

Fred Lukermann

- Youth 1
 - early interest in foreign policy, social studies, activism 1
- University of Minnesota - freshman, 1940 2
 - History and Geography 2
- Military service, Army 3
- Lukermann returns to University of Minnesota, 1946 4
 - M.A. in History 4
 - Ph.D. candidate in Geography 4
 - Fulbright to Turkey, 1951-53 4-8
 - Lukermann - instructor, Geography Department, 1954 8
- Administration 8
 - Associate dean - CLA 1966 8
 - Assistant vice-president, 1967-73 8
- Quality of Geography Department 8-11
 - expansion in 1950s-60s 10
- Role of Ziebarth, E.W. and CLA 13-14
- Funding for Geography Department, 1960s 14-15
 - NDEA (National Defense Education Act) 15
- Lukermann - assistant vice-president, 1967 15
- Community outreach 16
 - Cooperman, Dan 16
 - Smith, Don 16
 - Moos, Malcolm 16
- Public Administration program discontinues 18
- Origins of CURA 18
 - a new land-grant mission 19
 - multidisciplinary 22
 - Regents' reserve monies 23
- Occupation of Morrill Hall, 1968 23-24
- CURA special 25
- Education experiments, 1970s 26
 - Living Learning Center 26
 - Experimental College 26
 - Educational Development Fund 26
 - Inter-College Program 27
 - HELP Center 27
- University of Minnesota college crisis 28-29
 - misunderstanding - Shepherd and Moos 29
- Cambodian crisis, May 1972 29-30
 - absence of Moos 29
- General College 30-33
- Afro-American Studies Department 34-37
- Other minority programs 37-41
 - bearing on minority communities 40
- Role of Moos 41-42
- Retrenchments, 1971 42-

origins of planning 42
Crisis in Central Administration, 1973 44-
 Smith, Don - his role 45
 role of academic senate 45
 Moos and Communiversities 47
Occupation of Morrill Hall, 1968 47-48
 Fiscal crisis 48
 crisis in Health Sciences 49
 Smith, Don - as co-president, 1972-74 50
 Cambodia, May 1972 51
 Resignation of Shepherd, Lofquist, Lukermann 52
End of Moos 53
Lukermann - Greek archaeology 54-55

Interview with Fred Lukermann

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

Interviewed on September 16, 1984

Fred Lukermann - FL
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers and I'm interviewing this morning Fred Lukermann who's been at the University of Minnesota as a student, and then as a member of the faculty, and in many administrative positions for a very long time. It is September 16, 1984. We are conducting the interview in a ground floor study room looking out toward the golf course on a lovely autumn day and that sets the scene.

Fred, with everyone I've interviewed so far—I think it works rather well—it's kind of nice to get a little background of where the person came from, childhood/youth, not a great number of details, then particularly how you got interested in your own field of geography, how you got to the University of Minnesota, what you found when you got here . . . that's about ten questions; so, I'll just let you start.

FL: I was born in south Minneapolis on December 9, 1921. My father was a liberal arts college graduate. He had been born in Freeport, Illinois. His father had been an immigrant from Germany in the 1870s for Franco-Prussian reasons. My mother was an immigrant from central Sweden, Smoland? She'd come over when she was about twelve years old and finished only the eighth grade. I have a sister but that's the total family. I lived in south Minneapolis at the same address until I went to college. I went through Minnehaha and Nokomis Junior High and Roosevelt High School. It was a relatively homogeneous community, German and Swedish probably by national origin but really not deeply ethnic in its orientation.

I had gotten interested in history and geography in junior high and senior high. If I remember teachers, it's normally those who were from the United States History or from what was then called Civics . . . International Relations and so on. I remember as a senior in high school, I won

the Hope McDonald Peace Award which was awarded by the foreign policy groups in the Twin Cities for being the most oriented toward international problems.

CAC: [laughter] What on earth did you do to qualify for that?

FL: I don't know. I think it was largely on the responsibility of teachers to recommend if they had a student in class that was particularly interested in international things. I also remember I interviewed for the labor unions in Minneapolis, which came out of my eighth grade United States History teacher who was very much oriented toward that. I got involved in it as a practice teacher after I was in the College of Education at the University of Minnesota. When I was practice teaching, I got back into that school environment again. I was interested in the labor unions, and education, and so on. I suspect I was more radically oriented as a high school senior and an entrant into the college than afterwards—in other words, it came out of interests in the Soviet Union, Germany—the kind of activism of the middle and late 1930s because of World War II and, obviously also, because I grew up in the Twin Cities which had undergone a great, in a sense, social revolution in the labor troubles of the early and middle 1930s. I only remember that vaguely in the sense of passing strike-bound plants on the trolleys.

CAC: You don't remember the violence surrounding the teamsters?

FL: I don't remember the violence, quite frankly, but I remember reading about it immediately and getting heavily involved because there were old IWW [Industrial Workers of the World] members in our neighborhood who were still interested and had, during World War II, been up on the Iron Range, and in shipbuilding plants in Duluth, and places on the Great Lakes; so, there was an interest in but not a participation in a lot of these events.

I started at the University of Minnesota with the intent of becoming a teacher and it was quite obvious that history was the avenue to take when you got there. We entered into the Science, Literature, and Arts College at that time. This was in 1940, September, when I first walked in. The regular course of study and the group requirements led you not toward History as a major but History as a core subject in Social Studies. About my sophomore year, I got interested in Geography which was right across the hall in Burton Hall from the History Department. I took my first course in Geography, a semi-advanced course, on the historical geography of North America, and Ralph Brown was the one who taught it.

CAC: Oh, my heavens, yes. It couldn't have been much of a Geography Department in those days?

FL: There was a very strong Geography Department in the sense of its participation.

CAC: Strong but small.

FL: It had in those days Darrell Haug Davis, Ralph Brown, Sam Dicken. It had, after the war, been diminished. [Charles] Hartshorne had gone to Wisconsin in the late 1930s and a couple of students who had been there had disappeared in the war one way or another. When I came back in 1946, after four and one half years in the army, it was almost a completely new department. Dicken went to Oregon. Brown died in 1948. John Weaver came in in 1946 from the American Geographical Society and had been working for the Office of Naval Research on the Arctic atlas. Jan Broek came in from Utrecht [Netherlands] in 1948 and [John] Borchert in 1949; so, I antedated all of the Geography staff . . .

CAC: [laughter]

FL: . . . from 1946 onward in terms of being involved in both Geography and History.

CAC: Maybe we'll come back to that in a second but I think you were about to leave for the war when I interrupted.

FL: I spent four and one half years in the army . . . most of the time, a little bit more than half, at Fort Leonard Wood, the rest at Camp Carson. I came in under limited service, never thinking I would get drafted because I'm almost blind in one eye and have been since birth.

CAC: Heavens.

FL: But we were drafted and drafted immediately into the Medical Corps. I think I had three weeks of basic, then entered into surgery and spent my time up through buck sergeant running operating rooms. About 1944, we had a shift in operations to the Pacific in the war and we were ordered out of the station hospital in Fort Leonard Wood on limited service to go to the Pacific. We had taken a troop train on our way to the West Coast, Fort Lewis, Washington. By the time we were in the middle of Kansas, the Battle of the Bulge occurred and they suddenly had 10,000 trench cases they were flying back. We got off as an emergency in Camp Carson, Colorado, and I never left there until I was discharged at Camp McCoy. I was a non-com[missioned officer] in charge of surgery, eventually, out at Carson when I was separated from the army.

All the time I was in the army, I had collected books. In fact, when I came back, I had a whole foot locker full of history and geography books, knowing I was going to go on. So, when I came back, the first thing that influenced me—I was so eager to get back—I went to two full summer sessions. It was the first summer after the war when American Studies took off at the University of Minnesota and I remember we had Michael Kraus here on the Atlantic countries. I remember [Arthur] Bestor who was teaching Communalistic Societies . . .

CAC: Good heavens, yes.

FL: . . . and a couple of others [Richard H.] Shryock from the University of Pennsylvania on Science, and Gerlach on Science. These were all American Studies orientations; although, they

were also teaching their own disciplines. I entered the College of Education as a junior, senior. By that time, History was not only the core . . . I did a double core in the College of Education, History and Geography; and then, you took a number of other Social Studies besides that. I practice taught in north Minneapolis at Jordan Junior High. In my senior year, I also did some teaching assistance in the Geography course that was being offered in the General College.

When I graduated as an undergraduate, I immediately got a position as a graduate assistant in the Geography Department. By that time, I had completely filled up on all the Geography courses that were available and I became John Weaver's teaching assistant in Economic Geography. I decided to do a double major, a master's in one subject and a Ph.D. in another. After they told me I had to do both, I couldn't combine the two and save any credits or time. [laughter] So, I took my History master's from [Alice Felt] Tyler, and [Ernest] Osgood, and [George] Stevenson. I had had mostly American historians as an undergraduate and, obviously, continued in that frame with Alice Felt Tyler. I remember I did three B-Plan papers: one on anti-slavery sentiment in the Old South, one on the Shays' and Whiskey Rebellion, and another one on the Articles of Confederation. I really hadn't dug at any depth into political science but I was interested in the Articles of Confederation, probably because of its geographical importance in turning from a confederation to the centralized federal state—at least that's the way I'd rationalize it now. [laughter]

I, then, went on with graduate work in Geography and continued as a graduate assistant. I got up through the preliminary exam, and I got a Fulbright Grant to go to Turkey, and the next year, I got a Ford Grant to go to Turkey; so, I spent the better part of two years in Turkey.

CAC: That's a long way from the Articles of Confederation to Turkey. How on earth did you get on Turkey?

FL: We had to get some kind of support as graduate students if we wanted to do field work. I had been interested when I was in History with [George] Anderson, who had been a teaching assistant and instructor in History in the Introductory Course in European Civ[ics] . . .

CAC: That's George Anderson?

FL: George Anderson . . . and he had his background in western Russia but his interest was in the expansion into central Asia. The stories he told about the Russian expansion into central Asia and the Middle East . . . so, I took courses because the History requirement was not to concentrate in just one culture area. We had to do something outside of North America and the United States.

CAC: I would hope so.

FL: I took all of the courses he offered on the Ottoman Empire, on the expansion of the Arabs, and so on. When the Fulbright's came up, we, obviously, wanted to know what the chances we

had of getting a Fulbright were and there was, obviously, less competition for the Middle East than other places; so, I applied for the Turkish one because by that time, in my Geography Studies, I became interested in some of the source material and, particularly, the Geography of Strabo. Strabo describes, basically, along an outline of city centers and roads a settlement network; so, I did as a proposal to Fulbright, and later to Ford, the study of these ancient roads and to see how much they were consistent with the latter patterns. My thesis was that the distribution of population and resources are somehow imbedded into the site characteristics that they first start out with and, then, they become situational characteristics. I think I verified this in my studies. In Anatolia, I took the material from Herodotus on the satrapy system of the Persian Empire, which gives you some quantitative measures of the [unclear]. I had a hard time—this was probably the most difficult—in deciding what the boundaries were of these satrapies, but I think it came pretty close, and then calculated an index per unit area of the return to the Persians from these areas, obviously, resulting in an index of population, or output, or productivity, whatever you want. Then, I had found in Turkey, a French book on the Ottoman Empire of about the 1880s to 1900 which gave me a base survey of the output, and productivity, and population pattern densities of the provinces of Turkey. If you do a map of the Fifth Century B.C. Persian Empire and a map of the late Nineteenth Century Turkish Empire, you get almost the same distribution of wealth between provinces and unit areas.

CAC: [laughter]

FL: The next thing I did was to follow up, obviously, on the road pattern. How much did the urbanization pattern and the circulation pattern . . . are they consistent? There, of course, you're getting down to specifics where you're going to expect some discontinuities and gaps but they're not very great. They're really in the sense of shifting, maybe, within a valley from a central location on the main highway system that goes through the center of the valley to the edges of the valley when the government breaks down, when the tax collectors are out there collecting; so, it's a pattern of the central government authority, plus the fact that you reorient depending upon what are the major centers of power. If the major metropolitan city is at Constantinople or Istanbul, and the next one is at Smyrna or Ismir, and the next one is at Adana or Mersin on the south coast, the connections are different; so, you switch from the local road, to county road, to state road, to federal freeway but the segments are always the same. You just redesignate them and upgrade them.

CAC: Did you have to do archaeological work for this in the field?

FL: Mostly only survey. Archaeology at that stage was mainly in the sense of finding observable records of Roman milestones, of temple sites, and so on; so, it was really a recognition of the recorded history from the Byzantine period which was of gazetteers and outlines of bishoprics and parishes and getting them connected. I didn't get into archaeology in any excavation . . .

CAC: [unclear] to pull this off . . . place name language, I should at least?

FL: Yes, but basically, it had been organized. There was a guy by the name of William Ramsey who had done the historical geography of Asia Minor in the late Nineteenth Century which was in English and it's a standard work. All of the architectural epigraphy had been collected in vast volumes in English. If you wanted to get back into the sources, they were largely Latin sources that had been collected in the late Middle Ages, early modern times and the Germans who did the work maintained the Latin origins; so, it was fairly easy when you were dealing with place names and technical vocabulary then to use that kind of material.

CAC: You lived for two years on a high plateau of Anatolia?

FL: I actually was at Istanbul, and registered at the university, and used their library at the Geography Institute there but I only spent my time there during the winter. I was out in the field for the other nine months. It was mostly going to centers that I wanted to see the interconnections of . . . rural and urban. Typically, I would go out in the morning on a bus, go to some place, get off about twenty kilometers away, and walk back.

CAC: [laughter]

FL: When I'd done that in four or five directions, I had basically cased the joint, knowing what was there, and what I'd found, and I'd, obviously, done some library work in the meantime to know that.

CAC: Sure.

FL: I finally concentrated mostly on two sides of the inner plateau, one at Kayseri and the other at Afyon in Dinar. It was those focal points where you came into the interior either from the Bosphorus, from the Aegean, or from the southern Mediterranean so that you incorporated the rest of the country.

CAC: I have a sense that one could have done this easily on Peloponnesus in Greece, for example, but I should think the language problem in the high plateau would have been extraordinary.

FL: It wasn't because . . .

CAC: Just getting by in a logistical sense.

FL: As you know, the language is agglutinated so that the verb and the subject come first so you never had to complete a sentence. They always anticipated you and if you had the right verbs . . .

CAC: But you had to know some primitive Turkish to get by on . . . ?

FL: Primitive Turkish and some standard words about hotels, and restaurant foods, and where you were going, and how far, and that sort of thing, but it was in the period at the time of the Korean War.

CAC: Ohhh.

FL: I was there in 1951 through 1953. There was an enormous friendliness between Turks and Americans at that time. There wasn't extreme difficulty. I never asked, for example, for permission to go places, knowing that you'd be caught up in the bureaucracy and turned down. I just went there and usually was picked up in sensitive areas like the Bosphorus and the Hellespont. Particularly on the Dardanelles, I remember seeing Troy under police guard but it was very friendly police guard. All I had to do was to pay the taxi to take the police with me.

CAC: Ah ha!

FL: The governor had given me permission once I had been picked up . . . wondering what I was doing out there. I never got to the Russian or the Iranian borders because I was always picked up sixty or eighty miles from it on a train or a bus and shipped back. But, I got to see probably more out of the way places than any tourist, traveler, who asked for permission and tried to find out what to do. You just went out there and did it.

CAC: You were traveling by yourself for the most part? There weren't colleagues . . . ?

FL: Yes, always by myself, as a matter of fact. I had a few people in the Fulbright group. I remember one Armenian who was sent to Turkey by his Colombia professor. He just had one horrible, hell of a time in Turkey . . .

CAC: [laughter]

FL: . . . but he had to learn Turkish and he was buried, I remember, in the [unclear] district and how glad he was to see an American to get him away from all the local influences. [laughter]

CAC: Gosh!

FL: While I was in Turkey, I had been doing my work under Weaver and I got a letter from Jan Broek saying he had become my adviser; I'd been transferred to him. At about that point, I gave up getting a Ph.D. I had read the graduate bulletin thoroughly that it was up to the adviser and the graduate student to make these arrangements for graduate work; and there had been a fight between Broek and Weaver and Weaver left, actually, in 1955, probably because of other opportunities but basically Broek tended to be the central authority and tried to gather the graduate students he thought were the best under his aegis. About three years later, Broek was faced with the fact that Weaver had left and had gone on to academic administration in a number of places, Kansas State, Nebraska, Iowa, Ohio, Missouri, and, eventually, became president of

Wisconsin and Borchert was being offered jobs all over the place; so, Broek ended his chairmanship in the late 1950s . . . I believe it was 1958. At about that time, Cotton Mather had joined the department. I was an instructor then from 1954 onward after I got back from Turkey and never really got back to finishing the degree. We were booming at that time. I think Geography was expanding at about a 20 percent rate while the college and the university at an average was around 5 or 7 percent; and we were very short of instructors. I inherited Weaver's courses on North America and Economic Geography and I taught the Historical Geography that Brown had started. When Mather came in, I turned over all the North American stuff to him and did Economic and Historical Geography . . . Middle East.

I became chairman in the early, middle 1960s, then associate dean of Social Science in 1966 after a term as chair, and became assistant vice-president in 1967. I was the last appointment of O. Meredith Wilson. Everybody thought I'd been appointed by [Malcolm] Moos but I never had. I had two terms. I took a quarter leave between terms in 1970 and resigned in 1973. Basically, Gerry [Shepherd] had left first, then Lloyd [Lofquist], and I was the transition to Hal Chase in the summer and early fall of 1973.

CAC: That's an outline we want to flesh out but before we get into that whole sequence of career, one thing that has struck me as I've read these materials—I've gone through all the self surveys, for example—is the smallness. It may have been a good department but when you were here as a graduate student in Geography, it was a very small department. Then, in the early 1950s, there are these departures, Weaver and others that you're talking about, and by the mid/late 1960s, Geography is one of the most distinguished departments in the college but also one of the first departments in the United States?

FL: Yes.

CAC: It's just hard, in fifteen years, to go from not much to that high quality.

CAC: If you do it by numbers, I think you tend to leap frog some important things. The Department of Geography was started in 1923; so, it's one of the oldest departments of Geography in the country. It had distinguished beginnings. When it was started, it was decided that they would go to one of the old Midwest centers for people and they had made proposals to Carl Sauer, who was at Michigan, and to Darrell Haug Davis, who was at Michigan. Both of these people had finished their graduate work just after World War I, in the late teens. They had been involved in Michigan's Geography Department, which was very strong at that time and it was very productive at the graduate level. Sauer chose to go to California-Berkeley and found the department there. If you look at the history of geography in the United States, Carl Sauer is *the doyen* of geography in the late 1920s and early 1930s, yet the Department of Geography at Berkeley starts at the same time, 1923. Davis, of course, did not have the national reputation but in the early 1920s, he had brought in Charles Hartshorne, and Ralph Brown, and Sam Dicken. A four-person department at that time could make a very big splash because the Association of American Geographers [AAG], the professional group, was basically small selected and it was

concentrated in the Midwest, particularly on the Land-Grant universities. So that the Geography Department by the 1930s—Ralph Brown of the professional journal, *Hartshorne* was writing here at Minnesota his *Nature of Geography*, which was the Bible for thirty, forty years, supported by the graduate school here and other resources—was small but distinguished. Then, with the break of World War II, and particularly the middle 1940s, it virtually had to start in again but its reputation was such that it ticked off. Weaver was probably the brightest star. He had been trained both at Madison and at Berkeley. It had Brown, who was probably the senior editor and *doyenne* of historical geography in the United States at that time. Dicken was still here and was going to Oregon to found a department . . . in fact, a joint department of geology and geography. Then, they picked off Broek who had an enormous reputation because he had been out at Berkeley in an OSS [Office of Strategic Services] during the war. Borchert came in immediately afterwards.

CAC: It must have taken some kind of college commitment and recognition of the centrality of geography to pick off Broek and invite him here? We didn't have searches in those days.

FL: No. I think Broek's vita would reveal that he was picked by [T.R.] McConnell, who was then dean . . .

CAC: Right.

FL: . . . and Weaver who was already here as assistant professor said didn't want to be chair; so, he said, "McConnell write to Carl Sauer at Berkeley and get a recommendation." Broek was one of the plums. He had just gone back to the Netherlands, two years before, after the war. He had not gone back during the war because of his attitudes toward Germany. He left as the chair . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

CAC: I'm just trying to picture the way that different universities and colleges build at different times. If one looks at 1913 to 1945 with Guy Stanton Ford, for example, who built departments as dean without much departmental participation and you're describing McConnell playing an active role rather than the department because it's so small . . . ? McConnell's playing a role that you cannot as dean now or any of the deans that followed McConnell . . .

FL: I don't know the inside story here but I suspect it's this, that during the war the only persons who were really around here was Davis and Brown and they did an enormous ASTP [Army Specialized Training Program] service during the war because East Asia and Europe were the areas to be studied. After the war, Davis was getting close to retirement. He was a crusty old Yankee from Michigan and McConnell was looking to build the college.

CAC: Sure.

FL: He decided that Geography was one of those things given the recent global conflict and the international problems of student understanding, particularly Midwestern understanding, of the rest of the world. In fact, I know he offered Broek half of Pillsbury Hall rather than Ford Hall to build up the Geography Department when we moved out of Burton and Broek, for his good sense, turned down an alliance with Geology and Physical Geography; and I think was instrumental in associating with History and Political Science, which at that time were very strong departments. I mean an alliance with Geography on the same floor as History and Political Science right about it was an ideal location strategically if you were going to build a department. Broek, being European and knowing the strength of History in world history obviously appealed to people like [John] Wolf, and [August C.] Krey, and everybody else who was involved at that time. It was a very smart, if circumstantial, move.

CAC: We're really describing an era in collegial and university history, let us say, from 1910 to 1955, plus or minus, in which leaders of long tenure could build faculties and build departments . . .

FL: Yes.

CAC: . . . and in the mid 1950s for some reason—maybe we should come back to this later—that style really shifts. When the expansion of the 1960s takes place throughout the college and university here and elsewhere, that's not done?

FL: Right.

CAC: The initiative has shifted to other levels.

FL: I'm probably wrong but one of the conscious things I think about in trying to interpret that period was the weak administration of CLA [College of Liberal Arts] in the 1950s that followed these things and the break up of the interdisciplinary General Studies Program; so, again, there was a reversion back to the departments and the traditional disciplines. Geography, no matter how small or weak it is, is a traditional discipline, something you build upon. We, of course, were entering then into an expansion socially and economically, particularly here in the Twin Cities, and Geography again, probably because of circumstances not particularly good hindsight, had gotten into planning, into environmental topics. The vocational base of graduates from Geography . . . probably in 1960 half of the new employees at the planning agencies in the Twin Cities and the new Metropolitan Council were geographers. That, obviously, has to ascribed to Borchert and the orientation of the rest of the Geography staff in what would now be called Applied Geography.

CAC: There was a strong dean of the Graduate School. Did he play any part in this expansion and recognition? I mean, Mr. [Theodore] Blegen.

FL: Blegen, obviously, was congenial. I don't know of any particular incident or involvement. Borchert's relationship to graduate education came about the latter part of Blegen's history when [Jack] Darley was the associate dean. Borchert, I know, had many opportunities to be dean of a graduate school outside of Minnesota. Whether he was instrumental in the councils of the Graduate School at that time, I don't know. I would tend to think that, given the internal relations between Broek as a European chair type and the rest of the faculty, that Borchert and Weaver, basically, had to operate outside. I remember some committees that Weaver was on, for example, that had nothing to do with the college but were all-university committees, and that's what led him into looking elsewhere for administrative posts. I think in a sense, one doesn't want to underestimate the intellectual, conceptual components and impact of Broek but administratively, he tended to keep that faculty distant from the chair of the discipline; and it led to, I think, differences in graduate education and progress. Borchert and Weaver had very few degree candidates, if any, during the 1950s.

CAC: As you were suggesting just a moment ago, there is a kind of weakness at the center of the Arts College in the 1950s that leads to a certain erosion, that is to say the Mathematics will explode later in the 1960s and—you would be involved in some of these—the departure of Physics to join Chemistry in the Institute of Technology [IT]. There's kind of a fragmentation going on within the Arts College?

FL: Yes, the separating out of the Physical Sciences in the 1950s, the sort of depression and pushing back of the General Studies groups in the late 1950s, then the rise of the Biological Sciences under Gerry Shepherd's hand in the early 1960s. Then, E.W. Ziebarth came on. Probably Ziebarth's closest friend on the faculty was John Weaver. They lived just two or three doors apart down here on [unclear].

CAC: They had the Wisconsin connection, too.

FL: Yes, and "Easy" had come up under John's father, Andrew, who was head of the Theatre Arts Department.

CAC: Right.

FL: And, of course, the rise of Don Smith from the same focal point in Madison. You can't underestimate these kinds of social friendships but I don't think you'll find much in a formal way of that relationship. Certainly—just as another footnote—my first publication came under Ziebarth; he edited it. It was on the Middle East, which I had become sort of a resident expert in from the geographical side because of my graduate work. It was during the period of the Suez crisis and I remember contributing to symposia which "Easy" had edited at that time—this was in the 1950s. I had also done some work and published on statistical work on world economic production and so on with Weaver that we had produced. My first independent graduate paper was jointly with Athelstan Spilhaus.

CAC: Bravo!

FL: That was one of the advantages, I suppose, of being a geographer, you cut across the physical, natural, and social sciences; and when Athelstan needed somebody, he called Weaver and Weaver recommended me. [laughter] So, I did this joint paper on world equal area projection for radar stations. Spilhaus had been interested in Texas towers and radar coverage during the war. He'd been an inventor of sorts in radar detections and so on. He wanted to know every spot within, oh, 100 meters of the surface of the ocean where you could put in an installation; so, I did an analysis of the cartographic sources on this. The important thing was the transfer from various kinds of cartographic projections to a world equal area projection so that you got an aerial equality throughout the place. That was my first publication . . . technically.

CAC: You're chairman of Geography in 1964 and then pick up an associate deanship in the Social Sciences in 1966.

FL: Probably 1967..

CAC: You were probably in a very good position to understand something that to me remains something of a mystery and that is, how the college worked up a system for adding staff . . . 1963 to 1972, 1973, are really an era of great growth in staff. All the central departments are increasing every year. The documents that I've had a look at in the archives don't help very much on how that was done. How were priorities set? How were some departments given opportunities and others not so many? Both as a chairman and associate dean, you saw some of that operate?

FL: I don't know much about the 1950s. What I remember about the 1950s is personal. I was hired half time in Geography for my first job . . . the other was in the Social Science program, General Studies. Ben Nelson and Mulford Sibley hired me. You combined that with a disciplinary appointment. Anne Krueger and I came in at the same time, as a matter of fact. We all strived to get into a solid base and the solid base was in the disciplines not in the interdisciplinary courses. As we built in Geography over the 1950s, it was, in essence, a handout from the dean of the college who had handouts from the academic vice-president. During the 1950s, probably the dean of the Graduate School had more to say about it because until Gerry Shepherd came in the early 1960s, there was very little of a central administrative core. It was under Blegen and Darley. We built in Geography because of student demand. I don't think there's any doubt about that and we, of course, exploded in terms of the area studies, the interest in the world, and then this applied field where we were getting jobs consistently. It shows up, I think, in the record of the number of masters who went out and got their jobs as against the number of Ph.D.s who were still academic appointments in some other place. That was about the only job you could get in the 1950s.

In the 1960s, when I was an associate dean—I came in after [John] Turnbull who was the first associate dean for the Social Sciences—those allocations came down from yearly budgetary review of the resources of the college and the university. I'd have to ascribe it to "Easy's" ability to get money from Central Administration because of the build-up of the student population. I think there must be a direct connection between that. I don't think that we got more funds either in Geography, or in the Social Sciences, or the college than we deserved on an analysis of what the demand in student credit hours structure was.

CAC: [unclear] pretty loose enrollment related kind of expansion.

FL: There was no governance structure at that time, which there is now, which involved the faculty as they're now involved in a Budget Advisory Committee or even a Policy and Planning Council. Although there was an Educational Policy Committee, it was really a cabinet of the dean and the dean could or could not . . . as his pleasure revealed to them or used them in looking at budget.

CAC: Do you remember that committee meeting very often?

FL: Not in the time up through the late 1960s. I think what brought about those meetings were then the demands from Academic Affairs from 1968 onwards, which asked for planning. Then, the college had to produce a memo, a paper. If you look at the files in CLA, you see in the period of the middle 1960s the beginnings of documents on promotion and tenure, on committee structures, on programmatic proposals like Interdisciplinary Studies; and that was the way you got funded by Central Administration. Those were the years in the 1960s when the so-called Regents Reserve . . .

CAC: Ah, yes.

FL: . . . was a major instrument in the hands of Central Administration because they got all of the monies that weren't spent under the current budget. They reverted to Central Administration and we used those. That's why from a strictly resource point of view, we could do the things that we did; and I think we did a lot of things in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

CAC: How would "Easy" make a decision between adding two in Geography, and three in History, and one in Psychology, or whatever?

FL: I think "Easy" was evenhanded about that. He probably favored some of the Fine Arts more than the records, the student credit hours, would show because "Easy" had an appreciation of that. He, basically, I think felt that he could operate more as a dean in initiating in the weaker departments also. That is, I don't think he could influence the use of monies in History, in Political Science, in Economics, in Psychology. He would give them what the records showed them to be. But, he was influential in Theatre Arts, and Music, and Studio Arts, and Art History and in that side. I think that's where his influence was personal and he took a personal interest

in it. He pretty much, when I was associate dean, would counsel chairs of the strong departments but he, as far as I know, never really told them what he thought was intended by the college as a whole. I remember the particular case in Sociology under [Elio D.] Monachesi where we were running into problems because of factionalism within the department and both John Turnbull before me and I, as associate dean, advised "Easy" that something should be done, that we had to get into the rotating chairmanship or we were just going to perpetuate the factionalism. He and Monachesi were personal friends and he said, "I just cannot do that. This would kill Monte." Of course, as an associate dean, you make your case but you don't press it beyond that but certainly "Easy" had warnings of that kind of problem; and I think after Monachesi died and we did then try to turn to a rotating chairmanship of three years as in all the other departments by that time, we found we didn't have a talent pool that had been trained. Monte, for all the good things he did, did it by personal consultation in the hall. There were no committee structures within that department; and I would say, we're still suffering from that lack of bringing up people. Geography, on the other hand, had an enormous governance structure for its size. We met every damned week in a staff meeting—and still do.

CAC: That's one staff meeting . . . then, you have the Friday afternoon coffees. When did that start?

FL: That started with Broek. There were virtually no graduate programs, except on an individual basis, in the later 1940s. As soon as Broek got here, he took one of his vacancies at that time because Dicken had left and Brown had died and turned one of those into Borchert's appointment and the other, we kept as a visiting professorship for about six, seven years; so, we always had a visiting professor and it was usually somebody of strength outside of the United States. So, the coffee hour was generated as a general coffee hour which acquainted the visiting professor with the Twin City metropolitan region, and western Wisconsin, and central Minnesota and dealt with methodology and current issues. It might be on the geography of vegetation. It might be on the new social geography in Germany. It might be on any subject but it was something that all graduate students had to participate in. It was that Friday seminar that turned into the coffee hour. Then, as the staff grew, we each took on seminars within our subject areas but Broek always maintained that sort of coffee hour of his as chair of the department, as bringing and integrating everything. That tradition has continued. It's more and more a function a function of the graduate students as they attain stability, and size, and continuity of program. Since they were overlapping for three or four years as graduate students, it gradually took over but in the beginning there were few of us as graduate students in the department. It was basically generated by Broek.

CAC: You were attracted to the associated deanship by what kinds of hopes or expectations?

FL: The college had grown in the 1950s and the 1960s. "Easy" needed help. He had Roger Page. He had [Russell] Cooper who had been there under the old General Studies and had generated that. He selected John Turnbull as an associate dean to be brought into the central dean's office and I replaced John Turnbull; so, there was one associate dean of the Social

Sciences before me. The other dean of the Humanities and Fine Arts, when I came in—equivalent to me—was Dennis Hurrell but because the Social Sciences were the strongest division in the college, I think “Easy” picked on John Turnbull to essentially run that division. Then, when he saw that the college itself needed another associate dean as an executive officer, he switched John to the central area; and he asked me if I would be chair . . . that rather as dean. I don’t know what consultation he took. I, obviously, was not selected by a faculty committee nor any other way.

The Geography Department had expanded, as you intimated, and had started its rise toward number one in the country. We were probably, because there’s a lag in these ratings, among the top half dozen in the early 1960s just as when I became chair. We suddenly made it on the national horizon because of the NDEA [National Defense Education Act] acts of the middle 1960s and we ran institutes. Before I became dean, there was an opportunity to get a massive grant to retread high school teachers. I said that I would write a proposal if every member of the faculty would participate. I was not going to run an institute by myself. I got every member of the faculty to participate. I remember Broek had been very uneasy about losing the chair and so on—that was in 1958. I got him as, obviously, a major figure and he was then about to enter into the national arena. He was president of the AAG in the early 1960s. He asked me to chair his presidential session—I remember at the 1962 AAG meetings—and it was a controversy between geography of the traditional, cultural, historical type and the new quantitative geography. The journals were all full of this controversy and I and, to a certain extent, Phil Porter were one of the younger bad boys who were very critical—in fact, bitter and negative, we were called—against quantitative geography. When I became chair then, I had somewhat of a national reputation and the Office of Education gave us about four different grants in a row, right in the middle 1960s. I ran those as a professor and, then, as chair before I became the associate dean. In fact, one of the grants ran over when I was associate dean and I ran that also for the first couple of years. I think it was, basically, that activity and Ziebarth’s old relationship to John Weaver [unclear] that probably put my name up. I don’t think “Easy” had much conceptual framework wherein he placed me. I think I replaced John Turnbull because John Turnbull had to run the college. “Easy” was beginning to have some physical problems in those days. He couldn’t any longer depend upon his personal secretaries and administrative assistants who had come out of personal connections, spouses of former colleagues in Speech Communication and Theatre Arts and Speech Path[ology].

John came in and took hold. Then, John got a sabbatical and went to Belgium; so, in the last year, I was associate dean, I also became the executive officer in fact, because he was away for almost four or five months. That’s when I was plucked out and, again, not by any search committee, I’m sure but by Don Smith and Gerry because the university had run into a crisis of very severe proportions structurally, in that the proposals to consolidate the Extension divisions came crashing down right in the beginning of the legislative session of 1966, 1967. There was a proposal which had all good reason to be done at that time in centralizing the Extension

services and a campaign was mounted by the press and by the radio stations, particularly WCCO, against bringing in Ag Extension.

CAC: Why would WCCO have had an interest in that?

FL: WCCO is the major station in the state. It reaches all parts of the state. It's clear channel, 50,000 watts. Their morning programs and, particularly, their agricultural director, Jimmy Haeg and [Maynard] Speece had a tremendous influence . . .

CAC: I see.

FL: . . . and because the rural county agents were deathly afraid of losing their autonomy and independence under this proposal from Shepherd and Smith—and Wilson who wanted it done—there just was a letter writing campaign of a couple of weeks and it just crashed to the floor in the legislature. Don and Gerry wanting to rescue something because they firmly believed that the new era of community, and outreach, and so on had to be done. This was the period of the Vietnam War, and student activism, and the minority problems in the United States. They had to replace it. They got, I think on one week's notice, a proposal that Don wrote, probably overnight, sent to the legislature and asked for—I can't remember—\$170,000 or something like that maybe for the biennium to start some pilot programs in areas where neither the General Extension, which operated in the Twin Cities, and the Agricultural Extension weren't serving and they asked me to take it over. At the same time, they wanted to, essentially, increase their own staff; so, they made me an assistant vice-president. I don't know why they didn't choose a lesser route of a director of the pilot programs but they probably wanted some leverage.

CAC: Now, this is still when Wilson is president?

FL: This was in the summer of 1967 and he didn't leave until fall.

CAC: It's just the tag end then because one associates—what we're talking about is the communiversity—entirely with Malcolm Moos. But these things are underway?

FL: Well, should associate that with Dan Cooperman and Don Smith, not Malcolm Moos. That was the origin.

CAC: How does Dan Cooperman get into this?

FL: He invented the word.

CAC: I see.

FL: It's in his report which came out very late, after the fact. But Don used that in backing up Moos's first appearance on campus. The communiversity was introduced with Moos and became attached to him; but, it came out of papers in a committee that Dan Cooperman . . .

CAC: What was the charge to that committee because you were . . .

FL: I don't know.

CAC: Okay.

FL: You'll have to talk to Don. It may be in the records on that but this is my version of what went on.

CAC: Sure.

FL: Don had that capacity to pick up good words and good phrases. The communiversity that, in essence, gave context to Moos's appearance became attached to Moos as if it was his conception—but it couldn't be. Moos arrived on the scene. He had international, and eastern seaboard, and foundation backgrounds but the idea of the communiversity, I think, was basically out of a smaller group of faculty, a committee, and Don Smith's, obviously, polishing of this seed that had been planted.

CAC: I see. One of your first assignments then was to get these pilot projects started that Don Smith had gotten the money for . . . ?

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: . . . and put some of these things in place? That's why you were brought aboard in Morrill Hall really in the first instance was to take the initiative in these?

FL: Yes, now that you bring my mind back to it; I probably misspoke before. I think what we had for the biennium was something like \$70,000 or \$80,000. Let me go back and reconstruct this. The legislature ended in June. As soon as the thing had ended, Gerry and Don called me over—I had no inkling what was going on—and they asked me to become an assistant vice-president. I said, "What do you want of me?" They very nicely said it wasn't just this pilot project but that Don was from the Humanities side and Gerry was from IT and the sciences, and that they thought that there was some need for the Social Science input . . . Education, General College, and Extension.

CAC: I see.

FL: That was when I first heard about the special.

CAC: So, these are the implicit portfolios that they had in mind?

FL: Yes. Obviously, what was most on their mind was to get off the ground immediately on this special that was to take the place, and cover up the disaster from their view point, of the need for the university to reach out beyond the traditional areas of Ag Extension and General Extension. I devised then two things. I've left out a little bit here . . . when I was associate dean, there was a problem with the Center for Public Administration in Political Science under George Warp and, before that, Lloyd Short. George Warp had 125 advisees.

CAC: [laughter]

FL: He was the only one left in that.

CAC: My heavens.

FL: I set up a committee and asked Carl Auerbach to chair it, to review as an associate dean the Center for Public Administration. They reviewed it. Carl Auerbach knew what had to be done but in his personal relationships didn't want to cut the chord as fast as I did. The committee turned in its report and I, in effect, declared bankruptcy on the center and said, "We'll change this into a School of Public Affairs." The reasons I had gotten involved were—several years before—in terms of what we in Geography had been doing with planning, not in physical design but social planning and we had no instrument. I knew we didn't want it in Geography; I didn't want it in Geography. Geography is not planning even though it may be a good foundation for it. I thought the logical place for it was obviously in a School of Public Affairs, a School of Public Administration. We were having fights at that time with IT and the School of Architecture in trying to combine the physical side of planning with the social side of planning; and we weren't getting too much cooperation. We had some joint courses that Phil Raup, and Borchert, and some people from Architecture, like [Roger] Clements and a number of other people, were interested in but it wasn't in their minds a central theme. Borchert and I and a number of others, including people in Sociology like Dan Cooperman, and in Political Science like Tom Scott, felt there had to be a new curriculum; so, I had started moving on that. At that time, we proposed the original nucleus of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs. Gerry and Don were agreed to that, that it would not be within the college but be broader than that. I was running, as associate dean, a search committee for this new Center for Urban and Regional Affairs; and we were trying to restructure the curriculum separate from that in the Center for Public Administration.

I suspect that my role in that brought my name in front of Don and Gerry because I had no relationship to Don or Gerry before that. So, when they brought me in and asked if I'd be an assistant vice-president, they assured me they would support the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs. At that time, we were searching for Stuart Chapin, Jr. as chair and he was about ready

to take it when they made a retention offer . . . North Carolina. He didn't come; so, I became the first acting director . . . structure . . .

CAC: This is why you're still associate dean of the college?

FL: I was associate dean of the college but I held that acting directorship as assistant vice-president also until Borchert came on. Now, Borchert—I don't know if he'll say these things about himself—had been interested in these ideas because he and Phil Raup, back in the later 1950s and early 1960s, had a bunch of contracts . . . the Bureau of Public Roads and were dealing with the impact of the highway system. Borchert, you know, doesn't have any disciplinary bounds. He had gotten a Ford grant on the urban system in the Midwest as [James] Henderson got that economy grant. Borchert had very good relationships with the legislature but he never did it within either Ag Extension or within General Extension. Phil Raup was somewhat the same sort of a maverick. He never really operated through the regular structures. He was always looked upon as being roaming all over the place. There were some strong people there like Woodie Berg and [Will] Cochrane who had occupied spots where Ralph would have been a great contribution. So, it's probably that background when I was chair and associate dean because these were logical extensions of where I thought Geography was a foundation or a contributor to but it shouldn't be in Geography; so, these things had started.

The legislative special was to set up pilot programs and I had \$45,000 the first year and I spent about three times that much.

CAC: These are pilot projects within CURA?

FL: No, these were pilot projects for which I used CURA as the instrument to carry out but it wasn't CURA's money.

CAC: All right.

FL: The next biennium, I made it integral with CURA. There are some important points. First of all, I looked for three areas in which we could set up these pilots . . . one was obviously the inner city, ethnic ghettos in the Twin Cities: Selby Dale, lower Seventh Street, Guadalupe, Phillips neighborhood, and northeast Minneapolis, and "Northeast" Minneapolis because of its ethnic background. I remember being deeply involved in those as assistant vice-president. I'd set up meetings at various neighborhoods around the city; and Rudy Vecoli and I would go out and talk about pluralism, and immigration, and this sort of thing. We had the idea at that time that pluralism wasn't just the problem of racial minorities but pluralistic American society; and we'd go out and talk about the myth of the melting pot. We tried to bring everybody together.

CAC: What kind of people would come to these?

FL: Oh, if you were up in Nordeast, we obviously met at Tuttle school and there would be people from the ethnic federations and this sort of thing coming, as well as school teachers.

CAC: Who took the initiative? Who planned these meetings out there in the community?

FL: I did, and I asked Rudy, and then asked somebody else like Dan Cooperman, got some people from General College . . .

CAC: The initiatives didn't come from the community itself?

FL: Oh, no, no. These were pilot projects that . . .

CAC: Then, you had to advertise them to get the citizens to come in?

FL: There was undoubtedly a fertile seedbed out there.

CAC: Yes.

FL: Internally though, the problem was that the legislature, early, became aware that traditional people in Agricultural Extension were not going to be useful and traditional people in General Extension were not going to be useful and that general faculty . . . you just couldn't export the curriculum. I would go to meeting after meeting, for example, in the Glendale project; and we always had an import at that time of graduate students and radical faculty who were organizing at that level. I went over, for example—this is a good example, I think . . . did the same thing up on the north side—saying, "The university is reaching out. It's got some money. It wants to do some pilot programs in the community. Some places, you can call these storefronts . . . I used the settlement houses, the community urban renewal conference rooms, and libraries as the place where we operated out of. I said, "Here are some ideas. I'd like you to talk about them and tell us what the things are that you are interested in." They were interested in interior design because of the urban renewal placidness and evenness. I got John Hopkins to carry that out even though he was a civil servant. They were interested in insurance. They were interested in real estate. They were interested in rent. So, I got a guy from the School of Management, Andy Wickman—I hadn't thought of him for an age. They were interested in communication. They were interested in arithmetic. So, I went to General College. They were interested in movements. They were interested in organization. They were interested in really what had been a trend in social work, of community organization and participant planning, residential planning, and so on. So, would get somebody like that. I'd say, "We're not going to put courses that we have in the university out here. We're going out there and talk about themes. Then, we're going to ask them, 'Well, what sort of stuff do you want to read?' and we're going to make up the reading lists from pamphlets, and magazines, and newspapers, and this sort of thing. They're going to set the curriculum. They're going to tell us what they want to do. We'll come back in a couple of opening sessions and work with their materials and their questions. We're not going to outline this in the typical rational order of the curriculum inside." And it worked. We,

obviously got a lot of people interested who started dropping out because they couldn't make it and so on but it took hold. It hold in the Phillips neighborhood. It took hold up on the north side, Sumner. It took hold over in Glendale. Then, we had this traveling circus with Rudy and I on some other topics. At the same time, we had attempted, as you may know, to within the university start the ethnic questions which eventually evolved into the Ethnic Departments in American Studies. It started at the graduate level as a research thing which was obviously rejected. There was no accepting a dribble down [unclear] at that time. [laughter] That's how those things got started. That was the first, the inner city problem; and I used the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs to do that on the outside.

Then, we worked in Guadalupe as well and picked up talent within the university that would operate in that same [unclear].

CAC: You had to create these networks pretty much on your own?

FL: What I used was Barb Knudson and Esther Watenberg.

CAC: How did Barbara Knudson have those contacts at that time? I thought she learned them later.

FL: No, this was in 1966, 1967, when Glendenning first got grants out of juvenile delinquency grants which were for community organization. We had a group over in Clay School at that time which I incorporated into CURA. That was one of the first things I dragged in from the internal university. They had been talking to people on the north side, helping them set up Pilot City and all the federal programs because what they needed was some organizational sense, how to get together, how to write a proposal and so on.

CAC: Sure.

FL: I took those in and Barb had left to do something else; so, it was largely Esther who I utilized and a couple of other people.

CAC: It was Esther through the juvenile delinquency that was well networked in the community?

FL: Yes . . . had become particularly interested because of a sub-grant in the Indian community on Franklin Avenue at that time. Then, there was this organization, the Community/University Health Clinic, CUHC, over on Bloomington and Franklin which cut across all units of the university. It was basically functioning out of Pediatrics because it had a Title V program with the three elementary schools in that area and through the three elementary schools; and because they were forced to bring their kids into the clinic in order to get back in school if they had a cold or earache, the whole family was dragged in. We had social work people. We had people

from the College of Education. We were drawing from all segments of the university at that time.

The second area outside was rural depopulation. I set up a program and used Agriculture Extension for this. Because I was a vice-president, I could reach in and say, "I want something done and here's some money." I got Arly [Waldo] and a number of other people willing to do this. We got Wadena and Todd Counties, which is in that central/western lake district where there's an enormous depopulation and the new population was the urban resort, recreation group.

CAC: Ah, yes.

FL: They wanted culture out there; so, I said through this thing—I went out and met with these people along with the people from Extension—that we would provide circulating lectures, and concerts, and whatever they needed.

The third area was the reservation to urban centers. This was particularly the problem of White Earth, and Red Lake, and Cass Lake, and Nett Lake. The population would be out there in the summer and back in the welfare [unclear] city at that time. That's where we got involved with AIM [American Indian Movement] and others. The Guadalupe thing, we started a little bit afterwards when we became conscious of Sister Giovanni and what she was doing out there. Roger Clements and others worked out in Renville County with a design center that was down there on 26th and Nicollet Avenue [Minneapolis] which was designing community projects. For example, a problem like the mobility of the people on Franklin Avenue . . . we started counting the number of times a person had moved during the regular academic school year in the third grade and found out they had nine addresses within in nine months. One of the problems was in a reservation situation, even when you moved it here, the crowding of kids—teenage and elementary school—and parents, you couldn't get any studying done. What we did was have them design a cubicle that was soundproofed and we could put it inside a tenement.

CAC: [laughter] God!

FL: A guy can go in there and be fixed up with all the audio visual materials, insulated from his cohorts on the outside and do this. We just did fantastic design things and ideas. It was exciting all the way around. As I said, I spent about three times what I should have and at the end of the year, I told Gerry that we had to go in and ask [Larry] London for some money. There was, of course, the usual pissing and moaning about what in the hell, you had a budget. Why are you running over that? I said, "Fine, that's fine with me. If you don't want to fund it, we'll just drop the whole thing."

CAC: [laughter]

FL: No, they'd pull the money out of their Regents Reserve drawer without any difficulty. That, of course, was before the retrenchment of 1971, 1972 came; so, it was the end of that period of affluence.

CAC: Well before, because you were still on the rise in 1967, 1968, 1969?

FL: Right. Obviously, as we created more structure like CURA, and got the School of Public Affairs going, and generated the Department of Criminal Justice Studies, I became less of an active instrument. I sort of gravitated to . . . for almost eight years, I was the university person on the Urban Coalition. Moos never attended a session. Along with the other executives from Honeywell and other places, I was the only one from the university; so, I started operating at that different level. Within the university, we had the problems immediately with Martin Luther King's death and had a fight with the United Fund.

CAC: What is that? I know the United Fund . . . what kind of a . . .

FL: We got it on to the University Senate docket that we could add student financial aids to the Heart Fund, and the Cancer Fund, and all of these other United funds..

CAC: Ah! Okay.

FL: Bill Nunn fought us tooth and nail because we cut into other things but we got it done. You remember the occupation of Morrill Hall, the beginnings of . . . ?

CAC: Which was when?

FL: That was in 1968.

CAC: Who were the key figures from the administration point of view in that occupation and responding to it? That's another thing where documents are just no help at all and most of the people I've interviewed have very hazy memories. Perhaps, it was too traumatic?

FL: I'll have hazy memories too because each of us looked upon it differently. We were accused, Jim Reeves and I, of organizing the occupation of Morrill Hall at one time . . .

CAC: I never heard that.

FL: . . . because we were supposedly sympathetic. I was the one from academic administration that was there all night negotiating with people. I brought in Harry Davis and . . .

CAC: In the meantime, you were networked with these people; so, you knew them better probably than anyone in Morrill Hall?

FL: Yes, and as vice-president, in order to get state funds for minority scholarships, Jim Reeves from Cashman's office and I basically worked the legislature. When we started out, it was about \$3 million and I think by the time I got out of there it was up to around \$40 million of state scholarships; so, it was an Academic Administration/Student Affairs combination that dealt with these things. Later on, [Gene] Eidenberg came in as my replacement in 1970 when I went on quarter's leave; and I had had him with me for a quarter before that. I took him out of [Art] Naftalin's office and brought him in. Then, he became the successor to Don Smith as vice-president for administration during the Cambodian affair, and [Charles] Stenvig on campus, and this sort of this. There are just intricacies and linkages all over the place that aren't on paper at all.

CAC: I'm trying to imagine your personal and professional life in these years. You've got about five or eight traditional kinds of portfolios to care for; and then, you have all this other business breaking away and you have occupations and going out into the community. You must have been a rather busy person.

FL Yes, but it was exciting and interesting because you were forming something. You were initiating things. I never carried it on as a day-by-day operation. I would meet, for example, with Watenberg and what she had been assigned to or with coordinators like [Frank] Wilderson or Cooperman who had some of the pilot projects after the first year. I provided the access to the money and the resources. I would go out, for example, when they wanted to organized something on the north side for the first time. I would maybe drop in on one or two courses during the rest of that quarter, once or twice, but I never got down to the operational level. What success we had was in picking people—and it was a success. When we went back to the legislature in the next biennium, I remember the discussions. [Edward] Garrity from the north side, who was representative at that time and became senator . . . I remember his attitude because [Stan] Wenberg had gotten sick and Wenberg, of course, was always the liaison with the legislature. I only appeared at the legislature when a proposal was up or when some hard questions had to be answered. We had a crisis up on the north side, I remember, because as usual, you ran into differences of opinions and who was going to take care of what. The local Pilot City administration, of course, wanted as much credit as the university wanted . . .

CAC: Why not?

FL: . . . for doing these things. There was a contention then also that, yes, if the pilot is over, you either kill it—we killed a lot of things—or you make it permanent in a short term sense but get it into some structure that is already there in the university. Many of the pilot programs resulted in new programs but also they should have been taken over by General Extension. General Extension had all this network of support services for doing this. I remember I was called in Wenberg's hospital room over at University Hospital; he had some attack or something. Garrity was there and Fred Norton was there representing the two inner city things.

CAC: Right.

FL: They said, "We understand you're trying to turn these things over to General Extension to run. You cannot do that. You won't get a cent of money out of us if you put it in the hands of those people. They are not to be trusted. They can't do it." I said, "Look! We are putting it under there but we're importing the whole crew from the group that we have started on the outside. They will, then, come into the university and become part of that." They were not convinced. They knew it was going to be subverted in some sense.

CAC: That was not a bad instinct on their part.

FL: No, they were perfectly right because I had the same opinion. That's why the pilot programs, you see, after the collapse of the centralization scheme for Extension, was set up. It had not only been destroyed because the rural people didn't want the centralization but they didn't think the university could really help out in their districts where these social problems were—and they were quite right, we couldn't. That's why trying to set a course in the detail . . . I went into that as an illustration. You send a person from a faculty out and he offers the course . . . he'd desert it after three weeks, just wouldn't go on. That was in the summer time. At the next opening of the next biennium, I remember a testimony. I was introduced by the president, Gerry Shepherd to Garrity's committee and Garrity interrupted before I could speak. He said, "This guy is Lukermann." He said something to the effect that, "He's not very intellectual."

CAC: [laughter]

FL: "He's been up on the north side and we understand him," or something like that. [laughter]
You can believe this guy, in other words.

CAC: Right.

FL: By that time, we'd given up the pilot project special and it became the CURA special. It went, I think, from about \$70,000, to \$300,000, to \$700,000, to over \$1 million each biennium as we built that up. Borchert took over about a year and a half after I was vice-president and acting director. He brought in Andy [Wickman] and we had the coordinator's system. [Gisela] Konopka was a coordinator, Wilderson, and so on. It just got good grounds. We ran the community side but Borchert built up this state agency support service side on the land use and other things. It's been an enormous success. When Tom Scott took over, he obviously inherited that and he's built that same base. It has never directly competed with the Extension service, and it's been kept out of internal university politics basically because it is a special, and its money is sacred; that is, it comes from the legislature and not from Central Administration. I think we never put over \$80,000 to \$100,00 of O & M [Operations and Management] money into that. Each administration, Moos, and then [Peter] Magrath, and from one vice-president to another . . . they become satisfied that this is one of the successes of the university. I attribute it to the original intent not to make it permanent in the sense of the projects. They were experimental and we killed a lot. I think that's made a hell of a lot of difference in front of the legislature to come in and say, "We did this. It was stupid. It failed and we're not doing this anymore."

Those things that we did succeed at, we did try to put in some other structure and not build up CURA. That, of course, was an entirely different story from the history of Agriculture of Cooperative Extension and General Extension. They were constantly building their support services. I think CURA is influential well beyond its size, its amount of resources became it has done that.

CAC: We're kind of moving toward a kind of general historical law that good beginnings are the source of strength. We speak of the Geography Department, for example, and now CURA, how things are really structured to begin with and who occupies those positions . . . just of crucial importance . . . everything that's done.

Well! now, while all this is going on, things are breaking away . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

CAC: Let's talk about University College and, then, we'll talk about General College.

FL: The Council on Liberal Education under Don Smith, who chaired it, got involved in some proposals from various faculty on Living Learning Centers. The Living Learning Center idea got started as a special grant out of CLA. The Experimental College came from diverse sources and it had a separate entity until it was incorporated within the new University College. There were a number of other proposals, smaller ones, for teacher improvement, for educational contracts; that is, there were a number of themes that were rising out of the faculty and student body. Whenever that didn't seem to have a natural birthplace or home, it obviously entered into where I was as assistant vice-president for these outreach programs and so on. I don't know exactly how it happened but, eventually, ending up in 1970 with the restructuring of University College, the Living Learning Center, the Experimental College, and the Educational Development Fund all came together. Norm Kerr, and Jim Werntz, and I, I suppose, were the instruments. You can't leave out the people who started these things. Some names I remember and some I don't; some are still around. Grover Maxwell's wife [Mary Ann Maxwell], Roger Jones, [Arthur] Harkins were involved in the Experimental College. We started that, as you recall, over in the Living Learning Center in the "Y" [Young Men's Christian Association], University and 15th. I can't remember even the guy's name who started the Living Learning Center. He was a social worker and he went down to Iowa as . . .

CAC: Oh, my, yes. I'll come to that. The role, in this case, of Morrill Hall and of you there was really to respond to initiatives that are very clear? You aren't pushing but you're really responding to these?

FL: I always had connections which when you look back on must have had something to do with it; although, I wasn't conscious of it at the time in any stream of stages or development.

CAC: Sure.

FL: As associate dean in the College of Liberal Arts, I was the representative on the Inter-college Program. Al Vaughn, at that time, was running the University College. When I became vice-president, those linkages I had with Al, both for University College and for General College, of course, had links and root ways which I used, consciously or unconsciously. Knowing how I see unclear operated within University College and knowing that it was an umbrella and cut across, knowing that I didn't want to plant things in the traditional large seats of power where they'd just be absorbed into [unclear], in a sense I persuaded Al Vaughn—probably against his good judgment—to let people like Roger Jones, and Art Harkins, and Val Woodward, and Mary Ann Maxwell do these sorts of things. Getting to persuade the other associate deans from the Natural Sciences who had been in CLA—Jim Wertz and Norm Kerr—who had known as an associate dean the structure, there obviously was collusion of a sort in getting this done. When I got involved with MLK [Martin Luther King Program] and financial aids, I needed a tutorial system if we were going to be out there recruiting minorities. You just can't dump them into the regular main stream. You had to do something separately. I remember the first MLK structure had eleven MLK centers scattered around the university . . . in Agriculture, In Education, in Management, in the Health Sciences. It finally, of course, got back to two points. The Help Center in the General College which [Forrest J.] Harris had been doing along with Glendenning and . . .

CAC: [unclear]?

FL: Yes . . . Watenberg and Barbara Knudson on one side and he had been doing the Help Center on the other within General College; although, it was always separate. Jeanne Lupton and the other deans have spent twelve years trying to get it integrated into General College. Yet, it's still the Help Center no matter what they do to it. You can't get rid of that sort of thing. Al Vaughn was also dean of the General College; so, there were things I wanted planted in there if they had worked out in pilot form. Esther Watenberg got her first large grant on Career Development, which we started in CURA. This resulted in monies for resident planners in neighborhoods like Pilot City and the Phillips neighborhood, Selby Dale. Obviously, the high tone of curriculum in CLA couldn't accept things like that; so, we used General College and Al was very reluctant. Esther is not a favorite of regular faculty and regular faculty in General College are even worse than regular faculty in CLA. [laughter] They know what they want and what they're supposed to do. Why is this newcomer coming in and foisting this stuff on us? The Counseling and Advising Service, of course, in General College was ultra traditional. If we had a Williamson syndrome in CLA, they had it to the *Nth* degree. [laughter] There were constant fights over this. Those things had to be planted within the fabric of the regular university or they would die. I remember internal difficulties in CURA when I told them their jobs were not secure, that CURA could disappear after the next biennial if there [unclear]. Of course, people like Tom Anding, and Will Craig, and others who'd found a career there weren't too happy with that; although, they understood and accepted in principle what we were saying.

[sigh] University College was probably the hardest nut in the sense that we had to go to the University Senate, the regular traditional seats of power, and get them to expand that charter and organization of that thing. The debates in the Senate were basically conducted by Wertz and Kerr.

CAC: Wertz was, by then, dean of University College or from what position was he doing that?

FL: He had come up with the Educational Development Center and, then, had become dean of the college; but Barb was the intermediary one. You remember when I was searching for the dean of University College and Earl Craig was a candidate—you were the chair of the committee— . . .

CAC: I remember that scene but go ahead.

FL: . . . the crisis with Moos?

CAC: This is chronologically later but go ahead with that story.

FL: The role of [John] Ward and [George] King in not giving tenure to any of these people that had come into the minority department . . . Josie Johnson, Earl Craig . . .

CAC: Ah, I didn't know that angle.

FL: . . . Lillian Anthony and all of those. You remember when I asked you to chair the committee the charge had been that this person would have to be tenured?

CAC: Right.

FL: If Earl Craig came up, as he did on your short list, number one, he had to have the assurances that he'd have Afro-American tenure status and Ward and King absolutely refused to move on it.

CAC: I see.

FL: So, when your list came up, you remember, George Shapiro was on it, Barb Knudson, and Earl Craig. Earl was first. I couldn't get tenure out of King and Ward. George Shapiro sort of waffled around and . . .

CAC: Barb had tenure in what program?

FL: Barbara had tenure in CEE [Continuing Education and Extension]; although, her discipline is Sociology. She had been an assistant dean and director of some sort there. She was in Kenya.

I sent her a telegram and said, "You're it." She sent it back saying, "Okay." So, I reported to Moos the list and his inattention, of course, and all this kind of crap came up. He told some people on the Board of Regents that Earl Craig was the first choice, which was right on the list but that Barb Knudson was going to be the dean. I don't know because I wasn't in the internal regents meeting on this but it got all screwed up and questions then were raised about how the Black was ousted and how the white woman got in.

CAC: Sure.

FL: Moos swore to Elmer Andersen and the rest of the board that he had been misinformed by me and Academic Affairs as to the [unclear]. Elmer Andersen, of course, was just in an uproar wanting to find out the truth. There were a couple of hearings and so on. I don't know if Elmer believes now the right story or the wrong story. [laughter] But, Moos would never admit that he hadn't kept up with the facts and that he hadn't been told the inner history of why Earl Craig was not the candidate. Of course, Gerry Shepherd took the brunt of it. They weren't going to deal with an assistant vice-president. They were going to deal with *the* vice-president; and Gerry, of course, backed me up to the hilt but there was a lot of bad taste within that group. That allied with a lot of other things that had come to a head.

CAC: Right, right.

FL: I suppose where it really broke down, the rest of us internally knew what you could use Moos for and what you couldn't use him for but it was that Cambodian bombing and his conveniently staying away for three days while the campus was occupied by Stenvig that really broke the back of any cooperation. Gerry, I think, would not say that. He felt that . . .

CAC: Moos was informed at every point that the occupation was underway?

FL: Yes. We lost contact with him somewhere between Albany and Montreal for three days. Eidenberg had to make the decisions; so, we never had Moos's signature.

CAC: And he never responded, Moos, once he got back on campus to what had happened?

FL: No. No, he avoided things like that. Gerry would say that the crisis came over Moos not allowing Gerry to present the budget to the legislature. Gerry, I think knows—I don't know how much he'll admit—that he wasn't the greatest communicator between the university and the legislature. Don obviously had a much better style and presence; but Don, all the time he was in Academic Affairs and the first year he was vice-president for administration, was always very careful of Gerry's feelings about that. I remember that after Don had gone to Madison, Gerry and I, for some reason, were talking about things like that and came back to the structure here. Gerry said to me then—although, he'd never said it before—that Don always wanted to be an academic vice-president or vice-president for administration and that's obviously true.

CAC: One of the hazards of being a participant interviewer is that what happened to that committee report after it was sent along, I never knew at all. It's really not until I started doing this project that I realized that this was a big deal and for how many years? . . . for twelve years, I had no idea! [laughter]

FL: No, it was not broadcast or made public because . . .

CAC: Of course not.

FL: . . . that was the period of insensitivity.

CAC: But, you see, it raises questions of historical actors and what they're aware of and consequences that are not built into the intent at all.

FL: Oh, yes.

CAC: Historians are driven to be *ironists* . . . and I would be particularly. As I've talked to others . . . I sometime will have to interview myself and I'm quite certain how I'm going to do that.

FL: The sequence was Al Vaughn, to Barb Knudson, to [Gordon] Kingston, and then Werntz in the title but Werntz was always within the directorship of the Educational Development Center, which eventually became combined as retrenchment took place. After retrenchment, they brought all these things together. That was the sequence in University College. The expansion of University College in 1970 under the new Senate charter also had this component which was a proposal for upwards of 3 percent of central funding and so on, which never took place because in 1971, 1972, we got the first retrenchment.

CAC: We'll come to retrenchment in a moment.

FL: General College . . .

[break in the interview]

CAC: You had lots of portfolios and University College is just terribly complicated. I think I'll have to go and interview Jim Werntz, for example, and I will Barbara Knudson, and then Vaughn. I tried to call Vaughn. I haven't got him yet. Why don't we talk about General College then?

FL: General College, I had to defend and explain to the legislature and to Central Administration. There's always been an underlying antagonism and really disinterest on the part of the rest of the university both in understanding its structure and its function, as well as its faculty. I may have been a little bit more open because I'd been a teaching assistant in the

Geography courses under George Jennings as an undergraduate and knew a little bit about meetings in General College of faculty under Horace T. Morse. It was founded, as you know, at about the same time as University College in the 1930s. It had sort of a polarization to University College. While University College was to be an umbrella cut-across in terms of students of the CLA and IT type in the sense of admissions, General College was a response to, basically, the Depression and people who would not normally have entered into the port of entry of Science, Literature, and the Arts. Some people relate it back to the situation at Michigan State and that the General College here was modeled on that. I don't think it ever took that function. It started out, first of all, differently in the sense that it doesn't have a disciplinary structure. It has a thematic structure. That was done, as far as I know, deliberately and it has worked to its advantage. Secondly, it's an experimental college and always was viewed as that. In other words, it was not to just build and build, and develop, and grow, it had a particular function, and it had a relationship to General College level students and curriculum, and it was to export that. So, it always got interested when the community college, junior college, idea came into Minnesota that this was a place where within the university we could prepare teachers for that.

The third function—it's more hindsight than anything else, I think—is that as it had a special role in the Depression, it had a special role for the GIs. It had a special role for the minorities. It had a special role for the disadvantaged. And it's worked. If you look at the role of the General College in the over all university, it did its job magnificently well in the Depression, after World War II, and in the 1960s and the 1970s. The problems that it has always faced though have been, basically, internal and trying to explain to the legislature why the university wants resources for this after the rise of the state university system and the community college system. I think its basic reason for being, and the arguments I've always made, in a sense are pragmatic; but, they still are honest in terms of the original intent. There is no community college except Metropolitan Community College in the inner cities and it has never fulfilled its role either in its physical plant or in its numbers. Even the new college down there at Loring Park, Lyndale and Hennepin [Minneapolis Community College], is only about half full. There's never been anything in St. Paul to equal that so that the General College and the university are really the only public institutions in the central cities. Community colleges, other than Metropolitan, are all suburban, in the outside ring. Metropolitan State College, the University Without Walls, within the state university system really has never satisfied the lower income disadvantaged group; so, whatever that disadvantage is, General College has performed its task. I think it's skewed now because most of the disadvantages right now are racial disadvantage. That was not true in the 1930s. That was not true of the GI. In a sense, it bears that stigma then of being that other group and not the major group within the university [unclear]. Then, you add to that the internal view that it's less than the other colleges in its intellectual capabilities . . . It's always under attack, yet, it's so easy to explain to the legislature if the Central Administration would defend it as integral to the scope of the university; but they really only answer questions . . . that is, they don't get ahead of the questions when they face the legislature. Academic vice-presidents are not comfortable. They don't know why the General College is there either. [laughter] I think that's as true of [Kenneth] Keller as it was of Gerry Shepherd, as it was of Blegen and [James Lewis] Morrill. It just is a funny structure that through the cycles in history always has

its usefulness at an opportune moment; and then, when the questions come up, you recite those and everybody then backs off for the next time [unclear] General College. Gerry had pretty well set the limits of General College at 3,000 students when I came in and we never increased it; so, all during the period of Shepherd's regime when I was there, it was basically not receiving new faculty unless people retired. It basically borrowed a lot from the other college graduate students for a lot of its instruction and it never particularly took on a different role. The role that it did take on became a detriment in these periods of retrenchment and reallocation [R&R] and that was the role that Al Vaughn had started. Now, under Morse where Vaughn served his time also, this may have been an area which they talked about—I was never conscious of it—and that was the general education degrees in the junior and senior year, which were added on and which Lupton has had to fight Keller and [Henry] Koffler about all of these years. Originally, the community college that they did most of the experimenting with were the private business and technical colleges in the Twin Cities . . . the Brown Institute of radio, for example, or some technical organization or business. We would offer, through the General College, their general education courses.

CAC: I see.

FL: That's how it first started out. Then, there were pressures after loading on them career development, and minorities, and so on through the Help Center. We began to see that the minorities were not mainstreaming and that, essentially, as we set up an MLK program or a Help Center program, these became parallel institutions. MLK and CLA has always supposed to have been at the lower division and then you let the students go on and go through the main stream; but once you set up this unit and its component of support staff, they want to go all the way through. They want to hang onto the students until they graduate.

CAC: Sure.

FL: So, the addition of a baccalaureate degree, rather than the associate in arts degree, to General College was something that Al felt naturally came out of the relationships with these private institutions; and then all of the special programs, because we were the central city access point—there was no community college with which you'd actually access these people—it was very logical to have two different kinds of baccalaureate degrees. People have, I suspected, wondered why I, being CLA, was never publicly and vocally against that. I always thought it was contained. They've never been very large. But, if you look at the logical structure of the university, there's no reason for it. This is where, I think, the Senate Consultative Committee, and Ken Keller, and Chase, and others, and [Frank] Sorauf have always felt the General College somehow was this unnecessary thing out here. It never bothered them but when resources got short, that was always a place . . . well, why not get rid of that? You got rid of the Library School. You got rid of Criminal Justice. Why aren't you arguing for getting rid of General College? [laughter]

CAC: Does no one ever say, "Football team and basketball team" in these conversations?

FL: Not very much because I don't think the General College ever worked its mission and charge to accommodate that.

CAC: No, but from the university side, to keep people here in athletics for four years, there almost had to exist a General College?

FL: Yes.

CAC: That's put in the form of a question. I don't know whether it's true or not.

FL: Probably Jeanne could tell you more about this because she has consciously fought Sid Hartman and that sort of situation. You know, there's not a single football player who majors in the College of Education; although, they have a Physical Education unit. That's certainly true of the basketball situation. I can't believe that was true during the 1930s and 1940s because I remember the great football players as Glenn Seidel in the Medical School and people in other things. [laughter]

CAC: Oh, but there was that Alfonse who played . . .

FL: Juli[us]?

CAC: Juli Alfonse played left halfback.

FL: Yes?

CAC: He was there rooting for General College. [laughter]

FL: Yes? That was a northeast component. And Dave Moore, of course, is a General College graduate.

CAC: Ah ha.

FL: They're all over the place.

CAC: Right.

FL: We know that but I don't think it's ever been an issue that General College exists for the benefit of the athletic program—it's the other way around.

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[Tape 3, Side 1]

CAC: . . . and in so many, many different things. We've talked about the Martin Luther King Program but haven't talked in detail—a bit about the occupation of Morrill Hall—but one of the major curricular consequences was, of course, the whole series of ethnic departments: the Afro-American, Chicano, American Indian, and then Women's Studies. I don't know whether you had a role in that or not?

FL: I had a role in making it a department of CLA.

CAC: Okay. So, there's another line of conversation.

FL: Okay. It really does start with MLK. After the death of Martin Luther King and the occupation of Morrill Hall, which I don't think is different from similar events and incidences on other campuses in the United States, our attempt to respond to that occupation and new needs was first done in General [College] through MLK; and it had a number of components. One was to raise monies for student financial aid, particularly, for minorities and the disadvantaged. Martin Luther King, I think, has always been looked upon as a sort of a Black program and that's technically not true. Martin Luther King was basically the idea of the disadvantaged and the poverty segment, which in the first instance was dominated by Blacks but is no longer, in the university programs. The second part was a recruitment program and I, and Jim Reeves, and Don Zander in Student Affairs got together to combine the recruitment effort within an MLK office within Admissions and Records to do the recruitment, to go out to the high schools, to go to the central city schools in particular, and have minority people talk about the university and its programs, both those in the General College and in the other colleges of the university. The third component was the component of curriculum and tutorials, counseling and retention programs after they got here. In many ways, because the dominant group was Black, the Martin Luther King effort has basically developed and evolved from that foundation. When we first started, we had eleven different tutorial programs where a volunteer faculty and graduate students in virtually all segments of the university in the Twin Cities had a unit and where the faculty would serve the students and help out and train graduate students for the tutorial effort. After about a year and a half, it was quite evident we couldn't sustain eleven different programs and there were some that obviously should be consolidated; so, we had a series of staged retrenchments down to one unit in St. Paul, one in General College, one in Education, one in CLA and, eventually, that got down to support of the Help Center, the MLK Program in General College, and the MLK Program in CLA.

The Student Affairs admissions and recruitment continued on until about the middle of the 1970s and then what is now called OMSA was created. OMSA is the Office of Minority Student programs. After 1973, when Chase and, then, Koffler came in as academic vice-presidents, there was, from my view point, a general retreat in the sense of participation in the minority programs. The building of the individual departments had already ended by that time and Wilderson, as the vice-president for Student Affairs, had to go to the legislature to get monies for two types of

units which had not existed before in their separate ways. These were the Culture Centers, which recognize Black, Asian, Indian, Chicano, and, then, between those Culture Centers and the regular colleges were the Living Learning Centers. Now, OMSA was through Student Affairs rather than through Academic Affairs and the colleges and that division still exists; and it's caused problems as the separation of admissions and records from the collegiate units have caused problems on integration and coordination of programs.

I was back in the faculty during the middle 1970s but I still maintained some interest. I was appointed to the Chicano task force, for example, which was paralleled in the American Indian side by attempts to create a community university advisory committee and council to aid the university in new problems. During the 1970s, there was a large increase in the Chicano and American Indian population in the Twin Cities relative to the Black. The Black population increased but it became proportionately smaller in reference to this. Then, in the late 1970s, there was the huge influx of Southeast Asians, Hmong and Vietnamese. That changed the complexion of people actually using these minority services.

Let me go back then to the MLK Program. I've spoken about it as in Academic Affairs and our early efforts after the occupation of Morrill Hall, then the build up in the middle 1970s, late 1970s, of the Student Affairs Culture Centers and Living Learning Centers. What went on in the colleges? That goes back to the fact that after the Morrill Hall occupation, besides recruiting students, we felt that we had to structure units within the curriculum that recognized this new problem in the society. The first one we set up directly as a response to some issues that had been raised in the occupation was the Afro-American Studies Department. I got the authority and the resources from Central Administration to set up committees to look into this and we had some discussions and on general principles, we decided that if we were going to do this, we did not want a parallel college, an ethnic college that had been done in many universities in response to these questions. We did not want to put in any particular place an ethnic program that was parallel to regular departments and that we would recognize these as full departments and not programs. In other words, that they would have identity, space, office support, and independent faculty. This was largely, I think, general agreement.

CAC: Was there a thought there would be borrowed faculty as well though . . . initially?

FL: No.

CAC: It was all to be [unclear] unlike American Studies?

FL: Yes. In fact, American Studies had shown an interest under [Bernie] Bowron and [Mary] Turpie in getting involved because these were American problems.

CAC: Sure.

FL: There were suggestions that we have a graduate unit in American Studies interested in ethnicity, in racial research, and the problem of pluralism in American culture. That was soon rejected as not really responding to the Morrill Hall occupation and the recruitment of freshmen, and sophomores, and so on. That really never got off the ground because it was cut short by the development of departments. The first department was the Afro-American. I had money from Central Administration and the logical place to put it was, of course, in the College of Liberal Arts and in the Social Science area.

CAC: Is this while you were still associate dean in the Arts College?

FL: No.

CAC: Okay, I'm sorry.

FL: This was in 1968 after the Morrill Hall occupation.

CAC: Okay.

FL: We set up committees to formulate a constitution and, then, set up search committees to search for people. Our first faculty were borrowed from the Twin Cities and there were people in Afro-American like Josie Johnson, and Lillian Anthony, and Earl Craig, Milt Williams, and from a number of graduate students who could be hired as instructors and TAs [teaching assistant] just to get the programs off the ground. In the names I've used, you can see that this was not really a discipline but a cross-disciplinary department; that is, there were sociologists, political scientists, history people involved in this. Those people that were brought in at first did not have the vitae or the accreditation that one would expect in the final faculty; so, the search committees then were looking for permanent faculty. These were temporary instructors, assistant professors. Many of them were then brought up and evaluated as to whether they would become permanent faculty but there was obviously seeking on the outside. The search committees were completely within the college and I had let go of all of the attachments I had as assistant vice-president probably by 1970. That is, it took about two years to get this thing going. Our intent was to place in the college the responsibility of the colleges and we would even assign budgets and resources and put them into the hands of the college to do that. Since the Afro-American was the first, it was interesting in the sense of the curriculum committees that were supposed to evaluate and start programs, courses. It was interesting in the sense of the Social Science division and the associate dean of Social Science at that time to work this in.

I don't know if Roger Page told you about this but there was this famous meeting over in one of the case study rooms in Blegen [Hall] where Lloyd Lofquist, who was the associate dean at that time—he hadn't joined Central Administration yet—had called the councils of the college together in order to take on the new department which would be in the division of the Social Sciences. There were going to be speeches by Black students and by members of the council and curriculum committees about what role this would play. I remember Anna Stanley, who

weighed about 200 pounds at the time, sitting up in the front row and she made a speech. She was about to sit down, and she missed the chair, and sat on the floor. Roger Page got up behind her, and tried to lift her, and neither of them could budge. They both broke out laughing.

CAC: [laughter]

FL: All the tension that you could imagine was in there before hand and these two people just broke down. It was just an amazing happening to occur at that particular time. From the Afro-American view point, they embraced the idea of a department, of autonomy, of faculty rights, and students' rights to the *Nth* degree. They became *the* departments if you were looking at it from the associate dean's or the vice-president's level. They protected their rights and everything else about it. But it progressed fairly well. We had gathered sufficient money so that they could hire people at about the rate they could absorb them into the regular fabric. Because of that idea that we are a department and you've got to have as good faculty, and as creditable faculty, and all the degree components, and so on, you began to see as things evolved that the temporary faculty that started out, which were largely community oriented, became at odds with the internal faculty that had to make it academically with their peers in promotion, and tenure, and course development, and so on.

At the same time, in this early stage, because we didn't have what later became Culture Centers and Learning Resource Centers, there was always a community and recruitment program within the ethnic departments themselves so that we had lines where they'd have people who dealt with the community and with the university. It was only in the middle 1970s that we finally started removing those line items from the regular departments so that American Indian Studies, for example, had a community person well into the middle 1970s. Afro-American, which had started about a year earlier, got rid of its community orientation much faster. Chicano Studies still has an element of community liaison built into its program; although, they're not designated as such.

Recruitment also of students became more formal within Student Affairs rather within CLA or within the department. The MLK Center, which we set up in CLA, basically took the burden of a lot of community relations and a lot of student relations outside of Afro-American. The American Indians, after American Indian Studies were set up, maintained that community aspect longer within the department because MLK had become predominantly Black in its orientation in the college. We always had some Indian counselors in there but there wasn't a large element of Indian students within the MLK Program. They would rather associate with the American Studies Department; so, under Buffalohead and [Russell] Thornton, there was this community role all the time that was much stronger.

American Indian Studies was started about a year after the Afro and about a year after that Chicano Studies was started. American Indian Studies, I don't think, started essentially from the same sources as the Afro. The Afro had a base in students and in community. American Indians was largely, if we're going to have an Afro Studies Department, and knowing what the populations of Indians in Minnesota was and the problems within the inner city, we should give

equity to them but there wasn't the base there. I remember the first year that we started recruiting Indian students. We got about two dozen of them and within two weeks, there were only three or four left. They'd all left. That was almost a continuous history. In many ways, the discussion which led to these formations of departments, rather than starting them out as programs or loose associations of faculty and courses, was exactly that problem. Create identity, create a place, physical focus within the university; although, that seems, when you look at it now with some distance, as maintaining segregation and encouraging it, it was only, I think, legitimately the only way we could act if we wanted really to recruit students. Without an identifiable place and identifiable curriculum, our department, we wouldn't have succeeded in changing the colors as rapidly as we did. We were a great success in recruitment. After about three years, let's say 1972, 1973 . . .

CAC: Do you mean a success in recruiting staff of students or both?

FL: In recruiting students.

CAC: Okay.

FL: Staffing was always difficult and much more difficult in American Indian Studies because there weren't American Indian graduate students or Ph.D.s. There just was no talent pool. Chicano had almost as great difficulties, not because there wasn't a talent pool out there but because Chicano Studies did not have the base of community interaction that the others did. Guadalupe community in south and west St. Paul basically was not oriented in its activist community structure to the university in the way the American Indian Movement or the Afro-American community was. People have said that's due to their strong family ties, the fact that they had a good solid base in south St. Paul employment, and that they were much more attracted to the vocational/technical institutes than they were to a university education. That sounds a little false now because in the American Indian sense, there was no infrastructure any place. That was literally a leap frog from an elementary, junior high school which were the only places Indians were. The great decline in Indian enrollments was at the seventh and eighth grade level. They never even got to the high school level; so, we were trying to leap frog over a whole eighth grade through fourteenth grade system in order to get them in.

CAC: If I could, I'd like to interpose with a question. It's been fifteen years now since Afro-American, fourteen for Chicano, etcetera; so, there's been a long experience. If one considers their missions were difficult, missions that ordinary line departments didn't have . . . They had to serve students from those communities. They had to create an academic viability on their own. They had to relate also to the larger community of citizens in the metropolitan area or in the state. By any of those measures, none of these programs was worthwhile? I making it as a statement but really it's a question. I just wonder, in the country, are there places where they did work well.

FL: They haven't worked well in our view of what a department and a disciplinary department should be. I believe they were absolutely necessary and did work well in changing the enrollment characteristics of the university; that is, they were the reason we could recruit the number of Blacks, the number of American Indian, and the number of Chicanos that are now present here. The Southeast Asian group, which came in later, may give a different rationale because we were successful in the recruitment of them without a department; but, by that time, we had the Culture Centers, we had the Learning Resource Centers, and we had a population which didn't have identity as a minority within the United States of any longstanding. They tended to leap frog over some of the rationales that were given for these other three, let me call them, native or longstanding minority populations in the United States.

CAC: Has it had a bearing of the lack of demographic power base in Minnesota that they, relatively speaking, would not have gone well?

FL: I'm not sure about that. If you'd go through the history of the 1970s, you began to see where the breaking points were that are explanations for the development. As long as we were recruiting—we were recruiting at about a 10 percent increase in the minority, Black, population every year up until the middle 1970s—there was no decline, no plateauing of the number of Blacks recruited being added to the student population. What did decline was the number of majors and minors. We got, in the Afro-American, up to about eight to twelve majors by the middle 1970s. Now, when you think we started recruiting basically freshmen and they had a hard time, took time to be sophomore and so on, so when they declare their majors, it was about 1973, 1974 before we got any majors in the regular sense. By 1976, 1977, we had plateaued. We've had fewer majors since the middle 1970s than we had before. The reason, if you look at the statistics, is not that we don't have the students—we do—they are now declaring majors in History and Sociology, Political Science, Economics, Health Sciences, Biological Sciences. There are obviously differentials between the majority white students and minority Black students as to what they choose given their educational background; but, they don't chose Afro-American Studies to major in. Now, that could be, I suppose, explained by the nature of the Afro-American Studies Department, but I don't think that has anything to do with it because the same thing happened with American Indians, and with Chicanos, and it's certainly true of Southeast Asians. They don't need that kind of identity in order to get started.

CAC: Right. Is it a similar pattern in other cities where these populations are larger proportion of the total?

FL: That's what I hear. When you talk to people from the outside, that's what they say. They see parallels. I'm not really sure what the statistics are or what the facts are in other places because Minnesota is the place where the department has remained. Many other places got rid of their ethnic colleges and got rid of their programs. They never did become Afro-American Departments and so on.

CAC: If you take the measurement in number of students not of those communities being served in courses, it's also not a spectacular success?

FL: No, but it isn't the flattening out to the extent that it was in the middle 1970s with the majors and minors. That is, we started out because of the very few minority students with very large numbers of the majority population in courses offered by Afro-American, American Indian. That has, in actuality, declined; that is, the number. The total student credit hours is down also from what it used to be. That, I think, is due to a lot of external changes. I think we did satisfy the demands of the community and the society and that the university had committed itself to offering courses and opportunities for minority students and the education of majority students to these problems and issues; but, it also meant that these then were not the exclusive property of the faculty in Afro-American. History, and Geography, and Economics took on these things; and we added not as many as we should but faculty of minority backgrounds to these departments. In fact, where we were becoming successful was really in hiring minority faculty in the traditional disciplines and having them participate in the curriculum of the minority departments. That was particularly true in the Afro-American situation; although, it isn't just the way I've explained it, that Afro-American became Afro-American and African Studies. Now, part of that is due to internal problems within Afro-American and personalities in that first three or four years who tended to want to add faculty in each disciplinary branch so that, in effect, the department became a small college of Social Science, Humanities, and Fine Arts. They never really—except in one instance in American Indian Studies—got anybody from the Natural Sciences involved in it. Sometimes, there were additions from Education, Ed-Psych, Ed-Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Education motifs; but, basically the trend was always toward the original initiatory ideas and not changing with the changing university. There was active resistance to the Africanist joining them even though the majority of the Africanists might be Black. They just did not want to mix in that area studies. Chicano Studies where you'd see an affinity between the Spanish and Portuguese Department and Latin American area studies have never gotten together. They absolutely refused because this would blur the identity. I think identity and status were the major reasons for those departmental beginnings in the late 1960s and early 1970s. As the students broke away and became mainstreamed, the departments became more isolated. They were isolated, I think, because they didn't participate in the over all college and university functions, the senate committees, the assembly committees, and so on. But, I think they became isolated because they were attempting to compete with the traditional disciplines rather than taking on shared courses and cross-crediting, they wanted an English Literature person themselves. They wanted a sociologist of their particular problems and so on. When I became dean in 1978, and looking at the statistics of the college and the changes that had taken place since I remember the college in the late 1960s—I had kept up with the college pretty well until 1972, 1973 as to how it was changing demographically—the thing that struck me was the isolation of the minority departments and the linkages that had grown among the other units of the college toward interdisciplinary course structure. Right now about one quarter of our faculty teaches outside of its home discipline base every quarter but that is not true of the minority departments. There were other circumstances, of course, for going toward shared faculty appointments, retrenchment, lack of resources, and so on but . . .

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

[Tape 3, Side 2]

FL: . . . certainly the idea that one should have a graduate base and access to research by pointing people both in the traditional discipline and, then, the interdisciplinary program—which Afro-American was, which American Indian was, or Urban Studies, or Women’s Studies, or American Studies, or Humanities and all of these are undergraduate programs; they don’t have graduate extensions yet—was basically the argument from isolation . . . that new additions to the minority department faculties were having difficulty making it in promotion and tenure, the resources that were being funnelled in an earlier period directly to these departments because they were minority departments were declining, that we had to broaden the base of minority faculty and women in the college as a whole. The shared faculty idea that was implemented after 1978 is basically a response not to some ideological argument but the demographics of change of students and faculty in the early and middle 1970s.

CAC: What role did Malcolm Moos play in the Afro-American founding?

FL: Moos, I don’t think, played any direct role. He had no direct involvement in the Morrill Hall occupation in the sense of the president himself involving himself in the mission or structure of the departments. They were basically pushed from the general Morrill Hall incident back into the college structure as fast as possible. We didn’t attempt to set up the parallel college or Central Administration having control. It was turning it back into the colleges.

CAC: I have a sense of Moos being available. I went to at least two meetings, one associated with the war protest and the other with Black . . . that Moos frequently came to those. But that may be a misperception on my part because he did on those two occasions.

FL: No, we always had the president formally in after preliminary meetings with the community, with general concerns that the regents had either because they were direct connections between the regents and the minority communities; but, Moos never gave directives or really got involved except on that public relations level with the structuring of these departments. He never, except in the case of the Humphrey Institute which previously was the School of Public Affairs, of course, took a direct role. He took a direct role in the School of Public Affairs in the hiring Naftalin, for example. Gerry and I conducted most of those conversations. He was much more concerned with over-arching problems at the university, like the Health Sciences’ expansion. I don’t think he was uninterested. It’s just that I, and Jim Reeves, and Don Zander, and Frank Wilderson, and Russ Hamilton, and others got involved in that and we had clear channels because I was in Central Administration to carry out these things. I don’t think Ziebarth particularly got himself involved with the departments. When there were periods of crisis like the King affair in 1974—the [Charles] McLaughlin committee, and the Hamilton committee, and so on—John Turnbull was basically the one who acted as intermediary. I don’t want to imply in any sense that these people weren’t involved but they weren’t involved in a direct way at the levels of

structuring and setting up frameworks in the same sense they were interested in the relationship of the whole Heath Science service support levels [unclear] what a university was. These were matters of infinite concern. The setting up of the deputy vice-president for Agriculture far more occupied their time. In fact, in the trials of the Morrill Hall occupation, which came afterwards, I think the calling of President Moos on the stand and others basically reveals the lack of involvement and intimacy in the internal day-by-day affairs of these things. I think that would have been quite different if we'd gone the route of parallel college but, in essence, Central Administration and the deans were between the creation of these units; and they were pretty well taken care of in the normal resource allocations and so on. All three, Chicano, America Indian, and Afro-American were monies that came out of Central Administration and directly applied to the units. There was not competition with other units in the college.

CAC: With the first retrenchment in the late spring of 1971—to make a jump now—this was not a central portfolio of yours but you were part of the staff which really did operated collegially, I understand?

FL: No . . . what had happened over the years as I was assistant vice-president was that the bounds that we had really understood at the beginning, that I was in Social Science, Education, General College, CLA, tended to break down.

CAC: Hmmm.

FL: Lloyd Lofquist, and Don Smith, Eidenberg, [Jim] Haug, and a number of others had come into the operation, passed on. By the last three years of my terms as assistant vice-president, we largely saw things in general, and then sorted things out, and whoever had an interest or some background in that got it rather than the sort of, this is a Social Science, you take it. Part of that, obviously, was due to Lloyd being a social scientist also. My role became more important, I think, in planning, particularly in the organization. Don Smith, by that time, had passed to the vice-president for administration, which was really acting as the associate president in some sense. His role in Academic Affairs, which had been ex officio with Educational Policy Committee [unclear] had dropped out and I attended a lot of the meetings. Don still attended it because there were interests at that point because of the retrenchment coming up and difficulties before the legislature that the president's office and Central Administration needed to be involved in . . . what was to be a retrenchment allocation period. But, for example, the planning document which structures the 1971, 1972 R&R, essentially, came out of the Senate Consultative Committee and the Educational Policy Committee of the Senate. It first started out with Auerbach and May Brodbeck as respective heads of those committees to do the work. The actual document which lays out what we were going to do was largely a product of Brodbeck and the Educational Policy Committee but Don and I were intimately involved in the thing as ex officio members; so, there was, I think, a joint responsibility for that document. It really served as a base for the next planning efforts which after 1971, 1972 sort of laid dormant until the middle 1970s when Magrath got interested in this again as we came to the next retrenchment. If you'll notice the kinds of ideas that are central to planning at the university today, those that

talk about centrality and so on, they're just lifted almost word for word from the Brodbeck document. Everybody now claims them as their own and this vice-presidency and that, but there's basically a stream in similar thinking . . .

CAC: It's remarkable how quickly this thing happens. It really starts in the spring of 1971 and gets in place very quickly. As we converse, it just occurs to me that you were either a regular member or a participating member from the outside in the Arts College committee on responding to retrenchment and reallocation in the summer of 1971 . . . a committee that I was chairing.

FL: Right. That was partly because in the retrenchment, we actually pulled out and added to academic budgets \$3 million. Instead of retrenching the academic budgets, we got \$3 million from the rest of the university; and the role of the Arts College, the mechanism for their role, was essentially that School of Cross-Disciplinary Studies, which Brodbeck and [John] Wallace from Psychology had put together in a proposal.

CAC: That didn't come out of the summer committee that I was talking about.

FL: No, that came after the retrenchment; but before that, we were looking at the kinds of things that we had to do with the legislature. We were finding that All University demands like the library and its deterioration, things like University College and the Educational Development Center, programs that were cutting across colleges like the History of Science and Technology which had four deans basically responsible for that . . . There were a number of all-university incentives that had to have some new structure and the R&R process in 1971, 1972 was essentially a hierarchy of all-university needs that had to be funded because we were short of funds and then collegiate needs, which got allocations from Central. Now, the reason for that . . . it isn't that those things had never occurred to Central Administration before because they're part and parcel of the all-university things that we've talked about with these pilot programs, for example. They happen to change from year to year. But we had Regents Reserve until about that point; so, the flexible resources had suddenly disappeared. We had to cut back according to the legislative thing—my figures are probably wrong here—around 53 positions because there was a transfer now to the expanding Health Sciences. That, of course, was an internal crisis. Why should we be taking positions from here and putting them there? How do you explain this? You need some sort of mechanism. When I needed money for the minority programs, or for pilot projects, or so on, this was handled centrally among the vice-presidents by a proposal from me through Gerry to the Council of Vice-Presidents and Larry London and Regents Reserve provided that funding. But once you start getting cut back, then you have to have some sort of mechanism within the places where the charter and practice of the regents had put in the hands of faculty to legalize the kind of allocations we were making. In a period of cutback to divert resources into the libraries for example, you need some sort of mechanism; and it was through Educational Policy and the Consultative Committee reviewing proposals that we got a list of priorities on doing this. If we wanted to expand in 1971, 1972, monies into the MLK Program for recruitment of minority students, you had to have some authority, some base, for doing that. It became an All University proposal that, in essence, the faculty up through the University

Senate had endorsed in one way or another. I suppose it was a legitimizing of the previous process, not an entirely new one but in the records, in the archives, in those not intimately connected with the everyday operations it may have seemed as a complete new innovation—which it wasn't.

CAC: Yes, yes.

FL: It was a legitimizing, a rationalizing of a process that had gone on ad hoc before.

CAC: In working out these procedures, did members of Shepherd's staff, yourself, Lofquist, Shepherd himself, have occasion to have direct relationships with members of the Board of Regents? What is the relationship of the vice-president's office to the members or committees of the Board of Regents? Is that done entirely through the president?

FL: That's formally done entirely through the president. There are a number of subcommittees, Physical Plant, Finances, Student Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Educational Policy. Those committee meetings of the regents are held on Thursday. Then, on Friday morning there's the general meeting and committee reports are endorsed through the regents. So, you had a different group of regents serving on each of these committees. The way Gerry ran the areas, which were Academic Affairs, Educational Policy, and faculty appointments, and so on, was basically if there was a topic on some particular aspect of promotion and tenure that Lloyd had been working on, he would report so that we knew the regents of those particular committees much better than others. At the same time, there were special meetings in those days with sub groups of regents, particularly with some of the leadership like [Fred] Hughes, and [John] Ingve, and [Neil] Sherburne who were, in a sense, senior regents. There were discussions with them on particular programs that were coming up formally before this day and a half regents' meeting, which obviously needed much more discussion, and structuring, and understanding. Lloyd and I, I think, were included in most of what Gerry and Don wanted done at that time.

CAC: The regents you mention were those most active in considering the continuing tenure of Mr. Moos?

FL: Yes. The one I haven't mentioned is, of course, the automobile dealer . . .

CAC: [Lester] Malkerson.

FL: Malkerson. I think Malkerson, because he was there at the hiring of President Moos, maintained the longest interest in issues that were of concern over Moos's relationships with Central Administration and so on. Our impressions, I think—I can only talk about impressions here—were that Don Smith, in his last year, was much more the focal point of the presidency than Moos was, that Gerry's relationship, as the second academic officer of the university underneath the president, had somehow become sort of a co-directorship with Don. In many ways that was because, I think, Don basically wrote, if not in actuality, the outlines of most

official documents going out of the president's office. He was the one that carried the burden in the last years with the legislature. In part, I think that was because of his facility with the language and not necessarily that these ideas should be ascribed to Don, or to Shepherd, or to me, or to anybody else. It was one of the more congenial arrangements I've ever been in. I never felt that I ever was denied information or advice on anything and because we had started on this planning calendar which really was a structuring of, When does the issue come up? Where does it come from, and where do we handle it, and what does it have to go through in order to get onto the budget or the legislative request? What are our relations with Educational Policy Committee, Consultative Committee? There was Resources and Planning Committee and there was a Social Concerns Committee. Those were the ones we were most active with with the Senate structure. I think all of us felt—I wouldn't say I felt anymore deeply about faculty governance than anybody else—that, in essence, we'd have a much easier time of it involving ourselves with the Senate structure than it was in presenting them with our ideas after they had been well formulated. The Brodbeck document, for example, is a good illustration of Don and I, and particularly Don, laying out what we thought were the background issues and leaving May to formulate the paragraphs around these things. Then, the final document came back to us in the sense, Has this got the right tone? Is it aimed in the right direction? Our editorial function at that point was not to change things or insert things but really to provide the best joint document we could after those discussions.

It was after that period that we got these special task forces which dominate the 1970s and 1980s in the university structure that alienated the Senate because . . .

CAC: I see. By-passed regularly established committees?

FL: Yes. If you recall in the 1970s, there was this Wilderson task force on student affairs. It concerned basic issues of accessibility, of how we were treating new students, whether we had a decent system of counseling and advising them into the programs. After this task force report came out, then, it was given to the University Senate. It never came out of the Senate.

CAC: Yes, yes.

FL: The present four task forces, the one on graduate, the one on student experience, the one on the International . . .

CAC: The one on outreach.

FL: . . . and the one on outreach are essentially outcomes of the Senate. I suppose the only time when the Senate became involved in the way they were involved with Shepherd's period was the [Dennis] Watson report, which was essentially a reverberation from Shepherd's period questioning Magrath and Koffler in the middle 1970s as to what should be going on. I think in the eyes of most faculty that came out of the collective bargaining problem but it wasn't the collective bargaining problem. It was really a change in the relationship of president and vice-president

to the university governance structure. It so happened that Gerry, and I, and a number of others were involved more than we normally would be I suppose in the governance caucus that wanted the Watson committee in a questioning of Magrath's regime at that point. But, it really was, in a sense, a reversion back to the way we had operated in the past. Now, it is true that the University Senate in those days were probably good old boys—if I can call May Brodbeck a good old boy. [laughter]

CAC: Why not?

FL: But you had Auerbach, and Darley, and [Jack] Merwin, and people like that, who had been half administrators most of the time, operating as heads of committees in the Senate structure.

CAC: Sure.

FL: That was purposeful. There's no doubt that we wanted as Central administrators to have the support of the University Senate because we were beginning to start fights in terms of we want an accounting of this Regents Reserve. Anytime we made the issue big enough, we got the money but we never had control of the money. It was always in some drawer of London's or [Bill] Middlebrook's in the past. Agriculture was an entity unto itself. Health Sciences was becoming an entity unto itself. It was, basically, that kind of fight within Central Administration, I think, that, if you look back now, had to be dictated by our wanting allies within the regular faculty of the Arts and Sciences basically and this is how the pattern evolved.

[break in the interview]

CAC: We've talked earlier, and in passing, and in a number of places about the crisis years of 1972, 1973 in Morrill Hall, the University College crisis, the legislative . . . who was going to testify before the legislature, the general breakdown of communication within Morrill Hall, the Cambodian crisis, Mr. Moos's non-appearance and lack of leadership at that time. I know this is a very complex and sensitive area but would you wish to comment more on the latter days of Mr. Moos?

FL: Sure. Let me give a little bit of perspective. When I started out, I said—was careful in saying—that I was not an appointment of Moos, that it actually came under the last days of Meredith Wilson. I've got to maintain that because my contention would be that the basic outlines of Moos's Administration, as seen from an All University perspective, really started in Wilson's presidency because there's no change in 1967, 1968 when Moos came in from the general trend of events under Meredith Wilson. In a sense, I've been personal about my own role as assistant vice-president which came out of things that had happened in 1965 and 1966, and they'd come to a culmination, and that's why was brought into Central Administration—as far as I can figure. They were things like outreach. They were things like the activism that was beginning, not just in minorities but in all sorts of social, economic, and political affairs. It was the enormous baby boom, increasing enrollments . . . our ability to gain resources to carry on

with, which was a much broader program than the university had indulged in. It had really been contained within various disciplinary and extension service. But the new thing, for example, the idea of communiversity was, basically, something that came out of the last year of Meredith Wilson's program. If we want to talk, for example, about Honors and about students, that came out of Meredith Wilson's interest in an Honors College and the fact that he went to England to look at that. That's almost completely abortive in the sense of what he envisioned, what he understood, but the idea of Honors and what do you do in a public Land-Grant university without dorms, that is essentially a commuter university, the only really metropolitan, urban Land-Grant university in the country? Those can't be ascribed to a sudden change of interest. What they did was come to the fore just as Moos was coming in but the actors within the middle echelon of Central Administration—Don Smith and Gerry Shepherd to point out the major figures—had come from as far back as 1962 in Meredith Wilson's [unclear]. The first three years of Moos . . .

[End of Tape 3, Side 2]

[Tape 4, Side 1]

FL: . . . quarter leave because I was becoming heavily involved in archeological research in Greece. I also insisted that I could teach all the time I was vice-president—and I did. I usually taught on Tuesday's and Thursdays at 8:00 in the morning; so, I was in the office before anybody else had arrived anyway.

CAC: [laughter]

FL: I carried on and, I think the record will show, I had as many Ph.D. students and graduate students as any single individual in the department at that time.

The first three years then, I think, is a continuation of threads and roots that had beginnings before Moos. What Moos successfully did, and in cooperation, was to advance the ideas of communiversity, of the university reaching out, of what has more popularly been called in other parts of the country a University Without Walls, that is, a recognition of the complexity in demographics of the Twin Cities and the Twin City metropolitan region where we are the public four-year undergraduate institution. That is, there is no other state university around and we also, although there are universities in western Wisconsin, drew upon that area to a very large extent. By the middle of Moos's term, we had just gotten through the first major public crisis and that was the Morrill Hall incident. That was handled very well from an external viewpoint. While Columbia was burning, while Madison was upset, while Berkeley was going through its outrages, and so on, somehow the external appearance was that the University of Minnesota had the same crisis but handled it within a system. There's an anecdote I think that illustrates at least the external appearance. After the Morrill Hall incident, Columbia Broadcasting System [CBS] wanted to do some documentaries on this period of student activism in *Place in Flames*. They had as one of their commentators Eric Sevareid . . .

CAC: An old Minnesota boy.

FL: An old Minnesota, North Dakota boy. He was supposed to come back with a documentary team and sort of give his personalized viewpoint of this crisis in American education. CBS usually sends a team out to do some preliminary research and Severeid arrives on the last day, and does the interviewing, and so on. They came, and looked at us, and wondered why this place had not exploded. They had three explanations. They went back to New York and the documentary was never finished because it just wasn't exciting enough. The three propositions were that the Morrill Hall incident took place late enough in the year, and it was getting cold, and that the usual version of Minnesota environmental conditions was that there just wasn't enough energy to expand in the external realities of the situation to lead to that. The second explanation was in the nature of Minnesota population being Swedes and Norwegians who are dull, and there really is apathy, and there really wasn't any interest in it; and it takes a cutting edge between town and gown in order to get the results you got at Columbia, and Berkeley, and so on. The third explanation—the one obviously we enjoyed in Central Administration—was that the most liberal segment of the university was the Central Administration; and therefore, they had managed the Morrill Hall occupation in a way that resulted in a evolutionary development of ethnic departments, concern about students, and particularly, the pronouncements of the central officers—including Moos—of a very liberal stance in terms of what a university should be in this day and age, and not try to be an ivory tower, and stand isolated and so on. I think that Moos fitted in well with what was ongoing in 1968 when he came in.

The crisis in Moos's Administration then came not from activism either of the minority or the anti-war sentiment or the increasing number of students, women, the increasing demands for more specialized and relevant response in the curriculum to the activities of the day because he was in tune with that. He was liberal in his outlooks. The crisis really became internal in the university's structural response to the demands of the day. The first one was the Health Sciences and the demand for a vice-president for Health Sciences. The university regents, particularly under former Governor Elmer Andersen, was concerned with the delivery of health services. There's an obvious bone of contention here between the delivery of health services and a Medical School that is interested in research and in the basic biological and genetic sciences. If you take on the role of delivering health care to the state—that's literally what this board did—then, you're adding to the university budget and enormous additional resource base which is going to impinge in the state legislature's mind on how much they're willing to allocate to education. Those of us within the university that are concerned about the core of the university, knowledge, and research, and teaching, felt that we were being disadvantaged by the enormous increase in the budget and the proportion going to what was, essentially, a service to the state rather than a service to the university . . . the building of that hospital complex, relationships to catastrophic disease, the relationship with outside hospitals and so on to the university health services. That was complemented in the late years of the [President Lyndon B.] Johnson Administration and it did carry on into the [President Richard E.] Nixon Administration by enormous amounts of money . . .

CAC: Heavens.

FL: . . . available for building, for what eventually became part of our retrenchment; that is, the 1971, 1972 retrenchment is, in part, trying to take over the declining resources then of federal monies under the Nixon Administration. We were starting the downtrend and the withdrawal. We had enormous grants in the late 1960s and early 1970s for adding medical students. I don't mean to say it was so separate that you could, say, we could have cut out the delivery of health care and still maintained a major medical college here because it was a matter of supply of doctors and so on. Dentistry had additional funds. Public Health had additional funds in those years of the Johnson Administration. From one point of view—I don't think Gerry, and I, and Don, and others really objected to the need for special emphasis on the Health Sciences—it was the sudden separation of academic promotion, and tenure, and budgetary matters away from what had been the central function of Central Administration to now a parallel health care delivery thing and the vice-president for Health Sciences which was created. Gerry and the rest of us understood that that was a temporary solution. Lyle French, I think you'll find, said that and he said it again when they were searching for his successor. There was no intent of his having a successor, that this was for the building of this Health Science complex.

CAC: I see.

FL: Inevitably, as we walked into the late 1960s and early 1970s, the major issue came over tenure, and appointments, and the separation of appointments in promotion and tenure in the Health Sciences as separate from the rest of the university. The rest of the university was building up the tenure code. It had been there for along time but it hadn't really been a central concern of the faculty. It was during the late 1960s and 1970s where we had added this enormous number of new faculty, and we'd added them rapidly, and we were adding them really as they were available, and using the probationary periods to sort out. What we now do is emphasize the fact that this is the most important thing we're doing in the university is this search and don't hire somebody that you're not sure of. In those days, you hired somebody and you had six years to go through probation.

CAC: Right.

FL: It was becoming true then that the crisis was over a lot of faculty who were marginal in the sense they weren't traditional sources of faculty; so, the problems with Paula Giese, and with a number of the temporary appointments, those that had come out of the activism of the 1960s and so on . . . questions started arising. We got into the judicial committee process and that extended much more into the period 1970 to 1978 but you can see its roots in the late 1960s. When it became clear that Academic Affairs didn't have all the say they think it should have had in rejecting or turning down appointments in the Medical School, and Agriculture, and so on, there had to be some resolution. I think the resolution was the autonomy and independence of the Health Sciences. Then, there were at that same time questions coming out of agricultural research, out of Agricultural Extension, under the Nixon Administration as to Academic Affairs

having too much authority over their appointments, their particular circumstances, and so on; so, it was almost a replay but in a much modulated tone and not up on the surface with the regents over the Agricultural vice-president. You know that came about under Moos, under Chase, after Gerry had left; that is, the deputy vice-president was a creation out of that particular sequence. Those are two illustrations of the tension building in Central Administration between the presidency and his first echelon of administrators.

The other was, I think, the building of the presidential office. [sigh] Morrill depended a lot on Wenberg . . .

CAC: Instead of Morrill Hall, you're talking about James Morrill?

FL: James Morrill . . . but there wasn't, basically, a presidential staff. Under Wilson, he had his own administrative assistant—Elmer Learn, Tommy Thompson were brought in—but as the university exploded in the 1960s and started doing all these other things, there was an absolute need; and it, I think, came to a point under Moos that it hadn't had under Morrill and Wilson that there were a lot of topics and it needed a lot of writing and it needed a lot of coding. Now, it may be that Moos was not attuned to that. What he'd been doing before was with foundations. He'd been a speech writer for [President Dwight D.] Eisenhower. He liked to think about things and he liked to conceptualize things but the university presidency in the late 1960s started pouring out stuff. There used to be anecdotes about Moos's attention span . . . that you'd go in to talk to him and if you didn't get it across in the first three minutes, forget it. If he was out looking out the window, and he was turning his eyes away from you, and he was looking at the *Wall Street Journal* and the *New York Times*, then his mind was in other places. We'd produce documents that took an awful long time to be processed out of the president's office before they were released because they needed the president's signature. That's where Don Smith made the shift, obviously, from Academic Affairs to administration and became the co-president, as I've put it. The last two years of Don's period here, then, were largely as assistant president; and it was a demand that the university in its new roles, in its involvement in all of these services to the state and to the community just had to have. The whole communiversities idea, although Moos adopted it and spoke to it and certainly believed in it, basically had to be conceptualized and written up not just by him—he couldn't do that—and all the other things that came up. All of Affirmative Action had to be structured in those last years of the 1960s.

CAC: Yes.

FL: Eidenberg and I wrote the first Affirmative Action document. Lillian Williams was brought in under Moos, under Don, because that absolutely was necessary at that time. I guess I'm maybe underestimating Moos in the sense that Wilson, and Morrill, and the presidents I knew were the source of a lot of things, while he had become much more the public relations figure, the one who dispensed what was being produced. The vice-presidents had been expanded also. Cashman had come in as Student Affairs. Wenberg, and [Stan] Kegler, and [George] Robb had expanded, of course, in Institutional Relations. Everybody was heavily dependent upon Wenberg.

He had been brought up under Morrill. Wilson tended to keep him in place and Wilson did his presentations to the legislature himself. When Moos came on, I think, it had shifted. The vice-presidents became as important as the president before the legislature.

Then, of course, the crisis of the Vietnam thing, the Cambodian thing. Just about half way through his term, the honeymoon was over. Moos was being questioned about decisions; whether they were his or not, he had to explain them. The crisis on campus which we had avoided over the Morrill Hall affair, did result in tear gas, and quarrels between Stenvig and the state, rock throwing, all this sort of thing. It was in that particular period where the faculty came in very strongly. I remember Eidenberg, and I, as well as others—after Don Smith had left and was on this [unclear] thing for a couple of years after he married Eileen—basically had to be the support for all these external things that were happening . . . explanations. Moos became, I think, more and more distant. I can't compare it with vice-presidential and presidential meetings now but the vice-presidents basically ran the university. Moos attended some of these sessions but he was not integral to the agenda and planning. I think the regents began to wonder at Moos's role then vis-à-vis vice-presidents, and began to question Moos, and to dig deeper, and ask him what he thought about affairs . . . how had these things started, and so on. That, obviously, is saying something about the nature of the Board of Regents, that it was becoming more and more involved in the day-by-day affairs and putting its hand down into the administration.

CAC: Because they perceived a kind of vacuum?

FL: [sigh] I'm not sure that that's true. It may be in the differences between the board under Wilson, the board under Moos, and who Wilson and Moos were. I don't think Meredith would have allowed the board to stick their hands down that far. He would have said, "You hired me. I'm running this," and so on. I don't think Moos ever said that. Moos was more disengaged. He wasn't that close. There was public criticism. There was certainly criticism on campus about Moos among the faculty . . . the lack of leadership and so on. The regents then began to ask Moos, "Are you really running things here?" That meant that Moos then had to take back some of the power and . . .

CAC: Oh, heavens.

FL: . . . sort of things that had slipped away. That's when I see the appearance of Moos replacing Smith and Shepherd before the legislature in particular. In the last biennium, where I was a participant, and Gerry was a participant, I think it was quite evident that Gerry was being pulled back, that Wenberg and Moos were going to be the front men. That was a change and the legislature knew it.

To be personal, I had decided that after my second three-year term, I was going to resign, that I wanted to get back to teaching since I'd been teaching, and I wanted to get back to my research which was becoming more important to me. I announced ahead of time that I would in the next fall, the fall of 1973, the 1973, 1974 year, not be coming back. I was interviewed by the *Daily*

and it appeared in the *Daily*. Moos never spoke to me but I was told afterwards that Moos was upset because he didn't know I was resigning but if he'd had control and knew about these things, that would have been known to him. I had told Gerry some time before that I didn't intend to go on. I don't know, and I really can't imagine, that I'm more than an illustration of that not knowing what's going on thing. The University College thing we talked about may be an aspect of that, where Moos was asked, "Why don't you keep track of these things? You don't seem to know what other people are saying."

[sigh] Then, it was during that legislative session that Gerry felt that it was not just an evolutionary withdrawing of him but they had come to some decision—the regents or a group of regents and Moos—to keep him out of it. He didn't present the materials to the legislature in the way he had before. There were some remarks about, he isn't the one to present this . . . we need somebody who can convince the legislature. Gerry, I think, saw the writing on the wall. I had not formally resigned because I had always considered it would be a three-year term. [sigh] So, Gerry, and Lloyd, and I decided we're not just going to dribble out, just erode away. We were going to make a statement and we wrote letters to the Board of Regents and, basically, made a proposal which we thought summarized the problems of internal management, that is, in a restructuring of the university, not in any specific terms, merely as a result of questions that had been raised. Wasn't there a better management system? Part of it was the multiplication of vice-presidents. I think at one time there were seven of them. We tended to veto each other and couldn't get anything done. We proposed that, essentially, there were two vice-presidents, Finance and Academic Affairs and that the other vice-presidents were really presidential staff; that is, we recognized the need for a presidential staff if the president was to be the top of this pyramid. We argued for considering provosts in the sense that one of the things that had arisen in the last three years of Moos's term were Duluth, and Morris, and Crookston, and Waseca being disadvantage in terms of salaries and so on; and that was, of course, the result of the retrenchment and reallocation. [There were] questions about the Twin Cities campus and its graduate and professional roles as against the non-graduate profession roles in the other places and were faculty in other places really, in terms of their vita, and their research, and so on, the equivalent? There still is criticism, of course, and it comes forward every two or three years that this Central Administration is not just a system. Central Administration is the Twin City administration and, therefore, there aren't clear lines of decision making; so, we faced up to that problem in our proposal. We also suggested, as is now happening, that there be clusters of deans. For example, there are certain colleges that have part of entry functions but it's not in just one college. CLA, for example, handles only about 60 to 70 percent of that. Shouldn't these colleges that have these same similar problems . . . shouldn't the deans act under, let's say, a dean of faculties or a lead dean, in working on policy? There's the graduate and professional programs. Shouldn't the professional schools, which are scattered through several colleges, essentially act among themselves in a policy sort of way to initiate and deal with those kinds of problems? So, we suggested a number of deans of faculties as an intermediate step. I'm just saying that it illustrates the kind of problems that had come up that we felt weren't being solved by further centralization of the presidency, unless you created a staff and then a system of rationality in between.

From what I hear—I don't think there's been any serious discussion about this amongst Gerry, Lloyd, and I, or other members of the faculty; so, I'm speaking sort of about impressions that I don't really have an inner sense on—the resignation of Shepherd, and Lofquist, and myself was later taken as the beginning of the removal of Moos.

CAC: Sure.

FL: That certainly was not our intent. In essence, we did not want to sort of individually disappear at different times. We wanted to make a statement and we were all leaving at the end of the academic year; so, we put it together in that fashion. We were told afterwards that at about the same time the regents were coming to the conclusion that things were not right . . .

CAC: And the Regents professors?

FL: Regents professors also separately . . . and that basically the message was made clear to Moos that he had to start looking for some other job. There was not time table set on that. They were not going to remove him immediately or surreptitiously and he had some time to do that; but that virtually all the regents had come to the that conclusion. I think once that had come about and we were leaving, then, the last year and a half of Moos that followed before Magrath became president was essentially a transition period. Hal Chase came in. Al Linck was picked by Chase and Shirley Clark. The only singular difference externally was the deputy vice-president for Agriculture that came out of that period.

CAC: And didn't function very well for very long?

FL: No. There wasn't much that I remember about Hal Chase in the sense of structural change. There were continuations of the planning program that we had gotten on in a sort of, let's set themes of the Search for Excellence and this sort of thing; but there, basically, wasn't a sharp change, other than these three personalities leaving . . . Don Smith before, Eidenberg in between and then Shepherd, Lofquist, and I all of a sudden—what appeared to be all of a sudden.

I think the only other thing I'd say is that after we resigned, what seemed to startle people the most is that we went back into the faculty.

CAC: Where else were you going to go? [laughter]

FL: I don't think people conceived of administrators as being able to go back into the faculty. All three of us went back.

CAC: Of course. You went back and picked up your ancient studies interest. We've been at this a long time, why we make that kind of concluding observation. Then, we may come back again but for this afternoon at least . . .

FL: Sure. As I say, I had a Middle Eastern interest as a graduate student, taught for a number of years in the 1950s and 1960s a course on the Middle East, and, then, had as one of my major interests, the historical geography of North America, and I had a graduate degree in history. I don't think you can teach the Middle East except from an historical, cultural viewpoint. All this stuff about oil, and water, and politics, and language, and religion really are not explainable except in looking at the continuity of culture and civilization. I had become interested all during the 1950s and 1960s—even though I didn't complete the degree—in going back periodically and looking into . . .

[End of Tape 4, Side 1]

[Tape 4, Side 2]

FL: . . . this sort of thing. Then in 1962, on my last trip to Turkey, Bill McDonald had found out that I had taken all the books on Greece, the Aegean, and western Anatolia out of the library.

CAC: [laughter]

FL: I was then working on a map of the Athenian Empire—tributeless—trying to do the same thing I had done with Herodotus's list. He came over and he had been looking for Philipson's maps in Peterman's [unclear] on the Peloponnesus, which were the only modern maps and they had been done in the late Nineteenth Century. He said, "Can you read maps?" [laughter] I said, "I think so." He said, "Look, if you're going to be in Turkey, why don't you come over to the Peloponnesus and look at some of the things we've been doing?" This was in November; so, I took the train from Istanbul to Salonika, and then down to Athens, and took the bus to Kalámai, and went out and looked at Pylos and Nestor's palace. McDonald had been authorized by Karl Blegen to explore the areas of Nestor's kingdom outside of the capital. Messenia and the west coast up to the Alfiós was part of that area. He knew that I was interested. From 1962 until 1969 then, we were doing surface surveys. We got the Greek air force to fly air photos. They weren't of the caliber to directly map things but they were very useful in the field because they gave us that picture that maps didn't. They were from about 5,000 feet; so, they had pretty good registration. We could pick out fields and so on. I had a couple of students who had gotten joint degrees. Bill Loy, who is now out at Oregon, did an Office of Naval Research survey of land use, and land forms, and environment under Bill and I. [Stanley] Aschenbrenner got a joint degree under Bob Spencer, Bill McDonald, and I on the anthropology of village settlements. We published our first volume then in 1972 on reconstructing a Bronze age environment, which was essentially those years from the late 1950s when Bill had first started out—I had joined him in 1962 . . . Herb Wright and a number of others—up until 1969. It was a team of about ten, twelve different disciplines trying to put together everything we could do with surface surveys information.

Then, Bill got the five-year excavation permit for Nekoria. We picked Nekoria because it seemed to be in the right place for a crossroads town, a provincial town. We felt pretty sure by

some of the test excavations we had done that this was not a monumental site. There wasn't going to be any palace . . . a few tombs around. So, we reemphasized the teamwork aspect and that we were going to do a social science dig. We did things like measure every damned piece of limestone on this site. It was an upper plateau peninsula leaning over the lower coastal plain. It had deep soil on it with some outcroppings but the outcroppings were of sandstone. Every piece of limestone on this had to be transported; so, we saved every piece of limestone, measured it, weight and volume, tried to figure out how many people were needed to do that over a given period of time. We did a very broad settlement, probably the largest dig ever in Greece and, certainly, the most resources in the sense of finance of any expedition. We did streets. We did buildings. We did residential areas. In other words, we weren't looking for the classical elite type of archaeology that had been done before. I think Bill is responsible for the revolution. There was a similar one going on in the Middle East with Jarmo and with some of the pre-urban settlements. Herb Wright had been a part of that and Oriental Institute. Braidwood done a lot of that and a guy by the name of Flannery had been involved. But we were the first ones to put it together in that way. The Messenia publications—we're now just about to publish the third volume of the second four-volume set—on the excavation proper, I think, have had enormous impact and influence. What I'd like to do is to, obviously, go back to Geography and do my historical geography and methodology but continue my hand in ancient studies.

CAC: Does the Messenia project still go on? Is Bill still active in that environment?

FL: No. The things that followed from it and the people that followed from it are still organized. That brings in the Center for Ancient Studies which was, essentially, a creation out of the field experience. You know in your own case in History that priorities within different disciplines change and when Tom Jones retired, we really didn't replace Ancient History so that that became a major element in a center at the graduate level that was to include Anthropology, Classics, Geography, History, Ceramic Engineering, Biology, [unclear] Studies. So, the Center for Ancient Studies, much like the History of Science and Technology, is responsible to the dean at Duluth, CLA, the graduate dean, IT, CDS [Cross-Disciplinary Studies]. It really is, I think, a framework that reflects Liberal Arts . . . that it's both arts and sciences. We had some spectacular early graduate students who are now getting their Ph.D.s and out working in numerous places that have carried on this team approach. Basically, this idea of reconstructing on the highest probability the whole settlement, the whole environment, not the pursuit of the temple, or the kingship, or the military aspect but really doing a broad social science, natural science thing . . . it's sort of a retrodictive planning operation. We're trying to find the most probable world given the limits of artifacts you'll get. You've got all these artifacts and you want to put behavior around it. You want to put motives, and attitudes, and beliefs; in other words, you want to write history.

CAC: It's really pre-history because you're all the way back to 1500 B.C., plus or minus.

FL: Pre-history in a technical sense but there can't be any pre-history.

CAC: Yes, I know.

FL: As long as you find the cultural artifacts, you have to imply a cultural process which must be historic in every sense of the term.

CAC: In that case, they antedate reliable literary documents, written documents?

FL: Yes. I've called it proto-history rather than pre-history because we obviously do have elements in Egypt, and in Crete, in the Hittites which must refer to peoples who were in Greece and situations in Greece.

CAC: That was such a strong field of Professor Jones and I never could understand why he wasn't part of the field project in Messenia.

FL: I don't know. Tom, I think, is much more of a teacher and a worker with graduate students than he is with other faculty.

CAC: Yes, [unclear] very lonely.

FL: His major interest had turned to [unclear] and [unclear] in Anatolia and the Near East rather than in Greece. Much of his research was more along the lines that [] has taken up . . .

CAC: [unclear]

FL: . . . aren't particularly Greek and Mycenæan in its context.

CAC: You're hopeful to get back to that project then.

FL: I think, and I've always thought that history and geography, are probably separated only by one paragraph being history and the next paragraph being geography . . . that there's no serious disciplinary boundary. What I've been doing in archaeology is as much geography as it is history.

CAC: Yes.

FL: What I've expanded it to is obviously a history on the humanities where the artifacts are not just skeletal, and metal, and architectural but they're myth, language, place names.

CAC: This kind of brings us aesthetically back perfectly to where we started four hours ago talking about your original interest in history and geography.

FL: Right. Yes.

CAC: Maybe, it's a good close parentheses—not that we don't have things still to talk about—I think probably for one long session. I've asked everyone after an initial, very often two hours and sometimes three—we've run nearly four—that as they consider important things that they were engaged with and we haven't touched upon it, you can start jotting them down, and I can come back for another session. This one is extraordinarily useful and I thank you very much.

FL: Thank you for asking.

[End of Tape 4, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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