

**Interview with James Rothenberger**

**Interviewed by Ann Pflaum, Assistant Dean University College,  
University of Minnesota**

**Interviewed on March 16, 2000**

James Rothenberger - JR  
Ann Pflaum - AP

AP: One of the great courses in the university.

JR: All four of us have been absolute characters.

AP: Is that right?

JR: When you stop to think about it. Stewart Thompson was so dedicated to this class, he lived on the top of the Campus Club. He had two rooms in the Campus Club and lived there.

AP: We're still humming, but I have a second tape recorder. Let me try it.

JR: He was dedicated to his campus. [laughter] I'm not willing to live with my students.

AP: One of my favorite Campus Club stories was the padlock on the ice cream. For some reason the Campus Club had the idea that Professor Kolthoff was eating off their ice cream, so they put a padlock on it because, as you know, he lived in the Campus Club on the second floor. He was the very last lodger. So they would leave him a sandwich for dinner. I think their feeling was that he was getting too hungry, and I just loved the idea that a man who was supposed to leave millions to the university had a padlock in case he might have gone off with an extra scoop of ice cream. I'm sure it's apocryphal—it must have been the help.



AP: This is the sixteenth of March, 2000, and I'm interviewing James Rothenberger, who is a faculty member in the School of Public Health. He came to the university as a student and is a third generation of his family connected to the university. Jim, you had come attached to Paul Cashman in the late '60s as I recall, and you got into a drug abuse program?

JR: We can even back up a little bit. President Moos came in the fall of '67. In the spring of 1968 I was running for student body president. It was the first all-campus election we ever had. I won the popular vote but lost in the electoral college. I lost literally a couple of weeks before Moos' inauguration that spring. So because I had been visible, University Relations asked if I would help out with some of their events. It was a huge gala inauguration. I knew the campus and I knew students, so I said sure. I ended up with a part-time job in University Relations, going

to the official parties at the university for about four years, which in itself was an exciting, interesting thing that gave you a completely different picture on personalities than when people were sober. Also, I knew Ed Williamson, who was the dean of students, very well. The night I lost the electoral college for the student association presidency was the night that Mac Moos called Ed Williamson and said, "I'm going to appoint a vice president for student affairs." So Ed and I sort of commiserated together that night and the next morning, and he said, "Don't tell anybody, but you're on my staff from now on. We'll find a place for you." Ed was really one of my mentors and the last of the great dean of students in the country.

AP: I'm so glad we're having this interview, because that certainly is one of the things that we have heard from other people. Can you describe what he was like?

JR: He was a very intimidating person until you stood up to him. I think he was intimidating just to see what kind of metal you really had. I remember being over in the student association one day with Bill Newell, who'd been the president. Ed called and said, "You haven't read the Minnesota 1918 Board of Regents meeting, and if you would . . ." and I simply said to him, "Dean Williamson, you're not being rational," and hung up on him. Poor Bill just about died. But we were best of friends after that. Lots of people would say things. Don Zander used to tell stories like that, and Jim Reeves, who is no longer alive. The staff people who would stand up to him and fight for what they believed to be right, he respected. Others he just bowled over.

AP: I talked with Matthew Stark, and he said that his read on Williamson was, for example, on a topic like civil rights, he wasn't terribly liberal personally but that he had this theory of the student experience as a learning experience, so therefore he encouraged students to get experience in civil rights work as a way of broadening their horizon even if it wasn't his personal favorite thing to do. That was just his read; I didn't know Williamson, so I have no way of knowing. Would you describe him as left, center, a centrist, apolitical?

JR: I can't ever remember a political conversation with Ed. That's interesting. I got to know him through what was then called the Student Rights Movement that had started at Berkeley. He was looking at students from a developmental point of view. If you read his writings, it's very clear that he was the last of the great student personnel workers who said the faculty have a responsibility for student growth outside the classroom. We should essentially draw a big sandbox—this wasn't his words—and let people play in that sandbox, but it has to have big borders. Once they go beyond that border, you have to bring them back into the sandbox. Those weren't really his words, but it was giving students a lot of freedom to learn on their own. That was the days of George Lincoln Rockwell, the American Nazi Party speaking at Coffman Union, and the board of regents finally had to say, "Yes, we will sponsor that on a free speech issue." But Ed was behind that. He said, "You know, students need to hear it first hand." So I'd agree. It's one of the few things I'd probably agree with Matthew Stark on, come to think about it.

AP: One of the episodes that occurred, it occurred under Wilson, and you may not have remembered it . . . I'm trying to find somebody who can shed a little bit of light on it . . . It seemed to have been an episode involving a Russian flag on an exhibition that was touring the country, and the issue seemed to revolve around the right to display the Russian flag. A student tore down the flag. Wilson was prepared to make an apology; then he backed away from the

apology, writing somebody, "That person had no right to fly the flag anyway. Don't send an apology." It was such a sort of anti-liberal action that I was interested in trying to find somebody who remembered it. It was sort of an unusual fluke of a thing.

JR: I don't remember that at all.

AP: I can see why. It was one of those below the radar screen. It must have been a *Daily* article one day, and that was about all.

JR: Wilson was an historian. I remember he'd go into student meetings, and instead of talking about student fees he'd talk about terrorists. Speaking of the flag story, though, there is actually a funny one. The alumni office used to be on the second floor of Coffman Union overlooking the front plaza. During the first of the student demonstrations in 1970, Ed Haislet was head of the alumni association. He was just incensed that anybody would be questioning the patriotism of people of the United States, and that if we were in war it was a good war, and all those types of things. He charged out and he tears off from the wall what he thought was a Vietnamese flag, and he threw it on the ground, stomped all over it, until somebody pointed out that it was the Mexican flag that he had taken off the wall. [laughter] Second floor Coffman used to have all these international flags up there. So a group of us were going to complain to the Mexican Embassy, but we never followed through.

AP: Another Ed Haislet story that I'm tracking down . . . I know he wrote a very brave national editorial urging his student affairs colleagues not to hassle Communists. That sort of surprised me because I hadn't read him, from what I'd read about him, as quite . . .

JR: Ed Haislet or Ed Williamson?

AP: Ed Haislet.

JR: That surprised me about Haislet because he wasn't really a student affairs type.

AP: No, he wasn't. It was an issue that was important to Morrill. Morrill had also given a speech at Williamsburg on the same topic to a national association of alumni directors. So Haislet carried the torch a little bit further on behalf of sort of an academic freedom, don't harass the faculty. Certainly, Williamson just emerges as a giant in everything we've read. Why did Moos make a change?

JR: My read on that is that Williamson was too powerful. Mac wanted to assert his authority as the new president, that things were going to be different from now on, and set up a vice president for student affairs structure. One of the problems we have at the university is that we very seldom know how to say thank you and goodbye at the end of somebody's career. So the last year of Ed's tenure—and everybody knew he was retiring—he was subservient to the vice president for student affairs, Paul Cashman. Moos could have waited a year and set up that new structure, but didn't.

AP: People who talk about Moos feel that some of his most effective years were his earlier years. Do you have any comments on whether he was more effective at one part of his administration than another?

JR: My perspective would be from those days much more of a student perspective. I think he probably was. This honeymoon period where you had a former student becoming the president for the first time, a former marching band member coming back and becoming president . . . Bill Anglim was his driver and the marching band would go marching out of Northrop to the practice field and every once in a while there would be Mac and his limousine coming out to hear practice. He would show up on buses with students. He was closer to students than to faculty. I think that never sat very well with the faculty. So the two populations he seemed to be very comfortable with were students and then the big money people. In terms of big money people, one of the things that I don't think he's ever been given good credit for is, he started us on this super large endowment that we now have. So he brought in the vice president of the St. Paul Banks, then went to the Ford Foundation that's now head of the Park Service—Roger Kennedy. The downtown folks really didn't like Roger Kennedy, and there was all this argument as to did Roger do well in investing or poorly in investing? But the one thing that started is, the Foundation hadn't been very powerful and didn't have an awful lot of money before Mac Moos came. Mac did a lot of the lunch at the Minnesota Club and brought an awful lot of money into this place. At least that's my read on it. It was interesting being sort of a student through University Relations, student with the student government type of thing because I ended up on a first-name basis with all the vice presidents and all the regents and all the deans for a period of time, because those were back in the days when we were doing five graduations a year. That's a skill sort of like making license plates. If you know how to run graduation, there aren't very many places you can use that around the country. So Kelly Godfrey and I, and Claudia Wallace, who is now Claudia Wallace Gardner . . . Claudia took Kelly's place, but for some forty straight graduations we ran them. It was interesting. We got to see people in very different lights, which was interesting there.

AP: You had mentioned you had a perspective when we talked more than a year ago, on the famous demonstration of 1972. If I recall correctly, you believed that Stenvig had a personal animosity for Eugene Eidenberg because Eidenberg had worked for his political opponent. Did I hear you correctly, or am I just making this up?

JR: I think that can probably be well documented. Gene Eidenberg came here as a new professor in about '65 or '66 . . . very liberal, Democrat, got tied in with the liberal wing of Art Naftalin and Mondale and the old pols of the democratic side. He was doing research in that area, but also became very friendly with those folks. Gene becomes acting president; I'm not quite sure how he got up into the administration—I can't remember that right now—but when Mac went up to Canada in that spring of '72 to give a speech, it turned out that the only person on campus who was the acting president was Gene Eidenberg. That was the mining of the Haiphong Harbor, and students got upset and were marching not only on this campus but many of the other major campuses in the country. Normally what probably would have happened is there would have been some calls. In '70, for example, in the student riots, Mac Moos was on the phone with Governor LeVander many times during the day—Should they bring out the National Guard? Shouldn't they bring out the National Guard? Mac was a good facilitator and could talk with all

these folks. The mayor in '72 was Charlie Stenvig. Charlie Stenvig was a very anti-democratic individual in terms of the Democratic party. He had some out of the police force. He had literally started the Minneapolis Tactical Squad as part of the police force. So the sort of right-wing segment of the Minneapolis Police Department was some of Mayor Stenvig's biggest backers. So when things looked like they were getting out of control on campus, Idenberg didn't have a good relationship back and forth to negotiate this thing out, saying, "Look, let's just let it cool for a while." The students made the mistake that they didn't make in '70. They blockaded Washington Avenue, which is not university property, and it's a major city thoroughfare. At that point, they let it go overnight, and the next day the police came in and there was tear gas and the whole mess fell apart.

AP: Jim, one of the questions that we are all struggling mightily to remember was, Did Mac Moos get back from Canada, as you recall, at any point during that two-day period?

JR: I'm sure he was there the second day. When he got back into town, I don't remember. I can remember standing on Washington Avenue literally in the middle of the intersection, just kitty-corner from Coffman Union and Ford Hall, and people had pulled out desks and chairs from the botany building, the zoology building, Ford Hall, and you had this massive barricade of desks and chairs and whatever blocking that street that had to be fifteen feet tall. I remember standing there with the university police chief who . . .

AP: Was it Hanscom or Wilson?

JR: Chick had already retired by then.

AP: Okay, so it's Eugene Wilson probably then.

JR: Hold on a second. The name Wes Pomeroy is coming to me.

AP: Okay. We can check those dates.

JR: I'm thinking it might have been Wes. It was the police officer who came here to really turn things around and he wasn't here long. There was that particular disturbance, and then he left soon after that. I can remember, whoever it was, saying that his days were numbered when he looked at what was going on out there. But I don't remember ever seeing Mac. I would have been there I would guess until late in the evening. If Mac would have been there, I would have seen him.

AP: Did you think he came back the next day, though?

JR: I'm fairly sure he was on campus the next day.

AP: Idenberg must have been in charge because Mac was away, and so your memory is that he came back late in the evening and was there the next morning, then. Is that what I hear you saying?

JR: I'm thinking that's probably what would have happened. I can remember in the '70 disturbances, Mac was deeply involved in this. I even stayed a couple of nights out at Mac's home answering phones through the night. He wasn't as deeply involved in the '72 one, because he wasn't there for the start of it. By the time he did get back, a certain number of decisions had been made and it was out of the university's hands.

AP: Dianna, in the president's office, was remembering the same thing and we were trying to find somebody who remembered seeing Mac. She remembered that he had talked the students into a calmer posture, or she thought she remembered that.

JR: He certainly had in the '70 one.

AP: I mentioned that to her, too, but you're not as sure about the '72?

JR: I'm thinking that everything fell apart before he could have an influence on that. I'm trying to think who . . . Zander would have been on the scene.

AP: I think Zander is in Mexico. I'm also trying to reach Jim Price. Somebody thought he might have been on the scene.

JR: He wasn't as involved in the student affairs side. The people that were out there on the street would be Jim Reeves, who is now dead, and Paul Cashman, who is now dead. Lud Spolyer would have been there.

AP: And I talked to Lud.

JR: What's Lud's memory?

AP: He couldn't remember that he was back. He didn't remember seeing him. He certainly didn't remember any dramatic talk the students out of things.

JR: I have vivid pictures of Mac talking with students in '70 but not in '72.

AP: Do you have any light on the disturbance that was written up that occurred at Mac's inauguration?

JR: Yes. That was interesting. That was, in large part, against George Bundy from the state department.

AP: Right. And they wouldn't let Bundy finish, and then there was sort of apparently . . . Ziebarth tells that Moos went down into the audience, talked to the students and said, "If you let Bundy finish, I'll give you a chance to talk at the end." Then he came back up to the stage, but he hadn't conveyed this message to E. Z. Ziebarth, who was running the proceedings, so E. Z. sort of said, "These proceedings are over" without realizing the commitment Moos had made. So there was a big to-do, and the students felt betrayed, and this and that. But it was too late to sort of do anything about it by the time it got unscrambled.

JR: It was an actual interruption in that ceremony and talk, and he moved down off the stage. There were a lot of interesting things that happened at that inauguration. It was the last time we really brought so many people on campus to do the march from all these colleges around the country in the academic gowns. The program for that must be in the archives.

AP: It is, and I've read the speeches.

JR: There was a fellow from the NAACP; in fact . . . who was that? There is a story about Ziebarth at that point, too. The night before the ceremonies there is a reception at the Campus Club, and whoever was head of the NAACP at that time—it wasn't Farmer—had a rather militant young aide who corners several people including Ziebarth, and he says, "What do you call people like me here in Minnesota?" He had never been to Minnesota. He was looking for a way to find out, and was this a derogatory term and stuff like that. We at those times were using the term "black"; "African American" hadn't come in. He says, "I'm glad you're not using the term "colored." E. Z. looks at him and says, "Now what organization do you work with?" knowing full well. The guy said, "NAACP." And he said, "What does that stand for?" There are lots of memories from that. Who is still around? It would be interesting to track down Kelly Godfrey from University Relations, but I have no idea how to track her down. There was this piece of University Relations trying to keep the lid on and keep everything running smoothly because this is a huge production. At the same time we'd end up with these political disturbances that we're having to put out the fires around there, too. I was sort of in the middle of going to be going to Paul Cashman's staff, but I was essentially there working for University Relations.

AP: One of the comparative observations about Minnesota compared to Berkeley or Wisconsin or Columbia, Minnesota appeared to have a more collegial dialogue among students and administrators. Does that make any sense to you, or do you think there is kind of a rose-colored-glasses memory factor?

JR: I think up until '72 that's probably true. But the other variable there is that the intensity of our students and the numbers behind them just weren't there. We had a fairly hard core of people in SDS, Students for a Democratic Society. They were able to get quite a few people out for a few days, but they weren't there for the long run. Columbia was able to keep protests going for months, and our students just didn't have the commitment and stamina to keep that going that long. They didn't have the backing from other students. To a large extent, I think that's because we were much more of a commuter campus.

AP: That's interesting.

JR: The other side of that, you look at some of the other institutions, you didn't have a Don Zander who was out on the street all of the time, and Cashman and Moos. Even in '70, it was sort of sad and funny, but heartening at the same time, Les Malkerson, who was chairman of the board of regents, was absolutely terrified of these protesting students. One of my assignments was to take him around through campus and introduce him to people and have him talk to people, and he really tried, he really did. In most of those other institutions, you weren't having

the board of governors coming down and meeting with students on the street. Here, in the first one in '70, we did have a lot of that. I think that kept it from escalating.

AP: One of the stories we tell in the book has to do with the antiwar demonstrations and Honeywell and how Ed Anderson and a couple of faculty colleagues called up Jim when he was CEO of Honeywell and said, "Mr. Binger, we have some concerns about the cluster bombs. We want to come and see you, and we want you to know we are planning a demonstration." So he said, "Fine, come on up." So these three people came, and visited with him for about a half an hour, and both sides recounted this incredibly friendly, Jim saying, "You have every right to have this demonstration . . . I wouldn't dream of interfering with it." That just doesn't seem like other parts of the country.

JR: When we could get people to talk, it generally calmed things down. Governor LeVander in '70, we heard, wanted to bring in the National Guard and would not take any phone calls. Paul Cashman was going through somebody who knew the governor's wife, and said, "Let's sit down and talk about this," but there were a lot of those opportunities. If we could just sit down and talk about it as so-called Minnesota nice rational people, we could sort of figure something out. That happened in '70 a lot. It didn't happen in '72.

AP: But it didn't get out of hand in '72, other than the one late one evening.

JR: Right. If you take a look at what so-called "got out of hand" in '70, it was on the edge of the campus. It was the so-called "People's Park" issue over in Dinkytown, and it was on Oak and Washington at the Red Barn fast-foot restaurant. It never really hit the core of the campus. The '72 one was right in front of Coffman.

[end of side 1]

JR: I made the mistake of learning more than the people we were interviewing, so I got the job. My career goal at that point was to become a government bureaucrat, and I guess I've never fulfilled that particular goal. So I got involved in the drug area and I'm still doing a lot of that. I still teach a popular drug-use class. We get about 1500 students a year through.

AP: Who did you admire from those years on the campus? You mentioned Williamson. Are there other people who you think were particularly important?

JR: I admired Mac Moos a great deal when he was getting good staff information. He brought along with him a woman by the name of Eileen McAvoy. Eileen formed very close relationships with Don Smith, who was the academic vice president, and Paul Cashman, who was student affairs, and could channel the information Mac needed into him from those people. In fact, she formed such a close relationship with Don Smith she married him. They went off to Madison. As soon as Eileen left, the information that was getting to Mac was filtered by politics, I think. You were saying earlier that maybe Mac was more successful in his first years rather than his latter years. I think you can probably point to Eileen's leaving, and that's the demarcation line. In the student affairs area and the university area, Mac was very important, and Ed Williamson. Paul Cashman was a really nice guy. I think he did a disservice in the long run, but all the other

campuses were doing the same thing. He professionalized the student affairs staff. What I mean by that is that in Ed Williamson's day all of the senior student personnel officers had faculty appointments in departments, and they taught classes. With Paul, we started seeing a trend toward hiring people with counseling student personnel background, weren't given faculty appointments to the standpoint now where I think we may have only one person in that whole staff that has a faculty appointment. What that did is it separated the faculty from the student affairs responsibility; the student affairs people said, "We'll take care of this." Now we have the end result where the faculty don't want to get involved with students outside the classroom. They don't see it as their responsibility, and we've lost that part of the community sense. I think we can trace that back to Paul. Now, he was following what the rest of the student personnel vice presidents were doing across the country. It wasn't only there, but it was sad to see that sort of throwing it in Williamson's face this joint community that we all had before isn't going to be anymore.

AP: Williamson thought he was doing it, but he had a more psychology model than perhaps Cashman? And Cashman was probably a more secular model and less of a psychology model?

JR: I'm not sure if Cashman ever really knew what the field of student affairs was. He came out of speech communication.

AP: That's right. So he had a completely different take on it. I know a lot of the people that had come under Williamson were quite unhappy with the change.

JR: Martin Snoke . . .

AP: When you say the end of a dynasty, it was actually a single person dynasty because Williamson was appointed in 1940, and it was '69 when he left. When you go and see all of the . . . Matthew Stark was one of the most interesting people that I interviewed because of the seriousness of the record keeping that he had done, and he kept up with students and he gave me names, and he showed me programs, and he showed me things that he had donated to the archives, and suggested studies that had been done. It was remarkable, which seemed to be characteristic of Williamson. Having read a number of his books, I can see that, the idea that this is a specialized profession. I liked your image about the sandbox. That was just a wonderful image. I gather that Williamson was uncomfortable with the demonstrations, that that was outside the sandbox for him.

JR: It was outside the sandbox and it was outside his responsibilities. We had appointed the vice president for student affairs, and Ed was just sort of there.

AP: And, of course, that was a duplicate title because he in effect was vice president for student affairs as dean of students. Do you have any thoughts you'd like to share about those Moos years?

JR: I'm better at responding to specific probes.

AP: One probe was, there appeared to be quite a lot of discontent or lack of confidence in his leadership toward the end of his administration. There was, in fact, a discussion in the senate in April of the year that he resigned, which would have been '73 that he announced his resignation. I think he announced it a full year in advance of leaving. I think he said, "A year from now I will be going on."

JR: At a semi-secret meeting of the board of regents, and if I recall it was out at Les Malkerson's farm, they essentially had a vote of no confidence, which meant Mac had to leave. Elmer Anderson, if I recall, was then chairman of the board of regents. I always thought they treated Mac very poorly in the way that they handled that. Mac ends up getting a job out at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and he didn't go into it with his eyes open. Maynard Hutchins had started the center, the whiz kid who had been the youngest president of the University of Chicago ever. Hutchins had stepped down but not left. So this Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara had been his brain child; he says he's going to step down; Mac comes out and the guy is there every day countermanding Mac's decisions, which was an untenable situation to be in. Mac resigns within a year or so and comes back to Minnesota. Unfortunately, his ego was such that once you have been president of the University of Minnesota and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, there are only a handful of places that you could go, and one of them would be Harvard, and that was full for several years. He had lots of job offers, including an intriguing one as president of Gettysburg, which, being a former Eisenhower staff person, this little liberal arts college would have been a nice little end to his career. I don't think his ego ever allowed him to do that. That was his final destruction.

AP: Things seemed to fall apart. People speak of it as an unfortunate time. Then things got a lot worse. He had that sort of disastrous run for the senate towards the very end of his life.

JR: Actually, there's a portion of that I'd be happy to talk to you about, but I don't want to put it on tape.

AP: Tell me about your switch into public health and into the faculty. What year did you then move on into that position?

JR: That was in 1972. I had spent a good part of the first part of that year on loan from the university to the White House office for drug abuse prevention in the Nixon administration. We were writing federal drug policy. By June was the break in of Democratic national headquarters. I was writing papers that had previously been worked on by G. Gordon Liddy and I didn't know who he was, and it was really crazy. We figured by the end of the summer of '72 that there wasn't going to be a future in the Nixon administration. So I came back to the "U" and Bob Schwanke was assistant dean here at the school, and he knew my background in the drug area and asked if I would join him in teaching a new drug requirement that we had in the state that all teachers had to have a drug class. So that was my real introduction into the school, and that was the course I taught from '72 on.

AP: Has the attitude towards drugs changed over those years? The popular image of the '70s is a much more loose attitude toward drugs than before or after.

JR: I think if you look at the data in terms of use patterns, we had a higher rate of marijuana use, a higher rate of LSD use, and the alcohol use has remained constant all this period of time. We see fluctuations—we're seeing an increase again in marijuana use, for example. None of this ever goes away; it just sort of goes in cycles.

AP: Did you know Ancel Keys?

JR: No, I didn't. Most of the people in my department do. He still has an office.

AP: That's remarkable. I saw the article on him in the Academic Health Center magazine celebrating his 94<sup>th</sup> birthday.

JR: He's still around our West Bank office building once in a while when he's in the country. He's spending most of his time in Italy, and has since his retirement.

AP: That's what I gathered. I didn't know that the school had a West Bank office. I thought everybody was over where the dean's office is, at Mayo. But not so obviously.

JR: One of our problems is, we were the last of the line of health science schools to get a building, so we haven't gotten a building yet. We did get a door with our name over it, but we didn't get a building behind it. So some of the school is in the Mayo building—the dean's office is there. Some of it is here in the Moos tower where I am. Our division of epidemiology has about 600 employees, and there just isn't space anywhere on the East Bank. So the old FMC building was acquired by us. The university now leases that; we have most of it. The human sexuality program is over there. The Foundation had been over there until they moved to the Gateway building recently.

AP: I remember being over there, and I'd seen the human sexuality program. I guess I hadn't realized that it was also epidemiology.

JR: The basement level, the third and fourth floors are all epidemiology.

AP: I don't think a person could have had as interesting a career as you've had.

JR: It's really been fascinating, because in academia you usually move around quite about it. I'm in meetings and they turn to me and ask for history types of things. I've got this tremendous dedication to the university. It's been good to me and I've been good to it, and have gotten a few awards to recognize that, and I ended up with a couple of kidneys from John Najarian. I've had two transplants here.

AP: Do you have any comment on the Najarian affair—the ALG matter?

JR: Once again, this university cannot say thank you and good bye in kindly terms. John Najarian I think was the best recruit we have ever made here at the university, including football coaches. He certainly stayed here longer than Lou Holtz. A remarkable person. The ALG stuff got out of hand. He was the administrator; he had to take the fall. But I don't think he was treated

all that well. For the university to spend as much money trying to prosecute him as they did, and then to have the federal judge throw out all but one of those forty-some counts, has got to tell you something. The man himself is interesting. I still see him three or four days a week here in the halls. He's operating every day. He's been stripped of his faculty appointment; he's been stripped of the chair of the department, but he's so dedicated to his patients, and he's still one of the most respected transplant surgeons in the world, and he's still operating every day. I can't think of anybody who had been so humiliated by their home institution that they've continued to do that. To me, that's remarkable.

AP: I've certainly, in working on this history, seen a divergent opinion. If you interview north of Washington Avenue, you get one perspective, and among his medical colleagues a very, very different perspective. It's been one of the most challenging parts of the book to write, as you can perhaps guess.

JR: Since we owe my life to his program, I've got a bias.

AP: Do you have any sense of the reputation of the university, say in 1950, 1975, and the present? Do you see any changes?

JR: I think with reputations you've got to look at individual departments. I don't really think very many people think outside of the state of the university as a whole. They'll say psychology was so on top and it ranked number 1 and 2 with Harvard, for example. They'll look at our epidemiology department and public health and say epidemiology is on top, but they're not saying the whole school of public health is on top. It's really hard to get that type of reading. When I travel around the country, Minnesota is sort of known out there, but it's someplace between New York and San Francisco and they're not quite sure exactly where. In terms of over time, I'm not sure how you'd get an accurate read on that.

AP: We've been using the National Research Council ratings, which do, as you suggest, look at individual departments, so one can get a certain sense of that.

JR: I don't think we were ever destined to be the Harvard on the Mississippi as Ken Keller had envisioned.

AP: How do you interpret and understand the commitment to focus problems, the balance between access and excellence? Having been a student leader and then a faculty member, do you have any perspectives on how Keller and perhaps Hasselmo handled some of those dilemmas?

JR: You know, if you go back and read that document, I think most of it's a very reasonable document, but Keller's personality and the way he went about introducing it I think is what killed it. Minnesotans don't like pushy easterners. Ken sort of came off as an easterner. I think people like much lower key here, and you gradually introduce something. When there were some financial irregularities in terms of Eastcliff, that was the excuse to get rid of him. There is some other stuff in there with Ken Keller. One of the things somebody should look at some day is his purchasing of a few thousand feet of Lake Superior on the north shore, which came up as a item on the board of regents docket one day. People donate land to the university all the time, and

they sell it for the money. Take a look at what Ken paid for that land per running foot, and then look at the market value of that land, and there's a huge, huge difference. It seemed to be one of those insider types of things. I wish they'd gone after him on that instead of the Eastcliff type of thing. I'm not sure he had any responsibility at all for Eastcliff.

AP: At this point in the interview I always ask people is there anything that I did not ask that you would like to comment on?

JR: I've found several times after reading Jim Gray's book—in fact, I think I've read that four or five times—how would you write a modern history of the university that has gotten so absolutely large that it may be unmanageable? Do you write it based on who the president was? I'm coming to the conclusion that most of the time, for most of the decisions around here, the president is not terribly important, that things go on whether somebody is sitting in Morrill Hall or not. I think the thing that has so defined the university over the last several years is this huge increase in bureaucracy we have that has become self-sustaining. When I first came here in '65, in Morrill Hall on the first level you had the entire registrar's office . . . Dean Somers—remember Dean Somers, dean of registration? Second floor you had records; third floor you had the president and all the vice presidents; and then fourth and fifth floor you had all the business office. Now we've got separate buildings for all of those functions. If you could just take a look at the bureaucracy and what the influence of that bureaucracy has had on just how we run this institution and how decisions are made, I think the bureaucracy becomes more important than any one leader in that group.

AP: It certainly is larger.

JR: I can't remember when you came, Ann, but just this huge growth.

AP: I came as a student in '59, and entered the Ph.D. program in '66, got my Ph.D. in '74, and went to work for the administration in '75. So in the '50s I was there when I was still in high school taking summer school courses. In the '60s I entered graduate school and spent about eight years getting a Ph.D. In terms of the period we're writing about, I was on the staff for the second twenty-five years, and really as a Minnesota resident of course, had a pretty good feel for the place beginning about the end of the '50s. It is very unusual to try to explain it to somebody from another state or another country.

JR: That was during the period we moved to the West Bank for the first time, started our building program. The place blossomed; the place grew. You wonder if it's to the point where it's no longer manageable, that you can't grab a hold of the reigns and lead it in any direction, it just has sort of a power of its own and just keeps moving.

AP: Interesting question.

JR: This has been an interesting conversation.

AP: I thank you. What I'll do is send over the Human Subjects Permission, so we can get this transcribed if you're willing, and then it will go in the archives.

JR: Okay.

AP: Terrific. Thank you very, very much.

[end of interview]