

Oral History: The Peace Studies Program: From Mundelein to Loyola

Memoir Interview Number 4: Dr. Prudence Moylan

Interviewed by Kathleen Ermitage March 26, 2015
Chicago, Illinois

Edited Draft

Context: This interview was conducted at Piper Hall on Loyola University Chicago's Lake Shore Campus. Prue was very mindful about providing information about Sister Carol Frances Jegen's role in starting the Peace Studies Program at Mundelein College and to represent the thinking of people at Mundelein during the transition to Loyola University. There is some faculty interaction in the hallway at the end of the interview.

Part 1
00:00

Kathleen Ermitage: This is Kathleen Ermitage. I'm the researcher for the Oral History Peace Studies Project. I'm with Prudence Moylan and we are at Piper Hall on Loyola's Lakeshore Campus. It's March 26, 2015.

I'd like, if you would, to state your name and title and anything you'd like to share about your experience and expertise.

Dr. Moylan: My name is Prudence ... Prudence Moylan. And I'm a Professor Emerita at Loyola. My formal training in History, Modern British History. And, my other interest is Women's Studies/Gender Studies, so I was an affiliated faculty member of Women's Studies/Gender Studies at Loyola. And, in research years ... I would say maybe the last ten or so I moved away from British History, particularly, and I started teaching more Women's History and Peace History. So, my field kind of meandered away from my original education, but it was a great foundation because doing British history gives you a global perspective. So, you kind of see Britain as a very small place in a much larger world um ... even though it exercised enormous power for a while there. So, it was a good perspective to understand as an American trying to study peace.

Kathleen: Thank you. That's an interesting background that you brought to the development of the Peace Studies program. I'm grateful for that explanation. The focus of the project is, as you know, to better understand the transition from all of the great work at Mundelein and to understand how it was transferred over to Loyola to form a minor. I'm wondering if we could begin learning from your perspective how that process started.

Dr. Moylan: OK. That's a little bit of a challenging question for me because the process ... I guess I would like to talk about the process at Mundelein. The process when it got to Loyola is a second level for me or second stage.

Kathleen: OK, would you like ...

Dr. Moylan: So, I would really like to say what it was ...

Kathleen: Sure.

Dr. Moylan: ... that was going on at Mundelein and what we created at Mundelein that was then our ... and then we negotiated with Loyola about what was acceptable to them and what wasn't.

Kathleen: Yes. Please tell me about the Peace Studies program at Mundelein and then ... yes ...

Dr. Moylan: So, I'm a historian. So you're gonna have to bear with me for lots of context you know ... a certain amount of detail ... although my details may not be as sharp as I would like. But, anyway, I ... it's hard to find a starting point ... the archives on the Peace Studies project at Mundelein ... I think starts in 1939. I can't remember why the students did something then that was ... Carol Francis has always said ... "we were already doing that pastime" ... but I would really start it in the 1960s ... I suppose ... because I think the work ... the Second Vatican Council ... well, even before that ... the Encyclical *Pacem in Terris* really raised attention to peace and human rights as part of the Catholic tradition. And actually, *Pacem in Terris* is the first time the Catholic Church really recognizes human rights as developed through the UN and you know ... Eleanor Roosevelt and all. Pope John XXIII really says, "Yes, human rights are part of our tradition." I mean, this is a new way of naming them and we're happy to affirm that we too are committed to these statements of human rights. So that was a really big change that preceded the Second Vatican Council, but the second Second Vatican Council was really rethinking the place of the church in the modern world. That was one of the great documents that came from it. And it was a really important document in Carol Francis's theology and in her work. [5:00] So ... and actually for me too. I was born in 1939. So I grew up in a very triumphal church ... sort of ... we are going to have parallel and equal institutions to the secular world ... you know Catholic schools and all the way up. And, you know ... and CYO and all kinds of sports programs or whatever. So, and there were a lot of reasons for that but ... the 1960s and ... from actually the gathering of the world's bishops at the Council and from John the XXIII's leadership really really opened up a new way of being in the world and so it was ... you know fresh air, and open the windows, let the new ideas come in and go out. So, I entered the BVMs in 1959. And in the early ... Carol Francis was in a master's program in Theology at Marquette. Again, this was one of the first graduate programs in Theology for Catholics where women were admitted because they were not admitted to seminaries and even graduate schools of Theology didn't admit women. Marquette opened its program with a summer school program mostly for women religious ... um ... the dates are escaping me ... the PhD program was more like '62 or '64. The M.A. program was more like '57. So, she was teaching at Holy Angels, I think, in Milwaukee and going to the summer school in ... at Marquette. And when she ... I think ... I guess she formally finished her M.A. maybe in '58. But in 1957, Ann Ida Gannon (who had come to Mundelein in '54) and had arranged with the leadership of the BVMs that ... for her initiatives and her work at the college ... she first was a faculty member, by '57 she became President ... and she asked the BVMs to send Sister Carol Francis here to develop a theological program for women at a women's program that would be shaped by women. So, the idea of women studying theology and then women ... you know ... being equal in terms of a theological program and an education for younger people. So, Carol Francis from '57 to '68 was very focused on developing a Theology major for the undergraduates and almost at the same time the graduate program began. And her education at Marquette had included a lot of the Theology that would become formally approved by the Vatican Council. So, in the ...

this theology wasn't just newly invented. Already in the twentieth century, biblical scholarship, other kinds of pastoral theology, and scriptural ... well, I said scriptural theology, and ecclesiology (the understanding of the church) were all in process and she was educated in that new understanding. So, even before the Second Vatican Council that's what we were taught. And I was a novice in Dubuque ... from '59 to '61 and so the leaders of the BVM congregation were also interested in young members learning the theology of the new insights. So, we had visiting scholars come to Dubuque and talk to us about all of this new theology, about Christology, the Trinity, scripture ... incredible. I had an incredible theological education and its all because of Carol Francis's ... and then others joined her ... but she was kind of the central figure of linking the BVMs young and old to the theological experts that were actually the periti at the Second Vatican Council. So, that was what I learned. So when I came to Mundelein to finish my degree (which I finished in '63) that continued. And Carol Francis and others started a lecture series ... [10:00] well they had various lecture series where she would bring in these theological experts, but then in 1961 I think she started this sort of summer lecture series where she might have two or three different outstanding theologians, mostly men. There weren't too many women who were at that rank then. There are now but. And, all of Chicago ... I mean the priests and women religious and students would come. You know we'd have 800, 900, 1000 people in the Mundelein auditorium for these lectures during a week of review of this. All of these were taped by Sister Mary ... I think it's Mary Margaret Whalen who worked really closely with Carol Francis. And that was the beginning and that was called the Mundelein College Religious Education materials. But from '61 on these tapes were collected and then the BVMs ... well, let me go forward then. So all of this is happening already for us ... the Second Vatican Council. The Pachem in Terris is written, which opens up this idea of the church is ... lives in the world and is open to the world and engaged with the world and not a separate enclave that is somehow purer or you know superior ... and this is a very old conflict between you know ... the kings and the popes. So this was a twentieth century ... it was really an opening to democracy in a ... with human rights and all and also a kind of return to a sense of the church as a communion of the faithful. So, from '64 to '66, when the actual Council took place, there were lots of new images for the church, you know the pilgrim people, the people of God. And this was all about the community of saints as it were ... you know now. I mean theologically another foundation for the Second Vatican Council was the development of the theology of the mystical body of Christ, which comes from the 30s and the 40s so that was part of the push toward participation and relationship. Um ... so that the doctrine ... or the declaration on the church in the modern world, which I think is Gaudium et Spes which has an opening phrase, which I can't recite exactly but was very meaningful to Carol Francis and basically says the joys and sorrows of the world are our sorrows too. That we are one with all of the people of the world and so that is the role of the church, you know. And isn't it nice that we have a new Pope who is really trying to respond that way? It was a moment in the 60s and there was a lot of pullback from that but the 60s were very real for me so that was a formative world. I was very thrilled. I was well educated. I was enormously energized. So, what

else happened? Sixties. In addition to many important documents on the Catholic church, the Council issued a ... I don't know its not a ... I don't know what the formal name of it is ... anyway ... it was the renewal of religious life. And, so all religious women and men ... everywhere in the world were invited to return ... sort of directed ... to return to their origins and their founding charism and to rethink the way in which that inspiration would be lived out in a modern world. So, as you may know, there's a lot of tension between the Vatican and women religious in the United States because women religious in the United States took very seriously that request. And, as a result, they really changed their relationship with the larger world and they went back to [15:00] a much more foundational and simple gospel commitment to be disciples of Jesus, which means a nomadic existence in a way and a response to wherever there need (where people were not there). And so the institutional framework and sort of the power of women dissolved in some ways. Partly, it was change in the larger world, as we know about hospitals and number of women entering religious life and all of that. But that was an engagement they had with also the kind of work of the spirit in their lives because of course none of these communities had started with enormous powerful institutions you know or a great influence in society. So this was a return to this foundational work. And for many Catholics and many clergy ... who like to see sisters as kind of their helpers rather than as equals in terms of witnesses and servants in the Christian life there's a kind of feeling of ... of concern about whether the sisters are really able to be Christians without the direction of the bishops in Rome rather than recognizing the sisters bring insights and understandings of Christianity that are not available to clerical men. So that discussion is going on as we speak. But, it's part of this long story. And for women religious and bishops it goes back to their founding. They were always being challenged because somehow they were too ... um ... too determined to follow their own sense of the spirit rather than waiting for the bishop to tell them what it was and that's an ongoing tension. So anyway, Carol is a part of all of that. All the new theology. She's very involved with the BVMs in rewriting their constitutions in order to incorporate this sense of their work in the world. And I can't quote to you all of the things in the Constitutions, but the fundamental one is ... I think it's Article 10 ... experiencing freedom and sharing that sense of freedom with everyone, inviting everyone to share in the freedom of the gospel and of Christ. And then it's in education, justice ... and there's a third one. So anyway, the BVMs along with other communities, by the ... started in '68 ... these new constitutions were all approved by 1989. It was supposed to be a 20-year period to do this so that's when that ended. So, they had new constitutions and they had incorporated all of that. That's available to people if they want to look at it. But, it was very transformative ... of the sister's community. So their way of understanding the work of the gospel ... brings us to peace. See, I told you it was a long winding road to get there. But this is the context of her Catholic but transformative Catholic understanding of peacemaking. Carol Francis also had a deeply Catholic ... a deep prayer life. And it was very focused on the Eucharist. And her insight into the work of Vatican Council and into the work for justice and peace in the world was that they were integrally related because without the Eucharist, without the deepening relationship with Christ ... then the work of peace

couldn't proceed ... and the work of justice. So, they were necessary and one had to sustain the other. It's like the source of nourishment and encouragement that came from your Christian experience of prayer and that was expressed in your activism and work for justice in the world.

[20:00]

Kathleen: So ...

Dr. Moylan: Simple ... but also very different and transformative from what Catholics often thought of as the catechism and you know ... kneeling in church and going to confession. Not that any of those things were not still there, but there was a whole different way of understanding this. OK, so ...

Kathleen: If I could ...

Dr. Moylan: Yeah.

Kathleen: If I could just step in here for a moment because I'm very much appreciative of the big picture and how you are describing the new ideas that were coming through just as you were in the sixties and, as you mentioned, well-educated and then there's this transformation taking place. And not only that, but you are also working closely (it sounds like) with Carol Francis Jegen ...

Dr. Moylan: Well, first she was my teacher. It wasn't until the late sixties that I became a faculty member and worked with her.

Kathleen: Yeah. What I'm very interested is ... there's this understanding that of course that the Peace Studies Program was at Mundelein and then it was brought over to Loyola so there is all of this prologue about how it was formed and the ideas that informed the program there and the people involved who made it happen ... well before anything came over to Loyola ...

Dr. Moylan: Or any Peace program was formalized.

Kathleen: Or that ...

Dr. Moylan: This is all the prelude to new ways of doing justice and peace. And so, ... and the Jesuits of course had the same religious charge. I don't know all the story of their renewal, but they also participated of course in all these different ways in the Council, the meaning of the Council for them. And, in 1971, there was a World Synod and that was the ... the title of it was "Justice in the World" and the bishops basically said at that time very specifically that their um ... faith must be expressed in works for justice. They are equally obligatory for Catholics. There is no separation of faith and works. [some hand

sounds on table] Of course, that's all the way back to the Protestant Reformation. But they were ... they brought it together. And that's even been strengthened ... even Benedict the Sixteenth is talking about charity and justice together. So, that's an ongoing foundation that they shared. And the Jesuits then developed a collection of essays that's very, again, influential. And Carol Francis's thinking about this was "the faith that does justice." So, that's kind of the ... I'm setting up the common tradition that allowed the BVMs and the Jesuits and Mundelein and Loyola to find a way to talk about this together because they shared this broader Catholic Christian tradition of justice.

Part 2

Kathleen: Thank you for that um ... broad picture where you painted a wonderful picture of these ideas had come from, how they were transforming and released, and what people were doing with them to put the ideas into action ... because as you had noted that was one of the purposes ... was to move it into more of that direction. And, I find it interesting that these ideas were transformative and they were being distributed at an international level and, however, there was a group of people here in Chicago on Sheridan Road that were doing just that. They were putting the ideas into action. And, in terms of the Peace Studies Program ... I understand from your own work ... from Carol Frances Jegen's work in peace ... from her high school years ... I'm wondering how you encountered that work with her ... how you became a part of the Peace Studies program when it was at Mundelein.

Dr. Moylan: OK. Again, now we have to do a little background because I was a BVM. I graduated from Mundelein in 1963. I taught here for a little while and then I went to Stanford to do a M.A. And this was, again, the openness. The BVMs ... normally sisters would have gone to Catholic universities, but in my generation of young women we almost all were sent to secular universities. That was part of the openness to engage with the larger world and bring our faith into that world and engage ... you know, rather than being separated. So, I did that at Stanford and that, again, an ecumenical time after Second Vatican Council. So there were a whole group of women religious and Protestant leaders who um ... were trying to do action in the San Francisco area. And, so I became part of that group. That was really exciting. And mostly I remember Robert McAfee Brown who was a very very important Presbyterian leader and all those ideas about what Presbyterians were wanting to do and social justice action for the poor. So I got an education there. It's kind of a funny story how I got involved ... from a doctor in San Jose who wanted to give service to the sisters at Guadalupe College in Los Gatos, which is where I was living while I was going to Stanford. And ... uh, because he wanted them to be well. Well, the sisters were very grateful but not particularly interested but I was the youngest so they sent me to the doctor to express our appreciation of his interest. So, I had a physical and he was very involved in doing pro bono work with the farmers in Delano. So, one of the women who was at Guadalupe was very involved in San Jose with the Economic Opportunity Commission. So I used to go with her to meetings in San Jose

about that and that was the Johnson program. So, it was all of the poverty program and all of this discussion that Christians were having with the world of politics and policy. And this um .. Dr. Lachtner was a Jewish man, but he was involved with the farm workers, which was a major civil rights justice issue ... similar to the civil rights issue of African Americans and the Selma story. So my march ... sort of inspired by all of these links, especially Dr. Lachtner, was one weekend on the Delano to Sacramento march of the farm workers. We were still in habit. I had a companion. And we ... so we walked 20 miles. And there were lots of people ... kind of hecklers along the way and we were very obviously church people. And, they had asked for that ... priests and sisters as well as any lay people as well, too, to join because they wanted the sense of the broader commitment to justice from the church. Well, anyways, so I was very excited. I was young and healthy and able to walk ... and I thought it was great and you know ... I felt [5:00] proud even of being heckled because I thought 'oh, this is what it means to be a Christian. You have to stand up for what you believe in, you know' ... so innocent and naïve. But, so anyway, you know it was very real [laughs] and then we stopped in a park for the evening. And we were going to stay overnight and then march the next day. So, we were in Mantino and um ... there ... they did activist theater at night ... you know... while we were all eating our meal and then seeing the theater. And, of course it was all in Spanish. So I'm like, 'OK.' Here I am ... you know ... in a master's program at Stanford and I'm wanting to use my life in the service of justice and I can't understand a word these people are saying.' So, what does that mean? And it could have meant that I should go and learn Spanish, but that is not what it meant to me. What it meant to me is the mind is not enough. It doesn't matter how smart you are ... if your body isn't on the line in the right places it's not happening. And, this of course is very connected to the Jesuit idea of knowledge leads to love leads to action. That's their sort of their educational mantra. And, so there it was. I was learning it in a park in Mantino in California and absolutely transformed my life. I thought 'Oh' because I was a very heady person ... very proud of being smart and this just grounded me to the soles of my sore feet. [laughs] "Ok, now you know." Now, you know ... living it out isn't as simple, but that was the ... the integration of what faith doing justice meant to me. And then, this was another issue of privilege and position ... we got a visitor ... came to the blanket we were sitting on ... and this young man and his daughter drove us ... we rode with them to the march. And, um and we were invited to go and spend the night in the convent. So, I said to this sort of messenger, 'well, can our friend and his daughter come with us?' And he said no. So, I said, 'well, then we'll be spending the night with the people in the gym.' And that also was a revelation to me that was very much a part of the BVM growing and understanding of the fact that you know ... we are a part of the world. We do not get to go away and sleep in beds when the people we are with and the cause we are for is leaving people ... you know ... sleeping on gym floors. So that again was just the whole notion of privilege is very real to me. And, when we stopped wearing a habit ... that was another experience we had ... I was at a store buying something and I was used to ... you know ... being immediately served, but I didn't have a habit on. And so, several people just walked right in front of me up to the clerk. And I was thinking, "Well. What is this?" You know. Why

is the clerk not paying attention to who is here? And I realized I didn't have a habit on. And in five years of wearing a habit I had totally lost sight of the fact that the reason that I was always recognized was because I was wearing a habit. It had become my own expectation. It was privilege to the core of my being and I thought "Ahhh!" [laughs] So, you know there were just these illuminations and that was part of learning to be an activist, I think, in a way. You just had to realize. And even now I struggle with realizing ... you know ... how do you recognize your privilege but not um ... but also recognize what it's for. It's not for you. Whatever privilege you have is for service of others. So, that whole process I brought back and later on in '73 Carol Frances was in prison with farm workers as part of her work ... and she had already (with Sister Terese Avila Duffy) in '68 ... they had already had an outreach program in Hispanic ministry in Chicago. So that was really the origin of the justice outreach ... it was more Hispanic ministry. And then, Carol Frances's sister, Mary Evelyn Jegen who was a sister of Notre Dame de Namur. [10:00] They were very very close all their lives. And she was one of the founders of Pax Christi in America. And Pax Christi's founding meetings were held at Mundelein because Carol and Marilyn were sisters. So, a lot of Pax Christi was connected with Mundelein because of her family relationship.

Kathleen: Thank you for sharing all of those details about your own personal experience and your own activism. As a student ... I am aware that you have had those experiences to put to action some of the ideas that you were learning about ... and I'm curious how your peace activism intersected with your work at Mundelein in the development or the continuation of the Peace Studies Program there.

Dr. Moylan: OK. Well, I've introduced Carol's sister, Mary Evelyn who is Marilyn in the family so Carol Frances was Julie and Mary Eveyn was Marilyn. So there's always been a joke about how many names they have in the family. Anyway ... um ... Mary Evelyn Jegen had worked at the Vatican on the Peace and Justice Commission so she had this global justice vision. She also worked for Bread for the World when it was just established. And, so ... food, farm workers, Hispanic ministry ... all of these elements were part of doing justice ... the faith that does justice all the way through the 70s. I was ... I was studying for a PhD from '69 to '74. So I wasn't really here at Mundelein. But the ... Carol was busy developing the Theology program and ... and then, in the early 70s ... um that was when she marched ... marched ... well, no ... they were striking. They went down to support the farm workers strike in '73 and she ended up in jail for two weeks. And, the BVM congregation was having its general meeting and she was supposed to be one of the speakers. And there were six other BVMs, I think, who were in jail with her. And, so the ... so they ... you know ... it was kind of an insight that I had had ... in my experience ... "They were like no, we're staying in jail. We came here to do this. We're with the farm workers. We're not saying, ok, now we'll go back to Dubuque and have real lives, so." And the BVMs were ... fine with that and became major supporters of farm worker ministry. They came from Iowa, but also in California. So that was a big faith into action dimension for the BVMs. And then Pax Christi really kind of

gets established in '75 or '76 and Mary Evelyn is involved from the beginning so Carol Frances is also involved from the beginning. And that becomes a focal point for kind of a development of Catholic development in terms of peace. And Carol is ... still um ... let's see ... in the late 70s ... where are we ... she's established the Hispanic ministry and the graduate program and ... well, OK right now I'm not thinking about that block between like '74 and '84. But in the process of her own Theological work she moves in terms of the peace theme to looking at Jesus the peacemaker. And finally in '84 she gets a sabbatical so she goes to St. Johns in Minnesota, St. Cloud, and has a year there and she writes this book along with a number of other things. But then the following year she and her sister, Mary Evelyn Jegen, go to an anniversary retreat of Pax Christi International in Mombar, France. [15:00] And, so now Carol Frances meets an international community of Pax Christi people. And from that she is invited to become a part of a world council of churches meeting in Hungary in '87 where she presents her theology and she is the leader of theological section of this scripture section of this gathering. So she meets not just the Pax Christi people but a larger group of ecumenical people who are interested in ... in peace. And, at the same time when she's ... and also gets invited ... she represents the BVMs at a peace meeting in Havana, Cuba in '87 I think. So, she's had this direct encounter on an international level with other people interested in peace. And, because of Pax Christi right from '84 onward she's interested in how this can develop at Mundelein. So by '87 she has gathered together a group of faculty who will plan a Peace Studies program. And I wasn't on the first ... I came in like halfway through that planning process, but it was interdisciplinary ... it's like English, Theology, Sociology, uh ... it wasn't the arts so much but I guess they would have been part of that too. Anyway, it was an interdisciplinary committee and they began to think about how to frame a curriculum. So that went on in '87 and by '88 then because Carol was very interested in the issue of women and peace she wanted to be sure that the Women's Studies program was also part of the planning for the Peace Studies minor so she invited me to be on the committee. So I brought history and Women's Studies because I was the Director of the Women's Studies program. So, we worked on that and by '88 we had that in place and we got approval. So the first classes were in '89. We had ... I was looking at this in the archives ... we had eight themes that were ... some of them were interdisciplinary themes some of them reflected more one discipline rather than a multitude. And the students were supposed to take a course from each of these themes and then an opening and a closing course. And one of the themes was "Women and Peace." So that was a kind of perspectives on peace and it was really important for me and it was part of the development of the Women's College, which was under a lot of pressure obviously before '91 for enrollment and funding ... so it was emphasizing the importance of women and that was really also part of Mary Evelyn's work and Carol's work within Pax Christi. They really knew women peace activists around the world, especially people who were involved with religious aspects of peacemaking. So that was something that they wanted to emphasize and also the fact that it was important to develop women leaders in the field of peace ... well we can talk about the ways to define peace ... maybe we can talk about that when we get to the Loyola-Mundelein link, but anyway all of this emerged out of the

planning at Mundelein: That it had to address these women's college leadership questions as it related to the education of young women and the future of the world. So, the other thing Carol was very alert to was ... there were very few Peace Studies programs in the 70s. By the late 80s, there were 44 anyway who wanted to initiate a Peace Studies Association. So, Carol made sure that Mundelein was one of the founding members of the Peace Studies Association. So I think the formal founding was in '88 and then the first annual [20:00] conference was in '89 so Mundelein was part of that. And, I was not in attendance at those meetings, but that was part of our awareness that we were pioneers in a new field. And then really rather quickly, by the 90s in another decade the number of programs had risen to about 200. Now, actually although how there is some comment that Peace had more support than Women's Studies because it's a secular issue in a way ... or it's a political issue ... as well as Christian, so. And peace means different things to different people. But in fact, Women's Studies as an interdisciplinary program grew faster in the universities than Peace Studies did. And I would say personally it's much harder to teach Peace than Gender ... Women and Gender because it seems so unreal to students. Whereas being a man or a woman or a now a gender ... queer as they say ... is very real. But peace is very far away. And so that has emerged even though Peace Studies has become more fully developed and available.

Kathleen: Would ...

Dr. Moylan: And one of the issues ... I'll just ... let me just finish with this ... so Mundelein had established a curriculum, an understanding of the importance of women, understanding women's role in peacemaking and peace building, and also had then been inspired to develop a Center for Women and Peace that would not only serve students but it would serve the larger community and visiting scholars. And so by '88 ... '89 there was also a determination to seek funding for that.

Kathleen: I'd like to go back one of the things that you had mentioned. And I appreciated hearing all of the details about how the program was developed at Mundelein. And the ideas that Carol Frances Jegen had brought back and how you had worked together put together a curriculum with different themes and ... I also understand that there were some needs to do some fundraising to keep it going. I was wondering if you could speak some more to that and role in keeping it going at Mundelein.

Dr. Moylan: OK. One of the things that was an important development along with the curriculum was the idea of having a Center for Women and Peace, which would be an original contribution of a women's college, and a community outreach and an international outreach. So, Pat Bombard was working ... I don't know if she was working in the development office or anyway ... she was working administratively here at Loyola and she was invited ... she's a good writer ... so she was a good writer ... and so she came to work with Carol Frances and with Mary Breslin who was President and Vice President for Development ... to think about really a grant for this. And the MacArthur

Foundation seemed receptive ... and you know they do that checking out and they seemed receptive to the idea. So, then the focus of the grant was related to the curriculum but it was more devoted to women's initiatives and to international perspectives and there was a third thing I can't remember now. And so the Center for Women and Peace would do initiatives to bring people together in the local community and it would have visiting scholars from international perspectives and it would provide faculty development and student development grants for more education and more international experience. So that was funded ... I think we got the word in 1990. I think the ... it must have gone into the MacArthur Foundation in '89. And then in the summer of '90 I think we got the word that it had [25:00] been given, \$100,000, [25:00] which was a very large sum in our view and it was for two years. So, and ... then the question became "who would be the director?" And, Mary Evelyn was still very ... Vice President of Pax Christi International but she agreed to be a one-third time director of the center. And it was through her network that international scholars were connected to Mundelein and brought here. And so, there were visits from women traveling from the Soviet Union (from Russia after '89, I guess) and from Israel, Palestine. And, we had Margareta Ingelstam from Sweden who was a radio person who had done a lot of work with peace and nonviolence. And then Mary Sparks and I who were on the committee for the Peace Studies Program got a grant to ... in the summer of '92 to interview women peace leaders in Sweden and Norway in June. So we got that trip ... that also was very influential because for me ... we met women who were very ... who were artists, who were ... you know ... UN representatives, political figures ... who were activists in the 1982 protests in Europe against the Pershing missiles, which led to the Greenham Common events in England. And there were women's peace camps all over the world. There were eight or nine of them ... of women objecting to the military ... to missiles being placed in Europe and in the U.S. ... women objecting to missiles begin created and being sent to Europe. So there was this real sense that the future of the world required the elimination of nuclear weapons. I have to say also that in '83 the American bishops wrote their peace letter and Carol Frances had become good friends with Cardinal Bernardin over a number of different events and she was very much a part of that. And then that 1983 letter was very influential in her commitment to providing education in peace. So, there were all of these ... you know ... activities in the 80s that were pushing the agenda of peace and then by '89 and thru '91 ... with the fall of the Berlin Wall (that was '89) and '91 was the break up of the Soviet Union into the thirteen federated states and so it really seemed as if the potential for a new approach to the world order was possible. Now ... you know ... never underestimate the power of reaction. So, that happened after the Vatican Council ... and the church testing about ... you know ... relinquishing traditions instead of holding tight to them. And, certainly the military budget in the United States is evidence of the fact that it's very very difficult to take a different approach. And this is ... this is the historical point which isn't so relevant to Mundelein and Loyola ... but you know ... the U.S. budget (instead of going down) the military budget has gone up to the point where it's larger than the ten other largest budgets in the world. So ... you can't get ... if you're an American you cannot deny the fact that we are central to the militarization of

international relations. And, really that's not a subject that people want to talk about. [laugh] So, that is the transition ... now we're in 2015. In 1990, it looked like it was possible to think differently, but we haven't gotten there yet. But ... you know ... there's always hope. So, that's ... by ... 1990 there's this real sense of international possibilities and a real commitment that's grass-roots based to challenge [30:00] ... uh ... nuclear weapons. And so, the establishment of the program for women in peace ... the Center for Women and Peace is really exciting to me. Um ... you know ... it was part of the Mundelein tradition. The BVMs had made a commitment to peace practice and advocacy in '81, I think, as a congregation. And the nonviolence of Cesar Chavez had been very influential in understanding the Catholic practice of nonviolence. So there were all of these threads coming together ... you know ... and that is why there was such excitement on the campus. And student response was very positive because of course they respond to innovation and global outlooks and that was part of the world they were in so that was important. And Carol Frances ... we did also have internship work as part of the Peace Studies program ... that they should go out and do work for justice. And, then the ... when ... the Center for Women and Peace was formalized students ... two students maybe three went abroad to work ... one in Uppsala, Sweden ... one with Pax Christi in Belgium and I think there was a third one ... that I don't remember who got that international experience. Now, one of the sad things ... about the affiliation with Loyola that came in 1991 was that because the Center for Women and Peace was grant-funded Loyola was not interested in pursuing it. And, so ... the money that was allocated for the '91-'92 year was spent but no new elements ... Loyola's financing was ... they will take charge of the grant and you know it'll work out but whatever it was ... there was no more. And this was one of the painful challenges for me ... no more Mundelein control over the grant. That went to Loyola. And Mary Ellen Jegen, Carol Frances Jegen ... nobody ... that's now a business matter. So, it was just ... you know fulfilling that ... that was a precursor for me of the struggle that was to come as ... the effort to find a way to formalize a Peace Studies minor at Loyola got underway. So it was very painful ... the ... January. It was very fast ... I guess that was good ... from, I think the first meeting with the faculty at Mundelein about the affiliation was in March. We were told we would become part of Loyola in June and that ... it was kind of a ... I mean we had been involved in various committees to keep Mundelein alive or ... other things. But this was like, no ... this was decided. It was announced. And, we were all to go to the various departments at Loyola. We had kind of an interview ... and then we did get rank and tenure at the move to Loyola, which was very good. But I must also say we got a five-year pro-rated period of moving up to Loyola's salaries, but we were told very clearly that we would be evaluated by the same standards as Loyola faculty. We just wouldn't be paid as much until five years later. So ... there were those little ... it was good but it was also a little twist that was never talked about. That was just the way it had to be. And, it was to me it was victim-blaming in a way because ... the reason was that Mundelein's salaries were so low. I'm thinking, oh great ... you're getting ... you know all of this is happening and its because we had low salaries that it will take five years for us to have equal salaries, even though we will be held to the same standards. Just those

... [35:00] so it was really a positive part of the experience that Kathleen McCourt and other members of the Loyola faculty wanted the Peace Studies minor. They had done their own sort of peace initiatives and projects in the '80s but had not done an academic program. So, the ... and Carol Frances was thrilled because having just gotten all of this established she did not want to see the whole thing go down. And, one of the principles of the affiliation ... is that anything at Mundelein that wasn't already at Loyola would cease ... unless Loyola thought it was interesting. So most ... they did take the ... with Nursing they did something about the Home Ec. Program, the Nutrition Program ... but I think that was pretty much it. And the other element ... we didn't fully understand in '91 ... faculty who were not ... who didn't have tenure ... were given five-year contracts ... you know, the period of time for the affiliation to finally be fully realized. And we were of the understanding that they hadn't had tenure at Mundelein but after their work at Loyola, which would be judged to the same standard of Loyola faculty (which they thought I guess was higher than Mundelein's but I didn't find it to be true) ... but anyway they then would go through the process of applying for rank and tenure at Loyola. Well, five years later we found out that was not the case. Those were terminal contracts and that was not clear to us. So, there were these elements that are still kind of bitter elements even though the number of faculty who did get full-time employment did get higher salaries, did get professional benefits ... more than Mundelein would have been able to provide ... was a good thing. And now we have ... well, Carolyn Farrell who was the person who did the ... oversaw the affiliation from the Mundelein side ... she is also the person who did the renovation the renovation of this building by raising money from Mundelein alums to support it ... more Mundelein ... more Mundelein money for the Gannon Center for Women and Leadership than ever for Mundelein College. So, it was interesting ... and the Jesuits were good about saying that Mundelein could fundraise directly with alums because Mundelein alums were not wanting to contribute to Loyola so it was a way of working that out that worked for everybody. So this building, Piper Hall, was renovated as part of that plan. And, Carolyn Farrell and the BVMs were very responsible for that. One of the things that made the affiliation kind of ... well, some people were angry but generally it was seen as positive was that the BVMs wanted to end Mundelein in a way that would be as ... the least damaging to everyone involved, the most benefit. And the relationship with Loyola seemed to provide that. Now, there's a whole other story about the documents about what could have been and wasn't because of negotiations and all of that but anyway. The idea of Kathleen McCourt and ... she met with Carol Frances and ... Larry Reuter, I think (the Jesuit who was the campus ... Director of Campus Ministry) and somebody else. I think there were four of them that met that decided to go ahead with this committee that would move the academic program to Loyola and that was in June. And the committee really started meeting in August of '91.

Kathleen: Yeah. I'm noting that ... a lot of great context that you're providing about the transition ... and I think that is important because it gives a sense of the state of mind and the perspective of people who had been with a long-standing institution and that had this

program and had done a lot of great work ... and then how is that going to be perceived, changed, reformed in another setting ... um with people that hadn't been working with and that now you are being invited to join a committee to talk about this. [40:00]
However, you haven't worked with them before and there is all of these other things that are going on during the transition. So, thank you for that. And I'm wondering if you could talk a little bit about more ... and you just started ... about the meetings themselves and the ... you know what that was like for you? As I understand it through our research, I know that there was this multidisciplinary approach ... and I'd be interested to hear your thoughts about that and also what you brought to the table, as it were.

Dr. Moylan: OK. Um ... it was multidisciplinary. These were common ground ... I already explained the Catholic-Christian justice tradition and that both groups shared in their different institutions. And then that multidisciplinary aspect was shared. It wasn't just one approach it had to include lots of different ways to achieve peace in the world. I suppose there was some understanding of the challenges of getting it approved. You know, sort of the bureaucracy. So having Kathleen McCourt was kind of an upbeat thing because this wasn't just empty talk it could really happen. But, when we came together I would say that the first thing that went was any focus on women or even gender. So, for me that was a struggle. I held on as long as I could [laugh]. The other thing was that peace was too ... um ... undefined and diffuse of a notion. So we had to have war and peace or peace and conflict. So, the title of the program was immediately an issue ... whether Loyola could have any sense of approving a title of Peace Studies. And, that was something that Carol Frances felt strongly about and so did all of us that ... One of the challenges of the curriculum as we all worked on defining it was that peace is always overwhelmed by conflict ... that the notion is that peace isn't real only conflict is real. So we were like, "No. This is the study of those people who are not following the norm." This is what we are emphasizing. We're not giving up on it. It's not like, "Oh, we'll be the junior partner or we'll be the long-term goal but we won't be the reality of what needs to be studied and done." And so we wanted ... we insisted that peace be the central focus. And, we got it. And, you know ... Bill French has said to various people along the way he's very glad we won. But, you know ... at the time he just didn't see it. So, that ... the ... just the defining of peace even though it was multi-interdisciplinary ... and the defining of how the elements of the curriculum would come together and what ... well, I guess I'd like to talk a little bit about defining peace because then how we put it together in the curriculum comes after that. And in the '60s peace scholarship had really moved forward to being more state-based diplomacy. So, peace ... the scholarship and the specialization in making peace really kind of emerges after the second world war. And, the founder of the peace studies scholarship is often thought of as Johan Galtung who was a ... I think he's Norwegian not a Swede. But anyway, Scandinavian and he ... worked hard on multilevels. He's quite a brilliant fellow. And, one of the things that's interesting about him is that they started sort of a not-for-profit study ... you know think tank kind of thing. And ultimately in the '90s and early 2000s they became a for-profit research institute. And the reason he did that is that the ... the control of donors [45:00] is

too great. So you're really freer if you are part of the market. And people can invest or pay you for your services, but they don't control what you can do. And this of course has now become a big problem with humanitarian aid and funds reaching donors. And he saw it ... there's too many vested interests if people give you money they want to tell you what to do. And so he wanted to be independent. He still runs the institute, which is independent. But his brilliant insight in the sixties was ... and he wasn't alone but he is the person who formulated it most clearly to divide peace into multiple facets, particularly negative peace and positive peace. So negative peace is stopping violence ... on the personal level and on the global national level. Direct violence in communities, in relationships, in international affairs is a problem that has to be solved. But, it's not enough to say that peace will be achieved when the violence stops because (as we still know today), militarized societies have large justice issues because of the decisions about where the money goes. If the money goes into the military as a form of national security it does not go into the welfare of the people, which is the basis of human security. So peace activists are interested in human security not national security and that was part of the change. And human security is based on the panoply of human rights, which means economic security and that has to do with having a job and having clean air and clean water and at a corporate level it has to do with companies not being able to exploit water and air and ... you know ... heavy minerals and pollute landscapes and cut off the tops of mountains and all of those things are not contributing to peace even though they might economically very profitable. So it's the whole economic balance of sustainability that ... both at the level of the individual and the level of society. And then ... this is positive peace ... it has the economic and then it has the civil participation piece, which again is the personal level and the communal level. At the personal level, civil rights have to do with the full participation and support of becoming part of every dimension of social decisions. And this becomes ... and well then ... the second part is the governments must provide for the welfare of the people by what we say freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, but however you say it ... it's that they cannot prevent people freedom of press from expressing their views and from participating fully in decision-making ... so electoral politics and all of that. So, negative peace, positive peace ... six kind of um ... elements of [some external office noise] the work that can be done. And that means everything is part of peace. So that's a very big umbrella. And the traditional understanding of peace is ... it's all focused one negative peace and indirect violence. So all of this social justice work is kind of ... not peace. And so even civil rights ... even interracial justice is not always understood as peace. So, its all actions for justice are actions for peace. And that was Carol Frances's ... her own motivation came in the middle 80s I think ... she gave one of the first ... she was one of the first non-Jewish speakers at the lecture series that was held by Spertus College ... University. And she spoke on Psalm 85 which is the "justice and peace shall kiss some." And that is her inspiration. It was her inspiration for Christian-Jewish relations and all of this ... that the bringing those together. Well, the negative peace and positive peace and the secular scholarly world was in a way having a [50:00] structure for understanding how to bring

justice and peace together so that peace was not just ending direct violence it was creating a world in which people could flourish.

Kathleen: I noted you had mentioned the Women and Peace Center. And I'm wondering if there's anything more that you'd like to share about your work with the Center and how that informed your later work or ongoing work with the Peace Studies program

Dr. Moylan: Yes. There are a couple things. One is in ... as we were developing the curriculum ... oh, this was the other thing I was wanting to say later also about the Loyola collaboration is pedagogy. So one of the things that I brought to the discussions at Mundelein when we were developing the Peace Studies minor was the question of pedagogy because in Women Studies there was a whole development of pedagogy that involved the whole person ... that recognized that people had to integrate new knowledge with their own experience, and therefore you had to invite students to be reflective as well as critical in order to incorporate new knowledge, especially knowledge committed to a more just world. So, there were a ... there was a lot of information about pedagogy. And also at Mundelein we had established the weekend college in 1974, which meant classes with the same content met on five weekends in a term for three hours at a time. So you had to totally rethink the way you design the student interaction with the content material and it was very important that you try to get them to prepare on their own so that when they work together in class they could interact with one another and with the material and with you. It would be silly to lecture for three hours if it was even possible. So you had to build a classroom experience that was very interactive. Well, you know the lecture method was still high on the agenda at Loyola. And there was a Women's Studies program and there was discussion of pedagogy there but pedagogy was kind of off the topic when we actually came to talk together. But at Mundelein it was very central because everyone had done it. If they had done it for Women's Studies they had to do it for thinking about teaching adults on weekends. And all of that had also come into getting undergraduates to be more participative. In fact, I would say one of the things that happened generally when I was teaching Women's Studies at at ... right after the affiliation ... that ... and we had lots of students who were now at classes at Loyola and they would come back and talk to us and say, "It's really incredibly boring. Nobody talks. We're the only ones that ever talk in class." And I thought "I never thought you talked very much at Mundelein but [laughing] apparently is even harder to talk at Loyola because that just had not happened, transforming the classroom. And the ... I forget what they call it ... anyway ... the Jesuits have had an Ignatian pedagogy center for at least five years still at trying ... getting Loyola classrooms to transform. So, that was a big loss for me when I came to Loyola and I thought, "Oh, all of that community experience of engaging students as participants was really hard to do." Every time you tried to do you started uphill yourself ... all alone because they looked at you like, "What are you asking us to do here?" You know ... "we want you to perform and entertain us" and you know. So, anyway ... pedagogy was very important and so we talked a lot about that and it became part of the interactive process. One of the things that happened in '88 an

international conference honoring Jane Addams at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. So, I wrote the proposal that we should take a roundtable discussion and talk about building a program for teaching women and peace and creating a center for ... or planning to create a center for women and peace because this was Jane Addams, the Nobel Peace Prize winner in 1931. So, we went off to [55:00] ... to Champaign-Urbana and we were ... you know ... it was a large conference ... people from all over the world. And it was a transformative experience for me not so much because we gave our own panel presentation, although that was a nice opportunity to talk about our work in a broader context of colleagues from other places. But the international part of the conference involved speakers from South Africa. And this was already the time of the ... the OK, I'm losing the word ... the principals of anti-apartheid work and the sanctions against South Africa. And one of the areas of sanctions was that any representative of South Africa in an international conference had to be approved by the anti-apartheid board in South Africa as representing the future of that country and not the apartheid practices. So, as it turns out, the white woman speaker from South Africa had not gotten that approval. We had another speaker from South Africa who was a black woman ... she had gotten that approval. The white woman was in a prestigious place on the program. And the black woman was in a subordinated place on the program. And, who knew all of this? The Swedes. The Swedish representatives ... leaders in the world on sanctions, South Africa, the UN commitment, every nation's commitment, and the U.S. in particular. Practice what you preach. They disrupted the whole conference over this. They called a meeting. They talked about how this was a violation of the sanctions. And, we had to address this as a whole conference because we were in the United States and this was the very antithesis of what it meant to be at a conference for women and peace and not honoring the ... So the University of Illinois organizers were very embarrassed. The speaker was very embarrassed. She was a good woman, but she had not realized that part of her action had to be to recognize anti-apartheid authority in going abroad. All of us with privilege could have that happen very readily. So, the conference met and the decision was made. We met in a general body and the decision was made that the ... woman from .. the white woman and the black woman should share the podium and that we would hear from both together. And so that was agreed upon and then everyone took a deep breath. But we had to disrupt the whole conference and other sessions in order to have this general meeting. And, you know ... the more traditionalists were like 'it was pretty rude to disrupt this whole conference and maybe they could have solved the problem behind closed doors or work something out with the organizers.' And you know ... instead of putting everyone ... and I'm like, "I have never seen democracy in action like this!" [laughing] It was so exciting. It was again one of those moments where "practice what you preach." [sound of clapping hands] So, it was very transformative for me to think ... I'm not good at it ... but there are reasons for being rude ... not violent ...but for disrupting people's comfort on principle that they have to pay attention. And I mean ... this was Martin Luther King's Civil Rights campaign. This was Cesar Chavez's boycott of lettuce and grapes. This disrupts people's comfort zone. But, a social movement has to do that. So, that ... I'd always sort of ... see I'm kind of a middle-of-the

roader, even though sometimes I don't sound like one ... but it was always important to me to affirm the people who are disruptive (non-violently) because we (who are more in the middle and maybe are not so good at going out and doing this action) have to affirm it in order that the people who want to deny it are not allowed to do it. We have to be the bridge to a better world by saying, "No, I'm not in the streets but I affirm what they are saying." [1:00:00] And, we have to make the change. That has to be this whole continuum of people. So that was kind of what I learned ... that these Swedes were so informed about the UN and international sanctions and every detail ... they did their homework. They knew whether the conference was in compliance. And they invited all of us to address this problem that they discovered. And I thought it was fantastic. So, that was women and peace ... that was ... you know ... going off to a Jane Addams women-focused conference on women and peace and challenging women to ... you know ... live up to all of the principles as well. So, it wasn't like ... it was being reflexive and accountable. We as women had to be accountable in the same way we wanted to hold others to accountability. So that was a big focus ... of the dynamism of our Peace Studies minor because we all had that experience. And it was kind of like "oooh, this is real and political and public and international.

Kathleen: I was just thinking that ... that [cough] (excuse me) you brought all of these rich experiences to the campus. And the students had the benefit of that however it came up or came out ... whether it was through the course or through the discussions of forming this program. I'm curious about ... if there's anything more you'd like to say about bringing that experience, that expertise, your education from Mundelein to Loyola and being a part of a new group that had had their own experiences. You had noted earlier that some of the ... there was some activity at Loyola with different projects but there was no formalization of a minor. I am wondering how that got worked out together. So, that ultimately ... all did create a minor at Loyola. There is a legacy there.

Dr. Moylan: Right.

Kathleen: And I would like to know if there is anymore you'd like to say about that. I mean ...

Dr. Moylan: Yes. There is. So, our first meetings ... and I was reviewing (before our conversations) ... I think it was Bill French's minutes of the first meeting. And he is ... basically he's summarizing an overview, which he identified all of the things we are not in agreement on. So, we realized that these were very different academic cultures. And, I've explained a lot about the dynamics of the Mundelein academic culture. I'm not so informed about the Loyola culture except in so far [exterior office noise begins] it was not accepting of us. [exterior office noise continues]

[pause]

Kathleen: So I wanted to have an opportunity to ask you if there was anything more you would like to add about the different members of the committee coming together to formalize the Peace Studies minor at Loyola based on the fact that you brought your experiences, expertise, knowledge, education ... that was ... you know ... grass roots and international. You worked with a lot of people in a lot of different capacities ... you brought all of that back to the campus and then there's this transition and Loyola and Mundelein that's occurring and your working with a new group of people on the Loyola campus that bring their own experiences with peace and activism and so on. And, if you have anything more that you'd like to say about that process ... of that committee coming together and their work.

Dr. Moylan: Yes. I do have a little more to say. And as I remind myself and say that Carol Frances had a very strong commitment to getting Peace Studies formally approved at Loyola. And, she was pretty strategic about it. She was strategic about most things. I was a participant with less of a goal. I mean ... its not that I didn't want the Peace Studies minor. I figured Carol was going to handle that. So I was more concerned about how is it going to look and holding fast as much as I could to the value of what we were doing at Mundelein. [1:05:00] So, basically my experience of the conversations was ... being under duress ... that what we were bringing from Mundelein was being ... there was a very selective process at Loyola of what they would think was allowable. And the rest meant nothing then because it wouldn't exist at Loyola. So that was a very painful process of trying to ... of seeing your whole experience picked apart in terms of what was acceptable and what wasn't at Loyola. And this is all new to me. I didn't know this was my experience at Loyola yet but unfortunately ... and I realize now that I probably should have been ... if I had been a more strategic thinker I might have been better about the transition to Loyola because ... I wasn't really aware of how hard it would be to work creatively and with initiatives in a hostile environment. Mundelein ... although ... there was hostility ... there were tensions at Mundelein. Not everybody was a feminist or a peace advocate. But generally the college's principles were affirmed and there was a group of people within Mundelein that was affirming this. So, I was always working with a group that was moving and not feeling like OK I'm just out here by myself and I don't ... I don't know where to connect. So, I wasn't ... like I ... I never have been comfortable being alone as the champion of a new approach. I like being part of a movement to do it, you know, and do my part. So I found ... one of the things that I found when we went to Loyola to do this is no ... this was no movement where we were building this together. This was Loyola deciding what they could take from us that would be useful to them. And, so I already mentioned that the commonalities were the Catholic justice tradition, which was what really what gave everybody the belief that this was possible because this tradition would work ... you know ... to carry it through and multidisciplinary approach to have in the Peace Studies program. So those two things we agreed on. And, I do think it was the Jesuit tradition (commitment to justice) that ... probably carried it through. And one of the things that came out in one of the meetings as we went along was ... at some point we were all asked to say what we thought the Peace

Studies minor would look like ... you know... kind of bring our own vision and then we'd look at all of the diversity among that ... because we were not getting very far at just working it out. So ... and Carol Frances was complimented for making the plan for the Peace Studies minor at Loyola shaped around the Jesuit mission. So, she ... that was her strategic understanding all the way along. That whatever Mundelein's mission was (which was women) it was not going to be Loyola's mission. I didn't really feel betrayed by that, but it was one of the realities that I couldn't succeed in keeping women and women's leadership as central. And that's been the case at Loyola generally. The Women and Leadership Conference becomes kind of the place ... well, they are the people that have to do that. The real development of leadership and equality among women leaders at Loyola is not central to the agenda. They're very strong on justice issues for students. They're very strong on race and poverty. They are not very ... articulate about gender justice ...

Kathleen: Let me ask you something about that because we haven't covered it. It strikes me that it might be worth a question. Would you describe what Mundelein was? What it represented? What kind of institution it was? Who it taught? I think you are pointing out the distinction. And I think Carol Frances Jegen's wisdom ... in understanding when the Peace Studies program was at Mundelein it was under this umbrella of women because that is what Mundelein was about. And yet when it moved to Loyola she ... if I'm hearing you right ... she had to [1:10:00] find a way to fit it under another kind of umbrella, or principle. And that was social justice so that it could transfer over. Is that accurate?

Dr. Moylan: Yes. It is accurate. But it is a complicated ... reality because when we were focusing on women we were also realizing that women are human and women are equal representatives of the human experience. And that their experience is not men's and therefore it is not at the table, it is not invited, it is not respected at almost any level of peacemaking or peace dialogue. So, the need to have women's voices and train women to be part of that was a justice contribution to the larger good and an affirmation to the equality of men and women. So, when Loyola decided not to include this ... it wasn't because now we're all human again and we don't have any men or women. We always have men and women and they always have different experiences. And if you don't pay attention to the subordinated partner ... like saying, "oh, we're past ... we're post-racial." I think, well, we're not post-racial, we're not post-gender, and we're not post-poverty. So playing around with that notion "we're all one and the same and we're just happily working together" is an inadequate understanding of the nature of difference and the need for nonviolence. And I can just say in terms of contemporary issues the United States government through Title IX has required all universities to address sexual violence on campuses because it has not been addressed adequately by universities since Title IX was passed and certainly not before that. And now the Jesuits are doing that. They never had a program to address sexual violence on campus. Nobody ever knew where to go ... I mean they had all of the formalities, but it was not well integrated. It was not well formed. I

never remember as a faculty member having any corporate preparation for what it meant ... for what sexual harassment meant, for how it was appearing in many places ... in classrooms and faculty organizations. We never had any of it. Even when business corporations had to do it because they were legally liable. Well now, Loyola is legally liable and we are getting attention but often in a very ... but again not in building a positive environment of sexual openness and honesty but of reporting and addressing sexual violence. That's negative peace and positive peace. It's a positive thing that the government is requiring universities to stop direct violence. It's a long way from incorporating economic and civil and political ... let alone religious ... full partnerships. So, I feel strongly about this. To me, it was a big loss. It wasn't personal. It was ... it was intellectual. It was religious. It was justice. It was every dimension of the recognition of gender as an issue of violence and subordination that needed to be addressed. OK ... finishing up.

Kathleen: Yeah. I'd like to ...

[pause]

Dr. Moylan: That was the big gender piece. I have another piece ... a little bit about pedagogy.

Kathleen: OK. Well I did start recording again. I'd like to give you an opportunity to speak about anything that you think we've missed in this interview that you'd like to say something about.

Dr. Moylan: Well, as we talked about the gender issue ... the thing that was really a loss to the Peace Studies program that wasn't fully understood and also ... I mean ... I was new also to Loyola ... and we never ... but even as I went along ... I never fully made the connection between Women Studies and Peace Studies. I kind of did it as an individual but institutionally. So, that's something that can grow in the future. I mean ... the gender piece in the Peace Studies program is still not fully articulated. Now, the pedagogical piece is probably better. The whole university is more supportive of more engaged pedagogy both within the classroom and within the [1:10:00] community. But, I would say, it's still (as a member of the Women's Studies/Gender Studies, Gender Research Seminar) ... the notion of the importance of the embodiment of the student and of the term *affective learning*, which was totally dismissed in any discussion even at Mundelein when I brought that up as pedagogy. It's like "Oh no. That's subjective. That's emotional. That's ... you know ... not what we want to have as rationalism in the classroom and you know ... the logic of things and reason. And, Feminism was like "you cannot separate those two things. They are integrated and you have to address them all." Well, now what I have to say we are doing in Women's Studies/Gender Studies Seminar is ... we're looking at all the new psychology ... brain imaging, all of these ways in which it's perfectly clear that humans think with their emotions. And so, to act as though

even high-powered scholars try to separate themselves from their emotions and they create a myth of objectivity, which can never be fully ... it can never be real because its not the way knowledge is created. So we're still ... in Women Studies/Gender Studies raising these issues. They are more and more important in Peace Studies because brain function and getting human beings to operate on a ... a more empathetic rather than a ... a ... self-preservation motive is really crucial to Peace Studies. And one of the things that higher ... I mean education across the board, democratic participation, greater economic security ... has given everybody the opportunity to see that working together can be better than being alone. And that's a tremendous progress. But to say in a classroom ... the pedagogy cannot involve emotions and affect and feelings and a sense of values is craziness. So that was very disappointing to me ... that we just put pedagogy off the table. Every faculty member should just choose their own. Higher education faculty are never trained in teaching. That was one thing we were trained as. The BVMs ... we were trained to teach ... you know ... whatever level. So, pedagogy was a big loss. Ignatian pedagogy and the Jesuit effort to introduce that is helping but that doesn't address gender. So, Loyola has ways in which all of these things have to be brought together. And, um ... those were the things that I felt ... um ... disheartened by as we moved forward. So, we had a multidisciplinary framework. We never really had a faculty community because it was just courses from everywhere around and you did your bit. You never had to think about the whole. And ... and commitments about what it really meant ... and I would say most people ... this is true of Women's Studies too ... most people have a disciplinary base and in the university system you get all of your rewards through your department where you have tenure. So any work outside of a tenure program is all less serious, less valued, less part of your reputation ... so as we become increasingly professionalized in terms of you know ... making the mark, making national and international achievements ... the time to do work that doesn't count into the bottom line is less. Peace Studies and Women's Studies/Gender Studies among other studies programs are all marginalized in the university because of that. So, every individual who contributes may find Peace important in their own particular way of teaching their discipline. But Peace itself is not a community of ... action. And, you know ... that's hard to do. So that's where the limit still exists. But that's the way the program was built. Mundelein's program probably had those inherent limitations. It did. I know it did because we faculty didn't all agree. But there was more of a community around building this program than all of us being in our disciplines and not talking to one another. Actually, the scale of Loyola made that harder and it hasn't yet been achieved. But, it's still an ideal to work for so ...

Kathleen: I appreciate the time that we've had with you today. Thank you so much for the interview.

Dr. Moylan: It's been a pleasure. It's very exciting to talk about both the past and the future.

