

Colette Gaudin
**Professor of French & Italian Languages
and Literatures Emerita**

An Interview Conducted by

Jane Carroll

September 19, 1996

DOH-27

Special Collections

Dartmouth College

Hanover, New Hampshire

INTERVIEW: Colette Gaudin
INTERVIEWED BY: Jane Carroll
PLACE: Baker Library
Hanover, New Hampshire
DATE: September 19, 1996

CARROLL: [This is] September 19, 1996 and I am speaking with Colette Gaudin who is Professor of French and Italian Languages and Literatures Emerita, who came to Dartmouth in 1961 and left in 1993. I thought I would start by asking you what Dartmouth was like in 1961 when you got here.

GAUDIN: That is a fairly clear impression in my mind because I could not quite believe what I saw. I did not know much about Dartmouth. I had looked at a catalogue, but it did not make much sense. First of all, I had not realized that it was an all-male institution.

CARROLL: You had no idea?

GAUDIN: No. I had no idea. I had no idea. Nobody pointed that out to me and I had no reason to suspect that an institution at the level of university as opposed to high school would be segregated that way. So that was...I had the shock when I entered my first classroom.

CARROLL: No females.

GAUDIN: No females. One Black. There was one Black in the room ... and all these big guys sprawled in their chairs and not moving. So I said, "Please sit down." Sort of spontaneously without even being ironic because that was the way I used to enter classrooms. Students would rise.

CARROLL: Where had you come from?

GAUDIN: I was a philosophy teacher in France and then in Canada. The College Marie de France which was French was financed by the French government. So that's where I came from...from the French system.

So, what was Dartmouth like? I had the feeling that it was a very...it was something like a huge camp. When I say "camp", I'm not being funny or derogatory. A sort of enclave. A secluded place where men were between themselves and I was treated well, but I was certainly not...part of the game, quite.

My second shock was -- I think it was the first year -- when I realized that busloads of women were delivered on Saturday noon...because we had classes on Saturday morning, I could see as I was leaving campus going back home...those busloads of women coming for the weekend from Colby Junior, from Smith, from other places which would have creatures like that. That was a big shock.

CARROLL: When you walked in, were the men surprised to find a female instructor?

GAUDIN: Well, not in language classes because there was a woman in Russian, a lecturer, Mrs. [Nadezhda] Koroton and there had been a Fulbright Exchange Fellow, scholar, from France [on a yearly basis] in the French Department who traditionally was a woman. She was here for one year, and she was sort of an exchange person, so not there to stay. In language courses, I suppose we did not count that much.

CARROLL: Really?

GAUDIN: I don't know. Maybe I am adding something. But, I don't remember them being so surprised. The third shock. Fathers' visits. Father's Day. Father's.....

CARROLL: Weekend.

GAUDIN: Weekend. Because mothers did not appear much these days. The fathers were flocking to my class because they were more surprised than their sons, sort of.

CARROLL: Oh. Of course, because when they were here, there had been no women.

- GAUDIN: No. So, do you want to hear some of the questions I heard?
- CARROLL: Absolutely.
- GAUDIN: "Do students listen to your explanation of the subjunctive in French or do they look at your legs?"
- CARROLL: Oh, no. Really?
- GAUDIN: That was one question and some others maybe a little bit less....
- CARROLL: I hope you said "No."
- GAUDIN: Outrageous. I don't remember what I said. I was sort of... I did not take that very seriously, but these were the symptoms of the old situation. And I thought it would correct itself by itself, but it did not.
- CARROLL: Were there other women instructors or professors here when you came?
- GAUDIN: No. No. There was no one in the ranks except... Well, I was not in the ranks either. I had a very strange contract letter which I have kept, which said "lecturer, with the rank of assistant." When I showed that to the dean later...another dean, not the one who hired me...because I wanted my salary to be a little bit adjusted to reflect what I was doing, he could not believe it either. It didn't make sense. There was one woman, there was Hannah Croasdale in Biology, but I did not know her. I did not even know of her existence. I think she was still a secretary at the time when I came. I mean, she had the title of secretary, the glorious title of "secretary", although she was a doctor, she was doing research and so on, but...
- CARROLL: But that was much later when she actually....
- GAUDIN: Oh, yes, much, much later. I don't know when she was finally pulled in the ranks, but...
- CARROLL: I think it was almost into the 70's.
- GAUDIN: At the time of coeducation.
- CARROLL: Yes. Exactly.

GAUDIN: So there was no one. Women began to arrive in '66, '67, little by little.

CARROLL: What did you do for friendship or companionship?

GAUDIN: I was living in Woodstock at that time. I had my home and two little children, so that was a lot of work. And I had a few friends in the department like David Sices who was already there. The woman who was right from France as a Fulbright that year was a very good friend, and I had a few friends in Woodstock. Then I went away during the summer.

CARROLL: Did you go back to France?

GAUDIN: I went back to France that... I don't think it was the first summer, but, anyway, I went away every summer, practically.

CARROLL: And that helped.

GAUDIN: Yes.

CARROLL: Did you have trouble having the men listen to your voice...the male students listen to your voice as a voice of authority? Other women professors have commented on that, that they had problems.

GAUDIN: Yes. I know they have, but I did not perhaps because I did not think of it and I was authoritarian and I did not tolerate any... I don't know. I remember asking a student to get out of the room and he did, and he came afterwards to apologize because he was being obnoxious, making all sorts of noises. I did not realize that everything was so different from what I came from...a system where the professor was the authority. I exerted it and that was it. After that, I became a little more relaxed and more lenient. I had to learn the grading system also, it was completely different.

CARROLL: Did you learn it yourself or did you ask someone to explain it?

GAUDIN: Well, I asked...You know, the institution did not accept women and did not integrate women; but my colleagues were very, very nice...my close colleagues. I had absolutely no problem with them at that time. Of course, I was a lecturer, I was not threatening anybody. There was no sense of strong competition the way it exists now, anyway. On the contrary, they were very aware that I

could bring something new to the department, being trained in philosophy. So, very quickly, they gave me advanced courses and they asked me if I wanted to develop new courses.

I think the second or third year I proposed a new course in contemporary philosophy and ideas and current linguistics in France and it was accepted by the department and has been going on since with a few transformations. In fact, I had a great sense of professional freedom in the classroom, in the department. That was absolutely marvelous for me because, in France -- when I left, at least -- the program was set up by the Ministry in Paris and you had to follow that and there was no diversion. But things have changed there also. But when I came here, I thought it was absolutely marvelous. So that was a good, good thing for me.

I was very busy also because I had to sort of retool myself a little bit from philosophy to literature. I had to learn a lot of literary criticism, which was not exactly my specialty at that time. So that was interesting. Intellectually, that was very stimulating. It was not the negative experience that one could imagine.

CARROLL: That's right.

GAUDIN: I had, as I said, a few shocks. One of them was when I trotted to a meeting of the Ticknor Club, which was the ancestor of the university seminar where professors would present their research. That I can't remember what year it was. It was in the '60s, I'm sure. But, I created a minor earthquake, I think. And I was asked to leave...or not to come back. I can't remember if it was to leave or not to come back. Maybe they told it to me at the back of the room and I was asked afterwards not to come back. That's it. That's it.

CARROLL: Because you were too disturbing as a woman?

GAUDIN: No...I did not seem to disturb them simply because I was a woman. They were between them. That was that sense of male enclave that I talked about at the beginning. But, apart from that...they were not from my department...apart from that, that was really two different, completely different experiences. Apart from that, I had this marvelous library, good colleagues and....

CARROLL: When did the job become then a tenure-track job?

GAUDIN: My colleagues were acting on my behalf, because I was on my own. I did not have any expectation to stay or to become a professor here. But, whenever I could, I did some research and publications. I was working on my own, not for anything ultimate. So my colleagues proposed to the CAP [Committee Advisory to the President] my integration in the ranks and, again, I don't remember when was the first proposal. To my big surprise, I was told by the then Chair of the department that I was refused, and I had not asked anything. They asked for me. And it was refused by the CAP. Do you want to hear the first answer?

CARROLL: Yes.

GAUDIN: Because I lived in Woodstock. Because my husband was the manager of the ski area there, they did not know if I was skiing or teaching or what.

CARROLL: Oh, my heavens.

GAUDIN: That was one of the reasons, which I think was sort of a cover up for other things. Anyway... at the second attempt, I was promoted Associate Professor without tenure. So, from lecturer to associate. I did not go through their system and then I had tenure in 1972.

CARROLL: So, by '72 then, the college had become coed.

GAUDIN: The college was becoming coed at the same time.

CARROLL: And they became more enlightened, it sounds like.

GAUDIN: Well, by then we were... I don't know how many we were, but [we had become active] and we had been a little more militant, I mean there was no sense being militant when I was alone. Militant for what?

CARROLL: Do you remember who the first woman was on the faculty after you who you came to know?

GAUDIN: That I came to know?

CARROLL: As a friend, I would say.

GAUDIN: Oh, I knew a few before that in '66, '67. There was Vivian Kogan in our department, the French Department. She is still here. You

might be interested in talking to her, maybe. There was Jeanne Prosser. She was a historian; but, again, because she was French, she taught as a lecturer in the French Department. The History Department did not want her at that time. They finally took her in, but...the History Department was still a little bit stiffer. Language departments were a little more open to foreigners because that was their trademark in a way.

CARROLL: I was wondering that when I looked at the ranks and where women came into the faculty, they came first in the languages and, you think this was because of the kind of openness of living abroad and knowing other systems?

GAUDIN: I had the very strong feeling that being both a woman and a foreigner was a sort of disguising the womanness under the exoticism... so that we were something completely exotic like Papuans from Papua [New Guinea].

CARROLL: Oh, I like that. And the romance languages, specifically, had quite a few women who passed through.

GAUDIN: Yes.

GAUDIN: So what was I...

CARROLL: You were talking about the people who you came to know.

GAUDIN: Oh yes. Marysa Navarro-Aranguren came around that time, I think. I don't remember the exact year. There was Joan Smith in Sociology. I am trying to remember who were the first seven. We were seven. I know that we laughed because we were seven in the beginning. Oh, there was Marilyn [Austin] Baldwin. And, again, I don't remember the exact year. There was a woman lecturing the English Department. Lee Salomon. I don't know why these names don't....

CARROLL: Lee...What was that?

GAUDIN: Lee Salomon. She was in English or in German [English]. That I can't remember. She left. She had left very early. In Medical School, Rhona Mirsky, who had a very unfortunate story at Dartmouth, because she was not kept on.

CARROLL: Was she related to Jonathan Mirsky?

GAUDIN: Yes. She was his wife.

CARROLL: Wife. I was wondering. Okay.

GAUDIN: That's about it. So we worked on the first draft of the first Affirmative Action Plan.

CARROLL: Oh, okay.

GAUDIN: Even before coeducation.

CARROLL: Yes. It was adopted before coeducation.

GAUDIN: Oh, there were so many meetings. So many evenings. So many nights.

CARROLL: Do you remember who started the idea that there should be an Affirmative Action Plan? Was that President [John Sloan] Dickey?

GAUDIN: Was it before Kemeny?

CARROLL: Yes, because Kemeny was on the Committee and then had to be replaced when he became President.

GAUDIN: So that was probably under Dickey.

CARROLL: Did it come from on high? Did Dickey ask people to do it or was it something that was....

GAUDIN: That I don't remember. It may be that Marysa... Have you talked with Marysa yet?

CARROLL: Not yet. She is also....

GAUDIN: She would remember that. I'm sure. She has a historian memory. I had the feeling that it came from us. But that I... Because several women knew about these plans, about Title IX, about the legislation going on at that time and I was really amazed because I found the women at that time extremely sharp and militant in a very intelligent way. I admired very much their attitude then. It was very, very good to participate in that group.

CARROLL: With the Affirmative Action Plan written, did you then have to go out to the larger faculty and present it to them?

GAUDIN: I think so. I don't remember. Now something else happened to me which explains a little of my spotty memory.

I was also directing foreign study programs in France and there were a lot of terms when I was abroad. So I missed a lot of things. For instance in the spring of '69, I missed all of the excitement on campus. The seizure of Parkhurst and all that. I had a lot of interruptions and that was a little bit difficult to follow everything because these programs, particularly at the beginning, were very demanding in terms of responsibility and concentration.

CARROLL: Had the French Department always had a foreign study program or is this something that developed after World War II?

GAUDIN: I think it developed after World War II. I think it was George Diller who started the first one in the late '50's.

CARROLL: Where did they go first?

GAUDIN: It was Dijon [France] or Caen [France]. One or the other. I did not go there. I went to Strasbourg in '69, starting the first program in the site. Very, very demanding.

CARROLL: That is actually one of my questions. What does one have to do to start something like that?

GAUDIN: You have to make sure that the setup with the host families is good, that all the families are good, that the person we have selected for taking care of that aspect of the program is working well. We had to make sure that the professors we had hired to work with us from the university can work with American students.

For instance, in Strasbourg, I had a terrible time with the language professor, advanced language. She could not stand American students. She was extremely rigid. She would not move from the way she used to teach, to grade, to talk to students, and it was a disaster. We had to change her almost immediately. But I had to pick up a lot of the slack.

CARROLL: That was a heavy responsibility.

GAUDIN: Yes. Then, at that time, we were terribly ambitious. We were asking students to do a kind of mini-memoir on cultural subjects. With 25 students, you have to make them select a subject, find the contacts, follow their research and writing... [Laughter]

CARROLL: This sounds horrid.

GAUDIN: It was horrid. All that in ten weeks or nine weeks.

CARROLL: Oh, my heavens. With the programs that Dartmouth has selected, so oftentimes they avoid the bigger cities. Is that done with intent?

GAUDIN: Yes. With the intent of avoiding the syndrome of the American student in Paris clinging to other American students, meeting Americans all the time, and also being completely out of sight from the...

CARROLL: Oh, yes.

GAUDIN: Well, simply, the reason is also that our programs are so short. One term is so short.

CARROLL: That's true. Has there ever been any desire to make it into a two-term or year-long program?

GAUDIN: There were talks about it; but it loses a lot of its attraction for the students here. There were a lot of discussions at the time of the review of the Year-Round [Year-Round Operation Committee] and I was in favor of a year-round plan with three semesters instead of four quarters. Then we would have had longer programs, longer terms and so on. But, the sciences did not want it, the Spanish Department did not want it.

CARROLL: In language, one learns very quickly.

GAUDIN: And, also, we had [separated] from the Spanish Department, the relationship with them.

CARROLL: When the year-round plan was implemented under Kemeny, did these foreign study programs multiply? Did you do more of them?

GAUDIN: It seems so. Yes. Because then we were doing them in the summer also.

CARROLL: Oh, yes.

GAUDIN: Yes. So...

CARROLL: Did you need more faculty then to do...to have someone off-campus so frequently.

GAUDIN: Yes. So we had... I don't know when exactly, but we began to hire more lecturers and senior lecturers. Lecturers in the departments were senior lecturers who were people who had been teaching at the department for awhile and were well reviewed and well trained and so could go on these programs. So that was a help.

CARROLL: I wondered because it seems although there are quite a few women who then suddenly began to get added to the Language Department at that time.

GAUDIN: Yes, and, when I was Chair, I remember that was a real headache staffing the programs, having the rotations ...the rotations which would seem unfair to junior faculty, because, at one point, junior faculty almost rebelled against this obligation. So we had to establish a forced rotation.

CARROLL: Sort of like the Army, isn't it?

GAUDIN: Yes. Sort of like the Army.

CARROLL: Forced K.P., it sounds like. I was wondering... When you came here, you said you found your own sort of group of people to support you. When there was a big influx of other women in the '70's, you hear a lot of times them asking for people to mentor them. I wondered, did you seven who were here already try to respond to that in any way?

GAUDIN: There was not much talk about mentoring at the beginning. Very quickly, there was a Women's Caucus. So that was the center where all the big problems of relationships with the institution, with the departments, were discussed between us openly. Individual mentoring came later when women realized that they needed more training in the way of managing their career, which became more and more important. You know, in the '70's, there was competition, but it was not [severe] the way it is now. It was not as cruel as it is now.

CARROLL: And the Women's Caucus was formed by whom? Do you remember?

GAUDIN: I don't remember. I think it was formed around... I wonder if the first case we discussed in fact was not that of Rhona Mirsky. We were writing letters. We were studying the issue, whatever we knew about the case because there were parts which were confidential. We were trying to point out discrepancies and unfair judgments....

[End Tape 1, Side A -- Beginning Tape 1, Side B]

GAUDIN: ... I think it was Kemeny. I remember being often in the President's Office arguing a case.

CARROLL: Did it ever make any difference?

GAUDIN: [Laughter] I'm afraid not... Not in the case of Joan Smith. Not in the case of Rhona Mirsky. They had to leave, they had to go.

CARROLL: Did women, perhaps, learn from their examples on what to do and what not to do?

GAUDIN: Probably. We learned also, for instance, within my department, we learned how to institute procedures that would be helpful and supportive to junior people in general, to help them being aware very early on of the difficulties they might be facing later. To prepare their case. To have class visitations from senior colleagues. To have [yearly review] reports given to them to be able to discuss these reports. To answer these reports, if need be. To have yearly consultation with the chair. To have access to their departmental dossier and to be able to put things in it and so on.

I think, I mean, we started it in our department when I was Chair. We started a lot of these things because there was such an influx of junior people, mostly women. And because the older colleagues, all the colleagues who had been there for a long time, did not think about it.

CARROLL: Of course. Have you seen tenure procedures change during the time you have been here?

GAUDIN: Yes. It is such a painful thing...these tenure meetings and tenure discussions, particularly in my department, there have been such painful cases. I don't like to remember them. But, yes. The tenure procedures have changed, particularly in terms of preparing the dossier, giving the candidates the right to propose some outside readers.

The making of the list of readers for the scholarship was before, a mysterious production. Now it is done in a very rigorous way. The candidate proposes names, the department proposes names and there is a sort of... [

] a combination of the two lists by the dean. So the candidate has an input and I believe that the candidate has a right to give names that he or she does not want on the list.

CARROLL: I see.

GAUDIN: You should check me on that because, you know, I have quickly tried to put that behind me. [Laughter] Still after three years retirement, it is the most... the aspect of the profession that I dislike most.

CARROLL: Judging one's peers?

GAUDIN: Mmm.

CARROLL: It must be tough.

GAUDIN: Not only judging one's peers, but also having to suddenly enter into the thick of the departmental politics, which I was not prepared for at all. I did not understand the American institutions.

CARROLL: That may have been an advantage. Of angel's innocence... When I look back on the tenure cases from the '60's and '70's and then look at what happens today, it seems to me that there has been increased professionalization demands placed upon it. Do you think that is a fair assessment?

GAUDIN: Yes.

CARROLL: And what is the.... Why is that so?

GAUDIN: Because of the general competition, because jobs have become scarce. Because the criteria of excellence have gone up, generally. That's all.

CARROLL: Do you think the students have changed also? That they have gotten better over that time?

GAUDIN: That I could not say. I could not say. I think students have always been... There has always been a good proportion of intelligent students. I think students have gotten more demanding in a kind of mercantile way, a little bit. They want good product for their money, which has nothing to do with their intelligence or their commitment or their motivation to study.

If the institution can say that it has a core of professors which produces so many books, that's the kind of prestige the institution seeks. It has to be in comparison with other institutions. I think that enters into the picture. I'm not sure that students are well aware of what we do. You know, research... That was always a little bit frustrating. But some of them were well aware of it and interested.

CARROLL: What did you do your research on?

GAUDIN: At first I did research on the French philosopher, Gaston Bachelard, because I had taken his courses in the Sorbonne when I was studying there and [] his work was relevant to literature so I did a lot of research on the new novel in France, narratology, contemporary novelists and surrealism also. Then, finally, on the woman novelist, Marguerite Yourcenar.

CARROLL: Oh, a Canadian. Yes.

GAUDIN: No. She's not a Canadian. She's French.

CARROLL: I thought she was.

GAUDIN: She lived in Maine. That's why you think she was.

CARROLL: As I remember, she was the first woman who was elected to the French Academy.

GAUDIN: Yes. She was elected to the Royal Academy of Belgium before. But the first woman to the French Academy in 1980, 1981.

CARROLL: I remember fondly reading her Memoirs of Hadrian.

GAUDIN: Yes. I have just given two talks about it this year and written two papers.

CARROLL: I will have to look for this.

GAUDIN: But they are in French. Do you read French?

CARROLL: I read French, but German is really my second language. I read it reluctantly, let's put it this way.

You talked about that you were out of the country during the Parkhurst takeover. But you were around for, I assume, some of the Vietnam War protests.

GAUDIN: Yes. In the '70's for the moratorium. Yes. I thought Kemeny's decision to close the institution for several days...

CARROLL: It was almost a week.

GAUDIN: Almost a week? I thought it was a trait of genius. It was absolutely great because suddenly, everybody was talking, there were discussions. I remember a big meeting in Webster Hall when the professor of English, who was against the moratorium [Jeffrey Hart], said that we should take lessons from the British who continued their work and their studies [during the Blitz]. And we should go on.

There were very good discussions and very good... I think that was the beginning of, sort of, the breaking of the wall between the faculty and the students. [].

I felt that there was, at that time, a questioning on the part of the students. There was an answer on the part of the faculty. There was a dialogue at the level of the political uneasiness of the time between the two bodies. Maybe I am a little bit nostalgic for that period.

CARROLL: I am just reading about it. It seems so exciting.

GAUDIN: Because, then gradually when things settled down, I felt the generation gap later and, not simply because of age, but because the times were changing. Students' preoccupations were changing

also. It's as if we were not in the same boat any more. At that time, we were in the same boat.

CARROLL: I think that is very true. I can believe that and it seemed to have been a campus-wide effort, those moratorium days.

GAUDIN: Oh, yes.

CARROLL: Had you known John Kemeny before he became President?

GAUDIN: I mean I met him in parties. I always... I know that some of my colleagues criticized his kind of "Realpolitik,"
[] But I always felt a sort of affinity with his European background. A European mind. Because I think in Europe, politicians are expected to be a little bit cynical, which is not hypocritical. It is not the same thing. Not at all. I did not mind.

I think he was great on coeducation. He was extremely helpful. It is true that he wasn't really ready to stick his neck out (is that the expression?) for Joan [Smith] or for Rhona Mirsky, for instance. He did not want to approach the Dean of the Medical School on that subject. I think he had good words but no action on that matter. It was part of his politics. But, in general, he really steered the institution in a direction which I liked very much.

CARROLL: Were you surprised when he was chosen to be President?

GAUDIN: No.

CARROLL: No? Had he, in some way, indicated that this was a career trajectory for him?

GAUDIN: I don't know. I did not know him that well.

CARROLL: Okay.

GAUDIN: [] I think he remained exactly the same, always very busy, thinking all the time.

CARROLL: He really... When he comes into office, the recruitment of female faculty zooms. Was that something that he had on his agenda of things to do or was this just that the time was right?

- GAUDIN: Probably both. []
- CARROLL: That's nice. I like that. When coeducation... You were here when this was announced....
- GAUDIN: And, again, I was not here when it was announced. I missed that. I missed so many....
- CARROLL: Important moments.
- GAUDIN: Important moments.
- CARROLL: Well, then maybe I won't ask you this. But I was wondering, how much resistance was there at the time to the announcement?
- GAUDIN: Oh, that was not... At the time of the announcement, it was done. It was the two years before...between '70 and '72...when there were a lot of preparations and discussions. We had asked for it. We, a few women here.... The first solution that the Trustees came back with was a proposition for an associated school with the women on the other side of the river. [Laughter] I remember that because there was a dinner at the Hanover Inn with Trustees, Marysa Navarro, myself and someone else (I think we were three or two) I don't know, and we were sounded. We were supposed to be jumping with joy, I think. I was so appalled! I told one of the trustees, "I'm all for it if men students here learn home economics, knitting, cooking, sewing...." [Laughter]
- CARROLL: Whoops.
- GAUDIN: "Okay. We will have the same curriculum."
- CARROLL: How did....
- GAUDIN: I mean, we countered the proposition. They back tracked. [] They had their ideas of the separation of roles and places in society; but, they were also very civilized. They saw that we did not like it [] and went back to the drawing board.
- CARROLL: That's interesting. So you have been a part, really, of this lobbying of the idea of coeducation.

- GAUDIN: Before full coeducation, there was an exchange with the sister institutions. A few women came for one term or one year. [] That's when Meryl Streep was here.
- CARROLL: Oh, that's right. That was the Twelve-College Exchange.
- GAUDIN: And I had some of them in language courses. In language courses, women were accepted; but I remember having one day an open discussion with my students about coeducation.... What they thought about the prospect and, really, half of the male students were against it. I think they gradually accepted the idea, but they mostly used the standard argument, "The intellectual level will go down."
- CARROLL: Oh.
- GAUDIN: So I said, "Is drinking beer intellectual? Getting drunk on Saturday night?" "They won't be able to do that?" They are, in fact, unfortunately...
- CARROLL: Yes. That hasn't made much of a dent in that, has it?
- GAUDIN: No. The other argument was that women are too distracting. Finally, when they came, I think there were a few difficult adjustments for women. That you probably know. But, in the classroom, they quickly took their place.
- CARROLL: Did it change the atmosphere of the classroom at all, having them there?
- GAUDIN: A little bit, I think. It became more relaxed. I mean, I had to be very careful not to let any dominant male monopolize the discussion. At the beginning, at least. But it was a question of numbers, again, and, when you had a sufficient number of women, you had to be careful also that the men students were not being intimidated. There was a necessity to play on the group dynamic to make sure it was fair.
- CARROLL: Did the languages feel the impact of the women students more than the sciences did initially?
- GAUDIN: That, I don't know.
- CARROLL: I just wondered.

GAUDIN: Probably, but that was also, I think, a stereotype, saying that women study languages more than sciences. Marysa Navarro would talk to you about what she did to try to break the stereotype of the fear of mathematics in women. She worked with Kemeny on that. You know, women were also the victims of the idea that math and science are for men.

CARROLL: I think that is true.

GAUDIN: Yeah. But I think it's disappearing, has largely disappeared now.

CARROLL: Did you teach your classes any differently with women students present than you had when it was all male students?

GAUDIN: Maybe. I'm not sure. Except for what I mentioned before, being more aware of the different group dynamics. Maybe. Yes. Maybe I paid more attention, in the material I was teaching, to the question of the female voice, the place of women in literature, trying to include more women writers and things like that. I think I was doing it before also.

CARROLL: Did you feel a responsibility at all as a female faculty member to help make the way easier for those first coeds when they came on campus?

GAUDIN: Yes. But they were also, you know, Dartmouth. They were taken into so many organizations. There was a Vice President for Women, Ruth Adams.

CARROLL: I have interviewed her.

GAUDIN: She had tea for women. There were many activities offered them. I made myself more available to advising them individually. I have never been keen on participating in the institutionalized activities. I was appalled when one student came to ask for my sponsorship for a sorority or a secret society.

CARROLL: It's hard.

GAUDIN: Oh, I don't know. But they did it anyway.

CARROLL: They wanted to belong.

GAUDIN: They wanted to be real Dartmouth.

CARROLL: During this time, there were also increasing numbers of women in the administration. You talked about Ruth Adams and then there were several deans or assistant deans appointed at this time.

GAUDIN: Britta MacNamara was very active.

CARROLL: Did that change the relationship at all with the female faculty members to the administration?

GAUDIN: Oh, yes.

CARROLL: How?

GAUDIN: It became easier to talk to them. I don't know. It changed considerably. Before that, I was not well aware of the administration anyway. It was a sort of anonymous block on the other side of the campus, with one head. That's about it. No. I had a relationship with a dean when students were in trouble; but, that was it. Particularly for the first year of my presence here when I thought I would not stay. []
Then everything became quite different. That's true.

CARROLL: In the '80's, there seems to have been a lot of curricular changes. New distributional requirements. New requirements for the majors. How much a part of that is something that you took part in and how much comes about through just a general consensus?

GAUDIN: That's a difficult question.

CARROLL: Did you ever have to be an advocate for the languages?

GAUDIN: Do you mean in terms of...

CARROLL: Distributionals. Saying "Yes. We have to have two years of foreign language credit to our..."

GAUDIN: It seems like the foreign language requirement was fairly well established. It was attacked once in a while, but not seriously. We didn't really have to defend it. It seems to me that I have spent a lot of time arguing with the deans and with the budget officers for our departmental budget and our courses and our FTEs [Full Time Equivalent]. That's par for the course.

The big fight, the big action I remember in the curriculum change was in the establishment of the Women's Studies. That took a lot of effort and time and thinking. Other than that, further in the French Department, we had to maintain our turf. [

] We were a service department. That's it. We were told that we were a service department.

CARROLL: There has been a lot of additions of new languages in the program for several years.

GAUDIN: Yes.

CARROLL: Had that affected French in any way?

GAUDIN: Yes. A little bit. We had a period of tremendous expansion when we went to over 20 faculty. At one point, we had almost as many as the English Department. Then Spanish took a big leap, which is normal. Also, the addition of Chinese, Japanese, Hebrew, Arabic has taken a little bit of our clientele away.

CARROLL: Has the French major changed at all in its scope or its requirement?

GAUDIN: Oh, yes. Tremendously and I don't like to talk about it because I did not like all the changes that I saw in the last years that I worked within the department.

CARROLL: Come on. Talk about it. Just a little bit. [Laughter] What are the changes?

GAUDIN: The changes are that... There are some unstructured courses. I don't like to hear myself speaking like an old-fashioned, rigid, canonical professor. But they have too many rubrics like "Literature and Society", "Literature and Politics". I mean, we are an undergraduate institution and I think it is our responsibility to give a basis of judgment to our students and to open them up to inter-related, interdisciplinary studies at the same time. It is true that literature is open to society and we work in a network. [

].

CARROLL: I guess we have a problem. I really do. [Laughter]

[End Tape 1, Side B -- Beginning Tape 2, Side A]

GAUDIN: ... the classics. It's not that... I mean, [some] students were interested, motivated, hooked on literature. They would read them. It is not a problem. It's that we have also to give the other students a sense of proportion. We have to arm them to go on and look for something else. But they are often a little bit lost. They may finish a major with a very lop-sided reading... And I am not specifically for coverage, but they should have a sense of what exists and where they can go from there. Enough of that.

CARROLL: Okay.

GAUDIN: The changes in curriculum always follow a sort of pendulum. We have come a little too far in one direction, now in the other direction.

CARROLL: Were you involved in the founding of the Women's Studies Department?

GAUDIN: Yes.

CARROLL: But it started out....

GAUDIN: As a program.

CARROLL: As a concentration and a program. That's right. Was that something that came from the faculty or from the students?

GAUDIN: No. From the women. From the women. We met some resistance in the faculty, but we pushed and pushed and pushed and worked and worked and worked. At that time, we were a little more numerous and stronger. There was Marie [Mary] Kelley. There was Lynn Mather. Hilda Sokol. We were giving it a very strong interdisciplinary figure...

CARROLL: Why was it important to have a Women's Studies Department? Why couldn't these courses be taught in the different departments?

GAUDIN: First of all, there was no room in the different departments. Second of all, I think it had to be identified as a special place, a special nexus of specialties. We defended also another approach which was co-teaching from two different domains, different specialties,

disciplines. It was good to assert this approach, this different approach to the culture. []

CARROLL: You must feel very justified because now, one of the requirements of the students is that they have to take a course which is co-taught from people of two different disciplines. I think that Women's Studies must just beam when they see that in the ORC [Officers, Regulations and Courses] now.

GAUDIN: That was a new, new thing.

CARROLL: How popular was that in the beginning among students? Did students flock or was this a gradual increase?

GAUDIN: I think it was a gradual increase. We should look at the numbers and I am sure Anne Brooks [Coordinator, Women's Studies Program] has them all.

CARROLL: Anne Brooks. Yeah.

GAUDIN: She is very precise.

CARROLL: And about this time, there was also formed the Women's Center on campus.

GAUDIN: Later. I didn't have much to do with that because I think it came later and I was already sort of... You know, I became very sick in '89 and I had one year of sick leave and then I went on FRO [Flexible Retirement Option] because of the illness. So my last years were a little bit less involved.

CARROLL: I am going to come to David McLaughlin's presidency at this point. Were you surprised when Kemeny decided to retire after 11 years?

GAUDIN: Yes.

CARROLL: And why was that?

GAUDIN: I do not know. I did not have much contact with Kemeny so I did not know his reasons. I thought it was very wise on his part for his career because I knew how absorbing and sometimes alienating administration can be, so his desire to return to mathematics was quite understandable.

CARROLL: Had you known David McLaughlin before he was President?

GAUDIN: No. Not at all.

CARROLL: What was the initial response on the part of the faculty to the announcement of his election to the Presidency?

GAUDIN: It was a little [indifferent].

CARROLL: I can imagine. There are so many people... I hate to make comparisons, but it is inevitable I guess, between Kemeny and McLaughlin, because one followed upon the other. So often, when one asks people to do it, the comparison that one gets from McLaughlin is really to his detriment. I was wondering if you would agree with that. How would you compare the two of them, their leadership styles?

GAUDIN: No comparison. I think you have known me enough on that subject, I am sure.

CARROLL: Quite a bit, actually. Why do you think the faculty was so hostile to David McLaughlin?

GAUDIN: Oh, partly for good reasons; partly for bad reasons. For bad reasons because the faculty is a snob about non-intellectuals, thinking itself as the intellectual part of Dartmouth and McLaughlin was not. McLaughlin was a football player.

CARROLL: What were the good reasons for them to be?

GAUDIN: The good reasons, because... They are more or less the same, because McLaughlin was not intellectual! He did not understand the faculty.

CARROLL: Good reasons all. That's fascinating to me. The first time that I can come across where McLaughlin really had a major problem is when the shanties were erected. Were you in the country then?

GAUDIN: Yes.

CARROLL: Ah.

GAUDIN: Because I remember making soup one evening... one cold evening, bringing them a big batch of hot soup that was served in the shanties.

CARROLL: Do you remember what it was like on campus then? What the atmosphere was like?

GAUDIN: The atmosphere was quite divided. Within that division, there was The Dartmouth Review and the rallies.

CARROLL: [inaudible]

GAUDIN: The atmosphere was divided, but there was also very strong support for the people who were demonstrating at the center of campus. [] I had a student in my class at that time who was on The Dartmouth Review. I knew it indirectly. I don't remember how I found out, but he was at the rally in the back. I remember talking to him and forcing him to tell me what he thought about it. The following week he dropped my class. So that bothered me a great deal because I figured that he felt threatened. He maybe realized that I was not on the same side as he was. I wanted a discussion. I wanted a dialogue. That's when I realized that he probably thought, "Well, she's the Professor, she's going to give me a grade... It is better if I disappear from her sight." That was very troubling. Very upsetting. So, what should I have done? Not talked with him?

CARROLL: No. Liberal arts is about dialogue.

GAUDIN: Yes, but it is difficult because there, the relationship of authority remains somehow at the time of grading.

CARROLL: That's true. And divestiture was such a strong issue because of the South African connection. The faculty seemed very much on the side of divestiture.....

GAUDIN: Yes.

CARROLL: Then why do you think that the administration balked at accepting the Sullivan Principles?

GAUDIN: I do not know. The pressure of the trustees? Financial reasons? I cannot see the strength of financial reasons, but I think it was the pressure of the trustees. I do not know who was on the Board at

that time, but there were probably a few very powerful, conservative trustees. Because there were a few very conservative trustees.

CARROLL: There always are.

GAUDIN: They were probably more conservative in terms of finances, in economic terms, than in terms of women.

CARROLL: I think that is very true. Eventually, of course, they do accept the Sullivan Principles and eventually it does come out and they have to give in. But they do it so reluctantly, that is why I find it so interesting. The other thing that McLaughlin really pushed for against the wishes of the faculty was to reinstate ROTC. Do you remember this?

GAUDIN: No. I was not here. [] Again, I remember reading the minutes and my feeling...and asking my colleagues...and I think it was, again, the pressure of economics: It meant a few good scholarships for Dartmouth then that Dartmouth would not have to give otherwise. I don't know if I can put it that way.

CARROLL: At least that's the arguments that they ended up printing. And the last big moment in the McLaughlin presidency was moving the hospital out to its new location.

GAUDIN: Oh. That was harrowing.

CARROLL: Why?

GAUDIN: Why? Because we were suddenly placed in front of a sort of *fait accompli* complete with millions of dollars floating, being juggled in the air. I remember not understanding anything about it.

CARROLL: And, given the very small window in which to have to understand it...

GAUDIN: Yes.

CARROLL: I think it was presented at the October meeting and, by December 1, they would have to make a decision.

GAUDIN: Yes. Something like that. It was a sort of fake consultation. That's my feeling.

CARROLL: And certainly, as I read the minutes...

GAUDIN: [] There was so much at stake that, if we had voted "no"... What? I think I abstained then. A lot of people did, probably.

CARROLL: Yes, a lot, when you read the minutes.

GAUDIN: Yes.

CARROLL: What I am curious about is, when I read those minutes, the tone seemed so strident. Was it actually that way when you were sitting there?

GAUDIN: Yes. It was. It was a little bit outrageous. It was antagonistic.

CARROLL: At that point, it seems to me that McLaughlin had lost much of his credibility with the faculty. It was very soon after that that he puts in his resignation. Were you surprised or did this seem like the logical outcome?

GAUDIN: It was logical. There was a sigh of relief almost. It was sad, also. It is always sad to see someone saying, "Well, I failed".

CARROLL: When you look back and remember McLaughlin's period, was there something that he did that you think is the "good moment" in his presidency?

GAUDIN: I don't remember. Maybe if I look at my notes or my minutes or something, that would come....

CARROLL: It kind of faded away. Well, that's the end of my mandated period. I'm really only supposed to talk through McLaughlin. Is there something else that you wanted to mention before we finish?

GAUDIN: No. I have some bitter memories about Dartmouth, but the funny thing is that they don't come from my very first years here. Because my first year, I was shocked, scandalized sometimes; but, as I said, I had also this sense of freedom and close acceptance in the immediate milieu where I had to work. That was good.

It came from the conflicts afterwards where I was forced to participate more in the administration of the department.... I found

that very difficult. And also later when [
] the conflicts also became a way of professional life among women.

CARROLL: Did you see a difference in generation between the first women that came here and those who came in the '80's?

GAUDIN: Yes.

CARROLL: How would you characterize that?

GAUDIN: Well, you know, the women who came in the '80s did not have to fight the way we had to establish our professional credentials and our professional space and voice. [The goals are different.] Now the competition is general and they are much more competitive, much more aggressive. The sense of sisterhood is gone. I don't know if it is totally gone. I should not speak for them.

CARROLL: I think it is a selective group.

GAUDIN: It's different.

CARROLL: It is all encompassing. Thank you for everything.

END OF INTERVIEW