**PAT STEUERT**

**BEGINNING OF VIDEOTAPE 1**

I think it’s easiest for me to start with when I came to Boston. I came in the fall of 1960 from the Midwest, and that was the year JFK was elected president. And I thought I had died and gone to heaven because I didn’t ever feel like I quite fit in the Midwest politically. And I had been involved and been an activist for a few years. And Boston was alive, the streets were alive, everybody was crazy with the politics, and I just thought it was a wonderful place to be. So we moved here for Tom to go to graduate school, and had a daughter. And I finished my under­graduate work at BU. It took me eight years to finish my undergraduate because I only went on Tuesdays and Thursdays. I figured out that I could go to school on Tuesdays and Thursdays, get all the classes that I needed, and there was Tuesday/Thursday preschool in Copley School, that’s where Sharon went. So I think I’m one of the only people who got their entire college degree on Tuesdays and Thursdays. And then I started looking around for what did I want to do. And I substitute taught in Boston for a year, and it was the year that Jonathan Kozol was in the schools and wrote his book. It was a terrible experience. The schools were terrible. As a sub, you went to all the worst schools anyhow. And seeing the discrepancies between the good schools and the wealthier schools and the poorer schools was heartbreaking for me. Because where I’d come from in the Midwest, all the schools were pretty good. And I just couldn’t believe it. And I had a daughter who was growing up and then a son, and I was going to send them to these Boston Public Schools. And it was very discouraging for me. So I knew that I couldn’t teach in the Boston Public Schools, and I didn’t have a teaching degree anyhow. My undergraduate work was in Philosophy, so that was not a terribly useful subject, but it was very interesting studies. And so I found a book called The Next Step. And I’d always been kind of resourceful. And this book was just, again, it was like finding politics in Boston. It talked about women who wanted to have it all. Women who wanted to both be a good mother and have a family and have a professional life. And I couldn’t believe this book. And it was, I don’t know if it was produced by, but it was distributed by the Women’s Educational and Industrial Union. And they had a job placement service. And this book recommended that if you wanted an unusual experience, you should go with them. So I went down and interviewed with them. And they, again, they knew. I said, “I want part time, I need to be home with my kids, but I need something that challenges me and uses my skills.” And they just got it in a minute, and sent me on three fabulous interviews, one of which was the Children's Museum. And it was for the librarian job. And when I went and when the woman called and told me about and she showed me the description, and I said, “It says I have to have a library degree and I don’t.” And she said, “Well, you need to trust me on this. You need to go to the Children's Museum.” So I thought, “Okay”. So I went and I interviewed with Cynthia Cole, and then she introduced me to you and to Phyl, and then two days later you called and said that you were sorry, I didn’t have a library degree, and you thought that I would probably last in that job about a week anyhow. Which I didn’t quite know what that meant at that time. It was kind of a funny statement, but I remember it, like I wasn’t a librarian kind of. And six months later you called me back or Cynthia called me back and said that it had been funded to start the Resource Center and did I want to come talk about a job. And so I did, and I stayed for 30 years. And every four or five years we went through a process, you and I, where I needed some new challenge. But there was always something there that challenged me. So that’s how I ended up there. And I actually got offers at the other two jobs, too, so it could have been a very different career. But I’m glad it worked out the way it did. My job was to set up the Resource Center and how I understood it in those days was that, you know, the What’s Inside exhibit was there, and that I had read a lot of child development having children myself and being so interested in the Boston Public Schools and what they were providing and so forth. So I understood kind of the philosophy of kids learn in different ways and this is a new way of learning and some kids learn better this way and other kids learn other ways. And I found this all just personally very interesting because I was at that stage in life. And when the new Visitors Center opened, then we had all of the space on the first floor of that building to set up the **Workshop of Things** it was called. And my first job was to call all the publishers who made three-dimensional materials and ask them to give us materials for the Center. Now, Cynthia Cole was a good and strong manager. And she had very definite ideas about what was to happen. And she would just say something like, “Call the publishers and get the materials.” That was about as much direction as I got. So I thought that was terrific and I could just figure it out and do it. My office was in the third floor in the collection storage room in that building in Jamaica Plain with all of the jewelry. And one of the hardest things I had was not looking at stuff in the room. I had to focus on what my job was. I remember that being a temptation every time I came to work. It was just in this wonderful, terrible environment in terms of humidity and in terms of heat and in terms of cold. But wonderful in terms of objects, a lot of which Phyllis Morrison had brought back from her travels and so forth. Now, I do remember **early staff meetings** **[in the 60s]** held around a big table on the third floor there. And even at my young age of, I must have been 26 or something like that then, I thought they were disastrous. These meetings went on forever. And everybody was interesting and had lots of opinions, but that never resulted in everything. It was Fred Kresse and Cynthia Cole and Phyllis Morrison and Jennifer [Merrill], and everybody had wonderful ideas and opinions but it never ended. And of course for me, working only four hours a day, you know, if you spent two hours of that day in a meeting, it was half of the day. And I do remember feeling both interested but thinking “This is really a waste of time. I could be a lot more productive.” So I think that the kind of management issue, I was aware of that at that time. And later we had staff meetings in the library, I think, around that, there was a big table and there wasn’t enough room for everybody to sit, so people kind of stood around the outside. And I think by that time there was a little more organization to the meetings. There was an agenda and it was a little tighter. But there still were so many people. And I think that when I think back on it I think it was that in any given organization, when you have 30 people, not 30 of them are going to be interesting, kind of dynamic people. And I think that was part of the problem. Everybody had an opinion and everybody expressed it. And those meetings just went on forever. So I think it was also the nature of what was going on there. Because as the museum grew, the new Visitors Center opened. I know the Matchbox project had large grants. Sometimes those grants were as big or bigger than my operating budget. Just those growth pains of, “Are they making more money than we are? Do they have the same rules? Is everybody playing by the same rules?” And I think there was a lot of that that led up to the sort of first phoenix. I’m not exactly sure when the timing is on all that. But I think it was that unrest of there were certain rules for the Visitors Center. Everybody had to work vacation weeks, everybody had to do certain things, and then the people who were teaching classes and teaching in the university and doing things like this didn’t feel like they had to work on the floor. And all of these things went back and forth. And I was pretty focused on teaching teachers and getting these materials. **[0:30 min]** And one story I remember – I don’t know whether I ever told you this or not – but that one of my favorite Discovery Kits was the Eskimo bow-drill. And we used that a lot. And when we did workshops, we usually set up an area of math, an area of science and an area of social studies. And then we’d have the teachers. And what we were trying to do was model for them how you would set this up in a classroom, how you would do it. So the bow-drill was one that almost everybody could be successful with. So I used it a lot because I wanted the teachers to feel that they could be successful with this for the kids. So we wore out this bow-drill and we needed another one. And there was a little slip in one of the Matchbox folders that said the source of the bow-drill. So I called the number and asked if I could get another bow-drill and the man said, yes, he would make another bow-drill. And I said, fine, and I said, “Well, we don’t have a whole lot of money, how much is a bow-drill?” And he said it was $12. And I said, “Well, that’s great, we’d like to have that.” And he said, “And then there’s the shipping.” And I said, “Okay, that’ll be fine.” So I called him back and maybe a month later there wasn’t any bow-drill and a month later no bow-drill. One day this guy came walking up. He had this box and he had the bow-drill. He’d driven it down from somewhere in Canada. It was $12 with $70 for the transportation costs. And that was a lesson that I’d learned the hard way. I remember saying to Cynthia, “Well, you know, I think I maybe erred a little bit on this. I got the bow-drill but it cost $70 for some Native American craftsman to drive it to Boston and back.” Anyway, that’s how we got one of their bow-drills for the workshop. And I mostly did workshops. We taught classes. We taught courses at Lesley College and a Wheelock College. And it was a time when everybody was talking about the open education, about Dewey philosophy and Froebel and all of that, the people who espoused that theory. So it was a pretty exciting time. I often had Jeri Robinson, who was not in my division but was in the Community Services Division, work with us on the early childhood programs. We did a lot of Headstart workshops. So she would come and do her bit on those workshops. And so I got to know her and I got to know Dottie. But basically, my memory at that time was that the divisions worked very independently from each other. We kind of knew each other, we saw each other at staff meetings and stuff, but basically we operated as pretty independent units. And I think it must have been about 1974 or so when Judge Garrity declared the Boston Public Schools segregated and called for the desegregation plan. And I know you worked with Anne Hawley because they had put together Chapter 636, which said that monies could be spent at universities, and I believe at school systems could get money for desegregation programs, but cultural institutions were involved in that mix.

MIKE: Universities and businesses.

Businesses, businesses, that’s what it was, could run programs. And you and Anne Hawley I think were the leaders in getting them to include cultural institutions. And I remember feeling really good about that, thinking that we really should be part of it, and then thinking to myself that the cultural institutions aren’t any more integrated than the schools, and they need diversity just as much as the teachers and the schools. So I felt good about it, but a little bit nervous about it. And I know that then the Cultural Education Collaborative was set up really to administer all of those 636 and any suburban and urban pairing programs, as well as the urban-urban pairing programs. And I think we did 636 work for ten years. I was on the committee with, Anne started it and then Polly – I think it was Polly Rabinowitz then, but Polly Price – and members from several other cultural institutions. And we sat down to establish the criteria for those courses, or those activities. And that was very exciting, because we came really easily to consensus that one-time field trips had to be off the table and that kids didn’t get to know each other in a one-time field trip, and that everybody had to look at their staffs and try to hire, to have more diversity on their staffs and so forth. So that seemed like a very promising set up. I don’t think there was ever any really long-term evaluation on how effective they were. It wasn’t something that was very measurable. I think the theater programs and the dance programs, programs like that, had an easier time getting off the ground because it’s just what they did and you could either dance or you couldn’t dance and it worked. But with the kind of programs we did, Bernie did them for years and years because it was right down his alley. We would have science activities. And I remember one group we did ten weeks of bringing together a school from Watertown and the Hennigan School. And then we hired Cooperative Artists Institute to come in because they did this group-building, group-bonding tribe program. And Bernie did his physical science and [Kaki] did natural history at that time. And so she was doing a lot of the programs. [Marian Kerry] was involved at that time. And the one story I remember is – and this is when you and Jim and Elaine were all working on the wharf project and Phyl and I were kind of running the show back in JP, and Bernie was doing one of his toolmaking workshops, where he had lit fires out on the driveway and had kids around fires. And I was always, when Bernie’s projects were going on I always made myself available, and I remember I kept looking, thinking “Is Phyl looking out of her window and watching these kids with the fires?” I don’t know how we ever got by that one. But every once in a while Bernie would do something that he knew, if he had asked, I would have said no. So he would just go right ahead and do it. So I remember going out and saying, “Bernie, I’m going to float out here today and just make sure we don’t burn anybody up.” But I was very nervous about that. That was a little bit about the bow-drill. Once you’re in it, you don’t.... That was one of the scariest ones, I think, because he didn’t always think about the safety issues, in the same way that I did. I mean, I’m sure he wanted them to be safe, but he just didn’t think that way.

MIKE: One thing that, a sidebar related to that, was that for all the kids getting bitten by hamsters and climbing structures and all that kind of thing, we were never sued in all 23 that I was there.

I know. And when you think of the space, particularly in the old building. They certainly weren’t safe spaces by today’s standards. That messy room that Bernie had? I mean, it was slate floor and it was covered with soap bubbles. Every time you’d go back and forth there you’d slip a little bit. I don’t know, I guess we were lucky. We were young and lucky.

MIKE: We were lucky. It was actually because we convinced the underwriters that we took this [fault] really seriously. And any time there was an event – and there were lots of them – we had to take them to the hospital and everything like that. And it was because we never didn’t take responsibility for the whole thing. You know, “Of course we’ll help.” We’d call them afterwards, all that kind of thing. So it turned out nobody –

Nobody thought to do it, right. Because nobody needed –

MIKE: Nobody thought of suing because the suits are mostly from people that feel they’re not being paid attention to their concerns.

Yeah. I remember there were manuals, or sheets on what to do in an emergency and who to call and all of that about taking responsibility was all right there, very seriously.

MIKE: [inaudible] we went to the museum wharf with all those fire drills and evacuation issues, and oh man, we were really.... Yeah, but I thought it was a very interesting lesson. That the responsibilities we had to not making ourselves vulnerable to suits not by backing away from responsibility but moving in on [inaudible].

Not denying it or giving them any reason to think that you weren’t paying attention. Anyway, I think one thing about the 636 programs that was different at Children’s than at other institutions was that many of the museums hired a special staff to work, and it was almost like a separate education department or something that would be their 636 department. And then if they didn’t get funded, that group went away. And I kept trying to encourage people to hire within their staff, so that as people became more comfortable.... And I think it was very good preparation for our moving to the wharf and so forth, because so many of our developers had taught in schools with a high percentage of African-American, Latino students, and not very many of them had had that experience before. Because clearly our audience was primarily from Brookline and Newton and some Jamaica Plain, which at that time was not terribly diverse, at least who was coming from the museum. Once we started doing more with community centers and the school groups and so forth were more diverse. But I think it helped everybody get a different perspective on who the kids really are in the schools and who we’re really working with. So I think it was a good way to be part of the desegregation program while it was going on and clearly it was a rough time in Boston, and I was proud that we didn’t just sort of step away from it and watch from the outside, but we got right in the middle of it. And I think I did that almost up until the move. And then of course it continued after we moved. But during that time, the Community Center Division and the Resource Center Division got combined. We had gotten to the place where we were both doing quite a few programs, and it became very competitive at grant time because we all wanted to go to the same funders. And not only did they have to prioritize them, but it was just a lot of people to carry as each of these divisions got bigger. So I’m not sure exactly when that decision was made, after Phoenix I’m sure, before the move. It must have been somewhere between ’75 and ’79. Jim became the Director of the Resource Center, and the Teacher Services and Community Services were combined in there. Now, the way the combination was done was that all of the community services people stayed and all of the teacher services people went except me. So I was kind of the lone person in the Resource Center staff, and the librarian, Carol Anne, she stayed on and she was in the library and she worked for Jim also then. And Jim primarily worked on the wharf and I was the Associate Director and sort of kept things together at JP until the move. An interesting thing for me during that sort of four-year period was the Program Committee. I worked on the Program Committee and that gave me a chance to work with – that was the program for the wharf, and so I got to work with board members and you and people from other divisions on the various sites that we looked at. I remember the Copley Square site and the Watertown Arsenal. And some of them got as far as drawings. Others were more ideas. I don’t know that I went and looked at any of them, but I was pretty familiar with them and we did a lot of discussing about what would it mean to partner with the Horticultural Society, what would it mean to partner with other people in that? So I found that, because I think by that time I was a little tired of what my regular job was, and I always needed kind of a new challenge. And I think that Program Committee. And also at that time was the **Ethnic Discovery Project,** which was another one of those multicultural opportunities for the whole staff to get to know each other better. So I participated in that. We did a staff training where I think 12 staff people did the entire Ethnic Discovery Program after hours. And I think that was one of the most powerful ways that we really got closer together, and it just came at a good time. And I think the kind of friendships and things that developed out of there lasted a long time.

MIKE: It would be great if you could generate at some point just a list of those people who went to the training.

Okay. I’m sure that we can recall that. I think it helped us all, because again, the **divisions still at that time were pretty divided**. We all worked on our own work. Even though some of us had become friends across divisions, we only worked together when there was a contract for something to do together. And I think by that time there were tensions in the staff, but the tensions were really just kind of everybody was so busy, both serving the public on-site and trying to get this new building opened. And all the developers were both trying to teach and also develop new exhibits. So there was a lot of both excitement, but also tension of feeling a little overworked.

MIKE: A huge number of developers. And the other thing was –

**A huge number of developers**. Because there were so many – because we worked on this plan where we wanted subject matter specialists, where in almost every museum they have generalists who take on topics and learn more about them or bring somebody in as a consultant on them, but we had these subject matter specialists, and we wanted the richness that they could provide. We didn’t think you could have a generic person lead the Japanese program or the Native American program or the science program. And these were all characters, all very interesting people with very different backgrounds. And we would have these developers meetings that were worse than the early staff meetings. They were just.... Elaine and I would just be set up to be killed in those meetings. They would come with agendas, and there was no way we could win. And we were tough. Both of us are tough. But it was difficult. They competed with each other. They taught each other. They were so generous. That’s one thing that I remember, is that everyone at that place, nobody held their stuff to their chest like they do at universities and other places that I’ve heard about. Everybody taught everybody what they knew. So it was like learning every day all these things. But then it would just boil up into some small issue and – it wasn’t always a small issue. It become very difficult to manage them. And I think that Elaine and I worked very hard at this whole **matrix system**. I should talk about that a little bit. There had always been a coding system, where you coded what division you worked for. And you did this for long distance phone calls. You did this for your paycheck. You did this – I don’t know what else we recorded that way. Grants. We had to keep track of people on grants. All these 636 grants. And there were times when we had 30 grants in operation at the same time. We were very successful in getting grants. And then you had to administer them all. So we had this system of how to keep track of where all the money went. And it was a numerical system and pretty sophisticated. But then I think the matrix really came to be after the development for the wharf. Leading up to the wharf there were more funds raised, so you had more developers. And then after we got there, kind of the wisest thing would have been to pare down and only have a few and pay them well and move on with it. But of course we sort of kept everybody. And then we patched together this system because we thought, well, Elaine needed them to develop exhibits. She needed them to train the interpreters. She needed them to develop materials, to work on the floor. And I needed them to teach in 636 programs. And I developed a way for them to, or several of us did, develop a way for them to publish books and to teach courses and do other things. So that we tried to keep them, not fully funded, but as funded as they wanted to be. Fortunately, they didn’t all want to be fully funded or we’d have never made it. But it became a kind of a nightmare of keeping track of that. And then of course they were just, you know, they had 20% of this and 15% of that and 10% of this. And I remember that we developed a sheet, a quarter sheet, so that we would meet with them I think twice a year. Not quarterly, but I think it was twice a year, but we would plan with them how they could work on these things quarterly. So what would be their primary thing for this quarter, their primary thing for each of the quarters. We’d help them plan out their year. And it never worked out. You know, they’d be in the second quarter, they hadn’t done the first quarters, and they just couldn’t, they weren’t planning-type people. So somehow all the work got done. It’s really pretty amazing. Usually the timeframe was a little longer than we thought. Things would get stretched out. But they did projects, they helped write reports, they produced the materials, they produced the kits, the wrote the books. I mean, it was just so productive. And they’d complain. It’s too much to do, and it was too much for us to manage, and we’d complain it’s too much. But we didn’t seem to be able to make the cut. We didn’t seem to be able to get to the place where we said, “This is ridiculous. Here’s what you do. Line it all up and you put half of it away.” We didn’t make that cut. And it went on for a very long time. I think it was responsible for the richness of the institution. And we loved the richness. We loved the idea that there were half a dozen really rich, deep exhibits and we could do another one. And then this person would have an idea, and that was cutting edge and that hadn’t been done, and let’s do that one. And then this one.... When I think back of the number of what we carried and how we managed. They were home-based in either Elaine’s division, my division, and Joan was in Phyl’s, and got to play by different rules. That’s my memory of Phyl. She got to play by different rules. I think that happened a lot. I think in a lot of our processes Phyl had her way of doing things which wasn’t quite as straight as the rest of us. And I don’t know that I was ever angry about that, but I certainly was observant about that. And Elaine and I talked a lot about that. But we were never sure that she put everything on the table during the budgeting process. We were never sure that Joan had to play with the same developer rules as everybody else. But we couldn’t do anything about that. She had a special status. And, you know, we all got along pretty well, it just was kind of an assumption that, because it was pretty amazing how much we did share and how the people who were in Elaine’s came and the people who were in my camp, we really had to trade people’s time. And we did that, I think Elaine and I worked together very well professionally. We were also very close friends most of the time, not all of the time, and so that sometimes got in the way. But we usually, when we’d come to an impasse we’d just let it be for a while and then I think because both of us kind of needed the either companionship or the – I mean, we were both at a certain level. We weren’t developers and we weren’t the director, and we really only had each other and Phyl, that sooner or later we’d have to work this out.

MIKE: Did the matrix happen when you and Elaine were managers?

Yeah.

MIKE: It didn’t happen when Jim was there?

I don’t believe so.

MIKE: Okay. [inaudible] primary [inaudible].

SOPHISICATED AND WORKABLE MATRIX SYSTEM

I don’t think so. In fact, I think that one of the times when Elaine and I had had particular difficult times, we decided that we would go to New York together on the train and we weren’t going down for fundraising – because we went every fall for fundraising, to New York and to Washington – but we would just go down, we’d see a couple of exhibits, we’d eat some good food, we might go to a play, and we’d ride home, and we’d see what happened. So we both agreed to that plan, we thought that would be fun. And we had a wonderful. It was just one of those wonderful weekends. We talked some work, but not a lot of work. And then I think on the way home on that train ride, I think by the time we got, I think we invented it. I think we had relaxed enough and gotten kind of on wave again, and we both loved the idea. I think we worked well together because we were so different. Our styles were so different. And it just took effort, but we also brought out things in each other that were good. And so I think professionally we were both generous and willing to make it work. But there were times when it was trying. And I don’t know, I think we were pretty much left to handle that on our own. And I don’t remember a time when you really said, “Hey, people, sit down and make this work better.” I think we really did it on our own. And it might have been, you know, I don’t know that it would have been better if someone intervened. I think we were just so different it would have been hard to do that. I mean, we had very fair fights in the managers meetings and stuff.

[INTERRUPTION IN CONVERSATION]

The **managers meeting, [in the 80s]** I remember, was every Monday afternoon, and I really looked forward to that. I think many weeks that was my only contact with you, unless I had some particular thing I needed to work out. I always felt comfortable going up to your office and asking, but I think most things we held and did on those Monday afternoons. And I really looked forward to them, I remember that. I liked the camaraderie of the group. And I felt that you made it a very safe place that we could disagree and sometimes strongly and other times just mildly. We were pretty respectful of each other. But we had very differences of opinions.

And I particularly remember the **budgeting process.** And I’ve used it ever since. Every place I’ve been I’ve used that same budgeting process, and tried to do it in the same way of setting a fair place where everyone would bring in all the income that they had, and we’d put it up on the chart. It was income day, and I remember I’d write it in my book, “income day”. We did all the work preparing for that outside and independently. We never saw, really, each others’ stuff in that way. But we all brought it in, we put it all up on the board. And then we would question it, “is that really it?” Particularly in terms of the proposals, because so much of what it we were doing, particularly in my division but in both divisions, was on grants. We couldn’t really leave out all the grant income, even though we didn’t have it secured yet, all the proposed grants. Because if we did that, the income number would be so small we’d have to let everybody go, and then if the grants got funded, we’d have to hire them all back. So we figured out some ingenious formula for, I think it was 20% which was kind of the overhead rate, or something. We would put each proposal that was out and we’d kind of estimate, was it 40% chance, 80% chance, you know, some we had gotten every year and so we knew we were pretty sure of getting those. Others were real long shots. So first I think we would estimate the odds of getting them. And then we would take that number and somehow come up with this 20% formula. And then we’d put it in the budget as hard money. And I remember thinking, “That’s really a wonderful idea.” Now, we’d had a good track record of doing that, but I can see many boards or administrators who would have said, “You don’t have that money in hand, let’s not count it.” It would have made a huge difference. Maybe it would have caused us to cut some developers earlier or something. Maybe it wasn’t such a good plan. But I think it was. I think it really was. It was a good example of how we didn’t just have to do something by the book. We could say, “Okay, what’s a good shot at it?” We always went over that number. That number was never higher than the grants that we got. And sometimes it was significantly lower. But I think the fact that we all could come to an agreement on that kind of a mechanism.

MIKE: It was one of the pure innovations, [inaudible] innovations, and the formula came out of essentially probability theory. And the idea is you couldn’t count on any single one, but collectively they’d average out enough.

It’s a little bit like mutual funds. We were early on into mutual funds, I think. So we would put all the income up. And then we would all be sent away to come back with all of our expense budgets. And Elaine and I would kibbutz outside and think that Phyl didn’t put up all her income or something. There was always a little bit that went on, you know. And some ways that was good for Elaine and I. We kind of had this buffer together then. Because when you think about, I mean, it’s really asking people to bring all their people and then I don’t ever remember a year when there was just enough income so we didn’t have to cut back. I mean, we knew we were going to have to cut. And we brought in the stuff and we had not seen each others’ stuff. And I totally trusted that all of Elaine’s numbers, that she would bring them in, and she did mine. I mean, it was just really pretty amazing either how, you know, I just don’t think management happens like that a lot, that we would just lay it all out there and then you would say, “Well, could we get by without this?” Or, “Could we get...?” I mean, these were pet projects and people and stuff. And then you’d send us away. We didn’t try to cut them there, and that made it very safe. I think it would have been very hard if we had made some of those really tough decisions together, because then Elaine and I would have had to fight against each other. So you really said to us, “Go back and bring it back smaller.” And sometimes it was – it was never “Everybody makes a 10% line cut”, it was “We’re out about 10%”. So we were smart enough to know, “Well, I’d better be in the 10% range or I’m not doing my part.” And we brought stuff in. And I remember I worked, I don’t know how many nights. I mean, the printouts we got were this thick. And we had all of these numbers and all of these people. And by then the budget was pretty good sized. And I just remember that when it got to it zero we would be so pleased. **[2:25 min]** And I don’t think that I even understood right then what an accomplishment that was. I think when it occurred to me was later, after you had left, and there was another administration, and we had one moment where the board brought in an outside expert who was going to show us how the real world did this. And it was so different, just so totally different than what we had done. And people just balked. I mean, you couldn’t get anything out of anybody. It just had the exact opposite effect, where we just, you know, “Of course I can do this. How much do you want? $30,000? $50,000?” We went back in, we found it, and it was just the culture worked in that way for that group of people at that time. And later I got to see that in fact you got exactly the opposite. The sort’s of like the story about the insurance with the people getting hurt. If you’d been defensive at first, then people act that way. If you’re very dogmatic about it, people get much tighter about it. And it was much harder to get people to be generous and to think when they didn’t feel like they were kind of being trusted to come up with it. I think you just assumed that Elaine and I would go out and drop $90,000 from the budget or something.

[END OF AUDIOTAPE 1]

...$7 for this. It wasn’t like we had big money to deal with. But we were pretty remarkable. We were a remarkable team in doing that. And Phyl was, too. I mean, her job was slightly different than ours and she didn’t deal with as many people.

MIKE: She had the smallest resources, I guess, [inaudible] costs comparable [inaudible] museum. The thing was always loaded towards –

**MSW RELOCATE IN MUSEUM WHARF CHAPTER**

Progress, right. And in most museums the overhead or administration or support services is a much greater percentage of the museum. But so I really, I think the managers group – I’m trying to think of others issues that we dealt with. Of course, **after the move and people were so tired and wiped out and hadn’t had vacations. And then we were living in these terrible conditions,** at least those of us in the Resource Center division were living in unfinished, unsafe space. I mean, Jennie was little, and she’d come to work with Dottie and this door was open and it was three stories down. There was no grate, no anything. “Keep Jennie away from that.” And it was dirty. Oh, it was so dirty. I don’t think that, I mean, I’ve completely forgotten about what it was like to come home at night just covered with that black soot. I mean, we just were dirty all the time. We left jackets in there hanging on a coat tree so when we’d go fundraising if our clothes looked too dirty we’d have – I mean, it was like dress up. We’d put another jacket on so we’d have clean clothes. It was a mess. And people were angry. I mean, people who should have left earlier hadn’t left because they wanted to be part of it. There wasn’t the natural attrition and it was hard to get to work. Not everybody was pleased. Some of us urban types really liked it. I loved being down there. I just thought it was great to be in the heart of the city. But clearly our conditions weren’t very good. And Jim left the year that we moved in down there, and I became the division director then. So that’s when I started going to manager’s meeting. That’s also the year I got divorced, so it was a busy year. Those things are not unrelated, but I don’t think those stories are necessary here. We’ll let those go. So there was a lot that we had to do on the waterfront. And I think what happened next was the establishment of the **personnel committee**. Now, somehow I don’t think Elaine had to sit on the personnel committee, or maybe she refused to sit on the personnel committee. Was she on the personnel committee? Because I don’t remember that. I remember being on the personnel committee, and I remember you being on it. Who else was on it. Bill.

MIKE: I think the managers.

All the managers were on it?

MIKE: [inaudible] spent a lot of time on all personnel [inaudible].

On all personnel issues, yeah.

MIKE: And I think they also went to the – I don’t know.

We’ll ask and see tomorrow. Because I don’t remember her being there. I remember we worked on all of the policies, you know, who had to work when. Because there was all this feeling about that division’s getting paid better, they get overtime, we don’t get overtime, these people have to work vacation weeks, they don’t have to work vacations. All of those issues came up. And it always was – I think it was usually brought out about pay levels, levels of, you know, so we came up with this enormous list of jobs and job descriptions, and was this equal to that and was somebody in the EC that does this like somebody in the RC that does that like somebody in Support Services that does that? And we put all the jobs in the categories. And then I don’t remember how we did the getting people into those right slots from where they were. I don’t remember that. I remember there were quite a few people that left, and I think there were a couple of years where we had pretty substantial raises. And my memory – I could be wrong about this – but my memory is that we took the occasion of raises to make those fine tuning moves, like everybody gets a raise and we’ll put you in here so that people felt good about getting the raise and then ended up where they did.

MIKE: We used that same strategy when people went on to [inaudible] for the first time. We never lost, when you [inaudible] finally eligible and had to come in, you never lost [inaudible] during that.

Now, did TIAA-CREF start in JP? Way early, way early. Because I remember, and I think I remember you saying that TIAA-CREF that we were the first museum that was in that. I think that was such an amazing accomplishment and it’s made such a difference in everybody’s lives. Especially we retired people are terribly indebted to your looking ahead.

MIKE: [inaudible] unsympathetic [inaudible] person who was the person who drove it, an unlikely....

Was he connected with the university? Because the universities were the prime....

MIKE: No, he was on, I think, we’ve got to go back and check, but I think he was on the board of at least one, maybe several, independent schools. He was on that, you know, being a lawyer serving on boards and of course he would have been big enough to be [inaudible] the universities, but I think he started out for him, that he was the guy that thought about TIAA-CREF That’s another story, we’ll get to that. But it was very early on, maybe ’65.

Because I know I didn’t, a lot of us were recalcitrant about that, because we were working part time and making very little money, and barely covering the cost of day care and so forth. So that I didn’t do any, I didn’t join TIAA-CREF, I don’t think, until, like, 1980. I know we were down at the wharf. It was very late for me. Well, I didn’t think I was going to need that. And then things changed, and I did. And it was a wonderful thing for me, even though I started very late in it. But the personnel committee I think, I remember it as being several years of work, I mean, three, four years, some of it fine tuning. Some of it I remember us, we’d have to talk with board about things because certain benefits had real price tags and we’d have to research three different dental plans or this or that. And some of that was done through Support Services, Bill Wiseman, I don’t remember exactly who did some of that. But it was a real group effort, and people from Design & Production were on the committee, people from every kind of, it was a very broad committee.

MIKE: And people rotated in and out.

Rotated in and out, yes. You only stayed on it a certain period of time. And I think it kind of got the museum back in trusting the system again, because I think that trust, everyone was committed to the mission and committed to kids and committed to their own jobs, but they weren’t trusting that it was all working as a group. And so I think that built trust again, and then it would be very easy to say, “Well, no, that’s like that, and that’s like that,” and just that sense of fairness and all of it. And I’ve used that a lot of times in other places when they’ve talked about, well, the staff are complaining about this or that, I’d be consulting, a lot of times that’s the issue. There’s a sense that it’s not fair. And it’s not always fair. And you can’t make it always fair. But if there are just blatant inequities across divisions and it’s happening at the kind of secretarial, middle management level, that’s where the fires start. And I think we were very wise to spend the time to do that. **[end of post-opening problems]**

**END OF VIDEOTAPE 1**

**BEGINNING OF VIDEOTAPE 2**

I was talking about **manager’s meeting [continued]** and how I’ve used the strategies and some of the things that I’ve learned there. I think it wasn’t just at the budgeting process. I think there were other times when issues would be brought in and we’d have a good discussion of them. And I think there was a substantial change between earlier when there was just kind of endless discussion about things, and now your ability to list things and prioritize and keep us moving on. Because we covered a lot of ground in two to three hours on a Monday afternoon, I think. And I don’t think we could have done that if it, you know, of course there weren’t as many of us, and that was helpful, too, that there weren’t.

But we often brought in people. Anne would come in and we’d do the prioritizing of grants. That was, again, another issue where those were very sensitive and very competitive issues, because it meant who were you going to fund in your camp for the next three years. So in terms of NSF grants, in terms of NEA, NEH, Carnegie, all of them. That was a lot of trading we had to do. And I think I sort of remember it that was. I would give in on certain things but expect to win on other things. And I think you managed that. I don’t think that Elaine and I could have done those things alone. I think we could do the thing about the developers. We did a lot of things about ideas, about what was appropriate, what wasn’t appropriate, what we wanted to the community to know and feel about us and so forth. But we couldn’t have done that tough trading, both of grants and of budget and that kind of thing, by ourselves. Because it just wouldn’t have worked that way. So I think that was really a true use of the manager’s meeting. **[2:05 min]**

**[0:30+2:25+1:50=4:45 min]**

And again, going to the **executive committee meetings**. I loved the executive committee meetings, and I think I learned a lot there because you were in the room with the heads of these major banks and corporations and yet they were on their kind of informal mode. And Jeptha would run the meeting and he’d say “all contrary minded”, I remember that all the time, people would vote against something. And Bob Schecter, who I just really liked, was so smart about all the budgets and the financing and that, and I just kind of, everything he said I just took it in because I thought, you know, when do you get a chance to learn from the – I don’t know whether he was the CFO at Lotus or something. But when do you get to just sit and listen to him kind of brainstorm about how you might put this together or something. It was a **wonderful learning opportunity**. And then also I think it helped when you were in that set up to hear the rationale behind the discussion when decisions were made. So that when we went back to our camps, I don’t know whether this was true for Elaine as well, but for me, I knew the issues. It wasn’t just “the board has decided we should do this” or “we’re going to do that”. It was, “Here’s the kind of things that we talked about and here’s how they came to this decision.” So it was much easier for me to communicate to the people in my division what was going on so it wasn’t this really high-level board and we don’t have any contact with them. But I don’t know whether that was unusual to have all the managers in the executive committee meeting. I know other boards that I’ve been connected with have really only wanted the director in those meetings. And I think it’s a real loss because I think 1) you’re training up people for larger and more complicated jobs, but 2) you also just understand it better and see where they’re coming from. And I really liked that.

One story I remember is, of course, the **Mexican restaurant** in the building, and we had the fish restaurant, and I guess that didn’t go because they couldn’t get a liquor license or something. And they had McDonald’s and everybody wanted a little more expensive, a little more family restaurant on the end. And someone was negotiating, I suppose it was either Support Services because that’s usually where that kind of negotiating happened, or either the Director’s Office. And a Mexican restaurant wanted to go in there and everyone was very excited about it. And I remember they brought drawings to the executive committee meeting. And I had only been going for maybe about a year or something like that. And I wasn’t really – I never felt like I held back in what I wanted to say there, but most of the things were things that I felt very confident about. It wasn’t something sort of that controversial. So now they had this and everybody wanted this, and it’ll be good, we’ll have income, da-da-da-da-da-da. And here’s the drawing of this big, Mexican stereotype they wanted to put on the outside of the building. And I just couldn’t believe it. And I thought, “If I leave this room and haven’t said anything and somebody paints that on the side of the building, all the credibility that we have out there in the community is going to go.” And I think I was pretty straight and narrow about things like that. There was a lot of black and white for me in a lot of those issues. It might have worked just fine. But I remember thinking to myself, “Okay, now, how can I approach this?” And I remember saying something like, “I imagine the restaurant has a lot of logos. Could we look at their range of logos?” Well, of course, it was like the golden arches. I mean, if they were going to have the restaurant, they were going to put that on the side. So finally I just had to say, you know, “I think it’s a stereotype, and I don’t think it’s a good thing to put on the side of the building.” And I don’t know how the rest of the discussion went. I mean, it’s possible that the contract could never have been made anyhow or something like that. But I remember that was one time, I never felt hesitant with you or Elaine or any other staff people in sort of speaking that piece. But because so much money was involved. And their money. I mean, they had all invested in the restaurant. And how they came up, and here was another one, they might get their money back if this thing worked. And I knew that. And I remember just thinking, “Oh, why me?” But it never got painted and I was glad of that, and I wouldn’t have minded if it had been a chile pepper or something that wasn’t a person. But I think we paid almost too careful. We were very PC, or I was at least, about a lot of things like that. I think most of the time it was for a good cause. And I feel the same way about the Babar exhibit. I know that people in my exhibit were just adamant that that couldn’t happen. And I said, you know, “If everybody goes screaming and raging about it, we’re going to be in a pickle here. What we want is that the thing doesn’t come, or if it comes, that the offensive drawings are out of it.” So the kind of hot button people in my division were okay with that. We could get it so that it.... And then I guess the negotiations were that you couldn’t take it if you hadn’t.... But there were a lot of discussions about that. And I was very pleased when we didn’t take it, even though I liked some of the Babar stories myself. I think it was just the wrong time and a lot of people were looking for ways that we weren’t consistent, and it would have just been an easy way for people to say, “Well, they don’t really get it.” And there were, I think one of the things that was always true at the museum is that there was this wide spectrum of people on their feelings and their perceptions and their thoughts about issues of multiculturalism. And not everybody was in the same place at the same time. And we all tried to respect that, but it was very hard because the people who were the furthest on the left were really touchy. And as soon as you crossed that line you lost them. And they weren’t always the most easy to keep in tow. And I was with them most of the time. I mean, I really felt strongly that if we’re saying one thing – and I particularly felt because we raised a lot of money based on our community work and our multicultural work. And I thought, you know, you’re taking the money by using the words, then you’ve got to put up and do the right thing. So I just felt like we couldn’t just risk some of that. But it was pretty much unanimity about it. I mean, it was kind of an education process, like everything was. You know, Joan would say a few words, somebody else would say a few words, Jeri would say a few words. And some people would scream and other people would work it out. But most of the time I felt like at least there was an airing of those issues and we had a way of doing it. But I think what I learned on that was how far everybody’s issues were different – how can I say it – it isn’t akin to the First Amendment that everybody raises now. Well, you have First Amendment rights to say whatever you want, you know, that’s not a racist thing to say. But it was more people felt, “Well, let’s not worry about that. It’ll be alright. Nobody will notice” and that kind of thing. And it’s true. A very small percentage of the audience and the staff would have noticed. But that was the group we were trying to get to grow. And those were hard times. It was hard to get through those.

MIKE: Part of my memory of it is that I was so in love with **Babar,** with my own kids and it was one of the things that I loved to be read to – I couldn’t read – by my mother, that I couldn’t even see what the issue was. And I was so blind to that. So for me it was a perfect example the education of the people. It was very – I came around pretty fast, but it was hard for me to get it, initially.

And I think Elaine was hesitant at first because I remember her saying, “Well, any art museum would take it.” And I remember saying, “Send it to an art museum. Are we a children’s museum or are we an...?” So we had some fights about that kind of stuff. And I don’t know what I’d do today. I think my motivation was we have a whole group of people who have kind of put themselves out there on these issues, and my job is to defend them, you know, to keep them from having to do that. That was a hard one.

MIKE: We should ask Elaine. I think that she negotiated the deal of, could we go back and ask them for the expurgated version. And when they said no, I don’t think she had any problems with [inaudible].

No, I think she had made that decision. That if they would do it without, then we would do it. And if they wouldn’t, they wouldn’t.

MIKE: Everybody was comfortable with that.

Yeah, I think so. I think everybody was by then. And Jeri was delighted, because Jeri was quieter in those early years. Jeri got much more vocal later on. But in those early years she didn’t always say in the meeting what she was feeling. She would say in my meeting with her what she was feeling, so I would know in the meeting that she wasn’t saying it. So I found myself in that bind from time to time. And I do remember if we’d talk about the sort of boundaries between your job and my job, I don’t think that there was the tendency for you to get in my turf as much as there was in the exhibit center. Because you liked the exhibitions and you liked to fool around there. And if I wanted your opinion on the covers for publication, I would bring them up and show you, and you’d tell me and so forth. But I don’t remember your coming in and saying, “We should do this differently” or “We should do that differently.” And maybe it’s just selective remembering or something. But I don’t us –

MIKE: No, [inaudible].

So I don’t remember feeling territorial. In fact, I think I probably would have liked it if you had been involved a little bit more. On the other hand, I loved managing on my own, and so I wouldn’t have liked you interfering in that. But I never worried about that you would interfere with that. And I always felt like if I had a dilemma I was kind of wrestling with, I could talk with you about it. And I think I talked with you about Babar in that particular instance. And I mean, I was talking with Elaine. But I think I kind of came to – because I sometimes I wondered am I way out of sync here? So I think mostly it was me coming to you rather than your coming to.... Because a lot of what we did wasn’t so visible there. You know? It wasn’t really the kind of thing you could object to. You probably had opinions about it, but you didn’t get involved in it too much.

MIKE: [inaudible], but I was mostly just thrilled that you were doing what the Resource Center was doing, and the Community Services earlier. And I was not a source of great ideas, and therefore there was no sense of disappointment. The only thing that I could contribute was to make sure that we had a community that was bigger than just us, and [inaudible] and that kind of stuff. And I put a lot of investment in the business of trying to make sure that [we] were not alone on that one. And I was also tremendously grateful that you and your team invested so much in the training of other people that were – because lots of places were getting into the education as a commitment to the schools. [inaudible] time under this funding. And you were very generous in moving into the [inaudible] their learning part of [inaudible] pieces of it.

That was, I think it was a wonderful place, the museum was a wonderful place to be, in terms of **professional development**. I mean, I think you believed in it strongly for yourself. When you needed to learn something you went out and learned it. And you believed in it for us. So I think that – I mean, we always went to the NEMA conferences and we were always active in AAM and I was on the board and lots of people from the museum were on the board. And I went to the Museum Collaborative’s Management Institute with Columbia. And that was a wonderful program. And I learned a lot about number crunching and spreadsheets. But also the kind of management philosophy and so forth there. That was a very good program. But I think it was a treat for us, also, then to get to do professional development. And doing it with the CEC for other institutions, and all the back-to-back seminars we did, how to start a children’s museum, a Native American, later the multicultural one and early childhood conference. All of those. I mean, we brought people from all over the country, and we spent two or three days with colleagues, you know, teaching and learning. Those were wonderful experiences. And they broke even or paid a little bit to the museum. Heaven knows with all the time that went in them, you know, if you’d ever really costed them out whether they would have broken even. But they made such a difference in how the museum was viewed. And I’m sure they made a difference in 80% funding rate or whatever our proposal rate was that we got because all of these people, you know, we’d go to talk to a foundation and they’d say, “Oh, yeah, So-and-So was here. They were at your [inaudible].” You know, I think it just made a big....

CONSIDER ADDING AS SIDEBAR OR MEDIA ITEM TO JERI’S CHAPTER [PERHAPS SUBSTITUTING FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD NEWS ITEM]

I wanted to talk a little bit about the **Early Childhood Project**, because that was a really interesting one for me. Jeri had tried out the Before You Were 3 exhibit in Jamaica Plain, and clearly moms and little kids were coming. And eight year olds were having to go home because the babies didn’t have any place to go. And Jeri was a strong advocate for this young audience. And my memory of it is that we were really thinking that most of our visitors came on 180 days: the weekend days, the three vacation weeks, you know, the school year and the museum year were just switched. There were 180 school days and 180 museum days. And during the week, those were counted as school days. Kids were in school all day long. We had a few people in the afternoons, but not very many once we moved down to.... And we had school groups every morning. But very few. I mean, if you really talk about numbers, the number of people, because they came in and the school program was always filled to capacity, the 15 kids at a time with an interpreter. It was not like thousands of people. And so here was the rest of this humongous institution pretty empty during that time. And my memory of a lot of our discussion about early childhood is that preschoolers are the only other audience who are available during the day on those times. What if we could get people to come then? Would they then not come on the weekends? There wouldn’t be as many babies on the weekends if we really had a place that catered to them during the week when they can come. And if we partitioned it off, if we segregated it, we could keep them out of the places where the older kids are so we wouldn’t have to worry about the older kids feeling they were in a babies’ museum. And I really bought that. I really thought that’s a really good plan. Here we – [BREAK IN RECORDING] – and every weekend is going to be busy except a few during the year. And if we have to increase our attendance, we don’t want to have more school groups coming because we liked the way they were getting that kind of personalized attention and so forth through the museum. And of course Jeri was this strong advocate for having a bigger Play Space. And the Play Space on the first floor that opened before worked alright, but it was right at the beginning at the visit, and so everybody stopped there and thought this is the first thing you do is run around in this, what really wasn’t an exhibition, it was really just a space.

And so we wrote the **Carnegie grant,** and that was primarily to move it upstairs, expand it, wall it off, and then we built in all of the other things. The idea was larger than museums, it was really family places, places for families in public places, places where they congregate in natural settings. And Carnegie was really interested in the idea. Barbara [Finberg] at Carnegie was somebody that I adored. I think if she had ever offered me a job I would have gone in a moment. I thought she was the smartest woman I’d ever met. We’d be in her office and she’d answer the phone, and it would be about, you know, something serving 70,000 refugees in, you know, somewhere. I don’t know. I was totally impressed with her. So it was fun to go on those fundraising trips and try to talk with her about these ideas. And she was very much in sync with the museum. I think Carnegie had funded the workshop. And she was sort of amazed. She said, “Very few of our projects that we fund ever pass the funding in the three years.” And of course our workshop was still going on. So they funded the Early Childhood Project. And the exhibition was a huge part of that. Now I remember tension between Elaine and I over this whole running of this whole project. And Jeri was in division and I was the director of the project, and I don’t think she liked that at all. And she and I had to kind of work some of that out. She doesn’t remember, when she and I talk about, she doesn’t remember feeling that at all, but I know there was some tension. I remember it well. Between Elaine and I. Absolutely. There was tension. Jeri and I always did well.

MIKE: I think Janet would make the same [inaudible].

Yeah. And a big part of that grant was to **create the space**. And I saw that very much as **Elaine’s division**, and I didn’t want anything really to do with that, except I wanted her to listen to Jeri, because Jeri had very strong feelings about how it should happen. And so that was a very complex time. And I think it ended up with give and takes pretty much how Jeri wanted it, and became immediately, almost, too successful in terms of numbers of people coming.

The other part of the project that was very interesting to me was to look at other places. So we went to the **Framingham Women’s Prison** here, and to **Logan Airport**. And we talked to a number of restaurants and we talked to a number of shopping malls. And we could never get it to happen in the shopping mall. **Shopping malls** could not think of staffing in a central space. And there were several shopping malls that really wanted it to happen. But they wouldn’t commit to any kind of staffing there. And we saw this just not safe to have a totally unstaffed space. And of course they can build them now, but they were very different from what Jeri wanted and so forth. And every time I see one of those at a mall I think, “Yeah”. But of course, we were also negotiating hard. I mean, we wanted money back for all of these. You know, when we negotiated with the airport we got funds to build it and for development time. And there wasn’t any money that exchanged hands on the prison one. That was really just part of the project. And then we had the conference where Yuri [inaudible] came and people came from museums, but clearly half of the people in that were from other sites, other city sites, urban developments, other places. So I was very pleased about that. And I know that lots of places started after that. And of course, I and I had very mixed feelings. I had very strong feelings about each of the new children's museums, and the old ones wanting to put in an early childhood place. Because I think that we had shown that it was very successful in ours. I don’t think it didn’t lower the level of development that we were doing in the Japanese House or the science exhibits or any of that because it was very much contained. And I think it was only when that audience got big enough and started to spill out into the rest of it and also I think many institutions, children’s museums, began making decisions that top age was eight or something like that, which means six, which means you’ve got a preschool museum. And I was very sorry to see that trend start, because I don’t think that’s the real value of children’s museums. I think it’s part of the audience, but I think people could work harder to have places where that middle-age kid who really needs and who has the intellectual development to be able to really understand both culture and science and so forth. I think that there was just too much eventual catering to parents, what parents wanted and needed. And I think that’s a loss for children’s museums. I don’t know that that will ever turn around. But in fact I liked it best when it was a strong, definite audience that grew with the kids, but then there was always another group coming in there. And I think that was Jeri’s original idea. I think when the whole audience turns out to be very young, then you have to advocate for the rest of the institution being more friendly and work for the whole place. But I don’t know whether the exhibitions and the level of content in them determined the audience, or whether the audience determines that. I suppose it’s different each place. But I think that what we did with the Early Childhood Project was I think very useful for the museum, and certainly for the parents. I mean, there were so many kids that just grew up there. But that whole business about people coming every week, you know, 50 times a year, I mean, that wasn’t what we wanted. Our membership, I don’t remember what it cost, but it certainly wasn’t worth 50 times a year. So we were losing money on the Early Childhood Project by the end, I think. And they got their money’s worth. On the other hand, it was very busy all the time and that was never.... I don’t know what the situation is now so much, but I think that there’s a lot of schools that don’t take very many field trips. And so when they see another whole swing of more kits and resources going into the schools, because so many parents are afraid of their kids going on trips. And also all the demand for keeping your nose to the grindstone and doing those worksheets. So I’m not real thrilled with all that right now. But in think in terms of the Early Childhood Project, we certainly did, it lasted five or six years when it was really designed to be about three, because it took longer to do everything and to work it out.

MIKE: [inaudible] a lot of money.

Yeah. We raised a lot of money for that. And at the time, we were raising money for the all the multicultural work. And the early childhood was easier to raise than the multicultural. People understood, I think, from Headstart and from other things, how valuable those years were. We got better about the audience from the diversity – and here I’m talking more income rather than race. I mean, I came from a very middle-class, working-class background, and there were a few other people in the museum. But by and large, what I learned over my professional career is most museum people come from affluent families and well-educated families and so forth. And so I think my interest in diversity, while it might have played out more in terms of race and ethnicity because of the Civil Rights Movement and so forth, was really more about me personally and about middle class, and why aren’t these places for the working class? And I still think that, when I go into museums this is what I look for, this is what watch for. And I don’t think that people have cracked that very much. I think we came very close during those years in the ‘70s and also in the ‘80s, because we worked very hard on it. But it is just constant work, because it kind of goes against the culture. It isn’t what people are taught to expect. And I always felt that was a real loss. So I know that was my motivation when it got tough, is that that’s.... And of course Jeri and I were like peas in a pod. We both operated from the same motivation in that respect, and it made us very close friends. And we remain so.

MIKE: I was thinking that some of the shift –

**POSSIBLY USE AS MEDIA UNIT IN LEADERSHIP CHAPTER**

-- came later. After you were gone, actually. We did that better. One thing that I wanted to talk about was **publishing.** When we were, a lot of the developers when they were developing exhibits or programs, developed so much material. And what we tried to do was get every dollar we could get out of it. And also, we tried to get advances so that we could cover their staff time to do some of it. And we had people like Bernie, who was so productive with so many topics, and just wanted to publish everything. We had people like [Elette], who had published some on her own, but then did some work [that the] museum wanted published. And there were people who wanted Jeri’s early childhood activities. Some were Jeri’s, some where Dottie’s. But there was a lot of material that you really couldn’t use on the floor that was better used at home where there was more supervision, or a place you could have scissors. You know, there were a lot of things that you just couldn’t do out on the museum floor. And so we wanted to publish these. And I think Jim had started with one publisher for some of Bernie’s books, the first four little books, The Milk Carton House and a few of those. He had gotten that going. I think that was Little, Brown but I’m not positive right now about who published them. And they were pretty well done, but they weren’t as, they still had that little bit of a kind of a curriculum look to it. I mean, they weren’t quite a kids’ book. And so my goal for the next phase of Bernie’s books was to really get a publisher. We had those books to use, and to kind of get them kind of to the next level. Because in a trade book, a parent has to pick it off the shelf with all these other options, and schools would want them in the classroom, and they really needed to look a little zippier. So we had about five topics of Bernie’s. And I remember on one of our fundraising trips to New York, I set up appointments with several publishers. And it was fun to go and just, I don’t know, I always liked, I guess I’m a shoe salesman or something. But I always liked that, those trips, both to the foundations and to the publishers. And I had done so much foundation stuff that I was pretty comfortable now going in and just saying, you know, “Here’s all this wonderful stuff we have.” And I think it was the fact that I didn’t know what I was doing that let me just be so blatant about it. I said, “I’m going to talk to several publishers about it.” People don’t do that now. They first get one under their belt, and then....

[END OF AUDIOTAPE 2, SIDE A]

I negotiated, and I said we had to keep the copyright, that’s what museums do, and then how could we give away all this work to them. And so we set up systems where we had joint copyrights with the.... And as I’ve talked with people about publishing over the years, nobody does that. They never give you the copyright of it. So I was just kind of dumb and lucky in those early years to get some of that going. I think my favorite story about publishing Bernie’s books is the one about the covers. Because I fought those covers. They were science books, and they wanted to draw this nice little blond boy on the front working with all the stuff. And I said, “That’s really terrific, but we’ve got a broad audience. Bernie does almost all his development in urban schools with a wide range of kids. We want girls, we want minorities, we want....” “Can’t do it, won’t sell, never sell in a science cover.” And I was stubborn as always about it. So the first one, and if you lay them out in order, you can see the changes. First there’s white boys, I don’t know if it was more than one, because we decided that his stuff was kind of complex, and it was all paper cups and pencils. It was not very exciting materials. When you made them into something exciting they looked good. So they wanted kids on the front. And we had a good graphic guy. And we had gone through, I mean, just the idea of looking at how many graphic artists and can they really draw Asians and blacks so that they look like real people. And so the first book came out. And Bernie was pleased, everybody was pleased because it was a lot shinier, classier, fancier. But I wasn’t pleased with the cover because here was this boys again doing science. So by the next one we got, I thought, a girl going “Oh, wow!” or something. You know, she wasn’t even touching things. But she was at least on there. And then by the third one we got the girl was actually touching something and was doing it and they were watching her. And then we got a minority on the cover. And I remember one of the last times I went in, you know, the guy says, “I know. No wheelchairs?” So he was pretty tired of me by then. But I thought it was a really good.... And I’m sure that having to fight it out with me, they learned something about other things they were publishing. And I’m sure that they did that also.

MIKE: Same thing with [inaudible].

Yeah, you just have to fight it out. Like Brad White, was that his name? That little kid on the membership campaign. It was very hard to do that, and people would look at you, you know, today people would just say, “Oh, stop being so PC.” You know, it’s kind of beyond that. But in those days, if you weren’t blatant about it, and you had 20 minutes with them was all you had. You didn’t have time to give them your whole deal about how kids feel left out if they don’t see their images and all that. You know, we’d do a little bit of that, but mostly it was, you know, “It’s our book, we want a cover, that’s all we need.” So I felt good, we did make some progress on those. But we did publish a lot of books. And then, of course, his went into middle-school curriculum guides and the AAAS grant we got to do that, and he got a couple NSF grants to write more books and more curriculum units. So we really did a huge publishing job for Bernie. I think it was pretty uneven in terms of other staff, but other staff, I mean, Bernie is the one person who threw his whole career at the museum, worked with kids every week. He’s the only one. And I felt that we could sort of justify the disproportionate publishing of his in that he was so productive. He was publishing new stuff, interesting stuff, every week. And a lot of the things that were developed at the museum were not necessarily original. They were more art and craft activities, you could find them in other books. And we tried to do some of that. But it wasn’t as easy a sell as Bernie’s.

MIKE: Recyclopedia.

Recyclopedia was a wonderful one, though, because that was based on that just truly interesting space. And I didn’t talk about that at all. I mean, I didn’t originate that. I think Lenny knew Elaine and came through that way. But basically, the workshops and the managing, it was always mine. And Lenny was a trip to try to manage. I mean, he had his own way of doing things. I think when I see the recycle van now that Lenny would die if he saw it. You know, he wouldn’t wear a label on a shirt and he certainly wasn’t going to wear the museum’s label on his truck. And he fought that forever. And we thought it would make it easier for him when he was in places parking, I don’t know. He was not doing it. He was such an artist about some things. Some things were so off limits to him. But he had that wonderful artist’s eye. And he would bring in just these truly imaginative things. And I bet I’ve seen 20 Recycles, and I’ve never seen one that excited me but his. It’s just the quality of the stuff. And not everybody knew what the mix. And I think he had a real sense of color. He was a sculptor, but when I think back about it, because you know, you see these Recycle pieces and they’re all filled with things. Most of them do it just like he did in the barrels and with the – and it doesn’t look the same. And I think he just had a knack for the unusual and the mixture at the right time. And people just loved it. Came back year after year to buy the stuff. And I think that was another kind of quiet genius in the mix there. And again, he did things under circumstances that nobody else did. Sometimes he’d go to Phyl and he’d get special treatment on things. There were all sorts of side deals. I wouldn’t say that the museum was political, because it really didn’t operate in that way. And I’ve seen so many political institutions. But I never felt that. But there were, people were smart. They knew how to get around certain things. The people who could work the deals, worked the deals.

MIKE: I deflected you from publishing. You were only halfway through it, I think.

No, I think that we did publish two of Jeri’s books. And then we also negotiated several deals to have materials published. I think the AAAS was really curriculum materials. And of course, earlier the Matchboxes had had a major contract to reproduce then, but I didn’t negotiate that contract. That was before my time. And then, let’s see, who else. Janet [Camian]. But I think Janet worked with Elaine on a publisher, so it wasn’t all done out of my division. And we did publish Lenny’s factory-made book. Robin Simon’s book. Some of the [Ellette]’s. I don’t think we ever published any natural history books, or natural history ones. I think it was mostly the developers who really wanted to right. Oh, Sylvia [inaudible] and Phyl put together several Dover Books based on the paper doll collection or those kind of things. And I would work with them on that, but I didn’t take the lead in that. I didn’t work with Dover at all.

MIKE: How about when Joan’s We’re Still Here?

We’re Still Here was published? I think that Phyl handled most of that. Phyl and Joan kept that pretty much together. I didn’t negotiate that one.

MIKE: How about [inaudible]?

No, I don’t think so. That was earlier than me, I think, because I didn’t....

MIKE: How about Steve [Camian]?

Steve [Camian]. I was at the museum when Steve was there, but I think Steve had published an earlier book, and I think....

MIKE: I think his were all published directly by himself.

Yeah, they didn’t come through the museum as far as I knew. But I think all of those books, and all of Anne Wiseman’s books. She had a publisher and hers were published. I’m sure all of that led to our thinking, “Well, you could turn these things into books.” But I think our primary focus were the major senior developers who we were trying to both keep employed and keep their work out. I think one year we made maybe $10,000 in royalties or something. I don’t think we ever made much more than that. We got advances and we put that into staff salaries, and so then by the time they did their advances back, I don’t think we made much off of it. But it also kept people interested in the museum, and it spread it. I mean, the sort of philosophy of the Resource Center, as I understood it from the very beginning, was that most kids will only come to the museum on the third grade school trip, or they might come several times with their parents. But mostly they’re not going to get the kind of education that the museum is talking about, that kind of learning, they’re not going to get that very much in their [life]. And that the Resource Center’s job was to try to make as much of that available in the school hours, through school materials, curriculum materials, and after school through these, and at home through books and other things. So that was kind of, I always felt that was our job. The museum’s job was to give them the best experience they could while they were there. And our job was to make it available in other locations.

MIKE: I can’t even imagine how we came up with this, but we had more than, was it 140 titles that it [worked on]?

I think there’s about 140 titles on that list. And of course, some of them were ones that people did on their own outside and all of that. But, yeah, I think that is. I mean, that’s counting every topic that, I mean, 25 of them are probably Bernie. But that’s a lot of publications. I think also on there are the – we began to build into all the grants that we wrote some kind of publication that came out. So that the book that I wrote, the book on the teen [work] program, I think Joan did a couple of papers that were kind of semi-published. I mean, we had a little bit more than a project – it wasn’t really a project report, it was the writing that came out of that project. Those were – usually we knew by them we weren’t going to get people to purchase very many of those, and that we couldn’t go to commercial publishers for them. So we would write in the ability to do that. On the multicultural project, Rockefeller paid for the publication. So those were self-published. And I think there’s probably 15 or 20 of those on that list as well, that aren’t commercially published, but that are in a form that you could disseminate. So I think it was, you know, we never tried to do in-house publishing very much, because the Design & Production Department costs were so much, we’d have never been able to afford it. So while we didn’t make a lot of money on it, I think we kept people on and raised a lot of visibility. It was something you could hold in your hand or send to somebody. So I think it was good for the museum to do. And I liked doing it a lot.

MIKE: How did you feel about the way we finally split the **royalties proportionately** to the hours worked, time that was spent in developing the next phase of, say, Bernie’s thing?

Well, those were carefully negotiated. And I think they borderline, it wasn’t possible to do that the same for everybody. So I think we could have gotten into trouble with that kind of a policy. On the other hand, you know, when we couldn’t pay people full time, and they were getting paid 80% and they were spending a day a week at home writing, I couldn’t legitimately tell them that the museum should reap all that benefit. So we did it pretty much one on one, and we did it, you know, if Bernie was fully funded on a project and produced it, it was different than if he was working at home. And I don’t know that I would recommend that other people do that, god knows, one on one about their policies, because I think you can get into trouble doing that. But I think it was like everything else. We needed to find a solution, we found a solution, we tried to make it fair all the way around. And I think we would have done the same for somebody else. I don’t know what happened with Joan, with hers, how that was set up. Phyl set that up with her.

MIKE: What about Jeri?

No, Jeri never got royalties off her books because she worked full time. So we assumed that everything that she did was done there. But Bernie actually spent a day a week writing at home without getting paid for it, and so that was the difference with him. And I don’t know if we did that with anybody else. In reality we could have, because we had made the exception of that. It seems like there might have been somebody. [Ellette] maybe. Janet, maybe. I don’t know. You’d have to ask Elaine about that. I don’t really know how that worked. I know a lot of people did work at home. I was one of them. I worked Fridays at home for years, because it was the only way I could get the proposal stuff done and the writing done, the reports and everything. But I think people, for the most part, I don’t remember people really taking advantage of our willingness to be flexible. And I always felt like people could take time off to go to their kids’ programs at school. People brought kids in during vacation weeks. All that kind of stuff. You just felt like the culture of institution allowed for that and encouraged that. And I don’t think there were very many people who took advantage of that. I think we worked people awful hard, because we gave them a lot to do. But most of them were hard workers. And we worked hard ourselves, too, so it wasn’t like we were slouching off and wanting them to work hard. So I think it worked out in the end.

MIKE: Anything else?

I think that’s probably it. Tomorrow we can do some more.

**END OF VIDEOTAPE 2**
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