I had a class, and I had a rule my whole now forty years of teaching—I've just started to break it a little bit—but I never cancel classes for, um, some other professional engagement. And

so I said, “I’m sorry, I can’t come that day. I’m teaching.” So, they said, “Could you recommend somebody else?” So I did. I gave them the name of a friend of mine at Duke who went. And now I’m a little sorry that I didn’t get to go present my own, you know, paper, and then of course, the whole Hillary healthcare thing blew up. And it was very sad because in those years in Washington, I went to many meetings, both public and private, where she was presenting her case, and I think she presented the single best case still for universal healthcare and for single payer. And so I’ve been a little disappointed that the [President Barack] Obama people didn’t pick up on it. But she would tell this story. It happened at the time—it must have been ’93—two kids got meningitis, and one had money and one didn’t. And they wound up going to different emergency rooms in the hospital, and of course, the kid who had insurance got a full work-up, and it was—you know, there are two different kinds. There’s viral and bacterial meningitis, but it was the kind that was treatable, and that kid survived, and the other kid didn’t. And then she told a story, which I believed, living in Los Angeles—bacteria and viruses don’t know from class. So when you’re sitting here in this neighborhood, all the moms in Mandeville Canyon here have nannies that are from Guatemala and El Salvador and Nicaragua and some still from Mexico, but all of a sudden, there was a little tuberculosis breakout around here, and the reason was, a lot of the nannies were coming either home from their countries or they’d had visitors and they were crossing borders and, um, even though we more or less eliminated tuberculosis, it wasn’t gone. And also the kids were getting lice and, um, and Hillary did a very good speech on the things that cause disease. Don’t know from class, and don’t know from who has insurance, and this is why we all need healthcare. And it was a wonderful speech about the *interdependence of human beings*, which is what I believe in, so I mean—I hope she goes back to it when she runs for president, because I just thought it was compelling, and every time she did it, both in big settings

and small settings, people would just tear up and they would understand that everybody, to be healthy, needs to protect the health of the least healthy. And to protect the life chances of the— And I just thought it was fabulous. It was sad that the whole rest of the process got so screwed up. And it was kind of a mess, um, but I just thought it was terrific. And it was a, you know, it was a time in Washington when we really thought that we were making a difference. So I went from my more, you know, non-mainstreaming, being an outside agitator for about six or seven years, being engaged in the actual governmental process, and it was just fabulous.

Um, but on the family front, we'd always had a deal that—even though Bob's a political consultant, he despises Washington. Um, and especially now, you can see it, it was after the '94 democratic loss, it was a mess. It was really bad, and Bob's just always hated the spirit in Washington and the incivility. So the deal always was that we would eventually come back to California. I didn't want to. I loved Washington. I loved my engagement there. I loved my students. Georgetown was a great institution from which to be doing advocacy work in a more conventional way but still pretty important. And then, um, this new law school got founded at the University of California at Irvine, which is about forty miles south of here, and so this would have been in 2007 or 8. Erwin Chemerinsky, who had been a professor at USC [University of Southern California School of Law] when I was at UCLA called me up and asked if I would come join the founding faculty. And you might appreciate this as a principal—as an educator, what could be more interesting than to start a new institution? Since you've done it, too. And so—and he [my husband] wanted to come back to California, so I agreed to come, except that I had promised Georgetown that I would run their program in London for two years, so I delayed

my coming. And by that time, I was doing a lot of international work, international mediation and—

01:57:47 Q: So you lived in London for a couple of years. We'll come back to that.

01:57:51 Meadow: Okay. Anyway, that was a long answer to "What about SDS?" (Price laughs)

So, the theme here is that SDS led to my sitting on bricks at Columbia, which put me in the middle of a dispute, which led me to think of myself as a person in the middle who could mediate. Um, and, you know, forge my political goals and all of that stuff. But ultimately, I wound up in Washington doing some more, you know, conventional advocacy sorts of things.

01:58:18 Q: So you got to do your stuff on the Hill. A little late in life, but—

01:58:21 Meadow: Right. Exactly. And the other thing I'll say about Georgetown—Georgetown had a night school, which not very many schools have anymore, and the neat thing about my night students was at a place like Georgetown, a lot of the students going to law school at night were working on the Hill. So you had the experience of, if you were teaching something—like I was teaching about alternative dispute resolution—something you taught a student would wind up in a bill. So it was a very interesting, different form of impact that I had there. I wasn't necessarily doing—writing the statutes myself, but I can think of at least five different pieces of legislation that were affected because of the students that I taught at Georgetown.

01:59:02 Q: Who was that professor who said, “It’s important to educate women because they affect two generations?”

01:59:07 Meadow: Chilton Williamson. Absolutely right, absolutely right. And that was an interesting thing. And I’ll say I miss that terribly because, um, the University of California’s a fabulous system, but it’s California. And these kids mostly love being in California. There’s a California lifestyle, there’s plenty of politically active people here. There’s something about being in the East, that in a place like Washington or New York, the kids that go to law school and are political are really very serious and want to get stuff done. And in a place like Washington, they could, so it’s very different here, teaching the students here.

01:59:47 Q: It’s too nice outside.

01:59:48 Meadow: Yeah, exactly right. And you get used to it. When we first came here, the weather’s nice, you run outside. Eventually you realize it’s always going to be like this. Before you leave, we’ll go upstairs and take a look at my office. You’ll see we have this beautiful workspace up there and it’s all windows, so I do all my writing and class preparation up there, and it’s very beautiful and I don’t have to go outside. And I work like an East Coast person. I work pretty hard and I just look at how pretty it is. I go for a swim, so, um, but it’s definitely very different. There’s no question about it. So I miss the East in that respect.

02:00:23 Q: So we need to talk, um, about your time in London and how you got involved in international issues, and then let’s come back to founding the program at Irvine.

02:00:32 Meadow: Okay. So, I feel, again, incredibly fortunate in life, um, because the international stuff came because I was one of the founders, as you heard me say, of negotiation and mediation training in law schools, and at Georgetown, when I got there, I had a lot of international students. Georgetown has one of the biggest masters of law programs in the country. Harvard and Columbia have big ones, too, but Georgetown's is enormous. So these students that came from all over the world heard about this mediation thing that was starting to take off. And so starting in about 1998, I started to have a lot of students from South America, Europe, and then Asia who took my classes. And then they would ask me to come and consult for their governments. And of all the places—I'm a European person and I thought I would wind up being in Europe first. So as a girl who didn't study a word of Spanish in high school or any place else, the first place in 1998 or something that I get invited to go teach and advise the government in is Paraguay. So one of my students—who is as important in my life as any of these mentors—Carlos Rufinelli, invites me to come to Paraguay to teach diplomats, lawyers, government officials how to mediate and how to do—I also do a lot of deliberate democracy work. It's just like—community organizing for government officials, you know, and facilitating meetings to increase public participation, and he's trying to democratize his country. It's very exciting—

02:02:08 Q: And this is a country where there was a fair amount of human rights abuses—

02:02:13 Meadow: Oh, you've got that right. That's exactly where we're going with this.

(coughs, both talking at same time) So, Carlos, it turns out I learn later because I teach this case,

was friends with [Joel] Filártiga Jr., the kid who got killed in a famous international human rights case [See *Filartiga v. Peña-Irala*, 630 F.2nd 876 (2nd Cir. 1980)]; (coughs) he was one of his friends. So I go to teach in Paraguay, and I agree to do this. And Bob is very good with languages, so—and he’d studied Spanish—so we work with translators, and I start studying Spanish, and right before I get there, Carlos says, “Um, I just have to warn you. I didn’t want you to know before you came here, but—” What’s his name? The name of the dictator in Paraguay for so many decades. Uh, this middle-aged stuff. It’ll come back to me. I’m thinking [Anastasio] Somoza but that was Nicaragua. Um, anyway, he says, “The grandson of the main dictator [Alfredo Stroessner, 1929-2006] is going to be in your class.” And he said, “But don’t worry, you won’t know because he’s changed his name. He doesn’t want to have anything to do with him.” And he turned out to be one of the best students in the class. So I go down and I teach mediation and negotiation and public participation, and I just fall in love with it. It was very grueling. This was 1998, so what would I have been? 48 years old, I guess? So this is South America—I now do a lot of work in South America—I teach all by myself, all day long, from nine to six, four days running. And then I’m supposed to go party at night, because Carlos is, in addition to being a lawyer and a political activist, he’s a musician. And that’s what you do. You just go, dance, and—I have no idea how I did this. And I just remember that after this first weekend, I had an unbelievable migraine at the end of it because I taught all day long. Very hard work because you can hear I talk like a fast New Yorker, and when you’re doing this kind of teaching you really have to slow down. And by this time—because I had earphones on—I was beginning to know enough Spanish that I knew when the translator wasn’t getting it right. So as an example, I’m teaching mediation, arbitration, and negotiation, and the translator will want to alter the words so that it’s not boring. So I would listen in the earphones and I would hear that

when I was saying *mediation* and *arbitration*, she would interchange *mediación* and *arbitraje* because she wasn't a lawyer and she didn't understand this was a difference. And I said, "Oh, my God. Stop. Arbitration is someone decides something. Mediation is someone facilitates, and the parties are in control. And they're very different processes, and you can't just—" So I became very interested in translation.

Then I got a Fulbright, and I spent time teaching in Chile and then, um, that year, 2006 or 7, I got a Fulbright, I taught in Chile for three, or however long that was. And then I began what I've been doing for the last few years; I teach in Argentina every other summer and that year I also went to China. So the international work came from these countries being interested in alternative processes for different reasons. And in some places like the United States, you know, the court dockets are too long and they take too much time and they're too expensive, so people turn to mediation and dispute resolution to reduce the costs and fees. But in other countries, in China, for example, mediation's been part of the culture since Confucius. And then Mao [Zedung] co-opted it to use it for party control, so the mediators were all party officials for many years. So it's a double-edged sword, this mediation stuff. It can be used for lots of different purposes. But I got called in to train and consult, um, in Chile, Argentina, Brazil, China, and *then* Europe. So, uh, Georgetown had a program in Italy, so I taught in Florence for a year, and then, um, a wonderful dean at Georgetown, who is now the deputy commissioner for refugees at the UN [United Nations], Alex Aleinikoff [Thomas Alexander Aleinikoff], he came to Georgetown from Michigan, and he decided that he wanted Georgetown to have a really strong international presence; there it was in Washington. So I was part of three initiatives that Alex put into place at Georgetown, and one of them was to found a thing called the Center for Transnational Legal

Studies, and the idea was to form an institution somewhere in which students would come from all over the world and study law together. And every class was going to be taught by a common law and a civil law teacher so that every class would be comparative law, whatever the subject were. So I was part of the committee that helped frame this institution and we have—

02:06:56 Q: Let's make sure that folks who are listening to this transcript understand the difference between common law and civil law.

02:07:03 Meadow: Got it. Okay, so common law is England and all of its colonies, the US, Canada, Australia, to some extent South Africa, there's some mixed systems like Israel, which is mixed because it had the Brits in charge before '48, but also civil law because it actually was formed by a lot of German folks when they finally started the Hebrew University [Hebrew University of Jerusalem]. Um, civil law countries have codes, essentially the Napoleonic Code or some derivation of it from French law and everything statutory. And common law systems like ours—we have rules, we have statutes, but judges make decisions and the case law evolves, and it's a sort of a case-by-case decision process. There's a lot of work in law about how these are totally different forms of legal reasoning. That in common law systems, we do it case-by-case, we have more discretion, we have more interpretation; and the idea is in civil law systems, you just look up the statute and there's a right answer and there's a wrong answer. And what we decide in one case has no bearing on the next case. The neat part, in my professional life, about this is that they're really converging. The United States is full of statutes now, so we have lots of codes of all kinds. And in the European Union and places that have regional legal systems now, the courts are interpreting their statutes.

So the thing that made this, um, institution so interesting to me was that this was a place that we were going to explore whether legal systems in the world were converging or diverging. And I would say the things I've done in my life—having had no children— I, um, I'm so proud of having helped birth this program. So I helped with a bunch of people on the faculty at Georgetown, form it, and it opened in 2008. And I went to go teach the first class, and I wrote a problem that was intended to transcend common civil law problems and to explore the question of whether there was such a thing as transnational law. So when we have a contract for an American to go work in a European bank, what law applies? European banking law? American employment law? These are called conflict of law questions, and so I wrote experiential problems so that the students would have to work together across systems. And the magical moment—something we have to get to—is in that program, the first night, when the program of the day was over, the German students and the Israeli students—because when we founded the school, there were fourteen founding law schools from the US, Canada, Australia, Germany, England, um, Singapore, Brazil, Israel, Switzerland, Italy, France, the Netherlands, and ultimately Mexico, and a couple other—oh, and China , Russia and South Korea and Chile have now joined us. So there are now twenty-four countries that participate. But after that first day, everybody was exhausted and we were having our first week—we were having a little cocktail party. So the students all wanted to go and party, except that the Germans and the Israelis, who were unbelievably earnest, serious students, said, “Professor Menkel-Meadow, would you come with us? We want to keep talking about the problem.” And I thought, All those things that my family and everybody had died for, whatever—imagine what Hitler would have thought to see that it was the German and the Israeli students that bonded. So the neat thing about this program

is that this is my idea now of world peace. I don't believe in, you know, violent revolutions anymore like I might have in '68. But I believe they come from cultural interactions across groups when people find their human commonality.

So the Center for Transnational Legal Studies was just extraordinary, and so I was—Alex's concept was that faculty would rotate in as directors, and each of the fourteen to twenty-four schools would send a faculty member for either a semester or a year. So in 2009 and 2010, which was a hard year—my mother died that year—we went, and we lived in London. And the neat thing about it was aside from teaching all these students and looking at the question of what transnational law was, because I was in London, I then got called into lots of European meetings about making law and about a form of dispute resolution, and my whole career really shifted. So although I still teach—on Monday I'm going to start teaching very basic negotiation to UCI [University of California, Irvine] law students, but at an international level, what I now do is consulting and training and mediating. Uh, my last count, I've taught in twenty-six different countries. And, um, I took Spanish lessons for many years, so I taught in Spanish once and gave it up because although I understand Spanish, I'm not really good enough to teach in it. I have German understanding from my parents; I took French at Barnard and in college. My husband, who loves languages, studied Portuguese and Italian, and he now comes—as a semi-retired political consultant—he now comes with me wherever I teach, sometimes serving as my TA, because when I teach abroad, I use American experiential role-playing methods, which is still quite unusual in other countries, and so there has to be a teacher in every little small group, so Bob's become an expert in dispute resolution—

02:12:32 Q: Speed resolution?

02:12:34 Meadow: Dispute.

02:12:35 Q: Oh, dispute resolution. (laughs)

02:12:37 Meadow: So he helps with these little role-plays that we do with the students, and that is the program I just love the most. So at one point, Alex then left to go the UN and we have a new dean at Georgetown, and I, after my mother died, I would have gone on to be a permanent director of the program. I thought what the program needed was someone to be there all the time. What we had been doing is rotating directors, so the wheel gets reinvented every year. But I had promised him—my husband—and Erwin that I would come to UCI, so, um, so I left. I go back to see CTLS [Center for Transnational Legal Studies] every year. I do some teaching; I do some lecturing. That's the thing I think I'm the proudest of in my life. I love watching how the students interact, and it's now been seven years, and what's happened is—you know, no world peace has come out of it yet—but we've actually included Al-Quds [Al-Quds University] now, which is a Palestinian university.

And I don't know if you've read—or anybody who's watching this—in Thomas Friedman's book *From Beirut to Jerusalem*, the preface talks about when he was a graduate student—I forget now whether it was Cambridge or Oxford—but Thomas Friedman as young boy had gone to Israel, so he knew Hebrew. And when he was in grad school, he learned Arabic, and that is how he is a big Middle Eastern expert. And he describes when he was in graduate school that he

thought world peace was going to come from obviously the very elite being educated at British universities, but the people who are going to become the future leaders of their countries would be studying in a neutralish place—England—and they would form friendships that would ultimately solve the Middle Eastern crisis. Obviously that hasn't worked, but whenever I give a speech or a talk, I always tell people to go back and read that because that's my vision. So when I used to introduce people to CTLS, I would say, "My hope is that these kids studying together here from Israel and now the West Bank and Brazil and, uh, various places—they'll form (10 second break in audio 02:14:44) friendships in this program that, if they become leaders of their countries, will make world peace. That's what keeps me going." Um, there's no evidence of it yet, except that these students have created an international network, and it's extraordinary that when I went to go teach in Melbourne a couple of years ago—

02:15:09 Q: In Australia?

02:15:10 Meadow: In Australia, and the Australian students that were at CTLS heard that I was coming, so I now—when any one of us who have taught in the CTLS program are going somewhere, we have a—you know, it's another form of fraternity or sorority that we've made. We have this group of people that are all CTLS alums, and they have created a network of students that are now lawyers and government officials. It's not yet ten years so they're still at the beginning, but it's really remarkable. So that's my passion, and I'm a little sorry that I had to give it up. I don't think the current dean of Georgetown is as committed to it, you know. This shows you—you would appreciate this as an education administrator and education lawyer—what education institutions do, I've learned, depends on leadership, and so you need a good

leader, a principal, or a dean, or something and Alex Aleinikoff had that vision. We also did some innovative international law stuff internally at Georgetown, so I was part of a group that developed a program called Week One. Every law student at Georgetown had a week separate from their regular courses in which they worked on a transnational or international problem intensively for one week. And I ran that program with a bunch of colleagues, and this would have been its tenth year and the current dean just ended it because he thought it was taking up too many resources. And so you'd appreciate this: as anyone does who works in educational reform, you work very hard to do something different—for me, clinical education, feminism, and now international education—and it will depend on whether both there's financial support but also there's some leader behind it. So I don't really regret this: I've been asked to be a dean of law school several times, and I don't regret it because I'm not someone who wants to do all that political stuff but I do see—the one regret I have about it is if you have visions of things you want to accomplish, being a leader of something is very important to get it done. So I have been someone who's helped implement other people's ideas that are consistent with my own, and I just—that program in London is something I really cared about, and to watch somebody else not want to continue it is very sad.

So, the only way I could transfer that—to make the transition—is that when we started the new law school at Irvine, I said—I wasn't alone, there was a group of us—we wanted international law as a required course in the first year. But even students in a suburban law school outside of Los Angeles have to realize that no matter what kind of law they do, including family law here, right, people are intermarrying from all kinds of different countries. They have child custody disputes. There isn't a single law question that doesn't involve international law now. So

international law is a required course at Irvine, and I've been teaching it since I came. So, it's not very popular; a lot of students say, I just want to be a regular old lawyer in California. Why do I have to study, you know, the UN charter and human rights treaties and the *Filártiga* case, which I assign, but I am very committed. So that's the way I take that experience in London and try to use it here. So Irvine's been very innovative in that respect. We crafted our own curriculum, and international law is required, and legal ethics is required for first year also, so that part's been pretty neat. And, um, I could have retired years ago. The nice thing about being back in the University of California system is that we have a very generous retirement plan, and for all of us women of a certain age, every conversation I'm in these days is, What are your retirement plans? And I came back here kicking and screaming because I would much rather have stayed in Georgetown, or in London. But in a funny way it gave me a third lease on life or something, so I'm going to stick around for a few more years of teaching to implement some of these, some of these ideas.

The Irvine Law School's challenge—when Erwin Chemerinsky founded it, his goal was to make this a public interest law school. So, um, our first three classes had full tuition scholarships. He did all this fancy fundraising, and so the first two classes of students don't have a lot of debt. So we're tracking them. It's very interesting to see what happens—whether we're able to do that or not. Now everybody's got to pay tuition, so we're more conventional, but we have a required clinical component, um, and so every student does—and we have all kinds of pro bono stuff. So it's kind of interesting because the campus is beautiful; it's absolutely gorgeous. It's forty miles south of here. It's right near Laguna Beach. It's absolutely stunningly beautiful. So it's a very beautiful place to teach, but as we've been saying, the weather's nice, so people may not be as

super committed as some of the students in the East, but the school's ethos is one of public service and pro bono and it sort of has a nice feel to it.

02:20:23 Q: Who are your students?

02:20:24 Meadow: Well, that's a great question because, again, the idea was to be very diverse. It is California and it's very diverse, but in all kinds of unpredictable ways. Since Prop 209, which is still in effect, the limitations on affirmative action here are pretty strong, so, um, unlike Georgetown, relatively low representation of African Americans, some Hispanics. And Irvine, as a branch of the University of California, the undergraduate population is now getting pretty close to not 50%, but the highest Hispanic population of all the UC systems. So you'll see it at the undergraduate level. But my classes are incredibly diverse. When you look out there, [you see] all hues of color. So right near Irvine is Little Saigon, that's where all the Vietnamese refugees came, and interestingly the parents tended to be Republicans and conservative; the kids are not. So we have Vietnamese, Chinese, Japanese Americans. Thai, um, Indian, so all kinds of shades of color. Uh, and one of my colleagues is a Native American, who's fabulous, so we've been recruiting—so it's very diverse. Um, the student body's incredibly diverse. Many first gen—like me, I was a first generation lawyer from my German refugee parents. There are a lot of Armenians in California. My international law class has been fabulous. I've had three Russian immigrant kids who spoke Russian fluently. And what's interesting, in this—sort of the first generation kids, those are the ones who appreciate the international law courses, so they've been my favorites. So I had this small cohort of children of refugees from various parts of the world who wind up in Southern California who are really interested in international law. And we have

an enormous human rights program at Irvine. One of our clinical professors started an international human rights clinic, and then he got appointed to a very important position at the UN. So here are these kids in Irvine, California, that are traveling to Geneva and to Africa and working on, um, human rights cases. I think we're providing a really good experience.

And the other thing I'd say about Irvine that's kind of interesting—Georgetown was huge. Georgetown is over two thousand students between its JD [Juris Doctor] program and its LLM [Master of Laws] program. Very big. We're still very small. We were permitted to grow very slowly. So Irvine, although it's a public school, it has the feel, for me, of a private school. I know every single one of the students in the whole school. So I feel like I'm teaching—even though it's a public school—at a kind of weird—I wouldn't say elite, because a lot of these kids are working class as well as very privileged Los Angelinos, but, um, it has the feel of a very intense private school where the minute anybody's in trouble, somebody finds them. We have this enormously big administrative ratio of—so if a student gets into trouble, like I told you I was depressed at Barnard, somebody will figure that out very quickly. So it's a very congenial place to work.

02:23:43 Q: When you were designing the school, um, did you look at other, like CUNY [City University of New York School of Law], also—?

02:23:48 Meadow: Yes. I was involved at the founding of CUNY.

02:23:50 Q: No, get out of town!

02:23:52 Meadow: Yeah, absolutely. So, um, Charlie [Charles] Halpern, who was the founding dean, hired my mentor at law school, Howard Lesnick, who was at Penn, to join CUNY. And they lobbied me—I was still at UCLA at the time—to come and, um, come to CUNY. And I wasn't prepared to go back to New York, because we really loved it—And the irony is—you'll laugh—CUNY now has its own building, but when it started, the building it was in was Bob's elementary school. And then, when it finally opened and I went to go do a class, I looked out the window and there was the cemetery that my grandparents are buried in. So, it's very weird. So I was part of the group that helped found it. It was very interesting. I completely believed in the vision of CUNY, and my friends—they did every first-year course totally differently. It was fabulous. CUNY suffered from the problem that all lefty organizations do. Early on, two of my best friends in the world—Rhonda Copelon, who has subsequently died and was with me in Chile, we had Fulbrights the same year; and Jack Himmelstein, with whom I had worked with at Columbia and who started mediation training in the United States—the two of them both progressive, but Jack had worked on death penalty cases with Tony [Anthony] Amsterdam at the Inc. Fund [NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund], and Rhonda has been an incredible person forever.

02:25:25 Q: I worked for Rhonda.

02:25:16 Meadow: Adore her. And I knew Rhonda at the beginning of my career, and she was one of the people who thought I was a sellout for being a mediator. And it was very funny because we reconnected in Chile in 2007. But when CUNY got founded, Rhonda and Jack had

fights like Trotskyites and Stalinists did. So there you have a place, CUNY, which was founded out of very progressive values, and behind the scenes, the faculty had these unbelievable fights about the content of the program and what requirements the students were going to have. And so I decided I just wasn't interested in the politics of it. The design of the program was fabulous. So, yes, when we founded Irvine, I said, "Let's look at CUNY." And Erwin, my current dean with whom I've had a lot of difficulties—I have to credit him. He said, "Yeah, CUNY did a great thing." But he said, "I want to be the best law school that we can be and be as creative as possible without looking so different that nobody will come and take us seriously." So you may or may not know this, when CUNY opened, the first class, they had a very bad bar passage rate. Yeah, and Erwin said, "We're not going to do that." So Erwin—

02:26:31 Q: I had some of their students as my law students.

02:26:33 Meadow: Ah, yes. So over the years, CUNY has morphed into, I think, a still very creative place, but more conventional courses. So what Erwin did that was very clever—our first-year courses all actually have different content than a traditional class, but they have these funny names that make them look like they're more like conventional law school. So the first year's a little bit different, but he was very concerned about being a high-quality school, so I fought with him tooth and nail over stuff because I wanted us to be more like CUNY and more progressive, and we had lots of fights about things. But in an ironic way, he's really succeeded. Just last week, they issued a report; the University of California, Irvine is now the sixth-highest ranked faculty in scholarly impact. Sixth. We just got accredited and we came in at, I think it was thirtieth on *U.S. News*, which is unheard of for a brand new law school. And I hate rankings. I

hate this stuff. But I have to credit Erwin—for all of our fights, for a school to start from nothing and to be thirtieth on *U.S. News* and to be sixth. This is an extraordinary achievement because Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and all those fancy schools—their scholarly achievement is from a lot of people my age and older. The list now—they list faculty, and if you’re seventy or over, there’s a little asterisk next to your name, and there ain’t nobody on the Irvine faculty that’s seventy yet. So we got this ranking from a lot of brilliant, productive, junior—you know, me and younger people—faculty. So, yeah, it was pretty exciting.

Um, I will just say—this is a comment on us, our generation—I have a friend at Michigan, sorry, Wisconsin, who’s older than we are. And Mark Galanter (Prof of Law Emeritus, Wisconsin) wrote a wonderful piece. He said, “The sixties will return because the sixties generation will retire, and they will go back to doing good in the world and trying to make a very progressive—” So he said, “I’m looking at all the retired lawyers that’ll go back and do poverty stuff, and it will just be great.” And I will tell you, sadly, I don’t see it. I mean, our generation, like you guys, we are doing good stuff. My junior colleagues and in general, the younger generation, they’re all about themselves. So what I miss is the collectivity—the sense of collective enterprise that we had as progressive sixties people, and I don’t see it in this generation. So my junior colleagues are all about themselves. And I now wish—you now, all those fights at CUNY that happened, at least people were—my mentor, Howard Lesnick, who was at CUNY, used to use the phrase, “The most important thing is collective grappling with a problem.” Getting, you know, communitarian, collective people to work together and Irvine doesn’t have that. This world is all about individual achievement and selfies. We just came back from Europe. The number of people just walking around taking selfies was just appalling. And so I think this is the selfie

generation—and we weren't. We were the we—I call it the “ussy” generation. So if they're the selfie generation, we were the ussy generation, in the sense of caring about us, the whole world, together.

02:29:47 Q: Well, when you say the people who are taking selfies, um, of course, those are from all over the world; they were tourists from all over the world, right? But when you talk about your colleagues being more involved in their own careers, are you talking about millennials or people who are quite a bit older, like forties and fifties?

02:30:03 Meadow: Yeah. The millennials is a whole other issue. And I would say, if I retire, it's because I acknowledge that I don't live in their world, and they don't live in mine, and I am teaching with twentieth century materials—I write books, I write articles, I believe in the printed word. I am not someone who's gone totally electronic, so the millennials and the younger generation, they actually learn differently, and as a teacher I think I need to give it up soon. I need to either adapt, which I'm having trouble doing, or I need to give it up because law is changing and education is changing, so that's one set of problems. But when I talk about the selfies in the profession—both of lawyers and of law professors—that's the forty-somethings, too. And even the fifty-somethings.

And I will say, I feel—as you may have heard—I feel very regretful about leaving Georgetown because I think there the Jesuit ethos was very important. We did faculty retreats at Georgetown every year. The one hundred people on the faculty. When I suggested that we do a retreat at Irvine, Erwin said absolutely not. Because he was frightened that if you bring a group of people

together they'll have fights with each other. Well Georgetown—you know, I was hired to be the facilitator several times there before I joined the faculty. Um, schools figure out how to facilitate, how to work together, and at Georgetown we had this wonderful ethos that you went to the retreat and we had a cocktail party, and you were supposed to go have a drink with someone that was not one of your friends. So there was a lot of cross-fertilization and this ethos of working with people that were different than you, and groupy-ness. And we worked on committees—well, I think that's changed even there. So when I say this, some is institutional culture, but it's generational. So I am nostalgic for Georgetown but I'm still supervising doctoral work there. I'm still technically on the faculty; I haven't resigned. So [when] I'm back at Georgetown, I see the younger, forty-something people there also. Very concerned with their own achievements and less concerned with the world.

02:32:13 Q: So you have a semi-retired husband. That must be a challenge for you when you're working so very hard and two different law schools, plus all this international work. When are you going to slow down, and what is that going to look like?

02:32:27 Meadow: So I should talk about the other major thing in my life. I had breast cancer in 2004 and I was very lucky. It was, um, very early stages, but next week I have my annual mammogram, so I always get nervous. I have seven friends right now in cancer treatment, including my best friend here, who had very serious ovarian [cancer], so, um, I think about this question all the time. Given what limited amount of time I may have left on the earth, how do I want to spend it? Um, and I don't know the answer to that. Periodically I say it's time to enjoy life; who knows how much time we have left? On the other hand, um, I'm trying to find the

balance, and I think of all my friends, I think Bob's done it the best because he's—I laugh when I say “semi-retired.” We just came back from a trip in Italy and he was on conference calls virtually every day. So he picks two or three hours of the day. And Europe works great, because we tour all day and then we go to the hotel room and I read and he gets on the phone. So, you know, with the time difference, and that's what we did in London. He went out and had fun all day long, and then at night, he did his calls, and he flew back when he needed to. So I think the thing in life is balance. As long as I'm still enjoying teaching and getting stuff from my students—and I'm still writing a lot. And as long as I'm still getting interesting international gigs, um, I will keep working some. I'm very, very fortunate and privileged as a legal academic; my teaching load is very light. I have just had two sabbaticals in three years, and I only teach three courses a year. I have a very flexible schedule, and I still mediate on the side professionally. As long as I'm still getting some pleasure out of it, I think I'll probably go another few years. I have a very generous retirement plan. If I had my father's talents—my father was an artist. The paintings all here he did. Because he retired at sixty-five. They spent a lot of time in Florida until he started to lose his sight. If I could paint, if I could do sculpture, if I could do something, if I had some other talent, I might retire. But I think my only talent is reading and writing and teaching, so as long as I get some pleasure out of it—and I don't work that hard, I don't have to do it all the time. I mean, the hard part is, you know, I have to start next week; it's still a hot summer and I'll have to start teaching at 100 degrees, but I only teach four hours a week, so it's not really hard work. And as long as he's still—he thinks that the 2016 election will be his last one, so then we'll have to—And when people say “slow down,” I mean, it's weird—we travel so much. So when other people slow down it's because they want to travel. I just counted—I was on sabbatical this past semester—I was in twenty-five places since December.

02:35:21 Q: Mostly on work.

02:35:22 Meadow: Well, not entirely. I went to Antarctica. Um, that was pure vacation.

02:35:28 Q: Not too many conferences there.

02:35:30 Meadow: No. So I would say my favorite way to travel is to be invited to do some teaching or lecturing or consulting in some interesting place, do the work, and then do a trip from there. I love that. The other reason I love it, I will say—and Susan (Slyomovics, B’71) the anthropologist will appreciate this—Antarctica and this past trip to Italy were exceptions to what we now call our “behind-the-doors traveling.” So when I get invited some place because of work, I’m behind the doors. I’m working in an institution, I have friends or colleagues who invited me in, and I get to work with the government and go to peoples’ homes for dinner or stay in peoples’ houses, and also live in a place. So in Chile, I lived there on a Fulbright; in Argentina, every other summer, I lived there for two months. There’s something in England—I lived there. I actually have a hard time being a regular tourist now because, you know, I’ve been on all seven continents, and so I’ve seen a lot of stuff. I’m less interested in going to see the *Mona Lisa* for the forty-third time—I haven’t seen it that many times; I don’t really love it. But I’m more interested in people and culture, and these gigs that I do and the work that I do really allows me to get behind the doors. Um, so, in order to do behind-the-doors travel, I have to have work. It’s much harder to do that without it.

02:36:51 Q: So, some of the—we talked about—

02:36:55 Meadow: Ah, the one thing we forgot to talk about that we probably should is the Israel stuff.

02:26:59 Q: Oh, let's do that.

02:36:59 Meadow: Okay. Let's do that. And then you guys—whenever you want to quit is fine with me. Because you can tell—I could go on. So let me just say—

02:37:07 Q: I still have a few more questions anyway, but—

02:37:07 Meadow: Okay. So you heard I wasn't raised as a Jew, but I have a very strong ethnic Jewish identification, (phone rings) and I was invited in 2006 by a wonderful person to come teach at Haifa [University of Haifa], and I thought, Huh, Israel. Bob and I always had a rule we weren't going to Israel until there was peace. My parents, who were not observant Jews at all, had gone on their fiftieth wedding anniversary, and I remember my mother saying that other than the United States, Israel was the only other place she could imagine living. She loved it. Shocked. My mother was not Jewish at all. I mean, ethnically—my mother looked like Anne Frank, just so you get the picture. So I go, and he says he's not coming, and so I get there and I get met at the airport by this absolutely exquisite—I have a picture of her in this den—absolutely exquisite, young Russian Israeli woman who's my teaching assistant. And she's come to meet me at the airport because she says, "It's Saturday night and so everybody in the IDF [Israeli

Defense Forces]—in the army—is going to be going back to their base, and you’re going to be on a train, and everybody is going to be carrying guns, and I know you’re a peacenik, and you’re going to be very upset about this, so I’ve come to take you to your apartment.” From that moment on, it was like falling in love, literally. I mean, the whole experience was extraordinary. So Irena (Nutenko, with whom I have now written an article) takes me to my apartment on the Haifa campus, and I spent all this time trying to hook up my computer—my parents were both still alive—called my mother, and she said, “You’re going to have a great time.” The next morning, I get called by a friend, who says, “The person who invited you has just had a baby. She’s really sorry she’s not going to be around for most of the time that you’re here. But I’m her friend. I’m going to pick you up in the car and we’re going to go for a tour.” So Ronit (Alpern, professor at Haifa University) picks me up and we drive around all of northern Israel, and she takes me to the Druise village where I’ve now had lunches in tons of times. And, again, falling in love. Within five seconds— Ronit and I—you couldn’t shut either one of us up. We’re just talking like we’re old, old friends, and she’s describing all the politics—she’s a progressive, peace-oriented person, but she tells me all the issues, and I learned quickly that virtually everything I’ve read is much more complicated, much more complicated. Um, and then I teach mediation and conflict resolution in Haifa, which is the most diverse of the universities. I have Arab Israeli students.

02:39:37 Q: What’s the name of the university?

02:39:38 Meadow: University of Haifa. The town of Haifa. H-a-i-f-a. And Haifa’s in the north of Israel, so it has Jewish students and Arab Israeli students, and Israeli Jewish students. And this is

the year after the 2006 Lebanese war, so I'm shown where the bomb shelter is in my apartment where I'm supposed to go if I hear sirens. And I've decided—I'm teaching conflict resolution just as a regular law person—so contract disputes—and I learned from a wonderful Gestalt psychologist who taught me at Esalen, when you're dealing with high conflict, keep the focus off the focus. So instead of talking about the conflict in Israel, we're going to talk about conflicts everywhere else and everyday conflicts, and so I don't—until the last week of the class—mention anything about Israel and Palestine. We're just talking about conventional legal disputes. And the students are doing role-plays and simulations, and the thing about Israel—so I have two students who are—and most people would know this—is everyone in Israel has to go in the army, so they don't go to university until after they've done their three-year service, so they tend to be older and more mature at university. Law school's an undergraduate subject, but they're in their twenties. And I had these guys, these tough guys, that were in the IDF, and two of them were coming to class with their babies in sarongs in front of them, because the Israelis have this toughness and this unbelievable tenderness, and everybody's got kids and they're generating the next generation. And the best moment of my entire forty years of being a teacher comes at the end of this class when two of these tough guys—also Russian Israelis, big guys—they come over to me and they say, “Professor Menkel-Meadow, we just want to tell you that this is the best class we've ever had.” And of them has these little tears coming down, and he said, “My friend and I here, we've been fighting since last year about the war in Lebanon, and I think we needed to go in there and use our tanks and do everything we could, and Sergey's been telling me that's not the way to do it and we need to sit down and talk. And you've taught us how we need to do that and I now think that's the right way. Thank you.” Doesn't get any better than that. So, um, so I taught. That was amazing, and then I called Bob up and said, “Get your ass

over here. This is the most amazing place.” And Bob, who has been pretty anti-Zionist, he’s a—he’ll clobber me for saying this—he was bar mitzvahed in English. He is Jewish, but doesn’t identify that way at all. He says, “Judaism is a religion, and I’m not religious.” So he’s not anybody that ever would have liked Israel or thought about going there, and when he got there, he also just thought it was extraordinary. When you see what’s been done with the desert and the water and everything they’ve built, it’s just extraordinary.

So I should just mention, I’ve been back every other year to teach at Haifa or in some other capacity. Parallel to that, um, through Georgetown, the president of Georgetown, [John] Jack DeGioia, Catholic, the first non-priest president—he was in Israel around the same time I first went there, and he encountered a group called The Parents Circle [Parents Circle - Families Forum], and that’s where I do all my work now. Jack introduced me to one of the leaders of the Parents Circle, a woman named Robi Damelin, who is a force of nature. She’s a South African woman who was a big anti-apartheid advocate. She wound up going to Israel in the sixties; she’s on her way here to work in [the] Civil Rights Movement in the United States, got married, had kids, peaceniks, kids go into the army, kids get shot during the war. So she wasn’t the founder of the organization, but she’s one of its major mouthpieces and also falling in love. We just hit it off. She is just this incredibly dramatic lady. So since 2007, I’ve been working with the Parents Circle. And so what that means is, we facilitated conflict resolution programs first in Georgetown, and then on the West Bank. So I go every once in a while—whenever they want me—and I do little programs on the West Bank in a little town just south of Bethlehem, it’s just over the border. So the Parents Circle’s a group of people who have all lost somebody in the

conflict. It started out just being parents, but now it's kids, whatever. And it's an extraordinary group, and so I do whatever I can in the states, and I do whatever I can over there.

02:44:10 Q: And it's Israelis and Palestinians?

02:44:12 Meadow: Absolutely. And our programs have almost always been on the West Bank, so when we brought them to Georgetown, it was very complicated because my favorite people in this program, aside from Robi, are the Palestinian guys who've been in Israeli prisons. So my favorite guy is now the head of the program on the Palestinian side, he's a riot. Mazen [Faraj]. When Mazen came to Georgetown, we were at this fancy banquet that Jack DeGioia has arranged in Washington on the Georgetown campus, and he looks at me and says, "Professor, what are you going to teach me? I have spent seven years in an Israeli prison." I said, "I'm not going to teach you anything. I'm going to learn from you." So Mazen was one of these kids—was a kid [who] threw rocks in the first Intifada and he spent six or seven years in an Israeli prison, during which time he learned English, read the Bible, read the Quran, learned Hebrew. And by the end of the program—so I do all these little conflict resolution exercises—by the end of the program, it became this joke where I was calling him Professor Mazen because he had taught me so much and he had learned so much in prison, and he's just an extraordinary person. And then when I went over there and I started teaching, I realized how hard it was. His brother—he has two brothers that are still in jail and lost one, and the thing that's so dramatic—when I did this conflict resolution program, he told me that one of his brothers, who wouldn't talk to him because he was in the Parents Circle, had decided to come to hear what this is about. So Mazen's brother gets up there and says, "So what are you going to do to fix this?" he says to me. "You

American. What are you going to do to fix this?” And they’re in your face, and they’re very, very, very insistent. And I would say of all the things I’ve done in my life, it’s just the most real. The hatred’s there, the animosity’s there, in these great magical moments of mediation, the recognition of human common experience—it’s all there. It’s all there. And so, um, again, if I’d done this earlier in my life, I think I would have made it my life’s work in some way.

I had a couple of incredibly amazing years because I also did some work in Washington at the highest levels of the peace talks, and I knew Dennis Ross and David Aaron [Aaron David Miller]—they were these guys that were a part of the Secretary of State [James] Baker’s four—I don’t know if you know these four guys that have been the primary negotiators.

02:46:29 Q: This is Oslo we’re talking about?

02:46:31 Meadow: Before Oslo. They started—but they were at Oslo and then they did all of the, um, uh Wye Plantation, Camp David and Airlie House and all these other peace talks. So through my work as a mediator, with Jack Himmelstein in New York, he had trained a woman who was the highest-ranking woman in the IDF, Amira Dotan, and when she got out of the IDF, she was talked into going by [Ariel] Sharon into joining the Kadima party. She was a very conservative woman. She took mediation training with Jack and it just transformed her. So in 2008, she invited Jack and me over, and we went and we did all these very high-level meetings with the people at the top, and we did a conference on trying to bring mediative consciousness to the peace talks. And so, and then I went and did a workshop on the West Bank. It was staggeringly mind-blowing in the sense of working at these high levels with all the formal

diplomatic negotiators, and then working with the people on the ground. So until things got really bad lately, I would say that where I saw myself—once again, just like Columbia on the bricks—was in the middle. I’ve already decided what needs to happen is the fancy diplomatic negotiators are over here, where the solution’s perfectly clear. You talk to any of the diplomats, you know, they’ll draw you a map on a napkin of the property exchanges that will happen. I mean, everybody knows what the peace agreement’s going to be. The question is, “How are we going to get anybody to sign it?” It’s the opposite of most problems, where you don’t know what the solution is. And then there’s the people who’ve been hurt on the ground who want to make peace, too. And the problem is the extremists in the middle; Hamas is really a problem, and [Benjamin] Netanyahu’s a horrible problem—a horrible, horrible problem. So, um, if I were more active at the moment, my goal would be—and that’s what I was doing from 2009 until recently—was either through university settings or informal settings, to try to get these two levels of people to talk to each other. My heart—

02:48:30 Q: Which two people?

02:48:30 Meadow: The grassroots groups, like—

02:48:32 Q: Oh, to get these two groups of people—

02:48:34 Meadow: Like Parents Circle, there are hundreds of these peace groups in Israel. Some of my work, it turned out—I was invited by Israel but it turns out, when you go back and look at it, it was funded by USAID [United States Agency for International Development] or the State

Department, because the United States gives Israel, like, ten billion a year, and a lot of it goes to these programs. You look like you're being invited by Israel, but the US is paying for it. So I learned—because I was trying to form a group of all these peace groups—there are hundreds of them. That's what I mean. So the grassroots peace groups are not—the high-level fancy government officials on all levels say, Oh, those people. It's nice that they want to draw paintings together and sit around and sing “Kumbaya,” but we're the ones who have to do—and they're completely dismissive. When I am working there, I'd much rather be with the grassroots people, because that's who's going to make it work. And these guys are so arrogant—the politicians. So, um—

02:49:34 Q: On both sides.

02:49:35 Meadow: Yeah. And so here's a—at the high levels, when I was involved in 2008, what I'd say—People I admired, like Hanan Ashrawi—I don't know if she's been, you know. She used to be so articulate and be out there all the time. She's gone. A lot of Palestinian activists turn out to be Christians, and so they have no street cred. And so I would hang around with these guys who'd gone to Oxford and Cambridge and they sing beautiful poetry and it's all very fun and then we sit around and drink and talk or whatever. And if they're drinking, you know that they're not Muslim. So, uh, that's the other remaining passion in my life, as someone who was not very Jewish identified and never thought I was going to go there. I fell in love with the place. I wanted it to succeed. I hate what Israel's doing in Palestine. I despise it. So when you talk about what to do about BDS [Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions], I try really hard to boycott anything that was made on a settlement, which I discover, unfortunately, is all the skin

cream I've been buying. Yep, love it; it's all, you know—But the whole idea of boycotting Israel is insane, and I will tell you, as an academic, I was very sad because when I lived in England, it's the British academics who started a boycott academic meetings movement. They said no British academic should go to a conference when any Israeli was on the program. It was the first time I signed something as a Jew. There was a counter petition of American academics who said this is insane because the Israeli academics tend to be pro-peace people. Boycotting scholars and activists is really stupid. So it's really a mess. So, um, this is the first time in eight years that I have no immediate trip planned. In the last few years I've always had some work or some gig or something to do, so I'm in daily contact with my Israeli friends and my progressive friends who are all teachers and peace actors are totally depressed. It's a bad time.

02:51:36 Q: Very, very, very, bad time. Yes.

02:51:39 But that was one of these wonderful surprises in life. It just came to me because of the work I did as a mediator. It's just been amazing. These women friends—so there's now a cohort of these forty-something women professors at Haifa and elsewhere who are my younger sisters or my mentees and I love them. So I try to get over there or they come over here as much as they can. It's just amazing.

The saddest thing—so a couple of my friends—one of my friends, who's a brilliant feminist theorist in Israel—her daughter was going to be a CO [conscientious objector], and um, Noya [Rimalt]'s done a lot of writing about this. Women who become conscientious objectors wind up having, as you can imagine, a lot more trouble than men. Men go to jail, they serve their time,

and then they're regarded as strong, macho heroes. (coughs) But women who are COs wind up being called wimps and not defenders of the country, so Noya's written a lot about that. And Noya is now—she's a law professor—she's trying to form a women's party, a political party, in Israel.

02:52:50 Q: Whoa.

02:52:51 Meadow: So she likes to be friends with me, but she's actually more interested in my husband and his political work; she's much more interested in consulting with Bob about how to form a political party. And what she has told me—this is what's so fascinating—think about the beginning of our feminist movement. She's currently working with orthodox women who were starting to chomp at the bit a little bit. And she said, "That's the place where you see a lot of—" So these women are incredibly brave, um, and so I say that's my issue. I would like to do whatever I can, but this is the first time I have no outstanding invitations to do anything, so I think it's just a sign of the times that it's not a good time.

02:53:34 Q: Yes, yes. But you say, um, going back to something you said about—(coughs) Your work was mostly in the West Bank. So was that training people in mediation, or were you actually doing any mediation work?

02:53:51 Meadow: No, it's training. It's mostly training people. (Price coughs) Um, and I mean, so the Parents Circle has huge grants from the European Union and also from the USAID, so they are—their basic MO is they go into schools, both on both sides, Israel and the West Bank.

And every time they go to a school, there's an Israeli and a Palestinian, and they talk about how they lost their loved one and then they facilitate conversations in the classroom, and it's extraordinary because the Palestinian kids, as you might know, kids grow up in a house and they haven't even seen the water. They're three miles from the sea, and they can't—and they haven't gone. So Parents Circle has arranged for exchange programs, so we, um, you know, we train, and they have different groups. They have a grandmother's group that makes jam and jelly together and makes pottery, and artists that create calendars, and then they go and they speak around the world. So I have brought them here. Last year, I brought them to UCLA and UCI in Irvine and to various public fora in Los Angeles, Orange County and San Diego. They have—the group has about four films that they show, so it's an educational effort, and the idea is to educate kids in school and Robi, my friend, now says she's sick and tired of working with kids. She wants to work with the adults because she's not—she's older than I am—she says, "I can't wait around for these kids to grow up." So it's an advocacy group, too. And so right now, with this, um, horrible killing that happened with the Palestinian boy last week—

02:55:21 Q: And then his father?

02:55:22 Meadow: Right. The Parents Circle went to the hospital. I mean, it's hard to get the Palestinians visas to come to the United States sometimes if they've been in jail before, so it's training and facilitating, um, and then, because they get so much grant money, they get evaluated all the time. So two years ago, I went over to help them while they were being formally evaluated by a sociologist who had to show—you know, they have to develop indicators to show that they're making progress.

02:55:55 Q: So you were coaching them?

02:55:56 Meadow: Yeah, exactly. Exactly.

02:55:57 Q: So I was wondering what exactly you did for them because they know how to facilitate their own conversations.

02:56:02 Meadow: Well, yes and no. I mean, they're learning, they're learning. Some are better than others. And like any kind of training, when you do the stuff, some of these people are just—on both sides—naturals. They don't need any help from me. And others of them are just terrible. They're judgmental, you know, which you have to—What they're trying to do is tell their own stories to each other and—So here's an interesting example. So one of the things that got funded was a mutual, um, learning project, and the deal was four different groups: grandmothers, soldiers, would-be politicians, and school kids—so four different groups with Palestinian-Israeli components, and they were going to do different things. And the first part of this program is called “Seeing Through Others' Eyes” or something like that—is they take them to one of the Palestinian villages that the Israeli's ran over in '48, and then they go to Yad Vashem. So when I was there helping with the evaluation, we were having a group meeting to talk about the program—the program had been in operation for two years—and what was working and what wasn't working. And the Palestinians very powerfully said, What are we doing at Yad Vashem? There's nothing to do with us. What the Europeans did to you Jews, that's too bad. And Yad Vashem is there to be a statement about why there is Israel. And it left them completely cold.

And very angry. Because they said, You want to blame us for what these other people did to you? And I told them—they didn't want to hear it—I said, "You need to get this out of the program. Yad Vashem is very moving for me as a Holocaust-surviving kid, but it's not serving the function. They're saying Yad Vashem is not equal. That's their village that got run over by you guys, and they don't see—it's not working as an empathy-creating device." So that was a very interesting meeting because we had to fight that out, and they spent a lot of time creating this program and so the people had a big stake in thinking, If only the Palestinians got to Yad Vashem they would understand. And the Israeli, some of them, just couldn't see that it was not having that effect at all.

02:58:17 Q: Well, that was then and this is now also.

02:58:21 Meadow: Right, exactly.

02:58:21 Q: I'm surprised that the Palestinians didn't also say, Why are you doing to us what—?

02:58:26 Meadow: Exactly. For me, it is heartbreaking to go there, to think with what Jews have been through for thousands of years, wow could they possibly be doing this to somebody else? It's extraordinary. Bob and I watch every Israeli movie that's made, and the movies are incredible because the movies show the brutality of the Israelis—they're superb. It's just heartbreaking, heartbreaking.

02:58:53 Q: One thing you said about your work in Israel, Palestine that I'd like to follow up on a little bit is you said that real change—I'm paraphrasing now, you said it differently—the people who will make it happen are not the diplomats, it's the people on the ground. Can you explain that a little bit more, why you believe that to be true?

02:59:16 Meadow: Um, well, because either the diplomats will make a deal at the top that the grassroots—when I say street cred—won't adhere to because they haven't been involved in the process, or the diplomats are so—in my case, I watch them; they're so puffed up about themselves and it having to be their deal. I mean, it's interesting to watch the four—Daniel Kurtzer, David Aaron Miller [Aaron David Miller], uh, David, uh, Dennis Ross—these were all guys that went to work in Baker's State Department. They're brilliant guys, all of them. They work very hard with this, and I've watched all of them in Washington. They've all written books about it. And when Obama came in, um, Dennis Ross was in for a while, but then they shifted to other people. George Mitchell went in there. George Mitchell went to Georgetown, so I did a panel with him on this stuff. George Mitchell was a terrible choice for Israel in my view. Um, and it's— even though he has got—he's the best man in the sense that he doesn't have the same ego as these guys, but they're all so ego-driven that I think they're incapable of seeing new solutions, and everybody's wedded to what's been done before and wanting to claim that they fixed it. When I say people on the ground will make it happen, it's because they have to. What Americans who haven't been there—I fight with a lot of my friends here on both sides who have strong views about Israel and Palestine, but they've never been there. Um, and so I say—I talk about Israel all the time; I stop the minute I haven't been there for six months, because things change on the ground so much. But what people don't realize, with all the fighting that you hear

about, they live right next to each other. And my friends who lived there long ago say, Well, they're in Tel Aviv. They used to go to the food market on the West Bank all the time. It's two miles. It's two miles. And Palestinians, as you heard from this guy whose house got firebombed last week, he's a contractor, he's a construction worker in one of the settlements. So, eventually, the everyday people know that they have to fix this. I'm not saying everybody's going to be best friends, but the peace will come out of necessity of the people who live right next to each other and not the guys who are the politicians. That's what I mean by, "It's the grassroots folks that will make it happen."

03:01:46 Q: What struck me when I was there is how afraid Palestinians and Israelis are of each other.

03:01:53 Meadow: Yep. And then with the Parents Circle programs, when they go into the classrooms, even progressive kids—Israelis have been told all these things about the Palestinians so they're terrified, terrified. And there's a wonderful film that was made in 2000 that got disrupted by the Second Intifada, called *Promises*; it was on PBS [Public Broadcasting Service]. Um, B.Z. Goldberg, the producer, is a guy who's both Israeli and American. He grew up in Boston, and he made this film, which at the time was very hopeful. It was about five Israeli and five Palestinian kids and what they knew of or thought about the the conflict and he just interviewed them. And then he brought two sides together to play soccer—two of the boys. And it looks like it's all going to be wonderful, and then, after the film is finished the Second Intifada happened, so the parents tell them they can't see each other anymore. Those kids must be all

grown up now; it's a long time ago. So it's like Seeds of Peace, and all these efforts to bring people together, and they just don't have enough contact with each other.

03:02:55 Q: Did you run into a group called Shorashim or Roots?

03:02:57 Meadow: No. I mean, that's the amazing thing. My handler in the State Department in the US, when I found out that's who was funding me, she wanted me to come and do a program and I said, "Do you ever bring all these groups together?" She said, "We tried once and it was a disaster because they're all competing for the peace money." And the EU has the same thing. My friend Amira [Dotan], who isn't that active anymore, she's sort of retired. Amira calls it "the peace industry." And she said, "You think it's bad trying to get USAID money, you should see what goes on with the people trying to get the EU money. They're all competing with each other." So do you want to end or ask the last question or?

03:03:45 Q: Well, we probably are running out of steam, but let's wrap it up. Uh, the program that you started, the international program you started, is like your jewel in the crown for a program you started. What about a jewel in the crown for your writing and your mediation. What would you say were your best-ever accomplishments?

03:04:10 Meadow: So that's easy for me, too, in the sense that I've been very lucky. I've been getting a lot of recognition for all this. I'm getting a big honorary degree in Belgium next year. Um, I wrote this article coming out of my legal aid experience in 1984, "Toward Another View of Legal Negotiation: The Structure of Problem-Solving" [31 UCLA 754-842 (1984)]. So when

we talk about teaching problem solving in law school, um, people describe me as the founder of the idea that one can negotiate by—I don't know if you know the book *Getting to Yes*?

03:04:39 Q: Yes.

03:04:39 Meadow: So one of my articles came out about the same time. [*Getting to Yes* was first published in 1981; Menkel-Meadow, Legal Negotiation: Strategies in Search of a Theory, American Bar F, Res, J, in 1983.] So it's either Roger Fisher, *Getting to Yes* or Menkel-Meadow, "Problem Solving in Negotiation." And, you know, so I'd say the big jewel in the crown of my career is being one of the founders of teaching people to expand the pie and to look at each other's needs and interests when they're solving a problem, and not just try to win the case. But with a sense of principle and justice at the same time. And every law school in the country now teaches negotiation, and I was one of the starters of that, so I'm very proud of that. I will say at the same time that as a soon-to-retire person, I have come up with the concept of erasure, which is when something really works its way into the culture, which is a good thing, um, people sort of forget its origins. Roger Fisher was a dear friend and mentor to me and I used to go to Harvard all the time for programs, and he died two years ago. We had a big program at Harvard Law School to honor him, and he was very upset because he thought when he wrote *Getting to Yes* that peace was going to break out as a result of his book, and so he's very upset that that didn't happen. I said, "Don't be ridiculous. Your book's been translated into fifteen languages and it's sold millions of copies. And it has changed negotiation culture." And it's very interesting to me now when I go to conferences and stuff—*Getting to Yes* is still an enormous best seller and people don't know Roger Fisher anymore. So Roger Fisher is a much bigger figure than I am.

And I go into meetings now, and people talk about mediation and negotiation, and you know, who's Carrie Menkel-Meadow? So, when one thinks about one's life work, is it important to have an impact on the world and see that it's made it into the culture and who cares if your name is on it or not? But if you haven't had children so you don't have that sort of legacy—I've been telling Bob a lot—I've been looking at people who I think are really distinguished, wonderful people and seeing how what we all do is very ephemeral. So I'm proud of what I've done to, you know, be part of about five different innovative movements in legal education. I'm particularly proud of negotiation and problem-solving work and I realize that we are all ultimately going to be erased. That's the sadness of human existence.

03:06:57 Q: Writing in the sand.

03:06:58 Meadow: Right. And I do a lot of writing. I have published two hundred articles and ten books, and I bet that not too many of them will be read when I'm dead, but who knows. But I still keep it up.

03:07:11 Q: And what about in terms of actual mediations that you've done?

03:07:13 Meadow: Um, so it's very interesting—the thing I'm proudest of—I thought I would get a whole new career out of this—was, um, not so much my peace work and my interpersonal work, but I helped save a museum. I handled a pretty major dispute in which the donor of a museum was very unhappy with what was going on and was about to pull both the donation and all of the art that had been donated. I can't name names because it's confidential, but it's a pretty

well-known museum. And it was a really hard, difficult case, and we got it done and the museum is still standing, and arrangements have been made. It was just an incredible challenge and I love art, so it felt like, you know, legacy of my father's and it was really interesting. So I thought out of that I was going to develop a whole new expertise in institutional mediation and art conflicts, of which there are a lot. But that hasn't happened. But that's the one I'm the proudest of. Other than that, I do at least one big case a year now. I started with smaller, individual, person-to-person employment, landlord-tenant, student-teacher disputes. I've now done a lot of big class actions, healthcare. I was an arbitrator in the Dalkon Shield class action case. I was a mediator and arbitrator in some of the discrimination cases in the brokerage Merrill Lynch cases. So I've worked on, you know, some pretty big cases. Um, but I think the thing I'm proudest of individually is the museum case, because those other big cases, almost anybody else could do them—I mean, good mediators.

I'm very privileged to be part of this first generation of people who have become lawyer-mediators and trained the next generation, but there's a lot of people in my generation that I respect that could have done all those cases. I go to a group—I just came back from it; once a year, we have a group called the senior mediator's group. Self-appointed, Frank Sander, professor at Harvard Law School for many years, invited us twenty-five years ago. And he handpicked the people that he thought were the leading mediators in a couple of different domains, and for twenty-five years [we've met] in the summer. We just get together for a weekend and we talk about the issues in the field and I feel very privileged to be part of that group. It's a very distinguished group, so a lot of them do international work, but we represent a

whole spectrum—labor, employment, family, government matters—and it’s just, it’s neat. So the nice thing about being a mediator is to be sort of a general problem solver.

03:10:06 Q: But why, um, in this one case—the art museum—was that something that you were uniquely suited?

03:10:14 Meadow: Good question. *A* I think, because I had some sensitivity to the artists because my father was never a famous artist, but I know how much his paintings meant to him and where they went. One of my best friends in LA is the director of the Getty Foundation here. So in fact, when I was having issues, I could call her up without telling her where I was; I was able to develop some inside expertise. It also had to do with what provisions there were in the will and the probate and all that stuff. And there were some university issues. So there was a confluence of factors that I just thought—I had a little expertise in almost everything that had come up.

And I also will just say this about me as a mediator: for many years, I trained the mediators in the DC Circuit Court of Appeals before I moved to Washington, and I used to talk about using what you have. So when I was younger, people didn’t take me seriously because I was a girl with long hair, and I used to say, “I can’t wait until I get some gray hair so I will—” I now dye it. I had gray hair yesterday but I got rid of it. And so some of the big important mediators in Washington, like George Mitchell, who’s a successful mediator, and [James Earl] Jimmy Carter [Jr.] when he went to Korea and now Bill Clinton—they use their status and their power and what’s called muscle mediation. People will wind up agreeing to things because they think these important guys won’t approve of them unless they do it. And I’ve learned is that what I have is

that I'm a teacher, and so I use my being a woman, I use the fact that I don't walk into a room and have all this immediate respect that these important political figures do, and instead, I use what I have, which is to be a person who asks questions, and to be a law professor, to be Socratic, and that's what worked in the museum case. Unbelievable egos, unbelievable egos. So they might have responded to a Jimmy Carter or a George Mitchell, but I don't think so. I think what worked in that case was my being very gentle and their not feeling threatened by me. And their not having to do anything, because I couldn't force them to do anything. So I feel very proud of—that was the first case in which I felt like, I don't care that I'm not an important man. I am who I am. I am a teacher, and I'm going to help these people work it out. And I was proud of it because I think the solutions we came up with actually came from them; it was exactly the way mediation's supposed to be. They had agreed only to meet for a day, and since it was going, we did three days, and by the end the solutions were merging from their conversations. And I felt like, as a good teacher, that I had helped make that happen. But it was their idea, not mine.

03:13:01 Q: Did you ever find that one side said, "Let's include that thing that the other guy said?"

03:13:09 Meadow: Yep. And when that happens, that's just magical. So a lot of mediators do shuttle diplomacy, and so they go back and forth between the two rooms, and then the mediator gets to manipulate that. So I could say to you, "Well, you know, how about this, Janet?" And really, it would have come from Linda, but I'd make it sound like it came from me. Um, I mediate with a model that keeps the parties together as much as possible, because it's about keeping them together. So I do very minimal caucusing. So when they can do that mutual

recognition—that's what we call the magic of mediation. That moment when there's some appreciation of the other and finding some solution together.

03:13:48 Q: You know, it's interesting. Um, you've spoken about gender discrimination and sexism perhaps the least of any of the interviews that I've done. And now you're talking about how in a very subtle way, you've used that to be more effective. Any kind of feelings that women are less than you've used—less important, less threatening—you've used to actually be more effective in mediation. But do you think, um, uh, can you think of times when you've had to battle with gender discrimination?

03:14:29 Meadow: Oh absolutely. I mean it's funny when you say I haven't mentioned discrimination; a whole part of my work we haven't talked about is I've written a ton of feminist legal scholarship. And I was an employment discrimination lawyer. And I am one feisty pain in the ass when I think there is any sex discrimination going on. So it's funny that I haven't talked about it. I have learned to use who I am, but I'm older now. When I was younger it was—My first case in legal aid, I was doing this very simple child support case. I introduced myself as Carrie Menkel-Meadow and the judge said, "What's the matter? Isn't one name good enough for you?" And I said to the judge—I was scared, and I said, "Judge, you can call me anything you want." And when the case was over, my female black client on welfare turned to me and said, "If you can't fight for yourself, how are you going to fight for me?" So I said, "Thank you." And the next time, when I had a Third Circuit argument and the judges said the same thing—it was very funny—it was me, Menkel-Meadow, and the argument on the other side was David GirardiCarlo who has subsequently become a very important obnoxious person in the Republican

Party. And the third circuit judges said, “What’s with this case that there are so many names?” (Price laughs) So David Girard-diCarlo says, “Well my name is different than hers. She’s probably one of those feminists. Girard-diCarlo comes from the merger in France and Spain in the sixteenth century of the great diCarlos with the great Girards,” and he goes into this pretentious thing. (coughs) It was very funny because Leon Higginbotham was on that panel—who is an African American judge of some renown—and he said, “Okay, Mr. Girard-diCarlo. We get your point.” And I won the case—I mean, that’s not why I won it, but that one happened after the first one, and so I was very firm about, “Yes, your honors. I am Carrie Menkel-Meadow, and it is because it’s my name and my husband’s name.”

You know, I certainly felt it as a young lawyer. I felt it all. I think about one of my first jury trials, I was cross-examining a prison warden. It was a prisoner’s civil rights case, and the lawyer on the other side was quietly—he was fine. I was cross-examining this warden whose testimony on the stand was different from his deposition—classic cross-examination. “Janet, isn’t it true that at the deposition you said the sky was blue, and now you’re saying the sky is green. How do you explain that?” And the judge said, “Young lady, if you don’t stop fighting with the witness, I’m going to hold you in contempt.” And I said, “Your honor, I don’t hear an objection from the other side.” I was a young lawyer. I was quaking in my boots, but it was amazing. Total sexism. He couldn’t stand it that this young woman was exposing that this warden was lying, you know, and the guy on the bench was a Republican conservative—hated my case, hated me—and he couldn’t stand it. It caught him off guard when I said, “I don’t hear an objection pending from the other side,” because the other side thought that I was just doing my job. So I remember that day I had to call David Rudovsky in Philly who was a very famous criminal lawyer, and said, “I

think you may have to get me out of jail by the end of the day because I think this judge is going to hold me in contempt.” So I had plenty of that in my life. Plenty of it. And you know, this is so trite, but what I teach my women students is you’ve got to know when to hold them and know when to fold them. I’ve protested and been very feisty and complained about sexism, and other times when I’ve, you know, have just either let it go or as you say, “Learn to use it.”

One other example—my mentor, I mentioned earlier, who was very involved with CUNY—my teacher at Penn, Howard Lesnick. He’s a very tall, a cynical, sharp, funny labor law professor, and um, very caustic humor, and when I was at Georgetown—so I would have been in my late forties or early fifties, and he was in his seventies—he said he was starting to get very bad teaching evaluations, and he’d always had great teaching evaluations. So I was teaching his book in legal ethics, and he said, “Can I come and watch you teach?” I said sure. And he taught me to teach. So he came to watch my class and afterwards he said, “It’s amazing. You get all these people to talk in class. Nobody will talk in my classes anymore.” And it was that moment that I had this epiphany [that] because I was a woman and because I was short and because I was being nicer and not being so caustic and insulting and doing the Socratic thing—I said, “They don’t regard me as a threat. You’re doing the classic Kingsfield Socratic professor thing, and they’re terrified of you. And you’re a big man and you’re gonna make fun of them and you’re going to be caustic and nasty.” And that’s when I learned that all these years Howard was one of the people I used to complain about sexism to all the time. And in that moment I realized there comes a time in some circumstances in life when being a woman can be a positive thing, and in a teaching environment I was regarded as not a threat and more nurturing, and they were less afraid to speak up in class. So that was a big moment in realizing that all my life, I’d been

complaining about being a woman, and here was chance to see that there were times when it was actually helpful.

03:19:34 Q: Something that you said about when you were younger, you might have not have seen it this way made me come up with a hypothesis, I want to test at you, which is that now that we are older and we've lived our lives, and we've made our mistakes and we've had our victories and our accomplishments; we know who we are, we know what we've done, we just don't care as much about what other people think.

03:19:59 Meadow: Exactly. Absolutely, absolutely. I mean, I would say it's interesting—I told you I've been having some disputes with my current dean. In the second year, as we were planning something, we had a pretty horrible thing. There was a guy he wanted appointed to the faculty, and we had a vote and the guy got 50 percent but not 60 percent, and um, and he said—this is a guy who's world famous for writing constitutional law—and he said, “Oh, never mind the vote. This is a really good appointment. We should just do it.” And I said, “I cannot sit in this room—in a law school that's brand new, and committed to good values and everything you've done—” And I just got up and walked out, and four, five people followed me out. And that's when I realized, “I don't care. There's nothing he can do to me, and this is such an egregious thing.” And so he followed me to my office and begged me to come back, and I mean, I lost that one in the sense that that guy's on our faculty. Fortunately he'll never see this, probably, but he shouldn't be there. And so a younger woman—a very proper WASPy woman who's on my faculty—turned to one of my colleagues apparently—I learned this afterwards—and said, “Oh, my,” she said. “We would never do that in my family.” And my friend who reported it to me is

Latino, and I said it's interesting because I view that as a somewhat anti-Semitic comment that I think my WASPy colleague was saying, you know, "Isn't Carrie being one of those brassy Jewish ladies?" So yes, okay.

03:21:41 Q: So now is the time to call the question: what haven't you said that you want to get on tape? Not that we can't do it some more later on, but—

03:21:50 Meadow: The biggest thing I feel about our generation is I think we were incredibly privileged as women, and Barnard helped that—to allow us to make choices in life. However, as I tell my students, um, I think the wrong message in everything that the early feminist movement did was, "You can have it all." So, you know, we haven't talked that much about my regrets. I'm really sorry that I didn't have children. Um, I could have. I mean, I had a good marriage, I had a good job. I was, you know, busy running around the world and doing my other work so it didn't fit in, and then when I wanted to, I couldn't. So the truth is if you want to have children, you can't wait until you're forty-five. I mean, some people do. Janis (Chechanow Nelson, B'71, my best friend from Barnard in LA) was in her forties when she had her kids.

Um, so I think that, um, I feel that I've been incredibly fortunate. I think about this: I am the child of immigrants. Having taught at the most elite schools in the United States is extraordinary. That's the good part of this country, that the American dream worked in our generation. I don't think it's working so well anymore, and that's a sad, sad thing. So I feel like I have been both very privileged and I've had an incredibly good life, but I also feel guilty that I didn't do more because the world is still full of incredible amounts of injustice, and that's what I wanted to do

with my life. I wanted to make the world a much better place, and I think it's not so much better at the moment. I guess that's it. I just think—Oh, I guess the other thing I would say is that I sort of regret the fact that the strength of a place like Barnard that was a woman's college is evaporating because I'm not sure if I had a daughter, I would send her to a woman's college these days.

03:23:34 Q: Because?

03:23:34 Meadow: Because the world is full of men and women, and I think people need to be— And you asked me about the diversity; we think there should be diversity in any education, and so I think there should be gender diversity, too. And I think Barnard made us all strong because—those of us who are— because we were women and we were leaders and we got to do stuff we couldn't have done in a coed school, and I'm sure as hell glad I went to Barnard rather than Penn, which was a very traditional—But it makes me sad to think that on some level, I think they are anachronistic—women's colleges—and on the other hand, I would totally support the continuation of them.

03:24:11 Q: Anachronistic because it's not as necessary now as it was then?

03:24:15 Meadow: Yeah, yeah. Because the world is coed, and I think kids in school need to learn to deal with, you know, all kinds of difference. On the other hand—I mean, this could lead us to another twenty hours, which you don't want to do—when I watch what's going on on

campuses now, all the sexual harassment and all—yeah, it's still pretty bad. So having said that, I think we still need women's colleges.

03:24:37 Q: (laughs) Because the world was coed back then as well.

03:24:41 Meadow: That's true.

03:24:46 Q: Well, I think that we should end now—

03:24:50 Meadow: I do too.

03:24:51 Q: —and switch stuff off.

03:24:51 Videographer: Thank you very, very much.

03:24:53 Meadow: Oh, you're very welcome.

03:24:54 Q: Oh yes. I should thank you, um—

03:24:56 Meadow: We should thank Linda who stood up—I wanted to get you a chair!

03:24:58 Videographer: Oh, no—

03:24:59 Q: Thank you, videographer, Linda Rzesniowiecki.

03:25:01 Meadow: Yes! Thank you, videographer. Thank you, Janet. This has been a lot of fun.

03:25:05 Q: Thank you, professor Carrie Menkel-Meadow.

end of interview

INDEX

Achtenberg, Roberta	59
Adler, Felix	9
Aleinikoff, Thomas Alexander "Alex"	68, 71, 72, 74
Alpern, Ronit.....	86
Amsterdam, Anthony "Tony"	78
Ashrawi, Hanan.....	92
Baez, Joan	23
Baker, James	90
Bara, Theda.....	26
Basie, William James "Count"	18
Berger, Marshall	18
Black, Barbara.....	44–45
Boudin, Kathy	48
Boudin, Michael.....	48
Carter Jr., James Earl "Jimmy"	104
Catherine the Great	26
Chaucer, Geoffrey.....	32
Chechanow Nelson, Janis	110
Chemerinsky, Erwin	63, 72, 75, 79–80, 81
Cisneros, Henry.....	59
Cleopatra	26
Clinton, William Jefferson "Bill"	59, 104
Cobb, Jelani.....	6

Cole, Jonathan	36–40
Collins, Judy	41
Confucius	68
Connell, Frances	4
Copelon, Rhonda.....	78–79
Cross, Amanda.....	48
Damelin, Robi.....	88, 95
DeGioia, John "Jack"	88, 89
deLevie, Dagobert, Uncle of Carrie Menkel-Meadow	15
Dostoyevsky, Fyodor	11, 32
Dotan, Amira.....	90, 100
Edelman, Peter	58
Elizabeth I	26
Evie	50
Faraj, Mazen	89–90
Field, Martha.....	48
Filártiga Jr., Joel.....	67
Fisher, Roger.....	101–2
Ford, Harrison	58
Friedan, Betty.....	24, 25
Friedman, Thomas	72
Furstenberg, Frank	34
Futter, Ellen.....	46
Galanter, Mark	80
Garfield, Ruth "Ruthie"	30, 49–52

Garrett, Francie	50
Gilligan, Carol.....	37
Ginsberg Shaw, Barbara	49–52
Girard-diCarlo, David	106–7
Goldberg, B.Z.	99
Goldwater, Barry.....	40
González, Elián	60
Gordon, Mary.....	50
Guinier, Lani	47
Gustav	16
Halpern, Charles "Charlie"	78
Harding, Sandra	37
Hardwick, Elizabeth.....	50
Hauser, Kris	54
Heilbrun, Carolyn	48
Higginbotham, Leon	107
Himmelstein, Jack.....	78–79, 90
Hitler, Adolf.....	6, 14, 70
Holmes Norton, Eleanor	58
Ibargüen, Alberto	60
Kafka, Franz.....	13
Katz, Ruth	10, 32
King Jr., Martin Luther	41
Kirk, Grayson.....	41, 43, 44
Komarovsky, Mirra.....	32–33, 34, 36

Kurtzer, Daniel.....	98
Lehman, Herbert	15
Lenin, Vladimir.....	42
Lesnick, Howard.....	78, 80, 108–9
Liebman, Lance.....	45
Liebman, Wilma	34, 51
Luxembourg, Rosa.....	48
Maternal grandfather of Carrie Menkel-Meadow.....	15
McCarthy, Mary.....	30, 49, 51, 54
McKay, Doug.....	19
Mead, Margaret.....	11
Meadow, Dr. Robert G. "Bob" 6, 10, 19, 28, 29, 34, 40–41, 50, 52, 56–57, 58, 59, 63–64, 67, 71–72, 78, 82, 83, 85, 87–88, 94, 97, 102	
Menkel, Berthold, Paternal grandfather of Carrie Menkel-Meadow	8, 13, 16
Menkel, Gunter, Father of Carrie Menkel-Meadow 4–5, 7, 8–9, 13–14, 16–18, 19, 24–25, 26–27, 28, 46–47, 83, 104	
Menkel, Robert Adlai.....	7–8, 25
Meyer, Gladys.....	33, 36, 38, 49
Miller, Aaron David.....	90, 98
Millett, Katherine Murray "Kate"	37, 48
Mitchell, George	98, 104
Mitchell, Joni	41
Morgan, Mary	59
Mother of Carrie Menkel-Meadow 4–5, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15–18, 22, 24–27, 28–29, 31, 40, 50, 71, 85, 86	
Netanyahu, Benjamin.....	91

Nutenko, Irena.....	86
Obama, President Barack.....	62, 98
Paltrow, Gwyneth	58
Paternal grandmother of Carrie Menkel-Meadow	13, 16
Peter	50
Prescott, Anne	32
Price, Debbie.....	19
Rauch, Basil	36
Reagan, Ronald	18
Reno, Janet.....	59–60
Rimalt, Noya.....	93–94
Robeson, Paul	47
Rodham Clinton, Hillary Diane	23, 44, 61, 62–63
Ross, Dennis	90, 98
Rudd, Mark	45
Rudovsky, David.....	107
Rufinelli, Carlos.....	66–67
Russian Taketomo, Renee.....	49–52
Rzesniowiecki, Linda.....	4, 112
Sander, Frank	103
Schwarzenegger, Arnold.....	58
Scott, Steve	54
Shakespeare, William	32
Sharon, Ariel.....	90
Slyomovics, Susan	84

Somoza, Anastasio	67
Sovern, Michael Ira "Mike"	43–46
Stevenson II, Adlai.....	7
Stimpson, Catharine "Cate"	37, 48
Stroessner, Alfredo	67
Taketomo, Tosh	50–51
Trotsky, Leon.....	42
Vladeck, David	38
Vladeck, Judith	38
von Goethe, Johann Wolfgang.....	9
Williamson, Chilton.....	34–36, 65
Wolfman, Bernard "Bernie"	52–53
Wright Edelman, Marianne.....	58
Yuan, Patricia.....	20–21
Zedung, Mao	68

