



TALKING WITH MEN IN TIES

CREATED BY DANIEL HUNTER '01
March 2001 • hyrax@hyrax.ArsDigita.org

INDEX

PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT.....	1
CHOICES ON APPROACH.....	2
• CASE STUDY 1: GETTING PESTICIDES INFO FROM DICK SMITH.....	2
• CASE STUDY 2: BOARD OF TRUSTEE NOTES FROM PRESIDENT DOUG.....	3
• CASE STUDY 3: NEED-BLIND ADMISSIONS VIA JEFF RICKEY.....	3
• CASE STUDY 4: DIVERSITY WITH LEN CLARK.....	4
PROFILES.....	7
APPENDIX.....	8
APPENDIX A: PETITION FOR PESTICIDES/HERBICIDES INFORMATION.....	8
APPENDIX B: EARLHAM COLLEGE BY-LAWS.....	10
APPENDIX C: LEN CLARK MEETING TRANSCRIPT HIGHLIGHTS.....	11

PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

At Earlham College, certain people seem to make a lot of decisions with consensus, without consensus or in spite of consensus. It is too easy to assume the power that the President, Provost/Academic Dean, VP of Finance and Dean of Admissions have. In fact, there are *many* decisions that can be (and are) made by other people. Therefore, talking to these Men in Ties should be a last resort (there are others who I have not had contact with, i.e. VP for Institutional Advancement or perhaps members of the Board). As a rule they are busy and, unless pressure is exerted on them, less than likely to be very responsive.

Learn the structure as well as you can and move up the ladder of decision-makers trying to get things to happen. One of the most important questions one can ever learn at Earlham is “Whose decision is this?” This document is for those who finally have to talk to the so-called “Men in Ties.”

This document is my extended personal experience in talking with four of the “Men in Ties.” I do love all these people very much. However, I would like to see people learn how to talk to them better. Since they don’t give many clues, here are some rooted in my own experience.

If you find this document useful, write documents out of your own experience!

One of the most important things others taught me in the context of an oral community:

Write it down.

This is one attempt at doing that.

CHOICES ON APPROACH

When we approach the Men in Ties, we have many options about our style in the way we approach them. It is important to try to choose one's style consciously and be flexible in changing one's style.

I will first share stories from working with Men in Ties that displays some different styles of approach, along with some learnings that I gained. There are many lessons, no doubt, that I have missed. I offer these case studies so that people can find their own lessons, too.

• Case Study 1: Getting Pesticides Info from Dick Smith

I first came to Dick Smith's office to ask him how much money was spent on pesticides (I found later technically herbicides and some insecticides¹). I originally approached him in a very docile way without a lot of information. I asked him how much we paid for pesticides. He said he did not know. I asked him how I could get that information; he suggested contacting Bill Mullen (who I had already contacted and who gave me no information). After a series of questions, I got nowhere.

That first encounter taught me several things. Firstly, if I could not ask a specific question Dick Smith was not liable to answer it. Second came from after the meeting. After I finished meeting with Dick, I felt terrible and later realized that I had come out of the meeting with *no* new information.

Because information about pesticides is neither widely known nor widely published – Bill Mullen and Dick Smith essentially have all the information – I knew that a follow-up strategy would need to occur. Therefore, working with Earlham Environmental Action Committee (EEAC), I got 200 signatures for a petition requesting information and exploration of alternatives (see Appendix). Under suggestions by elder activists, I added a timetable with which to hold Dick Smith.

I walked into Dick Smith's office and handed him copies of the petition explaining that we really wanted this information. My style was still very laid-back but direct – and this time at least confident.

One thing I still remember from the conversation was an attempt I made to try to connect with him at a personal level. I asked him if he ever got frustrated that students would sometimes ask for the same information over and over again. Taken aback by the question, he became very honest and said no – but said he *did* get frustrated with faculty who asked for information over and over again.

By the next day, I had all the information I had been originally looking for.

Some lessons I found:

- Dick Smith responds to very specific requests that are backed up with some support (petitions).
- I should not have gone alone. I felt disheartened every time I met with him and felt like I was always going in circles with questions.

¹ More information on this situation can be found in the document "Environmental and Social Audit." One should be able to find copies in the Community Action Center, somewhere on-line, Earlham Student Government or some professors have copies. An e-mail to hyrax@hyrax.arsdigita.org is a last resort.

- Meeting without preparation and not knowing one’s stuff is generally not useful. Men in Ties will not casually give you information.

• **Case Study 2: Board of Trustee By-Laws from President Doug²**

After numerous conversations with Doug Bennett, he mentioned to me a document that he had explained he wanted many people to read and understand: the By-Laws for the Board of Trustees. I asked President Doug for a copy of the By-Laws. He said he would send me them. After a week of waiting, he did not give me a copy.

Eventually I walked into the President’s office, asked Darlena Rankin, secretary to the president, for a copy of the By-Laws and walked out with both an e-mail copy and hard-copy.³

Some lessons I found:

- Remember that the Men in Ties are busy! Find information through other mechanisms if possible.
- Build a relationship with the Men in Ties’ secretaries – they have *a lot* of information and can give a lot of it to you. Stop by periodically and just say hi to them. Ever so often, I give them “Thank you” cards for their work. They have given me more information than the Men in Ties ever have.

• **Case Study 3: Need-Blind Admissions via Jeff Rickey**

For a while a lot of questions about need-blind admissions and if it was going to be eliminated were being rumored at Earlham. Jeff Rickey and I had semi-regular lunch meetings in which we just chatted about stuff going on at Earlham⁴. I took an opportunity when eating lunch with him to ask him about need-blind admissions. He denied the rumors and explained that need-blind admissions was going to be kept solid.

I found out later that he did not explain the validity of the rumors – that need-blind admissions *was* being discussed and possibly challenged (and he knew about it).⁵

Some lessons I found:

- Informal conversations are not that informal. President Doug explained that he is *always* in his role as President – from when he gets up in the morning to when he sleeps. Therefore, he will not, despite a strong personal relationship, really take down his shell. He knows he can be quoted at any time.

² One may notice I often use the phrase “President Doug” to refer to President Doug Bennett. While I honor the belief that Quakers hold for equality, when I experience Doug Bennett in the Earlham institution he is not my equal – he holds more institutional power (which does not mean more power!). Out of respect for his position, I use the phrase “President Doug.”

³ See Appendix B for places to find a copy of the by-laws.

⁴ This is something I have, at various points, done with President Doug as well. Occasionally I would hear about things I had never heard about before – such as the By-Laws or College Conference.

⁵ I cannot remember the details involved in this case and I neglectfully did not write it down. That is another lesson. Write stuff down! For more information see: “Environmental and Social Audit.”

- Again, Men in Ties will not give you the entire situation. They'll sometimes answer very specific, very direct questions. Sometimes they'll entirely evade (for example, when Kumar Sathy asked President Doug for a Position Statement on Codes of Conduct, President Doug never did.)

• **Case Study 4: Diversity with Len Clark**

In September 2000, Len Clark was charged with the convenorship of the Diversity Aspirations Working Group (DAWG). After writing several open letters that asked for responses on the DAWG, I asked for a meeting with Len. Because the issue of diversity – for me particularly racism in relationship to Earham’s supposed commitment to diversity – is so passionate, I came into the meeting with a lot of passion and frustration. After receiving no response, my second letter (before either meetings) to Len Clark was clearly angry.⁶

I met with Len Clark to discuss frustrations with the Earlham institution – and intended to do so with a very confrontational edge (which I did). From past experiences, I chose consciously to go alone but bring a tape recorder. I also knew I would be very emotional after the conversation and so lined up people to debrief with.

Below is a letter I wrote to the Alliance, a group working on this issue, reflecting on the experience (public reflecting is very beneficial and allows others to learn, too):

On Thursday, March 1 [2001], Len Clark and I met to discuss letters that I had sent to the Diversity Aspirations Working Group. Specifically, I had gone because I had not gotten any response to them. So my intention was to get an understanding of why not with the hopes of finding some ways to move towards public dialogue.

I would like this transcript to be considered confidential and personal in nature. By the end of the conversation, Len and I were near yelling at each other. I had, with Len’s knowledge, taped the meeting. What follows is a general flow of conversation with periodic direct quotes. I want to offer it NOT as a tool to use against Len (or me) but as an opportunity to look at places where the administration may be (i.e. a defensive posture) and things to avoid in the future (i.e. perhaps stop paternalism the moment it starts, not letting some stuff slide). Ultimately, however frustrated we may get, we NEED Len’s understanding and unless we hear him and he hears us we will not get very far.

Highlights for me:

- * Len felt very defensive.
- * Len did not seem to be aware of structural forms of racism in the Earlham institution.
- * Len, I think, knew that I knew things he didn’t (such as student’s concerns) and was scared of that.
- * Len is very sensitive to language.
- * Len genuinely was surprised to hear that I think Earlham is stuck in its attempts to deal with diversity.

I have since sent Len a personal hand-written letter that is more personally accurate, centered, and sensitive. Because this was a hard meeting, I would prefer not to receive critical feedback about this particular engagement. I write this very cautiously and with trepidation -- please do not pass it around. Thanks for y’all’s work and support.

⁶ Copies of these letters can be found in the Alliance archives (created by Elspeth Gilmore), Alliance-I listserv archives, or DAWG archives [with Shenita Piper or Len Clark]. Further information on the DAWG can be found there. Look especially for a document called “Diversity Aspirations Working Group (DAWG)” created by Jesse Gritton and Daniel Hunter.

The conversation itself, summarized in the transcript (Appendix C), shows a conversation that was very strained. Being confrontational resulted in his being confrontational back. It was not an openly productive meeting.

After our first meeting, I decided to meet with Len Clark a second time. This time my strategy was to be heard and try to shift Len's thinking more. Since I really wanted him to hear me and recognized he could not hear my anger, I chose to stay very emotional-less. I also found that our previous conversation had made an impact.

Here was my report on the meeting:

So on Thursday the 15th, Len Clark and I met again. We had a more visibly productive meeting. Like before, I would like for these summary notes to be confidential (until I graduate).

I want to pick out the lessons that I got from this meeting, particularly in regards to upcoming meetings with Len.

First, the explosive earlier conversation helped him to know I was serious. He came to this meeting with paper and a pen, obviously ready to take some notes.

Second, the style I talked to him was his preferred style of speech -- cool and mostly emotion-less (saying "I'm angry" in a cool way.). Think Quaker. This greatly increased his willingness and ability to hear me.

Third, the model I mentally used as I talked to him was:

- 1. Diagnose the Problem (tell a story of my experience)**
* IE: Seeing 7 of the 8 new candidates [for faculty] being hired as white men.
- 2. Give my analysis of the Problem (why is that bad and pointed toward structural realities that support that)**
* IE: I don't see myself represented in faculty and how it is a continued practice to mainly hire white men. Then I talked about how we support "Institutional Fit" in hiring which often is in contrast to diversity.
- 3. Suggest Specific as well as broader solutions (the specifics were key for him)**
* IE: Get rid of Institutional Fit; re-think our Affirmative Action policy along with history of how it has been practiced and getting an external consultant to help get us un-stuck.

I assumed that Len could not make any of these steps on his own (one of my wrong assumptions from last conversation). His understanding of racism does not seem to give him the freedom to see the experience of others -- so he needs very specific diagnostic information. He has trouble seeing structural realities of oppression; he feels the need, I believe, to work on very specific problems within the structure. His heart is so good and really wants to be in the right place.

I am not sure how he can begin to actually hear anger (I took no opportunities to express feelings of pain or anger to him). I am hoping in a group context he can take some higher levels of emotion.

Fourth, his paternalism is very strong. Instead of challenging him on it, I took his language back. So when he said, "Look, Daniel" I would soon after repeat the phrase back to him, "Look, Len" but in a less paternalistic tone. I only let him interrupt me once (which he did to quote Hegel to me). The rest of the time I would keep repeating the phrase on which he had interrupted me until he stopped trying to interrupt (getting slightly louder each time).

His use of eye contact and body language (slouching back cross-legged) can also seem very power-oriented. I chose to respond by trying to keep my body language extremely controlled (sitting on the edge of the chair, back straight, looking forward and just above his head while using hand gestures). [Suggestions here on dealing with body language issues?]

Other thoughts:

He does not think we are stuck as an institution. He feels we have progressed a long way. For example, he said, that the number of African-American faculty has dramatically increased. I said it's way under par. He said, "Well percentage-wise it's dramatically increased!"

This suggests the need for benchmarks. Both to acknowledge how we have improved (which is true, from a percentage standpoint -- but 2 to 4 is 100% increase! [or whatever the numbers are]) and how far we have to go (2 of 50 to 4 of 50 is not a dramatic increase). Let's try to get those numbers.

He told me that he does see the role of students as to agitate for change (similar things have been said by Jeff Rickey, Doug Bennett, and Bonita Washington-Lacey). At points, I find this a technique to actually try to defuse agitation ("I'm on your side"). Don't be surprised to hear it. Also recognize many of these same people WERE the agitators a few decades ago! Give them some credit. But they'll also admit (at their honest points) they'll still play THEIR role and resist most change. Let's remind them of their responsibility to create positive change, too! (Change -- not affirming the positive aspects of the status quo!)

I think we need to create on-going spaces for dialogue between students and faculty (teaching and administrative) and students and administration and students and JUST teaching faculty (this latter category really are closer allies than we often recognize when dealing institutionally).

For me, the main goals of the meetings were to push Len Clark's awareness of student's experiences of structural racism. In addition to explaining several examples of structural racism, Len Clark agreed to meet with a group of students – "anytime, anyplace." That provided another opening. Another opening I found was the possibility of getting several specific documents he mentioned (i.e. an affirmation action hiring policy written, according to Len, by Bonita Washington-Lacey) and maybe benchmarks.

Some additional lessons I learned:

- It's okay to be confrontational! As students, we have very little to be afraid of!
- Tape recording can be a good way to listen again to conversations and notice places for connection/growth. Other people can be useful as well – but having an objective recording can really be useful. Most Men in Ties act as if they're always being tape recorded and so are generally already monitoring themselves.
- The second meeting was especially productive because I came in with four points I wanted to get across. Strategize your meetings. What is the purpose? What do you want to achieve? How will you know when you have achieved it?
- Look for openings. They may be future meetings or pieces of information.

PROFILES

All of the Men in Ties are very friendly, good-hearted and more on your side than you think. Jeff Rickey is especially personable and most likely to say he is on your side. He is “for real” on your side once he has done something for you. There is a difference.

Len Clark is very feeling-oriented (as can be seen from our discussion). Touch his heart. Be sensitive to his emotions and, I would advise, careful with them.

President Doug is very bright and knows a lot that happens on this campus – at least, institutionally. Think carefully about what you want and be clear with him. President Doug will appreciate clear thinking that offers new perspectives. He will not seem to take what you say but, if you watch his actions very carefully, he gets shifted by conversations.

Dick Smith also has appreciation for clear thinking, but more specifically rational thinking – his role is a powerful accountant.

Remember these are busy people with a lot of things to hold together. If you do not get what you want, figure out why! They do not hold up things because they are mean – they have lots of constraints. Find out what they are. Work to relieve their constraints or assert enough pressure to get what you want.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Petition for Pesticides/Herbicides Information

[For more information on this struggle, find the document "Environmental and Social Audit."]

Petition Portion:

ChemLawn and its Alternatives

WHEREAS we feel that the chemicals ChemLawn uses are potentially dangerous to the environment, including Earlham's squirrels, our trees (which are broadleaves -- the target of these chemicals), other animal friends and finally ourselves;

WHEREAS we take seriously Earlham's commitment to Peace, Justice, and the Environment as expressed in the Community Code in the following Queries:

- Do I try to work positively for change, without acting as if "just ends justify any means"?
- Do I take seriously and, according to my gifts and leadings, act on opportunities to "think globally, act locally"?
- Do I work actively to promote social justice on the campus and in the larger society?
- Do I give proper attention to principles of wellness? Am I careful to avoid activities which may be harmful to my own or another's health?

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, ask the Earlham administration to fully investigate alternatives to ChemLawn, including no herbicides, that are more in tune with Earlham's statement on Peace and Justice and present the Earlham community with a publicly accessible report which details the costs (especially economics, safety hazards) and the benefits.

Front page:

To: Doug Bennett, President of Earlham College
Dick Smith, VP for Financial Affairs
Bill Mullins, Director of Physical Plants

We, the undersigned to this petition, are concerned that the ChemLawn, which was recently applied to the Earlham lawns, may have serious affects on the life of our campus. While some of us object to the idea of intentionally killing certain forms of life for a greener grass, we are wholly concerned about the effects such a chemical may have on our campus. We are disturbed that the chemical used on our lawns may be harmful to the squirrels who, not being able to read the signs, continue to eat off the campus' lawn. We are disturbed that the chemical may be harmful to the trees who, not being able to move off the lawn, are subjected to these chemicals which attack broadleaf plants -- such as themselves. Furthermore, we are troubled by the affects such chemicals may have on other non-human animals (rabbits, pets, etc.) and, finally, on ourselves.

We find that these concerns are in line with our Community Code. The community code highlights Respect for Persons, Building Community, Peace and Justice and Simplicity. These areas directly relate to our actions as a college, including our policies towards how we manicure our lawn. The community code leads us to the following appropriate queries:

- Do I try to work positively for change, without acting as if "just ends justify any means"?
- Do I take seriously and, according to my gifts and leadings, act on opportunities to "think globally, act locally"?
- Do I work actively to promote social justice on the campus and in the larger society?
- Do I give proper attention to principles of wellness? Am I careful to avoid activities which may be harmful to my own or another's health?

As our community reflects on these queries, we, the undersigned, feel that the use of potentially dangerous chemicals on our lawn may be in violation with our principles. We therefore request that the administration produce a report which details the costs and benefits of our current practices, more environmentally-safe alternatives to ChemLawn and the possibility of no herbicides of any sort. We call for that document to include the economic costs, the environmental costs (including affects on Earlham's animal and plant life) and the benefits of such actions. We request that such information will become readily available to all students, staff, faculty and friends of the campus. We ask that this document should be produced within a reasonable timetable, which we suggest to be by April 25, 1999.

We hold that such a report can yield light on the issues and help us, as a community, strive to a fuller understanding of truth through integrity. We acknowledge, as our Mission Statement affirms, that we must let "the evidence lead that search" and use "rigorous integrity in dealing with the facts."

Appendix B: Earlham College By-Laws

This document is more important in a legal sense than the so-called Principles and Practices. Earlham College, in practice, runs like virtually any institution with a layer of Quaker ideology covering its practices. The by-laws attest to that.

Copies can be found in the President's office or at:

<http://www.earlham.edu/~esg/by-laws.htm>

Appendix C: Len Clark Meeting Transcript Highlights

- Len explains why he did not pass one of the letters onto the rest of the committee. "I think they would be hurtful" -- especially to Kalani where I ask how some students got on the committee, suggesting family relations as a possibility.

- Len showed me documents that showed that the order of events concerning students on the committee.

* His first communication with Elizabeth Stark (Oct '99) asked what the role of SNC should be; she said "about a week later" that "I don't have any preference" if Len or SNC fill the position. "But we'll refer them to you."

* He told Kalani "when over for dinner" about the committee and asked Kalani to be on it. He agreed.

* "I also spoke with Sara Thorpe."

About a year later in the transcripts:

* Jenny O'Neil got an e-mail that said there are two students Kalani and two interested members Mark and Sara.

* When the committee met they asked should it be characterized by a firm membership. Decided that "it should be open."

* So invited Maria Chan Morgan, and "we asked Sara Thorpe" (though the nominating process was fairly slow), "Dipti showed up once and we encouraged her to come again"

* "Phyllis did not resign she just doesn't come anymore"

[Note: Conversations with Jenny O'Neil and Elizabeth Stark both show mass frustration with the process and there can be more said on that at another point.]

- Daniel talked about how there still was not clear communication. Nevertheless, this was "one among a number of concerns about the committee from what I know about it.... That's a side thing about why am I seeing two processes going on.... It's those [deeper places] that I want to see dialogue open up." Talked about the fear of students to talk to Len and give him the feedback.

- Len: "I don't believe I tried to subvert ... the nomination process.... I think I did the best I could, and I think the record shows it." ... "we have to start with the documents" In regards to students' fear, "we have lots of members of the committee" so one can talk to some of them. Getting feedback is what we were trying to do.

- Daniel asks: what kind of response would you like to see them getting?

[Len responded with something like being heard and acknowledged.]

- Daniel replied "so when I wrote an e-mail, my experience was not getting any response. But I want to use that as an example -- as a personal example -- " of not getting any response or acknowledgement or being asked to continue input.

- "Well that's why I asked you here, Daniel."

- "No, actually, I invited myself here."

* The conversation continued about dialogue. He talked about the fact I had asked for a public response. "I don't normally try to get into an opinion board back-and-forth with people trying to defend or explain administrative stuff..."

- "Because..."

- "I think it's better to talk face-to-face."

- "Can you say more about why that is?"

- [long pause] "Sure... because I feel like if we just write memos at each other we generate more conflict. And I like to get more to the conflict resolving... and get to something constructive."

Conversation continues:

- Len says, "I didn't want to put on the opinion board that's nonsense [referring to my article]. But I'll tell *you* that's nonsense."

- "I think that'd be great to put on the opinion board."

- "No Daniel, maybe you think it'd be great to put on the opinion board but I'm not going to insult people in public. Maybe you think so but I don't think so. I'm not going to insult people in public."

- Daniel replied, "I, I want to see the truth get out" [interrupted: "and that means insult you in public? You can do it but I won't."]

- Daniel continues, "If that means for you to say, hey Daniel, that's not correct information, I'd love to hear that. But otherwise I feel like I'm going into black holes and not getting any feedback."

- "Well it's probably the way you're asking the question."

* * *

[Len suggested a less confrontational way to ask about the historical disbanding of the MCA, a very controversial issue in which many controversial parts were played. That is, instead of asking "What the MCA was forcibly disbanded?" asking something like "What happened to the MCA?". He said there is no process for disbanding organizations at Earlham. I pointed out that SOC can defund organizations.]

- Daniel at one point said, "The letter was to the working group, and it was an open letter.... because I want people to talk about what's painful for them, what they know and what they don't know...."

[more on MCA info]

- Daniel said, regarding the more confrontational language, "I realize it ups the ante on a conflict, but at this point I've asked... what do you know [to a lot of people]... sometimes we're getting straight answers and sometimes we're not and we're getting frustrated. My question is why hasn't Earlham been able to move very far? I know black students are still very frustrated. And we can name some very specific stuff. But when we name it we hear stuff like: 'Don't say it like that!'

"So for example, when the MCA actually sent out its list of 'demands' your response was on a very 'I don't like the way you're addressing this level' and not dealing with the content. And I want to see us deal with the content....

The reason why we say stuff very hard is because we're frustrated."

- Slightly later Len points out that conflict resolution does not encourage confrontational language. He then says, "You study conflict resolution don't you?"

- Daniel, "I do. And what I know is that a minority group is not going to be able to go to the majority language because the language is the mainstream way of talking."

- Later Len asks, "When you are counseling a group about how to make progress, I would guess that you'd spend some of the time talking about the processes [of consensus] ... you try not to at the beginning set up a we/they relationship...."

- Daniel responds, "Actually, I start off that way with a we/they" often separating two different groups into caucuses (men/women, US American/non-US American). "We are not equals," and we need to be clear about that. (I gave him a hand-out I use on Mainstream/Margin roles.)

- Daniel said, "I'd like to encourage that and maybe set up ways so that students, faculty, administration can have sessions to listen to each other."

- Len said, "That's precisely what we're trying to do."

* * *

- "I see my position with regards to students as a person who is here to serve the educational interests [of students]. Period. Not to exert power over them."

- "I really do believe you. And I think there are still ways we can use power and not know about it. [Len added: 'I'm sure that's true.'] And I want spaces for those things to be named."

- Len says, for example, I have an office. "But we need to get beyond that as quickly as we can." ..."So are you going to give up your office?..." "Is that what you think I should do? ...Let's talk about things of substance. What should we do?"

- "Well, I think we are stuck."

- "Do you?"

- Yes. Things I think we should do: Mixed training groups, outside facilitator, and old MCA list of demands. Maybe bring Niynou Spann back. Even if that doesn't happen, have regular meetings with students so we know what we know...

[Phone call telling him it's time for Student Government meeting.]

- I gave him a list of students' concerns of the committee.

- I said, "I want you to have that feedback. And I apologize that it feels confrontational at this point but I think we can work through it."

- Len asked: "Do you still believe that I hand-picked students?"

- "I still want to talk to other people about it."

- Len says, extremely frustrated, "It's not the way to keep trying to come together. By accusing people of things they didn't do and making it public as if it's a statement of fact. [Daniel: 'These are concerns...'] That hurts. That hurts. But hurting isn't the way to start a relationship. And I think you know that. [laughs uncomfortably]"

- "We do." At this point we are both talking firmly, "We need to talk out of -- [talking over Len] out of what are experiences are. Our experiences are not the same as yours."

- "It's a lie." [Repeats louder.]

- "It's a statement of what we've felt and what we've seen."

- "It doesn't make it true."

- "It doesn't make it true, but it does make it our experience. So validate our experience AND say it's wrong."

- "Validate it? To say a falsehood and to ask me to validate [laughs]."

...

[At this point he is standing above me.]

- "Planting a falsehood and planting it on the opinion board is wrong. And I think you know better. I think you know better than that. [wagging finger] Because you facilitate, you try to get people together. You would never teach someone to do that."

- "But I would never teach them to go back at someone and say, 'You know better than that.' I know that my experience - what I saw happen from my perspective was that it looked sketchy."

- "That is different than a statement of fact."
- "These are concerns we have. It doesn't make them true. It makes them our concerns."
- * "Concerns I'll listen to."

...

[Walks out to go to meeting. I follow to finish up.]

- "When you have open dialogue about it, then you can come back and say, 'Hey, this is what's happened.'"

...

- "And I'll meet with anybody anytime to go over the questions about what happened when and why with the diversity committee or [garbled] some of those questions [ie faculty questions]."

- "I hope you didn't start with the assumption that we haven't attempted to diversify faculty and haven't attempted to get the best people."

- "But what I want to go at is the experience."

[Len said he would be willing to attend a meeting of students to hear concerns -- day or evening ("anytime and anyplace") and to get the time from Janice.]

And so we left...