

**One Man's Empire? Don Canham's Tumultuous Relationship
with Title IX**

Kendall Lynn Lehmann

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

BACHELOR OF ARTS WITH HONORS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

April 2, 2018

Advised by Professor Mary Kelley

Table of Contents

Lists of Figures or Illustrations.....	ii
Abbreviations & Important Figures.....	iii
Abstract.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Canham’s Power.....	15
Football Success	
National Figure	
Complete Control at UM	
Chapter 2: Canham’s Battle Against Title IX.....	29
Political Activism	
Press Appearances	
‘M’ Award Controversy	
Chapter 3: The Need for Title IX at UM.....	48
Demand for Women’s Athletics	
Complaints	
Comparison of Other Colleges	
Conclusion.....	70
Appendix.....	73
Annotated Bibliography for Select Sources	
Sources/Methods	
Bibliography	

Lists of Figures or Illustrations

- Figure 1: Women's Varsity Jacket vs. Men's Varsity Jacket.....46
- Figure 2: Comparison of Women's Athletic Budgets at Big Ten Universities.....67-68

Abbreviations

- UM – University of Michigan
- MSU – Michigan State University
- EMU – Eastern Michigan University
- HEW – Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (in charge of implementing laws/rules of Title IX)
- NCAA – National Collegiate Athletic Association
- AIAW – Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (national organization similar to men's NCAA)
- Burns' Committee – University of Michigan Committee to Study Women's Intercollegiate Athletics
- ACWIA – Athletic Committee for Women's Intercollegiate Athletics (committee to help advise and assist the Director of Women's Athletics)
- Board – Board in Control of Athletics
- MWAA – Michigan Women's Athletic Association (counter-part to the men's 'M' club)

Important Figures

- Donald Canham – Athletic Director at University of Michigan from 1968-1988
- Bo Schembechler – Head Football Coach from 1969-1989
- Robben Fleming – President of the University of Michigan (1968-1978)
- Marie Hartwig – Member of the Burns' Committee & first Director of Women's Athletics at University of Michigan
- Sheryl Szady – Captain of the field hockey team & member of the Burns'

Committee & led fight for women to receive the 'M' award

Abstract

Title IX was a part of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 that prohibited sex-based discrimination in any educational program or activity that received federal funding. Title IX was needed at academic institutions due to a clear lack of inequality between the sexes, especially in sports. While this was apparent to many onlookers, employees within athletic departments did not agree and often sought to dispute the need for Title IX. The University of Michigan (UM) Athletic Director from 1968-1988, Don Canham, placed importance on football while neglecting women's athletics and challenging Title IX. Progress in women's sports was delayed as a result. There are three major questions that will be addressed in this thesis: 1) Why was Title IX integrated so slowly at UM? 2) How much influence did Canham have on the implementation of Title IX? Was Canham a major reason women's sports progressed so slowly at UM? 3) How much power did Canham have at UM? Was it truly 'Canham's Empire?' To answer these questions, the research will focus on primary documents from the Donald Canham Papers, Eunice Burns Papers, and the Women's Athletics Papers at the Bentley Historical Library in Ann Arbor. Secondary sources will also be consulted dealing with the history of women's sports, the history of women's intercollegiate athletics, the history of college football, and Title IX's implementation at other colleges. The research will illustrate how slowly change involving gender can occur at an academic institution, explore how one man can maintain decisive of power and influence within an athletic department, and explain the barriers to the progress of women's sports at UM.

Introduction

This thesis will explore the degree to which the athletic director, Don Canham, played a direct role in the delayed implementation of Title IX. As the individual with the greatest influence within the athletic department at UM, Canham was able to shape the progress of women's sports by meeting only minimal standards set by Title IX and even challenging its necessity. For example, in 1973, the women's program had inadequate facilities that were extremely small and were given limited financial support; the budget for women's teams at UM ranged from \$150-\$500 each compared with \$2.6 million for men's sports.¹ Canham was unwilling to dedicate funds to women's sports, but was determined to provide a healthy budget for men's athletics. UM was the first institution to face criticism of its progress and was the last university deemed acceptable by the government for meeting Title IX regulations in 1982.² UM and Canham provide an example of the resistance to Title IX in the U.S., even though it is the most extreme case.

The Title IX legislation is part of a larger nationwide movement towards equality in the United States. The Civil Rights Movement, Vietnam War protests, the Women's Rights Movement, and attempts to pass the Equal Rights Amendment all laid the foundation for the move towards gender equality within universities. The fight for fairness in sports began in the late 1960s and continued into the 1970s with pioneering women willing to confront sexist ideas about women and athletics.

In 1967, Kathy Switzer became the first woman to run in the Boston Marathon, one of the most prestigious marathons. She had been running at Syracuse University

¹ Jeffrey T. Ramsey 2014. "Big Men on Campus: Administrative Response to Title IX and the Development of Women's Sports in the Big Ten Conference, 1972-1982." Doctor of Philosophy, United States – Wisconsin: Marquette University, 332.

² Ibid, 112 and 369.

unofficially with the men's team since there was no women's cross-country team. The men's cross-country coach, Arnie Briggs, was excited to see a woman come out and run at the university, but was not enthusiastic about Switzer's idea to run in the Boston Marathon. Briggs believed that women could not run that distance because they were too fragile, but soon changed his mind when he saw Switzer tirelessly training for the marathon. He insisted that she should sign up.³ Although women were banned from running in the marathon, there was no official rule about gender in the rule book or entry form, so Switzer registered under her usual signature, K.V. Switzer; she was allowed to participate because the officials could not discern her sex from her name entry.

Switzer remembered that during the race many runners did double takes when they saw her running, but remained pleasant. However, race officials were not happy when they saw a woman running in the exclusive male event; Switzer recalled turning around and seeing "the most vicious face [she'd] ever seen."⁴ The race manager screamed "get the hell out of my race" and tried to rip off her bib number, but Arnie and her boyfriend, Tom, intervened and pushed the manager away. After this encounter, Switzer was afraid and contemplated quitting, but understood that this event had now become an issue for all women – a test of women's endurance and physical abilities. During her long run, she began to think about how there were no intercollegiate sports for women, no scholarships, or prize money because women did not have the chance to prove that they desired and deserved athletic opportunities. As a result, Switzer became determined to

³ Kathrine Switzer. 2017. "The Real Story of Kathrine Switzer's 1967 Boston Marathon." Kathrine Switzer Marathon Woman. 2017. <http://kathrineswitzer.com/about-kathrine/1967-boston-marathon-the-real-story/>.

⁴ Ibid.

create opportunities for other women.⁵ Switzer finished the race and proved that women could compete in physically challenging activities even with blood-soaked socks from blisters. Her pictures appeared on newspapers and encouraged women to defy antiquated ideas about women and sports.

Despite Switzer's bravery and athletic prowess, women were still not allowed to compete in many marathons until 1972. After the ban was lifted, women excelled in these competitions; in the 1979 Boston Marathon, there were a total of 7,877 participants – 520 were women and had competitive times with the men.⁶ Therefore, women continued to show their desire to compete in athletic endeavors, notwithstanding the previous discrimination against women. Marathons were considered the ultimate test of physical conditioning and by competing in these events, women proved that they could compete at any athletic level.

Women were required to demonstrate their athletic abilities even into the 1970s, as sports were originally designated for men. Athletics became important for men after industrialization and urbanization; sports were a way to combat “excess civilization” and avoid losing American manliness according to Theodore Roosevelt.⁷ While the importance of sports is a relatively new phenomenon in the United States dating to the nineteenth century, women's sports did not become popular until the twentieth century.⁸ Originally, women's sports progressed more slowly due to remnants of Victorian era ideas that portrayed women as the weaker sex. There were also concerns about damaging

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ David Diles. “The History of Title IX at the University of Michigan Department of Athletics” (University of Michigan, 1988), 55.

⁷ Gail Bederman, “Theodore Roosevelt: Manhood, Nation, and ‘Civilization,’” *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States* (1995), 186.

⁸ David Diles. “The History of Title IX at the University of Michigan,” 5.

women's reproductive abilities. The first sports recognized as acceptable for women included athletic events in croquet, archery, bowling, and tennis because they could be performed without "acquiring an indelicate sweat" and there was no physical contact, which did not harm the functions of the womb.⁹ These ideas were then transferred to women's college athletics. Instead of providing varsity athletics that involved aggressiveness and competitiveness, women's intramural and club sports highlighted how to move their bodies in feminine ways. Participants also held social events such as teas or dances.

Ideas surrounding femininity were an important aspect in women's athletics. A patriarchal gender ideology labeled aggression, physicality, competitive spirit, and athletic skill as masculine.¹⁰ When women displayed these characteristics, they were labeled mannish or lesbians. Women's physical educators and female athletes attempted to distance themselves from lesbian accusations. For example, in the 1940s and 1950s, Babe Didrikson, was often criticized for her tomboyish nature when she competed in track, but after she quit track, married a professional wrestler, and staged an athletic comeback in golf, the press portrayed her as a "true female" with much of the coverage spent on her love life instead of her golf game.¹¹ Other women learned from Didrikson to display outward signs of femininity in dress and demeanor. Physical educators revised their philosophy from a focus on health of women to placing femininity at the center of their objectives in the early and mid-twentieth century. Correct posture, facial and bodily

⁹ Ibid, 12.

¹⁰ Susan K Cahn. 2016. "Cold War Heteronormativity: 'Mannishness,' Lesbianism, and Homophobia in U.S. Women's Sports." In *Women's America: Refocusing the Past*, edited by Linda Kerber, Jane Sherron de Hart, Cornelia Hughes Dayton, and Judy Tzu-Chun Wu, Eight Edition, 550-558. New York: Oxford University Press., 551.

¹¹ Ibid, 553.

beauty, health, recreation, and the ideal of “sports for all” dominated the acceptable women’s athletic requirements.¹² Educators even implemented dress codes that forbade slacks, men’s shirts, boyish haircuts, and unshaven legs; if a woman did not comply with these standards there was risk that she could be expelled by the physical education department.¹³ Many universities across the US, including UM, implemented these beliefs as policy in the athletic department, which created stark differences between the programs for men and women.

Public opinion about women and sports began to shift in the 1960s as a part of the Cold War competition between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The U.S. Olympic performances during the Cold War had a negative impact on the international image of the U.S. because the country was seen as weak. The U.S. female athletes did not compete at a respectable level for the world’s superpower and the superiority of the USSR was demonstrated through female Olympians.¹⁴ In order to remedy this situation, U.S. amateur sports organizations began to pay more attention to neglected women’s sports programs and athletically talented women throughout the country. The NCAA became interested in placing women’s sports under its control in order to increase the organization’s power and control over U.S. amateur sports.¹⁵ The NCAA remained in competition with the Amateur Athletic Union and wanted to become the only organization for amateur sports. The NCAA began its discussion on women’s sports in

¹² Ying Wushanley. 2004. *Playing Nice and Losing: The Struggle for Control of Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics, 1960-2000*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 9.

¹³ Susan Cahn. 2007. “Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Sports.” In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Nancy Hogshead-Makar and Andrew Zimbalist. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 10.

¹⁴ Wushanley, 24.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, 29.

1964, as the leaders viewed control over women's sports as a path to becoming the dominant organization. The women in control of women's athletics under the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women had a different philosophical outlook on women's sports. The AIAW focused on the educational aspect and the idea of "sports for all," while the men's program through the NCAA focused on a more professional aspect. The AIAW and women in charge of women's athletics had hoped that Title IX would allow the men's intercollegiate athletic programs to emulate the informal amateurism of the AIAW. However, the women's program became similar to the men's professional program and the AIAW dissolved while the NCAA became the leader of amateur sports.¹⁶ The AIAW could not compete with the financial superiority of the NCAA and the already established long-term relationships with universities throughout the U.S. Athletic departments at universities did not want to pay dues for two separate athletic organizations, so the NCAA became the organization for both men's and women's sports. While many were discussing the importance of women's sports in the 1960s, Title IX was not passed until 1972 and the NCAA did not incorporate women's championships until 1981. Change in societal views and institutional progress of women's sports took decades.

Title IX was a part of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 that made illegal sex-based discrimination in any educational program or activity that received federal funding. Title IX states, "no person...shall on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Title IX was designed to correct

¹⁶ George H Hanford. 1979. "Controversies in College Sports." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 445 (September): 66–79.

inequalities, especially in sports. HEW published the final regulations detailing Title IX and President Ford signed the final regulations in 1975. Institutions were given a three-year adjustment period ending in July 1978 to comply with Title IX. The path to Title IX was long and started with women determined to create equality within academic institutions.

Bernice Sandler, “the godmother of Title IX,” finished her doctorate in education at the University of Maryland and was a part-time lecturer, but was not considered for any of the seven open positions in her department at the University of Maryland because she was “too strong for a woman.” Her many job rejections led her to the discovery of a footnote in a civil rights report that there was an Executive Order 11375 that covered sex discrimination. Sandler used her position in a women’s rights organization, the Women’s Equity Action League (WEAL), to begin filing the first administrative class action complaint against every university that received federal contracts in 1970 (the first federal investigations were at Harvard and the University of Michigan). Eventually, Sandler was able to help Edith Green (a member of the House of Representative and a member of WEAL’s advisory board) introduce the legislation that became Title IX. Title IX did not include the word “sport” so they had no idea the results Title IX would have on the athletic world, especially since there had been no study of sex discrimination in athletics before the 1970s. The first national study was conducted in 1974 where many disparities were found including the example of the University of Michigan. In the early 1970s, the budget for men’s varsity sports at U of M was 1.1 million dollars while the budget for women was zero, which led the women to depend on selling apples at football games to pay for their own expenses. In the end, Sandler believed that it would take many

generations to create a social revolution.¹⁷

While the law was passed in 1972, debate about the regulations went on for years afterwards. Athletic Departments argued that they did not desire government interference into their programs, that they could not afford women's sports, that revenue sports should be excluded from regulations, and that the timeline was too sudden as men's sports had benefited from years of progress and women's sports were supposed to be updated in a few years. Often the criticism of a reduction in men's non-revenue sports also arose, but many did note that if a desire for a well-rounded sports program existed, some money could be taken away from revenue sports and given to the non-revenue sports.¹⁸

Even though Title IX was a brief act with less than a thousand words, it had far reaching effects that shaped the increase for women's participation in sports. Before the Title IX deadline, U.S. colleges offered scholarships to 50,000 men while there were 50 scholarships offered to women in 1972.¹⁹ The expenses for men's teams were paid with student fees while women had to raise their own funds through bake sales or raffles. The numbers of women and men have also increased in the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA); in 1971 32,000 women and 173,000 men participated in the NCAA, but in 2012 203,600 women and 265,600 men participated in the NCAA – an increase of 600 percent for women and 53 percent for men.²⁰ Despite this increase in

¹⁷ Bernice Resnick Sandler. 2007. "Title IX: How We Got It and What a Difference It Made Symposium." *Cleveland State Law Review* 55 (4): 473–90.

¹⁸ Donald E Shelton. 2000. "Equally Bad Is Not Good: Allowing Title IX Compliance by the Elimination of Men's Collegiate Sports." *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 34 (1–2): 253–64.

¹⁹ Linda Kerber, Jane Sherron de Hart, Cornelia Hughes Dayton, and Judy Tzu-Chun Wu. 2016. "Gender Equality and the Law." In *Women's America: Refocusing the Past*, Eight Edition, New York: Oxford University Press, 747-751.

²⁰ *Ibid*, 747-751.

women's participation, the majority of women's sports teams continued to receive funding and opportunities out of proportion to their representation of the college population (women had less funding and opportunities compared to the number of women on campus). With the increase of women's participation in athletics, the attitudes throughout the country began to slowly shift over time.

Sociologists Eldon Snyder and Elmer Spreitzer studied the change in the social acceptance of female participation in sports. They compared a 1972 study of attitudes towards female athletes to their 1981 study. The 1972 and 1981 studies found that swimming was the most accepted sport for females followed by tennis, gymnastics, softball, basketball, and lastly track. However, since 1972 there has been greater acceptance of females participating in various sports by the general population and the acceptance is even higher among individuals who participate in sports themselves. The findings suggest that the traditional idea that sports were not compatible with feminine expectations was slowly being diminished. Title IX helped create change in societal gender roles even as early as 1981, nine years after its passage.²¹

UM had difficulty dealing with these societal changes that accepted women as athletes. After moving from the former location in Detroit that was founded in 1817, the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor opened in 1837 with the intention of being "open to all residents of this state, who may wish to avail themselves of its advantages."²² While this mission did not distinguish between men and women, women were not admitted to UM until 1870 when Madelon Stockwell became the first woman to attend UM. This

²¹ Eldon E Snyder., and Elmer Spreitzer. 1983. "Change and Variation in the Social Acceptance of Female Participation in Sports." *Journal of Sport Behavior; Mobile, Ala.* 6 (1): 3–8.

²² Sheryl Szady. "The History of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women at the University of Michigan," (University of Michigan, 1987), 9.

gender bias within the university spilled over to athletics. In the 1890s, walking and tennis were the most popular recreational activities among the UM female students, while the men's football team had already started a student organized association and played their first intercollegiate football game by 1878.²³ This type of disparity between the athletic opportunities for men and women continued within the UM department of athletics through the Title IX era.

The Athletic Department oversaw the men while the physical education department directed the women. The physical education department was concerned with keeping women's sports separate from the men's "evil" professionalism; at the head of this mission was Margaret Bell, an M.D. for the University Health Service and the director of the department of physical education for women from 1923-1957. Bell had three reasons for disapproving of women's varsity athletics: first, resources allocated for women's varsity athletics would result in fewer resources for physical education and recreation, which served more women; second, participation in varsity sports would disrupt the functioning of the female reproductive system because of emotional and physical strain; and third, she disapproved of the men's model of excessive publicity, exploitation, commercialism and hero worship.²⁴ This attitude shifted slightly when Bell's mentee, Marie Hartwig, a previous UM field hockey player, became the first Director of Women's Athletics from 1973-1976. Although she shared many of Bell's views, Hartwig adjusted to the times and began promoting women's varsity athletics during her time as the Director of Women's Athletics. While there was a history of underappreciating women's athletic abilities at UM by both men and women, the

²³ David Diles. "The History of Title IX," 7.

²⁴ Sheryl Szady. "The History of Intercollegiate Athletics," 35-36.

opinions of the women in charge shifted over time – even Bell’s “concept of women’s intercollegiate athletics slowly broadened during her tenure.”²⁵ Bell, a woman who had antiquated thoughts about women and athletics, was able to change her perspective, in contrast to the men in the Athletic Department fixed in their opinions. Don Canham embodies this rigidity and fixity of outmoded ideas.

Don Canham served as athletic director from 1968 until 1988, but had been a member of the UM community since his time as a student athlete in 1937. He competed in track from 1937 to 1941 and won the NCAA high jump championship in 1941. He graduated in 1941 with a bachelor’s degree in physical education, history, and science. After his discharge from military service in 1946, Canham returned to UM as the Assistant Track and Field Coach. He was promoted to Head Coach in 1948 and he won 12 conference championships. In 1954, Canham also started his own company, School-Tech Inc., which distributed instructional films and athletic equipment; the company became a multi-million-dollar operation and demonstrated the business ability that Canham would apply to his job as Athletic Director. On July 1, 1968, Canham was appointed to succeed Crisler as the fifth Athletic Director.²⁶

Canham would have been exposed to and influenced by sexist attitudes throughout his lifetime, as the idea that women were less capable was prevalent and culturally acceptable for the majority of his life. Sports for women implicitly challenged patriarchal constraints on women’s behaviors because sports altered the balance of power between the sexes; sports could empower women, which created the possibility of

²⁵ Sheryl Szady. “The History of Intercollegiate Athletics,” 80.

²⁶ Bentley Staff, “Summary of Donald Canham,” Bentley Historical Library, Ann Arbor Michigan.

altering societal norms.²⁷ Due to this perceived threat to society and men's power, men with jobs relating to athletics desperately tried to limit women's involvement with sports. Men would often refuse to admit women to sports clubs, mock women who competed, and created obstacles to keep women from challenging male superiority as athletes.²⁸ Sports offered an avenue for women to challenge gender norms that kept women and men in different spheres of life, therefore men who wished to retain the status quo prevented or made it incredibly challenging for women to compete in sports. Athletics remained a battleground for keeping women from claiming male prerogatives. Although Canham might not have been aware of these facts in his life, he would have seen these opinions by other men in the sports world, which either consciously or unconsciously influenced his own views about women's sports.

Due to his long term within Michigan Athletics, Canham would have also been exposed to antiquated views that persisted at UM. The women in charge of the women's physical education department, such as Bell, advocated for an extremely different model for women's athletic activities than the men's sports model. These ideas were firmly in place when Canham was a student and track coach at UM, which would have greatly influenced his opinion of women's sports. The women's program emphasized sports for all, not just the extremely talented or those participating in noncontact sports. Bell believed that "a girl should be a girl" and that the "social position of women does not stand this exploitation and competition" of contact sports, which is why intense contact sports were not offered.²⁹ The women's physical education department promoted old

²⁷ Mariah Burton Nelson. 1998. "Introduction: Who We Might Become." In *Nike Is a Goddess: History of Women in Sports*, edited by Lissa Smith. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, xii.

²⁸ *Ibid*, xiv.

²⁹ Sheryl Szady. "The History of Intercollegiate Athletics," 34.

Victorian ideas of the fragility of women. Telegraphic and extramural competitions were held for women during the Bell Era. Telegraphic competitions did not involve travel or direct competition with an opposing team; scores would be compared at a later time through mail. Extramural competitions occurred between two teams at a single location; these events were less frequent and were not enthusiastically supported by the department.³⁰ A UM committee was formulated in 1926 to determine if Bell's vision was correct for women's athletics – they concluded that they concurred with Bell.³¹ Canham would have grown up with these sexist ideas about women in sports. When he came to UM as a student, track coach, and then Athletic Director, his views about women in sports would have been confirmed by the rules and opinions of the women's physical education department. Even when reflecting back on his time at UM, he admits that it was "25 years later and [he] had not changed [his] mind" about the negative side effects of Title IX and the improvement of women's sports since his time retirement as athletic director.³² Unlike the women involved with sports, Canham refused to alter his view about women athletics.

Canham publicly and freely shared his negative opinion about Title IX; he disliked Title IX because he claimed that funding for women would remove money from men's sports, specifically revenue sports, and thought that the women's program was already adequate before Title IX. Although Title IX was needed at academic institutions due to a clear lack of equality between the sexes, especially in sports, many employees within athletic departments did not agree and often sought to dispute the need for Title

³⁰ Ibid, 47.

³¹ Ibid, 54.

³² Don Canham. *From the Inside: A Half Century of Michigan Athletics*, (Olympia Sports Press, 1996), 248.

IX. At UM, Don Canham, placed importance on football while neglecting women's athletics and challenging Title IX, which caused women's sports to progress at a slow pace. Canham's power within UM allowed him to have decisive influence over women's athletics, which directly corresponded to the slow pace of progress of women's intercollegiate athletics. Canham was the main opposition to Title IX on campus and was solely responsible for the slow advancement of women's athletics.

Chapter 1: Canham's Power

To explain the impact Canham had on the implementation of Title IX at UM, it is first necessary to understand how much power he had within the university. His control over all areas of athletics and influence of staff opinions or actions allowed him to dictate when and how women's athletics would improve. Women's athletics would progress as slowly as possible – Canham would meet the bare minimum requirements for Title IX. Canham's influence extended not only within UM, but throughout the city of Ann Arbor and even the nation due to his football success and innovative marketing techniques. With this amount of recognition, it was difficult to challenge his authority.

Football Success

Canham replaced Fritz Crisler as the Athletic Director in July 1968, but many in the UM community did not recognize Canham's credibility as the replacement for the previous beloved director.¹ Crisler was reluctant to leave at age 70 and did not even discuss the job with Canham during the transition between the two Athletic Directors.² In order to become accepted and adored, Canham needed to prove his ability to improve football, as football was the life-blood of the Athletic Department. Throughout the history of football, the sport has been able to survive and grow despite numerous recurring scandals that clashed with values of higher education including: the culture of violence, illicit recruiting and subsidies, academic shortcuts, and big-time profits.³ Football became a sport that was concerned with gate receipts, TV revenue, and glory. The success of football was important for alumni because it provided a link to the university that was

¹ Canham. *Don Canham's From the Inside*, 59.

² *Ibid*, 46.

³ John Sayle Watterson. 2000. *College Football: History, Spectacle, Controversy*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 379.

more exciting than any other aspect of the institution; the excitement of football was transferred into college pride, which encouraged donations.⁴ The 1960s was a time of unprecedented prosperity for football and universities waged an athletic arms race to see which university could build the most lavish facilities and attract the highest quality players.⁵ With this national emphasis on football, Canham needed to bolster the UM football team so faculty and supporters of UM could respect him as the new Athletic Director.

Despite the fact that football was the “S.U.V. of the college campus: aggressively big, resource guzzling, lots and lots of fun, potentially destructive of everything around it,” UM deemed the success of football as the ultimate goal for the Athletic Department and Canham.⁶ In Canham’s first meeting as Athletic Director he brought forward a motion to put new scoreboards in the Michigan Stadium at a cost of \$75,000 and six months after his appointment, Canham hired Bo Schembechler, which was the most important and rewarding appointment he was to make in his 20 years as Athletic Director.⁷ Canham was under immense pressure to improve the football team, which required him to dedicate the majority of the athletic budget to football. These improvements included becoming the second school in the nation to install artificial turf, renovating Michigan Stadium at a cost of \$8 million, and becoming one of the first colleges to get proposals from networks for football games to appear on television.⁸

⁴ Ibid, xii.

⁵ Michael Sokolove. 2007. “Football Is a Sucker’s Game.” In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Nancy Hogshead-Makar and Andrew Zimbalist. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 287.

⁶ Ibid, 287.

⁷ Canham. *Don Canham’s From the Inside*, 81 and 85 and 89.

⁸ Ibid, 87 and 112.

Canham reinvented how college football was promoted, watched, and experienced – he was able to create a football empire at UM.

Although \$8 million was spent on the stadium renovation, Canham seemed upset about the fact that “a million or more of that [was spent] on rest rooms for women since they were now coming to the games with the kids.”⁹ Canham probably viewed this as an unnecessary expense that could have been used elsewhere to improve another aspect of football that benefited the male players or male spectators. The creation of women’s bathrooms also illustrates the exclusivity of college football; women were not expected to attend or enjoy football games, but women were to become a large percentage of the individuals that filled the Big House. In order for Canham to fill the Big House to capacity of 110,000 fans every home game, he needed to use his business expertise to market the football team. Canham became the first to send out direct mail promotion and advertising and introduced the idea of tailgating to UM. To have success, Canham implemented “an important strategy...the way [they] slanted everything to appeal to the woman of the house...[since] she controls the weekend.”¹⁰ Canham’s sexist views caused him to believe women were in control of the family and weekend activities while the men were in control of fiscal support for the family. Even with this sexist assumption about the appropriate spheres of life for men and women, Canham’s desire to promote and create revenue from football trumped his sexism. While he was upset with the installation of women’s bathrooms, the bathrooms and women spectators were necessary for his plan to fill the Big House.

Canham was immensely successful with his marketing of the football team and

⁹ Ibid, 112.

¹⁰ Ibid, 109.

many appreciated his hiring of Schembechler, now seen as one of the greatest coaches in college football. According to Canham, his innovative promotion techniques such as souvenir sales and licensing of logos and products led many other colleges to follow his example.¹¹ Due to Canham's marketing and hiring strategies, UM was rated in the top ten in the nation for ten years and had eight Big Ten championships in football, which no other team duplicated during UM's "golden era."¹² The UM Athletics income continued to dramatically increase from \$2,109,082 in 1968 to \$9,478,802 in 1981 due to Canham's marketing success.¹³ Canham's accomplishments in football proved to the entire UM community that Canham was the correct choice to succeed Crisler – Canham was a smart and savvy businessman who quickly improved football. Canham remembered when the Michigan Marching Band even spelled his name out at two football games before he decided that twice was enough.¹⁴ Yet how did Canham rise to such prominence throughout the country?

National Figure

Canham first gained national and international attention for his success as a track and field coach. He wrote a few books that were published in 1950, *Track Techniques Illustrated*, *Field Techniques Illustrated*, and *Cross Country Techniques Illustrated*. According to Canham, the books became best-selling track and field books in the world for 15 years, which led Canham throughout the nation and world to give speeches about the sport and he even helped European, Caribbean, and African Olympic teams.¹⁵ This

¹¹ Ibid, 104.

¹² Ibid, 128.

¹³ "Go Blue: Competition, Controversy, and Community in Michigan Athletics." 2017. Michigan in the World. <http://michiganintheworld.history.lsa.umich.edu/michiganathletics/>.

¹⁴ Canham. *Don Canham's From the Inside*, 54.

¹⁵ Ibid, 67.

national and international success prepared Canham for his later success as an Athletic Director.

Canham gave speeches and provided seminars for other college athletic departments about athletic marketing and promotion and changes in the world of intercollegiate athletics. In these speeches he emphasized the revenue producing sports of men's football, basketball, and sometimes ice hockey. Canham insisted that the "prime concern at major institutions [was] the attraction of fans to the stadium" so institutions could receive some financial benefit.¹⁶ In order to prioritize these revenue sports, the major amount of money and advertising within the Athletic Department needed to be directed towards these important sports.

Canham was also concerned with the changes in the world of intercollegiate athletics. There were eight major changes he saw happening: changing financial problems, grant-in-aid escalation, rise of professional sports, increased need for campus recreation, women's athletic programs, maintenance changes, student involvement, and development of the NCAA.¹⁷ While he considered all eight as challenges, he viewed financial problems, women's athletic programs, and student involvement as some of the most pressing areas of change. Canham valued a balanced budget within the Athletic Department and was worried about the rise of club sports due to the "very serious problems not only in financing, but also in safety, travel, insurance and of course, most importantly land area and the use of facilities."¹⁸ He even complained that once the

¹⁶ Donald Canham. "Athletic Marketing and Promotion Speech." Folder: Speeches, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

¹⁷ Donald Canham. "Changes in the World of Intercollegiate Athletics Speech." Folder: Speeches, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

¹⁸ Ibid.

“Field House was reserved strictly for varsity baseball, football, and track, but is now used more hours per day for intramural than it is for varsity athletics...[at UM] we now have women playing field hockey in the vast University of Michigan Stadium.”¹⁹ At this time, women’s sports were at the club level and no varsity programs were offered for women, so Canham’s complaint about the financial burden and the time wasted on club sports in UM facilities was directed towards the women’s program. He believed that the money and facility time should be primarily utilized for men’s varsity athletics, specifically the revenue producing sports of football, basketball, and ice hockey. Canham understood that “in the very near future there will be women’s intercollegiate athletics sponsored and administered by the Athletic Departments,” but he had no desire to help improve women’s sports before women’s sports gained varsity status.²⁰ This suggests that Canham would never have improved women’s sports without Title IX, as he viewed women’s sports as a drain on the Athletic Department’s budget and resources. He was also concerned with the changing attitudes of the student body, “I am not referring to the lack of interest on the part of students. I am referring to just the opposite...across the country students have begun to ask questions as to what use is being made of their student fees.”²¹ Canham had determined what was best for the athletic programs without much push back from any of the UM community and did not want to be told what to do within his department.

Canham was so popular due to his football success that many newspapers in Michigan wrote about him in praise-worthy terms. The *Ann Arbor News* even ran an

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

article about his daily activities, so that readers could really understand a day in the life of Canham; the daily activities detailed the time he woke up, went for a run, ate breakfast, had meetings for UM, and even picked up a birthday gift for his daughter.²² Canham had reached celebrity status – people wanted to know what his life was like and wanted to know that some of his daily routines resembled their own. The *Chicago Tribune* praised Canham’s “unparalleled multimillion-dollar college sports operation” and his status as the “country’s finest college Athletic Director; as the imaginative, inventive, iconoclastic individual who heads the most successful college Athletic Department in all the land.”²³ The newspaper article went on to say that, “marketing [was] his favorite word, and when it [was] tossed out to him, Don Canham leaned back in his chair and smiled as if he’s been presented a gift long coveted.”²⁴ The *Great Lakes Sports Newspaper* also reiterated such admiration of Canham. The author described Canham as “an innovator, a man who gets things done, an administrator with the golden touch” who had steered UM “through the waters of recession, inflation, and declining student enrollment” when most other college athletic programs sank “deep into the sea of red ink.”²⁵ When asked by the interviewer about his reputation of being one of the best Athletic Directors in the nation, Canham said, “false modesty is a pain in the ass.”²⁶

²² Bob Schairer. June 29, 1980. “Don Canham: Variety His Life’s Spice.” Ann Arbor. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

²³ Skip Myslenski. November 8, 1981. “Marketing the Wolverines.” *Tribune*. Folder: Interviews, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Dale Conquest. 1982. “Don Canham: U-M’s A.D. on Drugs, the USFL, and why he’s so good at what he does.” Folder: Interviews, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

Not only did other people throughout the country laud Canham for his success at UM, Canham and his colleagues at UM knew of his fame, which would make it daunting to challenge Canham's opinions or actions within the Athletic Department. When a group of women from the basketball team complained that Canham did not promote or market their team to Hartwig, Hartwig merely said, "win some games and then I will talk to Don."²⁷ Canham believed that Hartwig acted correctly in this situation and that she truly believed that the women needed to do better in order to obtain acknowledgement; however, Hartwig most likely did not approach Canham until the team was winning more games because she knew that Canham would easily dismiss her and the women's complaint due to their poor skills. Hartwig understood that Canham possessed the power to advertise the women's basketball team and knew it was unlikely that Canham would support the women's team.

Canham was popular throughout the nation and within the state of Michigan. He was admitted to the Michigan Hall of Fame and even claims to have received "a ton" of offers to be Athletic Director at other schools, but only about "7 or 8 GOOD offers, really good offers, and [he'd] never leave (Michigan)."²⁸ Other schools desired to have the best Athletic Director in the country and were willing to pay a lot of money for Canham, but Canham had a long history at UM and total control of the Athletic Department. He was pleased with his reputation and proud that in his opinion, "every educational institution in the nation followed Michigan's lead."²⁹

Complete Control at UM

²⁷ Canham. *Don Canham's From the Inside*, 61-62.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid, xiv.

Canham believed that the “key to Michigan’s success [was] attention to details,” reflecting his “nature to be involved in everything.”³⁰ The *Detroit News Magazine* echoed this sentiment saying, “with a passion for details, Canham kept his eye on everything” in their magazine issue with Canham on the front cover.³¹ It was well known that Canham liked to know about every detail involving the Athletic Department. He even wrote a letter to a staff member about the disgraceful state of the landscaping on the golf course; he wanted a crew to immediately edge the flower beds, pull the weeds in the driveway, edge the driveway, and get some water on the grass.³² Canham was not content with anyone else writing this letter, even though a lower-level staff member could have taken care of the issue. He wanted to be in charge of everything, even the seemingly miniscule issues of landscaping – not only did he say the landscaping needed to be improved, but he even specified exactly what should be done.

Attention to all details were important to Canham – if he was not informed of an event he would become upset and demand to be up-to-date on all issues in the future. Marie Hartwig, when she was the first Director of Women’s Athletics, communicated to President Fleming about keeping the Advisory committee for Women active after the original three-year period. Canham did not know about this decision and wrote a letter to Hartwig stating, “this is completely new to me...I am at a loss to understand where this came from, and would appreciate your explaining it to me...my real concern is that I was

³⁰ Ibid, xiii.

³¹ *The Detroit News Magazine*. July 20, 1969. “U-M’s Man with a Mission.” Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³² Donald Canham. July 8, 1974. “Memorandum about Landscaping.” Folder: Correspondences (Departmental), 1971-1988, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

not aware” of the decision.³³ He was not so much upset with the prospect of the Committee continuing past the initial deadline, as he was distraught with Harwig going around him directly to the President. He even alludes to the fact that bickering between the women’s and men’s programs would continue if such occurrences continued. Canham also had similar problems with Phyllis Ocker, the third Director of Women’s Athletics. Ocker and women athletes discussed with President Shapiro the desire to have a dual membership with the AIAW and the NCAA for women. Canham was disappointed with Ocker, especially as she was supposed to reprimand a coach who had written a letter directly to Shapiro. Canham states, “Since when do you go directly over my head to the President of this university with anything? I cannot believe this...my associate athletic director is doing the same thing only worse!” He goes on to say that he cannot remember a time when Ocker “defended this department...and [he was] getting more than a little tired of it.”³⁴ Despite all this anger at Ocker about going around him and the Athletic Department, Ocker responded to his letter with the fact that she did not seek an audience with President Shapiro, but rather Shapiro’s office set up the appointment. Canham was worried about losing power and control over his Athletic Department; he did not want the President interfering with athletics and attempted to have every decision pass directly through him.

The relationship between the Athletic Director and President at UM was often tense, as they both had interest and a right to influence athletics at UM. Canham vied to

³³ Donald Canham. November 13, 1975. “Completely New to Me.” Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³⁴ Donald Canham. March 23, 1981. “Over My Head to Phyllis Ocker.” Folder: Women’s ‘M’ Club, 1980-1981, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

keep total power over the Athletic Department; there was even a rumor that Canham put a lock and chain on the doors of the athletic offices so that the President and other academic staff would not be allowed into meetings.³⁵ University presidents throughout the country have lost their jobs if they treated football in a way that boards found unacceptable, which is why presidents at UM were wary of interfering with Canham or the Athletic Department.³⁶ For example, President Fleming commissioned the Burns Report, which was the first administrative commitment to developing women's intercollegiate athletics, but then turned the implementation of their findings and Title IX over to Canham; President Fleming delegated responsibility to Canham to avoid being criticized by the Board or alumni.

Although university presidents may know more about athletic activities and its impact on campus than athletic departments, presidents are not always able to act decisively because they are at the mercy of athletic boards or alumni whose loyalty is kept through football.³⁷ Donations are important for universities, and pride in a university often comes through a successful football team. If college presidents wanted to keep alumni loyalty and support, presidents would need to relinquish control over the Athletic Department and allow the professionalization of football to take place. Football donations even took precedent over academic donations for female students. When the Center for the Education of Women (CEW) desired to continue its yearly donations from the Towsley family in 1990, CEW was told by the University Development Office to wait to

³⁵ Rich Thomaselli. September 2, 1999. "With Canham, 'M' Also Stood for Marketing." Ann Arbor News. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³⁶ Watterson, *College Football*, 389.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 389.

approach the Towsleys until Schembechler had secured a gift for the football program.³⁸ President Duderstadt even acknowledged this unfair transaction and encouraged CEW to work with the University Development Office while waiting to gain donations. Although the President should value academics more than football, he understood the importance of football to alumni. The Presidents at UM had less notoriety overall than Canham or Schembechler, but still showed up at athletic activities without complaint and treaded cautiously around intercollegiate athletics.

After the Burns Committee determined the first six varsity sports in November 1973, other women's teams wished to be added to the varsity line up. The first sport to petition for varsity status was skiing on October 14, 1973; the second was gymnastics on January 1, 1975; the third was track and field on March 20, 1975; the fourth was fencing on November 25, 1975; the fifth was golf on June 1, 1976.³⁹ Many women were excited about the new opportunity for a higher level of competition and coveted varsity status; however, while there was demand for more varsity sports, Canham was able to set limitations on the number of sports promoted to varsity. The women in control of the ACWIA had accepted petitions for gymnastics and track and field in April 1975, but all programmatic changes within the Athletic Department fell under the jurisdiction of the Board in Control of Athletics, which was greatly influenced by Canham. Hartwig expected that there would be "some fireworks" when she informed Canham of this

³⁸ Jeanne Miller. 2014. *A Matter of Fairness: A History of the Center for the Education of Women at the University of Michigan*. The University of Michigan: Bentley Historical Library, 51.

³⁹ "Petitions for Skiing, Gymnastics, Track and Field, Fencing, Golf." 1975-1976. Folder: Advisory Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, Petitions, 1973-1976, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

approval and she was correct. Canham did not respond kindly; “if we are going to have a viable program for women we cannot grab sports out of the air and make a varsity team until we find some interest on the part of the students.”⁴⁰ Canham acted as if these sports were randomly chosen without accounting for student interest, but the women’s club teams for both gymnastics and track and field were interested in becoming varsity sports, as they spent time creating and submitting their petitions.

President Fleming even acknowledged that there would be heated debate over the discrepancy over the addition of one or two sports. He said that the women’s advisory group thinks “probably with good reason, that the alumni members are not at all sympathetic to them and that Don gets them organized before the meetings.”⁴¹ President Fleming clearly knew that Canham controlled the decision of the Board and the outcome of the decision; he did not have much hope for the advancement of the women’s opinion. When the petitions were officially brought to the Board, Canham only recommended approving one of the two sports, which the Board agreed to by only authorizing gymnastics for varsity status in 1975.⁴² Even though President Fleming was not entirely informed about the dilemma, Fleming understood Canham’s power and his influence within the sports world. Canham probably did not relate the situation to Fleming because he did not want interference by the President. Canham even remembered that the presidents never “overruled the Board in Control” and the four presidents he worked for never “attempted to interfere with the conduct of athletics under the Board in Control.”⁴³ Fleming did not want to disrupt the success of the beloved Athletic Department, as it

⁴⁰ Szady, “The History of Intercollegiate Athletics,” 148.

⁴¹ Szady. “The History of Intercollegiate Athletics,” 149.

⁴² Ibid, 150.

⁴³ Canham. *Don Canham’s From the Inside*, 160 and xiii.

could risk his own popularity and even his job. Canham believed “the presidents...felt comfortable giving the athletic department...authority to do what it thought was right;” however, it seems that there was a slight fear by presidents and other academic staff to directly oppose Canham and his iron rule over the Athletic Department.⁴⁴

The Board then reluctantly added three new sports for women in November 1976 (track and field, golf, and softball), but put a freeze on the addition of any further women’s varsity sports for two years for financial reasons.⁴⁵ The Board decided to put the freeze in place supposedly to provide the best funding to the already established men and women’s programs. While there was progress in the addition of women’s varsity sports, there were also strict limitations with Canham only allowing the minimum for the women’s program.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 154.

⁴⁵ Ibid, 152.

Chapter 2: Canham's Battle Against Title IX

Canham's fight against Title IX expanded into the political arena at both the national and university level. He not only wanted to limit women's sports at UM, but also change the laws requiring equality. Canham supported efforts of major lobbying groups that advocated the exemption of revenue-producing sports from the implementation of Title IX.¹ At the time, there were extended debates about legislative adjustments due to lengthy compliance periods, which created a favorable environment for a disrespect of mandates. Many in the college sports world called for changes to Title IX before the final compliance deadline of Title IX in 1978. Canham expressed his opposition to equalizing women's sports through his political activism at the national level, interviews with state media, and the denial of identical awards for men and women within the UM Athletic Department.

Political Activism

Canham was a public and national figure in the fight against Title IX; he was involved in many political attempts to alter the regulations. On June 30, 1975, a month before President Ford would sign the final regulations for Title IX on July 21, 1975, Thomas Hanson from the NCAA wrote to Canham about a Michigan Representative, Robert Carr. Hanson explained that Carr, a Democrat, was outspoken in his support of Title IX and wanted to know if Canham would be able to direct an individual to change Carr's opinion.² Canham was contacted because of his well-known opposition to Title IX and connections with other individuals who shared the same beliefs. Hanson's outreach

¹ Diles, "The History of Title IX at the University of Michigan," 104.

² Thomas Hanson. June 30, 1975. "Title IX Politics." Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

to Canham also demonstrates the NCAA's determination to halt Title IX. This connection between UM and the NCAA would continue in their joint attempt to save revenue-producing sports from diverting funds to women's sports.

Members representing the NCAA and UM contacted President Ford directly to plead with him for an alteration to Title IX. These letters and visits to the President of the U.S. occurred before Ford was due to sign Title IX on July 21, 1975. The President of the NCAA, John Fuzak sent a letter to President Ford on May 9, 1975 with a copy being sent to "selected athletic directors," which included Canham; this suggests that Canham was a powerful voice within the intercollegiate sport community against Title IX. Fuzak claimed to write on the behalf of all college members of the NCAA. The main issues colleges had with Title IX involved the intrusion of the government into the affairs of college athletic departments and the idea that the regulations were arbitrary and ambiguous.³ The NCAA and college athletic departments throughout the nation did not want interference from outside forces – similar to how Canham prevented the intervention of UM presidents. They also used the excuse of ambiguity in an attempt for the regulations to be adjusted in their favor that excluded revenue-producing sports. The biggest concern and "potentially destructive example of the deficiencies of the athletic provisions of the draft[ed] regulations is their failure to incorporate provisions recognizing the role played by sports generated revenues."⁴ Fuzak and members of the NCAA were primarily concerned with their prized revenue-producing sports of football and to some extent basketball; they thought Title IX did not take into consideration the

³ John Fuzak. May 9, 1975. "NCAA Complaint of Title IX to President Ford." Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

⁴ Ibid.

realities of finances in athletic departments. To the men in charge of intercollegiate athletics, it seemed impossible to provide similar amounts of money to women's sports – if this occurred, college sports would supposedly be threatened with extinction.

Canham responded to Fuzak's letter by writing to a joint group within UM on May 20, 1975. He shared the fears Fuzak outlined to President Ford and even traveled to Washington D.C. himself to inquire about the Title IX situation. Canham talked to three White House lawyers for many hours, during which he lost his optimism about alterations to Title IX, and came to the conclusion that the law was not based on logic, but on political expediency.⁵ The end of intercollegiate athletics appeared imminent to these men who believed in the “back of [their] minds...that the proposed Title IX guidelines were so ridiculous that someone, somewhere along the line would straighten them out so that intercollegiate athletics [could] survive.”⁶ Canham understood at this point that Title IX would be required at all federally funded colleges and found that nothing could be done to reach the White House. He had hoped that the law would be modified through Congressional hearings or lobbying by intercollegiate organizations, but these efforts had failed.

On July 7, 1975, Schembechler, Barry Switzer (University of Oklahoma Head Football Coach), Darrell Royal (University of Texas Head Football Coach), and Ritchie Thomas (the Assistant Executive Director of the NCAA) met with President Ford to discuss the impact of Title IX on college athletic programs. Schembechler believed the meeting to be successful even though there was disagreement about what the regulations

⁵ Donald Canham. May 20, 1975. “Title IX to Joint Group.” Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

⁶ Ibid.

required because he thought President Ford would assist in changes to HEW's regulations.⁷ Their meeting and subsequent letters to President Ford demonstrated the unique access these men had to the President of the U.S. and the importance of intercollegiate sports in the country. The coaches, especially Schembechler, clearly believed that they would be able to influence President Ford because he had been an important member of the UM football team in the 1930s. The NCAA also attempted to influence Ford's decision by reminding him that he was a member of elite football men; they honored him with their Theodore Roosevelt Award in 1975, just months before he would sign the Title IX regulations.⁸

Ritchie Thomas also believed that their meeting had led President Ford to direct HEW to issue interpretive guidelines regarding the application of Title IX in order to create clarity of requirements and caused him to write to the chairmen of Congressional committees.⁹ In these letters, President Ford confirmed that Title IX should be applied to intercollegiate athletics, but was concerned with allegations that Title IX would destroy intercollegiate activities. Ford allowed and welcomed Congressional hearings on attempted changes to Title IX to exclude certain sports from the law.¹⁰ A Congressman from Michigan, Marvin Esch, wrote to President Ford on behalf of "athletic personnel" worried about the future survival of intercollegiate athletics and the desire for revenue-

⁷ Bo Schembechler. July 14, 1975. "Title IX Complaint to President Ford." Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

⁸ Kelly Belanger. 2016. *Invisible Seasons: Title IX and the Fight for Equity in College Sports*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 67.

⁹ Ritchie Thomas. July 25, 1975. "Meeting with President Ford." Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

¹⁰ Ibid.

producing sports to be excluded from the regulations.¹¹ The “athletic personnel” this Michigan Congressman likely referred to included Schembechler and Canham who would use all possibilities within the political realm to further their agenda.

Intercollegiate sports leaders and their allied politicians employed dire language to instill fear in other officials and attempt to create change to laws that would harm revenue-producing sports. To some extent this threat worked, it allowed hearings to be held about excluding revenue sports, but these pleas ultimately did not succeed.

Although President Ford signed the Title IX regulations in 1975, Canham’s fight against Title IX did not stop. He continued to condemn the law in interviews and still did not meet Title IX requirements. In December 1978, Richard Kennedy, the Vice President for State Relations, contacted Canham about the discrepancies in funding and facilities for men and women, which Canham denied; he said, “the guidelines we are operating under are still not clear, but we feel we are in compliance.”¹² In this statement, Canham still insisted that Title IX was vague and essentially a law that was not worth following since it could not be discerned what the law even required.

Press Appearances

In no other area, perhaps, has Canham’s influence been more profound than in his ability to publicize himself and UM throughout the state.¹³ His promotion of UM athletics focused on men’s revenue-producing support and his disapproval of Title IX. In

¹¹ Marvin Esch. July 16, 1975. “HEW Regulations to President Ford.” Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

¹² Donald Canham. December 11, 1978. “Title IX Compliance to Richard Kennedy.” Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

¹³ Diles, “The History of Title IX at the University of Michigan,” 194.

interviews throughout his career as Athletic Director and even after his retirement, he continued to fight against Title IX by discrediting the law. He was never afraid that his opinions would cause his dismissal – Canham stated, “I did everything I thought was in the best interests of Michigan and I did it honest and right. Maybe I made some mistakes, I don’t know...I never worried about them firing me because I always had this business to fall back on. I could make decisions based on what I thought was best for Michigan, what I thought was right, and not for political reasons.”¹⁴ With this mindset, Canham constantly criticized Title IX and belittled women and their athletic abilities. He did not have to consider what was politically or legally correct because he had always had a financially successful backup career and his carefully cultivated popularity within UM.

The *Detroit Free Press* published Curt Sylvester’s interview with Canham on July 6, 1975. The title of the article reveals Canham’s sentiments about Title IX, “Equal Opportunity: ‘We’ll End up in Court.’”¹⁵ Canham did not believe the regulations of Title IX were possible to implement, especially the section involving proportionate expenditures for women and men. When asked what Title IX was, Canham responded that his problem was not with the part of Title IX that equalized employment on campus, but his main issue was with HEW’s guidelines for intercollegiate activities.¹⁶ Canham was upset with what he thought was a targeting of athletics; he complained that nursing schools and engineering schools were not investigated for their discrepancies in gender

¹⁴ John Beckett. March 18, 1991. “Canham Speaks out on College Athletics.” College Athletics Newspaper of the Ann Arbor News. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

¹⁵ Sylvester Curt. July 6, 1975. Equal Opportunity: “‘We’ll end up in Court’.” Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

¹⁶ Ibid.

ratios. He then specifically named a woman in HEW who he believed had caused all the problems for sports, Gwen Gregory, the “woman lawyer” who had no background in intercollegiate athletics.¹⁷ Gregory received the blame from Canham because she was a woman, which supposedly meant that she did not understand anything about sports. He was also upset with President Ford who was “supposed to be knowledgeable about intercollegiate athletics...he must not have read it...I can’t imagine the president signing a bill like this.”¹⁸ Schembechler and Canham had hoped that President Ford would favor their side of the debate because of his football background. Canham also seemed perplexed that a man would sign a law that benefits women; in Canham’s mind, Title IX was specifically a feminist law that promoted women while harming men’s athletics. When asked about the women’s program at UM, Canham defended the current situation without any scholarships for women and only six varsity teams. He even commented, “in fact, we’ve got a women’s athletic director who is a doll.”¹⁹ His description of Harwig encapsulates how his sexist views that influenced his decisions within the Athletic Department. She was a “doll” he got along with because according to this description, she did not interfere in his business and remained silent. Canham thus reduced Hartwig to a feminine object he could control. He specifically used the term “doll,” as it is a toy for girls and not boys; he did not imagine that Hartwig would be able to understand the male sports world because she was a woman. The idea of control was again revealed in another reason he despised Title IX, “now what’s happening is we have somebody from outside coming in over our heads, trying to tell us what to do.”²⁰ Canham did not want anyone to

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

obstruct his direct control over his Athletic Department. He vowed to continue fighting Title IX because he was “not going to sit back and watch them kill athletics.”²¹

Dale Conquest of the *Great Lakes Sports* met Canham on his yacht at the Grosse Pointe Yacht Club to conduct an interview on September of 1982. In this interview, Canham talked about how finances impacted the Athletic Department. He believed that football, sometimes basketball, and even more uncertain, ice hockey were the only sports from men or women that could make money.²² He insisted once again that these were the most important sports because of the revenue aspect of these male activities. When asked if the economic crunch had slowed the progress of equality for women in college sports, Canham again defended the current women’s program. Canham believed that the “women had not suffered,” but he did believe that the “women had gotten things at the expense of the men’s programs...the men’s programs are the ones that had suffered.”²³ This idea was, of course, untrue – female athletic participation did expand dramatically because opportunities increased, but male participation rates stayed roughly the same or had a miniscule decline.²⁴ Also, economics have not been the basis upon which colleges have determined which sports to offer, as football would have been the first sport to be removed because of the huge expenses and an average loss of money from the program.²⁵

²¹ Ibid.

²² Dale Conquest. 1982. “Don Canham: U-M’s A.D. on Drugs, the USFL, and why he’s so good at what he does.” Folder: Interviews, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Donald E Shelton. 2000. “Equally Bad Is Not Good: Allowing Title IX Compliance by the Elimination of Men’s Collegiate Sports.” *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 34 (1–2): 256.

²⁵ Ibid, 261.

Canham stood by this false interpretation to protect his revenue-producing sports and blame women for the problems within the Athletic Department.

The majority of newspapers in Michigan and throughout the nation failed to challenge Canham's views on Title IX; some newspapers did not mention Title IX or others asked a few questions without any push back. The press did not want to portray Canham in a negative light and were reluctant to criticize the UM idol. However, Nicki McWhirter of the *Detroit Free Press* condemned Canham's negative views on women's sports. McWhirter alleged that athletic directors who fought against Title IX, such as Canham, were "still miffed, nine years after the fact" that they lost the battle and they continued to "resent every dime taken from the boys and given to the girls."²⁶ McWhirter focused primarily on Canham, as he publically condemned Title IX and refused to quickly improve women's sports. When Canham said that women would not suffer from a reduction in Title IX enforcement, McWhirter envisioned "the leopard telling the gazelle not to worry."²⁷ McWhirter clearly understood the power Canham had over the Athletic Department and his sexist attitudes that regarded women as less athletically inclined than men, which in his mind equated with less funding and opportunities for women athletes. Jean King (a women's rights lawyer who graduated from UM) praised McWhirter's article because she was one of the only journalists to criticize Canham; King believed she "picked exactly the right villain" and applauded her for highlighting Canham's sexism, as "most people did not realize Don Canham had been the national leader in opposition to Title IX."²⁸ King forwarded the article to all the women she knew

²⁶ Jean King. 2017. "Column on Title IX - Villain." Folder: Title IX, Box 10, Jean King Papers 1964-2004. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan. Accessed September 12.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

and encouraged them to write letters to UM President Shapiro about Canham's unacceptable use of his power and treatment of women athletes. King suspected that "the University had been subsidizing this jock attack by not reining in Canham."²⁹ King and McWhirter understood Canham had immense power within UM and wanted people to know that his power allowed him to make false claims that women's sports at UM were in great condition; in reality Canham's sexist beliefs had an enduring negative impact on the development of the women's athletic program.

'M' Award Controversy

The 'M' award had traditionally been reserved for male athletes since the beginning of the organization of UM sports in the 1860s. However, the Women's Athletic Association (WAA), which was founded in 1905, also wanted an award to recognize its outstanding female athletes. From 1905 until 1914 silver pins were awarded to female athletes, but by 1914, the WAA desired the same recognition for men and women. The WAA appealed the Athletic Association to be able to use the same 'M' award; when this appeal was discovered by students, there was an uproar in *The Michigan Daily* and ultimately the Athletic Association ruled that the WAA could not use any form of the 'M.' Due to this denial, the WAA explored other ways to honor their female athletes – blue silk ribbons with gold print were awarded after 1914 and pins were awarded for seniority. In 1917, the WAA created a new 'M' emblem that was thin, blue, and circled with a yellow band; this award served the exact same purpose the men's 'M' award as the highest athletic award at UM, but for women. While the men had varsity jackets, the WAA had sweaters that were white with roll collars and a blue M patch on a

²⁹ Ibid.

yellow background. The design shifted slightly in 1929 with navy blue wool jackets replacing the white sweaters and in 1936 the women's 'M' award was eliminated, being replaced with a blue and yellow scarf awarded for participation rather than athletic ability. By the 1940s, athletic awards for women completely disappeared, but was reinstated in 1975 when the debate over equal 'M' awards continued.³⁰

There were many men who were against providing the same 'M' award to women because of the association of the award with male prestige. The head football coach, Bo Schembechler, and the head basketball coach, John Orr, explained their views on the subject to Canham. Schembechler believed that the 'M' award stood for excellence of performance in men's athletics for many years and was a motivator for male athletes to perform to the best of their abilities. If women were to be awarded the same honor, it would "minimize the value of the 'M' in the eyes of not only our players but the public who place such a high value on it."³¹ Women were not seen to deserve or uphold the high athletic standards that the 'M' award represented; the 'M' award was associated with masculinity and any connection with women would devalue the coveted award. Orr also had similar sentiments as Schembechler – he did not approve of identical awards. Orr believed that "the levels of performance that the men had to exhibit were far above those of the women."³² Women were viewed as athletically inferior to men, as they did not have the same rigorous level of competition or similar popularity to the men's sports.

³⁰ "Go Blue: Competition, Controversy, and Community in Michigan Athletics." 2017. Michigan in the World. <http://michiganintheworld.history.lsa.umich.edu/michiganathletics/>.

³¹ Bo Schembechler. May 1, 1975. "'M' Award for Women." Folder: Awards (Varsity "M"), 1970-1984, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³² John Orr. May 1, 1975. "'M' Award for Women." Folder: Awards (Varsity "M"), 1970-1984, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Both Schembechler and Orr also stated that they would change the awards offered to their players if women were given the same award. Their strong opposition to identical 'M' awards to men and women demonstrate their sexist views; they believed male athletes would feel emasculated if they were competing for the same award as female athletes. They were so opposed to the same 'M' award that they were willing to create a new award for male athletes if women were given the same opportunity to achieve the 'M' award.

The male athletes, who had previously earned 'M' awards, became part of the 'M' Club. The 'M' men were informed of the pending decision to award female athletes the same 'M' award by the president of the 'M' men, William Mazer. Mazer believed that identical 'M' awards would "make the award worthless in [his] opinion."³³ Giving the 'M' award to women threatened "to dilute it by giving it to synchronized swimming for women or softball for women [and] would be a tragedy."³⁴ Women participated in inferior sports and did not compete at the same excellent level of the men, which would lower the standards of the 'M' award. Mazer believed that all the 'M' men had similar opinions and asked them to write letters to the Board about their disapproval for the same 'M' awards for both women and men. John Dobson and William Giles both took the advice of Mazer to write to the Board to voice their complaints. Dobson believed that identical awards would dilute the importance of the 'M' award and cause male athletes to lose incentive to play to the best of their abilities.³⁵ Dobson also stated that the men had

³³ William Mazer. "Dear 'M' Men." Folder: "M" Club, 1945-1987, Box 2, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ John Dobson. May 8, 1975. "Con Same 'M' Award." Folder: "M" Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

competed for the great university for years, which in his eyes gave men the right to maintain the prestigious award even though women were not allowed the same opportunities before. Giles believed that providing the same award to women would be “plagiarizing it and diluting its traditional and historical meaning” because there were “reasonable differences between men’s rugged Varsity Football and women’s artistic and beautiful synchronized swimming.”³⁶ Giles’ sexism can be seen in his vocabulary describing men’s sports and women’s sports; he did not consider women’s sports to be physically difficult or challenging, but men deserved the ‘M’ award because they exhibited manly behaviors in contact sports. He also brings up the same fact as Dobson that men have been competing and representing the university for a longer period of time. Perhaps Dobson and Giles did not understand the history of women’s sports at UM and the discrimination women athletes faced through unequal funding or opportunities. These previous UM male athletes did not value the hard work women athletes put into competing or the physical challenges of noncontact sports. While there were many men opposed to the same ‘M’ award for women, there were many women and even some men in favor of equal awards.

Women wrote letters to Marie Hartwig, Sheryl Szady, and even Canham about their desire for men and women to have the same ‘M’ award. Ilze Koch and Donald Koch wrote to Hartwig that if women athletes were not given the same block ‘M’ award as the men, then they would stop donating money to all UM alumni, scholarship, and general fund drives and also would stop attending UM games. The Kochs went on to say, “male

³⁶ William Giles. May 12, 1975. “Con Same ‘M’ Award.” Folder: “M” Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

chauvinism and eight-year old boy mentalities have no place in a great university.”³⁷ They understood the sexism that was present within the Athletic Department and were willing to remove their support from UM to see change happen. Richard Han was also in agreement that women and men should have identical awards; he stated, “I see athletic excellence as exactly that; regardless of sex.”³⁸ Han understood that athletic ability should not be segregated by sex – women were not physically inferior to men, contrary to what the Athletic Department contended. Charlotte Kuzuma was offended when she saw the letter from Mazer to the ‘M’ men and the letters from Schembechler and Orr. In response, she sent letters to Canham, Schebechler, Orr, and the Board with her own feelings on the issue. Kuzuma responded with sarcasm to the “horrible” fact that women should receive identical awards as the men, “mercy on us!”³⁹ She gave an example of how football history would never be forgotten or rewritten while women’s sports history was not remembered. Kuzuma calls the ‘M’ award controversy an “outrageously ludicrous situation.”⁴⁰ As a UM alum, Kuzuma wanted all those involved to understand how inappropriate their sexist opinions and behaviors were. At the end of the letters, she wrote, “P.S. your letterheads are incomplete. The printer forgot the ‘CP’ that belongs after the ‘M.’”⁴¹ She creatively called attention to their sexism by calling members of the

³⁷ Ilze Kock, and Donald Koch. May 30, 1975. “Pro Same ‘M’ Award.” Folder: “M” Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³⁸ Richard Han. May 20, 1975. “Pro Same ‘M’ Award.” Folder: “M” Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³⁹ Charlotte Kuzuma. 1975. “Pro Same ‘M’ Award,” May 24, 1975. Folder: “M” Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

Athletic Department MCP's, or in other words, male chauvinist pigs. Kuzuma was brave enough to tell Canham, Schembechler, and Orr that she disagreed with their antiquated beliefs because she was an outsider to the Athletic Department; she was not influenced by Canham's power and did not have to fear his reaction.

The 'M' award controversy gained attention outside of the university, with other people showing their support for the women to have the same 'M' award as the men. Robert Miller, the superintendent of the Grand Ledge Public Schools in Grand Ledge Michigan, wrote a letter of complaint to Canham. He had also read the letters from Schembechler, Orr, and Mazer and was dismayed by their statements. He believed that men's nonrevenue sports such as cross country, tennis, golf, or gymnastics could be inserted in the same place as when the men referred to women's sports because these men in the Athletic Department only valued men's revenue producing sports; the 'M' award was seen as a blue 'M' with a gold dollar sign.⁴² Miller clearly understood the most valuable agenda within the Athletic Department, money from revenue sports. He goes on to say that there are three paths schools could have taken regarding the demand for women's sports; one, jump on the bandwagon and become a leader; two, bury our heads in the sand and hope the problem will go away; or three, fight it all the way "and make asses of ourselves."⁴³ Miller believed MSU was reluctantly following the first option while UM was steadfastly clinging to the third option – making asses out of the UM Athletic Department. MSU was improving women's sports and was more progressive than UM, even though UM was one of the most profitable and successful Athletic

⁴² Robert Miller. May 23, 1975. "Pro Same 'M' Award." Folder: "M" Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

⁴³ Ibid.

Departments in the nation. The sexist attitudes of Canham, Schemechler, and Orr prevented the development of women's intercollegiate athletics. UM lagged behind other universities and various people were starting to notice the inequalities present within the UM Athletic Department even if the majority of the nation's press ignored the disparity of the men's program and women's program.

The *Kalamazoo Gazette* featured an article about the 'M' award controversy titled "Shame on UM."⁴⁴ Mazer, Schembechler, and Orr were all mentioned as the major opposition to equality. The article pointed out that these men believe the 'M' award stands for excellence, but club members have gone on to varying degrees of success later in life; one 'M' club member became President of the United States, while another became an Ohio bank robber.⁴⁵ Therefore, with such diversity within the 'M' club, there could have be no harm to reward women with the 'M' award. The article went on to ask, "doesn't excellence of performance have everything to do with success with the endeavor and nothing to do with sex?"⁴⁶ The article's critique of the Athletic Department was similar to Richard Han's condemnation of the sexism and inequality at UM; awards should have been given to those who demonstrate remarkable athletic ability, not on the basis of biological sex.

The Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics voted on the 'M' award issue on June 10, 1975. While there was vehement opposition to the same 'M' awards by Canham, Schembechler, and previous male 'M' award winners, the Board voted 14-1 in favor of

⁴⁴ Kalamazoo Gazette. June 5, 1975. "Shame on U-M." Folder: "M" Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

awarding equal varsity jackets to men and women. However, when the women received their jackets, they were not the same jackets the men were awarded. The women's 'M' patch was smaller and a different shade of yellow than the men's. In addition, the women's jackets included cloth sleeves opposed to the leather sleeves of the men's jackets. While there were obvious visual differences between these awards, the Athletic Department declared that the awards were identical. Women continued to receive different 'M' awards through the 1970s and 1980s; the awards were not created equal until Canham retired in 1988 and Schembechler (Canham's Athletic Director successor) retired in 1990. The next Athletic Director, Jack Weidenbach, implemented identical varsity awards in 1992 and in 2016 the Athletic Department retroactively awarded around 900 women athletes from 1975-1992 the correct 'M' award.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ "Go Blue: Competition, Controversy, and Community in Michigan Athletics." 2017. Michigan in the World. <http://michiganintheworld.history.lsa.umich.edu/michiganathletics/>.

Figure 1: Women's Varsity Jacket vs. Men's Varsity Jacket⁴⁸



Canham did not favor identical awards for men and women. Canham even communicated with the president of the ‘M’ men and instructed him on who to contact and what information to send out to other influential ‘M’ men.⁴⁹ Canham echoed the thoughts of Schembechler, Orr, and the ‘M’ men; he did not believe women were athletically talented enough to receive the same award as men. The complaints against the chauvinistic attitudes of the Athletic Department were mostly directed at Schembechler, Orr, and Mazer, but Canham had shown his disapproval of identical awards for men and women by basically writing the letter Mazer sent out to the ‘M’ men. Most people were

⁴⁸ Alisa Solomon, “Women's and Men's Varsity Jackets,” *Go Blue: Competition, Controversy, and Community in Michigan Athletics*, accessed December 3, 2017, <http://michiganintheworld.history.lsa.umich.edu/michiganathletics/items/show/152>.

⁴⁹ Donald Canham. May 2, 1975. “‘M’ Award for Women.” Folder: “M” Club, 1945-1987, Box 2, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

not aware of Canham's role in this battle and did not address him specifically, however, Canham did have responsibility for attempting to influence the Board's decision against equal awards.

Canham's attempt to prevent the Board from voting in favor for equal awards failed due to the announcement the night before the vote from the legendary Detroit sportscaster, Al Ackerman. Ackerman appeared on television and threatened to never mention another UM score on his broadcast again if UM did not agree to give women the same 'M' award as men.⁵⁰ The Board had to take this threat seriously, as publicity was incredibly important for revenue sports in order to keep loyal fans. Without this pressure, there might have been a different outcome of the Board vote; however, while the Board did vote in favor of the proposition, women were still prevented from receiving the same award. While Canham tried to get the Board to vote against identical awards and did not succeed, he was successful in controlling the restriction of the 'M' awards to women. Women did not receive identical awards, but were given different awards so that the men's 'M' award was not weakened. Canham did not believe separate awards would be viewed as discriminatory, as there was no law that stated identical awards must be given.⁵¹ Instead, Canham focused on creating a supposedly equal award for the women that was not identical to the men's award. Canham violated the spirit of Title IX – he did not provide equality within the men's program and women's program. Separate, but equal is never actually equal.

⁵⁰ "Go Blue: Competition, Controversy, and Community in Michigan Athletics." 2017. Michigan in the World. <http://michiganintheworld.history.lsa.umich.edu/michiganathletics/>.

⁵¹ Donald Canham. May 13, 1975. "'M' Award for Women." Folder: Awards (Varsity "M"), 1970-1984, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Chapter 3: The Need for Title IX at UM

Despite Canham's insistence that the women at UM were relatively happy with the athletic situation before the HEW guidelines, women students at UM were dissatisfied with the intercollegiate athletic programs for women.¹ Female athletes expressed complaints about many aspects of athletics, such as scholarships, travel expenses, athletic awards, the addition of varsity sports, coaching, and access to adequate facilities. The desire for advances in women's athletics was expressed through petitions for more varsity sports and insistence that improvements for facilities and funding were needed for competition to continue. Complaints to both the university and official complaints to HEW illustrate the unwillingness of the Athletic Department to comply with equality guidelines of Title IX. Compared to other universities, UM was lagging behind improvements in women's athletics in areas such as budget and the number of varsity sports for such a large and well-funded athletic department. Title IX was needed to push Canham and the Athletic Department to improve women's intercollegiate athletics, even if it was at an incredibly slow pace with robust resistance.

Demand for Improvements:

The desire for women to gain a more equal standing in athletics began before Title IX even became law. The women's swim club was established in 1923 and by the 1960s many women were exasperated with the conditions women faced. The main complaints involved a lack of a full time experienced coach, a lack of proper training, and a lack of suitable facilities.² These complaints were not met, which resulted in many

¹ Brian Deming. 1975. "Canham Talks about Title IX." *The Michigan Daily*, September 5, Vol 86, Iss 2. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

² Courtney Beyer. 2010. "I Am Too Competitive to Do Something Only Half Way: Swimming Ethos and the Development of the University of Michigan Women's Swim and Dive Team

women quitting the team or not even attempting to join the team in the first place. Some of the women were determined to swim and even trained with the men's team, which demonstrated that women had the ability to train at the varsity level.³ Notwithstanding their determination to swim and dive, Canham was unsympathetic. Barb Cheney learned this during her meeting with Canham in 1971 when the team had just returned from nationals. Cheney was disappointed with the support UM provided the women's team compared with other schools and told Canham her thoughts on the inequalities in men and women's sports at UM. However, "he responded by telling [Cheney] that football and basketball teams paid for the Athletic Department and funds from football had built the women's pool. He told [Cheney] that [she] should be grateful for the support that the women's team was receiving."⁴ According to Canham, the women should be satisfied that they were even allowed to practice and compete since the football and basketball teams were the main priority of the Athletic Department. Women's swimming and diving retained its popularity and were among the first varsity sports established for women in 1973. Due to Title IX, the women's swim and dive team gained a head coach, funding for equipment, suits, travel expenses, and gained access to the men's pool for practice.⁵ The team's focus shifted from existence to performance, which allowed the team to compete more effectively. Without the looming compliance deadline of Title IX, the women's swim and dive team would probably not have seen much improvement, as it had not from its inception in 1923 to 1972.

between 1958-1973." Bachelor's Honors Thesis, United States – Michigan: University of Michigan, 52.

³ Ibid, 49.

⁴ Ibid, 37.

⁵ Ibid, 60.

In 1971, a student, Claire Rumelhart, wrote letters to Canham expressing her dissatisfaction with unequal opportunities for the trampoline aspect of gymnastics; women were not given access to quality training or trampolines. She was disappointed that women were not allowed to register for trampoline courses even if the women had experience. Rumelhart went on to say that the Intramural Building was partially supported by student fees, which should have allowed women who are contributing to the financing of the building to be “equal beneficiaries.”⁶ Included in her letter was a newspaper article from the *New York Times* about the U.S. gymnasts being “strong foes” for the Soviet women in the Olympics. Rumelhart was trying desperately to convince Canham that women deserved the same treatment of men gymnasts, as they were allowed to compete for the country in the Olympics, but not even allowed access to the same facilities at UM. Canham responded with indifference citing the lack of locker rooms and showers for women as the reason trampoline courses were restricted to men. Canham’s solution was to grant women access to trampoline instruction on Friday nights during co-rec programs and to have a separate program for women in the women’s gymnasium. Canham did not offer to solve the lack of locker rooms and showers or provide women with decent timing to access trampoline instruction. Rumelhart did not accept Canham’s dismissal and wrote back stating that although there is a separate program for women, the program is not of the same caliber as the men’s, the women are not allowed to compete, and there is not adequate training that would allow women to eventually try out for the Olympics. Canham did not devote time or concern to Rumelhart’s concerns, as the

⁶ Claire Rumelhart. April 20, 1971. “Gymnastics for Women at the University of Michigan to Don Canham.” Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan. 1.

request dealt with non-revenue producing women's athletics. Rumelhart summed up the problem with Canham and the Athletic Department, "I think it is time that the Athletics Department start taking the initiative in this situation instead of always waiting for women to push and push for change."⁷ Women were required to pursue their own interests in advancing women's athletics without much support from the men in control of the Athletic Department.

There was a lack of attention for women's sports even after the passage of Title IX. Sheryl Szady, the women's field hockey captain, and Linda Laird, the women's basketball team captain, were desperate for change in women's sports and resorted to writing a letter to the executive officers of UM on April 11, 1973. The student athletes decided not to contact Hartwig or Canham because neither had pushed for the priority of advancing women's sports; instead they went to the Board of Regents.⁸ It had come to the attention of these two women that UM was not following the AIAW minimum requirements, which prevented them from competing against other institutions. The field hockey team had attempted to schedule a game against MSU, but MSU refused to schedule any games due to UM's inability to meet the minimum standards.⁹ Szady and Laird included a self-made table describing the requirements of the AIAW, the present status of women's programs at UM, the desired status of women's program at UM, and a comparison of present statuses at Eastern Michigan University and MSU.

The biggest discrepancies found by Szady and Laird involved the organization

⁷ Ibid, 4.

⁸ Szady, "The History of Intercollegiate Athletics," 125.

⁹ Sheryl Marie Szady, and Linda Laird. Memorandum. April 11, 1973. "Intercollegiate Program for Women." Folder: UM Committee to Study Intercollegiate Sports for Women - History 1970-1973, Box 2, Eunice Burns Papers 1960-2011. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, 1.

and responsibility of the athletic programs, access to health insurance, first aid services, pay for coaches, equipment, and transportation. At UM, students organized the athletic programs whereas at MSU and EMU the PE faculty organized sports. UM provided no health insurance protection for women athletes, while MSU covered all expenses for injuries, and EMU provided insurance paid for by the Athletic department. First aid services and emergency medical care were less than minimal at UM while adequate at both MSU and EMU. UM coaches were volunteers and sometimes given token pay, whereas MSU and EMU both had qualified paid coaches. At UM, the individual team member or team used whatever money they had raised or borrowed, while at MSU and EMU the equipment was provided. Female athletes at UM were required to find their own method of transportation through private cars for games, whereas MSU and EMU the universities provided cars and buses. Szady and Laird also found these discrepancies to be true at many other colleges, such as Schoolcraft Junior College, Toledo University, Wayne State University, Central Michigan University, Western Michigan University, Calvin College, and Oakland University. They ended their letter with a question, “now what can the University of Michigan and its ancient facilities say for itself? I am truly embarrassed and ashamed.”¹⁰ Despite UM’s large size and budget, other schools provided more support and had made more progress for women. UM was one of the worst universities for complying with AIAW standards and proved to be very frustrating for female athletes to create change since the Athletic Department showed little or no concern for women’s athletics.

Szady and Laird’s comprehensive report and demand for better treatment led to

¹⁰ Ibid, 6.

the creation of the Committee to Study Women's Intercollegiate Athletics (or the Burns Committee) by the University President in 1973.¹¹ President Fleming created the Burns Committee in order to assess the requirements UM needed to implement to create equality between the sexes; Title IX was released in 1972, and the committee would serve as evidence that UM was attempting to correct inequality within the Athletic Department. There were eight participants on the committee: Eunice Burns, Marie Hartwig, Linda Laird, Phyllis Ocker, Sheryl Szady, Robert Blackburn, Janet Hooper, and Robert Sauve. The Report of the Committee to Study Intercollegiate Athletics for Women was released on November 1, 1973. The Burns Committee found that there was immediate interest in six intercollegiate competition teams: basketball, field hockey, swimming and diving, synchronized swimming, tennis, and volleyball with more sports listed for the future. The Burns Committee also confirmed that UM had fallen behind other schools. It was suggested that financing should be shouldered by the Athletic Department and fall under the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics, while also suggesting an administrative position for a Woman's Athletic Director.¹² During the operation of the Burns Committee, a letter from a female student, Susan Smolenski, was directed towards the Burns Committee discussing her experience with women's athletics at UM and disclosing that she would like to be kept informed of the matter. Smolenski had always enjoyed "earnest, competent competition" and joined the women's basketball team in 1972. She mentions how the conditions were not attractive and that students "really had to *want* to play; if [students] were merely 'interested' it would all be very

¹¹ "Go Blue: Competition, Controversy, and Community in Michigan Athletics." 2017. Michigan in the World. <http://michiganintheworld.history.lsa.umich.edu/michiganathletics/>.

¹² Diles, "The History of Title IX at the University of Michigan," 148.

discouraging...it's a struggle just to play."¹³ Women's sports were not attractive to most female students; sports were underfunded and were not provided with adequate facilities or personnel, which created a situation where most women would not want to join athletics due to the constant constraints and inadequate conditions. Similar to Szady and Laird's statement, Smolenski asserted, "women's intercollegiate sports simply have no dignity here and that is due to inadequate funding and facilities."¹⁴ All of these student athletes were furious and ashamed by the lack of action taken by Canham and the Athletic Department, but persisted with their complaints in hopes that change would occur. There was a minimum amount of progress due to the persistence of the women in the 'M' club for women.

The UM Women's Athletic Association was created in 1979 as a counterpart to the men's 'M' club. Both clubs seek to recognize and connect letter-winners in athletics. The president of the newly formed group, Helen Morsink, wrote to Canham in 1980 about the purpose of the club, to seek approval, and to ask for publicity in a few football programs. The MWAA sought the endorsement of Canham in order to give the club "viability and credibility."¹⁵ Women had to start the club by themselves because they were not invited to join the men's 'M' club and the creation of a women's 'M' club was not offered. The approval of the women's 'M' club still rested with Canham even though the Athletic Department had done nothing to help establish an equal club for women.

¹³ Susan Smolenski. August 14, 1973. "Letter from Student to Burns Committee." Folder: UM Committee to Study Intercollegiate Athletics for Women - Memos and Correspondence 1973-1974, Box 2, Eunice Burns Papers 1960-2011. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Helen Morsink. July 15, 1980. "Women's 'M' Club." Folder: Women's 'M' Club, 1980-1981, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Canham approved of this club and gave it his full endorsement due to the fact that the Athletic Department would not have to provide any money to the organization and he would not be directly involved in the club, which saved him time and prevented women from pushing to enter the men's 'M' club. Canham was relieved that women wanted to create their own club instead of joining the elite men's club, which is why he was delighted to endorse the creation of a women's 'M' club.

To create positive change for the women's athletic program at UM, students were required to persist in their efforts to make their dedication to sports known. The female students were the ones who ultimately pushed the faculty to make changes. Without their determination and the requirement to comply with Title IX, Canham would have continued to insist that women were content with the existing women's program and that women had no desire to play varsity sports.

Complaints

Complaints by women against the UM Athletic Department were prompted by the inequalities present within the Athletic Department even after Title IX. In September 1976, there was a Title IX Evaluation and Recommendation Report composed to evaluate the progress of the women's athletic program at UM. The report compared the male and female athletic programs. The total number of participants for men in all sports was 511 and 151 for women. The total UM percentage of males was 58% and females were 42% of the student body; however, males constituted 77% of the UM varsity sport population, whereas females made up only 23% of that population. The budget also revealed huge discrepancies – the men's program had \$1,327,000 and the women's program had

\$160,000 total.¹⁶ Within the Athletic Department, the equipment and supplies budgets were even different with the men's program having \$214,600 while the women's program had \$29,250.¹⁷ The coaching salaries were also very different. For example, the women's basketball program was allowed \$3,500 for a coach while the men's basketball program was allowed \$73,100, as Canham believed that coaching for "men's sports is a full-time job; in women's sports it simply is not."¹⁸ The public relations expenses for the women's program was \$10,500 and for the men's program it was \$92,500.¹⁹ While the transportation for women had increased by 1976, with women being able to have similar per diem allowances per player and rental cars/vans instead of personal cars, the number of overnight trips for females was still lower; the men's basketball team had nine overnight trips while the women's basketball team had three overnight trips.²⁰ Although there was some improvement, the women's program was still underfunded when compared with the men's athletic program.

In June 1978, an update on the Title IX Report from 1976 was completed. This report did not provide specific numbers, but rather explained recommendations that still needed to be completed. The women's program needed additional staffing for publicity, better scheduling of competitions (further ahead of time and a more balanced schedule of home and away matches), refurbishment of office and meeting areas, and an increase of

¹⁶ Donald Canham, Virginia Hunt, and Charles Harris. October 5, 1976. "Title IX Evaluation and Recommendations." Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, 1.

¹⁷ Ibid, 2.

¹⁸ Ibid, 6. & Canham, Donald. March 4, 1977. "Coaching Salaries to Charles Allmand." Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

¹⁹ Ibid, 8.

²⁰ Ibid, 5.

scholarships for women.²¹ Even two years after the original 1976 evaluation, the women's athletic program still needed various improvements. Both of these reports explain why complaints were issued against the Athletic Department; progress of the women's program was extremely slow and there were still many discrepancies between the men's program and women's program.

Scholarships were a major area of focus for the women's program. During the fall semester of 1976, 28 women were each awarded \$263.²² During the winter semester of 1977, 37 women received awards of \$263 each.²³ While the progress of scholarships may seem great, it is important to remember that no scholarships were offered before 1976 and the women still lagged behind the men. The women's athletic program offered a total of \$19,950 for scholarships during the 1976-1977 school year whereas the men's athletic program offered a total of \$783,549 for scholarships during the 1975-1976 school year. Within this scholarship budget for the men, \$394,564 was spent on football, \$101,102 was spent on ice hockey, and \$50,682 was spent on basketball.²⁴ It is clear that Canham had an influence on the division of scholarship money, as Canham viewed those three sports as the most important for the Athletic Department. These revenue-producing sports received the most amount of money for scholarships, while the total scholarship money

²¹ Donald Canham, Phyllis Ocker, and Charles Harris. June 6, 1978. "Update on Title IX Report of October 5, 1976." Folder: Compliance Reports, 1976-1978, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

²² Ginny Hunt. November 5, 1976. "Women Athletic Scholarships Fall 1967-1977." Folder: Awards and Scholarships, 1974-1988, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

²³ Ginny Hunt. January 12, 1977. "Women Athletic Scholarships Winter 1976-1977." Folder: Awards and Scholarships, 1974-1988, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

²⁴ Donald Canham, Virginia Hunt, and Charles Harris. October 5, 1976. "Title IX Evaluation and Recommendations," 8.

allocated for the women's program did not even equal one revenue-producing male sport. When Phyllis Ocker, the Director of Women's Athletics at the time, indicated that the women's program would like to increase the number of women receiving athletic scholarships to 60 women, Canham responded negatively. Canham believed that this goal could possibly be met in the future, but the ratio of 60-40 would be kept since "there [was] much more interest on the part of men than women" and the "talent and interest [was] not yet there" for the women's program.²⁵ Even though female athletes had shown a great deal of interest and that they were athletically talented, Canham continued to insist that women were inferior to male athletes. Canham's sexist views and his desire to keep as much money as possible in the male revenue-producing sports hindered the achievement of equality for women's scholarships.

These discrepancies between the men's program and the women's program caused women to direct complaints against the Athletic Department. One of the first complaints was from Marcia Federbush. Federbush was a graduate student and a researcher in sex discrimination at the time when she issued a complaint to Casper Weinberger, the secretary of HEW in August of 1973. Federbush was joined by Tara Fujimoto, an undergraduate student; Louis Glazer, a graduate student; Harriet Powers, an alumna; Joan Rosen, a graduate student; Barn Stellard, an undergraduate student; and Vivian Sharen, a graduate student and the chairwoman of the Ann Arbor chapter of the National Organization for Women. This group became known as the Committee to Bring About Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women and Men at the University of

²⁵ Donald Canham. March 2, 1978. "Women's Scholarships." Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Michigan. The committee asked HEW to offer guidance to UM, as they did not believe the Athletic Department and Canham would vigorously pursue the creation of equality. They found that the most disturbing feature of the women's advisory committee was the inclusion of administrative personnel as voting members of programs that they were involved in. The Committee believed that UM was "Canham's Empire" and stated, "if one man is to be the chief employee overseeing all phases of physical education and athletics, as well as the chief functionary on the advisory bodies governing these programs, there is a strong suggestion of too much power."²⁶ Federbush and the other members of the committee believed that many of the inequalities between the men's program and women's program were due to Canham's control over every aspect of the Athletic Department. Canham was seen as being the major roadblock to the slow progress of women's athletics at UM.

Federbush continued her determination to gain equality for women and men athletes at UM. In 1975, an article in *The Michigan Daily* discussed Federbush's complaints. At this time, Federbush was the Athletic Coordinator for the National Organization of Women. She was mostly upset with Canham and Schembechler, as she believed that they were misleading the public about Title IX. Both men had insinuated that Title IX would destroy the UM athletic program; Federbush responded, "either [Canham] doesn't read well or he's forgotten what Title IX says or he's lying."²⁷

²⁶ Marcia Federbush, Joan Rosen, Barb Stellard, Vivian Shaner, Tara Fujimoto, Louis Glazer, and Harriet Powers. August 19, 1973. "Gross Discrimination in Athletics against Women at the University of Michigan." Folder: Title IX Complaints Field (Golf Complaint - Beckett) 1976, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

²⁷ Kralik, Doc. September 25, 1975. "Title Nine Bucking Sexist Barriers." *The Michigan Daily*. Folder: Title IX Complaints Field - Federbush Complaint 1973-1977, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Canham's reaction to Title IX was extreme because he told the press that equal expenditures and equal scholarships were ridiculous and could not be considered. To explain why Canham was so upset with the promotion of women's sports, Federbush rationalizes, "they think we're trying to steal their balls."²⁸ This statement had two meanings – first, Canham did not want to alter the emphasis on football and take away any money from the program; second, Canham and other men in the Athletic Department had sexist views and were threatened by the prospect of equality of women in sports. Federbush goes on to make another important point, she said, "Canham has a 'we' and 'they' attitude...he says, 'we even let them use our tartan turf...'"²⁹ in fact he is supposed to be the Athletic Director for both men and women.²⁹ Federbush wanted others to understand that Canham controlled all aspects of the Athletic Department, but only wished to promote men's sports. She understood that if Title IX did not exist, Canham would have been reluctant to ever provide varsity status or similar facilities or money for women's athletics.

A female athlete and her family issued a formal complaint against UM under Title IX on June 1976. Laura Lynne Beckett was a freshman and played golf. Her mother, Lee Beckett, represented her in this complaint. The Becketts wished to bring equality for all women in the realm of athletic scholarships. Lee Beckett had contacted the Athletic Department in April 1974, October 1975, and various times in 1976 to inquire about scholarships and opportunities in golf for women. When Lee talked to Hartwig, Hartwig said in 1974 and 1975 that there were no scholarships for women – if women needed scholarships they would need to apply to the Financial Aid office to qualify for financial

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

need, as UM was not allowed to recruit women athletes. In September of 1975, Lee went to President Fleming's office, but was then referred to his assistant who then referred Lee to a woman on the Board of Athletics. In 1976, Lee was informed that women would be allowed to have athletic scholarships, but there was still a large discrepancy between how many men and women received athletic scholarships, which did not comply with Title IX. Lee then sent a complaint to the Board of Regents in April 1976 requesting that UM comply with Title IX. She also appeared before the Board of Regents in May 1976, but never received a reply to her complaint. Lee believed that UM failed to establish a complaint procedure as required by the regulations for the Board of Regents and the Athletic Department. Due to all these factors, Lee Beckett sent her complaint and an insistence on an investigation of UM to HEW.³⁰ During the Beckett's long struggle to find answers about scholarships, there seemed to be an unofficial policy for everyone at UM to avoid direct answers about Title IX and the women's program. It appeared as if the employees at UM were aware of the lack of compliance with Title IX, but no one wanted to admit that the Athletic Department was doing something wrong. The Athletic Department was its own entity and others were reluctant to reprimand Canham for his actions involving women's sports.

Both Federbush and the Becketts wanted equality within the UM Athletic Department. Lee Beckett believed that "the University [was] not in good faith attempting to overcome the disparities that have existed and correct the sociological barriers to

³⁰ Lee Beckett. June 14, 1976. "Formal Complaint against the University of Michigan to Charles Duffy (Dept. of HEW)." Folder: Title IX Complaints Field (Golf Complaint - Beckett) 1976, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

developing a women's athletic program on the same caliber as that enjoyed by men."³¹ Federbush and Beckett understood that Canham and the Athletic Department did not truly wish to help improve the women's program, but rather attempted to slow down improvements for women. Both women continued their fight for years under the principle that female athletes were being denied their civil rights under the law. Their interventions were crucial because they finally received attention from HEW; they accomplished the first step in moving towards equality – UM and HEW had to acknowledge that UM was not meeting the standards of Title IX.

HEW sent a letter to President Fleming in August 1977 informing him that Federbush and Beckett had issued complaints against the university for sex discrimination. HEW finally began an investigation and requested material from UM to facilitate the investigation. UM had twenty days to send back the needed material.³² Action was finally being taken to recognize the complaints of women against UM. The Athletic Department would be held responsible for its lack of compliance with Title IX. However, UM continued even after the investigation to proceed slowly to implement progress in the women's sports program; UM was the last university to meet the minimum standards of Title IX in 1982.³³

Comparison of Other Colleges

During the Title IX era, many colleges kept in contact to understand how other

³¹ Mrs. Beckett. December 16, 1976. "Complaint over Scholarships." Folder: Title IX Complaints Field (Golf Complaint - Beckett) 1976, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³² Charles Duffy. September 1, 1977. "Federbush Complaint Info for President Fleming." Folder: Title IX Complaints Field - Federbush Complaint 1973-1977, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³³ Ramsey, "Big Men on Campus," 369.

colleges were dealing with the new law and regulations. When the Burns Committee was formed, letters were sent to other schools inquiring about the current state of affairs at other colleges; these colleges included, the University of Minnesota, Delta College, Western Michigan University, University of Iowa, Central Michigan University, University of Wisconsin, Indiana University, Michigan State University, Purdue University, and the University of Illinois. It seemed that many of these colleges were ahead of UM, as many of the letters came from women in charge of women's athletics. These women had titles ranging from Coordinator of Women's Athletics, Department Chairperson and Assistant Director of Athletics, and Associate Director of Athletics. At UM, there were no women in such high positions within the Athletic Department. When the final report was complete, the Burns Committee sent copies to other colleges that were interested in the process of women's athletics at UM.³⁴

When comparing UM to Northwestern University and Indiana University, UM does not fare well. Northwestern had the most supportive response to women's sports, UM had the most resistance to Title IX, while Indiana's response stood between these two universities. Northwestern was a private institution so the university had more maneuverability and also prided itself on having higher academic standards than the rest of the Big Ten Conference.³⁵ Northwestern did not value making a profit from revenue producing sports over a multi-faceted experience that include athletics and academic life, which meant that Title IX was not seen as a threat. The private institution was more open

³⁴ Eunice Burns, Robert Blackburn, Marie Hartwig, Janet Hooper, Linda Laird, Phyllis Ocker, Sheryl Marie Szady, and Robert Sauve. November 1, 1973. "Report of the Committee to Study Intercollegiate Athletics for Women." University of Michigan. Folder: Burns Committee Report, 1973, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³⁵ Ramsey, "Big Men on Campus," 313.

to Title IX because the university did not have much success in traditional men's sports – they did not have the same stake as UM in football. However, Northwestern was basically starting its women's program from scratch. The Northwestern Athletic Department made a commitment to the spirit of gender equality and the letter of the law. The Ad Hoc Committee on Women's Sports was formed in 1974 and the report was finalized in January 1975; the first recommendation of the committee was to create a new position of Women's Athletic Director within the already existing men's Athletic Department. This recommendation was quickly followed with the hiring of a Women's Athletic Director in July 1975.³⁶ Northwestern's commitment to creating an equal program for women was shown through the fast adherence to the committee's suggestion. In 1978, the Illinois Commission on the Status of Women asserted, "even the university's most strident critics admit that its women's athletic program is exemplary."³⁷ There had never been a discrimination complaint filed against Northwestern and the government deemed Northwestern to be Title IX compliant in 1980.³⁸

Indiana leaders were vocal in their opposition to the HEW standards, but still improved the women's program quickly and dramatically. Orwig lobbied behind the scenes, whereas Canham belligerently condemned the HEW regulations. Although officials at Indiana did not like the rules of Title IX, they still worked towards gender equality in sports and were committed to following the law. Indiana Athletic Director, Bill Orwig, also valued a wide variety of sports, not just the revenue-producing sports.³⁹ Indiana's investment in women's sports began before Title IX even became law; in the

³⁶ Ibid, 318.

³⁷ Ibid, 327.

³⁸ Ibid, 327.

³⁹ Ibid, 350.

summer of 1971, Orwig encouraged the president of Indiana University to move immediately toward a development of intercollegiate sports program for women.⁴⁰ Orwig believed that if the university provided a male program that proved useful for the university, then a women's program should be provided that would be equally beneficial for the university. The Vice President of Indiana believed the creation of a women's sports program would also help the image of Indiana University. Unlike UM, Indiana's appearance would be hindered by their treatment of female athletes; UM had become so renowned due to Canham's success in football that UM's appearance would not suffer due to the unfair treatment of women. Indiana also sensed the importance of women's sports before Title IX – improvements in women's sports might have occurred even without Title IX at Indiana. Despite Indiana's rapid improvements, the women's athletics program was still further behind than the men's program. The 1973-1974 women's budget of \$35,000 had improved from the 1971 budget of \$5,000; however, the women's budget was still miniscule compared to the \$2 million budget for men's sports.⁴¹ While there were still some discrepancies between the men's program and women's program, Indiana made a direct attempt to improve the latter. Indiana did not just desire to meet Title IX standards, but truly sought to improve women's sports, as this began in 1971 even before Title IX was implemented. Indiana joined Northwestern as the only two Big Ten institutions not subject to a government inspection due to its actual efforts to improve women's athletics.⁴² Northwestern and Indiana had more willingness to change and include women's athletics in the Athletic Department. The main reason these two

⁴⁰ Ibid, 351.

⁴¹ Ibid, 353.

⁴² Ibid, 348.

universities progressed more quickly was due to the open attitudes of the Athletic Departments; at UM, Canham was the main opposition to Title IX and his unwavering negative opinion of women's sports caused the Athletic Department to become one of the least equal programs in the country.

Unlike Northwestern's quick ability to adapt to the committee's findings, UM was reluctant to address the requests of the Burns Committee. The report was sent to President Fleming in November 1973, but a women's varsity program was not established until fall of 1974. The women's athletic program "still faced many of the same problems in 1975 that they had in 1972."⁴³ In contrast to Indiana, UM was not concerned with its appearance over chauvinistic comments. Schembechler thought it was ridiculous that there should be 50-50 equality between the men and the women in athletics; he said, "that's like me saying that I want 50-50 with the kitchen or the housework of things that have been predominantly women's things."⁴⁴ Schembechler and Canham allowed some token women athletes to participate in sports at a minimal level, but basically believed that women should not interfere in the male world of athletics – they should stay in the domestic sphere. Whenever Canham was asked about the discrepancies in his Athletic Department, he became defensive and would refer to other facts about UM, such as the exceptional football program or the number of varsity sports women did have. His defensiveness implied "that there were deeper problems that he refused to acknowledge."⁴⁵

As of June 1974, UM lagged far behind other schools in the Big Ten. UM had 6

⁴³ Ibid, 336.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 339.

⁴⁵ Ibid, 347.

varsity sports for women’s athletics whereas Illinois had 7, Indiana had 8, Iowa had 10, Michigan State had 9, Minnesota had 9, Northwestern had 9, Purdue had 9, Ohio State had 11, and Wisconsin had 11.⁴⁶ UM had the least varsity sports for women due to Canham’s emphasis on men’s revenue-producing sports and sexist attitude.

Women’s athletic budgets were minuscule compared to men’s. In 1973, MSU’s yearly budget for women was \$60,000 and was ranked as one of top colleges for supporting women’s sports; Illinois’ yearly budget for women ranked lowest among the Big Ten universities, only UM allocated less to women’s athletics with a budget of zero.⁴⁷ The budgets for women increased slightly every year after 1973. In 1974, the men’s athletic budget was on average 98% higher across the nation than women’s sports.⁴⁸ The chart below illustrates the budgets for two school years for Big Ten universities.

Figure 2: Comparison of Women’s Athletic Budgets at Big Ten Universities⁴⁹

University	Budget for 1975-1976	Budget for 1976-1977
University of Michigan	\$120,000	\$180,000
University of Illinois	\$133,441	\$187,104
University of Iowa	\$143,000	\$200,000
Michigan State University	\$165,000	\$270,000
University of Minnesota	\$250,000	\$313,822
Ohio State University	\$200,000	\$300,000
Wisconsin University	\$159,300	\$250,000

⁴⁶ Ibid, 158.

⁴⁷ Belanger. *Invisible Seasons*, 102.

⁴⁸ Ibid, 51.

⁴⁹ Ramsey, “Big Men on Campus,” 159.

Northwestern University	\$95,000	\$200,000
Indiana University	\$185,000	\$213,000
Purdue University	\$120,000	\$135,000

In 1975-1976 UM had one of the lowest budgets for women's sports.

Northwestern had a lower budget than UM in 1975-1976, but Northwestern's budget increased dramatically in 1976-1977 and surpassed UM's budget by \$20,000 even though Northwestern was a much smaller school. Purdue was the only college to have a lower budget than UM – in 1975-1976 UM and Purdue had the same budget, but UM increased its budget so that Purdue fell short of UM's budget. Even though UM was a big university with a lot of athletic prestige, UM was far behind in the women's sports division. All the universities increased their budgets for women's sports from the 1975-1976 academic year to the 1976-1977 academic year, but UM was still reluctant to dedicate a significant amount of money or resources to the women's program. As late as April 1982, the University was generating studies with titles like, *The Proposal for Doing Feasibility: Study for Doing Fund-Raising for Women's Athletics at the University of Michigan*. The purpose of this study was to demonstrate that there was still a need for additional funding for women's athletics and to show the need for a full-time position to do this fund-raising.⁵⁰ The women's athletic program still lacked sufficient funds in 1982 and needed a complete study to demonstrate this need; Canham did not direct enough money to the women's program, which led investigations and studies to continue to

⁵⁰ Mary Masters. April 6, 1982. "Proposal for Doing Feasibility Study for Doing Fund-Raising for Women's Athletics at the University of Michigan." Folder: Topical File - Fundraising, 1979-1982, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

illustrate the necessity for improvements for the women's program to endure despite the government's compliance stamp of UM in 1982. Women were obviously concerned that once the minimum standards of Title IX had been completed Canham would halt progress on the women's program.

Women's sports were like a different dialect of a mainstream language⁵¹ – they were not understood and were not given much attention as they were seen as a minority interest issue. Women were assumed to want and need fewer resources in sports just because they were female and sports had traditionally belonged in the male domain. The main issue at stake in the women's athletic debate was not money as Athletic Departments so often complained, but was the redefinition and acceptance of a new role for women in U.S. society. Men in charge of athletics were reluctant to alter societal gender roles, as sexism was prevalent in many Athletic Departments; however, some universities and Athletic Directors were better at adapting to change than others. Canham and UM were one of the most staunchly opposed universities to Title IX and support for women's athletic improvements. Although UM Athletics were world renowned, the University of Texas was widely considered the most financially and athletically successful women's program in the country as of 1992.⁵² During Canham's tenure, he created an enormously successful men's program, but gave little attention to women's sports. Just because Title IX was a law, the law did not self-execute – progress took time and many battles against sexist Athletic Departments.

⁵¹ Belanger, xi.

⁵² Belanger, 182.

Conclusion

Canham is remembered as “the man for the times” whose “administration inevitably will stand the test of time.”¹ At his public funeral in 2005 at Crisler Arena at UM, his education background, honors, and accomplishments were listed on the memorial booklet. Amongst Canham’s accomplishments, his years as Athletic Director were highlighted with specific reference to his ability to market and promote football; the pamphlet mentions his ability to fill the Big House to capacity and the winning streak of the football team under his leadership.² Even after his death, Canham remained a man strongly connected with football. His success as Athletic Director was directly tied to the success of football, not any of the other UM sports. A public funeral needed to be held in the 13,751 seat Crisler Center for Canham because of his enormous popularity and the reputation he brought to UM athletics.

Canham was remembered not only in the state of Michigan, but throughout the country. *The Los Angeles Times* ran an obituary for Canham in May of 2005. *The Los Angeles Times* considered Canham “the father of modern college athletic directors” and that the “practices that are used by almost all athletic directors today...were started by Canham.”³ The former University of Tennessee Athletic Director, Doug Dickey, remembered that Canham “was one of the original masters of intercollegiate athletics.”⁴ Though Canham was remembered throughout the nation as a pioneer in college athletics,

¹ Wayne DeNeff. 1985. “The Man for the Times,” February 4. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

² “Donald Canham Memorial Booklet.” 2005. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

³ Diane Pucin. 2005. “Obituaries; D. Canham, 87; Master of Selling University of Michigan Sports.” *Los Angeles Times*, May 5, 2005.

⁴ Ibid.

few acknowledge or remember his battle with Title IX. This obituary did mention that Canham built a “women’s training facility, even though he was adamantly opposed to Title IX because he feared a negative impact on men’s sports.”⁵ While this obituary mentioned his disagreement with Title IX, it did not mention his staunch opposition to improving women’s sports or the inaccurate belief that women’s sports would negatively affect men’s sports. There were no men’s sports dropped to accommodate women and athletic schedules were maintained or even improved during the 1970s and 1980s with good competition and no geographic limits.⁶

When scholars mention Canham or the Title IX period at UM in their dissertations or theses, they often skim over Canham and his influence. Specifically, at UM there have been a few dissertations about the history of women’s sports there, but none that explicitly focus on the athletic director’s tenure at UM, his power within the university, and his relationship with Title IX. Janet Kittell researched the history of Athletic Directors at UM; Sherly Szady, David Diles, and Courtney Beyer all researched women’s athletics at UM and provide information about the history of progress for women’s sports; Jeffrey Ramsey researched the response of university administrations within the Big Ten. If Canham is mentioned in any of these dissertations, it is to say that he was opposed to Title IX and might have been a barrier to women’s sports. These researchers do not mention how Canham was able to prevent progress for so long. The dissertations do not discuss how much influence he had on women’s sports due to the amount of power he amassed at UM. Canham’s legacy as a great Athletic Director is also demonstrated in this lack of focus on his dislike of Title IX and his attempt to oppose the

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Diles. “The History of Title IX at the University of Michigan,” 200.

law locally and nationally. In addition, these dissertations that briefly mention Canham will not be viewed by many individuals, as they are not published. Therefore, Canham's legacy continues to focus on football while ignoring more controversial aspects of his career.

When people remember Canham, they reminisce about the success of UM football and his ability to rapidly improve UM athletics – the swimming and diving natatorium is even named after him today. Despite his success with football, it also needs to be acknowledged that Canham was the main barrier to improvement to women's sports at UM. He fought against Title IX both on the national level through politics and at the university level through his power and influence within the UM athletic world. Canham was able to greatly influence the outcome of women's sports at UM because of his iron control over every aspect of athletics. He consistently claimed that women were content with their status as second-class citizens, but there was a large discrepancy between men and women's sports at UM and even compared to other Big Ten colleges. Canham was so successful as Athletic Director because of his ambition and ego; he was able to promote himself and UM and he had authority over everyone. Canham's sexism and financial concerns prevented him from considering improvements to women's athletics – it was truly “Don Canham's Empire.”⁷

⁷ Marcia Federbush, Joan Rosen, Barb Stellard, Vivian Shaner, Tara Fujimoto, Louis Glazer, and Harriet Powers. August 19, 1973. “Gross Discrimination in Athletics against Women at the University of Michigan.” Folder: Title IX Complaints Field (Golf Complaint - Beckett) 1976, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Appendix

Annotated Bibliography

Kittell, Janet Ruth. 1984. "A History of Intercollegiate Athletic Administration at the University of Michigan." Doctor of Philosophy in Education, United States -- Michigan: University of Michigan.

Janet Kittell wrote her dissertation, *A History of Intercollegiate Athletic Administration at the University of Michigan*, in 1984 for a degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education at the University of Michigan. The purpose of her dissertation was to provide the history of Athletic Directors from Fielding Yost to Fritz Crisler and Don Canham. Kittell compares the administrative styles, financial concerns, athletic facilities, personnel, major policy decisions, relationships with various governances, role of the faculty representative, and the projected transition between administrations of the three Athletic Directors. These three Athletic Directors all achieved national prominence and are men "who, by character and deed, stand out among their fellows as towers of strength and beacons for all future time."¹ Kittell mentions the issue of women's athletics and Title IX in a brief manner when talking about Canham, but ultimately overlooks this flaw in his record and states that all three men "merge on the highest plane."²

Szady, Sheryl Marie. 1987. "The History of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women at the University of Michigan." Ph.D., United States -- Michigan: University of Michigan.

¹ Kittell, Janet Ruth. 1984. "A History of Intercollegiate Athletic Administration at the University of Michigan." Doctor of Philosophy in Education, United States -- Michigan: University of Michigan. 3.

² Ibid, 187.

Sherly Szady wrote her dissertation, *The History of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women at the University of Michigan*, in 1987 for a degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education at the University of Michigan. The focus of her dissertation was on the organization and administration of the women's intercollegiate athletic program from 1922-1981. Szady mainly focuses on the period prior to Title IX to understand how women's sports transitioned to varsity athletics and how the women's athletic structure with a long history of the sports for all model at UM hindered the progress to varsity sports. She found that Title IX had two major effects: Title IX influenced decisions relating to women's athletics and the guidelines and interpretations of Title IX directly influenced athletic policy decisions.

Diles, David Lisle. 1988. "The History of Title IX at the University of Michigan Department of Athletics." Ed.D., United States -- Michigan: University of Michigan.

David Diles wrote his dissertation, *The History of Title IX at the University of Michigan Department of Athletics*, in 1988 for a degree of Doctor of Education at the University of Michigan. The purpose of his dissertation was to compare the women and men's intercollegiate athletic programs in 1988 to the programs available prior to Title IX (1964-1971), during Title IX (1972-1978), and the compliance period of Title IX (1979-1984). He focuses largely on retelling the history of both men's and women's athletics at UM by explaining the timeline of sports events at UM. Diles ultimately concludes that UM did not make a strong commitment to building a women's athletic program before Title IX and that Title IX was a major factor for the improvement of women's athletics; without Title IX, the women's program would have progressed much more slowly.

Beyer, Courtney. 2010. "I Am Too Competitive to Do Something Only Half Way: Swimming Ethos and the Development of the University of Michigan Women's Swim and Dive Team between 1958-1973." Bachelor's Honors Thesis, United States -- Michigan: University of Michigan.

Courtney Beyer wrote her undergraduate honors thesis, "*I am too Competitive to Do Something Only Half Way:*" *Swimming ethos and the development of the University of Michigan Swim and Dive Team between 1958-1973*, in 2010 for the Department of Anthropology at the University of Michigan. The purpose of her thesis was to illustrate that the women's swim and dive team was started before Title IX with the help of dedicated women despite the sport not being an official university team. Although Title IX created an official varsity women's swim and dive team, there were women who participated in the club sport before Title IX; however, the lack of varsity status caused many women to ignore their passion for swimming.

Ramsey, Jeffrey T. 2014. "Big Men on Campus: Administrative Response to Title IX and the Development of Women's Sports in the Big Ten Conference, 1972-1982." Doctor of Philosophy, United States -- Wisconsin: Marquette University.

Jeffrey Ramsey wrote his dissertation, *Big Men on Campus: Administrative Response to Title IX and the Development of Women's Sports in the Big Ten Conference, 1972-1982*, in 2014 for a degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Marquette University. Ramsey argues that chauvinistic attitudes were not the sole reason for the slow development of women's sports, but the slow development was due to financial and logistical burdens. Administrators responded by saying they supported the spirit of equality, while also denouncing the law mandated by the government. The last chapter of this

dissertation compares the administrative attitudes at three universities: Northwestern University, University of Michigan, and Indiana University. Ramsey concludes that Northwestern had the most supportive response to women's sports while Michigan had the most vehement objections to Title IX and established women's sports at the slowest rate while Indiana's response stood between these two universities. Ramsey concludes, "while administrative attitudes certainly impacted the growth of women's athletics, this was not the only factor that dictated the success or failure of these new programs."³

All of these researchers provide helpful information about the timeline of women's sports at UM and a comparison of Canham to other Athletic Directors. However, the dissertations either do not focus on a narrow time frame to analyze Title IX or do not focus on the athletic director's impact on Title IX as the major reason why women's athletics improved so slowly.

Sources/Methods/Limitations

The primary sources used for this research came from the Bentley Historical Library. Letters to and from Canham, student interactions with Canham, complaints about women's athletics, newspaper articles, and Canham's book about UM athletic history were some of the primary sources used for this thesis. The primary documents came from the Donald Canham Papers, Eunice Burns Papers, and the Women's Athletics Papers at the Bentley Historical Library in Ann Arbor. The secondary sources involved the history of women's sports, the history of women's intercollegiate athletics, the history of college football, Title IX's implementation at other colleges, the history of attitudes towards the role of women in society, and dissertations/theses about UM sports history.

³ Ramsey, "Big Men on Campus," 367.

My sources presented a limitation that could be researched further by another individual at a later date; I was not be able to extensively research how Canham's personal life prior to UM influenced his views on women in sports or Title IX.

Bibliography for Secondary Sources

- Acosta, Vivian, and Linda Jean Carpenter. 2007. "Women in Intercollegiate Sport: A Longitudinal, National Study, Twenty-Nine Year Update, 1977-2006." In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Nancy Hogshead-Makar and Andrew Zimbalist. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Belanger, Kelly. 2016. *Invisible Seasons: Title IX and the Fight for Equity in College Sports*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Beyer, Courtney. 2010. "I Am Too Competitive to Do Something Only Half Way: Swimming Ethos and the Development of the University of Michigan Women's Swim and Dive Team between 1958-1973." Bachelor's Honors Thesis, United States -- Michigan: University of Michigan.
- Cahn, Susan. 2007. "Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Sports." In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Nancy Hogshead-Makar and Andrew Zimbalist. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cahn, Susan K. 2016. "Cold War Heteronormativity: 'Mannishness,' Lesbianism, and Homophobia in U.S. Women's Sports." In *Women's America: Refocusing the Past*, edited by Linda Kerber, Jane Sherron de Hart, Cornelia Hughes Dayton, and Judy Tzu-Chun Wu, Eighth Edition, 550-58. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Canham, Don. 1996. *Don Canham's From the Inside: A Half Century of Michigan Athletics*. Ann Arbor: Olympia Sports Press.
- Danziger, Lucy. 1998. "Conclusion: A Seismic Shift in the Culture." In *Nike Is a Goddess: History of Women in Sports*, edited by Lissa Smith. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Diles, David Lisle. 1988. "The History of Title IX at the University of Michigan Department of Athletics." Ed.D., United States -- Michigan: University of Michigan.
- Gilbert, Bil, and Nancy Williamson. 2007. "Sports Is Unfair to Women." In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Nancy Hogshead-Makar and Andrew Zimbalist. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- “Go Blue: Competition, Controversy, and Community in Michigan Athletics.” 2017. Michigan in the World. 2017. <http://michiganintheworld.history.lsa.umich.edu/michiganathletics/>.
- Hanford, George H. 1979. “Controversies in College Sports.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 445 (September):66–79.
- Hanson, Thomas. 1975. “Title IX Politics,” June 30, 1975. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Hogshead-Makar, Nancy. 2007. “A Critique of Tilting the Playing Field: Schools, Sports, Sex and Title IX.” In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Andrew Zimbalist. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hogshead-Makar, Nancy, and Andrew Zimbalist. 2007a. “Introduction.” In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- “Staking a Claim: The First Decade.” In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007.
- “The Initial Backlash: The 1980s.” In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007.
- Jarratt, Elizabeth H. 1990. “Feminist Issues in Sport.” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 13 (5):491–99. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395\(90\)90101-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(90)90101-3).
- Kerber, Linda, Jane Sherron de Hart, Cornelia Hughes Dayton, and Judy Tzu-Chun Wu, eds. 2016. “Gender Equality and the Law.” In *Women’s America: Refocusing the Past*, Eighth Edition, 747–51. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kittell, Janet Ruth. 1984. “A History of Intercollegiate Athletic Administration at the University of Michigan.” Doctor of Philosophy in Education, United States -- Michigan: University of Michigan. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/303315893>.
- Lichtenstein, Grace. 1998. “Net Profits: Tennis.” In *Nike Is a Goddess: History of Women in Sports*, edited by Lissa Smith. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

- May, Elaine Tyler. 1988. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books.
- Nelson, Mariah Burton. 1998. "Introduction: Who We Might Become." In *Nike Is a Goddess: History of Women in Sports*, edited by Lissa Smith. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- "Stronger Women." In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Nancy Hogshead-Makar and Andrew Zimbalist. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007.
- Ramsey, Jeffrey T. 2014. "Big Men on Campus: Administrative Response to Title IX and the Development of Women's Sports in the Big Ten Conference, 1972-1982." Doctor of Philosophy, United States -- Wisconsin: Marquette University.
- Sandler, Bernice Resnick. 2007. "Title IX: How We Got It and What a Difference It Made Symposium." *Cleveland State Law Review* 55 (4):473-90.
- Shelton, Donald E. 2000. "Equally Bad Is Not Good: Allowing Title IX Compliance by the Elimination of Men's Collegiate Sports." *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 34 (1-2):253-64.
- Smith, Shelley. 1998. "Not Quite the Game Intended: Basketball." In *Nike Is a Goddess: History of Women in Sports*, edited by Lissa Smith. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Snyder, Eldon E., and Elmer Spreitzer. 1983. "Change and Variation in the Social Acceptance of Female Participation in Sports." *Journal of Sport Behavior; Mobile, Ala.* 6 (1):3-8.
- Sokolove, Michael. 2007. "Football Is a Sucker's Game." In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Nancy Hogshead-Makar and Andrew Zimbalist. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Staurowsky, Ellen J. 2003. "Title IX and College Sport: The Long Painful Path to Compliance and Reform." *Marquette Sports Law Review* 14 (1):95-122.
- Suggs, Welch. 2007. "Heroines as Well as Heroes." In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Nancy Hogshead-Makar and Andrew Zimbalist. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bederman, Gail. 1995. "Theodore Roosevelt: Manhood, Nation, and 'Civilization.'" In *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States*.

- Switzer, Kathrine. 2017. "The Real Story of Kathrine Switzer's 1967 Boston Marathon." Kathrine Switzer Marathon Woman. 2017. <http://kathrineswitzer.com/about-kathrine/1967-boston-marathon-the-real-story/>.
- Szady, Sheryl Marie. 1987. "The History of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women at the University of Michigan." Ph.D., United States -- Michigan: University of Michigan.
- Watterson, John Sayle. 2000. *College Football: History, Spectacle, Controversy*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wushanley, Ying. 2004. *Playing Nice and Losing: The Struggle for Control of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, 1960-2000*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Zimbalist, Andrew. 2007. "Title IX by the Numbers." In *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Nancy Hogshead-Makar. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bibliography for Primary Sources

- “1975-1976 Budget Report.” 1976. Folder: Budget Material, 1974/75-1975/76, Box 2, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- “Approximate 1975-1976 Budget.” 1975. Folder: Budget Material, 1974/75-1975/76, Box 2, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- “A Report to the President of the University of Texas at Austin on the Expansion of the Program of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women.” 1973. Folder: University of Texas Report, 1974, Box 7, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- “Athletic Grants-in-Aid for Women in Big Ten Schools.” 1977. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- “Athletic Marketing and Promotion Speech.” Folder: Speeches, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Barnas, Jo-Ann. 1999. “Hendricks and Family Have U-M Tales to Tell.” *Detroit Free Press*, September 9, 1999. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Beckett, John. 1991. “Canham Speaks out on College Athletics.” *College Athletics Newspaper of the Ann Arbor News*, March 18, 1991. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Beckett, Lee. 1976. “Formal Complaint against the University of Michigan to Charles Duffy (Dept. of HEW),” June 14, 1976. Folder: Title IX Complaints Field (Golf Complaint - Beckett) 1976, Box 6, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Bisacca, George. 1979. “Title IX Response to Eleanor Lemaire,” March 20, 1979. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Budget for 1974-1975.” 1975. Folder: Budget Material, 1974/75-1975/76, Box 2, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Burns, Eunice, Robert Blackburn, Marie Hartwig, Janet Hooper, Linda Laird, Phyllis Ocker, Sheryl Marie Szady, and Robert Sauve. 1973. “Report of the Committee to Study Intercollegiate Athletics for Women.” University of Michigan. Folder: Burns Committee Report, 1973, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Canham, Donald, Phyllis Ocker, and Charles Harris. 1978. “Update on Title IX Report of October 5, 1976.” Folder: Compliance Reports, 1976-1978, Box 6, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Canham, Donald, Virginia Hunt, and Charles Harris. 1976. “Title IX Evaluation and Recommendations.” Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Canham, Donald. 1974. “Title IX Complaint to Caspar Weinberger,” April 4, 1974. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs, Title IX, 1974-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Changes in the World of Intercollegiate Athletics Speech.” Folder: Speeches, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Coaching Salaries to Charles Allmand,” March 4, 1977. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Completely New to Me,” November 13, 1975. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Conquest, Dale. 1982. Don Canham: U-M’s A.D. on Drugs, the USFL, and why he’s so good at what he does. Folder: Interviews, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

- Curt, Sylvester. 1975. Equal Opportunity: "We'll end up in Court". Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Deming, Brian. 1975. "Canham Talks about Title IX." *The Michigan Daily*, September 5, 1975, Vol 86, Iss 2 edition. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- DeNeff, Wayne. 1985. "The Man for the Times," February 4, 1985. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Dobson, John. 1975. "Con Same 'M' Award," May 8, 1975. Folder: "M" Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- "Donald Canham Memorial Booklet." 2005. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- "Don Canham: Michigan Athletic Director." 1988. University of Michigan. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Duffy, Charles. 1977. "Federbush Complaint Info for President Fleming," September 1, 1977. Folder: Title IX Complaints Field - Federbush Complaint 1973-1977, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Esch, Marvin. 1975. "HEW Regulations to President Ford," July 16, 1975. Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Federbush, Marcia. 1973. "Federbush Complaint to Editor," June 22, 1973. Folder: Title IX Complaints Field - Federbush Complaint 1973-1977, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Federbush, Marcia, Joan Rosen, Barb Stellard, Vivian Shaner, Tara Fujimoto, Louis Glazer, and Harriet Powers. 1973. "Gross Discrimination in Athletics against Women at the

- University of Michigan.” Folder: Title IX Complaints Field (Golf Complaint - Beckett) 1976, Box 6, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Fleming, Robben. 1975. “Budget for Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics and Relationship to the Intercollegiate Athletic Board,” November 10, 1975. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- FN. 1980. Don Canham. Folder: Interviews, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Fuzak, John. 1975. “NCAA Complaint of Title IX to President Ford,” May 9, 1975. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Giles, William. 1975. “Con Same ‘M’ Award,” May 12, 1975. Folder: “M” Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Han, Richard. 1975. “Pro Same ‘M’ Award,” May 20, 1975. Folder: “M” Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Hunt, Ginny. 1976. “Scholarships for Women 1976-1977,” October 12, 1976. Folder: Awards and Scholarships, 1974-1988, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Kalamazoo Gazette*. 1975. “Shame on U-M,” June 5, 1975. Folder: “M” Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Kearl, Bryant. 1979. “Comments on a Proposed DHEW Policy Interpretation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 Submitted by The University of Wisconsin.” Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

- King, Jean. n.d. "Column on Title IX - Villain." Folder: Title IX, Box 10, Jean King Papers 1964-2004. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan. Accessed September 12, 2017.
- Koch, Ilze, and Donald Koch. 1975. "Pro Same 'M' Award," May 30, 1975. Folder: "M" Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Kralik, Doc. 1975. "Title Nine Bucking Sexist Barriers." *The Michigan Daily*, September 25, 1975. Folder: Title IX Complaints Field - Federbush Complaint 1973-1977, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Kuzuma, Charlotte. 1975. "Pro Same 'M' Award," May 24, 1975. Folder: "M" Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Masters, Mary. 1982. "Proposal for Doing Feasibility Study for Doing Fund-Raising for Women's Athletics at the University of Michigan." Folder: Topical File - Fundraising, 1979-1982, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- "'M' Award for Women," May 1, 1975. Folder: Awards (Varsity "M"), 1970-1984, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- "'M' Award for Women," May 2, 1975. Folder: "M" Club, 1945-1987, Box 2, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- "'M' Award for Women," May 13, 1975. Folder: Awards (Varsity "M"), 1970-1984, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Mazer, William. n.d. "Dear 'M' Men." Folder: "M" Club, 1945-1987, Box 2, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan. Accessed August 14, 2017.

- “Memorandum about Landscaping,” July 8, 1974. Folder: Correspondences (Departmental), 1971-1988, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- “Memorandum to Marie Hartwig.” Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 6, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Miller, Jeanne. 2014. *A Matter of Fairness: A History of the Center for the Education of Women at the University of Michigan*. The University of Michigan: Bentley Historical Library.
- Miller, Robert. 1975. “Pro Same ‘M’ Award,” May 23, 1975. Folder: “M” Award Controversy, 1975, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Morsink, Helen. 1980. “Women’s ‘M’ Club,” July 15, 1980. Folder: Women’s “M” Club, 1980-1981, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Mrs. Beckett. 1976. “Complaint over Scholarships,” December 16, 1976. Folder: Title IX Complaints Field (Golf Complaint - Beckett) 1976, Box 6, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Myslenski, Skip. 1981. “Marketing the Wolverines.” *Tribune*, November 8, 1981. Folder: Interviews, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Ocker, Phyllis. 1987. “Athletic Scholarship Information,” November 23, 1987. Folder: Awards and Scholarships, 1974-1988, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Orr, John. 1975. “‘M’ Award for Women,” May 1, 1975. Folder: Awards (Varsity “M”), 1970-1984, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Over My Head to Phyllis Ocker,” March 23, 1981. Folder: Women’s “M” Club, 1980-1981, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Petitions for Skiing, Gymnastics, Track and Field, Fencing, Golf.” 1975. Folder: Advisory Committee on Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics, Petitions, 1973-1976, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Philosophy of Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics.” 1975. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Pucin, Diane. 2005. “Obituaries; D. Canham, 87; Master of Selling University of Michigan Sports.” *Los Angeles Times*, May 5, 2005.

“Request for Formation of a Varsity Fencing Team.” 1975, November 25, 1975. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Rumelhart, Claire. 1971. “Gymnastics for Women at the University of Michigan to Don Canham,” April 20, 1971. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Schairer, Bob. 1980. “Don Canham: Varsity His Life’s Spice.” *Ann Arbor News*, June 29, 1980. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Scheduled Tennis Matches for Spring 1973.” 1973. Folder: 1973/74 - Tennis, Box 3, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Schembechler, Bo. 1975a. “Block M Varsity Award to Don Canham,” May 1, 1975. Art Exhibit: Moving Through the Centuries: The Empowerment of UM Women Through Physical Activity.

- Smith, Allan. 1973. "Intercollegiate Athletics for Women," August 15, 1973. Folder: UM Committee to Study Intercollegiate Athletics for Women - Memos and Correspondence 1973-1974, Box 2, Eunice Burns Papers 1960-2011. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Smolenski, Susan. 1973. "Letter from Student to Burns Committee," August 14, 1973. Folder: UM Committee to Study Intercollegiate Athletics for Women - Memos and Correspondence 1973-1974, Box 2, Eunice Burns Papers 1960-2011. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- "Speech about Marie Hartwig." 1982. Folder: Awards and Scholarships, 1974-1988, Box 1, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- "Summary of Title IX: What the Proposed Regulations Require." n.d. Project on the Status and Education of Women. Folder: Title IX - Project on Status and Education of Women - Reports, etc, 1972-1975, Box 7, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan. Accessed August 15, 2017.
- Szady, Sheryl Marie, and Linda Laird. Memorandum. 1973. "Intercollegiate Program for Women," April 11, 1973. Folder: UM Committee to Study Intercollegiate Sports for Women - History 1970-1973, Box 2, Eunice Burns Papers 1960-2011. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- "Tender Limitations," September 17, 1981. Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- "Tennis Team Competition." 1974. Folder: 1974/75 - Tennis, Box 3, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- The Detroit News Magazine*. 1969. "U-M's Man with a Mission," July 20, 1969. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Thomas, Ritchie. 1975. "Meeting with President Ford," July 25, 1975. Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Thomaselli, Rich. 1999. "With Canham, 'M' Also Stood for Marketing." *Ann Arbor News*, September 2, 1999. Folder: Biography, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

"Timeline of Title IX." 1979. Folder: Chronology of Implementation, 1979, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

"Title IX Evaluation Tool." 1976. Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

"Track Complaint." 1979, April 23, 1979. Folder: Title IX Complaints Field - Track Complaint (Mayberry, Supler), 1979, Box 6, Women's Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

"Title IX Complaint to President Ford," July 14, 1975. Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

"Title IX Compliance to Richard Kennedy," December 11, 1978. Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

"Title IX to Joint Group," May 20, 1975. Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.] "Title IX Compliance to Will Perry," July 21, 1978. Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

"Title IX & Football Tickets to William Ford," September 27, 1979. Folder: Women's Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Title IX & Stop ERA,” May 20, 1975. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Women’s Athletics Budget.” 1975. Folder: Budget Material, 1974/75-1975/76, Box 2, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Women’s Athletic Program.” Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Women Athletic Scholarships Fall 1967-1977.” Folder: Awards and Scholarships, 1974-1988, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Women Athletic Scholarships Winter 1976-1977.” Folder: Awards and Scholarships, 1974-1988, Box 1, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Women’s Coaches,” October 31, 1979. Folder: Women’s “M” Club, 1980-1981, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics Program,” June 16, 1977. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Women’s Scholarships,” March 2, 1978. Folder: Women’s Athletic Programs 1971-1979, Box 3, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“1980-1981 Budget,” June 17, 1980. Folder: Correspondences (Departmental), 1971-1988, Box 1, Donald B. Canham Papers 1968-1988. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Women’s Tennis Team.” n.d. Folder: 1975/76 - Tennis, Box 3, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan. Accessed August 15, 2017.

“Women’s Tennis Team Budget.” 1973. Folder: 1973/74 - Tennis: Budget, Box 3, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

“Women’s Tennis Team Schedule.” 1973. Folder: 1972/73 - Tennis, Box 3, Women’s Athletics University of Michigan Records 1972-1990. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.