**DAVID BURNHAM**

**[some of this might be useful for 12JJ’s chapter]** I guess I’ll start with what I think were a little bit of context and what I think were several moments in the overall rubric of what created change. Because I think the education of Mike might be what created change. And a little bit of context. Then I started going to the Children's Museum as a child, and went very frequently. I’d take the trolley to the museum and then walk down the street. And there were clubs and camps in those days as there were for many years and in some ways still are. And so I was a member of lots of those clubs and camps. So the Children's Museum was very much a part of my childhood experience. And so was the Museum of Science, but I was much more interested in the Children's Museum. And I think, although I didn’t know it, I think if you think about what became under you my commission of Children's Museum, what became of living, what was the reason the Natural History Museum split into two groups was that the overall purpose of the Children's Museum was to educate, and the purpose of the Science Museum was to awe, and A-W-E. And I think I was never as interested in going to the Science Museum because I learned so much more at the Children's Museum because it was participatory. The clubs were. Not the museum, because the museum was a looking‑at place, and I had no memory as a child of the Children's Museum whatsoever because I wasn’t interested in looking at things. What I remember are the clubs and the participatory things. And so when you approached what was then the Behavioral Science Center of Sterling Institute in late 1969, about helping you and the staff look at the where the Children's Museum was going, I was a new consultant at the Behavioral Science Center. And almost immediately became, in addition to being consultant, the Chief Financial Officer. And it wasn’t called McBer then. And so the President of the Behavioral Science Center, Dave Berlew and a colleague of mine, Steve Rhinesmith, were the people that then chose to work with you. But behind the scenes I was very involved because they had never been to the Children's Museum and I had a lot of opinions – right or wrong, I had strong opinions and a strong loyalty to the whole concept of the museum. And I think my daughter was then, Muffin was then three, and I had already begun to bring her to the museum just as I’d gone from the time I was a little kid. And the Visitor’s Center had begun and Jeri Robinson had *just* begun – *just* – and I had met her and it was just so exciting to bring my little daughter and to meet Jeri Robinson and sort of, it was like connecting my history with my family’s history and –

Q: [inaudible] grew up at the Children's Museum?

She did. She really grew up at the Children's Museum after that, just as I did. So it was a very strong bond. **[getting involved with MS at McBer, but Elaine and Jim came later]** And I think it was very clear at the staff seminar that Dave Berlew and Steve ran for you and the staff was a seminal experience. It was very clear. And they met with you, as you said, every six weeks. And what became clear was that in order to try and implement some of the changes that you all were interested in, you couldn’t just announce that you were going to devolve responsibility to people because the accounting system didn’t allow you to do that in any way, shape nor form. It was an aggregate of numbers. And Gus Sewell was the Treasurer, Phyl was the Chief Financial Officer even though it wasn’t the term you used. And so it was very hard to hold people responsible when they didn’t know what they were responsible for. Hard for you and hard for them. So it was an abstract concept that in a sense I could hear was becoming con­tentious. Because how could you hold people responsible and then they demanded responsibility in effect, and then everybody would say, “For what?” And your frustration was growing, and so was theirs. And Jim Zien, in his nice and relaxed way, was also angry about his – he didn’t know what to do and he felt [conned] and angry and yet he had, other than in a take it or leave it, he just had no solutions. And I could hear the frustration that Dave and Steve were having in trying to advise you all. And Phyl was equally frustrated because in her wonderful, open way, she also was the paradox where she’s very black and white. And so while she saw the entire concept, then she thought, “You know, what’s all this fuss about? We just do it somehow.” And Elaine, who’d recently moved into – how old was the Visitor Center then? A year and half maybe? About. Yeah, maybe it was 18 months. Something like that. Because I had actually gone to the opening party that Barbara Cleary chaired, that the associates did, with all the oysters, that fabulous party. And I think that was probably 18 months before. And I’d managed at age 28 to give $100, I got invited. That was a lot of money, $100. With one young baby and another on the way. And of course the whole Japanese exhibit was happening and the possibility of greater ties with Kyoto. So much was exciting and so much was problematic. **[0:45 min]** INTERRUPT THE NARATIVE AND INSERT COPY FROM P 5

**[working on new accounting system with Phyl and Tom]** And so I began to work with you and Phyl. And particularly with Phyl. And but also with you, around looking at what could we do to support the desire to create a greater collaborative, shared responsibility, first amongst the senior staff and then downwards. And if you couldn’t do it with the senior staff, how could you possibly do it anywhere else was, I think, where everybody was. And so Phyl and I first worked together to try and sketch how it might work. And we spent days sitting in that wonderful, sort of decaying sun room that Phyl had as an office, writing things on flip charts and trying to make a sketch. And once we’d gotten pretty much exactly what felt as though it would work, we then together – and I know you approved this – hired Tom Goldsmith who’d been a classmate of mine and who was pretty good at IT and pretty good in finance. And he took the sketch and made it operable on the DEC system. And because while we hadn’t had the DEC gift yet, but we had the DEC system that was already in place. And so he understood that platform, and that’s why we used the system. And I think that was seminal. Absolutely seminal. Because that meant that you could break expenses into tiny little pieces. You could say the equivalent of 1/8th of a job or 1/2 a job or 1/4 a job, and you could track it against the specific grant and against the specific piece of income. And so it meant that people could look exactly at what they were responsible for. And it meant that instead of speaking hypothetically, or “this is more important than this”, you could actually look at “what would be the impact if we did this instead of this?” And so that meant a real dialogue around priorities was possible. And once that happened, then we had the retreat at Elaine’s cottage. You, Elaine, myself, Jim Zien, and Pat Steuert. And Phyl. I remember I baked my one and only pie ever. I made a blueberry pie. But what the retreats really enabled, in my perception, from a senior staff point of view, is you didn’t have to either play devil’s advocate or roll over and play dead. That my role was mainly to facilitate, as I saw it, and you could all have a conversation that was based upon real numbers and real information, but dealing with what was the higher purpose, and what did you really want to accomplish together, and how were you going to do it, and how were you going to make it work for yourselves, and then how would it work for everybody else. And it was both a very, very tough meeting, and such an exciting meeting. It was tough because people had to abandon all the old stuff that they’d been, the old arguments of values and control, because they could be tested. And so everybody moved into what I perceived as a collaborative partnership. And I thought it was the most seminal event ever in changing the way the museum was to what it became. And I don’t remember if that was before or after I came on the board. It doesn’t really make any difference. Because I spent hours beforehand with Elaine, with Jim, with you, with Phyl, so that I could be facilitative and understand the issues. And so I had a very clear picture where everybody was coming from, what in their mind they were representing, and what they hoped to happen. And what I know happened was, at the end, instead of people having individual goals, they had common goals. That the individual goals had moved into common goals, and it was really a team. And it felt like a team, it looked like a team, and it behaved like a team.

**[2:30 min] [0:45+1:50+2:30=5:05 min]**

And for me as a young consultant, was working with an institution that I’d spent virtually all my life with, it was a seminal event for me as well, because it provided a pattern for me going forward for every client, and just as I think it was for all of you. And I became a partner with you all as well. And there was no question in my mind about that, that it was the education of us all together. So I think that’s sort of [my] description.

Q: ...but it seemed to me it was not only that the analysis of what was needed worked so well, but that the –

The format, the presentation.

Q: it was a tool, a incredibly powerful tool.

**[Using the system with other organizations could be useful in 09DMPS chapter]** We did invent it as a tool, for sure. And the evidence for that is, as you know, is that we then sold it to the cultural institutions all over Boston through the Mass Cultural Alliance and they used the tool for their own management purposes because there was no competition. And had we had a nationwide sales force, I think we could have sold it nationwide. And it wasn’t that we.... Spread­sheets, of course, had existed since the 15th, 16th century or earlier, you know, with accountants using ledgers. What we did was –

Q: It was the matrix formula. [inaudible]

INTERRUPT NARATIVE AND INSERT AT TOP OF PAGE 3Exactly. We made the matrix. I don’t think there was anything available, either on hand account­ing system, or certainly not computer accounting systems. And Tom made that happen. But Phyl and I did that, literally, sitting in her office. And we spent days just fooling with ideas. And of course one of the wonderful things about Phyllis O’Connell was her absolute joy, childlike, wonderful joy in experimenting with a new idea. So if you got here, then maybe we can go further. And it was just fun for her. And it was fun to do it together. And I don’t know if you remember, but you’d come into her office, and we’d tell you what we were doing, and bounce if off you, and you would make a pithy comment, almost immediately. I mean, you’d just zero in on what the output would be, and you’d ask a question like, “Well, how would that work if we wanted to do this?” Or, “What if we wanted to know that?” And we’d say, “We don’t know. Probably it wouldn’t.” And you’d say, “Well, it would be good if it would.” And you’d leave, and Phyl and I would have another few hours. And so over the period, I don’t know, it wasn’t very long, it wasn’t more than, I don’t know, 8 or 10 hours a week for about 6 or 8 weeks, and we just kept at it . Before we hired Tom. In fact, I just talked to Tom about this in preparation. And he said he really added nothing to the sketch we gave me. That we had done it all before he hired him to make it happen. But at that point we hadn’t involved anybody else. Just you, Phyl and me. ~~Not Elaine, not....~~ The first test was that retreat, when we used it for the retreat as the way to arrive at – and the overall objective was for the team to come out with a common shared plan going forward that everyone agreed with. That was the overall objective. And the tool was the way to make that happen. **[1:50 min]** RETURN TO PAGE 3 NARATIVE

Q: ...one of the things that was also brilliant about it was the package as it came out, [inaudible] simultaneous, was the backup sheets where you could find out the problems.

That was simultaneous. It had to be. Because you couldn’t do the.... When you looked, at for example, the Resource Center, here was the income, and in order to achieve the income with the following sources of income this is what the expenses would be. And if you did this, then what would the effect be on the income. Then you could print a report that said what was the detail that was behind that. Did you have Sing Hansen for 8 hours a day for 46 weeks? And did you have somebody for 16 hours a day for 21 weeks? And somebody else full time? And what were you going to spend on books? And what were you going to spend on...? And so every detail was immediately available. So if somebody said, “Well, that doesn’t work”, you could literally look at the detail and say, “So if we take this out,” and you could track it against the grant, for example, or against the other source of income and say, “If we take this out, what will be the effect on the income?” and not just eliminate the expense without some guesstimate. Everything was tied together. Which also meant you could question the assumptions. Why do you assume that that will be an effect upon income? Or why do you assume it won’t be? What about this? Which also meant that when the Board had overall questions, you could literally present to the Board, “Well, the reason we’re doing this is....” And if people had questions, you could answer those questions with specifics so that people could make policy as opposed to not know the effect of policy, it was perfectly possible to answer. And which is why it was such a useful tool at every level. And it also meant that you could explain to people even at the lowest level. “The reason you’re on these five projects is that we can’t support you with just this project. Even though you might like to be on it, there just aren’t the funds.” And so you could say, as we learned, you could say to a project team where people were dissatisfied with the dispersal of their time, “Well, here’s the way we’ve planned it. Here’s the funds that are coming in. Now, if you don’t like this, you guys can plan it. You know what’s coming in. You know what the expenses are. You can figure out what to do. We don’t have to do that for you anymore.” And so it enabled this wonderful change of people being responsible for results and knowing what the input was, at every level. So that’s why I think it was so seminal. And that test, we were there for four days, were we, Mike? Or was it three? I think it was four. It was a long time. We had a lot of fun, but we worked hard. And I think that test convinced all of us that that was possible. That we weren’t there and making it work but we could see that it would work, all of us.

Of course, it enabled us to skate the edge, because we could constantly adjust. That is, the figures, because the tool enabled us to track every detail, if Visitor Center income was not what was budgeted because state funding was cut or there were lots of snowstorms or whatever, or a recession, or a Resource Center grant got cancelled, or if Recycle didn’t sell as much as it’s supposed or the margins in the shop went down, we could a) find out what was going wrong and where, and we would know that immediately. It wasn’t two months or three months later. We would know it instantly, what was going wrong. And because we’d know what was going wrong, we could both figure out whether we could take action against the top line, either there or some­where else, or whether we needed to take action against the bottom line. And because we knew it so quickly, we were able to act much faster than three to six months after the fact when drastic action would be required in order to change anything, and even then it would probably be too late. So we were able to be at the edge because the information allowed us to be at the edge without the same penalty of not knowing until it was way down the line, which is why it usually came out close. Unless sometimes we knew it and didn’t act. And with magical thinking. And each time we had magical thinking we regretted that at leisure, because then we had to act more strongly. And I knew there was at least two years when we ignored what was going on and that was when we had the acrimonious arguments about the use of volunteers. You don’t remember that, oh. Well, this is before the demise of the associates. And there were a couple of years where it was clear that we weren’t going to make our figures. But through a series of assertions and inertia we didn’t take action. So then the Board and senior staff were presented, by Phyl, with ever increasing losses, and it was very clear that we had to take action. And was it the ’74 recession? I think so. ’74 or ’75 recession where we kept hoping things would change. And so I think it might have been Sue and, I think it was Sue’s strong suggestion that we replace staff with volunteers. And I think Sue had just become President. And I know you’ll remember this. That Elaine was determined that that wasn’t going to happen. And Sue was equally determined that it was. And I think that’s when we had that, I can’t remember, there was a movie fundraiser that Phyl ran. And you remember, that was not greeted with a lot of support by staff. And that was part of trying to get rid of the deficit. And we actually used the tool to deal with that in the end. Because we modeled, forgetting Sue’s determination or Elaine’s objections. And I know you tried to be facilitative. We modeled what the various assumptions were. Elaine’s assumptions were that a lot of staff would quit and people would wholesale stuff going to the Visitor’s Center because of the poor quality of the volunteer staff. And I think she estimated a 50% drop in attendance almost immediately, particularly if Sue was one of the staff. And when we modeled that, there was lots of giggling around the table. I think you were probably there. There were a lot of staff there at the assumptions. And I think the whole thing sort of evaporated and the tool just highlighted it as all these assumptions around values as opposed to what the real effect would be and Sue giggled and everybody giggled. And amongst facts, assumptions were tested, found wanting, and it just, the whole thing just evaporated. I think the issue never rose again. And we moved forward, as I remember, with a very collaborative plan that was made between senior staff and the Board – the Executive Committee I think at that point – that resolved the issues and we even ended up with a very tiny, I think it was $500, some tiny surplus for the year to everyone’s amazement, and without very significant cuts. I mean, everything sort of worked. And I think from then on we paid lots of attention to the numbers. We stopped having magical thinking. And I think that was another seminal change.

[long question]

It was a refinement that didn’t actually happen until we bought the wharf building. I’m absolutely sure about that, Mike, and I’m tell you why I’m sure. In the beginning as we used the tool, we would take the overall expected grand income that people would predict and I think starting with, of course, Carolyn Harrigan and then later with Ann Butterfield, and **[estimating the impact of unrestricted grant income on the operating budget]** the senior managers as well as the level below that, Joan Lester, etc., etc., all of whom were involved in one way or another in the income generation or grant process, and then they would make a guesstimate as to the probability of getting a grant. And it was not the kind of process that you’re describing here. It was a very rough guesstimate. And so in the first year, anything that was less than 50% we didn’t include at all. Anything above 50% we included as though it were 100%. And so it made it very iffy and difficult because if we then didn’t get a grant, we’d already included it as 100% and then we had to scramble. Now, we were much more conservative in the first two or three years about surplus, so we almost never came out with our projected surplus because we were very conservative in saying it was going to be a larger surplus than occurred. When we didn’t get that stuff it just ate up the surplus we projected, but we didn’t go into deficit because it would happen soon enough we could do something, even if it was six or eight months into the year. But on the other hand, we earmarked what we were going to do with those surpluses and they didn’t appear so we couldn’t do anything with them. And so lots of the future-oriented plans that were partially dependent upon those surpluses, such as giving people raises, you know, which was a good thing to do, often didn’t occur, or occurred at a cost. And so when we bought the wharf building in ’75 I think, in February? Well, it was snowing when I went there. It was right after there – and you did this, you alone, you did it by yourself and brought it to Phyl and to me, because I remem­ber vividly saying, “We’ve got to stop this”. And I was, by that time we’d already constituted the committee, that wonderful committee that John Bok headed to plan the move, and John and I had just come back from a meeting and we were reviewing in advance of a Board meeting because it was time for budget. And you came in and said, **“I’ve been thinking about how we can avoid this problem,” and you had that whole thing done. And it was all done, it required nothing. It was just, I remember looking at it and thinking, “This is just done. There’s nothing to do except automate it.”** And Phyl and I already knew how to automate that stuff because Tom Goldsmith had taught us in the process of doing it. So I think we actually got it done that afternoon, just precisely as you gave it to us. And it worked, and we used it that year for the budgeting cycle. And I’m sure, because I remember coming back from that John Bok meeting – which you hadn’t gone to for some reason, I don’t think you went all the time, maybe you did, well, but you weren’t there – and you walking into Phyl’s office with this done. And so I can almost see the page that you had it on. Almost I can practically retrieve it.

It solved lots of problems. It was very powerful. And I know it was literally that day it got incorporated into the system. Which was another wonderful thing about the system. It was so flexible that when we saw something new, we could simply add it. And that’s why we could sell it so easily to the other institutions, because we could adapt it for them at almost no cost. We ran all their printouts, we provided them the information, and we made money on it. In some years we made almost as much as the shop providing that service at virtually no cost because DEC had provided the computer, they sent the entered data, and we just ran it and gave them the printouts. It was astonishing, really.

Q: [Asks about being a case study for Harvard Business School students].

**[look up the reference:]** It really described exactly what I just reported. And it was a description of the – you can still buy the case study I’m pretty sure from the *Case Clearinghouse at Harvard Business School*. And it’s simply describing what I just described. And it’s two parts. The first part is the development of the tool and then the second part is how it was used. And so the first part, to use it in class, you stop and say, “So if you’re running this institution, would this work and what would it accomplish, what would be the problems?” And years ago I’ve taught it two or three times. And what a lot of students say when you teach it is the problem is that if you’re an autocratic manager, it means that all information is available to everyone and it’s much more difficult to be a dictator or to be autocratic when everyone knows and everyone can figure everything out, so a lot of people won’t like that, is what a lot of students say. And they say the good part is that it really commits people because if you use it right, then everybody can be jointly responsible. And so people get the message very well. And so when they get the second case study that tells about what happened, the Part B, it validates it very clearly, because it shows how the Children's Museum, the budgeting process, the Board, staff process, how collaborative everything became. And then I think it was a natural extension for us to commit ourselves to the values of diversity. Because if we could be truly collaborative as an institution, then we could commit ourselves to being collaborative in the wider world and making it real. And so I think it all fit.

Q: [question about how the follow-up team slammed how it worked].

Well, I don’t think so. I taught it, I’m sure they didn’t. I don’t know who said that.

Well, Case A ends just after the presentation of the tool to the Board and to staff. And so it has a lot of quotes from people that says, “Oh, this is like closing the barns doors after the horses escaped”, and so people are always worried about change. And so what it does it present accurately people’s concerns about something that was indeed quite radical. And so any group of students, some of them are going to say, well, so many people have said about this.... But I don’t know if you remember the climate survey, Mike? So you remember when we took the climate survey in 1970, you know, the very first one. Do you remember what the categories were? Conformity, which was is defined as the extent to which you have to adhere to rules and regulations; responsibility, the extent to which you feel you are responsible for results; rewards, that’s not money, the extent to which you’re recognized for your contribution; clarity, the extent to which you know where you’re going; and team spirit. And I don’t know if you remember what the lowest of those categories was in 1970? Clarity. People did not know what was expected. It was just very unclear. And of course it was, because you had this budget that was removed from reality. It really didn’t have – the detail that went into it you couldn’t keep track of until months later. People weren’t allocated. And next was responsibility. Below senior staff, responsibility was very low, because all decisions were being made really by – and they had to be, there was no information. So people didn’t, they felt responsible for their own little thing, but beyond that. And then I don’t know if you remember when the, you know, when we did that a year later. And all of those things had gone way up. And then when we did it again in 19 – I can’t remember.

[END OF TAPE 1, SIDE A]

**[diagnosing Mike’s problems with McBer]** So when my colleagues Dave Berlew and Steve Rheinsmith did the interviews prior to the retreat and collected the climate data and then met with Mike who was the primary client afterwards, the feedback that they gave Mike was that many of his staff, since everyone reported to him, perceived that he was the nexus of, and one of the primary problems. I didn’t think that was true. I had a very different take on it. What I saw was that their actual dissatisfaction was if it had been resolved the way they advocated it would have created even more dissatisfaction. What they were actually advocating for was for Mike to make decisive decisions to resolve conflicts. “We will do this and not this.” “We will spend this and not this.” And that Mike was not only reluctant to do that, but often refused. He said, “I don’t know how to make that decision because we don’t have enough information.” And it was very clear in the interviews, and they reported that verbatim. So what I argued was with that was that, in fact, Mike was being mature. That what we was saying was “We need to make these decisions together”. And the group itself was being immature. That they wanted him to make decisions that they then would not have accepted and would have complained about. And of course the net result was that no one was making a lot of critical decisions and some of them ended up with the Board making them completely inappro­priately, and when they made the wrong ones, Mike would threaten to quit or leave or whatever, and behave as immaturely as his staff did. But I thought that was simply a symptom, not a problem. And so it seemed to me that the real problem was that no one could make decisions because there wasn’t enough information to make the right ones, and that what Mike was really saying was “We have to figure this out together.” And because people were trying to argue from a values perspective, it was very hard to figure it out, and that the conflict was unproductive. It was not around the real issues, because the real issues couldn’t be confronted because the information wasn't present, is what it seemed to me. That was my diagnosis. It differed from my colleagues, which is why I started the conversation by telling you we argued a lot. In the begin­ning they were doing the work but I was arguing a different perspective. And partially that’s what drove the tool. If the tool could provide the data for people to make decisions collabora­tively, I thought that would fit your, what I perceived, more mature style of management, and more mature concern with influence, and enable your staff to come up to it, as opposed to you to move down to where they were. That was my perspective. And with the exception of Phyl, because while on the one hand Phyl was perfectly willing to make autocratic decisions, she also truly saw the value of collaboration as long as it didn’t take too long. And so she not only endorsed, she supported the idea of data underlying. And when Phyl when get upset is when the data got clear, everybody knew what the choices were, and then they did decide. Then she’d get impatient. But as long as it was important to find out where we were and what the impact was, she would be forever patient. And once it was on the table, then know we all know, we all agree, then this is the data, let’s decide. Whereas Elaine would often be disconcerted by the data, because especially if it didn’t support her point of view, she’d wish it wasn’t there. But she was also honest and rational, so that once it was on the table, she would say, “Well, okay.” So she tried to haggle off the table a little bit, but more or less she would accept it. And Pat would always accept the data. She might not like it, but she would accept it. So it was always easy to deal with Pat from that point of view. **[how the system fitted Mike’s leadership instincts]** Which is why, of course, I think you used that tool so well. Because it fit your own mode of influence which I think is, I call it “[indirected] power”. And I think indirected power is being very mutual and empathic with people, which you always have done. And so you could see where other people were coming from and what they felt. But at the same time, you were always work-focused, looking at what results do we want to accomplish, what’s going to make us proud, how do we plan to get there? And you could see paradox, you weren’t black and white. You could see that two things could co-exist at the same time so that we could have the Kids at Risk program and that it would contribute a lot to the values of the museum and to our own certainty of who we were in the world, and that it was also potentially very risky and expensive. And so you could see paradox and hold them and figure out how to deal with it. And so you’d bring the whole staff up to seeing things as paradoxes instead of black and white, you know, either/or. And I also think that you could return authority to people. And by that I mean that you gave people true – not responsibility, which is delegate – you made them accountable. So “You’ve committed to this, now you’re accountable for it.” And that you could hold a team accountable, and did. That you held teams accountable for results. And that’s really the mature manager. And it’s not the institutional manager of, you know, “I will decide and announce”, which is what a team that doesn’t know where they’re going frequently says they want. But if they get it, then they’re upset that they have it. So I thought that’s what they said they wanted, and they wouldn’t have wanted it. They were far too committed to the outcomes of the institution and to their jobs to see that kind of authority to a leader. They wanted to be leaders themselves. And that was the genius. The genius was that everyone became a leader. And I think that’s why the Children's Museum worked under your inspired leadership. And why it became a model of leadership, I think, for everybody. And, you know, I was so grateful that my children could work there and see that, be part of that model, you know, a seminal experience in my own life. Wonderful.

Q: [long paragraph. Ends with: If you want to understand science in the modern world, you have to think creatively about why things were the way they were, and then you have the [inaudible] ideas by doing things which you had to do with your hands. And so everybody had to be both a worker and an intellectual at the same time.]

It was brilliant. The mind/body connection, really. The representation of the mind/body connection.

And of course that, then, manifested itself in the design of the museum, the mind/body connec­tion, the hands-on experiential learning. But see it’s why it resonated with me, because as a child I learned the most from participating the clubs and the camps and all the hands-on stuff that frequently were facilitated by volunteers at the museum and not by staff, because the staff was committed to the didactic looking at teaching method. And so when you moved to make it happen at the museum what I had experienced there as a child it was so exciting, because that’s exactly where I had learned the most. Precisely.

Q: [They’re here already ... in the exhibit]

Exactly. The clubs are already there. Yes. The clubs are already there. And by that time, you know, a lot of the staff were people who’d grown up in the clubs. So they had naturally moved into the experiential, because that’s what they’d experienced. Whereas the staff was when I was going there, they’d established the clubs and staffed them with volunteers and not done it themselves. They did curriculum for them. But they didn’t do the day-to-day. They’d open and close stuff, but, you know, it was so many of the kids that I went to those clubs with clubs with became staff members, you know, like Dottie. And I knew so many staff members from the clubs that it was astonishing. Like, wow! You know? So it was like home. Dottie Merrill, I meant. And you brought that to, clearly. So it just picked up on what was already present.

The matchboxes, the kits, exactly. **[how Phyl insinuated herself into a job at the Museum could be used either at 01MS or 12JJ chapters]** And I suppose you know Sue and Dorothy’s story of how Phyl was hired. You know that story. No? Well, Phyl and Dorothy were very active in the associates. And you remember this story? D.A. Wilson. And both of them. And the associates were very involved in, they would provide staff for the clubs, they would do fundraising events. And they were also active in organizing the collections, and helping to preserve them and so forth. And so I can’t remember what they were doing, whether it was.... A bazaar. And they made things for the bazaar. And they actually hired Phyl. She was getting her Master’s degree in history, as a paid person for a few hours a week. And I don’t know exactly what it was to do with. She’s told me many times, and so was D.A. So I’m sure D.A. could tell you the details. Sue doesn’t seem to remember it as vividly as D.A. But D.A.’s story and Phyl’s were identical. And Miss – we paid her forever, the pension, the director before you, Miss, not Miss Dickey, before Ruth Dickey. What’s her name? The person who hired Phyl, what was her name? She lived forever in New Hampshire? I know, because I used to [inaudible], we were paying this enormous pension. We’d do the budget every year. I’d look at the budget and say “Oh, my god, she’s still alive.” And Phyllis would say, “She’s very strong”. Anyway. And so D.A. and Sue, actually, got Phyl involved that way. And then when Phyl got her Master’s degree in history, then the question was what was Phyl going to do? Since she’d never done anything except go to school and have a nice time. And this was the only job she’d ever had, this little part-time job for the – I think they were called The Ladies’ Aid, weren’t they? For the Aid. And so Miss Whoever-she-was who had worked with her, I guess, over the bazaar or the Aid’s volunteer work in helping to put the collections together which is where Phyl’s interest in collection actually began, then offered Phyl a part-time job. And Phyl said just as she retired by never coming to the museum again, Phyl said she never actually accepted the job. She just started coming. At first she came a couple of days a week and eventually she came five days a week. Isn’t this a typical Phyllis O’Connell story? She just worked herself into the job without ever addressing it, just as she worked herself out of the job without ever addressing it. And D.A. stopped at the point where Phyl started one or two days a week. And then Phyl filled in the rest of the story for me. I said, “How did you go from one or two days a week to being the Acting Director of the Children's Museum?” She said, “Well,” she said, “there was just a lot of do, so I just ended up coming in a little more often.” And I said, “Did anyone ever hire you, Phyl?” She said, “Not really.” And I knew, knowing Phyl, that it had to be true, that no one ever spoke to her, it just happened. And I don’t know when she took over the financial responsibility. But her initial responsibility was collections. And no one ever quite offered that to her, either. I think she said she was just hired to help. And undefined. And she said, “The first thing I helped with was collections,” which is why she knew them so well. And somewhere in the museum, and you’ve probably seen it, is the handwritten list in Phyl’s hand­writing where she copied all of the lists of everything that was in the collections and it’s what she did for the Aid before she was hired. And it’s in the museum because it was at her house, and when Mary and I cleaned her house we gave it [inaudible]. And there it was, pages of it.

Well, I think Phyl was always open to change. You know? I think she was, I always felt that it was so silly of Phyl to spend all this time lying about her age, because she was the youngest person on the staff. If there was something new to be done, Phyl was on the vanguard of “Let’s try it”. And it was always so exciting to work with Phyl because she was always so open to new ideas, always so open to experimentation. And her positive expectations of others were so great. She believed the best. No one was ever guilty unless they were really proven guilty. She always had an open mind and she always believed that people could and would change. And she supported people all the time in [inaudible]. And even when she would get angry or upset or feel that things were wrong, she would be able to get herself into a place to open her mind to listen as to why things were wrong, and what can we do about it. And I think she always felt in true partnership with you, and she personally loved you, but she respected and admired you. And she felt that you and she together were in a partnership, and she never, ever, in all the years I knew you, ever undermined you in the slightest way. And even when she disagreed with you, she would honestly tell you that, and then if a decision was made she disagreed with, she would support it 100%. 100%. That was [over]. Once a decision was made, there was no reason to revisit it. And it was such a joy to work with Phyl. She’s such an admirable, wonderful human being in every way. I miss her terribly. I loved her. Now I’m going to cry. Sorry. And I truly loved her. And she main­tained loyalty. And I looked at all the years that Mary had left and she maintained such a close friendship with [Laura] with Mary, and with Agnes who ran the shop, and with Judy, and with Judy’s children, and with Carolyn Harrigan and with Ann, and just, you know, she just truly, truly was such an admirable person.

Q: [...I also think it was the fact that she was, not really a daredevil [inaudible], too...]

Oh, she was. She was. She was so ahead of her time. And when she was dying, she had a lot of diaries in her house. **[let’s see if we can talk to Mary about Phyl’s diaries and her work on the books]** She kept a diary of her life. And I said, “Phyl, do you want to destroy these? Are there things in it that you don’t want read?” “Oh,” she said, “No, I’m fine, David.” I said, “Are you sure? Because,” I said, “Mary’s going to read them, you know, every one. And then she’ll tell everybody.” She said, “I know, David.” And so anyway, Mary of course read them all, so did I, and so did Ann. And they were, you know, Phyl seldom talked intimately, and as you know, Mike, it was such a rare occasion. She just didn’t talk about her feelings, and other people’s, even though she was so respectful of other people’s feelings, so was so careful never to do that, it was a standard she had, clearly. But reading her diaries, she talked about her feelings and her perception of others’ feelings, and not in the early years but in the later years, of course, I was so there that I knew about a lot of that. And they so, whenever she talked about mine, she so accurately had diagnosed it. And so her awareness was clearly very high. But the other thing was her delight and joy in trying new things. And her worry about it, which is why she was – she wasn’t a daredevil in that she didn’t see risk, she did. But the joy was in trying. And she wasn’t a daredevil because it was moderate risk, not high risk. And her diaries were just like her, you know? They were, except that they added all the feelings. And she experienced all events in such wonderful ways. It was just amazing. I loved reading them. **[let’s see of we can get them and excerpt them]** I donated them to NEHGS, the New England Historic & Genealogical Society. I donated all of her family papers, her birth certificates and marriage certificates and death certificates and wills and everything. And they haven’t been, they’re 15 years behind in cataloguing all the manuscripts and everything, but eventually they’ll get them.

***She didn’t talk about events at the museum so much***. She talked about her feelings more. I don’t think – you’d have to know so much. And the sweep of things wasn’t what she was recording, and the impact and the effect. I know you’d be interested, Mike, and I could probably get some­body to find them, although they’re not catalogued yet, and it was two or three years ago. It was pretty interesting to read. But a lot of it, of course, is about Dana and the death of her parents and sort of feelings [rather than fill]. She does tell the aide story. And she talks about being paid by the aide and she was 41 years old and it was the first time she’d ever in her life earned anything. And how her father said to her, “I don’t know if this is a good idea, Phyllis. I’ve always provided for you, there’s no need for you to have paid employment.” And how she thought she’d better not tell him about it anymore. And when she was 42 she wanted to give up smoking, and her father, who sold tobacco, said to her, “How can you betray my business?” You know, we weren’t societally condemning smokers then.

**[Museum regulars: some of this might be useful for 12JJ or 07?BZ chapters]** As you remember, I spend lots of time at the museum with my kids. And probably every week. So I think I felt intimately involved with the museum as a constant user. And Fran and I seldom had a week that we weren’t there, some portion of that week. And you know, there are regulars, right? People who are regulars. And so we were part of the regulars. And I think the only other regular was Sue Jackson, on the Board. And I don’t think there were any Board members who were regulars other than Fran and myself and Sue Jackson. And later on there were, because later on as more women in the aides became Board members, and many of those had been regulars. But in through most of the ‘70s that wasn’t true. And it was the ‘80s before that really happened, the early ‘80s. And so I always had a very personal experience. And I had a personal relationship with Jeri, and so did Fran, because my kids were there all the time. And you didn’t bring your kids without being part of it. Because you didn’t drop them there. And of course in the early years there was only a little bit of staff, so Jeri was with the kids all the time. So I felt like I was part of it. And then Bernie [Sobrowski] was so often in the Visitor’s Center, seeing how things worked and how kids were experiencing this. He was always tinkering with making things better. So I felt as though I had a personal relationship with Bernie because he’d ask people he didn’t know, but he’d ask people he knew. And he’d ask the kids. And so my kids felt like they were consultants. Dad was a consultant, I’d say, “Well, you kids are consultants, too.” And we got loads of stuff at Recycle because Fran had a playgroup and we both had volunteered to teach in schools and stuff. So we’d buy lots of stuff at Recycle. And so I felt like I had a personal rela­tionship with Recycle. And of course I had a very deep personal relationship with Elaine, and not just Phyl and the financial stuff. And I used the Resource Center. I took books out of the library. I read books from the library all the time. So I felt like I knew how the museum worked for the visitor because I was a visitor and how it worked for the kids. And it was just second nature to talk to the other kids that were playing with my kids, so I sort of felt like I – not quite as though I worked there, but close. And it felt the same way, it felt between Board and senior staff, you know, it was just fine, it was easy. I went and I behaved like a real person and everybody else did, too. But I didn’t feel like a visitor. I felt like I was part of the museum. And both my kids, as you know, as soon as they could work, the only place they wanted to work was the Children's Museum, and I think Muffin worked there four years, or five, a very long time, and Hoop three or four years. And it was seminal for both of them just the same way it was for me. And now when­ever we have little kids in town or people visiting us, I take them to the museum and I always feel, I mean, everything’s changed and nothing has changed. It’s different it’s the same. And I never feel like a stranger. I mean, I can look at a new exhibit and I can think about, I can think back 30 or 40 years and literally think about its roots. When did we first talk about this? When was this idea first [mooted]? And it might be fancier now. The Teachers’ Center is just a fancier version of stuff we were doing 40 years ago. There’s a little more of it, it’s a little better elaborated, it’s better funded. But we were talking about this, literally 40 years ago, exactly, this isn’t new. And I look at the kids’ stage and I remember all the stuff we were doing and this isn’t new. You know? It looks better, it’s better elaborated, and maybe even it’s a little too formal, I don’t know. When I’m there it doesn’t feel that way, but I’m not there as much as I used to to. It feels different but the same. It still feels involving, hands-on, easy.

Q: [Talk about Jeri]

Well, it wasn’t a deep or close relationship like it was with Phyl or Elaine or so many others. It was casual, but Jeri’s always been so authentic, welcoming, open, and so when my kids were little and I was going frequently, it was easy to dialogue with Jeri. “We’re here, what’s going on?” And Jeri’s ability to focus, and her memory, “Well, last time you were here you were doing this, and today I think you should do this.” And I was always astonished that she would remember accurately, and she did. Over and over I’d think, “Wow, that was ten days ago. There must have been 100 kids here. How does she remember ?” And she would. And it wasn’t just my kids’ names she remembered. It was kid after kid after kid. And she looked at them straight and they were real people for her, not.... The parents were real people, but so were the kids. And they were separate. They weren’t extensions of the parents. And so I felt she was such an ideal person for the job.

Jeri would make such careful, light touch comments. “She could probably do that herself.” “He seems to be really interested in that.” You know, just light touch observation comments. And I’d like, “Oh, why were you trying to control that?” And, “How come you tried to get him away from that?” And I can’t recall her ever being in my face or friend’s face and saying, “Stop controlling your kid,” or, “don’t get your kid to do what you want, let him do what he wants,” right? But just these little light touch comments that were clearly motivated by accurate observation of your tionship with the child. Again, noncritical, noninterventionist, but just enough that if you failed to get the message you were brain dead. That’s what I felt. And I didn’t have a personal rela­tion­ship with Jeri the way I did with so many other people. But I certainly had a visitor relationship with her.

I thought that it was very different working with Elaine than it was working with you or working with Phyl. Because working with Elaine I always found to be a negotiation as opposed to a collaboration. And both in my role as Treasurer, in my role as President of the Board of Trustees and in my role as Facilitator to the senior staff, all three roles I played, I think. I think I was Vice President a couple of years, too, I can’t remember that. And it was fun to negotiate with Elaine. And she’s a very good negotiator. And she’s authentic, she puts on the table what she wants, she’s not manipulative. And she’s stubborn. And her goal is frequently to win as opposed to achieve agreement, as least as I perceived it. And so I found that I had to spend a lot of time – it never felt intuitive. It always felt as though I had to prepare myself, you know, for the.... And I enjoyed the process but it was very different from the process of working with you or working with Phyl or working with Pat or Jim. And it was more like working with Karen before she left, where Karen would have a very clear goal, a clear objective, and then she’d want to win. And so it was like you’d arrive at a negotiation to get to an agreement as opposed to putting aside, the way everybody else could, their individual concerns to come to a common concern. And I think Elaine would agree with me, I think, because I think we named this together, that it was negotiation not collaboration. And she liked it. She did. And so I was happy to play the game, but I wasn’t as comfortable with the game. And I felt we often came out at the right place, but it was a much more difficult process, even though sometimes it was more fun. And I think only with Phyl would Elaine put aside those concerns, because I think that she couldn’t get Phyl on a feeling level, and yet she knew that she’d hurt her. And when she knew that, she would put those concerns aside. Because Elaine’s empathy is so high. And I think she, even though she ended up feeling Phyl betrayed her as she feels I did, I think she loved Phyl and so she put that aside. And sometimes she would do that with you. But you would just move in. Unconsciously you would move into negotiation with Elaine. It was very evident in a meeting. You’d be reaching common agreements with people, and if it got in the way of an objective Elaine had, you would just unconsciously move in the negotiation and you’d say things like the negotiation statements, “Well, Elaine, what is it that you’d be willing to settle for?”, which is a negotiation statement as opposed to the usual state­ment you’d make, which is “What do we all want?” And so I think you did that without even knowing you did it.

[END OF TAPE 1, SIDE B]

It’s my perception. On the other hand, I think if you looked at the [climate data] in the Exhibit Center, when we collected that the third and the fourth time it was really good. So Elaine was doing a great job of managing people, a terrific job. She represented people’s interests. She was very aware of what people wanted and needed. And I think she always held in her mind’s eye the child and the child’s experience, and that she was guided very much by that, in my opinion. And I could feel it. And you could almost see it dancing in front of her. And you could see that when she was on the floor and she was watching kids indirect, you could just see the true joy that she was taking in seeing that happen, and she loved it. It was wonderful to see that. Wonderful. That’s what I think.

**[working with the board]** Well, it felt to me, Mike, as though you made it work. That, like Phyl, you have such a positive belief in people. And certainly in your tenure there, there were a lot of very different characters. There were President of the Board of Trustees with different objectives and different back­grounds. And I think each time your very positive belief and – [requests recorder turned off for a minute to say something he doesn’t want on tape].

I think your positive appreciation for each person in the role as President of the Board of Trustees enabled them, enabled me certainly, and in my observation every one of us, to collaborate so effectively with you and to do the best job we could possibly do. And I think you enabled that to happen. Just your positive belief, the empathy that you had, and your open mind, and your ability to be authentic, and in such a nice way to suggest options. So occasionally you got exasperated. There was one famous meeting, I can’t remember where, you were enormously exasperated and said, “If you all do this I’m quitting”. I can’t remember what it was. It didn’t matter. But on the other hand, you did the same thing for me several times.

We were in New York, we were staying in your mother’s apartment. I forget why we were in New York, fundraising or something. And your mum was away. And I was exasperated over, I think I made Sue [inaudible] Chairman of the Nominating Committee or something. And it was her first year to do that and she was truly outrageous. And I think I had some adolescent solution. You pointed out it was very adolescent. In a nice way, a very nice way. There was also something about Edie, you know, when Edie was at her most right wing and she was being great at raising money in the corporate environs but she was advocating these solutions [inaudible] that I wanted to throw her off the Board and you said, “Grow up. No one’s even going to acknowledge these things, let alone act on them, David.” And in the process Edie almost became a liberal. I had dinner with her last year, she was telling me that. Last month. It was so cute.

It seemed to me that – do you remember the program that I ran at McBer around risk taking and building the paper houses, etc., and decision making? And I thought that was a seminal event because it was really at that event that we began to shape the idea not of the separate of powers between Board and staff, but of the joint accountability of the strength and health of the institution. That we all had to look at risk together. That we had to decide what the critical decisions were around risk and around values, and that we had to debate them openly, Board and staff, and that we all needed to be authentic and on the same page. And I think just as that retreat on Cape Cod was a seminal event for the staff, I think that was a seminal event at setting the stage for the Board to become partners with staff as opposed to overseers. In my perception. And I think after that things shifted dramatically and changed. And I think that continued right throughout. I don’t think that ever altered. And I don’t know how it works now because I don’t really go very often and I’m not really involved. But certainly that continued for years. You know, it set a pattern. Is that true now? Do you know what people say? We were involved personally, all of us, as well as professionally. We all saw each other socially. We all knew each other well. Both Board and staff. So I knew about peoples’ lives, they knew about mine. We were all in the same boat. And if you’re all in the same boat, it’s not a professional experience alone, it’s a shared experience and common experience.

**[making the decision to go to Museum Wharf for 11MS chapter]** We had clearly made the decision that we had to leave Jamaica Plain~~, that we couldn’t expand any more~~ there~~, that the Visitor Center income just couldn’t increase much more without [even substantial] investment, we were too far away, too out of the mainstream, too difficult for people in bad weather to get there on public transport with the long walk down [Buoroghs] Street for kids. It’s loads and loads of reasons. The buildings needed such~~ ~~upgrades, etc., etc. But one of the driving forces was~~ we had to grow. We knew if we were going to achieve our mission and if we were going to become stable as an institution, we just had to have more visitor revenue. And so at that point in time we had narrowed down to two possible choices: the castle and the Blackstone Block. Both had very significant liability. ~~The Blackstone Block had this significant liability of expensive parking, and in itself was a very small space. And we would have had to build from scratch, because you couldn’t use the buildings that were there. And the castle had significant liabilities. Also very expensive parking, the space was difficult to work with.~~ There were all kinds of things that were potentially wrong. And we couldn’t agree because we hadn’t found the ideal site. ~~But we were very close. And it was clear you were tired of the debate. And I was very unhappy with both places. I personally was unhappy. And I knew that~~ Stuart Pratt, who happens to be Sue Jackson’s godson, was in the commercial real estate business. And so I called him up and said, “Stuart, there must be more places that we haven’t seen.” And he said, “Well, would you consider South Boston?” And I said, “Absolutely not,” ~~thinking of L Street, at the end, and it would be like Jamaica Plain only maybe worse. And he said, “No, no, not that part of South Boston.” He said, “Just across the Fort Point Channel.” I said, “Well,~~ it’s a wasteland to me.” He said, “Exactly. There’s lots of parking. And it’s just across Congress Street Bridge.” And he said, “Come and see.” ~~And that was at 4:00 in the afternoon in December. December 17th or 18th. Or maybe it was the 19th. But it was something like that. And it started to snow, and it was the first snow of the winter.~~ And so I walked from Newbury Street where my office was to meet him. And so we got to this old warehouse, and it was totally empty, and we trudged up these sort of crumbling stairs to the very top floor, and threw open the steel doors, which was very hard to do because the bar on them had been rusted in place and we’re moving it, and finally it came off and the doors flew open. God knows how we ever got them closed again. And I looked out, and it was snowing, and there was Boston right in front of me, and the buildings and the lights. ~~And I looked down and there’s the Fort Point Channel and the apron and the Tea Party ship was already there. And you could see South Station right in front of you, the Federal Reserve Bank had just been built. And I looked at the right and I knew that Anthony’s Pier 4 was there, and there was the whole waterfront, and the commuter boats were beginning to come from Hingham. And they’d announced they were going to build the Boston Harbor Hotel.~~ And I thought, “This is it.” I said, “How much is it?” He said, “You can probably get it for 8.” I said, “8.” He said, “$800,000.” I said, “Wow!” ~~And so I called you, right? Literally, we walked down the stairs, and the payphone that was there when we moved in, right on that corner?~~ I went to that payphone and I called you and said, “Don’t buy the Blackstone Block. You have to see this.” And was it. The next day that you came to see? I think so. The next day you came to see it. And then the Blackstone block got abandoned quickly and so did the castle. ~~And I don’t know how long it took us before we, it was practically – it was such a short, it was like I looked at it, you looked at it, and [speeding sound], we bought it. It was like this. And it was like you just knew when you walked in it that....~~ We were right in Boston, there was all this space, and you could do anything you wanted with that space. Just anything. And it wasn’t going to be a new building but it was going to be, it felt like, you know, the right thing for the Children's Museum. It felt like our culture would thrive there and continue. So it just, as soon as those steel doors got open I just felt it. And it was so exciting. And I couldn’t believe it when we moved in. I thought wow, this is so amazing. Just, we bought it and we’re moving in. We’re here. Wow. And we’ll be here for the next 50 or 100 years. It’s amazing. I was so thrilled for everybody.

You did this, Mike. **[might go into the very end of the next-to-last 11MS chapter]** In a way, one of the fears I have about you writing this book is that you won’t give yourself the credit that you deserve. The genius that you had to build a team of people to coalesce about an idea and to make it real and to make everybody contribute from their best selves because of your ability to believe in them and to allow everyone to shape that idea with you. And it’s so important, I think, that you convey that, the central role that you had in making that happen for everyone. And I know part of that is your innate modesty. And it’s important you say it, that your belief in everyone was so strong, so truly strong, that that made it happen. And your ability and the thing you brought up before. I think the reason boards often spend a lot of time on the separation of powers is that Executive Directors are often so jealous of their own power that they have to circumscribe the power of the Board so that the Board won’t “interfere”. You didn’t have that need. Because you welcomed it not as – sometimes you saw it as inter­ference, and sometimes it truly was – but mostly you were mature enough to know that things that weren’t appropriate probably wouldn’t happen anyway, and appropriate ideas would happen and so you didn’t have to cut people off at the knees. The process would take care of it by and large, and by and large the process did. ~~IMAX is a good example. And because that was, the process took care of it. I don’t see it as a failure, I see it as a success. I think at the time it would have diverted us from our main goal, and I think it would have – weren’t not a looking at place, and IMAX is looking at. And sure you get a lot of revenue out it, and the Museum of Science has and the Aquarium has. So what? So what? It’s the one-way stuff. We’re not one way. I think it didn’t succeed because it shouldn’t have, not because BJ didn’t prepare. The numbers were risky certainly, they were very risky. And maybe had they been much less risky, we would have taken the risk. But we took lots of risks, loads. With much worse numbers than those. Because it was the right thing to do.~~ And my sense was that you didn’t need to have control because you were mature enough to know that by and large people make the right decisions, and if they don’t, those get corrected anyway. They just do. And so there wasn’t a need for separation because there isn’t a need if you bring that philosophy in real behavior and motivation to the process.

Q: [talks about other people being able to do it, and Sue Pucker did the exact same thing.]

She did. She was brilliant. She did a wonderful job.

I don’t know if I told you, but the English woman who lived in Wellesley, [inaudible], has gone back to England, her name is Diana [inaudible], and she started a children’s museum in London. Has she contacted you? She’s really wonderful. And six months ago Sue took a trip to England [inaudible], she wanted to go and visit friends. She went all over England by herself. And so the last day of the trip she was coming to London, and it was the last, for a week, but it was the last day that we were going to be there. So before she left, I said, “Well, Sue, why don’t you – we’ll have dinner with the [Eulines] because they’re starting this children’s museum we can talk to them about our experience and so forth.” She said, “Oh, I’d love to.” So I said, “Well, it’s going to be at their house, and where are you staying?” And she told me. And so she duly shows up, and hour late of course, as always, at the [Eulines] for dinner. I had told them she’d be an hour late. I said, “Well, I know you said 7, and I know it’s England, but Sue won’t be here until 8 or 8:30, and it’s the way it is. So plan dinner then.” And they said, “Well, but you told her 7?” I said, “It’s the way it is.” But actually it was 8:30 before she got there, full of apologies as always. And of course she stayed ‘til midnight. And she never would have done this before. She interviewed Diana about her goals, she listened well, she summarized, and then she incisively told her exactly what her thoughts were. And Diana said to me, “How old is she that she can do that?”

And she’s so wonderful. And we’re still close friends, all these years later, [inaudible] and she and I and Jimmy. And still, you know, working on things together. Terrific.

**[back to hanging out at the Museum as a kid, possibly in 12JJ chapter]** There were lots of different camps and clubs. The museum had lots of collections. It had a stuffed bird – it still has as far as I know – a stuffed bird collection. And so that led to a bird­watching club. And so it was actually, it was terrific, because you could look at what a bird looked like in the collection, and then you could go down the Fens, you could go way down along the Muddy River and sometimes right into Boston and back, or up to the Arnold Arboretum, and you’d go birdwatching. And then the birds that you saw that you hadn’t seen in the collection you’d then go see if you could find in the collection. So it was a wonderful, you know, and it was led by volun­teers who were members of the Audubon Society and who were professional bird­watchers or, you know, avocation. And so I learned loads about birdwatching, loads. And it was a wonder­ful juxtaposition. And then there was another club that I belonged to that used to meet – your parents had to bring you because you met after dark. And you’d look at the stars and you’d learn to recognize the constellations and there was twice when there were daytime eclipses of the moon. And that was terrific fun. Again, it was very experiential, learning about the stars. And you did it together as kids, and so it was so much fun. And then we used to camp, there used to be actual camps, and overnight camps, just as we had overnights in the Japanese house and overnights, and it was sort of hokey and they had tents that were fake wigwams and you’d use part of the Indian collections. I mean, it was really quite hokey, but nevertheless, it was a lot of fun and you’d talk about the, the volunteer that led it would talk about what the Indians would do and then you’d take on roles and be Indians. And you had costumes and you’d dress up as braves and squaws. And so it was great. And there was an actual kit that was used, you know, the kits that we had that was used in the club. And that more from – they didn’t have the word Native American then – that club morphed from being an Indian club into I think it was Ireland, you know, what was it like in the old country. And so it was sort of the beginning of looking at diversity and different cultures in Boston. And none of it could have been done today, the words that people used. There was an exploration of what it was like to be a Roman Catholic vs. a Protestest vs. Jewish. I can imagine doing that today, you’d get sued. But it was very exciting. And the Jewish kids in the group would talk about Synagogue, and the Roman Catholic kids would talk about their first communions, and you know, it was really terrific, actually. And that one was actually originally led by a woman that was, again, she was a volunteer, and I don’t know whether she was part Native American, I can’t remember. It was so long ago. But she was also from the Aid, and so she was very proper. And then it morphed into some Irish woman started leading it. And then some priest came, which is how we got into the – I think I was a member of that for seven years or something, you know, from the time I was six. So I went to that forever. And there were lots of them. We’d go across Jamaica Pond and we learned to canoe like the Indians. And the museum actually owned canoes. And they fell apart and I think people were worried about liability and they didn’t get new ones. But I learned how to canoe doing that. And you know, we were Indian braves canoeing.

It was 1946, ’47, that I remember. I mean, I went to the museum before that, but I remember....

Q: When were you born?

’42. So ’46, ’47 onwards, that I remember vividly. I went for a long time, because I started teaching in the clubs, you know, so probably until I was 16.

Q: Were the clubs like an after school program?

Oh, yeah, and Saturdays.

Q: So you’d come after school once a week?

Well, I actually didn’t care, you know, I’d just go to anything.

Q: How many would be in a club?

10, 12, 6, 8, it varied depending upon what you were interested in. But it was the same kids were in lots of clubs so you knew everybody. I still know kids, I still know people. They were doing dog days. I had a dog, she was a white spitz, her name was Miss Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch, and she used to come with me for dog day. They had cat days.

It was kids from all over, just like it is now. A lot of upper-middle-class kids come, you know, their parents bring them. But I came on my own. I had lots of family that lived in Jamaica Plain, so it was considered safe for me to go. Whether it was or wasn’t was beside the point. It was considered fine.

Q: [...why the [inaudible] failed and how we dealt with it]

**[collaboration or not at Museum Wharf, could also end up in 11MS chapter]** You know, I don’t know. I mean, I was involved, of course. But I didn’t meet with Duncan. I didn’t meet with John. I met with John Carberry a couple of times, but really it was John Bok and Jeff and yourself and others that were doing most of that, not me. And Ben. I thought they failed because they weren’t collaborative. They were secretive.

Q: ...In the beginning they were very collaborative.

I disagree. I think Phyl and I had to negotiate constantly with Julie and with Duncan and with the Board to get information, to jointly plan. I think it felt collaborative from the theoretical point of view, but when the rubber hit the road and you needed real data that there was always a negotiation. And much as I liked Julie, and I did, and liked Duncan, it was not a collaboration. I thought it was like dealing with Elaine, as opposed to dealing with you or Phyl. And it was fine to negotiate, but negotiation’s a different process than collaboration.

Negotiation begins with the point of view that “I have an interest and you have an interest and let’s see what we can do to meet both of our interests. And so let’s make sure that we hold onto the core of our interests.” And I think collaboration is “Let’s put aside our individual interests and see if we can come to a common interest.” And I think that’s the essential difference. Where you get to may be the same in the end, but the process is different, and therefore the implementation of the outcome is different. Because while you’re implementing, you’re still aware of your individual interest. You haven’t given those up for the greater common interest. And I think that’s the essential difference.

And I think a symbolic and telling thing on that was, that I was very aware of, was that they were one of the last organizations to use our accounting system. And the central concern was, would we have access to their data, #1, and #2, I think Julie, in particular, understood the implications, that it was much more difficult to make top-down decisions once she used that tool. And when they did use it, they wanted no instruction. They didn’t want to have any information about how we used it, unlike every other organization in Boston where Phyl and I spent nearly a day and a half, two days, every single time going through the stuff and how it worked and how we used it and whatever. Not an hour. Not ten minutes. Just here it is. And Julie would physically come down and get the printout from the operator, so she didn’t want anybody delivering it to her. They might have looked at it. So I thought symbolically that was just a symbol of separate.

Q: [inaudible]

It certainly did, yeah. Yeah. I mean, it’s a nice thought. I’m not saying there’s anything wrong, I like them both. Just different orientation.

[END OF INTERVIEW]