

Charles Backstrom

- Early interest in politics and public service 2
  - Naftalin, Art 1, 3
  - Mitau, Ted 2
  - Citizenship Clearing House 2-3
  - University of Minnesota near State Capitol 4
  - activist tradition in Minnesota 4
- Political internships at University of Minnesota, 1957- 4-5
  - Mullen, Gerald - University of Minnesota appropriations 5
  - Davies, Jack 7
  - Searle, Rod 7
  - Rosenmeier, Gordon 7-8
  - Wenberg, Stan 7-8
  - Middlebrook, William 9
- Mulford, Sibley - "free love crisis" 10-11
- Medical School - desensitization training 11-12
  - public misunderstanding 12
- African-American student protests, 1968-1970 12, 14
  - occupation of Morrill Hall 13
- Morrill, James and state legislature 13
  - Wilson, Meredith "Met" and state legislature 13
  - Moos, Malcolm and state legislature 14
- Ingve, John - named by legislature to Board of Regents 15
- Reapportionment of legislature following 1970 16-18
- University of Minnesota enrollments 19
  - elitism vs. democracy 19
- Expansion of state university system, 1970s 19-
- University of Minnesota as "flagship" idea - 21
  - Andersen, Elmer 22
  - Higher Education Coordinating Board, circa 1970s 23
- Decline in state appropriations 24
- Increase in regential powers 25
- Legislative leaders 27-

**Interview with Charles Backstrom**

**Interviewed by Professor Clarke A. Chambers  
University of Minnesota**

**Interviewed on April 26, 1995  
University of Minnesota Campus**

Charles Backstrom           - CB  
Clarke A. Chambers       - CAC

CAC: Today is April 26. I'm interviewing Charles Backstrom, longtime member of the Political Science Department.

CB: Since 1959.

CAC: Since 1959. Who—I don't know how early . . . we'll talk about it—took on student interns.

CB: Right away. That's what I was hired for.

CAC: He probably knows better the workings of the state legislature since then and, because he's a good scholar, before then. So, that's the chief agenda for our conversation this morning. Why don't you start by saying when you came here, what your assignment, and what training you had for it, and then we'll be off and running.

CB: We have to go one step before. The Political Science Department had developed a set of internship field work and politics courses that were internships that were very unique in higher education. It was done by Arthur Naftalin when he was a professor before my time. Art then went into state service as a commissioner of administration.

CAC: I have nice long interview with Art.

CB: Yes?

CAC: Yes.

CB: I was in Michigan at the time at Eastern Michigan University. They had a branch of what was called the Citizenship Clearing House. It was headquartered at NYU [New York University] and was premiered by Arthur Vanderbilt who was a professor there and who became the chief justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, one of America's most distinguished jurors. They were reacting to something that I think is an example of public opinion, polling, influence on a whole generation of people. Just before that time, some poll said that they had interviewed American people and they said they would not let their kids go into politics because they would either have to be crooked before they went or they would become so immediately.

CAC: [laughter]

CB: That shocked all of these activists, the kind of people who did public service as a mission in their own lives . . .

CAC: The John Gardner type.

CB: Yes . . . seeing the undercut of this morale item that would lead to destruction and to terrible people coming into government. So, they said, "What should we do? We should get the college kids interested in politics?" But all of the colleges shied away from having any politicians on campus. Some had rules that you couldn't have any politician come to campus to speak even. All of them had rules that you couldn't leave the campus. Of course, they were in lock step for graduation and they said if the student leaves campus, they might never come back. They had to have an innocuous name. The name later became the National Center for Education in Politics which it always was but that was developed some years later after they had established themselves without being such a threat to the campuses. They set this up, and it was called the Citizenship Clearing House, and the idea was that the students in the eastern universities, the private universities, were not from New York, and New Haven, and Boston but from someplace else but they would get their beginning training, and acquaintance, and understanding in politics there. Then they would go someplace else to have their career but there would be this clearing house that you could say to the state . . . if they went to Michigan, you could say, "Okay, here's so and so who is one of our good people. You should get him involved with politics." So, they had the best state chairs of the parties, people like Ray Bliss and the guy from Michigan . . . I might remember his name later.

CAC: So, this is not public service? It's elected . . .

CB: It was elected politics. They started financing some books about state politics and G.T. Mitau was commissioned to write *Minnesota Politics in Minnesota*.

CAC: Oh. At Macalester.

CB: It was supposed to be the little textbook that you could use because nobody had done anything about practical politics, about what you do, and what people are like in government.

Art Naftalin was one of the originators of this but he had already had this series of field work courses where the students would join a campaign, and then they would go to the legislature and be an intern with the victorious legislative candidate, and then in the spring quarter, they would go to work with a lobby so that they had this three-part experience. We had it every year.

CAC: This started in the late 1940s?

CB: Early 1950s. When I was selected to go to a national meeting about people like this, when I was in Michigan, there's the Minnesota people as the staff . . . Art Naftalin telling how it should be done. Of course, I never had any idea I would be at Minnesota. Then Art went into the state service and Floyd Flom was made the director. Then he got a vote for tenure of 8-7, or something like that, and decided that it was a good sign for him to leave; so, he went to work for GE [General Electric] as their public relations person, a wonderful job. He left in June and they had to have somebody instantly. In the old boy network, they called around you know. In Wisconsin, people said, "Here's Charles Backstrom." I was a congressional fellow and I had stayed on in Washington for a year.

CAC: You had been a Madison Ph.D. in Political Science?

CB: Yes, a Madison Ph.D. but then I was teaching in Michigan and then had gone to Washington as a congressional fellow with the American Political Science Association. I didn't want to go back to the school I was at because it was too poor a school. The president changed my grades for one thing.

CAC: [laughter]

CB: He said that the state of Michigan wouldn't have had Eastern Michigan seven miles from Ann Harbor if they didn't want every person in the state to get a BA. I said, "Why don't we just give it to them at birth and save the trouble of giving it to people who don't earn it? I didn't want to go back; so, I was going to lose. Since I had been in Michigan, I had been in the Citizenship Clearing House group that was an association of all the colleges, private and public, in the state . . . plus the party officials, and governors, and whoever cared about it. They said I was a natural for this job; so, they just hired me sight unseen as a temporary. Then I later qualified for a job here. I came for that reason. I wouldn't have been selected here if they didn't need this work to be done and I had had some beginning experience someplace else.

CAC: Minnesota couldn't have been entirely unique? There must have been other places?

CB: There were a few but mighty few, mighty few.

CAC: That's interesting. And it was because of one person like Art Naftalin or was there something in our culture here?

CB: Oh, it's partly the fortuitous situation. I call it fortuitous . . . that the university is in the largest city and the state capitol. I was offered a job at William and Mary one time. They said, "We want you to run our internship program." I said, "How am I going to do it? They said, "You can take a bus one day to the state capitol."

CAC: [laughter]

CB: If you're nowhere, you can't do this. But the students here can take classes . . . jump on the bus . . .

CAC: It's right here.

CB: . . . and half of the state's campaigns are here, the legislative campaigns, so there is plenty of work to be done. Think of doing this at Penn State in dead center of Pennsylvania where every survey you do and everything you do, you just drown out these individuals because there's nothing else there.

CAC: Yes.

CB: But here we have everything here to study and I had interns in local government and then the capitol . . . it's just marvelous. I said to the William and Mary people, "I can't do the job. I'm not going to go." It would be ridiculous to try to think I could do what I do here.

CAC: Right, right.

CB: Other than that, it was the active Political Science Department, the Hubert Humphrey influence, and Ben Lippincott, and the man that later became the president of American Political Science Association, Evron Kirkpatrick. Those people were here who were physiologically committed to activism. I don't know anything about the internal fights possibly in the department over doing this—you probably got that from Art—whether it was easy or hard. I know when I came there was some unreconstructed scholars who thought that it was a bad idea to have interns because they said that what you have to treat students to be is outsiders who are dispassionate in looking at it. If I have a student in a campaign or in the legislature who is working for the person, they're not going to be dispassionate. They are going to care about this person and think that he's the greatest person in the world. I tell students in a big talk the first day, this is a problem. You're supposed to be a participant observer, which is schizophrenic. You can't be both but you have to. I say, "We'll recognize your biases and then you do what you can but you'll trade inside information for this lack of dispassionate outside view because you're not going to get the inside view on the outside; so, you're either going to trade off and you're going to get it or not. That's how come I happened to come. I was taught in high school in Moorhead and I had gone to Moorhead State College; so, I knew something about Minnesota politics in the old Farmer Labor areas of the state.

CAC: You bet.

CB: So, it wasn't like I didn't know anything but I had to plunge in to advise my students. Then, of course, I read all their papers; so, I am in constant touch and I interview the students also when they're over there during the quarter. We talk about their learning.

CAC: Nineteen fifty-seven to 1995 is nearly forty years.

CB: Right. I've been around in Minnesota for 40 percent of the state's history.

CAC: [laughter]

CB: What the legislature was like in those days was a feudal system where powerful members of the senate, ten or so, each had a committee and they ran their committee like a fiefdom. There wasn't any central party leadership in the sense that came later under [Gordon] Rosenmeier. They just did what they wanted and every other committee let the chair of that committee run his fief. The university fief was Gerald Mullen, the president of Minnegasco. We have this great citizen legislature which means building lobbies. [laughter] We prize their experience and what it means is that they are working for themselves. That's my bias on that. Mullen was a great friend of the university and if you could find out why, that would be great. He was before my time so I didn't know him. He quit two years before I came. They would just let anything happen in the House, and then they would just go to Gerry Mullen, and he would fix it up in the bill. He would fight hard in the congress. He'd been a senator since 1930. He would just get what he wanted. The university's lobbying was a one person lobby and it was appropriate for its day because of the feudal system that it was. Each guy could get what they want.

CAC: I'm assuming that both houses were Republican controlled at that time?

CB: Yes. I was going to bring you down my chart of control.

CAC: All right.

CB: The Minnesota Senate has rotated once in the history of the state. It was entirely under Republican or conservative control until 1973. Then, it's been under DFL control ever since. So, we have one rotation of control.

CAC: [laughter]

CB: The House has been quite different in the rotation of control. The Farmer Laborites would control the House once in awhile and the DFL began to control the House once in awhile . . . then they wouldn't, and I have this chart I meant to lay my hands on it. If you want it, I can get it.

CAC: Many of these feudal lords were outstate, also? Mullen, perhaps, was not?

CB: Oh, yes.

CAC: But most of them were Republican rural?

CB: There were plenty of them in . . . Gordon Wright—I think his name was—was from Minneapolis. Alf Bergerud was a senator from the suburbs for many years. He was a different type from the others. Most of them were outstate, like [Donald] Sinclair from the far northwest who was chair of the Appropriations Committee and Rosenmeier—I have to say more about his later—from Little Falls who was the judiciary chair. Val Im was the appropriations person. Rosenmeier is dead. I was thinking that Val Im might well also be dead—he was the longtime chair of the Appropriations Committee from Mankato—but it would be worthwhile finding out. Maybe, you can think of a better way to do this than I can. I still keep all papers even when I go on vacation. I store them up and then I look because I don't want to not know who is dead. But one of the problems of my advancing age is that I can't remember whether I read that Dunlap . . . For instance, I was going to suggest that you see Bob Dunlap who was Sandy Keith's law partner in Rochester. He was from Wabasha, or Red Wing, or someplace like that. I don't know if he died or not. Carl Grande is still alive, I know. He was the DFL minority leader in that time and he is in full intellectual vigor. He was a public school administrator. He was the minority and he had no power but in terms of acute perceptions of what happens, he would just be unsurpassed.

CAC: What district was he?

CB: He was from St. Paul, I think the east side.

CAC: Which is Wendy Anderson's stamping ground.

CB: In that area. Grittner may be more in the central. I remember the school he had which was in the Midway area but I don't know if he lived there because you can be assigned around; so, I'm not positive what district he had. The other person from those days is Bill Dosland, from Moorhead and I have the idea that he died just a couple years ago. He's not that old . . . he was a young man when he came. He replaced his father, I think, in the Senate. I'll tell you some more about him later.

CAC: Okay.

CB: Have you talked to Wendy Anderson?

CAC: He's on my list. After all, he was governor, did the education bill, and so on. Of course, now he's a regent.

CB: Jack Davies is an Appeals Court judge.

CAC: Yes.

CB: He was in the Senate starting in 1959, the 1958 election. He was in this district right here and he is superb. He's got Parkinson's but don't let that throw you off because it has nothing to do with his mind. That's the senators from the day. I want to say something about Gerry Mullen.

[CAC shows CB a photo taken in 1994 of Jack Davies and CAC, a photo occasioned by Davies' having nominated CAC to the Alumni Association as his favorite professor.]

Yes, right. Oh, wonderful, wonderful. Yes, so you know him [Jack Davies] well?

CAC: Yes. I haven't interviewed him but I have him on the list.

CB: He was around forever and in the days of the majority. He became the president of the Senate later. He was kind of an outsider type. He wasn't an insider person.

CAC: [unclear] skeptical of the university although loyal to it in a way. Right?

CB: Yes. Right. When Gerry Mullen died, the university was completely shocked and it was absolutely unprepared to face the new situation of not having him there. At the same time, the House changed. The other person that you have to see without fail is Rod Searle. He was the speaker when they had a combined effort but he was a freshman in one of the first years I was here. You mentioned Stan Wenberg was the university's lobbyist and, of course, he was big, and brusque, and cocky, and he knew everything; so, he knew the old system, about the feudal system, but when the feudal lord died, he didn't know what to do. I'll tell you what he had done. Searle came in as a freshman and said to Wenberg, "I want to see the university's budget." He said, "We're not going to give it to you. You couldn't understand it anyway."

CAC: [laughter]

CB: That was their idea that you just give it to the committee chairs and people who [unclear] and so the university was never ever questioned by anybody. They just got whatever it was in the budget. You can imagine that Searle stung under this, and he got a copy anyway, and studied it. Fate would be that the very next year, the control of the House changed and Searle was the chair of the university committee. Here the university had built this animosity through its commitment to how it practiced in the old way of an institution that wasn't the old way anymore. Claude Allen became, I think, the university chair. He was a senator from the St. Paul campus. He was loyal to the "U" in the fashion that you want, that is a knee-jerk voter, but he had no impact whatever in the legislature; that is, he wasn't a Gerry Mullen. Then, the feudal system began to break down because all those powerful leaders retired or died and the second string

people were weak personalities, by and large. Then, Rosenmeier was one among equals but he towered above everybody else intellectually and in political force; and so, while he never became the majority leader—why should he?—he had John Schwack who was just a tool. I remember John Schwack saying on the floor one time, "Well! I don't know what's going on here. I just do what they tell me to." [laughter] He said it on the floor. And it was true. They had still had the rules committee that was each of the chairs but since Rosenmeier was head and shoulders above them, he dominated them all. Then, he put his people that he wanted on those committees and so you change from a feudal system to a central monarchy, all of a sudden. By all of sudden, I mean over a two- or four-year period.

CAC: Yes.

CB: So, Rosenmeier just dominated the place for twenty years or more. I don't know exactly the year Rosenmeier finally was beaten. The whole climate had changed and the university couldn't operate in the new system for awhile. It took them awhile to realize that.

CAC: As I recall, Met Wilson, who now in the 1960s, kept on Stan Wenberg as chief representative, right?

CB: Yes, oh, yes. Wenberg stayed until he died. I think he died with his boots on. He was a good lobbyist in the sense he knew what to do. He would spend all his off session time running around in the farmyards slopping the pigs and sitting and visiting. He just did everything right to cultivate all his people. I don't want to say that he was ineffective. They looked to him as a voice in the legislature. You've probably heard this many times, the university didn't want any faculty representation or any faculty voice of any kind over there.

CAC: That's very clear.

CB: Of course, the faculty finally revolted and had its own voices . . .

CAC: Oh, often very substantially, later.

CB: Yes, very much later. It's a cacophony over there now. The students, they say something else and so the university lost its . . . It was not only the change in the legislature but the change here, that you couldn't keep the lid on these. Wenberg would tell them, "Don't worry about the faculty. We've got this request for salaries and for buildings. Don't worry about the salaries . . . give us the buildings." They would do it. They'd say, "Which do you want?" in a time of budget problems. He would just tell them what they wanted, you see, and there was no faculty voice in that that said, "We have to have something for us." That was a change. Searle is viewed by many as an enemy of the university but it's not really true. He was a legislator that was doing his job in terms of finding out what was going on. He would ask the hard questions about what the budget was and he made the university change its budgetary, whole plan, so that

they told something that was going on. Do you remember [Bill] Middlebrook? I suppose people have talked to you about that or is that before your era?

CAC: No, no. Both Middlebrook and Willie come right into the era, since 1951. You bet.

CB: Middlebrook—this is about fourth hand by the time you're getting it—got somebody, a CPA [certified public accountant], to design an accounting system for the "U" that only he could understand.

CAC: [laughter]

CB: It wasn't until just a few years ago when there was this crisis over the reserves, like in the [Ken] Keller . . .

CAC: And David Lilly.

CB: . . . when the university realized that they couldn't tell where the money was. They had these pots of money around, like building the West Bank which Middlebrook did. He said, "We're going to go to the other side."

CAC: He was the architect of that, yes.

CB: He found whatever money there was, because he knew, but he had it hidden in pockets and it was disguised in the system so that only he could figure it out. I got that from somebody who knows the person who was the CPA and lived in Prospect Park; so, I think it's accurate. The subsequent problems with the university not knowing what it had to spend and going to a new budgetary system sort of indicate something like that. It was this idea that you don't let the legislature in on what's going on and you don't tell them what you're doing with the money. We went to Morris and built at Morris. That was a decision that wasn't made by the legislature. It was just the university acting in its autonomy.

CAC: Which they claimed as constitutional autonomy, which is constitutionally sound?

CB: Right, it's constitutionally sound but politically unwise to abuse it. I suppose you're going to trace the erosion of that principle of constitutional autonomy? I think it's terrible important because . . . I want to talk about some other times of crisis.

CAC: Sure.

CB: If we didn't have that . . . it's symbolic and I'm sure you can figure this out. Wisconsin has this plaque that John R. Commons, or somebody said, "The university is devoted to the fearless winnowing of the facts by which alone truth can be found." It's a plaque on the Bascomb Hall at the top of the hill. Everybody laughs at it but in a time of McCarthyism, or whatever, the

weak-willed, weak-kneed presidents, when the legislature would threaten to do something against the university, would point to the plaque and say, "We have this tradition."

CAC: [laughter]

CB: "We can't have you [unclear] fearlessly win over the truth because we have a reputation to uphold. In other words, it would have been gone, in my estimation. I was there at that time and it was a tough time for university. That's like our constitutional autonomy. You say, "You can't say this." Let me speak right away to this question. Do you remember the first the sex scandals and then the black take-over? You've heard about all that stuff?"

CAC: Well, not the sex scandals.

CB: Oh, you haven't heard about the sex scandals?

CAC: No, nobody has shared that.

CB: You know my colleague Mulford Sibley?

CAC: Very well.

CB: He was the only person that I've ever met who is truly devoted to civil liberties in practice and in theory. Everybody else talks about it but most of us don't lead the life like this.

CAC: Yes.

CB: He always would say outrageous things. He would say, "I'm a communist."

CAC: You're coming to the free love . . .

CB: It was the free love. It was that time when somebody said, "We should get rid of these student organizations." He said, "Quite the contrary. We should have as many student organizations as possible. We should have a league for Jeffersonian revolution, or regeneration, or whatever it is. We should have a free love society and we should have a communist . . . whatever." The communism which used to bug people and it did bug people then even—I want to talk about the Milt Rosen debate. You've heard and remember that?

CAC: Yes.

CB: It was the sex that really threw them off. You can imagine Mulford Sibley in a free love society?

CAC: [laughter]

CB: It's impossible to imagine. Personally, he's not the type. [unclear] then to be provocative which he always wanted to do but they took it literally. My own context over there indicated that this was what really threw people for a loop, the idea that you would have free love at the "U." I talked to one member who said, "I would like free love, too, but I went to the university and we couldn't do it then. The girls were locked in the dorms so by god! my kids aren't going to have it either!"

CAC: [laughter]

CB: "They're not going to have something I never had."

CAC: For the record, we should date this is the mid 1960s, isn't it?

CB: That's the mid 1960s.

CAC: And poor Met Wilson has to handle this thing?

CB: Right.

CAC: And they have to have this debate?

CB: Right.

CAC: I thought you meant a real sex scandal.

CB: No! No, I don't know how much sex there was before or after.

CAC: [laughter]

CB: But Mulford couldn't create anymore than there was.

I want to tell you about Walter Clouse who I know is dead. He was a bachelor farmer from Dakota County, which was rural in those days. His campaigning was he'd lost an arm in the war, which he did. He had a farm exemption and he caught it in a corn picker in the 1940s; so, he lost his arm in the war. [laughter] He was just violently anti-"U." He would crusade against this and it was on this sex question. He was kind of like Allen Quist when he was there. I dealt with him on reapportionment so I knew him quite well. I had him come to my class one time. Thirty years later when he died, which was just quite recently, he said, "One of the high points in my life"—in his Christmas letter that year—"was when I was invited over to Professor Backstrom's class as an expert on reapportionment" which said something to me about what we could do to lobby people if we wanted to. He sent away for a mail-order bride, and he stopped talking about the university, and sex after that. [laughter] Then he left the "U." The other sex problem was the Medical School's desensitization training for counselors.

CAC: Yes.

CB: This was terribly, terribly serious.

CAC: And for apprentice doctors, for interns and residents in the Medical School?

CB: Right. As I recall, it was two things. One of them was it was the disable veterans wanted to be able to have some kind of sex and so they had to train the therapists to show them what you can do if you're paralyzed. I remember somebody that I knew that was in the social work program, a mature woman who was in working in politics in Minneapolis, who decided to go into that as a career. She was there and she had to go through it. It was started really, I think, when the Lutherans said, "Our pastors can't handle counseling because they don't know anything about sex." I never went through the program but the cardinal . . . Part of it was the first day, you had pornographic movies showing around in several places and then people would call out names. They were supposed to name the parts of the body and what nasty names everything was. Do you know that?

CAC: Yes, it desensitized.

CB: That was the idea. You can imagine how scandalous this was for some people. Some people couldn't take it. Then, they would tell the legislators, "Do you know what the university is doing?" They took that on the road, and it was in Rochester, and one senator said—I don't remember what senator it was—"I just was going up to this building, and they were having this class, and I just looked in the window, and I saw these pornographic pictures, and the shouting of these names. I said, 'My god! what is the university doing? That's what they are advocating. We have to stop this.'" I considered that one of the major threats to the university here and the fact that it was saved was because we had the constitutional autonomy but there were people in the legislature who were defending the "U," not openly so much—occasionally they would be. I think in your interviews with these people I talked about, you have to try to find out who it was and how you do that, how you protect the university. The university was saying, "We have to have it. It's our best medical people and judgments, they have to have it." Like the trans-gender type thing . . . it's the same thing. It was before the family council . . . those [unclear] were officially organized over there but every rural member practically, it was not what they would do in their own place.

CAC: Again, these things coincide in the mid 1960s?

CB: That's right. They came one right after the other. First, the sex came . . . you could see the dates for sure. But then on top of that was the black revolution.

CAC: In 1968-1970.

CB: [Malcolm] Mac Moos was here then.

CAC: Yes. And the occupation of Morrill Hall?

CB: Yes. It showed the legislators that the university was not in control of it. Let me just pause to give you my description of what is legislative success. Legislators don't really know a lot about a lot of programs. They're the last generalists in the world . . . that people have to vote on every single issue about every single thing. The rest of us are all specialized except for them. That's why I admire them so much because they dare do it. I couldn't make wise decisions about every single thing about life but they do. They have to. What they are really good at is—they think they are really good at it—estimating people, whether people are any good because they are people people.

CAC: Sure.

CB: They relate. That's how they got to be a politician, why they wanted to be a politician. Then they sharpen and hone those skills in the campaigns so that they know how to do it. They think they can judge people so when the commissioner of commerce comes over and for his hearing on his thing, they make a judgment about Is this guy in control of his ship? If he is, they go for it, and if he isn't, they don't. They don't know what the programs are.

CAC: That's not an unreasonable criterion.

CB: It's the same thing about the university. [James Lewis] Morrill was staid, and stuffy, and insecure, I think. He would go over there, and he would have a phalanx of vice-presidents sitting behind him, and they would raise a question; and he would turn to vice-president so and so, and vice-president so and so. He would never answer a question because he didn't know anything about the "U" and he was too afraid; so, he would have these people back him up. They had a kind of contempt for him because he wasn't in charge of his show. They saw that he wasn't the master of the "U." That was Meredith Wilson's greatest contribution. He—I don't know whether he learned this on his own—talked to the vice-presidents, and everybody else, and tried to find out everything about the "U," and then he stayed there, and he answered all the questions. They said, "By gosh! this guy really knows and is in charge of that place."

CAC: He also looked like a president? I mean, he had a manner and a demeanor . . .

CB: Morrill did too but he was a stuffy type of president, austere, as opposed to somebody who can relax a little bit like Meredith Wilson because he is confident.

CAC: And he informed himself.

CB: He doesn't have any insecurities.

CAC: Yes. That's interesting.

CB: It makes the whole difference in the legislature whether they think you're in charge. Then comes Mac Moos and Mac Moos, he was an alcoholic, wasn't he?

CAC: It came to be more severe.

CB: He was gone most of the time.

CAC: It came to be more severe in the later years, I'm sure.

CB: Yes. He didn't look like he was running the university.

CAC: But you're saying that key legislators saw the occupation of Morrill Hall as a sign that the students were out of control and that Moos was not in control?

CB: Exactly right. The word that I heard over there was, "Boy! would Mac Moos's daddy be ashamed of him." Mac Moos's daddy was the postmaster in St. Paul and a big politician, maybe national committee man, or something, for the Republicans. That's why they had hired Mac Moos because he was a local good Republican. There's a racism in whatever that's triggering it. If the white students had done it, it wouldn't have been as bad as blacks but just the idea of giving in to students, they couldn't stand it. Moos, for his credit, was a principle civil libertarian and thought that you should let people express themselves. He said, "We shouldn't have violence to throw them out." He probably saved us from a Kent State, or something. I don't think he was wrong but it looked wrong and partly it was because he couldn't give the impression before that he was in charge of this place.

CAC: I think that perception is widely shared. I suppose I shouldn't interpose on this . . . I'm not the historian yet. But I think, it's an accurate one that Mac Moos created a climate internal to the university that took the sting away from a lot of this material.

CB: Oh, his positives, yes.

CAC: Yes.

CB: Right. In retrospect, we look pretty good, I think, because we weathered that and we did some things for the blacks. You can say, "Well, we shouldn't have a minority studies programs at Minnesota when we're all lily white" but I think that they did it right and they handled it. It's hard to do that. Presidents at Macalester bit the dust over their racial stuff . . . Jim Robinson. It wasn't like other universities didn't have the problem and it wasn't easy. Cornell and some places were terrible.

CAC: The legislative response is an important one to understand.

CB: Here's Mulford, and here's the medical sex, and then here's this, and the crux of it was that this place is out of control; and so, the expression I heard over there, "I'm going to get me a regent." In other words, they said . . . remember they elect the regents.

CAC: Ohhh.

CB: I can't tell you the date but it was 1970 or something, right after that . . . you can check that date . . . I'll tell you the date, it was when John Ingve was elected. I don't know if John Ingve is still alive but see if you can get him because he was the person that was selected to try to get this place under control. You can remember better than anybody probably but the Republicans in Minnesota used to be at the liberal extreme nationally.

CAC: Governor Elmer Andersen would be a good example.

CB: Elmer Andersen is a good example . . . who gave a speech at the national convention about moderate Republicanism in the [Barry] Goldwater years at midnight or 1:00 a.m. at the San Francisco convention and it was very literate. Also, the legislators, that is, there is a whole series of them and a lot of them are still around. You can write some of these names down: Gary Flakne, Lyle Schwartzkopf, and I don't know whether Bill Frenzel is still around in Washington but those were guys who were there at that time. They were moderate. We used to call them liberal Republicans. They didn't want to be called that but it was moderate. I think, that Ingve was on the fringes of that group. Doug Head.

CAC: Ah, yes.

CB: What I don't know, but what you need to find out, is if going to Ingve . . . They had to do something to get rid of the people they had on the regents who were letting the presidents just run the place without question. Was Ingve really going to make the university shoot the blacks or [unclear] sex program? I don't think so. What I think it was, was a tactical, a strategic move that said, "We'll get one of our guys in there." Ingve was going to leave the legislature or he had left the legislature. You can't be in the legislature and a regent at the same time. Maybe, he really was one who wanted to do that but I think it may have been the idea that better Ingve who can handle this with his general broad view, you know, he's no dummy and no reactionary.

CAC: So, he becomes a regent?

CB: He becomes a regent. This guy who was a big Chevrolet dealer in Chanhassen or Carver County someplace . . .

CAC: Well, Elmer Andersen becomes a regent pretty much at the same time because he's here for late Moos.

CB: Late Moos?

CAC: Yes, 1974, 1975, and in through there.

CB: Of course, that's the great coup for the university because he is such a pro university person.

CAC: But he comes in also, you see, maybe a bit later than Ingve.

CB: Yes. It would be good to look and see . . .

CAC: I can check out the dates on that. I'm going to interrupt a minute because I have a sense also that it is in the early 1970s that reapportionment makes a difference in the composition.

CB: Yes. I want to talk about that, too. We might as well talk about it right now. I was on the governor's reapportionment committee in the decision in *Baker v. Carr* [369 U.S. 186], 1962. I don't know if you remember this, the case should have been a Minnesota case. I've got to think of this guy's name. He was the attorney for the people. He got in 1959 a decision out of the federal court of Minnesota that the legislature had to reapportion. He made all the cases . . . everything that's in *Baker v. Carr* is his words; that is, the whole thing is the brief from Minnesota. He submitted it, and they won the case in Minnesota, and the judge said, "That's true. Reapportionment is judiciable but we won't make a ruling on what has to be done. We will let the legislature reapportion because there is no reason to think the legislature won't." Of course, the legislature hadn't reapportioned since 1913.

CAC: [laughter]

CB: But they said, "There's no reason that they won't do it; so, we'll let them do it." And the legislature did reapportion in 1959 for the 1962 election but with 1950 census data. Can you imagine how little modern it was?

CAC: Yes.

CB: Alf Bergerud, I mentioned, was the senator for the whole Hennepin County. Minneapolis had ten or eleven senators, and one for suburban Hennepin, and they were equal in population because they hadn't reapportioned. So, we got suburban senators and representatives, five or six of them. That's when all of these people like Frenzel, and Ingve, and all those guys were coming in in the first place because there wasn't any space for them to be represented before. There weren't any districts. So, you had a vast enlargement of the . . .

CAC: Metropolitan area.

CB: It was almost all suburban. Minneapolis, of course, had grown to 1913 and then it would grow much bigger in 1913, 1920s, and the 1930s, and then it began to go down; that is, the suburbs began to come up in the 1940s and 1950s and so Minneapolis didn't stand to benefit

much in the reapportionment because it went from rags to rags with no riches in between. The years when it should have been dominant, it wasn't. By this time, it was already going down and the suburbs are coming up. I think, Minneapolis gained one senator just for a moment and then lost it in the next reapportionment. We had a reapportionment in 1960, in the 1959 act, with 1950 census to go into effect in 1962 before *Baker v. Carr* was done.

CAC: Ohhh.

CB: Then, when the Tennessee case came up, this lawyer sent his brief to them, and they used it verbatim and so . . .

CAC: I never heard that story. That's wonderful.

CB: I can tell you who that attorney is if I look in my notes. I should know. He's a brilliant fellow and should get far more credit than he does. I've written on reapportionment so I think I've got it in a footnote. The *Minnesota Law Review* said "Give us a footnote here outlining the history of reapportionment in Minnesota," so, I had a fifteen page footnote.

CAC: [laughter]

CB: Rural Minnesota lost but it didn't lose much at that time because it was 1950 data and besides we didn't have the standards of one person, one vote. Remember, it was just that it was judicable and so the standards were applied in *Reynolds v. Simms* [377 U.S. 533 (1964)] and those in 1950, and 1964, and whatever. I was on the Reapportionment Commission of the governor to propose that we should tighten up the standards. We were going to allow, I think, 20 percent deviation as a reasonable amount . . . now, it's zero. You have congressional districts with one person out of 1/2 million. It's preposterous. Associated with that, but not entirely caused by that, was the accession of the Democrats in the 1970s in the House, when they controlled the House again.

CAC: They reapportioned again on the 1970 census?

CB: No, they had to do it mid-decade, in 1966. They had to do a mid-decade and then 1970.

CAC: Okay.

CB: We had three reapportionments in one ten-year period because the courts were insisting upon it.

CAC: But there is one in the early 1970s as well based on the 1970 . . . ?

CB: Oh, yes. Right 1970s, based on 1970 and late 1960s, 1966, 1967, based on 1960. We did get updated as the standards became tough.

CAC: Yes, yes. But that made an enormous difference in the old internal structure of the legislature?

CB: Right. The reapportionment is . . . An illustration is the Bible verse that I used to not be able to understand and I didn't like it was "To those who have, more shall be given and to those who don't have, even that shall be taken away." [Matthew 13:12] That's what reapportionment is. You lose population because of the economic changes. As farming is successful it becomes industrialized, and then you lose your . . . As you become poorer, people go elsewhere for their jobs so your kids all leave and you have brain drain. Then, your population goes down and then your only defense is your support in the legislature where you're controlling all these years and then you lose that, too. Everything else bad that happens to you is capped by the fact that your influence is taken away.

CAC: Right.

CB: So, you have to rely on a general culture of the state that says, "We care about equal education in rural Minnesota" because you can't do it with votes anymore. Minnesota has had that and people think about the state as a whole; so, it's something that we have not let go as bad as it could be.

CAC: It's one thing Wendell Anderson pulled off, wasn't it?

CB: Right.

CAC: An equalization tax for the school system, K-12.

CB: We're down now. We're going to up a little bit this year from 59 percent to 61 percent but we got as low as half but he had 75 percent paid. There's another consequence of the Democrats taking control. A lot of the smart asses—pardon the expression—at the university . . . I don't have too much respect for my colleagues political sense sometimes . . .

CAC: Fair enough.

CB: . . . I have tremendous respect for them as scholars but that disqualifies you from the world if you're really a good scholar.

CAC: [laughter]

CB: They said, "Wait till the Democrats get in control of the legislature . . ."

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

CB: I was saying that the university requires kind of an elitist attitude. Now, the university was all things to all people, and it was the only school in the Twin Cities area, and therefore had to serve every single body.

CAC: Metro[politan] State was not . . .

CB: There was no Metro State and there were no community colleges, purposely. They said, "The university takes care of that." So, we had general college for the people that needed the community college type thing and it was the first of its type. I can't imagine there being anything better of its type and, of course, politically it was tremendously sound because a lot of these people in the legislature got their degrees there.

CAC: That helped the [unclear] team, too.

CB: Very important. Then, we had to be big because we had to accommodate all the kids that were good students who were going here because there was no place else to go unless they can afford to go. But the elite, the true elite, the people with kids from Edina and that, were going to the eastern schools; so, they weren't coming here. You wouldn't send your kid to the University of Minnesota if you want prestige but we could be good and we were good—were, I say in the past. [laughter] We were good of type and we did all things for all people and we did it, I thought, quite well. Let me say that my view of U-2000 is that, I recognize times have changed but I wish we could try to be a good Minnesota instead of somebody else . . . what I think they're trying to do.

CAC: Again, just for whoever is listening to this later on, we're talking about the mid 1970s when all these things pile up and change?

CB: Right. The Democrats got control of the legislature and they were populists. They said, "Education is education. Why don't we have education for everybody at home?" So, they changed the state colleges into state universities because it was prestigious. The university people didn't like it but it was just foregone that the Democrats would do it because Why aren't they just as good as here? A populist can't understand why any education isn't equally good and you can't say, "We're going to support a prestigious institution here . . . we are all universities." The university had to fight to keep them from calling it the University of Minnesota at Mankato. They had to put the name in Mankato State University. That was a victory for the "U." Then, the community cause movement came after that when they said that the state universities can't even handle the business; so we got four, one in each corner and then we got Metro State besides. The commissions said this. Of course, for Elmer L. Andersen, he said, "This is wonderful. We should have a few more." But the idea was to have one university, one higher

education within thirty-five miles of every person in Minnesota. We got them all built except one.

CAC: And they all need money.

CB: There are sixty-seven. Not only do they all need money but they each have a representative, you see.

CAC: Yes.

CB: Before when we had six state universities, there were six senators and twelve representatives in each district. Of course, some people would have a little broader loyalty if you were from rural St. Cloud you were for St. Cloud. If you were from rural Bemidji . . . But the university has only one voice and that's the people who are here because these people think of the University of Minnesota not in the status of the state university but in the sense of that's Minneapolis's places and now it isn't even Minneapolis's. Added to this—is where I'm going to get sued—is that the representatives from the university area have not cared for the university in an uncritical way like the representatives from other institutions. Phyllis Kahn, for example, was probably justly angry because she thought that was sexist and she didn't get promoted, so she gets into the legislature, and she is a resident person, and she follows her own agenda, and tries to make the university change, whether to threaten them, whether it's the power plant today and everything else in the past. The representative from Winona doesn't do that. The representative from Winona said to somebody that I know, "Why doesn't your representative support the university like I do mine?" We used to say to my old congressman that I worked for—he was on the National Defense Education Act . . . it was really the [unclear] Act . . . he didn't know that—"You've got to take on the U.S. Office of Education. It's a rat hole. It's impossibly dumb, stupid, bad, corrupt." He said, "We're not taking on the Office of Education. The enemies of education are all after them. I'm a friend of education. I have to support them even though I know they're not good and I have to work from the inside to try to get them to change."

CAC: Now, there would be some exceptions . . . Ann Wynia, Allan Spear, for example? They represent university districts and have not been as questioning and skeptical as Phyllis Kahn?

CB: Right. But that's not who gets the visibility over there. They see Phyllis Kahn.

CAC: Our historian, Senator Spear is chair of the judicial committee and president of the Senate.

CB: That's right.

CAC: Ann Wynia becomes majority [unclear].

CB: What we needed was the idea that U-2000 is supposed to be . . . What did we call that under Keller?

CAC: Commitment to Focus.

CB: Commitment to Focus and Hal Chase was talking about a commitment to excellence. We got Rudy Perpich to say, "We should be one of the top five universities in the country." What you needed was the idea that we need this flagship—is the word they use—place and each person, each legislator, should have two loyalties: one to the university and one to Podunk-Tech. But most of them can't do that and the [unclear] now, Moe's bill, a combination of the other places into a single body, the three of them, which by the way got repealed in the state . . . [unclear] past but I'm saying that the House of Representatives, yesterday, voted to repeal it.

CAC: Yes, yes. I saw that, right. Why would Moe want to consolidate?

CB: He would have been glad to consolidate the "U" in there but we couldn't because of our constitutional amendment.

CAC: Yes, but why?

CB: The reason is that the legislators do not want to have this bargaining and have to go and disappoint somebody and [unclear] each other. They wanted it settled once before. In Illinois, they went to a Commission on Education, which was a non-legislative body that was over all of the higher education in the state, and they've got to come up with a budget, and then they come and the legislature makes one decision, how much budget and they don't have to argue between.

CAC: Okay.

CB: The legislators should be arguing between but they don't want to because it's too tough because you've got to say "No" to somebody. They don't want to do it and they want it done at a lower body. Wisconsin went to a consolidated system and all the *ruralies* hated that; they thought Madison dominated it. At least you can't say that the University of Minnesota dominates this.

CAC: Yes.

CB: Going to Duluth, and going to Morris, and going to Crookston, and going to Waseca . . . those were political decisions for which we needed the support of local people. Rod Searle just happens to be from Waseca. [laughter] Rod Searle sat on a film that I made for my students on the legislature, my [unclear] students. Being in the committee of education, a higher education committee, I have to worry about all higher education in the state but, of course, I happen to have a university campus in my own district. You happen to! [laughter] They put

it there because of the Searle-Tech. They thought they could get support by buying out the support.

CAC: I should add a minor footnote here that Rod Searle had a son who got his doctor's degree in this Department of History at the University of Minnesota.

CB: Is that right?

CAC: Yes.

CB: Searle is an unbelievable superb person. You can't imagine a better legislator. I don't consider him the enemy of the "U." It's just that the university, as I said, was lordly. They said, "Keep out of our business and whatever." They just swaggered around. Of course, they got by with it in the way the legislature was. Then, when Searle was there, you couldn't get by with it. He didn't say the university should . . . he thinks the university is a great place but it's just the idea that you've got to have somebody that justifies what they do. Of course now, that's big news. You see the bill passes saying we've got to graduate people. By god! you better not try to flunk anybody out. Oh, you're retired. You're not flunking anybody anymore. Can you see what that's going to do? Ah! but the new president's going to change my grades. I'll have to leave Minnesota, the same way I had to leave Eastern because they say, "We cannot have anybody flunk out of school."

But anyway, you see what I'm saying about the populism that came to the legislature and we have this sixty-seven campuses, or whatever it is. We have more than most states. We have more than California. It's preposterous. The university did some research that showed that if we'd taken every kid from rural Minnesota that went to all these schools and paid their tuition and board and room at the Minneapolis campus, it would have been cheaper. [laughter] We could have continued to educate everybody in the state if we wanted to—but we didn't. That wasn't the decision that was made; so, here we have this flowering complexity. Of course, Elmer L. was put in charge of a group to say "What should Minnesota be like?" That's like putting Santa Claus in charge of the [Newt] Gingrich budget. He said, "We ought to have more schools!" . . . that we should have more branches, bigger! . . . money, whatever, more students . . . because that's Elmer L. He's the only person in the state, probably, left that really believes that everything the university does should be tripled. [laughter] And it's not going to happen. The sweating down in the legislature now . . . they're talking about having another commission that's like the base closing commission.

CAC: Ah.

CB: You know about that?

CAC: Yes.

CB: Where you have somebody says . . . then the legislature's got to buy all . . . so you can't have these one campus against the other.

CAC: Right. You have to buy them back. Yes. When does the Higher Education Coordinating Board, HECB, come in?

CB: I can't tell you the date but it was in probably the early 1970s.

CAC: This was all part of the same turmoil of the mid 1970s?

CB: HECB was an attempt of the legislature to try to get this . . . it was like the Illinois situation.

CAC: To get some control over it.

CB: To get somebody below the legislature who will make the decisions about priorities so the legislature doesn't have to cut people off, somebody who will plan. Of course, they've had some success in terms of planning curricula. They've helped keep doctoral programs out of the state universities—that's a major victory for the university—because they don't allow doctoral programs.

CAC: Or MAs.

CB: They [unclear] master's programs and they do. They say, "You don't need this and you need this." First it came up and there was a committee of presidents so they were like the League of Nations. They're not going to be making decisions when you have everybody on the board. Then, they made a revision that said, "Those people will be an advisory committee instead of on the board or on a committee." So, they thought that would empower it but here there is still an advisory committee and the university appeared there but they said they can't really tell us what to do because of trying to defend the constitution of autonomy. I want to say something more about constitutional autonomy before we're done.

CAC: Okay.

CB: Maybe right now?

CAC: Go ahead.

CB: There have been many small incidents and I think the university has lost them all, like selection of architects. The university used to select their architects. Do you know that? I was on the Internal Advisory Committee looking at the School of Architecture when it was up for review one year. Of course, you can imagine what I don't know about architecture. But anyway, I surely learned a lot in a hurry. What I learned was that they had a core staff of six or seven that they paid and the rest of the people were all adjuncts. They were architects in the

community that conducted these seminars free. The students had all this practicum works, just brilliant instruction all free. I've never seen anybody get more bang for the buck than we got out that but the only problem with it was that it was tremendously exploitative of these people. They would do it for the prestige and because they liked to teach, many of them, but also they could say, "I'm on the staff at the University of Minnesota." They could put that on their things. Also then, they got to design. When the university was going to design the underground building, they give it to one of their people; so, the university said, "We can select the architects." Then the state had an architectural selection board because they didn't want it to be patronage. There was a case over it and the university lost. They had to go through the case because they said, "This isn't fundamental to the purpose of the constitutional autonomy, in the sense of what it does."

CAC: I see.

CB: I don't know what else we had . . . some labor case. I think we have lost all the little battles that we had and that the idea that the university is . . . We used to be getting a third of the money from the state . . . now, it's down to a quarter or something like 26 percent this year.

CAC: I think it used to be higher than a third. I think it's fallen from around—I'm told—40 to 26 percent.

CB: The 26 is big. You saw what the legislature said this time about the semester system? I don't know if that's still in the bill. They said, "We will cut off student aid . . ." See, they're not going to cut the university. They're not going to tell the university what to do but you don't get any student aid unless you go to semesters. Can you imagine what we'll do? What I'm saying is that the election of the regents and the money are enough of a combination that they can get the university to do almost everything they want. That's why that symbolic plaque that we don't have has been so important and the victory on the sex thing which really was teaching, and not firing Mulford Sibley, if you wanted to say that . . . those are terribly, terribly important . . . that we've won some critical ones. In the Texas legislature, they debate curriculum and order them to do this and that. Of course, that just doesn't happen here. We're much better off because of it but we're not free from it. We have to do. As I said, ultimately, when they got the idea of "get me a regent" that time, then these regents then began to ask questions. It was the beginning of the regents starting to ask questions. Like right now, I don't know if they have slipped back. I think some of the regents we have are not that kind of people but there was a period when the regents began to actually run the university, I thought, and they still do to some extent. [unclear] is somebody who asks questions.

CAC: Can you recall for historians or other persons who are listening to this, When and what was the change of the nature of the election of regents? You're suggesting that it becomes politicized again in the mid 1970s?

CB: It was always political. The regents were selected by people who the legislature liked and there was a political reward for them. The legislature is selecting their own people who are

going to lobby against them; so, it was an ideal situation. They give it to their friends and then the friends go back and say, "We need money." Then, they give them the money. How can you do better than that? What happened was, as I said in the revolution of the early 1970s . . . the Ingve one, was that they said, "We're going to have people that are not friends of the university." You know, the only job of the regents in the old days was to lobby the legislature—period. The university told nothing about what was going on. They never made any decision about what was going on.

CAC: Okay.

CB: They were just lobbyists. That was their function. When the legislature says, "We're going to have people that are going to watch what the university does," you can see how that changes the [unclear]. That's 1970s. Then, you get the Regents Selections Committee, the reformers who say, "We don't want this to be political." That's a disaster for the university because we don't need people who are nobodies. I mean, even if they represent some new community to the state, we don't need that. We need somebody who can get money out of the legislature. These people can't. They're not a product of the legislature. They're not the friends of the legislators. [sound of fist pounded on table]. Then, we say to the legislators, "You've got to vote for these people," and so they vote for them, and we have people that can't do us any good over there, and some of whom . . .

CAC: At what point, in your perception, do the regents begin to be skeptical about the management of the university?

CB: In the 1970s. That's when they came in with the mandate to say, "You've got to get this place under control."

CAC: Okay. And this coincides, according to the stories of others, with late Moos years when in fact . . .

CB: When he wasn't in control. Right.

CAC: When there was a vacuum?

CB: Right.

CAC: So, Elmer Andersen, as I remember, is chairman of the board in late Moos, and really has to come in, and give a kind of stability to . . . ?

CB: Yes. I can't tell you any of the internal things. I'm sure you can get plenty of people that can talk about that. I've got to go at twelve. I'm working on an exam but I want to make sure I told you all the people. We've got Searle down. I don't know if Peter Fugina is still alive. He was the representative from the [Iron] Range, and he was a community college prof, and he

was the chair of the university committee in the House in the 1950s, and a terribly able and interesting guy, and not pro university in the sense that he thought that the university was wrong. He would have liked to combine all the institutions together and he wanted more diversity . . . lots of things he wanted. But I can't tell you if he's still alive.

CAC: Yes, well, I can check.

CB: Willard Munger has been around forever in the legislature. He's been there since 1933 or something like that.

CAC: He's still there?

CB: Yes, he's still there. His sole interest is environment. I don't even know if he can talk about the university but he's a long time . . . Here, are some of those Democratic legislators from that period . . . D.D. Wozniak and Peter Popovich. Wozniak and Popovich were not pro university. Popovich was considered by the university to be an enemy of the university. They said that he wanted to be appointed an adjunct professor in the law school. I don't know if this is true. Popovich is a different kind of guy and both of those people were leaders of the Estes Kefauver revolution against the DFL. Popovich has become the chief justice and he manufactured the Appeals Court and Wozniak became the appeals person there. Both of them had to retire at seventy in their full vigor of their intellectual life. It was too bad that they did but they're both practicing law; so, they are around. I think you should get Popovich, because it's an anti-university view, to talk about the problems of the "U" in those days. By anti-university, you know what I mean? It's like Phyllis Kahn. It doesn't mean like he thinks that the university is not a good place. I worked with him on the Reapportionment Commission because he was the chair. That we were close workers and had tremendous respect for each other came out of this. It's just not anti-"U" but the "U" saw him as being anti-"U" because he was not doing everything they wanted.

CAC: Now, I have a memory from those days that it was Wozniak, Popovich, and Beanblossom.

CB: [laughter]

CAC: Right, the three?

CB: Yes.

CAC: But Beanblossom was not up to the quality of the authority of the other two?

CB: I can't even remember him.

CAC: Okay.

CB: I don't know what that says. Do you know Odegaard? I can't think of his first name. He was the director of the University Foundation for awhile.

CAC: Oh, Odegaard, sure. Yes, I've had an interview with him; although, he spoke mostly about the Minnesota Foundation and very little about the legislature.

CB: He was a legislator in those days but I don't know if he was on the committee. There was a guy by the name of Doug Sillers who was big Concordia supporter, and he was a Republican, and he retired from the legislature a few years ago, and I have seen him since. My parents were from Moorhead and I went to Moorhead State; so, I got to be friendly with him and I used to have him over to my house once in awhile to meet some profs and that, just because it was a good idea. Even though he was very conservative, he was open-minded to meet new people and see new people and I'd like to have him meet some colleagues at dinner. I don't know if he's still around. Fred Norton was on the Appeals Court, too, but he was later and kind of a speaker. Tom Berg is still around. He was the one who tried to run for the Senate. Harry Sieben was the speaker and he's so busy in his law practice, I don't know if he'd talk about it but he sure had a view of the legislature. Cal Larson is a senator now who is the ranking minority person on the university committee and very much anti-university in the sense that he thinks we don't work hard. If we could each teach twice as much, the place would be good. I don't know if Bob Dunn is still around. He was the senator, a longtime respected conservative senator, from Princeton, and he was the head of the Waste Commission of the legislature to try to find a place for hazardous waste; and it failed because nobody wants it in their backyard. He's tremendously stable and thoughtful from a conservative standpoint. Here's a must. It's Gene Mammenga. He was elected a senator. He was a History prof at Bemidji. You probably know him. He was elected to the Senate in 1966 and got defeated not too long after but he's been a lobbyist ever since; and he's the most delightful person I know, in the first place and secondly, utterly perceptive about everything. He's been a lobbyist for the community colleges but you just can't not have him. He's just superb. He's been around ever since and he's completely open about he tells you. I don't know how he dares tell you all the stuff. Gary Laidig is the Senator from Stillwater. He was in the House. He sponsored a term limit bill and I wrote a testimony against the term limit. I handed it out to him and afterwards I said—several of my students have been interns with him; so, I know him very well—"I was sorry to see you couldn't be the statesman-like person that we would expect to vote against this." He said, "Let me tell you that your testimony made it doubly hard for me to vote the way I did."

CAC: [laughter]

CB: He's been around for thirty-five years and he wants term limit. Gene Merriam is still in the legislature and the most thoughtful person around there. He's was on a study program at the Humphrey Institute. And Tom Nelson is back in the state. Tom Nelson was a senator from the Austin area and was a public school person, like the superintendent. Then he left the state, and went to Wyoming or something, and now he's back in some capacity; so, he's around someplace.

But here's a person who hasn't got any recent experience with the legislature but immensely thoughtful and observant in his day.

CAC: That's what we need.

CB: I just hated to see him leave the Senate. He's the kind of person you'd like to be there all the time working on educational policy. He comes from a K-12 there. You have Elmer L. Andersen already?

CAC: Yes.

CB: Of course, Al Quie was on the university committee in the old days, and Don Fraser was, and Harold "Dutch" Schultz is a judge in St. Paul, I think. He may be retired. That's all the people I know.

CAC: That's a hell of a long list. It would be very helpful, Charles, if you would annotate and set a priority for what I've got to do.

CB: Okay. You have to see Carl Grittner.

CAC: Why don't you do it . . .

CB: On my own time?

CAC: Yes, is that all right?

CB: Why don't we do it right now? I'll never think about this again.

CAC: Oh, come on.

CB: Carl Grittner. Jack Davies. The current people . . . Cal Larson, Gene Mammenga. John Ingve if you can get him.

CAC: And why couldn't I?

CB: I don't know, maybe he moved out of the state or maybe he died. I just never heard from him but I don't know what he does.

CAC: Okay.

CB: Popovich. Peter Fugina if he's alive. Rod Searles should be at the very top of the list. That's one two, three, four, five, six, seven.

CAC: Some of them go back to the 1960s but [unclear] the 1970s and 1980s?

CB: Yes, right.

CAC: That's fine.

CB: Some back to the 1950s. It's just lucky that they were so young and still so vigorous.

CAC: Yes. Is there a standard biography? Is there a legislators of Minnesota that I could look up biographical data before I started doing the next interviews?

CB: Look in any blue book [*Minnesota Legislative Manual*] from that era and see the little brief that they had. But I know what you mean . . . like we have for congress [unclear]. It's not been done.

CAC: There are blue books?

CB: I'll look on my shelf for a yellowed clipping. Once the *Tribune* used to have a series, just a little article like this, week by week, until they covered everybody in the legislature and I clipped them out in the 1950s. They didn't keep doing it but it was terribly important service. Then, they would have legislator of the year and whatever. The *Tribune* doesn't care about the legislature anymore. Their coverage is just awful.

CAC: They don't do much else . . .

CB: They don't have any coverage of the city and so the idea that you and I thought of . . . what newspapers are supposed to do is be the inside person who knew everybody.

CAC: Now, the blue books will give me a bare line biography.

CB: Yes, it's just bare line biography.

CAC: How would I get the current addresses of these folks if they aren't currently in the legislature?

CB: Why don't you call the legislative reference library. They are awfully good over there and they can tell you who they are they can say, "He died last year." Like Pete Fugina, I don't know but I know most everybody else is alive that I've talked to. I've talked to—not John Ingve—everybody else within the last year.

CAC: Good. I had a student by the name of Tom Todd who is in the legislative reference. I hadn't thought of that. I'll go see him.

CB: Have him look for files on those people. I'll bet they've got a file on each person and clippings and that; so, that can tell you something.

CAC: Absolutely, I've got to do some research before I talk to them.

CB: It's a superb place.

CAC: Charles your A+! I give you an A+ for this oral exam. [laughter]

CB: Good. And the president won't have to change my grade.

CAC: Oh! [laughter] I may be back to you after I've done some of this.

CB: Yes.

CAC: What I'm going to do is do this in the summer because they are in session now and I can't do anything.

CB: None of these guys are . . .

CAC: Well, some of them are still in there.

CB: Some of the judges but I didn't mention anybody who is still in the legislature. The people I mentioned, nobody is here now.

CAC: Okay.

CB: You remember those special charges I gave you that I can't help you with but I wish I knew is like, Who saved the university in the medical sex thing? And whether John Ingve was really a comprise candidate? I wish I could think of that guy who had the . . . his wife was killed by a bicyclist as she was walking around the lake in the morning.

CAC: Oh, yes, yes, yes.

CB: I don't know if he was chair of the regents but he came in at the same time and he was one of the other people that was supposed to get in control of the . . .

CAC: He was out of the *Strib* [*Star and Tribune*] and he was very close to the Journalism School. I think he endowed a chair.

CB: Is that right?

CAC: Yes. I can check on that.

CB: I can't think of his name.

CAC: You don't have a run down on members of the board of regents?

CB: No. I'm not a good person for that . . . somebody like John Turner.

CAC: Yes, I've interviewed him. I suspect maybe that George Robb in Morrill Hall, if he would share it, would be a good person there.

CB: Who was trying to sue Kegler, the university professors or [unclear]?

CAC: He never told me.

CB: What do you think?

CAC: He didn't hint at it. I have no idea.

CB: He didn't want to tell you that.

CAC: He just really cut it off and he said, "I just wouldn't do it for anything." He's the only person that I have invited that wouldn't do it.

CB: Most everybody says, "I'll wait till I'm out of the legislature or after I'm dead for twenty years, they can open my papers." Most everybody doesn't want to say.

CAC: I don't the sense in it at all and he won't share even what the occasion of his grievances were.

CB: Speaking of the problem I started out with about some of my department members who think that the students . . . Let me say my department members think I run the internship program better than anybody else in the country but it doesn't mean that they'd still think that it's not a problem intellectually to have somebody tied up.

CAC: It the same thing with Art Naftalin. [unclear]

CB: One of the guys who was at—Williams, I think his name is—Michigan State at the time I was there. He had worked with Governor Soapie Williams and I said, "When are you going to write the definitive state government book?" and he said he's writing it but it's not going to be definitive because there are some things that you can never say. It really is an intellectual compromise to [unclear]. Art has done these series on the governors.

CAC: Yes.

CB: But they were all kind of complimentary. He makes C. Elmer Anderson look good.

CAC: [laughter] That's not easy.

CB: I've been bugging Art to try to get him to do Quie and Perpich, and bring it up to date, and he won't do it. It's too much work but Homer Williamson, a prof at St. Cloud, did his Ph.D. thesis under me on governors, types of governors, and it's good. It's excellent. There's a little article in our book that we made on Minnesota government. I tried to get Homer to do it. He said he really doesn't have the personality for it and Perpich won't talk to him yet. Perpich is still mad because for being defeated the second time.

CAC: Oh, of course. Who knows what he has ahead of him yet. Do you know reporters whom I should see?

CB: Gene LaHammer, AP [*Associated Press*].

CAC: Like Hammer? L-E?

CB: LaHammer. I think it's L-A. He's still here. He's retired. He's been retired for fifteen years. He was the chair of the Frank Premack Award Committee the other day. He knew everybody for all that time.

CAC: And he's around?

CB: Yes.

CAC: Who else would have covered the scene well?

CB: From the old days? Frank Wright is still around. He's international but he was around in the early days. He wrote about the legislature but he hasn't even thought about it for years but he likes to talk about the old days.

CAC: We all do. Anyone from the *Strib* from olden days?

CB: That was him. We never had any good reporters after that. The current reporters . . . I can't even think of his name . . . the short guy . . . is really good. You have to come right up to date, too, I suppose?

CAC: Well, yes.

CB: He's really a short guy. He's really good. I like him a lot. Bob Whereatt covers the state, too. He's more of a kind of thoughtful guy. I'll have to think of that other reporter's name.

CAC: If you think of it, just drop me a note at inter-campus mail.

CB: Yes. The *St. Paul Pioneer Press* really feels more responsibility covering the legislature than the *Trib* does.

CAC: How about D.J. Leary?

CB: Yes, he knows everybody and everything.

CAC: And he goes back?

CB: Oh, yes. I don't know how far back . . . and his colleague, our graduate student . . . oh boy! I'm going to really pieces.

CAC: Spano.

CB: Wy[man] Spano. He's in our [unclear] program but he lobbies full time at the legislature. But after the legislature . . . you can't catch those guys until afterward.

CAC: Yes, understand that.

CB: But try to talk to one or both of them. I think that they share so much that they might not have all that much different to say . . . if time wise . . . if you just choose one of the two because you're going to hear the same thing from them. I wonder if Spano was ever in the legislature. He won one year. I think he beat Alpha Smaby and served in the legislature for a year. He's a former republican, who not a republican [unclear] the Republican Party.

CAC: I met Spano in the elevator election day last November and I said, "You're looking very worried. How are things going to turn out?" He said, "That's not why I'm worried. I'm taking my prelims today." [laughter]

CB: Oh!

CAC: Did he pass his prelims?

CB: Yes.

CAC: All right. What's he going to do with a Ph.D. in politics?

CB: He's just going to do what he does now.

CAC: I see.

CB: It's just like you make a commitment to something, you know, and it's part of your life, and so you do it. What did Alpha Smaby do with her MA? She wanted it.

CAC: She published it.

CB: She published it. That's right. D.J. and Spano out of their firm have this current thing about all of who's who in Minnesota politics with all the legislative stuff. Do you know about that? I don't know what the name of it is but it's like what you want for your task.

CAC: Ah.

CB: But I think it's only current. I don't think it's any dead people.

CAC: Okay.

CB: Royce Hanson . . . with me helping. He's coming [unclear] "with the assistance of" on the title. My department didn't know how to credit me for that.

CAC: What is this?

CB: A book on Minnesota government and the Minnesota legislature.

CAC: I don't even know that.

CB: *A Tribune of the People* published by Minnesota Press.

CAC: Royce Hanson?

CB: Royce Hanson. He was the associate director of the Humphrey Institute.

CAC: What is the book called?

CB *A Tribune of the People*. It's about the Minnesota legislature and it's excellent. I didn't think it would make a good but he wrote it into a good book. He has me credited as "with the assistance of" because what we did is we interviewed sixty former legislative leaders. That's why [unclear].

CAC: I see.

CB: So, we weren't talking about the "U" specifically. We were talking about decision making in the legislature but if you have time, you could read the chapter on the House and the Senate, which is the leadership type. You could just breeze through that.

CAC: All right.

CB: There's no reason you should read about the conference committees and stuff like that. Royce got permission of the Humphrey Institute to see if they were prepared for the year 2000. My main part was a survey of legislators about the legislature as a work place because the idea is How do you get good people to serve? You don't if it's a crummy place to work, if it doesn't have good standards, and good staff, and whatever. I also sat in on all those interviews we had once a week. We'd have four or five people in and we'd have them before dinner over at the Humphrey Institute from 4:30 to 6:30, and then we'd eat, and then we'd stay till 9:30, and talk about it. Then, he wrote it up in such a way that it's just superb about the legislature as a decision making institution. I was with my background . . . that's why he gave me credit. I was able to ask these kind of questions, you can imagine, because he was new to Minnesota. He's a shrewd political observer but he's new. Then, we let him go. He's now at Texas.

CAC: Is it your feeling, because you've done oral interviews yourself, that I will get a degree of candor from these folks?

CB: Oh, yes. Yes. I didn't tell you anybody that you won't get candor from.

CAC: All right. And there's no particular advice you would give me on how to approach them to make it a better interview?

CB: No. They will like to be a part of the record. Everybody has a sense that they need to defend themselves in the sense that they want to make their own decisions look good. But these people don't have anything to apologize for.

CAC: [unclear], sure.

CB: When I was doing interviewing on the progressives in Wisconsin, I found that most of those were living in the past; that is, when the progressive era came to an end in 1938, their lives came to an end. Many of them wore the same clothes. They drove the same cars. Gradually a few of them started getting changed over and began to be in the modern era but most of them did not. Of course, I had read everything, all the clippings files in the legislative reference library; so, that if they'd say this, then I'd say "Well, what about the situation when . . ." "Well, let me tell you the truth about that." They weren't going to tell me about that but the truth was my view of what happened . . . I don't have to tell you that. It was that idea that it's an honor for them to get a chance . . . that anybody cares about it and that anybody wants to get them on the record. You say, you know . . . that's why you're there. There's no reason on earth they wouldn't talk to you. Busy people like the judges and that will still talk to you. They care deeply about every public policy in this state and they care deeply about the university.

CAC: My friend, thank you very much.

CB: Good luck!

CAC: You're around this summer? I may have to call on you again.

CB: I'm going to be teaching first term.

CAC: Okay. Thanks!

CB: Yes.

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

Hermes Transcribing and Research Service  
12617 Fairgreen Avenue, Apple Valley, MN 55124  
(612) 953-0730