MS. SIEGEL: This is the second interview of the oral history of Stephanie K. Seymour, which is being taken on behalf of Women Trail Blazers in the Law, a project of the American Bar Association, Commission on Women in the Profession. It is being conducted by Nancy Siegel on April 24th, 2007.

QUESTIONS BY MS. SIEGEL:

Q. As I just stated, today is April 24th, 2007 and Stephanie Seymour and I are together in her office in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Stephanie, when we left off, we were in about 1966. Does that sound right to you?

A. Yes.

Q. And you, as I understand it, were in the process of returning to Tulsa?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you tell us a little bit about that?

A. I moved back to Tulsa after my husband finished a year of Harvard Business School in Boston and I went to work for the Holliman firm, the firm I had worked for in the summertime.

Q. Were there other people that you worked with in the summertime that came to work with the firm as well?

A. I was the only summer associate. It was a very small firm.

Q. How many people were in the firm?

A. I don't remember exactly. Fewer than ten.
Q. And were you the only female?
A. Of course, there weren't very many of us in town.

Q. And actually that would be a good question. How many female attorneys were there in town when you first came to practice?
A. I don't really remember in '66. I left for a time, as we'll get to, and came back in '71. And I recall then that there were — I only remember five women. One of them was Margaret Lamb, who was a state district court judge. One of them was Phyllis Zimmerman, who practiced with her husband. One of them was the law librarian at the University of Tulsa and then there were two older women, Norma Wheaton and Jewel Russell Mann. To the best of my memory, those were the only women here who were practicing.

Q. Were any of those women that you just identified trial lawyers?
A. Yes, I think that Norma Wheaton and Jewel Russell Mann did some trial work.

Q. When you came to the Holliman law firm, what was your title and what responsibilities were you charged with?
A. I was an associate and I did research.

Q. Did you work for any particular attorney?
A. I worked for John Arrington, who hired me, and I worked for Jim Kincaid who was a fairly new attorney then with the firm. I also did some general research for some of the other people.

Q. What kind of areas did you practice as an associate?
A. Oh, a little of this and a little of that. They represented the gas company, so primarily I did work in conjunction with that and they represented a bus company, MK&O, as I recall, probably a railroad or two, mostly defense kind of work.

Q. Did you ever have an occasion to appear in court?

A. Periodically. Not by myself, though. I would tagalong with whatever lawyer I was working for at the time.

Q. Let's digress for a moment and talk a little bit about what your ideas were about how to present yourself in court as a female lawyer?

A. Of course I didn't have a clue because I had never had a trial practice course, so I basically didn't know what I was doing, but I just showed up and smiled.

Q. Do you have any specific recollection of the type of clothing that you chose to wear at that time?

A. Oh, very conservative suit, not slacks, but suit-type clothing.

Q. Were there any court rules that prevented you from wearing slacks in the court?

A. No, there weren't enough women to make a rule about, so there were no rules at that time.

Q. Did you ever have occasion to appear in any courts in the rural areas of Oklahoma?

A. Yes, because of the nature of the work. I remember one time when I was very pregnant with my first child going with Jim Kincaid off to
some small courthouse in rural Oklahoma, I don’t remember where. He was marching in carrying his briefcase and I was following right behind him. The bailiff had one of those swinging gates between where the audience sits and where the members of the Bar go before the court. The bailiff threw his arm across the swinging door area right after Jim Kincaid went by and said, “You can’t go in there. That’s only for lawyers.”

Q. And your response?
A. “I am a lawyer.” And I’m sure he was totally dumbfounded at that very prospect.

Q. Did he then open the gate?
A. He then opened the gate.

Q. When did you become pregnant with your first child?
A. I don’t remember exactly when, but he was born in the summer of 1967, I think. Yes.

Q. When you returned to Tulsa, which is about a year earlier than that, what was your husband doing?
A. He had graduated from law school and had been a year at business school. He wasn’t practicing law. He was working for Reading and Bates Offshore Drilling Company, a company that he had started working for in the summers during law school, but I think actually even before he went to law school.

Q. Who was the primary bread winner?
A. We probably both made about the same back then and I can
remember what that was. My first paying job as a lawyer was $7,000 a year and that was –

Q. My how times have changed.
A. – top dollar in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Q. So Bart was born in 1967?
A. Yes.

Q. In June, is that right?
A. A month early. I was still working.

Q. Why was he born a month early?
A. I have no idea.

Q. That’s just what he decided?
A. The doctor had no idea. I was going to quit work the end of that week. The secretaries took me out to dinner. I remember we ate Chinese food and I went home and woke up in the middle of the night in labor. So I called the next day. I called John Arrington and said, “Guess what, I’m not coming in today.”

Q. When you say you were going to quit, were you taking a hiatus or were you actually going to leave the practice for a while?
A. No, I was actually going to quit because by that time Reading and Bates had decided to send my husband, Andy, to their Houston office and that was going to happen in the fall. So I knew I was quitting my job in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Q. So a couple of months after you had Bart, you were moving?
A. We were moving.

Q. And you moved to Houston?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you go to work when you were in Houston or was it just that your husband started out and you were raising the baby?

A. He started out and this was my first child and I really had no clue what impact that was going to make on my life. And I had already decided that I didn’t want to work full-time, so I had done no exploration at all about jobs in Houston. And you may recall, I had that one experience in law school with a partner of Baker and Botts when I went to the general interview and he told me that he didn’t hire women. So my hopes were not high. But in August or early September, I was in Michigan visiting my parents and I got a call out of the blue from a partner at Baker and Botts, who had been a Princeton roommate, a college roommate of John Arrington, my mentor in Tulsa. And this fellow called me and said that John had called him and told him they should hire me. John didn’t bother to tell me, so I was very surprised. I said, “Well, I do want to go back to work, but I only want to work three days a week.” And there was this long pause and he said, “I had the firm all talked into considering hiring a woman.” But, he said “They’ll never hire anybody part time.” And I said, “Well, thank you very much,” and that was the end of the conversation. And then we moved, I think in late September. In October, the Baker and Botts partner called me back up and said they were desperate, of course, because somebody had left
their labor law department. I had some labor law experience, actually from Arrington, and he wanted to know if I would consider coming to work for the labor law department. And I said, "Yes, three days a week." And he said he thought they would consider that, so would I come in for an interview. It was November when I went in for an interview and I was interviewed not by somebody from the labor law department, but by a managing partner. He was an older fellow who had great trouble looking me in the eye. He was sitting across the desk and he spent his whole time twirling the cord on a venetian blind instead, and sort of staring off sideways while he asked me questions about, you know, child care and all of that business, the kind of things they asked back then. He told me the labor law partner said he's willing to hire somebody three days a week so this is what we'll pay you.

And I said, "I'm not going to work for that. I'm not going to work for a penny less than three-fifths of what you're paying your new associates." I had a friend from law school, a classmate, who worked there, so I knew in advance what that figure was because I'm good at doing my research ahead of time. He hemmed and hawed and he said, "Okay. We'll pay you that."

And then he said, "Can you start next week?" I said, "No, I can't start next week. My parents are coming for a month at Christmas. I can't start until January 1." Oh, he twiddled the cord some more, and he said okay. So that was our agreement and he made it very plain that it was a big experiment, that there were no commitments, which was fine with me since we didn't expect to be in Houston forever anyway. But when I went to work in
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January, I was pregnant with my second child. It was a big surprise and I had to decide whether I was going to tell the firm that I was pregnant. I decided since we had no commitments to each other really, I was simply going to start work, which I did.

Q. So were you the first female hired by the Baker and Botts Law Firm?
A. Yes.
Q. And how many lawyers do you suppose they have today?
A. Oh, I have no idea. They had about a hundred then, I think, which was a huge law firm at that time. They’ve got multiple hundreds today.
Q. So not only were you the first female lawyer at one of the largest firms in the country, but you were also the first part-time lawyer in that group; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. That’s a lot of firsts. And how did it work out?
A. It worked out fine. The labor law department was very small. It only had one partner. He and I got along well and I enjoyed the work, working three days. And it was pretty easy to do three days a week in the labor law department. A lot of that was research. Some of it was going to arbitrations with union people. Remember, I’m pregnant again. I remember going to one arbitration and we walk in the door and this union guy – they weren’t represented by a lawyer – it was a union guy and he took one look at me and he started sputtering. And the arbitrator said, “What’s the matter.”
He said, "I just don’t think I can talk with her in the room.” I guess because his language was usually so foul and because he didn’t want to swear in a front of a pregnant lady, he was having trouble figuring out how he was going to argue his case.

Q. Well, do you believe that he would not have had a problem had you not been pregnant?
A. I have no idea.
Q. So you think it could just be related to the pregnancy, but it could be both?
A. It could be both.
Q. That’s funny.
A. Then I finally had to tell the firm that I was pregnant. I didn’t tell them until I was bursting out of my clothes and I went to in tell the partner in the labor law department.
Q. Whose name was?
A. Oh, gosh, John Abercrombie, I believe. I went in to tell him that I was going to give birth in August and he burst out laughing. And he said, “I can hardly wait to go tell old” — I can’t remember his name, the managing partner I had the interview with — “that our lady labor lawyer is going into labor in August,” and he went cackling off down the hall.
Q. What was the course of your employment with Baker and Botts?
A. I worked until probably a week before Bria was born on August 3, 1968, and she was two weeks early. Then I took off a year because I had
two babies essentially thirteen months apart and that was a pretty astounding experience, needless to say. About a year later, it was in August, I got a call from the partner in the labor law department who asked me if I would come back to work. And I said, “Three days a week?” And he said, “Sure.” And I said, “Do I get a raise?” And he said, “Sure.” So I went back to work.

I remember at one point somewhere in working for them, they had a formal black tie dinner dance and I was asked to dance by the partner who had come to Harvard and interviewed me during my second year about a summer job, the one who said they would never hire a woman. I told him the story of our conversation. He claimed not to remember and he said, “I never would have said that.” But by this time, it was after the 1964 Civil Rights Act had passed prohibiting discrimination against women and they were much more concerned about what they had said to whom.

Q. What impact do you believe that the Civil Rights Act and the passage of that act had on your law practice?
A. I suspect that was probably the only reason they hired me.

Q. Was that ever discussed in the firm?
A. No. I mean, I’m sure, but not with me.

Q. What kind of diversity was within the Baker and Botts firm at that time other than having one female?
A. I don’t remember any.

Q. It was all white men?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do with respect to child care when you were working three days a week?

A. I hired a person to come to my house who took care of my first baby, and then my two babies.

Q. How did you feel about having someone helping you in the initial stages of the baby's life?

A. I felt great because Bart was six months old before I went to work, and then the two of them were – Bria was a year and he was two and a half when I went back to work the second time. The child care worked out great. I had a wonderful woman who came and took care of the kids and kept my house in shape at the same time and did the laundry. So it worked out fine.

Q. Did your husband, Andy, have any objections or concerns about you not being a full-time mother?

A. No. No. I mean, after all, he married a law student, so he bought into the package when he got me and we both wanted to have children, so that was not a question.

Q. How long did you continue to work at Baker and Botts?

A. I was only there from September to December the second time because Andy's company transferred him to Singapore.

Q. That was an enormous move for you?

A. That was an enormous move.

Q. How did you feel about moving out of the country?

A. I felt fine because I had traveled abroad and I just had this attitude
— because I had never been to Southeast Asia, I had an attitude that I could
live anywhere. But it was a bit of a shock when I got over there and — well,
in good ways and bad ways. We spent Christmas in Hong Kong on the way
over, stayed there two days, I think, because it was a long trip. You couldn’t
get there in one day and when I got to Singapore I had expected it to be
fairly backward. I didn’t have any real concept and I was pleasantly
surprised to find out that the houses were very nice, the countryside was
beautiful, that orchids grew in the backyard. I had a full time staff. Andy
had a company car. We had a driver. We had a gardener. We had a cook. I
hired a baby amah. I couldn’t get a job, so I was a full time mom with a
huge staff and two little kids.

Q. It sounds like the cost of living in Singapore was substantially
better than in the United States?
A. It was incredibly better.

Q. What do you think accounts for the difference at that time?
A. Oh, our economy was very strong. It was — well, it’s economy
was growing. It was still, you know, basically a third world country.

Singapore is an island city state, sort of all by itself, and it was thriving and
there were supermarkets. I remember being able to get frozen Sara Lee
coffee cake in the supermarket. That’s not to say that I could get a lot of
other things that were that familiar, but it was just a great place to live.

There weren’t that many stores where you could buy the kind of clothes I
wanted, but there were little shops you could go to that had Vogue magazine,
you could point to a picture and pick out material and they would make you
whatever was in the magazine, and it cost next to nothing. So it was a pretty
idyllic kind of living circumstances except for the fact that I looked for a job
and I had a British law firm — there were no American firms — I had a British
law firm that agreed to hired me and I couldn’t get a work permit from the
Singapore government. They said I would be replacing a Singaporean. And
I couldn’t take classes at the University because they said I would be
replacing a Singaporean. So I found out what it was like to be discriminated
against for reasons other than my sex.

Q. What effect, if any, do you think that living or growing up in
another country in the early years had on the kids?

A. Very little because they were so small. I lived — I was only there
for a year and so Bria was one and a half and Bart was two and a half. They
were there for a year at that early stage and there was an American
community. I didn’t join the American club. I joined the British club just to
be contrary. But they were all English-speaking people and Chinese children
at that time in Singapore were all learning English, so it was just a little
American community — those were the people we socialized with. Those
were the kids, the people the kids played with. They went to a preschool
which was composed of all American children, so I’m sure they barely
noticed except for the fact that the people who worked in the house were
Chinese.

Q. Did they — did the kids learn to speak the second language?
A. No. They didn’t need to.

Q. So they were raised right from the beginning to speak English and only English?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you learn to speak another language while you were there?

A. A word or two, but not much. Again, because I didn’t have to.

You know, we went to restaurants and the people spoke English and it was — it was easy, easy living.

Q. What was the attitude of the Singaporeans towards the Americans at that time?

A. Very favorable. I think we were highly regarded pretty much everywhere in the world and we’re talking late ’60s. It was a very pleasant place to live. It was very interesting. They had – the majority of people there were Chinese, but they had a large minority of Indians from India who were merchants. They had a lot of Malaysians. It was an interesting society because the people who worked for the Chinese people in their houses were Malaysians. If they had domestic help, they hired Malaysians and the Malaysians were discriminated against. There weren’t any black people, but I saw – it was interesting to go to a different society where they practiced discrimination and segregation like we did at the time, only it was a different minority.

Q. What kind of social activities did you and Andy engage in when you were living in Singapore?
A. There was a – it was the oil business and there was a pecking order. The major oil companies were at the top. The company he worked for, which was an offshore oil drilling company, was the next rung down and then there were, you know, various levels. And you were expected to entertain the people above you and be entertained by the people below you and that was sort of the social structure, one in which I declined to participate. I mean, we had dinner parties for friends of ours, but I didn’t get involved in the company politics.

Q. Any specific reasons?

A. I just didn’t feel like it.

Q. What reactions did you have to working as a full-time stay-at-home mother?

A. It didn’t really count there because I had so much help, but we had a lot of free time. I mean, we would go to the Tanglin Club, that was a British club, where they had a swimming pool and it was certainly a country club life. I took up duplicate bridge out of boredom and made a lifelong friend who lives in California now who was my duplicate bridge partner. I tried to learn golf, but I failed miserably. So I flunked golf and spent a lot of time with the kids and with friends and doing nothing. It was strange, because I had never spent any time in my life living that way.

Q. How did the dynamics of having household help and not having a job, how did that affect your relationship with Andy?

A. I don’t really know if it did, but our relationship sort of fell apart
over there because I found out he was running around on me so —

Q. Yes, you did not have much tolerance for that?
A. No.

Q. Did you talk about it or —
A. Of course. And, actually, I got fairly depressed at one point and I
had a doctor who sent me to see — there weren’t any American doctors. I
had a British doctor who sent me to see a psychiatrist, who was Chinese,
and he couldn’t understand where I was coming from, so I just got anti-
depressants from him and quit seeing him. It was a very strange situation
because I was living in a world, the oil business world, where what Andy
was doing was not uncommon. I was the odd person out in that situation.

Q. Were you isolated from your family?
A. Yes, of course. My family lived in the U.S., so they didn’t have
any idea what was going on.

Q. Was it difficult to communicate with them at that time, those
years?
A. No E-mail. You know, we wrote letters, but they took a long time
to get back and forth.

Q. What about the telephone?
A. Occasional telephone, but telephone calls were very expensive.

Q. And there really was no other mode of communication at that
time?
A. No.
Q. It was not — it was not easy. If you had an emergency, how would you have contacted your family?

A. By phone. But the time was thirteen hours difference, so night was day. It was not easy to have casual conversations because our timing was totally off.

Q. Did anybody from your family come to visit you while you were living in Singapore?

A. I think my brother may have, my younger brother, because he — he worked in Southeast Asia. I can’t remember the timing, but he’s only three years younger than I am and he was working for Citibank, so probably by that time, he may have been living in Hong Kong after I moved to Singapore. Hong Kong is actually quite far from Singapore, so I think he may have come once.

Q. You said that after you found out that Andy was cheating on you that you became depressed. Was that the first time in your life that you had experienced depression? How did you react to that?

A. Well, depression is not a great thing. I mean, I was very unhappy and I started taking some sort of anti-depressant, which made me feel like I had a frontal lobotomy, so I just cut them in half and took them at night. That was fairly late in the year that we were there. We were coming home for a month over Christmas and I remember going ahead of time and taking the two kids to visit my parents, went to Florida. The most God-awful plane trip I’ve ever taken because the kids were, as I said, thirteen months apart. I
guess they were two and a half and one and a half at the time. And Bria,
didn’t shut her eyes between Hong Kong and San Francisco – so needless to
say, I couldn’t shut my eyes. And I remember in Tokyo this group of
Korean orphans got on the plane. We were changing planes in Tokyo and
they were so – they had little kids among them and they were totally well
behaved compared to my younger child. She didn’t shut her eyes before our
layover in LA, at which time Bart was wide awake. So by the time I got to
Florida, which was more than twenty-four hours after I left, I’d spent the
night in Hong Kong, I was not in very good shape, let’s say, but I never said
anything to my parents then about what was going on. Then I came to Tulsa
and while we were in Tulsa over Christmas, Andy got fired because there
had been a change in management at Reading and Bates and he had gotten
crosswise with a guy who had come into power. So he went back to
Indonesia because he had contacts there, to start a business. I can’t even
remember exactly what it was. I stayed in the U.S. and went to work.

Q. When you returned for Christmas in about 19 –

Q. Did you remain in the United States after that or did you go back
to Singapore?
A. No, I stayed in the U.S. It was planned that I would because he
wasn’t making very much money. I went to work full-time and put the kids
in child care, Miss Helen’s, which was sort of a combination day care,
preschool at the time. I went to work for Doerner, Stuart, Saunders, Daniel
and Langenkamp because my firm that I had worked for had split up and the lawyers I worked with there were scattered around town. So I went to work for Doerner, Stuart. And my father died in April of that year and I went to –

Q. April of 1971?

A. Yes. He was in Florida at the time and I went to Florida to the funeral and just decided I was, A, not going back to Singapore and B, going to get a divorce. I dumped this on my poor family, who didn’t have a clue, at my father’s funeral. That was an extremely emotional experience.

Q. What response did your family have?

A. They were very supportive.

Q. Had anyone else in the family gone through that type of experience?

A. No.

Q. I would think at that time that divorce was still somewhat rare?

A. It was very uncommon. It was very rare and my mother was concerned about how was I going to support myself and I said, “I can support myself.”

Q. You never had any concerns about that?

A. I never had any concerns about that, which was one of the real benefits of my education and, no, I never had any concerns about that.

Q. Did your decision to get a divorce, go back to work full-time, did that impact how your child care was going to be taken care of. Was it private or public child care?
A. Actually, I had brought back with me, I had almost forgotten that, my baby amah.

Q. Which is?

A. Which was the young Chinese woman who took care of the kids, that I had hired to help take care of the kids in Singapore. And at the time I left to come back, I was just bringing her with me for the month we were going to be in the U.S. and I thought it would be a great experience for her. She ended up getting very lonely and after she left, I discovered a lot of long distance calls made on my telephone bill. So she was there and I had her stay an extra month or two. Then when she left, I put the kids in day care.

Q. Did she try to get permanent residency here?

A. No. No, she thought this was a very strange place. They didn’t even use the right chopsticks at the Chinese restaurant. She said they were Japanese.

Q. What happened to your father, do you know why he had passed away?

A. My father had health problems because, you may remember, he had polio.

Q. Right.

A. And he had a brace on his leg all of those years. He developed some rare blood disease. He had too many red blood cells and I think that ultimately impacted his heart, so it was sort of vague what he died from. He was 72 when he died.
Q. How old was your mother when he passed away?

A. She was 65.

Q. What choices did your mother make after your father passed away? Did she remain in the same location?

A. She stayed where she was in Florida. She traveled. I remember she went to Hong Kong and visited John. She came to Tulsa a lot. When I remarried, she came and stayed with the kids when Tom and I went on our honeymoon. So she visited around. She had friends in Florida.

Q. When you decided that you were going to go through with the divorce, how did you notify Andy and what other arrangements did you have to make?

A. I can’t remember how I notified him. I guess I sent him a letter. He didn’t come to Tulsa, so it certainly wasn’t in person. It was in April when I notified him and I think he probably wasn’t surprised. My divorce was finalized in August.

Q. When you went to work at Doerner, Stuart, were you an associate?

A. I was an associate. I was the eighth lawyer in the firm at the time.

Q. Were you the first female?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you work full-time?

A. I worked full-time.

Q. Did you have a specific partner you worked with?

A. Not really. But shortly after I got there, they made Bill Anderson
and Tom partners, so the whole firm basically were partners except for me.

Then Mike Lewis came shortly after I did.

Q. What type of work were you engaged in?

A. Mostly federal court, federal law related, mostly defense oriented practice. We represented a bank. We represented Public Service Company, the electric company. I worked on cases that Mike Lewis was defending for the electric company, which involved everything. People getting zapped by electricity and suing the company, people dying.

I got designated to be the person who would handle anything having to do with discrimination for all of our clients because the Civil Rights Act had passed and President Nixon had mandated affirmative action plans by an executive order. So a lot of companies were under affirmative action plans that required them to hire women and minorities and I advised them on that.

I guess my firm just assumed because I was female that I had been discriminated against in my lifetime so I was the natural one to handle that area of practice. And as a matter of fact, when I came back from Singapore, I went to Sears Roebuck to obtain a credit card. Andy was gone and –

Q. You had a full-time job?

A. I had a full-time job. They wouldn’t give me a credit card because I was married. They said it had to be in my husband’s name. So I said okay. I took it out in his name even though he didn’t have a job, didn’t have any income at the time, and it was all based on my income, but it still had to be in his name.
Q. In the year 1971 when you started to work at Doerner, Stuart, how many women were members of the Tulsa County Bar?

A. That’s when I remember there being about five. The first summer after I was there, I went to the Tulsa County Bar picnic for the first time and I remember being with Bill Anderson and Tom and there was a dinner. I don’t remember what it was, but it was sort of a semi-outdoorsy thing and afterwards there was a stripper inside. I was so flabbergasted that I was going to march in there and make a scene but Bill Anderson and Tom dragged me off and took me home. The Tulsa County Bar Association never had a stripper at its official functions after that.

Q. Do you remember who the Bar president was then?

A. Oh, I have no recollection.

Q. That was pretty typical entertainment at the time?

A. I think so.

Q. When did you first start to get to know Tom Seymour?

A. He was at Doerner, Stuart when I started in January. He was an associate and then became a partner soon after.

Q. Did you immediately become friends?

A. Yes, we were friends. We worked together and we didn’t – we didn’t start dating until – I think it was October after I was divorced. I may have had to ask him out. I can’t remember exactly.

Q. Was there any kind of anti-nepotism rules in the firm?

A. No. No, nobody really knew what to do with me. They were all
very excited that we started dating and when we got married the next
summer. I don’t know if they expected me to quit, but I just kept right on
working. And then Sara was born in 1974, and I took a maternity leave for
six months, although there was no such thing as a maternity leave.

Q. When did you and Tom get married? What was the date?
A. June 10, 1972.

Q. And where did you get married?
A. Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Q. Did you get married at a church?
A. I got married at Sharp Chapel at the University of Tulsa by a
minister who had been a street minister for a street church. A guy we met
through some situation, a neat guy. I had gotten married in the Episcopal
Church the first time in Battle Creek. Well, we didn’t really have a church.
Tom was raised Methodist, I guess, Southern Baptist or Methodist, I can’t
remember which, but he wasn’t really going to church either at the time.

Q. How were your religious views evolving by this time?
A. Oh, they were probably on hold. I mean, we didn’t have any
discussions, Tom and I, before we got married, about religion and it was a
fairly nondenominational kind of church service.

Q. Did you believe that your divorce or the experience that you had
with depression affected your attitudes toward religion?
A. No.

Q. What do you think the most significant effect of your experience
with depression was?

A. I didn’t like it, but it was case specific, as it were. So when I got
rid of the problem – when I stayed in Oklahoma and the problem went to
Singapore or Indonesia, that disappeared.

Q. What questions did you have about how the children should
interact with their father?

A. I didn’t have to have any questions because he never showed up.

Q. How long was it before he became involved in their lives?

A. He didn’t get involved in their lives until Tom wrote him after we
were married. We probably had been married a year and Tom wrote him and
told him he wanted to adopt the kids. Then I guess he decided that he
needed to have some sort of relationship.

Q. Did – do you have any recollection of the kids asking questions
about their father?

A. I’m sure they did. I mean, they must have, but no, I don’t really
remember. If they did, I just said, you know, he was – had to change jobs
and I was staying here and he was working over there – but they were so
young.

Q. You married Tom in June of ’72. What happened after you guys
got married?

A. We continued to practice. After we went off on a honeymoon.

Q. Where?

A. Where did we honeymoon? We went to Jamaica for a week and
then we went to Mexico for a week. In Mexico City, we were out walking
around and it was a real hot day. I remember walking into this little
restaurant and we sat down, somebody plunked a glass of water in front of
both of us and we drank it without even thinking, and I have never been
sicker in my life. So the second week was not idyllic, shall we say.

Q. And when you came back, you both went back to work at Doerner,
Stuart?

A. Yes.

Q. Were there any rules associated with your employment there?

A. No.

Q. What name did you go by?

A. I went by Stephanie Kulp Seymour.

Q. Kulp was your maiden name?

A. Yes.

Q. So you adopted that as your middle name?

A. Yes, because they would let me do that in Oklahoma on my
driver’s license, unlike Michigan.

Q. At that time when you got married, were you considered to be
chattel?

A. Probably. I don’t remember. The laws were beginning to change
in that regard. The Equal Rights Amendment, the fight over the passage of
the Equal Rights Amendment was in the early ’70s and I got involved in that.
The Consumer Fair Credit Act was passed in ’74 and I was able to get a
credit card in my own name for the first time, and then I became an expert on that law. We had banking and financial clients, so I advised them about the ramifications of that new law. So things were beginning to change.

Q. Were you ever involved in any kind of demonstrations?

A. No, not really. And I never joined anything. I just, for some reason, had an aversion to joining organizations and so while I went to meetings, to National Organization of Women meetings, I never joined. Probably thank goodness, because when I wanted to become a judge, I didn’t have any of that in my background. But I was involved in a lot of — I helped set up Call Rape sometime in the ’70s. I don’t remember when. And I was involved in the City Human Rights Commission on various committees. So I was doing a lot of things and I guess I got my name out there because I talked a lot, spoke a lot on the Equal Rights Amendment.

Q. After you returned from your honeymoon and went back to work, where were you living?

A. We bought a house just before we got married. An old house over on South St. Louis, a great old house that had been built in the ’20s. And I remember our banking client, Utica Bank, having a fit because we needed to close before we got married, in my name as a single woman and his name as a single man. We didn’t move in together. We weren’t living there, but the bank said we couldn’t do that. And I said, “What do you mean you can’t do that? We’re your lawyers. We say you can do that. You will do that.” So they did do it, but not without raising a question about whether it was even
legal to have a house in the names of an unmarried man and woman. If we
had been brother and sister, they probably wouldn’t have thought anything
about it.

Q. When you look back on the property rolls with respect – or in the
abstract of the house – the original mortgage would have been in the names
of you two as single individuals?

A. Yes, it would have been bought in our separate names.

Q. That was probably very rare at the time?

A. I think it probably was.

Q. Was there any public fallout from that?

A. Nope. A little consciousness raising.

Q. How long did you live in that house?

A. We lived in that house four years. Sara was born there, our first
child together, in 1974. And I then took a six-month maternity leave
because I decided that was a nice thing to do and I wasn’t paid for these
maternity leaves. I never even asked about that. I just took off, but with the
understanding that I was coming back. And they called me up about various
matters while I was off, so I was providing free legal advice to my
colleagues at that time.

When I went back to work, I worked four days a week after Sara was
born. I hired, at that point, a woman who effectively became the nanny,
although, they weren’t called that back then. Virginia Davis had been
working for Grandmother’s, Inc., which was a babysitting outfit here. I first
met her when Bart and Bria got the chicken pox before I was married. I called Grandmothers, Inc. and they sent Virginia Davis to the house. She was a terrific person who always wanted to start her own day care center, but she never got her act together sufficiently to do that, so I hired her full-time when I returned to work after Sara was born. I also had a full-time housekeeper who came and took care of the house and the laundry. I wasn’t making any money because I was paying it all out, but the house was running well.

Q. How did you make decisions about what school the kids were going to go to?

A. I was always a big public school fan. I had gone to public schools. Tom had gone to public schools, so we never considered anything else. Lee Elementary School was between our house and our office, and our office was only ten minutes away from home. Before that, after Sara was born, we put Bart and Bria in Montessori. It was a local Montessori school here and Mrs. Davis picked them up. Then when it came time for elementary school, they just went to public school, which at the time had a gifted children’s program. So it was a great place.

Q. How long did the kids attend Lee?

A. They attended Lee all through their elementary school years, which for the older two, was until junior high. It would have been through sixth grade at that time. And then because we were in a totally drug ridden junior high school district, and you didn’t have the option of going to other
public schools, we put them in Holland Hall, both of them, a year apart for junior high, with the thought that we would get them to go for high school to Booker T. Washington, which was by then a terrific magnet school. That didn’t work out because they were in Holland Hall for three years and had made many friends and they wanted to stay, so they ended up staying.

Q. When was Sara born?


Q. What was different about Sara’s childhood than Bart and Bria’s?

A. It was more stable and we were living here and they weren’t running around the world, I was working four days a week and Sara had older siblings, which was great for her.

Q. Were there differences in the views between Tom and Andy about the father’s role as a parent?

A. Totally different. Andy sort of tolerated the kids when they were tolerable, liked them when they were tolerable, didn’t do a very good job of tolerating them when they weren’t, and they were very small at the time. Bria was a very colicky baby and as were Sara and Anna, but Tom was a very nurturing sort of guy. He was crazy about the kids so he was totally helpful with new babies and toddlers and helped with the cooking and that was great.

Q. So you resumed the idyllic life that you had come to know?

A. Yes. The one I had envisioned when I got married the first time.

Q. What involvement did you have with your family during those
early years?

A. Well, my father had died. He died before Tom and I got married, and so it was 1971. Tom and I got married in 1972, so Tom never knew him. But my mother visited often and we got together with my siblings quite a bit. We would often go to Florida all together at the same time in the winter over Christmas. My siblings were scattered and were having babies, the older ones. So, it was not an everyday occurrence because we didn’t live in the same place, but we got together at least once a year.

Q. Okay. Well, I'll just start with community work. Were you engaged in community work in Tulsa?

A. Some. Mostly related to issues involving women or discrimination and I think I mentioned I was in a group that incorporated Call Rape. That was just the beginning of women being interested in domestic violence issues and Call Rape was one of the first organizations to be set up in relation to that. I was on the Tulsa Task Force for battered women, the legal advisory panel, and that was the precursor to – it was after that the Domestic Violence Shelter, the first shelter here, was built.

Q. Did you have any experiences with individuals who sought help from the Task Force For Battered Women or from Call Rape?

A. No, I was just mostly doing legal work for the people who were directly involved in that.

Q. When was Sara born?

A. Sara was born in 1974.
Q. So you indicated that you took six months off at that time?
A. Yes.

Q. And then you went back to work?
A. Yes. Four days a week.

Q. What was your schedule like?
A. I worked Monday through Thursday. It didn’t make a lot of sense to me to work part days. It was easier for me to work full days and not work Friday. It gave me a long weekend, so that was my work schedule.

Q. Who picked the kids up from school?
A. Mrs. Davis.

Q. What was your day like?
A. Tom and I would drop them off, one or the other of us would drop them off on our way to work, and she would pick them up.

Q. Did you and Tom go to work together?
A. Sometimes we did, but not all the time because we were often doing different things.

Q. When did your day begin and end, your workday?
A. It didn’t begin before the kids went to school, so 8:30, I think, typically.

Q. What do you remember about billable hours when you first started practicing?
A. They existed. Let me think. We didn’t have to bill so many hours in a year, and I just remember striving to bill 40 hours a week.
Q. Do you remember what rate you were billed out as an associate?
A. I have no recollection.

Q. There was no link between what you were billed at and what you earned?
A. No.

Q. So Sara was born in February of 1974. And what was it like raising an infant with toddlers? Well, actually, they weren’t toddlers. They were already in elementary?
A. Bria was five and Bart was six when Sara was born, so they were great help. That’s a wonderful age. So it was considerably easier than raising my first two children thirteen months apart.

Q. What was Tom’s schedule like during those early years?
A. Pretty much the same as mine. We probably did drive separate cars by then because I tended to come regularly. He always came home for dinner. That’s one thing we did, we always had dinner together with the children every night. And if one of us had to do work afterwards, I would do mine at home. Sometimes he would go back to the office.

Q. Who made the meals?
A. I mostly made the meals back then. He loved to cook and I think he would have cooked during the week if I had asked him to. If we had a dinner party, we both cooked. I just — it was a nice transition for me from work to home to cook dinner because the kids were all around. It was just a way to wind down and I enjoyed cooking. So most of their growing up
years, I cooked dinner during the week.

Q. How long did you maintain your four-day-a-week work schedule?
A. I maintained that until Anna was born. She was born in 1977. I, again, took six months off, and I went back to work four days a week. And I was still working four days a week when I applied for the judgeship.

Q. By the time Anna was born, had you become a partner with the firm?
A. Yes. I became a partner in 1975 when I was working four days a week.

Q. What was that process?
A. Oh, the guys got together and decided they would make me a partner.

Q. What did that mean in those days?
A. Well, I was the first female partner in Tulsa because there were so few of us, at least at a regular firm. I mean, Phyllis Zimmerman, I’m sure, was a partner with her husband because there were just the two of them. I was invited to be partner and then I got to go to the partnership meetings and I got a percentage. I don’t even remember what it was. It wasn’t very big. I do remember, however, that some of the partners were concerned about whether Tom would control my vote until we had our first partnership meeting. Tom made a motion that died for lack of a second and then they decided that maybe that wouldn’t be a problem.

Q. Did you and Tom have similar attitudes toward the practice of
A. Not really. Before we got married, he worked all the time. After we got married, he worked less, but he worked more hours than I worked.

Q. What type of issues did you debate with each other?

A. How to raise kids more than legal issues.

Q. What interests did the kids have during their elementary years?

A. They started playing soccer. That’s when soccer came to Tulsa when the older two kids were in elementary school and they both signed up. And Tom actually was a referee. He didn’t coach, but he became a soccer referee. So every weekend we had two soccer games and he was refereeing in addition to that. It was pretty busy.

Q. Did the demands of work require you to do extra activities on the weekend?

A. You mean extra work activities?

Q. Yes.

A. Tom would go in on Saturdays. Most of the lawyers would go in on Saturdays. I learned early on that they did more goofing off on Saturdays than anything else. I just preferred to take my lunch during the week, keep my nose to the grindstone, and get my work done during the week. So I rarely worked on weekends unless we were getting ready for a trial and it was just before trial, but that wasn’t very often. Most of our cases settled or were resolved on summary judgment motions or motions to dismiss.

Q. When did you first consider pursuing a judgeship?
A. When Jimmy Carter created a position, a new position, on the Tenth Circuit and designated — well, actually, Congress created the position and the President designated it for Oklahoma. He set up merit nominating commissions to which one applied, and he announced he was looking for women and minorities, of which there were close to none on the federal bench at the time, especially at the circuit court level.

Tom encouraged me and I thought, why not. So I applied and that was in 1978.

Q. What did you think it meant to be a judge on the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals?

A. I didn’t have much of a clue except that I knew it was — I always loved the law and I liked writing and I liked the legal issues in cases and so I just thought it would be interesting. I didn’t have any idea about quantity of workload or anything else for that matter. I knew I would, if I got the job, would be the only woman on the Court of eight judges. The Court sits in six states and the judges come from the various states in the Circuit, which are Oklahoma, Colorado, Utah, Kansas, New Mexico and Wyoming. When I did some research about the nominating commission, I discovered that it was composed of eleven people, six of whom were lawyers, five of whom were lay people, and that they had all been appointed by the President, with the help of the Attorney General, from the six states involved. It really was kind of an interesting concept.

Q. What was the role of the Judicial Nominating Commission?
A. They were charged by the President with interviewing people, soliciting applications from women and minorities to the extent they didn’t receive any, and proposing three to five names to the President for each position.

Q. Were there other women within the Circuit that applied?
A. One.

Q. What state was she from?
A. Oklahoma. This was an Oklahoma position.

Q. It was an Oklahoma position?
A. Yes. And there had been, I found out subsequently, two judges, one from Kansas and one from Utah, who were proposed by the same Commission and they had no women applicants from those states. They had two in Oklahoma.

Q. Who was the other one?
A. Alma Wilson, who was a state trial judge at the time. So there were two of us and they had a total of thirty-five applications. And I heard this story afterwards, it was told to a friend of mine who lives in Colorado who was a friend of a woman named Josie Heath, who was on the Commission. Apparently the chairman, Mr. Pense, I’ll never forget him — he was a 70-year-old trial lawyer from Wyoming and he came to my interview in his cowboy boots — but apparently, he changed the procedure for the Oklahoma position and treated it differently than he had in Kansas and Utah.

At the first meeting he called, he said, “We have thirty-five applications and
we need to reduce the number so let’s go around the table and everybody
throw out somebody who’s obviously not qualified.” And he started with me
and threw my name out. Josie Heath, who was not a lawyer, a lay person
from Denver, said subsequently that she was sitting halfway around the table
and she was stunned. She said, “Why are you throwing her name out? She’s
pretty well qualified, it seems to me.” And he said, “No, she’s not. She’s
got four children and couldn’t possibly handle the job.” Then she was really
stunned and didn’t know what to say. So it was going around the table and it
got to her. Fortunately, for me, she gathered her wits and threw out Pat
Irwin, who was then a sitting justice on the Oklahoma Supreme Court, who
turned out to be Mr. Pense’s favorite candidate. Mr. Pense was horrified and
said, “He’s clearly well qualified. Why are you throwing him out?” And
she said, “Because he has five children and couldn’t possibly handle the
job.” They then had a discussion about whether the number of children
should be a disqualifying factor, decided maybe it shouldn’t be, threw both
of our names back in the pot, and we were both on the list of four that they
ultimately proposed.

Q. Do you remember who the four were?

A. Dale Cook, Federal District Judge from Tulsa; Pat Irwin, who was
a justice on the Oklahoma Supreme Court; and Lee West who had been a
state trial judge in Oklahoma and recently on the Civil Aeronautics Board.
Lee had been living in D.C. and he had just come back to Oklahoma and was
practicing with Hall, Estill as I recall. So those were the four names.
Q. What do you know about the process for the ultimate selection?

A. That was very political because we were all trying to get chosen by the President. Everybody was campaigning and I didn’t really know what I was doing. I’m not sure the other people did either, but the women’s groups were — had been agitating to get women appointed to the these positions. There had only been two women ever in the history of the U.S. appointed to a federal court of appeals. FDR had appointed a women to the Sixth Circuit in the ’30s and Johnson had appointed Shirley Hufstedler to the Ninth Circuit. She was still sitting at the time. So all the women’s groups in Washington were lobbying for me to get it.

Dobie Langenkamp, who was my partner at Doerner, Stuart, Saunders, Daniel and Langenkamp, had left and gone to work for the Carter administration in the Department of Energy, and he was in D.C. He was a friend and he had a contact in the Carter Administration. So Dobie did some work for me. And when I went back to D.C. to do my own lobbying, he hooked me up with a woman, who was a friend of some aide to Roselyn Carter. She worked at the White House and I got an interview with her, not with Roselyn, but with the aide. So those were my contacts.

Dale Cook was a Republican and he basically didn’t get too far because he was a white male in addition to being Republican. President Carter actually appointed some Republicans, a black woman on the Second Circuit and an Hispanic male on the Ninth Circuit, among others, but a white male Republican probably didn’t quite fit what he had in mind. And I
remember Griffin Bell, who was the Attorney General, commenting when some reporter asked him, “Well, how come if this is a merit nominating process, how come more Republicans aren’t getting this position?” Griffin Bell thought a second and he said, “We’re not running an affirmative action program for Republicans.”

So Dale Cook was a non-factor. I think Pat Irwin, my recollection was, didn’t really have any contacts and so it was between me and Lee West, who as it turned out, had gone bird hunting with the Associate Attorney General in charge of judgeships in the Justice Department, while he was back at the CAB. But I got nominated, I’m sure, because the President was looking for more women.

Q. Were there any stories about how President Carter made his decision?

A. Well, I’ve heard that Roselyn was a big force in this whole process. There was a story I subsequently heard from Mike Lewis, one of my former partners. Some lawyer friend that he knew told him this story afterwards. There was some guy, who must have been one of the applicants, who was still pushing for the position even after he didn’t get his name on the list. He had done a lot of work for Jimmy Carter when Carter ran for president. He had become a friend of Chip Carter because Chip had come to Oklahoma for Jimmy Carter when he was running. Apparently Chip had told this lawyer that if there was ever anything he could do for him, let him know. When this fellow was trying to get on the list to be considered by the
President, he called his friend, the lawyer, who called the number that Chip Carter had given him, which was a number in the White House. He got Chip Carter and told him that his friend was really well qualified and would like to be considered for the position. And Chip said, “Hold on a minute, I’ll see what I can find out.” He was gone a long time and when he came back and he said, “No, I don’t think that will happen.” He said, “I talked to my mother and there’s a woman – there’s a woman named Seymour on the list.” So I think Rosalyn probably had a lot to do with the consideration of women. And the President had set up in the Justice Department – there were actually women in the Justice Department, women lawyers, who worked for the Attorney General and were charged with finding women to apply for these positions.

Q. How did you find out that you were the one who was going to be selected for the position?

A. It was a very long process. I got a call from one of the women in the Justice Department who told me that the President was going to nominate me and that the FBI was doing a background check. I got calls about that from people who were interviewed by the FBI. The ABA, there was a Tenth Circuit representative – the way it works for the ABA, each circuit has a representative to the ABA Committee. They do the background checks on nominees for judgeships and then they report to the Committee, the Committee votes, and then tells the President or the Attorney General whether the Committee thinks the individual under consideration is qualified.
for the position. And nothing happened for a long time. I heard nothing from anybody. I had no feedback from anyone saying they had been called by the ABA representative, even though I had feedback when the FBI called them. And then one day the Tenth Circuit representative, a guy named John Couch, called me up and asked if he — he wanted to come and interview me the next – actually, I think it was the same day. I said sure. So he showed up in the office. He asked me no substantive questions about anything. He asked me how I could take care of my four children and handle the job and it was very short and that was it.

And the next thing I heard was a call from one of the women, my contact in the Justice Department, who said that they had gotten a call from the ABA which was proposing to rate me unqualified for insufficient trial experience. And she said because the ABA had taken so long, the Justice Department had done their own background check, and the Attorney General thought I was exceptionally qualified, and they were not going to withdraw my name. They were going to ask the ABA to appoint somebody else in place of John Couch and to do a recheck.

When I heard this, I immediately wrote a letter to the ABA because they had – I had gotten all of their rules about how they’re supposed to operate and if they’re going to propose to rate you unqualified, they’re supposed to tell you in the interview and give you an opportunity to respond. Well, of course, John Couch did none of that. So I wrote a letter to the President of the ABA and said, “You didn’t follow your own process.”
And, as it turned out, there had been no real background check because once the ABA appointed John Sutro, who had been president of the ABA, to replace John Couch, I started getting a lot of feedback from people telling me they had gotten a call from the ABA. None of that had happened with John Couch and I don’t think he called a soul.

The end result was I got through the process and was officially nominated. My name was sent to the Senate in October of 1979. My interview with the committee had been at the end of January or early February of '79. So my name was forwarded to the Senate. I was confirmed on October 31. I had my hearing earlier in October.

Q. What was that like?
A. It was easy. I mean, I had all the kids there. I had a hearing in the Senate along with Tom Brett and Jim Ellison who had been nominated for federal district court positions here in Tulsa; Lee West, who had been nominated, when he didn’t get the circuit position, for a federal district court position in Oklahoma City; and Frank Seay, who was the nominee for the Eastern District position. We all had our hearing at the same time, so mine was very short. It was very non-controversial.

Q. The proceedings, I take it, were not as combative back then as they are now?
A. No. No, they weren’t combative at all.

Q. There was a lot of deference paid to each individual who had been nominated?
A. Yes. They asked us some questions. Bob Doyle was there because he was, by that time, married to Liddy Hanford Doyle, who had been my law school classmate. So she had sent him over to be nice to me, which he was. Everything worked out fine. And then I had my formal swearing in on November 16th.

Q. How old were the kids then?

A. Anna was two, Bart was twelve, Bria was eleven, and so that would have made Sara five.

Q. And how old were you?

A. Thirty nine. I had turned 39 in October.

Q. As you were going through all of these different stages of your life where you were the first female to do so many different things with respect to law school, your work at Baker and Botts, Doerner, Stuart and then this position, did you have any concept or understanding of the fact that you were blazing a trail for other women?

A. I did. I mean, I knew in the sense that I knew there hadn’t been anybody before me because it was kind of lonely out there, but I have a much greater sense of having been a trail blazer now with women – when women started coming after me and looking up to me – but at the time I was doing it, it was just – I was just doing what I wanted to do in a man’s world.

Q. How did women generally react to you during those formative years of your career?

A. I would say they acted fine. I’ve always gotten along with people,
so I never had any trouble with secretaries or working relationships with
people. I had more reaction from guys than from women. I remember Sam
Daniel, one of my partners, asking me – I was working late on something
and his secretaries all left at 5:00. He was running around looking for a
secretary about 5:15 and he had something that he wanted typed, so he asked
me if I would type it. And I said, “Hell, No – type it yourself.”

Q. The first time anybody had said no to him about anything?
A. I’m sure. But that was more of the kind of response I got from
guys than from women. I wasn’t running across professional women. I
wasn’t really practicing in state court where there was one woman judge,
there certainly weren’t any women judges in the federal court at the time. I
was treated very nicely in court. Allan Barrow, the federal judge here, loved
me because he loved women and so he was very deferential in the
courtroom. It was always, “Gentlemen and Mrs. Seymour,” and he just went
out of his way to be nice. One time I remember being at a pretrial
conference, which were run by “Judge Marilyn,” which was probably before
your time, but he had a long-time career law clerk named Marilyn who ran
his pretrials, as she ran a lot of things, so we referred to her behind her back
as Judge Marilyn. We had been in the conference room with her and we took
a break. There were lawyers from Oklahoma City on the case, it was a bank
related matter, and we all went to the restroom and to talk on the phone. As
I was coming back down the hall, the back hallway from the restroom to go
back to the conference room, Judge Barrow came out of his chambers, saw
me, and threw his arms around me to give me a big hug. I was looking over
his shoulder when the two lawyers from Oklahoma City came around the
corner at the end of the hallway and their mouths just dropped open.

Q. That's just the way it is?
A. That's the way it was.

Q. What is your memory of your swearing in?
A. It was a lovely ceremony. Monroe — I invited Monroe McKay to
come from Utah. We had struck up a friendship over the phone because he
had called me a lot during the process — he was one of my new colleagues on
the Tenth Circuit. And Bill Holloway from Oklahoma City, who was the
other judge from Oklahoma at the time, was there, a lot of lawyers, and
friends and my family. It was just a very nice ceremony in the courtroom.

Q. What interaction did you have with the President?
A. I had no interaction with the President.

Q. Who did the swearing in?
A. Bill Holloway.

Q. So it was here in Tulsa?
A. It was here in Tulsa.

Q. Did you ever get to make a trip to Washington other than for the
Senate hearings?
A. Afterwards to attend new judges’ school.

Q. How was that?
A. Very interesting because President Carter, by that time, had
appointed eleven women to the courts of appeals from across the country and 
I had not previously met any of them. We were all back there. I think there 
were something like 40 new circuit judges that Carter appointed. There was 
an omnibus judgeship bill after President Carter was elected, which created a 
number of new positions, mine was one of those. And so he got to appoint a 
lot of judges in his four years, a lot more than a sitting President normally 
would. So I got to meet the women that Carter had appointed and that was 
really interesting. One interesting thing that I learned was that out of the 
eleven women, six of them – to my recollection, six of them had gone to 
women’s colleges. I thought that was sort of an interesting commentary on 
the kind of education I had.

Q. Did you become friendly with any of those women?

A. Yes. Among those women was Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who later 
went to the Supreme Court. She was appointed to the Second Circuit. Pat 
Wald, who was appointed to the D.C. Circuit and later became chief judge. 
Amalya Kearse was the first black female appointed to the Second Circuit. 
Oh, gosh, Mary Schroeder was appointed to the Ninth Circuit and later 
became chief judge. Dorothy Nelson was appointed to the Ninth Circuit. 
I’m not remembering all the names. Dolores Sloviter was appointed to the 
Third Circuit. She later became chief judge. Carolyn Randall – she was 
Carolyn Randall at the time – was appointed to the Fifth Circuit, and later 
became chief judge. So it was a really – it was a fun experience and a very 
nice occasion.
There was a black tie dinner in the Supreme Court for all of the new appointees, who were there at the new judges’ school, and Warren Burger was the Chief at the time. We had cocktails in one beautiful Supreme Court room and we had dinner in another beautiful Supreme Court room. At the end of the dinner, there were toasts. Finally, Justice Burger clinked on his glass and announced that Justice Blackmun, who was there, would give a tour of his chambers to all the attendees and their spouses except for the women judges, and they would meet Justice Burger at a different location. We’re all looking at each other wondering what was going on. So we women judges troop out and meet Justice Burger, with his wife in tow. And he gives us a tour of his chambers, a separate tour. Justice Burger liked women also. And I will never forget, he’s telling us – it was very interesting because the Chief has two sets of chambers – they’re connected, but one in which he does all of his administrative work, of which there’s quite a bit, and the other one in which he does his judicial work. We were in one of them, I can’t remember which, and he says, “Oh, ladies, come here and let me show you – you’ll be particularly interested in this.” And he showed us his kitchen. Whereupon I thought Mary Schroeder was going to come unglued and punch him out, but she was doing all of this behind his back. So it was so – it was strange.

Q. How long was judges’ school?

A. Oh, three days, I think.

Q. What kind of things do they teach you?
A. Oh, there were judges who were brought in to talk about different
topics, like opinion writing, and we had somebody talk about ethics. We had
somebody talk about the code of judicial conduct. And I will never forget,
this male judge is up there talking about how spouses of judges are not
supposed to be involved in politics. Abner Mikva, who was an appointee
from D.C. to the D.C. Circuit, raised his hand and he said, “Well, I can tell
you my wife is not a tea server and so she’s not going to stay uninvolved in
politics.” And so there was some discussion about that, how you weren’t
supposed to put political signs in your lawn even though it was your joint
lawn and so forth. Subsequently, a couple of years later, my husband Tom
ran for mayor of Tulsa and he had to get an opinion. I had to write to
request an opinion from the Committee on Judicial Conduct saying it was
okay for my spouse to run for office in Tulsa, Oklahoma, because there had
been a prior opinion stating that spouses shouldn’t get involved in politics
which had pretty much indicated that running for office was a no-no.

Q. Was this just because of the appearance of impropriety?

A. Yes. I’m strictly prohibited from being involved in politics in any
way, shape, fashion, or form. And because most of the spouses had been
female all these years, it was not considered a big deal.

Q. When you finished judges’ school and returned to start . . .

A. I had already started.

Q. Oh, you had already started?

A. I had started. I was sworn in on November 16, 1979. I don’t
remember what day of the week it was. It probably was a Thursday or
Friday and I had a term of court in Denver the next week.

Q. What did you learn about that?

A. I had gotten briefs ahead of time, before I was officially sworn in.

I didn’t have any chambers. I came down here. There was not a phone.

There was not a typewriter. I had hired my secretary at the firm, Joan
Swope, to come with me as my secretary. I had one law clerk, Nancy
Vyhnal, whom I had hired. I still hadn’t hired the other two law clerks. So I
went back and used my old office at the firm to get ready. And then I went
off to Denver to sit for two days, including an en banc. It was an interesting
experience. Of course, I had met Judge Holloway and I had met Judge
Monroe McKay. Bill Holloway is the world’s nicest man and he was all
solicitous about my coming to Denver and meeting the other judges.

Everyone stayed at the Brown Palace, so I got there and checked in. Bill
had told me ahead of time that the judges all got together for cocktails before
dinner in the Chief’s hotel suite. The Chief then was Oliver Seth. Bill had
told me before I left Tulsa that he would come and collect me and take me
down to introduce me to everybody. And I knew approximately what time,
6:30. I sat there and I sat there and I sat there and it got to be 7:00 and I was
thinking, you know, what is going on. Finally, Bill Holloway showed up all
in a snizzle. The Brown Palace had lost me. Bill didn’t know what room I
was in and he couldn’t find me. And, of course, they were all down there in
the Chief’s room wondering where this person was.
So that was my beginning. And I went down and got introduced to
the judges and the next day I sat on cases.

Q. Do you have any recollection of the first case?
A. No. I have a recollection of the first one I wrote. It was an
employment discrimination case involving a man who worked for a railroad,
but other than that, no. And on the second day, which was when the en banc
was, I got sick. I was throwing up and there was no way I could go to court.
I had to call the judges and say I’m not showing up. We sat in panels of
three. I was sitting there wondering what are they thinking, that I’m too
scared to show up or something? As it turned out, Tom was home with our
children, who were also throwing up. So I had a bug of some kind. Those
were my first two days of sitting on the Tenth Circuit.

Q. What were your thoughts about dividing your time between Tulsa
and Denver?
A. It wasn’t really a division because the court held oral argument a
week every other month and that was the only time I went to Denver. So
most of my work was done in Tulsa, Oklahoma, all the preparation and
opinion writing.

Q. Did the kids have different attitudes about your becoming a judge?
A. No, they just thought it was neat. I mean, they started referring to
me as Judge Mom after they went to the Senate hearing. They thought that
was fun. I was just going to a different office as far as they were concerned.
They didn’t really have a clue.
Q. Did people start to treat you differently once you became a judge?
A. Yes, everyone started calling me Judge and it was so strange. I mean, I would be in the grocery store and somebody would call me Judge and I would look around wondering who they were talking to. It took me a long time to get used to that concept and it was just — it was odd to go from practicing law to being a judge because I wasn’t a judge who was seeing lawyers on a daily basis. I was a judge who was sitting down here, you know, working away in my private office with my law clerks. It was very — it was strange to go from private practice to that kind of position. It took me a little while to get used to it.

Q. So you began your career as a judge at the age of 39?
A. Yes.

Q. And you continued in that full capacity until what age?
A. I took senior status at age 65. And I’m still working.

Q. During those years, do you have a specific or some specific cases that you have a very distinct recollection of?
A. Well, probably the most renowned case I sat on was Brown v. Board of Education. We would get our briefs maybe a month, three weeks before a term of court and they would just arrive in a stack. I would have so many for Monday and so many for — we sat four or five days a week. And I picked up this brief and it was it was Linda Brown Smith v. The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas. I got the case in probably about ’91 because the opinion was filed in ’92 and it was the same case as the one the Supreme
Court heard. Linda Brown was the child over whom school integration in Topeka, Kansas was fought — her mother brought the action on her behalf and she was the plaintiff child in that case. The Supreme Court ordered in the '50s that schools be desegregated in Topeka, Kansas and elsewhere in the country. That child grew up, married, and became Linda Brown Smith, the Supreme Court had remanded the case back to the Tenth Circuit, which had sent it back to Topeka, Kansas, and it had never gotten closed. So Linda Brown Smith reopened the case on behalf of her daughter, claiming that the School Board had never desegregated the schools in Topeka, Kansas, and that was the case.

Q. Did you decide that?
A. We decided that. The District Court had granted summary judgment for the school district, the Tenth Circuit reversed. There was lots of evidence that nothing much had happened. The City was still segregated and kids went to the same old elementary schools and for economic reasons, the City hadn’t really done much by way of integration.

Q. Have you followed up on that since then?
A. Yes. We commented in the opinion on how various cities had desegregated, some by busing, some by magnet schools. They ended up settling the case and developing magnet schools in Topeka as a result of that case. That one certainly stands out in my memory.

Q. Fifteen years ago?
A. Yes. Death penalty cases — those were always hard.
Q. Why were those hard?

A. Because I'm not a big believer in the death penalty, for one thing, and I had to decide when I applied for the position if I could ever affirm a death penalty. I was living in this state where we had a lot of people on death row, I knew that. And I rationalized before I applied that I wouldn't be on the jury making the decision or sentencing somebody to death, that I would instead be seeing the case from a legal standpoint and I thought I could apply the law. I don't remember when I got my first death penalty case, but it was in the early '80s. There was a huge backlog, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals was not deciding the capital cases very fast, and the process was really long. We didn't get them until the end of the process. I remember in the mid '80s, we started getting some and we had an en banc question about the constitutionality of the provision of the Oklahoma death penalty statute regarding aggravating circumstances. We held the provision unconstitutional and that sent all of them back, literally, to the state courts for resentencing. So then we didn't get a lot more capital cases until maybe the late '80s, and then we got tons of them again in the '90s. Those are hard cases because somebody's life is at stake and because Oklahoma sentences all kinds of people to death row that nobody else does. I mean, no other state in the Tenth Circuit has the number of prisoners on death row that Oklahoma did and does. They might have five, whereas Oklahoma would have 150. So we were getting all of our capital cases out of Oklahoma.

Q. Did you ever have to make a decision on a frantic appeal?
A. Many times.

Q. And how did you respond to that?

A. Frantically, as we all did. Subsequently, we developed a system when we began to get a lot of last minute appeals that solved that problem by requiring the federal district judges who got the case first, because you have to go to the trial court before you get to us, we asked the district courts to send us copies as soon as anything got filed. And panels were created separately so that we always knew when we were up on the next death penalty panel. We didn’t do that on first habeas cases because those weren’t critical. I mean, those were decided on appeal in the ordinary course and the execution date wasn’t set until after the decision was made. It was the second successive habeas cases which were filed when there was an execution imminent that were hectic.

Q. What was the most dramatic death penalty case you were ever involved with?

A. I have sat on two where the defendant was actually innocent and I have to say those fall in that category. The first one involved a guy that – THE INNOCENT MAN that John Grissom has written a book about – was my case. Frank Seay, the federal district judge in the Eastern District of Oklahoma, actually granted the writ of habeas corpus based on ineffective assistance of counsel. The State appealed, and that was the state of the case when we got it. I just remember the record in the case being so skimpy, but the issue before us was ineffective assistance of counsel. The defendant
wanted a new trial. We agreed and affirmed the grant of the writ. The
defendant got a new trial and subsequently DNA evidence established that he
was not the person who committed the rape and the murder. In fact, DNA
evidence pointed to the guy who fingered him, a man who had been in the
bar and said the defendant, who was mentally slow, as I recall, had left with
the victim. So there was that case.

The other case was incredible. Tom Brett — these were all out of
Oklahoma — Judge Brett granted a writ of habeas corpus. The case involved
an execution-style murder around a pool in a small town in western
Oklahoma at 2:00 a.m. in the morning at a motel. The absolutely only
evidence was eyewitness identification. These people were partying out by
the pool when a man walked out at 2:00 a.m., pulled a gun, and shot the
victim dead. The eye witness gave a description, which was passed around
in Oklahoma, and some Tulsa cop said, “Gee, that sounds like” — I don’t
remember his name, but it was the man who was charged in the case. They
had a mug shot because he had committed some minor burglary or something
and they had a picture of him. They did a photo lineup, put his picture in it,
she picked him out and said, that’s the man, and they tried him. No evidence
other than identification. No gun, no fingerprints. In his defense, he put on
twelve people who were not acquaintances, who testified that at 10:00 or so
that night, he had been at a horse race in Dallas.

In rebuttal, the State put on somebody who testified that there was
this small airport near the little town in western Oklahoma, that this was
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clearly an execution-style murder, and if whoever hired the murderer had put
him on a private plane and flown him to this little airport, he could have
gotten there in time to commit the murder. The jury convicted and sentenced
him to death.

Subsequently, Pat Williams, who, as you know, is a criminal defense
lawyer here, a renowned one, and Racehorse Haynes, a big criminal defense
lawyer from Texas, represented the defendant in his habeas action. They
gathered evidence that showed the police were called before the trial by a
prostitute from North or South Carolina, I don’t remember which, who said
she’d overheard a particular policeman talking to a woman about killing this
man in Oklahoma who was her ex-husband, and the police didn’t disclose
that to the defense. That was *Brady* material, as you know, a constitutional
violation not to disclose information that might be exculpatory, and it was on
that basis that Pat Williams and the Texas lawyer took the case and argued
on habeas that the defendant was entitled to a new trial.

It turned out during the evidentiary hearing in the habeas case, this is
a fascinating case, the cop was dating the ex-wife of the victim and they
were having a custody fight over their children. So we have a motive. And
the policeman’s own police department was investigating him for having
heard that he was involved in an execution-style murder someplace else.

All of that evidence was presented at the evidentiary hearing, and
Tom Brett granted the writ, ordering a new trial based on the *Brady* material.
That’s what came up to us on appeal. I will never forget looking in the
record at the photo of this cop — or ex-cop by then — from North or South Carolina and he and the defendant could have been brothers because there was a picture of the two of them in the habeas record. Needless to say, we affirmed the grant of the writ. It went back and the State was actually going to retry the defendant because this woman was damn sure that he was the guy who did it. I read in the paper that two weeks before the retrial, the witness choked to death in a public restaurant after getting a bone caught in her throat. Now, do you want to write a novel or make a movie? Is that not incredible?

Q. That is incredible. But there’s no book written about that one?
A. No, but there should be. So those were two of my cases. I don’t know how many I have actually sat on in the years I’ve been on the Court, how many death penalty cases, not all that many, you know, 30 or 40, but two of the defendants were actually innocent.

Q. Have there been any cases that you decided on legal grounds, had to deny the relief sought, the individual was executed and then it was discovered that he was innocent?
A. No.

Q. How did your work as a judge affect your performance as a parent?
A. Well, I can tell you the opposite of that. I think my parenting made me a better judge because you learn about negotiating solutions to family problems, and dealing with colleagues sometimes becomes like
dealing with kids, spouses. Becoming a judge actually made my life easier because I am in total control of my schedule when I’m here. So unlike law practice where you have to show up places and see clients, it was very easy for me to take off and go to school plays, and kid’s school conferences, and soccer games and that kind of thing. So in that sense it made it better, and I could read briefs at home if I wanted to.

Q. How did you evolve as a legal practitioner over the years?
A. Oh, heavens, I don’t know. I got better as we all do. Practice makes perfect. I don’t really know the answer to that question. Certainly, the nature of the law practice evolved. I mean, Congress was busily passing laws that didn’t exist when I was in law school, energy related, environmental related, the firm had a big securities class action litigation representing a plaintiff in the Homestead case, in which I was involved. So the nature of what I was doing changed over time just in terms of the types of cases. But basically, I was doing the same thing. I was working on federal court cases, I was writing a lot of briefs, I was doing a lot of research more than going to court, filing motions and the like.

Q. Did Tom continue in private practice?
A. Yes. Well, after I became a judge, he ran for mayor, as I mentioned, in 1982. He left the firm to do it, lost, and then he went out on his own.

Q. Why did he decide to do that?
A. I don’t know. Just decided he would rather do that than be in the
firm. He had to take off to run for mayor, so then he developed his own
practice.

Q. How did the two of you balance your work lives with your home
life?

A. We juggled a lot, but I had good help. I had Mrs. Davis all those
years. I had her until Anna was 11 or 12 before she retired. I had Emily,
who I still have, who was the housekeeper, and then she became basically
kid keeper as well after Mrs. Davis retired. By that time, Anna was 11 and
Sara was 14, so they were busy in school all day, so Emily did the car
pooling. We, Tom and I, made a big point to go on the weekends to all of
their sports activities. We didn’t take them to practice. Mrs. Davis did that.
We traveled a lot, took the kids on a lot of trips. I think we did a moderately
decent job. Even when we’re both working hard, we’re both pretty efficient
at balancing family life and kid life.

Q. Tell us a little bit how you evolved and how the Court evolved
during the time that you were there.

A. Well, the Court – appellate courts – are interesting places because
you sit in panels of three, so you hopefully have collegiality among the
judges. One of the early stories – kind of cute, fun stories we have – during
my first years on the court, there was a judge named Bill Doyle from
Colorado. He was already up in age and he was an Irishman with an Irish
temper who could get fairly cantankerous. And in his later years, which
were my early years, he got very testy about judges who disagreed with him,
even though the judges were disagreeing on legal matters. Judge Doyle would call them up and chew them out personally, ream them out if they disagreed with him. I remember Monroe McKay warning me ahead of time, before I sat for the first time, that Bill Doyle had this tendency and that I shouldn’t take it personally. I laughed and I said, “Oh, I bet he won’t do that if it’s a woman.” Sure enough, he didn’t. I could disagree with him on anything and he never got cross with me. So my colleagues learned that pretty fast and they would call me and get me to call Bill and tell him that I was the one disagreeing with him so they could avoid getting reamed out by him. I told my colleagues they were hiding behind my skirts. Our Court was pretty collegial because we were a small group. There were only eight of us when I went on the Court. We all sat together in Denver for the entire term, unlike many of the other circuit courts. Some of the courts were getting really big. The Fifth Circuit got huge and it was split into the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits.

But then we had a huge case explosion in the early 1980s. I remember one year our case load grew 16 percent. President Reagan had been elected in 1980 and new positions were being created. Our Court got two new positions about the same time that three of our judges took senior status and were going to be replaced. So we were faced with the prospect of getting five judges appointed by President Reagan, and the country had taken a conservative turn. In the first few years of the ’80s, there were a lot of new judges going on circuits across the country and there was a lot of political
tension, shall we say, between them and the many Carter appointees, of
which there had been a lot because of the Omnibus Judgeship Bill. There
was another Omnibus Judgeship Bill in the Reagan years because of this case
explosion. Before we got any of the new appointees, we actually had a
conversation about how we didn’t want to have a divisive court and that we
were going to go out of our way to be friends socially so that we could
hopefully avoid some contentiousness as a court. We were very successful
in doing that.

In 1985, I got my first female colleague. Deanell Tacha was
appointed from Kansas and then it was she and I versus the guys on non-
legal issues. Over a period in the ’80s, we got five new judges, two of which
were new positions, so there were then ten of us. In the early ’90s, we got
another new position, that was Paul Kelly from New Mexico, so there were
eleven of us. And then sometime later, I think in the Clinton years, we got
an additional position. So then there were twelve active judges on the Tenth
Circuit, which there are now. Over that period of time, judges took senior
status and were replaced. So we had a lot of senior judges helping out.

I became Chief Judge in 1994. You become Chief by seniority, it’s
not a popularity contest. The most senior active judge becomes Chief. That
happened to me when I was 58, in 1994, when Monroe McKay, my
colleague, decided to take senior status. He had only been Chief for a couple
of years. Then Jim Logan, another Carter appointee, took senior status and
suddenly I was the only remaining active judge on the court who had been
appointed by a Democratic President, which was sort of an interesting
phenomenon. In over ninety percent of the cases it doesn’t make any
difference. Ten percent of the cases, it probably does just because of
different philosophies about constitutional issues, search and seizure, and
that kind of thing.

But the dynamics of the Court change every time you get a new judge
because you have to learn about who they are and how they operate, and they
have to get used to you and they’re sitting with their new colleagues
immediately. We rotate panels in our circuit every day of the week when we
sit, unlike a lot of other circuits. The result is that we all sit together often,
which helps maintain collegiality. The Court just sort of evolves over time,
and it changes in personality and in the way the particular judges approach
work.

Clinton got four appointments as more judges took senior status.

When Deanell was appointed, she was 39 and had four kids, so we were the
youngest, and a lot of other judges were older and took senior status when I
was just beginning to be Chief Judge. It’s a dynamic process which makes
the job more interesting, I have to say.

Q. What additional responsibilities did you have as Chief Judge?

A. Oh, it was a pain in the you-know-what! Many administrative
responsibilities, which I really didn’t like at all. The Chief of the Circuit is
basically administrative chief for the whole circuit, all the way down to the
magistrate judges. The Chief of the Circuit gets every judicial misconduct
complaint that any lawyer or pro se prisoner elects to file against any judge of the circuit, including magistrate judges, and the Chief has to assess them and decide whether to set up an investigating committee. There are not that many, but they’re constant. And employee problems as the Circuit grew. When we grew as a court, the Circuit staff grew, the staff attorneys, the clerk’s office, and so on. The Chief ends up with all of that stuff on her desk and that was not my favorite thing. I’d rather be deciding cases. Actually, I thought about quitting the first year because I disliked that part of it so much, but the Chief of each circuit sits on the Judicial Conference of the United States, which is a body composed of the chief circuit judge in each circuit and one district judge elected by the district judges in each circuit, plus the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. It is the policy making arm for the courts and there are Judicial Conference Committees of judges in particular areas who actually work on matters like new federal rules, whether cameras in the courtroom should be allowed, whether new judgeships are warranted, and any number of other important matters. All of the work of the conference committees funnels through the Judicial Conference itself. That was very interesting and there were only two other women on it when I started. One of them was a district court judge and her term ended, and then there were two females out of twenty-seven voting members. I remember sitting there looking around thinking, “I can’t quit. I need to stay on this body – this virtually all-male body,” and so I did and that’s one of the reasons I stayed on as a Chief. But it was a lot of work.
Q. You served for how many years?

A. Seven. It was a seven-year term.

Q. What was the most interesting personal experience you had during that time that resulted in or that was associated with your being Chief?

A. Oh, well, I had some interesting experiences when I first started. I did two things that earned me the admiration of my male colleagues. I fired the circuit executive, that was my first official act. He was not very good at all and Judge McKay – Judge Holloway before him – had taken a lot of the matters the circuit executive should have been doing into their chambers and had their administrative assistant doing it. I decided I didn’t want to spend seven years with somebody getting paid a lot of money who wasn’t doing his job. The circuit executive serves at the pleasure of the Court and I announced what I planned to do, asked if anybody objected, nobody objected, and I did it.

Q. And the other thing?

A. One of my colleagues is the world’s nicest man. Unfortunately, he has the worst time making up his mind about decisions and he had a huge backlog of cases which nobody had really ever dealt with. The Chief Judge creates the panels. So I called that judge on the telephone and told him that because of his backlog, I wasn’t going to let him sit on oral argument cases until he got caught up. He was not happy, but he got caught up and he subsequently thanked me profusely for making him get current. Those are the two major things that I did out of the box.
Q. Did you have to spend any more time in Denver as a result of being Chief?

A. Not a lot. We hired an excellent circuit executive and by that time, we had E-mail and fax, so many matters could be handled that way. I did my judicial misconduct complaint work here in chambers. I only sat three days. I cut back my caseload when I was there so I could take the other two days during court week in Denver to do what I needed to do.

Q. Did you encourage any of your kids to follow in your footsteps by going to law school?

A. I would have been delighted if all of my kids followed in my footsteps. But they grew up around a dinner table – because, like I said, we always had dinner together – and that’s when we talked politics and cross-examined them about their lives. After living with two lawyers, they all decided they didn’t want to follow our footsteps. They all went off to college and majored in whatever they wanted to major in. The girls were more politically interested than Bart was and they were always very opinionated on feminist issues. Bart became an engineer and went into the computer field. Bria got a masters in clinical psychology, specializing in play therapy. Anna majored in psychology and worked with welfare families and then autistic children before she had her first child.

Sara was an art history major, which she loved and she still loves.

She went to Boston College and, in her last year, she interned in Senator Ted Kennedy’s office. And when she walked to his office from the subway, she
would go by these kids out in uniforms doing calisthenics on the Boston
Commons every morning. She inquired about what they were doing and
discovered they were members of City Year, which was an organization that
actually was started by some Harvard law school graduates. It involved
getting high school and college graduates to join together as a corp to work
on various public interest projects. Bill Clinton saw the same thing on a
visit to Boston and created AmeriCorps, which was patterned after City
Year. It gets kids to work for a year for very little pay doing public service
work. In City Year, they were divided up into teams and each team had a
sponsor like a law firm or corporation, and they worked together on projects
around the city. Sara became intrigued by the concept, took her first
political science course her senior year, and then decided that she wanted to
join AmeriCorps, which had been created by then and was running City
Year. So she signed up and did that for a year. She worked in a poor, mostly
Hispanic, inner-city school in Boston assisting the art teacher. In addition,
her team worked with its corporate sponsor to obtain a grant to fund a
playground for the school. That experience made her decide she wanted to
save the children of the world and she concluded the best way to do that was
to go to law school. So my art history major ended up becoming a lawyer,
the only lawyer in the family.

(Interview was adjourned.)