

Edith Mucke

- Mucke comes back to University of Minnesota, Continuing Education for Women 1-8
 - Schletzer, Vera 2
 - Ross, Ralph - New Worlds of Knowledge 1-3
 - Anderson, Richard, psychiatry 3
 - encouragement to Continuing Education
 - master's teachers 2-
 - Berryman, John 3
 - Mucke gets her B.A., 1967 8
- Graduate School and American Studies and Mucke's assistantship in CEW 9
- Continuing Education for Women, 1970s 10-21
 - Roff, Louise 10
 - credit and non-credit courses 12
 - impact on women's psychology 13
 - courses in business settings 17-
 - Women in American Life course 19
- Women's Studies 21-24
- Equal Employment Office 25
- Counseling in CEW 26
- Land-Grant philosophy 27

Interview with Edith Mucke

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

**Interviewed on August 13, 1984
University of Minnesota Campus**

Edith Mucke - EM
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers doing an interview this morning with Edith Mucke, a person longtime associated with Continuing Education for Women [CEW] at the University of Minnesota and it's director in the mid 1970s. It is August 13, 1984. The conversation is being conducted in my office in room 833 of the Social Science Tower.

Edith, you've had a different kind of experience at the University of Minnesota from most of the persons I've talked with the last several months. You came back here as a student having taking some work earlier?

EM: Yes, I had a year at the university directly after my high school years. Then, because of the Depression, I dropped out of school a quarter of my sophomore year and went to business school so that I could earn a living, and pay my dental bills, and buy my own glasses, and get off my father's shoulders.

CAC: Bravo! Then, it was that work in business, and then marriage, and family; and then in 1960, you decided to come back?

EM: Yes. About 1959 or 1960, I read an article in the Minneapolis newspaper about Continuing Education for Women.

CAC: It was just barely getting started then. Wasn't 1959 or 1960 it's first year?

EM: Yes. At that time, they were writing articles about the liberal arts seminars, New Worlds of Knowledge—which I think was the first seminar offered in Continuing Education for Women—writing about "This is an open door for women who would like to come back to the university and get an education." I had reached a point in my life where I didn't know what was

ahead. One of my children was married. The other daughter was getting ready to go off to college and life looked pretty bleak to me. I came over to the campus and had an interview with Dr. [Vera] Schletzer, who was just getting started in the program at that time. It was an hysterical day. We've laughed a lot about it since. I had bowled in the morning, and I had taken a widow friend to lunch at noon, and then I thought, fifteen minutes from downtown will get me over here for a parking place.

CAC: [laughter]

EM: I've laughed about that a whole lot since because I now tell everybody the same thing that Vera told me one time, "I'll tell you, Ph.D.s are a dime a dozen around this place but the people who really count are those who have parking spot." I finally found a parking spot. It was a long way from Eddy Hall where I was to see Vera. I was wearing contact lenses and a hat—would you believe a hat? That's how long ago it was. The wind blew my hat off. The wind made the dust hurt my contact lenses and I was really wild. I thought, what in the hell am I doing over here? This is really crazy. What am I trying to prove? As the years went on, I was to say that many times. I arrived somewhat breathless in my high heeled shoes in Vera's office. After I had talked to her for about an hour, I came out of there feeling like I was walking on a cloud . . . just wonderful.

CAC: Beautiful.

EM: I felt I had a whole new life ahead of me. She talked a little bit about the liberal art seminars and said that usually these seminars had been planned for college educated people, and people who had been out of college quite some time, whose skills were really rusty, and who were bored, and probably would like to go back to work. This was a way of refreshing all their academic skills and bringing them the knowledge that they had missed in the last twenty or thirty years. She said, "This is really for people who have a college degree; but, I'm going to recommend that this would be a good thing for you to do." I walked out of there . . . never mind that I was wearing high heeled shoes, I felt like I was bouncing in my running shoes.

CAC: You reentered through CEW and not directly into a regular undergraduate program?

EM: No, not right away. I took the New Worlds of Knowledge seminar and that was one of the greatest things that ever happened to me.

CAC: Who was coordinating it that year?

EM: Ralph Ross who was the chairman of the Humanities Department at that time and a brilliant man and a very fascinating man. He knew how to relate to women my age. We all just adored him. I learned later that when [Elizabeth] Liz Cless was staffing these seminars, she not only tried to get someone who knew great deal about his subject and was, indeed, an expert in his subject, but also somebody whose personality would not be intimidated by these women—a

lot of these women were powerful women—and who knew how to relate to these people, and was also a very good teacher. That's the kind of staffing that we had at that time. Everybody was super.

CAC: Was the course really one of coordination on Ralph's part or did he have visitors in to talk about special fields?

EM: He had visitors. [John] Berryman was there the first year that I was there and [Mulford] Sibley was there. [Herbert] Feigl was there.

CAC: Oh, my. You had the cream.

EM: Yes, we had the cream of the crop. It really was the cream of the crop. I was doing a course for credit; so, I decided that I would do a paper on creativity. I was assigned a tutor. My tutor was Dick Anderson, Dr. Richard Anderson, who was, at that time, head of the Psychiatry.

CAC: Oh, of course.

EM: I'll tell you something really funny. I'm not sure that I've ever even told anybody this before. Just to show you how naive I was when I started working on this paper . . . I walked into a bookstore one day and I said, "I would like to buy the complete books of [Sigmund] Freud." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

EM: Well . . . I went to the library. I spent a whole lot of time in the Minneapolis Public Library and, believe me, I learned what was so terribly funny about that request. I worked very hard. I had a couple of different meetings with Dick Anderson, who was very helpful. He also was one of the lecturers in the seminar that year. After I had finally finished the paper and sent it over to him, I got a telephone call from him and he said that he'd like to have me come over. I thought, oh, dear God! I'm going to have to do that thing whole thing over again. I was scared to death. I got to his office—on time this time; I had, by now, learned how to take the bus or the streetcar in those days—and I walked into his office and he said, "Didn't you tell me that you'd only had one year of college?" I said, "Yes, that's right." He said, "I can't believe that anybody with only one year of college has written this paper. It's wonderful." You know how I felt. Then, he talked to me and said, "I don't know what your plans are for the future; but, I really think it's very important that you give up bridge, and bowling, and all the other things that you might be doing. You're free now,"—he knew enough about my situation at home—"and I think that you should come back to school on a full time basis and earn a degree. [sigh] Until then, I really hadn't seriously considered coming back to school. I walked out of there on air somewhat like the way I felt when I left Vera's office the first day. It was pretty complimentary. Then, he wrote a letter to Liz Cless, sent me a copy, and said, "We need this woman on campus. Call her and tell her that she's got to finish school because we can use her on campus and the

minute that she gets through school, she can get a job teaching in any of the junior colleges while she works on her master's degree." Times were different then than they are now.

CAC: Sure. There was a good market. They spotted talent.

EM: I did, indeed, then decide to come back to school and work for a degree. I was amazed to go down to the registrar's office and in five minutes get my transcript from thirty years earlier. It's probably better than they do what with all their computers.

CAC: Right.

EM: My daughter, by that time, had spent a year at Duke University; so, the next summer, the two of us came to summer school together. We registered together for a class in English Literature from Leonard Unger. He was in his heyday at that time and a wonderful teacher. I also took an anthropology course that year. My daughter, Jane, was swimming in the Aqua Follies; so, I drove over. Jane took two Econ[omics] courses plus the English course; she took Macro-Economics and Micro-Economics. The only studying that Jane did was on the drive over and the drive home. Then, she swam till all hours of the night. I studied like the devil. I studied really, really hard. If I had ever had a biology course, it was so long ago that I remembered nothing and I probably didn't ever have one. The Anthropology course was Cultural Anthropology and the names of all the animals were as many as twenty-six letters on the typewriter. The kind of a student I was, I had to learn how to spell all these names. I really worked hard and I got a *D* in the mid-quarter in Anthropology. I felt terrible. My children laughed and said, "Mother! that *D* may or may not be an indication of what you know about Cultural Anthropology; but, mother it's a wonderful lesson in humility and you can probably use it." [laughter] I did pull a *C* out of that course and I want to tell you, it's the biggest triumph on my whole transcript. Jane got an *A* in the English course. I got a *B*.

[telephone rings - break in the interview]

CAC: We had a brief interruption. We're back to English Literature and Anthropology. This, I imagine, lead to other exciting courses.

EM: Yes, and some interesting experiences. There were not as many older people in school at that time. My Anthropology professor made me feel really uncomfortable. He looked at me one day and he said, "I don't know what you're doing here. You don't carry a briefcase and you're not wearing the right kind of shoes for a teacher." He made me feel that I was taking a place of a younger student. On the other hand, Professor Unger would say things such as, "I don't think that you students can remember this but what John Donne is saying in this poem is something like a song, 'Did You Ever See a Dream Walking?'" Then, he looked at me and winked. So, that was fun.

CAC: [laughter]

EM: I was seriously working for a degree now; so, I surmounted whatever obstacles there were. I learned how to take the bus.

CAC: How many courses could you take a quarter when you started back seriously?

EM: I didn't do it very quickly. I took about two or three courses a quarter . . . maybe two most quarters.

CAC: In the meantime, is Vera Schletzer advising you on the courses to take?

EM: Yes.

CAC: If you can start out with Dick Anderson, and Ralph Ross, and Leonard Unger, how do you sustain that? Did you?

EM: I eventually learned that all of the teachers on this campus are not the calibre of some of the people that were in New Worlds of Knowledge.

CAC: But you got good advice? For the most part, these courses were rewarding in different ways?

EM: When I set up my program, once I had decided what my degree would be in—that was humanities and that was an easy decision—I had a very good advisor in a young man named [Lynn] Loudon, who is no longer here. I think his name was Ralph; but, I'm not sure. He was very good. He advised me which professors were good. The first winter quarter when I first came back seriously, I was very fortunate. I had a Humanities I class with a young woman from Turkey named Oya Kaynor. Do you remember her?

CAC: By reputation . . . I didn't know her.

EM: Oh, she was great. She had a very large class, like maybe 150 students. In Humanities I, she had a lot of students who were forced to take this class because it was required . . . a lot of medical students, a lot of social workers, who really didn't want to be there. I was sitting there with my eyes wide open and thinking every word that came out of her mouth was a pearl of wisdom. One day, after passing out the mid-quarter exams, she asked me to stand up and she said, "I want you all to look at this woman." My face was bright red. She said, "Her hair is graying. She got the highest grade in this class because she knows that this is very important material and I wish that you, too, would take a lesson from her." [laughter]

CAC: That made you popular.

EM: I could have gone through the floor; but, of course, I loved her. I had some really good teachers. I had some good advice. Then, my second Humanities class was with Roy Swanson. Believe me, that was a happy day.

CAC: So many have said that. Could you say more about what the spark was there and why he reached so many people?

EM: There was nothing about Roy Swanson, as far as his students were concerned . . . he had no arrogance. He had a great deal of humility and, yet, it was perfectly obvious all the time that he knew a lot more than most people do. I learned later that when he decided to come back to school for a graduate degree, he had to go to evening classes because he was probably teaching; although, I'm not sure what he was doing. Because of his schedule, he really had no choices for his major; so, he went into Classics. You learn a lot in Classics. He also knew Greek. One of the fascinating things about him was that he could explain the most difficult things in simple language. After taking Humanities II from him, or whatever we called it in those days, I then had four more classes from Roy Swanson. I took a number of courses in Classics simply because he was teaching it.

CAC: He was active in Continuing Education, was he not?

EM: Yes, eventually he coordinated New Worlds of Knowledge, I think; but, that was after I had graduated.

CAC: The qualities you're suggesting are transferrable to different kinds of classroom settings.

EM: Right. One of the most interesting things about going back to school—I suppose younger students find this, too—is that I was always saying in a class, "Oh, I should have had this class before I had the last class because it relates so well." I know now that no matter how you do it, it always works this way.

CAC: You say that Humanities was a logical and a natural kind of major. Why is that? There are twenty-five things that would have been logical for you to do.

EM: First of all, I had absolutely no idea that I would ever be working. I didn't have to worry about marketable skills. I didn't even know if I'd ever finish the degree. I was going to school simply because this was the most fun thing to do that I could think of. There was nothing that I would rather do than go to school. I felt that I would be happy to go to school forever. I know now that's true. [laughter] It's interesting to remember now that before I had ever responded to the news paper article about Continuing Education for Women, I'd spent some time watching Jack Ludwig do television courses. You might remember that he was with the Humanities Department.

CAC: Oh, yes.

EM: I was intrigued by that material. I guess it was at that time that I went to the bookstore and asked for the complete Freud. Then, after the class with Oya Kaynor and Roy Swanson, I was positive that Humanities was the place.

CAC: Because it reached out to things.

EM: This was the kind of stuff I was really interested in. What is life all about? What is the meaning? Is there a God?

CAC: Big questions done well.

EM: That's right.

CAC: This is where you pick up Berryman again?

EM: Yes. Certainly one of the highlights of my whole undergraduate and graduate program was classes with John Berryman. His genius is something that's very hard to talk about; but, in a classroom of 200 or 300 students . . .

CAC: Oh, my, I didn't know he had classes that size.

EM: Oh, yes, and he hated it. He really hated it; but, he was so popular. I would venture to say that there wasn't a woman and not very many men in that whole classroom that wouldn't have been willing to help dear John walk down the aisle or take very good care of him. We loved him so much. We used to suffer for him. He would often walk down the aisle of that very huge auditorium in that terrible classroom building. It was a science classroom with faucets and things at the front of it.

CAC: Oh, yes, probably over in Botany.

EM: He hated it and he made terrible remarks about all technology. He didn't want to have anything to do with it. He came in reeking of alcohol, looking like a derelict, perspiration pouring down his face, unkempt. We all just sat there. I think sometimes it was the sheer will of the students sitting in that classroom that brought the guy down to the podium . . . 300 people, 200 people saying "Please, God let him make it." When he got back of that podium and he started reading *Don Quixote* to us, it didn't make any difference if John Berryman did anything other than simply read because the way he did it was so wonderful. I've seen him stand there reading *Don Quixote* with the tears rolling down his face and then, at another time, getting absolutely cracked up with laughter about something else. I remember the things that he taught me. I have a fondness for everything I read with him. Now, if the curriculum said that you were to read, oh say, [Jean Jacques] Rousseau in the class and John didn't really want to spend much time on that, we were assigned the readings and he talked about it a half an hour sometime.

CAC: Did you have him in smaller classes later? Did you ever have him for Poetics?

EM: No, I never did. I was privileged enough to be in a small class with Allan Tate.

CAC: Oh, my.

EM: We did southern regional writers. I wrote a paper on Flannery O'Connor for him. I feel that that was a great privilege . . . such a gentleman, a great southern gentleman. It was hard not to love Professor Tate. One day I was standing in the hall in the English Department waiting to see Professor [Edward] Griffin and Professor Tate came along and said, "Hey! what are you doing standing there? Come on in and visit with me." So, I came in his office and we started visiting about small things. Then, he started to chuckle and he said, "I want to tell you the most exciting thing."—this was his last marriage remember and he was not a young man—"We're going to have a baby at our house and I have just had the most glorious time telling my daughter." That was really fun because he was just having such a great time. He was so proud of himself.

CAC: He was probably in his sixties by then?

EM: Oh, he was, yes.

CAC: Any other high points of your training, your program as an undergraduate? How long did it take you, eight, nine years, to get the degree?

EM: No. I had enough credits in 1967. I graduated in 1967. I could have graduated a quarter before I did; but, I didn't want to stop going to school. [laughter]

CAC: But then, you had the opportunity to go to American Studies, right?

EM: I was really depressed about having to graduate because I didn't really think about Graduate School. I had been in an Honors seminar with Robert Ames . . . a Humanities seminar. He said, "Now you're going to graduate. What are you going to do?" I said, "I don't know. Maybe I'll just take some more classes." He said, "I suggest that you go to Graduate School. If you want to go to Graduate School, you can have a teaching assistantship in the Humanities Department." Then, [John] Clark was in the English Department and he heard I was going to go to Graduate School and he said, "Do you want to teach Freshman English?" Times were really different. Then, Louise Roff, who was director of Continuing Education for Women at that time and with whom I had been in touch . . . I kept on taking some of the stuff that was offered in Continuing Education . . .

CAC: These courses were transferrable to your regular program?

EM: Yes, everything in Continuing Education for Women was always transferrable to the regular transcript. She suggested that if I was going to be in Graduate School, maybe I'd like to work

for Continuing Education for Women. By that time, I had decided that I would go into American Studies; so, I knew Mary Turpie, one of the great pillars of the American Studies Department and a more kindly soul, we never knew. I talked with her about what shall I do, Mary? Shall I go into the Humanities Department, which I think would be really fun but you know I've never taught, or should I teach Freshman English which would be pretty easy to teach, or should I do the Continuing Education for Women thing? There was no question in Mary's mind. She thought I should do the Continuing Education for Women thing; so, I started working there as a graduate student from 1967, when I graduated, until 1970, when I had a master's degree in American Studies. Then, by that time, my husband had retired and one of the questions that I had when I was an undergraduate student was when Paul retires, I may not want to keep on doing this. I don't know what his plans will be and I don't know what the future holds. However, by the time he retired, I was already working full time for Continuing Education for Women and this seemed to work out very well. Not only did he not put any pressure on me to stop working, I think it's fair to say that he encouraged it.

CAC: Very good.

EM: I like to think about how far he came from when I first started school.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

EM: He viewed this with some tolerance, with some amusement, and did, indeed, one time make the remark, "I don't know why you're pushing yourself so hard. Why can't you just work in the hospital and do volunteer work like lots of other women do?" I also remember that when I was planning some of my schedules as an undergraduate student, I said to Vera one time, "I know that I don't want to leave home until Paul has gone to work in the morning and I certainly want to be home when he comes home." However, we reached the point where Paul was leaving the house earlier to give me a ride downtown to catch a bus to the campus and then, as I just said, when he had retired and when I was working full time, it was great that I was working full time . . . a wonderful role reversal . . . I'm sure one of the earliest. He's always liked to cook. I think he enjoyed having the house to himself. It didn't all happen at once; but, he did finally get to the point where he did all the marketing, got lunch for the cleaning lady, and fixed dinner five nights out of the week.

CAC: In the meantime, his support of you tended toward pride in what you were doing?

EM: Definitely; although, he didn't ever tell me this. There were a couple of people that worked in his office who told me that he used to talk a lot about me at the office and say, when somebody's wife had a nervous breakdown or somebody got divorced, "Too bad she didn't go back to school like my wife did."

CAC: Beautiful. You say you were working full time. Certainly, it must have been part time at CEW when you were doing your graduate work in American Studies for the MA [Master of Arts]?

EM: Right.

CAC: Put together it was full time?

EM: Paul retired in 1969 and I graduated in 1970. I was working full time shortly after that.

CAC: In one fashion or another, you had six or seven years working with Louise Roff in various capacities, first as a graduate assistant, and then as assistant director, and so forth. Tell us a little something about CEW with Louise. Let me say what the purpose of my question is. A lot of the archival material and reports will indicate what kinds of courses were there and numbers of students. That kind of material is down there. What is unclear, as one reads it, is how one goes about building a program, where she gets her ideas, whom the program consults, how staff is recruited, how did the program decide to do a seminar in this rather than in something else and to select a person to do it?

EM: From the very beginning, when I came to work as a graduate student for Louise Roff, we had a glorious team. It was the beginning of something that really was just fun for both of us all the time. Louise was a very creative person. She did not have a master's degree and this troubled her because she felt, to some extent, as though she didn't have the qualifications that she should have. She was very creative. She was very hard working. She had the kind of wonderful creative mind that is often talked about in creativity where you're not organized and you're not disciplined but you're really letting that right hand brain take over. With Louise, there was always a lot of free association. She came up with wonderful ideas. Since, I had been in school and was in classes at that time, I got to know a lot of the instructors, and was able to approach them on doing things for Continuing Education for Women, and knew which people were good which people were not good. The two of us had lots of fun brainstorming. We had lots of ideas that came from our own brainstorming, our own reading. Louise still is a woman who has interests that run in all kinds of different directions. She's a very brilliant woman. She's a great reader. She's very interested in politics, but also interested in philosophy, and humanities, and mathematics, and kinds of education. She's married to a psychologist and knew a lot about psychology. A lot of our ideas came from our own brainstorming. We also got ideas from students. We did a lot of evaluations and talked to students. In those days, Louise and I knew practically every student in Continuing Education for Women. We had the time and the opportunity to go to a lot of the classes ourselves. The program was small; so, between us, we covered some parts of all the classes that we had.

CAC: Firsthand . . .

EM: Yes, firsthand meeting with the students. Also, between us, we knew a lot of the professors and professors were very excited about the experience that they were having with these older students. As a result of that, professors often came to us with ideas. I know that you had a lot of good ideas and that you came to us and said, "Let's try this." You will remember the Generation Gap Seminar that you and I did in the 1960s where we had all those young people and all those old people who decided there wasn't any generation gap at all.

CAC: As I recall, the strategy there was to let young people talk to older persons who were their parents' ages but were not their parents.

EM: Right.

CAC: And vice versa . . . the parents could talk to young people who were not their own children.

EM: Yes.

CAC: There was a lot of non-credit things like that, right?

EM: Right.

CAC: That was not a credit course. That was just kind of a work experience.

EM: So often when we did things like that, Clarke, we'd have spinoffs. I was thinking the other night when I heard on the tube that it was ten years since [President Richard] Nixon had carried on about Watergate . . . remember, we had that seminar at Prescott [Wisconsin] that Joanne Arnaud . . .

CAC: Oh, yes. It was the summer of 1974.

EM: It was just before Nixon resigned. I remember you came into my office one day and said, "I think we ought to do something about the political situation. If we plan this for fall, God knows what Nixon is going to be doing about that time." We really hit it. Remember that?

CAC: Sure. I think this can be a conversation for a minute. What you're saying is correct. There were a lot of faculty who found it an attractive opportunity to work with older persons who were not in a traditional night school setting so that you could design a course. You could design a weekend that would center on issues that were important to yourself but in which the students were not there for credit but really there to engage in a real discussion. Some of the best learning that I engaged in was through CEW rather than Continuing Education generally and night school; although, I did that, too.

EM: A wonderful example of what you're talking about now is the seminars that we had with Sibley on Utopia. We did a number of retreat weekends and also classes on Utopia with Sibley. This was really fun because we had community leaders who were interested in politics and working in politics. When the program first started, the women that came into it were people from Kenwood, Lake Minnetonka, some from Edina . . .

CAC: People we used to know as "Rusty Ladies".

EM: Right, right. Whatever else you might want to say about these people, they didn't have to go to work, we weren't looking for jobs, or we weren't updating our education for any financial reasons. These people were, after all, community leaders. Whatever else people said about them, they followed in their footsteps; so, that it did, indeed, become the *in* thing to do to take a class.

CAC: Some of these classes were for credit and some were not?

EM: Yes. From the very beginning, the liberal arts seminars were for credit. That was nine credits. You had to register for the whole year. You had to take it all three quarters to get the credit. A lot of teachers finally did that to update their teaching certifications.

CAC: Right. When you and Louise were working together, this six or seven years, there was a rough balance between credit and non-credit, between informal weekend retreats, and workshops, and so forth?

EM: Yes.

CAC: But then, you kept a core of those courses for credit which often ran fall, winter, spring in sequence? So, you had kind of a rough balance between?

EM: Yes. The growth of the program actually was when we got into doing more credit things because, as the times changed and the women's liberation movements—I say movements because you're taught me to say movements—made it easier for women to come back to school, then, we did have to get into more credit courses because we had more women who did not have college degrees and were working for college credit.

CAC: And really had vocational or career objectives?

EM: Yes.

CAC: This would begin to happen approximately in the late 1960s and early 1970s? There's a gradual shift in emphasis?

EM: Yes, mid 1970s maybe.

CAC: That late?

EM: Yes, where we really got to concentrating more heavily on the credit classes. I'd say mid 1970s.

CAC: By this time, you're director of the program?

EM: In 1974. I want to say this. The wonderful thing about when Louise and I were running everything . . . we had a very small staff. When I started as a part time help for the department, there was only Louise and one secretary. Then, in 1970, when I went to work full time, we had two full time people and one secretary. About a year later, we got another half time secretary. We did everything. We designed brochures. We took care of all the advertising. We wrote the news releases. We planned the classes. We went and sat in on some of the classes. We hired the instructors. We took care of the payroll. We did everything. The wonderful memory I have of those halcyon days really is that it was such fun. Neither one of us had any ambition to do anything other than what we were doing. Our only ambition was for the program. We had no personal ambitions at all. It's impossible to find very many people today who aren't interested in climbing the ladder, who aren't aggressive and ambitious to get on with their lives, and get someplace where they can make more money, where they can have more status. Louise and I had been there; that is to say, we had been at the point where we had stood—if I really want to be dramatic—at the abyss and said, "What else is there in life? There must be more in life than this." So, when women came to our office, sat across our desks, and said, "There must be more in life than this," with tears rolling down their cheeks, we knew what they were talking about. When women came in and said, "There's money for a second car. There's money for a second television set; but, there's really not any money for me to come back to school," our hearts ached for these women because we had been there. We understood where they were coming from and what their problems were and we just wanted to be able to do everything we could for those women.

CAC: You begin in the mid 1970s to do courses close to the psychology of the women's movements, did you not? Assertiveness courses, math anxiety courses . . . these came in the mid 1970s? Again, you have a division here? A lot of those were not for credit but really to gear up.

EM: It's interesting that while Louise was still director, she was very interested in mathematics. We both knew Elizabeth Reed, a scientist who had done a lot of work around here.

CAC: But, could never have a full career because her husband . . .

EM: Could never have a full career because her husband Sheldon had a full time position here.

CAC: Nepotism rules in those days.

EM: Right . . . which, you might remember, kept [Eleanor] "Sis" and Stu[art] Fenton from getting married.

CAC: I don't know that story. [laughter]

EM: Louise knew that women needed something in math; so, we had a few math refresher courses but really never got them off the ground. What I learned from the need for math from her never really left my mind; so, that after I was director, and when I was allowed to hire another person, and before I hired Margie Matheson, I made it one of the recommendations of that position that whoever got that job would be saddled with the chore of setting up the Math Anxiety Program. That was really popular when we started it—still is.

CAC: In the mid 1970s is another range. It's not only the credit and the non-credit; but also, there are these courses designed to empower or to open opportunities for women who are interested in career and vocation?

EM: And, of course, it's not news to you and it isn't news to anybody in the whole wide world at this point that one of the things women really needed was self-esteem. Women felt really guilty about spending any of the family's money for education. Children need things. We need things for the future. We have kids going to college. Jimmy needs a new bicycle. Mother's education money was really low on the list. After the women's movement . . . some wonderful things happened as a result of that. Women began to realize that they didn't have to feel guilty about going back to school or spending money to go back to school, and finally, more than that, they realized that they had a responsibility to manage their own lives. One of the greatest things about the women's movement is that finally lady, woman, girl, you better take the responsibility for your own life. You can't be dependent on somebody else emotionally, financially, or in any other way.

CAC: This had a reflection in the program?

EM: Yes. The program grew by leaps and bounds. It was really fun for me. It was a great privilege for me to be there at the time when Continuing Education for Women was very popular. Then, having been one of the first programs established in the United States, we had all kinds of people come to see us and ask us how to start programs. It was fun.

CAC: Minnesota was one of the first in the country, was it not?

EM: It was *the* first. It was done on Carnegie Corporation money. They funded Radcliffe, Lawrence, and Minnesota. It just happened that we got ours off the ground first. All of the programs are different; but, we're a model for a lot of programs.

CAC: Your own connection was very serendipitous in timing that you come in as a graduate assistant in the late 1960s when things are really breaking loose and then when this other opportunity [unclear] women's liberation in the 1970s, you're the director.

EM: Luck.

CAC: What a really wonderful chance crossing of the right person at the right time.

EM: Yes, right time, right place . . . good luck.

AC: In the meantime, CEW had to be self-sustaining within Continuing Education however . . . or is that true of all divisions?

EM: No, that's not true of all divisions. Most of the budgets that I prepared—I was director for nine years—the first seven years that I was director . . . we had to be approximately 70 percent to 85 percent self-supporting. That meant that we had to take in enough money in fees and tuition to pay our salaries, the instructional costs for the professors and instructors . . .

CAC: About all you got was overhead? You didn't have to pay rent on your office?

EM: We didn't have to pay rent; but, we had to pay for our own typewriters and our own stationery . . .

CAC: All your supplies and equipment? This was not true of other divisions within CEE [Continuing Education and Extension]?

EM: Oh, some of them. It makes a difference what division it is. For instance, community programs in CEE didn't have to take in any money because they were serving the underprivileged people.

CAC: I see.

EM: The World Affairs Center was never self-supporting.

CAC: This meant that you had to have support from associates and good friends within CEE to move ahead with them and to accomplish what you needed to accomplish?

EM: Yes. I felt that I really had a great deal of support from the dean in CEE . . . all of the deans, from the executive committee in Continuing Education and Extension. Hal Miller, "Sis" Fenton, Barbara Stuhler, Gerry Klement, Don Woods all supported Continuing Education for Women heartily. I had to sometimes go and fight hard for my budget; but, I guess everybody fights really hard for money.

CAC: Was there a real gender difference in the support you had? You mention three women and several men. Did that make any difference?

EM: I don't think so.

CAC: The same thing would be true of your staff recruitment? You were using men and women alike?

EM: Right.

CAC: Those who were sensitive to the needs of the students you were working with?

EM: Yes. One of the interesting things is that most all of the instructors that we had—I guess it's fair to say that it might be even more true of the full professors who had been on campus for a long time than for some of the other people—loved teaching our classes. Jonathan Paradise and the man in the History Department that went to Wisconsin, Bob Berkhover . . .

CAC: He went to Michigan.

EM: . . . loved teaching our classes. Berkhover was another man that reminded me of Roy Swanson and Professor Sibley in that they had such a wide range of knowledge. They could talk about art history, philosophy, and bring all of that together. I should say that another highlight of my education, both undergraduate and graduate, was Norm Canedy in Art History.

CAC: Ah, yes. You were selecting . . . or persons selected themselves and came to you as you were suggesting earlier?

EM: Yes.

CAC: You were talking earlier about the partnership that you had with Louise from 1967 to 1974. From 1974 till your retirement, you had to carry this on your own. The staff was much larger. You spoke of a very small staff earlier, a lot of informality, everybody doing everything. As the program grew in numbers of students, size of staff, were there changes in internal procedure, and how you recruited staff, and set up new courses, etcetera?

EM: We grew so that at one time we had ten people in the department.

CAC: Ten full time regular office staff?

EM: Two of those people, when we had ten, were half time.

CAC: But, that's a large staff.

EM: That's a lot of people.

CAC: Right. It really made you more of a manger? It gave you less time to do these other fun things?

EM: Oh, yes. It meant that there were a lot of classes. I certainly couldn't be out there in the field talking to students very often and I didn't know as many of the instructors individually because I had other programmers programming those classes. Until the last couple of years, when we made a big push to add a lot of business classes for women who were wanting management classes, we did always manage to operate as one family unit; that is, we sat around the table and brainstormed for ideas with the secretaries who had many good program ideas. I think one of the things that distinguished Continuing Education for Women from every other department was that our secretaries were an integral part of our planning program. They were the people who talked to students on the telephone. They knew a lot of the problems the women had because they listened to them on the telephone. I made a great effort to impress upon anybody who answered the phone in my department that the telephone was the most important part of this as far as our students are concerned, and you must listen, and you must not be impatient.

CAC: You're also describing a style or a strategy that we associate with sisterhood at its best in the 1970s, that is a real responsiveness, not a reliance on hierarchy but on group and discussion.

EM: Right. We did work that way, too. I only had one programmer who ever objected to helping collate if that was necessary. It was sometimes necessary at the last minute to get a lot of material together. One programmer said to me one day, "I did not get a Ph.D. to stand here and pick up pieces of paper." I got mad and in a very nasty way I said, "On the other hand, just think of what you're getting paid to run around this table and pick up these pieces of paper."

CAC: [laughter]

EM: It was a great team effort. It worked. It really worked. It can work.

CAC: You began to do work in business settings also in the mid to late 1970s?

EM: Yes.

CAC: Where would that initiative come from . . . from the businesses or from your office?

EM: Oh, it started with our office. Actually, I got the idea one day . . . what do all the clerks at Dayton's do at noon? What do all those dental hygienists and the people that work in the doctor's offices do during their noon hour downtown? Why don't we do some things during the noon hour so they don't have to go out and spend their money. They can spend their money with

us and learn something. It seems to me it would add another dimension to their life that would be really good. Before Margie Matheson came to work, we started what we called the Brown Bag School. I was wrong. The clerks at Dayton's, and the hygienists in the offices, and those women working as salesgirls at Woolworth's didn't really want to come to very many classes. We didn't get that audience; but, we did find that we were getting women from some attorney's offices. We were getting a couple of women from Honeywell. We realized then that that was the clientele we were going to have to serve. These were women who wanted classes in assertiveness training, learning how to get along with their male colleagues, classes in personnel management, or classes in communication. I had one programmer who worked solely on classes for people that were employed.

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: In the outreach to the community, I assume that you came to build an advisory committee of persons in the community to advise in a more formal way on strategy?

EM: Yes, we had an advisory board. It wasn't a very active advisory board and it was a rather informal affair because almost anyone who expressed a desire to be on that committee and come over to campus once every quarter and give us ideas was welcome to come. We had a lot of students that were, as we got larger, going to day school who had ideas for instructors. They gave us ideas for courses and classes. They helped us get ideas for various locations in which we might have the classes. As time went on, we had classes in various locations, in libraries and so on. That advisory board also helped us raise money for the scholarship fund that was set up when Louise Roff retired. One of Louise's greatest concerns and a great sorrow was—I touched on this earlier—the women whose husbands could find money for everything else but there simply was no money for the women to go to school. These were women whose financial assets were such that there would be no way that they could get any scholarships that were based on need; so, when Louise Roff was retiring, we set up a scholarship fund, the Louise Roff Scholarship Fund. It wasn't a simple matter. I think I talked to two people at the Foundation, the university attorney, the financial people. It was wild. We finally got this fund set up and it was to be used only for Continuing Education for Women classes. It was not based on need.

CAC: Although, in fact, as I recall, some people who were in need did qualify for scholarships?

EM: Oh, yes. You could be needy but it wasn't one of the requirements. The requirement was that you should have demonstrated some real seriousness about your educational objectives. That's been a really good thing.

CAC: It moved it away, in some small part, from the "Rusty Lady" image.

EM: Right. There were a lot of people who really objected to the "Rusty Ladies." I never did because I remember with delight the day that I came into Berryman's class when we were reading *Pilgrim's Progress*. He announced to the class in no uncertain terms, "I have just come from teaching the 'Rusty Ladies' seminar. 'Rusty Ladies' . . . don't you believe it," just like they were all out of Bryn Mawr.

CAC: [laughter]

EM: I never objected to the term "Rusty Ladies;" but, lots of people did. We did, in time, change the name.

CAC: I remember students in my classes who were AFDC [Aid to Families with Dependent Children] mothers, for example.

EM: Oh, yes, we had a lot of them. Those women usually didn't have Louise Roff scholarships. They had scholarships based on need.

CAC: I see. Even before Women's Studies, as a part of the regular Arts College curriculum, came into existence, CEW was really doing a lot of the work that would then anticipate or lead into Women's Studies?

EM: Oh, Clarke, don't you remember that as a result of a lot of the work that you were doing in Ideas in America . . . I attended a lot of those meetings . . . you were insightful enough to see what was coming. As a result of the conversation that we had in some of those Ideas in America seminar, it was your idea that we should do something on women in America. So, we set up a three-quarter seminar or a two-quarter seminar on Women in America. It was accredited under American Studies. That was very successful. I remember this very cold February day when you and I went over and made a presentation to Dean [William] Gardner [College of Education] and [Lorraine]"Sunny" [Sundquist] Hansen because we wanted to do it in the summertime. We thought it would be wonderful for teachers. We came up with a class that was called Status and Role of Women in America with an education rubric. Remember that?

CAC: Oh, indeed.

EM: That was very successful. We did that for a number of years.

CAC: Yes, we did that three or four years.

EM: Yes.

CAC: That kind of illustrates the kind of partnership you were talking about because it was logical for persons like myself to go to you to say, "Wouldn't this be a good idea?" and you were

not only a facilitator but one who made substantial contributions to the structure, the form, the content, the instructors for the course. We did that how many summers?

EM: I think we must have done five years.

CAC: If this is a conversation, which it has to be because I'm a subjective participant as well as a cross-examiner, that was some of the most exciting teaching that I did.

EM: Oh, it was wonderful.

CAC: I think that many must have had that experience of wanting to do something and having a place to go where it would be done quickly and generously rather than cautiously, and prudently, and with all kinds of negativism.

EM: Another professor, with whom I worked in the same kind of way, was Dick Hay^e who also had a lot of ideas.

CAC: Bravo.

EM: He came up with some wonderful ideas. His greatest concern was relationships. He said that most all of the problems people have are relationship problems. He said, "I sometimes feel. Edith, that I don't want to teach anything that doesn't have to do with relationships because that's what I know something about." We came up with a seminar that was called the Art of Well-Being that also had some spin-offs just like Women in America did. I think that the Women in America Seminar that we did and the Status and Role of Women were certainly forerunners of the Women's Studies program.

CAC: Before we get into that, I wish that I'd—you've expressed this wish before also—kept a journal in these days which we were so exciting, educationally, academically, and delightfully culturally in every way. It was in an Ideas in America course, when we had spent a morning on Emerson and particularly the essay on self-reliance, that it came to me, and probably from what the women were saying in that course, that Emerson's admonitions dealing with self-reliance were in the 1830s and he certainly was speaking to men. His women were not expected to be self-reliant—although, many of them were. The message was a male message and here we were teaching it to women. I just wish I knew chronologically when that was because it was one of those turning moments in my own intellectual and cultural life. I'm sure that it was at that point that you and I talked about doing the Women in America.

EM: I remember when we put Emily Dickinson into Ideas in America. I think, if I remember correctly, that you came to most of those sessions and that there was a lot of conversation after Emily Dickinson about women, too.

CAC: Was Toni McNaron the one who did that the first time?

EM: No, the person who did Emily Dickinson for us the first time was that woman teacher in St. Louis Park.

CAC: Marjorie Bingham?

EM: Marjorie Bingham.

CAC: For heaven's sake. I'd forgotten that because we used Toni later.

EM: I haven't mentioned Toni anywhere in this conversation. Toni was always a great supporter of Continuing Education for Women and one of the people who always brought in a lot of students . . . a great asset to our program. I knew Toni well before they started talking about Women's Studies.

CAC: Probably when Women's Studies begin to be talked about as a viable opportunity in the Arts College in the late 1960s, early 1970s, your office, Louise Roff's program, had more understanding and more experience than any other place on campus.

EM: Oh, I suspect that that's true.

CAC: Was this experience drawn upon? Where did the initiative come for Women's Studies? I know you were involved on the various committees. You were EEO [Equal Employment Opportunity] officer for the program?

EM: There were a number of students, English Department students, Psychology students, Sociology students, American Studies students . . .

CAC: Graduate students . . . or not?

EM: They were undergraduate and graduate students who, I remember, came and talked with me. My first reaction—to be perfectly honest—was I don't really know why we need another Women's Studies rubric. After all, Clarke and I have been doing Women in America for a long time. We're meeting that need. Eventually, I was convinced, as were a lot of other people, that that was a need. Shall we talk about how it was started?

CAC: Sure. You're suggesting that it was student initiative early on that saw that need?

EM: Yes, I know it was.

CAC: That's interesting.

EM: I remember the petitions that came around.

CAC: Heavens.

EM: A number of students came and talked to me and I simply listened really. You can understand I was very jealous for my own department. I didn't want anybody to take over what I thought I was already doing, what we were doing in our department.

CAC: Sure.

EM: I guess I've always had some ambivalent feelings about . . . I thought women should be taken care of in all the various departments. Actually, I was not as convinced of the need for Women's Studies at that time as I later became. I did, indeed, spend quite some years thinking that it would self destruct if it served its purpose. We haven't reached that point yet.

Roger Page appointed a committee then—I was on that committee—to find a director for Women's Studies.

CAC: A director even before there was a program?

EM: A director for Women's Studies and there would be a couple Women's Studies courses.

CAC: But, the committee preceded the courses? Or the search for a coordinator preceded the establishment of course curriculum.

EM: I think that's right. I know that I was on that big Women's Studies committee.

CAC: Who chaired that committee?

EM: Maybe we didn't have a Women's Studies committee first. Maybe what we had was a search committee to choose the director. I don't remember whether there was a big Women's Studies committee first and from that we had a search committee or whether the search committee came first. I was on both of them.

CAC: Who chaired those committees?

EM: Adelle Donchenko chaired the search committee. I was on it . . . Adelle, Andrea Hinding, a young woman from Psychology, whose name I've forgotten. We hired Toni McNaron to be the first director. I believe she had a three-year term.

CAC: That would have been the usual at the college . . .

EM: Although, I'm not absolutely positive.

CAC: I'm interviewing her next week so I'll get that. Toni continued with this kind of a committee, an advisory committee, and you were part of that?

EM: It was called the Women's Studies Committee. It's function was to serve as a faculty would do in a department.

CAC: From surrogate faculty?

EM: Right. Members of the committee were appointed by Roger Page; but, once they started programming Women's Studies courses and Women's Studies classes were approved with that rubric, then the people who taught those classes were free to come to the meetings and participate in the decisions.

CAC: I'm sure there was a conscious effort in the early years to keep it an open and an informal rather than a tightly administered program?

EM: It was the most open, the most informal configuration you ever imagined. Students were vocal, listened to, and had a great deal to do with how things were run.

CAC: Again, these were both undergraduate and graduate students and from a variety of departments and programs?

EM: Right.

CAC: I'm sure, as you know, lacking a graduate component of the Women's Studies program, at least until very recently, that most of the dissertations and theses were done bootlegged, so to speak, in American Studies. That was the home that most of them came out of.

EM: I'm sure that was true.

CAC: Within the faculty, or within the college community, or the university community, where did real leadership come from? Obviously, Toni McNaron was the first coordinator and she had to have a lot of initiative. You're suggesting that students were bubbling through; but, within the faculty, what persons do you think were influential in bringing order out of this chaos that you describe?

EM: Mary Turpie came to a lot of those meetings; but, I can't say that she brought any order to it. Mary was not all that interested. Janet Spector, from the very beginning, was a mover, a hard worker, committed. Shirley Garner in the English Department and Mimi [Madelon] Gokey [Sprengnether] were both interested and came to most of the meetings.

CAC: Shirley Clark, although not teaching in the field, seemed . . .

EM: Shirley, as a vice-president, gave a lot of leadership and was very effective. Shirley and I used to feel that the two of us were called upon to do a lot of the balancing in the committee. There was another young woman, Diane Isaacs . . . Diane Isaacs, Mary Turpie, Shirley Clark, Adelle Donchenko, as long as she was there, and I considered ourselves often voting in a way different from a lot of the other people. The management of that Women's Studies Committee was very, very difficult because there was this tremendous effort to be open to everybody and nobody was really in charge. The administration was very difficult. But, I'm pleased to see how they have survived.

CAC: It didn't overlap with what CEW was doing?

EM: No, it really didn't. We worked together very, very well. Oftentimes in Women's Studies . . . they couldn't offer a course if they didn't have the money to pay for the teacher. We could offer it through Continuing Education for Women and if we didn't get enough students to pay the teacher, we could cancel the class . . . something that they couldn't do in Women's Studies.

CAC: Right.

EM: One of the more successful classes on campus, one of the classes that has probably served more women than any other one class, is the Sense of Identity Class that Dorothy Loeffler and Lois Fiedler started. That was offered as an experimental course through Social Science for one year. After that, we were able to get a Women's Studies rubric for that class. Then, ever since, it's been offered only through Continuing Education for Women.

CAC: Students who are regularly enrolled can take that course for credit and apply it to the regular course program?

EM: Yes, as is true of any Extension class.

CAC: There really had to be this kind of cooperation between the two programs.

EM: Then, a few years after the committee had been formed, Anne Truax from the Women's Center was added to the committee so that there was the liaison between that Women's Center and the Women's Studies Committee.

CAC: The Women's Center was autonomous from Continuing Education for Women?

EM: Yes.

CAC: That was set up by the university, by the college?

EM: The original Minnesota Plan—all of this is documented in the assessment survey done in the Northwest Area Grant and all that material is available in CEW files—was originally financed

by the Carnegie Corporation. When the university decided that even without Carnegie Corporation money, they would continue having a program for a Continuing Education for Women program, the duties of the old Minnesota Plan were split so that some of the student services, employment, and child care was given to the unit that turned out to be eventually to be the Women's Center and the programming and advising all stayed in Continuing Education and Extension.

CAC: You served for some time as Equal Employment Opportunity officer for the Women's Studies program?

EM: Did I?

CAC: Your record says so. Maybe you don't remember it quickly. I was wondering what business it had to do if it's affirmative action and employment, of course, you were going to employ women.

EM: I did that for a long time in Continuing Education for Women; but then, I had somebody else do it. Actually, all that involves usually is signing papers, signing documents, meaning that you have interviewed enough women, enough other racial . . .

CAC: Let me assure you that in line departments, it wasn't a proforma. It was a very important kind of . . .

EM: [laughter] It was really easy in my department. It was really easy in Women's Studies.

CAC: CEW came to have a great deal of visibility in the community but also within the university, which is to say that I suspect that vice-presidents and presidents were aware and supportive of it as well as one's own dean and one's own home in Continuing Education?

EM: Very true. Very true. President [C. Peter] Magrath and Diane Magrath were very supportive. We had a number of meetings at Eastcliff. Diane Magrath spoke at one of our Women's Day on Campus events. President Magrath made some presentations to us. Whenever I was at his house, he always spoke very kindly of Continuing Education for Women. When we went through the first of a number of retrenchments and [Kenneth] Keller and Magrath talked with Continuing Education and Extension groups, they often suggested cutting budgets in the World Affairs Center. They suggested cutting budgets in various other departments; but, they never once mentioned cutting the budget in Continuing Education for Women.

CAC: President [Malcolm] Moos had other priorities and other pressures other than these women's programs. You didn't have the same kind of relationship or support from President Moos as with President Magrath?

EM: I never knew him as well. I knew C. Peter much better than I ever knew President Moos. Mrs. Moos did the president's wife thing in that she came and poured coffee at some of our orientation programs in the fall.

CAC: Did you go to national conventions for CEW? Is there a national kind of coalition?

EM: Yes, the National University Extension Association. Yes, I went to a lot of conventions.

CAC: What sense do you have of this university's program in Continuing Education for Women as against what certainly was a national movement?

EM: We were far ahead of everybody else. We had more classes, more staff, more support, more money, more students, more programs, more everything than everybody else.

CAC: How do you account for that? Why should Minnesota have been in the visible position of leadership?

EM: First of all, because we got an early start; but, we were also financially supported and morally supported to a much greater extent than a lot of other institutions were. What happened in a lot of other institutions was that they never really got into the programming so that they didn't have any money. Because we were collecting fees and tuition, we had a lot of money that we could spend; so, it was possible for us to hire more help and do more things. A lot of those programs—this is the right way to start—started with a psychologist who counselled people and helped them get into the regular university classes . . . so that they didn't build that outreach program that we built.

CAC: CEW here on campus, had its own counseling staff?

EM: We used Dr. Schletzer's counselling staff in Extension.

CAC: But, they weren't assigned specifically to your program; although, they were sensitive to the needs of your students?

EM: Yes, especially since Dr. Schletzer had, for a short time, been the director of the Continuing Education for Women program before she set up the Counseling Department in Continuing Education and Extension.

CAC: Your responses and my questions are sometimes known in the academic world as begging the question. I asked why Minnesota did so well and then there are a lot of things that are true, objectively true, that you're saying . . . the structure here was better, the fees were there, the support system, etcetera; but, they maybe here because of qualities in this community.

EM: I was just going to say one thing we haven't talked about—I should have thought of it when you said, "Why did you do better than anybody else?"—we did have the community. This is, after all, two large cities. We have a large seven county population to draw from; so, the market was here.

CAC: This would be less true of other large state universities, Wisconsin, Indiana, and so on?

EM: Yes, or Ames, Iowa, wouldn't have this kind of a community to draw from. Our students came from Stillwater, White Bear, Red Wing, Wayzata, the whole seven county area . . . sometimes Rochester.

CAC: And had been accustomed in other areas to think of the university as their university, as a community university?

EM: Yes.

CAC: That's an impossible question; but, it's one that as I've done these interviews has occurred to me so often. Different universities, like all institutions, have their own personality, and history, and style.

EM: As a Land-Grant university, too, we've always . . . I think from the very beginning, this university has been . . . I think we have the first Continuing Education and Extension . . .

CAC: I didn't know that.

EM: . . . of a Land-Grant university; so, it has a long record of extending out to university and serving the community. It's only natural that it would be open to serving a particular group of people—that is to say, women.

CAC: President Moos, when he came in 1967, 1968, used the phrase communiversity. He had in mind primarily various dispossessed groups, which is to say, minority, ethnic, and racial groups; but, certainly the Continuing Education for Women would fit into that kind of outreach.

EM: He was very open to the beginnings of the Minnesota Plan. After all, it was Liz Kless and Virginia Senders who came up with the idea of Continuing Education for Women and who applied for the money from the Carnegie Corporation. There was a man named . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

EM: . . . Donald K. Smith who was very, very instrumental in getting the Minnesota Plan here to start with.

CAC: He later, himself, became a vice-president and then went to the University of Wisconsin as an administrative officer.

EM: He was very helpful and he was still here when I was here. He coordinated the old Arts of Reading Seminar for several years when I first came.

CAC: Right. There were certain bread and butter courses, weren't there? There was the New Worlds of Knowledge . . .

EM: Ideas in America, Arts of Reading, Culture in Society . . .

CAC: What was the Culture in Society?

EM: A lot of sociology and anthropology.

CAC: Who helped set that core course up?

EM: There was a sociologist named Joel for awhile. That class was never as popular as the others. Then, there was an anthropologist . . . the one who went to Alaska.

CAC: That's a pretty interesting story.

EM: We also had a lot of support from John Turner who, I think, has brought a great deal of political savvy to a lot of the leaders that are working in both parties in this town today.

CAC: I had a long interview with him. We're kind of meandering now; but, I think we've had a very fruitful hour and a half conversation about lots of very exciting and important things at the university.

EM: I think it was a glorious time. I refer to some years as the halcyon years. [laughter]

CAC: I hope it's not nostalgia of older persons; but, people whom I'm interviewing have had their careers in the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s; so, it's our years. As I've shared with you so often and with others my intellectual excitement really got going in the mid 1960s. Things were just breaking loose everywhere in the college, in the university, and in my own writing and scholarship. I think that you're reflecting that . . . that CEW was part of that general ferment in the 1960s and 1970s.

EM: It was really exciting.

CAC: That's a high point to buzz off on. Thank you very much.

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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