Population and Reproductive Health Oral History Project

Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College
Northampton, MA

Patrick Sheeran

Interviewed by
Deborah McFarlane

October 23, 2002
Bethesda, Maryland

This interview was made possible with generous support from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

Narrator

Patrick J. Sheeran, D.P.A. (b. 1932) was the director of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Office of Population (OPA). A former Catholic priest, Sheeran worked in the OPA from 1977 to 2006. Prior to joining OPA, he was director of Planned Parenthood in San Mateo, California. His scholarly work has examined the beliefs of leaders of the pro-choice and pro-life movements.

Interviewer

Deborah R. McFarlane is professor of political science at the University of New Mexico. She is the author, with K.J. Meier, of *The Politics of Fertility Control: Family Planning and Abortion Politics in the American States* (Congressional Quarterly Press, 2001). McFarlane worked as an administrator and a consultant in reproductive health in the U.S. and internationally for more than three decades.

Restrictions

None

Format

Six 60-minute audiocassettes.

Transcript

Transcribed, audited and edited at Baylor University. Transcript has been reviewed and approved by Patrick J. Sheeran.

Bibliography and Footnote Citation Forms

Audio Recording

Bibliography: Sheeran, Patrick J. Interview by Deborah McFarlane. Audio recording, October 23, 2002. Population and Reproductive Health Oral History Project, Sophia Smith Collection. **Footnote:** Patrick J. Sheeran, interview by Deborah McFarlane, audio recording, October 23, 2002, Population and Reproductive Health Oral History Project, Sophia Smith Collection, tape 1.

Transcript

Bibliography: Sheeran, Patrick J. Interview by Deborah McFarlane. Transcript of audio recording, October 23, 2002. Population and Reproductive Health Oral History Project, Sophia Smith Collection. **Footnote:** Patrick J. Sheeran, interview by Deborah McFarlane, transcript of audio recording, October 23, 2002, Population and Reproductive Health Oral History Project, Sophia Smith Collection, p. 23.

Population and Reproductive Health Oral History Project

Patrick Sheeran

Interviewed by Deborah McFarlane
October 23, 2002
Bethesda, Maryland

McFarlane Okay, so we're here with Patrick Sheeran on October 23, 2002. Patrick is the director of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy. And Patrick, I'd like to get started with kind of your early life upbringing, where you were born, parents, siblings.

Sheeran All right. Thank you, Deborah. I was born in Ireland, the oldest of five. Four of us lived, only one girl, and she died as an infant. I was brought up in rural Ireland in a place called County Roscommon, which is about ninety miles west of Dublin—a rural area. And I suppose it's in the province of Connaught, which Cromwell, the notorious Cromwell, once said, "Go to hell or to Connaught." (McFarlane laughs) So that kind of describes the terrain in which I was raised.

McFarlane Tell me something about your parents and family.

Sheeran Well, my parents were both from the same area. They got married, I suppose, in their twenties—late twenties. And they had four—five. My father was a farmer, a great believer in farming and particularly in horses, which was one of his fortes, raising and training horses, and sometimes for farming purposes and sometimes just to have beautiful horses. They were very simple people. They had never gone to high school, much less college

and they were mostly farm-earth people. As I said earlier, it was a poor community. And during the war years in particular—World War II that is, it was a pretty dismal place. I mean, in those days there were no cars. There were cars, but there was no petrol or gas for those cars so they were on stilts. In those days there were no tractors and if there were, there was no gasoline to keep the tractors moving or keep them working. So consequently everything had to be done by hand on the farm. So it was a tough rugged rough life in that area.

McFarlane Where did you go to school?

Sheeran I went to—in Ireland there's a system of national schools so I went to the local national school to the seventh grade. And I had to quit school in the seventh grade. I never did finish, the reason being that my father became very ill with a bad—something in his foot and leg which prevented him from being able to work, so consequently I had to take over at the ripe age of thirteen or so and work on the farm, including plowing and all the stuff with horses—no tractors, remember. And after about a year or so my father recovered and I was able to go to high school about a hundred miles away, a boarding school in County Kilkenny in Ireland. From there I decided that I was going to enter the seminary to study for the priesthood and entered St. Patrick's College in Thurles, a seminary, in Thurles, County Tipperary, where I spent seven years to become a Catholic priest.

McFarlane And you became a Catholic priest when?

Sheeran In 1956, and I volunteered to come to the United States and above all places to Corpus Christi, Texas, a place I didn't know existed until a priest

from that particular part of the—actually he was from my own county, Roscommon. He'd been a football hero and star. He came over on behalf of the bishop of Corpus Christi to recruit recruits like myself who would be willing to take a chance on going to Corpus Christi and I decided, Well, Corpus Christi is as good as any. Because I have a lot of relatives in New York, and Boston, and San Francisco, and Los Angeles and frankly I didn't want to be around any of them so I decided that it was better to go to someplace where I didn't know anybody and nobody knew me and start off on my own, a kind of a lone ranger, if you will, just to explore the great southwest and particularly the area—Texas and surrounding Mexico. So that was one of the reasons I decided to go there.

McFarlane In terms of going into the priesthood, did you have a calling? Did you know what you wanted to do with that?

Sheeran Well, I never heard any little voices if you mean by that a calling. I never knew what a calling was. I talked about vocations and callings. I really didn't have any of that. And frankly I went—I decided I was going to give it a shot, give it a try, and once you get into a seminary situation you become kind of institutionalized. It's an institution where you can live there from year to year and one year passes, then another and then you're still there. Actually, I enjoyed it to some extent, because although it was more like a concentration camp, certainly worse than the Marine Corps training area. Because in those days, the seminaries were not what they are today. There was a very rough, rugged, regulative, restrictive life that was run bureaucratically by rules and regulations. And that didn't mean that we

always lived up to them. It was fun breaking them and without being caught or trying to find a way around them. So that was kind of exciting. There were about 125 of us in that particular seminary, all great guys. And I think the thing that kept us going was sense of humor number one and most of us were very much involved in sports. And I really excelled in that in the sense that I wanted to play every sport, particularly Irish football, and when I came home during the summer time I was able to play for my county. Unfortunately, I missed a lot of games—some were played during the winter time when I was in school. And as one of my colleagues from County Roscommon once put it—he said the seminary, the priesthood, is "the graveyard of footballers." And that's a kind of a sad thing to say because, you know, you've a limited number of years to be there. You're never going to get a chance to play them all and sometimes when you come out your team has been beaten so you're not going to be able to do anything. I say the same thing with Irish hurling. And a lot of my colleagues were in the same boat. So we were all miserable together from that respect and it was going to be a question of time before we were going to have a very short career in that particular sport or any particular sport for that matter.

McFarlane Okay. So you show up in Corpus Christi in 1956?

Sheeran Uh-huh, I came to Corpus Christi in 1956—actually, I came to New York first. I spent about a couple of weeks there. It was in September of 1956 and I remember it well because we came over on a boat, the *SS America*, I believe. If I remember correctly, we came over through a hurricane. And I

remember very well that only two of us showed up regularly for breakfast every morning. We didn't get sick. We weathered the storm so to speak. And arrival in New York was an eye-opener, certainly a cultural shock to see the traffic, and the huge buildings, the high rises, the people—the number of people, the cars, the taxis. I remember those yellow taxis. I'd never seen them in Ireland before. It was an eye-opener and certainly I had to adapt very quickly to that atmosphere. I could have lived in New York in those days, but then my goal was to go to Corpus Christi. So I took my first airplane ride from Newark, New Jersey down to Houston, Texas. And I remember it very well. It was Eastern Airlines and then I was fortunate to have a chance of riding an airplane from there to Corpus Christi, long since out of business called TTA, Trans Texas Airlines. Anyhow, I arrived in Corpus Christi about five o'clock in the evening and it was so hot and humid I couldn't believe it. I saw all these priests out there with straw hats, cowboy hats, and the like and I said, "What the hell are they doing here?" And—I was so hot with my heavy Irish clothes that when I got off that airplane frankly if I had enough money I would be on the next plane back to New York. But I decided to stay and stayed in Corpus Christi for a few days and the weather was just unbelievable. It was just taxing and the heat and the humidity alone were such that one could get up in the morning at six o'clock and by nine o'clock you were so sleepy and tired you'd want to go back to bed. But anyhow gradually I was told that the blood would thin and you would become adjusted to the climate and everything would be just fine. That of course did happen in the next year or so and the heat and

humidity that I once couldn't stand, I never noticed at all after that.

McFarlane And what did you do when you first got to Corpus?

Sheeran Well, I was in the Cathedral in Corpus Christi until they made up their minds what they were going to do with me and another fellow who had come out with me from Ireland. Anyhow, both of us were sent to the "Magic Valley." I used to call it the "Tragic Valley" down in South Texas along the border of Mexico. I was sent to a little place called Mission, famous for only a couple of things. One is the home of the great Dallas Cowboy coach Tom Landry and a famous senator subsequently who ran for vice president of the United States. But it was a little town right across the Rio Grande River from Reynosa, Mexico. The other fellow was sent next door to McAllen, Texas, which was a much more uppity up community, a nicer place. McAllen even had an airport. The only good thing about Mission was about fifteen miles out from the town of Mission, I don't know whether you can call it a city or not, but there was an Air Force base called Moore Field—the training base for young Air Force cadets or trainees. And it was in the middle of nowhere; absolutely nothing out there except the wild deep blue yonder to put in Air Force terms. And these guys were bored. They had nothing to do. They couldn't stand the heat or the humidity either, so they'd come in and visit me in the interest of I guess "misery loves company." And so, I got to know the people of the military—the Air Force in particular. And they were all young guys my age and we had a great time together. We played tennis and we played all kinds of games and kept ourselves active—kept ourselves from going crazy. And

I used to go out there to the base and say mass for them and talk with them. And I was available for them for counseling or whatever else they needed and to make—if they got into trouble to be able to negotiate with their commanders to make sure that everyone is properly handled. Actually usually at every Air Force base there's a chaplain usually one Catholic chaplain—sometimes more than that and Protestant chaplains and Rabbis. This place was so small that they didn't even have a Catholic chaplain. They had a Protestant. So I was sort of an acting chaplain for those folks. It was at that environment that I got to love the United States Air Force. During the year down there in Mission, Texas I really picked up a lot of Spanish. I realized the first morning I went in for breakfast that I needed to know Spanish. I was with—fortunately enough, I was with a fellow down there, a pastor—a great character by the name of Monsignor Dan Lanning, L-a-n-n-i-n-g. And Dan had been a chaplain in World War II and he had great stories of what he experienced in World War II. In fact, he was a Protestant and became a Catholic, a convert. He was sort of a radical man. Dan had some great stories. I remember once he was trying to raise money to build a church—to build a new church and the church was kind of falling down. So, he was talking to the people one Sunday morning and all of a sudden a big piece of mortar fell at his feet, so he looked up and he said, "Thank you, Jesus," and carried right on. (McFarlane laughs) I guess he figured this was a message to the people. And Dan was very funny with things like that. He had a great thunderbird car, a convertible. We used to sport around that thing at 115 miles an hour going from Mission, Texas to Corpus Christi,

which is about a two and half hour drive. Dan would make it in an hour and half, no problem. He never stopped for lights or anything else. He just kept going. He always smoked a cigar. Never wore a clerical collar—sometimes would wear a little cap. Nobody knew who he was. He never wore any clerical clothes. Actually he didn't need to wear them. Down there in Corpus Christi—Mission, Texas because it was so hot and warm that you would faint from exhaustion from the heat. Anyhow, it was kind of interesting running around with Dan in this. It was in Mission with Dan that I started going to American football games, high school games. I couldn't understand what was happening at all. I didn't understand the rules and regulations and all these timeouts and huddles. And it was so different from soccer and Irish football, which I had played. And all of a sudden I began to pick up on it. And, I found out that in Texas if you're going to survive, you'd better know about football, you'd better know about high school football, and you'd better be in attendance at those games. And from then on I became an avid supporter of American football particularly in Texas going to all the high school games I could get to. And then of course all these kids were moving on to college so all of a sudden you become interested in and involved with such colleges as Texas itself and the University of Texas in Austin, Texas A&M, and all these schools that were competitive and competitive with each other. And it was an interesting experience. By then of course having been there you automatically have to become a supporter of the Dallas Cowboys professional team because it's Texas and Texas does things a bit differently. And I really had become, I

guess, a real native Texan in one sense and certainly an adopted Texan and subscribe to their big-thinking and their great old philosophy of the state of Texas.

McFarlane So, were you in Mission—how long?

Sheeran I was in Mission for one year and then after a year the bishop decided to move me to Corpus Christi to a great place, to St. Patrick's Parish in Corpus Christi, which was in the south end of Corpus Christi, very wealthy rich neighborhood with a lot of oil people, physicians, lawyers. Everybody wanted to live in that neighborhood in St. Patrick's Parish. In fact the real estate people used to advertise their houses for sale and whatever as being (phone rings) in St. Patrick's Parish. They advertised the housing and I suppose it was a spin they put on selling a house. If it is from St. Patrick's Parish, it must be just fine. And that applied not just to Catholics, but to Protestants and everybody that this was the place to live. At St. Patrick's Parish I was fortunate to have a great boss by the name of Monsignor Mullen who was a great big guy originally from Kansas City and he was a rock of common sense. He had a philosophy that he would never tell you not to do something because he would say, "If I told you don't do it, you'd always wonder could I have done it. And on the other hand if you do it and you make a mistake, you learn not to do it again. If on the other hand if it works, then fine and good." So, he said, "You have to make your own judgment calls. If you want guidance, I'll give you guidance, but I'm never going to tell you not to do something or to do something." And I thought that was a great philosophy. He was a financial wizard. He knew how to

manage money and property and I learned an awful lot about stocks and bonds and how you rob Peter to pay Paul. But St. Patrick's was a very affluent place. The church itself was brand new, the most modern in all of Texas. The schools were—the schools he had built were absolutely wonderful. They made the national education magazines as an ideal school with the facilities and everything else modern. We had everything there. We had—of course, being St. Patrick's the girls in particular wore green skirts and white tops. It was all an Irish image in a way. Even the football team, they were the Shamrocks. It was quite a place. I was fortunate enough that a classmate of mine from Ireland with whom I'd gone to high school and was in the seminary a year behind me, Seamus McGowan, he's still in Corpus Christi, he came out and joined me there. And we were at St. Patrick's together. Then we had another fellow come in from County Donegal in Ireland, Father Charlie Doherty. And we all became known as "the Irish mafia." We really were a team with Monsignor Mullen. We functioned as a team. We behaved as a team. We had great fun together, but we also were—they still talk about us down there all these years later about this Irish mafia and how they were all over the place. It was interesting. Mentioning St. Patrick's School, we had some very famous people there. For example, Farah Fawcett was a student at St. Patrick's in my time. It's interesting that when I go back to Texas nowadays, I run into people in Dallas, San Antonio, Austin, Corpus Christi who were in St. Patrick's school during my time. They are lawyers, judges, physicians. I know one fellow—I just talked to him a short time ago—who's a judge on the Texas Supreme Court—

superior court, and another one district attorney in Corpus Christi. There are all kinds of physicians and professionals that were at St. Patrick's in my time. It's interesting to run into them now that I'm wearing a different cap and share memories of the past. But all these young people were at the school, but they also were part of another organization that I founded at St. Patrick's called the CYO, the Catholic Youth Organization. And we had the biggest and the best one in all of Texas. We had probably about 250 high school students and it was boys and girls from grades nine through twelve. I followed Monsignor Mullen's motto of giving them all the kind of latitude and leadership. It was interesting in those days, President Kennedy had just become President of the United States. He became President of the United States shortly after I went to St. Patrick's and he put a great emphasis on youth and the importance of young people in the government. And Kennedy calling young people a wave of the future, it gave these young people something to look up to and they had, in a way what I might call, mentors at the highest level—people that they wanted to imitate and be like. And all of them had ambitions and leadership skills and we tried to just do that. We met once a week and we divided into different committees. Here today in the United States we're talking about young people and some of the problems the difficulties with them in terms of drugs and sex and pregnancy and violence and all of these things. And they have come up here with a multidimensional approach to try and give them incentives to be decent citizens and to be "productive members of society" as the language goes. In those days we had a little of this, a little of that, and a lot of

everything and some people say a lot of nothing. In our day we had the—the CYO motto was—we had some spiritual activities which were good. We had attendance at church. It mostly involved that and some other different things such as retreats. We had also other dimensions. There was an athletic dimension—sports, an athletic area where they played and organized themselves for football, baseball, bowling, softball—various types of activities. And getting together to go to games, high school football, college games et cetera. There was a social dimension to it too where we had dances and parties and all kinds of activities of that kind that were different from both the spiritual and the physical. And then there were some cultural activities. We had a cultural committee that developed plays and skits and various other things and put them on for parents and people all over the city. So, a little of this and a little of that and I looked at that now and I see—I look at it now and I see we were doing that then. And when I hear of youth development and developmental assets, this new thing in the United States—developed by Search Institute in Minneapolis, and I look at the forty so-called assets and I see them as nothing more than what we were doing with CYO back there then—it's nothing more than the same thing in a new suit. When I go back to Texas and I talk with some of those folks and they tell me about what they learned—for example, how they raised funds. We went to national meetings in Buffalo, New York, and Kansas City. We brought a whole lot of kids. I remember bringing about twenty-five, thirty of them from Corpus Christi on a train to Buffalo, New York to a national meeting where there were probably twenty-five thousand people of the

same age from all across the country. The people would say to me, "How could you manage to take these kids on a train? Well didn't they get out of hand?" Absolutely not, they were well-trained. That didn't mean that they were duds. They had a lot of fun, but it was good respectable fun. We took, oh, about, fifteen or twenty of them to Kansas City to another meeting in cars. Three or four of us drove them from Corpus Christi—a long drive, but again it was a lot of fun. And they met people from all across the country—became friends and so much so that they all became competitive and two of those—three of those young people whom I took became the national youths of the year in a national competition that they were named—two of them were named the National Young Person of the Year, CYO leader of the year, and one was runner-up over a period of three years. So they were able to compete successfully with their contemporaries from every nook and corner of the United States. They raised money for these trips. I mean they raised the funds—one of the wildest of these kids was absolutely terrific. He decided that we could—they could, not me—that they could put together an antique car show at the coliseum, a huge auditorium in Corpus Christi on Ocean Drive overlooking the Gulf of Mexico. And they would rent the coliseum for a weekend. They would get these antique cars and they would get all the new cars that were coming out that particular year to be shown at that particular show. And it was over a weekend. He hired police. He would hire off duty policemen and everything else. They ran the show. A tremendous success. We made far more money than was needed to do a lot of things. So in other words they were capable

of planning the activities themselves, raising the money to conduct them, learning skills and leadership. To me it was fascinating to see that type of involvement—it wasn't a question of preaching hellfire and damnation. That didn't work and wouldn't work anyhow. But to involve them in a lot of other things that they were interested in and to be able at the same time to develop skills and leadership, that was the important thing. And I was very proud to see them—so many of them—not all of them, but so many of them go on to very successful careers and indeed a credit to themselves and their families.

McFarlane So the youth club had about 250?

Sheeran That's correct, yeah.

McFarlane Okay.

Sheeran From there we went on to—we were able to organize in every other parish in Corpus Christi and all over the whole diocese of Corpus Christi everybody else, other CYO groups—we had inter-parish competition as well. We all had the same model, the same kind of things—so the same kind of programs. Maybe some were not—none of them were as large as ours, but they were competitive. These kids, they all knew each other and with great exchanges because we had not only a parish level we had a city wide group that met every once in a while to plan activities that were jointly conducted. It was just an exciting thing to see that work itself out.

McFarlane And how long were you in Corpus?

Sheeran I was in Corpus Christi from 1957 to 1962. I was there about five or six years.

McFarlane Directing the school?

Sheeran Oh, yeah. The only other job there was to be the director of St. Patrick's school and that was—we had, let's see, about eight hundred young people grades one through eight—huge statues—with the—a lot of Irish down from the Incarnate Word Order. Most of them—a few lay teachers and I tell you what, these old nuns they were something else. No way you could fool them. I mean they were very good. Very good teachers, everybody was trying to get into St. Patrick's School. We had more requests for people—from all kinds of people, not just Catholics but people from other parishes, Protestants, Jews, atheists, trying to get into St. Patrick's School because of its prestige and the high standards, thanks a lot to the nuns. Unfortunately some of the classrooms were too crowded overly crowded, but in spite of that they were very successful in turning out well-educated well-disciplined students. At St. Patrick's I worked with the principal of the school and taught some classes over there as well as to high school students who—we had classes for them every Monday night for four or five years. It was kind of exciting in addition to just working with the kids in the school. And of course also having football team and cheerleaders and the whole works, it was very exciting. There was always a question of money and Monsignor Mullen's issue on money was that if people could afford it, fine and good. Sometimes people had four or five children in the school and they weren't able to pay for them all so we just took them in. We somehow or other were able to get them through without putting the parents in complete debt. We were able to raise money from other sources for the school mostly for

the parish. We never preached money. There was never any talk about money. However, we did run during that time while I was there, a couple of fundraising campaigns to expand the school, the classrooms et cetera and were very successful. In fact we—over a period of about three weeks, we would put this into effect then. We brought in an expert, a pro—a professional group from Kansas City, we worked with them. And that was the only time money was ever mentioned. And the pledges were over a three year period—far surpassed the goal that we had set. So it was more money than you could shake a stick at to get the classrooms built and expanded and make sure that everything around there was perfect. There was no nickeling and dimming. There was no such thing as selling tickets or cakes or bake sales. There was none of this stuff. Everything was very uppity up, very professional, and people respected that. They didn't want to be hounded to death for money and certainly didn't want to be nickeled and dimed and selling cookies and stuff like that. There were far more important things to do. Of course other groups to work with—men's group that was very active in helping to support the programs as were the women's groups and all kinds of spiritual groups as well that I didn't have very much to do with. The other priests worked with them. I worked mostly with the young people at school and the young people. In addition to that I had another job.

Tape 1, side 1, ends; side 2 begins.

—at St. Patrick's, a job that would be full-time in any other diocese. I became the Secretary of what they call the Matrimonial Tribunal. There is a

Matrimonial Tribune in every Catholic diocese in the world. A Matrimonial Tribunal is really a court, a court that— you might call it a divorce court. That's about what it was. It's a court that decides—that hears cases from people who want to get divorced or who want to have declared a pervious marriage null and void or invalid or whatever. I was the Secretary of that court in which I was the person who advocated for divorce, my job was to collect all the information and argue in favor of what we call the petitioner, the plaintiff if you will. The plaintiff would come in and a case would be sent in by a priest from some parish any place in the diocese asking for an annulment. There were certain documents they had to supply such as a marriage certificate, the divorce decree, baptismal certificate, and the like. Some of these cases I could process myself by way of declaring them null and void. Easy if a couple had not gotten married in the Catholic Church in the first place, had a marriage license, divorce decree, and a recent baptismal certificate. And that was one within six months because if they had gotten married in the church, the recent baptismal certificate would show that they had been married in the church because it—whoever assisted at the—officiated at the Catholic church wedding would have notified the church of baptism of that particular ceremony and that notification would be noted in the baptismal record and a recent baptismal certificate would carry that. So it was very easy to asses that. Not necessarily a hundred percent certain but a very, very strong 95 to 99 percent strong indicator. So anyway I processed these. I processed these in five minutes, look at the documents and get it out to them right away. There were other cases that were a lot more

complicated—they involved people that for example had been married before such as where there was a Protestant married to another Protestant, one of whom was baptized or neither of whom were baptized. Easy enough for some of them—where neither was baptized; we could do that at the local level. If one was baptized and the other wasn't, then we had to collect all the evidence and send it to Rome. Technically, in my early days I was very fluent in Latin. I used to write Latin for example. At the seminary all my classes, examinations, oral and written, were in Latin so I was very fluent in Latin. I knew how to do that very well. But then I decided one day, Oh, the heck with this. We have some Americans over there in Rome—Brits and various other people, we're gonna try and send these over to Rome in English. And my bishop at the time was always on my case saying—he had to sign and he'd say, "Young man you're gonna get me into trouble." I would say, "No we're just testing the waters. Let's see what happens." And by golly they worked. They worked. And later on I talked about—the interesting thing was in all the cases I sent over, I never lost one. We never lost a case. We always had sufficient evidence and one time I had to appeal because they came back and said, "No. Not sufficient evidence. Not granted." So I appealed it by going out myself and personally collecting a whole bunch of additional information that supported what I had previously submitted. And they told me, "Nobody, nobody appeals against the Holy Office in Rome." The Holy Office is of course is the pope's committee or agency that looks at these particular cases and the group of them—so nobody appeals. And I said, "Well, watch me." And

they weren't very pleased that I was taking a very liberal, obstinate, Irish stance on this and it did work. And I guess my thing was somebody has got to test the waters. Somebody has got to see how far you can go, how far you can get these people to lighten up—to come down from windowless rooms and see reality and that's what I was trying to do. I was always trying to do things like that—testing the waters and to break out of the *status quo*, which is not always easy but I was very pleased to see that they were able to—that they didn't complain about being appealed against. Nobody else did either. Then it became a kind of a standard for others down the road of the future. So it was an interesting thing. Afterwards when I was in London I actually worked with the Archdiocese of Westminster and that's another story. When I was in the U.S. Air Force over there and I got a case that had to be submitted to Rome and I had the option of going to New York—the Archdiocese of New York, which was our immediate boss at the time. Our official Church office was called the Military Ordinariate. This diocese governed the military services. Instead I decided to go to the Archdiocese of Westminster. And I went down there and talked to these blokes as they called themselves, and they said, "Well, you've got to write it up in Latin first." I said, "Absolutely not. Why should you write it up in Latin?" And I told them about my experience of submitting similar cases to Rome in English. They said, "Well, by Jove! That's not a bad idea. Let's try it." And they were absolutely surprised when it came back granted without anybody quizzing them on—so this approach lightened up their burden and they all began to process things a lot faster in English because they were more

fluent in English I can assure you than they were in Latin. But anyhow, this was my other job. And normally in other diocese the person who would head that particular program, the Secretary of the Matrimonial Court would be a full-time job. Number two, in most dioceses the person who held that position would also hold a doctorate in Canon Law, which I didn't. And the bishop was not about ready to send me to Catholic University in Washington to get a doctorate in Canon Law. The bishop said he couldn't afford to. The man power shortage couldn't afford to do that, although I requested a couple of times so that I could at least be up to speed with or on the same level as my colleagues in other dioceses across the country. Anyhow to make a long story short that was my job. On the other side of the coin at the Matrimonial Tribunal there was also what they called a Defender of the Bond. The Defender of the Bond—the bond of marriage that is—really a cannon lawyer whose job was to argue that the bond of marriage should be preserved regardless of what evidence I could present. And then there was a court, three judges who sat and you presented your case—each side. And there were some—then they listened to whoever had the best argument and the best documentation and the like and it was a very interesting process. And we had some other interesting cases that I won't go into here, but they were absolutely—well, let me say briefly. The cases involved what they called *ratum non consummatum* marriages. What that means is, marriages that were valid that took place in the church before a priest and two witnesses but were never consummated. In other words the couple never had sexual intercourse whatsoever. The appeal—the argument can be

brought by one or the other that the marriage was valid, yes, but never consummated and therefore was dissolvable, could be dissolved. And we had to prove—my job was to prove that the marriage had never been consummated. The Defender of the Bond's argument was that it had been. So we had all kinds of medical tests and this that and the other thing to go through this and to ask interrogating witnesses under oath what they knew about the allegations and stuff like that. Kind of embarrassing in a way. You had men and women come in and testify, collect the evidence, and the questions they were asked sometimes were pretty sexual and pretty embarrassing. But it was an interesting process and we did in my time dissolve two or three or four of those in Corpus Christi. It was not easy, but on the other hand fair and we thought that it was something we had to do not necessarily because we wanted to because it was time consuming. And a lot of work goes into it and a lot of diplomacy and tact had to be involved. On the other hand in the interest of fair play and objectivity we did process them. Nobody wanted to do them really, but it's part of it. As Dan Rather once said, "It's all in a day's work."

McFarlane So you were getting increasing responsibility then.

Sheeran Oh, yeah. It was—I enjoyed St. Patrick's and it was fun. It was a lot of activity, a lot of different kinds of activity. And actually that's what made it all the more interesting because I wasn't stuck in any one particular thing. I had a great deal of flexibility. I was able to move from one particular job to another—in fact, I had two offices at St. Patrick's. The reason I was at St. Patrick's was that they moved the Matrimonial Court from downtown

cathedral where it normally would have been with the Chancellery Office to St. Patrick because Monsignor Mullen happened to be the chief judge of the Matrimonial Tribunal. We had the facilities and the space at St. Patrick's to guard all the documents under lock and key et cetera, et cetera. It was much easier for us to function there than waste time going downtown everyday. And we could work on these things morning, noon, or night whenever we were there. So we weren't stuck with the same thing all—but on every Tuesday we met all day on these cases, every Tuesday. And when my colleagues were out playing golf on Tuesday, was their day to play golf, I was stuck with a meeting of the Matrimonial Tribunal. And so consequently I never was able to get into the golf mode or improve my game significantly because of that.

McFarlane So you stayed at St. Patrick's until you joined the Air Force?

Sheeran Yeah. I joined the Air Force—I've always wanted—I always wanted to—from my days in Mission and my association with Moore Field Training Airbase, I always had a desire to join the U.S. Air Force. And in Corpus Christi—Corpus Christi is really a United States Navy town. They had a huge naval airbase there in Corpus Christi and a lot of the navy people lived in St. Patrick's Parish. When I began to talk about going into the Air Force, everybody, everybody with whom I spoke wanted me to reconsider and to think about the United States Navy. So one time one of the parishioners, he was a captain in the United States Navy, a medical officer, said to me, "Do you like water?" I said, "Not particularly." He said, "Then you're right. Join the Air Force." And that was it. There was no more flak, I don't like water,

folks. I'm going into the U.S. Air Force off into the wild blue yonder. So I decided to go into the Air Force and an interesting thing happened in regard to that. In 1962 it was—the Cuban Missile Crisis was going on. Well, I guess in 1960 I decided I'm going to go—when J.F. Kennedy said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." And I think I mentioned earlier about the CYO and the young people's interest in Kennedy. I guess I was turned on and motivated by that too. So, I had better do something about this. Anyhow, with the advent of the Cuban Missile Crisis, when that was beginning to happen, I decided now is the time. But I found out in an election year, in a general election year in the United States, you cannot become—or then at least—you could not become a United States citizen for sixty days prior to the general election. And I was not a United States citizen although I had my paperwork in. So I went down to check on it. I realized no, you can't become a citizen until after the election in November. So I hung around for—well, first of all I went out to California for a couple of weeks and I was itching to come back and eventually I got back to Corpus Christi. And one day I got a phone call—as soon as the election—when the election was over, two days after the election, I went down to Brownsville, Texas. There was a judge, Paul Martineau. He was a federal judge and he was a member of St. Patrick's Parish. So I talked to Paul about it and he said, "As soon as the election is over, you come down and I'll swear you in by yourself." So I came down to Brownsville to the federal court in Brownsville and they had a nice little ceremony for me and Paul gave a nice little speech about how

sometimes citizens—naturalized citizens become better Americans than those who are native born. And he says something similar to the church that sometimes converts are much better than people who are brought up in the church. He tied it all very nicely together, but I became a citizen in Brownsville, Texas right across the river from Matamoros, which I could see when I came out of the courthouse. And I sort of considered myself not just only a citizen of the United States and of Texas but also perhaps of Mexico as well. It was an interesting thing. So a few days after that, a week after that, after I sent in the paperwork and citizenship proof, I got another call from the Air Force and said, "You're going to Southern California." And so I was off right there after—I was on my way to Southern California to George Air Force Base, a fighter base up in the Mojave Desert near Victorville, California about forty or fifty miles north of San Bernardino up in the mountains. I had no idea where George Air Force Base was, never heard of it before. But anyhow, I drove out to Los Angeles and then drove up to George Air Force Base, and I'd know a lot about that route for the next year and a half or so. Technically, I should have gone to training school, military—Air Force training school at Lackland Air Base in San Antonio, Texas, but they needed somebody at George Air Force Base and there was no class going on so they said, "Go ahead out there first, we'll bring you back in a few months to San Antonio for the six weeks of chaplain training with lawyers." Anyhow, I went out to George and didn't have a uniform of course, didn't know how to get one. So the first day I was there that—I got checked into the base, got through clearance and all

that, then got a uniform. I'm not sure how it fitted; I didn't know how to put on bars. I was a captain, designated as a captain. I didn't know how to put the bars on or anything else or the different insignia. I learned that very quickly and learned all about the spit shinning of shoes and the military decorum and all the handbooks on military officers and military wives and all the expectations of what to do and what not to do and I thought to myself, Oh, my God. I thought, This place is worse than the Church. There's more rules and regulations than you can shake a stick at. In fact, it's worse than the seminary. But then that was on paper. I found out very quickly that the U.S. Air Force is far more lightened up and far more liberal in its workings and in its processes than the church, than the seminary, and in fact than any of the other services including the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and even the Coast Guard. It was a lot lighter and I found out very quickly that the U.S. Air Force was the newest of all the services that it was in fact born in 1947 right after World War II. Prior to that it was part of the Army Air Corps and then when they became a separate service—apparently what they did was something smart that they took the good things from the Army and the good things from the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard; they did not adopt the things they didn't like. So they created some new stuff, took off on their own, and so consequently they brought the Air Force into the modern world. And that kind of attitude, that kind of progress, that interest in competition and novelty and innovation and improvement was what I discovered very quickly in U.S. Air Force, which made me realize this is a heck of a lot more progressive than the Church.

These people—even though they're a bureaucracy—still have a will to change and change easy and adapt to change and use whatever will work—use it to the best degree possible. Consequently the next several years, the seven years I spent in the United States Air Force, were by far and away the best of my whole life. I will have a lot more to say about what I think about the U.S. Air Force and the military and the whole system—at the beginning I saw it as a bureaucracy, more of the same, same old, same old. Very quickly I learned, no, this is not the same. This is a bit more progressive, much more friendly, a much more innovative outfit. And I was right I think.

McFarlane So at this point you're dealing with two bureaucracies. You're a priest in the Air Force.

Sheeran I am a priest in the Air Force, that is correct. I'm dealing with two bureaucracies, yeah. I was no longer under the Diocese of Corpus Christi. To get into the Air Force, first of all I had to convince the bishop. And the bishop said, "No, we can't afford to let you go." The same bishop that said he couldn't afford to let me go to Catholic University either and he couldn't let me go because of scarcity of priests, manpower, down in the Diocese of Corpus Christi. And I went to him and I sat down and I said, "You know, there was another priest here that wanted to go to the Air Force a few years ago, you wouldn't let him go. You couldn't afford to—he got sick subsequently and had to go to California where he's now recovered and doing a magnificent job in Los Angeles. You lost him. You lost him anyhow, so what the heck." I said, "Besides, Bishop, you were a chaplain in

the United States Army during World War I and you served in the military service for a long time. Secondly, every diocese in this country is supposed to contribute to the military by sending one or two or more depending on the population of priests. You have nobody." I said, "They must be laughing at you wondering what is going on here." And of course, I was playing on the old man, but he was—his name was Bishop Mariano Simone Garriga and he used to always boast about the fact that he was the first Mexican priest ever to be named a bishop in the United States and he had great pride in the fact that he was Hispanic and Mexican. And he was very simple—he was very—he was easy to talk to in many ways. Sometimes when I was there and working in the Matrimonial Court, I'd have to bring out papers to him at night, documents for him to sign that were going to Rome. And he'd say, "Young man, will you sit down and watch a movie with me?" So I'd sit down and watch a movie against my will. I would be cringing, but he'd fall asleep in the middle of the movie and I couldn't leave and he'd wake up and I'd have to tell him what went on in the movie. When going in and talking to him, I knew how to play on his emotions and he's soft-hearted besides, you know, wearing a miter and having all that pride in being the first Hispanic bishop in the United States. I knew he was soft hearted enough so I used all of that on him saying, "Look, you have an obligation. You have a responsibility. You don't want these other guys to be talking about you. Secondly, you lost this other guy. You wouldn't let him go. Thirdly, you went yourself. You know what's involved. I'm willing to do it and I'm in good enough shape so I can pass the physical." And eventually

he looked up to me he says, "Young man, you're right. You're right. You can go. You can go." I said, "But I need it in writing, Bishop." In those days the military chaplains for all services were controlled by a group in New York called the Military Ordinariate, of which the Archbishop of New York, Cardinal Spellman, at the time was the head of. So they sent the letter to New York and I was accepted. There wasn't any problem with that. Today, it's a separate diocese from New York, but in those days the Military Ordinariate was under the Archdiocese of New York and housed in New York. I became great friends with the chancellor there, Monsignor Joe Marbach. We became great friends during the time I was in the Air Force. Of course in addition to that, we had the Chief of Chaplains Office in Washington at the—the United States Air Force headquarters near the Pentagon. Actually it was at Bolling Air Force Base. So we had really two bosses. We had the Military Ordinariate for church-related activities. We had—the Chief of Chaplain's office for military activities. At that time it was headed by a priest who was a two star general by the name of Ed Chess. He was from Chicago and I became very good friends with people in his office, particularly the guy that was head of personnel, Colonel John Graff. So they mostly were concerned with our military activities—with assigning us here, there, and everywhere so they could insure that we lived up to the military protocol, that we were doing a good job, that we got the training, et cetera. It was more the military aspects they were concerned with; whereas the Military Ordinariate was concerned with the spiritual aspects. So it was kind of a two-pronged monster in a way, but it worked

well. Sometimes these people never got together. Sometimes you never saw them, particularly if you're ten thousand miles away. You didn't want to know who they were, because when they'd come visit you, the most important thing was that you knew a good golf course to take them to and that you dined them and wined them to make sure that they knew you were okay that you could be able to handle yourself professionally, socially, and in every way possible. So it was a kind of a very interesting game of cards or game of chess to play. But it was partly politics, partly a desire to succeed and progress and move on. The other thing, of course, was that you had to make sure that from a military perspective you were going to live up to the job description you had and that you were going to progress in such a way as to get promoted. Because if you get a bad rating—you were rated the same way as everybody else. And you had the same rating system as all officers. OER they called it, Officer Effectiveness Reports. You wanted to make sure that on that page which went from one to ten or something across the page and the ten being the highest that you could get it right down that right hand side of the rating form. In other words, if you don't get a "ten" rating—the closer you get to that right hand side, the better chance you have of getting promoted and moving up from captain to major to lieutenant colonel, colonel et cetera. And that was the goal. They wanted to make sure that you have to work, number one, but that's not sufficient because the person grading you may be a Protestant chaplain or a Catholic chaplain or a Rabbi who doesn't particularly know what you're doing, agree with what you're doing, maybe doesn't like you. So consequently it's

supposedly objective but then a great deal of subjectivity came into that. So one needed to know how to play your cards in that particular environment to make sure that the rating official knew what you were doing and that you kept a good rapport with them to because it's not one or the other. It's a question of both. You have to do both in order to succeed. I learned—the people in the Chief of Chaplains Office were concerned about that aspect of it—to make sure you lived up to those expectations. And on the other hand, of course, if you were neglecting the spiritual part of it, well they might not know much about that although they would because they seemed to have a lot of intelligence gathering mechanisms from other sources that the chief of chaplain—I mean that the Military Ordinariate would not have in New York. At the Military Ordinariate there were only a few guys there. They didn't have the resources necessary to do anything very much except respond to your letters or phone calls. Anyhow, that was the system.

McFarlane How long were you at George?

Sheeran George Air Force Base, I was there about a year and a half. I went there in December of '62. The Cuban Missile Crisis had just finished or partly. I wasn't there for it all, but I know a lot of the guys who were there had been deployed to Florida and were laying in wait for the big day. But then most of them had come back and were coming back when I got there. I was there from then until April of '64. In February of '63, the Air Force decided that they had scheduled a chaplain training session down in San Antonio a six week program at Lackland Air Force Base. So I drove from George down to San Antonio to meet a bunch of other chaplains—twenty-five of us

brand new rookies. Some of them had not been on a base. Most of them had not except for me. So I was the youngest, but I was the most senior in terms of experience, which was virtually zero, you know, six weeks is whatever I had at that time. We had lawyers there too. I mean there were two separate classes. And we trained together. We marched together. And this was kind of interesting because we found out afterwards that they became our best colleagues at bases. See once you know the lawyers we called them the JAGS, the Judge Advocates—officer judge advocate so the JAGS as we called them—it was very important to meet with them and know what they were doing because when we had problems on the base, they were the prosecutors and defenders. We had a lot of input from them, a lot of dialogue, a lot of communication, a lot of negotiation so it became very important to be able to know them. Later I found out it was very important to know who the medics were—the physicians and nurses. And they went to a different school in Alabama but we became very much involved with that crowd. We were really the professional elites. And fortunately, when I was at George Air Force Base I was instrumental, actually totally responsible, for bringing together what I called a professional group—lawyers, physicians, and chaplains. And we would meet once a month to talk about issues that we had in common—have a dinner. Actually it became so interesting that the fighter pilots at George Air Force Base—these guys were the wildest men I ever met—would come to the bar to party. It's amazing because one has to understand the mentality. They're flying those wild F-104's, F-106's, and with all those things—the F-15's

today. And to go up in one of these with them is taking your life into your hands in a way, because I did that. I went up to get the experience. But you never know when you're coming down and I'd asked my boss at one time who was a fighter pilot and said, "What is it like to ride in one of these F-104's?" And he said, "Everything was just fine except the landing is like a controlled crash." Well, you know, these fighter pilots are a piece of work. If they weren't fighter pilots, they'd be hot-rodders. Driving cars out there, hot-rodding up and down. But that's the mentality they had. I got to like them. But I remember we were at one of the professional meetings they were so envious and jealous that we had put together what they called this professional group, and they said the only professional group in the United States Air Force were the pilots. They were the only ones that counted, and to a certain extent that was correct. I mean the Air Force is about flying and about machines and about stuff like that. On the other hand, we were a support group that wanted to be able to provide professional services to them and their families—both lawyers, physicians, chaplains. We wanted to provide the best support and we had to negotiate with them and say—it's a different role. We wanted to make sure that we're up to speed, and that we're on the same wavelength, and that we can cut the mustard, we can cut the red tape, we can really get to the heart of this if and when something is messed with. The professional group was interesting, an interesting group. I guess I took full responsibility for it because I had rapport with all of them and even the Protestant chaplains who were reluctant in the beginning thought this was well worthwhile and certainly a great forum for exchanging

information and being able to cut red tape in dealings with one another. Anyhow that was at George Air Force Base. After I got back from San Antonio I started this professional group. In San Antonio I'd learned the importance of being able to communicate with Protestant members of a professional group. There was a Catholic chaplain at George when I went there at first and he was in the process of being transferred overseas. And another guy came in, Father John Martin, who was a great friend of mine and we hit it off well but eventually in March of 1964 I got orders to Clark Air Base in the Philippines. That was during the Vietnam era, in the middle of it.

Tape 1 ends; tape 2, side 1, begins.

Okay. Clark Air Base is now closed unfortunately, but it was by far and away the largest U.S. military complex overseas and that applies to all the services. Clark Air Base—I got over there in April of 1964 and that was an eye-opener. Clark—a sprawling base right beside Angeles City in the Philippines. A lot of the people, the military people, lived on base and some of them lived off base in complexes in and around Angeles City. It was a fighter base; headquarters of the 405th Fighter Wing and from my days at George and working with fighter pilots this was no mystery to me. It was more of the same. George was a fighter base. They had F-104's, F-105's, and F-106's at George. At Clark they had the 405th Fighter Wing which was a combination of mostly F-105's and 104's. And of course Clark also had a passenger or capacity for bringing in other planes with cargo, passengers, and the like both civilian and military. So it was what they called a MAC,

military airlift command component. They had a lot of helicopters at Clark. They had contingents of Army and Navy forces there as well, a lot of civilians, a lot of communications folks, and I suppose intelligence people. It was the headquarters of Thirteenth Air Force. And it was headed by a three star general, and it was one of these famous places that had a great history from way back in World War II. And it was overrun by the Japanese and we heard some great stories about what happened in and around Clark when General McArthur lived in Angeles City in a big house there which is a very historic place. And it was from Clark that he took off saying, "I shall return." And they had the famous or infamous Baatan down the road from Clark where all the Americans and particularly Filipinos where mustered and marched to death. The Baatan Death March it was called. There were other bases in the Philippines. In and around Manila the Navy had two—actually had one, and the Marines had another. Clark by the way was situated about sixty miles north of Manila. The Air Force had another base up in the mountains a resort area kind of a rest and recreation area called John Hay Air Base, at Baggio. And it was a place where we went up in helicopters or drove our way up the mountains. It was day and night between the two. Clark was very much like Corpus Christi, very hot, humid. In Corpus Christi where I endured a hurricane I also had the experience of going through a type of hurricane—the Pacific equivalent to a hurricane, a typhoon. Anyhow whatever it was, I experienced that at Clark. But anyhow we'd go up to John Hay and the difference was day and night. First of all they had a lot of cabins up there with fire places and a lot of wood and

everything else because it was cold. It was a lovely place to play tennis and to resort and to shop particularly the wood carvings and everything else in and around Baggio were just splendid. And it was fun to go out there and bargain with the natives and talk to them and various other things. At Clark I got involved to a great extent with the natives going out and working in the local areas and going to some of their social functions. One of the things I did at Clark when I got there, was to establish the first Knights of Columbus Council ever established overseas at any American institution or place and we established one at Clark in conjunction with the Knights of Columbus Council in Manila and in New York. As it turned out—we got an old airman's club. We fixed it up ourselves and we had parties over there. There was one rule—it was open to officers and enlisted men—that rank stopped at the door—that when people went into the Knights of Columbus Hall everybody was on a first-name basis and equal. And that was a step forward and sort of breaking military rules and traditions in a way having officers associate or socialize with enlisted men. We had a restaurant and bar in there. The bar was wonderful. Fifteen cents a drink. One couldn't afford not to be involved. We had all kinds of parties out there. The interesting thing was a block or two away the Masons had their own similar facility and we became all tightly involved. At one stage of the game, they were running out of space over at Clark and even though the facility we had, the abandoned airman's club had been condemned and we fixed it, they wanted to take it back. However we had in the general's office at that time a sergeant, the top sergeant in the Air Force, a fellow by the name of

Ed Brown. And Ed Brown was a great friend of Robert Kennedy's and Secretary Robert McNamara's. And he wrote a letter to McNamara and told him about the situation. And word came back—a twixt as they call it—came back to the general at Clark Air Base telling him that the Knights of Columbus and the Masons would not be moved off of Clark Air Base in the Philippines without express permission of the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Defense refuses to give any such permission. And these people were wondering, "What the heck kind of power do these guys have?" It was a fun thing. We had recruiting and we had processing of new members and it was a lot of fun to have the Knights of Columbus over there. In fact several times after midnight mass when all the clubs—officers', NCOs', the non-commissioned officers' club or the airman's club—huge airman's club over there—were all closed, our Knights of Columbus was opened. Sometimes I would stay over there from one o'clock after midnight mass at Christmas until six in the morning—stagger out of there for Christmas dinner or somehow or other. But it was a fun place. Clark was different. At Clark I used to give a briefing every morning at seven o'clock in the morning. My regular schedule was I'd get up and go over to the—we had two chapels. And I'd go over there and we would—I was assigned to one of them and right across the street from the theater, called the Kelly Theater, and then there was a hotel over there we called it the Kelly Hotel, where all the visitors came and stayed. So after mass at six thirty, go across the street to the Kelly Theater for a briefing of incoming personnel and my speech was always the same. I'd open it by saying, "Welcome to Clark Air Base in

the Philippines where everyday is Christmas day and every night is New Year's Eve." And that's about how it was. Every day was Christmas day and every night was New Year's Eve. Everybody seemed happy even though we were in the middle of a war. At that time all the—eventually everybody from all the services who were going to Vietnam came through Clark on the way over and on the way back. Unfortunately on the way back, many times in caskets. That was the sad thing about it. It was amazing. The military personnel assigned to Clark went back and forth to Vietnam flying missions. You never knew where they were going to be and when they were going to be dead. And there were many times we had to go and notify, at the request of the commanding officer, the family and the next of kin. It was a tough job. The people at Clark were spoiled in a way. Everybody had house keepers—native Filipinos who were paid very little. And as a result the wives didn't have to clean or cook or wash or whatever and just that gave them often time a lot more free time than they ever had, so some of them were inclined to go wild. Likewise the men were gone many times and come back and they would want to celebrate after living to fight another day. It was a party base. I lived up on a place we called it "the hill," right on the perimeters of the base. All the single people lived there—bachelor officers, the civilian teachers, school teachers—and we had a lot of them over there who were teaching at both the grade school and the high school which was called Wagner High—Wagner High School. I'm still a member of the Wagner Group. They still meet once a year for—here in the States—for a reunion even though Wagner is long since closed. But they all

worked—we all lived in the same area. We had also, of course, the nurses, the single nurses and physicians. And we had our own officers' club up there. It was an annex to the regular officers' club which was huge. We often went down to this place—they made so much money over there that every Tuesday night we'd have a free steak dinner. Free, outside—and it was packed. They had tennis courts. We used to go out and play tennis with whomever we could get to play tennis. And we had a lot of fun, a lot of rapport, camaraderie, and particularly among those of us who were single at that time. Of course we always joked about the fact that this was a married Air Force in that the people who were married and the families got better treatment or seemed to get better treatment than we did. We were in an area of the base that one might describe as sort of far removed and maybe—I suppose you wouldn't call it a ghetto but something similar. Not the most desirable spot. Around Clark Air Base we had a bunch of Filipino guards who guarded the base. We called them "Negritos," the black Filipino, Ne-gri-tos. They were great little guys. They were small but they had guns. And they would walk up and down in front of our place and come get a cigarette from us and spoke very little English. The story goes that they had a king and the king was their boss. And apparently at one time at Clark, the general decided that he was going to replace the Negrito soldiers, or guardsmen, with American GIs to guard the base perimeters. The king went to the general and he said, "You know, your men can't do it. We have more experience and expertise. We beat the heck out of the Japanese." He said, "If you give us one more chance, I'll prove it to you." He said, "All right.

Tonight," he said—the general said fine. He said, "All right, tonight," he said, "when your men are on guard my men will infiltrate the area and your men will never know they were there." The next morning when the GIs came in from patrol duty, there was a white chalk mark on every man at the heel of their shoes. And the white chalk marks were put there by the Negritos who had come in and went out—actually the Americans didn't even know they were there, they never saw any of them and all that. So the general had no choice. "Your guys are better than our guys. They're cheaper, better, more qualified." It was great. The security was great. That was a story off the side but it was interesting to see how that thing worked out. At Clark, I say it was huge. We had six Catholic chaplains. And there were supposed to be fourteen or fifteen Protestant chaplains and a rabbi and we all got on very well. We had joint meetings like we did at George and—but this was far more—I mean some of these guys were going to Vietnam one day and then they'd be in Japan another day and they were all over the place. And I did my fair share of travel, including a few trips to Vietnam during that period. But like what I did at St. Patrick's in Corpus Christi, I did start the CYO at Clark. I did start one at George which I forgot to mention, quite similar, quite active, and the very same and at Clark. I started the CYO at Clark as well as a club for another group of people that were over the age of eighteen or out of high school or college or whatever for young adults. And that was another group that I had started briefly at St. Patrick's and at George—I mean at Clark there was so many young airmen, so many of these new troops and we wanted to give them

something else to do above and beyond what they were normally doing. At Clark I suppose some people say it was Sodom and Gomorrah. It was a base of sin and debauchery and the like and Angeles City was notorious for its prostitution and all kinds of things that went on from stealing and robbing and mugging. A lot of young airmen would go down there to Angeles City and they would get mugged and of course we had our own Air Force security people, patrol people down there—they would have their paddy wagons along. When they'd find these guys drunk, they would just throw them in the back, bring them back to the base, and sober them up, and sometimes give them a court marshal—not a court marshal but an Article 15, anyhow it got into their records. It was a place of sex, sex, sex. We had a policy over there that came down from the Pacific Air Command headquarters in Hawaii several years before that that anybody that contracted VD, whatever kind it was, had to go first of all to the physician on base. Number two, that they had to report to their commander and number three to a chaplain. Now this was very humiliating and particularly when a guy would come in two or three times during a short period of time to go through that process. Secondly it was a waste of time on behalf of the commanders and chaplains in particular. There's not much you can do about them. It's over. What are you going to do? Tell them, "Go forth, you're cleansed, and sin no more?" Anyhow, I took a grave issue with that particular policy. Yet I found out that some of the guys were not coming in for treatment because they were scared and they didn't want to go through the humiliation of reporting to their commanders or the chaplains in

particular. Secondly, some of them were going downtown and being treated by physicians whose skills and professionalism were often times questioned. And so I argued the point that this was a stupid policy and got it removed—and eventually, I was successful in getting it removed from the books so that these guys did not have to go through that particular pattern. And I think it was a step in the right direction. Some people accused me of trying to lower morality. I thought it was a question of upping human dignity and trying to give some degree of confidentiality and privacy to the people serving in the armed forces. That was one I undertook on my own. I did get some flack initially from some of my own Catholic chaplains and Protestants, but I was successful in prevailing by working with commanders who couldn't agree more. The physicians were also very supportive of this and that goes back to the partnership that I had with the physicians and even the lawyers so that we were able to jointly overcome that effort. But it was, in my opinion, the important contribution I'd made. Secondly, we had—we used to have what were called moral leadership, having programs for enlisted personnel. We used to have them at George, too, when I was there. Once a month or once every three months rather, chaplains had to give lectures on moral leadership. Well, it was a little of this, little of that, depending on who was giving it. Sometimes a Protestant chaplain would give it, sometimes a Jewish rabbi, Catholic, whoever. We used some films made elsewhere. Some of them were put out by the Moody Institute in Chicago. Some of them were useless, totally worthless, and not germane. Anyhow we had a guy over in Hawaii at the headquarters, PACAF, by the

name of Monsignor Bill Clasby, one of the veterans of World War II, a great speaker, looked like Jackie Gleason. I had heard him speak to over twenty thousand teens and young people in the CYO meeting in Kansas City that I talked about earlier and you could have heard a needle fall while he spoke. Anyhow, we got Colonel Bill Clasby over there and it was interesting. The people wondered, the generals, commanders, everybody wondered what did this guy have. So I invited them to come to hear him. He would do three lectures—one an hour for a packed Kelly Theater of a thousand men in there at each session. And by the time he got finished, the perspiration would come through his uniform. He'd start off on the stage and he would talk to them—talking into a microphone, and all of a sudden he's down on the floor but you never know his voice has gotten down because it's such—so booming that it was heard all over the theater. And all of a sudden he's saying to a bored, half-asleep airman, "Young man, you're in the United States Air Force. And the United States Air Force believes in moral leadership. Now, you tell me, why should you be moral?" And he's pointing at a guy who is dozing off, bored in the front row and the guy wakes up, shakes his head and says, "My mother told me sir, to be moral." Then Clasby would make a snotty remark saying, "Your mother told you and she told you there was a Santa Claus too and did you believe her?" And then all of a sudden he's back up on the stage and from then on he had their attention. And it was interesting, by the time he got through all these guys were awake, alert, and really repentant. In fact most of these guys were off downtown to pick up their belongings with whomever they were

shacking up and moving back on base. Generals and commanders couldn't believe that he could do this by one tremendous speech. I used to tell Clasby, "You've got two or three canned speeches and that's very good, now how do you keep these guys on base?" And he'd say, "That's your problem. My job is to get them back. It's your problem to keep them there." It was very easy for me to figure out at that time that Clasby was a good showman very, very effective but as far as being able to maintain that kind of commitment afterwards, it was not something that was in his deck of cards or certainly not his "cup of tea" as the British would say. So it was left up to the rest of us to do the best we could. At Clark. I did mention we had the young people, we had the CYO, a huge CYO. We probably had—oh, a couple hundred kids from Wagner High School in it. We had—also the Protestant group, protestant youth organization, Protestant Youth of the Chapel—PYOC—they called themselves. We dialogued. We competed. We worked together. It was great experience in terms of ecumenism in that we were able to exchange ideas and compete along the same lines. The second—the other thing was I had great rapport with the rabbi who was all over the place. His total parish was all of Southeast Asia. He was a great character. Lived down the street from me. He wrote articles for such liberal things as *Playboy* and was absolutely one of the easiest to work with and cooperate with and we had so many things in common. Anyhow, that was at Clark. The biggest thing that happened at Clark while I was there happened about two weeks after I got there, when a huge Air Force C-135, which is the same as a 707 aircraft, was coming in in a big rainstorm on a

Saturday night and it crashed at Clark Air Base just at the end of the runway, hitting a cab and killing the driver just before touchdown. And nearly everybody onboard was killed except for the air crew. I was on duty that night and—we always had a Catholic chaplain on duty. There were six of us on base but there was always one—one guy who was on duty every night. So I got the call, resurrected the Protestant chaplains and all the other Catholic chaplains and I went on my way down to the flight line to the command center. After a very short period of time, the other Catholic chaplains and Protestant chaplains showed up. By that time I'd been helping drag out bodies from the airplane and helping the crew with various other things. I remember that night one of the Protestant chaplains came up and he said—the Catholic chaplains were giving last rights and he said, "Gee," he said, "I don't have anything to do it. To bad I don't have my uniform." I said, "What the bloody hell good is a uniform to you? Don't you have two hands? You can help carry these people out. Do something." At which time he did begin to help. But, I'll never forget that. In talking to the crew members afterwards, I realized just how sad the whole situation was for them out of all of us. I remember we went back to our house on the Hill, the famous Hill as I talked about and I took a shower. I couldn't wash—get the smell of burned flesh off my hands or body and everything else and I couldn't—all the other guys were having a drink and there was no way I could go to sleep. So eventually—in those days—I had never had an alcoholic beverage before then except at Mass, and I decided that maybe if I have a beer—this is Saturday night—I mean probably three o'clock on a

Sunday morning and I had to be up at six and be over at the chapel for Mass. I won't get no sleep at all. So I decided maybe a drink will help me. So I had my first alcoholic beverage, a beer, a San Miguel the famous Filipino beer. And I went to bed and I slept and I did get up and was working again the next day. Clark was a great place. One of the other things I think that a lot of people don't know about are important. There are a couple of stories that I think might help to understand why. Everybody that went over to Vietnam in those days came through Clark and some of them came back unfortunately in body bags and coffins. On the way over, when they would arrive at Clark—the situation was very bad. Clark didn't have enough space, enough place, to house them properly. And some of the other services the Army, Navy, and Marines and indeed the Air Force when people left their own bases they were given orders and sometimes they weren't given money. When they would arrive at Travis Air Force base in Northern California, and Travis didn't have the resources to pay them either. Then they would arrive at Clark with no money and some of these guys would be wandering around for a couple of days at Clark with no money, no ID. I eventually found this out. And I went to the general of the 13th Air Force and I said, "This is absolutely insane. We cannot allow this. Here are men going over to Vietnam who may come back in caskets, and we're treating them like this. This is no way to run a military." The general was so interested—we called him Whip Wilson, General Wilson. And he used to go down to the airmen's club, to the mess hall, rather, and he would go through the line and he would—the officer there would try to have him

come into a private room rather than going through the line, and oh he'd go through the line, he'd pick up what he wanted to pick up, and he'd look at, and he'd walk over to pay for it, and he'd throw the tray of stuff into the captain or sergeants laugh and say, "You eat that crap and you're fired," because—the food was bad. And, his mission was one thing simply the basic thing in Maslow's ladder of needs, hierarchy of needs, pay them, house them, and feed them. Three basic things—pay the men, house them, make sure they have a decent place to live, and feed them. Make sure they have food at least. So I knew I was still out there going in with something—I was going to talk to a person that had at least Maslow's lowest common denominator and sure enough he was willing to do that and not only that. He had the finance office open twenty-four hours a day to provide services—provide for finance, payment, et cetera for people passing through. That was one thing. The other thing was in those days there were a lot of casualties coming back from Vietnam. And we had an old hospital and it was just going out of business and a brand new one was just opening, a brand new hospital at Clark, a huge complex. Every evening there would be three or four aerovacs arriving from Vietnam and carrying people from the field sometimes in uniform or their fatigues, bleeding with nurses and military personnel taking care of them. Often times there wasn't enough military medical personnel at the hospital to be at the flight line with the ambulances to take the wounded off the planes and put them in the ambulances and when they got back to the hospital, there were not sufficient staff to take the wounded off. So I organized a bunch of young

troops, young adults, from the organizations we formed. So we had one group at the hospital and the other group at the flight line to meet the planes to help take these wounded soldiers and military personnel and put them in ambulances and take them to the hospital. The second group was at the hospital. That went over very big. The general was so pleased with the effort that he got the Air Force Band to the flight line to play for them as they came off the plane. It was very, very interesting that some of these guys, wounded as they were, being carried off you could see the tears coming down their faces when they heard the American—U.S. Air Force Band. Anyhow we did some interesting things like that to show our affection and gratitude to the young men. This continued even after I left Clark. It was, I suppose, an invaluable service. Another interesting thing about Clark was that when I got there, Clark had mostly one way streets. One way streets, no stop signs, yields. And I found out that the commanding officer of the 405th Fighter Wing, the commanding officer of that wing was a fellow by the name of Colonel Laven. We used to call him Raving Laven. And he was a fighter pilot. But apparently he loved to drive sports cars and drive fast and he didn't like stop signs and he didn't like two way streets. He had all the stop signs taken out and put yield signs in their places, and all the two way streets became one way streets. When General Wilson came in a year or so later, he was being taken around the base by Sergeant Brown, whom I mentioned before, to his headquarters. Sergeant Brown had worked for General Wilson previously. He said he was going to be a tiger. They were driving in from the flight lines and Wilson said to

Brown, "What is that?" pointing at a young airman in uniform. "That's an airman," says Brown. Wilson says, "He looks like no airman to me look at that uniform. It's a mess." And he said, "Sergeant, yours doesn't look much better either." But Brown said that afternoon I was getting myself new uniforms. "Turn this way," Wilson said to Sergeant Brown. And Brown says, "I cannot, sir." Wilson says, "Why not?" And Brown says, "Sir, it's a one way street." General Wilson responded, "It just became two ways." And over night Wilson had all the one way streets changed to two ways and different things like that. It was a totally different change in the way things were done. But it was interesting that people were able to adapt to that kind of change over night. I mean, people weren't complaining about that. I mentioned before the Clark Air Base School. There was a huge high school, Wagner High School and we used to use the school on Sunday mornings for religion classes. We had a huge group of teachers whom we had recruited and trained to teach religion classes. In fact, I borrowed lessons from my Protestant chaplain colleagues. When new people arrived on base every year—every August or September, the Protestants wanted to recruit them and train them for teaching the Protestant youth groups different Bible classes or whatever. So they used to have a tea for them at the officers' club.

Tape 2, side 1, ends; side 2 begins.

Anyhow, I decided to go one better—to hold a cocktail party for everybody, every new officer, school teacher, and civilian, and military. It didn't matter. A huge free cocktail party at the officers' club. It was

unbelievable how many showed up. And I had even a lot of Protestant people coming in and volunteering to help me teach Sunday School to Catholic kids and everything else. And the Protestant Chaplains were saying, "That's what we're doing." I said, "No, I didn't need any of your people. I had enough on my own, but I want to tell you that you guys could do better. But I just took a leaf out of your book—substituted a cocktail party for a tea party—and hope you didn't mind because it worked." In the past few years I've gone to a few of the Wagner High School reunions here in the States, and it's amazing how many of them show up and the pride they have. They have their own website, Clark Air Base—Wagner High School, Clark Air Base the Philippines. It is amazing; the pride, the rapport, and the camaraderie that exists in this group. I've never seen anything quite like it for an institution that's so many thousand miles away probably ten thousand miles away from here in Washington. And so many years have passed and the institution no longer exists, but there is that whatever *esprit de corps*, pride, and delight that they had the opportunity of being there and delight in seeing and associating with each other over the years. It's amazing.

McFarlane When did you leave Clark?

Sheeran I left Clark—well now, you're bringing me to a very critical part. As I said earlier I was in the Matrimonial Tribunal in Corpus Christi, which was really part of the Chancellery Office. In 1965 the bishop of Corpus Christi, Bishop Garriga, we talked about him earlier, died, and he was replaced as bishop by Thomas Drury, who was originally from County Sligo my next

door neighbor in Ireland. He was a former Air Force chaplain too. But anyhow he knew about my work in Corpus Christi and he was going to the ecumenical council in Rome which was going out at that particular time. And he wrote to me and asked me to come back to the diocese of Corpus Christi to be the chancellor. In other words, his next in command. I told him I really didn't want to come back. I was enjoying the Air Force too much and that it was a way of life that I really didn't feel like leaving, but he said, "I need you." And he said, "Think about it." I got several letters from him begging me to do it and to meet him in Rome for the ecumenical council and the like. But, anyhow to make a long story short, I decided after consultation with the Military Ordinariate in New York and my friend Monsignor Marbach and with the Air Force Chief of Chaplain's Office, I'd better give it a chance. So I resigned my commission from the Air Force but held onto reserve status. So I came back and I didn't go to Rome but I came back in December of '65 and went to—from Travis Air Force base near San Francisco to Ireland for a couple of weeks and then came back and went down to Corpus Christi to meet with the bishop and stayed at Bishop Drury's house, a wonderful mansion on Ocean Drive overlooking the Gulf of Mexico in Corpus Christi. I was there about a week and we talked about various things and eventually I said to him, "What arrangements have you made for me?" He says, "Well, you know, I had been thinking about you as chancellor. I think I was premature in that. Now, I think it would look very bad for an Irishman like myself, a bishop, to have a chancellor also an Irishman. Not politically smart." I said, "All

right, Bishop, you're absolutely right. But you should have thought of that when I kept telling you I didn't want to come back." "Oh," he said, "but I'm going to give you a job." I said, "What is the job?" He said, "I'm going to make you head of the diocesan newspaper." And I said, "Look, I know nothing about newspapers." Oh he said, "You don't have to. I run a newspaper and I'd be doing the work." And I said, "Bishop, if you put me in charge of the newspaper, I'd be doing the work not you but, I don't want to do that. Besides, why would you put me in charge of this when you have one of the most brilliant English majors and a scholar newspaper man down at the Cathedral in Corpus Christi by the name of Father Willie Goff from Dublin? Absolutely magnificent. That guy is the one who should be heading all the newspapers and be the editor and everything else. He's brilliant. Anyhow, in a couple more days I want to go back in the Air Force." That wasn't so easy to do. I phoned Monsignor Marbach and General Chess, who were happy to have me return to active duty. In the mean time, I went out to California to wait for the processing of my paperwork. Back out to California, I visited some people in Los Angeles and went up to my aunt's house in San Jose and waited for the Air Force to process my paperwork. I had to take a new physical at Hamilton Air Force Base in Marin County. I eventually got an assignment. The assignment was to Travis Air Force Base which is about sixty miles north of San Francisco and about forty-five or so south of Sacramento. An ideal place—a place I'd flown out of to Clark and had come back into on my way back from Clark Air Base. So I was delighted to be assigned to Travis. I was able to get my

reserve status back. That wasn't a problem, but to get back and become a regular member of the Air Force was another battle. Going through my paperwork they detected that when I left I had a—supposedly had an ulcer at one time. Anyhow, to make a long story—if you have an ulcer, you're not qualified for regular status in the Air Force, which I didn't know. I was talking to a psychiatrist friend of mine who was also a flight surgeon at Travis AFB and we decided we were going to have another physician friend of ours do the tests on me. We decided on a plan for the attending physician. We decided that as he conducted the upper GI series to allow him to tell me and document only what he saw. The flight surgeon laid out the plan as follows: "When he looks at that thing," he said, "ask him what he sees. What do you see? Don't let him tell you what he doesn't see." I don't remember the physician's name, but his first name was Harry. So, I went down there with Harry. Harry had completed this test and he's giving me the results of it and he's saying, "I don't"—I said, "Harry, do you see an ulcer?" "No, I do not see an ulcer, but"—I said, "I'm not asking what comes after the 'but'—what you don't see. Is there an ulcer there?" "No, but—" "No, Harry." So, eventually anyhow we got Harry to sign this saying there is no ulcer. So anyhow, it was sent over to the hospital commander who was a kind of a timid little guy who was really a chicken as far as I was concerned. And he had to sign that document. And he's holding the document in his hands and he said, "I don't know whether these hands are shaking or they should be signing this document or not." And I said, "Come on get some guts, man. Sign it." And he's shaking his hand and he's

signing it and he's handing it on to me, "And you take it from here." And it's almost like Pontius Pilot saying, "I'm innocent of the blood of this just man." This guy is just protecting his own rear-end, but he signed it anyhow. I got my regular Air Force commission back. It was interesting. It took me a few months to do that, but it was a fun time going through the process of bureaucracy and the like. Now, Travis was a great base one of the finest places I've ever been to. The big sign when I went into Travis, inside the main gate, was "The Friendliest and the Finest." A motto I think I have tried to stay with every since. At Travis the general—they had the Military Airlift Command at the 60th Wing. The man in charge was a one star general, Brigadier General Maurice Casey. I did not meet Casey for about a month. People would say, "Oh, you've got to meet General Casey. He is the greatest." General Casey came to Mass every Sunday. I said, "I will meet General Casey in due course." So eventually we did meet, and I found out that he was the author of the dictum "The Friendliest and Finest." He wanted people to say hello to everybody. But Travis was the place at which the military—most of them came through on their way to Clark and then to Vietnam and the far east. Also the cargo—a lot of cargo went out of there. General Casey had airplanes—C-133s, C-124s and especially the new C-141—flying all over the world. There'd be a briefing every morning. He would want to know where these planes were, their condition, et cetera. He had a first hand briefing on the status of the planes, why is one down here, why it wasn't flying, what was wrong with it et cetera. It was a magnificent thing to go through. What I didn't know about General Casey—he was

from Chicago. His parents were from Ireland originally. He used to call me "Irishman" but he never carried any kind of one of these idiot boxes or phones or anything else. Number two, he had never gone to college. This fellow was a high school graduate, but he was by far and away the brightest, smartest individual I'd ever met. You could not pull the wool over Casey's eyes. He knew everything even though he didn't carry around beepers or phones. He had great rapport with people. The commanders, the enlisted men, the officers would do anything for this man. He was on a first name basis with his people. He'd go around slapping people on the back. He was tremendous. He was all over the place. He was a great pilot, flew in World War II in England out of London, over Germany several times and he was very proficient—C-141 pilot. The C-141 was the newest toy in the Air Force in those days. Casey—I remember flying with Casey—I flew with him many times. We went from Travis into Vietnam. In fact when we went in there the first time, he took a C-141 into Pleiku escorted by fighter planes and it was the first C-141 to land there. "The old man," General Casey, brought that thing down perfectly. He just loved to do daring things like that. But there was more to it than that. I remember on the way over stopping at Hickam AFB in Hawaii in the middle of the night, and seeing airmen outside drinking coffee as we were going into the coffee shop to get a cup of coffee. Casey was coming up last and the airmen see the star. And they're on their feet saluting and he's saying, "Men at ease. Sit down." He sat down there with them and talked to them. He never had coffee himself. And I said, "General, why do you do that?" He said, "Well, these young

guys," he said, "that are out here are eighteen and nineteen years old. They're out here far away from home—thousands of miles away from Oklahoma, New Jersey, or North Dakota. He says, "You know, somebody should talk to them," he says, "take an interest in them." He says, "Give them a pat on the back. They have a huge responsibility—having them working on these huge planes that carry so much personnel and cargo it's just tremendous." And he said, "Just from the point of view of morale they can always write home and say, you know, a general stopped and talked us me and said thank you." At Travis AFB, he would be down on the flight line crawling under airplanes talking to sergeants and airmen working—same kind of thing to boost morale and keep them going. I remember one time he found a sergeant with whom he had worked in England and the guy is down there under an airplane and he says, "Sarge, so are you the one who kept me alive in England during the WWII? Come on, I'll buy you a cup of coffee." Of course, he had the sergeant speak to the young officers on various other things including his experiences. This was the man that—when I said to him once, "General Wilson at Clark," I said, "He was a good guy with a totally different style from yours." And he said, "Yeah," he said, "He liked to drive people, I like to lead them." He said, "Both of us are perfectionists. We like to get the job done and done well." He said, "There are two different styles of getting it done." He says, "I prefer my way," and I said, "I think I do too." So as a result I think it changed my whole perspective on management and people skills of seeing somebody of that caliber being able to work with people—take care of people first to

motivate people by word and example. And it was probably the best lesson I ever had in organizational behavior and motivation. So anyhow that was at Travis AFB. I flew many times to Vietnam, Japan, and the Phillipines with him. And one of the reasons he wanted me to fly was he said, "You know, these pilots they're out there, they go out there for ten or fifteen days in a row. They fly from Clark into Hawaii and they're on to Wake Island or Guam and then on to Clark and on to Pleiku in Vietnam or Tan Son Nhut in Saigon and even Cam Ranh Bay. I was in there—all these places with him. He said, "I want you to see," he said, "Just what effect this is having—you know the long flying hours, then they'll be over there for two days, three days head back and forth through the Philippines back to Korea back to Japan. What effect does this have on them and on their morale and on the families when they come home?" Well it's interesting. The interesting thing about my days flying with these guys in particular is that, when they got up in the cockpit—and I'd ride up there to the jump seat—flying is a most boring thing. To ride an airplane for seventeen or eighteen hours over the Pacific and see nothing, have nothing much to do is boring. The trend of the conversation of those pilots was they'd be talking about sex. Then on the other hand when they come home and there is a party at somebody's house, pilots tended to meet in the kitchen, and you know what they'd be talking about in the kitchens? Airplanes. This appears contradictory, but they were a total different breed—a different breed from fighter pilots. Fighter pilots who were gung ho, I mean hot rod drivers. MAC pilots were a lot more relaxed and more gentlemen type, not hell raisers. However

when they got home after they'd only been gone ten or fifteen days—and this would happen several times in the course of the year—the wives have been cooped up at home at Travis. And the wives would want to go out—go to the officer's club—go out to party. The husbands had seen enough officers' clubs in the days they were gone, and would want to stay home. So there were always a lot of conflicts like that that had to be resolved. And Casey wanted to know how do you deal with them? How—there was a way of trying to make all of them more sensitive to make this place the friendliest and the finest. We had in those days a lot of people coming through. There were no great facilities for taking care of them, where to stay and I mentioned about the problem with financing before. But another thing was housing, they'd be sleeping down in the terminal with no place—and I remember saying to General Casey I said, "It's a shame." We got all these military people of different branches of the service coming through here and we're the friendliest and finest. What can we do to make it easier and better for them?" I said, "There's a big old place in the bottom of the officers' club that could be fixed up and we could turn it into an informal place." So he said, "Go over and talk to Mugavero, Jim Mugavero." Jim was a friend of mine, a former fighter pilot and a great party man. So we decided that we'd do that. We had a young officers' club that I was a member of. And we got these guys and we decided to get this place fixed up and we could turn it into a great informal place. You didn't have to go in with a uniform on or a tie or a jacket or that kind of stuff. These guys weren't going to Southeast Asia—they didn't need that kind of formality. So we

went and got the place fixed up and we called it "The Gateway to The Specific." The Gateway to The Specific, not Pacific. It was open twenty-four hours a day after hours and it was informal. We even had go-go dancers in there—we brought them up from San Francisco. You know the people who were maddest at us about the go-go girls were the wives of the officers on the base because they felt that the officers—and they were—a lot of them would come over there because it was informal and drinks were cheaper and it was a lot of fun and hell raising so it was great—but for the people passing through, it was mainly for their benefit. So it was kind of an interesting thing. That was one. Another thing at Travis was we had a lot of problems with young airmen not only at Travis but at the previous bases. The problem became more prevalent at Travis. There were three Catholic chaplains and I was the head one at the time. There were seven or eight—nine Protestant chaplains and a Rabbi. And we all got on well. There were three Catholic chaplains actually. We had a lot of airmen, young men away from home for the first time. We had the same situations—to a certain extent in the Philippines, we had the same thing, only more so at Travis. These young men would meet a girl and run off and get married. I'll say more about that—I may want to tie in the Philippine one here first. The Filipino one was worse than that because what you had was young airmen getting involved with a woman who had kids by four or five previous airmen, in other words someone that is thirty-five, forty-years-old and here is a guy nineteen or twenty and he's madly in love and all of a sudden he's saying he's gonna get married. Of course, what I found was—and this was

one of the things I was very sad about and tried to do something about it, that these guys would want to get married and sometimes they would marry them and then they'd have to get them a visa to come to the States. The airmen would go back to the States and the woman would never hear from that person again. As a result we had a lot of young kids whose mothers had five or six kids by different airmen. They wouldn't have money to buy food for them, nothing. And we were trying to raise money and everything else to solve that problem. When a couple came in to get married, we would try to discourage them from getting married and various other things but they're gonna to do it anyhow. And I remember one case, there was a Protestant chaplain over there in the Philippines, his name was McDuffy, a good friend of mine. And he was Southern Baptist. And his office was next door to me. I had this couple come in and she said—she was Filipino and a Catholic and her fiancé was Baptist. They wanted to get married and she was you know much older than he was with a couple of kids by previous American airmen. Eventually I got around to asking, "What religion are you?" And they were of two different religions. So you know, I don't know how to handle this but I said, "You know, you're Baptist and she's Catholic—that's another problem. You have two different religions. You have two different backgrounds, two different ages. You got a bunch of stuff—would you mind going in and talking to my friend Chaplain McDuffy next door? He's Southern Baptist so I suggest that you get another opinion." Anyway, I called Mac on the phone and I said, "Are you busy?" "No." "Would you do this? I'm sending over a couple." So he was

very gracious. My office was next door as I say, they were in there about five minutes and then I heard Mack screaming at them saying, "You man, you're not in love. You're in heat." And he threw them out. So he comes to my office and I say, "Mac, that was fast." "You were right," he says, "They're not in love; that's a heat. That's hormones going." He said, "That's no way—we can't afford to officiate at this marriage." At Travis I found out the same kind of thing. We had a lot of people getting married who had no money—different circumstances. They would get tired very quickly eating hotdogs morning, noon, and night and there were all kinds of domestic problems of people going AWOL, absent without leave. As a result the commanders and first sergeants were involved. All of us were involved, the legal officers, the lawyers, the JAGs, the chaplains. Everybody's time was being wasted in trying to counsel these people. So I went up to General Casey and I said—well, first of all I talked to the Protestant chaplains. I said, "You all counsel—we're all doing counseling on an individual basis. This doesn't make any sense." I said, "We can't handle them all and we're not doing a very good job—it's a hit or miss situation. We need a whole comprehensive thing. And what I propose is that we have a team consisting of psychologists, psychiatrists, medical people, lawyers, financial people, human services, and the chaplains." They said, "You'll never pull it off." I said, "Well, let me go talk to General Casey." So I go to General Casey and I said, "You know this problem with this agency—AWOL, AWOL, all these—I said, Now, if we could get these guys before they got married maybe we could discourage them from doing so or at least they would walk

into it with their eyes wide open instead of blind. Maybe we can solve some of the things." And I said, "This is my idea." He said, "You go do it, Irishman. You do it. Go ahead and do it. Put it together." I said, "No, there's more to it than that. I want you to issue an order that all the commanders would—that if we hold these things one a month—once a month, you know, from twelve o'clock until whatever time six, seven, eight in the evening and you, the commanders, will release their men from the job and that the young women with whom they were proposing to marry have an opportunity to attend, and if there are Air Force women that want to go to it, great." He did. So we ran these seminars once a month. And the head Protestant chaplain would say, "How can you do this?" He would say, "How can you cover anything on birth control as a Catholic?" I said, "Look, that's my problem, not yours." I said, "First of all we need a psychologist, a guy that can talk about commonalities, relationships, communications. Then we will have a lawyer to tell about the legal things of getting married and military and civilian requirements and what they need to know. We should have somebody from the base to tell them about all the things that are available at the base in terms of the rights they have, as well as other services, such as the commissary, et cetera, et cetera. Particularly for the young women that needed to know what they were entitled to. Then we should have a chaplain from the three major denominations, Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, discuss the religious requirements. And then finally we can have the physician." Again he says, "What about birth control?" I said, The same information should be given to all, Catholic, Protestants, and

Jewish. They said, "What about your Catholic view?" I said, "That's my problem. Catholics should know what the effective methods are, how to use them, various other things about them. The rest of it is a moral issue. That's something I can handle. The physicians should not be tied by you or me or anybody else. It's something the airmen have a right to know." My God, the program was most effective. So every month we had a hundred and fifty people, you know, coming to these things while I was at Travis. So it went on. We were very successful. Some people decided they weren't ready to marry. The financial people, after demonstrating that they could not afford to get married, would draw it out showing how much a troop made and the different grades and what it would take to live, et cetera, et cetera, and show that they couldn't afford to be married. As a result people's eyes became open and those who married at least were forewarned and thereby forearmed about what to do. A lot of other military bases adopted that model afterwards. If it were not for my rapport with General Casey I would never have been able to pull this off because commanders would be reluctant to let people off from work and wanted men to do it in their spare time. That would not work. So we had to offer an incentive of free time.

McFarlane As a Catholic priest were you having any misgiving problems with the birth control issue?

Sheeran I always had. I always had. I'll come back to that. Oh yeah, I've always had that—I mean from my days in the seminary— you see what bugs me about the church and some of the would be theologians that we have out there who have little education in the order. A lot of people say things about the

church that are not really true or are merely theological opinions and they quote them as infallible and absolutely dogmatic. When I was at the seminary I had four years of theology and two years of philosophy and I'll go back to that a bit later when we talk about some of the other stuff. You would think that everything would be either black or white. In fact in theology a lot of things are grey, are grey, very grey. You can become very dogmatic in moral theology and sometimes the morality cited is different opinions on the same issue. Some opinions diametrically opposed to others and consequently the theory was and what the theologians talked about was probable opinions. And there were a lot of probable opinions—what constitutes a probable opinion? Well, a whole bunch of theologians of significant importance or prestige—and even one notoriously prestigious theologian could set a probable opinion, but if there's an opinion opposite of that, you are free—you are totally free and at liberty to follow whichever opinion suits you. This involves a great deal of subjectivity, and I used that particular philosophy, that particular approach, liberally. I'm not sure what a lot of my colleagues did and I'm not sure a lot of the people who taught religion, like nuns and brothers, in high schools and the like across America or in grade schools in particular across the United States really know this background. They stuck with the most strict, conservative approach. It drove me nuts many times to hear some of these teachers—nuns, teachers, and lay teachers just telling kids stuff that was absolutely off the wall which had nothing to do with the Catholic Church's view—they taught their own views and that is a shame. Now, on the birth control issue, I had some

concerns about it, but again it was based upon what I call very flimsy—very flimsy and very poorly founded theoretical evidence. I've always had doubts about that because I will come to it a little bit later when I moved to London. Maybe this is as good a place as any to deal with it. In the Air Force we always had opportunities to go into advanced training, for Protestant chaplains and Catholic chaplains. The Protestant chaplains usually went to the University of Texas in Austin. Catholics went to a Catholic university in Washington D.C. for a six, eight week course on counseling in human factors to help us to understand the basics of counseling and human relations and the whole bunch of skills and organizational development. I mean it was a wonderful course. I attended such a course at Catholic University [of America] from October 1968 to December 1968. When I was a Catholic I knew I was fortunate enough to meet some of the great theologians at the time, Father Charlie Curran, absolutely a good teacher of ethics and the like and Father Gene Burke both of them were liberals. And we had—on our own spare time away from the counseling classes we had meetings with them oh a couple nights a week on our own. And hearing them and the rationale, their liberal perspectives on birth control, contraception, and the like meshed beautifully with my own views. I've always felt that way and now I was hearing some of the experts in the field. Now I know Father Curran was moved out there because of his views on ethics and went to the University of Southern California and then to SMU in Dallas to head the ethics department. He wrote a lot of great stuff on it. They were in trouble with the cardinal at the time in

Washington. However, they held their opinions and they were never really censured. I thought what's good enough for Charlie Curran and Gene Burke was good enough for me. The whole program at CUA was excellent. I learned a lot of things in Washington from the other program. There was a Dr. Kinnane, who was head of the counseling program. He was a psychologist and psychiatrist. And from him I learned a lot, most of which was common sense. In talking about how many people do not know how to communicate and open up. Dr. Kinnane suggested that they were hearing but not listening. He used to experience that in his classes and in private practice and the like and he found himself doing the same thing. And he blamed everything—everything was an extension of what he called "SDT," same damn thing. Same damn thing seems to be causing a lot of problems. People do the same damn thing and without knowing they're doing it and continue on to perpetuate this kind of behavior. It was interesting. I learned a lot of stuff there—how to manage an organization, organizational behavior. Subsequently I got involved with organizational behavior at USC and then taught it. Observing General Casey's common sense approach on how to deal with people made me realize the importance of communication, management, and leadership. This was very effective and a good break for us. We had a lot of our colleagues, Catholic chaplains in the classes who were on the other side of the coin. I would say that the group of about twenty-five was split down the middle and that about half of us were in the liberal approach and the other half were traditionalists or conservatives.

Tape 2 ends; tape 3, side 1, begins.

In early 1968, I got orders to be transferred from Travis AFB to Headquarters Third Air Force in London, England, Ruislip, West Ruislip. And I went over there for two years. It was a different kind of base. There were several bases: West Ruislip, Ruislip, High Wycombe, Northolt, which was old London airport before Heathrow at Northolt. The Americans, USAF, had one side of the field and the RAF [Royal Air Force of the United Kingdom] had the other side. Anyhow, it was very interesting. There was no base housing, so we all lived off base in the community and I was very fortunate to live in Ruislip for a while, West Ruislip and then subsequently I moved to Gerard's Cross in Buckingham up the road on the A40, a beautiful place. There was a wonderful house there that was owned by Quakers

McFarlane Oh, Quakers?

Sheeran Quakers. And I had a wonderful two-bedroom apartment downstairs in their house— private entrance and everything. It was great. Anyhow, it was a different experience from anything else I'd experienced in the Air Force. I was all over the place from three or four different bases. Although my headquarters was at West Ruislip, a lot of my work was at South Ruislip. It was a very interesting experience. I was the only Catholic chaplain there. There were four or five Protestant chaplains and a Rabbi and we worked a lot with the community. I had a priest who came in, a guy from Belfast in the north of Ireland. He came and helped me on Sundays. And we had pretty much the same programs as I had at the other bases, including CYOs

and religion classes on Sunday mornings. I was able to recruit some seminarians from Mill Hill Seminary in London which was one of my former alma maters. I went to school at Mill Hill's College in Ireland. I knew some of the priests who worked there who were students in my time went then on to become priests. I was able to recruit some of the seminarians to come out and help and teach and, oh, a lot of things. It was kind of a very interesting program. Anyhow, the London experience was a different, no flying nothing—except at Northolt. I did get to go over to Germany and France and various other places on trips. I also became a member of the base golf team and my big thing was going over to Ireland to play the Irish Army in golf. This was a tournament that had gone on for sixteen years and the scores were tied. Twice a year they played, once in London and once in Curragh, headquarters of the Irish Army in Ireland. The scores were tied sixteen-sixteen. The Irish always won at the Curragh and the Americans always won in London. I went over to the Curragh with the U.S. Air Force on a plane to Dublin. The Irish army picked us up in a bus, took us down. We played a practice round of golf at the Curragh. There were sheep all over the course. We had a big dinner that night and I mean I was really roasted in the sense that they were saying, "This is a traitor. You guys went to the bottom of the barrel." Some of my old Irish football players were there and so we had a great time. We went out the next day to play the Irish officers and we lost. The night before, after dinner, the Irish guys went home and the Americans partied. Everybody was roasted. There was great camaraderie and great rapport between the

two sets of the military people and I remember the colonel in Ireland saying, "You know, you see all these protests about the Vietnam War and everything else, but here you will not find any such protests. We are your comrades and we have a good time together. You know, we love you all. We admire what you're doing." As I said, the Irish guys went home after dinner, about eleven o'clock at night, and of course the party carried on—the Irish wives were there till about three or four in the morning. And when we went down to the golf course the next morning nobody could see the ball. And the result was that the Irish won. Six months later, back to London, the Americans did the same thing with the Irish and the Americans won. So it was a great experience. In London and at Travis, I began to reflect on the Bishop Drury situation. I think that had an effect on me. I began to realize that there's something wrong with this church. And when people behave and act like that, there is no such thing as justice and an awful lot of hypocrisy. I thought to myself I'm not sure I'm going to stay in this thing forever, so I began to think about future alternatives.

McFarlane When people behave and act like what?

Sheeran Oh, like trying to get you to take a job, come back, and won't give it to you and for no good solid reasons. And I thought to myself, This is not the type of church or the type of organization I want to be associated with. Secondly, I'd also began to think to myself, I'm doing an awful lot of things here that are outside the realm of the church, outside the realm of what I was ordained to do. I'm doing a lot of social work, counseling, getting involved in a lot of activities that are political and policy and I need to

broaden my scope. So in California I decided to enter a university part-time. At Travis I enrolled at the University of San Francisco in an MBA program. Now, these university people didn't recognize my degree from Ireland—the University of Notre Dame and Catholic University said it was more than a bachelor's degree. However, when I went to the University of San Francisco, a good Jesuit school said, No, we don't have any evidence to that effect at the school of social work, which I was thinking about. I had a good friend of mine there at USF—he was from Ireland and was teaching in the MBA program. He said, "Oh what the hell do you want to go into social work for anyhow? Let's do a real thing." He says, "Organizational theory and organizational behavior, these are things you are interested in." "Okay." So he introduced me to a dean, Dean Wright at the School of Business Administration, the graduate school, and I was admitted to the University of San Francisco in the graduate program. And then, of course, when I was transferred to London I was out of the USF graduate program. When I went to London I decided, I'm going to check the education program out. So I found out that the University of Southern California was running a master's program in international relations on the base two nights a week and two nights a week downtown London for the Navy. So if a student missed a class on a Monday night on the base at Ruislip, he could go downtown and catch the same class on Wednesday night at the Navy headquarters. The University of Southern California was tied in with the London School of Economics, the University of London, and the University of Surrey, but by and large it was the London School of

Economics. We had joint professors from both USC and the London School of Economics, a great program. So they were willing to admit me and when I said, Well, I'm in the graduate program in business administration at the University of San Francisco, will you take me? And they said, "What's good enough for USF is good enough for USC." And I was in. I took the GRE and all that stuff, which I studied for—two courses every semester at USC. We went to school from six until nine two nights a week at USC, which destroyed the hell out of our social life, but I worked on weekends—I mean nights and weekends at London School of Economics and USC. I finished at USC in January of 1970 during which time I had really decided, I'm getting out of this place. I went home to Ireland, told my folks. They didn't like what I was going to do, didn't appreciate it, didn't understand it. But nevertheless I felt they should hear it from me and not from anybody else. I had decided that as soon as I finished this degree I was going back to California.

McFarlane That must have been tough.

Sheeran Oh, yeah, it was a tough decision. A tough decision. I knew, it was going to hurt a lot of people and I knew I was going to be ostracized to some extent, which really didn't happen too much. But I thought I better level with people. I sent my paperwork to the Air Force personnel office, but first told Joe Marbach. First of all I thought, I'm going to do this gradually. I'm going to quit here. I knew I'd have to get out of the Air Force. You couldn't stay in as an officer if you were not a chaplain (McFarlane sighs) so I had to resign from the Air Force and to do that I wanted to tell them—take time

out before I got involved in anything else. I wrote to Joe Marbach, my friend at the Military Ordinariate and I said, "Look, I'm really considering a leave of absence." And he wrote me back, I'll never forget it. I still have the letter, it said, "Maybe we all need a leave of absence at this time." In London in 1968 the big encyclical came out on *Humanae Vitae*, you know, condemning birth control and all this business. I'll never forget Father Jimmie Boothman, who was from Belfast, North Ireland, who walked in that Sunday morning said, "I cannot believe this. This is so stupid," and various other things. Then a few days later a priest came over there, he had been on the committee in the Vatican, you know, the committee—the majority—and we were talking to him about it and he couldn't believe it either. He said, "I can't believe it. This is not democracy, because we had the majority opinion and yet they went against the majority." And he said, "You know, I was in that committee," and he said, "I was telling them the story about it was down in Bolivia or Columbia or someplace in South America," and he said, "There was a man who got up every morning. He lived in a hovel," he said, "with a wife and seven or eight kids in a place I wouldn't even put my motorcycle. He went out every morning to get food from trashcan heaps. He dragged enough food out of them to sustain his family. That was the only means of subsistence. They had no television, no lights, no radio, no nothing."

McFarlane So you're—he had related the story of the Bolivian family.

Sheeran Yeah, he said—he said to them—he said, "What advice would you give them—should I have give them?" And they said, "You should tell them

they should be restrained and they should contain themselves, and they should abstain." And he said, "Like hell." He said, "They don't have any other things," he said, "And the only fun, the only joy, the only excitement they've got is this and you want me to tell them that?" He said, "You do it." He says, "There's no way I can live with this and the various other things." So I thought to myself, I agree. I had already agreed on that beforehand. Anyhow, that was the straw that broke the camel's back, in a way.

McFarlane But that's two years before you decided to leave?

Sheeran No. This was during the process after '68, because I was back in school at USC and I was really working on it and I had pretty much come to the conclusion—but I didn't want to rush out of it. I was at school. I'm going to finish my degree. I'm going to follow the advice of my friend at the University of San Francisco, Eamonn Barrett, who was one of the great professors I ever had, the one that got me admitted into the university—he lives in Ireland now and I visit him every year. "Sheeran," he said, "calculate the whole plan." He really wanted to make sure that when I did leave—he was certain I was going to leave and this was the best thing. Number two, he wanted to make sure that I was going to be prepared to take on a different job and a different way of life. I was going to be qualified. And that's exactly what I did. So anyhow, I wrote him a letter—I wrote a letter to the Military Ordinariate and said, "I need a leave of absence." I put in my paperwork with the Air Force Chief of Chaplains and I resigned. And I came back with the view of going to California, which I did. I came back and got out of the Air Force at McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey, and

went on to California. And that was in January, 1970. So I couldn't find a job any place in California. I mean there were bad days economically in California, there were people with Ph.D.s from Stanford and everything else—the economy—that they couldn't find a job. Over Christmas they had been bagging groceries and various other things. The economy was in terrible status. I had a couple of good interviews, I thought, at Bank of America and some connections I had out there all fizzled away. Eventually one day I saw this ad for executive director of Planned Parenthood in San Mateo County. And I said, "Alright, I'll send in a resume anyhow." So I sent in a resume. My God I was surprised. I got a call back from them and they wanted to know—I was living in San Jose at my aunt's house and they said, "Would you come for an interview?" And I said, "When do you want me?" And they said, "Can you come today?" And I said, "I'll be up there within two hours." So I went up there and I was interviewed and they—what I didn't know then was they had interviewed several people before that and they already had decided on one person. But there was a woman by the name of Pat Mulvaney, a volunteer there. When the resume came in, she said, "Oh, give him a chance. We have one. We have nothing to lose interviewing this guy." So anyhow, the women who interviewed me, one of them was the wife of a big executive out there. The other one, her husband was a big wheel with one of the motor companies, American Motors in Detroit. The third one I don't remember but anyhow, they decided that I was it. I mean they asked me the pertinent questions about birth control and family planning and all this business which I alluded to previously and it

all suited their philosophy including abortion. And abortion was a big discussion then. Anyhow—

McFarlane Tell me about that. Tell me about the abortion and where you fit in on it.

Sheeran Well, on abortion I think I spelled that out pretty well. I wrote a book on it here a few years ago for my doctoral dissertation at USC. It was essentially the same thing except I did more research for that than I had then. But I always felt that abortion was a matter of choice. I always felt that first of all the anti-abortion folks were basing their judgments and their views upon a very unproven unsound principle. And that they had taken into account something as *de facto*. That was actually a fact, an undisputable fact, a certainty as certain as two and two are four. And from my days in philosophy—and I did two years of philosophy, and I'll come back to it at USC later—were very important in that philosophy teaches you how to think, how to act, and how to behave. I know some good things there are such as logic and epistemology, epistemology in particular of how you know for certain the different ways of going from doubt to certitude. The different degrees—not like John McLaughlin's, although he uses that on a scale of one to ten, ten being metaphysical certitude. Well, all these things are discussed. What is metaphysical certitude? What is certitude? What is doubt? What is opinion? The range in all of this and I don't think the ordinary people out there who are articulating a point of view on abortion really know what category they're in whether it's a one, two, three, or ten. But sometimes it comes across as a ten with very little evidence of anything for it. Now, having said that, it all begins on a premise that I said—a theory

of when life begins. And that was essentially what got me going—thinking, thinking. When does life begin? Well, there is no real certitude on when life begins. There are opinions on it, yes. Metaphysical certitude, no. And nobody really knows. I had learned that was from my days in philosophy and my days in theology. That was very evident, very clear that there was no dogmatic certitude, metaphysical certitude, on when life begins. So when does life begin? Even Thomas Aquinas wrestled with that one. So I felt what was good enough for Thomas Aquinas was good enough for me. I had every right to question the certitude of when life began. I came to the conclusion nobody knows. Nobody knows—not doctors, lawyers, researchers, or any of the biologists or chemists, or any of those folks know exactly when—and they never will because I think theology doesn't state it and neither does philosophy. They provide no evidence so consequently there are different opinions, different opinions. And if you have different opinions, if one is more probable than the other and some less, you're free to follow either one. I took that attitude and I've always taken that. I don't know and when I don't know I'm at liberty to follow my own conscience, my own belief, my own—what would I call it—instincts because that's what it comes down to. And I felt that it was therefore an opinion that should not be imposed. If it's not certain, you cannot impose it and it is something in the realm of a woman's right to choose. A woman—it's a question of a woman and depending on her mental—physical, mental state, her own conscience, and everything else, and her physician. That has always been my philosophy though I've never had a problem with that. The only thing I

learned from going on further on research for the book I wrote for my doctoral dissertation is that I threw away far more materials than I put in the book. I mean I had heaps of stuff. I was warned by the people who were on my committee, "Make sure you don't get overwhelmed. It's not a question of what you put in; it's what you leave out." In doing that, I looked at it from different points of view and all it did was confirm what I already knew—confirm which gave me a little more certitude than I had. Therefore I am at liberty to act either way, and I choose that you cannot impose an unknown, an unknown element, an unproven theory, on anybody else. You cannot and should not do that. I feel there are more rights in it than the one right to life, liberty, and property, I suppose Hobbes used to say the right to life only. But John Locke said we had these inalienable rights—rights to life, liberty, and property. Right to life is one thing. That's alright when you're born. When you know a life is there. That's a different question than when it begins because we haven't answered that and liberty, you have a right to liberty and that was even harder. Locke noted that human nature existed long before any government started, so something you have as he said in the state of nature goes back a long time before government. So in other words, some think if you have an inalienable right, nobody can take it away from you. I have the liberty to make that assessment, that judgment, as the right to life, when a person is alive I have no doubt about that. It's a different story from when life begins. But the abortion issue has been tagged on to this. Now some people would like to get away from it. I know a guy here, Jack Wilkey, he wrote a book that's up there somewhere on my

shelf, on when life begins. We have had big arguments about that question. And Jack was an able debater—he was a physician. He was able to provide me with no substantial evidence whatsoever of anything that would indicate fact. It's opinions. It's nice. It'd be nice. But you cannot impose those opinions on somebody else over another equally responsible opinion. So consequently I think liberty does give you the benefit, the entitlement. It's an inalienable right you have to make that judgment, to make that assessment based on the information that you have. And since there's nothing proven one way or the other, you're at liberty to interpret it any way you want. So consequently I say, Go ahead, interpret it your way. I interpret it mine but, please, don't impose your views upon my people and I will not impose mine. It's a question of respect.

McFarlane So you had this pretty much this line of reasoning by the time you interviewed at Planned Parenthood.

Sheeran Oh, yes. Oh, absolutely. Oh, yeah, absolutely. I think you know we get back to the natural law, I remember when I was coming back from the Philippines from Clark Air Base I was reading an opinion in *Time* magazine by a Catholic bishop in India who said the natural law was constantly evolving, constantly being discarded. Now, Senator Joseph Biden was great on the natural law. I thought he was when he was interviewing Justice Thomas. But natural law is not something that's clear or definitive. All it does is states one theory—and we know some other principles of it that clarify what's in the natural law, but nobody really knows for sure what it is. The law of nature, what is it? It's there but this Indian bishop I thought

made a very profound statement, something I hadn't thought about before and it influenced me a great deal. I wish I could remember his name, but he said the natural law is not something that is absolutely clear from day one. It's not clear—the natural law is constantly being discovered. And, you know, you think about all the research we do and all the breakthroughs we have of getting people into space and nature of man, nature of the world, nature of everything else these constant findings. Things that were obscure become clarified and I think the natural law has that element of exposing clarifying further through human research, through human endeavors, through human ingenuity, I think this is the best way I could put it. And that a little bit more—you won't find anything biblical to help. The Bible is no help to you on abortion. The Bible is no help to you whatsoever on birth control either. It's not there. You can read into it and interpret it, but you know Shakespeare a long time ago said, "The devil can quote scripture for his own purpose." And I have not seen any arguments or any elements that clarifies the issue—it's far stretched to make a connection between the Bible and the scriptures and abortion or contraception. It is strange, very strange. It's a great leap of faith I would have to say to be able to do that. So consequently in the mean time I have no apologies to anybody for having, maintaining the point of view I have which is ideal—we don't know when life begins, we cannot impose a view that's very shaky to regulative the beliefs and actions of other people. So consequently I think people have a right to make up their own minds to choose and particularly it's a woman's matter at this stage of the game. I think we—if somebody feels

like I do, then I think I have a responsibility to be able to tell people honestly that this is what I feel. This is what I belief and these are the reasons for it and that's all I can say about it.

McFarlane So you get the job at planned parenthood.

Sheeran Yeah.

McFarlane This is nineteen seventy—

Sheeran Seventy.

McFarlane Seventy. And they had a candidate but then they interviewed you.

Sheeran Yeah. They had a candidate, interviewed me, and they decided to offer me the job and I accepted.

McFarlane Okay, tell me about Planned Parenthood in San Mateo.

Sheeran Planned Parenthood in San Mateo had been around for a couple years. It was basically a small organization that was founded by a few, mostly Republican, very wealthy women in particular from the Hillsborough area, you know, where Patty Hearst, and Bing Crosby, and all these folks, and Woodside, Portola Valley, and Atherton. And it was a group plan or—a do-good organization. It tended in a way to be racist that they were focused on providing family planning so that these minority folks would not have more babies whom they would have to support through welfare. It was that kind of a mentality. It was a good Republican organization in those days. The board of directors consisted mostly of people who worked as volunteers in the office and they wanted to run the show and my coming in there was to break down that barrier—break down that setup and put in a management system in place that was going to be professional and not amateurish. I

wanted to make sure the board of directors was going to be more representative of the County of San Mateo than the narrow group of people. So I moved—I was warned not to play politics, well you have to play politics if you're going to be in any organization. I got that from the gurus who always played politics but said don't do what I do—don't do what I say but—do what I say but don't do what I do and that's exactly what they said. "Don't play politics. Don't get involved in that," but then they were doing it themselves. Hypocrisy at it's worst. So anyhow I did—over the years I did manage to get some young people on the board. We got some Democrats, some men, some bankers, some lawyers, some business people. We broke it down fairly evenly between men and women. A board of about thirty. I got on very well with them. Number two, I wanted to make sure we were going to move and expand. We moved from a very small little office that was worthless. We had no staff with one person or two. We had a Title X grant from the federal government that was managed by a coordinator who was very bright, but she left and went to Australia so I took that over as well. So we moved to another place temporarily. The new place was huge—I mean in comparison, five times bigger. And then I proposed to the board, Look this is San Mateo County—very wealthy area. I know this area now and let's buy a building. So we went and bought a building a huge complex. They still have it. Then I proposed buying two more. One in Redwood City and another in Pacifica—doctor's offices. And we expanded—we ran a couple of capital campaigns and we got more than enough money to purchase all of them. I negotiated with people like the

San Francisco Foundation and a couple of other foundations in San Francisco, and I got matching funds. And I challenged the board. They'll give us this much—for every one dollar we raised they'd give us three or whatever it's going to be. And I had a hard time getting the board to do that, but my God we did it. And I knew I had a secret thing in the bag. There was an old Irish guy in San Mateo. One of the great people, he and his wife, Frank and Ellen McCoy. They were great people, great advocates of planned parenthood. His father built the grotto at Notre Dame, he told me. So Frank was a very wealthy man who imported steel from Europe and sold it cheaper than anybody else. So Frank had said to me, "You know, I want to tell you something." He said, "You've got the right attitude." He said, "You know, you've got this thing going here, foundation money and all kinds of grants and various other things and you've challenged the board." He said, "Now, if you can't make that," he says, "We're not going to let that foundation money just go to loss." He said, "If it gets down to the end and you're short, call me. I'll give you a check." So we got down to the very end, the last day and there was the president of the board, a lawyer, sitting in my office and he said, "How much are we missing?" So I called in the accountant and she said, "We're missing what fifty thousand bucks." "Jeez, fifty thousand bucks." So I said, "Is there anything else coming in. How much time do we have?" And she said, "Oh you got till about one o'clock. We have about a couple of hours." I said, "All right, so, I said, you guys sit here." And I just picked up the phone and I made that call and I said, "Frank, Patrick here. This is the last day. We're fifty thousand dollars

short." He said, "Can you be in my office within the hour and the check will be there for you?" And I came to the office, got the check, and we got—capitalized on the whole thing. Anyway, we were very successful in that, we broadened the scope. We hired a lot of nurse practitioners. In fact, I was very fortunate to hire a brilliant young nurse practitioner from Stanford University, Jo Hebard. She was absolutely magnificent. She was a nurse and then went to nurse practitioner school. She took the full year course to become a nurse practitioner—her father was a physician in New York. I wanted her to go to a medical school. She used to teach the nurse practitioner programs. Doctors were afraid—embarrassed to talk to her because she had read every book on medicine. She knew everything. And they didn't know the answers to the questions she had. Well, anyhow, she put the thing in order. First, we got a couple of physicians—a lot of part-time physicians and we had one full-time physician on staff. We increased that place by five hundred fold while I was there. It was a great—we were pretty well accepted in the community. We put a different image on planned parenthood. We increased the quality of programs. We cut down waiting time from two hours. We went to full-time day clinics all day long and some evenings to make sure we were going to serve the public. We even opened on Saturday mornings. Anything the public needed, we wanted to test. Title X was no help to us in those days. We were so good in fact that the Feds took away Title X funds from us because the state had Title V funds and they wanted to give Title V funds from the state to entities that were successful. So I got the same amount of money from Title V and a whole

bunch of state money. Remember this Title XX, of the Social Security Act? The state law required that its money was to be used mostly as fee for service. We got our place licensed, all our clinics licensed a very tough job in California to pass the fire marshals and all this other business and have all the water in the right place to be able to get Medicaid money, if you will, which is a fee for service. We were making so much money on it, we didn't know what to do with it. We were able to do that because of all this fee for service and reimbursement funds from the state. So it was a great experience. I really enjoyed it. I did do a lot of speaking in various groups. We made videos, films. For example, we made one on birth—your breast and pelvic exam for young women in particular to take the mystery out of what a breast and pelvic exam was like. And it was all around the country. We produced it with somebody who produced the Christmas show for NBC. And this nurse I was telling you about, Jo Hebard, she was in it. And another, a woman who worked for us. It was used by a lot of clinics nationwide for years. Now, we did another one on something else too. We did two of them. I mean it's a tough job to do, but we made quite a bit of money on that as well. It was all a lot of education—a lot of fundraising. But it was a great, tremendous experience. But we put together all the Planned Parenthoods in the San Francisco Bay area. First of all we fought the national Planned Parenthood office in New York. We didn't want them to dictate to us. Number two, we put together a state organization: PPAC, the Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California. It was discussed for years and eventually I took over the chair of the directors' meeting in Phoenix. It

started at seven o'clock in the morning in Phoenix. And I said, You know, we're going to meet all day and we are either going to launch this thing or bury it.

Tape 3, side 1, ends; side 2 begins.

Anyhow, eventually at the end of the day by about one o'clock in the afternoon five hours, six hours after we started, we agreed that we would start and we wanted to make sure that executive directors and board presidents would be members of it. Both could vote equally, and to heck with the Federation in New York.

McFarlane Both would what equally?

Sheeran Vote, would be able to vote—equal vote. And we called in the presidents of the boards and said, "All right, this is what we plan on doing. We support you now that all of us, presidents and directors, agreed and it was done within an hour. And then Tom Kring and myself and various other people met to establish bylaws, different committees and we put these together and that's how PPAC got started. That was my contribution to PPAC. It was an interesting thing. Prior to that, we had great meetings with the other affiliates in the Bay Area such as San Mateo, San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa County, Marin, San Jose, Santa Clara Planned Parenthood actually, and the one down in Monterey. The directors used to meet once a month to share ideas and we sort of were competing with each other. They all merged which was the right thing to do anyhow. We were talking about it in those days, but nobody was willing to give in but it did happen a few years ago. I think it's what now is Golden Gate Planned Parenthood. Before

I left there, Planned Parenthood proposed that our affiliate to San Mateo would begin to provide abortion services on site. That went round and round with the board for several months and eventually in my last month or so there the board voted to implement an abortion program at Planned Parenthood of San Mateo County which is still in effect.

McFarlane What year was that?

Sheeran That was 1977. Well, during that time—okay, then again about Planned Parenthood—I think that's—

McFarlane Why did you decide to leave?

Sheeran Well, I'm coming to that. Okay, for a reason I always thought—I'd spent several years in the Air Force and I was always interested in the federal government. During that time I was teaching part-time at the college of San Mateo, a junior college up the hill from our organization, and taught California government and politics there. And I said, You know what—

McFarlane Hold on. I think I just—(pause in recording)

Sheeran —I used to teach a lot of California government and politics and thinking about my days in the Air Force and my interest in government and stuff like that. I thought maybe I'd like to go back to Washington one of these days. So I saw an announcement somewhere about—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as we called it, DHEW, in those days had a fellows program. The White House also had one, but the fellows program I learned about was advertised and since it was a Health, Education, and Welfare program, I thought I'd better apply. Naively, I put in a résumé and an application. I knew nothing about it, but what I didn't know was that twelve

hundred other people from across the country put in applications as well.

McFarlane And this is really your desire to be in the federal government.

Sheeran That's right, yes, because I was dealing with Title X and some of these other Federal stuff. While I was at San Mateo, I did not mention this that I had gone back to school again. I worked part-time. At the University of San Francisco I said I studied business administration had it changed to international relations. When in San Mateo I went back to Golden Gate University in San Francisco to work on—finish up the master's in business administration in health services because I was in health services now. So I wanted to finish it, so I took several courses there and then I remembered something else—when I was at USC in London the last class we asked the professor, "What use is a graduate degree in international relations?" And the professor from USC said, "Not much unless you get one in public administration." I found out while I was working at Golden Gate University, USC was now offering a master's in public administration at Berkeley. So I inquired about it and indeed they were. And some of the courses I had taken were germane and having a master's from USC already, I said, "Look, I'm going to do that. I'm going to transfer." So I went back to USC and finished up a master's in public administration. I was finishing up in 1976—during the Carter administration. One of the things I did study and knew very well from the course I started in 1975—President Carter's ZBB, zero-based budgeting. Well fresh from USC with that in mind I thought, Well, maybe I can get involved in this in the federal government. Maybe this is going to work. So anyhow I applied and I was accepted. They

had twelve hundred applicants—they selected sixty out of twelve hundred for interviews and brought us to Washington. Of the sixty they chose twenty and I was one of the twenty. Most were all Ph.D.s except me. I was one of the twenty chosen—all of them I should say—nearly all of them except me and one other guy, who was an attorney, were PhDs. So, I was with an elegant group. So, anyhow it was a one year thing and I decided I was going to try and stay. I eventually was able to lure my way into the federal government. It took a lot of effort, a hiring freeze was on in those days in the Carter administration so when my year was up I became an expert consultant for another year, worked with planning and evaluation and with the Office of Population Affairs. But let me say when I got to Washington, I had chosen deliberately not to get involved in Title X or any family planning. I choose to go into the Health Resources Administration at that time which consisted of two bureaus and two centers, National Center for Health Statistics was one your familiar with and the other one was the National Health Research Center. The other two bureaus were the Bureau of Health Professionals and then the Bureau of Health Planning. Remember the old Bureau of Health Planning to where all the community agencies had to submit grant applications? I was familiar with those guys because we had to submit grant applications to those folks in San Mateo before we could get a grant anyhow, even from the state. So I was familiar with that but what I wanted to do is get not necessarily involved with the bureaus but get into the management areas so that's where I ended up. The people were doing the budget and financing and management—at the management

level. Because I knew zero-based budgeting and they didn't. They had minimal amount of knowledge. So, I got myself involved in that developing packages for the different budget proposals that would give alternatives to which way an agency should go, 5 percent less, 10 percent less, 5 percent more, 10 percent more, or just the same amount for the next year. It was a very interesting thing and of course, I could see the fallacy in the whole thing because it kept going up a bit higher. We had other people who were not very knowledgeable on the whole process, making judgments on our calls and our recommendations. And then when it got through in the office of the Secretary, then it was all put into line-item budgets and sent to Congress because Congress could understand only line-item budgeting. Well I knew ZBB [zero-based budgeting] well. I had already done that in California at Planned Parenthood before I left because that got away from line item budgeting into program budgeting which was a USC approach used by the San Mateo County government and cities and counties all over California. And then it was very easy to move from program budgets to ZBB. When I saw that—I knew that it could be transferred very easily into a line item budget because one of our board members did exactly that with my ZBB approach and it made sense to everybody. But all the board members liked it because it gave an explanation of what the options were and which way to go. It made people think and review and analyze and evaluate what was going on and with a perspective as to what was going to take place in the future. I became very disillusioned with the process as I saw it at the Health Resources and Services Administration. There was a lot

of process with very few understanding the purpose of ZBB. One day I got a call from Ernie Peterson, who worked here in the Office of Population Affairs. The Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Ford years had left, and Dr. Shultz, who was the director of the Office of Population Affairs died. Peterson, who was head of the Office of Family Planning, was acting director of the Office of Population Affairs and he had very few people and needed some help. He begged me to come down to the Office of Population Affairs. So after a great deal of thinking and consultation with some of the staff whom I knew in the regional office in San Francisco folks, I decided to take a chance at it. So I ended up in the Office of Population Affairs in December of 1977 and there's where the story begins. From there on I started to work again with Title X. I had a lot of things going. Remember there was an SDA going on at that time. Joseph Califano was secretary of HEW at the time.

McFarlane An SDA?

Sheeran SDA, service delivery assessment, It was a quick and dirty—some people say a quick and clean evaluation of how family planning programs were operating across the country in terms of teenage pregnancy in particular. Califano was one of these visionaries who wanted a quick and easy answer, not quick and dirty, quick and easy. And he asked my agency in DC, you know, "What can you do for us in finding out the status of teenage pregnancy? What are some of the issues involved and some of the problems?" It would take several years to research that. So he went to the Inspector General and he asked the inspector general, "Can you come up

with something?" So they set up a bunch of committees and in about fifteen weeks they did interviews similar to what you and I are doing with folks across the country, service agencies et cetera and they came up with a lot of findings— findings on teenage pregnancy issues. And Califano got the information he needed though maybe not completely valid and reliable but good enough. But anyway the Office of Population Affairs was asked to validate this by going out and doing subsequent interviews with the agencies and clients involved or at least a sample of them. And that became my job. I started off doing that and I went out to confirm the findings. And I went to various parts of the country meeting with people to write it up and to validate it and that's how I got involved in teenage pregnancy issues. At the same time there was a move by—Califano began to—and Mrs. Shriver, Sergeant Shriver's wife, to establish a teenage pregnancy program. A program that would serve pregnant and parenting adolescents and their infants to enable them to overcome the difficulties they encountered from early pregnancy and the like and child abuse and neglect and some of the other, shall we say, the bad things that have happened to pregnant and parenting teens many times, and in particular what teen pregnancies do to families. There was a committee set up to do that and Califano supported it. He was highly supportive of it. I was involved in getting together the first group to do that, a group of people from New Mexico. Carolyn Gaston was one of them. There was Lula Mae Nix from DAPI, Delaware Adolescent Pregnancy Program. By the way Carolyn Gaston was with the New Futures School in Albuquerque. Dr. Lula Mae Nix was the head of the DAPI

program. There was Lois Gatchel, the head of the Margaret Hudson program, a teen pregnancy program in Tulsa, Oklahoma and a few others. We got together and we began to work on developing something that would make some kind of sense to us. The proposal was supported by Califano, was taken up by Senator Kennedy, and became law in 1978. Lula Mae Nix was appointed director of the program. The Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs, where you're in right now, was established to administer that particular program. It's only purpose was to deal with pregnant and parenting teens, infants, and their families. It was supposed to be coordinated with the Office of Population Affairs, not under it but coordinated with it. Dr. Irv Cushner came in from UCLA to be Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs. Irv became my boss and Irv was one of the greatest guys I ever met. His office and the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs were side by side but they never communicated with each other. It was a kind of a professional jealousy. I was a liaison between both of them because I could communicate with both. So consequently we were able to maintain some degree of communication and coordination. I was also on the review committee for the first grant applications that the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Program received for review. I was there to help them to get a staff in place, including a grants and program folks. That was my main role back there then in 1978 and '79. When I came to the Office of Population Affairs, Peterson was acting director of the office. We had a DASPA [Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs] in name only. She was Dr. Joyce Lashof. Lashof had been appointed by the Califano

and what he and his people did was to make the DASPA job a half-time position, which drove the Title X family planning people in the field nuts. And out of that came the Family Planning Forum which had been established years before then and of which I was a member when I was at Planned Parenthood of San Mateo. I was the first planned parenthood ever to join this Forum.

McFarlane What was the Forum?

Sheeran The Forum was the predecessor of NFPRHA, National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association. Russ Richardson from Atlanta, Georgia, was one of the organizers.

McFarlane Richardson?

Sheeran Russ Richardson was the founder and I worked with Russ down there. We went to meetings and everything else, but the Forum felt that the administration was breaking the law because the DASPA was mandated legislatively in Title X legislation. Anyhow, Califano—there was a lot of pressure put on him. He responded. My job was to try and get the DASPA job restored to a full-time position. And I wrote the job description for the DASPA and extended responsibilities for the DASPA and for the Office of Population Affairs to include complete monitoring of or responsibility for the Title X program as well as Title XX of the Social Security Act as well as Medicaid. Anything the family planning program that DASPA was going to have really would have some teeth in it and the role of the DASPA was not only restore a full-time DASPA, but extend the powers, the authority, the responsibilities of that DASPA to be something rather than just a paper

tiger, just a name. I argued and fought—had to fight with some of the people again from my USC days working with management. I was dealing with some guys in the bureaucracy who were amateur managers—they were the bureaucrats, who follow the rules and regulations. "You can't do this, you can't do that." So we argued and argued for months, but however we argued on the gist of it, and were able to get the new role posted.

McFarlane Now who gave you the job description?

Sheeran It came directly out of Califano's office. It came directly out through Peterson who was the acting director of OPA. It came in a round about way. It came down through the chain of command—the Assistant Secretary of Health, who was also the Surgeon General, Dr. Julius Richardson from Boston. It came through him that we prepared this plan for the secretary, and in doing so, we had to go through the office of management which is part of the secretary's group of wizards. And these guys are steeped in the *status quo* and in the past and everything else and not very adaptive to change. I mean they left me out there to dry and I got little support because nobody knew anything about how you do this and how you might be able to put this into meaningful language with some kind of teeth. But at least we got the DASPA position restored to a full position. And Califano agreed—they agreed to include most of the things that I put in the job description. Some of the documents you already have include the duties of the DASPA. I wasn't able to get everything I wanted, but we got a lot more power and authority for the DASPA which were later extended.

McFarlane What didn't get in that you were trying to get in?

Sheeran Moving, for example, the family planning program into the office of the DASPA—under the office of the—under the DASPA itself and the DASPA would be responsible, where it is today. The argument back there in 1970 when the program was established was that it should be conducted by the DASPA. That was what Congress established. However, the department, HEW, said, "Look here Congress, thank you very much for giving us the money but we make the administrative decisions where an office is going to be located. It should not be located in an agency that makes policy. It should be located in an operating agency that operates programs." And in those days it was HSA, Health Services Administration, which was the operating program agency. Well, anyhow they put it in HAS which made no sense because the person who ran family planning would not report directly to the DASPA but through the Administrator of HSA. The DASPA position was a political appointee job. The previous DASPA was Dr. Lou Hellman.

McFarlane Hellman.

Sheeran Hellman. Dr. Hellman was head the DASPA but he became Administrator of HSA as well. That was in the last days of the Ford administration. So by wearing two hats he was reporting to himself as DASPA. You know, it was one of these weird setups. And he was more interested in HSA at that point in time than he was in the Office of Population Affairs as DASPA. So it was a part-time job. Anyhow we were trying to get some kind of handle on this thing where it would be so that it would have status. When family planning was started first, it was the Center for Family Planning. And then

they reduced its prestige to that of an office and there wasn't too much regard for it—it was there. But, you know, that administration wanted to get rid of it altogether. The Carter people were no better. They wanted to phase it out—they weren't very big on it because Dr. Lashof was a half-time DASPA. She seldom came to OPA—I never saw her in the Office of Population Affairs during the whole time I was there until she left. So we had arguments to make to justify its existence and we were able to articulate that. So we did get a full-time DASPA as I said. We weren't able to get the Office of Family Planning immediately under it. And the third thing I had proposed was moving the Office of Population Affairs from the office of the assistant secretary for health to the office of the secretary. My argument was if you're going to deal with the Medicaid people who are at that level as was HSA, Title XX of the Social Security Act, all of that, they're all on the same level. For the DASPA to have some control over these, he needs to be directly under the Office of Secretary to whom their agencies were reporting. So administratively and organizationally my argument was, you know, to make this thing work you need to have all the agencies on the same level. There was no way that agencies on a higher level would report to the DASPA who was on a lower echelon. So what I was saying was if you're not all on the same level they're going to tell you ta-ta. The Medicaid people are not going to give you any information. The Social Security Act, Title XX will tell the DASPA that, We do our own thing anyhow. MCH another agency had Title V funds for family planning in those days as well. They didn't give a damn. So I was trying to ensure that if the DASPA is

going to be responsible for the over all family planning, he or she needed to be on a level to which these people could look and look up to and not down. Organizationally I wasn't able to pull that one off then, and it never has been achieved. Irv Cushner was one of the greatest guys I ever met. He was the one that sort of took me under his wing when he came in. He gave me a lot of go ahead and allowed me to sit in a lot of meetings for him, negotiating this, that, and the other thing. We were good friends. We used go down sometimes after work to the Market Inn down the street from the Humphrey Building on Independence Avenue and we'd have a couple of martinis while we were discussing strategies. And he would change—play roles and he would play the secretary and I'd play Irv Cushner and we'd figure it out how we were going to handle things like this—I mean what will we do if this happens or comes up—it was a great relationship. We agreed during those days that it was time to get 1 percent evaluation money to do some evaluations of—that family planning program. We did—we got evaluation funds to do so. One of the things that happened was Califano was very big on clarifying sterilization regulations. Do you remember the scandals about people being—mentally handicapped people—being operated on without parental consent? Well, anyhow new regulations were issued by Califano to ensure that this kind of thing never happened again and he put in a lot of restrictions. Our job was to go across the country—go down to the ten HEW regional offices. Irv did some of them out west. I guess in five days I did six different regional orientations in offices in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Kansas City, Dallas, and Atlanta in one swirl to

bring the regional people up to speed on the new regulations, you know, informing them and giving them guidelines et cetera. We had to do it. Then we decided that one of the things in these regulations provided for an evaluation of the outcomes and what results, so we got 1 percent money to look at the sterilization regulations after one year—see how they were being implemented, did we need to meet the changes, and whatever else. That was one. Number two, we got—my argument was we needed to find out at what stage the family planning research was. So we decided to ask for money to look at all family planning research that occurred between 1985 and nineteen—excuse me—1965 and 1978 and we were going to look not at medical stuff but at all the social services research that had been done by NIH, CDC et cetera. We hired a group in this building here 4350 East, West Highway here in Bethesda to do it. We had a contract with them to do that part. Now the job was to find out what was the research, what was done, where were the gaps. And we wanted all this to be, shall we say, simplified into language that researchers—I mean that program people could understand. There was a woman who worked with us—she worked for planned parenthood, director of planned parenthood the Metropolitan Washington office, Dr. Emily Moore. Emily came to work for us as a consultant for Irv Cushner and OPA. Emily maintained that she was not a researcher but she was one who was able to translate research into meaningful managerial language to simplify it. What do you call that? It's not only summarizing it and consolidating it but making it more meaningful. And Emily then left our office and came to work for this

crowd, System Sciences was the name of the crowd that did the evaluation. And Emily came out and worked with them in doing—completing the work, showing the gaps, and translating the summaries into meaningful language. And all that was turned in to the departments down to the Office of Planning and Evaluation downtown on the fourth floor of the Hubert Humphrey Building, where it has been gathering dust because nobody has ever read. It's a shame. But anyhow that was sterilization regulations—the same thing. Marilyn Martin was the project officer on that one. She worked with me in the Office of Population Affairs. That report was never read—no attention was ever paid to it. The research literature was not read and I was part-time coordinator of that project office with Joyce Johnson from the Office of Planning and Evaluation and Joyce unfortunately died so I had to finish it. The third one was the most meaningful of all. It was a new concept developed at that time by Dr. Joe Wholey. Joe was the deputy assistant secretary for planning and evaluation in HEW. I worked very closely with Joe on the service delivery assessment thing I mentioned previously, but also on this one. I got money from Joe to do what we call the evaluability assessment of family planning programs under Title X. Now evaluability assessment, EA, was a concept developed by Joe. He was at Urban Institute before coming to the department and it meant essentially this: Is a program ready for evaluation? Is it ready, if its not you're not going to evaluate it. How do you tell if it's ready or not? Well, an EA consists really of three things. First of all, there's initial assessment, then there's development of a methodology to conduct a full-scale evaluation, and then

third is the conduct of the full-scale evaluation. The EA—the first step of it was setting up a group, a group to look at the family planning program and interview people on the Hill, the legislature, people in the department, people out in the field in the programs, clients, interested parties, constituencies if you will, to see what they think Family Planning Title X meant. Now, I was the project officer with a fellow by the name of Richard Schmidt who worked for Joe Wholey. And Bill White who was the head of the Office of Family Planning fought this thing tooth and nail. He didn't want to let us do anything. He didn't want to let us go out. He didn't want us to conduct anything. And I remember Richard Schmidt telling them say, "Look, you stay out of it. Sheeran runs this program as of now." We did it. We went out and we did a full-scale assessment. Now, first it was—a full scale assessment. Now the assessment was like this: First of all you find out is there a program. If there's no program, there is nothing to evaluate. If there is a program, does the program have objectives? If it doesn't, there's nothing to evaluate. Assuming it has objectives, are the objectives measurable? If they're not, don't evaluate—nothing to evaluate. Assuming it has measurable objectives, then you go ahead and find out what they are. And that's what the initial—first stage of an evaluability assessment is. It was done in several areas across the department in the Carter administration and it was found that Title X was the only HEW program that had a program that had objectives, that were measurable, and was ready for a full-scale evaluation, Title X was the only one. Now, that study is also down there in the Office of Planning and Evaluation. We presented that to the

assistant secretary for health and Surgeon General in the last days of the Carter administration. No attention was ever paid to it. Evaluability assessment did come up with a couple of interesting things. It validated my point of view that the Office of Population Affairs should be at the office of the secretary level to be able to coordinate across programs. That did come out of it. Secondly, it said that the Office of Population Affairs—the Office of Family Planning should be administrated by the Office of Population Affairs. And that—when the Reagan people came to town, that was the one thing they took out of that evaluabilty assessment, was that line. It gave them the rationale, the ground, if you will, the foundation for moving the Office of Family Planning from HSRA, Health Services and Resource Administration to the Office of Population Affairs in the summer of 1982 by secretary—HHS secretary Schweiker. And when a majority of people in the constituencies revolted, and in Congress he retracted, but soon, a few days before he resigned in January of 1983, he permanently moved it back to OPA—moved family planning from the office of—from the Health Resources and Service Administration to the Office of Population Affairs. And I was given the job to assist in making sure that took place. And that was one of the things that the people at HRSA—and a lot of people didn't like me because I had recommended it, of course, a few years before and now here I am delivering the goodies. And it was interesting. During the Carter administration, the same constituencies were clamoring for that to happen because they had such admiration for and trust in Irv Cushner. That's why I was able very clearly to recommend that

the Office of Family Planning be under the Office of Population Affairs. One of the things I wasn't able to get as I told you. The family planning constituency were all in favor of it in the Carter administration because they didn't like Ed Martin the head of the program at HAS and some of the things that were going on in HSA and trying to impose some of his BCRR, the bureau's common reporting requirements on family planning and using family planning Title X money in community health centers et cetera. So they wanted to move it to OPA. Then, of course, when it happened in 1982 and 1983 there was a different person from Irv Cushner, a Republican person—Margerie Mecklenburg, who had been appointed head of the office of family planning and Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population and head of the office of adolescent pregnancy programs. She was a Republican, not well known, and therefore she was thought to be dangerous. Not very sympathetic shall we say to family planning.

Tape 3 ends; tape 4, side 1, begins.

McFarlane —seven October 23, Dr. Sheeran.

Sheeran Okay, just a few words about the DHEW fellowship. It was a one year thing. During that year I was reassigned from the Health Resources Administration to the Office of Population Affairs where I've remained ever since. During that year we met constantly with the other fellows, the other nineteen fellows. We were exposed to all agencies in the department, got tours. We met members of Congress including members of the senate—Senator Kennedy, for example, and we really got a tremendous overview of how the department worked. And this is absolutely a wild

place. I had no idea how extensive it was. It's a real zoo—it was the Department of Health Education and Welfare. When Secretary Califano was here, he came in with a view that this agency, DHEW, had not so much been mismanaged, it never had been managed at all. And I couldn't agree more. I think it's such a zoo that I'm not sure it has even been managed since then—it's impossible to manage it. Number two, I do not believe that it's ever been managed at all, even in Califano's day or since. Not even with the—reorganization has occurred when they took away the e—the education component and made it a new separate department. And later the welfare component became a separate department, we are just now mostly health and human services. It's a smaller—shrunk, but it's still a zoo and I'm not sure the management system has improved to any great degree in spite of all the focus on improving management systems, cutting costs, waste, fraud, and abuse, all these wonderful things. It's now called the Department of Health and Human Services. I think one of the misnomers is the human services part of it is—it's very poorly done. There is no such thing as human services really or a regard for people. When I was in the Air Force I mentioned before when I talked about Travis Air Force Base as being the friendliest and the finest. The Air Force also had a motto that said, "The Air Force takes care of its own," and by God they did. They took care of their people, their men, their women, their families. When people moved from one place to another, there was a committee to help them to move out and a committee to help them when they got to a new base. A person was designated to be responsible for the orientation of that

particular person. That does not happen in HHS. For example, back in 1978 when the first director of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs, came to town—she was coming to the office on a Monday and on a Friday afternoon they didn't even have an office for her and eventually they kicked a GS-15 out of an office that was absolutely a disgrace. But nobody had made any plans to cleanup or take all the cobwebs and the dirt and the nails off the wall and the floors. And I remember that day thinking to myself, This is an awful place to be. I can't believe that this place—the Department of Health and Human Services is supposed to be for the welfare of people, cannot take care of its own. It's a far cry from the Air Force— military that has the capacity of destroying the world in a very short period of time. They have far more regard for people than this particular department. On that Friday afternoon I worked for several hours vacuuming the floors, cleaning the walls to make sure that this person who was coming in, a Ph.D., an African American, would at least be given the courtesy of being welcomed into a place where there is some degree of appreciation shown. Unfortunately that degree of appreciation didn't last very long because, although she lasted for a couple of years in the Carter administration, the Reagan people came in 1980 and they wanted to keep her. They interviewed her on a Thursday afternoon and told her she was going to be retained on the job. On Friday afternoon they fired her.

McFarlane Who was that?

Sheeran Dr. Lula Mae Nix. She was the head of the program at Delaware Adolescent pregnancy program in Wilmington, Delaware before then and

subsequently is now at Temple University. But there was this kind of thing that the bureaucracy seems to take precedence over managing people and while people are your best resources there is no regard for people. Everything is run by rules and regulations and it is quite this way even in the Office of Population Affairs not only today but for the past five or six years. Since 1995 there has been nothing but total disregard for people and bullying, not paying, not rewarding, not recognizing, not taking care of your own. And I think this is—if this is an indication of the way the government functions particularly an agency that is supposed to have sympathy and regard for the welfare of people across the nation, and it cannot take care of its own, I question its ability to manage. I question its sincerity. In fact I would venture to put a lot of emphasis on hypocrisy more than on honesty.

McFarlane Okay. The atmosphere changed. I want to get back to your point, but in terms of the political atmosphere, the political atmosphere changed in 1980?

Sheeran Yeah. The political atmosphere—the Republican—President Reagan replaced President Carter brought with him a lot of Republican wizards, people who had been out of government for a few years they came in with their own mission. First of all, there was no question about the fact that this department needed overhauling and then it needed to be reorganized. Number two the Republicans had a general dislike for federal employees and regarded them as mostly Democrats, lazy and untrustworthy. In the words of Fredrick Taylor—a management approach that sees people as no damn good because people in general are lazy, worthless, cannot be trusted. They're loafers et cetera. And that's exactly how the Republicans regarded

federal employees. There were some documents that came out like from the Heritage Foundation and others that said to make sure that when you come to office you never let the bureaucrats know what you're doing. Have two or three people working on the same job and make sure none of them knows that the other is working on it. And this was kind of a philosophy that was promulgated across departments and offices. It was interesting. I wrote a book on ethics back there a few years ago, ethics and public administration. I pointed out the number of scandals—the number of people in the Reagan administration alone who were fired from the government for inappropriate behavior and for down right failures to the ethical. In talking with some of these people afterwards at the University of Southern California which had a forum for evaluators in the Washington area across all departments Living, HUD, Department of Defense, HHS, and others, it was interesting to hear those views from some of these people who came to town as deputy assistant secretaries, political appointees, as secretaries had the philosophy I mentioned when they came. Gradually, they began to realize that the bureaucrats were not as bad as they thought they were and as time went on the Republican appointees began to realize that they had been given misinformation and had come around a long way, had to make an about face, if you will, to be working with federal employees and discovered that federal employees weren't as bad as they were supposed to be. However, the leadership saw it differently and unfortunately they'd inflicted an awful lot of harm. There was a lot of reorganization, a lot of mistrust. A lot of secrecy—invoking of secrecy and security. Of course

these are all bureaucratic terms that made the place less efficient than it was before.

McFarlane Was that your experience with the political appointee who came to the Office of Population Affairs?

Sheeran The political appointee who came to the Office of Population Affairs during those days were—well, first of all we had—Marjorie Mecklenburg was a house wife, totally unqualified to be deputy assistant secretary neither advanced degrees nor any experience in government but had the right to life background, favored contraception, but opposed to abortion, a one issue person. When she came in she was very nice. I had met her before she came in. She was—during the Carter years there was a Select Committee on Population appointed by Congress to look at population, family planning, birth control et cetera and I was the liaison from the Office of Population Affairs to work with that committee. And I'd met her through working with her through testimony and the like but she came in and she was fine. However, she got entangled with the director of the Office of Population Affairs, Ernie Peterson, who was probably the most—the essence of bureaucracy, Mr. Bureaucrat himself, a man who never told the truth and couldn't be trusted but who gave her an orientation that was totally opposite to what leadership should be about and she became more introverted—I guess she became more introverted and more interested in subversion rather than in the candor, the openness which she originally had. And as a result it was—nobody knew what she was up to, what she was going to pull next. And she was—her attitude was—their attitude became

one of distrust, disregard for family planning, number one. The Office of Adolescent Pregnancy and any programs, they hated. It was almost like reminiscent of President Nixon. They hated those outside of government as well as those inside. I mean everybody became an enemy. And that's unfortunate because the Office of Population Affairs became an enemy as did the Office of Family Planning and so were the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Program personnel. But that was the atmosphere under which we worked, or should I say operated. We were there in name but we never had a job—my job was in the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Program—Marjorie Mecklenburg did appoint me as director of the program development and monitoring, which meant I had all the demonstration grants authorized by Congress, both the old program, adolescent pregnancy program under Title VI and the new one under the adolescent family life legislation signed by Reagan in 1981. Then we added a research component to that that was headed by Dr. Patricia Thompson, but neither of us were allowed to do anything except to be involved in bringing a family planning program from the HRSA organization to OPA but we for quite a while we were not allowed to do anything. Patricia Thompson eventually got fed up and joined the NIH. I realized that unless you had a Ph.D. or a doctorate of some kind one wasn't going to move forward in this organization. Since I wasn't being used and they hated me I guess because I wasn't a married person and didn't represent the notion of—the true notion of family values depicted by a happy couple with two kids and a station wagon, the boy being older than the girl and all this, I should not be out there representing

them. So I made a move. I proposed to them that they allow me to go to school for a year and that under an education initiative the Reagan people had left in place and I did the documentation and they approved it, while at the same time telling those at the higher level that they should disapprove at that level. However, to make a long story short, an incident happened that convinced them to do—to let me go. So I went to school for a year at the University of Southern California—working on a doctorate program in public administration. Now you cannot get reimbursed for working on a—for a degree according to government rules, but you can get reimbursed for attending courses and learning skills that is going to improve your ability to manage and to conduct programs. And on that version of it—interpretation if you will that twist that spin I gave them they had no choice. But anyhow I did get to school and when I finished the all the doctoral courses, I did not get a doctorate degree in that year. On my own time afterwards after the year was up, I was able in a space of three months to complete the program, complete all the examinations, and the dissertation successfully. But I was gone for a year. During the year when I was gone the Secretary fired Mecklenburg and Peterson, and they brought in another woman from the department, a Republican, Joanne Gasper who had a master's in business administration and she was going to run the OPA and its constituent offices just like a business.

McFarlane Let me back up a bit. The year you were gone was what year?

Sheeran 1984 to 1985.

McFarlane And during that time Mecklenburg was fired—

Sheeran Uh-huh.

McFarlane —as—

Sheeran February of '85.

McFarlane Summer of '85?

Sheeran No. February.

McFarlane February? And Peterson as well? He was a civil servant?

Sheeran Yeah, he was moved to Siberia someplace in a windowless room on the seventeenth floor, eighteenth floor of the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Maryland, where he stayed for a while until he retired.

McFarlane Why were they fired?

Sheeran Well, there are different reasons to fire them. Big investigation being done by Jack Anderson, the *Washington Post*, and other folks about their using federal funds to go to football games to watch Mecklenburg's son, who was a pro-player with the Denver Broncos, and going out to places where they never went at all. They were eventually caught in some kind of amorous relationship in the garage of the HHS building at 200 Independence Avenue and they were observed by somebody the joint chiefs—the chief of staff for the secretary of HHS at the time and he reported the matter to the secretary who fired them immediately. They brought in Joanne Gasper to take her place.

McFarlane And Joanne Gasper came from where?

Sheeran Joanne Gasper came from another part of the department, consumer affairs or something like that, and brought with her a deputy to replace Peterson her friend, Jerry Bennett, who remained in the office until 1995, 1996 when

he too retired.

McFarlane Tell me about the Gasper-Bennett years.

Sheeran Well, Gasper was—there wasn't any doubt about Gasper. Her philosophy was that of a right-wing Republican. I mean her books in her office were such—they were all Republican right-wing type of things and I used to kid her about those. I would say, "You know, I mean obviously you and I could never get along because you subscribe to that and I subscribe to a different philosophy. I understand where you're coming from. I've read some of that stuff, don't agree with any of it, on the other hand you will not agree with me so we agree to be different." So we got along fine on that basis. We just didn't talk about any of the issues. I just did my own thing. When I came back from school, Gasper was there but she had—she offered me a job of running her research component—she had reorganized the Office of Population Affairs and taken adolescent research, adolescent family life research component out of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Program and the service of every improvement research piece out of the Office of Family Planning and put the two of them in the Office of Population Affairs. She wanted to know if I might be interested in running them and I said absolutely not. In the meantime, of course, I had nothing else to do so I asked to be sent to the Department of Defense on a detail. I had friends in the Department of Defense, people I had met when I was in the Air Force, civilians, and they were in need of people. They were trying to put together a whole program on families in accordance with the Reagan focus on both military and family and they were having trouble trying to help the army,

navy, Air Force, and Marines, Coast Guard develop policies and plans for—to put more emphasis on counseling families so they had established at the Office of the Secretary of Defense an Office of Family Matters. And they asked me to come over there and help put that thing together and to work with the different services in trying to put programs in place not just on paper, that too, but in place on every base—United States military base domestically and overseas. My job was to help them do that and it was great fun trying to do it. I was working mostly with civilians although some with military people. But being in the Office of the Secretary of Defense one had some clout, one had some authority, one had some power, and generally speaking it was easy enough to get military type of people to fall in line. I didn't try to use a heavy hand on them, but I used a lot of the General Casey approach of trying to lead them—get them to not argue but discuss, mediate, negotiate and be able to come up with something and we did. We did a fairly decent job of putting these things in place. Now I knew very well why there was great emphasis on those—that these were not going to be very permanent programs in that they—the military hardware, the military airplanes, tanks and guns, (skip in tape) ships would—(unintelligible, skip in tape) in the case of any kind of emergency and if money were needed for these, these would take precedents over the social programs. However, a good effort was made and I do commend the military. I saw some of the plans—the Air Force had by far and away the best plan on paper, absolutely magnificently done. It was a paper tiger. They had little in practice on the bases. The Army and Navy had better programs

in place but not much on paper. I suppose I came to the conclusion after reviewing the Air Force plan that paper seldom refuses ink and that a paper well done and well written doesn't necessarily ensure that a program will be implemented in accordance with that, whereas the Army and the Navy had done a much better job and so did the coast guard for that matter. I met with all of them and went out and visited their places. It was interesting. It was a tremendous experience, but I was delighted to be back and learned a great deal from it. Secondly, I also learned that the military had less bureaucracy. For example, writing letters, the letters would come in via the secretary of defense and part of my job was to respond to these letters in areas pertaining to family services and the like. So, I would prepare responses to those letters and they were very—what are they called—human, personal. We said, "Dear Mr. So and so or Dear Mrs. So and so. Thank you for your letter of whatever date regarding this," and tell them straight out. Now the Department of Health and Human Services—the office—the agency that deals with human people. That would not be allowed when I came back and tried to do it that way I was told by the office, by the executive secretary—the office was in the office of the secretary and the assistant secretary for health, "That's not how we do it here. You must do it this way. This is a response to your letter of so and so concerning so and so." Absolutely cold, aloof, nothing personal or warmth in it, no cordial greetings at the end or get in touch. So consequently it's like day and night. Sometimes I wonder whether I was working for the same government or not.

McFarlane But then you came back to the office—

Sheeran I was recalled to the office because there were so many people from HHS on temporary assignments to other federal agencies. It was right after the explosion where the teacher was killed in the space shuttle disaster. The assistant secretary for health found out there were too many people from HHS on detail to the White House and to the Department of Defense and elsewhere. I suppose the others were in the same boat I was trying to figure out another place to be. In fact, I would have stayed over—I was just in the process of beginning to find a place to stay over there permanently and I would have, but I got called back and that clipped my wings. I was called back and I came back to HHS without any real job. When I was at school they had reorganized the place as I said before. My position had been deleted had been canceled out, something they were not supposed to do, something they're not supposed to do because technically according to the rules—the same rules and regulations they use for everything else stipulate, while a person is out on school or on detail, they cannot abolish the position or the job description. Yet they did that. When I talked to some of the people the counselors with whom one files grievances, they all agreed. But I came to the conclusion that a situation like that would be like filing a grievance against the devil and holding the hearings in hell. I was not going to win regardless so—sometimes one has to figure out is it worth it—is this worth fighting for now or shall we loose this battle here and win a war at a higher level another day another time. And that's exactly what I decided to do. I'm not going to fight this one but I will prevail and that's why I'm here.

McFarlane So you came back as director of the office of adolescent affairs?

Sheeran No, I did not. I came back as a regular program project officer something I had not been for years where I just came back reporting to some other people. The person I came back to was head of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs then was Nabors Cabaniss. She was a beautiful young woman who worked on the Hill for Senator Jeremiah Denton and helped to craft the adolescent family life legislation prior to 1981. A very solid Republican, young, smart, good political skills, no management skills, but a delightful person and I got on very well with Nabors Cabaniss. She came to hear my doctoral dissertation presentation. In fact when she left, she invited me to the office of the secretary for a going away party the only one in the whole area that was invited. Not that I subscribed to all of her philosophy, but I did respect her integrity as she was one of the few bright lights that I saw in the Office of Population Affairs ever since the days of Dr. Irv Cushner.

McFarlane How did you dish—how would your philosophical differences have played out in programs?

Sheeran Our philosophical differences—Nabors Cabaniss was banded by the press. Sometimes they'd make great hype out of the fact that she was twenty-eight-years-old and was a virgin and stuff like that. And I thought a lot of that thing was so unnecessary—she was Republican, virgin, twenty-eight-years-old—it's competence more than anything else. I thought they went a little bit far. Secondly, I know that she was very anti-abortion for her own reasons. We never discussed them. We agreed not to discuss and not to go

there. On family planning she had some concerns about some of the methods of being—abortifacients—in a way and we didn't agree—we agreed not to discuss those. As far as having a program in place for the point of view of adolescent pregnancy program is a safe program. The big thing in it, of course, was abstinence education. That was introduced in 1981 legislation. There were some great concerns about that. That actually caused that particular program to be controversial—at the time of Nabors Cabaniss—actually when she helped to craft the legislation back in 1980 or '81. There was no focus or no interest or no great—about HIV/AIDS for example. It was just starting then. As the years went on obviously there was a great increase in HIV/AIDS and concerns about it and one of the things that came through loud and clear was that abstinence was probably—well, not probably, was the most effective way of preventing HIV/AIDS in the first place, as well as pregnancy. So the purpose of the legislation broadened and the scope of it broadened and we certainly could agree on all these issues. Now whether it was realistic or not that every kid—every teenager needed to have all the information of family planning—we continued to be able to do that, but all was showing that abstinence was more effective and that was the only message. I was able philosophically to understand that and subscribe to it and she was too. On the other hand some people—some folks misinterpreted our position that once you give any information, you are promoting. And there's a big difference between giving information and promoting. My philosophy had been you give the information on various effectiveness rates. Some people call it failure rates, I don't. Effectiveness

rate is more positive than failure. Give them the information, and abstinence will always come out number one as the most effective. Let people use their intelligence, their common sense, their freedom to make that judgment themselves—what is best for them. That's how I operate this program and that's how I can live with it and that's how I can subscribe to it. From that point of view she was supportive of that. There wasn't any doubt about that. She would probably go a little bit more in promoting abstinence. A little bit more than I would, but I feel that you can bring a horse to the water but you can't make the horse drink. I think the same—I apply that rule to—you can give people information about the a, b, c, and d and effectiveness rates and everything else and even though abstinence may be number one you cannot force them. Circumstances may arise when—while they may subscribe to it they may not be able to. Something they have—so there's a whole bunch of factors involved. I have no problem with it—I've never had a problem with that part of it. Okay.

McFarlane Okay. So you were a program analyst and program officer until 1991?

Sheeran Then Joanne Gasper got fired for doing something wild in the area of trying to do something with Planned Parenthood that was detrimental to Planned Parenthood against the best advice from all of us. And Nabors Cabaniss, campaigned very, very prominently for the job of DASPA, deputy assistant secretary, and she got it.

McFarlane Campaigned with?

Sheeran She campaigned with the department heads and with Congress and everything else to be appointed as the deputy assistant secretary for

population affairs replacing Joanne Gasper and she got the job. After she got the job I was still there as a program officer and during her replacement. There were two people who replaced her. One was Laura Truman who lasted about a year and left and then Patricia Funderberg, now Patricia Funderburk-Ware, who is heading an office on HIV/AIDS in a current office of the secretary of HHS. Pat Funderburk had a deputy, Dr. Ruth Sanchez Wade, who had come in on a detail previously. While I was at school they had appointed her as deputy director of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs. That situation lasted until 1993, when the Clinton administration replaced the Bush administration and the first day of the Clinton administration, with Patricia Fundenberk gone, they appointed me as acting director of the office of adolescent pregnancy programs. The director of the office of adolescent pregnancy programs was a political position. It was one the Clinton people intended to fill but never could and never did. I acted in that capacity from 1993 until 2001. In the last days of the Clinton administration they abolished the position of director of the office of adolescent pregnancy programs as a political position and made it a regular civil service position and therefore I had to apply as a civil service person for this particular job and I got it. So I don't know how many other applications there were maybe none maybe it was easy. But anyhow I got it. So getting back to what I'd said earlier, I figured there'd be another day, another time, another place to fight the battle so therefore, at least I feel that I had stayed the course long enough to be able to get back to a meaningful position and just be able to do something, a few things,

differently perhaps. So that's where I am—January 2001, I have been director of the office of population—I mean the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs.

Tape 4, side 1, ends; side 2 begins.

As I said that in 1983, in the fall of 1983, I had no real job and nothing to do and nobody ever consulted me and several other people were in the same boat in the office. So, I decided that since there seemed to be so much emphasis on and utilization of people with doctoral degrees as consultants and the like that I needed to get a doctorate degree—hence I talked to you, Debra about that and you laughed at me saying, "Why do you want to endure all the punishment of going through a doctoral program?" And I think I said, Well, I was asked to do so. I went over to the University of Southern California and I interviewed Joe Wholey, my former boss in planning and evaluation whom I'd mentioned earlier, and Joe asked me the same question, "Why do you want a doctorate?" And I said, "Just for the sake of pride, just for the sake of proving that I could do it." And he said, "That's good enough reason for me." And he said, "You know, you're so qualified we—you can do it here in Washington and get a doctorate in public administration. MSC had a school in downtown Washington right across from the Ford Theater. It had been operating for several years. Since I had been at USC in two previous graduate programs it seemed to me the place to go. Secondly, I was familiar with their approach. They had an intensive seminar approach which is very demanding. You got your books six weeks in advance of the beginning of course. You went to school for

four days from nine until five. You had a month off during which you did papers or other work and then you came back for four more days of school nine to five, a total of fifty-six hours of classroom work for four units. I liked the four units thing as well as that. You were in class. You might as well be in class for an extra hour and so it seemed to me that this was a quick and easy and fast way of doing that. I liked the intensive seminar approach. I liked the fact that the students were very competent. With so many military people—higher level military—federal—HHS and other department people, it was going to be a very competitive thing. A tough thing to get in. They took no more than twenty-five students. But I liked the idea of getting the books in advance. In doing this, I started off by taking two courses at a time and sometimes I would take three. I was off for a year. I didn't have to go to work. I didn't have to go to school everyday because the seminar—the days of class were Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. So I had those four days and in a semester I took two courses to be regarded as full-time. That was sixteen days during the course of a semester, but then I had done all the six weeks of reading for two courses before hand. And this was very tedious. At the same time I also decided I'm going to work on this from the point of view of completing the dissertation with a view to writing a chapter in every paper. Every paper became a chapter toward the dissertation. And I was fortunate enough to have a woman from Texas, Dr. Cynthia McSwain, on the staff at USC, a professor—she's now currently at George Washington University and she helped me with my career and dissertation. Her husband Orion White, who

was dean of the school of public administration at Virginia Polytech, was very helpful. They encouraged me to choose abortion as my topic. They'd tape stuff from the radio while driving in their car and mail the tapes to me. But anyhow, they were very helpful and Cynthia encouraged me to do what I said I was going to do, to write a chapter in every course. Now, the courses themselves were huge—I mean the classes were wonderful. I mean there were about twenty-five students in every class. Professors were absolutely magnificent. The rapport between the students—sometimes we had students come in from the Department of Defense and they'd be sitting at attention for the first couple of days, and by the time they left the program, they would be such roaring liberals that one couldn't believe what had transpired during the course of the program. Not that USC is that liberal of a school, but the atmosphere was such that it provided for great dialogue. Then we also worked with a team of people. I had four classmates I believe. Four of us worked on papers, on exams, and everything else. We called ourselves Team America. It's on the internet headed by Roger Gilbertson, who was a Navy captain, and two Air Force colonels, and Frank Gavin, who worked for the Army personnel and myself. We wrote short summaries of different books and different papers that were germane to public administration, this that and the other thing. We exchanged information. We met regularly at least once every couple of weeks at USC during lunch time for an hour, an hour and a half. We had great fun. We had great time. We also did a lot of work and it was very helpful. I mean the courses I took helped me—got me back to the old days where I really

appreciated the days in the seminary in Ireland were not wasted. The knowledge I had of philosophy and theology, particularly philosophy, was very helpful in the study of public administration. And many times during classes I would be asked by other students, "What is epistemology?" "How do you work this?" "What is ontology?" "When they say 'ontologically speaking,' what does that mean?" So I had to contribute in the course with some briefings on ontology, epistemology, logic, and how these things were connected and how they were connected with ethics and behavior and stuff like this down the road. It was very interesting that I had to go back and review my materials on these subjects. Afterwards I wrote a book on ethics. I had to go back to philosophy because the basic foundation of ethics is in philosophy. I was able to go back and place ethics on philosophy, showing where it belonged and how it was related and how it was linked to certitude and everything else that epistemology covers, as well as ontology. Reality is a major issue in philosophy. Is there a real world or do we live in a world that we ourselves create? And we took into account the great philosophies of Plato, who was a subjectivist, I suppose, an interpretivist in many ways, and Aristotle, his student, who was an objectivist. And we had the two types of theories in public administration constantly. Here's where ontology and epistemology came together and hopefully those of us who went through that were able to get a better understanding of reality and perception. It was a tremendous study. We also covered some of the great theories on the role of government and getting back to Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau (sirens) and some of the great conservative theorists, such as Edmond Burke, the

Irish philosopher and politician. It was very interesting to be able to put government in its proper perspective. Proceeding from there, it was easy to take up management, what management was and figuring out the contributions made by such people in the area of management as Frederick Taylor, and of course Max Weber, and figuring out how bureaucracy got such a hold in management, particularly when we're talking in a year when all of us are trying to de-bureaucratize the whole federal system and the whole management system, and introduce a new concept of management, utilization of people, taking care of people, coaching, teaching, ensuring that people have the necessary facilities and necessary support to get the job done. And then we attempted to reconcile the rules and regulations that bureaucracy has in place to ensure that you don't get the job done. It's a very interesting problem to see how one can get around those rules and regulations to make them work. I after went back to General Casey. I think I said this earlier. I remember Casey and I went down to a procurement office on base to get sunglasses to go on a flight. The individual—sergeant in charge said, "We don't have any, Sir." And General Casey said, "Why not?" He said, "You didn't fill out the paperwork, sir." "Why can't you give them to me?" General Casey asked. The sergeant said, "The rules, Sir, the rules and regulations." And General Casey said, "Let me tell you something, young man. As I understand this man's Air Force, the rules and regulations are there to help you do the job, not to prevent you from doing it. I suggest you find a way of doing your job." "Yes, sir." He pulled out two pairs of sunglasses. General Casey wasn't telling him to break the rules, but he was

trying to simplify a situation where the answer should have been the same. And I wrote the ethics book from that perspective to try to make government work and try to make sure that one uses the rules, even in the bureaucratic settings to ensure that the job gets done, and to make sure that the rules and regulations are not used to prevent one from doing it. Unfortunately in the Office of Population Affairs, Adolescent Pregnancy Program, and the HHS as I know them, the rules and regulations are too often used to prevent one from doing the job and certainly to make sure that you don't do it well. It's a mistake. In spite of encouraging people to go to management courses, public administration courses, courses put on by the department, consultants and the like, people often go to those courses and when they come back, nobody asks them where they were much less what they learned and certainly never allow them to put into practice anything they have learned. So it's paying lip service to the need for good management—more modern management, and yet using the rules, using the bureaucratic setup, to do nothing or do the same damn thing.

McFarlane Can you give an example of where the rules have frustrated you in this office?

Sheeran The rules of this office I mean—for example, we have a rule in this office—I mean I worked on a committee in this office over the past couple of years—a committee to develop training policies for all staff. I mean all three—four offices: family planning, grants management, population affairs, and adolescent pregnancy. The rules—the general department rules encourage training. We encourage training, more education—everything

else to upgrade skills to make sure people are going to stay around and be competent, capable of carrying on the programs down the road. We have a number of people whom I brought in here as trainees. Some of them had college degrees. Some of them had none, but they could work on them. My big thing was to make sure that these people upgraded those skills by not only getting college degrees but attending graduate programs. Those who didn't have college degrees were encouraged to work on them. Technically we should be able to pay for those people to get those degrees and the policy we came up with was very short and sweet that the program manager, myself for example—a director—had the authority to approve everybody to go to these courses if funds were available. Availability of funds is something made by the financial office. The financial officer and the people in the Office of Population Affairs are required only to certify that funds are available and concur with me. Now over the past year—for example, to give you one example, take Joanna Nestor next door, she was working on a master's in public health at George Washington University School of Public Health here in Washington D.C. All her classmates, not all but most of them, are from other parts of the federal government, particularly HHS, the National Institutes of Health down the street here, CDC, and HRSA. All their tuition and books were being paid for by their own office and agencies. She put in numerous requests to have tuition assistance provided for the courses she was taking. While funds were available, our requests were never honored, never paid for, yet they stayed there unanswered, unapproved, they need approval. They needed

concurrence only, but the bureaucratic regulations were such that the concurring officials did nothing except to ensure that Ms. Nestor did not receive tuition. This was not only dishonest, it was discriminatory. There were a couple of other people in the same boat. Anyhow to make a long story short, Joanna Nestor completed her master's in public health earlier this year without any tuition reimbursement. People didn't even ask her if she had it, could care less. The rules—in other words the bureaucratic rules in government were such that they prevented something like that from occurring. Anyhow, we have that system where the rules—where the policy is one thing, the interpretation of that policy or the attitudes of some top managers or policy people are such that they will interpret concurrence as approval, and disregard what the polices are. In other words, the policies and the rules can be clear, but they say, Well, we can't do that for one reason or another. We have to have, quote, "parity." Now the use of parity, parity means everybody should be entitled. Right, I agree with parity. But not everybody is going to apply. Not everybody needs it. Not everybody has the initiative and not everybody wants to move up the line. But these are young people. They were trainees. Example, Joanna Nestor was one. I got Alicia Richmond Scott next door here, Jackie McCain next to her. Joanne Jensen finished a Ph.D. this year, finished it in medical education at the University of Maryland. She never received a penny of tuition for it. Tarsha Wilson finished an M.S.W. this year and never got a penny of tuition. All these are examples of nobody on staff receiving tuition for education. I didn't give up. In the mean time I reapplied this year—I reinstituted the

process this year so that Alicia Richmond Scott next door working on a master's in social work for which she is receiving tuition. So is Tarsha Wilson who got an M.S.W. and is working on a Ph.D. now for which she is receiving tuition. Jackie McCaine is working on an undergraduate doing as well and receiving tuition for it. Quinn Buster, my staff assistant, is working on an undergraduate and being compensated. But it has been pulling and pulling of teeth to get those courses paid for. But Joanna Nestor was turned down on one occasion because the courses she was taking was—HIV/AIDS in society, were judged not to be related to her work. Well, yes that's what adolescent pregnancy programs were dealing with—abstinence—HIV/AIDS, STIs, et cetera. We're talking about Healthy People 2010—it's a planning thing with HHS—we use that all the time with our grants. We want to make sure people address how their program is going to fit in with that. There's another course on evaluation and public health organizations. We are required by law to evaluate all our programs. In other words, their interpretation of something that's obvious to even a two-year-old is apparently not obvious to those who have MDs or Ph.D.s to be able to say this is indeed a fact. How can you fight that? Ms. Nestor received no tuition for taking and passing all these courses. Eventually we have turned it around and hopefully now with the new DASPA maybe we are going to have a degree of common sense enter the equation at last. But anyhow that's what I see and that's one example. There are several other examples. You cannot do this. Why can't I do it? Well, you can't do it because the rule says so. For example, I got one here yesterday that said

grants management people should not travel because—they say program people should be able to do this—be able to do audits and accounting type of things. Program people are not trained to do any of these—they have a spattering of knowledge on such areas. They have a spattering of training in grants areas so that they're able to know what funds should be spent for. But they are not qualified to go in and do an audit in accounting. So I had to write a letter back so program wouldn't do such tasks. It's our policy that we have to conduct a site visit within a year and this person should be there as well. So they're trying to tell me no. This is somebody at the higher level. I'm saying this is not your decision. This decision is a management decision made by me and the person who is the grants management officer for the need or both—a program person and grants management specialist to go and be able to do quotes a "comprehensive" review of a program and that is what the rule said. Now, what they're doing is picking out bits and pieces saying, We don't give a damn about those rules. We're going to make up our own if there are no rules. Do you see what I mean? You can use it both ways. You can say, we don't agree with the rules. We make up our own. Or we'll use the rules to prevent you from doing it. It's a two way street. I teach courses in management and I've been teaching for several years at—the public administration graduate courses at USC and at George Mason University in Virginia and I also teach business administration—graduate programs at Johns Hopkins in Baltimore. And I always teach the same thing management and organizational behavior. And I see two things. One is I tell them that bureaucracy is "rule by bureaus," which is the literal definition.

Ruling by bureaus and that's why people hate bureaucracy. Bureaus not people—the bureau runs your life. That's what government does. That's why I say I like to go and dance on Max Weber's grave every chance I can get and Fredrick Taylor's to do worse. But I also tell them one other thing. When I was at the University of San Francisco my friend, Eamonn Barrett, who is now over in Ireland who taught business management and labor relations he used to say—would start every class every year by saying, "Thanks be to God for stupid managers. Because if there were no stupid managers out there I would not be making all the money I'm making. And do you know why?" He would say, "I'm an arbitrator in my spare time, an arbitrator. These cases that come before me all brought because of the stupidity of managers." And that's what we have unfortunately even today in spite of all the courses, all the training, an awful lot of stupid managers. Unfortunately they're not called to task because of the devil and hell thing that I talked about earlier—filing a grievance against the devil and holding the hearing in hell. Filing a grievance against the manager and holding it right in his front office. It doesn't work. I mean there seems to be no solution to it—I mean there are many examples I can give you of the stupidity of managers and how they can get away with it and get away with it for so long that it's just unbelievable. Hopefully by ignoring things, they hope that these things are going to go away. And talk about getting things done in a timely manner and being effective and efficient, all that's just talk, talk, play talk, empty talk. Now that's my view on that.

end Interview 1

Interview 2

McFarlane —with Patrick Sheeran. (pause in recording) You've stayed the course with adolescent pregnancy and family planning. I would like to know a little bit about the legislation that set up this office, the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy.

Sheeran Well, the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs was established back in 1978 by a statute that established the first specifically-oriented adolescent pregnancy program, or a program for pregnant and parenting teens and their children, families, and young fathers during the Carter administration. The entity established to administer that program was the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs, often time called O-A-P-P or OAPP, and that program lasted for three years. In the Reagan years, when the statute came up for renewal, a new piece of legislation occurred or was enacted instead called the Adolescent Family Life Program, AFL. Some folks out there called it AFLA, A-F-L-A, Adolescent Family Life Act, different names. It's also known as Title XX of the Public Health Service Act. There were different names. The entity retained to administer and implement that program, the AFL program that is, was the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Program. So interestingly enough for a few days they tried to change the office to call it, oh, the Office of Adolescent Family Life, but the acronym, O-A-F-L, I guess, sounded rather "awful." And so they retained the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs for a while to carry out the program, but that was back in 1981. The act was—the AFL Act was enacted and the first programs under that act were implemented on October 1, 1982.

McFarlane How has the authorization changed over the years?

Sheeran Oh, the authorization has changed—the authorization of the AFL Act was significant change from the previous Adolescent Pregnancy Act or the Title VI of the Health Services Amendments of 1978. It added, in addition to just providing a program for pregnant and parenting teens and their families, a prevention component which was abstinence education. It also added a third component, a research component. A small amount of money, but a third would go for research. The way they divvied up the funds was kind of interesting and silly in a way. The AFL Act of 1981, signed by President Reagan in August of 1981, stated that one third of the money appropriated for adolescent pregnancy programs would go for research of causes and consequences of teen pregnancy; of the remaining two thirds, two thirds of that amount would be for care programs for pregnant and parenting teens. Two thirds of it would be programs for pregnant and parenting teens, and the final one third would be for prevention or abstinence education programs.

It was an interesting, when this legislation was being contemplated, the author, Senator Jeremiah Denton from Alabama, better known as one of the Hanoi Hilton survivors, was the one that put in the abstinence piece. The original legislation under Title VI was authored by Senator Kennedy, and Senator Kennedy went along with the addition of the abstinence part of the program with the prevention program. This prevention component was very controversial. In fact, in some of the legislative history you'll find that Senator Denton often talked about chastity and chastity being the important

part of the abstinence program. And the AFL program therefore was dubbed as the Chastity Act, and as a result of that it was rather controversial early on because people didn't see it as being very realistic that the program has to promote the prevention of adolescent pregnancy, and actually through the prevention of sexual activity they figured that abstinence alone was not a realistic option. And consequently it was very controversial from the day it started. However, over the years it became less controversial.

McFarlane How do you see the adolescent pregnancy program relative to Title X?

Sheeran Well, that's an interesting question. Title X was enacted in 1970 and had nearly a ten year lead over the adolescent pregnancy program. The Title X did serve adolescents, but mostly from the point of view—mostly, but not solely—from the point of view of providing contraception as a mechanism for preventing pregnancy and disease, particularly pregnancy, but the Title X program also offered abstinence as an option. And many of the programs back in the 1970s did promote abstinence as one option—however, Title X never got very much credit for this, if any, and some people even questioned the sincerity of Title X programs in providing abstinence as an option because the people of the right-wing, the very conservatives, thought that Title X was a Democratic, liberally created program whose primary purpose was to promote contraception. Not to curtail sexual activity, but promote safe sex, contraception, prevent pregnancy and the like. And they saw contraception as a marketing thing.

And some of them went as far as saying that Title X was just a front for abortion, that it allowed abortion to be an option. While it didn't permit

funds to be used to pay for abortion, it nevertheless contained abortion as an option whereas Title XX, AFL, specifically was created to be an alternative to abortion. You could not counsel on, refer for, give information on, and promote abortion in any way whatsoever under the Title XX statute. It also promoted adoption as an alternative to abortion. It also required all clients, whether they be receiving comprehensive health education, social services in the case of pregnancy and parenting teens, or abstinence education in the case of non-sexually active teens, that parental consent be obtained for all services within a reasonable period of time after being admitted to the program. If parental consent was not obtained, then the services should be discontinued. Now, parental consent was only one factor in this because this legislation, the Title XX legislation, also in, I suppose, relation to Title X or in contrast with Title X, required a great deal of family involvement. Now, this was the message that the Reagan people brought to the government: family involvement, family values. And the Title XX was a reflection of that, family values and—while parental consent was only one part of the family values, the whole AFL Title XX program focused a great deal on family, getting families involved in the life of kids, better communications, better sexual information given and the like. So in contrast with Title XX, Title X had no requirement for actually obtaining parental consent, although Title X statute does encourage parental consent for services and parental involvement. However, Title XX goes beyond that by mandating both.

McFarlane Do you find that cumbersome as a program administrator, above the

federal level, at the local level?

Sheeran Actually, in the Title XX program there is no problem with getting parental consent. For example, there's no real burden because pregnant and parenting teens, pregnant teens—parents are going to know very soon because they're going to show. They might as well discuss it with them and get parental consent. In the case of prevention programs or abstinence education it's not much of a problem, either, because most of the people—the legislation says, or states, that we can serve young people under the age of nineteen. Most of those that are served in the abstinence or prevention program are between the ages of nine and fourteen. So it's really not too much of a problem getting parental consent. The only time it becomes a problem is in a case of young people whose parents are overseas or in a different country, for example Mexico or the Philippines. We've had cases like that where it's not possible to get parental consent. And furthermore, in the case of illegal, undocumented aliens many times they do not want to sign the parental consent in case they might be discovered and deported. On the other hand, the legislation can be interpreted broadly. It doesn't require that parental consent be in writing, so consequently parental consent can be obtained verbally and documented that it was obtained as such. But that's not necessary to have to be in writing, although in most programs it is in writing. So in actual practice, it doesn't create much of a burden for most of our programs.

In the case of Title X, it might be somewhat different to obtain parental consent. Title X and the Office of Population Affairs in the 1980s did try to

implement a requirement for all recipients of services to have parental permission. This was put together in the days of Marjorie Mecklenberg and Ernie Peterson. In fact, they had a consultant from University of Michigan, a fellow by the name of Dr. Maris Vanoskis, a historian at the University of Michigan dabbling in government work for quite a while. They called this the famous or infamous "squeal rule." The squeal rule meant that clinics and providers of Title X services were going to have to squeal on their clients to parents in order to provide services.

That document requiring that came up for discussion back in December, in the winter of 1982. I didn't realize it was going on, and then over the Christmas holidays Marjorie Mecklenberg and Ernie Peterson were off on a trip, they were not in the office, and I got a call from the Office of General Counsel, the lawyers, saying that this document needed to be signed, that we needed to sign this rule and get it into the Federal Register, and I looked at it and I said, "No, I don't want to sign that. I'm not authorized to. Secondly, I don't agree with it."

And they said, "Well, you're acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs."

I said, "I don't give a damn what I'm acting. I'm not going to sign it." Anyhow, after hours of negotiation I agreed that I would sign it for them. I'm not taking any responsibility, and I realized I could be signing my own death warrant in a way that my name would be associated forever with this infamous regulation. And when they came back, if they didn't like it, they could always blame this on an ill-informed, foolish Irishman who didn't

know what the hell he was doing. So anyhow, I signed it for them, and of course it was published, and the reaction was a great deal of protest by folks, by all of Title X people and a lot of other people across the country. Eventually, it never really was implemented because of the opposition to it. However, a few months prior to that time, I should have been aware of this, I went to the White House with Marjorie Mecklenberg to hear a group of conservatives talk about the status of Title X. They met with a lawyer there, and these were the ugliest looking people I've ever seen. (McFarlane laughs) In fact, a lot of unhealthy looking and not physically fit people, but they were absolutely right-wingers. And their big thing was how they could dismantle, get rid of Title X in the first place. In fact, President Reagan wrote a letter, a famous letter, the "Dear Orrin Letter," a letter to Senator Orrin Hatch, telling Hatch how they might be able to get rid of parts of Title X or most of it through administrative efforts rather than through legislation. Anyhow, at the White House, these people were talking about Title X and parental consent and various other things. This crowd wasn't very interested in Title X, dismantling it as such or getting parental consent. They figured this was Mickey Mouse, small steps. Their big focus was on abortion, to get abortion out of the government, and abortion had to go to overturn *Roe v. Wade* and they went on and on. It was absolutely chaos. But eventually the lawyer who ran the meeting at the White House, pointed out that Title X was indeed the work of the Democrats. It was the Democrats, the liberal Democrats, and particularly Senator Tydings. But it's interesting enough that George Bush, the subsequent president, has signed

onto that. The Title X legislation was signed initially by President Nixon. So, it wasn't really that much of a Democratic effort in as much as a bipartisan effort. But anyhow, this crowd wanted to get rid of abortion completely. The attorney pointed out to them that it was primarily the work of the Democrats, Title X was, and abortion had crept in there and *Roe v. Wade* was really a liberal effort on the part of the Supreme Court and that the procedures adopted by the Reagan White House was to whittle away, to whittle away all these rules and regulations one at a time. Hence, they were proposing to require parental consent for all recipients of family planning services under Title X. Then they would go a little bit farther and add something else and delete something else. This crowd of attendees, on hearing that, became a little bit more interested and pacified in a way that as long as you are whittling away Title X gradually, with the overall goal of making abortion totally illegal in the United States, that would be fine. We will support your efforts. So as a result of that, I really didn't feel there was too much interest in the parental consent issue at that particular time, but then I saw this document that was put together by Vanoskis, Mecklenberg, and Peterson. I said, "Oh, we have started." And that's how it started by December of 1982.

McFarlane Tell me about the Clinton years. Let's start—we've talked about the Reagan/Bush years a bit.

Sheeran Well, in the Clinton years there was not much action or inaction in regard to either Title X or Title XX. They were there. The Clinton people did hold on in 1995-94 to the Title XX, the Adolescent Family Life Legislation, which

was supposed to be whittled away and lost forever. There was a Democratic-controlled Congress at the time, and they passed a legislation supported by the Clinton administration that would continue the Adolescent Family Life one more year, in other words for the year '95-'96. So we got money, about four million dollars, for one more year, and then we were supposed to be out of business.

As a result of that effort, we thought we'd issue a few big grants to see how they would work for a year. We issued a request for applications. There was so much interest in the Adolescent Family Life Program for care and prevention that we received 331 applications. And if we had money to fund all of them, we would need about 100 million dollars. So, the 331 applications was the biggest number we ever got.

So, that demonstrated to all that there was interest in the program, more than the care and the prevention. We had money to fund only about fifteen at that particular time, and a year later maybe a couple more. However, the Clinton people supported that program, and the next year, of course, Congress, through the appropriations process, continued the program again for another year, and that's how that continued ever since on an appropriation base, not by statute but by the budgeting process. At that particular time, I think we had about 7 million, 6.8 million or something, back in '95-'96. The program has increased to nearly thirty million this year, but thirty-four million in the fiscal year 2003. I guess the interest of the Democratic Party and the Clinton people encouraged it.

I met myself with Secretary Donna Shalala, secretary of HHS, and some

other people a number of times. And while there was no great, shall we say, great interest one way or another in disbanding the program or promoting it, Dr. Shalala had a program—had a policy across the department that focused on young people through the ages of nine to fourteen, and she wanted to encourage us to focus on that particular group to bring all the services like Girls, Inc., and a whole bunch of other programs focusing on young people, and mostly on young girls because they are the ones who get pregnant. And the promotion of abstinence did seem to be a way of preventing that.

In the Clinton years, the welfare program legislation was enacted. Clinton came to office saying, "We're going to get rid of welfare as we know it." Anyhow, the welfare act was passed, Public Law 104-193. And in that particular piece of legislation there were several things pertaining to teenagers and teenage pregnancy. In fact, it was a very tough document on teenagers, punitive in many ways. It also included a piece on abstinence that gave the Maternal Child Health Bureau fifty million dollars to be given out for abstinence education programs, in block grants, to the states.

It gave our program, Adolescent Family Life, no money but it did say that we were to follow the definition of abstinence contained in that welfare reform bill. That definition of abstinence consisted of eight items, eight requirements, the famous—or infamous—*A* through *H* requirements. It defined abstinence, and one of the elements of that definition was abstinence until marriage. Abstinence until marriage was one of the eight requirements. There were several others in there, too, saying that have been

disputed, criticized, and I guess derided in many ways, in the *A* through *H* requirements of Public Law 104-93. To make a long story short on this one, what we had then was this particular definition of abstinence, and I remember being called down by Dr. Shalala, the secretary of HHS, who said to me, "Will you explain to me the difference, what abstinence means? What is the definition of abstinence?"

And I said, "Madame Secretary, it depends on who you talk to. In our old AFL program it talked about premarital sex, but some people would advocate abstinence until death."

And she said, "Patrick, you and I know who those people are."

And I said, "Yes we do."

Then there are others who want to abstain from sex until marriage. There are others who would advocate abstinence during one's teenage years. There are others who want abstaining from sex until one is ready. And there are others who would advocate abstaining from sex until the end of the course and some even until the end of class. So, it depends. There is a broad range of definition of abstinence. And so consequently, there's a great deal of confusion out there.

This abstinence until marriage is one that the Adolescent Family Life program from now on is going to have to abide by. In fact, Senator Specter has given us over nine million additional dollars to implement the new abstinence education programs with this welfare reform definition, *A* through *H* involved. So, I suspect from now on we'll be going more in that direction than with the old definition, which was rather liberal and could be

interpreted in many different ways.

McFarlane How did this affect the program and here on grantees?

Sheeran It was criticized by a lot of intellectuals and liberals out there across the country. In actual fact it really has made no difference. Essentially, there's no difference from what we were doing before as promoting abstinence as the most effective way for preventing pregnancy in the first place, preventing sexually transmitted diseases, which are prevalent, and preventing HIV/AIDS, which wasn't around in the early days when the AFL act was first enacted in 1981. So consequently, as a result of the spread of sexually transmitted diseases and HIV/AIDS, the abstinence definition, the abstinence program had become a lot more popular and palatable, and regarded by a lot of people as the most effective way of preventing both pregnancy and diseases. As to whether that's realistic or not is something else.

We had a lawsuit back in the early days of this AFL program, enacted in 1981. The program went into effect in October 1982. In February of 1983, a lawsuit was filed against this program on behalf of two Methodist ministers and a Rabbi. The suit was filed by the ACLU, American Civil Liberties Union, on their behalf, claiming that this particular act, the Adolescent Family Life Program, was unconstitutional either on its face or in the way that the program was administered. In the discovery, they found complaints where some programs that we funded, particularly religious faith-based agencies, were using this money to teach and promote religion, and giving out medically inaccurate information. To make a long story

short, this lawsuit was filed in the Federal District Court in Washington and went all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States and back again to the District Court, and it was supposed to go to trial in January of 1993. In the last days of the George Bush administration this lawsuit was settled by the ACLU and the U.S. Department of Justice with HHS being involved. It required several things. First of all, the conditions of the settlement would last for five years, that it was the duty of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Program, my office, to conduct site visits to all new programs within six months of funding to monitor programs on a regular basis. We had not done a good job in this and prior to 1993.

All programs would have to submit curricula, educational materials, including videos and films that they proposed for use in the programs to our office for review and approval prior to use in the projects. The reason for that was that many of our projects were giving out information that was not medically accurate. In fact, what some of them were doing was promoting abstinence by thrashing contraception. They would talk about abstinence—talk about not so much the effectiveness rates of condoms and other contraceptives but their failure rates, a rather negative approach. And some of the failure rates that they cited were not accurate, certainly not issued by CDC or NIH or by any of the well known reliable sources of—for example, the textbook *Contraceptive Technology*, that is updated every year or so, and it does have effectiveness rates as revised. So we were required to make sure that the information was medically accurate. It created a great burden on us.

Another point was that we wanted to make sure that the agencies who got money were not going to use it to teach or promote religion. So consequently, in the curricula and educational materials we had to review them to see if religion was being promoted, taught, or federal funds were being used for that. So, these were some of the key things. The ACLU also could come in and look at our official files once a year, and they could look at some of the curricula and education materials. There were several other factors. We also had a representative of the ACLU on the review panels for the objective review of requests for applications, for new grants. The main conditions were the review of educational materials for medical accuracy and no promotion of religion or abortion.

Regarding the abortion issue, in the days prior to the settlement in 1993, some agencies stated, particularly those that had religious affiliations—were under the impression that the AFL legislation was an alternative to abortion. Therefore, one could present in the programs what they called the negative, the so-called negative consequences of abortion. In other words they frequently went way too far by talking about some of the trauma and psychological things that affected women who had abortions. During the course of the depositions on this lawsuit, it was discovered this was happening, as well as the provision of medically inaccurate information and promotion of religion. Anyhow, the settlement stated that you will not provide any information on abortion, and the legislation is quite specific. Section 2011 of the AFL statute specifically states that.

Side 1, tape 1, ends; side 2 begins.

Sheeran The legislation Section 2011 states no AFL programs can provide, counsel on, refer for abortion, or provide any information except in one instance where a client and her parents request information on a referral for abortion. In that case you could provide the names of abortion providers or people who counsel on abortion, but the programs themselves cannot—as opposed to Title X can give information on or refer for abortion. Neither Title X nor Title XX can perform abortions. So the settlement said you're supposed to be neutral on abortion. You will neither be for it nor against, and in programs you provide no information one way or the other. You will neither talk about the so-called negative or positive or any kinds of consequences of abortion. You're supposed to be neutral. That was one of the things that was clarified by the settlement of January 1993.

McFarlane Well, let's say a client asks you about abortion. Can you talk about it?

Sheeran You could give general information on abortion. This is allowed. There's an *x* number performed every year in the United States. Abortion is legal.

McFarlane Could you tell me where to get one?

Sheeran No. I could not. On the other hand, if I had some degree of imagination, I'd be able to say, "There's a book of yellow pages and there's a whole bunch of agencies under Social Services and you can find all the information you want, but you're not getting it from me." You're not going to hear it here.

McFarlane Okay, in terms of the Office of Population Affairs, which was the umbrella for Title X and your office, in the Clinton years you said there wasn't a lot of interest from the government in these programs. Is that correct?

Sheeran Yeah, I think it's more passive than active in contrast with the Republican administrations. All administrations looked at us, but the Republicans looked at the Title X program as a creature of the Democratic party, even though it was signed by President Nixon. The Title XX AFL program was signed on Reagan's watch, so it's a creature of the Republican party and it reflected a very conservative perspective that took into account many of their values and policies and family values: opposition to abortion, teenage sex, and the like. So, they promoted that, promoted a great deal of interest in adoption and abstinence and stuff like that, whereas they had very little time, if any, for Title X. It was regarded as a kind of a program that promoted immorality and promotion of sexual activity and all those terrible things that, of course, members of Congress themselves never engaged in. So, that was the Reagan years.

The Clinton years were a little bit more active in promoting Title X and giving Title X the go ahead, and do what you have to do without any great fanfare. It never really got down to family values. Regarding Title XX, there was a more passive type thing, it was there. Let's see how it works without any great enthusiasm for the programs. So, in other words, in contrast, the Republicans were all in favor of Title XX, AFL, and looked down upon Title X. In the Clinton years, both programs were sort of there and encouraged, do the best you can, without very actively supporting either one of them.

McFarlane And we talked about the political appointees during the Republican years. What about during the Clinton years? You had political appointees at what

levels?

Sheeran Well, during the reorganization of the whole office back in 1982, in the Republican years, 1983, the Office of Population Affairs became the head agency, umbrella agency, for the Office of Family Planning which administers Title X and the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Program which administers Title XX. One of the things that occurred in 1983, the head of the Office of Population Affairs had always been a political appointee, a deputy assistant secretary appointed by the party in power. In 1983, when the two other offices, Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs and Family Planning, were brought under the Office of Population Affairs, the heads of these two offices, which traditionally had been civil service, were made political. And in the Reagan years there were politicals in charge of both offices.

I mentioned Nabors Cabaniss yesterday, and subsequently Laura Treuman and then Pat Funderburk-Ware, who was head of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Program. They had similar people in charge of the Office of Family Planning, Title X, and the head of the Office of Population Affairs. Actually in the last years of the Bush administration, the DASPA was Dr. William Reyn Archer from Texas, whose father was a member of Congress and chairman of a very powerful Appropriations Committee in the House.

When Clinton came in there was no great interest in the Office of Population Affairs per se. They had an acting director of the office—an acting deputy assistant secretary civil service person for the first two or

three years. And then they eventually were successful in bringing in Dr. Felicia Stewart, an obstetrician/gynecologist from California, with a great deal of knowledge and skills in family planning as DASPA. And she stayed around for a couple of years. They didn't appoint anybody as head of the Office of Family Planning or the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs. Sam Taylor, a civil service employee, became the acting director of the Office of Family Planning and myself the acting director of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs. While Dr. Stewart was DASPA, Tom Kring had come in and had been an expert consultant to her and eventually became the deputy. He became the acting deputy assistant secretary of population for about two years after Dr. Stewart left. Eventually, the Clinton people in 1998 appointed Dr. Denise Shervington, a psychiatrist from New Orleans, as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs, and that turned out to be a total disaster. This woman was probably the worst administrator and the most bizarre person that the Office of Population Affairs or subsequent offices have ever seen—erratic, unstable, unpredictable. I mean some of the things she did was bizarre; one day during her reign she fired Sam Taylor, director of the Office of Family Planning, and myself in the space of minutes and reinstated us that evening. I mean, just awful for no good reason. Anyhow, a lot of things happened during her reign. A lot of people were very dissatisfied in all offices. Complaints were registered with the office assistant secretary for health and an investigation was conducted. And the surgeon general who was supposedly a good friend of hers, Surgeon General and Assistant Secretary

Dr. David Satcher, fired her. Actually, during the history over the years of DASPA there were several ASPOAs who were fired. Mecklenberg was fired. Gasper was fired. There were some questions about some of the others. And then of course Shervington, the most notorious of the lot of them, she got the ax too.

And then rather than appoint somebody else, they put in an acting director of the Office of Population Affairs, a woman by the name of Dr. Mireille Kanda, a civil service person—a pediatrician who came from the Administration of Children and Families. She's continued in that capacity until just a couple of months ago in 2002, when they brought in a Dr. Alma Golden from Texas to be the head of the office of the deputy assistant secretary for Population Affairs, and that's how it as at the moment. In the meantime, from 1993 until the year 2001, Sam Taylor had been acting director of the Office of Family Planning and I had been acting director of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs.

In January 2001, in the last days of the Clinton administration, it almost seems like a pardon since there were other pardons issued at that time. The Clinton administration abolished the positions of director of the Office of Family Planning and director of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs as political offices and returned them to civil service. As a result Sam Taylor and myself were eligible to compete for those two options. Sam never did apply. I applied through the civil service system for the position of director of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs, and I got it. Consequently, the two positions are no longer political appointee positions

which they were before. And I think the Reagan people put that in place just to make sure that they had more control over both family planning and adolescent pregnancy. And it's interesting to note that in the Reagan and George Bush years, the political appointee for the deputy assistant secretary position were all appointed by the White House. During the Clinton years, the White House was not involved except to be notified—the secretary of HHS made the selection in Dr. Stewart's case. Tom Kring was acting. He never had to go to that level at all. He didn't acquire any such confirmation. Now we're back here in the Bush administration, George W. Bush administration, the White House again has entered the picture and made a selection of Dr. Alma Golden to be the deputy assistant secretary for Population Affairs. So it's an area that is obviously very sensitive, in which Republicans are very interested and they want to make sure that they have the right person, their person, in charge of all the policies and programs administered by both Title X and Title XX.

McFarlane Has Dr. Golden been here long enough for you to see effects of the new administration?

Sheeran Dr. Golden was sworn in about three weeks ago, which was in the first of October 2002. She had been here in the office as a consultant a couple of months prior to that time. She's very pleasant and very nice, a pediatrician, worked a lot with young people, and she worked with both pregnant and parenting as well as abstinence education folks. I think she's very nice, very liberal—she was middle-of-the-road, middle-of-the-road, easy to get along with. She understands these things. She does not to seem to have her mind

made up that everything is absolute, that there are absolute standards. She understands that kids do engage in sex. Kids do get pregnant. She's very interested in the welfare of young people. So, from that perspective I don't think she is—or she appears to be, so far, very fair, very interested in both programs with no closed mind on what should be done. I think it remains to be seen. It's too early to tell at this point.

McFarlane Too early to tell. Okay. One of the overall questions I have for you is why have you stayed the course. You've been in this office for—

Sheeran Twenty-five years. Well, I came to Washington, as I said, back in 1977 as a one year program fellow and I stayed on. I never intended to come to this office in the first place and certainly never intended to stay. But the more one got into it—I always liked being in a place that's somewhat controversial. It's something that is not dull. It's not routine. It's not the same damn thing type of thing. And this certainly is one place in the federal government that is controversial, with this Office of Population Affairs, Family Planning, and Adolescent Pregnancy being in value. You're dealing with issues that are very personal and private to a lot of people. You're dealing with the issue of something that's very important such as human sexuality. You're dealing with a lot of young people. You're dealing with controversial issues such as abortion, sterilization. Back in Dr. Cushner's days we had the issue of in-vitro fertilization. We had all kinds of things, and I know a lot of people in the field from both sides of the coin, both conservatives and liberals. It's kind of fun working with them. And there's never a dull moment because if it's not a squeal rule, there's a gag rule, a gag

rule which the department or our office, the Office of Population Affairs, tried to enforce at one time. And these are issues that Congress are interested in. There's the familiarity of it. I guess the reason I like to stay in it, I feel we are doing something important that benefits young people and older people, too, benefiting the future of America. And I think I have a role to play in that.

I mentioned earlier on that I worked a lot with young people, and I was in the service before that. I can't work with them directly anymore, but I can work indirectly through ensuring that we provide whatever services they need to be able to grow up healthy and have a good life. I think I mentioned yesterday about Dr. Cushner's vision of when he came to the office. He was concerned about them, the ten million women in need of Family Planning service. I see that as my role—concern for them out there, the young people in the country who need some kind of guidance service, a helping hand in a way, to get over a hump and really stay on course.
I like the controversy. I like to be able to knock heads, if you will, with some of those who were off the wall. I want to make sure that there's fairness and equity and some degree of sanity maintained, and that whatever it takes you have to be able to stand up to a situation. You have to be able to take a stand. I had been criticized many times, I think, for going from a Planned Parenthood point of view, pro-choice, very liberal to adolescent pregnancy, and some people said, You sold out on us, particularly the Title X people. I didn't sell out on anybody. I remember when Dr. Cushner came to town as deputy assistant secretary for Population Affairs back in 1978,

'79. He was asked by Secretary Califano, he said, "You're a pro-choice physician."

And Dr. Cushner said, "That's right. I believe abortion should be a choice." Califano was right-to-life.

And Califano said, "How are you going to handle this?"

And Dr. Cushner said something that was remarkable, that I adhere to. He said, "I'm going to carry out the law. Whatever the law of the land is, I'll carry that out. I'm not going beyond that."

And Califano shook hands with him and said, "All right, I'm okay with that. With that view we will get on fine."

I maintain the same thing. I believe it is important to be able to carry out the law or the statute for the benefit of those who will benefit by it. If somebody gets in the way and tries to distort that statute, one way or the other, that's where I come in. That's when my Irish blood boils and I take a stand that's sometimes not very popular, but I want to ensure it's the right thing, the fair thing, and it's a good thing. But it doesn't matter, whatever the law says. I may not agree with the law. I didn't create it. The Congress did that, but my job is to make sure that it's enforced, not distorted, or not misinterpreted or misrepresented. I want to make sure that, whoever is in charge, that they're not going to distort the program in such a way as to violate the statute, and that what we do is in the best interest of the common good. So consequently, I feel that I have a role to play in implementing the law, and also be the guardian against violations, abuses, fraud, misinterpretation, and hypocrisy, in particular, to ensure that that

doesn't occur. So consequently, my main mission has been that wherever I see this happening, and I've seen it several times in different administrations where people had their own agenda or trying to start one, I stand up for it. And it's not very popular. Some people know very little about this, but somebody has to do it, and I feel I've been around, I can anticipate what's coming down the road, keep my eyes open, make sure that I'm on top of it, and that I act before something bad happens. There's no point in closing the barn door after the horse has gone out. You want to close the barn door before, and I want to make sure I am in a position to do that. And I feel that with my experience here over the years I can make an impact, and that's the only reason I'm here.

I have another point in that when I see some things like this happening I will say, "I'm going to outlive you. I will figure out who you are and I'm going to make sure that whatever you do is not a permanent type of thing, that we will get peace and tranquility and common sense restored eventually." We may lose a battle here and there but we don't want to lose the war, and that's where I come in, do not lose the war. In the short term you may look like a loser, but in the long term if you stand up and keep your eyes open and do the right thing and anticipate what's coming up, the fight will be all right.

McFarlane Are there laws in this area you couldn't implement?

Sheeran No, I think the laws are fine, and I think it's the interpretation of the law and the people who make the rules and regulations who are the problem. I've always felt, before I came into the government, that the law is maybe

fair enough and clear enough, but it's the foolish lawyers in the government who often make rules and regulations who sometimes violate the spirit of the law. And I think that one has to be in a position where you're able to use the law and the rules and regulations to get the job done. My job is to figure out what that is without breaking either the law or the rules. Make sure to get the job done.

McFarlane You've worked for a number of political appointees. How do you operate, particularly when the political appointee may have different values, agendas?

Sheeran Well, in a place like that sometimes, as I told somebody out of the regional office, HHS regional office in San Francisco several years ago, they asked me that same question. And jokingly I said, "You wear a hardhat. You stay low. And you duck often." In other words, you survive. You weave a lot, but you can't ensure that—you become less visible, but keep an eye on the target as a moving target to make sure that nothing is going to get you—it's like the baseball game last night, trying to steal a base. Make sure that you're watching the pitcher and the catcher, that you're going to take the opportunity when it comes, but you have limited options. So, do the best you can for a while, wear a hardhat, stay low, and duck often.

McFarlane You've managed to get along with people with whom you disagree.

Sheeran Oh, yeah. I think you have to do that, but on the other hand that doesn't mean that you always get along with them. Sometimes you've got to stand up and say, You know I disagree with you, and here are the reasons. And I think you have different options. Sometimes you can compromise and work out something that's reasonable and sometimes you cannot. But then you

agree to disagree. Stand up and say that and be counted.

On the other hand, caving in is not always the answer, and it's certainly not telling people something just because they want to hear it or just what they want to hear. That's not the way to approach it. I think everyone has to be basically honest and exhibit some degree of integrity and common sense. I got on with most of them, but not with Dr. Shervington. I did survive. As far as it was possible for anybody to get along with her, I did alright, and with the others too. I really didn't ever burn bridges with any of them. Mecklenberg, of course, was gone when I came back from school. She was fired. I never saw her since. Cushner I did see. Dr. Cushner remained a good friend of mine after he left the governments, and Dr. Felicia Stewart is still a very good friend of mine out at the University of California in San Francisco. Nabors Cabaniss still remains very close to her ever since. Joanne Gasper—I never heard from her since she was fired from here. She's someplace in Dallas, Texas. The others, by and large, I got along with. It hasn't really been a problem. Dr. Archer—I never got on very well with him because I was never sure what he wanted, and besides, he was kind of scared of me anyhow. He had been around a short time, and he wasn't willing to take me on on anything. But yeah, I got on pretty well.

McFarlane Do you have any parting advice for people in your position in the future?

Sheeran I think we're in a different ball game today. I didn't know the situation before family planning and adolescent pregnancy program. They were all new programs. Family planning began in the 1970s and by and large the late 1970s and eighties particularly eighties, the adolescent pregnancy programs

began. We had a lot of amateurs coming into the programs. In Title X, it was mostly a Planned Parenthood-oriented program in the beginning. They'd be doing family planning before the Title X legislation was passed, so consequently they had some experience and expertise.

We, my friends out in California, we all learned from one another. We didn't learn much from the federal regional office of HHS because they didn't know anything. They had no people who had done family planning before, so it was kind of trial and error. But we did, I think, a fairly decent job.

We put together a network of clinics, family planning clinics, across the country, some five thousand clinics in every state under Title X. And I think they've done an excellent job. Sometimes they're the only services available to poor women and kids in certain parts of the United States, and many times the only physician, the only clinician that a client will see during the course of several years would be a Planned Parenthood clinician than there or Title X clinician and Title X program. It was the same thing with Title XX; we were amateurs. There were only a couple of programs out there beginning in 1978. I mentioned Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Delaware. Today we have expanded our program to 110 adolescent family life programs across the country in thirty-eight states right now, and again they are all demonstration grants. Demonstration programs give a great deal of creativity and innovation to be able to see what works.

What is it that works? We provide care programs for pregnant and parenting teens. We provide components of health, education, and social

services. We want to make sure that these young people have the best prenatal care to alleviate and reduce the negative consequences associated with teenage pregnancy, such as low birth rate babies, et cetera, that the young women are going to have fewer complications during delivery, that adequate post-natal care, pediatric care, immunizations and the like, and that the young people in particular are going to do two important things. One, continue their education, stay in school, be all that you can be, and the other one is to prevent the repeat pregnancies at least for some time. And these are the two things that are important. And so, there's a whole bunch of things.

We're dealing with a bunch of health education and social service gurus from three different disciplines. They're hard to merge together, but it's kind of an interesting thing to work with. And how did a country working with males, young males, and fathers, and babies, and families, and the whole schools, community, and working with university people do evaluations of these programs? That's very interesting. The other part of the Title XX, the prevention part of this program, also is very interesting. What kind of innovation—what kind of message do you give to young people to keep them from getting involved sexually, getting pregnant, and preventing pregnancy and disease? What do you do?

I think I mentioned earlier that some of the programs I had in place in Texas when I worked in Corpus Christi did all these things, but I think, again, it's not just all education saying no, no, no, no. That's fine and good, but sometimes you're going to say no and nobody is going to believe you

anyhow, and laugh at you. You have to have a lot more involvement. Curriculum education is one part of it, but it's not the only thing. Now there are some out there who disagree with me and have that education philosophy of, *No* is the only thing that matters. Give them the education. Knowledge is going to do everything. Knowledge may help. My old grandmother in Ireland used to say, "Knowledge is no burden." It's an important thing, but it's not the only thing. You can know everything you want, but it doesn't necessarily change your behavior. So I think we have moved on to youth development and to creativity and innovation and trying to get young people involved in sports and a whole bunch of community-related activities that keeps them involved, keeps them engaged. Community mentoring, support from adults, parents, teachers, a whole network of people, and this is the interesting thing, the challenge of trying to bring all these things and see which works and which doesn't.
We bring our grantees together a couple of times a year. We conduct training programs to create exposure to these different types of things that can work, what people are doing, and hopefully they will be able to go back to their own communities, their own projects and be able to integrate or implement whatever they have learned. And this is the exciting thing, to see some of the great things that people are doing.

An example I was going to give you, I think it's very important. I was down in San Antonio, Texas, several months ago during spring break. There is a wonderful program going on in a Hispanic community. The kids were out of school. And the person running the program and all the staff were

working with these kids that whole week. The building right beside where the program was housed had been consistently and constantly subjected to graffiti, graffiti all over it, sprayed with paint and various other things. It was a store, the poorest one of the community, but these kids went out with their mentors and the people in the program and they cleaned that whole thing up, and did a beautiful job on it. Then the next day I was over there and saw them doing a car wash where they were washing cars, being shown how to wash a car, how to dry it, how to ensure that car washing was done well.

Tape 1 ends; tape 2, side 1, begins.

Sheeran They were washing the cars to make sure it was done right. Showing how to wash a car, how to dry it, et cetera, all for money. And the mentors were telling these young people, This is how you do it, and you want to make sure you do a good job. You're getting paid good money, and you are raising money that we're giving to military families. San Antonio is a military town. We're going to get them involved in the community, and that respect was tremendous. The next day they were going to the state capital in Austin to learn more about government. So, they're involved. They had these young people involved every day after school during the critical hours when sexual activity often occurs, between the hours of three and six. They have them when they're out of school on Saturdays and holidays and particularly during spring break to keep them active in a lot of things, so that they have other things to do besides becoming involved sexually—it's interesting to see how things like this work out.

It's wonderful to see how each community tries to put its own spin, its own interpretation on interventions. In other words, I see significant progress being made in this area of teenage pregnancy. It's almost like the Title X thing when we started out first in the 1970s. The AFL programs have come a long way. They're not nearly as sophisticated as the Title X people, that is, the people involved in adolescent pregnancy programs. They're not nearly as sophisticated in terms of experience. But in terms of creativity, yes, I think they are way ahead. And it's fascinating to see them, and every time I go out to see programs—and I do go out to see a lot of them across the country—I'm amazed at what can be done and the differences that different leaders are coming up with in creating new approaches and new spins and new twists to these programs. That's exciting. Where were we?

McFarlane Do you have any lessons or advice? Would you have any lessons or advice for people setting up adolescent pregnancy or family planning programs in other countries?

Sheeran Well, I have heard over the past several years, particularly during Dr. Shervington's time, that we here in the United States should be able to learn, or could learn, an awful lot from other countries in what they're doing. And I don't know very much about that. I've talked to a lot of people who have had programs in China and delegations from Africa, England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, Philippines, all who have visited here, and I have taken them to visit some of our programs here in the United States as a way for them to learn what's going on here. I've taken a lot of

people in the University of Maryland in Baltimore, where they have a program, an adolescent family life program for several years. They have also the Title X program over there, Sexually Transmitted Disease Clinic, HIV/AIDS, a Trauma Center. It's a huge program. And the visitors have been fascinated by the various types of services provided, the number of people available, the staff who are involved. And the British, in particular the British Embassy, were particularly interested in some of the adolescent programs that the University was offering. I think all this helped. We spoke to a lot of delegations from the various countries, and they're asking us how we do this and how we do that and how we set up the programs.

And I think, being a kind of visual person myself, one can always learn from what already exists. See what happened, how things got started, the trials and errors. This may be a very hard way of doing it, but I think there's no use in reinventing the wheel. If something has started and, as I said about the AFL programs, Adolescent Family Life, and Title X, we often learned by mistakes, trial and error. And that was the only way we could do it because there were no gurus, no specialists out there who had done this before. I think what we had been doing over the past several years has created a great deal of history. A great deal of progress has been made and a lot has been learned.

So I think if you're setting up a program in different countries, one has to take into account the economic situation, the political situations, the culture, the transportation, et cetera. A whole variety of things, one would have to try and adapt them to each environment. Ours is quite a different

society. I mean, there's so much mobility. There are so much economic differences, even though a lot of the people we serve in our programs are deprived and are poor and often times are uneducated and sort of at the bottom of the barrel in society. Theirs may be somewhere similar to that. We live in a different country where there is a great deal of common culture in the various communities. There's a great deal of prosperity in many ways. Access is a very important element—access to services where you would establish the programs.

And I think from some of the courses I have studied in graduate programs, one has to take into account where you want to put your program. How are you going to market it? And how will you adapt it to your messages? I mean, there are such things as planning. I've been talking with some program folks from Los Angeles while studying public administration. I ask such questions as, Where do you want to put a clinic, particularly if you have a number of freeways and roads dividing the community? Do you put it outside or inside the community? Where do people tend to go? The general feeling I got from some of the programs I've seen and from some of the theoretical writings I have read, seemed to be that the placing of clinics wasn't given too much thought until recent years. Now, trying to find a suitable place has become a very important thing. Where people will go to for services? If they won't go outside the freeway or certain boundary areas, there's no use in putting a clinic or a program or a facility in such a location. You may have the best facility in the world, but if people are not going to go there, there's no point in putting it

there.

So I think one has to adapt. Adapt is the name of the game. Adapting to the environment is a good old theoretical systems theory approach. I think we can learn some things from people in other countries about, first of all, the environment in which the program is going to be conducted, the need, the access, the whole cultural area, the sensitivity setup, and be able to adapt to all of these. And I don't think there's one best way to do this. I think it may vary from place to place, but seeing what's in place and seeing what has been done here would serve as a model that can be adapted by other countries, as well. Certainly I don't think it can be replicated exactly, but can be adapted in a way that makes some kind of sense. Location is important, is what I'm trying to say. Location is important, so the decision of where to put the program is vital.

Also access is important; how does one get to the program, and how does one provide for access? In our case, many times we serve rural areas where there is no public transportation. One has to use other means, such as taxis. One has to use workers, social workers and the like, to transport people. This is something that's kind of risky business in many ways because of insurance considerations. We have places where we have tokens to help people ride a bus that comes by every five hours and get people to the programs. Sometimes we've had people who have had to ride three different buses to get there. Sometimes we work with school systems where we're able to get people transported, particularly pregnant teens and parenting teens, on the regular school bus or have special school buses pick

them up. So in a developing country transportation may be one of the greatest problems. You can have the best program and the best services, but if people can't get there, what are the benefits? How are you going to get them there? So one has to be able to adapt.

I also think the kind of services one has to offer should be culturally sensitive. The kind of workers you have in place should be culturally sensitive to the needs of the folks who need the services. Training of staff in this area is important. Without training you can have the best services, access, and everything else, but unless your people are trained and know what they're doing and be able to relate to clients and their needs, the program may be of little value. If there's one thing I would emphasize, that is the importance of training, having competent, capable, well-trained, culturally sensitive people who know what they're doing so that they can recruit, treat, and retain clients. And without that, the program is not going to be worth a darn. I think one has to have the educational materials for them, that they can read and understand. That is, materials that are not only culturally sensitive but also easy to understand and that they can read. We have a lot of people in areas and certain parts of the United States who cannot read and they need somebody to read to them, and read at a certain level. Materials should be at that level. There's a whole variety of factors. There's also a price and money and, of course, these are a very important ingredients. You can't have a program without these. It needs to be supported. So I think that people, by seeing what we do in some of the areas, can learn a lot from us.

Besides the University of Maryland, I'd like to take visitors to some of the other places such as San Antonio, Texas. There's another program down there that serves by and large a Hispanic community, that has a variety of services, the Children's Center of San Antonio. They have all kinds of programs, not just a teenage pregnancy program, but they have also programs for runaway and homeless youth. They have drug clinics. They have programs for young babies and young kids who are abandoned, who are sexually abused and abused in other ways as well. It is an amazing setup of how this variety of services are all linked but separate. So is the different kinds of staff, the different kinds of training, the different kinds of programs they have in place and are adapted for the use of the particular client. A tremendous program. You want to see that, and how you get to from one to the other, how it has been put together, that may not always be replicable, but it gives an idea of how this program has been put together. It may be adaptable in some other way for some other countries or some other groups of people.

McFarlane You're a great proponent of program evaluation aren't you?

Sheeran Yes.

McFarlane What do you mean by evaluation? What are you trying to do with your programs now?

Sheeran Well, essentially I mean, the bottom line is this: you talk to the gurus—first of all, let me put it this way. Our program, the AFL program, is required by legislation to have all programs in the field evaluated by an independent evaluator associated with the college and university in each grantee's home

state. The state did not want evaluations of all programs to be conducted by one entity. Some of the other programs are—Maternal and Child Health, for example, have evaluation components which are evaluated by one central evaluation group, which probably makes more sense. I'm not sure it's any better. By evaluation, we want to see how well we're doing. I think there are several things about evaluation. First of all it's very important. I should say that a lot of people are threatened by evaluation. They don't like it because they feel that evaluation points out their deficiencies and what they have not been doing well, and perhaps that the program is no good at all. You know, most agencies, most programs want to continue. They want to become a continuing effort. It's very hard to stamp out a program once it's in place unless you have accomplished the goal of wiping out something, such as some kind of disease, and then there's no longer need for the program. In program evaluation, the experts want to focus on usually one thing and that's outcomes, the results. Does the program work? What did it do? Did it reduce the problem that you talked about? Did it eliminate it? Perhaps elimination would be a long-term outcome. Reducing a problem—reducing, for example, teenage pregnancy, reducing the negative consequences such as low birth weight, or reducing the number of kids who dropped out of school, reducing the number of young women who subsequently became pregnant. These are the short term outcomes.

McFarlane How are you doing evaluation in this program?

Sheeran We're doing evaluation—we have an evaluator for every program—every one of the 110 programs a college- or university-based evaluator who is

supposed to be a guru, an expert, an independent evaluator, independent of the program that is, who looks at the data, the intake, what was done, outcomes and alike. It's somewhat easy, in a way, to measure the outcomes in terms of care programs, that is programs for pregnant and parenting teens. You can find out how many young people, how many women, became pregnant two years after the birth of a child. You can figure out and get data on the number who dropped out of school, as opposed to those who stayed in school and graduated and those who went on to college. These are some of the outcomes. It's easy enough. We talked about prevention or abstinence education program.

The outcomes of these programs are very hard to measure because it's something that's fairly recent, fairly new. What do you expect? What are the expected outcomes? Well, first of all that you try to reduce sexual activity, initiation of sexual activity. How do you know that? Very difficult. There were three things that the evaluators look for. One is increasing knowledge. Did you increase the knowledge of the participants? Easy enough, but as I said earlier knowledge alone is not sufficient. You can have all the knowledge you want, but you may not influence behavior. The second thing is attitude. Did the knowledge and program you initiated change the attitudes of the participants to have a better view, a better image, of what they should do? And then thirdly, the behavior. Did the increase in knowledge and change in attitudes reduce sexual activity, reduce teenage births, reduce disease? These are sometimes very hard to determine. And how long do you have to follow them? According to our legislation, the

definition of abstinence is until marriage. You'd have to follow them until marriage to know that for sure. Other definitions of abstinence would be through the teenage years. There's a variety of approaches here. It's very, very difficult in this area to be able to know the area of prevention, particularly in abstinence education, whether the programs produced the desired effect of reducing sexual initiation, and therefore pregnancy, disease et cetera.

So, it's very hard. That's one of the things that the gurus in evaluation, the experts, college related folks, want to measure in quantitative terms. In other words, in quantitative evaluations, you have numbers, the numbers game, percentages, decreasing by a certain percentage over a period of time. We call them SMART objectives, which are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-framed. Specific in reducing teenage pregnancy or initiation of sex during a year by a certain percentage, and that's achievable. You're not going to reduce teen pregnancy by a hundred percent. That's not realistic. It's not achievable, really. So, we want to get evaluations focused on that. But in the meantime there are some other things evaluations can look at.

There's another type of evaluation called process evaluation or qualitative approaches. We want to know how the program got started. What kind of mix of services are being delivered? Are they being delivered? What is the number of participants? How did you recruit them? What kind of dosage did you give them? How intensive was the intervention? How many participated? How many completed the course? These are some of

the factors which may help a program to change. For example, if you find out that you have the wrong tactics, the wrong strategy in recruiting or retaining or providing services, that information can provide the managers feedback to be able to change the program or get rid of the objective or reduce it, refine it. So it gives programs a different aim.

Evaluation does help to improve the program from a qualitative perspective. It also lets you know what you're doing, although you never may be able to attain the real outcome objective, the long term outcome of eliminating a whole problem. And I don't think any area of teenage pregnancy would ever come to that, where you're going to eliminate it totally. We may be able to reduce the risks. We may be able to make some dent in it, but I think the long term is an impossible dream. So consequently, we have to be satisfied in the area of evaluation, with less not more. And that doesn't mean we should cut it out, but that does give you some idea of what is working and what is not.

When our program was started first—let me give you an example of how stupid some of this stuff is. We started first in 1982, in October of '82, and about March of '83, I got a call from a congressman asking me what our evaluations of this program were showing. So this had just been funded the previous October, and probably some of them didn't get started until after January. What was the evaluation showing in terms of outcome? Well, first of all you can't evaluate anything unless there's a program in place. Some of the programs weren't implemented. I said, "This is totally unrealistic. Obviously you don't know what you're talking about. Call me

back in five years and maybe we'll be able to give you something."

"Oh, we need some results right now."

And I said, "Well, that was one of the things I think that former Secretary Califano thought too, when he wanted a quick and clean review of how the family planning was doing, and he couldn't get his research done for five years through NIH or CDC, so he invited a service delivery assessment through the inspector general to get an assessment of the program. The assessment was completed in about three months, but many regarded it as a 'quick and dirty' study, far below the quality of an NIH research study."

I think people have to be patient. They have to know the deficiencies in evaluation, the long range type of thing. Secondly, there's not enough money. We're allowed to use between 1 and 5 percent of our budget for evaluation, according to the statute. That's a very small amount, and evaluation is not easy. Secondly, it is expensive if you want to do a good evaluation. And thirdly, there's a whole bunch of ethical issues here. Evaluators have talked about making sure that you have control groups, that people are randomly assigned. Evaluators want to have in the control group and in the treatment group people of the same caliber and, I suppose, the same culture, the same background, et cetera, that are comparable to each other. They want to make sure that you're going to randomly assign clients to each group. Two girls come in and you're going to say, You go here, and the other one, you go there. The choice you make, the selection you make, has to be right and ethical. One girl may need the services more

than the other. What does one do? There's a whole myriad of problems associated with evaluation that have been addressed through the literature, and we are certainly trying to take all these into consideration. We have some successes. Evaluation does not necessarily prove everything. I think there are other ways of doing it. One can visit our program.

Dr. Joe Wholey, who wrote some great books, for example his book on *Evaluation and Effective Public Management*, is one of the great evaluators. He talks about evaluation, and different types of evaluation: long-term, short-term, outcome evaluations and quantitative versus qualitative approaches. He also talks about site-visiting, which is a way of getting very rich data and being able to see what's going on and how the program is implemented. Site-visiting gives you an awful lot more than something that's done in a quantitative manner on paper.

A couple of years ago, one of our former DASPAs decided that it might be a good idea to conduct what she called "listening meetings" across the country to hear what people in the communities thought their needs were. They would tell us what was going on and how we needed to respond. Now, that was nothing new to me. I think we have been doing this with our AFL programs across the country. We'd go out and see them at least once a year. We'd go into the community. We'd see where they live, where the programs are located, and we'd talk to people. We talked to clients, community members, school boards, school teachers, medical people, social workers. We got a feel of what was going on. So I think it's a very rich and valuable way of seeing what is needed, as well as how the program is doing.

Seeing the obstacles that a program is up against and trying to get them technical assistance can enhance programs. We can probably be more objective in that we're not living in the community. We can give them feedback of how they might try to do this. Have you thought about this? So, we do a lot of help in this area through site-visiting. But at one of those listening meetings in Seattle, there was a young woman, a Native American, in the audience, and she got up and said, "Listen, if you people want to know what's going on in my area, you come to my house. You come and see where I live, what's going on, with whom I interact, what my problems are," and all this. And she went on this for a while. Then this was by and large a Title X meeting.

I was there from the point of view of adolescent pregnancy. Title X people reacted, but they never addressed what the young woman said. So, I got up and I said, "You know, one thing that came through loud and clear to me was this young woman from Washington state said, 'If you want to know what's going on in my community, you come to my house.'" And I said, "I don't care what you read in an application for money, what needs assessment or anything else you include, unless you're out there on the front line, and see where these people live, what they're doing, it is obvious that you don't know. And consequently, I totally agree that she's absolutely right." So, if we want to listen, we are going to go there, see it first hand. End of the year reports, evaluation reports may tell you one thing but it's not like being there anyway. If you haven't done it, you don't know it. If you haven't seen it, you don't know it. And I really feel that you have to be

able to communicate in this particular way with the community. And I guess that's very important in evaluation. It's just as important, I think, as any of those methodologically sound evaluations with a great statement of need and inclusion of comparison, control groups, data collection instruments that are valid, reliable, and all that. All these are wonderful, but unfortunately we don't have enough money to do all of that and do it completely right, so we have to be satisfied with less, not more. That doesn't mean it's not important to evaluate because I would like to know, too, how good and how well our programs are doing.

Sometimes little stories tell a lot. President Reagan was great at telling stories to illustrate a point. When he was in the White House, many times he used to bring people in, and sometimes he went down and listened to what people said and tell a story that made a point. Naturally a lot of people would laugh at making policy by anecdote, and that's valid in itself. But on the other hand, the story does make a point, and it does get across a message, and I think we have a lot of those.

Now these days the whole fad—and newest fad in the federal government—is focused on what they say are best practices, best practices. And that's probably coming as close to evaluation as possible. Is it valid? I don't know. Is it a fad? This gets back to what we were talking about earlier, you know, what impact our programs would have on other countries. What you're really trying to discern or ascertain is what the best practice is. And what the best practice is here may not be the best practice elsewhere.

But sometimes there are some good stories that indicate best practices.

For example, this is important, I really want to get this one in. Our program focuses on families and family involvement. One of the big difficulties is: how do you get families involved? Well, ask the PTAs. How do they get people to come to meetings? It's a disaster. They've had a very difficult time.

It's very difficult to get people to come out, particularly in a family where there's only one head of household, where the couple has separated or is divorced, et cetera, where people have two jobs, they don't have access, they don't have time, there are great demands on people's time from the point of view of sports, education, health, social service, I mean on and on. How do you get people—parents to become involved? And this is one of the big things family involvement does.

We have a program that was funded in the state of Nevada whose main focus was not on kids directly, but rather on parents. How does a program get parents more involved in the lives of their children and be able to deal with such issues as sexuality and other things? For the first two or three years I met with the state's attorney general about this program. She was tremendously interested. The first couple of years it was a total disaster. I went out there at least four or five times to try and get this program off the ground, to get the right people in place, to do the recruiting, training, et cetera. They couldn't pull it off, but about three years ago we had a woman who was from London, England, came to the program. She has a master's in public health and absolutely wonderful. The program was by and large focused on Clark County in and around Las Vegas, which has a huge

Spanish population. And this is what the attorney general had told me back a few years before, that they were concerned about the influx of Spanish people and how to be able to reach them and get the parents involved. And it was a cultural, a language barrier, and various other things. There's also a question that some of them were undocumented aliens who had a variety of suspicions. Anyhow, the program hired this woman from London and she didn't know any Spanish, but she knew a lot of techniques of how to get people involved. She initiated a program called the Tupperware approach, where she hired a bunch of Hispanic women, Spanish-speaking, trained them and everything else, and they went out and they gathered Hispanic women and brought them to a Tupperware type of approach, where they could get them to come and participate over a long period of time, and it turned out to be a tremendous success.

A lot of these women didn't know anything about sexuality or reproductive health or contraception or well-being or pregnancy or anything on teenage problems. So they all got started off from square one. She helped them to understand themselves before they could get to their children, and they felt that this was a very effective way of doing it. And as a result, they made headway, significant headway. But it was a model that I think is one that can be replicated elsewhere. We have this woman now doing some workshops for other communities across the country and how to recruit and train people for their particular area to be able to do this kind of thing. It's an interesting program. What are the outcomes? We don't have any outcomes yet, but I can assure you that the amount of information that

these folks have learned and the fact that women participate, and the men too by the way, has had a significant impact on their own lives, and now they feel more comfortable dealing with their children. This is a model for all of us, that parents are supposedly the best, most effective educators, sex educators, of their children. We're putting that particular issue back where it belongs: in the family setting. And I think that's not something that liberals or conservatives should object to. It's a way of doing the right thing in the right way. I'm looking forward to something like that being replicable elsewhere.

McFarlane All right. To change courses a little bit, you started out your professional career as a Catholic priest, and you've stayed within the church; is that correct?

Sheeran Yes.

McFarlane You're a practicing Catholic?

Sheeran Oh, yeah. That's correct.

Tape 2, side 1, ends; side 2 begins.

McFarlane So what do you think about faith-based programs?

Sheeran Good questions. I mentioned the Kendrick Case, the lawsuit that was brought against our office claiming that our legislation violated the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution because it allowed programs to teach and promote religion. We had some programs that did, in fact, do that. We could see that easily, and that is, of course, a violation of the First Amendment, separation of church and state. Safeguards we put in subsequently were such that were an overreaction to the allegation. In spite

of those allegations, our office continued to support a number of faith-based organizations. I called them at that time "religiously-associated organizations." Now the new language is faith-based groups, FBOs. Over the years we supported many of them, including organizations such as Catholic charities in different places across the country, Catholic hospitals like Mercy Hospital in Pittsburgh, and various groups. And they were able to adhere to our policies in that they would not use federal monies to teach or promote religion, and to give medically accurate information and to be neutral in abortion. So, we had no problem. Some others had a very difficult time, and would turn money down because they couldn't do that in conscience, and that was fine.

Now, of course, in the Bush administration and in the campaign of two years ago, both candidates—Gore and Bush—were subscribing to the use of faith-based groups as organizations that could help to do a lot of things, conduct a lot of social programs, welfare programs, education programs better than public or private community-based agencies. And that is true. I have no problem with that. They've done assessments here in the federal government over the past couple of years. How many faith-based organizations do you support? Just for the record, it would be important to state that our office, the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs, had the highest percentage of faith-based organizations supported by the federal government of any federal agency—our percentage was 25 percent. Twenty-five percent of the agencies we funded were faith-based groups, and we had no problem with them. The next highest percentage was about

15 or 16 percent, and others down as far as zero. And as a result, the administration were trying to promote more funding for FBOs.

We said, Look, we're doing it. We'll even go for it when we put out the next request for applications. We are going to add a line that says, specifically, "Faith-based organizations are eligible to apply." We did that. Now the department was so interested that they required everybody, every agency in the Department of Health and Human Services, to use our language. So faith-based groups, I have no problems with them. We are funding a number of them right now. For example, a Baptist church down the road in Roanoke, Virginia, another one, The Night Ministries in Chicago. But they are all willing to live with our policies of not using federal funds to teach and promote religion, that they're going to give medically accurate information, and they're not going to be for or against abortion, pro or con on the abortion issue. That's essentially what it is. We believe and know and experience that they do good work, that they have a lot of commitment, a lot of experience, they have a lot of volunteers, they have a lot good people, they have access to a lot of young people that other community agencies wouldn't. So, I believe that they can do it.

Now one has to be very careful. We know that the recent experience down in Louisiana, for example, where the abstinence education program, not conducted and funded by our office, but rather by the state of Louisiana to a block grant from Maternal and Child Health Bureau here in the Health Resources and Service Administration, have been brought to court and found guilty of giving money to agencies that did teach and promote

religion. It was a big court case recently, and these people have been de-funded as a result by the state of Louisiana. What I'm saying is, essentially, while faith-based groups can do a good service and live within the limitations of the Constitution and the policies and the statute itself of whatever statute that may be, they need to be monitored. One needs to be—ensure that the separation of church and state is maintained.

Now, I'm a little concerned. Having said that, I think they can do a good job. I am concerned about it because when we talk about church and state—in the Reagan years there was no such thing as separation of church and state. They didn't care really whether they were separated. And it has continued into this administration, not in the Clinton administration, but this administration too. They're paying lip service to the separation of church and state, but we see all this movement to have prayers in public schools, to have prayers at football games, prayers—in fact, some people would just as soon to see that First Amendment whittled away, even though it's part of the United States Constitution. I see a danger here that the faith-based approach—funding a faith-based group is the first step towards getting there. It's like the situation in the Reagan administration about the squeal rule, of whittling away all the parts of Title X in order to reach abortion. I think this could be another endeavor by some of the right-wing conservatives to ensure that one type of religion, Christianity and Christian faith-based groups, would have all the preference. I think we've had enough wars over the centuries, and we see some of them today, and we got this situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan and various other countries about the

influence of religion and what trouble that can get you into. Lots of experience over the history of humanity shows that wars being fought in the name of God and the name of religion, and I think that we did a great job here in the United States from the experiences, in that the founders had seen the European experience and established a constitution and country where the church and state issues were separated. And I think it gets back to the old days when Christ himself said, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's." I think separation of church and state is essential. I see attempts being made. And I would hope that the faith-based initiative, while meritorious on its face, has the capacity of doing good things. It also needs watching, monitoring, and vigilance to ensure that church and state issues are kept separate.

McFarlane Do you have any recommendations for people who will plan and manage adolescent pregnancy and family planning programs in the future?

Sheeran Oh, yeah. I think I do. Probably one of the things that I'm very critical of is that many people, not only in family planning and adolescent pregnancy, but in all businesses out there, come to management from different backgrounds. They are what I call amateur managers. They come from vocational perspective. And by that, I mean they are trained in one particular vocation, a way of life. For example, teachers, social workers, lawyers, physicians, they're doing things on their own. They are trained to be a teacher, counselor, or lawyer. They deal usually with one person. And they may be good at that. They like it, they are doing things. Some day or other as a result of longevity, experience, and promotion they may be

selected to head an agency, and that means becoming a manager. Now a lot of people unfortunately bring to the management only their vocational skills, the skills of doing things on their own. And management is not that. In fact, management is getting things done with the help of other people. There's a big difference. The managers have to really change their perspective, their outlook. Instead of doing things, being able to get things done with the help of other people. They have the staff you work with. So, consequently, a manager needs to change, change drastically from being a doer to the one that gets things done.

Now, I teach graduate courses at Johns Hopkins and University of Southern California in both public and business management. I have lawyers, physicians, laboratory directors coming and working in graduate degrees, master's degrees, in business administration and public administration. I ask them why. Well, they tell me. They tell me, To learn management. In the case of a physician in a managed care situation, he says, I'm in a physicians group. I'm responsible for the management of all the services that other physicians provide. I'm a physician. I know nothing about management. I'm a good doctor. I know my vocation. Now I have to learn how to get these people to work, to make out schedules, to motivate them, to inspire them, to get things done. Lawyers have similar needs. They will say, I know how to go to court. I know how to represent a client. I know the law. Now I'm head of a law firm. How do I manage lawyers? And this means going back to school and trying to learn what management is. I would say if there's one thing that is missing in family planning and in

adolescent pregnancy programs, et cetera, is the lack of trained managers. We have a lot of amateurs, people who are still vocational people doing things and don't know how to get things done, unable to make the shift, never have made it, and don't know how to do it. In fact we have a lot of what I call ignorant managers out there, people that don't know that they don't know and that is, can hold programs back. For example, we have programs run out there in the Title X program operated by nurses. Well, when I taught at George Mason University in public administration we had people from the nursing school coming over to take graduate programs in management to be administrators. Why? Because they were going to be in charge of groups of nurses. They wanted to send people out there who had some managerial skills as well as nursing skills. I think that's one of the things that if I were running a family planning program or an adolescent program, I'd make sure that whoever is going to manage that program has managerial skills, either in the hiring or training, to make sure that they're able to recruit, select, train, supervise, monitor those staff through whom they are going to get things done. Otherwise it's a hit and miss. There is no good management system in place. That would be my first thing, ensuring proper managers, trained managers, experienced managers, managers that are willing to be not just vocational people—though it's nice to have the vocational part in that you know what others should be doing, but how the heck are you going to train others and motivate them to do it?

In addition, we have found that these people, amateur managers, have no experience in finance, managing money or whatever it's going to be. And

part of managerial training involves at least rudimentary knowledge of accounting, bookkeeping, finances et cetera. Management courses cover a lot of topics such as organizational behavior, management skills, development of goals, objectives, accounting and finance, planning and evaluation—how you write a proposal and how you evaluate it. Managers have to know all of these topics, even though they do not necessarily do each part of it. They have to know it in the sense that they are going to be responsible for the whole program, and to have the people with whom they work or have worked for them or with them to be able to carry out these things. They need to know how to be able to motivate their employees how to do the job. I think that's the biggest advice I can give.

McFarlane Would you give any political advice to managers in the field?

Sheeran Yes, yes. You have to keep up to date, read, know what the government is doing, know what the federal, state, and local systems—what is going on at the local level, the way the wind is blowing, to be able to stay in touch with your local legislators, whether it be city, county, state, and particularly federal agencies, one should stay in touch with them, and communicate with them. What is their stance on this issue? How are they going to vote for this? I think one needs to be very astute to be able to at least know not just the party in power's policies and views, but the opposition's policies. You want to know both sides. For example, here in Washington I get every day several papers, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, they're liberal papers, but I also get the *Washington Times*, a very conservative paper. After I read the same story in the *Post* and the *Washington Times* one can often tell

that it is written from two different perspectives, two different stances, one liberal, one very conservative. But one needs to know that to find out what the other side is thinking of. It's like playing a football game. You want to know what play this guy is going to run next. Where should I be? And this is how it is for a manager out there in Title X, Title XX. You're dealing with very sensitive issues, very political issues, you should know what they're thinking.

I remember watching a movie, *Michael Collins*, the Irish patriot who led the war for independence against the Brits, and he maintained that the Brits were able to be successful for centuries against the Irish because the Brits knew everything about the Irish. The intelligence was great. And Collins's view was, Next time it's going to be different because we need to know what these guys eat for breakfast, and that's exactly how he was able to beat the Brits: by intelligence, knowing what they eat for breakfast, knowing their every move, what's coming down the pike. You have to have eyes and ears. That's getting back to systems theory, knowing the kind of environment you're in and scanning it. A good manager has to be able to scan that environment and be able to adapt, roll with the punches, as we say, and that's part of management, too. So I think the political awareness is very important.

McFarlane Is there anything else I should know about your thoughts on this field or your career?

Sheeran I don't see any great conflict between church and state. My own personal view is that, I was in the church and I'm still in the church. That's not a

question with which I have any problems. I know the church's official view on family planning, birth control, and abortion, and stuff like that. There's no great evidence for some of these views one way or the other. As I said earlier, at the beginning, the opinions of theologians—there were many different gray areas. It's a conscience matter. I don't see a problem with that. I do go to church. I don't necessarily participate in a variety of activities, but I do support it. And, you know, you have the issue here of all this child sex abuse and pedophilia and various things like that going on with the priests. The priests have been condemned in all the meetings with Rome and bishops of the United States. On that issue I had some very strong views, too, and that comes back to the management issue.

I have a perfect example of what I see—of what I just said earlier. There are bishops or theologians or scholars in theology and biblical scholars who have moved up the line, whether it be in theology or canon law or teaching, to be managers. In previous jobs, they were vocational people, doing things on their own. When they are appointed to be a pastor or bishop, none of them know anything about management. The problem is one of ignorance. They don't know what they don't know. There's a guy wrote a book many years ago up in Vermont, and the title was *Why the American Common Man Believes What He Believes* [Robert Lane, *Political Ideology: Why the American Common Man Believes What He Does*] There was one great line of two words in that book that said, "Ignorance penalizes." I think that the situation with the bishops in the United States, with the church, is not a theological thing, it's a management thing, a management issue, that you

have amateur managers who are ignorant of management and management skills, never knew of their ignorance, but don't know that they don't know it. They know nothing, very little, if anything, about managing property, plants, buildings, facilities, money, organizational behavior, behavior of priests, getting things done with the help of those priests in the diocese. They are aloof above and they don't know what they should know. Consequently, when they were in a crisis it's almost like management by the seat of your pants. Reacting to a crisis and this is what you call a crisis manager as opposed to a purposeful, visionary type manager. "Ignorance penalizes." It is totally different. And, consequently, the decisions that have been made have been reactions with no previous planning and no vision. I think that Warren Bennis, the great public administration guru at the University of Southern California, and now at George Washington University, talked about the vision thing. George W. Bush used to talk about the visionary thing. A manager having a vision, a strong point of view, a very strong point of view, being able to see things down the road, a long-term planner, getting things done with the help of other people. But the bishops don't know what they don't know and they appear to be reacting to problems with little or no planning, no vision. The only thing with which they can inspire people is theology, but that's being only one area.

There's a whole bunch of other areas that are just as important, such as the skills to get along with people, get along with kids, get along with communities, seeing needs, being able to manage money, being able to

manage facilities, being able to negotiate, but the bishops often don't know these areas. It's very easy, if you have a problem, to send the problem away, and that's again not knowing how to handle a problem. I think some of the things the bishops, like a lot of managers do is to mistake a problem for a symptom, and what they try to do is cure the symptom but the problem remains. For example, if I have a toothache I can cure it in a few ways temporarily. I can go and have a shot of Irish whiskey, for example, or I can get a few aspirins and it will cure it for a while. So what have I done? I cured the symptom, but the cavity is still there. The problem is still there. That's what the bishops have attempted to do over the years. They've attempted to cure the symptom by sending away these priests accused of sex abuse, but the problems remained. There was nothing done to address the problem. The new situation they have is an over-reaction. It still doesn't cure the management thing. There is no effort made to train these guys in how to manage or to plan.

I had a friend, a monsignor down in Texas, Corpus Christi, Texas and we'd been talking about this situation for years. We all agree that this was a management problem. He was one of the few priests who went to management school, took an MBA program, put all his stuff and parish stuff in his computer. This instigated committees at a parish level to get things done, and he doesn't do anything very much because it's all done with the help of those other people whom he trained and uses to get things done. You think the bishops would be into this type of approach. No, they're afraid to give up their power because they do not have the vision to

be able to do that.

I'm very critical of the sex abuse problem among Catholic clergy, not from a theological perspective, but from a management perspective. When I was at USC a professor there started off the program—and talking about management by saying, "The management situation in the United States today is rotten." The evidence indicates that it is rotten in spite of the fact that so much emphasis is placed on it, so many workshops, so many consulting agencies focusing on improving management. In spite of that, management is rotten because they are learning nothing, and if they are, they are not able to translate it into operations. And that's why my friend Eamon Barrett used to say at the University of San Francisco, "Thanks be to God for stupid managers." And we have a lot of those today, and I would put many of the bishops in that category.

McFarlane Is there anything else you'd like to add?

Sheeran No. I understand that from the point of the church I don't have a theological problem; I have a management problem. When I see management as key in this area, I see it in social services, in health. I agree that we may have made some improvement theoretically and practically. There are some books written by some good managers. There was a guy down there in Dallas, Texas—unfortunately he's dead now, William Oncken, Jr.—who wrote a book called *Managing Management Time*. And he did a lot of workshops across the country for both public and private agencies. Also, his son is running that same thing now, and I attended one that he ran out in California many years ago at Hewlett Packard. Oncken

was the one who initiated the language talking about "amateur managers" versus "professional mangers."

The amateur manager is the one who practices solo or as a lone ranger, the vocational person. The professional manager has gotten beyond, has learned skills important to get things done with the help of other people, and he goes through how one gets from the vocational amateur manager to be a professional manager. And unfortunately, a lot of managers never make that transition. And I'm very concerned about that. In both the public and private sectors, it's a mess. You hear about all these agencies making profits. You also hear about people like Enron and all these people going down the drain. Again I put the blame on management, on managers.
A manager needs to be scientifically qualified and grounded in management science, because management science is a science just as much as any medicine or anything else is and not the same type—it has it's own legs. It stands on its own two feet. A manager, unless he or she is grounded in that, doesn't have a clue. It's hit and miss. It's managing by the seat of your pants as opposed to a very professional way. So I'm very concerned about that, in both the public and private sectors. What I see happening in a lot of the pub—the private big companies is not much different from what we see going on in the public arena. The public sector, unfortunately, is caught more in the area of bureaucratic management, which I despise, to scientific management, which was the old Frederick Taylor approach—that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about modern management, which is focused on people, focusing on people, and people not so much being

bad or evil and can't be trusted, but people as having potential, who can be trusted, who can be more, who can change. That's the way it should be going. The old philosophy was, people are no damn good. My philosophy is that of John Locke, that people are good and can be trained and motivated. And until we come around to having that kind of faith, that kind of confidence, we're never going to be able to make a difference publicly or privately in the management sector. That's my theory.

McFarlane Is there anything else you would like to add?

Sheeran I think it's been useful. I enjoyed talking to you. I'm sorry that I probably repeated the same things in different places, but it was an experience in reminiscing and focusing on where I've been, where I am, and what I've learned, and where I think some of the issues and problems are, not just with the church, but with the agencies, both public and private, and particularly my own organization, where we're going and the support one needs to do that. Without being negative, I would hope that somehow or other change could occur, and change is difficult. A lot of people are very interested in the status quo, and how one brings about change is a big part of management too. And this morning I didn't mention about the bishops or anybody else to be able to look at what change involves, how you motivate people, how you educate people, how you prepare people for change, how you go through the difference, the whole gamut that the books and the literature talks about in bringing about change. Very few people do that. Change occurs. It happens. People are supposed to be happy. Many times they're ignorant of what has happened, and therefore not going to

support it. Someone has to. You know, one needs to read this stuff and go around seeing how organizations do it and have done it, but need to know the literature of it, too, because I think it's an important thing in bringing about change. And change to me is the biggest factor involved, as far as management is concerned, and as far as improving programs and conditions.

McFarlane Okay. I want to thank you very much for—

Sheeran Okay. Nine-thirty.

end Interview 2