

Sheldon Goldstein

- Early interest in radio 1
- University of Minnesota radio 2
- University of Minnesota TV, 1952 3
 - first TV course, 1956 4
 - Harris, Dale - Child Development 5
 - Ameson, Harvey - 20th Century art 5
 - Walker, Arnold 7
- KTCA - Nunn, Bill 8
 - North, Joe 9
- Closed circuit TV, 1962 10-
 - move to Rarig Center, 1972 13
- Matrix - 1980s 18
- Minnesota Public Radio 20-
 - KUOM 22
 - never acquired FM 21
 - pressure of Minnesota Public Radio Board 22
 - move to turn KUOM over to MPR 23
 - KUOM turned over to students, 1992 23
- University theater 26
- Loyalty to University of Minnesota declines 29

Interview with Sheldon Goldstein

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

**Interviewed on July 21, 1994
University of Minnesota Campus**

Sheldon Goldstein - SG
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: I'm interviewing today Sheldon Goldstein who's been at the university for approximately forty years and largely in radio and TV [television], but also teaching in the Speech and Communications Department. We have many items to discuss between us. It is Thursday afternoon, July 21, 1994, and the tape is being cut in my office in 833 Social Science, and I'm Clarke Chambers.

Sheldon, welcome.

SG: Thank you.

CAC: As I have with others, let's start out with a little autobiography of how you got interested in radio at whatever point that was in your career, how you trained for it, and then what happens when you get here to the University of Minnesota.

SG: I actually started getting interested in radio—I was going to say broadcasting but in those days, it was just radio—very early, essentially from the performance end. I remember that in grade school and high school, I got involved in performance work.

CAC: Were you a local boy here?

SG: Yes, St. Paul.

CAC: What high school?

SG: Marshall High School in St. Paul.

CAC: Bravo.

SG: It was a high school for a period of thirteen years. Before that, it was a junior high and I think it may still be a junior high . . . I'm not sure. My older brother was involved in broadcast work so that, of course, got me stimulated as well. I was also very much involved in theater work in high school. We started a community theater group while I was in high school in St. Paul. Then, when I came back from service in Army on the GI Bill here to the university, I honestly can't tell you exactly how it happened, but I got involved with the work at KUOM, which really became kind of a second home for me.

CAC: Were you a student volunteer or were you on the payroll?

SG: There was an organization there that was known as the Radio Guild, which was a student organization. You auditioned for it. It was run entirely by students; but, it was housed at the station.

CAC: How wonderful.

SG: They had auditions every quarter and there were, as I recall, anywhere from 60 to 100 people who auditioned every quarter.

CAC: Good grief.

SG: Radio was very big in those days. [laughter]

CAC: It still is with me.

SG: This was just so you could have the privilege of doing volunteer work at the station. It wasn't for a job or anything like that. It was very much like a club. For heavens sakes! I met my wife there. I wasn't the only one; I could name several people whose marriages were born in that environment.

CAC: I'm going to interrupt a second because we talk about the university and how difficult it is for students in a large university to find a home and a community and there are little places like that all around this university. That's a good story.

SG: Exactly. That's exactly what that was. It was a little enclave of people with common interests and I'm sure the same kind of environment you'd find on a small campus. As a result of that experience there, I did an awful lot of work writing, producing, acting, and also, at the same time, was involved at the University Theater.

CAC: What kind of a major were you?

SG: That's what I was just leading up to.

CAC: Okay.

SG: I suppose I probably would have been a theater major except that I didn't like the technical theater end of it; so, I wound up with what was then a radio major in the Speech Department.

CAC: I see.

SG: It was really a, looking back on it, minimal kind of . . . I don't think there were more than three courses in the whole sequence that actually dealt with radio. It was essentially pretty much a speech major with a couple of broadcast courses thrown in. That's what I got my B.A. in and, then, I started work on my master's but then got a job offer in Oregon to be the production director at the educational radio station in Corvallis. I married, and we went out there, and spent a couple of years there. This was about the time that TV . . . this was from 1951 to 1953.

CAC: Just breaking.

SG: TV was just beginning to emerge. I wanted to get involved in TV. There was no TV happening out there at that time—since then, they have a very extensive system out there—so, I came back here, and went to work at KUOM, and finished up my master's. I worked for about a year or two in radio and then made the switch to TV as it began to emerge in what was then KUOM but later became the Department of Radio and Television.

CAC: This was a department within Continuing Education [CE]?

SG: It was then called the General Extension Division. Later, the name changed to Continuing Education and Extension.

CAC: That's where the administrative home was?

SG: That's right.

CAC: Did you volunteer or did you apply for this kind of job? Were you selected out to move from radio to TV?

SG: In that period before 1957 . . .

[telephone rings - break in the interview]

SG: Maybe I should backtrack just a little bit . . . not too far. In 1952, the FCC [Federal Communications Commission] reserved some channels for educational television. That prompted

a lot of interest in educational television around the country. I was not here at the time; as I said, I was in Oregon from 1951 to 1953, but people sent me newspaper clippings out there . . . something you might want to follow up on with others. In 1952, the university went to the legislature with a request to establish essentially, as I recall, a statewide television network. For whatever reasons—I've heard a lot of stories as to possible reasons—it was shot down. As a matter of fact, I recall seeing a newspaper clipping to this effect that one legislator got up on the floor of either the House or the Senate and said he would certainly not vote to put such a powerful medium of communication in the hands of the Communists over at the university. Whether that was the reason or not, I don't know; but, in any event, it didn't happen. KUOM did acquire a couple of television cameras from a trade school here in town that went bankrupt or for tax purposes they donated these two camera [unclear]. When I came back in 1953, these cameras were set up in what was then the largest radio studio over there in the basement of Eddy Hall, or as we liked to refer to it, the ground floor of Eddy Hall. There was a little experimentation going on with those cameras. Then, gradually, we started putting together programs, rehearsing programs there. Everything, of course, was live in those days. There was no video tape. A little later, there was kinescope recording but there was essentially no way to record programs. We used to rehearse programs there, and then, as a package, take them down to the commercial stations, and do them live at the commercial stations. As a matter of fact, the first telecourse, the first television course for credit, was done that way in 1956.

CAC: Now, you had a mission from the university to proceed along these lines?

SG: I honestly don't know whether we had a mission or not.

CAC: You had a green light somewhere and some budget?

SG: We were allowed to do it, that's right.

CAC: And a budget to make it possible.

SG: And a budget to make it possible, that's right; although, it wasn't costing very much. At the same time that those of us who were on the staff were doing this, we were still doing radio work. As I recall, my job was the director of adult programs on KUOM, and I was programming talks and a series of adult programs, and then doing this TV business kind of on the side. When we got to doing these telecourses, that was more formal. The first one that was done was a course in child psychology with Dale Harris, who was, at that time, head of the Institute of Child Development. We did that on Channel 11 but at that time it was WMIN-TV over in the Hamm building in St. Paul.

CAC: This was an Extension course for credit?

SG: That's right.

CAC: Why did you choose Dale Harris and child development?

SG: It was a subject that was going to be broadcast, as I recall, late morning, something like ten-thirty or eleven o'clock in the morning. That was time they would give us. In those days, that meant an audience of women and child development seemed like the kind of thing that . . .

CAC: But you had checked out Dale Harris as a possible performer?

SG: Oh, yes. He had been doing some things on radio, on KUOM. Of course, his willingness to do it was a major factor. It wasn't as though everyone on the faculty was dying to do one of these crazy telecourses.. [laughter] There was an existing correspondence study course; so, when students registered for the course, they were really registering for the correspondence course. They got these television lectures, two half hours a week, as a bonus if you will. That really became the pattern for telecourses not only here but around the country. What is now called Independent Study but used to be called Correspondence Study really provided the instructional backbone and the television lectures were a way of highlighting aspects of the course, providing motivation, and also keeping them on schedule so that they got the lessons in rather than spreading it out over two . . .

CAC: The fees couldn't possibly begin to pay for the what the costs were?

SG: No, no. Later on, when Channel 2 was on the air and we had evening hours, we had some very, very successful courses. We were getting enrollments of anywhere from 200 to 250 . . . 300 for some courses. At that time, of course, we were producing them live from our own studio. Even with enrollments of that size, it wouldn't meet the full cost; but, it did meet about two-thirds of the cost, which is essentially the cost of day school instruction.

CAC: You were producing Dale Harris then?

SG: I produced that course. Then, after that Harvey Arneson, who was at that time head of Art History, did a course—I don't remember what the title was—on Twentieth Century art or something like that. That was the second one. That, too, was done on a commercial station. Then, in 1957, KTCA went on the air. At that time, the university made a commitment to program an hour a day on this station. We had the hour from nine to ten in the evening, five days a week.

CAC: Were other educational institutions given hours also?

SG: They weren't given; you bought them.

CAC: Yes.

SG: The private colleges had the hour, as I recall, eight to nine. The school systems did extensive programming during the daytime hours.

CAC: KTCA is fully autonomous then?

SG: Yes, it still is. Actually, it was because of that legislative action, that I referred to when they wouldn't refund the university, that a movement started to develop a community group to be the licensee in order to get that channel that was allocated to the Twin Cities.

CAC: Were they often allocated to universities or colleges in other states?

SG: The FCC just allocates the channel. To be eligible for it, you had to be a non-profit, or an educational institution, or a governmental entity. Particularly in the Big Ten, most of the Big Ten schools have a station of their own. Illinois has a license. Ohio State has a license. Wisconsin has a license. Michigan State has a license.

CAC: That makes them fully responsible for the whole [unclear]?

SG: That's right.

CAC: The model here was different?

SG: This one is different.

CAC: It may be a better model.

SG: It may be. The model that exists here is typical of the larger metropolitan areas. New York has this kind . . . Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, St. Louis. The non-profit corporation is the licensee. They call it a community license. That's much the more typical arrangement in a metropolitan area. When the TV activity became more formalized and regular, at that point—your question earlier was, "Did I apply for a job?"—a job was created to be television program director in the department. I got the job. I honestly don't remember whether I went through an application process or what the process was; but, I became the television program director.

CAC: You were on the ground floor and obviously as skilled as anyone around.

SG: Yes. At that time, the department name was changed to the Department of Radio and Television; whereas, before that, it was just KUOM. Then, we embarked on doing an hour a day of programming out of that little matchbox of a studio in the basement of Eddy Hall. That was doing two half hour programs back-to-back out of that studio. We used to run some promotional spots between the programs that would last about a minute and a half and during that minute and a half have to move people in and out of the studio, move the cameras to the other set, relight.

It was fun; but, it was wild . . . it really was. We did some exciting things in there I think. Of course, it always looks better when you look back on it than what it really was.

CAC: Which of the experiments do you find, looking back, as the more interesting, or successful, or exciting?

SG: There were several that I could mention. We actually produced out of that studio the very first magazine program that was done in this market, maybe in this region. We called in "*Folio*." It was a weekly, one hour program. We had a host; Arnold Walker was the host.

CAC: Of course.

SG: He was on the radio staff at that time at KUOM.

CAC: He had a wonderful voice and presence.

SG: Our production staff consisted of me and two producer/directors. Each of us would, during the course of the week, roundup . . . again, all of this was live. We couldn't rely on video tape or anything like that.

CAC: No elbow room for mistakes.

SG: We would line up features and on a given program, we would have as many as four or five features. Some of them would be public affairs interviews. Some of them would be book reviews.

CAC: It was a magazine format?

SG: Yes. Or sometimes, we'd just get in a piece of sculpture, play some music, and have the camera play on that. We did some interesting things and we tried to get guests who were on the campus or in the community to come in. It was a struggle. It was very, very tough putting that program together; but, I think in many ways, it may have been, from a production point of view, the most gratifying. We did some other things. I remember Bob Moore did a series on Shakespeare that was just terrific.

CAC: He just was a talking head on that show, wasn't he?

SG: That's right.

CAC: Which was quite enough to sustain it in those days?

SG: Exactly. I've lost his first name . . . Wolf . . .

CAC: John Wolf.

SG: John Wolf in History did a couple of series that were just terrific. There were some really very exciting, both intellectually and production, kinds of things that we were doing. We did an occasional drama, too, out of that crazy little studio.

CAC: With the state of commercial television at that time, there must have been a hunger for the kinds of programs that you're talking about now?

SG: I think that's probably true. The other side of the coin was that people weren't nearly as critical of TV in those days because it was new and it was a novelty factor. You couldn't help but be experimental because everything you were doing was essentially being done for the first time. It was an altogether different kind of climate.

CAC: Let me interrupt again.

SG: Sure.

CAC: Did you get listener/viewer response? Would they spontaneously write in and say, "Boy, . . . "?

SG: Oh, of course, we got some letters of that type. We got some complaints, too.

CAC: You were just shooting in the dark?

SG: We really never knew.

CAC: You didn't know how many listeners you had?

SG: No, we had no audience data. This was a little later but when we did start offering courses for credit, of course, you could judge by enrollments and also, we used to sell the study guide separately if somebody just wanted to follow the course without registering but get a study guide and do the reading or whatever. That was another gauge of interest. We had no hard data. It was all anecdotal as to what anybody thought of it. That went on for a period of about five years, until about 1962. There was great tension, in those days, between the university and Channel 2. John Schwarzwald was then the manager of KTCA. Even at the time, I was never entirely certain what the basis for the tension was. John Schwarzwald, I think, always felt threatened by the university . . . that somehow, he felt the university was trying to take KTCA over—maybe they were, I don't know. I had no knowledge that that was going on. Bill Nunn, who at the time was the director of University Relations, is probably the person who deserves the most credit for getting KTCA on the air.

CAC: I see.

SG: He did most of the organization work, putting together that citizen's group, and putting together the money; so that, when the station actually came on the air, he was a presence that a manager coming in, as John did, from Houston couldn't ignore. For all I know, maybe Bill Nunn did want to take over the station. I don't think so; but, maybe he did. Certainly, I think John believed that he did. As I say, there was just constant tension. The fact that we were producing the programs . . . We were the only entity supplying programs that were not using their facilities. We had our own facilities. We had a microwave and we microwaved our programs over to their studio and transmitter. That gave us an independence that nobody else had. I can understand why they would be nervous about that, quite frankly; but, we didn't care.

CAC: That was one hour a day?

SG: Yes. There was that tension; so, in 1962 . . .

CAC: Did you have to have a green light from John in order to do a kind of program?

SG: That was, I think, part of the tension that we had this level of independence.

CAC: You could stage what you wanted to in that hour?

SG: Yes, we could do whatever we wanted and he wouldn't know until it went on the air. I can understand why he would be nervous about that. That was essentially the way it was. On the other hand, we all had broadcasting backgrounds. We were responsible broadcasters, let me put it that way. It's just that we weren't under his supervision. As I recall, there was only one time that we put something on—it was a live interview—and somebody used some foul language and John raised hell about that, as he should have. In 1962, all of this really kind of came to a head. O. Meredith Wilson was newly arrived as president and some pressure was being put to bear on the Board of Regents by the KTCA Board; so, it was decided in 1962 to move the production of these programs to KTCA. Joe North was hired by KTCA to program.

CAC: Oh, yes.

SG: He had been on the faculty at Iowa State. He was hired by KTCA to be the programmer and the producer of the university programs and the production of these programs was moved from our shop out to KTCA and under the control of KTCA.

CAC: Did you go along?

SG: No. At the same time that that happened, we . . .

CAC: Now, who was the liaison person from here then?

SG: Joe North.

CAC: But, he was paid by KTCA and not by the university?

SG: Actually, he was paid by the university as a part of the university's contract with KTCA. He was hired by KTCA and reported to KTCA; but, he was being paid with university money.

CAC: But, he did other things for us other than the university hour?

SG: Not initially.

CAC: All right.

SG: Later on, he did. At the same time that that occurred, the use of television for instructional applications had been growing around the country since the early 1950s. The university was facing enrollment pressures; so, we, in the Department of Radio and Television, were directed to develop closed-circuit television on the campus and devote our energies and our facilities to that. I can't recall the exact details but we still somehow worked with Joe. I think he ran program ideas past us, things like that, but essentially we were out of that loop. We proceeded to start developing closed-circuit television and we put in cables to the campus. By the end of that decade, by the end of the 1960s, we had something like twenty or thirty classrooms wired. In 1967-1968, during that academic year, we did seventy-nine courses . . .

CAC: Good grief.

SG: . . . with a total enrollment of over 40,000 students.

CAC: Oof!

SG: We were cranking out instructional material.

CAC: By that time, could you put these on tape and use them again?

SG: Yes. We acquired our first tape recorder in about 1962 and, shortly thereafter, a second one.

CAC: Could students tune in on these at different times of day?

SG: It varied considerably from course to course. For some courses, as I recall, a professor would come into the studio and feed a lecture out to the rooms, and it would be recorded at the same time, and then repeated two or three times during the course of the day. In other instances, it would just be live and not recorded. In some instances, material, whether it be a lecture, or a demonstration, or whatever, would be recorded and then saved from quarter to quarter and repeated.

CAC: That's why some faculty were uneasy about that.

SG: It was never done without faculty members approval.

CAC: I meant the faculty generally who were not involved.

SG: I'm sure that's true. The real pressure against it—maybe I shouldn't be so glib about it—maybe it was being . . .

. . .

CAC: You put us out of business.

SG: No, not . . .

CAC: I know it wasn't; but, a lot of people perceived it that way.

SG: [laughter] This was a common concern; you're absolutely right. The question was always asked. Remember, this was a period where their enrollments were huge. There was a shortage of faculty. Departments could not hire the people that they needed, or wanted, or even had the money for. It was, at that time at least, meeting an institutional need.

CAC: Of course.

SG: The nervousness, I'm sure, was there.

CAC: How many of these professors then invested extra time to meet the visual component?

SG: Some, not all.

CAC: In most instances, they went right ahead and gave a lecture as they would before a large lecture group?

SG: This is a generalization; but, it wasn't uncommon, let's put it that way, for an individual professor to come in and start out teaching the way he—in those days, it really was he—would teach in the classroom but then they'd get kind of weaned. They'd get interested and . . . could I try this? Then, they started playing around with different forms of visualization. Of course, we were always encouraging them in that direction. It was not uncommon for the level of sophistication in the use of the medium or the production elements to increase as the faculty member used it. On the other hand, you're absolutely right that the really critical element—this is true up to today; it was true then and it's still true—in all of that is how much time the faculty member is either prepared to invest or is able to invest.

CAC: Time, imagination . . .

SG: The time is many cases the critical . . . most of them have some kind of imagination. As I say, we are there to help them . . . producers are now and they were then; but, it does take time.

CAC: As a lay person, I remember in Economics and Psychology where they had such hordes of students . . . that those were popular areas. Does that match your memory?

SG: Psychology was one of the courses. We put in a video projector in Northrop Auditorium, one of the very early video projectors. As a matter of fact, the elevator is still there in the center aisle in Northrop Auditorium. The projector was raised in that center aisle. Psychology had been teaching, in a mass lecture, their Introductory Psychology course live in Northrop Auditorium with someone standing on that stage and lecturing to the students. The next step for them was to record those lectures on video tape. Then, we put in the projector to project that image, which, I must say, I think was an improvement over having some little, small figure standing on a stage. At least you could see the face and the expression.

CAC: And body language.

SG: Even if there were no visuals used at all and they did use some, I think it would be an improvement. The students didn't perceive it that way however. On the other hand, students only take the course once and they really have no basis of comparison—if they pass, they only take it once. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

SG: By the early 1970s, for a combination of reasons—perhaps the one that you cited . . . the faculty fears—the students began to become dissatisfied by this technological teaching, the lack of human contact and so forth, and the pressure, the institutional need for it was beginning to diminish. From the 1970s on, we still do this kind of thing but it's entirely different. It's not full courses. It's recording of demonstrations or going out in the field and recording something so it's a means of bringing things into the classroom that otherwise would be difficult to do. There is still something approaching full courses but they're very specialized or there's a specialized reason for doing it. It's not nearly that mass kind of thing.

CAC: This is still done through Continuing Education?

SG: Through what is now University Media Resources.

CAC: And they're under CE?

SG: Yes. Maybe I ought to spend a minute on that.

CAC: All right.

SG: In 1972 approximately, we moved into Rarig Center. We had been, as I said, in Eddy Hall. Rarig Center was completed in 1972 and we moved.

CAC: That gave you state-of-the-art space?

SG: That gave us great space, right. Shortly thereafter, in 1973 or 1974, the Department of Radio and Television and Continuing Education and Extension was combined with what was then called the Audio Visual Education Service, which operated out of the business vice-president's office. Those two units were combined to form University Media Resources, but were housed under Continuing Education and Extension. We became a very comprehensive media unit including art services, and engineering services, and a photo lab, and campus equipment rental service, plus the radio and television activity.

CAC: That's a good deal. It takes a lot of effort.

SG: That was a trend . . . these things are very cyclical, I'm convinced. That kind of consolidation of all media units into one department was going on on campuses all over the country. That was the style. That was the fashion. The idea was—I think, to some extent at least, it proved to be true—that there were efficiencies and economies to be achieved by this kind of consolidation. Certainly, administrative overhead is reduced.

CAC: And you get a coordination of experts who can be brought in from different places.

SG: Exactly. Shall I say something about University TV College?

CAC: I know nothing about it. Everything would be new to me and to posterity, I'm sure.

SG: [laughter] It relates, in part, to the KTCA relationship but not entirely. This was going on around the country. There had been an experiment at the Chicago Junior College to offer the first two years of the baccalaureate program, essentially the distribution requirements in the Arts College . . .

CAC: You just stay home and watch TV.

SG: . . . by way of television. It's again this combination of a correspondence course with TV. The experience at the Chicago Junior College, which was very successful, had a slight wrinkle in it. They embarked on it with the hope that they wouldn't have to invest in new buildings. They were getting this influx of students and rather than make this capital investment in order to house all these students, they said, "Let's try this TV College," and as you say, "Let the students study at home" and then we won't have to build classrooms for them. It proved to be very successful. Of course, they didn't charge tuition; it was tuition free at least for residents of

Chicago. That was the way they were funded; so, money wasn't a deterrent. What they found was that they were not attracting the eighteen, nineteen year olds, that is to say, the college-aged students, those who had just graduated from high school; but, rather they were attracting the thirty to thirty-five year old woman—this was the profile of the typical student—who, in most instances, had started a collegiate career but had it interrupted in order to raise a family and so forth and was now interested in going back and testing the waters to see whether she could pursue a degree.

CAC: It's the same thing that Continuing Education for Women was doing here in a more traditional way.

SG: Very similar. It proved to be successful; but, it proved to be successful by uncovering a new market not by reaching the target audience that they had hoped to reach. We here at the University of Minnesota decided that we're going to try the same thing. The university was instituting at that time a controlled enrollment policy. They were limiting admissions. So, they said, looking at that Chicago experience, "How can we make this more attractive to college-aged students?" They decided that the thing that was lacking in the Chicago Junior College experience was that there was no socializing, that the students weren't getting together and that that would be attractive to the eighteen and nineteen year old and would make it more of a collegiate experience; so, we set up study groups all over the metropolitan area.

CAC: Ohhh.

SG: When a student registered for a course, they not only were required to watch the TV but, once a week for most of the courses, they would have to go to a local library, or the high school, or wherever it was set up and meet with a graduate student in a study group. The hope was that this new wrinkle would make it more attractive to the eighteen, nineteen year olds.

CAC: But in someone else's space? It wouldn't be university space?

SG: Make it a more convenient space out there in the suburbs or wherever.

CAC: Outstate as well . . . metropolitan?

SG: No. Just within the coverage area of KTCA. In those days, there was no cable.

CAC: How wide was that?

SG: About thirty-five miles.

CAC: It would be the metropolitan area basically.

SG: Exactly, the whole metropolitan area. This experiment ran during 1959, 1960, and 1961. I think it was the Hill Foundation or the Bush [Foundation] underwrote some of the costs of the experiment, essentially the cost of buying the time from KTCA. These courses were offered and the graduate students went out there to run the study. The enrollments were very scant. During that three-year period, there were thirty course offerings with a total of 884 enrollees. That's skewed because one of the courses that was offered several times was Psych[ology] I and Psych II and those had over 100.

CAC: That didn't meet the expectations [unclear].

SG: Not at all financially. Not only that, the demographic breakdown of the audience was exactly the same as the experience in Chicago. Oregon ran a similar experience and they came up with exactly the same response. In other words, nobody was successful in attracting the eighteen, nineteen year olds to begin their collegiate experience by this means; but, in making the effort, this new market was uncovered of the thirty, thirty-five year old woman.

CAC: I'm sure that was a surprise; but, was it met with dismay? I should think that would have been exciting to find out. When I started teaching people age thirty to sixty . . . oh! that was more fun than teaching a bright seventeen year old kid.

SG: Let me put it this way: I think it would have been a more joyous discovery if the thirty to thirty-five year old women had turned up in greater numbers. [laughter] Financially, it wasn't a success at all. The experiment was called off after that three-year period.

CAC: I'm going to stop you for a minute. Whom else were you working with on that kind of a project . . . other persons on the campus here? That really is interesting.

SG: Tommy Thompson was the dean of Continuing Education at the time—it may still have been called General Extension. This was, in many ways, his brainchild; it was his baby.

CAC: What professors . . . was there a range of peak courses with sex appeal?

SG: Of course, you had to meet that distribution requirement.

CAC: These were courses mostly at the 1-xxx and 3-xxx level then?

SG: They were all established professors. The graduate students were used out in the discussion groups and in the second or third year, we even experimented with that. We offered the same courses—I believe it was an Anthropology course; I think Bob Spencer taught it—and the students were given an option. At that time, we began wondering maybe the discussion groups were a deterrent so the students were given an option. They could register for three credits for this Introductory Anthropology class and not go to the study groups or they could register for four credits and go to the study group. That proved inconclusive.

CAC: You didn't have a large enough sample?

SG: That's right, the numbers weren't large enough to really draw any conclusions from that. It was an interesting experiment. After it was called off, we continued to do credit courses but they were on an ad hoc basis. In other words, we tried to determine essentially what kinds of materials that audience that was identified would be interested in registering for.

CAC: A lot of those non-traditional students, as we came to know them, were coming through regular Extension night school on campus and they were beginning to register in day school part-time. That was another phenomenon in the 1970s and 1980s; so, you were getting . . . some of them may have been stimulated by this college.

SG: As a matter of fact, there was some research done in some of the community colleges in the Los Angeles area that were involved in this kind of activity and what they found . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

SG: . . . became a first stage to coming back to campus and taking courses in a more traditional way.

CAC: You didn't settle into a routine career at any point. You're always doing something different. Wasn't that fun?

SG: [laughter] You're absolutely right. At the same time as all of this going on, of course the technology is changing tremendously.

CAC: You had to keep up with the technical side or it.

SG: That's right. There was no rut there either. For me, that's always been the most gratifying part of it. Yet, another aspect of it is in recruiting and in hiring producer/directors the thing that I really look for in many ways more than the television skills is intellectual curiosity . . .

CAC: Ahhh! An inquiring mind.

SG: . . . because you spend the morning with an anthropologist. You spend the afternoon with a political scientist. You spend the next day with an historian or an electric engineer. There's no way to do that effectively or to enjoy it unless you enjoy working with ideas.

CAC: That's one of the reasons I'm having fun with this project.

SG: I'll bet.

CAC: I talk to someone different every day.

SG: That's been the nature of my business, at least until I became a paper pusher.

CAC: While all of this is going on and starting in the early to mid 1970s, 1971, 1975, 1977, the university is also going through retrenchment and reallocation and that leads really to what comes to be called Commitment to Focus. I think that we're trying to focus and edit our programs beginning exactly at the time you're talking about now in the 1970s.

SG: First of all, the production of the broadcast programs did subsequently come back to our shop. As the series of budgetary retrenchments occurred, the broadcast activity was the activity that became the most expendable.

CAC: Most vulnerable. That's because it was not generating income or because it was perceived as marginal to basic missions of the university?

SG: Both, I think. Certainly, it wasn't generating income. I'm not talking now just about the credit courses; I'm also talking about the general audience programming that we did. The credit courses were, in the 1970s, still viable. We were getting large enrollments. They never broke even; but, it depends on how you cost account those things. The broadcast activity was more and more cut back. In part also, I might add, that's because of the changes in the technology. In the early 1970s, you started getting the lower cost of tape recorders. By the mid 1970s and early 1980s, you had cassette tape recorders and it was possible to distribute programs by cassettes. This affected the closed-circuit work as well. Rather than feeding programs through the cable, you could play them back right in the classroom and pedagogically, that's a . . .

CAC: Or in your home.

SG: That became, in many ways, a more efficient way to accomplish some of these purposes. Just to follow through on the Commitment to Focus . . . the broadcast activity was pretty much eliminated. Right now, we're doing one half hour program a week with the Health Sciences, a call-in program on Channel 17. There were also changes at Channel 2 management which affected the availability of time for us on Channel 2.

CAC: [unclear] get fully programmed and can rent national programs, the whole bit.

SG: What happened there was Schwarzwald, for all of his strangeness, really had a commitment to education. The new breed of public broadcaster . . . it's beginning to change now because Congress is beginning to put some pressure on them. There was a period there from 1967 when the Public Broadcasting Act was passed until very recently where there was really very little difference if you talked to a commercial broadcaster or a public broadcaster. Essentially, they were interested in getting as large an audience as possible because that's how you raise money; so, instruction, education was very, very much a secondary . . . That's a

generalization; but certainly, it was true here in the Twin Cities with some of the newer . . . When Copin became the manager of KTCA, he took all of our programs off prime time and gave us Saturday morning time for the credit courses. I can understand why he did it; but, obviously you're not going to try . . . and you can't justify spending the same amount of money to produce a program for a Saturday morning as you can for prime time. The whole activity began to diminish.

CAC: Do you perceive this vulnerability within the General Extension, or whatever title it's going under, or is it a larger university . . . Morrill Hall. Did these things get bucked up to the vice-presidential level and the presidential level?

SG: At that time, it was more within Continuing Education and Extension.

CAC: That's one way they can . . .

SG: They could save money. It becomes, as you have to cut, harder and harder to justify the investment given both the time of broadcast and the . . .

CAC: These never reach the point of the president's office or the Regents?

SG: Not that I'm aware of. Maybe it was happening and I didn't know about it. There was one exception to that, however. In the early 1980s, when C. Peter Magrath was president, we undertook with him—actually Diane Magrath was one of the primer movers of it—a series called *Matrix* . . .

CAC: I remember that.

SG: . . . that was produced by us. KSTP gave us time on Sunday morning, as I recall, around eleven or eleven-thirty or sometimes it was noon. For about five years, we did that. Most of those years, we did thirteen programs.

CAC: This would be perceived as university relations, outreach to the public generally?

SG: It was a public relations effort. It was a magazine format. We brought Peter Graves in to be the host; he is, as you know, an alum[nus] and one of those people, by the way, who was involved in those early days that I was talking about in the student groups. That was a kind of exception to the over all trend.

CAC: You were involved in the production of *Matrix*?

SG: We produced that in our shop, right. Interestingly enough, I think that series proved more successful in the secondary use that some of those features received than it did on the actual broadcast. Some of those individual features are still being used by individual departments.

When they go out to give a speech or whatever, they'll use some of those features to explain to the public what they're all about. The basic effect of Commitment to Focus on the broadcast activity . . . I guess I would say on outreach activity in general was quite negative. The message was—I think it's even in the document—not to be market driven, that is to say, to do those things that are reflective of the institution whether anybody is interested in it or not. That became the rule, if you will, that we were forced to abide by. This affected KUOM, too, even more than television. When you're told to program for internal needs rather than what the public might be interested in or need to know, you're . . .

CAC: You're cutting yourself off.

SG: That's right . . . just deciding you don't care if there's one person out there listening to you. You're not addressing an audience then. What you're doing is kind of a narcissistic effort to satisfy yourself and that's essentially what happened.

CAC: I'm guessing also that this activity could be seen as marginal and vulnerable but also internal to the university, it doesn't have a large constituency? It doesn't have a political base as large and powerful as other interests would be?

SG: The broadcast activity doesn't. I think the instructional activity does.

CAC: I'm talking about the broadcast. You're politically vulnerable as well as . . . ?

SG: Oh, absolutely . . . no question about it. But, I think for a reason that you may not be aware of.

CAC: Okay.

SG: When I first started back in those early days and dealing with my counter parts at the other Big Ten schools or other schools around the country, I always had a sense of pride that we were involved in this activity in a metropolitan area where there were people . . .

CAC: Ahhh, right.

SG: . . . as opposed to say [the University of Illinois at] Champaign-Urbana or East Lansing.

CAC: You bet. You had half the population of the state right here.

SG: Exactly . . . two-thirds within the coverage area of KUOM, for example. As the years went by, that proved to be a negative rather than a positive because the university for political or whatever reasons never wanted to take on or appear to be competitive with the other broadcasters in the area. So, that for example, when the KTCA situation came up, you caved into KTCA. You just say, "Okay, we don't want to make you mad. You go ahead and do these programs." When

KSJN . . . they merged and there was a window of opportunity there that was lost because the university said, "Let them do it."

CAC: KSJN is a coalition of different . . . ?

SG: No, that's Minnesota Public Radio [MPR].

CAC: Yes, I know it; but, Minnesota Public Radio is a coalition. Don't they have to have different outlets?

SG: KSJN is the outlet in the Twin Cities. At that time, it was just that one and the one at St. John's in Collegeville.

CAC: But, it came to be more than that?

SG: Minnesota Public Radio came to be much, much more than that, yes.

CAC: Now, I see we're switching to radio, which is fine. [laughter] To what degree personally were you involved in the radio side of the story?

SG: My primary responsibility from 1957 on was television. Somewhere along the line, I don't recall the exact date, I became the assistant director and subsequently associate director of the department with my prime responsibilities in television but I was kind of a kibitzer in radio.

CAC: Who was the director of the [unclear]?

SG: Burton Paulu. There were periods of time when I actually had direct responsibility with respect to radio but those were spotty. In terms of planning and things of that sort, I would get involved in things relative to radio.

CAC: Both radio and TV were under Burton Paulu?

SG: That's right. I was more on the TV side.

CAC: I understand that; but, you're one team?

SG: That's right. I rarely, during that period, had any day-to-day responsibility for radio.

CAC: Who was your counterpart down the radio side at that time then?

SG: There was Bob Boyle early on, then Marvin Granger, and then Marion Watson. Their titles were either program director or station manager reporting to Burton Paulu.

CAC: You're suggesting it's a parallel story with radio?

SG: In a very real sense; although, the missed opportunities are much more dramatic in radio, much more dramatic.

CAC: All right. Say something about . . .

SG: In 1948—I found out about this subsequently—the FCC reserved some frequencies for non-commercial radio and the University of Minnesota actually had a construction permit to build an FM station. [William] Middlebrook, who at that time was the business vice-president, decided, FM isn't going to go anywhere. We don't need an FM station. He let it lapse. That was opportunity one that went down the drain. In 1967, when the Public Broadcasting Act was passed, I was in Washington working in the office of the secretary of HEW [Health, Education, and Welfare] for several months. I was quite familiar with the legislation . . . had worked on it. For the first time, radio was going to be included as a possibility for federal funding. The Facilities Act that preceded that was limited to television. It was up for renewal in 1967 and was renewed as a part of the Public Broadcasting Act and it included radio. So, here again was another opportunity to try to get an FM station with the possibility of some federal support to help build it. When I came back, we started pushing for that. There was one open frequency in the metropolitan area, one frequency available in the that reserve band that the commission had established. By the time the university got around to applying, WCAL in St. Olaf had applied for a frequency and that frequency was no longer available because of the separation requirements and technical folderol.

CAC: They had a long tradition of AM radio?

SG: They were sharing time with us on 7.70. In 1969 approximately, we hired a consulting engineer and they determined that if KSJN, which had just gone on the air—it couldn't have been more than a couple of years prior to that, if that long—moved their frequency just slightly that would then open up the possibility of dropping in another frequency for us.

CAC: And WCAL having it's own?

SG: That's right. We prepared an application to the commission along those lines. KSJN violently opposed that. The university was prepared to pick up whatever costs were involved in their making that slight move.

CAC: They were worried about the competition not the cost of moving?

SG: Exactly, although they didn't say that; they talked about everything else. I won't go into all of the folderol that developed. The upshot of the whole thing was that the commission ruled against the university. Our FCC lawyers—who knows whether you can believe them?—said was that if we appealed it, we almost certainly would win. The university decided not to appeal it.

CAC: At what level were decisions like that made?

SG: Those were made at the presidential level.

CAC: So, the pressures are being brought on Mr. [Malcolm] Moos and others?

SG: Incredibly, incredibly. The KSJN Board . . . the MPR Board was very, very strongly pushing that. It was putting great pressure on the university not to pursue this. There were two opportunities missed there.

CAC: So, it kept you on AM?

SG: That's right. Then, about 1972, the university had an opportunity to acquire an FM station in Duluth, WDTH. It was a commercial station that was going out of business and it was available. I don't remember the details . . . whether it was a combination gift/sale or all sale; but, it was available for a . . .

CAC: Plausible price?

SG: . . . very reasonable figure and the university bought or took it or whatever.

CAC: I see. I never knew that.

SG: KSJN by then was Minnesota Educational Radio, as I recall. That just raised their hackles because they said, "We have plans to put a station there so how dare you have a station before we do in Duluth?" Essentially that was their position. They just raised all kinds of hell about that. The university stood firm on the acquisition of the Duluth station. That was a done deal; there wasn't much to do about that. The ground shifted on that discussion and essentially it became a question of how the university might work with Minnesota Public Radio and then the whole KUOM business came into the picture. That took a variety of twists and turns.

CAC: They wanted to have you become part of a network?

SG: That's right.

CAC: But a lesser part?

SG: They wanted the university to turn KUOM over to Minnesota Public Radio is what it boiled down to. It may have, indeed, been in the very first year of the Magrath Administration. Walt Bruning was the vice-president . . .

CAC: Of Finance.

SG: Yes. He was the point person on this and he was pushing very hard to have the university turn KUOM over to Minnesota Public Radio. There's no question, in my mind at least, but what the major reason for this was that essentially the threats that were being made by the board of Minnesota Public Radio about what they would do to the university at the legislature if they didn't do this.

CAC: Ohhh.

SG: There was that kind of pressure being brought to bear. It became a big brouhaha . . . so much so that finally there was a governor's commission appointed. I think it was Elmer Andersen who was governor then.

CAC: No, he was much earlier.

SG: Who was it then?

CAC: I don't know; we can find out. It may have been Wendy Anderson.

SG: Wendell Anderson, yes, that's what I meant to say. He appointed a commission to study the whole thing and make a recommendation. They recommended a dual network, one thing or another. The whole thing essentially cooled down; but, the tension remained. I would say, from that point on . . .

CAC: Then you were really vulnerable.

SG: . . . KUOM was in jeopardy. It was one crisis after another from that point on with respect to KUOM for whatever reasons.

CAC: You don't have access to the FM band?

SG: That was part of it . . . in an era of FM. Every time there was any kind of a budget crisis, that was a natural target. It was one thing after another from that point on. Last year, in 1992, when the Board of Regents actually passed a resolution saying they should eliminate KUOM, that was a culmination of twenty years of hanging on by your fingernails.

CAC: Yes, from 1972 to 1992.

SG: That's right.

CAC: During this period, did KUOM ever think of being membership supported as WCAL and all the other public radio [stations] do?

SG: Oh, yes. KUOM ran fund drives. There were a couple of things argued against that however. Number one . . . a very, very long tradition of not being listener supported. In other words, you had to change the habits of the listener. The fact that it was the university . . . people begin to expect things from the university and the limited broadcast hours. Remember on the shared time arrangement, KUOM signed on at 10:30 a.m. and then was off at sunset—that varied from 4:15 p.m. till about 9:00 or 10:00 p.m., depending on whether it was daylight savings time—and then, signing on at noon on Saturday and not on the air at all on Sunday. You got a limited broadcast day in which . . .

CAC: To build membership.

SG: Even more than that, the kind of programming that the station did . . . Let me put it to you this way. Minnesota Public Radio . . . I have great admiration for what they did right from the beginning with KSJN. Their programming is market driven. In other words, they have decided what will sell in this market and that's what they program. That was never done at KUOM. KUOM was always driven more from the point of view of, what's the right thing to do?

CAC: [unclear] educational institute?

SG: What kind of service should the university be providing? That kind of thinking came to a head with Commitment to Focus. I heard it with my own ears when Ken Keller said, "Don't worry about audiences." I put the question, "How will we decide whether KUOM is successful or not?" "It won't be by audiences. It will be by whether you're reflecting the institution, whether you're doing programs that are faculty driven." So, we revamped the whole program schedule along those lines. Of course, we got no audiences. Then, people said, "Why are we putting all this money into the station if there's no audience?" You don't raise money in a community, is what I'm trying to say, unless you take a market driven approach. You've got to give people things that they're going to be interested in, and want to hear, and are willing to support. You don't generate funds in a community, in broadcasting at least, by deciding, we're going to give you this dose of castor oil whether you want it or not.

CAC: But, down the other line, over decades, KUOM did, in fact, provide a source of information for a significant number of listeners not course oriented but persons who were experts on current events for example, or on arts, or theater, or whatever. It was criticism . . .

SG: Absolutely. A couple of things with respect to that . . . number one, much of that was in the era before FM . . .

CAC: Okay.

SG: . . . and before there were so many public stations in the market.

CAC: So, it's highly competitive?

SG: It's very competitive. That goes back to my point about one of the disadvantages of being in a metropolitan area. If you're WILL in Champaign-Urbana, you're the only game in town. But, if you're KUOM in the Twin Cities, you're one of five or six public radio stations in this market. It's at least five or six and maybe more. The audience gets splintered. I guess I would have to say, too, KUOM was slow to react, in my judgment, to the advent of Minnesota Public Radio. There was an opportunity there early on to make a complete shift to public affairs programming and essentially say, "FM is going to be the medium for classical music. Let's not bother with that anymore. Let's concentrate on news and public affairs talk only." My own judgment is—I must confess this is not just retrospective; I proposed it at the time—that if that shift had been made around 1970 when KSJN was first coming on the air, KUOM's competitive position might have been much stronger. It wouldn't have been an easy thing to do—don't misunderstand me—but, I think there was again an opportunity there to step out and do more in that area and establish the niche for the station.

CAC: It's just at that time that the university is getting very uneasy about retrenchment.

SG: Exactly. There were a lot of factors that argued against it. That's yet another aspect of the whole thing.

CAC: Let's end on a higher note [unclear].

SG: [laughter]

CAC: This has been very interesting.

SG: Good.

CAC: I consider myself a reasonably well-informed citizen of the community and I'm learning from this interview, as I have from others as well. You also, Sheldon, were involved in community theater. You spoke of an original interest when you were a student in the theater and I know that you have been on boards of small theaters [unclear], Guthrie [Theatre], or whatever they were called and you've acted in them. Talk a bit about the theater.

SG: It's always been an avocation. I never tried to make a living at it. I enjoy it. The theater groups over the years that I've been involved with . . . The Theatre St. Paul. This would have been in the 1950s and 1960s. Actually, the Crawford Livingston Theatre in the Science Museum was built for Theatre St. Paul.

CAC: I didn't know that.

SG: I was on the board of the Theatre St. Paul at the time that that was being planned. Ralph Rapson designed it. It was shortly after he designed the Guthrie. I might also add that moving into that theater is what destroyed Theatre St. Paul. That's not uncommon. Sometimes a theater

group functions quite well in a modest facility; but, when they move into something more grand, the audience expectations grow and sometimes you're taking on a greater financial obligation and it can destroy a theater. That also happened with the Actor's Theatre in St. Paul. I served on their board much later. I did some plays there.

CAC: Did you ever direct or just play?

SG: I've never directed in major part because direction is too much like work. I did this for fun.

CAC: It was after hours; you wanted to have a good time. You had some fat parts, too, Sheldon.

SG: Oh, yes, I've been very fortunate. At Theatre St. Paul, I did Caesar in *Caesar and Cleopatra*. I did Hamlet [*Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*].

CAC: I never knew that. Good for you.

SG: I did Ulysses in *Tiger at the Gate*. I did Greenwald in the *Caine Mutiny Court-Martial*.

CAC: Oh my!

SG: This is beginning to sound a little bit like, and then I wrote one of those songwriter . . . [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

SG: There was a period there where I really—I suppose it coincided with the beginning of TV—just didn't have the time.

CAC: Sure.

SG: Then later on, I got associated with Theatre in the Round and, again, I had some terrific roles over there. I did the central character, Quentin, in *After the Fall*, the Arthur Miller [play]. I was in *The Iceman Cometh*; I did Harry Hope in that and Jack Boyle in the *Juno and the Paycock*.

CAC: You're a lucky and a skilled person. How does one explain the vitality of the theater in the Twin Cities community? Does it go way back or it's a matter of the last thirty, forty years, I'm guessing?

SG: I can remember when essentially the University Theater was *the* theater in town.

CAC: You bet.

SG: There was the Edith Bush over in St. Paul that did some theater.

CAC: There was some suburban summer theater; but, no I think that's right.

SG: I can remember when the University Theater was really . . . I'm not talking about road shows. Obviously, those were coming through. But, then a number of theaters began growing up.

CAC: How do you account for that?

SG: I think that the presence of the university is one part of it.

CAC: They were a seedbed for actors and directors?

SG: Not only that but for audiences.

CAC: Ahhh.

SG: I think that you've got a faculty and staff here that is oriented toward cultural activities. I think that's one of the reasons music thrives here as well . . . and the students and probably as participants as well; but, I think mostly, the presence of the university is to supply audiences. Also, there is the support of corporate community in Minneapolis that provided some grants to some of these theaters. The Guthrie, I think, stimulated a lot of theater, too.

CAC: You bet. Actors got here for one thing or another and they didn't want to leave.

SG: Exactly. Also, you build an audience for theater . . . people will seek theater; so, I think that was a factor.

CAC: As it went along . . . it has been said that the University Theater then loses its centrality.

SG: It did. I think that's a reality. In terms of the quality of work—some of my friends over there at the theater, I'm sure, would disagree me—I think the heyday of the University Theater . . . although I'd like to think it was during the year that I was performing there, honesty compels me to say that it was in the early days of the Guthrie when they were attracting with the McKnight fellows . . .

CAC: That's the 1960s, early 1970s.

SG: That's right . . . some first-class talent in every aspect: writers, actors, directors, costumers, technical people.

CAC: But that didn't sustain itself at the university?

SG: The McKnight money dried up.

CAC: I see. They lost the fellows?

SG: They lost the fellowships. I think they've got a more modest program going now that is now also beginning to attract some good people. My goodness! there was some tremendous talent . . . people that you still see turning up around the country who started out in that McKnight fellowship program.

CAC: You never acted in University Theater?

SG: I did as a student, yes. I did Iago [*Othello*] as a student . . . oh, it was many things. I think the theater climate is going through another change now in the Twin Cities . . . the tough economic times. Some of the theaters are really having some problems; but, it's still just a tremendously vital community in the Twin Cities. When a community theater—I'm not talking now about professional work—let's say like Theatre in the Round, which is as close to a community theater as I think there is in the area . . . when they have auditions for a play, they'll have 60, 70, 80, 100 people audition.

CAC: Is there a tendency for these theaters to go from community to professional? I'm thinking of Penumbra, which I think is one of the best theaters.

SG: Absolutely, that is a professional theater now. I think a better example of that kind of transition may be Park Square, which started out as a totally community theater . . . volunteer. Now, they're, what I would term, in a kind of a middle ground. They're paying people stipends, nothing approaching equity or anything like that; but, they're probably beginning to work toward that—at least I'm sure that's their goal. Whether they have the means to do it, I don't know. Penumbra . . . maybe they went through that same kind of development. It's possible; but, it seems to me they jumped rather quickly to the equity level. Cricket was a first-class theater group and they're now struggling. They lost their home. On the other hand, you have new ones turning up like the Jungle Theatre, which is doing terrific work. They come and go I guess is what happens.

CAC: Sheldon, each person I interview has a different angle, different experience. This is a large university. Do you have any reflections in conclusion on persons or programs that were supportive for the kinds of things you were interested in, which is to say, particular deans, or presidents, or vice-presidents, or faculty groups?

SG: A couple things come to mind. I recall, for example, what I thought was a particular act of wisdom that O. Meredith Wilson took in 1962 when we made that change to applying closed-circuit television to instruct. The directive from him was, "Look! the fact that we can use this medium to teach has been established. There's no need for us to reestablish that. Let's concentrate on applying it and using it."

CAC: Good.

SG: That set the stage for the kind of development . . .

CAC: You're getting a real green light.

SG: . . . and application that we were talking about. Don Smith, who was vice-president around that same time, took what I thought was a very enlightened position—I suppose because it favored us. [laughter] He decided to support the use of instructional television centrally rather than have cross-charges to departments for its use. I recall his position at that time was that if you want to encourage its use, if you want to be sure people use it, that's the way you've got to do it. If you give the money to the departments, it won't be used for that purpose. It will be used for graduate assistants or whatever. So, I thought that was a particularly enlightened, wise position. I'm trying to think of only the favorable things.

CAC: History is concerned with things that didn't work, too.

SG: Yes, I know. It's probably likely that it's just the reflection back on years past but obviously the university has changed enormously over the period of time.

CAC: Of course.

SG: Sadly, I feel that the changes have not been for the better. The major difference, at least that I kind of get a sense of, is the lack of . . . I don't know whether loyalty is the right word but commitment to the institution. That isn't there in anything approaching the extent to which it used to be.

CAC: That's an interesting commentary that shows up in many of the interviews I've had.

SG: I would imagine. I think it started happening in the 1960s and 1970s as faculty, for obvious reasons . . . their loyalty was more to their discipline than to the institution.

CAC: David Reisman at Harvard wrote an essay on the "Home Guard and the Mercenaries," and he said that the universities used to be peopled by the home guard who were loyal to the institution then and the mercenaries would go and fight for anybody. They didn't [unclear].

SG: [laughter]

CAC: It's a crude metaphor but it's what you're talking about.

SG: It's exactly what I'm talking about. That has a very pervasive effect. It begins, I think, to erode at a lot of things. Lord knows—I think it's self-evident—that the morale of faculty and staff is nothing like it used to be.

CAC: That's right and you and I are alike skeptical of nostalgia and particularly nostalgia of old men, right? It's a real risk.

SG: Of course it is. Of course it is.

CAC: But this is for posterity and we're recording subjective [unclear] at this time. This is a remarkable afternoon. I had a good time.

SG: I hope it's been helpful.

CAC: Very helpful! I've been trying to gather a set of spoken words and . . .

[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