Interview with: K. Offen

Interview by: Danelle Moon

Transcriber: Mark Rivas

Interview DS400059.wav

[00:37:19] at beginning {start at [00:00]}

Offen:

And uh that one I think I mentioned, I'll give you a copy of that article it's very short but the gist of it was that people had gone through textbooks and they added "and women" every so often at places that were extremely inappropriate. So I got involved not only with the teacher but also with the editorial team of the textbook raising a big ruckus about it.

Moon:

Right.

Offen:

So that was one thing that was one of the ways that textbook authors were fudging and were not really including them, they're were just adding them. And then looking more deeply into textbooks, I did some textbook reading for the California Commission, when they were entertaining these textbook proposals.

Moon:

Um-hm. Okay.

Offen:

And, finally I decided something had to be done at the state level because the history of social science framework had come out. So I heard a lot of really good things about inclusion and women and so forth, but the framework didn't deliver. So we put together a committee through the Western Association and, had people read and make suggestions-textbooks, and make suggestions of what actually could be done given the state of the knowledge base. And we submitted that information to the state, and we asked them, we went to the hearings in Sacramento and asked them to, um, when they were talking about revising the framework, and saying "Well this really needs to be done". So we were, you know at that level, we got very active. But we got torpedoed at the hearing by the chairman who was calling the question at the point where the discussion of the board was such that we thought we were really going to get this through.

Moon:

Right.

Offen:

So they ended up saying, "Well we're not going revise at all", because the Armenians were there too, and they wanted the Armenian Genocide, and there were all these other groups-

Moon:

Right. That wanted something.

Offen:

-in that curriculum about their specific cause.

Moon:

Right.

Offen:

And we kept saying that, "yes, this was important but you know, half of the Armenians and half of the resistors, and half of the thats are also women. And we want more attention to women broadly based and that's not specifically a group that's more than half the population. And they thought that was important.

Moon:

(laughs)

Offen:

But not important enough to totally go after the framework and the suggestions to do something about it. So then we backed off. That was effectively in defeat, only not quite because then we, um, the Educational Office in Sacramento decided that something needed to be done, so they started putting out supplemental materials. One of the people involved in the committee and these other efforts was [Lynn Reese?] and she came to speak at the thing and she has been doing women in world history and the development for a very long time. And She has [inaudible 00:03:32]

Moon:

Lynn Reese?

Offen:

Lynn Reese, yeah. And she has been doing that all on her own. Berkeley High School had a Women's History program at one point.

Moon:

Oh did they?

Offen:

Yeah. And she was very involved with that but since she has been developing curriculum materials and selling them-she's got a website.

Moon:

Oh does she?

Offen:

And she does a lot of online business. And a lot of resource list and suggestions on it.

Moon:

Wow! Now, did she start off as a history teacher? Or do you know?

Offen:

Yeah she was teaching history, she has a Master's in history and she was in the classroom, I think, for a number of years, and she decided to move in that direction. I don't know the full story of that trajectory, when I met her for the first time she was already involved in the California State level of the Social Science Association. And trying to talk to the teachers there at the annual conventions and such about including Women's History.

Moon:

Yeah. At San Jose State they have been, uh, they've hired a number of younger scholars in the last like ten years or so, in particular in the last five. And that department has been heavily dominated by, um, men, for one, although there have been women that obviously have been a part of that program too. But the focus has been largely on Military History or on you know kind of traditional sort of topics and you know, foreign policy, you know diplomatic history, that kind of thing. Um, and this last semester, they just sponsored a

gender studies sort of conference presentation. And the reason why they're doing that is that they are having trouble getting their students to sign up for some of the courses that are focused on Women's History or gender. And I was so surprised by that, I would've thought that it would have been just a matter of-you know, it seems like it's kind of late, (laughs), that they should've done this like, ten years ago. But they are trying to promote just students, and a lot of the students that answer the history program there are probably 75% male.

Offen:

Really?

Moon:

And you know, the males generally are more interested, it seems, and maybe this is a terrible stereotype, but, they seem more interested in Military History than some other topics in history at that level. But, um, I'm hoping that they are able to get this gender studies kind of symposium off the ground because it would be a great way for students to both present maybe the work that they've been doing for some of those classes, as well as for the faculty to be able to, you know, promote kind of a cross-disciplinary sort of approach. Right now, it's not um, over disciplined it's just the History Department. But, they have a big-they have one of the oldest Women's Studies program there. And it seems like they should be able to promote it more in sort of a cross-discipline sort of way. But um, I have been hoping to get involved with it next year. I didn't really now about it until they were just presenting it and then I was out of town when they were doing it. But um, that the other problem with academics is that groups don't talk to one another either you know, so that there is a lot of miscommunication.

Offen:

So true.

Moon:

But, I think Lynn's work sounds really interesting and that whole process of trying to, you know, put women into the historical, you know, into the K-12 sort of curriculum is really an important-you know contribution that someone could make. I'm just thinking in context of my daughter. My daughter is nineteen, and she is in her 2nd year, she just finished her 2nd year of college, and I'm certain she got very little in the way of Women's History accept through me. And so when she was in high school and writing a paper she was taking stuff that, she said, "Well mom, what do you think I should do on this?" And so then we would talk about it and then she would write on you know whatever it was [inaudible 00:07:43] or something. But, um, I don't have that much context with the K-12 environment, so it's hard to know how they're actually doing, you know, Women's Studies. There's a report card on how they're doing, and putting women into the-

Offen:

I don't think they're doing great unless there is someone on site to push it.

Moon:

Yeah, I don't think so either.

Offen:

And every once in a while I run into people at the Ed. School at Stanford and its like-

Moon:

(laughs)

Offen:

And they continue to put out curriculum materials that are not up to date with what they are doing right now. But a few years ago they were putting out curriculum units which were suppose to be more global and stuff. Not a woman in sight. No gender, nothing. And topics that cry out for it, like World War I.

Moon:

Yeah. Well that's discouraging (laughs).

Offen:

Yeah, there are topics that absolutely lend themselves to thinking about Women's History big time, like the Industrial Revolution. Actually [inaudible 00:08:52] when I was still involved down there a few years ago, chose not to teach that part in 7th grade. You know kids come out of that school not knowing there was an Industrial Revolution, much less that there were women in it.

Moon:

So what are they teaching in-Are they picking another theme in it?

Offen:

7th Grade is an impossible situation. You're supposed to teach three out of five world cultures to kids who can't sit still. How do you do that?

Moon:

Yeah, that's a pretty difficult task (both laugh). They could care less about problems in other world cultures.

Offen:

And the next year it's the U.S. History and U.S. Constitution, which is at least focused on something you can-but the people who-you know, unless they've changed the framework, 7th grade is still like that. It's just, all over the place.

Moon:

Yeah, I think-

Offen:

And these teachers have not had the coursework that they need, or done the reading, you know what I mean, to be able to do that cleverly. That requires somebody with a lot of experience.

Moon:

Yeah, well in San Jose State's History Department, is working collaboratively with the San Jose Board of Education, and they just received one of those big education grants to teach American History. To teach American History, grant and they're like up, you know, they could be up to, upwards of three million dollars, but I think they got about a million dollars for this grant. And this is one of those programs that was initiated through Laura Bush-

Offen:

Oh yeah, is this through the NEH?

Moon:

Uh-huh. And so, they just got this grant, and the purpose of this grant is to teach teachers, or to re-teach teachers, you know, historical methodology and historiography so that they're actually–and its based on thematic sort of approaches to teaching U.S. History. And uh, that whole purpose was to get the teachers, you know, certain teachers

in for these intensive sort of training, you know, in service or in training, parts, and they're adding kind of an archival sort of component, where the local archives are putting together primary sources that they can use based on the thematic, you know, areas that they are trying to explore for the class. But, I think that's exactly what all teachers that are teaching history probably need to have access to, but only, you know, a limited number of teachers will actually get to be able to do that.

Offen:

Right, absolutely

Moon:

The other problem I think is there just teaching-

Offen:

And its fine you know, I love it that they're doing it for American History because, lord knows that's a problem, but they should be doing it for European History, for Asian History-

Moon:

Yeah, well because, you know, it's a Bush orientated sort of program, you know, of course it's just *American* History. But-

Offen:

Yeah, it's American, and it doesn't include Canada you can be sure.

Moon:

Yeah, or Mexico[both]. [Moon laughs]

Offen:

That's the other piece of my crusade is, uh NAFTA history.

Moon:

Yeah. [both laugh] That's probably a clever way of looking at it. Now one of the things that you mentioned that I thought was an interesting thing you said at the end of your article, you were talking about what your motto was or is about history, you said, "Ask not what feminist theory can do for history, but what history can do for feminist theory" and I thought that was a great quote. So I just thought that I would ask you to explain what you meant by that.

Offen:

Uh I got tired of reading theoreticians who didn't know any history. They were saying stupid things because they didn't know any history. And I also get really tired of people who want to, you know, look at X-Y-or Z, and you know, this is kind of an infection that has taken over some historians too. I hope you're not one of them. You know let's look at this through the lens of Foucault and let's look at this through the lens of [Jerry Dao?]-

Moon:

I'm not really a post-modern historian.

Offen:

-whoever and get the damn lenses out of the way and look what the people are doing and saying and talking about. Give them some credit for being real. So that's what's behind that.

Moon:

Okay. Now I think you have a long, a lot of work ahead of you, but I have been asking this question to all the people I've been interviewing, particularly to the women who

were involved in politics, but, what is your legacy as a feminist scholar? Or what would you like your legacy to be?

Offen:

What would I like my legacy to be? I would like my legacy to be to have spawned a whole bunch of people who are interested in the history of feminism. To get it into the schools and you know 40,000 young women reading it, that would be-quite nice.

Moon:

That would be great. I think that would be an important legacy.

Offen:

What it would really turn out to be is really difficult to say [both laugh]. Maybe part of the legacy will be the work I do for the museum if we could get the major, major funding that we need-

Moon:

Well, I think that's a great start. I mean it was just really empowering to watch the video that they put together for that. You know with the book and everything. And I had seen, actually they had come down to San Jose and did a presentation. Paula had done, a presentation down there, And it was really so inspiring, and there were a lot of young women who actually were like [Pocket Intel?] like some of the Dot-Com, you know, companies were helping to sponsor the [inaudible 00:14:42] I was really, you know it gave me goose bumps to watch it because I was in this kind of mode where I was thinking, you know, what is happening, you know, with young women today? And where are we headed, and how is Women's History or you know, the history of, you know, family or whatever. I mean there is always it's not just about women obviously

it's you know, it's much broader than that, about gender. How are we going to inform the next generation if they aren't activist? How do we produce, how do we create activists? As teachers or as, you know, educators? And you know, where have we broken down in actually being activists anymore? And if you read some of the, actually [name inaudible 00:15:34] talks a lot about being a feminist activist in her work. And she actually really defines herself that way. And I'm not sure that other women historians, that are scholars necessarily define themselves as activists, but I think, I listened to [Elizabeth Plex?] was actually talking about this at the [Berksher?] on this panel that I was on with her, and she was saying that it's really hard to be an activist in the academy and she also is another person who has had a lot of rough knocks trying to get through the tenure process. And she said that you know, that is hard to be an activist because the academy doesn't allow you to be. It doesn't really reward activism, they reward, you know, publication. And they might reward you if you bring in grants to your institution. And I thought that was a really sad testament (laughs) to what the academy is doing. It should be, you should be able to encourage activism. If you aren't an activist scholar, how are you encouraging your students to be you know, politically active or socially active, and I just would like to see more activism I guess. And so, when I was you know, a party to seeing that message from the museum, I was really inspired to think that maybe there is more activism out there than I-you know, we're just not really aware of because we're sheltered in our own sort of little world.

Offen:

Well, there are a lot of pockets. We have attracted some really interesting people to the museum thing but we've got a lot of ways to go still. There are still a lot of people who have not heard of us. If you could get the word out.

Moon:

Right.

Offen:

Yeah, the biggest problem I have is the content person is that, even the people in the museum don't know Women's History. They are very interested in the present-

Moon:

Right, but not so much how they got there.

Offen:

An energetic piece of what's going on right now all over the world. And certainly reaching young women. But, yeah, I spent the last six, seven years, that I have been on the board you know, trying to push the message of Women's History. I think the biggest problem and this is not just the museum people, but with museums you have to break everything down. It's got to be you know, sound bytes and little paragraphs for exhibits, for example. It's got to be really well conceptualized but you can't put that much text out there. Historians are text people. Texts and illustrations. Illustrations, they do fine in museums but text people don't like sound bytes fundamentally. They want you know, "Read the damn article! Read the book!" You know trying to get people to immerse themselves in it. It's not so simple. People, a lot of people aren't readers anymore.

Moon:

Right, and that's a problem.

Offen:

And that's a huge problem. And I don't know how you get it. You can't get it from T.V., you can't get it from the movies, you can't get it from the five minute special, or the one and a half hour walkthrough exhibit. You have to immerse yourself. And I don't know what the other option is. Maybe there's a formula where you can you can boil it all down and make a liquid and inject it in your vein, and the texts somehow appear. But I don't think so. I don't see that happening

Moon:

Now are your girls really interested in women's, uh feminism and Women's History?

Offen:

I think they're getting more interested as they move into their thirties.

Moon:

Uh-huh [laughs]

Offen:

Beginning to see where the pressures are and the hang-ups. Both of them have these little children. And they're carrying the career versus family issue or having to combine them. My younger daughter in particular right now, looks as though she's going to have to give up what she has been doing and in order to give more time to her family life.

Moon:

Yeah, that's a real struggle.

Offen:

Yeah, it was her dream job, but she has a one year old now, and her husband has got full-time work too. So somebody's got to coordinate all this.

Moon:

And you have your-

Offen:

My older daughter is a licensed social worker. She has got a Master's and State license and all that. When she had her first child, this is an example. The agency she was working with in foster care would not allow her to do part-time. There were two women who were going to have babies that could have combined, split the position, and the agency said no. So she said, you know, "Up yours, I am going to put my skills to work and stay home with the Children. And the salary was so bad anyway, it doesn't pay me to work." [Go outside?] So she is doing an awesome job with these little kids.

Moon:

Well, I think it's a real struggle for-

Offen:

I am not sure she is entirely happy with-she's happy with doing that, but she sometimes says, "I feel brain-dead." It's the Woodpecker Syndrome. It's just constant.

Moon:

[laughs] Yeah, yeah. Well you know because you raised your children and-

Offen:

So I think they're, you know, they're beginnings to see the tensions that are there for women in a way that they are not for men. They're not legal issues anymore, they're not about education. They're about life.

Moon:

Now do you think, you know, there is a movement, the ERA movement is still underfoot to try and promote a federal amendment. How do you feel about promoting the ERA again? And you know, is it something that you think we actually need? Or would it just be a symbolic sort of-

Offen:

Well the problem with the ERA both when it was originally proposed and in the 70's configuration, was what it would do to the protected labor legislation that was the kicker. Which I didn't really understand as well then as I does now. And a lot of that protective labor legislation is now gone. So if equal rights is really about you know, legal equality you know, we're already pretty close on a lot of fronts. Especially compared to you know, the way things were in the 19th century. So I don't know. I don't know what the answer is to that question now. I would really like to know-the Equal Rights Advocates group seems to be very energized in having their annual luncheons and dinners and things. But I don't know what the latest thing is on that. Do you?

Moon:

I don't. And I was just following a little bit. I haven't been a part of that group, but I was you know, since I have been so involved in studying it in the earlier period. Even in the 40's, protective legislation was not the issue after-you know in the middle of WWII because, even the opponents, acknowledged that it wasn't over protective legislation anymore, because it was clear, that women were being discriminated left and right in the work place. So it wasn't really about that issue, but they held onto that issue for the longest time. And I think it was the division that occurred, was really complex sort of division and the personalities were really complex that were part, you know, like from

[Alice Paulis?] and some of the other women that were involved in it. But it seems to me that it was also a power play between womens' organizations trying to determine who was going to have control over the policy making. And the National Women's Bureau didn't, felt that they were the policy makers. And actually they were, to some extent.

Offen:

Yeah

Moon:

But they had no-their opposition to it was, almost entirely based on the protective labor legislation and [Mary Anderson?] was adamantly opposed to it and so was [Alice Hamilton?] but then Hamilton endorsed the ERA in the 40's and the late 40's, I think that it was 48. As did a lot of Women's groups, you know AEW was one of those organizations that you know came around, and so did all these other you know the Federation of Women's clubs and so on and so forth. But I don't know today it seems like you know, we have so many other laws that are in place that would- its not really necessary, but I can see it as a symbolic sort of gesture for promoting it. But the question is, Would it be ratified? You know, because there is still this kind of strange hostility towards this notion.

Offen:

Even now, yeah.

Moon:

Even though in the 70's it wasn't about protective legislation.

Offen:

It was about bathrooms!

Moon:

It was about bathrooms and military service. And then also some other scholars who are writing on the ERA in different states, at the state level the ratification process, they're finding that it was also about-you know, well they used abortion Roe V. Wade as one of their reasons, but I don't think it was because of Roe, I think it was because of the military issue and then [Shaftly?] became such a outspoken opponent. And as we know, in U.S. History especially, you can, you know, the opposition usually is louder, you know, and they may only represent a small percentage. It was like that-

Offen:

She was very good at getting her message out. Shaftly was very contradictory person on a lot of levels but she certainly got people scared and running. The problem-you know I spent a lot of time thinking about equality, and trying to understand what that means historically. And roughly what it has always meant in the Women's Movement is for equality before the law, equality of opportunity. But it was never about sameness. And if you think about why you need to think about equality, it's because there are a lot of differences. You want to maintain. It's not about making everybody the same.

Moon:

Yeah. Well no. But that's what originally-

Offen:

But that's somehow that came out in the debates and maybe it's some peculiar characteristic of American Law that equality somehow does lead to same.

Moon:

Yeah, well just because you gave voting rights to African American males didn't mean that they were the same. Right?

Offen:

Right.

Moon:

I mean so that was just-you know reading the debates that were going on you know from the 20's to the 40's were really interesting and they were talking about it. And at one point Alice Paulis got into this argument with this women that I'm actually doing my bigger project on, about what it-

Offen:

What is her name?

Moon:

Her name is [Florence Kitchel?] And she's not, she's pretty much, she's not totally unknown, but she was a regional organizer for the National Woman's Party. She was a member, but she was a late member. She was part of the kind of, Mary Anderson, kind of social feminist, in the post-suffrage era, and Women's, the [peak?] movement. And promoted the whole idea of protective legislation until it was clear during WWII that women just weren't getting you know, the equality that they needed. So she felt the Federal Amendment would be the quickest way to change women's status in society. But she and Paulis would have these disagreements about these things and Paulis would talk into re-doing or revamping the kind of language of the amendment during that time period. So they change it from men and women, to sex. And some of the- like Kitchel

she really disagreed with us. She thought it should've stayed as it was because she thought it would be too confusing, to you know, collapse it into the terminology of sex.

Offen:

Uh-huh.

Moon:

And actually Katherine [McKinna?] just recently in her book she just published, she makes a similar argument. I don't know what the name of the book is but she just-

Offen:

She's got a new one right now-

Moon:

Yeah, and her piece is on the ERA. And why the ERA failed. And then she kind of goes back historically and talks about how the language of the amendment changed. And so the amendment kind of morphed into this other sort of meaning. And I think Kitchel might have been right that it did confuse some people over the whole concept of you know, identity versus equality. And so they had this big discussion about this. And Paulis didn't believe that women would- that it would like mean that people were not different but that it would be a cleaner representation. She was also trying to court Congress to move it forward. And so that was one of the issues that was debated. So it was probably a political maneuver on her part more than it was about the language so much. But, it was interesting how these women had such-you know, different opinions on the meaning of the language and a different understanding of what that meant.

Offen:

Yeah.

Moon:

But, you actually had said that-I had written this down, taking notes on your article. And I wrote it down right after you had gotten the-you mentioned you got the *Betty Crocker Feature Home-Maker of the Year Award* from the Camp Fire Girls, and I thought that was so interesting.

Offen:

No. Not from the Camp Fire Girls, from the State. Home-

Moon:

Oh, okay-

Offen:

It was a Congressional thing.

Moon:

Oh, and then one of the things you had said, you were talking about kind of the whole concept of equality versus difference, and then also equality indifference. And I thought that was a really interesting-

Offen:

Equality indifference was a phrase that came up with my French Fry list in the mid 19th century. And I thought it was just so right-

Moon:

Uh-huh, and did they use that language?

Offen:

Yeah [inaudible 00:30:23] Used exactly that language.

Moon:

Well there is-that's why it's important to-you know outside of the box of America certainly.

Offen:

Yeah. Yeah. It was fun.

Moon:

That's interesting. Yeah, I don't know if people are even talking about equality versus difference in the same way as they did in the 70's.

Offen:

Yeah it sort of gotten pushed back. It's not entirely gone.

Moon:

Yeah. I don't think-it's kind of been watered down a little bit though you know. It seemed like in the 90's we had a lot of interest in-there was a lot kind of a backlash with the [Susanne Felity?] book that came out and kind of an Anti-Reagan sort of position on women. It would be interesting if somebody was to do a retrospective on that kind of, you know, that post-ERA sort of ratification process to that backlash to, you know what we're doing today.

Offen:

Yeah well there's been backlash all the way along. Since [Women's?] Revolution there's been backlash.

Moon:

Hmm, well anyway-

Offen:

I just read an absolutely fascinating article, which is, in the brand new issue of the *Journal of Women's History*. It's on Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte. Have you seen it?

Moon:

Oh! I haven't seen it.

Offen:

Do you get the Journal?

Moon:

We get the Journal at the Library but, I, you know, I peruse it

Offen:

[Inaudible whisper 00:31:52]

Moon:

I know I should.

Offen:

But anyway, this is a woman from New Jersey who in 1802, fell in love with and married the youngest brother of Napoleon Bonaparte, just as he was-before he was Emperor but not too long before. Elizabeth Patterson was the daughter of the [inaudible 00:32:19] Families in Maryland. No, New Jersey? Now I'm confused. I though it was-no it's Baltimore. But any rate, she was also apparently very beautiful and adopted the new French diaphanous fashions of the Empire. And she would wear them in Washington D.C. and other places. It was quite scandalized.

Moon:

(laughs)

Offen:

But she always felt more of a European then she did an American but she normally didn't have too much to do with America. So she would go off and live in Europe and eventually Napoleon forced his brother into a divorce from her so that this younger brother could be married off to the Princess from Westphalia. A real one of Napoleon's other conquered [areas?]. Anyway the whole story of Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte is this article in the *Journal of Women's History*, and once again, it shows the kind of backlash that happened in the English speaking countries, Great Britain and the U.S. against things French in the immediate post-revolution.

Moon:

Yeah, uh-huh.

Offen:

That's a point I've been making in my work for a long time. These tremendous counter-revolutionary movements, which shape the entire character of nations, and its an anti-French one in this case.

Moon:

Uh-huh, isn't that curious?

Offen:

But it was a very important both to the English speaking world and in the German speaking world. Because the French were so far out there, they were so radical, they were doing this, that, and the other thing and people were just throwing up their hands and "Ah!"

Moon:

(laughs)

Offen:

You can see it again a little bit now. There is a very important political woman in France named [Segolene Royal] who is running for president.

Moon:

Uh-huh, right.

Offen:

Nowl, Segolene Royal alliances with the man who is the head of the Socialist Party, but they are not married and have four children together. So she is technically an unwed mother of four. And people here just go, "Huh? These people in France are-"

Moon:

Who cares? Do you think she has a chance?

Offen:

Half the mothers in France these days are not married, although they probably are in steady relationships.

Moon:

No, but do you think she has a chance of getting elected? I would be curious.

Offen:

I don't know. It will be a very interesting to follow.

Moon:

Very interesting to Follow. Now, how many languages do you read and speak?

Offen:

French, obviously, some German. I can get by in Italian and Spanish with a little work. Um, I can decipher a number of other ones. And uh, Dutch for example, Scandinavian languages if I sit and do it long enough.

Moon:

You have a real knack for languages, it sounds like.

Offen:

I can't do Slavic languages

Moon:

Oh, you can't?

Offen:

But um, there are words you can pick out ["jensky"?]

Moon:

Sure, uh-huh, right.

Offen:

But uh, I know enough people where I can get help whenever I need it.

Moon:

That is true.

Offen:

And I usually have a pretty good sense of when I need help, which, is sometimes fairly close to the beginning. [inaudible 00:35:52] there is so much scholarship in English, French, and German even on these other parts of the European world, that you can fish out a lot of things before you have to cry for help.

Moon:

Right, well I-

Offen:

People have been very generous with their help.

Moon:

Yeah, well that's great. Well, I-thank you for so much, for letting me come here and just pick your brain about some of the things you've done, because I-you know, it's really a pleasure to have gotten to meet you and-

Offen:

I think it's just fun to sit down with people and actually have a two hour conversation-

Moon:

Yeah, I mean, you know, you just don't do that all that much. But, I just-there's so much, um you've done so many wonderful things, you know, with your abilities, and I think that's a really important-I think younger scholars really need to be mentored in it. You know, you're a person that has mentored a lot of people, and I think that's a really great-I think that's a great legacy to have left, even though you haven't been in a tenure track position. You know, and there's a lot of tenure track historians out there who aren't very good (laughs)

Offen:

A-, and B- they all want to retire so they could do what I'm doing at [Starbucks?]

Moon:

(laughs) Yeah, so-but I really-I might want to come back and just talk later on-

Offen:

Sure

Moon:

-but I think that, you know, this is a good start.

Offen:

Well, let's have some lunch.

Moon:

Yeah, let's do that-(end of recording 00:37:19)